

Camp Bullis Road Fence Summary

At the 2009 Crownridge annual meeting, a concern was raised by a member re: the appearance of the fences that directly abut Camp Bullis Road. This concern had been raised on multiple occasions since the 1990s. It was suggested that the fences be replaced with an upgraded fence material in order to achieve a more consistent appearance. Because Crownridge does not own these fences, a legal opinion was first obtained to determine whether Crownridge funds could even be used for such a project. As Crownridge is only permitted to use association funds on defined common areas, the Association's attorney suggested that the property owners grant a ten-foot permanent easement to Crownridge along the back of their property. This would enable Crownridge to have the right to build and maintain the fences along Camp Bullis Road. (Note: There is a non-access easement along the lots that back up to Camp Bullis in Walden Heights, Walden Point and Walden Creek. The non-access easement is on the recorded plat for each of these units.)

To clarify, the fences we are referring to are as follows: As you are headed west on Camp Bullis Rd, the project includes those just west of the large drainage culvert on Camp Bullis Road up to Gracy Travel (12 properties on Wittenburg) as well as those just west of La Sierra up to Walden Meadows (7 properties on Arbor Meadow). As you are headed east on Camp Bullis Rd, the 10 fences on Hill Creek that back up to Camp Bullis are also part of this project. (Total of 29 properties; approximately 2,560 linear feet)

The fence committee was formed after the 2010 annual meeting. It was originally composed of 6 members; however, due to time constraints during the day, the bulk of the work and the meetings with contractors, etc. was done by 4 members on the committee. Following is a summary of their research:

Issues addressed:

Cost - Phase I and Phase II, later went to cost per linear foot

Longevity of Materials - material used for fence and columns, removal of foliage, footings and ties required, includes description of connecting materials, dimensions, etc.

Aesthetics - how does the material used meld with the community, variety of looks that can be obtained

Drainage - how will natural drainage be handled through the fence

Maintenance - required, cleaning, ability to clean any and all graffiti

Warranty - materials and workmanship to include footings and ties

Replaceability - due to damage and/or defacement including costs in some cases

Timeliness - how quickly the project will be completed, will it be done in sections and how big are the sections, temp fence and potential for nuisance to homeowner, water from homeowner, staging area needed

Demolition Costs - additional costs such as removal of trees etc. if not covered in cost and extent that may be needed for that particular product

Survey - included, needed?

Referrals - including time in the business, past jobs survey, etc., how the project would be approached (on site management)

Products researched:

Verti Crete - columns and one large panel between made from concrete that are textured and stained to various looks

Fence Crete - concrete columns with slatted panels between columns in a variety of patterns and colors

Sim Tech - Polyethylene panels with galvanized steel tubes

Stone Wall - with and without columns replaced, variety of rock products and patterns, with varying footing requirements

Wood - just replace wood and probably repair/replace columns

Iron - replace wood with iron and repair/replace columns

Contractors were invited to look at the project and present bids. Each contractor spent time with the committee explaining the above areas of concern so that committee could compare each product. The committee also spent time doing independent research on each product, driving by existing projects done by the contractors and checking referrals. In addition, there have been meetings with the association's attorney regarding the easement; calls to the city to determine permit processes; research into property records to determine the correct owners and legal descriptions so the easements could be prepared; preparation of the easements and cover letters; walking the fence lines on numerous occasions to resolve various issues relating to trees and shrubs; discussions with pro bono engineers regarding the possible need for retaining walls; not to mention numerous meetings among the fence committee to review bids and several meetings with the board. An extensive spreadsheet was used initially to view each product versus the areas of concern. It became apparent after viewing the products and comparing the

areas of consideration above that stone was more suited for our purpose, e.g., more flexibility in construction around trees, than the other products and thus the variances within this product were then the focus of research and cost comparison. It goes without saying that hundreds of hours have been spent by the fence committee on this project.

The wall being considered is six feet tall and will be 10-12" thick. It will be constructed of natural limestone/rock, not artificial materials. One of the masons built a sample wall, free of charge on the church property on Summer Oaks. Pictures of the wall have been emailed to residents. The easement prepared by the Association's attorney includes language that the owner of each lot provides water for the construction of the wall. This was done so that the masons would have a source of water at their disposal while they were working on that section of the wall. The fence committee met with the Crownridge Board on January 18, 2011, to present their recommendation that a masonry wall be built. Stone was the committee's recommendation because of durability, maintenance and aesthetics (to coordinate with the existing entryway and the interior monuments, and generally, with the Hill Country look of the area). They also invited two contractors who the committee felt would give the best performance so that the Board would have an opportunity to ask them questions. At the end of the meeting, the Board voted to approve the construction of a masonry wall provided easements for all properties are obtained and several other concerns be adequately addressed.

On March 22, 2011, a blast email asking for your feedback was sent. One purpose of the email was to determine if residents consider the fences to even be an issue. It appears we achieved some balance in our questions since responses ranged from "...Hopefully, this was not an intentional attempt to stack the poll in favor of the fence project..." to "...the negative tone...As written it seems to criticize the people who did speak that night and implies that opposing views were not allowed to be stated. It also appears to be targeted to getting responses from residents that oppose the fence project..." to everything in between. We continue to receive responses to the blast email. Final results have not been tabulated.

Even though we had a record attendance at the 2011 annual meeting, many of you were not able to attend; therefore, the following information is provided in an effort to answer some of your questions:

-leaving the existing stone columns does not defray costs but ironically

would add to the cost of the project. (More than one contractor has confirmed this.) Therefore, the existing columns will be removed. The new columns will be constructed at the property lot lines resulting in a fewer number of columns overall.

-the cost of the masonry project is \$275,000 plus approximately \$10,000 for incidentals, e.g., recording fees. (The random Pena blend is slightly more expensive.)

-approximately \$239,000 is currently invested in CDs. As would be expected, savings eventually get spent on projects; some are more worthy projects than others. Is this one of those?

-some residents pointed out that we do not own the medians and yet we maintain them. (Leaving them for the city to maintain means they might be trimmed 4 times a year.)

- re: the project's effect on assessment: the 2011 assessment is unchanged. Since this project is a one-time project and maintenance is expected to be minimal (e.g., it does not need re-building every few years), finances would be lean until reserves are replenished. Other expenses, e.g., SAWS commercial rates, have increased in the last few months. We cannot promise there would not be an increase in dues.

-Crownridge would carry insurance on the fence; however, if a property owner were to damage the fence, we would pursue restitution.

-Crownridge cannot demand residents build this masonry fence at the individual/private homeowner's expense

-several residents suggested a Camp Bullis fence fund be set up; any money contributed would be solely on a voluntary basis and would be used strictly for construction of said fence

-commercial owners within Crownridge already pay annual assessments based on their membership class. (This is mentioned since some homeowners do not know this. Some had suggested the commercial properties might be interested in donating funds since the project would improve the overall appearance of Camp Bullis and therefore their nearby properties.)