

**Pawnee Hills Community Association  
Covenant Committee  
FINAL RESULTS**

**112 surveys returned as of May 17, 2006**

***1. Check the facilities used by anyone in your home:***

<b>tennis court</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>multi-purpose court</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>swimming pool</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>clubhouse</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>horse barn</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>riding arena</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>equestrian trails</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>sauna/steam room</b>	<b>32</b>

- can't use no handicap access
- what is the point to this question
- pool: 1 x in 13 years
- clubhouse: 1 x in 13 years
- pool: rarely
- clubhouse: rarely
- equestrian trails: for walking
- would lights at courts help or hinder. Kids could play bball or tennis on summer evenings. Would direct neighbors object?
- None. And we don't believe that maintaining these antiquated facilities adds to the value of our home. Sell off the money pits!
- Never have, never will
- Tennis court (upper west): Tear it out
- Horse barn: sell it
- Riding arena: sell it
- Clubhouse: once in awhile
- Riding arena: very limited use
- Equestrian trails: very limited use
- Pool: too cold
- Swimming pool: 10 times
- Sauna/steam room: 3 times
- Horse barn: never; not usable!
- Equestrian trails: please post map at mailboxes

***2. Should a revision to Article VI, Paragraph 1 regarding structures be revised (clarified for exact numbers / sizes of structures allowed)?***

<b>yes</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>no</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>no opinion</b>	<b>15</b>

- are you asking that the article be revised or clarified
- ("clarified" underlined on survey)
- I've heard interpretations from 2 to 5 buildings. Why have a restriction at all?
- This would be good because 1) the board could control the size, color, and the look of the buildings and 2) then all the owner possessions should be put inside of the building so all the neighbors don't have to look at them.
- More than 1 barn should be allowed if approved structure
- ("clarified" underlined on survey)
- ("clarified" underlined on survey)

**3. Should Article VI, Paragraph 7 regarding livestock/animals be revised (change the number of and type of animals allowed)?**

<b>yes</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>no</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>no opinion</b>	<b>5</b>

- Maybe
- Goats are great companion animals for horses – recognized by equestrians everywhere except here.
- Why do you continue to propose this? This is stupid and will lower our home's values.
- Yes to other animals
- Less is better! Less dust, noise, erosion, flies, traffic, water use, odors, eyesores, property value loss. You want more animals? Support the wildlife!
- !!
- (“number of” underlined) No
- (“type of animals” underlined) clarified

**4. Which of the following animals would you consider allowing in Pawnee Hills?**

<b>alpaca</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>fowl</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>goat</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>sheep</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>horses</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>llama</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>donkey</b>	<b>62</b>

- any
- equine family
- horses are currently allowed. Perhaps change “horse” to “equine”
- small penned as long as OK with neighbors
- all above plus cattle in small numbers
- aren't donkeys equines? Why would they be different from a horse?
- fowl: peacocks? Turkeys? Pheasants? Please define
- no sheep no pigs no cattle
- 4-H only
- All of these are acceptable – adopt the county policy of animal units for numbers
- dogs, cats
- mule
- no roosters
- just limit how many
- miniature cows
- mule
- cows, or anything else people like as long as it is with county regulations
- chickens
- dogs, cats
- burro
- cow
- rabbits
- horses only
- cows
- rabbit
- mules
- dogs and cats
- cattle – 4-H projects – limited #
- bison
- chickens

**5. Should there be a restrictive number of driveways; ex: 1, 2, 3, 4 (Article VI, Paragraph3) as allowed by Elbert County definition?**

<b>yes</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>no</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>no opinion</b>	<b>13</b>

