

Hello,

Here is a recap of the meeting and our findings:

Present David Tate, Joe Fetzner, Judy Garland and Yvonne Gibb.

Meeting was called to order at 6:45 pm at Mayflower Church.

5 homeowners showed up. We explained to each homeowner 1) that our job was to determine if we agreed that a rule had been broken 2) if the association followed the rules of the association and law for notifications 3) to hear their side 4) make a determination if we agreed to the board fine or not. (By law we can only say yes or no. We can not adjust any fines)

The first case was 102 Muirfield Cir.

We believed from the board notes that this fine of \$1000 was for not getting an ARC for Solar Panels. However, the certified letter sent to the homeowner said that the hearing was for painting his house and installing a well. Jamie Smart did come prepared to discuss the Solar panels. He stated that he never received the e-mail requesting the ARC. Further he brought correspondence to/from the contractor stating he needed approval from the LCCPOA. The contractor wrote back "We wouldn't have commenced work with out them approving". Dave Tate excused himself from vote. Unanimous Decision was to **NOT IMPOSE FINE.**

Second case- 765 Saint Andrews Jimmy and Joanie Schulman- Both in Law of owner Muirfield were present. House belonged to brother , who died this summer. They believe the notices were sent to his e-mail and never received by them or sister in law. Very sincere about no longer parking on grass. Unanimous Decision we **NOT TO IMPOSE FINE.** Just FYI, they asked that any further correspondence be sent to them at JOANISCHULMAN@GMAIL.COM

Third case-170 Muirfield Cir. Tina Carvalho was present. She claims never received ARC e-mail from assn. She talked with Carolyn and confirmed that ARC letter was sent to a no longer valid e-mail address. She had problems with trees too close to house and insurance would not insure unless trees were removed. Dave Tate excused himself from vote. Unanimous decision **NOT TO IMPOSE FINE.**

Fourth Case-117 Palmetto Dunes Cheri Demanico was present. Claimed dog making noise died this summer. Did not think surviving dog did barking. Played recording made by neighbor in November of barking dog. She verified it was her surviving dog. Many excuses and letters from other

neighbors claiming they did not hear dog barking. This has been going on since first letters from assn regarding dog barking in October 2020. Joe Fetzer excused himself from vote. There were two of the three votes cast **TO FINE \$1000 AS RECOMMENDED BY BOARD.**

5TH and 6th cases 516 and 518 Saint Andrews -Abby Shemesh was there representing both sides. There was an ARC dated 3/25/22. Permit search shows final inspection 8/17/22. Committee believed ARC submitted in March may have been misplaced by Management Assn. Unanimous vote **NOT TO IMPOSE FINES ON EITHER PROPERTY**

7TH CASE 237 Palmetto Dunes Painting fine \$100 Arc was approved after letter sent to homeowner. Unanimous vote **TO IMPOSE \$100 fine for painting prior to ARC**

237 Palmetto Dunes Well fine of \$1000. Section 3.08 of LCCPOA Covenants state that “underground landscape irrigation systems which are designed to irrigate the entire landscaped portion of the Plot shall be installed” E-mail dated 12/14/22 regarding 135 Palmetto Dunes from Tom Robustelli stated that “AR for removing shrubs to maintain their irrigation system is unnecessary and that they will not be fined for doing so”. Given these two items the committee felt that an ARC for a Well should not be required Unanimous vote **NOT TO IMPOSE FINE.**

8TH CASE 149 Palmetto Dunes -Trees cut down before ARC was submitted. Unanimous vote **TO IMPOSE FINE OF \$100**

9TH CASE 135 Palmetto Dunes New windows installed before ARC submitted. Joe Fetzer excused himself Votes were two to one **TO IMPOSE FINE OF \$100.**

10TH CASE 162 Palmetto Dunes- Committee reviewed paint chips submitted with ARC and comments that they were very similar to original. Article 111 of the covenants 3.02 -b states “repainting a residence with the same paint colors..... does not require Architectural Committee approval” it was felt by the committee that the paint colors were close enough to qualify them as same. Unanimous vote **NOT TO IMPOSE FINE**

Lastly it is a strong recommendation from the committee that in the future all e-mail notifications be followed up immediately with the same

attachment to be sent by regular mail to the address of the violation in question.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:05 pm.

Thanks,

Dave

Dave Tate