

**Approved
August 16, 2022,
as corrected**

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING
IN PERSON & VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
JULY 19, 2022

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

Ex Officio: Robert Rosing, HOA Counsel

Excused: George Sears

John Adams called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m.

Minutes

June 21, 2022

Paul Suitor referred to the fifth paragraph under the Manager's Report and corrected 18,000 loads to correctly read \$18,000.

Mr. Suitor referred to page 10 and the reference by Scott Boyle to Lot PI-G-44 regarding the fire pit. He was unsure which lot Mr. Boyle was talking about, but he was certain it was not PI-G-44. Paul noted that PI-G-44 was two lots down from him.

Ed Deffner, the owner of Lot PI-I-37, believed Mr. Boyle was referring to his lot because they received approval for a fire pit last month following the Board discussion at the last meeting.

Paul Suitor corrected the Minutes to change Lot PI-G-44 to correctly read Lot PI-I-37.

Mr. Adams read from page 2 under the Ranch Manger Report, "Jody reported that the mag was completed", and changed the sentence to correctly read, "Jody reported that the mag water was completed."

Mr. Adams read from page 8 under Area Rep reports, "Mr. Vincent asked if the HOA should have a smaller guideline for propane." He believed the sentence should read, "...a similar guideline for propane."

MOTION: Michelle Suitor moved to approve the Minutes of June 21, 2022, as corrected. Katie Winters seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Ranch Manager Report

Jody was not in attendance. He had provided a report summary to John Adams.

Mr. Adams reported that currently Jody was spending most of his time grading roads following the storms. Jody was working on the Forest Meadow side this week and he plans to move back to the Pine Meadow side next week.

Jody was also working on bar ditches and spraying thistle. Jody was trying to catch up on these projects before the roads get too dry to avoid the risk of starting a fire.

Jody will start spreading road base again in August. He is about halfway through his budget. Jody intends to go back to Willow Circle and then to the south side of Forest Circle and then continue with the priority list of roads.

Mr. Suitor suggested that Jody clear the drain on Bobcat that was clogged by two beavers.

Water Company Report

John Adams had attended the Water Company Board meeting.

Mr. Adams reported that Pine Meadow has not had to purchase water from Mountain Regional since May. There was a large leak that was found on the intersection of Forest Meadow and Arapaho that was repaired. Before it was repaired, the leak was spilling 10-12 gallons per minute over a year or two.

Mr. Adams stated that Eric Cylvick had reported that with the source from the Pine Meadow wells and the perpetual agreement with Mountain Regional, for the first time ever Pine Meadow has the water needed for full buildout of the Ranch.

Mr. Adams reported that the Mountain Regional system is currently running on a different technology compared to Pine Meadow Water. Mr. Cylvick noted that Pine Meadow Water was also looking at possibly migrating to the same technology.

If at some point Pine Meadow were to annex into Mountain Regional the transition would be smoother if they were on the same system.

Mr. Vincent asked if the new technology would help to identify a leak sooner. Mr. Adams answered yes. The current water system operates at a higher flow rate before it is detected. Mr. Adams stated that the Water Company plans to put in a new water meter connection between Pine

Meadow and Mountain Regional on the west side of the Mountain. It will enable them to measure water flow rates at $\frac{3}{4}$ of a gallon per minute. Shaun Baker who also is a member of the Pine Meadow Water Board of Trustees, pointed out that the new meter will measure the water from Pine Meadow Water to Stagecoach. The meter that measures water coming from Mountain Regional to Pine Meadow is already in place. Mr. Baker explained that the meter between Pine Meadow and Stagecoach is an older meter, and it does not detect anything under a few gallons per minute.

Mr. Adams asked Mr. Baker why the leak on Forest Meadow and Arapaho went on for so long. Mr. Baker stated that two leak detection companies came up and pressurized the line and ran dye through it. Both companies told Brody that it was definitely not a leak. He believed the line finally blew out when Brody and Trevor were working on it, which is how the location was detected.

