

**Q1 Section 1.2 Intent.** It is the intent of this Declaration to protect and enhance the value, desirability, and attractiveness of the Subdivision as a low-density, residential, quality-oriented community of approximately 200 single-family lots whose development and use are covenant controlled. Restrictions are kept to a minimum while keeping in constant focus the right of lot owners to enjoy their property in attractive surroundings free of nuisances, undue noise, and danger. Further, it is intended that the natural environment be disturbed as little as possible. (Compare to Section 1 of current covenants)

Answered: 75 Skipped: 3

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
I would vote YES to this section	68% 51
I would vote NO to this section	32% 24
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>75</b>

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	The additional wording breaks up the continuity and cohesiveness of the original text. The phrase "quality-oriented community" is highly subjective and open to widely contrasting interpretations.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
2	I am generally not opposed to this outside of the "quality-oriented community" section. It is not abundantly clear what the intent of this statement is and what quality refers to. High/low quality of what? Humans, nature, economy, etc. It is too vague and open to individual interpretation.	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
3	One of the reasons we bought here in Silverheels is because we understood it to be a residential community filled with neighbors who were focused on preserving the beauty of South Park/Silverheels.	3/7/2023 12:44 PM
4	This is the most critical and fundamental statement in the entire Covenants document, and is therefore appropriately referenced explicitly or implicitly several times throughout. It defines the type of neighborhood that all current Owners intended to live in when they bought their lots here. The details in red should be uncontroversial to anyone who doesn't want to radically change what this community is and has been for more than 40 years.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
5	This questionnaire is far, far too long.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
6	I'm tentatively opposed to the "single-family lot" words, as unnecessary over-specification. Homeowners could apply to the county for a "guest house" with the zoning and that should be the right of the homeowner. I agree with everything else.	3/5/2023 8:00 PM
7	The word "approximately " is ambiguous , and the words "covenant controlled" are leading.	3/5/2023 6:54 PM
8	I don't see why this section was changed basically just to add the total # of lots. But	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
9	Quality oriented is such a subjective term. This ties back to the idea of the ACC needing to control other people's homes. Why aren't the county regulations sufficient? We already know you can't subdivide the lots, we don't need subjective terms like "quality-oriented". Stop trying to control everyone's aesthetic.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
10	This is why I purchased property in Silverheels....I wanted a single family, covenant controlled community where I know my neighbors.	2/28/2023 10:05 AM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

11	I would like to highlight the "restrictions are kept to minium" which is not true and far from true! Especially this document is clearly designed to be very restrictive which is completely opposite with that sentence.	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
12	I don't agree. Restrictions are not kept to a minimum. Also, quality-oriented community is a snotty statement. We are a mountain/country/RURAL area.	2/25/2023 5:14 PM
13	Objectives / Goals, with no measurable feedback.	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
14	generally OK, but since this section is the most critical as is defines the overriding principle of the document it isn't fit for purpose as currently amended. Specifically, stating SR is exclusively "residential" makes it a sleeping place only. Agree with the intent, but stating residential explicitly excludes any work-from-home activity - even if it is office work from a computer i.e. an activity that is commercial in any sense. How would anyone checking emails in the evening fit this rule? There is a clarification attempted with the intention of Section 3.7 but this should be to explain what is possible, the overarching principle shouldn't need annulling by a subsequent by-law. We think it is better not to use the term "residential" here so as to avoid ambiguities. instead, use a different, less restrictive term, or just delete "residential" since it is implied by the term "Single Family". Explicitly NOT restricting low impact commercial activities such as work-from-home and craft like activities (e.g. home woodworker selling chain-saw bears; an artist with their own studio; a candle maker etc. etc. I.e activities that someone could do as a hobby and turn that into a business. If they grow/expand to a full-scale endeavour, that should be restricted and made to move outside the community, as should any retail operation within SR. This is what should be, and is, covered by Section 3.7.	2/19/2023 2:07 PM
15	I see no reason for the ARC, we already have enough rules and regulations with the country! We need to keep restrictions to a minimum! People move to Park county to get away from the city requirements, and ridiculousness! We do not need more covenant controls. We purchased in Silver Hills to reading the original covenants. They seemed like they were a little more relaxed which is what we wanted. It is private property and I don't believe the ARC should have control as to what people do on their own property.	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
16	Original covenants are fine.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
17	Remove "as a low-density, residential, quality-oriented community of approximately 200 single-family lots whose development and use are covenant controlled. " Not necessary - excess wording. Keep to original intent.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
18	New state law CCIOA includes severe and costly reporting requirements as protections from very large corporate run HOAs and it is important to state that SROA meets criteria and intent to remain a small and limited expense planned communities. The HOA covenants are an agreement between members to regulate and govern the association to meet the HOA intent as stated in the covenants. "Restrictions are kept to a minimum while keeping in constant focus the right of Lot Owners to enjoy their property in attractive surroundings free of nuisances, undue noise, and danger." Covenants provide the framework of what member can and cannot do with a focus on the intent. Bylaws are used to provide rules on how the HOA operates (e.g. Duties of the Board of Directors). The covenants are commitments between the members and not about powers of the Board. The environment in which the covenants exist (current laws, social norms, and technology) changes, and therefore covenants need to be periodically updated. The SNACC started with a draft version of covenants put together by a firm that specializes in and understands current best practices for HOAs. Best practices are not a menu of options and need to be taken as a whole. Anyone taking a survey should be aware that the articles and sections were the result of much discussion and compromise and these items cannot stand alone. All items are in this document for a purpose as a part of a complete document. This document should not be voted on in pieces but in total where there will be some give and take from everyone.	2/11/2023 4:30 PM
19	This is non-controversial and reflects our current covenants.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
20	This keeps restrictions on single lot owners to a minimum. But it also protects the rights of neighbors from lot owners who choose to engage in disruptive or dangerous activities	2/11/2023 11:43 AM
21	This is the most important section of the Covenants. Especially "the right of lot owners to enjoy their property in attractive surroundings free of nuisances, undue noise, and danger."	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
22	We bought our lot 30 yrs ago and were finally able to afford to build just 10 yrs ago, something that was the completion of our dream. We were attracted to the development because of the	2/10/2023 6:47 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

beauty and tranquility of the area. We had dealt with neighbors in the city who had no concern for the effect their trash, broken-down vehicles, loud vehicle repair, motorcycle use, etc. had on our lives. We did not want, and could not afford, a gated community with an over-abundance of covenants that dictated our actions. We did want some place where all residents respected the rights of each other, took responsibility for the health and safety of their property, and recognized their part in maintaining the beauty and tranquility of where they lived.

---

23	Don't like the 'covenant controlled" language.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
----	--	------------------

---

**Q2 Section 2.1 Improvements Defined; Building Permit Required.**  
**“Improvements” are defined as all structures now or hereafter located on a Lot, or exterior modifications to any such structures. A building permit must be obtained from Park County prior to construction of any Improvement, unless specifically exempted by Park County ordinances or regulations.**  
**(Compare to Section 3 of current covenants)**

Answered: 78 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	62%	48
I would vote NO to this section	38%	30
TOTAL		78

