



Palisair Homeowners Association <palisair@gmail.com>

Story poles 1111 Las Lomas1 message

Brian Bradford <bwbbradford@aol.com>

Thu, Mar 10, 2016 at 3:49 PM

To: Kim Bantle <ksbantle@gmail.com>, Valerie Henderson <vrhenderson@gmail.com>, palisair@gmail.com

Hi Kim,

Elliot has had people redoing the story poles for the last three and a half days (they left after working a couple hours this morning so I assume they are finished) at 1111 Las Lomas. They still have not marked where the proposed deck behind the living room will be.

I thought it had been established that he would do this?

The current location (going by the latest poles) of his living room greatly impacts the light, privacy and views the master bedroom and bathroom as well as in our entire back yard. Also, I was at the building department today and the deck he wants to build (according to the plans I was given by him) show it (the deck) going up to our mutual property line. This will not be allowed by the city (I asked for and was given the current building code requirements for decks on a hillside) so I think there needs to be more accurate plans (approved by the city) before it can be decided on what to allow and what not to allow? I'm also worried about the height issue. If I am correct, there should be a maximum height of just under 461 feet above sea level at all areas of the roof (this is the original grade level of approx. 445 feet above sea level plus 15 and a half feet or 460 and a half feet above sea level). I mention this because it is easy to confuse the issue. If one refers in the same set of plans to so many feet above the first floor level (which happens to be two feet higher than the original grade) some of time and at other times to feet above sea level it becomes confusing and may lead to misunderstandings (the current plans I have been given by Elliot are not always clear as to where the measurement is referring to; for example on page A3.1 the living room height shows it going from the first floor level to the bottom of the overhang not the top of the roof, this means the actual height could be much higher than allowed by the current CC&R's). The use of only feet above sea level when referring to maximum heights is the way to solve this problem. The heights on my plans go to at least 463 and a half feet above sea level and should be rejected for this only. Also, as drawn now the roof deck exceeds the allowable size (greater than twenty-five percent of the building square footage) according to the current CC&R's not to mention the privacy issues.

Thank you,
Brian Bradford

Sent from my iPad