

GLA Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes
January 25, 2016, Liberty Hall kitchen
Confidential – Do Not Copy

Attending:

Committee Members; Kevin Newby Co-Chair, Gerald Dubiel Co-Chair; Ed Dobrowski, Sally Muto, Leo Keeler

Board Members: Charlotte Mizzi, Charlene Murphy

Landowners: Clare Parker, Tim Murphy, Debbie Blais, Claudette Dirkers, Dorothy Keeler, Chris Williams, Sheila Laverty, Michael Laverty, Donna Lash, Ia Williams, Tim Brockett

Meeting Started 7:10 PM, Ended 9:30PM

Agenda presented for the evening: 1) Get new fee schedule approved; 2) Approve new instructions for Project Review Process; 3) Set goals for 2016 4) Make a Checklist for Project Review process

1. The new fee schedule has been mailed out for 30 day Landowner review and comments.
 - a. It was announced the new fee schedule would set rates at \$25.00 for the 1st page.
 - b. The fee for each additional page will be \$10.00.
 - c. Landowner comments and suggestions will be reviewed and incorporated as appropriate.
 - d. Final instructions are to be ready for Board vote at the March meeting.
2. A draft of new Project Review Instructions developed within the committee was shared with the audience to enable immediate input. After incorporating this input, it will be presented to the Board and then sent out for 30 day Member comment.
 - a. There is a major problem with timing of the Committee receiving the files and the data needed for the review process.
 - i. It was recommended the timeline for submitting applications be increased to 30 days.
 1. It was presented that the new Administrative Assistant will be trained by the Project Review Committee to assure knowledge of timelines. It was emphasized that getting information to the Committee quickly was critical to allow adequate time to review.
 2. Objective is that the Committee has all paperwork 3 weeks before a scheduled Board meeting

- ii. It was recommended that the final project application instructions be included in the WELCOME PACKAGE for new landowners.
 - iii. It was recognized that information on late assessment debts will be difficult to pass on to prospective buyers. Sellers in compliance are likely to check the box identifying the land is within an HOA, but sellers in debt may not.
 - iv. It was recommend to increase Realtor and Title Company awareness of GLA requirements so they could pass the information on to land & home buyers.
 - 1. Gerald offered to make contacts and hand out the Project Review Instructions to Realtors and Title Companies in Livingston and Bozeman; however he may not be able to contact all of them.
- b. It was brought up that to be considered in good standing and qualify to submit a project for review, the Member must be current with all assessments and in compliance with all covenants.
 - i. Landowners with multiple lots must be current on the assessments for all lots and not just the lot where the project would occur.
 - ii. The requirement that the Landowner not be in violation of other Covenants, such as nuisance and eyesores.
 - 1. It was recommended that when the Project Review Committee inspects the project site, they also consider conditions of the lot and possible violations of other covenants. All violations, or potential violations, would be presented to the Board for action before approval of the project.
 - 2. It was suggested that “nuisance and eyesore” may be different for different people and hard to enforce. A counter argument and reference to covenants and Board ability to enforce was made known and will be part of the Committee final recommendations

Note: It was presented that developing a data base for GLA would be useful in many areas. It was presented that the Project Review Co-Chairs had started gathering information through a drive around that might be used in a data base if GLA proceeds to develop one. Gerald informed everyone he was still working on getting good maps with accurate road and property boundary locations of both North and South Glastonbury and that once received they would be a visual asset to a data base.

- c. The need to have DEQ approvals and their plats locating septic and drain fields they approved was presented.

- i. It was recommended that the Project Review Instructions require the DEQ approvals be submitted as part of the application. It was noted that GLA approvals depend upon the DEQ approvals being in place.
 - ii. It was recognized that getting DEQ approvals and other approvals might delay construction in our short construction season. It was presented that errors in timing should not cause GLA to rush a decision.
 - d. It was requested to include a step in the instructions to have a meeting open to the members be held before the Board meeting to discuss the project.
 - i. Co-Chairman Newby presented they were going to include such a meeting, like this one of 1/26/2016, within the process being establishing. The amount of time available before Board meetings may be challenging to setting up these meetings. This will be included in the final Project Review Instructions Proposal presented for the 30 day landowner review and comments.
 - 1. Methods to inform landowners of the project and open meeting were discussed. Posting of the projects on the web was discussed, as well as post card mail outs to adjoining properties when variances were involved.
 - e. How to make all Board members aware of and fully informed on the project was discussed.
 - i. Concern was voiced over the last two projects before the Board voted and the amount of knowledge obtained after the Board meeting. It was presented that mistakes were made due to Board members not fully participating in Project reviews.
 - ii. It was requested that in all major construction projects, that all Board members visit the project site before voting, or abstain from the process.
- 3. The 2016 Goals for the Project Review Committee that were discussed were:
 - a. Updating the fee schedule is out for landowner review and on track for completion.
 - b. Developing new Project Application Instructions, were discussed in detail (reference above)
 - i. Committee Members will incorporate items discussed at this meeting into the draft and present it to the Board at the February meeting.
 - 1. After approval by the Board, the Board's recommended changes will be incorporated and the instructions will be sent to all Landowners for a 30 day comment period.

2. All comments received will be discussed by the Project Review Committee, incorporated as appropriate, and a final document will be presented for Board approval.
4. Developing a checklist for all Covenant and Master Plan requirements pertaining to projects was briefly discussed. The Project Review Committee will be developing a checklist for use in considering all projects. It was acknowledged such a list may not be pertinent to all projects, but the use of the checklist would help assure no issues are overlooked.

Other Topics:

- A. The current Meeting Decorum and process by which it was established was questioned by many in the audience.
 - a. Little could be discussed on this matter as it is a Board issue not a Project Review issue
 - b. The Committee welcomed the comments on this topic as an educational effort to make them more responsive to Landowners.
- B. The Buchanan project generated questions including:
 - a. There being 3 drawings for the project and not knowing which drawing was approved by DEQ.
 - b. A discussion of the new Sage Grouse protection law effective January 1, 2016, and if current re-review of the project by DEQ cancels the Board approval of January 11th
 - i. If the Board knew which drawing they were approving?
 - ii. Had applicant requested another change to the project asking to have 2 residents on the lot?
 1. Having 2 residents on this small lot would be a violation of density standards;
 - iii. Has the Board approved the timing of construction of both the residence and shop?
 - iv. Were the well and septic locations verified as having proper setbacks and DEQ approval?
 - v. How and where were any stipulations or conditions placed on the approval?
- C. The fear of a commercial operation without a residence on site was voiced by many attending the meeting.
 - i. It was requested to have the Governing Document change process clearly spell out that Glastonbury is a residential community and all commercial activities of any nature must be totally concealed. This was requested by many in the audience.

- D. The Marius Michael-George project approval and his midnight hauling the storage shed to his lot generated many complaints and discussion.
- a. The primary concern expressed by the audience was the new Meeting Decorum and Board process which was interpreted as a forced approval of the project without all facts and concerns presented to the Board.
 - i. Both Co-Chairmen were not allowed to present all their information and their recommendations to the Board before the vote was called.
 - ii. Committee members attempted to participate, but were not allowed to speak, causing the Board to be further in the dark about important issues.
 - iii. Neighboring Landowners allowed only 3 minutes to speak prevented the Board from understanding their position.
 - iv. The new Meeting Decorum makes an assumption the Board knows everything, but the audience questioned how can the Board know what it does not know? Would allowing all Committee members and impacted landowners to speak resolve this problem?
 - b. It was brought out by many in attendance, including 4 Committee members, that Mr. Michael-George had openly and freely made promises to conduct specific work.
 - i. Mr. Michael-George agreed to put in writing what he was promising to do.
 - ii. Those promises were not allowed to be presented to the Board, included in the Project Approval or the minutes of the meeting.
 - iii. This was acknowledged by at least 6 people in the room.
 - 1. It was presented that a letter stating what Mr. Michael-George had promised he would do would be developed and signed by those on the on-site review, with their comments as needed. That letter would be used by Gerald and presented to the Board for the record, to insure Mr. Michael-George took the actions to repair the driveway to GLA Standards and protect the neighbor's lands.
- E. The requirement requested by President Mizzi to Gerald at the 1/11/2016 meeting to "FIX the Ziegler problem at the next Committee meeting" was not addressed. It will be placed on the agenda for the next Project Review Committee meeting.

NEXT MEETING: The Project Review Committee tentatively scheduled a meeting on February 29th.

Exact time, place and agenda items, including Ziegler issue to be announced.

Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes-FINAL

July 25, 2016

Committee Members Present: Kevin N, Gerald D, Ed D, Paul R, Leo K

Board Members Present: Charlene M, Charlotte M, Richard J

Landowners Present: Claudette D, Donna A, Ia W, Catherine F

Meeting Called to Order: 7:05

First Topic: Review Pending Projects

1. NG26-B-1 Shed. Paul reported the landowner has the information from the surveyor that the board required. The Admin Assistant will send this to the board.
2. NG11-E Shed. Paul reported that he inspected the site and the setbacks are OK, the application is completed, \$40 impact fee is paid. Admin assistant will send this to the board.
3. SG 39-E Septic. Ed reports that the land is reclaimed but since it is a driveway and near a chicken coop, no grass will be reseeded. New Septic is approved by Park County. Old Septic is filled with dirt. Gerald will do the final inspection. Assessments are not current so bond cannot be refunded.

Claudette reported that a realtor is advertising that a “mobile or modular home” can be placed on a property that is listed for sale. Mobile homes not allowed by Covenants. Another realtor listing states a shelter property can be used as a multiple unit vacation rental. Multiple Unit dwellings not allowed by Covenants. Kevin will follow up.

Second Topic: Project Review Application Instructions

Proposed changes to the Project Review instructions mailed to the members with the Spring Newsletter were reviewed. Discussion resulted in the rewording of several sections of the document. The Board will review the changes on August 8 board meeting.

The Committee took a vote on posting projects to be reviewed on the GLA public website. Kevin motioned and Leo seconded to place pending projects on the website without any personal information. Gerald, Kevin and Leo voted Yes. Ed voted No, due to landowner input received by the board during the 30-day input period. Paul abstained. Motion carried.

Charlotte will research if and when a former Board formally adopted a policy to require projects be completed in 18 months.

Meeting Adjourned 9:45 PM

Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes – FINAL

August 29, 2016

Committee Members Present: Ed D., Gerald D., Leo K., Kevin N., Paul R.

Board members Present: Charlotte M., Charlene M.

Landowners Present: Donna A., Leticia S.

Contractors Representing Landowners Present: Butch K., William S.

Meeting was called to order at 7:05 pm.

Four Projects were reviewed. Paperwork for three of the projects was presented at the meeting, within the 2 week deadline for review before the Sept. 12 board meeting.

SG 51-A William S. presented a project for review from Hathaway Homes LLC that is under contract with property owner Kathleen R. Approval of the project is a condition for the contract/sale. Project includes dwelling, septic, garage and deck. Leo K. had walked the property and noted some stakes had fallen over or were missing. William S. will meet with PRC members Gerald, Paul, and Leo so he can identify the property boundaries and setbacks to the PRC members.

Factory built home 76' x 30' on concrete foundation. Less than 30 feet high. DEQ maps with septic.

Conditions for approval include: 1. Staking easement boundaries, (especially west flags) and all setbacks. 2. All assessments are paid; \$17.50 each on three lots is owed for the fourth quarter. 3. The oversized sign on SG 51-A near Arcturus, which does not follow the Master Plan, must be removed prior to the Sept. 12 board meeting.

NG 28-A Leticia S. the original project for a dwelling, driveway, septic, and well was approved in April 2015. The landowner has completed everything but the dwelling. The original project was for a stick built home. The landowner presented a new project for a modular home, (slightly smaller in square footage) instead of the stick built home. The fees for the stick built home were already paid. The fees for the modular home are less and the difference will be refunded to the landowner after the modular home project is approved on Sept 12.

SG 68 The contractor from Crazy Mountain Builders presented the application from Fred and Karen D. for a dwelling and septic. The driveway and well already exist on this property. Dwelling is a single story 3 bedroom house. The septic permit is approved by Park County. The contractor will meet with PRC members Gerald, Paul, and Leo so he can identify the property boundaries and setbacks to the PRC members.

Conditions for approval on Sept 12 include: 1. Stake boundaries. 2. Prove setbacks. The dwelling is to be placed on 27 acres, but boundaries must be staked and setbacks must be recorded as an exact number of feet from the boundary. 3. Send check for fees. The Contractor will send the fees after the Admin Assistant finalizes the application.

SG 56 A2 Ranganath and Anju P. This application was mailed in before the 2 week deadline. The property owners were not present at the meeting. The dwelling was built in 2007 and the new owners want to build a garage that attaches to the house. The location they proposed for the garage is not 50 feet away from the road easement on Hercules Rd. The members of the committee will meet with the landowners to discuss options.

Timeline for submitting completed applications.

Completed project applications must be received no later than 2 weeks before the next board meeting. An application is not considered a complete application, and thus ready for processing/review, until the corners of the corner survey markers for the lot are found and flagged. The corner boundaries are required to be viewed during the on-site project review process. The flagging must be completed by the time the application is submitted. Project Committee personnel are not expected to find the corners, and/or any easement boundaries, for the Landowners. If the landowners are not capable of this work, the GLA has a list on the website of people who can assist them. This information will be put on the website.

The website calendar will list the due dates for applications. The due dates are 2 weeks before the monthly board meeting.

The website calendar will list the upcoming PR Committee meetings which are one week before the monthly board meetings: Sept. 26, Oct. 31, and Nov. 28. The PR meeting will have a generic agenda: To review completed projects that have been submitted by the 2 week timeline.

The meeting adjourned at 8:54 pm.

Project Review Committee Meeting

September 26, 2016

Call to Order: 7:10, Adjourn 7:40

Committee Members Attending: Kevin N, Gerald D, Ed D, Paul R, Leo K

Landowners Attending: Robert S.

Boundary Adjustment for NG 31-W, NG 31E.

Mr. Robert S., owner of NG 31-W is in the process of acquiring a small portion of NG 31-E from Mr. Brian T. Mr. S has planted trees and managed weeds and vegetation on the portion of NG 31-E he is acquiring.

Adjusting the boundary will move the property line slightly closer to a road easement held by Mr. S as it crosses the remainder of NG 31-E. No set backs or other covenants are affected by moving the property line.

Park County regulations require that subdivisions or boundary adjustments made within existing subdivisions be approved by the subdivision administrators before being submitted for Commissioner review and/or recordation. Mr. S. and Mr. T. are asking for GLA approval of the boundary change to enable them to proceed with the land transaction.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approving the boundary adjustment.

SG 42A Garage

Bob and Michelle Q. have submitted an application to build a 32x32 two story garage. Construction had already begun on the project as the owner thought he had included the garage in the 2002 project application for the residence.

The garage is under construction with the foundation established, first level walls erected, water, power and septic lines in place at the east wall.

Committee members, Leo K. and Ed D. visited the site and confirmed that the closest property line is over 200 feet from the garage.

Bob Q. was informed that because there were already two dwelling units on Lot 42A, the second level of the garage could not be used as a dwelling unit. He acknowledged awareness of the issue and asserted it would be a workshop with some minor furniture inside.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approving the Project.

Shed/Garage Standards

A Committee member has been asked if a steel sided shed could be placed on a lot with a wood sided residence. The Committee discussed Master Plan definition Accessory Building – A structure larger than five hundred (500) square feet on the same Lot as the principal or main building devoted to a use for Cottage Industry, Light Manufacturing. Design standard for an Accessory Building must be comparable to the main structure.

GLA Project Review Committee Meeting
Monday, 6 February 2017

Meeting Call to Order: 7:01 pm.

Project Review Committee Meeting Members in attendance: Kevin N., Co-chair; Gerald D., Co-chair; Leo K., Paul R., Richard J., Ed. D (arrived ~ 7:30 pm)

Landowners in attendance: Debbie B., Alan P., Jerry L.

The meeting was called to order by Kevin N.

SG parcel 39-E driveway/walkway was discussed. It was put in under the auspicious of being a walkway, but the Committee did not concur. Ed. D has removed part of it. Jerry L. commented that it was originally 10'4" wide and is still wide enough to drive over. Ed D. offered to remove the rest of it when the ground thaws.

NG parcel 25-4 proposal to subdivide was discussed next. A letter has been written to property owner advising what is required to subdivide and will be sent out. Subdivision covenants allow subdivision into 5 parcels; currently at 4 parcels. Park County must be involved and Gerald indicated it would take approximately 2 years and cost approximately \$40K to do this. There is a single well in the subdivision, currently shared by 4 parcels.

NG parcel 54-D proposal for a Pole Barn was discussed. Following a site inspection, all Committee Members agreed that this Project Application was lacking in several respects. Gerald will write a letter to the property owner, specifying the following items that need to be supplied or corrected:

1. Application incomplete; owner unaware of his own Subdivision Covenants.
2. Drawing is unacceptable; need Plat Plan.
3. No building plan submitted showing: building dimensions, maximum height, construction materials that will be IAW subdivision specifications.
4. Cannot identify property nor building boundaries; incomplete staking.
5. Drain field not staked and not shown on plans.
6. Distances from building to property boundary missing.
7. No Form E for driveway to new structure. Use of a dirt driveway would violate Subdivision Covenants.

