

Approved
April 19, 2022
as written

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS' ASSOCIATION
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING
IN PERSON & VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
MARCH 15, 2022

In Attendance: George Sears, President; John Adams, Vice-President; Michelle Suito, Secretary; Dwaine Anderson (Area 1); Marty Hansen (Area 2); Sam Vincent (Area 3); Katie Winters (Area 4); Shaun Baker (Area 5); Paul Suito (Area 6)

Ex Officio: Nolan Mitchell, Fire Safety Coordinator; Robert Rosing, Legal Counsel

Excused: Andrew Pagel, Scott Boyle, Jody Robinson

Guests: Andi Harris, FM-B-29; Courtney Palmer, PI-G-95; Chris Bell, PI-D-35
Jeff and Barbara Chaffee, PI-25; Ed and Kathleen Deffner, PI-I-37; Lisa Avila, PI-G-10; Rob Hodson, PI-F-42;
Eric Leonard, PI-E-13; Erik Brunvand, PI-F-5; Ethan Lamiman, FM-D-158-A; Chris and Cassy Hahn, PI-C-26;
Nanette Palmer, PI-E-59.

George Sears called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Minutes

February 15, 2022

John Adams corrected two sentences in the Minutes under Architectural Review Committee regarding changes to the Lot Improvement Plan and corrected two sentences that began with "**A septic**" that should correctly read, **The septic**.

John Adams referred to the motion for PI-I-37 on Page 13 and noted that the Board approved material should be corrected to read Flex Loc; not Flex Stock as reflected in the Minutes.

MOTION: George Sears moved to approve the Minutes of February 15, 2022, as corrected. Shaun Baker seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Ranch Manager Report

Mr. Sears reported that Jody Robinson was unable to attend this evening; however, he provided Mr. Sears with an update to report to the Board.

Trent Lott is the newly hired assistant, and he has been working with Jody. They have primarily been pushing snow and working on getting the equipment ready for Spring and Summer.

Jody needs a new spreader for next year, which will be a capital expenditure. He will obtain a quote and submit it to the Board for a decision.

Mr. Sears stated that Jody obtained a quote for mag water, and it is considerably higher than in the past.

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association
Monthly Board Meeting
March 15, 2022
Page 2

Jody will forward that quote to the Board for their review. Mag water is tentatively scheduled for the end of June, subject to Board approval. Mr. Sears had not had the opportunity to look at the details of the quote. Michelle Suitor asked what they paid last year. Mr. Sears did not have that information available this evening, but he would find it and forward it to the Board members.

Jody told Mr. Sears that Trent was working out very well and is actively engaged on the Ranch.

Ms. Suitor wanted to know when the Board would get a list of which roads were prioritized for this year.

Paul Suitor stated that before the Board approves the increase for mag water, they should also find out how much the cost of road base has been increased. Mr. Sears agreed. He believed road base would be addressed as part of the mag water discussion.

Water Company Report

Mr. Sears was unable to attend the Water Board Meeting and he asked Shaun Baker to update the Board on what occurred.

Mr. Baker reported that the Water Company was trying to get the agreement with Mountain Regional approved on March 17th. If it is not finalized in March, the next date will be April 16th when the Mountain Regional Board meets again.

Mr. Baker stated that the Water Company Board Meeting was quite short and there was nothing else new to report.

Monthly Budget Review

The Board reviewed the unpaid bills detail.

Michelle Suitor recalled at the last meeting that Mr. Sears had made a comment about making sure the bills reconciled to the budget. She noted that Robert Rosing had submitted a bill for his services so far this year and was paid last month because his January bill was late. She noted that the payment to Mr. Rosing was not reflected in the budget.

Mr. Sears noted that he had raised the question at the last meeting to make sure all the necessary adjustments were made to the budget. Unfortunately, Mr. Pagel was not able to attend this meeting to answer those questions. Mr. Sears pointed out that Mr. Rosing was asked to be actively engaged in a variety of things and Mr. Pagel is aware that Mr. Rosing will exceed the \$2,000 threshold in his next bill. Mr. Rosing has worked with the Fire Committee, and he also assisting in getting the request for financial assistance from FEMA.

