

The Farm at Creekside HOA Annual Neighborhood Meeting for 2017

Date of Meeting: Tuesday, March 21, 2017
Place of meeting: Longmont Public Library
Time: 6:30 p.m. - meeting scheduled
Called to Order: 6:33 p.m.
Closed: 8:10 p.m.
Minutes Prepared by: Rosalyn Weller, Secretary

Note about Quorum:

Based on the revised Bylaws of April 29, 2015, the required quorum is now 15% of members, or 28 households. A quorum was achieved by a combination of number of households attending (35) and number of submitted proxies (40), for a total of 75. It should be noted that just the number of households present met the quorum.

Board members in Attendance:

Bilge Birsoy	President
Adam Rush	Vice President
Rosalyn Weller	Secretary
Vann Hilty	Treasurer
Heather Staples	Director at Large
Sharon Steele	Director at Large

Board member absent without notice: David Duckworth, temporary replacement for Robert Taylor, Director at Large

Agenda:

1. Report from the Treasurer
2. Election of new board members, getting volunteers for committees, and vote on 2017 budget that includes money to hire a Management Company
3. Homeowner input about Property Guideline topics
4. Neighborhood mailbox vandalism
5. Other homeowner input: holiday lights, neighborhood junk collection, Oktoberfest charity collection, HOA fence

Reports:

1. Report from the Treasurer. The Treasurer passed out and highlighted aspects of the Comparative Balance Sheet and two versions of the 2017 budget, with and without the cost of a Management Company. These sheets were also posted on our website before the meeting.
2. Election of new board members, getting volunteers for committees, and vote on 2017 budget that includes money to hire a Management Company. These topics were discussed

together, as a major impetus for hiring a Management Company was the difficulty getting volunteers for board positions and committees. If a management company was not hired to do some of the work of the board, four new board members were needed to replace outgoing members. The HOA also needed a new Maintenance Manager, Webmaster, two of the three Architectural Control Committee members, and more Social Committee members. Four volunteers came forward for the board positions, and they were unanimously elected: Phil Haratsaris, Bernie Newcomb, Tiffany Ross, and Jen Wawrzynczak. Other volunteers came forward to fill the Maintenance Manager, Architectural Control Committee, and Social Committee positions.

The pro's and con's of hiring a Management Company were discussed, with emphasis on replacing the efforts of departing Maintenance Manager and Secretary. Although there wasn't time at the meeting to mention all the "pro's", they include: duties of the board and committee members would be reduced, no maintenance manager would be necessary, Property Guideline enforcement would be better and not have to be done by a neighbor, the management company would provide a roster of vendors for us to pick from for a job, proactively keep the HOA abreast of new HOA legislation, and keep current our required HOA documents. The "con's" were the increased cost (about \$60/year/house) and the feeling that we ourselves would be better at the job (if we actually did the work). Although some were fearful of enforcement, a board member pointed out that a management company would only enforced what's in our documents. Thus, if we have things in the Property Guidelines we don't want enforced, we simply have to remove or modify them.

A vote was taken on the question included in the annual meeting letter with proxy – do homeowners approve or disapprove a 2017 budget that includes money to hire a management company. The results were:

Proxies: 27 approvals, 12 disapprovals (plus 1 proxy that did not contain a vote)

Meeting Attendees: 2 approvals, 33 disapprovals

Totals: 29 approvals, 45 disapprovals (majority)

Although the disapprovals were not a majority* of all 184 households, it was decided to listen to the voices of those who voted and disapprove a 2017 budget that included funds to hire a management company. [*According to Colorado Senate Bill 05-100, section 13.38-33.3-303 (4), CO revised statutes, "... the budget proposed by the executive board does not require approval from the unit owners and it will be deemed approved by the unit owners in the absence of a veto at the noticed meeting by a majority of all unit owners..."

The treasurer had also prepared a version of the 2017 budget without funds to hire a management company, and those present voted to approve it. Thus, for now, no management company will be hired.