The committee members began work on an updated Project Review Checklist for use by both the GLA Admin Assistant and the Project Review Committee members. Discussion included several items to add to the existing Project Review Check List. Discussion tabled for next meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:50 pm

.

GLA Project Review Committee Meeting
March, 6th 2017

Meeting Call to Order: 7:04 PM

Project Review Committee Meeting Members in Attendance: Kevin N. **Co-Chair**, Gerald D. **Co-Chair**, **Board Members:** Paul R, Leo K, Ed D. **Landowners:** Sally M, Joe T. Claudette D. Donna A, Debbie B, Ia W. Jeff N (arrived at 7:15 PM)

Meeting called to order by Kevin N.

Landowner Input: Donna A. objected to Landowner input saying committee meetings were the place for landowners to voice concerns. She was assured landowner input would be taken throughout the meeting.

No applications for approval at this time.

Kevin explained how important it is to check all boxes on the Project Review application form.

Sally M. proposed that project applicants obtain approval of their project from their neighbors in the subdivision they are part of and this would eliminate future complaints made from landowners in that subdivision by documentation, plus it would save money and time for the project review committee to review the project.

Claudette D. asked the committee where the subdivision covenants come from.

Leo K. explained that most subdivisions that are recorded by the county have covenants.

Ia W. asked who is in charge of managing Iona, general consensus is Charlene M.

Debbie B. asked why Iona is working on Project Review Applications when we have a Committee that can do the work. Kevin N. explained that we have revised our Project Review application fee schedule to include the extra expense of admin assistant. The admin assistant reviews the application to make sure it is correct. Then the Project Review Chair double checks it again for accuracy.

Debbie B. and Ia W. want the Board to do more administration work to lower admin expenses. Kevin N. explained that the Project Review Committee Chairs and Board members job is out in the field checking setbacks and property lines.

Debbie B. also stated Mark S. did not give the list of delinquent landowners in Feb.

Claudette D. asked if the GLA website is on the Project Review application.

Sally M. asked how the tower house in North G got passed. In the future, should surrounding landowners receive a postcard/letter explaining what is being built?

Kevin N. said this is the 4th or 5th time the postcard issue has been brought up. The general consensus in the room was yes, but no motion to recommend it was made.

Ia W. asked why Charlotte M. told her to bring her Marious G. complaint to a Committee meeting. What is the conflict of interest policy with Board members working as Contractors (Paul R. did work for Marious G) and how did Marious G. Project Review Application get passed. What is the policy of Board Members trespassing?

Gerald D. responded that we never set foot on someone's property without notifying them first.

Joe T. insists that we get an engineer to sign off on the easement driveway that his neighbor wants to install on his property. Joe T. is worried about water runoff and does not want any water from the neighbor's property damaging or restricting use of his land nor across Leo Dr.

Leo explained his point of view on the Marious G. and Chris and Ia W. conflict. Leo also explained his concern on the liability of installing a culvert across Capricorn exceeding the 60 foot easement and going onto Michelle M. property. Paul stated that Michelle M. is willing to let us correct the drainage issue.

Jeff N. showed Kevin, Gerald, and Paul his copied plot map from the county and his drawing of the pole barn building he wants to build.

Kevin N. explained that we need all Project Review applications submitted 1 week prior to the Project Review meeting to process the application.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
May 1, 2017

Called to order 7:05 PM, Closed 9:10 PM

Attending Committee Members: Co-Chair Kevin N.; Co-Chair Gerald D.; Richard J.; Leo K.; Paul R.

Attending Landowners: Sally M., Claudette D., Debbie B., Ia W (start of meeting only), Chuck M, (Start and ending of meeting)

Project Review: SG 41 D; Septic field replacement, driveway modification.

1. April 22, 2017 motion to address an emergency situation under Article VI J “Action By Written Consent” made by Leo K. and seconded by Kevin N. *“I make a motion under Article VI (J), to approve Mr. L. to be able to immediately proceed with replacing his drain field and that the approval of the driveway extension be held until normal processing can be completed.”* Passed the Board email vote with 11 votes, Ed. D. not voting.
2. Motion at this meeting for the committee to recommend the GLA Board approve driveway modification made by Leo K., second by Gerald D. Passed unanimously.

Discussion Topics:

1. Water rights and landowners protection under state law. Committee collectively decided it is not a GLA issue.
2. DEQ regulations on drain field replacement, GLA processing of Project Application and Form C only and related landowner application fees.
3. Project Review Committee checklist for processing applications.
 - a. Reviewed to item # 5.

Action Item: Action Item: Kevin to request that an item be added to the GLA Board Meeting Agenda on May 8, 2017. The discussion request is whether to ask landowners for a copy of their private subdivision regulations to have in our files for reference purposes.

Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes July 10, 2017

Board Members in Attendance:

Kevin N., Co-chairman
Gerald D., Co-chairman (arrived at 7:18)
Richard J., Committee Member
Leo K., Committee Member
Regina W.

Absent:

Paul R., Committee Member (2nd month in a row absent)

8 Landowners Attended

Meeting was called to Order at 7:03 by Kevin N.

1. **NG 45 – COS - 615A:** Discussion about new roads: Cannes Ct. and Lorraine Ln. being installed for this planned subdivision. The work being done is required by Park County No Action.
2. **Projects lingering over 2 years:** Discussion to change the Preliminary Project Approval application wording limit of 18 months to 2 years before a time extension is required. Action Item: Present to the Board a desire to change the application wording from 18 months to 2 years.
3. **Project Application for NG 28-A:** The landowner for this project was not in attendance at this meeting. There was no phone # on the application provided to the PR Committee members. Kevin N. visited the property on 7/4/17 at 3:30 pm; no one was home. The project was not staked out. Kevin N. visited the property a second time on 7/10/17 at 6:45 pm and the project was still not staked. It was noted that the contractor for this project is Ed D. It is recommended that an engineer report on how to contain/control the current water runoff problem from this property over Capricorn Rd. The committee and Board of Directors are aware that a neighboring landowner has filed and delivered a Cease and Desist letter to the property owner of NG 28-A. The committee members present voted unanimously to deny this project until the current Cease and Desist action has been resolved/lifted and the property is staked out.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:49 pm. by Kevin N.

Project Review Committee Meeting
August 7, 2017

ATTENDING:

Committee Members: Kevin Newby Co-Chair; Gerald Dubiel Co-Chair; Leo Keeler; Richard Johnson

Landowners: Sally Muto; Charlotte Mizzi; Donna Andersen; Debbie Blais; Michele McCowen

ABSENT: Committee Member: Paul Rantallo

AGENDA:

1. Review Page 1 of Application for Preliminary Project Approval;
2. Revisit NG 28 Project Application.
3. Preliminary Project Approval timeline reviewed.

TOPIC:

1. Review Page 1:

MOTION: Leo motioned and Gerald seconded to present to the Board the new page 1 with a correction of “your” being made bold in 3 places, as the new page 1 of Application For Preliminary Project Approval and to post the new page in the GLA website. Vote 4-0.

2. NG 28:

This project was referred back to the committee at the July 17 Board meeting, due to it not being staked in time and the need to address a water drainage issue.

- a. Gerald presented the project is now staked:
- b. No formal information has been provided on the progress to address the drainage problem.
 - i. A hydrologist contacted Gerald.
- c. Michele provided a copy of the Cease and Desist Order to GLA PR committee for the record.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Kevin to determine if the Board is sending a letter to owner of NG 28 to document application being sent back to the Committee.
2. Copy of final Project Review Committee meeting minutes of 8/7/17 to be sent to owner of NG 28.

Project Status: Action suspended pending drainage problem being resolved.

3. Approval Timeline: Kevin presented corrections needed to the Preliminary Project Review Timeline within the Instructions For Project Review Applications on the GLA website.

**GLA Project Review Committee Meeting
Friday, 8 September 2017**

ATTENDING:

Committee Members: Kevin Newby, Co-chair; Leo Keeler, Paul Rantallo, Richard Johnson
Landowners: Donna Andersen, Ia Williams, Debbie Blais Guests: Sally Muto

ABSENT:

Committee Member: Gerald DuBiel, Co-chair

AGENDA:

1. Work on Project Review Checklist

The meeting was called to order by Co-chair Kevin Newby at 7:04 pm.

There are no new projects up for review. A landowner asked for an update on the Sandoval project and Kevin answered there was nothing new to report on that project.

TOPIC 1:

The Administrative Review and GLA Website portions of the Project Review Checklist was discussed and revised.

TOPIC 2:

The Project Review checklist item regarding posting projects up for review brought to light that the Project Review data is no longer posted to the website, as was initially done (redacted). Instead, the parcels having projects under review are only listed with their parcel identifier and project type. Ie. currently there is this listing on the website with no further data available:

1. NG 28-A Garage

Landowners wanted to know why the project application was no longer posted on the website.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Kevin to add an Agenda Item for the September Board of Directors Meeting on 9/11/17 in regards to posting the project application on the GLA website.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:10 pm.

**PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 2, 2017**

LOCATION: 12 Gemini Road

ATTENDING COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Co Chairmen's, Kevin Newby, and Gerald Dubiel.
Committee Members: Richard Johnson, Paul Rantalalo, Leo Keeler.

ATTENDING LANDOWNERS: Ia Williams, Claudette Dirkers, Donna Lash/Anderson, Jenny Helmbrecht, and Don Helmbrecht.

VISITOR: Sally Muto

Call To Order: 7:08 PM by Kevin Newby

Topics: SG 94 Residence application, NG 32-B1 Garage application; NG 51C Residence Application.

SG 94 Residence:

Discussion: Field inspection revealed proper staking of property and easement lines, buildings, boundaries, roads and the existence of a well and 15 foot hole newly required by Park County sanitation rules. Office review showed that all fees were proper and all paperwork supplied, with the exception of an approved septic permit, which property owners Mr. & Mrs. Helmbrecht stated had been applied for and was being processed.

Motion: Leo motioned, and Kevin seconded, "The PR Committee present the Project Application to the Board as being complete, with the exception of the septic permit, and request the Board approve the project subject to receipt of a copy of the septic permit, and subject to reseedling all disturbed lands on completion of the Construction.

Vote: Motion passed unanimously.

NG 31 B1.

Discussion: Field inspection by Leo, Kevin, and Paul revealed all GLA requirements had been fulfilled. All fees paper work had been submitted and all fees had been paid.

Motion: Kevin motioned, and Leo seconded "that the Project Committee request the Board to approve the project subject to reseedling all disturbed ground on completion of the project.

Vote: Gerald recused himself as the owner of Lot 32-B1, Kevin, RJ, Paul and Leo all voted Yes.

NG 51 C:

Discussion: Review of application identified the proposed building height of the two-story building to be listed as 31 feet 4 inches, which exceeds the GLA maximum height of 30 feet. Concern was expressed that the location of the building may be on the top of a ridgeline which would violate Masterplan 2.0 Building Placement “*Buildings shall be set back from ridges and hilltops with no more than one (1) story visible above the ridgeline so that the building is not the predominant feature of the landscape.*”

The project was rejected from further review and consideration. Gerald and Paul were asked to complete their assignment of reviewing the application with the landowner to address the design and location issues preventing further review. The application will be reconsidered after a report is filed by Gerald and/or Paul.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSIONS:

Mr. Helmbrecht asked if the application information GLA provides could present more detail on the costs and process of meeting the County sanitation permitting. The new County requirement for a 10-foot hole to verify no ground water is present requires a hiring an excavator and increases costs to landowners.

New construction and impacts to visual are becoming a major issue, with some feeling North Glastonbury has been destroyed.

Committee members could not verify the construction of new dwellings in 2017 that could be reported to the Treasurer for proper billing. Each Committee member was assigned to do a review and report new dwellings.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING:

March 5, 2018

Call To Order: 7:10 PM

Attending: Committee Members Kevin Newby, Co-Chair; Richard Johnson; Paul Rantallo; Leo Keeler; Gerald Dubiel announced absence; **Quorum present;**

Landowners Present: Sally Muto, representing NG 27; Claudette Dirkers; Donna Lash-Anderson;

Guests: Chuck Muto,

Phone Access: System activated, no one called in to attend by phone.

Topic: Meeting Minutes, It was agreed that each Committee Member should be responsible for taking and recording Project Review Committee Minutes. Assignments agreed to are:

1. Feb-Kevin
2. Mar-Leo
3. April-Paul
4. May-RJ
5. June-Gerald.
6. July - Kevin

If you are absent for your month's meeting minutes the person next in the list will do the minutes for you and you will fill in his spot when you return

Topic: SG-60 Project Application – Application to construct single-story residence less than 30 feet in height, within original 20+ acre lot SG 60. Distance to nearest boundary line measured at 129 feet. Well in place and over 100 feet from proposed Drain Field. Access to be a driveway from an existing road off Libra. No need for a culvert identified.

Motion: Kevin motioned, Paul seconded to recommend the Board approve the application with the condition that DEQ approval and permit be provided to GLA prior to the beginning of any construction activities and all disturbed grounds be reseeded at completion of construction. Motion Passed unanimously by attending Members.

Topic: Revisit Committee motion from 2/12/18 to ask the Board to establish a 2-year time limit for project approvals. Discussed need for a spreadsheet or method to track timelines; ability to inform landowner of pending expiration; ability to offer forms for extension and the need to compare GLA proposed actions with City of Livingston, Park County and others with expiration timelines.

Motion: Leo motioned, Kevin seconded, to delay presenting the 2-year timeline motion of 2/12 to the Board. Passed unanimously by attending Members.

Topic: Project Checklist – work proceeded on Project Checklist.

Adjournment: 9:00 PM

Minutes Prepared by Leo Keeler, Approved by vote of: 4/ 0 with one absent.

Project Review Meeting
April 2, 2018

Call to order: 7:03 p.m.

Attending: Kevin Newby, Gerald Dubiel, Richard Johnson, Leo Keeler, and Paul Rantalo.

Agenda:

#1 SG 56 A-2 Parthasarathy - 10x12 outbuilding (pottery shed).

Kevin motioned, Gerald seconded. Approved unanimously.

#2 SG Diehl building dried in? Assessment?

#3 NG 34 Tom & Christy Wiley. Dirt moving only.

#4 Project Review check list- Admin part done. To be continued.

#5 Disclaimer for survey-Gerald (put on website).

#6 Gerald action item - new dwelling definition?

#7 Kevin clarified (master plan 2.1 building extensions)- roof overhangs not part of structure. They belong to beautification of property and are encouraged.

From: gerald dubiel <gpdubiel@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, June 7, 2018 7:30 PM

To: GLA Board <board@glamontana.org>

Subject: [GLA Board List] Project Review Committee meeting minutes June 4, 2018

Meeting called to order at 7:08 PM at the home of Sally Muto, 18 Gemini Road, in attendance were Committee members Kevin Newby, Gerald P. Dubiel, Richard Johnson and Leo Keeler, also landowners Linda Ulrich, Sally Muto, Ia Williams, Debbie Blais, Donna Anderson and guest Aubrey Keeler.

(1) Discussion of Tom Willie's proposed project, workshop with apartment above on Tract 34, NG.

To date, no application has been turned in, however, there have been reports of construction

taking place. Dubiel has been delegated to call Tom for an explanation.

(2) The Skinner proposed house and garage were discussed. Leo made a motion to approve the application with a condition that the balance (\$80) be sent in. Kevin did second, voting was

Leo yes, Kevin yes, Richard yes and Gerald yes. Motion approved

(3) Discussion about Paul Rantttalo's shed variance ensued. Leo made a motion to reject the variance. Kevin did second, voting was Leo yes, Kevin yes, Richard abstain, Gerald no.

Further discussion continued where Leo and Kevin pointed out in the GLA covenants, to Richard and Gerald, that the submitted variance was in fact not legal. A new motion was made

by Leo to reject the variance. Kevin did second, voting was Leo yes, Kevin yes, Richard yes,

Gerald yes. New motion approved to reject the variance.

(4) Discussion about the completion of editing the project review check list. The check list is now

complete and will be typed and sent to the Board.

(5) Discussion about the proposed library to be located at the existing building on the soccer field

in NG. Kevin stated that we do not have an application for this project.

(6) Janet Sharpless has three dwellings on Lot 25 3A. Richard investigated this infraction with her

and discovered that she may not be willing to change this. Janet will be assessed for three

dwellings and is presently no longer in good standing and will not be allowed to participate or

vote for the GLA.

(7) Maydell Goulart on lot 25 1 NG has two dwellings and she will pay two assessments.

Richard

did the investigation.

At 9:08 PM the meeting was ended.

Thank you for everyone's participation. Please feel free to make corrections or omissions.

Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes
7-9-2018

Committee Members Present: Kevin N. (Co-chairman), Richard J., Leo K.

Landowners Present: Ia W., Debbie B., Claudette D.

Guest: Sally & Chuck M.

Meeting was called to order at 7:03 pm by Kevin N.

SG-34A-1: Possible new owner, Kim K., has submitted building plans with a DEQ report to the PR Committee (PRC). Leo K. and Kevin N. meet with Kim K. on site 7-8-18. His submitted plans to build a berm home, as he has staked it out on the property, comply with our MP and Covenants. Our committee approved those plans with a 3-0 vote, as presented to the PRC. This approval would allow him to make an offer to purchase the property that is for sale, knowing he may build per his submitted plans. He has paid a \$25 application fee that is nonrefundable.

