

**Minutes from the Annual Meeting of Springdale HOA Board of Directors**  
**Wednesday, June 11, 2014 @ 7PM at Stokesdale Town Hall**

**1) Administrative**

A) Brian Byrd, John Moran, Tom McCoy, Cathy Steffenhagen in attendance.

B) Quorum established.

C) Kay Thornton, Slatter Management, Inc., in attendance.

D) 22 Homeowners attended the meeting.

E) 5 proxies submitted and approved at the meeting.

**2) Financial**

A) All financial documents through April 2014 have been submitted by Cathy Steffenhagen and approved by the BOD.

B) May 2014 financials will be prepared upon receipt of bank statements.

C) Graph and pie charts comparing monthly Income and Expenses from 2013 and 2014 (to date) were prepared by Cathy Steffenhagen and handed out to the attendees. The major difference between the two year comparison is the 2014 Management Fee expense incurred by bringing Slatter Management on board for covenant enforcement.

D) Assessments have been collected in full from every homeowner except two. One homeowner is current on a monthly payment plan terminating in September. A second homeowner refuses to communicate with the BOD, or to pay the amounts due. A lien has been taken on this homeowner's property and interest continues to accrue on the outstanding balance on a monthly basis.

**3) Architectural Review Committee**

A) The ARC is receiving requests at the same rate as it did last year. Many of these projects seem to be larger in scope than those of

earlier years.

B) The ARC is currently comprised of 3 members. There are two remaining vacancies on the ARC and all Springdale residents are encouraged to become members.

C) One resident noted that it seemed like earlier ARC committees were stricter than the current committee is. The resident expressed some frustration/confusion as to what projects needed to be submitted for approval and suggested that the ARC redefine and revamp its guidelines to make the regulations clearer and more consistent to the community.

D) Decisions are usually generated within a few days. There are no project applications currently pending.

#### **4) Slatter Management**

A) Brian Byrd began the discussion by explaining the necessity for hiring a management company, especially for covenant violations. He explained that with so few volunteers on the Board the time necessary to enforce the covenants fairly and equally was more than the Board members could realistically devote. He also explained that there was a natural reticence on the part of the Board members to enforce rules and regulations on their neighbors and friends. Consequently, self-management produced spotty and sporadic covenant enforcement, resulting in a general disregard for the rules.

B) Deidre Clack is our regular Slatter Management representative. Unfortunately, she was out of town and unavailable for this meeting. Fortunately, Kay Thornton, Slatter Management's Director of Operations, was able to attend and gave a brief synopsis of the goals and directions both Slatter and the Springdale BOD hope to accomplish in the next year.

C) One resident brought up the fact that the covenants seemed to be enforced erratically and on an inconsistent basis. Many people echoed that sentiment saying that it seemed there were always a select few who ignore the rules and always seem to get away with it. Kay and Brian explained that, within the parameters established by



the management systems, improvements had already begun and that further progress was imminent and ongoing.

D) Another resident brought up the erosion concerns and their dependence on weather for growth. Both Kay & Brian addressed this issue by saying that the most egregious offenders had been given months, if not years, to address this problem on their property; that quite a few residents had successfully grown grass on their previously barren soil; and, that grass was not the only solution – plants, bushes and trees could be planted and maintained in many of these areas to successfully resolve the problem.

D) Kay asked if there were any further questions or concerns. Hearing none, the Board moved to the next agenda item.

#### **5) New Parking Rule**

A) Brian began the discussion by advising that the courts generally backed up the HOA when common areas were the focus of discussion. However, he acknowledged, when the focus became individuals lots, they became a lot more conservative and reticent to legislate. The Board felt strongly, however, that the issue of parking illegally on the road and haphazardly on one's property affected safety values and property values adversely and needed to be addressed.

B) One resident voiced concern that vehicles would now not be allowed on the lawns or other non-paved areas to help owners to maintain, repair or improve the lots.

C) Another resident complained that, in the event of a social gathering where all of the vehicles would not fit on the driveways or parking pad areas, any spillover would be subject to sanctions.

D) John Moran replied to both B & C by stating that "common sense" needed to be applied in these instances. The Board is not looking to make residents lives more restricted or less enjoyable. If work or improvements were needed to be done on the property, of course vehicles would be allowed to assist in those endeavors – just don't leave them there for days on end, as one resident did recently – that

abuses the privilege. If you have a social situation that requires a car or two to park off driveway, that is fine, too – but not for days and days at a time. The ARC has had a few requests to widen or expand existing driveways to resolve this problem, and has approved every one.

#### **6) Discussion and Vote on the Proposed Amendment to the Covenants**

A) Brian opened the discussion by citing the North Carolina Planned Community Act's requirement that 70% of the existing households in a development are needed to vote affirmatively to amend the development's covenants.

B) After reviewing the household sign in sheet (22) and counting the Proxy forms (5), it was determined that there were not enough households represented at the Annual Meeting to hold a vote. Consequently, the proposed amendment failed to pass.

C) Discussion centered around the difficulty of getting 70% to attend, much less agree on the vote. One resident questioned who would pay for any amendment to be proposed, citing paper, ink, and postage costs among others. It was determined that, according to Springdale's bylaws, the amendment's proponent(s) would assume the cost for proposing and holding the vote.

D) Another resident suggested that residents could go door to door with a proposed amendment to get the required signatures – and she volunteered to do so. The Board advised that any resident was certainly free to attempt that on any issue, but that each signature would need to be notarized at the time of the vote, and that any accompanying Notary could not have any vested interest in the outcome of the vote.

#### **7) New Business**

A) The floor was thrown open for discussion of any topic by any resident present. Hearing none, the Board proceeded onto the last agenda item.



#### **8) Nomination and Election of New Board Members**

A) The two Board positions held by Brian Byrd (President) and by John Moran (Treasurer) were declared vacant due to their terms of office expiring. Brian volunteered to remain on the Board in an advisory, voting position until his house sold. John's house has already sold (much to Brian's chagrin) and he will be moving shortly. Tom McCoy will remain on the Board for another year. Three seats are available to be filled.

B) Henry Ashton, 8520 Springbirch Terrace volunteered to serve.

C) Matt Osborne, 7782 Springdale Meadow Dr. volunteered to serve.

D) Darlene Conner, 8194 Springbirch Dr. volunteered to serve.

E) The attending residents approved the appointment of the three volunteers to the BOD by acclamation.

#### **9) Adjournment**

A) The meeting adjourned at 8:55 PM.