



**Village of South Russell
5205 Chillicothe Road
South Russell, Ohio 44022
440-338-6700**

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES**

May 19, 2021 7:00 p.m.

Members Present: David Maistros, Chairman, Laura LaChapelle, Andy Hitchcock, Bill Stone, Mike Mulloy
Other Officials: Bridey Matheney, Solicitor; Mayor Bill Koons, Dave Hocevar, CBO, Ruth Griswold, Board Secretary
Visitors: Candace and Nate Remington, Chris Smith, Chris Bell, Jaclynn Bosley, William McDonnell, Adam Tomkins and Mike Stusek

David Maistros called the meeting to order at 7:00p.m. Board Secretary Ruth Griswold conducted roll call.

Mr. Maistros motioned to approve the minutes of the BZA meeting on April 21, 2021, subject to a correction Ms. LaChapelle mentioned, which would be clarified via email to Ms. Griswold after the meeting. Ms. LaChapelle seconded. On roll call vote, the motion carried.

Mr. Maistros reviewed the item before the board, which will be presented by Mike Stusek of the Artisan Design Group on behalf of the owners of 312 Fox Way. He said they are seeking a variance from Chapter 4.01.1 of the Zoning Code, which allows a maximum of 500 square feet per acre for accessory structures. He said the lot in question is 0.8 acres, which would mean they are entitled to 400 square feet, and the applicant's proposed pool house is 800 square feet, therefore the request before the board is for a variance of 400 square feet.

Mr. Maistros asked Ms. Matheney to swear in anyone present at the meeting who may like to speak on any agenda items. Ms. Matheney swore in visitors.

Mr. Maistros asked Mr. Stusek to begin his presentation to the board.

Mr. Stusek began by saying the Remingtons, owners of 312 Fox Way, have 0.8 acres, which would allow them to build a 400 square foot accessory structure. He said their plans include the installation of an in-ground fiberglass shell swimming pool in the back yard, and as part of that installation, an equipment room and a basic storage area is necessary. He said they are proposing 400 square feet of enclosed space for storage and a small bathroom, and the additional 400 square feet would be an overhang. The roof area in total is about 800 square feet, and the enclosed square footage is about 400 square feet. He said the project will not require them to infringe on the side or rear yard setbacks, the height restriction will be met, and they would match the existing structure on the property. He said they are trying to achieve a low impact build, but they would like the additional 400 square feet to provide some seating area for poolside enjoyment.

Mr. Maistros then called on board members for any questions, starting with Laura LaChapelle. Ms. LaChapelle asked Mr. Stusek what kind fencing they would be installing. Mr. Stusek said initially they were hoping to avoid putting up any fencing and use an auto cover instead, so they want to keep it very minimal and are proposing a black aluminum powder coated fence, which looks like wrought iron. He said the fence will be very attractive, with a small square baluster and a 2" square flat post and a few self-closing gates. Ms. LaChapelle asked if there would be any natural screening outside the fence, to the north and south of the property. Mr. Stusek said there is existing screening, many arborvitae to the north, and to the south there are some tall evergreens. Ms. LaChapelle asked if the arborvitae is older and established. Mr. Stusek said they are established, and that there is quite a bit of existing privacy. He went on to say at the back of the property is a buffer, and the neighboring daycare center behind them can't be seen. Ms. LaChapelle said when you drive down Fox Trail and look south, or you drive down Fox Way and look east, you can see through those from the road. Mr. Stusek said he agrees, if you are out on the road in front of the Remington's home and you're looking for this thing, you will be able to see it, but he wouldn't call it highly visible. Ms. LaChapelle asked where they were as far as obtaining HOA approval. Mr. Stusek said that's a great question, and that they had been working very hard to meet with and talk with Chris, but he went on vacation, and he has been very hard to get a hold of for the last two weeks. He went on to say that he is aware that the neighbor to the south had some concerns, but that he didn't think they were interested in preventing them from building, and that their concerns were regarding drainage. He said they had reached out to them unilaterally but had not heard back from them either. Ms. LaChapelle asked if they reached out via email, or had they tried to talk to them personally by phone. Mr. Stusek said he and the Remingtons both reached out to the neighbor via a couple of phone calls and texts but did not hear from them. He went on to say that they know of their concern because it was relayed to them by Chris Smith of the HOA. Mr. Stusek said he had conversations with Mr. Smith a couple of weeks ago, gave him the information he needed, but has not heard back from him. He said he reached out to him about a week and a half ago and then learned second-hand that he was on his way out of town, and he has not returned his phone calls.

