

LGPOA - COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, June 28, 2007

1. Call to Order / Roll Call:
 - A. Present: Doug Earle / Stu Shafer / Craig Benham
 - B. Absent: None
2. Guests:
 - A. John Donahue, 1210 S. Geneva Drive
 - B. Joe Barbiero, 1114 Schavey
 - C. Tom Hakes, 1506 Waxwing
3. Issues
 - A. Water craft and Beach Issues
 - 1) There was discussion regarding control of trespassers, pets, and other security issues related to the East and West beach parks. It was decided to explore costs for hiring a guard from an agency or a student on an hourly basis. Duties would include courteously verifying that people are members or guests of members using a membership list, asking non-members who are not guests to leave, calling the police if non-members refuse to leave, advising people with dogs that dogs are not permitted and asking them to leave, providing a written report at the end of each day. This person would not have life guard duties. He/she would patrol both parks. Time would include both weekend days and random days during the week, if necessary. Doug will explore MSU student website and Craig will explore costs of an agency. Doug will talk to Brian Vick about these issues, and whether the DeWitt Police are able to patrol in some way.
 - 2) Speed continues to be an issue raising concerns of safety for swimmers and divers, erosion of shoreline, stirring the bottom and thereby creating additional weed problems, and disturbs the peace and quiet. John D. Proposed buying and using buoys marked with Slow - No Wake. The upside is that it would give notice to those who may not know of the no wake rule and remind others. The downside is that it people may not want them in front of their properties, some people could begin using them to swim to, some people may speed around them in their boat. The cost would be about \$200 per buoy. There was some discussion of enforcement alternatives. Most practical would be talking to the boat owners and/or letters to the boat owners. More cumbersome and expensive would be seeking a restraining order. Not practical would be instituting fines or suspension of rights. This matter will be brought to the attention of the Board for further discussion.
 - B. Shed Enforcement Issues
 - 1) There was discussion of the status of the issue. 6 members have signed agreements. 8 members have retained legal counsel and are in discussions with our legal counsel. 13 members have not responded. There was some discussion regarding the possibility of amending the B&UR's. Even if we were able to do that, there would be a possibility of having 5 different B&UR's. If they were amended, how would they be enforced.

- C. Unpaid Dues
 - 1) There was a brief discussion about unpaid dues.
- D. Trailers / Vehicles, etc
 - 1) There was discussion regarding whether the Building and Use Restrictions prohibit trailers, mobile homes, etc to be parked in driveways. The City is responsible for parking or storing on the side and in the back yards off driveways. Provision 3c of the B&UR indicate that trailers, mobile homes, etc, are not permitted for any purpose other than for construction. It would seem that temporary parking for a day or two while in preparation for or after a trip would not be a violation, but long term storage would be a violation. This issue will be brought back before the Board.
- 4. Member Comments
 - A. Joe B. was present to discuss the shed and trailer issues. While Joe is not making any specific complaint, he pointed out that mobile homes are more of an eye sore than sheds.
 - B. Tom H. is a neighbor of Joe B.'s. Tom recently purchased a home, requested approval for a shed, which was denied, and would like a shed. Tom raised the issue of playhouses, but indicated he is not really trying to get rid of them, but to merely raise the issue.
- 5. Adjourn