

MINUTES OF MEETING
AMELIA WALK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Amelia Walk Community Development District was held Tuesday, February 16, 2021 at the Amelia Walk Amenity Center, 85287 Majestic Walk Boulevard, Fernandina Beach, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Gregg Kern	Chairman
Michael Harbison	Vice Chairman
Jeff Robinson	Supervisor
Henry "Red" Jentz	Supervisor

Also present were:

Daniel Laughlin	District Manager
Jennifer Kilinski	District Counsel
Dan McCranie	District Engineer
Michael Molineaux	Evergreen Lifestyles Management
Carl Eldred	Hopping Green & Sams by telephone

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Laughlin called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m. and called the roll.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Audience Comments

There being no comments, the next item followed.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes of the January 19, 2021

There were no comments on the minutes.

On MOTION by Mr. Robinson seconded by Mr. Jentz with all in favor the Minutes of the January 19, 2021 meeting were approved.
--

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Acceptance of the Audit Committee's Recommendation and Consideration of Authorizing Staff to Issue an RFP

Mr. Laughlin stated this agenda item is accepting the recommendation to use the criteria that you all approved as the audit committee. We will issue an RFP to audit firms.

On MOTION by Mr. Kern seconded by Mr. Harbison with all in favor the audit committee's recommendation was accepted and staff was authorized to issue an RFP for audit services.

Mr. Harbison asked are we going to request an RFP from our current auditor?

Mr. Laughlin responded yes. There are probably three or four major audit firms and it usually comes down to price, but you can't select an auditor based solely on that.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ratification of E-Verify Memorandum of Understanding

Ms. Kiliniski stated there was a law passed last year that requires all local governments to register with E-Verify. Previously it was only if you were doing work on federal contracts or certain types of state contracts that received federal funds, but it has been changed now that any state contracts or any contract for a local government you have to enter into E-Verify, so even though the District doesn't have any direct employees we still have to register with the database. You'll see subsequent to this law becoming effective that all of your agreements will have E-Verify provisions that require any of our direct contractors to go through the E-Verify system. We're not asking them for evidence that they've complied with those requirements, but they will testify essentially with the agreement execution that they are compliant with E-Verify requirements. This is just a memorandum that has been presented by the federal government for use at the state level and essentially to our level.

Mr. Harbison stated it's actually very easy to use as an employer and very helpful.

On MOTION by Mr. Harbison seconded by Mr. Kern with all in favor the E-Verify Memorandum of Understanding was ratified.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion on Speeding Issues

Mr. Laughlin stated this is a carryover from the last meeting. There was a request for pricing on the "your speed is" sign and the average cost for that sign is \$18,851 according to the FDOT website.

Mr. Robinson asked that's solar?

Mr. McCranie responded yes it has the solar panel, the battery backup and has the “your speed is” wording and that’s the FDOT state-wide average cost per sign.

Mr. Kern stated in my experience a lot of times the solar versus the electrical seems to almost wash out by the time you put in the electrical numbers. I don’t know the exact cost.

Mr. Robinson asked what about the cost of the static sign without the radar?

Mr. McCranie stated about \$300 or \$350, somewhere in that range.

Mr. Kern stated our signs are decorative so there’s a little bit more costs usually to match the signs.

Mr. Molineaux stated I don’t know exactly, but that seems like a fair number.

Mr. Kern stated typical ones in other communities that are less decorative are about \$300-\$400. These are more like \$800 or \$900 if I remember.

Mr. Robinson asked do we need County approval for those, or can we just put them in?

Mr. McCranie responded we want to confirm it with the County and then we still need engineering judgment as to where to put it, so I’d have to have conversations as to the locations to make sure we’re putting it in an appropriate location.

Mr. Robinson asked have you seen the locations that were suggested at the last meeting?

Mr. McCranie responded I read the notes, but I did not see any maps, so I don’t recall where you were talking about.

Mr. Robinson stated I didn’t put a map together. When you get past the roundabout heading towards phase 4 and 5 there are no speed limit signs on Majestic so one was suggested to put it there and another was on the opposite end when you’re leaving phase 4 and 5 at the intersection of Champlain. And then another one on Majestic just after the sales offices.

Mr. McCranie stated I can tell you through experience and all research that signs do not slow down drivers; enforcement does, and how the road feels is how people drive so adding lots of signs to remind them, I don’t know if it fixes the problem.

