

Approved
June 21, 2022
as corrected

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS' ASSOCIATION
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING
IN PERSON & VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
MAY 17, 2022

In Attendance: George Sears, President; John Adams, Vice-President; Michelle Sutor, Secretary; Andrew Pagel, Treasurer; Dwaine Anderson (Area 1); Sam Vincent (Area 3); Katie Winters (Area 4); Shaun Baker (Area 5); Paul Sutor (Area 6); Scott Boyle (Area 7)

Ex Officio: Jody Robinson, Ranch Manager; Nolan Mitchell, Fire Safety Coordinator

Excused: Marty Hansen (Area 2)

George Sears called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.

Minutes

April 19, 2022

MOTION: George Sears moved to approve the Minutes of April 19, 2022, as written. John Adams seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Ranch Manager Report

Jody reported that they have been grading and rolling the roads. They have also been doing sign repairs.

Jody asked the Board to make a decision on mag water. Mr. Sears recalled that the Area Reps were asked to poll the owners in their area. He noted that Marty Hansen, who was excused this evening, had provided Mr. Sears with a report from Area 2. Six people in Area 2 had responded and they were all in favor of road base.

Sam Vincent, the Area 3 rep, reported that four owners in his area favored mag water and one owner favored road base. Paul Sutor stated that five people in Area 6 all wanted road base. Shaun Baker, Area 5, had 29 responses in his area. Twenty-six owners wanted road base, two owners wanted road base and mag water, and 1 owner wanted mag water. Scott Boyle, Area 7, heard from two owners who wanted road base and two owners who wanted mag water.

Mr. Sears thought the mass majority wanted road base based on the numbers.

Mr. Boyle stated that one of the considerations is to do mag water in some areas and road base in other areas. For example, Tollgate Canyon takes a beating and he questioned how often it will need to be graded if they only do road base. He noted that each time the road is graded, road base is pushed off to the side. Mr. Boyle asked if there were certain areas that

could be mag watered, such as the area that gets heavy traffic from the Church camps. He also suggested mag water for the incline on the road between Elk Road and Alexander Canyon just above Beaver Circle. Mr. Boyle understood the cost factor of mag water, but he thought they could be spending more money if Jody needs to maintain the road by grading once a week.

Jody agreed that mag water helps keep the road base on the steep hills. Mr. Sears thought it would be less expensive if they could mag water certain areas and put road base on less crucial areas where they usually put mag water. Michelle Sutor suggested the application of mag water on Boyce's Corner and the section from Beaver Circle up. Jody thought it made sense to mag water those areas and it would decrease the cost of mag water by two loads.

Mr. Sears allowed the owners online for their comments on mag water versus road base.

Alex Falkenstein, Lot PI-67, stated that from a cost analysis perspective they were looking at \$2.32 per linear foot of treatment for mag chloride; however, re-graveling a section of road is \$7.69 per linear foot for an 18 foot wide road. He remarked that without mag chloride, the degradation on the road will be substantial and require a significant amount of maintenance on the main road. Mr. Falkenstein stated that he has worked in Mountain Operations for years at the ski resort and managed summer maintenance on the roads. There is a significant difference between roads treated with mag chloride and roads that are not treated.

Mr. Vincent stated that the owners in Area 3 shared Mr. Falkenstein's concern. He believed the owners in Area 3 would be pleased if at least the section from Boyce's up and around the corner from Bobcat is mag watered.

Mr. Sears asked if any of the Board members were against partial mag water. Michelle Sutor favored mag water on the critical areas. Paul Sutor thought they could experiment by doing mag water on the steeper area and road base on the rest. The Board members agreed.

Chris Bell, Lot PI-D-35 appreciated the discussion for a hybrid approach and optimizing the materials. He favored the idea of looking at critical places in each area and hybridizing the approach.

Mr. Sears stated that the Board would do an experiment this year with both mag water and road base. They would let Jody determine the best places for mag water and use the remainder of the budget to increase the amount of road base.

Scott Boyle noted that without mag water the individuals across from the gravel pit will have

a lot of dust and he anticipated a lot of push back from those people. Mr. Boyle asked if it was possible to give those owners the option of contributing to the cost of mag water on that road. Mr. Suitor was not opposed to that idea because the Board previously discussed giving owners the ability to contribute to road base. Mr. Sears thought it was possible to reach out to those owners.

