

**BOARD OF DIRECTOR'S MEETING MINUTES**  
**(CONTINUATION OF MEETING HELD MARCH 9<sup>TH</sup> 2023)**  
**MARCH 15th, 2023 4:00 P.M.**  
**LOG HILL FIRE STATION / ZOOM**

The meeting was called to order by President Randy Mathis at 4:05 p.m. President Randy Mathis, Vice President John Peters, Secretary Bob del Rossi and Board Member Paul Stashick were in attendance at the Fire Station. Treasurer Mike Jones was in attendance via Zoom.

Evelyn Bailey (administrative assistant) hosted the Zoom portion of the meeting.

Prior to the start of the meeting, Randy Mathis said he had been notified by a member regarding concerns of a possible conflict of interest by board member John Peters.

John Peters elected to speak on his behalf and said the following statement. "It was brought up to me that there's members that feel I had a conflict of interest because I'm a developer in a project and I can't barely look at these standards. I want to kind of clarify a few things. The last meeting I showed two examples of some architecture. Those were sent to me by a person that said they were interested in looking at Fairway Pines and building something and what were the standards that we had. I said that's an ARC thing and I can't comment on the ARC Committee's things as I'm a board member, and ARC is a separate committee that's going to review those things. They forwarded me the two exhibits and I have nothing to do with that and they're not any project I'm proposing or going to be involved with and I thought those were some interesting things because they pointed to some examples on ridgelines and roofs. One of the things I'm struggling with is when we have a written statement on how a roof may be there are no real clear graphics other than the little sketches that have been put in the standards that you can look at and say, okay, does this meet the standards or doesn't it. In terms of conflict of interest, I went to school for landscape architecture, environmental planning (which is a combination of architecture and civil engineering), I've been practicing in the real world of that my entire adult career. I feel that I have an expertise that other people may not have because it deals with the land and the engineering or architecture behind the house and I've spent my life designing to have things blend as best as possible. Not always does it work as you want, but I do. And in my approach and my discussions at the board meeting during the last session was not for my projects, it was how the document that we're working on reviewing can work in real life and how the design and the materials can work in harmony towards a good solid basis for design. And I understand that some people think that's a conflict because I have projects underway, and I did not intend in any way or imply that I was objecting as to how they would impact my projects. So, I want to make that clear. I understand the board's concern and other peoples' concern and I think I can objectively look at these guidelines and make constructive criticism as to what can work and what can't work from a professional point of view, not a developer point of view. That's what I'm trying to do. If the appearance is that no matter what I say is going to be a conflict of interest, because I'm building projects, I don't know how to address it unless I can look at it and state clearly how this is not applicable to my projects on a case by case

basis so I'd like to bring this to the board and see how they'd like to proceed and answer any questions they may have from those that have concerns."

Mike Jones asked if anyone online had a belief that John Peters has a conflict of interest.

Steve Williams said the only thing that he had to go on was a house that he knew John Peters had developed around the corner from him, and his only concern was if John could look at what the neighborhood wanted objectively versus what he was building himself.

There were no other comments raised from the Zoom audience or in person at the meeting reflecting any concern of John Peters having a conflict of interest.

Randy pointed out that in all the discussion in the last meeting, every line item vote was 5-0 and there was compromise from every board member in each case of the revisions. He said that as they move forward, with every item they are voting on, they will ask John if he feels he has a conflict of interest. If there's a disagreement with the other board members as to how they feel about it being a conflict of interest, they will discuss and vote accordingly as to whether they believe it's a conflict of interest.

After that statement, the board members continued to move on with the discussion of the proposed revisions starting with the roof and ridgeline discussion and continuing on from page 37, which is where they left off at the last meeting.

When the revisions were completely looked at and discussed by the board, the board asked for comments from both the Zoom audience and the in person audience. Pam Farnham commented on Zoom that she felt the sentence that was removed from the lighting portion of the ARC standards should not have been removed.

A motion was made by Randy Mathis to vote on the document that was created with the proposed changes that the task force made, along with the discussed changes that the board made. The motion was seconded by Bob del Rossi and the motion carried.

Randy said a written copy of the revisions would be made available as soon as possible. He also thanked the members of the task force that worked on the revisions, along with the board members for all of their consideration and due diligence on the revisions.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.