MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 7, 2018 ACC MEETING

1. The meeting was called to order by interim\* chair, Robert Pruski.

1. All ACC members were present except Bill Pope.
2. Also present were Nick Colosi, board member, Jim Smock, executive director, and Heather Coulee, ACC administrator
3. Those present to appeal an application decision were Mike and Emily Smith of 15401 Cruiser and their contractor, Kirk Doumurque of Gulf Coast Palapas.
4. Application Appeal for 15401 Cruiser

The original application was not approved, as the plan was to build a permanent Palapa aft of the rear building line mandated by the subdivision covenants.

Kirk presented a Palapa design that was removable envisioning that it could be called “temporary”. There was discussion about this and it was decided that the definition of temporary could be a “removable” Palapa (2 bolts) with the following restrictions:

1. Two poles
2. 110 square feet measured by the width and length of the outside edges
3. A maximum height of 8 feet\*
4. One Palapa per Garden lot property
5. No built in table or stools\*

The members present were unanimous in agreeing for the approval. However, there were some reservations.

Obviously this action will require a rule change, as the term “temporary “ will have to be defined in the rules. Refining the definition was necessary in any case, as a circus tent is also temporary.

\*\*Therefore, 15401 Cruiser should be the only such application approved until such time as the board approves an ACC proposed rule with possible additions to the 5 restrictions listed above.

\*\*The ACC is aware that the Board may reject the rule as it does push the limit of “temporary” and a covenant is involved.

This discussion required less than 30 minutes.

1. The minutes of the October 18th meeting were approved.
2. Tom Cable added two items to the agenda:
3. To discuss with Nick Colosi the lack of response of the board to ACC recommendations even as far back as September.
4. To review a 1.5 page paper Tom Cable created illustrating the discrepancies between the Board Policy Manual and the current and proposed ACC document.
5. It was agreed by acclamation to begin the discussion with Nick. Jim Smock seemed to know more about the lack of response and iterated that the Board did not know what action the committee expected. Tom Cable was of the opinion, that for numerous stated reasons, such ignorance was highly unlikely. However, he agreed to resubmit the requests to the Board. This discussion may have required 15 minutes.
6. The next agenda item to be discussed was to be B. above. However, the ACC administrator, who usually leaves after administrative matters, wanted to skip ahead to Agenda Item C. “Work on completing the ACC document revision review.” This was reasonable, as she wanted to address proposed rule changes adversely affecting administrative process.

1. After an hour or so of lively discussion on this topic, but no actions, the meeting concluded without a motion at approximately 7:30 PM? This informal conclusion had the following ramifications:
2. Agenda Item A. , “Reviewing a proposed cantilevered walkway rule for 15 foot Mooring Line boatlifts”, was not addressed. This rule was designed for San Felipe Court and other similar situations.
3. Agenda Item B., under 7. above, was not addressed.
4. Work to complete the proposed ACC document (Agenda Item C.) in the thorough ordered manner found in the October 18, 2018 minutes was not accomplished. Therefore, it may not be possible to complete the entire revision for the December 11, 2108 Board meeting.
5. The next meeting is scheduled for 5:30 PM, November 28, 2018 at the POA office.

\*These items were added by me, Tom Cable, and not discussed or approved at the meeting. They are there for the purpose of directing discussion at the next meeting.

\*\*\*The decision not to approve further such applications without new Board approved was not discussed by the committee. I believe the committee agrees with it, but it may not. I found it necessary to include this to demonstrate the further work necessary to establish this concept. Also, the statement illustrates that the committee is cognizant of the obstacles that must be surmounted to create this compromise.

I am aware that is atypical at best to include such personal discussion in the minutes. However, the unusual nature of the reversal of the application and the convoluted way forward seems to warrant these statements.