Mr. Sears clarified that the direction for Jody is to look at mag water on critical areas and road base on the rest. The Area Rep could reach out to the owners by the gravel pit to see if they are interested in contributing to mag water for that road.

Jody also commented on repairs that need to be done on the water truck.

Water Company Report

Mr. Sears had attended the Water Board Meeting. He reported that the contract with Mountain Regional was finalized, and Pine Meadow has guaranteed water for up to five years.

Mr. Sears stated that a few people are interested in how the Water Company will handle fire in relation to the number of fire hydrants. The Pine Meadow Water Company is looking at ways to put in more fire hydrants, primarily on the Forest Meadow side.

Mr. Vincent asked if Mountain Regional was still doing the infrastructure assessment. Mr. Sears replied that the assessment is still in process, and they anticipate the report in July.

Monthly Budget Review

Andrew Pagel reviewed the unpaid bills detail. He had no issues or questions.

Mr. Sears reported that an invoice from Robert Rosing came in today in the amount of \$300. Carol had included the invoice in Dropbox, and it should be added to the unpaid bills this evening.

MOTION: George Sears moved to approve the Unpaid Bills as presented, plus the \$300 invoice from Robert Rosing. John Adams seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Rules and Regulations

Fire Safety Rule Update

Mr. Sears asked for the status of the fire safety rule. John Adams stated that the survey was done, and the community responded. Everyone was in favor of fire mitigation; however, the majority who responded did not like the rule. Some suggested that if there is a rule, it should apply to everyone and not just new construction.

Mr. Adams thought the Board Members and/or the Fire Committee should discuss what they could do with the rule. The results from the community were so mixed the committee did not feel comfortable rushing forward. Michelle Suitor agreed. She noted that the committee also talked about having a presentation at the Fire Safety BBQ where they can talk to people in person. A lot of people assume they need to clear cut their entire lot and the barbeque would give the Board members and the Fire Committee the opportunity to explain what the rule would actually require. Paul Suitor stated that it comes down to education and helping people understand the fire-wise recommendations. He believes the majority are interested but they want everyone to comply. Mr. Suitor commented on the issue of only applying it to new builds, noting that they do not have the manpower to enforce the new rule on everyone and it was easier to start with a smaller group. He was in favor of starting with the new builds and educating the rest at the barbeque. It is important for people to understand that they do not need to clear everything on their property. It is the only way they will become fire-wise and have any hope of having homeowners insurance coverage.

Mr. Sears stated that if what was articulated is the consensus of the Fire Committee, he suggested that they do one more review of the wording before the Board votes on making it a rule. After the Board votes, they have 15 days to formally notify the homeowners that this is the rule and how it will be implemented. Mr. Suitor suggested starting with new builds and giving a five-year window for the existing builds to comply. That would allow the HOA to figure out enforcement.

Mr. Adams reiterated that the comments from the community was about applying this rule fairly. He pointed out that new people coming in to build will already be fire conscious. He questioned what they would accomplish by only focusing on the new builds. Mr. Suitor emphasized that the eventual goal is to have the rule apply to everyone, but they want to implement it one step at a time because it is impossible to enforce it on every lot owner from the beginning.

Nolan Mitchell stated that when this was originally discussed, it was going to be a several step process. However, in order to start down the fire-wise path and make sure that people do not lose their insurance and the home values do not decrease, the reasoning was to start with new builds and let people know what rules they need to follow. He was concerned

that if they cannot get the rule to pass because of the comments by people who are wanting to build, they will never get it passed if they try to make everyone comply. A lot of people do not live on the Ranch, and they do not care. They have a part-time cabin that is already paid off and they are not worried about insurance. Mr. Mitchell stated that if the HOA does not do something, they will lose people like himself and others who are leaving the Mountain because they are afraid of fire. He pointed out that the Board is responsible for what happens on the Mountain.

Mr. Sears thought Mr. Mitchell made a good point. The Board and the Fire Committee have been working for almost a year to determine what kind of rules and regulations they should have to encourage better management of individual properties. As an executive group they agreed to take it forward and they still have not made a decision.