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	I think we need to clarify whether the ARC needs to approve Improvements that do not require a building permit, such as structures less than 200 sq. ft.	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
2	Current Section 3 is much more detailed and informative.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
3	Improvement is defined too broadly since "exterior modification" could be any number of innocuous things (e.g., basic repair to return a structure to original condition).	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
4	We think it's important to require building permits to ensure that anything built is safe for the individual and the community.	3/7/2023 12:44 PM
5	This is in compliance with the county. I think this needs to have measurement requirements A small tack shed does not need to have HOA approval. Take out "any such structures".	3/7/2023 9:20 AM
6	This definition makes clear that the Covenants are only concerned with structures and not things like gardens, plants, rocks, and the like.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
7	Bugger off. The covenants do not need to reproduce existing government requirements; this is just nosey neighbors wanting to reinforce Karen-like behavior. This adds no value.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
8	Current language is sufficient.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
9	The way this was written in regards to improvements, I have a problem with it.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
10	Fencing, major landscaping (i.e. retaining walls) should be included in this ARC review as well.	2/22/2023 11:24 AM
11	too broad a right. This is a carte-blanche oversight, even down to, for example, new/repainted gutters. Keep the original or at most rephrase to be for "major" modifications, where "major" is defined to be along the lines of - "substantive changes affecting > XX% of the Improvements' surface area or volume to the form, usage or appearance of said Improvement". If concerned of "change by a thousand cuts" add a section that covers "when the total changes to an improvement differ from the ARC approved state by greater than XX%, the structure must gain re-approval or SOME/ALL such changes become subject to removal and restoration back to the approved state - make this a really big, bad stick.	2/19/2023 2:07 PM
12	I see no need for the ARC to get involved in this when the county can take care of it. The HOA/or ARC does not need to be policing its own residents!	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
13	Original covenants are fine. We think the second sentence “A building permit...or regulations.” is fine addition.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
14	This definition includes fences and general maintenance such as repainting or roofing of your home with the same color paint or material. Doing general maintenance on your home or	2/13/2023 8:10 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

putting up a fence should not be an improvement that requires ARC approval.

15	Approval by local board (ARC) would be sufficient.	2/13/2023 3:57 PM
16	Informative and important to include.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
17	I would like a definition of structure, is a deck a structure?	2/10/2023 7:00 PM
18	Just like the original covenants, all structures must be approved by ACC/ARC.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
19	Is a fence considered an improvement? Is it a structure?	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
20	Exterior modifications is too vast.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM

**Q3 Section 2.2 Easements.** The Subdivision is subject to certain easements identified in the Plats, including any amendments to the Plats. Such easements shall be and remain appurtenant to and shall pass with the title to the Lots, subject to any restrictions and rights set forth in these Covenants. Within these easements, no Improvement shall be placed or permitted to remain which may damage or interfere with the use of the easements for their intended purposes. (Compare to Section 5 of current covenants)

Answered: 76 Skipped: 2

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	71%	54
I would vote NO to this question	29%	22
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>76</b>

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	This legalese rambling is stated more plainly in current Section 5.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
2	"Plats" and "amendments to the Plats" is overly broad and therefore not sufficiently clear. Original document specifies "recorded plat". Furthermore, how is the "intended purposes" of the easements known? This seems open to interpretation and subjective judgment rather than being clearly defined.	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
3	This is informational - it only states what the law is anyway. It highlights the existence and impact of the easements that may not otherwise be known or understood by Owners.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
4	The breadth of potential improvements to easements has not been fully considered and this revision does not allow them to be addressed. For example, the addition of power, gas, or telco lines in the easement.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
5	as on the recorded Subdivision plats.	3/5/2023 1:04 PM
6	Setting aside some wording differences, I felt it said the same as the original section, and I felt this with a lot of the sections and wonder about the time spent on all this was necessary.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
7	No evidence of sidewalks- and utilities are either overhead or underground??	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
8	I believe the ARC does not need to get involved in this. If someone wants to file for an a variance or an adjustment on their own lot, and the county approves it, I believe it should be allowed. This does not need to be a hard set rule. It needs to be a case-by-case basis.	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
9	Park county already regulates this	2/16/2023 6:35 PM
10	Original covenants are fine.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
11	already addressed	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
12	Must be in our covenants and this section's inclusion in this survey is unnecessary.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
13	Easements cannot be altered by the whim of a lotowner	2/11/2023 11:43 AM
14	This is legal boilerplate and does not need to be in the survey.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
15	Better explanation than the existing covenants	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
16	Although it is unnecessarily wordy.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM



**Q4 Section 2.7 Architectural Review Committee – Purpose. The Architectural Review Committee (“ARC”) exists to assure, through review of Owners’ overall design and placement of proposed Improvements, as well as conformity of actual construction to the proposed design and placement, that the Subdivision shall continue to uphold the Intent of these Covenants as expressed in Section 1.2. (Compare to Section 2a of current covenant)**

Answered: 77 Skipped: 1

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	55%	42
I would vote NO to this section	45%	35
TOTAL		77

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	While the idea of an ARC is valid and appropriate for SROA I worry about the actual process of determining "conformity of actual construction to the proposed design". Take siding for instance. If during construction the homeowner decides - for esthetic or cost reasons - to change the siding from something rather green to something rather brown or white or red, would the ARC determine it was non-conforming? And who on the ARC will be monitoring this conformity and how often and with the owner's knowledge, fore-warning, and so forth? It's a tough issue.	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
2	Current Section 2 addresses the purpose, composition, authority and procedures of the ARC in a more concise and cohesive manner. The proposed changes create multiple sections containing more restrictions.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
3	The statement, "as well as conformity of actual construction to the proposed design and placement" should be clarified so the purpose of the ARC is to assure proposed improvements as opposed to existing structures.	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
4	I would ask, who is upholding the conformity to the proposed design? This was not seemingly the case when our neighbor constructed his barn-dominium using materials that are not congruent with the environment. Their structure literally becomes blinding when sunlight reflects off of the metal. Our ability to be in our yard when the sun hits the metal structure is absolutely impacted. How does "the Subdivision"actually uphold the intent of the covenants? We will now have to construct something to block the glare.	3/7/2023 12:52 PM
5	Part of keeping our neighborhood looking as beautiful as it does right now is ensuring that new owners/builders maintain certain standards, and the ARC has the ability to guide and instruct on our covenants and vision for the neighborhood.	3/7/2023 12:44 PM
6	Stop policing the owners.	3/7/2023 9:20 AM
7	The Covenants Committee spent hours discussing and working on this definition of the role of the ARC. It defines and limits the role of the ARC in a reasonable and fair way. It sets more limits on the role of the ARC than some ACCs in the past may have tried to exercise.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
8	The ARC and other residents of the community do not get to veto my design or ensure that it conforms to plans. Not your job. You are not a government, you're neighbors that want a say in what I do to my property.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
9	Park County regulations are sufficient.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
10	Again the wording spent on improvements again and again, I have problems with it.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM



SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

11	We do not believe we need an ARC at all. The county regulations should be sufficient. Lot owners should be responsible for following the rules and regulations as set out by the county. The ACC/ARC has been nothing but inconsistent and ineffective. Neighbors likes the Burghardt's who clearly have money to spend should not have any input in what someone who is trying to build affordably can do on their lot. We are sick of the entitled behavior as housing is a fundamental human need.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
12	The ARC should be applauded for their work.....we need an ARC....	2/28/2023 10:05 AM
13	We are small mountain community and we should not be a subject to ARC. No need to enforce big city perspective onto our small rural community. Resolve the ARC. Everyone is on 5 acres and more and no need to control everyone and everything.	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
14	I do not agree with the ARC. Neighbors policing neighbors. The County has a process and is the authority.	2/25/2023 5:14 PM
15	I do not believe the ARC has any right to tell me where I can put a building on my property! I do not believe the ARC has the right to tell me what kind of house I can build! As long as the county approves it, it should be allowed.	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
16	I believe this should be controlled by the Park County building department.	2/16/2023 6:35 PM
17	Too wordy and too much control to the ARC. We all bought our lots/homes to get away from the city rules, let's get rid of the ACC/ARC and possibly the HOA.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
18	Park County's building codes are fairly strict. Silverheels has a large mix of homes that are of every color, size, shape, and materials - it is part of the neighborhood charm. Everyone has likes and dislikes when it comes to designs and colors. The County ensures that the placement of the home is within county regulations re: well, septic, and easements. I do not feel that it appropriate for one neighbor to tell another neighbor what they can and can't build on their property.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
19	I don't think we need an "ARC". We have sufficient over seeing by the Park County Building and Planning Department.	2/12/2023 8:58 PM
20	A straightforward and reasonable description of the ARC's purpose. Architectural committees are part of practically every HOA for a reason.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
21	This could be very restrictive depending on who is on the committee and their individual beliefs of conformity.	2/10/2023 7:00 PM
22	ARC is crucial to maintaining property values. Much of Park County shows what happens without it - Flag Man anyone?	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
23	We believe that the Board should have some support for the management of growth in our development. Referring back to our comments in 1.2 Intent, we KNOW that not all people will take responsibility to recognize the rights of others, but will feel compelled to do as they please no matter the consequences their neighbors must suffer.	2/10/2023 6:47 PM
24	It is extremely important this section includes the conformity of actual construction language. Without oversight as to conformity the committee will be hamstrung by noncompliant Improvements.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
25	Just need stated color and easements. No need for review. Follow Park County building codes.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
26	"As well as conformity...." Seems like you intend the ARC to police the entire construction phase as well.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
27	the only reason i vote 'no' is because of some of the obviously odd building recently constructed i In full view of all as the main property is entered. possibly a mental institution or a drug rehab center...how this happen? integrity out the window.	2/6/2023 11:58 PM
28	was this word from the question above meant to be "thorough"? "through review of Owners"	2/6/2023 7:05 PM

