

Redington Place Board of Directors
Meeting Minutes
+
Owner's meeting
May 5, 2023

Meeting Location: Redington Beach Town Hall meeting room 2 PM

Evidence of meeting notice: Notice for this board meeting was mailed to all owners by US Postal Service mail 14 days prior to the meeting and also posted in the usual public location adjacent to our garage level elevator doors 14 days prior to the meeting.

Board Members present at the meeting: Cheryl Saccone, President; Michael Longino, VP; Robert Matacchiero, Treasurer; Brad Henningsen, Member at large; Sal Licciardi, Secretary. Scott Vignery, Ameritech Community Manager. A **board Quorum is achieved** as 3 or more members present.

Owner's Present: Alfred and Marina Marek, Nancy Licciardi, Leeann Longino, Chris and Linda Seibert, Dru Albano, Susan Reiter, Lindsay Matacchiero, David Meinhart were all present in person for the meeting. Sean Pregibon, Bill and Debbie Caputi, Tony and Rosa Gayoso were present for the meeting by zoom. Attending via Proxy vote only were: Vera and Americo Moscariello, Christine Cavalaris, Lynn Savino, Joseph Lee, Linda and Mike Schuyler. An **owner's vote quorum is achieved** as 9 or more members are present (18 of 18 are represented by person, zoom or proxy).

Meeting called to order: Cheryl Saccone called the meeting to order at 2:06 PM.

Minutes of the prior board of Directors meeting: Although not specifically brought forth at this meeting, Draft minutes of the 4/11/23 BOD meeting were reviewed by the board via email distribution. Modifications were made to correct the record by board member Rob Matacchiero. Those corrections were made and minutes re-sent and accepted by the board without further input via email.

Old Business: None

New Business:

1. **Introduction:** Cheryl Saccone began the meeting reviewing for all in attendance the accomplishments of the board over the last 3 years. These included Palms planted up front, Lighting up front, Bike and Kayak areas, Dog play area, ceiling in the garage, turtle safe lighting, New fence at the pool seawall, new gates and keypads, drainage system along walkway, upgraded vinyl fences, new trash shoot fire gating system, and also the board elected to add cable and internet into the monthly fees achieving a cost savings there. She also reminded all owners in attendance that the board is subject to the same assessments passed on to the owners. Appreciation was given to **Sal Licciardi** for diligence in reviewing vendor contracts and watching the costs passed on to Redington Place by vendors. New cleaners have been brought on board. Cheryl encouraged any willing owner to run for our board of directors. Transparency of the workings of the board of directors is always the goal and all owners were reminded that our minutes of the Board meetings are posted on the association website. **Cheryl Saccone** continued by explaining how the paint colors for our building ultimately got chosen. The board, at our meeting with owners last August, solicited input and only 3 owners volunteered suggestions. The gemstone coating was selected to try to blend in with the paint scheme. The board, by virtue of jumping on the engineering assessment soon after the Surfside collapse, put our condo ahead of what has now become a 1 year waiting list for work to satisfy the Structural Integrity requirements of 4D. She reminded everyone to contact our Ameritech community manager Scott Vignery with issues that arise.
2. **New Soffit required:** Brad Henningsen advised we will need new soffit at our eave enclosures which will be added to the roofing project as our current soffit is sagging and some had been torn off with recent high winds.