Ms. Suitor noted that Mr. Rosing's bills from the beginning of the year totaled \$1426; however, that

amount was not listed in Carol's budget. Mr. Sears offered to follow up with Carol.

John Adams pointed out the \$8,000 reimbursement to PI-D-31, David Bush. He noted that Mr. Bush had initially requested to build a large house and an accessory dwelling unit. After meeting with the ARC, Mr. Bush decided not to go forward with the accessory dwelling unit. The fees were recalculated based on the resubmittal and Mr. Bush should be reimbursed \$8,000. Mr. Adams remarked that Mr. Bush would still be paying \$6500 for the revised project, which will be presented later in the meeting. Ms. Suitor noted that Carol had listed the refund in the financials.

MOTION: George Sears moved to approve the Unpaid Bills as presented. Sam Vincent seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Rules and Regulations

Fire Safety Rule Update

Mr. Adams reported that a notice was issued on March 9th regarding the proposed rules change and introducing the defensible space rule for new construction. The proposal was emailed to all lot owners on March 9th, and it was also posted on Facebook. They had received feedback. Ms. Suitor clarified that the proposal was also posted on the website, minus the link so the link was not available publicly.

Mr. Adams stated that the idea behind the rule is to create defensible space that would potentially slow the spread of fire and prevent surface level fires from climbing up trees and tall brush. He assumed there would be more feedback based on some of the Facebook comments; but so far only approximately 50 people had provided feedback. Mr. Adams noted that approximately 43% of the people who reviewed the proposal support it; 23% would support it on the condition that changes are introduced and offered up suggestions for those changes; 34% were against it. Mr. Adams focused his presentation on the recommendations people had submitted. Those who were opposed outright said they were in favor of fire mitigation, and if the HOA does anything the process should apply to all homes and cabins. Many believe the HOA should stick with road maintenance, and that the proposal forces the removal of healthy trees. Mr. Adams stated that those opposed focused in part on the rules being a source of harassment for some people on the Ranch. Other issues included trespassing, privacy, and the desire to be part of nature rather than removing it.

Mr. Adams commented on the people who would support the rule with changes. The changes generally included eliminating the 80' extended zone. Some suggested having a higher bond payment upfront and others thought the HOA should be less heavy-handed. A suggestion was also made to fine people instead of collecting a bond deposit. Some were concerned that the new rule would lead to an increase in dues. Someone stated that no one should be allowed to enter their property, and another person pointed out that they should be incentivizing people instead of penalizing them. A few people thought the HOA should

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association
Monthly Board Meeting
March 15, 2022
Page 4

only focus on removing dead and fallen trees.

Mr. Adams hoped to still hear additional feedback from people who had not yet responded. Over the next month they will review the feedback and decide whether to revise the proposal and present it to the Board for a vote.

Michelle Suitor thought the comment period was left open for two weeks. Mr. Adams replied that the proposed change was introduced on March 9th and the comment period could be left open until the next Board meeting. Mr. Sears suggested informing the owners that the comment period has been extended in hopes of getting more feedback. Ms. Suitor pointed out that the time frame was still within the normal comment period, and they only needed to send a reminder.

Mr. Adams asked if the Executive Members wanted to meet after the 15-day period to discuss it. Mr. Sears stated that after the comment period is over and the rule has been finalized, the Executive Board should review it and present it back to the entire Board for a decision on whether to proceed. Ms. Suitor thought the entire Board should review it together after the comment period rather than just the Executive Committee. Mr. Sears agreed that the Board should review it collectively; however, the Executive Members could decide to extend the comment period if they have not received sufficient feedback. Ms. Suitor noted that the notice went out on March 9th and the comment period would expire on March 24th.

