

Special Board Meeting July 12th, 2014

President Rich Nagel called the meeting to order at 0900 at the Club House with some opening remarks. They included a reminder that all of us are neighbors. All members will be allowed to speak, and all members will be allowed to speak before we take 2nd responses from members. The group was reminded to be respectful.

Members present: all Board members were present except Kathy Jefferson who was available by phone. Manager Sharon Kadlec was present as well.

The minutes of the Board Meeting on June 21st were reviewed but not voted on as this is a Special meeting of the Board. There were no reports by committee's and no Treasurer's Report as this is a special meeting.

The group was reminded that the next regularly scheduled Board meeting is August 16th at the Club House.

New Business:

The group started with a discussion about the issue of garages in Sylvan Shores. Below are the highlights of some of the concerns/discussion:

1. Currently the 2009 motion requires that property owners must combine their lots at the Todd Co level in order to build an outbuilding on a 2nd lot. At this time Todd Co does let you separate the lots at a later date. Their only requirement is that the current year taxes must be paid in full (there is no fee to combine or separate lots).
2. There are a group of land owners who are "Land-locked" (have water, roadways, or other buildings that would prohibit them from purchasing an adjoining lot to build an outbuilding on a 2nd lot). These land-locked owners would like an option to be able to build an outbuilding on a 2nd lot that is not adjoining the lot their home is located on. Todd Co does not allow properties to be joined at the Co level if they are not touching (can't be separated by water or roadways and have to be in the same block and subdivision in SSPOA).

Members concerns:

Todd Co could change the rules about combining/separation of lots at any time and without notice.

Is the 2009 Motion a change in boundaries of the property. If this is changing the property boundaries, this would be in direct violation of SSPOA Covenants and By-laws. Should the 2009 ruling be sent to a vote of the entire membership? If this was sent for a vote, would there be enough returned votes to pass a change.

Does the Architectural Committee/Board have the authority to require owners to combine their property at the Co level.

If we make significant changes to the SSPOA covenants and By-Laws, will the State of MN require SSPOA to change to MCOIA. What would that mean for the owners at SSPOA.

New owners receive a copy of the Covenants and By-laws when they purchase their property but they don't receive a copy of all the motions and amendments that have changed since the original documents were created.

There is no central list of motions and amendments that have been made since the original document was created for current owners.

Possible solutions:

Should SSPOA build a "mini" storage facility for owners only to rent.

Where would this be built, would you have to commit to X # of months/years to ensure that SSPOA would not put up the \$\$ without any return.

How big would the units be? Could the "Barn" be used for this purpose.

Should we look at the issue from a density perspective? Only allow a % of free-standing garages (garage build on a property that is not adjoining the property where the owners residence is located). For example we would only allow 20% of free-standing garages in any block of SSPOA.

After much discussion the following motion was made by Bruce Dibbs:

This issue will be tabled until the next regularly scheduled SSPOA Board meeting on August 16, 2014. The Board requests that the Architectural Committee meet again prior to the Board meeting in August and revise the recommendation to the Board based on the feedback received from members today. This revised recommendation will need to be given to the SSPOA attorney for review so the Board can make a decision on this issue at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting.

Lance 2nd the motion and the motion passed with all yes votes. Kathy Jefferson was not contacted for this vote.

Respectfully submitted,
Peggy Forstner, secretary