

Minutes of the Shadow Hawk Architectural Review Committee (SHARC)

Meeting called to order at 6:00pm on 16-May-99.

Attendance: Steve Dubravitz, Nancy Janza, Tom McMahon, Dean Zimmermann

Old Business

There was no old business.

New Business

- The committee reviewed the state of affairs and agreed the CC&Rs are vague, that no formal process exists or is recommended for submission and review of improvements to properties, and many pre-existing improvements were constructed by homeowners while Beazer acted as the Architectural Review Committee.
- The committee discussed setting priorities. It was agreed that the following general areas need to be addressed:
 1. Establish a procedure for submitting, reviewing, and following up on plans for architectural review. The committee spent a great deal of time reviewing a proposed form including the draft instructions.
 2. Write and distribute the procedures as quickly as possible to induce homeowners to use the application process, thereby mitigating the likelihood of new improvements not meeting architectural review guidelines and requiring costly corrective measures. Clearly state that existing improvements must be submitted for review, offering special consideration and helping establish the Architectural Review Guidelines. Existing improvements that are not submitted for review will be evaluated against the Architectural Review Guidelines and corrective measures will be required to meet the proposed guidelines.
 3. Review the CC&Rs to develop Architectural Review Guidelines as quickly as possible, in conjunction with the arrival of new Architectural Review forms, interpreting the CC&Rs, and identifying areas where a questionnaire posed to the community at large may help define the Architectural Guidelines.
- The committee began reviewing section 1 and 2 of the CC&Rs (see notes at end of minutes), and discovered a reference to "the Map". The committee decided to request a copy of this map from Beazer through the Board of Directors.
- The committee determined that detailed review of section 3 would require a great deal of time and decided to table further review of the CC&Rs to proceed to review the form and establish procedures.
- The committee reviewed the proposed Architectural Review Form that included instructions and notes on the process. The committee agreed to make several changes to the proposed form.
- General procedural issues were discussed regarding appeals, response times, documentation, and out of compliance notification.

The committee decided to hold their next meeting Sun, May 23 @ 6:30pm at Dean Zimmermann's residence (Lot 3, 2024 Talon Dr) and shared e-mail addresses to continue communications in the interim.

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Dean Zimmermann | deanz@jps.net |
| Tom McMahon | tmcMahon@calweb.com |
| Steve Dubravetz | sdubravetz@chp.ca.gov |
| Nancy Janza | shadohawk@jps.net (not sure of address) |

CC&R Section 1 & 2 Review Notes:

2.2 – This section requires us to establish guidelines.

2.6 – Use definitions from this paragraph for improvements. Other areas of concern:

- Do we care about flowers or just plantings that will be sizable upon maturation? What dimensions constitute sizable? 15' or more in height and 10' or more in width?
- Are smaller plants or lawns an issue if sufficiently large to require substantial water usage?

2.8 – "The Map" – We need a copy – Ask Beazer for it.

2.15 – Incorporate this section directly into guidelines.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45pm.