

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.