**Q5 Section 2.8 Architectural Review Committee - Composition.** The ARC shall consist of three members, with staggered terms of three years each, with at least one position to be elected by SROA Members each year at the Annual Meeting. Any vacancy of a position on the ARC that occurs between Annual Meetings shall be filled by the Board, choosing among available candidates after issuing a request to all SROA Members for volunteers; provided, however, that: (i) the filled position shall be temporary, lasting only until the next Annual Meeting, when an election for the position shall be held to cover the remainder of its term, and (ii) a Board member may not temporarily fill a vacant position on the ARC unless no other volunteers have been identified. An ARC member may be removed from office before the end of his or her term by a vote of the SROA Members at an Annual Meeting or a special meeting. (Compare to Section 2b current covenants)

Answered: 78 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	62%	48
I would vote NO to this section	38%	30
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>78</b>

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	I would rather see an ARC with only two members instead of allowing a Board member to occupy a vacated seat. To wit: (ii) a Board member may not temporarily or permanently fill a vacant position on the ARC.	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
2	Power to replace ARC vacancies should continue to reside with the remaining members of the ARC as opposed to giving additional power to the Board. Further, "vote" for removal of an ARC member should be better defined. How many/what percentage SROA Members are required to vote an ARC member out?	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
3	This makes clear that ARC members are elected by the Owners, rather than selected by the Board. It also clearly defines details of ARC members' terms, how vacancies are to be filled, and how removal can be achieved. None of these details exist in the current covenants; providing these details should be helpful to all of us.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
4	Immaterial, if we sufficiently disempower the Karens.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
5	See above.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
6	NO ARC	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
7	We need an ARC.....is important! They have done a great job!	2/28/2023 10:05 AM
8	See above. No need for ARC in our small RURAL community. If I wanted other people to control my life I would live in front range.	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
9	Rephrase: "before the end of his or her term by" to be: "before the end of their term by" since "his or her" imposes a binary designation that is no longer appropriate	2/19/2023 2:07 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

10	I don't believe our neighbors should tell other neighbors what color, style of home they should build Or how they should improve their property.	2/16/2023 6:35 PM
11	Get rid of the ACC/ARC.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
12	I don't think an ARC is necessary so would vote no.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
13	Voting no on the ARC so don't need composition of members .	2/12/2023 8:58 PM
14	It's misleading to highlight the entirety of this section in red, as it reflects our current covenants (e.g. 3 ARC members and 3-year terms) and with thoughtful updates.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
15	Terms of service on the ARC has not been in writing before, it's always been much more informal. This layers a good foundation for rotation in the ARC, a process to fill vacanted positions, and a process to remove unsatisfactory members	2/11/2023 11:43 AM
16	These guidelines will allow for change within the ARC when the majority of the membership feels change is needed.	2/10/2023 6:47 PM
17	Just need stated color and easements. No need for review. Follow Park County building codes.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
18	Over complicated process in my opinion.	2/6/2023 7:05 PM

**Q6 Section 2.9 Owner’s Preliminary Informal Communication with ARC; Owner’s Formal Application to ARC; Required Review by ARC.** a. An Owner considering the possibility of constructing any Improvement on the Owner’s Lot is strongly encouraged to review the ARC section of the Association’s website and then communicate on an early, preliminary, and informal basis with the ARC for comments or suggestions related to conformity with these Covenants. Any such comments or suggestions do not constitute actionable advice regarding Park County ordinances, regulations, or requirements; the Owner must obtain such advice from the Owner’s architect, contractor, or other professional consultant. (This section is new and not in current covenants) b. Except as otherwise stated below, no Improvement shall be constructed, placed, applied, installed, or modified on any Lot, unless a complete application for the Improvement (“Application”) has first been submitted to and approved, or conditionally approved, in writing by the ARC. The Application shall include all site plans (including size, proposed location, and location of any existing structures), exterior elevations where applicable, and all exterior materials and colors pertaining to the Improvement. Floor plans and construction details (i.e., engineered drawings) are not required. (Compare to Section 2c current covenants) c. The color scheme for any Improvement shall be compatible with the natural environment of the Subdivision. Predominant colors in natural or earth tones, with accent colors complementary to the predominant colors, are acceptable. (Compare to Section 2c current covenants) d. The ARC shall have the authority to approve, disapprove, or conditionally approve an Application by a majority vote of its members, using its reasonable good-faith judgment. (Compare to Section 2c current covenants)

Answered: 78 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	50%	39
I would vote NO to this section	50%	39
TOTAL		78

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	We need ARC recommendations that allow us to avoid another "Motel 6" Improvement from being approved and built. Perhaps in addition to considering color and structural elevations the	3/10/2023 1:41 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

ARC could also evaluate an Improvement's "proposed location" and how it would be compatible with the natural environment of the subdivision. Numerous Silverheels properties are visible from throughout the subdivision but do not stand out because of their appropriate elevation and color choice. If we are going to have Covenants and an ARC to protect the esthetics of the Subdivision we ought to find a way to prevent an eyesore from being erected.

2	This makes the application process more complicated.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
3	ARC should make the recommendation to the BOD to approve, disapprove or conditionally improve...	3/8/2023 2:32 PM
4	b. Will there be a formal application for residents to use? The new language doesn't sufficiently clarify the current application requirements and in some cases makes it more difficult to understand. For example, "exterior elevations where applicable" vs. "topography and to finished grade elevation". To the layperson, it is not clear what this is referring to. Elevation of what? The structure, improvement, or land itself? c. The existing covenants are clear enough by defining what natural or earth colors are; however, the new language of "compatible with the natural environment" leaves the decision completely subjective (i.e., all colors occur naturally in the environment so who is to say what is compatible).	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
5	Stop policing	3/7/2023 9:20 AM
6	The details provided here are intended to set out a clear, speedy, and fair process for moving forward with a proposed Improvement. It emphasizes the benefit of early and informal interaction between the owner and the ARC before the actual application is filed. Present and former ACC members have explained that informal and early communication has been the key to successful applications many times.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
7	There is no need for this section of the Covenant at all. Remember that only covens need covenants.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
8	See above.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
9	Oh geez...	3/5/2023 6:54 PM
10	To much total control.	3/5/2023 1:04 PM
11	The committee has spent too much time on repetitive sections especially pertaining to improvements,when the original section appeared to be good enough.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
12	NO ARC	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
13	no need for this.	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
14	There are too many unknowns - it sounds like power could be too easily abused	2/21/2023 11:18 AM
15	The simple wording and instructions located under Dwellings and Locations allows a DIYer to easily maintain compliance with the actual or implied oversight.	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
16	A - why MUST an owner obtain professional advice to become in compliance with Park County regulations? If they can become compliant without hiring someone, why MUST they? Rephrase to be "It is recommended that the owner obtains such advice..." B - similar to 2.1, this is too broad an allotment of control. Painting a different earth colour needs approval. Hmm, can't agree to that. Needs to be more specific on the scale of what is acceptable. If concerned of "change by a thousand cuts" add the section recommended for 2.1 and make it very draconian C- OK D - see B, also here's the draconian stick	2/19/2023 2:07 PM
17	The only change I would vote yes, for is the way paint colors section was reworded! Everything else I disagree with. We do not need an ARC. That is why we have a County!	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
18	I don't believe our neighbors should tell other neighbors what color, style of home they should build Or how they should improve their property.	2/16/2023 6:35 PM
19	Way too many words and rules. Get rid of the ACC/ARC.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
20	I think Park County Building codes are enough and do not feel we need an ARC.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
21	after members, insert (2 of 3).	2/13/2023 3:57 PM
22	We should not be relying on a committee with no experience telling lot owners that have paid good money for their property what style, color, size or placement should be. This is why we	2/12/2023 8:42 AM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

