

rules, and an additional one-year effort by a group of homeowners to change the fence rules.

Kevin summarized the advice from SHHA's lawyers regarding consistent and comprehensive enforcement of the CCRs, and their review and approval of Policy Resolution #4 dealing with fences. He also restated the legal advice that the Board is bound to enforce all the regulations and cannot make exceptions. Making exceptions can lead to lawsuits, and potentially to the Board losing its power to enforce any of the CCRs.

Another homeowner talked about her difficulty in obtaining Board approval for her architectural request. The Board pointed out that despite numerous requests, that homeowner had not provided requested images of the proposed modifications – thus delaying the review and approval. Kevin stated for the record that the average approval time for ARC requests over the past two years has been 15 days.

A few homeowners unleashed personal attacks and accusations on the Board regarding their interpretation and enforcement of the CCRs.

At 8:30, some homeowners who had Hearings scheduled for that time arrived.

At that point Pete made a motion that the enforcements against the split rail fences be temporarily suspended so that the points raised at the meeting could be discussed with the lawyers, and that the meeting be continued at a later time when arrangements for a meeting room can be made. Linda seconded this motion.

Kevin submitted for discussion a few points:

He feels it is unfair to homeowners who have spent time and money changing their split rail fences to be in compliance with the CCRs for the Board to now enforce other fences differently.

He believes it is wrong for the Board to ignore Policy Resolution #4, which has been approved and followed for nearly three years.

These discussions regarding fences are not new; there will always be some who are not pleased with the enforcement. He believes that constant and consistent enforcement is the legal and fair course.

The motion was called to vote. Pete and Linda voted for it and Kevin voted against it. With 2 for and 1 against the motion carried.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:39.