

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA
June 21, 2022
Assateague Room

<i>ARC Meeting Agenda 6-21-22</i>					
<i>Public Comments</i>					
<i>Variances/Exceptions:</i>					
<i>Time</i>	<i>Sec/Lot</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Owner</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Comments</i>
10:05 a.m.	10/1278	4 Abbey Circle	Dilmore	Exception to install a fence 5' off of rear property line.	<i>Approved</i>
10:25 a.m.	10/0041	52 Nottingham Lane	Crouthamel	Exception to install a privacy fence in the rear of the property.	<i>Tabled</i>
10:45 a.m.	04/0013	343 Ocean Parkway	Coster	Exception to allow a fence to be installed on the side property line (fence approved to be 6' off of side property line).	<i>Tabled</i>
11:25 a.m.	04/0271	2 Riverside Court	Novack	Exception to keep a sign on the property.	<i>Not Approved</i>
11:45 a.m.	13/0047-0048	51 & 49 Fairway Lane	-	Review of request from 51 Fairway Lane to have the stone border between 51 and 49 Fairway Lane be removed.	<i>Stone Border to Remain</i>
<i>Violations:</i>					
<i>Time</i>	<i>Sec/Lot</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Owner</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	06/0420	12 Starboard Court	Laque	Non-Compliance: Maintenance	<i>Final Letter then GM</i>
	10/0231	47 Nottingham Lane	Scramlin	Non-Compliance: Unregistered Vehicle	<i>Final Letter then GM</i>

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

June 21, 2022

PRESENT: John Dilworth, Susan Holt, Kevin Middleton, Beth Gismondi, Gary Murray.

ALSO PRESENT: Josette Wheatley (Board Liaison), Linda Martin (Office Manager), Josh Vickers (Chief Inspector).

John called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

4 Abbey Circle – Exception to install a fence 5' off of rear property line

Ms. Dilmore attended the hearing. She presented the new boundary survey which was completed as requested at her previous hearing. The fence has been modified to 4' high, but she is requesting the fence be closer to the rear property line. The fence will be constructed of wood.

John asked if the fence will be placed in the row of trees as seen on her property. Ms. Dilmore replied yes, and the trees will function as her screening of the rear of the fence.

Beth questioned why the fence could not be moved towards the home and connect to the shed. Ms. Dilmore stated that they plan to move the shed as the ground at the current location is very wet.

John commented that he has no issues approving the fence 5' off the rear property line as trees would need to be removed to accommodate for 10' from the rear property line. Susan agreed, noting that the property is densely wooded.

Susan moved to approve the request for the fence to be 5' off the rear property line and if any adjustment need to be made to the rear location that the fence would need to move inward toward the house. Kevin seconded, and all were in favor.

52 Nottingham Lane – Exception to install a privacy fence in the rear of the property

Mr. Crouthamel attended the hearing. He is requesting a 6' high fence in the back of the property. The fence will not be enclosed. The reason for his request is that the noise from the traffic from Route 589 in the rear of his property is unbearable. The fence will align with his neighbor's fence.

Kevin questioned about the recent tree removal in the yard. Mr. Crouthamel confirmed that he did remove trees and was unaware that he needed a permit. Kevin then questioned the grass violation currently on the property. Mr. Crouthamel noted that the grass has been cut.

Kevin requested that a new site plan be provided, as the site plan in the packet is not to scale. The proposed fence location will need to be marked on the site plan.

The request was tabled for a future meeting until the survey of the property is redone. John also requested that Josh visit the property to verify the trees that were removed and initiate a violation, along with confirming the location of the neighbor's fence.

343 Ocean Parkway – Exception to allow a fence to be installed on the side property line

Ms. Coster attended the hearing. She recently received approval for the fence, but when the contractor went to install it was confirmed that the trees were in the way on the side property. The only way to install the fence is to place it on the property line. Ms. Coster presented a note from her neighbor that she has no issues with the fence being installed on the property line.

Kevin noted that a new survey will need to be completed to determine the property lines.

John commented that he prefers the fence to be placed at least 1' off the property line to allow for the plantings to screen the fence to be maintained from Ms. Coster's property.

The request was tabled for a future meeting until the new survey of the property is received.

2 Riverside Court – Exception to keep a sign on the property

As no one attended the hearing, the Committee discussed the request with representation.

Kevin noted that the sign is in non-conformance, and is against ARC Guidelines 600, 600.1, and 600.2 as far as no permit, location of sign, size of sign, and materials used for the sign.

Susan moved to deny the request to keep the sign on the property, Kevin seconded, and the request was denied.

John ordered the sign to be removed immediately by CPI, as the sign is currently in the easement area.

Review of 51 & 49 Fairway Lane

The Committee reviewed the letter received from the 51 Fairway Lane regarding the stone barrier put on the property line by the owners of 49 Fairway Lane. The owner of 51 Fairway Lane is requesting that the ARC consider the stone barrier as a fence and require it to be moved to the side building restriction line.

After discussion, the Committee agreed that the stone barrier is considered landscaping as it is only approximately 2' high. This is a neighbor dispute and if the owner is considered about any encroachment, he should get a survey done.

John requested that CPI send a letter to the owner of the review outcome of the ARC.

Violations

The Committee unanimously agreed to send a final 15-day letter, then forward to the General Manager for action:

- 12 Starboard Court (Maintenance)
- 47 Nottingham Lane (Unregistered Vehicle)

Minutes

Kevin moved to accept the minutes from the May 17, 2022 meeting, Susan seconded, and all were in favor.

New Business

John noted that he plans to send additional violations that are in legal to the Board in July for their approval to hold amenity and voting rights to the owners.

As for the violations approved in May by the Board, John requested that CPI send a letter to the owners notifying them of the ban.

Adjournment

John moved to adjourn, Kevin seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 12:42 p.m.