have County regulations and a Building Department. What may be right for you may not be right for me.

23	This section provides a clear course of action for owners considering construction of any improvement on their lot, as well as for current and future ARC members.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
24	Section d. The ARC would like authority but not responsibility. If they receive authority to approve/disapprove improvements, then they need some level of responsibility and accountability for their decisions.	2/10/2023 9:14 PM
25	again there are sections of this i can agree with but it could be overly restrictive to the individual land owner.	2/10/2023 7:00 PM
26	This is exactly what most of the community wants - more transparency and a clear process with the ARC.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
27	These sections are appropriate but I would amend to include (as does the current covenants) fences as Improvements and specifying "shades of brown or green or natural wood" as the current covenants do. Blue is not an earth tone.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
28	In the past, we have been too restrictive on colors (greens and browns). In Breckenridge, a wide variety of colors are used very tastefully. I like the new wording here.	2/10/2023 8:54 AM
29	Just need stated color and easements. No need for review. Follow Park County building codes.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
30	Don't like (a) the word "modified" in (b) is too vague.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM

**Q7 Section 2.10 ARC Decision Deadline.** Promptly upon receipt of an Application, the ARC shall email and phone (including voicemail) the applicant to acknowledge receipt and to advise whether the Application is complete or requires additional information. The ARC shall decide to approve, approve subject to additional stated conditions, or disapprove an Application within 21 days after providing notice that the Application is complete (the “Decision Deadline”). No later than the first business day after the Decision Deadline, the ARC shall email and phone (including voicemail) the applicant to communicate its decision; a failure to do so shall automatically constitute approval. (Compare to Section 2d current covenants)

Answered: 75 Skipped: 3

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	61%	46
I would vote NO to this section	39%	29
TOTAL		75

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	I don't think we need to specify how (email, phone and voicemail). I think we are just trying to say that the ARC needs to make sure they get in touch with the owner - even if they have to try multiple times. But that isn't important enough of a change for me to vote against this section.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	Stuff happens. There should be no automatic approval of an application to the ARC. Instead, if the Committee needs more time because of some unusual, extenuating circumstance or need for further consideration, there should be a provision for communication with the Applicant and an extension of this 21 day requirement. The Applicant could also appeal to the Board if he/she believes the Committee has not been acting in good faith.	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
3	The ARC shall recommend ... the BOD... shall email and phone (including voicemail) the applicant to communicate its decision; a failure to do so shall automatically constitute approval.	3/8/2023 2:32 PM
4	"Promptly" should be defined. I believe the original 30-day language in the original covenants was sufficient.	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
5	This puts the ARC on a very short timeline to respond to an application, which will be of great benefit to Owners seeking to move forward with their projects during the building season.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
6	There is no need for an ARC or this section of the Covenant.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
7	See above.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
8	define promptly	3/5/2023 1:04 PM
9	Again, we do not support the ARC or the restrictions on what a homeowner can build based on a small, biased group of individuals.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
10	SMS/TXT should be added as a valid means of communication. Any two of the three should/can be used	2/19/2023 2:07 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

11	Too many words and rules. Get rid of the ACC/ARC.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
12	I do not feel an ARC is needed.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
13	We have a very short building season in Park County one more layer of delay is unacceptable. Everyone knew when they moved to Park County there were County Building codes to follow which is fine. Another layer of permitting is not ok.	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
14	Much better than the current covenants and provides fair treatment to any applicant.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
15	Just need stated color and easements. No need for review. Follow Park County building codes.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
16	There may be times when it is reasonable to take longer than 21 days. Suggest saying time limit is 21 days unless in their good faith judgment there is a reason for taking longer.	2/6/2023 7:40 PM
17	"Promptly upon receipt of an Application" lacks definition. It should read "Within 72 hours of receipt of an application" The phone call portion is a waste of time. It should be email or mail with formal written acknowledgement required within 72 hours.	2/6/2023 7:05 PM



**Q8 Section 2.11 Right to Appeal Disapproval Decision.** A decision by the ARC to disapprove an Application, after further good-faith attempts to resolve outstanding issues by both the applicant and the ARC have been exhausted, may be appealed by the applicant to the Board. The Board shall act promptly to decide the appeal after hearing from both the applicant and the ARC. (This section is new and not in current covenants)

Answered: 74 Skipped: 4

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	65%	48
I would vote NO to this section	35%	26
TOTAL		74

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	How many times has the ARC ever said no? This would be nice to know. However, we need an Appeals process, so this section is fine.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	What happens if an applicant ignores the Committee and Board's disapproval and proceeds with construction anyway? Article 5 is addressing that, I presume?	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
3	The board should not have the power to overrule the ARC.	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
4	This is a great section that allows for recourse if a homeowner is upset by ARC's decision, it allows for the board to step in as a mediator if there's a disagreement. This section also means ARC doesn't have sole decision making abilities.	3/7/2023 12:44 PM
5	Why does someone else have the right to tell an owner what is appealing or not.	3/7/2023 9:20 AM
6	The right of appeal never existed before. This an important addition to the overall fairness of the application process.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
7	Like we trust the higher-level Karens more than we would the ARC.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
8	Not needed as I advocate for dissolution of the ARC.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
9	If for some reason the above changes are somehow accepted I would want to be able to appeal to the Board. Hopefully, there will be no changes to the covenants making the use of our beautiful land overseen for safety issues by a governing entity other than Park County.	3/5/2023 6:54 PM
10	Should there be a definition of "promptly"?	3/5/2023 3:27 PM
11	again define promptly	3/5/2023 1:04 PM
12	We just do not understand why we need to be involved in what someone else builds IF IT MEETS COUNTY REGULATIONS! This is excessive control. The ARC has already proven themselves incapable of following our ridiculous rules with recent builds. Just get rid of this section all together. Maintain the legally required sections pertaining to HOA open space, roads, easements, but the approval of "quality-oriented" housing IS SUBJECTIVE. Refer back to previous statement regarding housing as a fundamental human need.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
13	yes, but with a request to modify. Specifically, as with the ARC set a hard deadline, not the woolly "promptly" for the Board's ruling decision. To some, promptly is 6 months, which could/would ruin a project. The ARC should have previously informed Board (we strongly recommend adding a clause requiring the ARC to inform the Board in cases of ARC disapproval) that a project could end up with them, so they (Board) should be aware of the need for a decision. We feel there should also be an external arbitration option, but that may	2/19/2023 2:07 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

undermine the Board's authority beyond what the Community is prepared to accept, so whilst we'd like an arbitration clause added we can, probably, live without it.