NG-30D: It was reported weeks ago to the PRC that the landowner of this parcel had partially filled in our newly constructed drainage ditch on the West side of Venus Way. This was done to provide access to a parking area on the property for a pickup truck, boat and trailer. This has caused unnecessary erosion on Venus Way, which was just graded. About 2 weeks ago, Director and Co-chairman Kevin Newby visited the site during rainfall and witnessed the erosion across Venus Way in progress. He called the landowner, while still at the site, leaving a voicemail advising a 14" culvert be installed.

During the PRC meeting, Claudette D., a road committee member, stated the drainage ditch was installed on the wrong side of Venus Way. Another road committee member, Richard J., then stated it could be a year or 2 before the ditch is moved to the correct side of the road. Richard J. also stated it could be next year before the needed culvert is installed by Venus and Mercury.

It is the belief of the PRC that, at this point, the landowner of NG-30D needs to submit a Project Review Application with Form E for a driveway, which will include a culvert.

Potential New Dwelling Assessments: Committee discussion on lower South Glastonbury SG-25D, Diehl parcel, and NG parcel 49A, Boderek parcel concluded the GLA should send out letters for additional 2nd dwelling assessments on each of these parcels. (Note: 49A may not have a current dwelling assessment at all, per April 2017 records.)

PRC Checklist: We completed discussion on this. **Action Item:** Kevin N. will submit the checklist to the Board of Directors for approval.

Website Hotlink: Adding a link to the GLA Standards from the PR Instructions on the GLA website was discussed. **Action Item:** Kevin N. will add this to the July BOD Meeting Agenda.

Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 9 pm. Next PRC meeting will be Monday, August 6th, with Leo K. taking meeting minutes.

Project Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
August 6 2018

Committee Members Attending: Gerald Dubiel, Co Chair; Ia Williams; Donna Lash-Anderson; Leo Keeler; Richard Johnson

Co-Chair Kevn Newby was out of town.

Landowners and Guests: Claudette Dirkers; Sally Muto

Call to Order: 7:10 PM. Ending at 9:00 PM

Topics:

1. Ms. Janet Sharpless dwelling assessments and member in good standing for voting:
Discussed sequence of construction and occupation of buildings resulting in Ms. Sharpless plus 2 renters living on Lot 25 3A of minor subdivision SD 273.

ACTION ITEMS:

- A. Committee to obtain historical data for review at next Project Review Committee meeting for the purpose of requesting the Board to define what is necessary for Janet to vote in November.
 - a. Committee to ask Administrative Assistant to recover all Project Applications for dwellings and garage from 1997 to Present for Janet Shaprless and/or for Lot 25 3 A.
 - b. Committee to review/obtain copy of plat SD 516 and any possible related covenants for historical indications of land development and use.
 - c. Gerald and Leo to meet with Ms. Sharpless to review her records related to land development, assessments/taxes and use.
2. Culvert on NG 30D installed on 8/6/2018 and ground disturbance in the GLA Road Easement.

Discussed the culvert installed by Paul Rantallo the morning of 8/6/2018 and associated ground disturbance and damages to previous grading work in the GLA easement to obtain dirt to place over the culvert. Verbal discussions by various committee members with Paul and Robert should have been documented by email or other means.

ACTION ITEM:

Committee report to the Board that no project application for a driveway (GLA Form E) had been submitted for approval as required by governing document Road and Driveway Standards 3.3 and does not meet standards defined in 3.5.5 Culverts and observed in field inspection.

MOTION:

Leo motioned, Second by RJ. Request the Board notify Mr. Wallace he is not a member in good standing due to installing the culvert without Project Approval and that he is responsible to install the culvert according to standards and reestablishing the work done by the Grading Contractor. Motion passed unanimously

3. Wiley (NG 34)& Bennet/Spallone (NG 57 A3): Initiating construction without/before submitting Project Applications.

Discussed Bennett/Spallone initiating ground work under past GLA Board inaction/assumption earth work did not constitute an element of construction, even though a Form E Road/Driveway application requires GLA approval before that work begins. Bennett construction is obvious as seen from Hercules and Wiley construction indicated by volume of gravel/construction materials delivered to land and photos sent to the Board.

MOTION:

Leo Motioned; Second by Donna – Committee ask the Board to find Wiley and Bennett in violation of covenants and members not in good standing for failure to file project review applications, including construction of driveways, and obtain approval prior to initiating work. Motion passed unanimously

4. Chad Stone firewood business: The need for Chad Stone to have a project approval was presented to the Committee with concerns for noise as noted in existing complaints.

Addition of more complaints being filed was presented to the Committee. The Committee discussed that PRC reviews only deal with construction activities and complaint resolution is the responsibility of the entire Board. Past precedent of the Lannes/Clawson firewood business noise complaint and Tanner lack of complaints were discussed.

Project Review Committee Meeting

September 3, 2018

Members Attending: Co-Chair Gerald Dubiel; Richard Johnson; Donna-Las Andersen; Leo Keeler; Ia Williams.

Board member present: Charlene Murphy

Landowners present: Ron Wartman

Guests Present: Sally Muto

TOPICS:

1. Wartman - Variance: Request is for a variance to reduce the setback and allow construction of a 24'X40" RV storage shed adjacent to and parallel with the existing Residence and Attached Garage. The shed would be 28 to 39 feet from the property boundary rather than the 50 foot required for a building over 500 sq ft.

Variance requested to consolidate visual impact, reduce costs, reduce impacts to the native Lichen matt maintaining natural grass cover and preventing weed establishment

Gerald read a letter of objection from the Naclerio's. The Committee considered the letter a statement of adverse impact as addressed within Master Plan 4.1 statement *"Variance requests, such as setbacks, height, or location issues that do not adversely impact neighbors, can be dealt with by the Association Board directly without neighborhood review."*

Action Item: Gerald to identify the "Neighborhood" required to be involved in the review of the variance requested. Ron to contact neighborhood residents and inform of his requested variance and provide written comments to the Committee.

NOTE: Ron sated he would not attend any Board meeting to present these materials due to his fear of another possible outburst resulting in physical harm to those in the room.

2. Fairbairn - Factory Built residence replacing a mobile home, utilizing existing septic, power and water. Existing DEQ approval is for 3 bedroom home.

Motion by Leo, Second by RJ: Approve the application if confirm a 3 bedroom Factory home is incoming and if a 4 bedroom home is being brought in that DEQ approval is increased accordingly. PASSED unanimously

3. Willie – Other Structure of 40'x60', with septic system.

Donna motioned, Leo Seconded – to deny the applications until we have full understanding of how the comparable Buchanan issue was addressed and we assure consistency. Yes – Donna, Leo, No – Gerald, RJ, abstained – Ia.

Motion failing with 2/2 vote did not justify a counter motion to approve the applications.

4. Skinner – New well, which is already in place.

Motion by Leo, Second by RJ: The Committee did not act on the application since the well is already in place and action to address covenant violation is a Board issue. PASSED unanimously

5. Schreyer – Residence, attached garage, well, septic. DEQ approval for was attached without the accompanying map showing the location.

Motion by Leo, Second by RJ: Recommend approval after receipt of DEQ map. PASSED unanimously

6. Bennett – Residence, well, driveway, no Committee member had visited the site due to the complete application not being received from Admin until 8/29, 4 days before the meeting.

No action taken by the Committee since the well and driveway are already in place and it presents a covenant violation similar to the Skinner violation and others of commencing work before applications are approved.

7. Application fines - Construction being initiated prior to project application submittal and/or approval has increased requiring some type action. The Committee discussed and agreed to recommend to the Board that a \$ 500.00 fine be established and noted on all applications and the web site if construction is initiated prior to approval.

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
OCT. 4, 2018

Meeting commenced at 7:09 pm

Committee Members attending:

Co-chair Gerald Dubiel, Richard Johnson, Leo Keeler, Ia Williams, Donna Andersen

Landowners attending: Claudette Dirkers, Ron Wartman

Guests: William Smith

TOPICS

1. Mr. Wartman resubmitted his garage project reduced in size to 14X35.

Leo motioned to approve, Richard seconded. Passed unanimously.

2. William Smith presented a project for Mark Scariano on lot NG 64 for a 24X100 barn, plus a septic and driveway.

Richard motioned to approve, and Leo seconded. Passed unanimously.

3. Gerald discussed a phone call from Ellen Eaton inquiring about the possibility of parking 2 busses, 2 passenger vans and 4, 12X4 trailers on SG 51B for her son.

No project review submitted, no action taken.

Gerald will submit info to the board.

4. Gerald discussed a landowner's wish to place a Caboose on rails on SG lot 8. John Waid and James Kozlik involved.

Gerald will discuss with the board. No project submitted, no action taken.

Meeting adjourned at 8:29PM

Notes from Donna for Project Review

Draft Minutes for the Project Review meeting on November 26, 2018

Committee Co-chair Kevin Newby convened the meeting at 7:36 pm in the kitchen at Liberty Hall in North Glastonbury.

Committee members present: Co-chair Gerald Dubiel, Ia Williams and Donna Lash-Andersen

Committee members absent: Richard Johnson and Leo Keeler.

Landowner present: Debbie Newby

Shed on Jupiter Way: The committee reviewed a project review application for a shed in NG to be located on a parcel off of Jupiter Way which is accessed off of Capricorn. By consensus the committee questioned the need for a driveway project review application in light of the fact that this parcel appears to be accessed on a private subdivision road; found the Form A section of the application form to be incomplete; and noted that no one from the committee had done any field work for this application.

Action Item: Co-chair Gerald Dubiel will inform the applicant that his Project Review application is not complete, that the parcel corners and shed location need to be marked, and that the committee needs some time to review whether GLA driveway standards apply to private subdivision roads.

Fee for delayed project applications: The committee discussed and agreed by consensus to recommend a \$500 assessment fee for delayed project applications.

Action Item: Ia Williams, Donna Lash-Andersen and landowner Debbie Newby will collaborate to draft the wording for the new policy and bring it back to committee.

Shed on Capricorn Drive: Discussion about a shed in NG which is already built on northern Capricorn without project review followed.

Action Item: Dubiel and Lash-Andersen will arrange a conference call with the owners advising them of the requirement to submit a Project Review application prior to any construction and in particular, in this case, to inform them that the application still needs to be done after the fact.

Closing discussion focused on the rural residential character of Glastonbury as established by the governing documents and the question of whether the approval of accessory buildings prior to the construction of a dwelling— some of which are now

housing commercial businesses –adds to or detracts from the rural residential character of Glastonbury. No consensus was reached.

The meeting adjourned about 9:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ia Williams

Project Review Committee Minutes

March 4th 2019

7:00 p.m. Liberty Hall

Committee members present	Ronald Price, Gerald Dubiel, Richard Johnson
Committee members absent	Kevin Newby, Donna Lash-Andersen, Ia Williams
Landowners present	Claudette Dirkers, Debbie Newby
Board members present	Charlotte Mizzi, Dennis Riley, Jerry Ladewig
Also present	Ben Mitchum

Dennis Riley suggested committee members be diligent in completing project reviews as soon as possible to maintain credibility at a high standard and those who start a project should take the review all the way to completion. He noted that careful documentation should be kept.

Debbie raised the question as to whether we could continue the project committee meeting without a quorum. It was decided that by making a motion to waive the quorum requirement and taking the necessary vote we could continue.

Ron Price motioned that we waive the need for the committee quorum to continue the meeting and Richard Johnson seconded and all said aye.

Kelly Mitchum project. SG28-b

Nancy Mitchum is requesting a 25 foot dwelling variance. Charlotte noted that a neighbor had no problem with the variance request. She also noted that the topography alone requires a variance approval. Dennis Riley said that the variance definitely qualifies to be specifically considered due to the land mass situation at this time. Dennis then took his leave.

Gerald made a motion that the project review committee approve a 25 foot variance, Ronald Price seconded the motion and all approved. Gerald made a motion that the owners be ready at the next GLA Board Meeting to substantiate this need for a variance, Richard J. seconded and all said aye.

Margaret Thomson (Kelly) SG43-b

Plans to relocate a stick built house from Gardiner to a new cement foundation at 69 Leo Drive. Gerald motioned for approval with proper permits and grass seeding, Richard seconded and all said aye. This action passes to the GLA Board for approval.

Isham and Margaret Buice SG 85 43 Sagittarius Skyway

A brand new empty area. A question was raised about the 30 ft height. William Smith, by phone at the meeting, said he will meet Gerald D. and Richard J. and Ronald P. Saturday 6th April 1:00 p.m. at the site.

Gerald motioned for approval with 1. the proper measurements 2. new architectural drawing with the proper height. Ronald P. seconded and all said aye and the motion passed for approval to the GLA board.

Brown/Ford 155 Hercules Road SG parcel 107

Charlotte suggested that we obtain a proper form and a time/date stamp showing when an application is received. Gerald D. made a motion that this application go back to the administrative assistant for signature and we find out the driveway location and that the dwelling height be lowered to 30ft and that the DEQ report and

number be produced before further action be considered. Richard J. seconded this and the motioned was passed unanimously.

Dean Anderson SG39-E

The following issues were raised. Where are the set backs? Who is the local builder contact for Anderson? What is the location of the property stakes? The required DEQ permit for moving the septic system must be supplied. The property height measurement has to be re-set. The septic cannot be re-installed on disturbed property.

Gerald D. motioned that further action be delayed pending the above issues being completed and receipt of the required documents. Richard J. seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Gerald Dubiel called for the April Project Review Committee Meeting adjournment at 9:30 p.m.

Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 6, 2019

Project Review Co-chair Gerald Dubiel convened the May 6, 2019 Project Review Committee meeting on Monday, May 6, 2019 at 7:04 pm at Liberty Hall.

Committee members present: Dubiel, Co-chair Kevin Newby, Richard Johnson, Ia Williams and Donna Lash-Andersen. Landowners present: Ron Wortman, Debbie Newby, and Claudette Dirkers.

Agenda Items:

1. A motion by Lash-Andersen, seconded by Williams, to recommend approval of Ron and Bonnie Wortman third Project Review application for a 30 x 40-foot storage building in NG passed unanimously subject to field confirmation of staked location. Though measurements were confirmed by field work prior to the meeting, the committee choose by consensus to withhold full recommendation until the stakes were found to agree with the project plans.

Action Item: Williams and Lash-Andersen will verify the placement of the stakes for the Wortman application and email their findings to the committee.

2. A motion by Newby, seconded by Lash-Andersen, to not recommend approval of the Mike and Alison Himmelspace application for a 128 sq., ft. shed and a 768 sq. ft. pole barn in NG until the locations were staked passed unanimously. Per the PR application check list, committee members must be able to verify that the project plans coincides/agrees with the location stakes before they can recommend any project approval.

Action Item: Dubiel will inform Himmelspace that the site must be staked before the committee can recommend approval of his projects.

3. A motion by Newby, seconded by Lash-Andersen, to recommend approval of the Byron Kassing application in SG for a residence, driveway and detached garage subject to receipt of the DEQ report passed unanimously.

Non-agenda business

1. Newby reported that Willie's non-compliant construction situation in NG has been turned over to the GLA attorney.
2. Johnson and Dubiel agreed to re-state the committee's request that the GLA Treasurer Mark Seaver begin to assess the new dwelling projects per the annual report given to the Treasurer last January.

3. A motion by Johnson, seconded by Newby, to limit attendance at field work to a maximum of three and minimum of two committee members passed with four 'yes' votes and a no vote from Dubiel. Limited attendance was deemed important so as not to overwhelm an applicant and to respect personal property rights.
4. The committee noted that the Project Applications are not being posted on the website, given that neither of the former Web Masters, Ross Brunson or Mark Seaver have time to teach the new webmaster Ken Hurley how to do this. **By consensus, the committee agreed to ask the webmaster to include the project review applicants name and location on the calendar meeting and agenda notice.**

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 8:50 pm.

Next PR Committee meeting was set for Monday, June 3, 2019 at 7 pm at Liberty Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Lash-Andersen, secretary for the above named meeting.

Working Notes

Agenda items

1. Wortman application

Dubiel suggested that the Wortman application would be better addressed with a new variance request for a location closer to the garage because board secretary Charlotte Mizzi did not think the new structure should be located in the front yard of the applicant. Committee discussion confirmed that the committee is required to follow the covenants and may not grant any variance relief based on anyone's personal likes or dislikes.

Wortman reported that in conversation with himself, Johnson and Dubiel during the initial field work for his project, Johnson corrected Dubiel's statement that the "covenants did not mean shit", Johnson stated that the directors are required to follow the covenants.

2. Himmelspach application

The check list used by the Adm Asst to assist landowners in completing their project application forms states that the Adm Asst should receive verbal verification that the building site is appropriately staked.

The committee was initially reluctant to delay the Himmelspach project in light of Board President Dennis Riley's recent statement that area realtors and contractors are finding it

difficult to work with the PR requirements. However, the committee reasoned that they must follow the governing documents as a service to members, even though it may not always be convenient for those working in the trades for an applicant.

3. Kassing application

GLA requires and keeps copies of the DEQ report for each project application even though GLA is not responsible for the enforcement of well and septic codes.

Non-agenda items

1. Willie construction

As an adjacent landowner, Dirkers restated her February 4, 2019 request to know if the committee has confirmed the lot line and related setbacks for the Willie project and if the committee received a driveway application from Willie showing the distance of the driveway from the creek bed. Dirkers also asked to see the committee's verification of the footprint and height dimensions of the Willie structure, given that Willie's initial project review application, which was not approved, does not correspond with the actual construction.