Mr. Harbison stated if you talk to people and ask them if they know what the speed limit is and they say 35 and I say first, it’s 25, but second, you were going 45. It’s just unbelievable.

Mr. McCranie stated from the engineering side of things, how speed limits are set up on the whole road system is based upon the curvature and how narrow the road is and everything

else. We have curves throughout, so that typically slows down drivers and when people park in the street that typically slows down drivers. When they feel it's wide open and clear, even the nicest, most polite driver will drive what they feel is a comfortable speed so it's going to be hard to keep people at 25mph.

Mr. Kern stated in my experience this issue is in every community and every district and we've put a bunch of signs out and there just ends up being a bunch of signs but there's still speeders. Speed bumps have a similar concept. They will slow you down for that moment, and then people try to speed up in between. Then the folks that aren't speeding have to deal with speed bumps every day. I haven't come to a great solution other than enforcement. Getting local authorities that have that authority to enforce the laws.

Mr. Molineaux stated the last time we had the Sheriff's officers on the property I think they ticketed five people and out of those four were residents and one was a contractor. As soon as they leave the property people go back to their habit.

Mr. Robinson asked what about the other items that I brought up? I'm not a big fan of stop signs because of the noise they create, but they definitely slow traffic.

Mr. McCranie stated if you put stop signs on a straightaway in which they know they're not normally supposed to stop they will not use them and then it makes it more dangerous to any pedestrian that believes a stop sign will stop a car and that would be a concern if someone tries to cross a road.

Mr. Harbison stated a related issue, especially if we're getting the authorities involved, is leaving Amelia Walk. The people that just run the light on Amelia Concourse. Maybe if we got Amelia National and North Hampton involved. They've got the same issues. There's a policeman that is pretty much all the time down on Amelia Concourse by the construction entrance for Amelia National. I don't know why he's there, but it's these lights that are really causing an issue.

Mr. McCranie asked what's the safety issue about the lights?

Mr. Harbison responded they run the light.

Mr. Robinson stated when the light turns red there's only a small delay before the other side turns green.

Mr. McCranie stated that is definitely the County because they set all of those timings so that's where you would talk to them on that concern.

Mr. Kern asked is that something you could bring to the County's attention on the District's behalf? Maybe there's something they could look into if they're not aware of it.

Mr. McCranie responded I can give the County engineers a call and let them know that we have concerns that there is no delay. I'll go observe it first.

Mr. Harbison asked do you have any other communities that have put in speed bumps?

Mr. Laughlin responded I have one that was approved by the County in Duval, but it was never done. It's the only situation I've seen where the County was favorable toward it.

Mr. Harbison asked they're really expensive too, right?

Mr. Laughlin responded there are cheap ones that are plastic and screw into the ground.

Mr. McCranie stated the unforeseen thinking is it creates more pollution and more noise. The people are stopping so they're hitting their brakes and then they're accelerating, so if you put one in front of somebody's house, they get more noise. Then because of the brake dust and gas from acceleration, you're also getting more pollution at that location.

Mr. Robinson stated I can attest to that. When I lived in California, we had a speeding issue, so they decided to put a stop sign in front of our house. You literally couldn't use the front of the house because the cars would stop and start up and it was extremely noisy, and it was a three-way intersection. That's why I said at the last meeting we could look at stop signs, but it was going to create a noise issue. The only other suggestion we have is having a Sheriff come.

Mr. Laughlin stated you can get off-duty officers that the District has to actually pay for, but they will just sit in one spot.

Mr. Robinson asked do you know what the cost of that is?

Mr. Laughlin stated I'd have to look at the hourly rate. I want to say it's about \$40 an hour and then there's usually a \$200 or \$300 administrative fee that you have to pay.

Mr. Kern stated I thought we had requested that, and the Nassau County Sheriff's Office was not agreeable to that, because I've done that in other counties.

Mr. Laughlin stated they sat at Amelia Concourse for a few days, but they were just there because the gate was broken, and people were breaking into the amenity center. They weren't monitoring traffic. I can look into the hourly rate for that. I looked into Duval County recently and they're normal rate was about \$25-\$30 an hour but they were charging \$60 an

hour a couple of months ago. I can't recall if I mentioned this at this meeting, but sometimes the county will bring out their portable radar detectors.

Mr. Jentz asked that has some benefit for some short period of time, right?