3. Homeowner input about Property Guideline topics. Homeowners were asked their thoughts about a list of possible changes to the Guidelines (last revised 12/2/2016; at [www.fachoa.org/documents/Property Guidelines](http://www.fachoa.org/documents/Property%20Guidelines)).
- a. A board member presented the following topics for discussion. A homeowner said he wanted to see the original sections in writing (these are now included below) and have longer to think about the wording. A board member noted that the board can make such changes as it sees fit to the Property Guidelines without homeowner approval (voting), but we were using the annual meeting gathering to obtain homeowner input. A homeowner commented that the Property Guidelines are strict for a reason – that is, we don’t want our neighborhood to go downhill and have property values lowered. It was noted that, based on homeowner input at last year’s annual meeting, the board does not walk the neighborhood looking for infractions (except for outside the HOA perimeter fence), but waits for homeowner written (email OK; a picture is great) complaints that the board then investigates. The board then follows-up, without mentioning the complainant’s name to preserve their anonymity.
 - b. Section II, A, 6. Seasonal decorations. As written, seasonal decorations [are exempt from requiring Architectural Control Committee approval] “if removed within seventy-five (75) days following the holiday.” A board member suggested changing the wording to not require removal of roof-line lights if the lights are unplugged, but homeowners did not want this.
 - c. II, F, 2. Irrigation System. As written, “each and every lot shall be provided with an automatic irrigation system capable of watering all landscaped areas containing plant materials to ensure the continued survival of plant life.” A board member noted that there were homeowners whose underground irrigation lines were evidently broken, and now used above-ground sprinklers, and wondered whether we should change the section. It was noted that “automatic irrigation system” was ambiguous – does that mean above-ground hoses could be used if on a timer? This section needs clarification as to what we want.
 - d. II, F, 3. Ornamentation. As written, “the utilization of non-living objects (such as ornaments) in the landscape is not permitted. Such ornamentation includes animal skulls, wagon wheels and “kitsch sculpture” (flamingos, deer, cherubs, ducks, etc.).” A board member noted that many examples of such are found throughout the neighborhood and wondered whether we should change the Guidelines. It was suggested that such ornamentation in the front [or side] yard visible from the street or sidewalk should require Architectural Committee approval, but no approval was needed for ornamentation not visible in a back yard.
 - e. II, 5. Maintenance [of landscaping]. As written, “minimum [landscaping] requirements include ... removal and/or elimination and replacement of dead or dying plant materials ...” A homeowner suggested that we change “and

replacement” to “and replacement according to II, F, 4. Minimum plant materials quantities and placement of plants”, as the Guidelines no longer require replacement if the yard contains the minimum number of plants otherwise. A board member asked whether we wanted to soften the requirement to allow homeowners with dead trees, which could be expensive to remove, some leniency, perhaps by just submitting a quote and proposed date for removal. However, homeowners disagreed and said to keep the strictness of the current rule.

- f. II, I (i), 9, f. Screening, I, paragraph 2, “junk”. As written, “ ‘Junk’, unused or broken equipment, trash, and surplus building or project supplies are not to be stored longer than one week in front of or besides residences if they are visible from the street.” Keep as is?
 - g. Homeowners can email the board (hoa@fachoa.org) with comments about the above and any other possible Property Guideline changes.
4. Neighborhood mailbox vandalism. A homeowner reported that neighborhood mailboxes had again been vandalized March 11. A white Cherokee Laredo containing teenagers was observed. Watersong has had car break-ins recently, as well. So we should be observant and report illegal or suspicious behavior to the police.
5. Other homeowner input: holiday lights, neighborhood junk collection, Oktoberfest charity collection, HOA fence.
- a. Homeowners present were asked about whether they liked the holiday lights that the board had paid for on 3 trees at the Eagleview Circle island. A few homeowners present said they never drove that way and felt we didn’t need them.
 - b. A board member said that the HOA was looking into a neighborhood trash/junk collection and asked whether homeowners would be interested. The answer was “yes!” A homeowner also asked about a neighborhood pick-up of hard-to-recycle items, but a board member noted that there were places in Longmont to dispose of such items, usually for a fee.
 - c. The Social Committee Chair noted dismay at the paucity of items we collected at last year’s Oktoberfest for HOPE, a charity for those experiencing homelessness in Longmont. She noted that most of the cash and merchandise donations are given because we collect for a charity. A homeowner suggested that collection of winter clothing in late September might be the problem, and suggested we switch to something like non-perishable food.
 - d. A homeowner said their HOA perimeter fence needed repair and was unaware that such repairs were done last summer, after homeowners were asked to submit addresses where repairs were needed.
 - e. Another homeowner noted that the current fence is showing its age and that even when initially installed, was of inferior quality to the original fence. The board will keep this in mind when it comes time for fence replacement.