Mr. Sears asked Mr. Adams to send the language to the Board for one last review and the Board will make it a priority item for the next meeting. Mr. Adams remarked that they should incorporate the feedback from the community and weave it into the original language to see if it still makes sense. He thought they should balance what the owners want versus what the Board wants.

Mr. Pagel stated that everyone appreciates what the Fire Committee has done. He asked Paul Suitor and Sam Vincent if they had reviewed the feedback and what they believed was the most positive feedback that could be easily implemented. Mr. Pagel thought they could do a multi-tiered implementation.

Robert Rosing pointed out that the statute that governs rule making in Utah for HOAs was amended this year. For the first time it has language that reads, "The association shall adopt...". The language says that the HOA must adopt, not can adopt, rules supporting water efficient landscape, including allowance for low water use lawns and drought conditions, as well as other rules about minimizing water use. Mr. Rosing understood that there is no landscaping on Pine Meadow Ranch, but the point is an acknowledgment that HOAs can and should be more proactive. Mr. Rosing anticipated litigation over this rule. The HOA must adopt rules on this subject, and they can be more proactive about adopting rules that apply to things that already exist. He believed it supported the fire-wise rules.

ARC Building Rule Changes

Mr. Adams stated that with the feedback from the fire survey, people also asked why the HOA would not allow people to use more fire-resistant materials on their homes. Mr. Adams stated that the Committee did a survey and 165-170 people participated. The survey asked how people in Tollgate felt about using metal siding as a primary building material. He noted that 96% were comfortable with metal as a primary material. The majority respondents wanted to update the Guidelines to allow metal. The survey also asked about

the percentage of metal that should be allowed. Mr. Adams noted that 87% of the respondents were fine allowing 60-100% of metal on a structure. There were a number of comments and based on the ones they had already read people favored a rusty metal but not shiny metal.

Mr. Adams remarked that the survey also showed that people wanted to allow board form concrete. There were a lot of comments and people had good ideas that could be considered.

Mr. Adams stated that the biggest question is whether metal supports the Tollgate vernacular. He hoped they were beginning to figure out that mysterious terminology. Mr. Adams remarked that they looked at 23 homes that were all metal, and he presented the top six to the Board. He was surprised that a lot of people picked a rusty metal corrugated home 90% of the time. It shows what is becoming acceptable as the new norm. Mr. Adams stated that because the selection was not large, they added in the homes that did not have as much support. He noted that the last home shown, which was a modified A-frame, only had 60% support and it continued to drop off from there. Mr. Adams clarified that approximately 15-20 people did not like metal homes at all.

Mr. Adams showed 17 metal buildings. He pointed to a metal garage that was selected 88% of the time. A second structure that received 86% was a Tollgate building on Valley View Circle. Support for the other structures gradually dropped off to 68%. Mr. Adams showed six other structures that had less support.

Mr. Adams presented two photos that were both selected 93% of the time. He believed those structures clearly represented the community. He showed other photos that were selected with high percentages that also represent the Tollgate community.

Mr. Adams noted that the Committee recently collected this information, and they were still going through some of it. He remarked that even with the overwhelming response, the Board needed to decide if they were at the point of moving forward quickly, or whether they should come back and revisit this at another time. Mr. Sears did not believe the Board was prepared to vote this evening. They have the language, but they need to finish reviewing the data that was provided by the 170 participants and validate that it is the direction they want going forward. Mr. Sears thought they should wait until June to get the information back out to the Board. Paul Suitor noted that 97% of the people are in favor of using more metal. Mr. Sears remarked that the issue is still how much metal should be allowed. Mr. Pagel noted that 85% of the people favored allowing at least 60% metal on the structure.

Mr. Adams stated that he took the feedback and tried to weave it into what he presented based on that feedback. He explained his method for addressing Class A or Class B materials and adding them to his presentation.

Michelle Suitor thought they were only talking about metal siding. Mr. Adams clarified that he was showing the results of the survey based on community feedback, which also included board formed concrete. Ms. Suitor remarked that including concrete requires more discussion and review. She pointed out that the Lot Improvement Plan already covers poured foundation and that wood formed board concrete is acceptable. She questioned why they were reviewing it again.

