



Architectural Committee Meeting Minutes – July 16, 2020

BSAC/Staff in Attendance:

Jess Bevilacqua

Using GoTo Meeting:

Brian Wheeler

Suzan Scott

John Gladstein

Trever McSpadden

Grant Hilton

Kate Scott

Maggie Good

Dan Hoadley

Guests:

Todd Fowler

LeAnne McMahon

Cassandra Elwell

Mike & Nina Rowe

Katie & Erik Morrison

Rebecca Bagley

Frank Cikan

Jaime Dugaard

Project Attending For:

#04619 Fowler

#04317 McMahon

#06171A Rowe/#06300 Horne

#06171A Rowe

#06171A Rowe

#06267 Bagley

#06218A Lone Peak Land Co (Israel)

#02514 Volosin

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 GoTo Meeting.

1. Membership Forum - none

2. Call to Order - Brian Wheeler called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM.

3. Meeting Minutes – Maggie Good made a Motion to approve the June 18, 2020 Meeting Minutes. Kate Scott seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

4. Minor Alteration Review

BSOA #04619 Fowler Minor Alterations

Legal: Meadow Village Block 6 Lot 19

Street: 2160 Spotted Elk Road

Staff presented the plans for the Fowler minor alterations application. The application was to replace the existing asphalt roof, repaint the siding and trim and replace windows on the home. Todd Fowler attended the call. Staff presented samples of the proposed paint colors, roof material, and photos of the existing home. Staff recommended the application be approved as submitted. Mr. Fowler noted that he wished to give the home a more modern appearance in correlation with surrounding homes.

John Gladstein made a Motion to approve the application as submitted. Kate Scott seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

BSOA #04317 McMahon Minor Alterations

Legal: Meadow Village Block 3 Lot 17

Street: 2160 Spotted Elk Road

Staff presented the plans for the McMahon minor alterations application, represented by LeAnne McMahon. The application was to add a staircase to the rear deck of the home, install underground

irrigation and install an underground propane tank. The paint of the staircase would match the paint color of the existing deck.

Staff presented photos of the home and asked Mrs. McMahon to confirm the location of the staircase. Staff had asked Mrs. McMahon to confirm that none of the proposed improvements interfered with setbacks as it was difficult to tell from the site aerial provided. Mrs. McMahon confirmed that none of the improvements interfered with setbacks. Mrs. McMahon also confirmed that the location of the staircase would be on the opposite side of the deck as originally indicated, making the diagram provided a “mirror image” of the actual location of the staircase.

A BSAC member noted concern with the location of the staircase not being accurate on the submitted plan. Staff noted that this change had only recently been communicated in the last couple days. It was agreed that Mrs. McMahon would provide an updated drawing showing the correct location of the deck.

Grant Hilton made a Motion to approve the application as submitted subject to the applicant providing staff an accurate diagram of the deck location. Trever McSpadden seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

5. Variance Request Review

BSOA #06171A Rowe Building Envelope Variance

Legal: Cascade Block 3 Lot 171A

Street: TBD Speaking Eagle Road

Staff presented a variance request from owners Michael and Nina Rowe, represented by Cassandra Elwell. The request was to move the existing building envelope back toward the rear of the lot to avoid questionable soil conditions at the front of the lot. Staff explained that according to the applicant, Geotech results found problematic (sandy) soils at the front of the current building envelope and that test pits toward the back of lot did not contain the same sandy soil. AE Dynamics, the structural engineer for the project, recommended the house not be placed on varied soil or differential settling could occur and cause damage to the home. The applicant believes that the proposed building envelope location and home design have taken into account neighboring views and height requirements, and that the street view will be minimized with the proposed placement of the home/envelope if the variance were to be approved. AE Dynamics had provided a summary of their recommendation. Staff had distributed the letter from the applicant, the letter from AE Dynamics, and feedback from three surrounding neighbors to the BSAC prior to the meeting.

Staff noted that since the time the variance request was originally submitted, there had been negotiations between the applicant and Ms. Elwell and three neighbors, the Morrison's, the Pugh's, and the Walker's regarding the exact placement of the building envelope. Only recently was the location for the building envelope found to be acceptable by the Pugh's and the Walker's, with the Morrison's still objecting to the move. Staff had provided the revised location to the two other neighbors, one of which did not object to the final proposed location and one of which did not respond, but did not object to the original proposal which moved the home by approximately 25'.

Staff presented the existing vs. proposed building envelope locations, site photos and a sketch of the proposed home. It was noted that the home would be presented in more detail at the sketch plan review, and the drawings were to help the committee and neighbors get an idea of how neighboring views would be affected if the building envelope were to be moved as proposed. Staff presented the variance criteria outlined in the design regulations and Cascade Covenants, noting that the design regulation language

had changed recently and became effective at the last Board meeting. Staff noted that neighbor concerns and impact would have to be considered in the approval of this or any variance.