3. **Roofing project update:** **Sal Licciardi** explained how our roofing project expanded in scope to the slant roof. Arrys roofing performed an inspection as allowed by our attic access. They reported that a limited replacement of fascia, sub fascia etc. would likely exceed the cost of a new roof. Our slant roof, being 17 years old, and the insurance mandate wildcard pushed the board in the direction of a new slant roof. The recent windstorm and visible inspection of the soffits sagging under the 3rd floor eaves have us now adding new soffit replacement to the scope of work. Price as of yet is out for bid. **Robert Matachierro** recapped Sal's description of how the roof project evolved over time. He advised we have been mostly successful in collecting the assessment for the work being done by CPR. Based on our known estimates and the unknown quantity of wood and ultimate soffit replacement costs. We have used \$12,000 as our current estimate of the necessary special assessment based on our current unknowns. If the figure ends up lower, we will adjust it downward before finalizing the figure. **Dru Albano** (205) asked whether or not the insurance mandated sloped roof replacement? Answer: No, damage was discovered as CPR exposed the underside of the eaves to do their work on the concrete structure. **Brad Henningsen** added that having one roofing company do both portions now also saves cost by staging all equipment just once. **Michael Longino** explained that the price will be adjusted when the unknown quantities become known quantities. **Rob Matacchiero** added that the unknowns at this time are 1) Quantity of wood required, 2) Cost of the soffit job, 3) AC relocation quote. **Susan Reiter** asked if the adjustment will be made once we know the true costs? **Brad Henningsen** answered Sue by saying that yes, despite the board's collective efforts to pin down all of these costs prior to this meeting, there are still unknowns including the quantity of damaged wood that will be discovered during roof teardown. **Michael Longino** made a motion that the board pass the \$12,000 special assessment. **Brad Henningsen** seconds and the motion carries 5 for, 0 against.
4. **Vote on roof tile choice:** The vote for the choice of tile ends up being 14 owners voting for choice 1, 4 owners voting choice 2. **Choice 1 Vierra blend flat tile is the choice of our owners by a majority vote.**
5. **Vote on modification of Article XIII section B of the declaration (\$150 dollar application fee per continuous rental term):** On this measure, the owners chose "yes" by a margin of 11 Yes to 7 No. The measure passes to amend this portion of the Declaration. It will be recorded with the Pinellas County Clerk of Court.
6. **Vote on Modification of Article XIII Section J (Requires landlord to file a \$1000 security deposit with the association for a continuous rental term of a tenant):** On this measure the owners choose "yes" by a margin of 9 to 8. One owner abstained from voting on this measure lowering the total to 17. The measure passes to amend this portion of the Declaration. It will be recorded with the Pinellas County Clerk of Court.
7. **Owner discussion following vote:** **Bill Caputi** spoke after the vote concluded. He expressed that he was very unhappy about the direction taken by the board to offer this vote to the owners. He did express displeasure at use of association funds to create the dog run on the North side of the building. Bill asked if other fees might apply, for example to dog owners? **Brad Henningsen** did interject that the owners spoke via their vote and the measure has passed. **Bill Caputi** continued (some inaudible over multiple speakers as Bill was on zoom). He mentioned several issues including plugging in electric vehicles on house power. Bill stated he has never seen anybody ruin our property. **Cheryl Saccone** mentioned that in the last several months we have had tenants leave water running at the foot wash as long as 5 hours flooding the garage storage areas, pool furniture thrown over and hitting the pool fence to be used as beach chairs, a dog in the pool area, a child hitting our gate lock multiple times frustrated in would not open all while her mom watched. In addition, a tenant and his son carelessly played catch with a hardball on the walkway entrances to condominium units. **Lindsay Matacchiero** spoke and acknowledged that everyone wants our building to be maintained and has an investment in seeing this through. Guests of owners, she maintains, have also done things that were potentially damaging to the common elements and building. **Cheryl Saccone** answered that owners are directly responsible for the behavior and actions of guests but that tenants, generally on property without the owner (who is ultimately responsible for damage to association property), are not closely supervised by that owner by virtue of the landlord being absent. **Lindsay Matacchiero** and **Linda Seibert** provided other arguments in opposition to the security deposit. **Linda Seibert** noted her friend sits on the board of another condominium whom wrestled with the same topic and in the end, elected simply to enforce the fact that the owner is ultimately responsible. **Brad Henningsen** gave a hypothetical example in the case of pool furniture thrown over the fence that ultimately

