

Belt's Landing, A Condominium, Inc.
Board of Directors Rules and Regulations Meeting
September 13, 2010
Minutes

Board Members present were: Nelson Roos, President
Jim Doyle, Vice-President
John Forgach, Treasurer
Chris Greenawalt, Member
Debra Alascio, Secretary

Village Management Representatives present were: George Bereska and Joe Gier

Belt's Landing Residents present were: See Attachment Number A.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Nelson Roos at 7:10 p.m.

2. Review of Rules and Regulations

Nelson began by stating the purpose of the meeting with a general overview of the process which will be followed in the amendment of the Rules and Regulations. The proposed Rules and Regulations were mailed to all unit owners on August 25, 2010.

3. Review of Written Comments / Complaints from Residents (which were received via email and are attached below beginning with Number 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 below)

1. From Michael Erdek regarding window treatments (Rule 1.1):

Michael was not present. The Board discussed allowing wood tone and different window treatment colors at length. John Forgach made a motion to change the proposed Rule to allow wood tone window coverings. Nelson seconded the motion. In keeping with continuity throughout the building, Jim Doyle, Chris Greenawalt, Debra Alascio voted against the motion and the motion failed. There was no change to the proposed Rule.

2. From Donna Howard regarding decorating choices, children play areas, pool memberships, and other intrusions stated but not elaborated:

Donna was not present. The Board wasn't clear on which section(s) of the proposed Rules Donna was referring to with regard to decorating choices. So, there was no discussion on that topic. The Board discussed whether to allow children to play wherever they wanted, but determined that all areas listed in the proposed Rules are specific areas where children should not be playing due to danger and the liability of the Association if a child is injured by playing in those areas. The Board discussed Pool Memberships. Donna's question was regarding memberships sold outside of the Yacht Club and the Condominium. The Board clarified that memberships are not sold or offered to persons who do not occupy Yacht Club slips or residents of the Pier Building.

3. From Paul Ellis regarding a variety of issues including possible Media attention of the meeting, DNA testing of Pets in Belts Landing and Section 8 Housing. There was no specific question or request for rule change.

Paul was not present. No action on the new rules with regard to Paul's email other than to read the message.

4. From Shawn Smith regarding Yacht Club Pool Memberships, specifically guest count per membership:

Shawn was present. The Board discussed allowing 2-guests per Non-Resident Pool Member. Nelson Roos made a motion to allow no more than two guests per membership. John Forgach seconded the motion. A vote was taken and passed unanimously.

5. From Charles Turnbaugh regarding the Sale of Resident Owned Parking Spaces:

Charles was present. The Board discussed the wording of the proposed Rules 23.6 and 23.7 and agreed to change the proposed Rules so those Units could be sold or leased to slip occupants of the Yacht Club or Belts Landing residents only. Nelson Roos made a motion to allow individually deeded Parking Units to be sold or leased to slip occupants of the Yacht Club or other Belt's Landing residents only. John Forgach seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. *From Jane Hellawell regarding definitions of Common Areas and Limited Common Elements, Parking, leasing of Association Parking spaces, Handicap Spaces and Insurance Policies Maintained by the Condominium:*

Jane was not present. Her email unfortunately was missed when reading the other emails. A response was given to Ms. Hellawell via email with regard to her questions listed on the attached email.

4. **Review of Comments / Complaints from Residents from the Floor with Feedback on emails and New Questions**