Mr. Adams offered to take it out. He then asked whether engineered stone should also be taken out. Mr. Sears remarked that the challenge given to the ARC was to look at how the HOA should be modifying the requirements for building on the Ranch. Michelle Suitor replied that it was for metal, roof pitch, and size. Paul Suitor thought it was also concrete siding. Ms. Suitor stated that what was presented to the owners for review so the Board could vote after two weeks was metal, roof, and size. If they add additional items, they need to review it with the homeowners and that will delay everything.

Mr. Sears asked if the Board wanted to make all the changes to the Architectural Guidelines at one time or if they wanted to make changes in phases. Ms. Suitor recalled that the Board had talked about approving the rules in stages. Mr. Adams agreed. Paul Suitor stated that the HOA needs to send out a mailer and give a 15-day comment period. For budget purposes, he thought it would be smarter to do all the changes at one time. Michelle Suitor noted that they have been notifying the owners by email and there is no mailing expense.

Paul Suitor asked Mr. Rosing if email is sufficient notification for the 15-day comment period. Mr. Rosing replied that email is a method of communication that suffices. Mr. Sears pointed out that not all the owners have email, and they still need to send a mailer to those people.

Mr. Sears was concerned with how the owners will react to constantly changing the rules. Mr. Adams suggested that they could present the original version from the survey and include a few modifications based on the direct feedback. Option A could be metal. Option B could include board formed concrete. Option C could include engineered stone. All three could be presented and people might find all three acceptable. Mr. Suitor believed they had overwhelming support to make the changes. People can come to the next meeting to hear the discussion before the Board votes. They just need to inform the owners of their intent.

Michelle Suitor clarified that they needed to draft verbiage and email it to the owners. Mr. Boyle asked if the new rule would apply to any existing buildings. Mr. Suitor replied that it only applies to new construction. It should also apply to existing buildings. Mr. Boyle commented on existing cabins that have more than 10% of concrete foundations showing, which he why he wanted to know if it would apply to existing homes. Paul Suitor asked Mr.

Boyle if he was asking whether the homes showing more concrete would be allowed to continue showing more concrete. Mr. Boyle answered yes. Mr. Suitor remarked that they have been allowed to do it and they could continue to do it. Mr. Adams stated that if the Board approves a rule with concrete, the stipulation would be for the concrete to have a wood grain finish.

Michelle Suitor stated that the foundation on their house shows more than 10% of formed concrete. Under the new rule, they would not need to put siding on it. Paul Suitor believed the 10% concrete applies to the foundation. They are talking about concrete or cement logs and siding material that looks like wood but are actually made of concrete. He thought the 10% rule for foundations would remain. Scott Boyle clarified that any poured foundation material may not exceed 10% of the exterior surfaces. Mr. Suitor answered yes, and that wording would stay the same. Mr. Boyle asked if having more than 10% of concrete walls for a basement would be allowed. Mr. Suitor stated that if the walls are exposed, they would still need to be covered with a siding material approved by the Board. They were not changing the “no more than 10% of exposed concrete foundation” rule.

Michelle Suitor stated that the Lot Improvement Plan also states, “formed foundation is acceptable”. They are changing the rule for cement in addition to the foundation.

Nolan Mitchell thought the goal was to get away from confusing percentages and instead have a can or cannot list to make it simpler for the owners and builders.

Mr. Adams thought the Board could review and revise the language in one separate meeting. If they can find a time to address it this week, they should be able to move forward with a vote. The Board agreed to meet on Saturday after the Fire Safety BBQ.

Roof Variances

Mr. Adams stated that the survey also addressed the constant roof variance requests. The current minimum pitch is 4:12, yet they continue to see people who want to do 3:12, 2:12, and sometimes nearly flat. The survey asked whether the Board should be allowed to look at different roof pitches. Mr. Adams remarked that 85 said they should allow a roof pitch somewhere between 0 and 3:12 slope. Approximately 54% were comfortable with a flat to 2:12 roof, and 32% were comfortable with a 3:12 roof. Based on the numbers, Mr. Adams assumed the community majority would accept between a 2 to 2.5% pitch. However, the Board needed to discuss it and make sure they were looking at the data correctly. Mr. Adams clarified that these numbers were for the entire roof line of the home. A second question asked about secondary elements of the roof line such as dormers, breezeways, and roofs over porches. Mr. Adams stated that 85% were comfortable with something between 0 and 2:12 pitch.