Mr. Molineaux responded it does. For the time that the sign is onsite it's beneficial and as soon as it disappears, people are back to their normal behavior.

Mr. Laughlin stated I'll look into the cost. It's a pretty easy process; you just a fill out a form with the County and they will have somebody out the next day if they're available.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion on CBU Locations for Phases 4 and 5

Mr. Robinson stated I had an onsite meeting with the District Manager for delivery services and he basically decides routes district-wide. He came up with a variety of locations and sent me an email and I put some pictures on it. He suggested in phase 5 an area that borders wetland or green space, but this particular location is next to lot 176 and it can accommodate the eleven 16-unit CBUs that are proposed. It's a flat area so it would require minor renovation. We did look at a couple of other locations that were pursuable, but you'd have to break them up into two slots in order to keep the one location since that's what we approved at the last meeting.

Mr. Kern stated so we approved the proposal for the phase 4 and 5 mailboxes in substantial form pending the location.

Mr. Robinson stated we approved phase 5 because that was the proposal. Phase 4 is a different discussion because we have to talk about getting bids for the relocation and installation. If this is an agreeable location for phase 5, then we should move forward with it.

Mr. Kern stated yes, homeowners will eventually be there. I'll make a general comment. You know from the beginning in my coordination with Andre was the same desire to have them all generally together and just from past experience with this district specifically, any time we place mailboxes, we're putting a burden on somebody because all of those residents are going to that location so those are things to consider. This is obviously a common area that the District owns so there's no reason we can't go here. My one consideration would be that you have 175 homes that will be picking up mail in front of these future homes. It's better to do it now then to do it later because presumably if you're buying then you know they're there. I can tell you those are probably the last lots that get sold. It's not favorable

obviously for some folks if they see eleven boxes with 175 units and they might say I don't want to live there so it makes home sales a bit of a challenge in that vicinity, but also in the future as we've seen in the past, even if it's across the street or adjacent to your home, you have 175 people parking in that common area to stop and pick up their mail.

Mr. Robinson stated I had an interesting discussion with Andre on locations, as well as the local mail delivery person who wasn't kind about the amenity center because they have to also deliver packages and I would say 50% of the packages that they get don't fit in the boxes, whether it's the individual slots or the package box, so they still have to drive around all throughout the neighborhood delivering packages. She would prefer them not to be here but whether there's one location or multiple locations, the desire from a logic standpoint was they could just go from there to deliver the packages.

Mr. Kern stated it seems to be the packages would be a scenario no matter where the boxes are located.

Mr. Harbison asked this is approved by the postal service?

Mr. Robinson responded yes. This is the postal service text from the email I got, and I just copied it over and put some pictures on it.

Mr. Jentz stated to the point about the builder having a harder time selling those houses closest to the mailboxes, I think there's two issues there. One is people don't want 175 people stopping in front of their house. The other thing is maybe the appearance of it. That could be on the builder if they want to come to the homeowner's association and come up with some idea to make it better looking or whatever. That would be on them if they thought that was going to help them sell houses. I think this is a great idea because I don't think having them all up here works either, especially when people start coming down to use the pool and things like that. I think Jeff said last time that he's seen people come in and park across three or four spaces and get out of their car.

Mr. Robinson stated there's approximately about 30 homes that seem to be occupied between Lennar and Richmond American in phase 4 today. It's probably growing somewhere between 5 and 10 homes per month.

Mr. Kern stated certainly phase 4 has those additional considerations with sold houses. I just wanted to add one other comment to the point of the amenity center. To the extent somebody doesn't park in the parking spot, maybe that's something we can look at trying to

monitor and enforce, but at least there is a parking spot and in this location, there is no parking available and no infrastructure available so the district presumably will be landscaping this common area just like they do all of the other common areas and right of ways. The other thing I've experienced is when you have these mailboxes, people don't always park in the road, they pull off the road up on the curb and on the landscaping and it ends up being this constant maintenance where they're breaking irrigation heads and running over sod that has to be replaced so there's maybe some additional considerations for restricting vehicles from being able to pull up into the landscaping in that area. A little to your point, if the builders want to add to that to pretty it up, certainly they could. Just some considerations on the infrastructure side if it is available there. One of the reasons we ended up with the amenity center is Andre originally asked for them all to be on Majestic Walk Boulevard going into phase 4 and to me that was a safety concern and I felt like we were going to get concerns later on that we were going to have to potentially address and here we are again being asked to relocate boxes so just as another note for anytime we're doing this, the amenity center while maybe not always appropriately used, it at least has the infrastructure available. A lot of these common areas don't so it creates those other obstacles. One other consideration in my discussions with the mailbox provider, the concrete pad that we have here we were basically going to add on to and the boxes need ADA accessibility, so you have to have a certain amount of concrete pad space available around the boxes. We're able to take advantage of the pad that we have currently and just add on to it. When we go somewhere else that doesn't have an existing pad, we're going to have to increase the size of that pad to provide ADA accessibility so our cost will go up. I don't have the quantity in front of me, but it's something to be noted.