1. Michael Erdek. Above discussion was opened to the floor and there was little if no feedback from the floor other than Charles saying that the Pier Homes didn't have to abide by the same rules as the Fell Street Building Unit Owners and Residents.
2. Donna Howard. Fran Valmas commented on, and witnessed with concern, children playing unattended in the courtyards; jumping from brick wall to brick wall; and, playing in the garage where they aren't tall enough for a car to see them if they run out or riding their bikes in the garage. This also brought up discussion regarding the pool area and the many voices that did not want to see a repeat of the kind of lifeguard that we had over the summer. Mel Howard, Trishia Ellis, Fran Valmas, Bruce Gilmore, Mark Berman all had similar comments. *This will be discussed with the new Pool Company.*
3. Paul Ellis. No comments from the floor.
4. Shawn Smith. No other comments made from the floor.
5. Charles Turnbaugh. Charles made additional comments regarding his parking spaces. The Board's response is as stated in item 5 above.
6. Jane Hellawell. Email not read. No comments from floor.
7. Sandy Brooks. New Question regarding the \$100.00 non-refundable fee under (Section 10.4) as it relates to contractors and projects requiring the use of the Freight Elevator. Sandy asked that the Board reconsider the proposed Rule to waive the fee. *The Board agreed to strike that portion of the rule.* The \$200.00 refundable deposit remains part of this Rule. The Board clarified that this Rule regarding a \$200.00 refundable deposit does not apply to the owners of the Townhomes.
8. Ed Pons. New Question regarding clarification on Architectural Changes and planned renovations (Section 2.1), Floors and floor coverings (Section 16.1). The Board responded that it is the right of any owner to renovate the interior of his or her Unit so long as there are no structural changes made within the Unit and/or no non-structural changes are made to any common element. Further, the Board clarified that area rugs satisfy the Rule of 75% floor coverings. Additionally, the Board clarified that this rule does not apply to Townhouse Units. *There were no changes to either proposed Rule.*
9. Debra Tempera. New Question regarding Licensed Contractors (Section 10.1) and Insurance (Sections 18.1 & 18.2). Ron responded to these questions by stating that these Rules mean what they say.
10. Bruce Gilmore. New Question regarding furniture on Balconies, Porches, Terraces and Yards (Section 4.7), Common Areas (Section 7.4), Contractors (Section 10.4), Elevators, Moving and Deliveries (Section 13.3), Parking (as it relates to Guest Parking) (Section 22.10). Bruce requested that all of these proposed Rule be dismissed. *After discussion, the new rules were adopted with changes mentioned in this document.*
11. Fran Valmas. New Question (which Fran asked on behalf of Trisha Ellis) asking for clarification as to furniture placed in the Common Area Brick Courtyard and whether it would be removed by the Board. The response was that an owner would be notified in writing requesting the removal of any items of personal property when required by the Board.

12. Judy Ward. New Question regarding clarification of the 149 Spaces under the rule of Parking (Section 22.2). Ron explained that 149 parking spaces are owned by the Condominium Association while other spaces are privately owned by others.

13. Robin Salawitch. New Question regarding Non-Owner Residents, Leases and Occupancy of Units (Section 21.4), relating to the Addendum of Lease requiring additional liability insurance to be carried by tenant, Robin believed this was overkill and should be stricken from the proposed Rules. No change was made to this proposed Rule/Lease Addendum.

14. Mark Berman. New Question regarding Elevators, Moving and Deliveries (Section 13). Mark wanted to know why the Moving Fee and Deposit is required by Section 13.3 would apply to the Townhomes. The board clarified that the Rule does not apply to the Townhomes. Next Question regarded Trash (Section 30). Mark asked that we insert into first sentence of Section 30.5 "Recycling is required in accordance with the current Baltimore City recycling policy." The request was noted.

15. Jan Walecka. New Question regarding Bicycles (Section 5.4). This was actually a request for additional bike racks for the garage. Note to George Bereska for additional racks.

5. Review of Hand Carried Comment / Complaint from Resident unable to participate in the Meeting

1. From Alisa Adamo regarding the use of cranes to replace HVAC Units on the roof. The Board approved Rule 18.4 to address this concern.

6. BOD Vote on Open Items

Chris Greenawalt made a motion to adopt the Rules and Regulations with the proposed changes noted. Jim Doyle seconded the motion; the vote motion passed unanimously.

7. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Alascio,
Secretary

HORENSTEIN #417

**BELT'S LANDING CONDOMINIUM
BOARD MEETING**

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2010

SIGN-IN SHEET

x Gloria Impagliatelli

610

NAME

ADDRESS

Pat Gorman

#409

PAUL CHRZANOWSKI

#415

M. Howard

#314

Deborah TEMPERA

#314

Kay Hogan

#109

SANDY BROOKS

304

Mark Berman

936

Ed Pons

403

JUDY WARD

317

J. Ellis

303

ROBYN SAWITCH

407

JAN WALECKA

616

Charles Turnbough

101

John Paul

412

Ron Hankar

720

Ira Zahner

305

Tim Boswell

946

Walt Filly

611

Mike Hilegarout

306

Small John

515

Norma Giln

George Bereska

From: "Michael Erdek" <merdek@jhmi.edu>
Date: Monday, September 13, 2010 3:40 PM
To: <gbereska@villagemanagement.net>
Subject: RE: Proposed Rules and Regs for Belt's Landing

Mr. Bereska:

I have some concerns with regard to one of the proposed regulations regarding window treatments. I have fairly expensive hardwood blinds which match my hardwood floors. These, I feel, add considerably to the look and value of the property (much more than would standard white blinds).

The goal of our regulations would be to enhance the quality and value of our property here at Belt's Landing. In this case, that would not be achieved. I am unable to make this evening's meeting due to a prior commitment, but please consider deleting this particular item from the proposed plan. Thank you.

