

Kevin Kelly, President, PBV kmk1046@gmail.com

Cc: Peter Probasco, Pool Fence Committee Chair, probasco007@gmail.com

Steve Croft, croftsc@comcast.net

Bette Tsoutsouras, tsou@comcast.net

Al Jakelis, a1944@icloud.com

Alex Petron, apetron4@gmail.com

Don Groshong, rddemond2@yahoo.com

Dear Kevin,

Thank you for taking the time on Saturday to outline the circumstances the PBV association faces relative to our liability insurance and the accelerated timeframe needed to install a pool fence. While we understand the board has a difficult decision to make to ensure the association keeps its insurance, we request the board consider any conclusion forced by the threat of insurance cancellation which does not meet our input from earlier this year be an interim decision. We do not like the visual impairment from our condos resulting from a fence. But, we want the emergency to be met but then reopened to better meet our proposal.

As background, in January you asked the four first floor units in F building to put together a fence enclosure design and priced proposal that would keep in mind our concerns for any fence that would need to be placed between our units and the pool. Various design options were considered, but in the end we all came to the same conclusion that placing a fence as far away as reasonably possible from our units was our preference. We enjoy the unobstructed view from our units of the pool area and wish to install a solution that impedes the least on that view. The further the fence is away from our building the 'smaller' it will appear to us.

The proposal we provided to Peter Probasco in late March placed the fence 25 feet from the closest point of building F to the pool. This was not an arbitrary distance for several reasons. This is the same distance that buildings D and E have between their units and the shrubbery in front of the boundary fence on the property line to the east of PBV. These two buildings are the only others on our property that have an obstruction near their patios. We were looking for similar consideration. Also, the proposed fence location at 25 feet would allow for the least amount of disruption to existing plantings in the pool area. The design would require removal of some of the patio curve in front of unit F63, however this 10 feet of space is not really used today, and those pavers could be repurposed to other areas within the new pool enclosure eliminating grass and extending the pool decking such that we could place chairs meeting state guidelines of 12 feet from the pool which we are not meeting today.

In your comments about the challenge facing the board, you mentioned that making any change to the pool decking would constitute a material change to the common element and would require the 75% approval of the community. It is our recollection that when the current paver system and walkway towards the G building were installed, that the board at that time did not seek the 75% approval to

implement that change. That board included Bob Gardell, president, and Bud Rodgers. Also, we believe that the curve in front of F63 was enlarged then, and our proposal might be shrinking it back to close to the original concrete decking. We agree that community rules should be followed, however it is frustrating when they are used selectively and not consistently. We note there were several changes made this summer to the common areas that appear to meet the 75% community approval requirement, but were done anyways. Nevertheless, we do feel it was to the benefit of the community just as we feel our proposal would do likewise.

While we recognize our proposal was an initial design and needs to be shared with the rest of the community for input and potential improvements, we ventured into the effort encouraged by the board's public promise that our input would receive significant weighting to any pool fencing decision. We send this letter to request that whatever the board decides to implement for the pool fence in the very unreasonable time given PBV by the insurance company is considered temporary, and that we be given an opportunity to articulate our concerns and design to the rest of the PBV community.

Sincerely,

Lynn & Dave Chisholm

Carol & Bob Gardell

Joan Ohl

Gail and Bud Rodgers