

Architectural Committee Meeting Minutes – December 2, 2021

BSAC/Staff in Attendance:

Amy San Nicolas
Suzan Scott
John Seelye
Stacy Ossorio
Clay Lorinsky
Gary Walton

Guests:

Jackson Trout
Brett Gaylis
Joe Schwem
Mike Hall
Doug Bing
Sarah Palakovich
Caroline Peterson

Project Attending for:

#06294
#06294
#06074A
#02514
#07715
#07715

Using GoTo Meeting (GT):

Maggie Good

Due to precautions being taken to prevent the spread of the Covid19, all BSAC members and guests were allowed to join the meeting remotely using GoToMeeting.

1. **Membership Forum** - None
2. **Call to Order** – The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM.
3. **Meeting Minutes** – November 18, 2021 Meeting Minutes Corrections: None.

Motion made by Clay Lorinsky to approve the November 18, 2021 Meeting; seconded by John Seelye. Motion passed.

4. Single-Family Residence – Sketch:

BSOA: 06294 Gaylis

Legal: Cascade Block 4 lot 294

Street: TBD White Grass

Staff presented the Gaylis Sketch Plan review which proposed a two-story traditional mountain home that was 5,042 square feet with a 779 square foot two-car garage. The home included five bedrooms and six bathrooms while the finish materials would include: asphalt singles, standing seam metal roof, wood fascia and trim, horizontal and vertical wood siding, aluminum-clad windows, stone veneer, stone retaining walls, and a steel/cable railing system. The average height was just below 28-feet, the max height in Cascade; the max ridgeline fell at 37-feet, and staff noted that the deepest point of fill would exceed the max by about six feet and that the driveway would be roughly 345 feet long requiring fire department approval and turnarounds. After discussion at the meeting on November 4, 2021, the applicant submitted several more drawings and plans that better detailed the scope of the height in relation to the existing grade. The new drawings showed that the house would be approximately 28'3" from four feet above existing grade, although proposed grade would be higher than that. The applicant expressed that the 3" would be a simple adjustment that could be made to the roof for final. The neighbors to the east submitted an email on December 1, 2021 stating that as long as the proposed home was compliant, they were in support of the project and only asked that the Committee ensure only the minimum number of trees be removed for the build to protect privacy.

Staff recommended the Committee grant exceptions to Design Regulations 3.2 and 3.4 for the retaining walls and the fill and to approve the application as submitted, conditional on fire department approval of the driveway and an updated site plan.

There was discussion about how the new height was calculated and it was clarified that the new height calculations were based on a max of 4' above existing grade as allowed by the Design Regulations. The applicant represented that the house could not be built on the lot without the fill due to the topography. The Committee questioned whether or not the homes on either side had to build on fill also and whether the existing trees were higher than the proposed buildings. The architect responded yes to both questions. It was noted that no variance was required and that the Committee had the discretion to determine whether or not the height of a proposed building would impact a view unreasonably, and if it determined that the view was impacted unreasonably, to require the height measure be determined from existing grade. The Committee ultimately determined the views from either adjacently lot were not unreasonably impacted by the proposed home.

Motion made by John Seelye to approve the application as submitted with exceptions for the fill and retaining walls; seconded by Stacy Ossorio. Motion passed.

BSOA: 06074A Landry
Legal: Cascade Block 2 lot 274A
Street: 11 Swift Bear

Staff presented the Landry Sketch Plan Review which consisted of a two-story cabin style home that was 2640 square foot home with a 448 square foot garage, three bedrooms, and four bathrooms. The proposed finish materials would include: asphalt and metal roof, horizontal log slab siding, stucco siding, wood trim and fascia, and metal clad windows. The average height was around 27-feet and the applicant increased the width of the chimney to bring the ridgeline down to the 40-foot max.

Staff recommended the Committee approve the application as submitted.

Motion made by Clay Lorinsky to approve the application as submitted; seconded by John Seelye. Motion passed with four in favor and one against.

5. Major Alteration – Alteration to Approved Plan:

BSOA: 02514 Volosin
Legal: AG Block A lot 14
Street: 879 Andesite Road

Staff presented the Volosin Alteration to Approved plan application, represented by Mike Hall. The original application was to add a sunroom to the front of the home, a patio space, bump out the mud room next to the garage, extend the master bedroom at the back of residence, bump out the master closet to the North West, and modify the roofline over the master bedroom. The alteration to approved plan would reduce the scope of this addition project to only the first floor and reduce the size of the additions on the lower level to just a new deck, extended living room, and bump out the mudroom/garage. The modified roofline would not exceed existing height and all materials would match existing except for a standing seam metal roof over the master bedroom and mud room. There were no proposed changes to the landscape or lighting plans.