Mr. Adams reported that the cost of the new meter could be approximately \$175,000. The Water Company will ask Mountain Regional about splitting the cost, and based on earlier discussions with Mountain Regional, the Water Company has credits that they would like to use towards their half. Mr. Baker clarified that the project will be split 50/50 between Pine Meadow Water and Mountain Regional, regardless of whether they can use the credit. Mr. Baker remarked that Pine Meadow Water would like to have the new meter because when people at Stagecoach use small amounts of water at night it does not get picked up because the flow rate is so low. Over time, there is significant water usage and Pine Meadow does not get credit for providing that water. Pine Meadow Water is working with Mountain Regional to get the meter installed.

Mr. Adams reported that the Water Company plans to purchase 10 loads of 3" gravel to spread on the road to the upper lot. They would like to lay the gravel by Fall before trailers and other vehicles use the road. Brody estimated the cost at approximately \$3,000, and the Water Company asked if the HOA would split the cost. Mr. Adams offered to bring it to the HOA Board. He personally thought it was a reasonable request. The HOA would pay approximately \$1500. The road gets muddy in bad weather and gravel would help.

MOTION: Michelle Sutor moved to split the cost of gravel for the road to the upper lot with the Water Company. John Adams seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. One vote was opposed.

Mr. Baker remarked that the Water Board also talked about running a new water line down Forgotten Lane. Brody and Trevor would do the work rather than hiring a contractor. Mr. Baker recalled that the bids received were \$78,000 to \$80,000 and Brody thought he and Trevor could do it for half the cost. The project should take a week to 10 days to complete. Due to their current

workload, they will not begin work on the line until end of September or first part of October.

Monthly Budget Review

The Board reviewed the unpaid bills detail.

Mr. Pagel was unsure whether the \$8,000 invoice for mag water was the total cost or if they should expect another invoice. He would ask Jody for clarification.

Mr. Pagel reviewed the financials. He noted that they were at 92% collections on both the HOA assessment and the special fire assessment.

Mr. Pagel stated that they were exceeding the projected construction assessment fees. They had budgeted \$42,000 and currently the variable income was \$157,000. They would like to put a significant amount into the reserve account at the end of the year if possible.

Mr. Suitor asked if they were in a position to authorize Jody to purchase additional aggregate. Mr. Pagel could see no issue with Jody purchasing more aggregate. They have approved aggregate purchases every time Jody has asked this year. Mr. Suitor thought the Board should tell Jody that money is available for that purpose because he typically does not ask. Mr. Pagel replied that Jody usually asks when he needs something. Mr. Pagel asked if the Board was comfortable spending another \$20,000 to \$40,000 on aggregate. The Board was in favor.

Ms. Suitor stated that if they are putting aggregate on roads, they should also assess whether the road needs a culvert to keep the aggregate from washing off in the spring. Mr. Pagel agreed. Mr. Pagel suggested that the Board identify key areas that need aggregate and culvert installation. They will tell Jody that the Board approved an additional amount for aggregate.

MOTION: Paul Suitor moved to approve \$20,000 for Jody to purchase additional aggregate. Sam Vincent seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Mr. Pagel moved to approve paying the unpaid bills as presented in the amount of \$15,272.34. John Adams seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Marty Hansen referred to the line item for Escrow Fire Station Deposit at \$15,000 under Liabilities

and Equities. Since there have been changes to the plans, he asked if that had been acknowledged. Mr. Pagel replied that if it is not going to be used for the fire station, it would make sense to allocate the funds towards additional fire mitigation if the additional funds can be utilized.