Ms. LaChapelle said this is a concern, because it is unusual to see a situation where you have three parcels, a pool to the north and a pool to the south, and a parcel in the middle of that. She said obviously there would be potential runoff concerns and asked Mr. Stusek to comment on that. Mr. Stusek said he didn't think they would be impacting runoff, necessarily, as no regrading of the Remington's property would occur, and any drainage at the pool would be addressed by a sump system which would be pumped out to the sewer. Mr. Tomkins, also of The Artisan Design Group, said they would have downspouts that run back to the house's sewers. Ms. LaChapelle asked if they would be submitting a landscape plan. Mr. Stusek said the Village has the landscape plan. He went on to say that due to the type of questions being asked, it sounds like a topo from a civil engineer is

going to be required, although his understanding was that they did not need to provide one. Ms. LaChapelle said there are obviously storm water runoff issues in this area. Mr. Stusek said it is a big, flat area and water does collect. Mr. Tomkins said they will have to do work to move water from the property, because of how flat the back yard is now. He said on the southeast corner of the back yard there is a massive 12" crock that they intend to utilize. Ms. LaChapelle said the installation is obviously closer to the property to the south vs the property to the north.

Mr. Stusek asked for clarification on the water runoff concern and asked if it were that the water that would ordinarily flow off the neighbor's lot would be prevented from escaping due to their installation. Ms. LaChapelle said the concern is any stormwater impact whatsoever. Mr. Stusek said he wishes there were a water runoff problem right now, since there is a standing water problem that they will address as it relates to the pool itself. He said they would not create a situation so as to have standing water. He reiterated that any water runoff they create would be addressed by tying into existing downspouts and such. Mr. Tomkins said there would actually be improved runoff when their project is complete.

Ms. LaChapelle asked if they are flexible as far as the dimensions of the overhang. Mr. Stusek said he doesn't want to be, but he wants to hear what the board is looking for. He said just the enclosed portion of the structure maximizes the allowed area, and he thought if they were going for a variance, they should go big, but they are flexible if they have to be. Ms. LaChapelle said her questions also throw out information for consideration by the board, who will be asking questions as well.

Mr. Maistros then called on Andy Hitchcock. Mr. Hitchcock said one of his concerns is regarding water, and not just the runoff, but the fact that they are adding 800 square feet of impermeable structure to the backyard, not to mention the pool, and during a heavy rain, where would that water go. He said it sounds like the gutters from that building will be tied back into the drainage system, which is great, but the concern remains regarding removing permeable grass and landscaping in favor of hardscaping, which would just push the water away. He then referenced emails received from a neighbor to the south and one from Chris, the president of the HOA, and asked if the Village had heard from any other neighbors. Ms. Griswold said nothing else in writing had been received.

Jaclynn Bosley, a resident of Fox Run, introduced herself as a member of the board, and said while she is a trustee on the board, she is not a voting member on their Architectural Review Board. She said she is not seeing any fellow board members at the meeting. She said as a board member, she wasn't even notified of this meeting by Chris, and she received an email from him late last evening indicating the Remingtons are applying for a variance, and that any parties having an opinion on the project should attend the meeting. She went on to say that she and Chris have been exchanging emails throughout the day. She said because she has been working all day and has not had an opportunity to provide something in writing to the board but would like to express her views on the proposed variance when the time comes. Mr. Hitchcock said there will be an opportunity for attendees to voice their opinions later in the meeting.

Mr. Hitchcock referenced Chris' concern in the email regarding any possible future enclosing of the proposed pool house. He said that what is currently a 400 square foot building, doubles in size due to the overhang, and since it is structurally possible, the board should keep in mind that in the future there is nothing the board could do to prevent that from ever being boxed in. He said with the best

of intentions to approve this today as a 400 square foot structure, that could very well change drastically at a later date and adversely affect the street and the neighborhood. He then addressed Dave Hocevar regarding total floor area as mentioned in the code as “total area of all floors measured from exterior faces of a structure”. He asked if this were to be a cantilevered roof and there were no posts holding up the side, would that still be considered floor area because of the overhang, since there aren’t any exterior faces other than the structure itself. Mr. Hocevar said in determining side and rear yard setbacks, they measure from the overhangs, whether it’s an accessory building or not. He said in reference to some of the board members’ concerns, he would like to see a site plan showing water run off submitted to the building department for review by the Village engineer and stated that the board can restrict any future enclosing of the structure.