Mr. Adams noted that one question asked if all the slope requirements should be removed, and the answer was 50/50, for and against. Mr. Adams thought they could also address roof pitch at their meeting on Saturday.

Foundation Size

Mr. Adams stated that a survey question asked if people would be comfortable setting a foundation size limit on properties that are zero to just under 2 acres, and then from two acres up. On the small lots they proposed a foundation size maximum of 2500 square feet and a total square footage of 4500 square feet. For 2 acres and larger, they proposed a foundation size maximum of 3700 square feet and a total maximum home of 6500 square feet. Mr. Adams stated that more than 50% were comfortable with the sizes as presented. However, 27% wanted it either broken up more finely or the maximums increased slightly. Mr. Adams did not believe people were as pleased with the selection presented on the larger lots. Only 46% were comfortable with a 3700 square foot foundation and a 6500 square foot maximum home size.

Mr. Adams stated that people were also asked if they wanted to see these types of proposals and drafts for feedback. He noted that 86% wanted to continue this process. Mr. Adams believed they found a process that was not too intrusive but helped to collect information so they can update the Guidelines.

Short-Term Rentals

Mr. Sears had sent the Board members information that was posted last week in Park City regarding short-term rentals in Summit County. The County is looking at putting in place a 6-month moratorium on any new licenses for short-term rentals. He had not seen the actual outcome of that recommendation. Mr. Sears stated that Summit County will be drafting new laws that apply to short-term rentals. Many of the issues Pine Meadow has addressed in their rules and regulations will be covered in the new law. Mr. Sears noted that the Board members had copies of the short-term and long-term rental rules that Pine Meadow has in place. Robert Rosing was in the process of reviewing those rules. At the next meeting the Board will be asked to provide feedback on the rules and also for the best way to send it to the owners for their input.

Mr. Sears remarked that there is definitely a need, and he would like to have the rules for rentals reviewed and approved by the Board before it is circulated to all of the owners.

Area Rep Reports

Area 1 - Dwaine Anderson had nothing to report.

Area 2 - Marty Hansen was excused from the meeting and no report was given.
Area 3 - Sam Vincent had nothing new to report.
Area 4 - Katie Winters had nothing to report.
Area 5 - Shaun Baker had nothing to report.
Area 6 - Paul Suitor had nothing to report.
Area 7 - Scott Boyle had nothing to report.

Open Public Forum

An owner stated that they were looking at getting a new roof. She noted that there is a membrane roofing material that is an alternative to metal, underneath metal, or can just be adjunctive to a metal roofing system. She asked if there were any HOA restrictions on the membrane roofing material.

Paul Suitor thought the Board needed to see a sample. There was also a question about color.

The owner stated that they have pitch issues, and this would mitigate the snow leaking problems. The material comes from Aspen Roofing, who is very familiar with the area and fire mitigation. The Board did not believe there were any HOA rules prohibiting the proposed material, pending seeing a sample. The owner offered to provide a sample.

Committee Reports

Roads and Parking – There was nothing new to report.

Fire Committee – Mr. Sears stated that the Fire Safety BBQ was scheduled for this coming Saturday. It was highly publicized, and he anticipated a good turnout.

Sam Vincent stated that they were planning three and possibly four volunteer fire cleanup events throughout the summer. The first is June 11th. Mr. Vincent reported that they were working on hiring a contractor to do Phase 1 of the road easement Forestry Fuel Reduction project, which will end up spanning a total of three years if they get the grant. This year will only be Phase 1 using the amount they have budgeted.

Mr. Vincent stated that he and Paul Suitor were hosting a meeting with interested contractors on Saturday morning. There is an ad on KSL, and it was posted on the website. They personally reached out to six different forestry companies in the area. Mr. Vincent remarked that they were doing their due diligence to solicit any and all bids for that contract.

Paul Suitor stated that they were still trying to finalize the location of the volunteer cleanup

and hope to have it finalized by Saturday. Meg stated that they were also working on the evacuation plan and getting that approved by Summit County. Signs have gone up and they would call owners to get feedback about signs for the evacuation plan. They will eventually have more permanent signs once they get feedback from the owners on whether the signs are confusing or easy to follow, and what actually works. They were coordinating with North Summit Fire District and everything else the fire committee does. Mr. Suitor remarked that the CWPP was finished, finalized, and sent in as well.