Mr. Vincent referred to the comment from Peter Kemp asking that someone explain how new rules can be imposed without a community vote, as opposed to changes to existing rules such as the CC&R issue last year. Mr. Sears replied that per the CC&Rs, the Board has the ability to create rules and impose those rules as an HOA. He explained that by law, if they decide to create a new rule or make a significant change in an existing rule, they are required to allow time for feedback from the owners to determine how the owners feel about the proposed change. Mr. Sears pointed out that the Board was following that requirement with this new rule regarding fire mitigation. He stated that this is not a CC&R. It is a rule and regulation in the management of the overall responsibilities that the Board has for the Ranch. Mr. Sears emphasized that there are some things by law that the Board cannot change. He used short-term rentals as an example of something they cannot change, but they can manage through rules and regulations. Ms. Suitor clarified that CC&Rs in other HOAs do not allow their Board to change the rules and that is specifically written in the CC&Rs. Pine Meadow CC&Rs does not say that and therefore they fall under the State Law.

Robert Rosing explained that the Rules and Regulations are subordinate to the CC&Rs, and the Board cannot adopt a rule that conflicts with the language in the CC&Rs. Last year they tried to amend the CC&Rs. The Board is currently trying to adopt rules which are more of a Statute but still subordinate to the CC&Rs. Mr. Rosing remarked that because this issue arises a lot, the Utah Community Association Act gives express authority for the Board to adopt rules as long as they do not conflict with CC&Rs or the Utah Community Association Act. He clarified that if the Board intends to adopt rules, they are required to send a notice and allow for a public comment period; however, the Board makes the final decision and votes to adopt the rule.

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association
Monthly Board Meeting
March 15, 2022
Page 5

Mr. Adams noted that the bottom of the proposed rule change outlines the State of Utah rules. If people pull up the PDF, there should be hyperlinks that take them directly to each State rule.

Mr. Suitor noted that Peter Kemp also asked a question regarding the fire rules. He asked if a rule could be established, for example, requiring lots with existing homes to remove dead trees or otherwise comply with the new rule as well. If not, why not. Mr. Suitor understood that they could, but at this point the Board was trying to encourage existing homeowners to clear their own lot without making that rule. He stated that the fire committee was also working on putting together volunteer help for people who cannot clear their own lots. Additional issues are covered in other fire meetings.

Mr. Sears reported that two additional rules and regulations are being flushed out. Mr. Adams had sent out the metal siding guidelines and short-term rentals were flushed out a year ago. Mr. Sears remarked that the Board will be discussing both items in the next few weeks. They will set up a meeting similar to what they did on the fire safety rule, where the Board will review input and look at changes and modifications. Mr. Sears wanted everyone to be aware of what was coming next. Invitations will be sent out to participate in another meeting that will focus only on those two items.

Mr. Sears reported that Michelle Suitor had mentioned size of a new build. He noted that the Board would need to work on proposed language and determine an acceptable size within the Rules.

Regarding metal siding, Mr. Adams stated that the ARC determined that it was inevitable that they will face a new proposal requesting the use of some type of metal or concrete beyond the 10% limit as expressed in the Architectural Guidelines. Instead of listening to the rationale each time from an aesthetic perspective and increasingly more as a material that slows the spread of fire; as well as a material that prevents rot and mildew on the snowpack sides of a home. Instead of constantly granting variances, the ARC thought it was important to seriously talk about introducing a change to the guidelines.

Mr. Adams focused on Section 4.1d which states, "finished metal siding and concrete cement block may be acceptable siding materials when used as a secondary material providing that the use of these materials does not exceed 10% of the total surface area of the exterior siding". Mr. Adams stated that he deleted "finished metal siding" from the language and left the remaining language in 4.1d. He then added 4.1e to read, "Finished metal siding could be used as a secondary or primary material providing that its use does not exceed 40% of the total surface area of the exterior siding and includes a simulated wood grain finish. Corrugated metal siding may be used as a secondary material providing that its use does not exceed 10% of the total surface area of the exterior siding".

Mr. Adams would like the Board to meet in committee this month or next to discuss the changes as proposed and determine whether to move forward.

Ms. Suitor stated that metal siding and house size relative to lot size are ongoing issues that come up every month during the Architectural Review. She was surprised that short-term rental was on the list.