Mr. Maistros then called on Bill Stone. Mr. Stone referenced the email from the HOA stating they had not received plans yet, and he asked what the precedent is for the BZA to review plans in communities that also have an HOA. He asked if HOA approval has to be taken care of before review by the BZA. Mr. Maistros said it will be part of what is put on the record, and whatever the board decides does not override the HOA, they still have their regulations that must be complied with. He said even if the BZA approves the submittal, the applicant still must comply with the HOA. Mr. Stone asked if the BZA discussion and review was premature. Mr. Maistros said the HOA would make their approval conditional on BZA approval, just as the BZA would make it conditional on the HOA approval.

Ms. LaChapelle said it was unusual to see a submittal that did not have HOA approval prior to appearing before the BZA.

Mr. Stone then referred to the neighbor’s letter of concern regarding water runoff. He said when he drove by, he noticed there is a bit of mound between 312 Fox Way and the daycare center to the north of the property, and he got the impression that it would be a tricky place to get water out of. He said that being the case, there doesn’t seem to be a lot of water movement plans or information presently available. He said the driveway looks to be very close to the property line, so trenching out to the street is not a good option, therefore everything from the pavement around the pool and the roof drainage would probably have to be run through downspout lines from the house, but he’s not sure if that is standard protocol in a case like this. He asked Dave Hocevar his thoughts on it. Mr. Hocevar said that would be one of the things the contractor would have to address on a site plan, with contours, which would then be reviewed by the Village engineer, who is very well aware of the water flow to the storm sewers and the runoffs on these properties. Mr. Hocevar asked that the submittal of a site plan with contours be part of the requirement of any motion tonight. Mr. Stone said that even if the board were to approve something tonight, there would still be many other steps where the project may be cancelled, or changes may be needed.

Mr. Maistros then called on Mike Mulloy. Mr. Mulloy said he wanted to confirm what was stated earlier, that the gutters and downspouts for this accessory structure would be tied into the sewer lines. Mr. Stusek responded yes, that is correct. Mr. Mulloy asked for confirmation that the drainage system from the pool would be tied into a sump system, which would then also be tied into the sewer line. Mr. Stusek responded yes, that is correct. Mr. Mulloy said he had no further questions at this time.

Mr. Maistros asked for clarity if *runoff from the concrete pool deck* was being referred to when they said the *“runoff from the pool”*, which would be tied into the sewer lines. Mr. Stusek said he may have answered that question incorrectly earlier and clarified that the runoff from the structure will be diverted into the downspout system. He deferred to Adam Tomkins to respond to how the runoff from the pool deck would be handled. Mr. Tomkins said the runoff from the pool deck would be caught by a newly installed drainage system in the yard itself, and there will also be a sump pump underneath the pool itself, in a bed of gravel, that would catch any water that would collect underneath the pool shell. He said the discharge would be go to the large 12” existing crock. He said the yard is very flat and that is why the crock is currently underutilized, so they plan to use that resource to relieve water from the property. Mr. Maistros asked that all elements discussed regarding stormwater management be depicted on a site plan. Mr. Stusek said they will submit a site plan addressing the issues as requested, and that he had underestimated the importance of drainage because they had been focused on obtaining the variance for the accessory structure.

Mr. Maistros then asked if any members of the Board of Zoning Appeals had questions for the homeowners of 312 Fox Way, Candace and Nate Remington. There were none at that time. Mr. Maistros then asked Chris Smith, president of the HOA, for questions and comments.