Michael Erdek
Unit 107

PAGE 5

George Bereska

From: "Donna Howard" <donna-howard@mrisc.com>
Date: Monday, September 13, 2010 2:06 PM
To: <gbereska@villagemanagement.net>
Cc: <mphsails@verizon.net>; "Tricia Ellis" <triciae@gbc.org>; "Paul Ellis" <pelliscsfb@msn.com>;
"Shawn Smith" <ShawnSmith@bressonassociates.com>
Subject: Belt's Rules and Regs
George,

I'm pretty sure I can't be at the meeting tonight but I wanted it to be on record that there are certain changes that I find very much beyond the board's right to impose.

1. Allowing the board to approve your decorating choices according to the board's version of "tasteful." Is that even allowable by law? By what standard would they determine something tasteful?

2. Dictating where children are allowed in the building is ridiculous since they are residents or guests too and no board should be able to say they can't go to certain areas. I understand that children should have adult supervision at all times but to not be allowed in the courtyards, the halls, the exercise room at all is completely uncalled for. To my knowledge, the board has no point of reference for children since I don't think any of them have children in their lives but we residents who do have them won't be dictated to by this board's rules. I would be willing to look into the legality of this rule with the aid of my attorney.

3. Pool memberships being sold outside the building and marina should not be allowed since the pool we have and pay for so dearly is a great asset to the residents and the little money we would receive would be minor compared to the intrusion of outsiders.

There are other rules I find intrusive and even offensive as a resident but since I feel that you should choose your battles, the above are most critical for me.

Donna Howard
#314

page 6

George Bereska

From: "csfb scholarship fund" <pelliscsfb@msn.com>
Date: Monday, September 13, 2010 11:03 AM
To: "George Bereska" <gbereska@villagemanagement.net>

George,

One of my local media contacts got in touch with me today to give me an "off the record" heads up about a possible unflattering Belt's story. He led me to believe a reporter may be attending the meeting tonight. It seems the story angle started as a Belt's pet issue (?) that could be tied into the recent Scarlet Place pet DNA story. It has since developed to include the "clandestine rewriting" of the rules and regs (not my words), plus a document being circulated to lower taxes and a discrimination incident (I hope to hell it is not the racist Section 8 rumors that were being spread around last year).

I don't know if this was really a heads up or an attempt to pump me for information but I said I know nothing about any of this. There is no love lost between me and some of the board members but none of us need any bad publicity like this. I am trying to sell my unit and don't need it to plummet any lower than it already has. Board members might want to consider being extra careful of what they say and to whom they speak.

Paul Ellis

page 7

George Bereska

From: "Charles W. Turnbaugh" <cpturnbaugh@comcast.net>
Date: Saturday, September 11, 2010 2:33 PM
To: <gbereska@villagemanagement.net>
Cc: "Phil Collyer" <phil@nassembly.org>; <scott@cont-elec.com>; <lewkydiuguid@earthlink.net>; <merdek@jhmi.edu>; <ecomer@eacarchaeology.com>; <janetcarestia@gmail.com>
Subject: Proposed Rules and Regs for Belt's Landing

George: Please distribute these comments about the proposed Rules and Regulations to the members of the Board of Directors. They refuse to allow their phone numbers or email addresses to be divulged to Belt's Landing Owners.

Background: I was the President of the Belt's Landing Condo Assoc. for almost four years and came to understand the condominium documents, bylaws, Rules and Regulations reasonably well. I also served for several years as the President of the Pier Unit Sub council. Finally, I was a party to litigation with the Condominium Association that corrected the unlawful allocation of expenses that the developer had established and which was adopted later adopted by the Board. During the 10 years I owned my unit prior to the settlement of this litigation, my wife and I paid more than \$24,000 in unlawful maintenance fees to the condominium association. Although some changes may be necessary to the current Rules and Regulations, the proposed massive and nit picking set of Rules and Regulations are overly burdensome, unnecessary, will discourage potential buyers and contain many provisions that are contrary to the condominium documents.

Objections: The proposed Rules and Regulations do not recognize the Pier Unit Sub council's responsibility to manage the affairs of the Pier Building and that the Pier Unit Sub council has its own bylaws with the power to adopt rules and regulations for the Pier Units as well as hire their own management company. A huge portion of the proposed nit picking rules and regs are simply not applicable to a townhouse condo regime.

My wife and I own two parking units in the main building garage and have a deed to a garage sized, enclosed storage unit. That "storage unit" (a converted Parking space), and two adjacent parking spaces were acquired at a considerable cost from a prior owner. I have a title policy in regard to the "garage storage unit" and the two parking spaces guaranteeing my ownership. In the Belt's Landing Condominium documents, the parking spaces and the residential condos are all defined as "Units" of the Condominium. Units of a Condominium are sold as real property subject to the Condominium Declaration as filed in the land records. There are no restrictions in the Condominium Declaration on the right of owners to rent or sell the units of the Belt's landing Condominium. I strongly believe I have every right under Maryland law to sell or rent my units to whom I please. I can sell or rent the storage unit and parking spaces to Yacht Club Members or others. However, I doubt that others would have an interest in ownership. To restrict my right to sell or rent my units deprives me of the full value of my units. We would have no alternative but to initiate litigation if the Board of Directors of the Association tries to place such restrictions on my right to convey my real property.