Communications – Michelle Suitor stated that she is willing to post things on the website, but the Area Reps need to send her what they want posted. She had updated the Facebook page and the website.

Architectural Review Committee

Lot PI-D-34

John Adams reported that the Board voted on Lot PI-D-34 electronically after the last meeting. The unanimous approval needed to be ratified this evening for the record.

MOTION: John Adams moved to ratify the approval for Lot Improvement Plan for Lot PI-D-34. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Lot PI-F-37

Mr. Adams reviewed plans for Lot PI-F-37. The owners, Brady and Lizzie Stout, were proposing a 2,701 square foot new home on a one-acre lot. The Lot Improvement Plan was complete, and all the fees were paid.

The proposed material was Hardie Plank in a cedar mill woodgrain texture. The colors are primarily pine *tree* green or charcoal smoke with dark granite trim. The roof pitch is 6:12 and the owners plan to use standing seam brown metal or *PBR* metal in dark bronze.

The Architectural Committee reviewed the plans and found no issues. However, there was a question regarding the pine *tree* color and whether it was green or bluish green. Ms. Stout had provided a sample and Mr. Adams thought it looked green. Mr. Sears agreed. The Board had no issues with the green color.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan for Lot PI-F-37, Brady and Lizzie Stout, for a 2,701 square foot new home as described in the Lot Improvement Plan. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

FM-B-37

Mr. Adams presented plans for FM-B-27. The owner, Blake Stones, was proposing a 4,090 square foot new home on 5.2 acres. The Lot Improvement Plan was complete. The owners were proposing 1 x 8 cedar ship lap siding and Cedar Mill Hardie Plank lap siding in iron gray. They were also proposing to use a woodgrain fiber ship lap siding in brown. Mr. Adams noted that a previous property chose these same products a month ago. The owner was also proposing to use Kodiak natural stone in brown, grays, and tans. The roof will be a ribbed metal in coco brown with primarily a 4:12 pitch. However, they were proposing a 1.75:12 pitch over the garage and a designed awning pitch of 0.25, which the Board would need to grant a variance.

The ARC reviewed the plans and found no issues.

Scott Boyle asked about the pitch of the roof on the garage. From looking at the drawings, he believed the 4:12 pitch roof would be dumping snow onto a flatter roof. Michelle Suitor stated that personally having a house with a steep pitch that leads onto another pitch, there is so much velocity when it comes off that it takes everything in its path. Mr. Boyle stated that it was his only concern.

Mr. Adams noted that the Board previously raised issues about a secondary roof line due to engineering problems. However, engineering issues is something the HOA does not address. He believed the HOA has granted variances in this type of situation. He appreciated Mr. Boyle's concern, but since it was allowed in the past, they need to be consistent. Ms. Suitor stated that if the engineer signed off on the design, she did not have a problem with the roof.

Mr. Sears thought the Board should at least inform the owners of the problems that could arise from having that much snow shed off into the other area.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the variance request for Lot FM-B-37, two separate pitches; one for the garage pitch at 1.75:12, and the other for the awning pitch at 0.25:12. Sam Vincent seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan for Lot FM-B-37, for a 4,090 square foot new home. Paul Suitor seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Lot FM-A-8-2AM

Mr. Adams reviewed plans for a new home with an accessory dwelling unit on Lot FM-A-8-2AM, 2886 Forest Meadow. The owner, Robert Kaplin, was proposing to build a 7,525 square foot new home. The barn will be 1,728 square feet with an accessory dwelling unit. The lot size is 8.37 acres. The Lot Improvement Plan was complete, and all the fees were paid.

Mr. Adams stated that the owner was proposing a vertical 1 x 6 cedar or random natural in each plank for siding. They will either let the materials naturally age or they will be sealed. If the owner chooses to stain the siding material, they selected *Valstar*, Darkest Night, in gray. The roof material will be standing seam metal and presidential shake asphalt in black. The owner was also proposing to use natural rock. They initially proposed an original rock material and later decided that it was too dark. The owners introduced a Gomez stone in a lighter color with a variety of grays and a tint of rust.