On MOTION by Mr. Robinson seconded by Mr. Harbison with Mr. Jentz in favor and Mr. Kern opposed the location for the phase 5 CBUs adjacent to lot 176 as proposed by Mr. Robinson was approved.

Mr. Robinson stated the other portion of this was the relocation of the amenity center boxes in phase 4. A copy of the text Andre put together is included but the number of units just needs to be confirmed with them. There are two locations. One is across the street from lot 109 near the lift station on Fall River Parkway and the other is a lot that is currently being used for

cement across from lots 155 and 154 on Riverbirch Court. I think it's like a five or six/four split. I'm not too worried about the split. If want to do this, we would need to do this as quick as possible. We could potentially look at the pad that is existing at the amenity center being reused for something like bike racks.

Mr. Harbison stated I'm all for moving the boxes from here. I'm very concerned about the summer and people driving in with kids running around the parking lot and things like that. On the other hand though, I'm concerned about where people will park and block other traffic and so forth so I guess we just need to keep all of that in mind.

Mr. Kern stated for the record, I would oppose the locations for the same reasons in the previous discussions, but I think we need some more considerations, one of them obviously being the price. An additional being that there are residents in those areas already and they've purchased a house without those there, we've run into that in the past and lastly, looking at the safety concerns here.

Mr. Harbison stated obviously looking at those things, there's more to explore than to just go ahead and do them, right?

Mr. Robinson stated yes, I was thinking we would obtain a proposal to get the cost of removal and installation.

Mr. Laughlin asked Dan, could you look into the cost of removing the cluster mailbox removed.

Mr. McCranie stated I can coordinate with Gregg.

Mr. Kern stated I've typically done the coordination for mailboxes in the past with the vendor. I'm happy to do it, but frankly I'm opposed to it. Obviously, anyone on the board or staff could reach out to the vendor to get a price to relocate those boxes and add the pads.

Mr. Robinson stated I don't have a problem doing it if you want me to. You want me to just reach out to the one vendor because we've used them in the past?

Mr. Kern responded yes; they've been a good vendor for me on multiple projects. They seem competitively priced and obviously they are familiar with their boxes.

Mr. Laughlin stated send me the contact information for whoever it is, and I'll get it to Jeff and if you get a proposal, we can have it included in the next agenda package.

Mr. Kern stated a lot of times Michael will assist me in confirming when the installations happen and coordinating onsite meetings, so Michael is a good resource too for that vendor.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. District Counsel

Ms. Kilinski stated I've got my law partner Carl Eldred on the phone. He will be the point person, at least through legislative session. I handle all legislative matters for the firm as it relates to special district representation and session has heated up. We're in our fourth week of committee meetings now and session ends April 30th so in the event there are any pressing issues that I can't immediately attend to, Carl will be the point of contact.

You should have gotten by email our legislative updates. We send weekly newsletters where we are just monitoring legislation that may affect special districts. At the end of the session, we will bring back a summary of which bills have passed and how that may affect district operations. We are tracking a number of bills this year. Ethics seems to be the number one focus of session so far. A couple of bills that are proposed would require special district board members to also go through ethics training as the County Commissioners do, so obviously we will let you know if that is the case. I'm happy to answer any questions that you have.

B. District Engineer – Requisition Summary

Mr. McCranie stated I have two requisitions, both of them to Earthworks. The first one is number 78 for \$24,831.10 and that's their final basic draw. Number 79 is for \$225,823.33, which is for a large portion of their retainage. We are still holding back \$50,000 of retainage. I have walked through the project. Effectively, we are complete. We are doing some final paperwork and I noted that I want them to remove some silt fencing from around the perimeter that is still there and doesn't need to be. We're waiting for final DEP approvals and we still hold their money just in case there's little things that have to happen. I would recommend ratification of these requisitions.

