

**Eldorado Community Improvement Association, Inc.**  
**Architectural Committee Meeting Minutes of February 9th, 2016 DRAFT 2**

**TIME AND PLACE:**

The bi-monthly meeting of the ECIA Architecture Committee was held on Tuesday February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016 at 7 PM at the Community Center.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:04 PM

**DESIGNATION OF QUORUM:**

Attending the meeting were members: Chair Katherine Mortimer, Casey Cronin, Steve Taratula, Gary Moran, Board Liaison Antone Forneris, and Staff Liaison Mark Young. Prospective Committee Candidate Laurence Cohen was present for the last ½ hour of the meeting. A quorum was present for this meeting.

**Announcements:**

1. Mark Young announced that we would have a guest, Jerry Gulseth, from the Conservation Committee at this meeting to discuss a Landscaping Best Practices brochure that they are working on.

**Consent Agenda Approvals:**

<b><u>UBL#</u></b>	<b><u>Address:</u></b>	<b><u>Resident</u></b>	<b><u>Nature of Project:</u></b>	<b><u>Details:</u></b>
--------------------	------------------------	------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------

There were not items under the consent agenda.

**RESIDENTS:**

There were 8 residents attending the meeting.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

There was no old business.

**NEW PLANS FOR REVIEW:**

1. **UBL #12820, 6 Casa Del Oro Lane, Frances Aull**, with plans for an 11 panel roof mount PV system at a low ballast 10 degree mount. With a 6 inch parapet height and a height of the panels of 13" off the roof, there will be a 7 inches of visibility of these panels. The Committee unanimously approved of these plans with the requirement that the resident contact the ECIA at the time of installation to verify the angle of the panels and height of the system off the roof.

2. **UBL # 32709, 2 Conchas Court, Alexandra Heath**, with plans for Installation of 5 no trespassing signs and one camera warning sign. This submission was required due to the fact that such signs are not allowed under blanket approval in Article II, Section 9 of the Covenants. Due to the fact that the

resident has had issues of trespassing on their lot, and these signs were installed as a deterrent at the request of the Santa Fe County Sheriff's Department, the Committee voted to approve of these plans with the stipulation that the signs shall not be any larger or closer together than State, Federal or County laws allow.

3. **UBL# 14615, 10 Redondo Court, Ellen Gross**, with plans and variance request for two large accessory structures, and one small accessory structure on lot without ECIA approval, as well as a coyote screening fence that requires a variance due to its location inside the 20 foot side setback and another fence that encroaches into the 50 foot roadside setback. Additionally the amount of enclosure on the lot is 7031 sq. ft. and exceeds the maximum allowable on the lot of 4000 and a variance is also required for this issue. The committee voted to recommend approval of the following variance requests to the Board with the following stipulations, due to the fact that the Architecture Committee does not have the authority to approve of variances.

a. Sheds: Due to the fact that all 3 sheds are all attached, the committee is considering these 3 structures as one large accessory structure requiring one variance due to the fact that the structures do not match the architectural style of the home. The justification for this recommendation is that the sheds have been on the lot for more than 10 years and are fully screened from view by the existing fence and vegetation on the lot. The stipulation attached to this recommendation is that the resident shall paint the large accessory structure to match the color of the home, as required under Section 11 of the Guidelines.

b. Fences: The committee is also recommending approval of the two variance requests for the fence encroachments and for exceeding the allowable area enclosed by the fences due to the fact that the fences were installed on the lot in 1993 and 1994 (greater than 10 years ago) and approved by the ECIA at that time. Additionally the committee is justifying this recommendation due to the fact that in both the 1993 and 1994 ECIA approvals there were very limited details concerning the exact location of the fence, relative to the property lines, and no details concerning the amount of fence enclosure allowed in each project.

4. **UBL# 30817, Robert Rohwer, 43 Cuesta Road** with plans for a new 6 foot tall coyote enclosure screening fence with one gate of the same construction. With no issues of encroachment and only 1650 square feet of enclosure on the lot, these were approved with the following stipulations:

a. Stringers to be on the inside of the fence.

As well due to the fact that Mr. Rohwer is trying to sell his house and there is less than a 1 foot encroachment of a neighbors fence onto his lot. Mr. Rohwer has requested either variance approval to allow for this fence to remain, or acknowledgment by the ECIA of the existence of this encroaching fence and confirmation from the ECIA that they will not take any enforcement actions with the current or future owners of this property, relative to this fence encroachment. The committee voted to recommend approval of the following variance requests to the Board with the following stipulations attached, due to the fact that the Architecture Committee does not have the authority to approve of variances. This variance will be reviewed by the ECIA Board at their February 18<sup>th</sup> meeting at 7 PM. The reason for this recommendation is that this fence was not built by the applicant but by the neighbor, originates on the neighbors' lot and has been on the lot for more than 10 years. The stipulations attached are as follows:

1. Approval of this fence variance does not alleviate the risk that a utility company could remove the fence.

2. If the fence is ever in need of repair it shall not be re-built on this property and would need approval by the ECIA.

## Other Business:

1. The committee discussed the status of the 2016 Guideline Review process. Mark Young reported that this issue would be brought up at the February Board Meeting and that he would report back with their findings.
2. Committee Member Steve Taratula updated the committee on the status of his work in identifying the various stucco and window companies in the Santa Fe Area. He pointed out that he has met with the manager of Chaparral Stucco/Building Material and that they have agreed to help distribute our color charts and business cards to prospective residents wanting to learn about re-stuccoing in Eldorado. Mark Young reported that he has printed the needed color cards and has sent these to Chaparral. Steve then agreed to approach the two other major stucco suppliers in Santa Fe about working with us and he will report back to the Board on his results at the next meeting.
3. Resident and Conservation Committee Member, Gerry Gulseth, presented the idea to the committee of doing a Best Landscaping Practices brochure that could be used by Eldorado Residents. This project is being done in conjunction with the ECIA Conservation Committee and would be located on the Eldorado Website and would have links to other relevant web sites. He came to seek input from the Architecture Committee in this matter. The Committee agreed to work with Jerry on this publication and Chair, Katherine Mortimer, having the needed expertise in such areas, agreed to review the drafts of this publication and provide suggestions. The Committee also recommends that Gerry and Eduardo consider advertising in the Vistas, or on the website, to recruit other qualified individuals to work on this project. Gerry will report back to the Committee as further progress is made on this publication.
4. Resident Steven Rudnick submitted a question to the Architecture Committee asking for a waiver from having to notify neighbors of his array as it was a low angle roof mount and not visible above the parapets. The Committee discussed this matter and will respond to Mr. Rudnick with regard to the need to still notify these neighbors but with more cost effective ways to accomplish this.
5. The Committee decided to postpone the review of edits to the Solar Installation Review Procedures until the next meeting and Mark Young will send out the working draft that he and Kathrine have been working on via e-mail.

## FINAL ORDER OF BUSINESS:

There was no further business.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 PM

Submitted By:

Mark Young, Staff Liaison \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_