



Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>

FW: 16163 Anoka

15 messages

Di Saia, Steven <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Thu, Feb 6, 2014 at 6:04 PM

To: Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckarmed.com>, Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>, Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

All:

Here is Margye Baumgardner's response to the last correspondence received from Mr. Huber for your consideration.

Steve

From: Margye Baumgardner [mailto:margye.sb@verizon.net]

Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2014 3:38 PM

To: Di Saia, Steven

Subject: 16163 Anoka

Harry,

Thank you for reviewing the letter to Steve below, along with the addendum. Given the circumstances in my family at the moment, it's hard for me to clear my thoughts and determine if my letter adequately addresses the important points, so I trust you will add whatever must be included (as well as suggest what to eliminate if it is not wise to retain).

I assume I can share it with the Schultzes, but also with Dennis Mendel?

Many thanks,

Margye

Steve,

Thank you for inviting my response to Mr. Huber's letter. With the understanding that this is very difficult timing for me, given a death in the family this week, and that Mr. Huber's demand for a response in 2 days' time does not seem usual or appropriate, I will address as best I can the issues with the intention and wish that the parties can come to a compromise and/or solution of the issues. Please be assured that I have absolutely no desire for taking an adversarial position.

Mr. Schultz wrote a thorough and very fair response, and I join him and Mrs. Schultz generally in the intent and conclusion. As you and the PHOA board know, it has been well established and documented by two authorities that my property value would be considerably diminished by the approval of the requested variance, and that the proposed 15 ½ foot second story would greatly impact my property's light, air, privacy, and trees and vegetation. We must work toward a solution of this impact on the property where I have resided for nearly 32 years.

As Mr. Schultz suggested, Mr. DC would gain the added 600 square feet in a second story structure that he desires by moving the addition to the other side above the proposed garage, lessening the height and easing the issues of light, air, and privacy, and making moot Mr. DC's proposed removal of the long-established trees on my property. If that option, or a similar new proposal from Mr. DC is made, I certainly would be pleased to seriously consider accepting it.

The trees, vegetation, and fence bordering my and the DC property have always been agreed upon by the Fick family (the previous owners) and me for the 30 years that we mutually shared the upkeep and trimming. Mr. DC has never taken advantage of contacting me during the many months since he closed on the property to the time of the PHOA meeting at which his plans were presented, and at which time I did not even know who he was, nor did Mr. Huber introduce himself to me or to you as Plans Committee chair. Surely there has been more than adequate time and opportunity for these matters to have been addressed and resolved.

The PHOA board of directors has given untold hours over the months, and provided their considerable expertise on the Plans Committee, to arrive at an equitable decision. I thank them for their generous service to our neighborhood, and trust that their process will proceed to everyone's mutual satisfaction.

Best regards to you and the PHOA board members,

Margye

Just for clarification of some of Mr. Huber's denigrating remarks about my property in his Sunday, February 2 letter:

Roof: I replaced the roof a year ago, and two of the PHOA board members remarked about the good work that was done when they viewed it from the Schultz property during their final visit to my property.

Landscape maintenance: The regular tri-annual trimming of trees was planned for last October but was delayed upon the advice of the professional trimmer until an arborist's opinion could be sought about a major branch of the elm tree that was cracked. Then the trimmer was unavailable while recovering from an injury, and the holidays ensued, and we finally accomplished the trimming last week, with the exception of the trees and foliage along the fence bordering the DC property.

View: The view from my property is impeded only by the pine and eucalyptus trees and oleander vegetation at 949 Las Lomas Avenue, which is being reviewed by PHOA in response to six neighbors' complaints.

Fence between my and Mr. DC's property: In spite of my and my fence builder talking with the Fick family in 2010 about replacing the fence at my expense, and with their approval of the style/location/height of the fence, they were an elderly, ailing couple and

simply asked me to wait until they no longer lived there and would not have to put up with any noise and commotion right outside their bedroom windows. I of course honored their request, and then further delayed replacing the fence in order to talk with the new owner after the property changed hands about a mutually satisfactory replacement.

Windows, counter tops, kitchen, bathroom, appliances, etc.: It is unknown how Mr. Huber arrives at his conclusions about the status of the interior of my house, as he has never been inside, to my knowledge. I am told that Mr. Huber came onto my property, without my knowledge or permission, when the PHOA board visited, and he took numerous photos without introducing himself to me or asking if he could take photos. Is this how he arrived at his opinion? And he apparently did not observe that about 1/3 of the windows were replaced about three years ago.