On MOTION by Mr. Kern seconded by Mr. Jentz with all in favor requisition numbers 78 and 79 were ratified.

Mr. McCranie stated I know we have a pothole here. We have a temporary patch there and I've asked Duval Asphalt to come through the entire subdivision and look at all of phase one and phase two roadways to see permanent fixes for any kind of potholes or damage they see because a lot of times they have a minimum charge if they have to come out. I'm waiting on their report and as soon as I get it, I will bring it to the Board.

Mr. Harbison stated we had a consultant do a study that was almost like a capital project study that included the roadways and everything and at the time I felt pretty good about that. It was very thorough.

Mr. Laughlin stated the roadways weren't included in the reserve study.

Mr. Harbison stated oh they weren't, okay. There has been a lot of concern by residents. One guy got everybody riled up with the fact that we're going to have a \$1,000 assessment shortly and it's because none of these roadways are included or budgeted for.

Mr. Laughlin stated I don't think it would be that much and it would probably be about four or five years away. The roads aren't terrible.

Mr. McCranie stated it's best to patch if they are minor areas because I don't know how many years ago, maybe four or five, we did all kinds of patches throughout phase one and that's holding well. We're going to get between 17 and some say 23 to 24 years of life in our roadways. I think in my annual report I explained how much I think it's going to cost in today's dollars to mill and resurface the asphalt. These were built in 2004 or 2005 so we are 15 years old approximately so certainly in the next four to six years we are going to have an expense for phase one and phase two is about two years later.

Mr. Kern stated phase two is quite a bit later. Phase two we did in 2015 or 2016.

Mr. McCranie stated maybe we did a phase 2a and then a phase 2b because I remember doing one a little off.

Mr. Kern stated to the reserve study that was done, it was done two ways. One with the roads included and one without. Really, for the purpose of setting the reserve amount, this board determined to not consider the projected roadway cost understanding that while it may not have been included in the assessment amount annually, the reserves are still available to fund roadway repairs if needed, just like they would be for any other district asset so while we didn't assess more to reserve for the roadways in the future, we do have reserves available under the current assessment levels if and when we need roadway work. I'm going off

recollection here, but part of that is we made a significant investment in the amenity, which is the main cost or expense in that reserve study, so we felt like there is a long useful life left on the amenity given that recent investment so by the time phase one is needing to be re-milled and resurfaced the regular reserves should be at a point where we can utilize those funds. The phase 3, 4 and 5 useful life are 15 to 20 years out at this point where those reserves will continue to compile. In addition to that, this district and district being a special district has the ability to issue additional bonds at a later time to fund those projects rather than paying today. You can issue those bonds 20 years from now when the work is needed and then amortize that over 20 to 30 years, whatever it may be. That was the thought process going into it.

Mr. Harbison asked and that sort of spreads out whatever CDD fee would be paid by residents as opposed to an assessment?

Mr. Kern responded anytime you issue bonds, those assessments will be levied over a certain assessment area and in that instance it would more than likely be over the entire community so everybody would incur an assessment at that time when those bonds are issued.

Mr. Harbison stated when I hear of a one-time assessment, I think of a one-time deal. \$1,000 kind of thing. Would it be that?

Mr. Laughlin responded no it would be similar to your debt service portion, but it wouldn't be \$1,000 a year, maybe \$30. We had a community that took out \$1,000,000 to repair multiple pond bank failures that they had, and I want to say that assessment for everybody was maybe \$66 a year for like 20 years.

Mr. Kern stated yes, it's not a one-time assessment because it's amortized over X amount of term.

Mr. Laughlin stated we currently put away \$100,000 a year into the reserves. We have been using it more because there's been needed repairs, but as Gregg said, we're in a good spot because the pool was resurfaced and there's a new amenity center so ideally in four to five years, we will have \$300,000 or \$400,000 in the account to cover that.

C. District Manager

There being nothing to report, the next item followed.

D. Community Manager - Report

Mr. Molineaux stated we have, as Dan said filled a pothole at the main entrance and it seems to have helped really well, but it is temporary. We also have to replace the motor for the fountain that is directly outside the amenity center. The only things really at the moment that we're working on is Cherry Creek appears to have a few sidewalk issues that are fairly minor. Those are scheduled to be repaired on Friday.

