

**Minutes of the Public Hearing
of the Black Point Beach Club Charter Revision Commission**

Thursday, 09/03/26 7:00 PM

Present: Anita Schepker (co-chair), Jennifer Bogue (co-chair), Phil Lombardo, Geri Johnson-Reis, Larry Connors, Jessica Lastarza, Maureen Hahn

Absent: Don Mackenzie

Submitted comments

Linda Gesualdi - 24 Saltaire Avenue

In the past, families, including mine, living on the perimeter of the Black Point Beach Club have asked to join the Black Point Beach Club Association and were denied. I'd like to ask:

1. What has changed that causes Black Point Beach Club Association to now ask families to join
2. what reasons were given to the families at the time of the past requests, as to why they were denied

Bill Bayne – 2 Osprey Road

In general terms:

Sections 1, 2, 4 agree, and agree we should be very careful with voting (i.e. the old proxy voting discussion may come up, that has many potholes for BP!)

Section 5 - I still believe this section needs a soft hand to broadly update to reflect current times/options

Section 6 - maybe ok to refine with bylaw, but would want to discuss risk/benefit with lawyer versus charter revision - sensitive topic for BP

Section 7 - This section in my opinion needs lots of work beyond the debt ceiling (will provide separate email on concepts for discussion). Here, we should again broadly define rights, responsibilities, and general enforcement expectations - as there have been many BOG discussions that end in confusion

Section 8 - I feel more strongly that this language lends itself to a Board (not us of course) exercising unnecessary discretion that can lead to loads of legal complaints. Hence, think this wording should be a bit tweaked to narrow that discretion, good lawyer discussion.

Section 9 - I have no religion on "planning and zoning" or any big changes here, but we may want to refine responsibility call-outs to help BP be more efficient. Also, don't want any potential discussions to be based around the current conditions, this needs to stand the test of time.

The following comments were offered during the hearing.

Sharon Bruce – 53 Sea Spray

Opposed to expanding borders; concerned about owner's long-term interest in Black Point. This effort on expansion should not be taken lightly. It has been raised previously, but no action was taken. What has changed? If the interest is expressed by those not in the Association why are we considering this now? Once borders are opened, there are concerns about the long-term implications and precedent. There is a large lot abutting the north side of the clubhouse lot and concerns about the implications if that lot (or future lots) seek inclusion in Black Point. There is the question of fairness. Those properties wishing to come into the Association knew they weren't buying in the Association so it is not fair for them to increase their property values by being included in the future. Asks to see the legal opinion that would allow a boundary expansion. Some of these properties are large and could be subdivided. Would such subdivided properties be included within the Association? Would these properties be subject to Black Point zoning regulations? If all 13 invited properties agreed, that would net approximately \$16,000 in new taxes. That works out to approximately \$35 per current property. If the goal is increased revenue, surely current owners could carry that additional charge. What is the "why"? Why is this being considered now when it hasn't been considered previously. What is in it for Black Point. Is this potential action really in the best interest of the Association?

Anita Schepker – co-chair

The Board has asked the Charter Revision Commission to specifically consider Charter language regarding boundary changes. This comes following the Annual Meeting where the membership overwhelmingly supported pursuing this idea. Properties that would come into the Association would be subject to Black Point's zoning regulations.

Patty Foley DeAngelis – 56 Sea Spray

Appreciates Sharon's comments. Does not understand the "why". Are we setting a precedent? What happens 10 years down the road? Is there an additional expansion? Voted no in May. Owners pay a premium to buy property within the current boundaries. Why allow those that didn't buy within the Association to now enter without that premium?

Schepker – co-chair

We believe that these properties are likely still using our amenities without any tax payments. Changing boundaries to include these properties would allow us to capture that revenue.

DeAngelis – 56 Sea Spray

That does not seem to be a sufficient reason for this.

Jim Moffett – 27 Nehantic

Section 4 lays out term limits for the Board of Governors, but not for the Zoning Commission or the Zoning Board of Appeals. He would like to see term limits considered for those appointed commissions. Concerned that if language in Section 9 expands the Zoning Commission to the Planning and Zoning Commission then without term limits, there would effectively be lifetime appointments with an expansion of duties which should be taken into consideration.

Shevon Hickey – 8 Sunset

Wholeheartedly agrees with Sharon and Patty. At the May meeting tried to ask questions but then the question was called. That was supposed to be the time for members to comment. Lots of people not in the Association already park at the clubhouse and then walk down to the beach.

Bill Bayne – 2 Osprey

The Charter has firewalls to avoid slipper slopes. The boundaries must change to at least take in the estuary property. Ultimately the community will have a vote to adopt any changes that the Commission recommends.

DeAngelis – 56 Sea Spray

People do not understand why the Association is considering this boundary expansion. What is the “why”?

With no additional public comments, the Hearing closed at 7:50pm