Ms. Suitor questioned the \$15,000 as a deposit for the fire station. She noted that the HOA always has \$15,000 annually in the budget for various reasons. Mr. Adams clarified that the Board allocated \$15,000 on the income statement side, and they also looked at the balance sheet item where Alan Powell collected \$15,000. Ms. Suitor asked if they have two \$15,000 line items. Mr. Adams replied that one was on the balance sheet. He explained that when the land transferred it went to Summit County and Summit County paid the HOA \$15,000 for the 3 acres. Mr. Pagel suggested verifying that the \$15,000 would not be used for the fire station. If that is the case, he was not opposed to allocating the money towards other fire measures, based on the Board's approval. Mr. Pagel clarified that the line item is not in the budget. The line item is in the balance sheet, which means it can sit in the account.

Ms. Suitor noted that the Board had set aside \$15,000 in the budget for fire mitigation. She asked if that \$15,000 was still there, and there was another \$15,000 that came from the sale of the 3 acres. Mr. Adams answered yes. The Board discussed possibilities for using the \$15,000 designated for the fire station.

Ms. Suitor asked if Pine Meadow could get the 3 acres back if the fire station is not built. Mr. Adams thought it was an interesting discussion that should occur in a closed meeting. Ms. Suitor pointed out that they should not spend that \$15,000 without knowing whether they might need to refund it back to Summit County. Mr. Adams suggested continuing this discussion with Ben to get a better understanding of the long-term plan. Wanship is the first priority; however, Pine Meadow continues to grow. Mr. Adams noted that Mr. Sears and representatives from the Fire Safety Committee attended a committee meeting that he believed went well. The downside from that meeting is that Pine Meadow will not be getting a fire station. Mr. Suitor pointed out that during that meeting it was clarified that all the equipment on the Mountain would be sold. Mr. Pagel stated that the excess \$157,000 versus \$42,000 on the variable income side gives the HOA the opportunity to potentially purchase back some of that equipment.

Open Board Position

Mr. Adams reported that Scott Boyle had stepped down as Area 7 Rep., which created a vacancy on the Board. He noted that three people submitted their name as possible candidates to replace Mr. Boyle until elections are held at the Annual Meeting this winter; however, two of those people withdrew their names from consideration. The remaining person was Aja Martin.

Mr. Adams remarked that the Board would be voting in closed session later this evening to discuss the nomination of Aja Martin as the Area 7 Representative for the remainder of the year. Mr. Adams asked Ms. Martin to briefly introduce herself so they would know a little more about her.

Aja Martin stated that she and her partner purchased their property in 2020 and they are full-time residents. She is helping to organize the fire cleanup and she sits on the Fire and Safety Committee. Ms. Martin has seen a lot of people get excited over fire mitigation. They care about the community and volunteer to help. Mr. Adams thought it was very noticeable that Ms. Martin is passionate about fire mitigation and has been diligent in getting things done. Ms. Martin stated that she is an environmental scientist by profession. On a personal level she wants the Mountain to be safe and she thinks it is important for people to understand fire mitigation and the benefits.

Rules and Regulations

Building Rule Changes to Architectural Guidelines 4.1 and 4.2

Mr. Adams stated that changes to Architectural Guidelines 4.1 and 4.2 were approved at the last meeting. However, the actual physical document had been updated and the Board needed to ratify the document. Mr. Adams remarked that the Board would be ratifying the document with corrections. Some errors were typed into it, and they need to note the corrections.

MOTION: Mr. Adams moved to ratify passage and inclusion of the June 22, 2022, rule changes in the Architectural Guidelines as presented and voted on at the June 22, 2022 Board Meeting, with the corrections to the document as follows:

Page 2 - should read, 4.1 Siding – followed by acceptable materials include:

Page 2 - line item E, “engineered stone pre-finished” currently shows Class A and Class fire rated. It should be corrected to show “Class A or Class B fire rated”.

Page 3 - line item G, “Unfinished pour foundation”. It should be corrected to read, “unfinished poured foundation.”

Page 3 - Acceptable Finishes – line item A shows finished siding in colores that...”. It should be corrected to read, “in colors that.”