Di Saia, Steven <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Thu, Feb 6, 2014 at 6:11 PM

To: Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckarmed.com>, Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>, Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

And we have Mr. Huber's response to Mr. Schultz' response.

As he has requested, I will forward the other response just received from Ms. Baumgardner.

Steve

From: Terrance Huber [mailto:terrancehuber@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2014 3:30 PM

To: Di Saia, Steven

Cc: Jerry Del Colliano

Subject: 16163 Anoka

Steve,

Thanks for forwarding Mr. Schultz's comments and for your continued hard work on this matter.

Regarding moving the addition to the other side of the Del Colliano home, this is simply not going to work architecturally and would involve tremendous cost. It is not a reasonable option, and even if feasible, would provide the kind of architecture which does not positively affect property values.

We've all spent a lot of time, money and effort debating the issue of the Del Colliano addition. At this late date the sole remaining issue is whether and to what extent the possible casting of a shadow between 8 and 9 AM from the addition, at certain times of the year, would affect the value of 1100 Las Lomas.

CC&R's Article III Section 1

"No structure of any kind shall exceed 15 ½ feet above the finished ground from the front of the building pad to the top of its ridge pole, nor more than 14 feet above the finished floor, except that the Tract Committee in its sole discretion and after consultation with the possible affected neighbors may permit the erection of a structure higher than 15 ½ feet above the finished ground measured from the front of the building pad, provided it will not unreasonably obstruct or unreasonably (emphasis added) diminish the quality and nature of the view from any other land of this or an adjoining tract.

S. Di Saia e-mail 12/15/13

"I have consulted with other members of the Plans Committee, and we simply don't feel that we can provide a proper review of this aspect of the proposed project without professional assistance. We do not consider such assistance to be speculative, as suggested by Mr. Huber, and believe that the review would help in directing the Board, and the affected homeowners, as to compliance with the CC&R's on this topic. Of note, this review would be instructive, not determinative, for the Board."

S. Di Saia 12/15/13

"Nonetheless, the Board is required to consider value and the effect on value for the affected neighbors, with any project proposed in the Association, as required by the CC&R's. Specifically with regard to view, the CC&R's require that the Board consider "any other sight deemed by the Tract Committee as being an important part of the property's value that is entitled to protection." S. Di Saia 12/15/13

Mr. Kirshner, in his report suggests some undefined impact "...would in fact impact ..." without trying to identify amount and/or timing. In fact, Mr. Kirshner, in his final paragraph states "Determining specific value impact requires considerable research and this task was beyond the scope of what I was asked to perform."

Mr. Kirshner's review provides very little guidance and it is difficult to characterize the Kirshner opinion as evidence of unreasonable effect.

Mr. Aberle, in his unfortunate letter dated December 26, 2013 predicts a loss of value "..." somewhere in the six figure range."

Mr. Aberle's opinion fails for many reasons, as previously pointed out, not the least of which reasons are:

- Opinion of Michael Edlen in Pali Post pointing out general increases in property values in the area in excess of 15% in 2013
- Opinion of Mr. Aberle in his January newsletter, February 2014 reporting upon an
“...explosion in property values ...” Yes, he impeaches his own opinion.

The issue remains both under the CC&R's (Article III Section I) and, California law whether the proposed addition “unreasonably” obstructs or “unreasonably” diminishes the quality, etc

Ms. Baumgartner has not had a view to the east for decades, due to her own vegetation. Ms. Baumgartner, because of her vegetation has reduced the amount of and quality of light available to her home.

Ms. Baumgartner appears to be concerned about the loss of privacy, which privacy is currently afforded by vegetation which no one has suggested should not remain.

Mr. Del Colliano has offered to address reasonable privacy concerns, at his expense.

The question therefore remains just what unreasonable impact or unreasonable diminishment this proposed addition will have.

The HOA Board has a fiduciary duty to all affected homeowners (including Mr. & Mrs. Del Colliano) to exercise any discretion reasonably and in good faith. The CC&R's so state as does applicable California law.

No professional with any credibility has proposed that the impact of the proposed addition will unreasonably affect any protectable interest in Palisair community properties.

The number one reason why there is a light issue on 1100 Las Lomas is Ms. Baumgartner's neglect in landscaping. Mr. Del Colliano is offering to pay for this to be solved at the total discretion of Ms. Baumgartner.

The issue of light in no way affected the record price which 16163 recently sold for, notwithstanding the HOA approved monstrosity immediately to the east.