- ("2" circled on survey)
- use county guidelines ("Elbert County definition" underlined on survey)
- circles are fine. Access to barns OK. Not across others property. Like us
- ("1" circled on survey) ("Elbert County definition" underlined on survey)
- ("Elbert County definition" underlined on survey)
- ("1" circled on survey)
- ("2" circled on survey)
- No more restrictive than Elbert County ("Elbert County definition" underlined on survey)
- Who really cares!
- ("2" circled on survey)
- No limit on driveways as all lots are different
- ("?" by question on survey)
- Horse trailers require large turning areas
- ("Elbert County" underlined on survey)
- Should just be monitored to look good

**6. Should Article VI, Paragraph 11 addressing temporary structures be revised to allow, ex: existing A-Frame homes; temporary occupation of motor homes?**

<b>yes</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>no</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>no opinion</b>	<b>15</b>

- this is two different questions
- maybe What defines temporary? 1 week? 30 days?
- visitors should be allowed a rotating schedule but not to exceed x amount of days
- ("yes" with arrow pointing to A-Frame homes; "no" with arrow pointing to motor homes)
- I don't understand this? Seems like something is missing.
- These properties are large enough to allow for visitors in RV's.
- ("revised", "existing", "temporary" underlined on survey)

**7. An amendment to the By-Laws (Article XIII) was approved by homeowners in 1998. Some of the paragraphs in the By-Law disagree with covenants. The covenants are the higher authority and take precedence. Should the covenants be amended to agree with Article XIII of the By-Laws?**

- #7 is confusing
- NO
- NO – do not change covenants
- Yes

**Fences. (Section 2, of Article VI) No barbed wire fences shall be allowed. No chain link fences shall be allowed except for dog runs. The maximum height of any fence shall be six feet (6'). No solid fencing shall be allowed on the perimeter of the property.**

<b>yes</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>no</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>no opinion</b>	<b>8</b>

- leave above "as is"
- not as written here

- suggestion – allow 8' fences around garden areas
- no barbed wire!
- Keep
- Is this in by-laws or covenants?
- (“no barbed wire...”) – good thing
- (“no chain link...”) – OK
- (“maximum height...”) - ?
- (“no solid fencing...”) - ?
- What is wrong with chain link?

**Livestock.** (Section 7, of Article VI) *Zoning for Pawnee Hills is RA-1, and County Regulations provide the containment area (corral) shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of the gross lot acreage or one-half (1/2) acre, whichever is less.*

<b>yes</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>no</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>no opinion</b>	<b>14</b>

- what ever works so overgrazing does not occur
- keep
- is this in by-laws or covenants?
- (“County Regulations” underlined on survey)
- This should be clarified – what about riding areas on your own property – combined open?

**Trees.** (Section 8, of Article VI) *Minor pruning and trimming are to be done at the discretion of the homeowner*

<b>yes</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>no</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>no opinion</b>	<b>3</b>

- should be All pruning be done at discretion of homeowner
- (“at the discretion of the homeowner” underlined on survey)
- Keep
- Does the county have any control of this in relation to fire hazard?

**Landscaping.** (Section 9, of Article VI) *Improved lawns of an area up to 1,600 square feet are allowed if approved by the Well Permit. The preferred types of grasses shall include: Fescue, Buffalograss, Grama, Wheatgrass, Bromes, Clover, and Rye.*

<b>yes</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>no</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>no opinion</b>	<b>11</b>

- types of grasses should be cultivars that use less water. Which could include Blue grasses
- opinion is not to exceed 1600 sf. Water, or lack of, will not be an option some day. Conserve now!
- How would you ever enforce this?
- What????? Don't know what you are saying!
- Improvements are good for the community! If the well permit allows why discourage this?
- keep
- Who will check the well permit? Some dopes still plant Kentucky Bluegrass!
- (“preferred” underlined on survey)

**Commercial Activity.** (Section 13, of Article VI) All activities in the common areas shall be for a resident's personal use and / or training of an animal. No commercial activities in the common areas shall be approved. No business signs shall be permitted on any structure and non free-standing business signs shall be erected on any lot.