Mr. Smith said the Remingtons first contacted him about their proposed pool project in January or February of 2021. He then sent them a copy of the deed restrictions. He said he was also contacted by the Artisan Design Group, so he sent them the deed restrictions as well, and received a thank you email in return, saying they had received them. He said he has asked multiple times for items that were in the deed restrictions and referred to Article I; *“No building shall be constructed on premises until plans, plot plans, landscaping plans, specifications including the exterior color of any such building be submitted.”* He said he feels it is very clear what is required, but the contractor was confused about what he was asking for. Mr. Smith said he in turn contacted an architectural firm to relay what the requirements were, and was told that the requirements were fairly standard, very clear and should not be difficult to provide. Mr. Smith said the contractors kept asking for definitions of the requirements, so he asked them to send him an email as to what exactly they don’t understand. He was willing to contact the architectural firm to obtain exact definitions for the contractors. After multiple attempts to obtain information, they finally thought they had what they needed, and he asked the contractor if they were confident they had supplied all the necessary documents to obtain HOA review and approval; they said yes. He scheduled a meeting with the other volunteers on the HOA Architectural Review Committee at 8:30am on a Saturday to go over the plans. It was then they realized they did not, and still do not, have a building plan, but they went over what they could at the meeting. He said he does not have the authority to say they don’t need to submit a building plan. The committee did determine three months ago that they were concerned about water runoff and also requested a privacy fence on the side of McDonnell’s. He said he then got a call from the Artisan Group refusing to out a privacy fence up, and he said they might want to approach it differently by speaking to the affected neighbor, although he doesn’t know if that ever happened. He said things went on and on, and finally, 27 emails later, the contractor sent him something on May 11, and he advised them he did not have time to review it, as he was out of town and would be returning May 18th. He said he did send the items on to the other committee members but does not know if they have reviewed it yet. He said he came back into town yesterday and emailed the other members to try and get approval, but he still does not have a building plan.

He then asked if the Village building department has received a building g plan. Mr. Hocevar said no, the building department had not yet received a structural building plan. Mr. Smith said some of the questions that came up tonight pertained to lighting. He said the documents he has do not indicate a lighting plan. He said until he received the letter from the Village, he did not know they needed a variance for double the allowed size of the accessory structure. He said he doesn't really have a problem with that, and their deed restrictions do not prohibit pool houses, but they do prohibit pavilions, so they agreed to look at this project as a pool house. The issues they have pertain to water runoff, privacy, lighting and obtaining the information they require in order to give approval. He said as a trustee, he cannot change the requirements of the bylaws that require a building plan, and this could have been provided two months ago. The volunteers took the time to have a meeting in order to move this project forward. He then said he just checked his phone and does not see a phone call from Mike Stusek, who said he had been trying to reach him. He said he did get an email from Candace when he was out of town, inquiring if anyone else could handle this in his absence. He said even if the others could have reviewed what they have, it would not have made any difference due to the lack of a building plan. He said he doesn't think anyone on the Architectural Review Committee have a big problem with the project. His concerns are the request is for a variance that is double the size of what is allowed, but as one of the trustees pointed out, only 400 square feet is covered. He said it is not controlled by that, it is controlled by the footprint of the roof, and what stops someone from closing it in at a later date. He went on to say that a subsequent owner may not want the pool, so they remove it and do something different with the pool house. He said he is not sure who governs or enforces such things, but that is a personal concern of his, along with the runoff, which is already an issue, which was addressed in a letter to the contractors two months ago. He said he would prefer to have all the correct information, which is clearly stated in the deed restrictions, ahead of time. He apologized to the Remingtons that the recent last-minute submittal could not be reviewed right away. He went on to say that everyone speaking tonight is under oath, and he takes offense when it is said that he hasn't responded to phone calls, his phone shows no missed calls or messages.

Mr. Maistros said on behalf of the BZA, he wanted to point out that many times these issues are on two different tracks, and they are not here tonight to decide the HOA's issues, conditions and bylaws, although the board does care about them. He said just as their decision on granting or denying this variance isn't for the HOA to decide, each entity has their role. He said that regardless of what happens here tonight, everything mentioned by Mr. Smith here tonight must be provided before the HOA makes their decision.

Mr. Maistros then called on William McDonnell. Mr. McDonnell, of 310 Fox Way, said when he received the notice from the Village, he had a conversation with Chris, and put his concerns in writing. He confirmed what Mr. Smith said, that they met as a committee months ago and did not have many of the required documents. He said Candace had called to set up a meeting in the yards, which had to be cancelled due to not having complete documents from the contractor. He said he received his first and only phone call from Mike Stusek this morning; he returned the call, and the voicemail was full and would not accept any messages. He said he was excited about the plans for the Remingtons, and thinks it looks very nice. He said he is curious about the zoning restriction limiting the square footage of an accessory building based on acreage and would like to understand the reasoning behind it. He said as he pointed out in his email, he does have concerns regarding water issues in the backyards, but he is not qualified to comment on that and would like to know how that gets addressed. He is appreciative that the BZA is also concerned. He went on to express

concern about privacy since there is already a pool on the other side of his house, and some of the trees that could provide privacy, as seen in the outdated photo submitted, have either been removed or the pines have grown to a height where you can see under them. He said the biggest issue he has is getting an understanding of the water issues, and other than that, it looks like an attractive project.

