

WOODFIELD HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION, INC

2019 SUMMER MEETING

On May 6, 2019, Woodfield HOA held a summer/semi-annual meeting at the College Park Church - Greenwood. The primary purposes of the meeting were to discuss the playground survey, give homeowners an opportunity to discuss current HOA issues, and review the budget/finances. The board was represented by Mike Rowda, Bill Pinkley, Tony Moyers, and Dave Estridge. Joey Harris represented Main Street Management. There were 19 lots in attendance. Because the meeting was informal and no voting took place, quorum was not applicable.

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

Playground Discussion:

At the time of the meeting, there were 84 responses to the questionnaire. The votes were in favor of removal and replacement, but the number of responses only constituted a very small percentage of the residents in the HOA. Based on that response, the board has elected to continue to monitor the safety of the playground and continue the questionnaire. The board had just received the results of a safety review, which revealed mostly minor safety issues. Anything potentially dangerous was addressed shortly after the meeting. A copy of the report is posted on the HOA webpage under the HOA Documents tab.

(Update: the board has made some repairs and will continue to solicit residents' opinions. The discussion has continued and there is a chance the board will work to budget for the replacement over the next three years. If anything costly arises, then the replacement may take place sooner.)

Question: Can the parts be replaced?

Answer: The parent company of the original installer was contacted, but the matching parts that they stock are very limited. The parts that are needed for the Woodfield playground are not available for replacement

Comments:

- The playground is simply not nice enough and not in character of the surrounding neighborhood.
- The playground is not big enough.

Q: Can we seek out advice from a real estate agent to find out if a nicer neighborhood would have immediate positive impact on property values?

A: A few agents were contacted and the consensus was that there would be no noticeable impact on property values.

One resident stood up and spoke for a moment about his perception of the playground replacement. His opinion was that the board was made aware of the "issue" in 2018 and had been continually "kicking the can" instead of taking any action. To this, the board responded with their description of their efforts that they have taken to ensure that the residents' best interests (financial, safety, etc.) were considered in the process of researching the playground situation. The resident still felt that the board should stop putting money into the playground and just replace it.

Q: What number of positive responses would be required?

A: With 2/3 of the voting base, the board would have no option but to follow the residents' request. Other factors would help to decide with a lower percentage.

Q: What other large expenses are expected that prevent the board from deciding to add the playground?

A: The ponds and the pool are the two most potentially expensive assets. The pool has equipment replaced often and requires painting and other maintenance on a routine basis. The ponds will eventually need to be dredged, which is a very expensive project, and the pond banks are always at risk of needing some repairs. The HOA has paid more than \$12,000 on pond bank repairs over the last 3 years and there is another pond bank repair taking place this fall.

Q: Can a task force be formed to encourage residents to complete the questionnaire?

A: Yes. (As of 8/29, the total responses have more than doubled)

Open Discussion:

During the open discussion, a resident discussed a pending legal suit against them regarding a fence that was constructed without approval. The resident strongly felt that the board's interpretation and enforcement of the restrictions were unfair and not in line with the actual verbiage of the architectural guidelines. The board agreed to reconsider the denial of the fence, but refused to openly discuss the case.

Discussion Board of Directors Candidacy Form Submission:

Two residents were interested in joining the board. Jaime Nunez and Dana Gordon were each given the opportunity to introduce themselves and describe their intentions of being on the board. After much discussion, the Board elected to appoint Jaime to fill the vacancy. He fills the vacancy opened by Bryan Murray's resignation and his term will expire in 2020.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.

NOTES:

-A few years ago, the board took over the Architectural Standards Committee due to slow turnaround time. Over the last few years, the approval time has improved from routinely taking 20+ days for a standard approval. Currently the approval time is typically 7-10 days and often much less than that.

In an effort to increase community engagement, the board would like to reach out residents interested in volunteering on the ASC. Please email joey.harris@mainstreetmanagementllc.com with a short explanation of your interest, a brief summary of your understanding of the HOA restrictions and Architectural Guidelines, and your expectations for time to vote to approve.

-There have been some complaints to MSM lately about the water pressure in the neighborhood. Though the HOA and/or board have no authority over any utility provider, they do wish to encourage residents to give their feedback to the water company. The issue seems to be pretty consistent in the neighborhood and if the water company fields enough complaints, they have expressed that they may be willing to make adjustments to resolve the issue.

-In the future, non-essential mailings like this will be sent by email to all accounts with an email address in MSM's system and mailed to the remainder. If you need to update your email address, please alert MSM.