The last question at hand is: is it reasonable for the board to approve the Del Colliano addition if it *potentially* might cast a shadow on Ms. Baumgartner's plantings for an hour in the morning.

Of course we reserve the right to respond to Ms. Baumgartner's communication to the Board, which we understand will be delivered to the Board by the end of the day today.

Terry Huber

--

Terrance P Huber, Esq.
Terrance P Huber, APC
16133 Ventura Blvd
Suite 650
Encino, CA 91436
[818 435-4755](tel:8184354755) or [310 273-1850](tel:3102731850) Phone
[818 528-2036](tel:8185282036) or [310 556-1862](tel:3105561862) Fax
[310 362-8755](tel:3103628755) EFax

Important Notice: In compliance with Treasury Department Circular 230, unless stated to the contrary, any federal tax advice contained in this correspondence (or any attachment) was not intended or written to be used and cannot be used for the purposes of avoiding penalties.

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Di Saia, Steven <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Fri, Feb 7, 2014 at 4:09 PM

To: Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckarmed.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>, Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

A slightly amended response from Ms. Baumgardner to the letter from Mr. Huber. I spoke with her yesterday evening and she wanted to run her last version, a draft, past her counsel.

Steve

From: Margye Baumgardner [<mailto:margye.sb@verizon.net>]

Sent: Friday, February 07, 2014 2:24 PM

To: Di Saia, Steven

Cc: 'Rachel Schultz'; dschultz@mckennalong.com

Subject: 16163 Anoka

Steve and members of the PHOA board of directors,

Thank you for inviting my response to Mr. Huber's letter. With the understanding that this is very difficult timing for me, given a death in the family this week, and that Mr. Huber's demand for a response in 2 days' time does not seem usual or appropriate, I will address as best I can the issues with the intention and wish that the parties can come to a

compromise and/or solution of the issues. Please be assured that I have absolutely no desire for taking an adversarial position.

Mr. Huber's statements, besides being false and offensive, do not address the REAL ISSUE, which is that the proposed addition will significantly DECREASE the value of my property and severely impact the enjoyment of my home of 32 years in our wonderful neighborhood.

Mr. Huber's remarks on how to increase the value of my property are not only irrelevant but, simply put, none of his business. The PRIMARY GOAL must be on MAINTAINING the value of my property which, as documented, would significantly diminish with the proposed addition, which is completely out of character for the neighborhood..

Mr. Schultz wrote a thorough and very fair response, and I join him and Mrs. Schultz generally in the intent and conclusion. As you all know, it has been well established and documented by two authorities that my property value would be considerably diminished by the approval of the requested variance, and that the proposed 15 ½ foot second story would greatly impact my property's light, air, privacy, trees and vegetation. We must work toward a solution of this impact on my property and cherished home.

As Mr. Schultz suggested, Mr. Del Colliano would gain the added 600 square feet in a second story structure that he desires by moving the addition to the other side above the proposed garage, lessening the height and easing the issues of light, air, and privacy, and making moot Mr. Del Colliano's proposed removal of the long-established trees on my property. If that option, or a similar new proposal from Mr. Del Colliano, is made, I certainly would be pleased to seriously consider accepting it.

The trees, vegetation, and fence bordering my and the Del Colliano property have always been agreed upon by the Fick family (the previous owners) and me for the 30 years that we mutually shared the upkeep and trimming. Mr. Del Colliano has never taken advantage of contacting me during the many months since he closed on the property, to the time of the PHOA meeting at which his plans were presented, and at which time I did not even know who he was, nor did Mr. Huber introduce himself to me or to you, Steve, as Plans Committee chair. Surely there has been more than adequate time and

opportunity for these matters to have been addressed and resolved.

You on the PHOA board of directors have given untold hours over the months, and provided your considerable expertise on the Plans Committee, to arrive at an equitable decision. I thank everyone for your generous service to our neighborhood, and trust that your process will proceed to everyone's mutual satisfaction.

Best regards to all of you on the PHOA board of directors,

Margye

For clarification of some of Mr. Huber's denigrating remarks about my property in his Sunday, February 2 letter:

Roof: I replaced the roof a year ago, and two of the PHOA board members remarked about the good work that was done when they viewed it from the Schultz property during their final visit to my property.

Landscape maintenance: The regular tri-annual trimming of trees was planned for last October but was delayed upon the advice of the professional trimmer until an arborist's opinion could be sought about a major branch of the elm tree that was cracked. Then the trimmer was unavailable while recovering from an injury, and the holidays ensued, and we finally accomplished the trimming last week, with the exception of the trees and foliage along the fence bordering the Del Colliano property.