*Home occupations shall only be allowed as permitted by Elbert County Regulations, Section 23, page 153, which is attached to these Bylaws and incorporated herein by reference. (Section 23 of the Elbert County Regulations concerning home occupations are attached to these Bylaws and incorporated by reference herein.)*

**Elbert County Regulations, Section 23, page 153 HOME OCCUPATIONS**

**A. Intent**

*To provide for the operation of limited commercial activities (such as tutoring, music lessons, artist studios, etc.) within established residential zones.*

**B. Permitted Home Occupations**

*A home occupation shall be allowed as a permitted use in all residential zones provided that:*

- 1. Such use shall be conducted only by the residents of the principal dwelling and only within the principal dwelling. (No detached accessory structures will be allowed.)*
- 2. Such use shall be clearly incidental and secondary to the use of the dwelling as dwelling unit and shall not change the character thereof.*
- 3. The total area utilized for such purposes shall not exceed one-half (1/2) of the first floor area of the principal dwelling.*
- 4. There shall be no exterior advertising of the home occupation.*
- 5. There shall be only limited and incidental sale of products made by the residents and conducted on the premises.*
- 6. There shall be no outside storage on the premises of materials or equipment used in connection with the home occupation.*
- 7. There shall be no excessive or offensive noise, vibration, smoke, dust, odors, heat, glare or light noticeable or extending beyond the property.*
- 8. Home occupations shall not generate traffic which significantly affects the residential character of an area.*
- 9. The Board of County Commissioners shall determine which activities other than those listed, are compatible with this section, and shall proceed in conformance with Part II, Section 18 of these regulations.*
- 10. The occupant shall provide parking needed and not deface the neighborhood.*

<b>yes</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>no</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>no opinion</b>	<b>8</b>

- leave "as is"
- also the activities from the Apr 14 1976 covenants Article VI section1
- keep as is (arrow pointing to printed text)
- unclear again. What is yes and what is no??? Business signs are OK! Commercial activities OK! Just go with the county regulations and than there won't be an issue!
- Keep
- Agree with this (arrow pointing to Elbert County regs)
- This should be on a case by case basis – approval like building structures

### General Comments:

- get rid of HOA
- Good idea on survey. I work early, my day starts at 3:00 a.m. If I come to meetings, I'm the sleeper in the back row.
- Let's be reasonable, live and let live, remember that we live in a rural area for a reason, and put the lawyer fees to a better use.
- Our covenants are terrible, vague, unenforceable, and out of compliance with several Colorado statutes. Why not adopt a completely new set. Re-writing these won't help. Take the results of this survey and shop around. Look for recent covenants that were written with the new laws in mind. What does Wild Pointe have, for instance?
- This is poorly put together and confusing. You need to show both the existing wordings of covenant and amendment.
- Poor work for all the time it took. Little bit more effort please!!!
- Thanks to the committee for taking this on. Hoping for positive results and homeowner's cooperation.
- Maybe?? – all owners could pay a flat fee of ~\$30 per month for “clubhouse facilities” upkeep. Then those that actually want to use the facilities could pay additional fees for use????? P.S. Keep up the good work you're doing!
- Everyone mind their own business! How about let's dissolve the association, sell all assets, divide money between homeowners --- all bull will stop. Set up fees for the people who use facilities. Is our property values any higher than Cimarron? Come on. We're considering moving out to a location without an association.
- We moved here many years ago because it was an Equestrian community with restrictive covenants. These are only 5 acre lots, not ranches. Why would you move to a community like this, without reading the covenants first, (or choosing to ignore them) and not expect conflict?
- (written on envelope) Where is my stamped envelope. Can't read return address? Spend \$2.00 for ink
- Barn is not useable as is; is more of a fire hazard – area could be better used!
- The covenants are outdated – this subdivision can come together and make it work for everyone with some new guidelines in place – re: livestock, home businesses, outbuildings, fencing, driveways – too much effort being wasted with fighting.