14	Too many words and rules. Get rid of the ACC/ARC.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
15	No ARC needed.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
16	Who are the experts to make such a decision	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
17	This gives the Board too much power. The ARC's purpose is to approve any Improvements and their applications, and that job ought to remain theirs.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
18	appeals are usually a good thing.	2/10/2023 7:00 PM
19	This would allow the Board to override any ARC decision. It is an overreach of power and would allow the Board to approve structures that could lower property values.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
20	This is an important addition to the Covenants. Over the years since we bought our lot we have seen decisions made by the then ACC that we felt were unnecessary. Owners need a process to present their case.	2/10/2023 6:47 PM
21	Properly provides for recourse should a stalemate occur between applicant and ARC. Effective and fair section and necessary for inclusion in amended covenants.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
22	Just need stated color and easements. No need for review. Follow Park County building codes.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
23	Just how promptly is the board's reply.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
24	"The Board shall act promptly" again this lacks definition. At a minimum it should read; "The Board shall respond in writing within (X hours/calendar days) with a decision or decision timeline".	2/6/2023 7:05 PM

**Q9 Section 2.12 Variances or Adjustments.** The ARC may approve a written request for a reasonable variance or adjustment of any condition or restriction imposed by this Article 2 in order to overcome significant practical difficulties or prevent unnecessary hardships that would arise from strict imposition of the condition or restriction. Specifically with regard to setback requirements, exceptions or adjustments may be approved in the case of topographic limitations, or where strict compliance would require excessive destruction of trees or foliage. (This section is new and not in current covenants)

Answered: 77 Skipped: 1

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
I would vote YES to this section	64% 49
I would vote NO to this section	36% 28
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>77</b>

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	The section starting "Specifically" - I would rather that be about "some specific examples" - so that other reasons for allowing a Variance that we can't anticipate right now are allowed.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	The ARC's issuance of a variance or adjustment should be in writing, not just the request for such variance.	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
3	Current Section 3 addresses exceptions to setback requirements with more specific information.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
4	The ARC may recommend to the BOD .....	3/8/2023 2:32 PM
5	I would add that new owners intending on building should be informed that excessive destruction of this high mountain land literally requires decades to be restored. Since 1980 when we first bought our lot, I have watched the old ranch road that cuts across the common ground take until recently to be restored to it's natural growth.	3/7/2023 12:52 PM
6	Let the county ordinances take care of our community; not a busy body sub committee	3/7/2023 9:20 AM
7	This is another example of the attempt these Covenants make to provide reasonableness and fairness to all parts of the process.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
8	The ARC does not have the power to provide a variance for my private property. See answer to question 2.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
9	See above.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
10	This should not be the control of the ARC.	3/5/2023 1:04 PM
11	Again the committee has taken several sections and separated them into longer drawn out wording.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
12	Does financial ability to build according to the ARC desires count as a practical difficulty? This all ties back to quality oriented. It is all personal, subjective, based on the current ARC (or board) opinions.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
13	Why are so many questions ARC????	2/28/2023 10:05 AM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

14	This is addressed in 3.b in the Existing Covenants and the fourth paragraph of the 3. Dwellings and Locations.	2/22/2023 11:24 AM
15	Somehow I think this scenario may resemble a false hope, rather than providing an avenue for overcoming truly significant impediments.	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
16	Note that the ARC should not approve things that Park County will not approve. Suggest adding a sentence clarifying that just because ARC approves may approve a Variance or Adjustment, it must still (er)gain Park County approval. This is implicit since as stated earlier anything that has to gain County approval must get that approval in addition to the ARC. However making it explicit here makes it clear that the ARC is in addition to/bound by the County's regulations.	2/19/2023 2:07 PM
17	The county can handle this. The ARC does not need to be involved! If the county approves it, then it should be allowed.	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
18	This should be governed by Park County	2/16/2023 6:35 PM
19	Once again, not needed. Too wordy and too many rules. Get rid of the ACC/ARC.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
20	ARC not needed.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
21	Not applicable if you don't have an ARC.	2/12/2023 8:58 PM
22	ARC should have no authority to make that kind of adjustment. What is their experience to make a land use decision.	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
23	more freedom	2/10/2023 7:00 PM
24	Again, fair recourse for an applicant and allows for negotiation should an impasse be reached.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
25	Just need stated color and easements. No need for review. Follow Park County building codes.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
26	But an adjacent land owner should be able to appeal to board if a set back is adjusted	2/7/2023 4:14 PM

## Q10 Section 2.13 No Precedent. The ARC's decision as to any Application shall not constitute a precedent as to any other matter. (This section is new and not in current covenants)

Answered: 76 Skipped: 2

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	62%	47
I would vote NO to this section	38%	29
TOTAL		76

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	I would actually prefer that the accumulation of ARC decisions does form precedent for future decisions. In a positive manner, this allows us to build a more practical set of rules. In preventing negatives - this holds back "favoritism" wherein the ARC allows owner A something that they don't allow owner B. So I would like ARC decisions to form a precedent. But I'm ok with this as is.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	Similar situations on different lots should be addressed with consistent decision making.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
3	In our community, it is unlikely that any two Improvement situations are identical. Therefore, each Improvement should be considered completely on its own merits.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
4	Nothing the ARC (or Board) says is precedential.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
5	You are setting a precedent.	3/5/2023 1:04 PM
6	Again why is this section here, should have been included in previously said section.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
7	Ya'll don't want to be held responsible for the mistakes made in the past. This is why we don't need the ARC.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
8	A qualified yes, pending explicit clarification with an example. We read this as meaning: "ARC didn't approve a 20' x 40' red shed for Tom, but can still approve a 20' x 40' red shed for Dick and Harry" since they are separate matters. Whether it's likely or not is irrelevant since each application/consideration is unique and treated as such. Furthermore, when disapproving Dick's red shed citing that Tom's red shed wasn't approved is not a valid reason." If that isn't the meaning, it needs rewriting so it is.	2/19/2023 2:07 PM
9	Too many words and rules. Get rid of the ACC/ARC.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
10	Needs some rewording. Someone can't assume their change is approved without submittal because someone else's same change was previously approved. However, if the ARC previously approves something it should be consistent in it's approvals.	2/14/2023 12:40 PM
11	If a project is approved by one ARC, then that should set a precedent for any future project of the same type. For example - if one person is allowed to put a blue metal roof on their home, then another person should be allowed to do the same.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
12	How would this apply to previous decisions?	2/13/2023 3:57 PM
13	Best practice. These are important to include because we are not all lawyers or experts.	2/11/2023 4:30 PM
14	This is typical legal language and essential to include.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
15	Very important section. Each application should be reviewed and (dis)approved on an individual basis.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
16	Just need stated color and easements. No need for review. Follow Park County building codes.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
17	Not sure what you mean	2/7/2023 4:05 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

---

18	thats overthinking. if a good job wasn't done in the first place....	2/6/2023 11:58 PM
----	--	-------------------

---

**Q11 Section 2.14 Conformity of Construction to Approved Application.** Construction of an Improvement must conform in all material and practical respects to the terms of the approved Application. Complaints or expressions of concern by any member of the Association about potential nonconformity, or about other possible violations of these Covenants regarding the construction work, must be directed to the ARC. The ARC will communicate with the Owner to review the complaint or concern in an effort to address the problem informally. The Owner is strongly encouraged to allow the ARC to visit the construction site for this purpose, but in the absence of such consent must provide detailed photographs of all exterior aspects of the Improvement to the ARC. If the ARC and the Owner cannot resolve the problem informally, the ARC will report the matter to the Board, and thereafter the Board will assume sole responsibility for addressing the problem. If the problem still cannot be resolved informally within a reasonable time, the Board shall retain all enforcement powers set forth in Article 5. (This section is new and not in current covenants)