gets broken but nobody witnessed it. What happens? Who pays for the furniture? The owners do via association fees. **Lindsay Matacchiero** responded back, why is that the landlord/tenants problem if no one saw it? She maintained that guests, owners and tenants equally have damaged the condominium. As such, she would like to have a vote to impose a security deposit on every owner to be held for such damage occurrences. **Alfred Marek** stated his opposition in that he felt this rule singled out those that are renting. <Multiple people began talking all at once and the recording became inaudible> **Cheryl Saccone** advised that the attorney suggested, in drafting proposed amendments, to include 1 full month's security deposit as a requirement to be met by landlords as this is in the statute. **Cheryl Saccone** stated that this email was shared with the board and 4 of 5 members answered that this was excessive and it was felt that \$1000 in escrow would be sufficient to protect the association. One board member felt that the imposition of a security deposit was duplicative and punitive to landlords. **Sal Licciardi** stated that he has reviewed a host (5 or more) local condominium documents and did state that, as condominium rules go, Redington Place has very few strict rules and regulations that are imposed on our owners. Some basic protective actions however, as recently experience has proven, were felt by the majority of the board to be necessary to protect the association. Not all board members felt this way. **Bill Caputi** is afraid that one rule after another will compound and lead the condominium to become far less enjoyable. He feels as though landlords are getting targeted unfairly. **Rob Matacchiero** spoke and stated that he has owned for 21 years and what he sees today saddens him. He does not care what other condominiums do. He maintained he has never heard one example of damage caused by tenants. He stated "an owner asked at our last meeting, what is coming next?" He continued, You know what is coming next, its not going to stop, I'm on the board and I hear these things behind the scenes. He worries about an application fee measuring who is doing more wear and tear on the building as well as people "following you around with a clipboard watching what you do". **Alfred Marek** stated that at the Tides, where he lives, "do they like renters? Not really but it is a fact of life and if you want to be alone buy a house on the beach and pay 3-5 x as much". Likewise, he has not experienced anyone damaging the common elements. **Cheryl Saccone** advised she is not anti-tenant and goes out of her way to help tenants when they request help. Several from the audience were heard telling her to tell them to call the owner. **Tony Gayoso** added that as time goes on we, as owners, must adapt to the changing times. He has owned since 1981. He believes the board is "fighting the people" and that "Redington place is a vacation place and if someone lives there full time that is fine and that is their choice but normally it is a vacation place". **Sean Pregibon** advised ultimately he has a security deposit charged of his renters to cover damage to the condominium or the common elements. **Dru Albano** noted on a different topic that other condominiums force their owners to protect the elevator and common elements from damage during construction and CPR/gemstone's attempt to protect our elevator is not up to those standards seen in other condominiums.

***This last portion was difficult to pick up from the audio as the owners began talking amongst themselves in the background however **Rob Matacchiero** stated: "...proper protocol would have been to have this discussion between everybody and this board decided that was not going to take place". **Cheryl Saccone** advised Rob that he had 5 days by which he could have offered an opinion on the matter via email and chose not to until the very day (April 20, 2023) the amendment was drafted by the attorney and sent back to the board via email for distribution. By that time, 4 out 5 board members felt offering both components of the amendments were reasonable for the whole of the owners to consider and therefore this was done.

Dave Meinhart asked about the structural integrity law and how the board anticipates calculating necessary maintenance fees when the 2nd portion of the law comes online after a structural integrity reserve study is accomplished. **Rob Matacchiero** advised after the reserve study is accomplished we will have a better idea of our costs but that we need to remind owners that this is coming and to be advised to prepare for costs to potentially go up. We cannot yet say by how much that will be.

Meeting adjourned: Cheryl Saccone adjourned the meeting at 3:22 pm.

Next meeting: Not yet determined.

Respectfully submitted,

Sal Licciardi
Redington Place Board of Directors
Secretary