Mr. Robinson asked what are the issues? Is it just raised?

Mr. Molineau responded just raised with tree roots. They're still very minimal but they could potentially be a trip hazard so we can just grind them.

Mr. Robinson asked we didn't grind them in the last go around?

Mr. Molineaux responded no, they've actually moved since that time.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisors' Requests and Audience Comments

Mr. Harbison stated this is sort of related to the pothole. We've talked about this in the past, but do we have any specific agreements with Village Walk about sharing costs on an ongoing basis?

Mr. Laughlin responded I was actually just talking to Gregg about that. We're working on that. I broke down the monthly cost for our budget so it's as of now just determining a good percentage such as 5% of our overall budget or 10%.

Mr. Kern stated that came back up at the last meeting so since then he has gone back and evaluated the costs and I think Jennifer has been able to pull up a form of agreement that would be between the CDD and Village Walk HOA and you've gone through it to review it and maybe update it since the last time we had it so there has been some progress made and we will continue to evaluate that and try to enter into that agreement. There are various considerations in there such as landscaping, irrigation and roadway maintenance.

Mr. Robinson stated I know that development across the street is not our development, but it seems to be maybe on their second or third time they're draining the lakes of water and it seems like every time they do that over there, both of these lakes over here drop as well.

Mr. Molineaux stated these pumps can run at a very low level but as soon as someone dewater, they're basically taking down the natural level of all of the water in the area which

results in our ponds going down and as soon as they stop doing it, the ponds go back up to the natural level again. This one has had a turtle stuck in it a couple times which hasn't helped so it was only a matter of time before it needed to be replaced and they've got some years on them now.

Mr. Harbison stated I wasn't here at the last meeting, but I saw we talked about tennis lights and things like that. Where I lived up north, they had a system for the town tennis lights where you could put a credit card in, and it would turn on the lights and it charged people at the rate that created a profit for sort of amortizing the cost of putting in the lights. I don't know if it's worth it. I don't think I've ever seen more than five people playing.

Mr. Laughlin stated I think the thing about that is the people living here are already paying towards these amenities so sometimes you get backlash if you try to charge them more.

Mr. Harbison stated well, we would charge the people that are using the courts.

Mr. Laughlin stated right, I'm just saying their residents and they are already paying their assessments. It's just a thought.

Mr. Harbison stated I'm confused about what the rules are on masks in the gym. I saw this thing about aerobics classes and things like that. Every time I go in there, there's a bunch of people not wearing masks, so I just leave.

Mr. Kern stated ever since this pandemic started, we've essentially with Hopping Green's assistance basically followed the executive orders and recommendations being passed down. I know there was a time that we shut down. Jennifer, you might know better than I do or it's certainly something we can look into, but I'm not aware of any recent executive orders from the Governor's office mandating any mask requirement.

Mr. Harbison stated the County doesn't require them.

Ms. Kilinski stated it's a very case-by-case basis. I have districts that are requiring masks in the gym 24/7, I've got some that aren't requiring them at all, but we just have appropriate signage up. In fact, I was speaking to your insurance company this morning about what they're projecting for spring and summer months knowing that we will have pool capacity questions and that sort of thing. I also have districts that have mask-only hours so they're picking blocks of time during the day where they require masks in the gym so those

folks that want to participate in mask wearing are able to use the facilities. You can set your own policy, there's no mandatory requirements one way or the other.

Mr. Harbison stated Michael, you're the closest to it. If you could just sort of observe and before the next meeting think about it because I follow the Facebook group closely and there's just a lot of anger both ways on this and I don't want it to end up in fist fights.

Mr. Kern stated I have one thing I wanted to bring to the board's attention and it probably needs more detail for further consideration, but I was approached by one of our home builders who would like to add some parking on Fallen Leaf Drive. When the request came through, I asked for their site plans and those kinds of things. I guess there is a resident back there and essentially, they want to create a memorial parking location for some overflow parking in this common area. If you're familiar with Fallen Leaf Drive, it has that turnaround and I think there are some mailboxes there so they were interested in what our interest would be if we would be agreeable to additional parking there. My initial thought was cost so I inquired about how it would be funded, and they said they just want to explore it really and they weren't sure. I'm sure there's a contribution from their party but wanted to understand because it is District property, if this Board would be agreeable to allowing that.