Mr. Maistros asked if anyone who hasn't spoken would like to speak further on the matter.

Mr. Smith said he wanted to make it clear that he doesn't have any objection to the project, but he does have objections to the fact that the HOA has not been able to get the information necessary in order to make a decision. He said he has gone above and beyond in his attempts to obtain the necessary information, and then was made out to be the bad guy, which is not the case. He said lighting is an issue and asked if the BZA controls lighting. Mr. Maistros said while that issue is important, the BZA does not control lighting, and that the issue before the board is the variance of 400 additional feet of the structure.

Mr. Maistros asked the Remingtons if there has been any thought to landscape screening between their property and the McDonnell property. Ms. Remington said part of their landscape plan included planting larger arborvitae in some of the open spaces, and in the back corner where there are a few gaps. She said their plans are to put some low, natural bushes in the areas where the pines have grown higher. Mr. Maistros asked if that would cover the open areas on both sides of her property. Ms. Remington said it would, and there had been discussion about doing a mound on one side, and she does understand the privacy concerns.

Mr. Maistros asked if any board members had any follow up questions. Ms. LaChapelle said she didn't have any questions but was reviewing the Duncan factors as she listened to the testimonies. She said she knows the board has discussed rendering a decision tonight, but she felt that due to all the outstanding issues between the homeowners and the HOA, they need more time to resolve them and may do so in a manner that possibly could be satisfactory for everyone. Ms. LaChapelle then referred to Duncan Factor C, "*Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties will suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance*" and stated that factor, in conjunction with Factor G, "*Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed, and substantial justice done by granting the variance*" are directly impacted by the outstanding issues. She said in all fairness to all parties involved, she doesn't know if it would be in the best interest of everyone to render a decision tonight.

Mr. Maistros said his concern is that the BZA is not acting as the advocate of the HOA to get them their information, and the applicants still have to go through that approval. Ms. LaChapelle agreed, and said the information and issues that are outstanding tonight do impact those factors, and she just wanted to raise that for discussion.

Mr. Stusek asked if it was possible for the BZA to render an approval pending the approval of the HOA. Mr. Maistros said any decision would be conditional on the HOA approval. Mr. Smith said he would be in agreement with that, and he would like to receive the required information so the project could move forward.

Mr. Maistros then asked the other board members for follow up questions or comments. Mr. Hitchcock said he had no questions, but regarding the Duncan Factors that Laura referenced, he does understand where she's coming from and agrees with her thoughts. He said what he keeps coming back to is if the variance is substantial, and he doesn't know how to get around that one. He said even if all the other issues are addressed, such as the site plan, water concerns and HOA approval, he is still having difficulty with the size of the structure.

Mr. Maistros said that was his initial reaction also, but took into account that the actual enclosed portion of the building is within the 400' requirement. He said the additional approximate 410' overhang is to provide shelter and shade. He understands that the Village's definition of structure encompasses all of that, but some other definitions of structure define everything within the walls. He said from that standpoint you are not looking at an 800 square foot walled structure, this would have pillars and the ability to look through it, which he considers when looking at the substantial nature of the request. He said the stormwater runoff and screening issues and how they would be handled are bigger concerns of his, since those would directly impact the neighbors. He feels a conditional motion could require those issues to be resolved, and if he made a motion, it would be conditioned upon a site plan addressing all stormwater runoff, verifying tie-ins to the storm sewers, and signed off by Village engineer, and also a condition of landscape screening to provide privacy for the neighbors, and that the overhang portion could not ever be enclosed, and of course HOA approval as well. He does understand if the majority of the board members would want to see those issues up front, but it would just circle back to the BZA. Mr. Maistros asked the board members for their thoughts.

Mr. Mulloy asked for confirmation on the height of the roof. Mr. Stusek it was originally drawn at 15'6", but they reduced it to 15' after learning of the restriction. Mr. Smith asked what the roof pitch would be since the HOA has a restriction on that and asked if they had recalculated the pitch after lowering the roof. Mr. Stusek said both gables would be at a 6:12 pitch.

