## **Architectural Committee Meeting Minutes – December 3, 2020**

BSAC/Staff in Attendance:	Guests:	<b>Project Attending For:</b>
Amy San Nicolas	Kris Nunn	#04630
	Grant Jardine	#06545
Using GoTo Meeting:	Corey Kelly	#06034
Stacy Ossorio	Peter Fischer	#06545
Suzan Scott		
John Gladstein		
John Seelye		
Gary Walton		
Grant Hilton		
Clay Lorinsky		
		taken to prevent the spread of the Covid19, all BSAC allowed to join the meeting remotely using GoToMeeting.

- 1. **Membership Forum** None
- **2.** Call to Order called the meeting to order at 9:01 AM.
- 3. Meeting Minutes November 19, 2020 corrections: none

### Motion made by Clay Lorinsky to approve the November 19, 2020 Meeting Minutes; seconded by Stacy Ossorio. Motion passed with Grant Hilton abstaining.

### 4. Alteration to Approved Plan Review

BSOA #04630 Bob Rowe

Legal: Meadow Village Block 6 Lot 30

Street: 1350 Spotted Elk

Staff presented the Rowe Alteration to Approved Plan Application for an additional buried 500 gallon propane tank to be located on the north western side of the existing home. The original application was a major alteration approved in September 2019. One Alteration to the Approved Plan had already been accepted by the Committee, so there was a fee for this application. All proposed work was compliant with the relevant Governing Documents.

Staff recommended the Committee approve this application as submitted.

It was noted by Stacy Ossorio that she had sold this property to the applicant a few years back but the Committee did not feel this was a conflict of interest. There was general discussion about the reason for installing a second propane tank.

# Motion made by John Gladstein to approve the application as submitted; seconded by John Seelye. Motion passed unanimously.

BSOA #06545 Hill Condos Legal: Cascade Block 1 Lot 5A Street: 21 Sitting Bull Road

Prior to discussing the application, the Committee discussed the Applicants request for waiver of the after-the-fact fee. The Committee was reminded that in accordance with the Procedure Resolution a waiver of fees is considered when a project benefits the entire Association and that the fees are tied to the work of the staff in review of an application. It was the Committee's opinion that this application was not an example of an appropriate request in which a waiver of fees could be approved.

# Motion made by John Gladstein to deny the request to waive the fees; seconded by Clay Lorinsky. Motion passed unanimously.

Staff presented the Hill Condo Association Alteration to Approved Plan Application starting with a recap of the previously approved Major Alteration Application from February 2019 and the history of the current situation. During the course of construction on the first phase of the project, a member of the Hill Condo Association complained to the State about the limited amount of lights being installed on the exterior of the building. This prompted the State to send inspectors to the project who threatened to shut it down if more lights were not added. There was back and forth communication between Alpine, the management company overseeing the project, and the State office in Helena. Ultimately, the State issued a requirement of 1 footcandle (11 lux) per 1 square foot of walking surface on the stairways and Alpine took this requirement to their electrician and a lighting specialist to bring the project into compliance with the State. Reluctantly the State inspectors approved the modification, noting they would still be more comfortable with even more lights. As a point of unintentional oversight, Alpine did not apply at the time for an Alteration to Approved Plan with the BSAC but after a complaint from a Hill Condo member came to the BSOA about the change, staff contacted Alpine and an application was immediately submitted. It was noted that the work had been partially completed but had not been completed entirely.

Staff recommended the Committee discuss the new lighting fixtures and placement in relation to the Design Regulation requirement for dark-sky lighting prior to approving the application, noting that the placement and amount of lights were required by State.

The Committee discussed the lighting fixtures and staff noted that the dual head security light was positioned downward on the doors at the top of each building and were motion activated. The Committee felt the dual headed light might not comply with the Design Regulations and the applicant expressed the difficulties Hill Condo faced in this situation. There was discussion about the brightness of each light and particularly the halo light, which could be turned up to 5000 kelvins. It was noted that these lights would be set to 3000 kelvins. The exterior conduits were also discussed as an unappealing addition to the remodel. The applicant reported that the electrician was installing and replacing conduit as needed. Hill Condo Owner Peter Fischer expressed concerns about the amount of lighting that were potentially noncompliant as well as

the decision to install the conduit on the exterior instead of on the interior of the buildings. The applicant confirmed that the Hill Condo Owners Association (HCOA) Board had met, reviewed, and approved this project. The HCOA board was not thrilled about it but worked with the electrician, architect and State Inspector, to meet the state requirement which was approved by the State after a review of one building installation that had been completed. It was noted that due to the age and condition of the Hill Condos, the applicant had been particularly limited in choices for resolution.