They only heard about it two days ago and she and others were surprised that it was on the agenda. Mr. Sears stated that short-term rentals came up a year ago and language was submitted. He explained that in recent months a company called Vasa was actively recruiting in this area for short-term rentals. Because he is a part-time owner, Vasa contacted him asking if he was willing to have his cabin be a short-term rental. He called Vasa and asked why they were targeting the Pine Meadow area. Vasa informed him that based on feedback they were informed that the Pine Meadow area does not prohibit short-term rentals unlike other areas. Vasa decided to target the Pine Meadow area to increase the number of rentals through their organization because there was nothing on the Ranch website indicating restrictions on short-term rentals. Mr. Sears stated that he shared this information with Mr. Adams and the actual recruiting letter he received from Vasa. He and Carol are always being asked whether Pine Meadow has Rules and Regulations regarding short-term rentals. Mr. Sears thought it was appropriate to move forward on discussing short-term rentals so people who are renting their structures can make sure their renters are conforming with the rules and regulations. The property owner has the obligation to educate their renters.

Ms. Sutor stated that last year she and Paul volunteered to be involved in the short-term rental discussions. Mr. Sears noted that neither she nor Paul attended the first organization meeting. He clarified that going forward everyone on the Board will have the opportunity to participate and review the proposed rules. Ms. Sutor explained that only one meeting was scheduled and she and Paul were both out of town. They were not allowed to provide feedback and she wanted to make sure it did not happen again. Mr. Sears anticipated a committee meeting within the next few weeks.

HOA Property

Mr. Sears commented on a 40-acre property off of Tollgate that is owned by the HOA. He noted that the HOA has a legal obligation to allow access to another piece of property. That agreement was signed a year ago and the other party requested approval from the Summit County Board to build off of that road; however, they were turned down because of the approach. They adjusted the approach and submitted it to the HOA for review and a determination on whether the HOA finds it acceptable. Mr. Sears forwarded the submission to the Executive Committee, but he had not heard back from anyone. He personally thought the revised approach looked reasonable. Mr. Sears explained that it was originally denied by Summit County because the initial approach going into the property was too steep. The revised approach is more of a gentle grade going up to their property.

Mr. Sears wanted all the Board members to be aware that HOA owned that piece of property, which is right below the old Moss' cabin and the pond. Mr. Sutor asked why the submission was only sent to the Executive Committee. Mr. Sears replied that the agreement was already signed, and he sent it to the Executive Committee members to make them aware of the revision. The question is whether the HOA was willing to accept the adjustment to the design. He offered to forward it to the other Board Members. Mr. Sutor wanted to see the amended agreement before it is signed. Mr. Sears emphasized that the agreement was signed last year. The approval will come from Summit County pending acceptance by the HOA for the revised design.

Mr. Rosing clarified that the agreement language was not changing. The issue is that the location of the road they intend to build has moved. Mr. Suitor stated that he spoke with the engineer who decided that the original approach was not acceptable, and in their conversation, Mr. Suitor understood that the other party would need to use a lot more of the HOA land. Mr. Suitor also wanted to see the amended proposal before it is approved. Mr. Sears reiterated that he would send the revised design to all the Board Members. Ms. Suitor asked if the original agreement was signed as recent as last year, or when the lot was split off thirty years ago. Mr. Rosing replied that the agreement was signed last year. Ms. Suitor wanted to know who had signed it. Mr. Sears stated that he signed the agreement because it was a legal issue that was previously agreed to by Pamela Middleton and the Board at that time. Mr. Rosing and the attorney for the other party drafted the agreement. Mr. Sears explained that until last year he was totally unaware that the previous Board had agreed to it in principle. Letters were sent between both parties outlining what would be done, and the HOA agreed to it. Pamela Middleton was the HOA President at the time. Ms. Suitor stated that she was not on the Board at that time, which is why she could not recall reviewing it. Mr. Sears clarified that he was also not on the Board at that time of the initial agreement.

Area Rep Reports

Area 1 – Dwaine Anderson wanted to know how he could get a list of the private plowing groups in Area 1. Ms. Suitor suggested that he speak with the neighbors who live in that area because the HOA does not have any control over private plow groups.

