

# 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 14<sup>th</sup>, 2020 at 2:00 PM.

Meeting ended 3:35 PM