

Architectural Committee Meeting Minutes – November 18, 2021

<u>BSAC/Staff in Attendance:</u>	<u>Guests:</u>	<u>Project Attending for:</u>
Suzan Scott	Bill Merrit	#06241
Stacy Ossorio	Laurie Merrit	#06241
Gary Walton	Alanah Griffith	#06241
Clay Lorinsky	Lily Flood	#06241
	Andrew Flood GT	#06241
	Mark Weirick	#06241
	Jackson Trout GT	#06262/#06294
	Brett Gaylis	#06294
<u>Using GoTo Meeting (GT):</u>	Joe Schwem GT	#06074A
Maggie Good	Sten Witmer GT	#05317
Grant Hilton	Ryan Welch	Crail Creek
Amy San Nicolas	Mike Hall	#02514
	Robert DePiero GT	#06294
	Joe Wisnieski	#06294
	Steven Chernausik	#02514
	Pat Lopker	#06074A
	Bill Thompson	#06241
	Kali Quick GT	#06294
	Rist GT	#06294
	Amy Swick GT	#06241
	Jane DePiero GT	#06294
	James DePiero GT	#06294
	Casandra Elwell	#06294

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 9:00 AM.
3. **Meeting Minutes** – November 4, 2021 Meeting Minutes Corrections: some minor grammatical changes and one content addition were made by Maggie Good and sent to Staff prior to the meeting to be implemented.

Motion made by Maggie Good to approve the November 4, 2021 Meeting Minutes including grammar redlines and corrections sent to staff; seconded by Grant Hilton. Motion passed. Stacy and Clay abstained because they were not in attendance at that meeting.

4. Major Alteration – Approval Appeal

BSOA: 06241 Flood

Appealed by: William and Laurel Merrit

Legal: Cascade Block 3 lot 241

Street: 11 Swift Bear

Chair addressed the Committee and attendees on the appropriateness of the appeal noting that per the governing documents the Merrit's should not have been allowed to appeal the decision of another owner applicant. However, due to an error by Staff in communicating that it was permitted and that this was on the agenda, the Committee agreed to listen to the Merrit's case in this one instance especially considering the Merrit's made a special trip out to Big Sky from Georgia for this occasion. This by no means constituted precedence for other applications.

The Merrit's were granted five minutes to present their case; their Attorney representative Alanah Griffith spoke on their behalf noting the main concern being the impact on their current natural view with the addition of a building and the opinion that the Committee did not adequately perform a view shed analysis to determine the impact on her client's view. Merrit's attorney confirmed that the Committee had the authority to make a subjective assessment of the impact on the view and, with that assessment, had the discretion to approve or deny the appeal. After the appellant's presentation, the Floods were permitted to rebut the arguments and noted that the main obstruction to the Merrit's view now and after the addition was completed was the current trees in between the two homes evidenced by several that were cut down this past spring located in the current gap where the addition would be visible. It was noted that approval was not received for this work. Ultimately after hearing arguments from both sides and reviewing the evidence submitted by both parties, the majority of the Committee felt that the evidence did not support overturning the original approval as the view of Lone Peak was not sufficiently impacted. It was noted that the only views obstructed by the addition would be that of the Flood's driveway and Swift Bear Road.

Motion made by Clay Lorinsky to deny the appeal and allow the applicant to continue with the approval process; seconded by Stacy Ossorio. Motion passed with 4 in favor and 1 against.

5. Major Alteration – Final:

BSOA: 06241 Flood
Legal: Cascade Block 3 lot 241
Street: 11 Swift Bear

Staff presented the Flood Final Plan review noting no substantial changes had been made since Sketch Plan approval and that all finish materials would match the existing home except for a metal standing-seam roof material and a vertical fir shiplap accents in a Wind River stain.

Staff recommended the Committee approve the application as submitted.

There was discussion about the landscaping and the sufficiency of the screening, particularly whether or not it would be sufficient. The neighbors expressed concerns to this regard since the intended Aspen trees would lose their leaves each fall and the home would effectively lose its screening. The applicants said they would be willing to replace the planned Aspens with conifers and to replant some of the removed trees along the lot line.

Motion made by Stacy Ossorio to approve the application with the additional trees and replacement of the proposed Aspens with conifers; seconded by Clay Lorinsky. Motion passed with 4 in favor and 1 against.