Page 3 - line item G – Unacceptable roof materials – copper, silver. It should be corrected to read, copper, or silver.”

Ms. Suitor read the entire sentence in line Item G under Unacceptable roof materials, “Reflective materials and colors such as white, red, blue, yellow, copper, silver are unacceptable. She thought the sentence as printed read correctly. Mr. Adams clarified that he was only correcting the sentence to include the word “or”, to match the exact language that was presented to the community.

Katie Winters seconded the motion to approve the changes as presented.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Building Rule Changes to Architectural Guideline 4.4 - Size

Mr. Adams stated that there was an extended comment period on this proposed rule change to Guideline 4.4. The public comment period opened on June 17th, and it was closed yesterday. They received a total of 157 responses. In total, 57.3% of the responders were in favor of size restrictions; and 39.5% either completely opposed size restrictions or some opposed the wording as presented. Mr. Adams noted that 3.2% had no opinion.

Mr. Adams stated that 31.8% approved the language as written; 25.5% approved the language as written but also wanted to add a sentence that would restrict foundation size to 67% of the total build.

Mr. Adams reviewed some of the public comments, which included whether existing structures would be grandfathered in; and not including structures such as carports or garages. Some thought they should let Summit County make the decision on what can or cannot be built and to enforce County size restrictions. Others thought 3,000 square feet was still too big. Mr. Adams noted that some people believe they should be looking at road safety as a priority over house size. Others thought 8500 square feet is too large for any size lot. Mr. Adams remarked that some comments questioned why they were specifying a 400 square foot minimum for a dwelling rather than allowing people to build what they want.

Ms. Suitor stated that Summit County does not dictate a size ratio. When she and Mr. Adams started looking into it in February, they found that each development typically sets its own square foot regulations. Ms. Suitor remarked that since 1970, most development have a 5,000 square foot limit. Some developments are as low as 4,000 square feet. Promontory has a few dwellings that are 8,000 square feet, but only on a 15-acre lot. Ms. Suitor clarified that they were trying to bring Pine Meadow Ranch in line with what other communities currently allow.

Mr. Adams stated that the official comment period has ended; however, they would allow the community to respond online or in person to voice their opinions or ask questions at this meeting.

A property owner asked if the certain square footage only includes the main floor or the entire square footage of the structure. He pointed out that a lot of people have basements that can be finished as livable space. Mr. Adams pulled up the definition of how they calculate square footage,

which states that the HOA uses the architect's calculations for the main level, plus the upper and lower levels, plus the garage, as well as a shed if it is over 120 square feet. Mr. Adams clarified that it includes any square footage in the home regardless of whether it is conditioned. The square footage does not include open porches, open patios, or open decks unless there are plans to enclose them. The property owner understood that it includes all finished area, but it does not need to be livable area. He suggested limiting the house size to the size of buildable area on the lot. He noted that many lots hang off the back end of the mountain and only have a small spot on the top to build. He thought the lot size itself should not determine the lot size allowed on it. It should be the usable amount of lot that can accommodate a structure.

Mr. Pagel pointed out other factors that restrict building size on the lot outside of this proposed Guideline and they were not targeting those cases. The Board was trying to limit putting a 10,000 square foot home on a one acre lot, which would impede wildlife. The property owner stated that watching the Board meetings over the past few months, he has seen a lot of houses proposed that are quite large for a small lot. When he looks at the lot, it is not only small, but half of it is hanging off the back of the mountain, which is unbuildable area. Mr. Pagel understood the point being made. He thought those were good examples where it would end up resulting in a much larger structure before they had building size enforcements. The HOA was now trying to enforce building size to keep that from occurring.

Someone stated that usable space originally restricted the size of home, and she did not think it needed to be written into the language.