As Section 11-111 of the Real Estate Article of the Maryland Code provides that no rule may be adopted if the rule is inconsistent with the condominium declaration or bylaws. The Condo Board only has authority to adopt rules that carry out the responsibilities of the council of owners. The Belt's Landing Condominium documents generally places the authority to adopt rules and regulations for the Pier Units in the Pier Unit Sub Council. Under the Condominium documents, the Board of Directors has no authority to restrict the right of owners of units. Restrictions on the right to sell or rent units must be included in the Condominium Declaration as filed in the land records.

page B

Finally, it is difficult to sell condominium units, especially in today's competitive market. Too often, condominium politics and the desire of some to control the condominium at the expense of others make living in a condominium unpleasant. These Rules and Regulations reek of excessive control and intrusiveness. To read these Rules and Regulations gives the impression of management by busybodies and control freaks. They will be counterproductive to sales and generate needless conflict among owners. Please do not adopt these Rules and Regulations.

Page 9

George Bereska

From: "Jane Hellawell" <jhellawell@verizon.net>
Date: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 5:30 PM
To: "George Bereska" <gbereska@villagemanagement.net>
Subject: Belt's Landing Amended Rules and Regulations

George: Because chances are I will not be able to attend the 9/13 meeting, I am, as you suggested, sending some questions and comments for the Board regarding the new Rules. They are as follows:

1. #1 and #7. I would like definitions of Common Areas. General Areas and Limited Common Elements. What will be the impact on those items already placed in a defined Common Area -- e.g. pictures hung in a hallway? Is the tiled entrance to a unit considered Common Area? What about those TV satellite dishes already installed and in violation of the new Rules and Regulations?

2. Parking #22. Are Association owned parking units still being leased? Given that two spaces may be used for every unit, how many does that leave for lease?

Also, I see no mention of the Handicapped spaces. There appears to be an increase of those people who have handicapped tags. There also seems to be little effort to warn or sanction people who are unauthorized to use these spaces. I have a vague memory that people who have handicapped tags should register that fact at the desk. But I am not sure of that.

3. Some time ago I tried to obtain a copy of the "insurance policies maintained by the Condominium" (See #32.5) in order to be sure that as an owner of a unit and in light of new legislation, I hoped to find out what I was now responsible for and what I might not have coverage for under my own policy. I was shuffled from one source to another and never was able to get such information. I am still interested in knowing exactly what Belt's Landing's liability involves. Why should this be so difficult?

I will, of course, be interested in Board comments on the above matters.

Thanks for your help.

Jane Hellawell #301

page 10

HAND DELIVERED DURING MEETING

September 13, 2010

Dear Board of Directors:

I am not able to attend tonight's meeting, but I wanted to raise a current concern of mine. My air conditioning unit broke last week and needs to be replaced. From what has been told to me so far, it appears that the custom is to use a crane for this endeavor. I have reviewed the by-laws carefully and this issue is not addressed. There is absolutely no mention of specific equipment that must be utilized for air conditioning replacement. Therefore, common sense applies

My contractor would do the following in order to replace my air conditioning unit:

- Dismantle the old unit and place the pieces into trash bags. The trash bags will be disposed of through the roof access door.
- The new unit will be placed on the roof through the roof access door.
- The unit will be off the ground the entire time that it is on the roof.
- A special dolly with padded tires will be used if necessary.

What my contractor would like to do is actually safer and poses less risk of damage to the roof than a crane. Cranes can cause a lot of damage. The units need to be moved to the edge of the roof in order to access the crane. My contractor takes roof safety seriously and he guarantees that his work will not cause any damage. The maintenance manager can supervise the whole process and any concerns will be addressed immediately. The board is welcome to watch the process as well.

It is hard for me to determine exactly how this custom originated. But, it appears that the rationale was that damage to the roof would be minimized by using a crane. This might have made sense years ago when units were bigger and heavier. In today's world, air conditioning units are much smaller and lighter. Our new unit is less than 100 pounds. It makes no sense to use a crane for this. The unit can be easily moved with human strength. Moving the unit from the 7th to the 6th floor is not a complicated or risky process. This is clearly the most efficient manner to replace our air conditioning unit.

Time is of the essence. I would appreciate a speedy response on this matter. If you have any questions about any of this feel free to contact me. I can be reached at 443-690-2208.

Sincerely,

Alisa Adamo (Unit #605)

page 11