



Accessory Building Townhall - Meeting Minutes

Held September 23, 2026 - 7:00pm - East Bay Township Hall (South Room)

1. Welcome

- A. Thank you to everyone who has contributed their time and effort toward developing the proposed language regarding accessory buildings.
- B. A Reminder that at the 2025 AGM, a call for volunteers was made to serve on a committee that would develop preliminary language and definitions regarding sheds and accessory buildings. The work of that group, along with feedback collected from the membership in the spring of 2026, provided valuable input for the Design Control Committee as it reviewed and developed the proposed language that was distributed to the membership in August of this year.
- C. An attorney has been contacted to ensure that the appropriate procedures and protocols for this bylaw revision are being followed.
- D. Clarification that the purpose of tonight's meeting is to hear any additional feedback from the membership, discuss areas of concern or possible changes, and ultimately work toward finalizing proposed language to be presented to the membership at the 2026 AGM.
- E. Suggestion from the Board of Directors that the finalized motion from tonight's meeting is reviewed by an attorney prior to the AGM. This review is intended to ensure that the proposed amendment follows the appropriate procedures and does not conflict with the association's existing bylaws.
- F. By an informal show of hands it was determined that the membership would like to discuss the proposed August 2026 by-law language in order of the section headings.

2. Open Discussion

- A. A question was brought forward regarding an existing shed on a Unit within the community. A member raised a question regarding an existing shed within the community, questioning Design Control Committee (DCC) approval and penalty enforcement. The existing by-laws regarding sheds/accessory building were clarified. (referencing Cinnamon Ridge Condominium By-Laws, Article 7: Building and Use Restrictions, Item 7.3 Building Restrictions, a) Number of Structures). The membership present was reminded that the intent of this meeting is to discuss the proposed by-law revisions regarding accessory buildings. If more information or



discussion is wanted regarding the current enforcement of the by-laws this can occur after this meeting.

3. Review of August 2026 Proposed By-Law Revision Language

A. Section 3 - Permitted Accessory Buildings

1. The membership expressed concern regarding the inclusion of "Gazebo"
2. It was noted that a property with an existing Gazebo could not have an accessory building based upon the current proposed language.
3. Membership agreed to remove item 3.c. Gazebo from Section 3.

B. Section/Item 1 - DCC Review

1. Discussion whether or not accessory buildings need the approval occurred.
2. Discussion occurred on whether DCC review is necessary if bylaws are sufficiently detailed or align with East Bay Township standards.
 - a. An additional point was made that if East Bay Township standards are inline with what the proposed by-laws revision would require, does this eliminate the need for the DCC review.
3. Dale Barker commented that allowing for the DCC to review any proposed accessory buildings protects the neighborhood as well as the homeowner.
4. The membership agreed that while they do not feel that a homeowner would build an unsightly accessory building, the DCC allows for oversight to ensure accessory buildings are built within the HOA standards.
5. Attendees agreed that DCC oversight is necessary to maintain HOA standards and voted to keep Item 1 as written.

C. Requirements for Design Control Committee Review

1. Some members brought forward the opinion that Section 2 should be eliminated in its entirety.
2. It was stated that the existing language can be and was interpreted that to scale drawings developed by an engineer, architect or surveyor would be required. It was clarified that this was not the intent of this language.
3. Matthew Wollam stated that the list of requirements stated is in alignment with what would be necessary for Township approval.
4. It was discussed as to why the DCC needs this information.
 - a. It was clarified that this helps locate the proposed accessory building on the property, ensure setbacks are followed etc.