View: The view from my property is impeded only by the pine and eucalyptus trees and oleander vegetation at 949 Las Lomas Avenue, which is being reviewed by PHOA in response to six neighbors' complaints.

Fence between my and Mr. Del Colliano's property: In spite of my and my fence builder talking with the Fick family in 2010 about replacing the fence at my expense, and with their approval of the style/location/height of the fence, they were an elderly, ailing couple and simply asked me to wait until they no longer lived there and would not have to put up with any noise and commotion right outside their bedroom windows. I of course honored their request, and then further delayed replacing the fence in order to talk with the new owner about a mutually satisfactory replacement after the property changed hands.

Windows, counter tops, kitchen, bathroom, appliances, etc.: It is unknown how Mr. Huber arrives at his conclusions about the status of the interior of my house, as he has never been inside, to my knowledge. I am told that Mr. Huber came onto my property, without my knowledge or permission, when the PHOA board visited, and he took numerous photos without introducing himself to me or asking if he could take photos. Is this how he arrived at his opinion? And he apparently did not observe that about 1/3 of the windows were replaced about three years ago.

Di Saia, Steven <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 8:42 AM

To: "Di Saia, Steven" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>, Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermed.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>, Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

All:

I have a question for all. Now that the vote has taken place, I can see several of those involved wanting to know what the vote was – both the count and the votes by individuals.

I do not care one way or another if this information is revealed, but do not know if there is a rule in this regard – are we required to make the vote count, or vote of the individual members, known? If there is no requirement one way or another, does anyone have an opinion whether or not we should reveal one or the other?

Steve

From: Di Saia, Steven

Sent: Friday, February 07, 2014 4:10 PM

To: Larry Friedman; Francine Kirkpatrick; Patti Gallagher; Karen Olan; Diana Ungerleider; Syd Vinnedge; Vi Walquist;

Hal Erdley
Subject: FW: 16163 Anoka

[Quoted text hidden]

Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 9:05 AM

To: "Di Saia, Steven" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>, Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermed.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>

The only previous experience in my recollection are two similar votes taken by the Board during the time that Robert Munakash was President of the PHOA. The first vote was taken in an open to all meeting, highly formalized, with steno and sound recording and related to the first Baumblatt proposal, and this vote was taken only after a series of attempted compromises and negotiations with Baumblatt.

The second vote was in a Board meeting and related to the first Doug Baron proposal and there was no such formality and followed by a series of plan variations and negotiations.

I suggest that the vote be disclosed to Del Colliano in such a way that the Board hopes that by a suitable modification of the plan currently proposed an agreement can be reached, rather than a "Black and White" situation in which Del Colliano wants to have the current plan with no flexibility whatever. We should, I believe, treat this current negative vote by the Board as the opening round in a series of negotiations and compromises with Del Colliano, and try to present it as such.

Hal

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.

Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermed.com>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 9:09 AM

To: "Di Saia, Steven" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>, Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>, Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

My feeling is if there is no requirement to reveal our individual votes that our votes should be confidential.

From: "Di Saia, Steven" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Date: Sun, 9 Feb 2014 16:42:04 +0000

To: "Di Saia, Steven" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>, 'Larry Friedman' <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, 'Francine Kirkpatrick' <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, 'Patti Gallagher' <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermed.com>, 'Diana Ungerleider' <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, 'Syd Vinnedge' <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, 'Vi Walquist' <viwalquist@gmail.com>, 'Hal Erdley' <halerdley@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: 16163 Anoka

All:

I have a question for all. Now that the vote has taken place, I can see several of those involved wanting to know what the vote was – both the count and the votes by individuals.

I do not care one way or another if this information is revealed, but do not know if there is a rule in this regard – are we required to make the vote count, or vote of the individual members, known? If there is no requirement one way or another, does anyone have an opinion whether or not we should reveal one or the other?

Steve

From: Di Saia, Steven
Sent: Friday, February 07, 2014 4:10 PM
To: Larry Friedman; Francine Kirkpatrick; Patti Gallagher; Karen Olan; Diana Ungerleider; Syd Vinnedge; Vi Walquist; Hal Erdley
Subject: FW: 16163 Anoka

A slightly amended response from Ms. Baumgardner to the letter from Mr. Huber. I spoke with her yesterday evening and she wanted to run her last version, a draft, past her counsel.