Answered: 78 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	51%	40
I would vote NO to this section	49%	38
TOTAL		78

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	Barely a Yes here, I'd like to see this section changed. If Park County approves that the construction conforms to the approved application, then our ARC really only needs to protect the other owners in regards to color (not part of Park County's approval process). Otherwise, this paragraph should only apply to items that the ARC has to approve that do not require Park County approval. This wording could be added somehow.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	A good addition especially the emphasis on informal communication. Rather than just wait for complaints or concerns from the Association, would there ever be a circumstance when the Committee would perhaps poll the neighborhood or the Silverheels community regarding an application or a variance or conformity?	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
3	This allows anyone to monitor and evaluate the conformity of their neighbors. The policing of ones' neighbors should not be encouraged.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
4	Requiring expressions of concerns to go to the ARC, as opposed to having a discussion with one's neighbor, is not appropriate and way beyond the purview of the ARC. The board should not have the power to overrule the ARC.	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
5	Similar to some of the sections above, this is a way to balance and provide different options for different homeowners based on their level of comfort with ARC visiting and observing construction. Including the board in any issues also creates a sense of balance of power in case of a disagreement.	3/7/2023 12:44 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

6	This provision balances private property rights of an Owner with the rights of other Owners (most likely his neighbors) to make sure that Improvements conform reasonably closely to the application that the ARC approved. However, one change is needed: the reference to Article 5 in the last sentence is too limited - a disadvantage of putting out this survey before the Covenants Committee had completed its work. We should replace "Article 5" with "the Governing Documents" because the Board's enforcement capabilities run through multiple Articles in the Covenants (and also the Bylaws).	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
7	See answer to question 2.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
8	It Is the job of the building inspectors.	3/5/2023 1:04 PM
9	I feel the committee is attempting to give the Board a lot more power in certain matters that is unnecessary.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
10	Mind your own biscuits and life will be gravy. We mean this.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
11	There is enough building restrictions regulated on the county level. No other member should be concerned and raise objections in regards to what owners wish to do with the property they own.	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
12	With the number of assorted inspections during a build, by inspectors who sometimes convey soul crushing findings, why is this necessary??	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
13	Overly inflexible in case unavailability of products or construction necessitates changes what can be adhered to. Need to add clear phrasing around the exact process for obtaining an ARC exemption/change to the approved in those cases i.e. referencing Variance/Adjustment (2.12) Art 5 is about easements, what is the correct description of Board power? Need to add option of 3rd party (e.g. County, State or professional arbitration) Need to be clearer that if ARC has approved, another association Member CANNOT say "I don't like what ARC approved" and try to get things changed using this clause. This must be rephrased to more clearly state that this is relevant ONLY if the Improvement is out of compliance with what the ARC approved. Recommend making the non-ARC aspects of this clause a separate item so that it is clear that the Improvement has to abide by all the other (non-ARC) rules.	2/19/2023 2:07 PM
14	The ARC has no need to be notified of what type of building materials I am using! That's why we have the county if the county approves it then it should be allowed. If the ARC needs to do a visit in order to see what is going on on my property, then they definitely don't need to do a site visit as it's not hurting anyone because it's not being seen! People should be able to do whatever they wanna do on their own lot. It is private property!	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
15	I don't believe our neighbors should tell other neighbors what color, style of home they should build Or how they should improve their property.	2/16/2023 6:35 PM
16	Too wordy and not needed.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
17	No ARC needed. Building Department responsible for making sure a home conforms to code.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
18	ARC should have no authority. Park County has full authority not a Committee that lacks experience.	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
19	This is a reasonable section to include. Owners should build what is presented to the ARC.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
20	we already have State and County codes.	2/10/2023 7:00 PM
21	The HOA needs to be able to enforce our policies against neighbors acting in bad faith. Otherwise, our property values will be lowered.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
22	We recognize the importance of an owner's right to their privacy. We also feel the need for some type of action if the health and safety of their neighbors become a concern, ie. outhouse built directly over water source.	2/10/2023 6:47 PM
23	I favor this section but would do away with the photographs language. Applicants should allow, with owner's consent, on-site inspections to verify Improvements follow submitted/approved plans. If they've nothing to hide, a simple visit to inspect is not an imposition.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
24	Just need stated color and easements. No need for review. Follow Park County building codes.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
25	Just NO	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
26	Access to property should be required	2/6/2023 7:40 PM



SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

---

27	"within a reasonable time". Weak	2/6/2023 7:05 PM
----	----------------------------------	------------------

---

**Q12 Section 2.15 No Liability.** The ARC, the Board, the Association, and all members, Directors, Officers, and other agents of any of them, shall have no liability to any person submitting an Application or to any other person, due to any action, failure to act, approval, conditional approval, disapproval, or failure to approve or disapprove any Application. In reviewing any matter, neither the ARC nor any of its members shall be responsible for the safety, whether structural or otherwise, of any item(s) submitted for review, nor for conformity with any applicable governmental laws or regulations. Any approval or conditional approval by the ARC (or the Board on appeal) of an Application shall not be deemed an affirmation or certification of conformity to any applicable governmental laws or regulations. (This section is new and not in current covenants)

Answered: 77 Skipped: 1

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	62%	48
I would vote NO to this section	38%	29
TOTAL		77

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	Anyone in a decision making capacity should be held accountable. Knowing they are subject to all applicable laws encourages timely, well-informed and reasonable decisions. Sorry, no "get out of jail free" cards.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
2	I would say yes to this except I don't approve of the ARC board making any decisions in the first place	3/7/2023 9:20 AM
3	If our Covenants don't contain these kinds of protections for our neighbors who volunteer their time and best efforts to serve in these positions for the benefit of the entire community, we will need to hire outsiders to do this work at considerable expense and at a loss of our freedom.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
4	Oh, you want power over me but no responsibility? Yeah, like any reasonable person would vote in favor of that.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
5	You have lumped too much for liability of approval through construction.	3/5/2023 1:04 PM
6	Another section that could briefly have been included in previously mentioned sections.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
7	Responsibility seems to be an issue. If you want to insert yourself into the building process, this is part of the game. If the ARC says something isn't approved, but the county says it must be built that way for safety, the ARC is wrong and shouldn't have any say in the matter. The ARC is a bunch of nosy neighbors who can't mind their own business, they are not experts on safety or building regulations.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
8	This is not in the current covenants but the first sentence is in the By-Laws 8.2.	2/22/2023 11:24 AM
9	Too many words and rules. Get rid of the ACC/ARC.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
10	ARC not necessary so would vote no.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
11	Undecided.	2/13/2023 3:57 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

12	An inexperienced board that makes a determination that could cost a lot owner financially has no business being placed into this document. If a lot owner is financially responsible then the ARC should not be relieved of any liability. Keep this section out	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
13	Protects us as members from actions of others	2/11/2023 4:30 PM
14	This is typical legal language and its inclusion is necessary.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
15	Once again, the ARC should provide guidance only unless they would also like to assume some level of responsibility/liability for their decisions.	2/10/2023 9:14 PM
16	Correct - this section, specifically, is not in the current covenants. But the bylaws do contain very similar language - see 8.2. This new covenant section does clarify and expand protection for the ARC and should remain.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
17	Just need stated color and easements. No need for review. Follow Park County building codes.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM

**Q13 Section 3.2 Rules and Regulations. a. The Restrictions are general in nature. The Board, in the exercise of its good-faith business judgment, shall have the power to adopt, amend, repeal, and enforce reasonable Rules and Regulations, provided that they are consistent with the terms and Intent of these Covenants as expressed in Section 1.2.b. Except in a situation that the Board deems urgent, the Board shall give notice to the Members of a proposed Rule or Regulation that the Board wishes to adopt and allow a reasonable period of time (not less than three weeks) for Member feedback before the Board may vote on the proposal at a subsequent meeting. Upon adoption of any Policy, the Board shall promptly provide notice thereof to all Members. c. At the next Annual Meeting of the Association, any Rule or Regulation adopted by the Board since the last Annual Meeting shall be subject to a motion to affirm, which shall be made by the President of the Board. Affirmation must occur by a majority of those voting on the motion in person or by proxy. (This section is new and not in current covenants)**

