

From: Kameron Comstock <kwcomstock@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2020 8:13 PM
To: RSFA <RSFA@rsfassociation.org>
Cc: Daniel Comstock <dcomstock71783@gmail.com>
Subject: Proposed 25% regulation on wood as an exterior material

My name is Kameron Comstock, my husband Dan, 3 children, and I have lived in our home on La Valle Plateada since 2013, and we own a property recently purchased in 2019 on Lago Lindo. This email is in regards to the proposed restriction on use of wood (board and batten and siding) on the exterior of new builds and remodels.

Overall, the limitation to 25% is too restrictive, and instead of applying a specific and restrictive percentage limitation, the board should continue to review each project individually, without any restrictive guidelines.

1) The proposed limitation of only 25% of the exterior of a new build is too restrictive an interpretation. The board appears to read that merely because the guidelines list wood as not a "preferred" material, they need to apply a restrictive limitation. "Not preferred" does not equate to a restrictive percentage limitation. This is too narrow of an interpretation to put on new home builds. If the overall new construction of a California ranch style home (an acceptable style in the covenant) is of "latin types," meaning it's structures are low profile, feature horizontal lines, includes things such as a corridor or a front courtyard, gently broken topography, natural landscapes, etc., then the usage of wood as an exterior material for the home should be reviewed on a case by case basis. It is a fact that wood as an exterior material on a California ranch style home/building is congruent with deriving from "latin types." (It should be noted that even Lillian Rice designed buildings in the covenant village with board and batten siding).

2) This seems to be very restrictive and prejudicial to younger homeowners. Our neighbors move here for various reasons, and one reason is because R. Roger Rowe is a state-wide leading elementary and middle school, and in many cases, younger families move here for the good schools. In lots of those cases, families cannot afford the larger, more elaborate homes that may be available on the market at the time. Instead, they purchase the ranch style homes that may need upgrading or remodeling. To tell a new homeowner that purchases a home with solely wood exterior materials that when they remodel they will be forced to remodel to a newer aesthetic style, also known as, a "preferred" exterior material, completely contradicts the way that the proposed policy is written. (More in point 3. below; but in short, the remodel to a "preferred" exterior material will force a new aesthetic style to the home--a direct contradiction to the proposal where it reads that aesthetics cannot be a consideration.) This forced new aesthetic will cause undue and unnecessary hardship to those families that financially need to keep with the current design aesthetic, and exterior material, of the original home. Forcing homeowners to restrict the use of wood in a remodel where the home already had wood exterior materials to 25% of the original square footage, is very wrong and should be reconsidered.

3) Where it says, "aesthetics will not be considered as a reason to justify the use of wood as an exterior building material" is almost comical. Frankly speaking, aesthetics is a MAIN consideration and driving force behind buying and selling homes! Homeowners, simply put, buy homes because of aesthetics!

In conclusion, while it has become quite evident that new home builders and new homeowners looking to remodel in the covenant need clarification on why wood has been listed as "not preferred," the board needs to reconsider putting a specific and limiting percentage as a restriction. Each home should still be reviewed on a case by case basis, not by a definitive percentage restriction. A California ranch style home is "consistent" with the "latin types" of the covenant, and as a factual aesthetic interpretation, wood on the exterior of a ranch-style home can and does include a design where it can be completely clad in wood, 100%. The board should instead advise the art jury that in their reviews, using wood as an exterior material should be allowed in whatever percentage, as long as the chief inspiration of the home's design comes from "latin types".

This proposal should not be accepted as written.

Thank you,
Kameron Comstock

From: Michael Helms <mhelms@westcore.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 5:06 PM
To: RSFA <RSFA@rsfassociation.org>
Cc: 'kristin.m.helms@gmail.com' <kristin.m.helms@gmail.com>
Subject: Proposed Materials Regulation

Good Afternoon,

Kristin and I are concerned with the proposed regulation on Exterior Materials which restricts the use of “wood siding” on a home.

We find the proposed regulation too restrictive, the percentages arbitrary, a complete departure from protecting the original language and intent of the Protective Covenant, and altogether unnecessary. Arbitrary interpretations and restrictions such as this have far reaching and unknown consequences on the future property values of homes within the Covenant.

We do not agree with the proposal and urge the board to reject the proposed regulation.

Best,
Kristin and Mike Helms

IMPORTANT: This information is confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client privilege and is intended only for the named addressee(s). If the recipient is not an intended recipient (or the individual responsible for the delivery of this email message to an intended recipient), please be advised that any use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this email is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please reply to sender that you have received it in error and delete it.

No binding legal agreement with regard to any real estate transaction will be created by email correspondence.