Ms. Elwell spoke on behalf of the Rowe's and stated that the building envelope would only be moved 10' back in an effort to avoid the sandy soil, and complimented the neighbors for working together with the Rowe's.

Mike Rowe stated that he was very concerned with the sandy soils and did not believe the new location of the building envelope would cause the home to interfere with the sight lines of surrounding homes. Mr. Rowe noted that he was willing to replace trees to mitigate any view issues but was not able to reach an agreement with Katie and Erik Morrison, who objected to moving the building envelope as requested. Mr. Rowe believed that they had met the criteria required for variances and had taken into account the impact on neighbors.

Katie Morrison noted that when walking the lot with the Rowe's, it appeared the house would still be in the sandy soil and that the variance seemed based on a design element regarding the front patio. Mrs. Morrison believed that moving the home back would affect the view corridor from their home unfavorably.

Mrs. Morrison referenced an exhibit provided by their architect. Staff was unable to locate the exhibit, as it did not come through with the email providing the Morrison's final comments to the committee. Mr. Morrison resent the email to staff and staff confirmed that the images did not come through with the original email.

The BSAC discussed the nature of the variance request and asked if there is any evidence that the home could absolutely not be built in the existing envelope. Ms. Elwell confirmed that there is not.

Mr. Rowe reiterated his concerns with the placement of the existing building envelope and stated that if the variance request was denied, they would be required to compress the center of the home, potentially raising the second story height and making the home narrower and longer.

The BSAC continued to discuss the variance. Ms. Elwell was asked to clarify how much of the home would still be in the sandy soil area even with the new envelope location. Ms. Elwell noted that a portion of the northwest corner of the home would still be in the sandy soil area.

BSAC members continued to weigh in on the variance, and the design regulation 7.1.2 regarding undue hardship was discussed. It was noted that the Cascade Covenants were designed to protect property owners who have already designed and built their home based on the location of surrounding building envelopes. Several BSAC members agreed that this variance request did not rise to the level of an undue hardship.

Maggie Good made a Motion to deny the variance request. John Gladstein seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

The reason for the denial of the variance request given by the BSAC was that the hardship presented did not rise to the level of an undue hardship as described in design regulation 7.1.2

Mr. Rowe thanked the BSAC and staff for the consideration of the variance.

6. Alteration to Approved Plan Review

BSOA #06267 Bagley SFR

Legal: Cascade Block 4 Lot 267

Street: TBD Little Wolf Road

Staff presented the plans for the Bagley alteration to approved plan application. The final plan had been approved in July 2019 and is nearing completion. The request was to change the approved metal siding over the bump out area to a black painted wood siding due to delivery issues with the original materials, to replace with Pines and reconfigure some Aspen trees near the entry view of the home, and to add several retaining walls that were deemed necessary due to the site layout.

Staff presented the new proposed material and a revised site plan. The walls ranged from 9-15' in length with the longer wall along the driveway totaling approximately 40' in length. There were five walls, all composed of natural boulder of which a photo was provided, and none exceeding 4' in height.

A BSAC member noted that they liked the Aspen trees better. Mrs. Bagley noted that after living in the area they preferred to have Pine trees. A BSAC member noted that it appeared the changes had already been made. Mrs. Bagley confirmed that the changes had already been made. Another BSAC member noted concerns with how staff presented the application. Staff noted that for projects in process it has been agreed by the BSAC in the past that there are no "after the fact" approvals, and that applicants understand that when they move forward with unapproved changes it is sometimes necessary at that point in construction, but it is at their own risk.

Trever McSpadden made a Motion to approve the application as submitted. Kate Scott seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

7. Major Alteration Sketch Plan Review

BSOA #06218A Lone Peak Land Co Major Alteration

Legal: Cascade Block 3 Lot 218A

Street: 38 Middle Rider Road

Staff presented the plans for the Lone Peak Land Company major alteration sketch plan application, represented by Frank Cikan. The owners are Dan and Cyndi Israel. The application was to remodel the interior kitchen of the home which would require bumping out a wall and reconfiguring the roof slightly. A deck would also be added to the south side of the home, several windows would be replaced, and the asphalt roof which was over 25 years old would be replaced with a cold roof to prevent ice damming issues. Finish materials would match the existing home. Mr. Cikan had stated in the application that the overall height of the home would not be increased by the proposed renovations.

Staff presented existing vs. proposed elevations, floor plans and a site plan. A BSAC member noted that the upgrade was appreciated. Another BSAC member asked if the proposed deck addition was within the building envelope. Staff presented the site plan again and noted that the deck was shown to be within the building envelope.