5. The membership discussed that the Zoning Department/Township will provide you with a plot map of your property and does have this information available.
6. The discussion narrowed down to item 2.b and 2.c on the proposed by-laws. It ultimately was determined that the word “scale” could lead to homeowners believing that a professional drawing would be required for approval.
7. The membership present agreed to the following alternation in Section 2.
 - a. 2.b. Floor plan drawn with dimensions
 - b. 2.c. All exterior elevations drawn with dimensions (length, width, height)

D. Section 4 - Size and Location Requirements

1. It was noted that an 12'x16' accessory building may not require a permit from the Township.
2. Both the maximum and minimum sizes were reviewed. The membership present expressed no concerns or desire to change these values.
3. A question was raised regarding the limitation of “No single dimension shall exceed 24'-0”. It was clarified that this was included to avoid long, narrow accessory buildings from being constructed.
4. Item 4.c - It was clarified that the intent was to not allow a person/persons to dwell in the accessory building prior to the primary home being built. It was noted that this is likely in alignment with East Bay Township rules as well.
5. Item 4.e - A discussion occurred around the language regarding roof pitch.
 - a. It was clarified that the language would allow for single slope roofs.
 - b. It was further clarified that the intention was for the accessory building roof pitch to coordinate or be harmonious with the existing residence.
 - c. An idea of including a minimum and maximum roof pitch was proposed.
 - d. It was stated that the intent of this language “....but not be greater than any roof pitch of the residence” was included to avoid severely sloped roofs, A-Frames etc.
 - e. The membership present ultimately agreed to leave roof pitch language as is.



6. A member questioned whether the topic of "Location" should be its own section within the by-law revision. The membership disagreed and continued with the discussion keeping the topic of "Location" in Section 4.
7. Line Item 4.f
 - a. Clarification that the proposed language states "Building Line" not structure.
 - b. It was discussed that the intent of this language would be to ensure that the entire accessory building is located at or behind the building line (not just a portion of the accessory building).
 - c. Discussion was had regarding setbacks and how this would allow or disallow accessory building being constructed in sideyards. It was noted that the setbacks do limit some properties. It was also noted that the current proposed language does not limit the location of an accessory building to the "back yard" or eliminate the opportunity to place an accessory building in the "side yard".
 - d. It was questioned as to what would be used to determine the building line. Specifically, how does one determine the building line if the home is located on a corner lot where one could argue two sides of the residence may be the "building line".
 - e. Membership present elected to modify line item 4.f. To read:
 - a. Must be located at or behind the front building line of the residence
 - f. Membership also agreed to modify the line item 4.f. To account for the "front building line" to be further defined in the revised language.
8. Line Item 4.g
 - a. The membership present discussed that anyone may be able to argue that an accessory building obstructs a view.
 - b. Membership present agreed to remove Line Item 4.g

E. Section 5 - Construction

1. The discussion focused on Item 5.c., 5.d. and 5.f.
2. It was noted that the current by-laws state allowable construction materials. Any accessory buildings would have to follow the current by-laws.



3. The membership present discussed line item 5.d regarding “compatible colors”. It was noted that this was altered to allow for more flexibility to create a harmonious appearing accessory building. In lieu of stating that the colors/materials must match, this allows for the Design Control Committee to ensure that appearance is “compatible”.
4. Line Item 5.f. - It was clarified that the intent of this language was to ensure that “Rubbermaid” or similar style resin sheds are not used.
5. It was noted that certain steel building materials are now available on the market that are made to appear like vinyl siding. Line Item 5.f would not limit the use but ultimately the Design Control Committee would have to review and approve the materials.
6. It was asked if this would eliminate the ability for a homeowner to construct their own accessory building. It was clarified and agreed that the language would not limit or restrict who constructs the accessory building.
7. Membership present agreed to allow Section 5 remain as it.

F. Section 6 - Prohibited Uses

1. The definition of “Living Quarters” was discussed.
2. Membership present agreed to allow Section 6 remain as it.

G. Other Discussion

1. The Board of Directors proposed the option of presenting the final proposed by-law revisions as it relates to accessory buildings to an attorney to ensure that the language is in alignment with the current by-laws and does not conflict with an existing language. The present membership appeared to express that the need for an attorney review prior to a vote was not wanted.
 2. It was clarified the Board of Directors contacted an attorney who confirmed that mortgagee approval is NOT required for this amendment.
 3. It was also noted that in order for this by-law change to be voted into place, it would take 47 affirmative votes.
4. Meeting Adjourned at 9:00PM EST.