**Hawk Ridge Covenants Updates Feedback**

**Berry: ----------------------------------------------**

 **Errors and Questions in Declaration of Covenants Red Line**

1. The text of sections 6.1(k)(1) and (2) needs to be indented.
2. In section 6.1(m) is the county/state still allowing cedar shingles, wood shake shingles because of potential fire hazard?

And what happened to “clay, composition or cement tile shingles”? This could have been just an eye slip to the wrong line.

The last line indicates that even the sheds and greenhouses must have a 24” overhang. Is this what you intended?

1. On the first line of 6.2(a) the word “as” has a space between the “a” and the “s”.
2. Section 6.2(g) The first line needs to be reworded to include owners (i.e., Vehicles of short-term guests or agents of the resident/owner, or non-concealed recreational vehicle(s)/trailer(s) of the resident/owner may be parked….). Or do you mean that any non-concealed recreational vehicle or trailer of the resident/owner must be driven off the lot at least once a week?

Would you consider removing “of vehicles” from the Garage door statement? It is very inconvenient to work in your yard when you have to continually open and close the garage door.

Are you going to remove the last sentence of this section because it may invite legal action?

1. In section 6.2(r) General – What about making an exception for Christmas displays?

Additionally, the Post Office has asked us to put our street number on our mailbox or post.

A 9 square inch street number on our front door is not readable from the street with the 100-foot mandated setback. This should be revised because many of us have signage that is in violation of this but is necessarily readable from the street for fire/police guidance.

Can you add “or ballot measure” after “single candidate”?

**My main concern is not on the list.**  It is that the last changes to the Covenants was not done in a legal manner and therefore are not valid.  The document filed with the county states that letters were sent to the Mortgagees  (twice), but no written responses were forthcoming.  The Covenants require a written response from them.  You cannot assume that “no news is good news”.

 I would suggest that you ask each homeowner to contact their Mortgagee(s) and find out who in that organization the request for vote be directed to.  You cannot change the Covenants without a written “Yes” vote from 2/3 of them for each item changed.

 Sorry to be a wet blanket.  I believe that some changes need to be made, but they must be made in compliance with the law.

**Alexander: ---------------------------------------------**

Thank you for you hard work and good intentions in this matter. Nancy and I have served as Treasurer and ARC member in the past, so we do relate to your time and effort.

We are not enthusiastic about several of the proposal changes. We built twenty three years ago. We accepted the covenants then, and have respected them ever since. Overall the neighborhood is obviously adhering, although a few infractions are always evident.

Our main concerns are with the vehicles and recreational vehicles storage proposals. At the meeting, we proposed several times that limits should be set on the number of vehicles being parked / stored. Generally speaking we felt our comments were falling on deaf ears. Without quantity limits, the ARC won’t have any teeth. Everything will be subjective, and their job will be much harder. Our existing covenants have several of size / dimension guidelines - Minimum square footages of homes; Eaves dimensions; Colors; Let’s give the ARC the tools they need.

As we see it, some situations that could get out of hand are:

6.2b, would allow business, trade, commercial activity.

6.2g, would allow storage of auxiliary vehicles.

What would prevent someone running a boat / car / camper, repair business behind their fence? How many could they have stored?  If you take this to the extreme, we could end up with a scrapyard behind a fence. Need limitations on fenced area or number of auxiliary vehicles.

Campers are listed under "auxiliary vehicles” What happens when a resident interprets a fifth wheel as a camper? Regardless, most campers, other than pop up’s are not going to be hidden by a 7ft fence.

6.2a, Hawkridge is a single family development. Friends and family visits are totally normal, but renting out a room or rooms becomes a multi-family home. This would also increase the number of vehicles in use at the home.

Need limitations on the number of vehicles not in garages.

RV parking is just fine the way it is.

6.1f, accessory structures should blend with the main home. No bright red sheds. I think we agreed on that at the meeting.

Sorry. Our intention was to make suggestions and not just throw out negative comments, but we just noticed that today is the deadline for responding, so need to get this to you. Would be happy to discuss further.