Answered: 78 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	55%	43
I would vote NO to this section	45%	35
TOTAL		78

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	I am not sure what Rules and Regulations can't wait until the next Annual Meeting. Maybe if we had some examples I might change my mind on this.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	Update to read "Policies" as changed 1/4/23. In 3.2 b. remove the exception - what could possibly be so urgent that the Board would need to enact a new Policy without notice to the community.	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
3	Way too much power and control given to the Board. More restrictions do not necessarily enhance the desirability (or value) of Silverheels properties.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
4	I appreciate the word "reasonable" being in this section; otherwise, I would vote no. I'm also glad to see that there would be a period of time for feedback.	3/8/2023 9:46 AM
5	I do not support giving additional powers to the Board. Furthermore, this section allows "good-faith business judgment" to interpret what a "quality-oriented community" is. This has the potential to be wildly incongruent with the existing "Intent" section of the Covenants (e.g., keeping restrictions to a minimum).	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
6	Two key points: - Whoever put this together failed to recognize that the Committee voted at its 1/4/23 meeting to change all references to "Rules and Regulations" to "Policies" (they got it right once - in the last sentence of subsection b). "Policies" is a broadly-defined term in Appendix A that includes but is not limited to rules and regulations. - We have serious questions about the practicality of subsection c and would prefer to see it deleted, as we	3/6/2023 7:22 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

believe the Board is elected to determine Policies and there's already a provision for feedback from the community at the time the policy is being considered for adoption. That should be enough. But if this is an all or nothing proposition, we vote Yes, so long as the "Policies" replacement is made for the sake of clarity and consistency.

7	The Board may dissolve itself, or otherwise meet in private to complain about how the neighbors don't like it interfering with them, but it doesn't have the authority to grant itself new powers or to adopt rules that concern others. You're not the Government. We have plenty of those already, thank you.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
8	Absolutely not. Board Member's definition of reasonable does not always match common practice in a rural area.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
9	It's unclear if the Board's adoption makes it in-affect immediately, or if only after it's affirmed in the next annual meeting.	3/5/2023 8:00 PM
10	My question on this section is how often in the past would this have been necessary for the Board to deal with.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
11	I don't think the board should be able to deem things urgent. This all comes back to personal opinion! The members of this community should ALWAYS have the ability to approve rules or regulations that impact them.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
12	3.2.a is in 5.1.a of the By-Laws.	2/22/2023 11:24 AM
13	or perhaps YES - Not clear. Would prefer the option for an Emergency Meeting of Members for such drastic changes, then might change to YES	2/19/2023 2:07 PM
14	I believe in order for something to be changed every single lot must vote on it.	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
15	Too many words and rules. Get rid of the ACC/ARC.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
16	All rules and regulations should have to be approved by the majority of the membership. We all have to live under them so should be able to vote on them prior to being put in place. Also, rules and regulations should apply to common areas and not private property.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
17	Again where is their experience. Not every board member has business experience. Leave this section out	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
18	The Board currently has 3 rules & regulations in place: a Fishing Policy, Signs Policy, and Bearproof trash cans rule. And why is the preceding section not included in this survey, which gives important context?	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
19	We need rules and enforcement, because not every neighbor is a good neighbor. This is a very reasonable, slow, and cautionary way to implement basic rules to ensure our neighborhood remains a peaceful place to live.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
20	You call this section new and not in current covenants. While there is no section with this specific titling, section 16 of the current covenants (as well as interspersed throughout its text) does address the concept of rules and regulations, so I submit this is not a new concept. In the unlikely event a new rule is deemed necessary by the board (3-4 new rules in 4 decades so far) this section provides a mechanism for its fair implementation and ultimate affirmation by the membership.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
21	Wait to vote on anything in the community as a community.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
22	HELL NO	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
23	great!	2/6/2023 11:58 PM

**Q14 Section 3.3 Compliance With Laws. All Owners, all Permittees, and all other persons, shall comply with all applicable federal, state, county, and local statutes, ordinances, laws, regulations, rules, and requirements, of all governmental and quasi-governmental entities, agencies and authorities (collectively, "Laws"). A violation of any Law also constitutes a violation of these Covenants. (This section is new and not in current covenants)**

Answered: 77    Skipped: 1

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	66%	51
I would vote NO to this section	34%	26
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>77</b>

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	I can only guess at the intention here - we want law abiding citizens in our neighborhood here and wouldn't want meth labs or explosives testing to exist in our subdivision. But this is way too broad - if I run a stop sign at 2AM in a city in another state - I would be in violation of these Covenants - for example. This wording needs to get narrower or this section needs to go away. (Or maybe I need examples of why this is here).	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	RE: Sections 3.4, 3.5, 3.6 relating to water use. Do we need any distinction between watering horses and other livestock such as goats, sheep, llamas? And who is responsible for assuring the Subdivision doesn't over-use its water allocation? And how would the Association remedy any such over-use?	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
3	Too restrictive. "All quasi-governmental entities"? Seriously?	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
4	"Quasi-governmental entities" is too broad. "A violation of any Law also constitutes a violation of these Covenants" is too broad. Literally taken, this means a violation of any law, even one completely unrelated to SROA, violates the Covenants.	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
5	I think this is an important section to indicate to homeowners that all of us who live here respect and abide by the applicable laws, and that we all agree as neighbors to abide by them.	3/7/2023 12:44 PM
6	Again, leave out the HOA sticking its nose in owner's business	3/7/2023 9:20 AM
7	This is necessary due to the obvious fact that, much of the time, Park County either cannot or will not enforce its own ordinances and regulations. This provision gives the Board the ability to reach out to an Owner who is violating a Law (the complaint is usually from a neighbor) and explain that he or she is also violating our Covenants. Hopefully this will persuade the Owner to stop whatever they are doing, even if the County never does anything about it.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
8	We have laws. We don't need rules saying we need to follow laws.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
9	Quasi governmental? No.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
10	Basically how many different ways and times are the committee going to address this section.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
11	This is the simple language we need. Stop making it complicated with OPINIONS.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
12	Why complement something that already exists?	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
13	We do not need violations from the ARC. Park county can handle this situation. No need for the ARC to even be involved!	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
14	Not necessary.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

15	Absolutely NO! HOAs have no business in enforcing government laws. They have no training or experience in doing so. If a person is a witness to a violation of government laws, they can call the appropriate agency to have it addressed. Allowing a violation of any law to be a violation of the covenants is an overreach of our covenant.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
16	Any law constitutes a violation of the covenants?	2/13/2023 3:57 PM
17	No on this. We should only be relying on County and State regulations and laws. Federal, quasi government and any other entity has no business in our regulations.	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
18	Key words: "Applicable laws." This wording would enable the SROA Board to enforce county violations that affect our property values, such as unlawful camping and trailers. The county shows no evidence of enforcing their own rules which leaves SROA in a bind.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
19	i would vote yes however some of these laws impinge on individual property rights,	2/10/2023 7:00 PM
20	Good neighbors follow the law.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
21	Again, while longer and appropriately more detailed, this is not new. The opening paragraphs, prior to section 1. of the current covenants references the "ordinances of the County of Park, Colorado" and owners' adherence to them alongside the covenants. This section correctly expands to include a more broad reference to other jurisdictions.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
22	This one is touchy. If we only follow local and federal laws I may be ok with this. Laws do not need to be placed in our covenants.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
23	Not necessary	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
24	great too !	2/6/2023 11:58 PM