Mr. Molineaux stated I'm guessing this came from the first house on the left past that wooded area because they moved in with six teenage children and they all have vehicles. They have the biggest house in the community, but it has the smallest driveway. We've already had to turn down a request for an ARB request to widen the driveway because it's not in accordance with the architectural guideline so I wouldn't be shocked if this started from that home and then made its way into the builder's office. At any one time there's probably six, seven or eight cars there.

Mr. Kern asked in the roadway?

Mr. Molineaux responded there's usually two in the driveway because it's a very short driveway. I've actually had a conversation with the owner. It's a little bit tongue in cheek, but there are homes in the community with quite sizeable driveways and I made the suggestion that perhaps they should be looking at one of those. They have a really big house, at least six bedrooms but parking out there is definitely a problem and I would say if we could utilize that space, I'm almost certain that house would be the sole user of it.

Mr. Kern stated I guess I just wanted to bring it up to see if there is any general direction from the Board that I can convey as to whether it is something we would consider or not. Obviously, it's on our common area properties.

Mr. Jentz asked there's a half cul-de-sac there right?

Mr. Molineaux responded correct.

Mr. Jentz stated there's one on Cherry Creek there too. Why do they need permission to park there? Why isn't it just first come, first serve.

Mr. Robinson responded they want to carve out a bigger space to put a bigger parking lot.

Mr. Kern stated my understanding of it from the fairly crude site plan that was provided was that they wanted to go past the curb and create parking beyond the curb. Almost like parking spots that would look like a driveway coming off the roadway there. Those type of details would have to be ironed out. To your point, they could certainly park in the roadway. We don't have any restrictions on that, but the request for additional parking beyond the curb line, which is in the District common area right of way.

Mr. Harbison stated I don't see why we would pay a dime of it though unless it's close enough to where the mailboxes are going to go and then we could use it for the mail parking.

Mr. Laughlin stated maybe it could be worked out with Duval Asphalt too if they do come out here.

Mr. Kern stated I tend to agree that I don't think the District should bear the whole cost but those are the kind of things that might answer their inquiry right off the bat.

Mr. Robinson stated Fallen Leaf has about 75% occupied now roughly speaking. If we were going to do anything on that street, from my past experience as a town councilman in Connecticut, we might want to poll everybody on the street, and I can guarantee about half would be opposed and the other half will be either neutral or in favor.

Mr. Molineaux stated I do get complaints from the homeowner of the house across the street from this home, but they have now sold the house to somebody from up north who is only going to be using it in the summer, so they are only going to be exposed to it half of the year. There just isn't a solution for that family with so many people.

Mr. Kern stated I will respond with some feedback from this discussion. Perhaps if they want to pursue it, they should come address the Board themselves.

Mr. Robinson stated we've had builders come to us and offer money for improvements like the fountains and so far, you've heard what from that?

Mr. Kern responded they haven't paid.

Mr. Robinson stated right, that's my point.

Mr. Jentz stated along those lines of people asking for things, from walking around the neighborhood people who don't even know who I am have said it would be nice to have park benches on some of the easements. It probably doesn't cost a lot of money, but everybody who has land adjacent to the easement is probably going to have something to say about putting a park bench in front of their house. It's hard to do after the fact.

Audience Comments

Resident Connie Philips stated you were talking about speed signs but we brought up no solicitation in our covenants and someone mentioned that they thought it was posted. I haven't found that sign if it's somewhere, so I do think we should have a no solicitation sign in the front of our community.

Mr. Molineaux stated I think there's one at the main entrance.

Resident Connie Philips stated I didn't see it.

Mr. Laughlin stated they are pretty low to the ground.

Mr. Robinson stated there may be one right after the circle. I can't remember if it's no solicitation or the one that talks about the construction.

Mr. Laughlin we can look into it and see what they cost and go from there.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There being none, the next item followed.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Financial Reports

A. Balance Sheet & Income Statement

B. Assessment Receipts Schedule

C. Approval of Check Register

Mr. Laughlin stated the check register totals \$19,213.88.

On MOTION by Mr. Harbison seconded by Mr. Kern with all in favor the check register was approved.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Next Scheduled Meeting – March 16, 2021
at 2:00 p.m. at the Amelia Walk Amenity
Center**

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Harbison seconded by Mr. Robinson with
all in favor the meeting was adjourned.


Secretary/Assistant Secretary


Chairman/Vice Chairman