

Architectural Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, September 9, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Eric Erickson
Rob Gordon
Jim Eyster
Tom Anglewicz
Tim Triggs
Rob Quinn – HOA board Liaison

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUESTS PRESENT:

None

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION:

The meeting was convened in the PBH Community Center at 7:00 p.m.

MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING – August 8, 2017. Approved.

NEW COMMITTEE APPLICATIONS:

DUNCAN – 122 FIR LANE – SMALL ADDITION – Review delayed. There has been a delay in providing a site plan and elevation for this 160 square foot addition. Update provided by Eric Erickson, case manager.

COMMITTEE REVIEWS:

RICHARDSON – 208 ALPINE WAY – NEW HOME – Final approval was granted on June 14, 2016. Project was delayed for various reasons, but tree removal and earthwork has now just begun. No changes have been made to the approved drawings. The general contractor is now AGR of Boulder. Update provided by Tim Triggs, case manager. He will suggest to owners that they call the adjacent neighbors to give them the latest information.

HEMBURY – 795 PINE BROOK ROAD – NEW HOME – Expect the presentation for final approval at the October 10 meeting. Second garage is no longer part of the scope. Update provided by Jim Eyster, case manager.

HOOPER – 497 CEDAR BROOK – ADDITION – As this project has been significantly delayed, the owner will be notified by the case manager, Eric Erickson, that his application has expired and a new one will be required if and when he, Hooper, decides to move forward with the project.

PUBLISHED POLICIES REVIEWS:

GENERAL MODIFICATIONS TO THE ARC WEBPAGES – Based on recommendations from Tim Triggs, changes will be implemented to make the ARC pages easier to navigate. A title will be added to each page. Links on the pages will show in bold and be underlined for ease of identification. A tab will be added on the main page to take the user directly to the Application Form. Various links and page names will be re-named for both consistency and clarity.

APPLICATION EXPIRATION CRITERIA – COMMITTEE CONSENSUS: Internal policy -- After an on-line application has been submitted by a PBH property owner for an exterior construction project, the ARC expects that the project will normally move forward according to the following time frames:

Receipt of Supporting Documentation – NLT 90 days from on-line application

Final Review – NLT 9 months following Preliminary Review

Start of Construction after Final Review – NLT 1 year

Should the case manager for a particular project fail to receive ongoing updates from the project's property owner during any one of the time periods described above, the project will be labelled "dormant" and ineligible for further ARC review. The case manager for the project will notify the property owner of the expiration of the original application and the need, should the project still be viable, for a new application to be filed.

MODIFICATION TO ACCESSORY STRUCTURES PUBLISHED POLICY – Substantive discussion. **Committee Consensus:** In view of the ease and prompt responsiveness of the ARC's on-line, Fast Track application process, the ARC unanimously believes that all Accessory Structures, including dog houses, tree houses, play structures, storage and garden sheds, gazebos, etc, should be routinely and promptly reviewed by the ARC, regardless of whether they are exempt from a Boulder County permit. Tom Anglewicz will draft a modification to our existing, published Accessory Structures policy for an ARC and HOA final review.

APPLICATION GUIDELINES – A sentence was added, to clarify what is needed to make the application submission complete and ready for Review.



Architectural Review Committee (ARC)

DESIGN REVIEW – In the Design Review section of the main ARC webpage, three paragraphs were approved with modifications to underscore the requirements for a formal Final Review.

APPLICABILITY OF PARAGRAPH 3.4, UNIFIED COVENANTS, TO ARC DECISION CRITERIA – COMMITTEE

CONSENSUS: Internal Policy - The ARC does not interpret our Unified Covenants to require consideration of “projected use” or, more specifically, “potential noise detriments” as part of their project review criteria.

MEETING ADJOURNED – 9:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Triggs

Recorder