

## Timothy M. Mulford

---

**From:** Lani Mark <pinkstudio@live.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 24, 2015 5:22 PM  
**To:** Timothy M. Mulford  
**Cc:** jamesbox03@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Comments re: Draft Architectural Guidelines for Washingtonian Woods

Dear HOA Board of Directors

My husband and I are unable to attend the meeting on March 24th, 2015 but have some concerns and thoughts I have after reviewing the new Draft Architectural Guidelines. I will start by saying that I really appreciate the time and effort the committee took in coming up with these draft guidelines. Since it took the committee seven months to come up with this draft, I would think it would behoove the Board to give the community more than a month to go over the suggestions, put various changes up to a vote, create more drafts that we vote on as a community, etc. These are sweeping and significant changes that could in their own right make our neighborhood more or less desirable to potential owners. I would also mention that in the letter it states "The review period will extend for a minimum of 30 days from the date of this mailing, ending on or about April 15th, 2015." Residents did not receive the mailing until the 21st or later. I would respectfully ask that the Board extend the review period by a minimum of at least 30 additional days, ending on or about May 20th, 2015.

If we are going to adopt new guidelines, this would be an important time to address that there are many changes to homes that should be much more simple to complete. Why don't we have a list of approved paint colors for doors, siding, trim, etc.? I would also think having a list of approved windows, and roof options that are pre-approved in cases where an emergency repair is required would also be very beneficial to the community. This would protect the Board from wasting valuable time on such simple changes, would save homeowners time in having to get signatures from neighbors and waiting for board approval, and would encourage homeowners to take better care of the routine maintenance of their home. I would also think it would save everyone a lot of time and effort if a list of what is considered "routine maintenance" was published by the Board. If routine maintenance such as re-painting trim, painting front doors, replacing dead plants, re-sealing a driveway with no change to the shape or color, etc. could just be completed by homeowners staying within the guidelines, it would encourage everyone to take better care of their homes, especially those that currently are not keeping their homes maintained due to lack of desire to go through a formal application process.

application process. and our neighborhood and as a whole.  
Architectural Application

We disapprove of the new \$1,000 fine. It is excessive considering the current fine is \$150 and there is no justification for this change so it seems very arbitrary. It also seems inconsistent with Covenant Section 12.06, sub-part a, which states that "fines not to exceed 25 dollars per day may be issued for a given offense." Furthermore, under the Homeowner's Acknowledgement it states "I may be subject to a fine of at least \$1,000.00 ... A \$15 daily fine may be charged until the unapproved change is satisfactorily corrected." Is the \$15 per day in addition to the already excessive \$1,000 fine?

What happens in cases of emergency? There does not seem to be any provision for an expedited/emergency review. This places the homeowner in a bind where they are either forced to violate the rules and risk a \$1,000 fine, or suffer potentially more expensive and damaging results by not addressing the problem immediately.

Under Homeowner's Acknowledgement Section 6, it states "That I authorize members of the committee to enter upon my property to make one or more routine inspections." This section needs to be revised to clarify that members of the committee may enter the EXTERIOR of my property to make routine inspections.

If an application is rejected the Board should propose a recommendation for a modification (if possible) to the plan that constitute a pending approval should the homeowner accept the proposed modification.

Architectural Guidelines:

The document states that this is a "going forward" document, however I think it is important that a clause be added that all homes that are currently not in violation of the current guidelines will be grand-fathered in and cannot be fined for anything that was in place prior to the date if/when new guidelines are approved by the Board.

For the Addendum covering Lawn Care, we take issue with requiring lawn clippings be bagged. This is inconsistent with Montgomery County's "[grasscycling](#)" environmental initiative. "Grasscycling eliminates the need to use commercial fertilizers and reduces the amount of yard trim materials that must be collected and processed by the County." We would ask that this requirement be removed in its entirety.

We thank the Board for considering our concerns and reviewing our comments regarding these proposed changes.

Respectfully,  
Ilana Mark & James Box  
418 Upshire Cir.

**Lani Mark**

Attorney, Blogger & Publisher

p:240-277-

6047 | e:[pinkstudio@live.com](mailto:pinkstudio@live.com) | w:<http://rockville.macaronikid.com>;

<http://www.justaddpixiedust.com>