Mr. Adams stated that based on the feedback received, they could argue that the majority of the community who responded want the Guideline regulating size. Mr. Adams thought they should recognize the people who do not want this Guideline. As they continue this discussion, he would like the decision reached to somehow acknowledge those people, so they know that the Board understands their concerns. There is a group of people that feel strongly about protecting nature and protecting the Ranch environment. Mr. Adams would like the Board's decision to be balanced and at least achieve some level of compromise.

Mr. Adams proposed an amendment to apply the rule only when a lot is sold or after seven years for all existing owners, whichever comes first. If the Board decides to pass the Guideline as proposed, they could follow up with the amendment which would need to be presented with a 15-day public notice to give the community the opportunity to respond. Mr. Adams believed it was an olive branch that could be presented to the entire community as a compromise. The Board agreed on the seven-year grandfathering for existing owners.

Mr. Adams asked how the Board felt about the foundation limit. He noted that only 25.5% of all

respondents were interested in a foundation limit. He noted that only 44% of the group who said yes to the house size limit want a foundation limit. Mr. Pagel asked if the 33% who said no had direct comments towards that particular item. Mr. Adams replied that people just said no to the foundation limit, and some did not vote.

Mr. Adams summarized that the board could approve the Guideline as written, with the foundation size limit, they could do a motion to amend, or they could do nothing.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the proposed Architectural Guideline change to Section 4.4 – Size, as written and as presented to the community for a comment period that began on June 17, 2022. Michelle Suitor seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Marty Hansen, Sam Vincent, Katie Winters, Shaun Baker, Paul Suitor, Andrew Pagel, Michelle Suitor, and John Adams voted in favor of the motion. Dwaine Anderson voted against the motion. George Sears was not present for the vote.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve and submit the following amendment to Guideline 4.4 for a 15-day public comment period. This amendment would appear as Bullet C and state, “All existing Lot owners as of July 19, 2022, are exempt from the maximum allowable square footage restrictions for a period of seven years, or whenever the lot that they own is sold, whichever comes first. Michelle Suitor seconded the motion.

Robert Rosing suggested replacing “sold” with the following “All existing Lot owners as of July 19, 2022, are exempt from the maximum allowable square footage restrictions for a period of seven years. The exemption shall terminate upon the earlier of seven years or a transfer of title for value, whichever comes first.

AMENDED MOTION: Mr. Adams amended his motion to approve and submit the following amendment to Guideline 4.4 for a 15-day public comment period. The amendment would appear as Bullet C and state, “All existing Lot owners as of July 19, 2022 are exempt from the maximum allowable square footage restrictions for a period of seven years. The exemption shall terminate upon the earlier of seven years or a transfer of title for value, whichever comes first.” Michelle Suitor seconded the amended motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Marty Hansen, Sam Vincent, Katie Winters, Shaun Baker, Paul Suitor, Andrew Pagel, Michelle Suitor, John Adams voted in favor of the motion. Dwaine Anderson voted against the motion. George Sears was not present for the vote.

Mr. Adams thanked the members who provided feedback. He wanted it clear that the Board tries

to represent everyone as best as possible. Realizing that they cannot always please everyone, they do try to be sensitive to opposing positions and respect those positions.

Area Rep Reports

Area 1 - Dwaine Anderson had nothing to report.

Area 2 - Marty Hansen had nothing to report.

Area 3 - Sam Vincent had nothing to report.

Area 4 - Katie Winters reported on feedback from people in the community asking if the HOA has a say or will take action on the noxious weed situation. She appreciated that Michelle Suitor had reached out to Summit County. Ms. Winters understood that Summit County already has enough regulation on noxious weeds and Pine Meadow Ranch does not need to do anything more to enforce additional regulation. Ms. Winters raised the issue this evening to see if there was additional community comment. Mr. Adams pointed out that it is a primary issue for everyone because Dyers Woad, Thistle, and other noxious weeds are rampant. Ms. Winters thought it was best for Pine Meadow to continue working with Summit County.