Area 6 – Paul Suitor reported on complaints about people parking in the street to access a short-term rental property that is outside of the HOA but being accessed through the HOA. He understood that people can buy the stickers if they join the HOA and pay dues, but this is the first time he heard about someone paying dues to obtain stickers. Mr. Sears was unaware that the HOA sold parking stickers to people outside of the Ranch who are not members of the HOA. Mr. Suitor contacted the owner who told him that it would not happen again. Mr. Sears asked if it was the owner of the property with the Yurt and whether he is a member of the HOA. Mr. Suitor replied that it is the property with the Yurt and the owner is not a member of the HOA.

Mr. Sears asked if anyone was aware that the HOA sold stickers to use the winter lot for people outside the Ranch. The Board members answered no. Mr. Sears will follow up with Carol on this issue.

Open Public Forum

There were no comments.

Committee Reports

Roads and Parking – Scott Boyle was not present to give a report.

Fire Committee – Nolan Mitchell had to leave the meeting and asked Sam Vincent to provide an update.

Mr. Vincent reported that the fire committee was in the process of applying for a grant for FEMA money. The money was originally designated to communities that survive a fire. However, if it is not claimed, the money goes into a fund, and anyone can apply to use it for proactive fire mitigation efforts. The funds are dispensed through Summit County. Mr. Vincent stated that Jessica Kirby, the Summit County Public Lands manager, reached out to Pine Meadow because she understood that the community had approved an assessment for fire mitigation work. Ms. Kirby is aware that Pine Meadow is interested in supplementing their own funds and she has been helping them with the application for over a month.

Mr. Vincent stated that \$358,777 is the total amount including the grant money requested and their own contribution of \$63,000 which comes from the annual budget and the fire mitigation assessment, as well as the in-kind donation estimated at \$15,000. He remarked that the fire committee was proposing to do hazardous fuels reduction along the shoulders of the road; a total of 33' from center of the road minus the 16-18 feet of the actual width of the road. He explained that they were proposing approximately 10' on each side of the road to do hazardous fuels reduction such as limbs, removing of dead brush, dried grasses, and flammable fuels along every road in the HOA.

Mr. Vincent noted that with the requested funds they would be able to hire a forestry company to do the work. He stated that there was a reason why roads were written into the grant. Rather than take the time to explain the reason this evening, he was happy to provide that explanation in detail to anyone who was interested.

Mr. Vincent pointed out that they only found out about the grant opportunity less than a month ago and they could have planned out other projects if they had learned about it earlier. In order to take advantage of this opportunity they chose to focus on the roads. The goal is to create defensible space that will allow everyone to exit from their homes and safely leave the canyon in case of a fire. Focusing on the roads also reduces the chance of a fire starting from a vehicle. It also creates breaks that can stump the progress of a fire moving through the community. Mr. Vincent remarked that they can do roads without spending a year going through the approval process.

Mr. Sears stated that the fire committee has done an incredible job working through the process, and Mr. Vincent has been the point person on putting it together. He has worked closely with Robert Rosing to make sure the HOA was within their rights to clean the sides of the roads without having to ask each owner for permission since timing was so tight. Mr. Sears commended Mr. Vincent, Mr. Mitchell, and the entire team for the work they did to put this together.

Mr. Vincent clarified that they will not know if they are awarded the grant until Fall. This summer will be a scaled back beginning to what they hope is the full-scale project of including all roads in the community.

Katie Winters asked if the money always needs to be for service or labor to bring people in, or if they could

use any future money to purchase equipment such as a wood-chipper. Mr. Vincent replied that the funds must be spent on the creation of defensible space. Fuels reduction is the primary focus for the money. There is some wiggle room in terms of what constitutes fuel reduction, but it definitely does not include purchasing equipment. Mr. Suitor stated that they were also looking into other grants. He pointed out that Pine Meadow was able to apply for this grant because no one else had projects ready to go and money to contribute. Mr. Vincent explained that the \$60,000 special assessment that everyone approved to put towards fire mitigation has allowed them to potentially multiply that into a lot more money.

