

**KAREN O. GAFFNEY, P.A.**

ATTORNEY AT LAW

221 WEST MAIN STREET • SUITE D  
INVERNESS, FLORIDA 34450

KAREN O. GAFFNEY

TELEPHONE  
352 / 726-9222  
FAX  
352 / 726-2124

November 14, 2003

Penne Ard  
1937 W. Nicole Drive  
Lecanto, FL 34461

*RE: Meadowcrest Community Association, Inc. Placement of Structure in Limited  
Common Areas*

Dear Ms. Ard:


As you are aware, I have the pleasure of representing Meadowcrest Community Association, Inc. The Association is aware that you disagree with the decision of the Board of Directors to place a storage facility on a portion of the limited common areas of the Association. As you may be aware, a vote was taken to approve that placement and thereafter, no Director sought to re-consider that vote. Accordingly, the issue is complete. While the Board understands that you do not agree with the same; the same was approved by a majority of the Directors representing each of the individual Associations

As you also aware, solicitation is not permitted in Meadowcrest pursuant to the various Declarations of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions. We would request that you refrain from soliciting door to door or otherwise, in so much as the same, violates the Amended and Restated Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions. While we regret that you are dissatisfied with the decision of the Board of Directors on the issue of the storage facility, that issue is complete and cannot be re-addressed.

If you should have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,

KAREN O. GAFFNEY, P.A.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Karen O. Gaffney

KOG/pem

Cc: Meadowcrest Community Association, Inc.

## ARD Buddies

---

**From:** ARD Buddies [buddyflies@tampabay.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2003 12:37 PM  
**To:** Karen O. Gaffney (kgaffney@xtalwind.net)  
**Cc:** Meadowcrest Community Association (mca@atlantic.net); Concerned Property Owners of Meadowcrest (freebornuscs@tampabay.rr.com)  
**Subject:** Response to Letter from Karen O. Gaffney, MCA Attorney

Dear Ms. Gaffney,

Your letter of 14 November 2003 has been duly received. Since the timing of the message makes it difficult to respond in time for **today's Board of Directors meeting (2:00PM, MCA Office, limited seating)**, we are sending a reply via e-mail. In regard to the placement of a temporary structure in the limited common area of our Community, our objections are based on the fact that we were led to believe that this building would be of standard household size and used for storing seasonal decorations. Not until the building was installed next to our property did we learn that it is an oversized 12x30 custom-made structure, purchased primarily for housing a pressure washer and trailer frequently used for maintaining common property. We are still very much concerned about the amount of traffic coming to and from the shed as evidenced by the well-worn tire tracks throughout MacVicar Park, and the accompanying dangers to children living and playing in the area. The large piles of limbs and brush along with the overgrown mound of dirt where an oak was removed outside of our property line have also long called for attention, if not a serious re-evaluation of the management and future of this limited common property.

From another safety standpoint, it is common knowledge that temporary structures pose a great hazard to surrounding homes in severe weather. This is a standard warning issued by the weather service in areas such as ours: "Residents remaining in the area during hurricane season should be aware that all persons living in a **Mobile Home, Travel Trailer, RV, or Ground Level Modular Home** will be **ordered to evacuate** their residences whenever a hurricane threatens their area." Since the maintenance/storage shed is no less the size of a travel trailer or RV, we can assume that all residences near the shed will be affected by this type of forced evacuation order. We also assume that the costs of evacuation, temporary housing, damages, etc., will be the responsibility of the Meadowcrest Community Association. Please advise if this assessment is not completely accurate.

As the owners of the property in closest proximity to the new metal maintenance shed, we openly admit to our support of the "Petition for Storage Shed Review" ([Petition](#)), which was framed by the original list of [Objections](#) presented by a representative of the Hillcrest Board of Directors at the special meeting this summer. This meeting was called for the purpose of re-voting on a known dead issue, namely, the acquisition of a storage shed subsequently permitted for "office supplies" per the official application. The assertion that "thereafter, no Director sought to reconsider that vote" is an utter falsity, of which most, if not all interested parties are certainly aware.

Based on the misinformation provided to us throughout the past year in our *numerous* attempts to understand this problem *before and after* the vote, and the conduct displayed by the MCA management in dealings with our Village representative(s), we will continue to support the call for a review of this matter by the same Architectural Control Board improperly disbanded before the special vote. For the record, my husband and I spoke only with those who expressed an interest in learning more about this matter. Never did we "solicit" our friends and neighbors, "door-to-door or otherwise," in order to obtain signatures for the Petition. If this matter had been pursued more aggressively, the number of Petitioners would most certainly have been much greater. As newcomers to the Community, we personally hesitated to question the MCA Board of Directors, but unfortunately, have since learned that this was a mistake.

After the MCA President suggested an *ad hoc* committee review would be acceptable, the decision to poll the Community via a petition was made. It was initially presented to the Association Manager when permission was requested to post the document on the Clubhouse Bulletin Board, where it remained until after the October meeting of the MCA Board. Many of the 200-plus Petitioners first viewed the document along with the additional information online, and we have provided periodic updates on the progress of the Petition via email and telephone. A [Rebuttal](#) to the false and misleading information published in the recent MCA President's Message was sent out per the author's request to all known property owners in the Community with e-mail accounts, and only positive feedback was received in response. As we understand it, the list of those who receive these updates extends far beyond our circle of correspondents, yet *no one* has written to accuse us of spamming or solicitation of any kind. We will continue to abide by the deed restrictions common to our Associations and expect no less from the Meadowcrest Board of Directors.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Chuck Ard (Penne) & Family

11/18/2003