6. Single Family Residence – Final:

BSOA: 06262 McBrayer
Legal: Cascade Block 3 lot 262
Street: TBD Swift Bear

Staff presented the McBrayer Final Plan review noting only minor changes had been made since sketch including window reconfiguration, the moving of footers into the envelope, and the removal of the interior downstairs fireplace. The Committee reviewed the required lighting and landscape plans. The former included 3 fixture types, one of which was a directional light that could be adjusted. The landscaping plan included the addition of 19 various types of trees, 16 shrubs, mixed native grass seed, and a rock 'mulch' that protected the home from fire danger. Staff noted that the applicant would need to submit the address sign detail to staff prior to installation and also that the supporting retaining walls on either side of the home slightly exceeded the building envelope which would require an exception to Design Regulation 3.2 but that the Cascade Covenants permit this type of structure outside the envelope at the owner's risk.

Staff recommended the Committee approve the application as submitted and grant an exception to 3.2.

There was discussion about the directional lights and it was noted both by staff and the applicant's architect that these would be situated toward the home and down cast to ensure compliance with Dark Sky regulation. The architect further noted that in addition to aesthetic reasons, these lights had been selected in favor of recessed cans due to a desire to avoid any heat emissions in the soffit.

Motion made by Maggie Good to approve the application as submitting noting that all the directional lights be down cast and directed inward toward the home and to grant an exception to Design Regulation 3.2 for the retaining walls outside the building enveloped to be installed at the owner's risk; seconded by Grant Hilton. Motion passed unanimously.

7. 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.

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 the excess fill and potential impact of any added height to the home from this fill. Several neighbors express the concern that the excess amount of fill would adversely impact views as well as impose greater erosion risks. Additionally, an architect representative of one of the neighbors asserted that since the height calculations were taken from finished grade instead of existing grade which didn't adequately represent the height change from the current views to the proposed roofline. The Committee noted that the building was in the building envelope and met the height restriction as the Design Regulations dictated calculation of it. Further investigation brought to light that the Covenants, while still dictating height be calculated from averaged finished grade, did provide the committee with the discretion to reevaluate height based on existing if it was determined that the fill and height of a home would deleteriously impact the views of neighbors.

Motion made by Grant Hilton to table the application until further information could be submitted to adequate address the concerns of the neighbors. Any further evidence by the neighbors to this end would need to be submitted to Staff no later than Dec 2nd to be considered; seconded by Clay Lorinsky. 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 but the longest ridgeline exceeded the max by three and a half feet.

Staff recommended the Committee discuss the point of measurement for ridgeline length for clarification prior to making a decision on the application.

There was discussion about the roof length and where this measurement should be taken. It was not that in the past, applications were reviewed at the eaves but the Design Regulations clearly stated overhang not eaves. Ultimately the Committee determined that the ridgeline exceeded the allowable length and the applicant would need to redesign it with something to break the up the ridgeline.

Motion made by Grant Hilton to deny the application due to the roofline in excess of the 40' max; seconded by Maggie Good. Motion passed with 4 in favor and 1 against.

8. Major Alteration – Sketch:

BSOA: 05317 Maw and Leskonic

Legal: SGH Block 3 lot 17

Street: 2665 Bobtail Horse

Staff presented the Maw Major Alteration Sketch Plan review which proposed a two-story addition between the currently detached garage and the existing home. Staff noted that the height would still be compliant with the Covenants and that the proposed finish material was a matte metal shingle. Additionally, for the Committee's reference, staff pointed out the kitchenette in the addition as well as the unique layout but noted there was no stove or exterior entrance to the addition separate from the main house entrance.

Staff recommended the Committee discuss the siding and kitchenette prior to approval but noted that the siding could be decided at final and that ADUs were allowed by the Covenants in Sweetgrass Hills.

There was discussion about the proposed metal shingles and it was determined that until a physical sample of the siding was presented at final, no decision would be made. The Committee discussed the kitchenette in the addition and the applicant's architect noted there was no desired use of this space as an ADU and that it was connected to the main flow of the house by stairs and a hallway.

Motion made by Grant Hilton to approve the application noting that the applicant asserted the addition would not to be used as an ADU; seconded by Clay Lorinsky. Motion passed.

Grant left the meeting at 10:59

9. Minor/Landscape Alt.

BSOA: Crail Creek Club

Legal: Cascade Block 3 lot 241

Street: 11 Swift Bear

Staff presented the Crail Creek Club Minor Alteration noting no changes had been made since the last time the Committee reviewed this project but that the requested technical plans had been submitted.

Staff recommended the Committee approve the application as submitted noting that there had been urgency due to safety concerns and that the alterations were an upgrade to both safety and longevity.

There was discussion about the After the Fact fee and it was determined that since no formal request of waiver had been submitted that the fee would be applied to the account.

Motion made by Maggie Good to approve the application; seconded by Stacy Ossorio. Motion passed.

Clay left the meeting at 11:01

Adjourn – Due to lack of quorum, the meeting adjourned at 11:04 a.m.

Gary Walton, BSAC Chairman