Maggie Good made a Motion to approve the application as submitted. John Gladstein seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

BSOA #02514 Volosin Major Alteration

Legal: Aspen Groves Block A Lot 14

Street: 879 Andesite Road

Staff presented the plans for the Volosin major alteration application, represented by Jaime Daugaard. The application was for several miscellaneous renovations including the following: adding a sunroom and additional patio space, bumping out the mud room next to the garage, extending the master bedroom toward the back of the home and bumping out the master closet. The roofline would be modified to accommodate the renovated master bedroom but would not increase the height of the home. Materials would match the existing home, with the exception of a section of standing seam metal roof over the master bedroom and mud room.

Staff presented the proposed and existing elevations and floor plans for the proposed renovations, as well as the height calculation provided by Centre Sky. Staff noted that a more detailed construction parking and management plan would be required for final, per the request of the Aspen Groves HOA.

Mr. Daugaard noted that the architectural aesthetic of the existing home would be mimicked in the proposed renovations.

Kate Scott made a Motion to approve the application as submitted, Grant Hilton seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

8. SFR Final Plan Review

BSOA #06300 Horne SFR Final Plan

Legal: Cascade Block 4 Lot 300

Street: TBD White Grass Road

Staff presented the plans for the Horne SFR final plan application. The sketch plan was approved in February 2020 with no conditions, though a parking area was noted as an item to be confirmed at final review. The application was represented by Cassandra Elwell. Staff noted that there were no noted changes to the final plan since sketch approval, and that the parking area in question was on the final site plan.

Staff presented the renderings of the home which had not changed since sketch plan approval. Staff presented a landscape plan with minimal features and pointed out the additional parking spaces off of the driveway. Staff presented the lighting plan noting a wall sconce fixture and six recessed cans over the deck/outdoor dining area. Staff asked Ms. Elwell to confirm the size of the cans. Ms. Elwell confirmed that they are 6" cans. Staff presented photos of the finish materials which had been provided by Josh Greene prior to the meeting.

Maggie Good made a Motion to approve the application as submitted. John Gladstein seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

9. Discussion Items:

a) Member Report Tracking Update

Staff provided an update on 2510 Curley Bear Road, the site of a home fire in 2019 that is owned by the Wolfram's and was rented at the time of the fire. Jon Epstein, a relative of the Wolfram's, responded to the letter sent by staff at the request of the BSAC and explained that because the

home was rented at the time of the fire, they are still working to resolve insurance claims. Staff noted that Mr. Epstein had stated politely in an email that any further concerns should be directed to their attorney.

Grant Hilton had originally raised the complaint regarding the Wolfram home and noted that several neighbors had approached him and there were concerns with the home being an attractive nuisance to kids and potentially attracting vagrants. The BSAC discussed how to proceed and if the issue should be raised to the legal committee. It was agreed that staff will provide correspondence to the legal committee for a determination on how to proceed.

Mr. Hilton also voiced a complaint about parking in front of an empty lot on Curley Bear that appeared to be overflow from Glacier Condos, and requested that the existing no parking sign be moved. Executive Director Suzan Scott noted that staff could move the no parking sign without BSAC approval and place a notice on the car and have it towed if it remains.

Per a complaint from Maggie Good regarding trees being cut down at the end of Black Moon Road, staff had investigated the area and asked Ms. Good to clarify the complaint and the location of the trees being removed. Ms. Good stated that the trees had been cut through the property and provided staff with a map. Ms. Good noted that the complaint was being made per a discussion with Eric Ossorio. A discussion took place regarding proper procedure for complaints and BSAC review for site disturbances. It is unclear what the reason for the tree removal is at this time. Staff will re-investigate and reach out to the lot owner before recommending any next steps.

b) Performance Deposit Tracking Update

Staff presented the active project/performance deposit list. Several more performance deposits have been received. Staff noted that there is a growing queue of projects due for inspection.

c) Variance Language Update

Executive Director Suzan Scott had informed staff that the proposed variance language that had been under review was approved by the Board and the BSAC should be updated. The new language was communicated to the BSAC.

d) Subcommittee Update

Staff asked Trever McSpadden to summarize the discussion regarding commercial and residential design regulations and to clarify some points that were made as there seemed to be a misunderstanding with information shared after the last BSAC meeting. Mr. McSpadden noted that progress is being made and it appears the subcommittee is on track to deliver something to the BSAC soon. Maggie Good noted concerns with the timing as only the commercial design regulations had been discussed so far.

e) Adjourn

Brian Wheeler, Chair

The meeting adjourned at 9:37 AM.

Brian Wheeler, BSAC Chairman

