

October 2012 Covenants Survey Results

	Homes	Survey Responses		Voted for Covenants to Be Re-established		
		Number	% of Homes	Number	% of Respondents	% of Homes
Older Section	144	40	28%	27	82%	19%
Newer Section	61	11	18%	9	68%	15%
Total	205	51	25%	36	71%	18%

The response rate (25%) was not sufficient to draw any conclusions about the homeowner population. The 51 respondents were self-selected and therefore cannot be considered a representative sample. To get a representative sample it would need to be a random sample. Our sample is subject to all sorts of self-selection biases, meaning that the people who responded may have had an agenda different from those who didn't respond. So we can't make any assumptions about how the other 154 homeowners would have voted. In other words, we can't generalize the results from the 51 responses and say that they represent the wishes of the HP residents.

On the survey form, we specified that a large majority of homeowners (as opposed to a large majority of respondents) would be required in order for the board to proceed with reestablishing the covenants:

"If the results of this survey show that a large majority of homeowners would like to establish covenants for those homes that do not have covenants, the Board will send a consent letter to all affected homeowners."

Since only 18% of the homeowners voted to re-establish covenants, the above requirement has not been met.

Comments from "Yes" Voters

1. I think all homes/whole neighborhood should have same set of rules.
2. Too many vehicles parked in side yards (on grass). All vehicles require current tags (proof of insurance) boats, campers—thus not junk cars/vehicles. Dead trees/bushes removed. Keep garage doors closed unless working in yard.
3. I would like for the covenants to be established for homes in HP that currently do not have covenants, as long as each property owner can decide for themselves. (underlined the statement "these homeowners will be able to opt in or opt out of the covenants.")
4. Only reason for covenants: to make neighborhood whole (or as whole as possible) since big part of HP will always have them. My thought is future boards could try to develop new set of covenants with ability to amend.
5. Would the board consider establishing an off-leash dog park within HP? I am thinking of the parcel currently for sale on W. Huntington. No parking spaces should be provided, to discourage non-HP residents from coming and to encourage HP residents to walk pets to the enclosure. The same "at your own risk" signage as the Sandy Creek Park dog exercise area would suffice. This beautiful parcel could also be used as a community garden (flowers and vegetables) and would provide a new source of neighborly interaction. I believe the potential for positive interaction outweighs the potential for negative interaction. *Note: I am not a dog owner, but I would gladly support my dues going toward the purchase or lease of land for a "dog exercise/off-leash park" and for the improvements of fencing, gate and signage to accommodate such a park. If the cost of purchasing the parcel on W. Huntington is prohibitive, would a homeowner on Cleveland Road near the horse pastures consider leasing a small area for an off-leash dog run? Question: On p. e, Exhibit A, Restriction #9 (of covenants), "No exposed above ground tanks will be permitted for storage of fuel, water, or for any other use." Does this include rain barrels? By this, I mean a rain barrel collection container linked to a home gutter system for use in watering outdoor flower beds, shrubs, and plantings. If so, I would propose amending Restriction #9 to explicitly exempt rain collection barrels. Finally, thanks to the

current leadership of HP Homeowners Association for the extraordinary good work you do for our community!

6. Do we have to have a quorum? Also, the property behind our home (140 Eton Court) should be a part of "common area," not our property. It's a spillway for the next street.
7. Cars parked on the street—Is there any way the trash schedule can be fixed—more often, day and time
8. All vehicles belonging to a single household must be parked off the street overnight.
9. There seems to be an unusually large number of cars parked on the street continuously. These cars are more prevalent at night. Two houses on my street average 7 cars per house. (110 Regent Court)

Comments from "No" Voters

1. It just seems to me the county ordinances are very comprehensive.
2. Seems to me that the Athens Clarke Co. Code pretty much covers everything needed to protect our property values.
3. Please consider discussing shrubbery, tree limbs, etc, that encroach onto the street. I have had one antenna ripped from my car when I approached another car on Chesterfield Road but had nowhere to go but to the right side of the street where shrubbery was hanging out into the street. The shrubbery became entangled with the antenna, breaking it off. Thanks!
4. Don't waste the money—county has enough restrictions
5. Adding more covenants might discourage more people not to join the homeowner's association. Even city rules are not enforced well. How would covenants be enforced and what kind of penalties would be given?
6. It seems that if we get in a position of trying to enforce covenants it will create ill will in the neighborhood.
7. Avoid imposing arbitrary rules created by a minority. Retroactive changes should be considered only with great care. Great respect should be exercised in considering rights of others. Many of our neighbors have special needs that must be kept in mind. New regulations should be kept to an absolute minimum. Precisely what is the "problem" to which the previous section refers? Current county ordinances appear to be quite sufficient.
8. I am including a check for \$40 because I don't believe I sent one for membership dues last time.