Staff recommended the Committee approve the application as submitted.

Motion made by Maggie Good to approve as submitted; seconded by John Seelye. Motion passed.

6. Minor/Landscape Alt.

BSOA: #07715 Barkley Ranch LLC

Legal: COS 2826B Lots 2A-1B, 3A

Street: TBD Upper Chief Joseph

Staff presented the Barkley Ranch Landscape Alteration which proposed the installation of a 1685-foot driveway to the proposed building site on lot 2A-1b. The proposed driveway would begin on lot 3A, also owner by the applicant, and terminate on the west side of lot 2A-1b. It would also require extensive retaining walls that did not meet Design Regulation Standards. Staff noted that no building design had been submitted or approved at this point, that there was no precedence for approval of a driveway prior to approval of a building design, but that the County had determined the building envelope did not infringe on any of its governing documents, and the properties Declarations describe a need for the BSAC to consider exceptions for this property due to its size and nature. The applicant also submitted a disturbed area calculation for the entirety of the driveway and a distribution calculation of that disturbance between his two properties.

Staff recommended the Committee discuss the project classification and related fees, the proposed new location of the driveway, the retaining walls, the current compliance issue on the property, and the list of items staff requested of the applicant by email prior to granting any approval. Staff also recommended a higher performance deposit based on the scope and size of the project as well as the lack of an approved building plan.

Motion made by John Seelye to treat the application as a Major alteration with the review fee of \$300 and \$5000 Performance Deposit on each lot; seconded by Clay Lorinsky. Motion passed.

Attorney Sarah Palakovich attend the meeting to represent adjacent property owners: Coones, Kaufman, and Noel. She presented client concerns about future plans of the lot specifically plans to subdivided and the number of home sites planned with relation to the view shed restrictions. Deed language for the Barkley Ranch properties suggested possible subdivision as well as deed restrictions for view sheds which the applicant representative did not request further information on. It was noted that this would be outside of BSAC purview but might be pertinent information in the applicant's design of the driveway and home. There were some concerns from the Committee about hearing the application while the property was technically out of compliance but the chair noted that the Bylaws require a Board action to suspend a member's rights and privileges which had not been made.

The applicant representative clarified the driveway would terminate to the proposed building site shown on the site plan, the property Declarations allow for four buildings to be built on the lot and the owner intended to build four buildings, but that there had been no discussion of subdividing the lot and no plans for having an office built there for sales. A Committee member noted that current driveway terminus would not reflect where the end would be after all buildings had been constructed because those buildings would need to be accessed. Staff noted that, due to the unique nature of the project, neighbor notification did go out in a timely fashion to all adjacent neighbors and known interested parties.

Motion made by John Seelye to approve the sketch plan as submitted with an exception to 3.6 for the retaining walls; seconded by Maggie Good. Motion passed two in favor, one against and one present. Stacy Ossorio recused herself from the vote for a conflict of interest.

Given the unique application and the amount of time already devoted to it by both the Committee and the applicant, the Committee decided that with no further information required, final approval could be considered at this time. It was noted that a remediation plan for the noncompliance would be required to be submitted to Staff and determined acceptable prior to any work commencing.

Motion made by John Seelye to consider final plan review at this time and to grant final approval to the application conditional on the submission of an acceptable remediation plan for the area within the utility easement disturbed by the adjacent property owner prior to the commencement of construction; seconded by Clay Lorinsky. Motion passed with four in favor. Stacy Ossorio recused herself from the vote for a conflict of interest.

7. Discussion:

- a. *Covenant Amendment Items:* Staff presented an excerpt of minutes from May 2018 and asked the Committee to discuss whether or not the listed recommendations for Covenant amendments still answered the needs of the Committee and membership. The following additions were recommended for discussion: Meadow Village height restriction be changed to 28' and whether or not ADUs could be allowed there; the requirements for Single-Family Condo across all Covenants be considered given the complex nature of a single-family dwelling being situated on a multi-family tract.
- b. *Staff Releases and Approvals:* Staff made no approval and no releases since the last meeting.
- c. *Compliance Tracking Report:* Staff updated the Committee on ongoing compliance issues.
- d. *Performance Deposit Tracking:* Nothing new to report.
- e. *Design Regulations Revision Subcommittee:* Nothing new to report.

8. Adjourn – Due to lack of quorum, the meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Gary Walton, BSAC Chairman