

APPENDICE C FENCE STUDY

Fence study of Canyon View Estates existing fencing through 2017

Canyon View Estates is made up of 33 Lots. A study of fencing was done to determine the types of fencing that currently exist, the location fencing styles, and the aesthetic value added in consideration of the View Corridor within Canyon View Estates.

Two members of the community recorded the findings on a Canyon View Subdivision Key Map. Please see the following map on page 3. One board member, one member of the Documents Committee, prepared this study.

- Wood yellow
- Iron orange
- Chain Link red
- Concrete black
- Lattice blue
- Vinyl green
- None _____
- V=Owned by Vacant Lot

Of the 33 lots, two owners own more than one lot. This is true for lots 20 & 21, and lots 17 & 18. Most lots share some type of fencing with a neighbor.

- 9 lots share wood fencing
- 15 lots share Iron fencing
- 1 lot has chain link fencing
- 3 lots share cement fencing
- 2 lots share lattice fencing
- 2 lots share vinyl fencing
- 10 lots do not have fencing
- 7 lots are vacant

The following describes each lot individually, addresses privacy, landscaping, and other elements:

1. Vacant, shared iron fencing.
2. Three sides of iron fencing. Pool. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
3. Three sides of iron fencing. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
4. Three sides of iron fencing. Privacy achieved with landscaping.

5. Two sides of iron fencing, one side chain link. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
6. Two sides of iron fencing, one side with concrete. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
7. One side of iron fencing, once side with concrete. Pool. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
8. One side of iron fencing, once side with concrete. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
9. Two sides of iron fencing, one side wood fencing. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
10. One side of iron fencing, two sides no fencing. Wood Gate hides side yard. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
11. No perimeter fencing. Small Iron fencing on interior yard.
12. No fencing. The rear yard slopes down toward the canyon. Front yard landscaping only.
13. Small section of wood fencing and no other fencing. Lot 13 is the largest lot in the development. Front yard landscaping only.
14. Vacant, no fencing.
15. No fencing. Front yard landscaping only.
16. Vacant, no fencing.
17. Vacant, no fencing.
18. Vacant, no fencing.
19. Lattice fencing in shared back area. Pool. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
20. Vacant with two shared iron fences.
21. Iron fencing. Pool. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
22. Corner lot shares one iron fence. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
23. New construction. Elevated lot by 4'.
24. Iron fencing on one side, lattice fencing on one side, and minor wood fence in one area. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
25. Iron fencing on three sides. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
26. Vacant, shared vinyl fencing on one side.
27. Chain Link fence on one side, vinyl fencing on one side. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
28. Wood fence on three sides. Lot location is uphill and not in View Corridor.
29. Shares a wood fence on two sides. No fence on one side. Lot location is uphill and not in View Corridor. Privacy achieved with landscaping.

30. Shares a wood fence on two sides. No fence on one side. Lot location is uphill and not in View Corridor. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
31. Shares a wood fence on one side. No fence on one side (removed fence on one side). Privacy achieved with landscaping.
32. Wood fence on two sides. Iron gate. Privacy achieved with landscaping. Lot location is uphill and not in View Corridor. Privacy achieved with landscaping.
33. Shares a wood fence on three sides. Lot location is uphill and not in View Corridor. Privacy achieved with landscaping.

Following a close review of this information, the result from this study suggests that the majority of property owners prefer iron fencing and no fencing to other fencing styles. Six lots with wood fencing are found toward the top of Harlequin Way and Sierra Sunrise Way. Lots with wood fencing often have iron gates. These fence locations do not obstruct views of any properties within Canyon View Estates. Two of the remaining wood fences are parallel in location and do not block any views. The remaining wood fence is found on the back property of Lot 9. It is not visible to any neighbors. The chain link fencing is found on perimeter locations, and do not obstruct view of any properties within Canyon View Estates. The findings suggest that the unobstructed view is a dominant feature within the subdivision. Findings suggest that decisions for fencing have been made on a case-by-case basis with priority consideration given to give openness within the development.

See All Fencing Information Sections 9.21 through 9.23. The wood fencing located on Lot 23 does not set precedent in Canyon View Estates as set forth in a lawsuit settlement. The fence was built without approval through the application process and in violation of the CC&R's, the Architectural Rules.

APPENDICE D GATE STUDY

The purpose of the Gate study in 2017 was to understand current gate installations set from 2001 through 2017 within Placer Canyon View Estates. The study establishes Precedent.

The following is a list, by lot number, of property owners within the development and the type of gate approved for the lot.