Mr. Adams stated that the Board would need to approve a variance request for a 2.75:12 roof line over the rear deck. The barn overhang would also require a 3:12 variance.

The Architectural Committee reviewed the proposed plans and found no issues.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve a variance request for a 2.75:12 roof line over the rear deck, and a variance request for a 3:12 roof line over the barn overhang. Paul Suitor seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan as presented for Lot FM-A-8-2AM, 2886 Forest Meadow, for a 7,525 square foot new home, and a 1,728 square foot new barn that also has an accessory dwelling unit. Shaun Baker seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Lot FM-C-67-A

Mr. Adams reviewed plans for Lot FM-67-A. The owners, Jim Jeffries and Mark Flickinger were proposing a 4,098 square foot new home on .83 acres. The Lot Improvement Plan was complete, and all the fees were paid.

Mr. Adams stated that the plans were originally reviewed at an ARC meeting; however, the Committee had trouble focusing because they were given so many selection items. Since then, Mr. Jeffries pulled the materials together showing that the home will be built in

traditional log. It may be a square-faced log on the exterior, or it may be a rounded log. Both are acceptable and both would look nice. Mr. Adams stated that traditional logs will be used on three of the exterior sides, the north, east, and west. One side will also have local random board to board trestle wood, which is a naturally aged random width material. He noted that the owners may decide to stain it in a cedar gray. If the gray does not look right, they would like to use a Hill Country brown. The structure will have approximately 7% concrete. The roof materials will be a standing seam metal in slate gray or charcoal.

Mr. Adams reported that a variance would be required for the pitch over the entire home. The owners were proposing a 3:12 pitch with a pitch over the master bedroom at 1.5:12.

Mr. Pagel asked if the revisions mentioned were specifically called out in the signed Lot Improvement Plan. Mr. Adams answered yes. Mr. Suitor questioned the 3:12 pitch and thought it looked like a huge house on a small lot. Mr. Adams replied that roof pitch majority was 3:12. He indicated the section where the pitch would drop to 1.5:12.

Mr. Pagel thought from the plan that a retaining wall would be required. Mr. Adams noted that they would need to use boulders. Mr. Pagel recommended specifically stating it in the Lot Improvement Plan that if a retaining wall is required it must be boulders. He believed it was consistent with what was done on past properties. Mr. Pagel also requested that the Lot Improvement Plan specify 10% or less for the concrete.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve a variance request for a 3:12 main roof line, and a 1.5:12 pitch over the master bedroom on Lot FM-C-67-A. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan as specified for Lot FM-C-67-A for a 4,098 square foot new home on .83 acres. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Impact Fee Calculation

Mr. Adams reported that the new Impact Fee Calculations were in place and being used. The new calculation was included in the Lot Improvement Plan. Michelle Suitor will post it online.

Open Public Forum on issues discussed later in the meeting.

There were no comments or questions.

Refund – Lot PI-D-100 and PI-D-101.

Mr. Sears noted that the Board previously approved a project on Lot PI-D-100 and Lot D-101; however, the owners are unable to move forward because the cost to build a road per Summit County was \$125,000. The owners were requesting to have the \$12,000 impact fee refunded. No visible work has been done on the lot. Mr. Sears understood that the Water Company would not reimburse their fee because it is a utility. The HOA does have the ability to reimburse the fees that were paid because the owners have not disturbed the lot and have no intention of building until they can figure out the road issue or whether to just build on one lot.

The Board was comfortable issuing the \$12,000 refund. Mr. Sears would direct Carol to proceed with the refund.

Mr. Adams reported that the Board previously approved the Lot Improvement Plan for another owner, but he could not recall the lot number. The owner may need to delay building beyond the two-year window, and he wanted to know the best course of action. Ms. Suitor was comfortable giving an extension on a plan that the Board had already approved. Mr. Sears preferred to grant an extension rather than have the owner restart the process.

Mr. Pagel thought they should tell the owner that if it goes beyond the 2 years, he could resubmit his plans if nothing has changed. Any changes to the plan would require Board discussion and approval. After two years, the owner will also be subject to any changes to the architectural rules and/or increased impact fees.

The Board adjourned the regular meeting at 8:32pm and moved into Closed Session.
