

**Meeting:**

Rose Hill HOA Board of Directors Special Meeting

**Date:**

Thursday, April 27, 2006, at 7:30PM

**Location:**

K2 Development  
751 Rockville Pike  
Suite 11-B  
Rockville, MD 20852

**Attendance:**

Board members:

Ben Katz  
Noam Fischman  
Craig Kay  
Serge Ohana  
Jason Bulson

Property management:

Ahmed Motawi

8 additional homeowners

**Minutes:**

1. President calls meeting to order
2. Special meeting explained by President. President says the meeting was called because the subject of additions to homes was deemed by the Board to be of high importance and the timing of the applications required response prior to the next scheduled meeting of May 9, 2006
3. Comment from a Board member supporting the importance of the meeting since additions represent a permanent change to the property that cannot be undone without significant expense
4. Shared email comments from homeowner and past member of the ACC:
  - a. Question as to whether there is a separate ACC
  - b. States there is no rule in HOA documents prohibiting additions
  - c. States there was an application for an addition submitted to the ACC and approved in prior years although the addition was apparently not constructed
  - d. Comments regarding an individual application were withheld at the request to the email author
  - e. States personal opinion that additions should be allowed as we do not live in a townhouse or condominium community
  - f. Shared recollection of prior homeowner discussions that community felt we should have guidelines but retain control over our property

- g. Shared personal comments that each house must need not look like the neighbors
- 5. Homeowner shared concern with regard to the length of the construction process as well as damage to neighboring property due to changes in drainage
- 6. Comment from homeowner regarding concern access to back yard for heavy construction equipment without affecting neighboring property
- 7. Comment from homeowner expressing concern that contractors walk across neighboring lot after being instructed not to do so
- 8. Comment from homeowner requesting some sort of bond be put in place to guarantee work is performance on time and providing recourse in neighbor are adversely affected
- 9. Comment from homeowner that the city would not allow the additions to be built if it wasn't appropriate
- 10. Comment from homeowner that the city doesn't always provide adequate protection from mistakes
- 11. Comment from homeowners suggesting that the guidelines require a license and bonded contractor
- 12. Comment from Board member suggest design of community approved additions that could be prepared by a license architect
- 13. Comment from homeowner suggesting that plans be subject to review by an architect
- 14. Comment from homeowner summarizing that we're facing three different categories of issues:
  - a. Functional issues
  - b. Aesthetic issues
  - c. "Getting along with your neighbor" issues
- 15. Comment from homeowner requesting reasonable rules so that all are not punished for concern over one bad contractor
- 16. Comment from homeowner that in the past the Board failed to enforce certain guidelines
- 17. Comment from Property Manager suggesting the completion dates could be accomplished with a performance bond
- 18. Comment from a homeowner suggesting the permit from the city expires after a certain date
- 19. Comment from a homeowner stated that a new permit can be requesting in such a case
- 20. Comment from an applicant regarding a lack of response from the Property Manager
- 21. Comment from a homeowner suggesting that the applicant receiving a slow response may receive some level of "grandfathered" response, separate from the new guidelines being established
- 22. Comment from a homeowner expressing serious concern with any "grandfathered" exceptions
- 23. Comment from an application offer to facilitate a meeting with the contractor and a concern neighboring homeowner

24. Comment from an application requesting an account of what has happen in the nearly 60 days since the application was submitted
25. Explanation from the Property Manager that the application was sent to the past President of the HOA Board
26. Comment from a homeowner expressing concern that a decision is rushed to accommodate these applications
27. Comment from a Board member express sympathy for the plight of the applicant and commitment that the process with be moved forward as quickly as possible
28. Comment from a homeowner that applications be posted and available for comment by the community
29. Comment from homeowner that requiring any sort of guarantee is burdensome and the process should be resolved through community discussion
30. Comment from homeowner suggesting that application pay for mediation in the event of the dispute
31. Comment from Board member questioning group as to what role the HOA Board should play in the process and how strictly violations should be enforced
32. Comment from homeowner suggesting that the ACC needs to clearly state its goals
33. Comment from application requesting a timeline when the application will be resolved
34. Response from Board member that the Board cannot provide a timeline without understanding all the issue, but is committed to providing a response as quickly as possible
35. Suggestion from Property Manager to engage an architect to review application and attorney to research the issue of bonding
36. Comment from a homeowner that not everyone has the means to engage an architect for the review process in addition to the costs already incurred in the building process
37. Comment from homeowner that whatever guidelines are established they should be inclusive of the community and communication is a good thing
38. Comment from an applicant to keep in mind the addition is to accommodate a person with a disability and to keep in mind the relevant laws
39. Comment form an applicant that they did not have a choice with respect to the existing structure when they purchased there home
- 40.
41. Meeting adjourns