

2012 Cherryhill Home Owners' Association (HOA) annual meeting.

The annual meeting of the Cherryhill home owners' meeting started at 6:05 pm on July 23, 2012. There were fifteen members present and a quorum was established.

Mr. Ron Hegge, HOA President, asked attendees introduce themselves which they did. Mr. Hegge then asked if there were any corrections need to the 2011 minutes. There were none and a motion was made to accept the minutes and Judy Hegge seconded the motion.

Opening remarks by the President focused on the development's irrigation system. Mr. Hegge stated that we didn't have many problems this year and the system is running properly. Mr. Hegge then addressed water conservation in the development and the need for everyone to conserve. Mr. Hegge encouraged everyone to follow the city guidelines when watering their yards.

The second issues Mr. Hegge discussed was an attempted break in at Dwain Watson's home. This led to a discussion about the fence height along 26 ½ road. Mr. Hegge stated that the city has been more lenient about fence heights since the developer put the original fence in. Anne Talley stated that she has explored the history behind the wall and has gotten a bid from a landscape business to shield their own backyard from 26 ½ road traffic with vegetation. This led to a discussion about raising the masonry wall along 26 ½ road. Ms. Talley expressed concerns about privacy of homes along 26 ½ road and the problem of having home owners along 26 ½ road to carry the entire financial burden to extend the height of the wall. Another member (no name given) stated that landscaping at the entry to the development was restricted by the city due to necessary sight lines required for 26 ½ road. Greg Isaman brought up another issue related to privacy. Another home owner (name not provided) stated that the Ottos and Stern's do not want to pay for any cost associated with raising the wall along 26 ½ road. Mr. Hegge asked if there were any objections if the home owners along 26 ½ would pay for it. Heidi Scotting stated that there should be no objection to someone looking into what it would cost to raise the wall along 26 ½ road. Mr. Hegge stated that design requirements since the original wall was built has probably changed and if the city has lightened up on these requirements then we could at least check on it. That would provide affected homeowners' some options. Ms. Talley stated that any landscaping improvements along the 26 ½ road wall that they would consider would be submitted to the architectural review committee.

A discussion of development fences was then started. Some homeowners' suggested that 75% of the homeowners have to approved any changes to the covenant regarding the construction of new or the repair of existing fences. Greg Isaman suggested that someone should write a section regarding fence modification and put it to a vote of the members. Ken Leis stated that the architectural committee would still need to approve any fence submittal. Kathy Hall then made a motion supporting a submission of new fence design and construction to the architectural committee. Brett Winder seconded the motion. Kathy Hall then suggested that stucco would just be an addition to the fence approval. Upon further discussion, Heidi Scotting brought up that the existing requirements state that other fencing options may be approved by the architectural committee. At that point Kathy withdrew her original motion. There was no second but subsequent discussions indicated that the existing covenant language was sufficient and no changes were needed.

Ms. Scotting suggested that someone needs talk to the owner who rents out their home about their renters parking their vehicles long term on Dahlia Court. Ken Leis indicated that the owner has talked to the renter about this problem. No one seemed to know what the outcome was. Jerry Olshove also pointed out that the renters have had barking dogs but they have corrected that problem. Mr. Olshove then made some comments about his house not meeting any of the covenant requirements since it was

built before the rest of the homes in the development. Mr. Olshove then stated that he would like some kind of variance regarding his house so he could sell it. Mr. Olshove stated that a variance should include a driveway easement to the pond. Another home owner (name not provided) brought up a problem with the variance where as a new owner may not like it. She stated that allowing a variance on the property might make future buyers wary. She was also opposed to a variance to allow additional vehicles on Mr. Olshove's property. Mr. Olshove then stated that we should just ignore the problem. Laughs. Mr. Leis asked Mr. Olshove if before the subdivision was built how he became included in the HOA. Mr. Olshove stated that his property came within 10 days of being included in the subdivision. It was not clear from the discussion how Mr. Olshove's property did become part of the HOA. Regarding the drive way to the pond, Mr. Olshove indicated that the access road to the irrigation pond is not in the subdivision. Ms. Scotting asked "Do we need to be worried about the easement to the pond?" Mr. Olshove said he didn't have a problem with the current situation. Ms. Talley and Judy Hegge stated that they believe that the the non conforming requirements of Mr. Olshove's property should stay as is but could be put in the listing agreement if the property is put up for sale. At that time Mr. Olshove could refile the existing easement to the pond with new names and dates. A vote was taken on the easements on Mr. Olshove property staying as is. Tim Stern made a motion to accept the existing variances to the 674 26 ½ road. Jason Broidy seconded that motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mike Holt presented treasurers report: All dues for 2012 have been collected. Mr. Holt then declared that we are a little ahead of last year but he believes that we are in good shape. The HOA has about \$12,000 in the bank for anticipated bills and that we need to carry a buffer for things like emergencies (i.e., repairs to the pond, pumps, etc.). Mr. Hegge asked if we have a motion to accept the treasurers report? The report was accepted on a motion by Heidi Scotting and Anne Talley seconded the motion.

A discussion was brought up regarding the weeds along 26 ½ road. Anne Talley stated that it has been sprayed and that should take care of the problem.

Mr. Hegge asked for further concerns. Dwain Watson then returned to the fence issue and asked for clarification about the wall along 26 ½ road and Mr. Hegge stated that the City may have a problem with raising it. Mr. Watson again asked if the 26 ½ road wall was raised would all owners have to pay for it or just those who would be affected (i.e., Isaman, Watson, and Talley)? The general consensus was that those affected would have to bear the entire costs. Ms. Talley stated again that, as an option, they could use vegetation as a viable option for privacy. Ms. Talley and Mr. Broidy again stated they are open to all suggestions regarding things they can do to get more privacy. Mr. Broidy then asked if the wall along 26 ½ road had to be uniform and a small discussion was undertaken. Mr. Hegge and others believe that any modification (i.e., physically raising the wall to a different height) of the wall along 26 ½ road would have to be uniform. Mr. Isaman suggested to Mr. Broidy that it might be prudent for him to obtain an estimate on the cost per lineal foot for raising the wall and to give to the owners along 26 ½ road.

In closing Mr. Hegge asked about retaining the current members on the Board or did anyone want to volunteer to replace an existing member. Mr. Isaman said he was Ok with his position as Secretary. Messrs. Hegge, Leis, and Holt said they would continue for another year. No one objected for the current members retaining their positions for one more year. Ms. Scotting made a motion to keep existing members and Kathy Hall seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Mr. Isaman made a motion to adjourn and Judy Hegge seconded the motion. It carried.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:04 p.m.