

Meeting held at 9 Oakwood Lane on 15 August 2018 to discuss Hughenden Meadows SRA

Homes represented:

9 Oakwood Lane
lynn@lynnfagg.com

3 Oakwood Lane
leapearse@icloud.com

1 Oakwood Lane
nicholevaughan74@outlook.com

7 Grotto Way
gregson@iafrica.com

11 Grotto Way
grantberndsen@gmail.com

4 Riverwalk
frank@fha.law.za

3 Grotto Way
Robin.alistoun@gmail.com

6 Oakwood Lane
Carla_bath@hillspet.com

Summary:

We are unanimously against our estates inclusion in the proposed SRA. It's important to note that we are however supportive of the creation of a Hughenden Meadows SRA and would like to collaborate to make the SRA a success as we recognize the community benefits of a partnership. If we exclude ourselves from the SRA boundary we could still choose to make a financial contribution to the SRA – but one that we govern. We would like to intervene as a united HOA as fast as possible to allow the Hugheden Meadows SRA proposal to redraw their boundaries to exclude our estate from the council submission and afford the steering committee the opportunity to still get the application in time to implement the SRA from 1 July 2019. This way our objections do not jeopardise the SRA's development.

Our main concerns are:

- 1) The proposed SRA budget is approximately R980 000 to cover 190 homes with the primary focus being on security. Our levy budget comes to a similar amount but only cover 30 homes. This budget cannot meaningfully improve security.
- 2) The SRA is only as good as its steering committee or trustees. If they become dysfunctional after it's passed we are only 30 homes of 190 and may be unable to make meaningful changes in the management of funds but would be forced to continue paying. Penzance and Mount Rhodes are examples of SRA's who've not achieved their objectives. As soon as we join an SRA we lose control of how our funds are spent.
- 3) Our HOA and levies cover off many of the proposed security & beautification projects being proposed and we've worked hard to achieve this already.

- 4) The SRA will not help us get a new road access and residents should not be tempted to vote for the SRA for this reason.
- 5) An SRA is able to raise special levies based on a majority of attendees voting in favour at a special meeting. The concern around this is that levies can be increased with little control. This occurred in the Llandudno SRA where all the resident's levies increased by a multiple of 7 when their SRA called for a special security levy and there was a majority show of hands at a meeting attended. There was no recourse.
- 6) It seems reasonable to assume that the security concerns will be focused on those in greatest need – which would not be our residents. Based on the higher values of our properties it seems we're being included to fund areas of greater needs (21% of the money raised will come from our estate, however it's unlikely a fifth of the funds would be directed at our homes which make up 15% of the homes already in a far better security position)
- 7) Residents with houses for sale are experiencing objections to levies and there is concern that further increases could jeopardise resale value.
- 8) It was raised that it's important for trustees to ensure that when there are potential talks on community / neighbourhood projects that they are involving residents early and are in fact representing the majority opinion.

Forward Actions:

We would like the trustees to hold a special meeting or to have a round robin voting process as per the borehole vote to gauge the resident's opinion on the SRA proposal. If the majority are against our estate's inclusion then we would like the HOA to formally object to the SRA steering committee allowing them time to redraw their boundaries to exclude our estate in the council submission and still submit the application in time to commence the SRA by 1 July 2019