Dubiel answered questions from Williams about the field work on the Willie project which Dubiel claims he did with Johnson with conflicting statements. He said he did not see that Willie's driveway crosses a stream bed. Dubiel could not confirm the dimensions of the large two-story structure though he stated that the setbacks were ok. Dubiel did not explain why he and Johnson did not report their field work findings to the committee until months after they said they were on Willie's property/

When asked how it felt to learn that while he had had to jump through numerous hoops to get his storage building approved, another landowner has not been stopped from proceeding with his project for over a year and a half, Wortman called for an end to discrimination within GLA.

Per reports from neighbors, Willie brought in construction materials and broke ground in November, 2017 and has worked on his project without GLA approval ever since.

2. Repeated request to Treasurer to get new dwellings assessed

In a departure from routine board practice that would have the Treasurer send invoices to members with newly closed-in dwellings, Seaver maintains that the PR committee (and not himself) should send notice to the members of their new assessments. Former treasurers, Janice McCann, Rudy Parker, and Regina Wunsch routinely sent new dwelling invoices after receiving notice from the PR committee about which new homes were ready for assessments.

3. *Field work attendance to be limited to PR committee members*

Dubiel argued unsuccessfully that board members should be encouraged to be attend PR field work sessions. Given his opinions, Dubiel failed to explain why he had invited only two board members, Mizzi and Ken Hurley, to join in the field work for Kassing, Wortman and Himmelspace and not all the other board members.

Project Review Committee Meeting – 5 August 2019 - St. John's Church

Board Members Present: Kevin Newby, co-chair; Gerald Dubiel, co-chair; Richard Johnson, Charlotte Mizzi Committee Members Present: Donna Anderson
Committee Members Absent: Ia Williams Landowners Present: Don Taylor, Claudette Dirkers, Tim Brockett, Debbie Newby Call-in Attendees: None (Meeting was available by phone until 6:15)

CALL TO ORDER: 6:01 pm with quorum of 4 Project Review Committee members

MEETING ADJOURNED:
7:15 pm

TAYLOR - NG 29-C, DRIVEWAY EASEMENT Kevin Newby (KN) performed a site inspection Sunday, July 28th. Donna Anderson and Ia Williams also did a subsequent site inspection. Kevin measured 403' of driveway to the split, with 93' continuing to the right and 95' continuing to the left. This is a longer measurement than shown on the application of 356', so another \$50 in fees is owed to the GLA for the additional length. Other discussion included the Dirkers' request that the pine tree remains on the Dirkers' property and Mr. Taylor agreed to that, when constructing his driveway easement.

Mr. Newby pointed out that the Subdivision covenants are stricter than the GLA Road and Driveway standards. The GLA enforces the GLA Road and Driveway standards which requires a 12' wide driveway serving a single residence. Donna Anderson (DA) noted that the PR Checklist needs to update the driveway width from 10' to 12' to agree with that.

The driveway needs to be moved 23' to the north to provide a 25' setback from the approved, proposed well on NG 29-B. This distance will also miss the currently established pine tree that the owner of lot NG 29-B wants saved. Mr. Taylor will construct the driveway with 6" pit run of angular rock and 3" of road mix on top of that to comply with the GLA standards.

Gerald Dubiel (GD) asked about a 2nd driveway location staked on the lower end of the property entering from Capricorn. It was agreed to install an 8" culvert to maintain drainage along Capricorn where the driveway enters.

KN moved to recommend approval of the project to the GLA board with the setbacks mentioned, above, and re-seeding of any disturbed land. GD seconded motion.
MOTION Passed (Yes 3, DA Recused due to decision that new, revised easement

documentation was not be required by the PRC or GLA)

NOTE – Later in the meeting, following discussion of the Kassing project, below, GD made a statement that a 12-14" culvert was needed vice the 8" culvert discussed and approved earlier in the meeting. By this time, Mr. Taylor had already left the meeting.

KASSING – SG 83 GARAGE ADDITION

Gerald Dubiel and Richard Johnson performed a site inspection (date unspecified) on this addition to an existing garage. KN did not participate in this project review due to continued refusal by the GLA Admin to include all PR Committee members in PRC emailing's.

GD said distance to easement is > 150', however, no measurements were taken. This project will double the size of existing, wood frame garage.

Tim suggested the existing driveway to the garage be upgraded, as part of this project, to GLA Road Standards with 3" road mix over 6" pit run. It was agreed upon that this should be a recommendation as part of project approval by the board.

RJ moved to recommend approval of the project with re-seeding of any disturbed ground to the GLA Board. GD seconded motion. MOTION Passed (Yes 3; No 1)

Action Item**: GD to contact William Smith to ensure slope of a newly started project in high souths driveway is within GLA maximum of 10%. Tim noted they are pouring concrete now, so this communication needs to be done ASAP.

NEXT PROJECT REVIEW MEETING: None specified.

Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes

February 29, 2020

Meeting Started: 2:15 PM

Committee members present: Gerald Dubiel, Ed Dobrowski, Charlotte Mizzi

Board member: Claudette Dirkers

Administrator: Karleen McSherry

Karleen, who is responsible for helping landowners with their applications, opened the meeting with going over the PR Application for Preliminary Project Approval and then moved on to looking at some of the forms, especially A & B.

Karleen recommended that the application include the applicant's email address along with the physical address of the building site.

She also stated that most of the sub-division requests on the application are not needed and could be consolidated into one question: Have you read your subdivision covenants and is your project in compliance with them?

Page 2 of the application, the 'Project Review Fee Worksheet ' was discussed as being difficult to use, especially when the application includes more than one structure, such as a house, garage and barn. It was recommended that Form A be divided into four forms: A-1 for a residence, A-2 for an outbuilding, A-3 for an accessory building, and A-4 for an addition. Fees for each aspect of the project could be placed at the bottom of the appropriate form and a tally sheet included at the end to add up all of the various fees. Discussion also included the idea of increasing the Construction Bond Fee Cap to not exceed \$500 in order to give more incentive to landowners to comply with the board's conditions for approval and finish their projects in a timely manner.

It was noted that currently the Construction Bond Account has \$20,000 in it. This account has been accumulating for a number of years. Landowners have not asked for their bond money back. The question was raised about how long the association needs to keep the construction bond money in the "escrow" account after the project is completed. The suggestion was made to research state law or ask for a legal opinion about when the unclaimed funds could be transferred to another account.

Garages

Issues with garages were discussed as well as the need to write clear instructions so architectural plans are drawn up separating the square footage of the residence from the garage so it can be properly priced. Attached to the house or unattached, the garage is priced as a structure, not a residence. In the case of a garage under the house and therefore in its

footprint, it was recommended to price the garage as a structure in the same manner as if it were a separate building.

'Application for Preliminary Project Approval' –Form B: Well

Considerable discussion was given to the first line on Form B: Well that asks if the well is 50' from the boundary. The original purpose of putting this on the form was for landowners to try to comply with that restriction. If the well is 50' from the boundary and the neighbor's septic is 50' from the boundary, the requisite 100' radius from the well to septic would be established. However, it was noted that the Covenants are very forgiving regarding water. Not only can you drill a well on your boundary, you can also drill on your neighbor's property if that is the only place water is to be found. It was noted that landowners currently fear their application being rejected if they can't check the 50' box. It was therefore suggested that the instructions suggest the 50' setback be used when possible and the form not include the 50' requirement. Others believed the 50' requirement should stay on the form to show the importance of adhering to it when possible. It was also suggested that the form state that a well cannot be placed on an easement.

Blasting

Assessing a construction bond for blasting was discussed. Historically dirt moving and blasting have not been overseen by the association and no clear reason to change that policy was given. No consensus was reached and therefore there was no recommendation from the committee.

Movable buildings under 200 sq. ft

The committee recommended that a movable building under 200 sq. ft. such as a shed, dog house, meditation cabin, etc. do not need an application but do need to conform to the setback requirements and not be placed on easements.

Charlotte recommended that the Board draft a rule to read as follows:

The Project Review Committee has the right to inspect and review all construction, with 24-hour notice to the landowner, at any time from the beginning to the final completion of a project. Non-compliance with the preliminary approval of the application and any variation to the application may and can result in a court-ordered injunction and disapproval of the project.

The Project Review Committee will meet in two weeks to discuss Road Impact Fees and any other changes to the PR forms. Next Meeting May 14th, 2020 at 2:00 PM.

Meeting ended 3:35 PM

Project Review Committee Meeting

Minutes

April 25, 2020

Time: 2:02 pm

Bd. Members Present:

Gerald Dubiel, Chair

John McAlister

Charlotte Mizzi

Ed Dobrowski

Absent: Jean Carp

Administrator: Karleen McSherry

Claudette Dirkers, Bd. Member

First topic of discussion was Kevin and Casey Van Uden Parcel SG-46A. Administrator, Karleen McSherry stated that the Van Uden's received a letter from Brown Law Firm requesting they cease and desist building until they filed an application and received approval from the board. Question came up regarding the form to send and the application fee. The committee recommended to send the new form however the fee is to remain the same since the fees have not been approved by the GLA Board.

A question arose by Claudette Dirkers as to how long to keep the construction fees. So far GLA has construction fees in the budget totaling approximately \$20,000.

John McAlister motioned that a construction bond be held for 3 years with the option that a landowner/applicant could ask for an extension until the completion of the project. Attorney's advice is needed. Motion was seconded and approved unanimously. The recommendation will be brought up before the Board.

Another issue was discussed regarding the application fee of \$25 with an additional fee of \$25 per page which is to go towards the Administrators' salary for processing Project Review applications. Debate ensued regarding a flat rate or the percentage of the impact fee(s)/construction bond allotted for each form to cover the administrator's time.

Action Item: Karleen to research with Accounting Services regarding payment to Administrator for processing project review applications for the year 2019 and amount collected in application fees.

Mark Scariano Project: Gerald Dubiel reported that William Smith the engineer told him the landowner does not want any court proceedings. It was recommended that all correspondence be put in writing and not by word of mouth. The committee wanted to know the status of the letter that needed to be sent by Seth Cunningham attorney working for the Brown Law Firm.

Action Item: Charlotte Mizzi to communicate with Newman Brozovsky to see if the letter was sent out to the attorney and the attorney to Mark Scariano.

Review of Instructions for Project Review Application

Karleen McSherry stated that the current instructions are more like policy and procedure. Suggestion was made to write instructions for how to fill out the forms.

The committee started to identify construction projects that do not need an application. Discussed were the following:

Moving Dirt, building a fence, patio, uncovered deck, structure that is less than 200 ft., walkway, pond (depending on size), pergola, house painting.

Karleen asked the committee to come up with other items to be considered.

Action Item: Gerald is to research State and County regulations regarding ponds.

The committee scheduled a special meeting on May 2nd at 2 pm to discuss application fees and review Karleen's research on 2019 salary for processing Project Review application.

Committee will meet on May 9th, 2020 to continue reviewing instructions for Project Applications.

Meeting Ended at 4:44 pm

Working Notes

In order to provide context for these minutes and the brief statements about the actions contained therein, these notes are appended.

With regard to John McAlister's motion concerning Construction Bonds: Construction bonds are collected as part of the application process to be used by the GLA to repair damage to roads and mitigate site cleanup and repair upon completion of construction as assessed by the Project Review Committee. Currently, construction bonds are collected but frequently are not assessed with the balance returned to the landowner. The funds from past projects are currently in an internal GLA account and not being accessed. This motion was intended to provide a process to determine when construction bonds were either returned to the landowner or moved into the general operating budget of the GLA.

The motion provided that a project would be given 3 years to be completed as a standard. If the project were not completed within the three years, the landowner can apply for a 3-year extension, leaving the construction bond in place, or the construction bond would be forfeited in total to the GLA. If an extension were applied for and granted, the project would be assessed upon completion if that occurred within the extension period and the balance of the construction bond not used to mitigate damage to roads or the construction site would be refunded to the landowner. If the project were not completed within the extension period, the landowner would forfeit the construction bond to the GLA.

With regard to the Application Fee assessed for Projects: GLA Administrator Karleen McSherry told the Project Review Committee that the currently assessed fees (\$25 for the first form + \$10 for each

additional form) was not covering the expense allocated to the helping landowners complete the forms based on the time she spent on the efforts. Application fees had not been raised in 20 years. It was recommended that the fees be raised to a level that offset these expenses. At first, it was proposed that an administrative fee be added to the application fee. However, because the application fee was originally intended to cover these expenses, the Committee determined to simply raise the application fee and not add an additional fee. Ms. McSherry was asked to determine the amount of allocated expense and the total application fees for 2019. The committee would use that information to determine the amount of increase to recommend for the application fees.

With regard to the Mark Scariano Project: The Project Review Committee was aware that Attorney Seth Cunningham of the Brown Law Firm had been provided a letter regarding the above project with the intent that the attorney send it to Mark Scariano and his builder with a fixed period (15 days) for a response. The Committee was not aware if and when the letter was sent nor if there had been a response within the required period. The Committee was seeking answers to these questions in order to formulate the next steps in dealing with the matter at hand.

Project Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

August 3, 2020

Meeting started at 7:05 PM

Present:

Chairperson, Gerald Dubiel

Charlotte Mizzi

John McAlister

Board Member - Claudette Dirkers

Landowner - Sabrina Hanan

GLA Admin – Karleen McSherry

Absent:

Ed Dowbroski

Landowner Sabrina Hanan complained about her neighbor Christopher Brookhart building an addition to his pole barn without making an application to the GLA. She brought out issues regarding the initial barn approval being against her sub-division covenants. John McAlister will draft a letter to the Brookharts regarding the pole barn being built without an application.

Scott Stromierowski, Parcel 48, SG - House and Garage

Motion was made by Charlotte Mizzi and seconded by John Mc Alister for the Board to give a conditional approval based on the following:

1. Resubmit using the revised project application
2. Provide correct application fees
3. Provide a site plan with the residence and garage in their correct place
4. Signatures required of owner, contractor and any other persons connected with the project

JT Schmitt 51B SG – Driveway and changing the building envelope

Before giving the project consideration, the Project Committee needs to have the original sub-division plat as well as the proposed building envelope. Committee

needs to see site plan for the entire project; where the house will be, drain field and well. The owner is to supply Form E. It was brought to the attention of the committee that there is firefighting equipment on the property. The committee needs to have corroboration from local fire marshal that the driveway does not interfere with firefighting capability.

Tabled until required docs are submitted.

John Lee lot 22-D SG – Well

Motion was made by Charlotte Mizzi and seconded by Gerald Dubiel to recommend to the Board a conditional approval based on flagging the well and approval by the DEQ of the well in relation to the drain field.

Debra Smith 62 NG – Addition to existing cabin

The addition structure met all setback requirements.

Motion was made by John McAlister and seconded by Gerald Dubiel to recommend that the Board approve the addition.

Meeting ended 9:14 PM

Project Review Committee Meeting

Minutes **Draft**

March 8, 2021

Time: 10:33 AM MST

Landowner: Jacob Anderson

Committee Members Present:

Gerald Dubiel, Chair

John McAlister

Charlotte Mizzi

1. Review Application: Residence - Parcel /Lot 95-B South
Property Owner Jacob Anderson and Rochelle Plocek

The property has a septic, well and driveway which was there prior to purchasing the property. Gerald stated that the building meets the setback requirements.

Motion: John McAlister motioned to recommend to the Board to approve the application. Charlotte Mizzi seconded the motion. Vote 3 yes Motion carried.

2. Review Application: Parcel/Lot SG-46A and 46 SG49 Boundary Adjustment.

Applicants Francis Ragsdale, Erin F. Peters, Devin Van Uden and Casey Van Uden
Frances Ragdale and Erin F Peters submitted a plat map of the boundary adjustment showing the boundary line change giving the setback requirement for the Van Uden garage.
Gerald was the surveyor and therefor did not vote.

Motion: Charlotte Mizzi motioned to recommend to the Board to approve the application for the Boundary Adjustment. John McAlister seconded the motion. Vote 2 yes, 1 abstention.
Motion carried.

2. Review Application: Parcel/Lot SG-46A - Garage

Property Owners - Kevin and Casey Van Uden submitted and application for a 832 sq. ft. garage. The garage met the setback requirement. All assessments are paid up to date.

Motion: John McAlister motioned to recommend to the Board to approve the application. Charlotte Mizzi seconded the motion. Vote 2 yes, 1 abstained Motion carried.

Meeting Ended at 10:54 AM MST

Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes

April 15, 2021

Start Time: 7.05 PM

Present:

Committee Members- Gerald Dubiel, John McAlister, Charlotte Mizzi

Board Member - Claudette Dirkers, Ed Dobrowski

Landowners – Donna Anderson, Kevin & Casey Van Uden, Jaime Rambo,(by Phone) Martha McAlister, Dave Thorpe, Joe Bezotsky, George Roscoe,

Van Uden boundary adjustment - Lots SG 46A and SG49

Motion: Charlotte Motion to recommend to the Board to approve and to impose a \$250 fine for the violation of having nuisance vehicles visible from the road.

John Seconded. Charlotte and John voted yes. Gerald recused himself. Motion passed

Note the car nuisance was resolved.

Gill Well Project Lot 69 33 Acres

Gerald Dubiel was on site and stated 2 wells are planned and observed the construction of 2 driveways .

Motion: John motion for a letter to be sent out to Cease & Desist from any further work on the property until the Project Review Committee receives a project plan. Also to be fined \$250 for starting the project without Board approval. Gerald, John, Charlotte voted yes.