Steve

From: Margye Baumgardner [<mailto:margye.sb@verizon.net>]
Sent: Friday, February 07, 2014 2:24 PM
To: Di Saia, Steven
Cc: 'Rachel Schultz'; dschultz@mckennalong.com
Subject: 16163 Anoka

Steve and members of the PHOA board of directors,

Thank you for inviting my response to Mr. Huber's letter. With the understanding that this is very difficult timing for me, given a death in the family this week, and that Mr. Huber's demand for a response in 2 days' time does not seem usual or appropriate, I will address as best I can the issues with the intention and wish that the parties can come to a compromise and/or solution of the issues. Please be assured that I have absolutely no desire for taking an adversarial position.

Mr. Huber's statements, besides being false and offensive, do not address the REAL

ISSUE, which is that the proposed addition will significantly DECREASE the value of my property and severely impact the enjoyment of my home of 32 years in our wonderful neighborhood.

Mr. Huber's remarks on how to increase the value of my property are not only irrelevant but, simply put, none of his business. The PRIMARY GOAL must be on MAINTAINING the value of my property which, as documented, would significantly diminish with the proposed addition, which is completely out of character for the neighborhood..

Mr. Schultz wrote a thorough and very fair response, and I join him and Mrs. Schultz generally in the intent and conclusion. As you all know, it has been well established and documented by two authorities that my property value would be considerably diminished by the approval of the requested variance, and that the proposed 15 1/2 foot second story would greatly impact my property's light, air, privacy, trees and vegetation. We must work toward a solution of this impact on my property and cherished home.

As Mr. Schultz suggested, Mr. Del Colliano would gain the added 600 square feet in a second story structure that he desires by moving the addition to the other side above the proposed garage, lessening the height and easing the issues of light, air, and privacy, and making moot Mr. Del Colliano's proposed removal of the long-established trees on my property. If that option, or a similar new proposal from Mr. Del Colliano, is made, I certainly would be pleased to seriously consider accepting it.

The trees, vegetation, and fence bordering my and the Del Colliano property have always been agreed upon by the Fick family (the previous owners) and me for the 30 years that we mutually shared the upkeep and trimming. Mr. Del Colliano has never taken advantage of contacting me during the many months since he closed on the property, to the time of the PHOA meeting at which his plans were presented, and at which time I did not even know who he was, nor did Mr. Huber introduce himself to me or to you, Steve, as Plans Committee chair. Surely there has been more than adequate time and opportunity for these matters to have been addressed and resolved.

You on the PHOA board of directors have given untold hours over the months, and provided your considerable expertise on the Plans Committee, to arrive at an equitable

decision. I thank everyone for your generous service to our neighborhood, and trust that your process will proceed to everyone's mutual satisfaction.

Best regards to all of you on the PHOA board of directors,

Margye

For clarification of some of Mr. Huber's denigrating remarks about my property in his Sunday, February 2 letter:

Roof: I replaced the roof a year ago, and two of the PHOA board members remarked about the good work that was done when they viewed it from the Schultz property during their final visit to my property.

Landscape maintenance: The regular tri-annual trimming of trees was planned for last October but was delayed upon the advice of the professional trimmer until an arborist's opinion could be sought about a major branch of the elm tree that was cracked. Then the trimmer was unavailable while recovering from an injury, and the holidays ensued, and we finally accomplished the trimming last week, with the exception of the trees and foliage along the fence bordering the Del Colliano property.

View: The view from my property is impeded only by the pine and eucalyptus trees and oleander vegetation at 949 Las Lomas Avenue, which is being reviewed by PHOA in response to six neighbors' complaints.

Fence between my and Mr. Del Colliano's property: In spite of my and my fence builder talking with the Fick family in 2010 about replacing the fence at my expense, and with their approval of the style/location/height of the fence, they were an elderly, ailing couple and simply asked me to wait until they no longer lived there and would not have to put up with any noise and commotion right outside their bedroom windows. I of

course honored their request, and then further delayed replacing the fence in order to talk with the new owner about a mutually satisfactory replacement after the property changed hands.

Windows, counter tops, kitchen, bathroom, appliances, etc.: It is unknown how Mr. Huber arrives at his conclusions about the status of the interior of my house, as he has never been inside, to my knowledge. I am told that Mr. Huber came onto my property, without my knowledge or permission, when the PHOA board visited, and he took numerous photos without introducing himself to me or asking if he could take photos. Is this how he arrived at his opinion? And he apparently did not observe that about 1/3 of the windows were replaced about three years ago.

Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 9:14 AM

To: "Di Saia, Steven" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>, Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckarmed.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>, Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

Steve,

I do not recall any Davis-Stirling specific requirements that all details of the vote be publicized.

However, that doesn't mean there aren't any especially given that Board meetings are public. Those most interested however did not request that they be present for the vote. I think it reasonable that the minutes reflect 3 in favor, 6 opposed.

Francine

All:

[Quoted text hidden]

Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 10:03 AM

To: "Di Saia, Steven" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Cc: Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckarmed.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>, Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

While I have an objection to folks knowing how I voted, and I suspect most of you do, I think if only for the sake of precedent that it should be kept "officially secret". There may be a legal reason negating this but....

We may be in a situation down the road where relations with close neighbors could become quite acrimonious, or worse!

Syd

[Quoted text hidden]

Di Saia, Steven <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 12:04 PM

To: Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>, Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermmed.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>

I have heard from most now, and, while there is not absolute agreement, Hal, Patti, and Francine seem to have raised the most important issues in favor of some disclosure – that the minutes will need to reflect the numerical vote and there is value in noting for the homeowner, with an eye toward compromise, that the vote was not insurmountable. Others have also wisely raised the acrimony which may develop from absolute disclosure.

Absent strong objection, for now and into the future on similar matters and events, I believe the policy should be that the numerical vote may be disclosed, but specific votes should be kept confidential.

Thank you all!

Steve

From: Hal Erdley [mailto:halerdley@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, February 09, 2014 9:05 AM

To: Di Saia, Steven; 'Larry Friedman'; 'Francine Kirkpatrick'; 'Patti Gallagher'; 'Karen Olan'; 'Diana Ungerleider'; 'Syd Vinnedge'; 'Vi Walquist'

Subject: Re: 16163 Anoka

[Quoted text hidden]

Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 1:02 PM

To: "Di Saia, Steven" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Cc: Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermmed.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>, Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

I don't see it's necessary to know who voted what way but don't see the harm in them knowing it wasn't unanimous (unless we have something written prohibiting it).

Patti

[Quoted text hidden]

Di Saia, Steven <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 1:04 PM

To: Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>

Cc: Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermmed.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>, Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

To my knowledge, there is no prohibition. Thanks.

Steve

[Quoted text hidden]

Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 1:34 PM

To: "Di Saia, Steven" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Cc: Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermmed.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Syd Vinnedge

<syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>, Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

Sorry for being late in my response having just gotten home. I'm in agreement with the general tenor of the emails -- particularly Hal's comments in that was the way the discussion went -- even without Hal being there. Seems to me to be appropriate to disclose the count and hold onto individual confidentiality -- if we can.

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Larry Friedman

Di Saia, Steven <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 1:35 PM

To: Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>

Cc: Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermed.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>, Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

Thanks – I believe we can!

Steve

From: Larry Friedman [mailto:lpfriedman1@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, February 09, 2014 1:35 PM

To: Di Saia, Steven

Cc: Patti Gallagher; Francine Kirkpatrick; Karen Olan; Diana Ungerleider; Syd Vinnedge; Vi Walquist; Hal Erdley

Subject: Re: 16163 Anoka

[Quoted text hidden]

Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 3:34 PM

To: Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>

Be sure to make a "policy" note in your notes re the vote. - list under Board Policy

Francine

----- Forwarded Message

From: "Di Saia, Steven" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Date: Sun, 09 Feb 2014 20:04:49 +0000

To: Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>, 'Larry Friedman' <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, 'Francine Kirkpatrick' <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, 'Patti Gallagher' <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, 'Karen Olan' <karenolan@beckermed.com>, 'Diana Ungerleider' <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, 'Syd Vinnedge' <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, 'Vi Walquist' <viwalquist@gmail.com>

Conversation: 16163 Anoka

Subject: 16163 Anoka

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

<<http://www.avast.com/>> This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus

<<http://www.avast.com/>> protection is active.

----- End of Forwarded Message

Hal Erdley <halerdley@gmail.com>

Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 10:20 PM

To: "Di Saia, Steven" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>, Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>

Cc: Patti Gallagher <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, Francine Kirkpatrick <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermed.com>, Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Syd Vinnedge <syd.vinnedge@gmail.com>, Vi Walquist <viwalquist@gmail.com>

Considering the personality of the owner, I believe the names of the positive and negative voters must be kept confidential under any conditions.

Hal

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.