Motion made by Grant Hilton to approve the application as submitted noting the single lights would be set at 3000 kelvins, the applicant would investigate a way to aesthetically improve the exterior conduit, and granting an exception to Design Regulation 3.13 due to the State's requirements; seconded by John Seelye. Motion passed unanimously. Chair abstained.

#### 5. SFR Final Plan Review

BSOA #06034 Jason Nickell Legal: Cascade Block 1 Lot 34

Street: TBD White Otter

Staff presented the plans for the Nickell Single-Family Residence Final Plan Application. The sketch plan was approved on November 5, 2020 with three exceptions for the retaining wall length and location, the permanent structures outside the setbacks including a hammerhead portion of driveway, and a structurally necessary excess of fill as well as a condition that the rooflines in excess of the 40-foot max be brought into compliance. There were no significant changes to the plan since sketch plan approval other than the roofline and setback issues which were addressed to be compliant and a small increase in overall square footage. Staff presented the revised elevations noting the increased width of the chimney which brough the roofline into compliance, and presented finalized renderings of the home noting the location of the hot tub. It appeared that the hot tub was not screened additionally to the topography and staff noted that the view angle faced down slope toward the resort and ski slopes.

Staff presented the landscape plan noting 17,500 square feet of seeding, 14 trees of various species, 17 shrubs, and 44 ornamental grasses as well as the pertinent section of the Design Regulations related to the hot tub screening. The lighting plan included four different kinds of lights: a decorative sconce of which there would be a total of six, two different types of recessed cans of which there would be a total of ten, and an adjustable monopoint light of which there would be four on the south elevation lower story. Staff referenced the relevant section of the design regulations for lighting.

Staff recommended the Committee discuss the following items prior to approving the application: roof length changes, lighting fixtures, lack of hot tub screening, and need for an address sign detail.

The Committee discussed the amount of the monopoints and their orientation determining it was compliant; the roofline adjustment and determined it was now compliant; the hot tub location and lack of additional screening and determined that since it was recessed in the lower patio extending only 14 inches above the ground and there were a decent amount of trees at the bottom of the property that the hot tub was compliant; and finally that the applicant and staff would communicate about the address sign detail to get it approved.

Motion made by Grant Hilton to approve the application as submitted subject to staff approval of the address marker and conditional on the receipt of the Fire Department approval for the driveway length prior to construction; seconded by Stacy Ossorio. Motion passed unanimously.

#### 6. Discussion Items:

- a. Staff Approvals and Releases: Staff reported one staff approval, details of which were included in the packet, and one release.
- b. Member Compliance Tracking Report: Three new compliance issues were reported including: a construction parking issue on Swift Bear, the Hill Condo lighting complaint, and the unapproved installation of a shed on Little Coyote. No action was requested of the Committee by Staff.
- c. Performance Deposit Tracking/Active Project List Update: Staff presented the updated Performance Deposit Tracking sheet.
- d. Pinnacles Sketch Plan update: Legal Committee reviewed the application and the entire history of the project. The Committee found that in 2003 the original owner of the Pinnacle Condos, then Grey Goose, received approval to an ODP and plat amendment from Madison County on the tract in question with the condition that in order to build the 8 Single-Family Condominiums, the developer had to meet the 28-foot height maximum for Cascade Single-Family Residences. It was Legal Committee's recommendation that the provisional sketch approval be withdrawn and that any application going forward would need to meet the 28' max requirement. Additionally, the Legal Committee would work with staff to compose an official letter updating the applicant on this recommendation.

7. Hajouin	With nothing farthe	r to discuss,	the meeting ac	godined at 10.11	> 1 <b>1111.</b>
Gary Walton, BSA	AC Chairman				

Adjourn - With nothing further to discuss the meeting adjourned at 10:19 AM