

TSPC/Shea (Preston Holdner)

Results of Meeting

9/10/2018

1. Review of prior Neighborhood Watch activities (i.e. Jean Morton)

Result:

Prior attempt to implement Neighborhood Watch occurred around 2012 and was led by Jean Morton. The effort was mostly unsuccessful (a few scattered neighborhoods implemented versions of a program). The effort occurred around the time of the Trevon Martin shooting event in Florida and the organizers wanted the effort to be established as a "Charter Club" within the CCMA HOA. The HOA Boards (Shea) at the time sought legal opinion and were told that the HOAs could potentially be held liable for a Trevon Martin type situation should they agree. The organizers also wanted Neighborhood Watch signs placed at all community entrances. Shea felt that the signs would unduly alarm potential buyers who might think we have a crime problem in the community and thereby depress property values and Shea home sales. As a result, the effort died.

I contacted Jean Morton and Yvonne Williams as well as one of the neighborhoods that implemented their own Watch program. Yvonne provided me with names and contact information for people who were interested in pursuing the Watch effort at that time. Jean and Yvonne told me that they had difficulty getting people to volunteer to be Block Captains so when the legal issues came up they dropped the effort.

Preston said that Shea would still resist any Neighborhood Watch organizing effort that would expose the HOAs to legal liability. However, he said that the HOA Boards (Shea) would actively support Neighborhood Watch efforts that avoid the problem of liability.

2. Discussion regarding Neighborhood Watch and security camera signs
 - a. Private property
 - i. Shea interpretation of current written regulations (see pictures)

Result:

We reviewed the operative California Civil code sections 712 and 713, the CCMA CC&Rs, the CCMA Design Review Committee Guidelines, and the 2018 CCMA Rules and Regulations. Preston

agreed that the current documented sign regulations permit display of one (1) properly sized noncommercial sign on the homeowner's land or in the homeowner's window. The Neighborhood Watch sign meets that criteria for window installation. Yard mounted displays would require use of the specified post mounting technique. We also discussed how it would be better if the Neighborhood Watch sign design were more attractive and less garish, but he agreed that the current design could be used.

We discussed commercial security company signs (e.g. Sentinel, Smith, etc.) that are posted on private property. He stated that these signs have been loosely interpreted as "noncommercial" by the Design Review Committee in the past but a homeowner that puts both the Neighborhood Watch sign in the window and the security company sign in the yard would technically be in violation of the regulations.

I asked him about displaying a video surveillance sign for homes that have cameras. He pointed out that the same problem as was noted above would also exist for these signs. He suggested finding a way to get the security company sign and video surveillance sign made into one sign.

He emphasized that the sign regulations were intended to prevent the proliferation of signs on private property to the visual detriment of the community.

ii. Privacy wall locations (see pictures)

Result:

My understanding of the regulations for privacy wall mounting is that it would require Design Review Committee approval. If you use the post mounting approach noted above then you probably would be OK but then you might not be able to display the security company/video surveillance sign.

b. Common areas

Result:

All common area signs are subject to HOA Board approval on a case by case basis. Preston reiterated that the HOA Board (Shea) will not approve display of Neighborhood Watch signs of the current design at the community entrances for the reasons stated previously.

3. Discussion regarding placement and field of view from security cameras on private property

Result:

Preston supported the idea of private property surveillance systems if they were discretely deployed and were not visually distracting to neighbors or pedestrians passing by. I suggested the TSPC might provide some assistance to homeowners that want to deploy cameras by either giving them a list of manufacturer models and/or helping them pick what they want and where to put it. He thought that might be a good idea.

I brought up the idea of getting people to orient their security cameras so that they could see license plates of cars driving through their neighborhood. This could assist the sheriff's department in their efforts to apprehend criminals should a crime occur in the neighborhood. I pointed out that this might negate the argument that the community needed public area surveillance cameras at the entrances. He was supportive of the idea and didn't see any issue with the Board.

4. Discussion regarding TSPC contacting commercial developers within the community regarding security cameras (i.e. business park and retail area developers)

Result:

Preston saw no reason why the TSPC couldn't have a direct relationship with the commercial and retail entities in the community and suggested we contact Carolyn to get the information for the three (3) companies now in the business park.

He stated that the retail area development effort is not contractually far enough along for the TSPC to initiate contact but that when the contract is finalized there should be no reason that we couldn't begin a dialog with the developer regarding video surveillance and other security plans.