



Howard 39 <hlweisberg0@gmail.com>

16058 Anoka Approval Issues

Francine Kirkpatrick <fpksphoa@gmail.com>

Mon, May 15, 2017 at 8:01 AM

To: Howard Weisberg <hlweisberg0@gmail.com>, Chuck Emerick <cemerick@yahoo.com>, Diana Ungerleider <diana.phoa@gmail.com>, Brian Bradford <bwbbradford@aol.com>, Miriam Schulman <miriamschulman@hotmail.com>, Suzanne Weisberg <sjw@sjwlegal.com>, roger broderick <chaselaw@me.com>

Cc: Kim Bantle <ksbantle@gmail.com>

Hello all,

Thank you Howard for taking the photos to introduce my view obstruction claim. I've not been well enough to muster the effort on my behalf.

If you all can come today, Monday, in the afternoon I will be home (and out of bed) to point out a few facts critical to the evaluation:

FIRST: The lowering of the original pad by 5 feet only relates to the house which was build right up to the edge of the original (5 ft lowered) pad. *It has NOTHING TO DO WITH MY VIEW OBSTRUCTION that I am claiming* which is off pad and entails the extended pad created by a 26 ft fill wall + 2 ft planter wall + 6 ft fence. See the slope of the terrain downhill – black chain link fence on property line (between 16058 & 16100 Anoka), which gives you an idea of my original view.

SECOND: My obstructed view is not only of the hills beyond and the Santa Monica city lights but my SUNRISE VIEW.

FROM MY BACK PATIO: 100% OBSTRUCTION OF THE SUNRISE and COMPLETE OBSTRUCTION OF SANTA MONICA CITY LIGHTS EAST OF QUEEN'S NECKLACE. In addition to fences, the GATE PLACEMENT DOES NOT HAVE BOARD APPROVAL AND IS AGAINST A BOARD RULING IN 1995 (that's a complicated story in itself that involves my being bullied by Robert May into an agreement).

FROM MY STUDY AND FAMILY ROOM: 75% OBSTRUCTION OF THE SUNRISE AND 50% OBSTRUCTION OF SANTA MONICA CITY LIGHTS EAST OF QUEENS NECKLACE.

ONCE THE RIDGE OF THE HILL IS BLOCKED THE GRANDEUR OF THE SUNRISE IS LOST. THIS VIEW IS NOT ONLY OF THE HILL EAST OF TEMESCAL CN BUT ALSO THE SADDLE BACK MOUNTAIN RANGE IN IRVINE – MOST SPECTACULAR!

I have all documentation including 1) the 1995 Board President letter requiring the gate to be at the top of the drive to protect my view. 2) the 26 ft wall after it was constructed was noted on 8/6/14 by Richard to be an off-pad violation. A variance was given by the board (5/8/15) because it was considered to not unreasonably block views, my own and homeowners on Palisair Pl (of SM mountain range)*. 3) A year ago a rogue Board member went against board ruling & decided to get involved, claiming directly to me that my effort to protect my view (May fence) was “ridiculous” and allowed May's fence lowering to be contingent on my approving Gonen's gate placement.

*THE VARIANCE FOR THE WALL WAS LIMITED TO THE 26 FT WALL,
NOTHING ON TOP OF IT. Now 2 more feet have been added by the planter + a 6'
fence.

Thank you all for the time spent to consider my plea to protect my view.

Francine

From: Howard Weisberg <hlweisberg0@gmail.com>

Date: Sunday, May 14, 2017 at 4:07 PM

To: ">" <fpksphoa@gmail.com>, Chuck Emerick <cemerick@yahoo.com>, Diana
Ungerleider <diana.phoa@gmail.com>, Brian Bradford <bwbbbradford@aol.com>,
Miriam Schulman <miriamschulman@hotmail.com>, Suzanne Weisberg
<sjw@sjwlegal.com>, roger broderick <chaselaw@me.com>

Cc: Kim Bantle <ksbantle@gmail.com>, Richard Blumenberg
<richard@rlbarchitecture.com>

Subject: 16058 Anoka Approval Issues

[Quoted text hidden]