Motion passed.

Andersen (SG 95-B) project and failure to pay outstanding fees

The Board did not receive \$790 filing fees. The treasurer and Chairman of the PR committee communicated with the Anderson's several times for payment. They failed to respond.

Motion : John motioned and seconded by Charlotte for the Committee to send a Cease & Desist letter to be in effect until the fees are received. Furthermore a \$250 fine is imposed until the Board receives the filing fees and fine. Motion passed with a 3-0 voted.

Johnson Pole Barn and sign Lot NG 9-B

The sign was withdrawn from the application. All setbacks were approved

Motion John motioned to approve the Pole Barn and seconded by Gerald; John, Charlotte and Gerald voted yes. Motion passed 3-0

Laird Airbnb request – Lot NG 35D

The property is 1.83 acres. It is found to be too small to have a cabin (Airbnb) on the property Because there is already a residence on the property. This was an email inquiry to the committee for review. The landowner Kathie Laird will be sent an email.

Thompson/Thorpe Tiny House request – Lot NG 06-A

This was a request to move a Tiny House unto 66 Taurus Rd.

David Thorpe was present on the phone and explained that Adeline Thompson was a tenant who lived in one of the trailers that was on his property. The trailer had a fire and is no longer there. The area where the tiny house would be has septic and water lines. Once an application is made the committee would recommend to allow the Tiny House with the following conditions:

That it be on a permanent concrete foundation or cement blocks with no wheels.

Motion: Charlotte made a motion to recommend to the Board after an application is made to approve based on having a permanent concrete foundation or cement blocks. John seconded. Charlotte, John and Gerald voted yes. Motion passed 3-0.

Gelderloos House Extension – Lot NG 33 A2

The committee inspected the extension and found that it meets the setback requirement.

The project was started without making an application first.

Motion: Gerald motioned that the extension be recommended to the Board for an approval that the road impact fees be paid, and that the landowner be fined \$250 for starting the project without first making an application. Seconded by John. Note; Gerald will measure the distance to the property from the entrance to North Glastonbury nearest to the property (either Story Road/Hwy 89 or old Yellowstone trail/ Hwy. 89) and apply the \$50 per mile as required Estimated to be 3 miles. John, Charlotte and Gerald voted yes. Motion passed 3-0.

Meeting Ended: 8:37 PM

Respectfully Submitted,
Charlotte Mizzi

Project Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

June 10, 2021

Place: Liberty Hall
Meeting Time: 7:06 PM

Present:

Committee Members – Gerald Dubiel, Charlotte Mizzi, and (by phone) John McAlister
Board Members – Tim Brockett, Claudette Dirkers
Landowners - Joe Bezotsky, and (by phone) Don Taylor,
Douglas Gill, Jake Anderson, George Roscoe

• NG 8-2A Jaime Rambo - Pole Barn

Charlotte and Gerald visited the site and Charlotte stated that the pole barn met the setback requirement. Discussion ensued about Rambo's project filed last year. The committee stated any changes regarding the Board's approval for Residence, Garage and Driveway dated 11/19/20, the owner needs to re-apply.

John McAlister made a motion to recommend approval of the Pole Barn to the GLA Board. Charlotte Mizzi seconded the motion. Vote: John and Charlotte, Yes. Gerald abstained.

• NG 29-C Don and Sara Taylor - Pole Barn

Charlotte and Gerald visited the site and both stated that the Pole Barn met the setback requirement.

Charlotte Mizzi made a motion to recommend approval of the Pole Barn to the GLA Board. Gerald Dubiel seconded.

The motion passed unanimously 3-0.

• NG 69 Douglas W. Gill Well (Discussion on Driveway and Project Plan)

Charlotte apologized on behalf of the committee for sending a Cease and Desist letter. This letter was a result of a photograph depicting a dirt road and a gravel road submitted by the chairperson. Apparently there was a breakdown in communication. Mr. Gill submitted an application and on another email with a project plan which only went to the chairperson. Douglas Gill stated that the gravel road leading to the well site was temporary depending on the well driller finding water on the site. Gill needs to supply an application for a driveway/road.

Charlotte Mizzi made a motion to recommend approval of the well to the GLA Board. John McAlister seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 3-0.

• NG 35-A Herb Dawson Construction - No Application

Project Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

June 10, 2021

Board members observed the beginning of construction activity on the Dawson's site. The Dawsons are not in good standing and cannot submit an application for building until they pay delinquent dues and return to good standing. In addition to the lack of any application for construction, the building activity was less than 25 feet off the road.

Charlotte Mizzi made a motion to recommend to the GLA Board that a Cease & Desist letter be drafted and sent to the Dawson's accompanied by a fine for \$250. John McAlister seconded the motion.

Motion was passed unanimously. Charlotte volunteered to produce the first draft of the letter to be entertained by the board.

- SG 84-C- Gretchen Lundberg, - Well - No Application (no phone number or email)

Board members observed a well installed without the owners making an application. Discussion ensued regarding the location of the property in High South. It was noted that the property is located in Upper Forested Area and according to 3.5 Residential Topographical Area and Density Schedule of the Master Plan, only two subdivisions are allowed in the upper forested area. The property was originally deeded as Tenancy In Common. According to the state cadastral, the property was divided into 5 sub-divisions

Charlotte Mizzi made a motion to recommend to the GLA Board that the landowner be sent a letter describing the violation of drilling a well without an application and having a storage container which is an eyesore accompanied by a fine of \$250. Gerald Dubiel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 3-0.

Other Issues not on the agenda:

- NG 24-B Joyce Smith – There are reports of construction of a free-standing garage as well as multiple people residing in temporary RVs on the property. The garage and other structures have created view shed issues for neighbors. The owner is not in good standing.

-Action: Further investigation is required to bring this to the next PRC meeting.

- SG 28 – B. Kassing Project - Mr. Kassing, who developed and sold this property, left a scar on the landscape that requires restoration.

Action Item: Gerald Dubiel to take pictures.

Project Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

June 10, 2021

• NG 22-C Paul Rantalo: One of the Board members stated she received verbal complaints (no written complaints) from close by landowners. She stated that there are construction debris, a storage container and other eyesores have been transferred to this property.

Action: The committee recommends to the GLA Board that a notice be sent to the landowner that he has 30 days to clean up the property and that he would be subject to a fine if the property is not cleaned up.

SG 95-B Jake Anderson

Mr. Anderson submitted an application for a residence construction on this property early in 2021. The PRC recommended and the board approved that plan. A board member has raised an issue about the construction materials that are being used by Mr. Anderson in the construction. He is using storage containers as the superstructure for the residence. The Master Plan restricts use of storage containers visible on properties as eyesores. Mr. Anderson states that the storage containers will be internal to the construction and will not be eyesores. They will be finished professionally with exterior siding.

Action: Observe the state of the construction and ensure that the residence appears as depicted in the approved project drawings.

• NG 23-Aaron Cain

Mr. Cain has a financial arrangement to sell this subdivision to Jim Sconyers who plans to move a fully stick-built residence onto the property. Park County has not finally approved the subdivision but is in the process. In the interim, Mr. Cain has given permission to Mr. Sconyers to have the residence moved to the property and left on the transport vehicles until such County approval is received and the sale transaction is completed. At that time, the residence will be installed on a permanent foundation and connected to the existing well and septic system. Mr. Cain has provided a letter to the board detailing this arrangement.

Meeting ended: 9:11 PM

Respectfully Submitted,
Charlotte Mizzi

Glastonbury Landowners Association, Inc.
Project Review Committee Meeting
August 11, 2021
Minutes

Starting Time: 7:07 PM

Present:

Committee Members: Gerald Dubiel, Charlotte Mizzi, John McAlister (by phone)

Board Member: Claudette Dirkers

Landowners: Ellen Smith Eaton on behalf of SG 51B(phone), William & Loreen Guldán (NG54C), Paul Ranttalo NG 22C, James Tiscione Contractor for Tom Hubert NG 42C, Joe Bezotsky

NG 62 Debra Smith - Driveway

Charlotte and Gerald inspected the driveway and found to be in compliance with GLA Governing Documents.

Charlotte motioned to approve the driveway. Gerald Dubiel seconded the motion. Voice vote unanimous 3-0

SG 51B JT Schmitt - Small House (Approval for driveway, septic and Sewage approved by Board meeting on 9/14/20 DEQ approved the septic.)

Charlotte and Gerald inspected the property and found the house location was staked and complied with the 50 ft. setback and is in compliance with GLA Governing Documents

Charlotte Mizzi motioned to approve the small house subject to assessment paid on SG 51B and SG 51D. Gerald seconded the motion. Voice vote was unanimous 3-0.

NG 22C Paul Ranttalo - Residence Outbuilding, Driveway, Well, Septic/Sewage

Charlotte and Gerald inspected the property and found the house, outbuilding, well, septic and driveway were staked. The outbuilding and house is in compliance with the 50 ft. setback and the well and septic are in compliance with GLA Governing Documents

Charlotte motioned to approve the residence, outbuilding, driveway, well and septic subject that all permits are secured from the proper agencies. John McAlister seconded the motion. Gerald recused himself. Motion passed, voice vote 2 yes and 1 refusal.

NG 42C Tom Hubert - Residence, Well, Sewage/Septic, Driveway

Charlotte and Gerald inspected the property and found the house, well, septic and driveway were staked. The house is in compliance with the 50 ft. setback and the well and septic are in compliance with GLA Governing Documents

Glastonbury Landowners Association, Inc.
Project Review Committee Meeting
August 11, 2021
Minutes

Charlotte motioned to approve the residence, driveway, well and septic subject that all permits are secured from the proper agencies. Gerald seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous as per voice vote 3-0.

NG 28C Mark Greiner Tiny home on wheels Complaint

It was determined that Gerald write a letter to Mark Greiner stating the violations of the house not being on a permanent foundation, no applications were made for a residence on the property and for the house not having proper sanitation facilities. A date needs to be established for a response to the complaint.

Discussion

- Jake Anderson was sent a cease and desist letter in April. The amount owed needs to be corrected, he owes is \$715 application fees and \$250 for starting a project without approval. The committee recommends a cease and desist letter to be sent from our attorney and for Newman to communicate this to Seth Cunningham.
- John McAlister to formulate a cease and desist letter to the Covingtons, stating they are in violation of our Master Plan for starting a Greenhouse without making an application. Charlotte to send a letter template to John.
- Regarding Joyce Smith, Charlotte will send a letter regarding the violations.
- Van Uden garage project. Gerald stated that they just got a Boundary Adjustment from the Board. The County still needs to approve the Boundary Adjustment. When the County approves the boundary adjustment then Van Uden can make an application for the garage. Gerald will inform the committee when approval is made. The Van Udens will be responsible for the penalty fee of \$250 for the construction of the garage without making an application to the PR Committee.
- Hummel Residence SG-37-1-E1 - This project was approved and a request is made for the return of their bond. Gerald said he would inspect and let the committee be informed of his findings.
- Brunson Complaint – SG 84B – A complaint by a board member was made about tires on the property and an unfinished construction. Needs to be inspected and then a letter to be sent.

Glastonbury Landowners Association, Inc.
Project Review Committee Meeting
August 11, 2021
Minutes

- Elizabeth Mordensky NG 29-A-1 She made an inquiry, however could not be reached by phone. Phone is full and could not leave a message.

Project Review Committee Meeting

September 27, 2021

The Project Review Committee will meet as follows:

When: September 27, 2021
Place: Liberty Hall – 30 Sirius Rd.
Meeting Time: 7:00 pm
Call-In Numbers: 877-660-4960 or 406-272-4075

Agenda:

SG 51-3A Robert R. Bennett - Garage (will submit Preliminary App., Additional Fees)
NG 67 Tyson Wright - Family Conveyance and 2 driveways
SG84C David & I Gretchen Lundberg – Well
SG 53C Anna Stull- Residence, Well, Driveway (will submit additional forms, site map & fees) This will be inspected on Saturday.

SG 39-A3 Ohlen property – Garage/second story -Gerald Dubiel and Charlotte Mizzi will report on findings

Discussion on Residence Form A-1 and Well Form B

Form A-1 Residence:

<http://www.glamontana.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/forma1.pdf>

Form B: Well

<http://www.glamontana.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/formb.pdf>

Project Review Committee Minutes

February 24, 2022

Virtual Meeting

Call-in Numbers: 406-272-4075 or 877-660-4969

Starting time: 7:03 PM

Present: Committee Members-Gerald Dubiel, John McAlister, Charlotte Mizzi
Board Member Claudette Dirkers, Landowners: Debbie Newby, Jessica DeBruin and John Lee,
Douglas Gill, David Lundberg
Guest Contractor: Ken Short

Zane Curry & Kelly Kearney (SG 79)

Application for a Guest House - Gerald stated that he and Charlotte visited the property and inspected the barn that was to be converted to a guest house. Gerald stated that the barn met the setback requirements and the prior owner kept his equipment in it. Charlotte testified that the barn has three sides with a roof that is on a cement slab. John McAlister stated that the owner is not in good standing because he owns two properties and only paid assessments on the one lot SG79 and not on the corresponding lot. John stated he overpaid for the application fees that should be \$70 not \$90 and noted that the applicant owes for the road fee which is \$50 per mile.

Motion: A motion was made by Charlotte Mizzi to recommend to the Board give a conditional approval. The condition would be that Mr. Curry pays the assessment for the second lot he owns; that the application fee is adjusted and that an additional fee would be \$50 per mile from Hercules to his property. Motion passed 2 yes [Charlotte and Gerald] and 1 no [John McAlister].

Action Item: Gerald Dubiel to measure the distance from Hercules to the barn on Mr. Curry's property.

Jessica De Bruin and John Lee (SG 22-D)

Application for a Septic System – Gerald Dubiel stated that he is familiar with the property as he inspected the property for a prior application. Mr. Lee supplied a site plan and approval from the Park County Environmental Health Department dated Jan 25, 2022. Required septic permit is in order and proper application fees of \$225.00 were submitted with the application.

Motion: John McAlister made a motion to recommend to the Board to approve the application for a septic system, seconded by Charlotte Mizzi. Motion passed unanimously.

Outstanding Issues

Kevin & Casey VanUden (SG 46-A)

Mr. VanUden built an accessory building that extended onto Parcel SG 49 owned by Ms. Ragsdale. Mr. VanUden did not apply to the PRC for the accessory building and thus the property boundary violation was not discovered before the construction. The owner of the violated property, Ms. Ragsdale (SG 49) agreed to a private exchange of property through a boundary adjustment. This application for a boundary adjustment is delayed by Park County. The board made an approval on June 28 2021 for a Boundary Adjustment. *[copies of board minutes; VanUden/Ragsdale Boundary Adjustment SG 49 – SG 46 A: Gerald Dubiel maintained that the fine recommended by the Project Review Committee of \$250 be removed since the application was for a boundary adjustment only and not to consider complaints regarding nuisance vehicle. John Mc Alister agreed. Motion: Charlotte Mizzi made a motion to approve the boundary adjustment recommended by the Project Review without the fine for SG 46-A. John McAlister seconded the motion. Motion passed - 6 yes and 1 recusal.]* The matter of the unapproved accessory building will be handled once the boundary adjustment has been completed.

Mr. VanUden and Ms. Ragsdale had to re-apply with Park County for a Boundary adjustment. Gerald stated that he could not reach the neighbor, Ms. Ragsdale, to sign the paperwork that was necessary to re-file with Park County. Gerald Dubiel was the surveyor and was following up on the application with Park County.

Action: Gerald Dubiel to go physically to the neighbor to get the signature.

Gerald Dubiel left the meeting at approximately 7:45 PM and assigned Charlotte Mizzi to take over the meeting.

David Lundberg (SG 84-C)

The board discussed monies owed for a fine imposed for drilling the well without an application.

Mr. Lundberg attended the meeting and stated he was approved for his well on October 6, 2021. He emailed a copy of the approval letter form. Mr. Lundberg stated he would send the money owed.

Motion: John McAlister made a motion that Mr. Lundberg pay \$225 dollars (\$250 less \$100 return on the bond he paid with his application). The motion was seconded by Charlotte Mizzi.

Motion passed unanimously.

NOTE: The next day Charlotte Mizzi found that the GLA Board did not have the Project Review recommendation of Sept. 27, 2021 on Oct. 6, 2021 Board agenda. The approval notice was sent in error. **Action:** The board will have the Project Review recommendation on the next board agenda.

Gelderloos House Extension (NG 33-A2)

The Board approved a building extension on board meeting minutes of June 28, 2021. The owner owes \$490. in penalties and fees. The committee decided to send Pouwel Gelderloos a second letter for payment of the money he owes.

Joyce Smith (NG 24-B)

There are multiple vehicles and campers on the property in violation of Covenant 5.05. A letter was sent to the property owner previously but it was never acknowledged. The Project Review Committee decided to ask our attorney, Seth Cunningham to send Ms. Smith a letter regarding all the violations. **Action:** John will call the attorney.

Robert Branson (SG 84-B)

The owner has various construction materials strewn about his property. It was reported by a Board member that construction was begun without an application. The construction is in an unfinished state. There are old tires and other trash on property. Mr. Branson did not respond to a letter dated Aug. 26, 2021.