Chris Hahn stated that he was speaking with a neighbor who mentioned that someone had turned him in for the Dyers Woad along the front of his house. He only had a limited amount of time to take care of it or he would be charged the cost to hire someone to do it. Ms. Suitor stated that Summit County gives a warning and a specific number of days to comply. If a second warning is given and there is still no compliance, the County can hire someone and charge the homeowner for the cleanup. It is enforced by Summit County and not the HOA.

Area 5 - Shaun Baker had nothing to report.

Area 6 - Paul Suitor had one issue from Area 6 but it needed to be discussed in closed session.

Area 7 – There was currently no Area Rep for Area 7, and no report was given.

Open Public Forum

John Labrum, Lot FM-D-96-A, asked if the Board has ever looked at the locations of fire hydrants on the Mountain. Mr. Adams stated that the Water Company has a map of where fire hydrants are located. Mr. Labrum stated that a few owners are building on Forgotten Lane. His address is 741 Forgotten Lane and the nearest hydrant is at 519 Forgotten Lane, which is five lots away. The next hydrant after that is at Forest Meadow and Grandview.

Paul Suitor stated that the Water Company will install a fire hydrant if the homeowner pays for the

hydrant. He understood that in most cases a hydrant costs less than a home sprinkling system. Mr. Suitor noted that several homeowners could request to pay for one hydrant, but they would need to pursue it through the Water Company.

Mr. Labrum stated that the Fire Chief was requiring him to put in a 5,000-gallon storage facility. Ms. Adams stated that this same issue was brought up a few times by other residents who are more than 600 feet away from a hydrant. Mr. Labrum pointed out that it was a Summit County rule. Ms. Suitor asked if Summit County has any stipulation on how far a hydrant should be disbursed from another hydrant. Mr. Labrum replied that they should be 600 feet apart. He noted that the fire department only has 600 feet of hose, and they are not able to tap into a hydrant if it is further away from the fire.

Mr. Labrum stated that the Fire Chief has also been getting a lot of calls regarding insurability of homes. The Fire Chief told him that unless the property is within 600 feet of a hydrant, the owner is required to put in a 5,000-gallon tank and a sprinkler system inside the home.

Shaun Baker stated that the new water line on Forgotten Lane could possibly include a couple of hydrants. He had not yet seen the map from Brody Blonquist. Mr. Baker recalled that 950 feet of line was being added to Forgotten Lane.

Chris Bell, Lot PI-D-35, commented on the public comment period regarding grandfathering the square footage restrictions. He asked if the grandfathering would apply to both aspects of the motion, which includes the overall size and the foundation ratio. Mr. Adams replied that the foundation ratio was not included in the vote. It only applies to the square footage of the total structures. Mr. Suitor clarified that at this point there would not be a foundation limit. There would only be a square footage limit.

Committee Reports

Roads and Parking - No report was given. Michelle Suitor noted that Scott Boyle was head of the Roads and Parking Committee and he had resigned. If a Board member or anyone from the community was interested in being on the Roads and Parking Committee, they should reach out to the Board.

Fire Committee – Aja Martin reported on the second cleanup day. She noted that a lot of people came out and they were able to clean up all the way from Valley View and Bull Moose and all the way to the fence line. There were raffles and people won gifts and prizes that were donated. Ms. Martin stated that the committee was trying to see if there is a way to create a non-profit account

in the future for the donation money.

Mr. Vincent commended Ms. Martin for doing an awesome job planning the cleanup event. Michelle Suitor stated that if people can only come for a couple of hours, it is a great way to meet neighbors.

Ms. Martin asked if the HOA could put up permanent posts for fire signage such as no fireworks and other fire related issues.

Communications – Michelle Suitor stated that she has worked with the Fire Safety committee and the evacuation plan is now posted on the website, along with suggested check lists, and a map of the evacuation routes. Ms. Suitor remarked that she posted what the Fire Committee provided. The Fire Safety Committee previously recommended chain saws and bolt cutters as priority items for people to take with them when evacuating, but those items were not on the checklist. If the Fire Committee wanted to revise the checklist, she would repost it.

