JOINT BOARD AND ARC MEETING JULY 5, 2016, at Bell residence; AGENDA:

 Campbell (Lot 22) Entry - Action

 Herreid/Ponto (Lot 27) – Action

 Carmichael (Lot 33) – Enforcement needed?

 privacy fencing/solid fencing discussion

The ARC met first to review Campbell and Herreid Ponto applications. The Board joined the ARC in order to streamline Board action on 2 applications and to discuss one potential enforcement issue (Carmichael) and the general issue of perimeter “privacy fencing’ in the subdivision.

Campbell

The ARC approved Campbell’s application for a new entry, a separate application from original garage project, with conditions. The Board then joined the ARC and discussed ARC conditions, approving with similar conditions, including payment of fee for new application. Assignment: cmd to scan and send to Campbells.

Herreid/Ponto

The ARC and Board discussed amendment to the original garage/storage area application: “privacy fencing” between lots 1 and 27, 6’ high entry gate and fence, approximately 15’ wide, slated and connected to garage, yard fencing for dogs. ARC approved with conditions, prior to Board and ARC discussion. Board approved with similar conditions, specifying that the entry was not approved as “privacy fencing” but as an architectural addition to balance new garage and storage area, located behind front yard landscaping and attached to garage. The fencing and entry are not on perimeter and are part of the 42 linear feet of 2-rail yard fence. Board also denied the 45’ linear feet of free-standing privacy fence on west side of lot, between 1 and 27. It was important to both ARC and Board that the storage area on the west side of garage be closed in, as previously approved. Assignment: cmd to scan and send to Lot Owner.

Carmichael

Both Board and ARC happy to see that wainscoting is rusting, but unhappy that the Carmichaels totally “blew off” review process by ARC and Board. They never responded to Dave’s request for a sample or MD sheet on material that would rust, and, installed without further review by ARC and action by Board. Assignment: cmd to write letter requesting review process be followed in future and requesting sample so application complete, even though approval never given. Dave and Adam to review letter.

Privacy Fencing Issue

Considering the denial of the Herreid Ponto request for between-lot privacy fencing, the ARC and Board discussed the issue of solid fencing within Kings Row. Examples of 6’ and lower deck railing and privacy fencing, solid gates, and screening of “unsightly” items were given. No one knows if the deck enclosure on Hutter house went through ARC review or when it was constructed. The request by the owners of lot 4 for fencing along their south boundary with CR 82 was discussed. The ARC and Board see this as a new and different request for fencing because it is many feet of solid perimeter fencing. The ARC – unanimously – stated the desire to stick with the Covenants on requiring “open” split-rail/pole type fencing and denying any kind of perimeter privacy fencing. The ARC’s opinion is based on the value of openness expressed in the Covenants, interpreted as not just openness within the subdivision but, also, openness between Kings Row and surrounding land parcels. ARC is concerned about setting a precedent if a variance is granted to this lot. Assignment: cmd to make sure the variance request is set for Board vote and find out if Roshni has contacted neighbors.