Motion: John Mc Alister motioned to send a second letter to Robert Branson. Charlotte Mizzi seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Jacob Anderson (SG 95-B)

Jacob Anderson was sent a letter from our attorney on Sept. 16, 2021 requesting payment of monies owed in the amount of \$965 in project fees. As of the date of the PR Committee meeting, no payment was received. **Action:** John McAlister will call Attorney Seth Cunningham to find out the requirements regarding filing a lien especially as it pertains to project fees and penalties.

Mark Grenier (NG 28-C)

Mark Grenier responded on Sept 21, 2021 to a letter sent to him by the GLA Board concerning a tiny home on his property that has no plumbing facilities (no water, no septic system) in violation of the State and County Sanitary Codes, the Master Plan, and the Covenants. Mr. Grenier stated in his September letter that he would ask the owner of the tiny house to have it removed from his property within 6 to 8 months.

Motion: John McAlister made a motion to send a letter to Mr. Greiner determine the progress of removing the tiny house or installing proper plumbing facilities to come into compliance with the Sanitary Codes and the Master Plan and Covenants. The letter was to go out on March 1st. Seconded by Charlotte Mizzi. Motion passed unanimously.

Log Cabin on O'Connell's Property (NG 5-C)

Letter was sent on January 31, 2022 regarding a log cabin on the O'Connell's property that belongs to Mr. Sconyers. A second letter was drafted and sent to John McAlister for approval. This letter will be re-examined and dispatched once approved.

David Thorpe (NG 6-A)

A Travel Trailer on the property is believed to be used as a residence in violation of the Master Plan and Covenants. A letter was drafted on Jan. 31, 2022 and sent to John McAlister. The letter has not been sent to Mr. Thorpe. It will be re-examined and dispatched once approved.

Linda Zsilavetz (NG 6-B1)

A director brought to the attention of the committee that there is a skirted single-wide trailer on Bluebird Trail in which someone has been living since July of 2021. Per the GLA Governing Documents, single-wide trailers are no longer permitted in Glastonbury. Charlotte Mizzi commented that all landowners making complaints need to follow procedures that are on the website www.glamontana.org. John McAlister and Claudette Dirkers disagreed with Director Mizzi. Multiple actions have been initiated by observation by board members and landowners of non-compliant actions of landowners. No action was taken.

Philip & Ann Marie Covington (SG 34-B & C)

A board member reported a greenhouse being constructed on the Covington property without PRC approval. A letter was sent on August 29, 2021 which stated: *With this notification, the GLA Board requests that you stop construction of this addition until you have paid your delinquent assessments and filed the appropriate application, paid the attendant project fees plus a fine for starting construction without an application, and had a site visit by the PRC to ensure that the addition complies with the Covenants and Master Plan of the GLA. It is also your responsibility to ensure that your construction complies with any subdivision covenants. At completion of these actions, the PRC may recommend that the GLA Board approve your project at which time you may resume construction.*

It was reported that construction of the Greenhouse stopped. John McAlister reported that a substantial payment on the delinquent assessments was made by the Covington's. No further action was taken.

Herb Dawson (NG 35-A)

After letters sent by the GLA Board, Attorney Seth Cunningham sent a Cease and Desist Letter on September 3, 2021 to Herb Dawson citing the construction of a large building without approval of the GLA Board in violation of the Master Plan and GLA Covenants. Construction has not stopped. Recent pictures were sent to the Board and the attorney. The Dawsons also have substantial unpaid assessments that make them ineligible to apply for project approval. **Action:** John Mc Alister will confer with our attorney to ask the court to stop construction.

Gabriele M. Barthlen (SG 32-A)

Ms. Barthlen sent an incomplete packet for approval of a tiny house on this property. Committee members are working with her to complete documentation so that the project can be evaluated.

Nick and Emma Rendleman Parcel 68

The Rendleman's applied for a project that included a residence and guest house. The guest house was to be a canvas-sided yurt. The GLA Board approved the residence but denied approval of the yurt. These results were communicated to the Rendleman's contractor, Mr. Raddick by John McAlister. Mr. Raddick informed the board that the Rendleman's would contest this action and still wanted to build the yurt. No contesting action has been seen to this point. In addition, because the project fees for the main residence and the yurt were not separated, there is a matter to be resolved in the project fees for this account. John McAlister emailed Mr. Raddick with this information. To date, there has been no response from Mr. Raddick.

Meeting ended at 9:20 PM

Draft Project Review Committee Agenda

April 12, 2022, 7:00 p.m.

Phone numbers: 406-272-4075, 877-660-4969

New Business

- Stull (SG 52) – Garage- Accessory Building
- Barthlen (SG 32-A3) – Residence, Accessory Building, Septic
- Rantalo (NG 22-C) – Garage re-location, Accessory Building
- Meier (SG 32-D) – Residence, Driveway, Septic, Well
- Leo Keeler(SG26-A1)
- Draft Tiny Home Policy - Discussion

Unfinished Business

- Dawson (NG 35-A) – Barn – Legal status?
- Van Uden (SG 46-A) – County Application Status - Boundary Adjustment, Accessory Building
- Lundberg (SG 84-C) – Penalty Fees - Well
- Grenier (NG 28-C) – Tiny home to be sold or moved. Status?
- O'Connell (NG 5-C) – Log cabin on trailer on property

Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes

April 12, 2022, 7:00 p.m.

Phone numbers: 406-272-4075, 877-660-4969

Starting Time 7:08 PM

Committee Members Present: Gerald Dubiel, John McAlister (on Phone) Charlotte Mizzi

Board Member: Claudette Dirkers

Landowners: Ron Wartman, Anna Stull, Debbie Newby, Miriam Barker

Contractor: Cohutta Lee with Lee May Wolton

Stull (SG 52) – Garage- Accessory Building and Guest House

Anna Stull had a prior approval on October 6th, 2021 for a residence, well, septic and driveway. The total structure dimensions for the approval was 1536 sq. ft. The current application for the bottom portion of the Accessory Building has the same sq. ft. The second floor has 2048 sq. ft.

Motion was made by Charlotte Mizzi for a conditional approval of any additional monies would be paid for the increase second floor footage, that \$250 be fined for building without prior approval and all seeding to be made on disturbed land. Motion seconded by Gerald Dubiel. Yes votes, Charlotte Mizzi, Gerald Dubiel and Charlotte Mizzi, Motion passed unanimously.

John Mc did not approve of the \$250 fine.

Accessory Bldg., 2,048 sq. ft., Impact = \$200/Bond = \$200, Well = \$75/\$100, Septic = \$75/\$100, Drive = \$75/\$100. App = \$110. Imp = \$425; Bond = \$500; Total = \$1,035. Original total was \$1,177.50. Probably overpaid. Has check been received?

Barthlen (SG 32-A3) – Residence, Accessory Building, Septic

Committee determined that the application was incomplete. Gerald Dubiel motioned for Gabriel Barthlen to re-file her application with appropriate fees. Seconded by Charlotte Mizzi. Yes votes, Gerald Dubiel, Charlotte Mizzi and John Mc Alister. Motion passed unanimously.

John Mc Notes: Accurate.

Meier (SG 32-D) – Residence, Driveway, Septic, Well

The committee review the application and found it to be complete. Gerald Dubiel and Charlotte Mizzi made an onsite inspection and stated that the construction area was staked and met the setback requirements. The Contractor, Cohutta Lee was present to answer question. At the meeting it was determined that he overpaid by \$30. Motion was made by Gerald Dubiel to approve the application and to seed disturbed land. Seconded by Charlotte Mizzi. Yes votes, Gerald Dubiel, Charlotte Mizzi and John Mc Alister. Motion passed unanimously.

Note: It was found the day after that additional fees are owed.

John Mc Notes: Overpaid by \$140. Check to be returned to Cohutta Lee Builders upon approval.

Ranttalo (NG 22-C) – Garage re-location, Accessory Building

Ranttalo's original application for residence, outbuilding, driveway, well and septic was approved on Board meeting of August 23, 2021. On March 12, 2022 the neighbors, Raya Johansson came into a

mediation agreement with Anneli and Paul Ranttalo to relocate the residence and the proposed outbuilding to the west. This was due to a complaint by the Johanssons regarding a view shed issue. Paul Ranttalo filed form A-3 for an Accessory Building. The garage/accessory building is in 25 ft. from the boundary line. The requirement of the Master Plan is 500 ft. set back. The accessory building is 713 ft., larger than the original outbuilding of 360 ft. Charlotte Mizzi motioned that Paul Ranttalo file for a variance to allow the setback of 25 ft. John McAlister seconded the motion. John McAlister and Charlotte Mizzi voted yes, Gerald Dubiel recused himself. Vote passed.

John Mc Notes: There are inaccuracies here. It is irrelevant that the Johanssons entered an agreement with Ranttalo. Ranttalo did not build what he applied for. He filed a second application after the fact that was also inaccurate. John Mc made a motion that Ranttalo be required to stop construction and either move the accessory building or apply for a variance that would allow the board to inspect the work and determine whether to grant it. Also, Mr. Ranttalo did not pay the correct fee differential for his new application. It was \$20 short.

Day after the meeting, John Mc reminded Mizzi that a letter had to be generated to Mr. Ranttalo informing him of the decision. Mizzi wrote back to John Mc that she had forwarded my email to Mr. Ranttalo.

Leo Keeler(SG26-A1) Well

Landowner made an application and site plan for a well. Mr. Keeler stated that there are 2 possible locations for a well and is waiting of a geologist report. Gerald Dubiel made a motion to approve the well application pending approval of the geologist report. Seconded by John McAlister. Yes votes, Charlotte Mizzi, Gerald Dubiel and Charlotte Mizzi, Motion passed unanimously.

John Mc Notes: Mizzi did not approve twice. John Mc approved.

Draft Tiny Home Policy – Discussion

John McAlister stated that a tiny house should be acknowledged to be the same as any other residence. John McAlister motioned that his Tiny House policy be sent to the Board. Seconded by Gerald Dubiel. Yes votes, Charlotte Mizzi, Gerald Dubiel and Charlotte Mizzi, Motion passed unanimously.

John Mc Notes: John Mc presented a draft tiny home policy that had been developed by a group of landowners. John Mc did not claim it was his. The policy was circulated to the board and will be raised again at the board meeting.

Unfinished Business

- **Dawson (NG 35-A)** –Commercial Structure – Legal status?

John McAlister reported that Attorney, Seth Cunningham sent a letter to Cease and Desist. Next step is to file for a legal injunction for possession. John McAlister stated that Seth is in a midst of a court case and if it goes to trial he will not have time to deal with GLA cases and we need to get a new attorney.

John Mc Notes: Seth Cunningham refuses to do any work on this until the new board is seated.

- **Van Uden (SG 46-A)** – Boundary Adjustment, Accessory Building – Status?

Gerald Dubiel has been working with the County for the last two years. It is taking a long time for the County to give an approval. The garage/shack has been built on the neighbor's property and is in violation of our covenants.

John Mc Notes: Van Uden must complete the boundary adjustment and then will face the fact that he build his shed with no building application.

- **Lundberg (SG 84-C)** – Well, Eyesores

Board is to review the recommendation to approve the well. Check for \$150 was mailed of Feb 28, 2022

Note: PRC Motion of Sept. 27, 2021 - John McAlister motioned that the Lundberg's container is allowed to stay in place for 18 months. Well fees and fine would be \$425 (\$75 impact fee and \$100 construction bond together with \$250 fine. David Lundberg sent a \$225 check to the GLA. Total due is \$200); Gerald Dubiel seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously

John Mc Notes: Lundberg drilled a well without permit. Should have been charged \$75/\$100.

By now the construction bond is irrelevant. Fined \$250 for proceeding without a permit. Total payment due to GLA should be \$325. He has provided checks totaling \$375, though they may be too old to be negotiable. Need to get a new check. Agreed to delay removal of the storage container for 18 months. In the interim, Mr. Lundberg is out of compliance and not in good standing with the GLA.

- **Rendleman (NG 68)** – Residence, Well, Septic, Driveway, Guesthouse

The GLA Board approved the residence but denied approval of the yurt. These results were communicated to the Rendleman's contractor, Mr. Raddick by John McAlister. Mr. Raddick informed the board that the Rendleman's would contest this action. Gerald Dubiel was in the area and did not see any construction.

John Mc Notes: Project fees must be adjusted based on the approvals and denials. Mr. Raddick was informed by John McAlister but he has not responded to the meage.

- **O'Connell (NG 5-C)** – Log Cabin on property

Charlotte Mizzi reported that the O'Connell's are taking the owner of the log cabin to court to have it removed from their property

Action Items:

Charlotte Mizzi to send letter to Mark Grenier, NG 28-C, and ask for update of the tiny house.

Charlotte Mizzi to send letter of inquiry to David Thorpe, NG-6A, regarding travel trailer and ask if there are people living in trailer.

Charlotte Mizzi to send letter to Steven and Amanda Hull, SG-33B, regarding whether they are installing a greenhouse.

Seth Cunningham to send a letter to Joyce Smith regarding violation of Covenant 5.05 of multiple vehicles and campers on the property.

John Mc Notes: Letter to be written to owner of NG 8-A1 concerning their plans for tiny homes on the property. One tiny home is already present. No application filed. Rumors are that the owners plan multiple tiny homes as residences for employees of a camp in Gardiner.

Report from Seth Cunningham:

Question on Liens: Board cannot file a lien for project fees that are owed.

Meeting Ended: 10:22 PM

PROJECT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES OF 7/15/2022

Meeting called to order by Chair Leo Keeler at 7:02 PM

Committee Members Attending: Leo Keeler, Chair, John McAlister, Claudette Dirkers.

Committee Members Absent: Gerald Dubiel

Landowners Attending: Sara Hirosaki, Lionel McCann, Alyssa Allen

Agenda Item 1: NG 23-E application for residence, well and septic.

Site visit by Leo and John with Lionel McCann showed residence, well and septic all exceeding setback requirements.

Discussion centered on the need for a PR Driveway Application Form E.

The subdivision road ends on at a cul-de-sac that is entirely on lot NG 23-E.

No driveway application was in the original application packet.

Lionel McCann will submit a driveway application and pay additional fees, as calculated by John.

Motion by Leo, seconded by Claudette: That we approve the applications for the residence, well and septic as located with the requirement that the disturbed ground be reseeded and all disturbed vegetation be properly disposed of with the requirement. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Agenda Item 2: SG-73 application for a garage.

Site visit by Leo and John with Alyssa Allen showed the garage stated with 51-foot setback from the property line.

Leo and John also confirmed the completion of a pergola, for which GLA still held a \$70 bond..

Primary discussion centered on the need for an extension of the existing driveway and filing a PR Driveway Application Form E.

Alyssa Allen will submit a driveway application and pay additional fees as calculated by John.

Secondary discussion: Refund of Allen's deposit of \$70 for a pergola approved and built in 2018.

Leo and John saw the pergola was complete and all grounds in good condition.

Discussed crediting the 2018 Pergola Bond to the fees required with a PR Driveway Application.

Motion 1 by Leo, seconded by John: That we approve the garage as submitted with the request that a driveway application fee be posted prior to construction. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion 2 by Leo, seconded by John: We approve the pergola bond as requested, with the \$70 deposit to count towards the garage driveway fees. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Agenda Item 3: SG 25-C PR applications for a prebuilt Outbuilding, Form A-2 and Driveway, Form E.

Site visit by Leo and John with Stacy Cahill verified that all setbacks had been exceeded, the site distances for the driveway were exceeded and the driveway flagged to the higher ground appeared to be within GLA Road and Driveway Standards.

Discussed the driveway and need for a 12" diameter culvert and placement of the Outbuilding near a telephone line crossing the property.

Motion by Leo, seconded by Claudette: that we approve the Cahill request for a driveway with the condition that it has a 12-inch diameter culvert at the junction with Arcturus Drive and that we approve the storage shed as requested. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Agenda Item 4: SG 25-B applications for residence, septic and driveway.

Site visit by Leo and John with Engineer William Smith showed the structure staking failed to meet GLA setbacks from the telephone line and the staking needed to be redone.

Leo and John helped stakeout the easement and setback lines required by GLA.

A follow-up site visit by Leo verified site properly staked and all setbacks exceeded——requirements???

Discussed the telephone and powerline easements crossing the property and that the buildings locations had to be staked again to avoid encroaching into the required 15-foot setback requirements.

Motion by John, seconded by Claudette: Approve the construction on 25-B of the house, septic and driveway since they are now fully compliant. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Application by Pouwel Gelderloos SG 84-E, for a new driveway was incomplete and he will be contacted by John.

The Committee briefly discussed the need for 12-inch diameter culvert or greater where subdivision roads or driveways meet GLA roads. The 12-inch minimum diameter requirement should be added to project review committee's road/driveway application forms.

The PR Committee discussed that past Boards have not ensured cul-de-sacs were established and there are numerous subdivision roads without the cul-de-sac required by Park County. Cul-de-sacs are always shown on subdivision COS surveys, but had not built when subdivision roads were/are constructed and lands developed. This problem has created safety hazards scattered throughout GLA. The GLA may tackle this issue when legal action requires GLA to address Covenant 9.09, stating subdivided landowners are "*entitled to the same rights and privileges and subject to the same obligations and restrictions as an original parcel*" i.e., GLA road maintenance to property lines. Alternatively, the cul-de-sac issue could be a County/State problem, as GLA will have difficulty requiring that any single landowner be held responsible to build a cul-de-sac when past Boards have not held that as an issue at the time when developments were approved.