As things stand our vote will be a definite “No”. We will be voting as owners of both the lots we own. Would be happy to review proposed language changes.

Just an afterthought. The amendment  approving detached garages ten years ago, was designed to address many of the issues you are re-addressing now. You said at the meeting that in every survey conducted these issues have been paramount in residents responses. What surveys? We have never been approached with a survey? How many residents have requested these changes? Just curious…..

Thanks.

Chris & Nancy.

**Etnyre: ------------------------------------------------**

Ken, Think under group 4 need to add “…by a fence no higher than 7’.  If I remember right that was your comment when questioned about the height of the fence, that Colorado restrictions were 7’.

Terry Etnyre

**Kendrick: ---------------------------------------------**

6.2 (g)  Storage of Vehicles

Concur with most points of proposal: IF more than one family resides in a residence, as listed in the proposal (we agree on bringing in family members who can’t live alone any more) this will add to the amount of additional cars that are placed on the property.  Hopefully the additional residents in a family home will follow covenants. If not, can the HOA intervene successfully and efficiently?

Another issue to consider –– when a Hawk Ridge home becomes classified as a RENTAL HOME –– what happens when the renter is not even aware of the Hawk Ridge HOA covenants, much less those regarding “cars parked on property?”  In the past we have had this situation with a rental home (no longer a rental) in our immediate area with numerous ungaraged cars/trucks and pieces of construction equipment parked without being moved for months –– it was an eyesore, from our perspective, for over a year.

6/2 (g)  Comments:

Comment: The fencing of RV vehicles will present a judgement call by the ARC about the required minimum height of the fence to conceal un-garaged vehicles from surrounding lots and roads.  Revised covenants need to account for the actual height of the RV(s) as well as specifically describe the new corresponding required height of fencing and specifically describe what the actual visibility limits of this screening fencing will be (100%? – like it would be if garaged?).  This is also particularly true for larger commercial vehicles and a variety of construction equipment stored outside Hawk Ridge homes that will be used by residents or renters who are operating construction businesses from their Hawk Ridge home.

Comment:  What if the lot owner has more than one ungaraged RV and/or vehicle or piece of construction equipment and only provides adequate screening fencing  for one RV/auxiliary vehicle?  How will the ARC enforce screening for the other ungaraged RV(s) and/or ungaraged vehicle(s) and/or ungaraged piece(s) of construction equipment that aren’t fenced-in or can’t be fenced-in in a rental situation?

Comment:  Not all lots in Hawk Ridge are on level terrain and not all homes are one-level/ranch models.  Some residents’ homes are two stories which would cause different “sight-line issues” with their nearby residents’ homes.  For example, the steeper grades of the southern portion of Soaring Wing Drive and center portion Wing Tip Road create unique “sight-line issues” depending on the relative orientation of the lots as well the variety of exterior vehicle parking locations used by a variety of ungaraged vehicles/RVs/skid loaders etc.

Comment: Another issue regarding the increasing number of rental home conversions in the Hawk Ridge community is whether the potential renter who owns an RV or oversize work pickup truck that can’t be garaged would even know what the Hawk Ridge current/revised covenants are or how to deal with these covenants if the property owner has not already installed sufficient already-adequate screening fencing  for a tall RV up to 10-12 feet high?  Would the ARC even be able to intervene and adjudicate a solution for this situation, much less a family resident living in a house with ungaraged vehicle(s) and/or RV(s)?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment now, since we were unable to attend the recent meeting by ZOOM, though we tried for half an hour to sign in.

Jim and Paula Kendrick

**Decker: -----------------------------------------------------------**

Dear Ken:

I appreciated the opportunity to join you all via zoom for the meeting. I agree with all of the proposals that have been brought forth. I appreciate all of your hard work for all of us and our families.

I might have missed the next step. Will you be sending out a new ballot for us to vote on these changes? And do we have to have a majority in the vote? I have noticed that there is generally not more than 50 percent represented at the meetings. I know you mentioned that you will go physically to all the homes. I am happy to help with this endeavor. Just let me know.

Thank you,

Emily Decker