Mr. Stone said that having more information, such as an architectural rendering, would no doubt allow their decision to be more easily rendered. He said he shares Laura's concerns about the process of the information, and that the lack of information is pushing him in one direction. Mr. Maistros said viewing architectural plans and designs are not part of their role. Mr. Stone said he was looking at it from the standpoint of the concerns expressed earlier, if the structure could be enclosed at a later date, in that pools tend to come and go.

Ms. Remington asked if they could sign a document to be kept on file with the Village, stating that they would not enclose the structure and that any future owners would not be permitted to enclose it. Mr. Maistros said that would be a condition of approval, and the granting of the variance would run with the property and also apply to any future owners.

Mr. Maistros said he would be happy to make a motion for conditional approval but does not want to push this forward if board members are not comfortable making a decision one way or the other, given the lack of information. He said any board member could make a motion to continue the case and require more information.

Ms. LaChapelle said at this point in time, if all parties involved feel they can address the issues that have been raised, they could take a stab at a motion, depending on how other board members feel

about it. She said she also recognizes that the BZA is just one step of the process, and that HOA and Village ARB approvals are also required.

Mr. Maistros said he did not want to have any board members feel they have to vote “no” due to lack of information presented, which would put the homeowners in a bad spot, and he did not want to force it to a vote if that was the case.

Per Mr. Stone’s request, Mr. Maistros recited the proposed conditions to approval: 1) HOA approval, 2) That the overhang area cannot be enclosed in the future, 3) That a site plan be delivered to the Village engineer, addressing the water runoff, both from the building and the concrete pad around the pool, 4) Landscape screening must be provided to both neighboring properties for privacy.

Ms. LaChapelle asked if the the landscape screening would be provided to the satisfaction of the property owner and the adjacent property owner. Mr. Maistros said since it would be primarily filling in gaps to ensure privacy, the Village could create a meeting between the property owners and the neighbor to ensure all parties are satisfied. He said he feels confident that the Remingtons will work with the neighbors. Mr. Hocevar said the landscape plan would be reviewed by the Village engineer, and that the aesthetics of the project would be reviewed by the Village ARB. Ms. LaChapelle confirmed that the Village engineer must approve the site plan; Mr. Hocevar said yes, they would need an approved site plan with landscaping.

Mr. Stone referred to the two letters from the neighbors who are concerned about water runoff and noted that they are not disapproving of the pool. Mr. Smith said that is correct, they are mainly just concerned about the water runoff. Ms. Remington said that she and her neighbor, Bill McDonnell, have spoken and that they are both concerned regarding the water runoff and the last thing they want would be to cause more issues for them, and they would do whatever it takes so that the water runoff is not an issue. She said Bill has been very encouraging and they do not want to create any rifts with their neighbors over this project. Mr. Smith said he has had the same conversation with Ms. Remington regarding her concern for the neighbors.

Mr. Maistros made a motion as it relates to the variance request at 312 Fox Way, for a 400 square foot variance for an accessory structure specifically related to the pool house depicted on the plans submitted and reviewed by the BZA tonight, on the following conditions: 1) Prior to any construction, the homeowners receive full HOA approval, 2) That the area covered by the roof, which is approximately 400 square feet, cannot be enclosed or boxed in in any manner in the future, 3) That a site plan, fully addressing water runoff and handling of the stormwater management, and showing tie-ins to the storm sewer lines, be submitted to the Village engineer for approval, 4) That a landscape plan depicting the screening between the Remington’s property at 312 Fox Way and their neighbors in the back, showing that all the gaps are being filled from a privacy standpoint, be submitted to the Village for approval.

Mr. Maistros asked if there were any questions on the motion. Seeing none, he asked for a second. Mr. Mulloy seconded. On roll call vote, David Maistros-Yes, Andy Hitchcock-No, Laura LaChapelle-Yes, Bill Stone-Yes, Mike Mulloy-Yes.

Ms. LaChapelle thanked Mr. Maistros and said it was very helpful that a lot of the concerns were addressed in the conditions. Mr. Maistros said some very important points were brought up during the meeting, and that there is a lot of work that still needs to be done. He asked the homeowners to ensure that they comply with everything the HOA needs, as well as the providing all the required documents to the Village.

Mr. Maistros reminded the board that summer vacation season is approaching, and the sooner things can be addressed, the better, with all members present, to avoid juggling standard meeting dates due to absences.

There being no further business, Mr. Maistros motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:07pm. Ms. LaChapelle seconded.



David Maistros, Chairman

9/15/2021

Date



Ruth Griswold, Board Secretary

9-15-2021

Date