Concerns were raised about: 1) people currently living in bomb shelters, 2) having multiple bedrooms and kitchenettes not counted as dwelling, according to the definition of a dwelling unit in the GLA Covenants.,

The committee also discussed holding an in-person meeting to identify how best to convey data to the next PRC.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 PM.

**Glastonbury Landowners Association, Inc.
Project Review Committee Agenda**

August 1, 2022, 7:00 p.m.

Virtual Only

Call-in Nos. 877-660-4969 or 406-272-4075

<https://meetings.dialpad.com/room/glastonburymt>

New Business

- Tepper (NG 23-C) - Well
- Dawson (NG 35-A) - Accessory Building
- McCann (NG 35-B) - Variance Processing
- Barthlen (SG 32-A3) - Manufactured Home and Septic.
- Barnasevitch (SG 51-C) - Manufactured Home, Drain field hookup
- Gelderloos (SG 84-E) - Driveway.

Project Review Meeting Minutes 8/1/22

Approved by Leo, Claudette John

Gerald did not vote

Call-in Nos. 877-660-4969 or 406-272-4075

<https://meetings.dialpad.com/room/glastonburymt>

Note: In most of the motions, I did not include a reference that meeting all regulations and reseeding of disturbed ground are required and I forgot to mention the 12" diameter culvert be installed at the driveway/Hercules intersection on SG 84-E. I will make a note of that as the final minutes and recommendations are made to the Board after PRC approval of these minutes.

Meeting called to order at 7:02 PM

PRC attending: Chairman Leo Keeler, John McAlister, Claudette Dirkers, Gerald Dubiel.

Landowners Attending: Michelle Tepper, Debbie Newby, Joe Bezotsky, Charlotte Mizzi, Doug Gill, Joey Parker, Scott Stomierowski, Ron Wartman, Isaac McCann, Jill and Mike Barnasevitch.

Notice was given that SG 51-C would be moved to the top of the agenda due to time differences on the East Coast.

Agenda:

Barnasevitch, SG 51-C Manufactured Home and Septic
Tepper, NG 23-C, Well
Dawson, NG 35-A, Accessory Building
McCann, NG 35-B, Variance Processing
Barthlen, SG 32-A2, Manufactured Home and Septic
Gelderloos, SG 84-E, Driveway

Agenda Item 1: SG 51-C, application to put a manufactured home on a concrete foundation with a 4-foot crawlspace, install a septic tank and hook to an existing drainfield.

Site visit by Leo Keeler confirmed the staking of the home and septic tank were all within GLA setback limits.

Discussion: Lot already has a driveway, well, garage and large drainfield established. The issue of SG 51-C being authorized only for a 1-bedroom home and the processing of changing that and getting the Park County Sanitarian approval for a 2-bedroom home on the lot was presented.

Processing the change is well underway and the final approval will be sent by the landowners to GLA.

Motion by Leo, seconded by Claudette: That we approve their application pending receipt of the Park County Sanitarian's approval of the change in the hookup.

Passed Unanimously. Notice of actions to be sent to GLA Board as soon as Project Review Committee (PRC) minutes are approved.

Agenda Item 2: NG 23-C, application to drill a well on an undeveloped lot.

Site visit by Leo Keeler could not find any staking for the well location on the undeveloped lot.

Discussion: The location of the well is identified on the Water and Sanitation Layout for the subdivision and there are no other wells or septic systems near this site. When drilling for a well, drillers must comply with laws and regulations, and with the Water and Sanitation Layout there is assurance the well will be properly located.

Motion by Leo Keeler, second by John: That we approve the drilling of the well with the condition that any disturbed ground be reseeded.

Passed with affirmative votes by Leo, John and Claudette, with Gerald recusing himself due to past employment by the landowner.

Agenda Item 3: NG 35-A, application for an Accessory Building

Site visit by the entire PRC on 8/29/22 with JoAnne Dawson and Mike ____ (??), revealed the existing structure was only 26.5 feet from the road easement rather than the required 50 feet. The PRC agreed to inform the Board that we could not recommend approval of the request they have made. The process of requesting a variance was discussed on-site and JoAnne is expected to submit a variance request.

Discussion: The GLA is in a legal process on this development and per a court order the Board is required to respond to the application within 10 business days, which ends 8/4 or 8/5. The question was asked if the Dawsons were asking the court to remove the restrictions of where they can build. No information on that has been made available to the PRC Chair and attending Board members did not speak to it.

A challenge to the processing of an Accessory Building without there being a main residence on the lot was made and discussed. The intent of the Dawsons to use the building to eliminate eyesores based on Formal Complaints from previous GLA Boards, was presented. The precedent setting nature of correcting an "Oops," either unintentionally or intentionally, and then getting a variance was presented; the requirements of the Board to determine if there are exceptional or unusual circumstances warranting a variance; and any variance not being impactive to neighbors, was discussed.

Motion by Leo, seconded by John: That the Project Review Committee officially notify the Board that we cannot recommend they approve this accessory building application and for them to expect a variance request from the Dawsons that the Board should then process, and this information will be shared with the Dawsons.

Passed Unanimously.

Agenda Item 4: NG 35-B, Variance processing.

Site visits by all PRC members enabled review of the limited space for construction on this lot, and discussions with landowners during the visits identified a "neighborhood" that should be involved in the neighborhood review as required in the Master Plan for processing a variance.

Discussion: The landowners filed a request to build a 1400 sq ft home with detached 1-car garage and shop that cannot be built without a variance from required setbacks, thus setting the eastern lot line setback at only 25 feet, and to allow an 8-foot encroachment into the southern setback from the road easement. The lot boundaries forming a parallelogram and the steep hillside encumbering most of the lot were presented. The residence and garage/shop specifications meet GLA requirements. Isaac informed the group that they had contacted most of the people comprising their "neighborhood" and their contact information will be shared with the Board. Isaac informed the PRC that without a variance they would have to dig into the hillside for over 100 feet long to a height of at least 8 feet tall and establishing a retaining wall extra would cost over \$30,000 and create an eyesore.

Motion by Leo, seconded by Claudette: That we notify the Board that the house and garage meet GLA standards, but their placement on the lot requires a variance for a 25 foot encroachment on their eastern boundary and 8 foot encroachment on their southern boundary, and the Project Review Committee asks the Board to act on processing the variance, and if encroachments are allowed to approve the construction of the home and garage.

Passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 5: SG 32-A3, Manufactured home and septic.

A site visit by Leo and John was conducted on 8/28.

Discussion: The site visit revealed the need to locate the drainfield in the lowlands of the lot which are separated by a steep cliff/hillside. and the drawings indicating that a road exceeding GLA's 14% grade would be built when installing the pipeline. The landowner said no such road would be built at this time.

Past discussions of the lot having subdivision covenants (these established in 2008) that prohibit manufactured homes and limit dwellings to one single family residence were brought forward. Leo presented that a denial of the application based on subdivision covenants was a de-facto enforcement of the subdivision covenants, which would place GLA in legal jeopardy. The landowner is working with others in that subdivision to legally amend their covenants. The dimensions of the building and size of living space etc. were discussed as to what is being proposed now does not match the data on the applications, and sections of the applications were incomplete and/or not complete. There will be a porch attached to the upper level and GLA does not include a porch in the size of a living area, unless the porch is enclosed with a roof and hard siding – i.e. a simple bug screen does not count toward it being enclosed.

Motion by Leo, seconded by John: There is enough confusion between the forms submitted and the discussions with the Project Review Committee members, and the other information that has been provided, that create enough confusion that the Project Review Committee should not approve the requests at this time. The PRC will ask her to cleanup the confusion between all the documents and to provide something that shows the total height of the building, the actual living space upstairs and downstairs be cleared up before the PRC revisits this site.

Passed Unanimously.

Agenda Item 6: SG 84-E Driveway

Site visit by Leo and Claudette found the driveway to be at a 9.7% grade with site distances exceeding 240 feet to the NE and 200 feet to the SW.

Discussion: Discussions and email exchanges at the beginning of the review revealed that Pouwel planned to hook into an existing septic system for a bomb shelter and because of an awareness of past issues GLA faced in use of shelters and their systems, I (Leo) asked the Park County Sanitarian if that was a possibility. He said no and questioned the usability of the system since it had not been used since installed.

The paperwork that Pouwel had submitted cut off the signature area showing the installation had been covered over before the required final Park County Sanitarian inspection. Pouwel did send an email saying he knew that to hook anything else to that system required another filing and approval by the County. The need for a culvert at the junction of the driveway and Hercules Road was discussed and Pouwel has stated it would be installed.

Motion by Leo, seconded by Claudette: That the PRC recommend the Board approve the driveway with the notation that a discussion of future use of the septic system identified the need for additional Sanitarian review before any additional hookups are made.

Passed Unanimously.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 8:34 PM

**Project Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
2/6/2023**

Meeting Called to Order at 7:02 PM

PRC Members attending: Jaylyn Jensen, Hendrik Gelderloos, Pouwel Gelderloos

PRC Member Absent: None

Ombudsman Attending: None

Landowners attending: Jess Hass, Eric Ackley

Agenda Item 1: SG-40-A Ackley Dry In Status

Summary:

Hendrik drove by and observed that the building was "Dried In".

Discussion:

It was determined we can report to the Board that the building has reached "Dried In" status, and SG-40-A can now be assessed for an additional dwelling unit.

Agenda Item 2: SG-25-BDeStefano Dry In Status

Summary:

Hendrik reported that there is a door still missing on the building and it is not technically "Dried In".

Discussion:

We will have to visit the site in the coming weeks to confirm dry in.

Agenda Item 3: NG-68 Rendleman Dry In Status

Summary:

Hendrik visited the site and reported that the building is well past dry in stage.

Discussion:

PRC can report to the Board that the building has reached "Dried In" status, and NG-68 can now be assessed for a dwelling unit.

Additional topics:

- Applying Dwelling Assessments:

Discussion ensued about the appropriate time during construction to apply assessments on a building.

Motion: By Pouwel Gelderloos: To recommend to the Board, that we change our standard of application of dwelling assessments from the "Dry In stage" to an 18 month period, from the date the project approval is signed.

Seconded by: Jaylyn

Passed unanimously.

- The NG-68 Rendleman Guest House/Yurt

There was discussion about the pending application for the Rendlemans yurt, and why the original soft walled yurt application was denied by the previous PRC. The current PRC will request clarification on the reason and the standards used to make that decision.

Motion to adjourn by: Jaylyn

Seconded by: Hendrik

Passed unanimously.

Adjournment: 7:42 PM

Project Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
3/1/23

Meeting Called to Order at 7:16 PM.

PRC Members attending: Jaylyn Jensen, Alicia Roskind Dearing, Hendrik Gelderloos

PRC Member Absent: Pouwel Gelderloos

Ombudsman Attending: None

Landowners attending: Rudy Parker, Miriam Barker, Gerald Dubiel

Agenda:

Agenda Item 1: SG 42-D Parker Well Application

Summary:

Hendrik visited the property and measured setbacks at 30' from easements and property line, and well over the 100' setback from any drain field and septic tank.

Discussion:

The application recommends a property line setback of 50'. However, it also states that well setbacks can be less than 50' in certain circumstances. County Requirements are a minimum of 10'.

Jaylyn Motion:

To recommend to the board that the well application for SG 42-D be approved.

Seconded by Alicia

Passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 2: NG 68 Rendleman Guest house

Summary:

Hendrik checked setbacks of the proposed hard walled yurt, ground steaks were at 70' from the property line, and 50' from the road easement.

Discussion: This application meets all requirements

Alicia Motion:

To recommend the board approve the application for the guest house at NG 68.

Seconded by Jaylyn

Passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 3: NG 36-D Brozovsky solar panels

Summary:

There was an email request from Purelight Power to install solar panels on the Brozovskys roof.

Discussion:

The current GLA governing documents do not advise on, or have any requirements or limitations to the installation of solar panels on an existing building. The committee will discuss this with the Board.

Additional topics:

The committee realized we did not reach a resolution to inform LO's about the comment period for the proposed changes to the timing of assessment application. Jaylyn will draft a postcard.

Adjournment: 8:12

Project Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
4/5/23

Meeting Called to Order at 7:10 PM.

PRC Members attending: Jaylyn Jensen, Alicia Roskind Dearing, Hendrik Gelderloos

PRC Member Absent: Pouwel Gelderloos

Ombudsman Attending: None

Landowners attending: Douglas Gill, Tyson Wright, Aija-mara Accatino

Agenda:

Agenda Item 1: Douglas Gill NG 69 Dwelling/Sewage disposal application

Summary:

Hendrik visited the property. The proposed build site is well within the setbacks required.

The proposed septic sight is not staked out, NG 69 is an un-divided original parcel and there are plenty of options for drain field placement. The PRC will revisit the sewage disposal application once the L.O. has it engineered.

The L.O. took into consideration the viewshed of his neighbors when designing the dwelling. The application and all fees are in order.

Jaylyn Motion:

To recommend to the board that the dwelling application for NG 69 be approved.

Seconded by Alicia

Passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 2: Tyson Write NG 67-A Dwelling/Variance

Summary:

Hendrik checked setbacks of the proposed dwelling. The L.O. explained that he had worked out a deal with his neighbor to the west to do a B.L.A. through the county because there are not many options on his lot for a build site, due to the shallow bedrock and steep terrain.

Even after the B.L.A. the setbacks of the dwelling sight would require a variance. Granting this variance does not immediately affect the neighbors to the west due to the terrain and inaccessibility of that part of the property.

Alicia Motion:

To recommend the board approve the application for the Dwelling and Variance at NG 67-A

Seconded by Jaylyn

Passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 3: Aija-Mara Accatino NG 36-C Green House

Summary:

The L.O. would like a small Greenhouse built on an existing deck on the property. The existing deck is out of view from neighbors and will be very low impact.

Alicia Motion:

To recommend approval to the board for the greenhouse at NG 36-C

Seconded by Jaylyn

Passed unanimously.

Adjournment: 8:12

**Project Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
5/3/23**

Meeting Called to Order at 7:03 PM.

PRC Members attending: Jaylyn Jensen, Alicia Roskind Dearing, Hendrik Gelderloos

PRC Member Absent: Pouwel Gelderloos

Ombudsman Attending: None

Landowners attending: Michelle Tepper

Agenda:

Agenda Item 1: Michelle Tepper NG 23-C Septic/Driveway/Residence

Summary:

Hendrik visited the property and measured marking steaks. All setback requirements have been met. Hendrik recommended to include a culvert in the driveway.

Alicia Motion:

To recommend approval to the board of the application for septic, driveway, and residence at NG 23-C.

Seconded by Jaylyn

Passed unanimously.

Adjournment: 7:46 PM

Project Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
6/7/23

Meeting Called to Order at 7:07 PM.

PRC Members attending: Jaylyn Jensen, Alicia Roskind Dearing, Hendrik Gelderloos

PRC Member Absent: Pouwel Gelderloos

Ombudsman Attending: None

Landowners attending: Byron Kassing, Kenneth Selzer, Kristine Dhiex-Fowle, Miriam Barker

Agenda:

Agenda Item 1: NG 22-B Macchio Septic/Modular home/Well Applications

Summary:

Jaylyn visited the property and relayed to the PRC that the well, modular, and septic locations were all staked out and conformed to the setback requirements.

Jaylyn Motion:

To recommend approval to the board for the well, septic, and Modular home applications at NG 22-B.

Seconded by Alicia

Passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 2: SG 84-C Selzer Septic/Driveway/Residence Applications

Summary:

The applicants submitted Form H (Variance) along with their document package but after inspection by Jaylyn, and review by the PRC, it was determined that Form H was not needed. These applications meet all setback requirements.

Alicia Motion:

To recommend the board approve the NG 84-C applications for septic, driveway, and residence.

Seconded by Jaylyn

Passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 3: NG 35-B McCann Septic/Well Applications

Summary:

The lot is a special case, the L.O. has already had a Variance approved for the building site due to the topography. The well setbacks are less than 50' from the property line bordering dedicated parkland for the minor subdivision. Due to the limited building space the PRC has decided the setbacks for the well are adequate. Septic has already been stamped and approved by the county sanitarian.

Alicia Motion:

To recommend the approval of the well and septic applications for NG 35-B

Seconded by Jaylyn
Passed unanimously.

Discussion:

Topic1:

Discussion ensued about the comments from L.O.s' regarding changes to applying assessments after construction. After considering the feedback from L.O.s' The committee feels there may be a better way to approach this topic and would like to explore other ideas.

Alicia Motion:

To recommend the board withdraw the proposed changes to the application of dwelling assessments.

Seconded by: Jaylyn.

Passed unanimously.

Topic2:

There was a discussion about including overall height in the building applications. Currently the application asks the applicant what the height is. We may want to make it a check box that has the maximum height and says: ____ Is your building under (Maximum height)

Topic3

There seems to be some confusion about easement setbacks in the covenants/master plan. The committee discussed tracking down the issues and bringing to the attention of the gov. docs. committee.

Adjournment: 8:21PM

GLA Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes Wednesday Nov. 1, 2023

Committee members present: John Carp (Chair), Alicia Roskind, Jaylyn Jensen.

Committee members absent: none

Landowners' phone-in: Scott Stomierski

Meeting called to order by John at 7:02 pm.