Lot#	Gate	Type of Gate visible from view corridor	Comments
1	0	none	vacant property
2	6	1 parallel wood 1 iron	1 wood open gate 3 perimeter iron gates and 2 interior iron gates
3	1	Large electric iron gate	plus 1 perimeter iron gate
4	2	Iron	2 perimeter iron gates
5	0	no gate	
6	1	iron	
7	2	1 small wood gate 1 small iron gate	
8	1	iron gate	
9	2	iron gate	
10	2	Small wood gate 1 small iron gate	Wood fence is parallel with home iron gate is adjacent with home
11	1	iron	
12	0	no gate	
13	0	no gate	
14	0	none	vacant property
15	0	no gate	
16	0	none	vacant property
17	0	no gate	
18	0	none	vacant property
19	1	iron gate	Pool gate
20	0	none	vacant property
21	2	Iron gates	
22	0	no gate	
23			currently under construction
24	1	Small painted wood gate	see notes
25	0	no gate	
26	0	none	vacant property

27	2	Vinyl gates	property adjacent with BLM property
28	3	1 small wood gate 2 small iron gates	
29	0	no gate	vacant property
30	2	1 iron-arched gate 1 small wood	iron gate with wood fence
31	2	2 Iron gates	perimeter wood fence with iron gate
32	2	2 Both iron	Large iron gate visible in front of home
33	2	Small wood	

FINDINGS

Of the 33 Lots within Placer Canyon View Estates, 17 properties have gates for a total of 35 gates, 12 have more than 2 gates, 7 properties are vacant:

- Iron gates 24
- Wood gates 7
- No gates 14
- Vacant lots 7
- Vinyl gates 2

Gate installations set from 2001 through 2017 per these findings suggest that the preference for most homeowners is openness as indicated with the 14-No Gates and 24-Iron Gates over only 7-wood gates, and 2-vinyl as shown within the numbers. This suggests that during ACC Reviews, committees have based decisions on Case-by-Case perspectives. For example, Lot 10 wood gate is in parallel with the home and does not block the view corridor. The gate is visible from the street but is not obstructive. A second example is Lot 2. The approved wood gate is located at the top of an upward sloping driveway, to the rear of the property. The gate is capped, painted white and made with an open construction. Lot 2 also has 5 other gates which are all iron. A third example is Lot 28. The property is one of several perimeter properties on the Placer Canyon View Boundary. Wood fences were approved at the early development stage of the subdivision. Originally there were two wood gates on this property, but one was recently replaced with an iron gate by the current owners.

APPENDICE E ANTENNA STUDY THROUGH 2018

The purpose of this study is to understand current antenna location installations from 2001 through 2018 within Placer Canyon View Estates. The study was performed by two Documents Committee members on April 12, 2018.

Following is a list, by lot number, of property owners at the time the study was completed, within the development and the location approved for antenna on individual lots.

Lot#	Approved Antenna Location with View Corridor consideration	Comments
1	none	vacant property
2	not visible from street or neighbors view	
3	not visible from street or neighbors view	
4	not visible from street or neighbors view	
5	not visible from street or neighbors view	
6	not visible from street or neighbors view	
7	not visible from street or neighbors view	
8	Visible from street	
9	not visible from street or neighbors view	
10	not visible from street or neighbors view	
11	not visible from street or neighbors view	
12	not visible from street or neighbors view	
13	Visible from all view points	ACC requested Antenna be relocated. Owner said he might.
14	none	vacant property
15	not visible from street or neighbors view	
16	none	vacant property
17	not visible from street or neighbors view	
18	none	vacant property

19	not visible from street or neighbors view	
20	none	vacant property
21	not visible from street or neighbors view	
22	not visible from street or neighbors view	
23	not visible from street or neighbors view	currently under construction
24	not visible from street or neighbors view	
25	Located on front roof	
26	none	vacant property
27	Located as side view	property adjacent with BLM property
28	Located as front view	
29	none	vacant property
30	Located as back view	
31	not visible from street or neighbors view	
32	Located as back view	
33	not visible from street or neighbors view	

Findings

Of the 33 Lots within Placer Canyon View Estates, 26 properties have antennas. Of the Antennas, all were placed within the ACC application process except for two. Those two antennas were installed in violation of the ACC application process.

- No antennas from vacant Lots 7
- Antennas Not visible within the View Corridor 19
- Antennas Visible from the Front of the Street 2
- Antennas Visible from the Rear of the Home 3
- Antennas Visible from All Points of View 2

Issues

When a homeowner calls an Internet provider, the provider usually recommends placement of the antenna. The homeowner is not always aware that they are required to use the ACC Application process. The result is a violation. Another issue is a homeowner to make the change on their own without consideration to the ACC Application process. This is a clear intentional violation. This has nothing to do with if an antenna is acceptable nor does it give consideration to the View Corridor.

It is the responsibility of the Homeowner to refer to the Architectural Rules prior to making any changes to their property.

Violations are subject to Fines and Penalties if they Fail to Remedy Noncompliance. See CC&Rs Section 8.14 (c) and Section 8.15. Enforcement.