Communications – Mr. Adams provided an update on Broadband and Comcast. They have had conversations with Summit County and with Comcast. Currently, Comcast is at a pause because they cannot negotiate access across Promontory or Silver Summit. At this point Comcast is unable to give a hard timeline or estimates for the Board to present to the owners. Comcast is still interested in providing service. Mr. Adams stated that Summit County voted to approve a grant that would coordinate Summit County’s grant writer with Comcast, and because Comcast dropped the ball and wanted to delay moving forward with that grant, they are stuck with Comcast for a while. For example, if they wanted to have conversations with Utopia or Allwest, those carriers might be reluctant to talk with Pine Meadow under the current circumstances. Mr. Adams noted that Comcast offered to do a Zoom meeting with the community to answer questions on what they plan to do.

Mr. Adams pointed out that there is competition for any grant money. Governor Cox recently highlighted something called speedtestutah.gov. They are asking anyone who has internet service and those who have no internet service to go to the website and put in where they live and their internet speed if they have internet. The State will use that information to steer money from some of these grants to the communities that have little or no high-speed broadband. Mr. Adams encouraged everyone to visit the website.

Michelle Suitor reported that two Tollgate residents were asked by Summit County to be involved in the interviews for the new Fire Chief. She understood there were three interviews last week, but she did not know the outcome. Ms. Suitor thought it was encouraging that Summit County was aware that Tollgate needs representation, and they have their attention. She understood that Summit County had identified at least one member they would like to have sit on the new Board. Ms. Suitor explained that the Advisory Control Board for North Summit Fire Department was five members, and last month they voted to expand it to 11 members. She attended that meeting and requested that Tollgate get one of those positions.

Architectural Review Committee

PI-D-50

Mr. Adams noted that on February 27th the Board voted electronically to approve the revised construction plans for a new 6,251 square foot home for Michael and Mary Nuttal, Lot PI-D-50. He stated that the original plan for the home had a very high angular peaked roof that made the architecture stand out. The Architectural Committee met with the owners at the property, and they a revised design showing a typical roof line that blends in very well with the surrounding community.

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association
Monthly Board Meeting
March 15, 2022
Page 10

Mr. Adams reported that the Board voted on the revised roof design electronically and there were eight votes in favor, no one against, and no abstentions. The Board needed to Ratify their electronic approval.

MOTION: John Adams moved to Ratify the revised plan for a new 6,251 square foot home on Lot PI-D-50, lot size .8 acre. Shaun Baker seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PI-D-16

Mr. Adams reviewed plans for a new home on Lot PI-D-16. The proposed construction is for 3,148 square feet. The lot size is .75 acre. The Lot Improvement Plan was complete, and all the fees were paid. The owners will put a very detailed list of materials into the Lot Improvement Plan. They were proposing wood grain fiber cement boards in dark gray and dark brown colors. The roof material will be either black or dark gray standing seam metal. Mr. Adams had observed a carport in the architectural drawings, and he was told that the owners intend to enclose it in the future. The ARC made it clear that the carport would not be part of this approval. Other than the carport, the ARC had no other issues.

Ms. Suitor stated that she had looked for a garage when she reviewed the drawings, and from the angle shown, it could not be seen. She asked if the carport was to the left underneath the deck. Mr. Adams answered yes.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the PI-D-16 Lot Improvement Plan for a 3,148 square foot new home on Lot size .75 not including the carport. seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

FM-D-158A

Mr. Adams reviewed plans for a home addition on Lot FM-D-158A, 2293 Forest Meadow. The owner, Ethan Lamimam, was proposing a 1,259 square foot addition to the existing home. The addition would add a garage, kitchen, and master bath, as well as a 2,152 square foot open deck. The total addition would be 3,411 square feet. The property is 8.4 acres. The Lot Improvement Plan is complete, and all fees were paid.