1. NG50A LTS Architecture Setback Variance Application

- Both neighbors have reviewed and approved the set back.
- Mark Seaver had brought up the importance of not just granting variances at the last Board meeting.
- John had some follow-up questions for the architect. The architect said they cannot build to the North due to the rocky terrain to the North.

Scott joined the meeting. Alicia made a motion to approve Scott onto PRC, upon voted Board approval. Jaylyn seconded. All in favor. **Motion passes**

- Jaylyn says that the road that is to the right of it is ridiculously steep, so they cannot come any closer to that ledge without violating Covenants due to terrain issues. In the Covenants, it states you are not supposed to build on the ridge.
- John recommends the OnX Hunt app to the committee because it lists all the owners and boundaries to help with project approval.
- It appears that would meet the extenuating circumstances and need.

Jaylyn made a motion to recommend a variance to 50A NG for approval. Alicia seconded. All in favor. *Scott votes yes upon Board approval of his position. **Motion passes**

2. Ng 47 Wheeler Cargo Containers Variance Review

- John Carp had about a half-hour meeting with surrounding neighbors.
- Scott said that he was told by the President, at the time, Hendrik Gelderloos that he could bring the containers in for construction.
- During the meeting with the neighbors Scott Wheeler gave 4 options to mitigate the eyesore:
 1. Privacy fence.
 2. Siding and roof.
 3. Build and outbuilding in their place.
 4. Move them about 100 yards north on his property.
- Of all these suggestions the neighbors only liked point #4, move them about 100 yards on the property to where there are more trees and depression in the area. The neighbors were sympathetic to his situation.

- Scott Wheeler mentioned two other properties that had shipping containers on them, saying that, if they have them, why can't he have them? That is his second reason for having the containers.
- Scott S says that Hendrik should not have the authority to approve without Board approval. Scott says that if Scott Wheeler had versed himself in the Covenants, Bylaws and Standards. Scott S. cited Standards 1.1 it is stated that the storage sheds shall be put in front of the Board for approval.
- Jaylyn feels that it is a true miscommunication and a mistake on Hendrik's part and we need to work with Scott Wheeler to find a solution. "Was the owner of this mobile home above in the picture, at this meeting? If you move these
- John said the owner of the mobile home, Tim, was at the meeting and agreed to this solution. John said that everyone at the meeting was happy with the solution to move them to the North.
- There are **three projects** he'd like to do using the containers:
 - Take the thousands of buckets from out of the shelter to place in two of the containers for that work.
 - Build a house
 - Build a storage building
- Alicia suggests we give him one storage unit, with a 12-18 months' time limit and moving it 100 yards to the North and a sign stating that a variance had been granted for the cargo container for the time period.
- Standish has said that he can move them or would possibly buy them. So, Scott Wheeler has an option.
- Jaylyn, would we recommend a motion that we move 1 to the North with a 12 month limit?
- Scott Wheeler said they still have a storage container at the Rendleman's that is still there over the years.

Alicia motions to present to the Board for approval allowing a variance for 1 storage unit with a 12 month limit and moving them 100 yards to the North. Jaylyn seconded. All in favor. Scott cannot vote until confirmed by the Board.

Motion passes

3. NG 57B Andrew Billings

- Andrew purchased this property recently. He had requested an approval for remodeling back in August, but this was before he had closed the sale. He was told he had to wait until he owned it.
- Since the closing was delayed, he has decided not to do any work on the property until spring. So his application will be on hold then.
- No need to do anything at this time.

NG 30E Villeneuve

- There are two structures in question, but only one is in need of a variance. Paul Rantalo was the owner at the time, and he built both structures. One structure in question, a shop building with a second story apartment, had a setback were 24.5 ft instead of 25 ft. Eventually the Board approved this variance.
- What is in question now is a long garage unit. This building was built on a neighbor's property line with no setback. Rantalo was found to be out of compliance in 2018 and meanwhile he sold the property to Michael Villeneuve in 2021. Villeneuve was aware of the infraction but had nothing to do with the situation, however, the infractions go with the property, so he is out of compliance and asking for a variance to come into compliance.
- The committee will get more information on the background of this situation and bring it to the Board.
- John suggests we recommend the current owner reach back out to this owner of the neighboring property to adjust the boundary line.
- Alicia suggests we get better pictures of the garage and topography and suggest they reach out to the neighbor to do a land trade or purchase to adjust the boundary line.
- John said he will reach out to the owner with these suggestions. John also wants to get more background information from Charlene Murphy. Alicia will reach out to Andrea for further information that she may know.

Meeting adjourned at 8:52pm.
Alicia Roskind

GLA Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes Wednesday Nov. 29, 2023 (Dec. meeting)

Committee members present: John Carp (Chair), Alicia Roskind, Jaylyn Jensen.

Committee members absent: none

Landowners' phone-in: Scott Stomieroski

Meeting called to order by John at 7:03 pm.

1. NG 69 - Gill Dried-in Status

Discussion: Discussing dried-in definition. Dried-in means doors, windows, roof, and siding. Doug's house is not dried-in at this point. Gill's doors are not on yet, so we will hold off on this until the doors are on.

Motion: None.

2. NG 37 - Wheeler Project Application

Discussion: Wheeler wasn't happy about the vote by the Board. He said he wants to put his emphasis on clearing out the shelter. He sent in an application to to put a ramp down into the tank in a way that makes it accessible to a pick-up truck. John suggests that we make a caveat that he cleans up the dirt he removes.

Motion: Scott makes a conditional motion for approval to create a hole so he can make access for a pick-up truck and stairs to his shelter to access it. Conditions: provide a map and a plan for removed dirt. Jaylyn seconded. All in favor. **Motion passes.**

3. Villeneuve Variance Request

Discussion: John spoke with him a couple of weeks ago after discussing going to see his long shed. When John called him, he said he should not need a variance because the shed had already been approved by the Board in 2007. He wants to withdraw his variance and request a removal of the violation from the property. John suggests we ask him for a formal request to withdraw his variance. John told him the committee would look at this and get back to him. It is the understanding that he was aware of the violation when he bought it. He's saying that it was given a violation in 2017, but it already had been given a variance in 2007, per information he has recently discovered. Question comes down to why the Board in 2018 decided it was in violation when the Board gave him the variance in 2007. Doug, Scott, and Alicia feel it is his burden to prove the documentation that the variance was approved in 2017. John will draw up an email to

Villeneuve requesting him to withdraw and provide evidence. John will send it to PRC for approval before sending it to Villeneuve.

Motion: None.

Adjourned

Meeting adjourned at 7:51pm.

GLA Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday Feb. 7 , 2024

Committee members present: John Carp, Scott Stomieroski, Doug Gill, Jack Sutton,

Committee members absent: none

Landowners' phone-in: Claudette Dirkers, Bill Kelly

Meeting called to order by John at 7:05 pm.

1. Bill Kelly Project proposal NG – 43-4. Bill inquired as to whether that upon building a new house next to his current dwelling, his current home could be designated as guest house. It is 1700 sq. ft. and the size stipulation for guest homes is 1200 sq. ft. Bill, Doug and John will meet with Bill in a couple of weeks to review the project site. Bill will get exact square footage of current home, it may be less than 1700 sq. ft.
2. John agreed to remain committee chair. Jack Sutton agreed to research the backlog of outstanding project review cases.
3. Review bond refunds for Barnasevitch, NG 51-C, Keeler, 26-A1, and Stomieroski, SG 25. John has inspected them, and they are complete and in compliance with setbacks and original plans. Motion: Doug: Approve these refunds, upon condition that final refund amounts are determined. Jack: Second. Motion passed unanimously.
4. Dried-in policy review. Committee agreed that the process should remain as is. Even though framed dwellings are not habitable, contractor traffic for finishing the project justifies assessments starting at the dried-in stage. Three projects in North are close to dried-in status: McCann NG 35-B, Tepper NG 23-C, and Hirosake NG 23-E . Doug Gill NG 69 recently reached dried-in status and assessments can start.
5. Wheeler NG-37 project applications – tabled.
6. Several building projects that were not followed up by previous Boards need updating and final inspections. John has provided Jack Sutton with the database spreadsheet for outstanding projects that he received from Hendrick Gelderloos, previous PRC Chair. Jack has agreed to take on the task of updating the information and prioritizing projects that need inspections and/or new assessments levied and/or bonds refunded. The committee will work on getting all projects into one central database. The committee will coordinate with Claudette Dirkers, Asst. Treasurer, in verifying LO data for bond refunds and assessments. The final inspection form also needs to be completed and filed for each project after final inspection.
7. O'Connell Project application: Discussion on the O'Connell project and ownership dispute of the cabin in question. Committee agreed to get legal advice on the situation before furtherer action on the application.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 pm

John Carp, PRC Chair

GLA Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday April. 3, 2024

Committee members present: John Carp, Scott Stomieroski, Doug Gill, Jack Sutton,

Committee members absent: none

Landowners' phone-in: Board members Claudette Dirkers and Tim Brockett; Newman Brozovsky

Meeting called to order by John at 7:03 pm.

1. Review pending dried-in projects: Three projects in North are close to dried-in status: McCann NG 35-B, Tepper NG 23-C and Grindstaff NG 23-A. They have not reached dried-in status yet.
2. Nick Rendlemen, NG-68, installed a septic and driveway to their guest house without filing for GLA applications. Doug to speak with them. It may be they were relying on their contractor to submit the apps.
3. Scott Wheeler NG 37-D. Cargo container project update; review new project applications: Scott has removed the ramp plan and is now applying for a pit with a shed over it as shelter access. Committee will request the following from Scott: That he become current with all his application fees and forms; that he provides agreement docs from the north neighbor approving variance of shed and retaining wall location, and viewshed; that he provide an elevation drawing for the retaining wall; that that he indicate if the shed will be temporary or permanent; that he provide a date for moving the third cargo container, with the understanding that no projects may proceed before the cc is moved. John to send him an email indicating all the above.
4. Windorski SG-44 subdivision application review. Darryl Windorski had applied for a subdivision review in Sept 2022. He recently completed his family conveyance subdivision application with the County, and it was approved. But he has yet to be approved by the GLA for the subdivision and he is hesitant to allow the GLA do a final inspection for the subdivision layout. Tim Brockett has agreed to communicate with Darryl on the matter to resolve any misunderstandings so that Darryl may allow subdivision approval by the GLA. He will need to do this before any other projects are approved.
5. Construction Bonds refund update: John expressed his frustration regarding the confusing process for computing and refunding construction bonds. The committee agreed the process needs to be handled more efficiently, not just the bonds issue but the entire Project Review process. Tim has been working on a computer program that will calculate bonds, keep track of all LO database info, and allow for GLA website changes. Doug motioned to approve the use of the program and to have Tim oversee updating the backlog of unpaid bond refunds. Jack Seconded. Motion approved unanimously. The committee was very grateful that Tim will take on this arduous task.
6. Update on other miscellaneous project review items: Rantalo NG-37 has a drive that has to be checked for boundary issues. Sweeney NG 33 has to be checked for dwelling issues. Curry SG-79 has to be checked for bond refunds. Letters of inquiry will be sent. John to follow up with Jaylyn on PRC website doc updates.
7. Saunders property, NG 61-B, has commenced a building project without any GLA applications. The board will send a cease-and desist letter to them, indicating they must file all relevant applications with appropriate fees and late fee. John to write letter for committee approval first.

8. Brozovsky garage application, NG 36-D. The committee reviewed his application and spoke with him during the review. He is applying for a variance on the garage location setback. He recently changed the garage from one level to two, to allow for a workshop on the upper level. Before approval, the committee requests updated approvals from his neighbors, more photos, and an onsite meeting with another committee or board member to review the setbacks. John to meet with Jewel Wiczorek, board member, at the site and provide photos.
9. Review payment language for project application fee calculations. Item tabled for future review.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm
John Carp, PRC Road Chair

GLA Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday July 10, 2024

Committee members present: John Carp, Doug Gill, Jack Sutton, Phil Pickens

Committee members absent: Scott Stomieroski,

Landowners' phone-in: Ciara Wallace, Tyne Flannigan (Ciara Wallace fiancé), Ron Wallace, Ron Wartman

Meeting called to order by John at 7:08 pm.

1. Review Ciara Wallace NG 53-C barn project application. Barn intended to be used for small wedding events. Several concerns brought up by committee members and/or LO: Potential issues: Noise and light nuisance, traffic impact, off-road parking capacity, septic capacity, and lighting and cooling provisions in the barn.

The committee requested the following info before considering approval: Updated septic capacity review, plan for parking space, and elevation drawings showing doors and windows on the barn. There was also an adjustment to be made on the amount owing for application fees. A new invoice will be sent.

Ciara and Tyne indicated they will provide this info to the committee as soon as possible.

2. The above discussion lasted until 8:25. The meeting was adjourned early at 8:36. as John had computer technical problems. No action was taken on the other agenda items below. These will be addressed in subsequent meetings or emails.

2. Nordemann NG 44 D-1 new project application.
3. Wheeler NG 37 project update.
4. Windorski SG 46 driveway app update.
5. Rushmeyer NG 42-D project update.
6. Sweeney NG 44 C inquiry on building.
7. Review status of shelters for assessment as dwellings.

Meeting adjourned at 8:36pm

John Carp, PRC Chair

GLA Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday Aug. 7, 2024

Committee members present: John Carp, Jack Sutton, Phil Pickens, Scott Stomieroski,

Committee members absent: Doug Gill

Landowners' phone-in: Ciara Wallace, Tyne Flannigan (Ciara Wallace fiancé), Robert Wallace, George Makris, Jenny White

Meeting called to order by John at 7:05 pm.

1. Makris SG-20A guest house application review. Georg Makris is requesting a variance for his drainfield setback from the required 50 ft. to 20 ft. The committee did not approve the project at this time. Phil had concerns about the drainfield location. Scott and Jack will visit the property and look the terrain and location of the drainfield in respect to the neighbor, who would potentially be affected by the reduced drainfield setback were he to decide to install a well. The committee also requested George to speak to his neighbor to determine if there are plans for any wells on that lot. George said others in the area had tried to drill two wells but came up dry. The committee will review his app again via email once the information is gathered.

2. Wallace NG 53C guest house application review. The application was in order and all requirements met. There was some concern over their private subdivision requirement of only one driveway access onto Aquarius, while they have two. Robert stated the south access is not used in the winter as drifting snow blocks it, even with a fence. He said they would aim to use the north access exclusively. Scott motioned and Jack seconded that the project application be approved. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Donald Helmbrecht and Jenny White SG 94 guest house application review. This project was begun by the previous owners and the Helmbrecht's are finishing it. There was some concern over the setback on the foundation, whether it met the 50 ft. requirement. As measured from Google earth it appeared to be short. Scott and Jack agreed to meet with them and measure the setback, before approval would be given. They will report back to the committee.

4. Review status of shelters as dwelling units for assessments: The committee felt that assessing all shelters, whether used as housing or not, would not be viable. They did feel that if a particular shelter is known to be housing residents, that particular situation may be looked into by the board. More input will be sought from the entire Board on the issue.

Meeting adjourned by John at 8:30 pm.

GLA Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday Oct. 9, 2024

Committee members present: John Carp, Doug Gill, Jack Sutton, Phil Pickens

Committee members absent: Scott Stomieroski

Landowners' phone-in: Neil and Linda Kremer, Claudette Dirkers, Elizabeth Mordensky

Meeting called to order by John at 7:08 pm.

1. Kremer SG-57 subdivision application. Discussion on the complex history of the Kremer subdivision of his previous three parcels, which are now one. A previous 2017 Board approved a boundary adjustment which in effect created three dwellings on one parcel. The Kremers' current subdivision plan will create three parcels, each with one dwelling. Although there were questions on the appropriateness of the 2017 Board's decision to approve the subdivision, it was agreed that it was a done deal, and is not a compliance issue that affects the current subdivision application. Doug motioned and Jack seconded to approve the subdivision application, that changes one parcel into three, each with one dwelling. Motion passed unanimously.
2. Mordensky NG-29A dwelling application. Review of application for residence and driveway at the corner of Capricorn and Venus. The application is complete and in compliance with all setback guidelines. Doug motioned and John seconded to approve. Fees appear correct. Jack and Doug will inspect the property next week. Motion passed unanimously.
3. Sweeney NG- 44C addition application. Mr. Sweeney had completed a small room in addition to his mobile in 2022 without an application. He thought room additions under 100 sq. ft. did not require an application. The committee found that he still has to file the preliminary app form and pay the \$250 late fee to return to good standing. John will inform him.
4. Everett SG - 33E dwelling application. Review of Everett application for residence and driveway. Jack and Doug visited the property and found all setbacks in compliance. Jack motioned and Doug seconded to approve the application, with the condition that the current older septic that was used for a mobile home that has been removed be reviewed as suitable for the new dwelling. Everetts will report back on this. Motion passed unanimously.
5. Garner Sg 64 B Driveway app. Adam Ganer has an app for a long driveway that runs through his neighbors parcel. Phil Pickens communicated with Adam and Adam told him that he has an easement agreement with the neighbor. The committee recommended Phil communicate with Adam again to show documentation of the easement along with confirmation by the neighbor, Chuck Tanner. Once that is done the application will be approved. Mr. Garner also overpaid his application by \$95, he will be due a refund.
6. Discussion with Claudette on finishing up outstanding final inspections and bond refunds. Jack will help on this and both Jack and Doug will conduct final inspection on approved properties next week.

Meeting adjourned at 8:33 pm

John Carp, PRC Chair