Architectural Review Committee

Lot PI-4

Mr. Adams reviewed an amendment to Lot Improvement Plan for PI-4. The owner, Andrew Pagel, is in the process of building a 1,495 square foot pole barn. The Board previously approved the Lot Improvement Plan on April 19, 2022. Mr. Pagel later asked the Architectural Committee if they would allow him to increase the use of the previously approved metal siding from the 35% to 79%. Mr. Pagel also proposed additional changes from the original approval. Instead of the Hardie Plank that he initially planned to use, Mr. Pagel will finish the siding in the natural cedar plank that was previously approved.

Mr. Adams clarified that all the materials were the same as the original approval with the exception of not using Hardie Plank and requesting an increase in the metal to 79%.

Paul Suitor asked if the metal would be the same grade as originally proposed. Mr. Adams answered yes.

MOTION: Michelle Suitor moved to approve the amended Lot Improvement Plan with the siding in the natural cedar plank and metal increased to 79%, for Andrew Pagel, Lot PI-4, as presented. Paul Suitor seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Dwaine Anderson abstained from the vote.

PI-D-80

Mr. Adams reviewed a request to update the Lot Improvement Plan for PI-D-80. The owners are Trent and Allie Childs. The owners originally proposed a 2,891 square foot home with a garage. The garage has an accessory dwelling unit. The Board approved the original Lot Improvement Plan in February 2020. The home is completely built, and the garage is currently under construction. Mr. Adams presented a photo of how it looks currently.

The Childs have requested to extend the garage and the accessory dwelling by 642 square feet. They would like to add a 14' x 17' square foot section on either side of what was originally proposed, bringing the total project to 3,491 square feet.

Mr. Adams stated that the materials were standard and included Cedar Mill and Hardie Plank in a Rafter Brown, and a standing seam metal roof in black.

The Architectural Review Committee reviewed the request over the weekend and the owners were asked to address specific concerns. Mr. Adams indicated an upstairs living area and a lower section with what looked like a toilet, wash area, and possibly a refrigerator. Mr. Adams noted that the stairwell that connects the upstairs unit is at the back of the house. There is no direct connection from the downstairs to the upstairs. The Architectural Committee thought it looked like two accessory dwelling units.

After meeting several times with Trent and Allie, Mr. Childs clarified that the lower section is his work area and where he plans to clean up or use the restroom while he is working. Mr. Adams emphasized that the house is already built. They were only looking at the garage. Mr. Child stated that he told the architect that he wanted a bathroom, a sink and a refrigerator. It is like a shop, and he does not want to go into the house to use those facilities when he is working. Mr. Child recognized that in looking at the plans it could be perceived as an apartment unit on the side, but it is actually a workshop. It is not connected to the upstairs dwelling unit. He explained that the only access to the accessory dwelling unit is the deck that comes off the back of the garage.

Mr. Adams remarked that the only issue this evening were the two 14' x 17' pads with a 2.5 pitch roof on either side. In 2020 the garage was approved at approximately 672 square feet. He was unsure whether the upstairs was counted in the square footage when it was approved in 2020.

Mr. Suitor was not opposed to the two pads as long as the square footage remains under 1,000 square feet. Mr. Adams stated that the square footage would still be under 1,000 square feet. Summit County will need to address the sink, toilet, and refrigerator.

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association
Monthly Board Meeting
July 19, 2022
Page 14

MOTION: John Adams moved to amend the Lot Improvement Plan for Lot PI-D-80 that would allow the expansion of the garage/ADU combination by 672 square feet subject to Summit County approval according to the plans as presented.

Katie Winters seconded the motion as amended.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Open Public Forum on issues discussed later in the meeting.

There were no comments or questions.

The Board adjourned the regular meeting and moved into Closed Session.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 8:24 p.m.