The proposed siding is Wood Tones Jim Hardie Lapsiding and Rustic Series, which is a wood grain, and the same Jim Hardie shakes in the Rustic Series. Both would be gray cascade slate. The roofing material would be a standing seam metal in ivy green to match the existing home. Mr. Adams stated that the roof proposed over the deck is flatter than the existing roof. The upper portion of the roof is 4.5/12. The owner was requesting a variance to put in a 2.5/12 roof pitch for the roof over the deck. Mr. Adams pointed out that if the owner wanted to enclose the deck in the future, they would need to submit another Lot Improvement Plan.

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association
Monthly Board Meeting
March 15, 2022
Page 11

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the variance request for Lot FM-D-158A for a 2.5/12 roof pitch over the deck as presented in the architectural plans. Shaun Baker seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan for a new 1,259 square foot addition to the existing home on Lot FM-D-158A, and a 2,152 square foot open deck. Paul Suitor seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PI-G-44

Mr. Adams reviewed plans for a new pole barn garage for Lot PI-G-44, 2214 Aspen Ridge. The owner is John Kleebe. A Lot Improvement Plan was submitted two years ago and the plan proposed a garage. When the owner built their home, Summit County asked them to make some changes. Due to the hillside behind, the owner has decided to build a pole barn instead of the originally proposed garage.

The lot size is 4 acres. The HOA fees are paid. The owner intended to submit a detailed materials list. The plans call for 60% split logs and a brown stain to match the existing cabin. They hope to use 10% Coronado Engineered Sawtooth Ledge Mount Vernon Graystone, which was previously approved for their house. Mr. Adams stated that on one side of the pole barn the owner was proposing 30% metal siding in brown. The metal will be on the side against the mountain and does not get sunlight. It will not be visible, and the owner is concerned about rot and mildew.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve a variance request for Lot PI-G-44, allowing the owner to use up to 30% metal siding as presented in the architectural drawings. Paul Suitor seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan for a new 1,200 square foot pole barn on Lot PI-G-44, 2214 Aspen Ridge. Paul Suitor seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PI-D-31

Mr. Adams noted that at the last meeting the Board discussed building plans for PI-D-31, 1078 Beaver Circle. The owner is David Bush. He recalled that the original plan was to put a house and a separate accessory dwelling unit on the property.

Mr. Adams reported that the plans were changed and the only structure to be built was the house shown on the upper left section of the screen. The lot is 0.59 acre. The proposed material will be wood grain Hardie Plank in a light brown or bronze color. The owner also plans to use a Wood River Natural Stone in

brown and tan colors. The roof will be asphalt shingles in a dark brown.

Mr. Adams noted that the Lot Improvement Plan shows decking in the architectural drawings; however, it will currently be left open. If the owner decides to enclose it in the future he would need to submit another Lot Improvement Plan.

Ms. Sutor recalled that the owner was not going to build the garage that was offset on the right. She remembered the size at 7,000 square feet, but it now looks like 4,000 square feet. Mr. Adams clarified that subtracting the decking leaves a total of 3,707 square feet. If the decking is counted, the total is 4,381 square feet. Mr. Adams presented an architectural drawing and the correct site plan to show what the owner was planning to build.

Mr. Adams stated that Mr. Bush listened to all the comments at the last meeting and revised their plan to reflect what the Board had requested. The ARC found no issues with the revised proposal.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan for a new 3,707 square foot new home only on Lot PI-D-31, which also includes 81 square feet of decking. Sam Vincent seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Adams reported that he planned to work on the methodology of calculating square footage for calculating the impact fee. He pointed out that currently there is not a hard and fast guideline they can point to for how the square footage is calculated for the Lot Improvement Plan. Mr. Adams hoped to have something ready to present for discussion at the next meeting.

Katie Winters commented on the Communications Grant and the recommendation that owners do the speed test in case they decide to move forward with Comcast or any other provider. She suggested that people turn off their Wi-Fi and run a speed test because that would identify dead zones in the Valley that are not served by Broadband. Mr. Adams favored that idea.

Miscellaneous

Mr. Vincent requested a short, closed session at the end of this meeting to address certain parts of the grant. Mr. Sears stated that the official monthly Board meeting would adjourn, and he asked the public participants to drop off so the Board could have a closed meeting.

The Board adjourned the regular meeting and moved into closed session.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 7:48 p.m.