**Q15 Section 3.7 Residential Use; Permitted Business Activities.** All Lots and Dwelling Units shall be used for residential and recreational purposes only, and may be used only for business, commercial, or professional purposes that are incidental to the use and occupancy of the Dwelling Unit as a residence. Any business conducted in a Dwelling Unit must be clearly secondary to the residential use of the Dwelling Unit and must be conducted entirely within the Dwelling Unit. The existence or operation of the business must not be detectable from outside the Dwelling Unit by sight, sound, smell, vibration, or otherwise, or by the existence of signs, additional traffic, and/or deliveries which indicate that a business is being conducted. The business must not result in an undue volume of traffic or parking within the Community. For the purposes of this paragraph only, the term “Dwelling Unit” includes any accessory building on the Lot. (This section is new and not in current covenants)

Answered: 77 Skipped: 1

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	68%	52
I would vote NO to this section	32%	25
TOTAL		77

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	The intention here is fine - we don't want big commercial operations in the subdivision. But working at home is a necessary and growing phenomenon and for people that own their own business, this section is worded too strongly. Agree with no signs, undue volume of traffic or parking. Much of the rest seems too strong - things will occur outside the dwelling for example.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	As someone who lives on a street with a commercial business (which I believe is operating illegally?) I can attest to the importance of keeping our neighborhood residential. Large trucks go up and down our road more often than an individual's vehicle would be used, and loud machinery is used often, more often than an individual would use for their own personal purposes. Both of these disrupt our peaceful neighborhood.	3/7/2023 12:44 PM
3	This is absolutely critical if we are to maintain the residential nature of our community as described in Section 1.2.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
4	Neither you nor I should tell others what do do on their private property.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
5	The way the wording is written can be misleading and looks like businesses are okay, this needs to be reworded, too wordy and long.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
6	No. Absolutely not, try again. Some of the members in the community run legit businesses, not hotels. The rules need to be more clear on running a short term rental vs a legit business. The liability of a hotel in the neighborhood is greater for everyone as we all know the visitors here do not like to respect the local laws and regulations. Separate the people who are capitalizing off of the beauty of our neighborhood with STR vs the people who live here and want to preserve it for future generations.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM



SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

7	This statement removes ANY STR from the subdivision which I have no issue with. However how do you plan to enforce? Every STR increases traffic, wear on our roads and noise etc. as well as parking on the county road in winter months of STR guests coming here in a vehicle that can't make the driveway.	2/25/2023 5:14 PM
8	What about short term rentals? I think they should be allowed.	2/21/2023 11:18 AM
9	This likely describes the activities of many residences that have not or never will conduct business within the confines of their dwelling. Why segregate?	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
10	Few edits for clarification: Residential Use; Permitted Business Activities. All Lots and Dwelling Units shall be used primarily for residential and recreational purposes. Lot usage for business, commercial, or professional purposes must incidental to the main use and occupancy of the Dwelling Unit as a residence. Any business conducted in a Dwelling Unit must be secondary to the residential use of the Dwelling Unit and must be conducted entirely within the Dwelling Unit. The existence or operation of the business must not be detectable from outside the Dwelling Unit by sight, sound, smell, vibration, or otherwise, or by the existence of signs, additional traffic, and/or deliveries which indicate that a business is being conducted. The business must not result in an undue volume of traffic or parking within the Community, implying that retail outlets are not permitted. For the purposes of this paragraph only, the term "Dwelling Unit" includes any accessory building on the Lot.	2/19/2023 2:07 PM
11	I feel that any lot owner has the right to do what they want with their lot! If they someone wants to run a small business, long term or short term rental, camping...that is totally fine with me! We do not need the ARC overreaching and policing its residents!!! we have the county to do that.	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
12	"Additional traffic". Just wondering if we can actually regulate this since these are county roads and are maintained by the county. (Supposedly)	2/17/2023 8:46 AM
13	This is ridiculous. If I decide to build a wood shop or garage and make Christmas ornaments to sell at fairs (which I have no intent to do), I can only do this work at my kitchen table.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
14	How does this apply to running a B&B which would be a business?	2/14/2023 12:40 PM
15	The county already has regulations on this. If there is an issue a person can contact Park County how has the ability to enforce their regulations.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
16	Owers should be able to have a business on their property.	2/12/2023 8:58 PM
17	No need for extra section that the County residential regulations cover.	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
18	While this is new as a section, the general restrictions and intent are in the current covenants.	2/11/2023 4:30 PM
19	This aligns with Park County's rules, and if SROA allowed more than this, that would cause either a zoning issue or require a variance from the county, if granted. There are currently log businesses in Silverheels Ranch that are a nuisance to neighbors, with no enforcement from the County.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
20	There is at least one business - the log cutting/sales on Sawmill Ln - which has been a perpetual nuisance in terms of noise, traffic, and fire safety. The Board must be able to enforce this provision, because Park County has known about the violation for months and has failed to act.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
21	Section adequately addresses the fact that SR is a residential development but allows for a home business to be present but must be operated without impacting neighbors or the community as a whole.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
22	How do we enforce this? Presently not being enforced.	2/10/2023 8:54 AM
23	I am ok with this as I do not want to see excessive added traffic.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
24	Who will enforce that. The county already has restrictions on residential property.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM

**Q16 Section 3.8 Recreational Vehicles; Abandoned Vehicles; Parking. Trailers (including camping trailers, boat trailers, hauling trailers), snowmobiles, jet skis, boats, and accessories thereto, self-contained motorized recreational vehicles, and other types of recreational or commercial vehicles or equipment, must be parked or stored in compliance with County regulations. No abandoned or inoperable vehicles or equipment of any kind shall be stored or parked in the Community except in an enclosed structure. (Section 3a of current covenants)**

Answered: 77 Skipped: 1

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	60%	46
I would vote NO to this section	40%	31
TOTAL		77

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	Again I agree with the intent. But this needs to be worded in a friendlier way.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	Too restrictive	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
3	This is not clear. Removing some of the "or" No ... equipment of any kind shall be stored or parked in the Community	3/8/2023 2:32 PM
4	"Inoperable vehicles" is excessively broad. The implication is if my neighbor's car breaks down they can't park it in their own driveway while trying to get it fixed.	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
5	The first sentence simply informs Owners that if they have this kind of equipment, there are County rules telling them how they must keep it. The second sentence protects an Owner's neighbors from having to look at eyesores. It's another effort to put meat on the bones of Section 1.2.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
6	Covered by Park County.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
7	Why was mobile homes addressed in this section.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
8	It is already regulated on the county level. No need to include this in our covenants.	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
9	The storage of junk and old inoperable vehicles is addressed in 7 Nuisance.	2/22/2023 11:24 AM
10	A dedicated Plow truck would trigger this section.	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
11	"enclosed" only is restrictive. Suggest "enclosed or covered structure where it is not visible from a public road or an adjacent Lot" would be better.	2/19/2023 2:07 PM
12	It's private property! People should be able to do what they want with their property! If I want to park a trailer on my property, it should be allowed! I know the county has rules and regulations on RVs, which I also do not agree with! We don't need anymore rules and regulations! I don't think the county should be able to tell you that you can only camp during certain times of the year! Getting a camping permit is difficult enough! I do not feel everything has to be enclosed!	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
13	This is governed by Park County.	2/16/2023 6:35 PM
14	How do you know that they're inoperable? Are we making a abandoned vehicle control team (AVCT) that will have the right to go on lots and attempt to start these vehicles? Too many rules.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

15	Some equipment stays outside because people don't have garage to store it in or because they use it frequently. If a person owns a tractor or log splitter and doesn't have a garage, it is unreasonable to expect them to keep it in an enclosure.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
16	County regulations should be inserted.	2/13/2023 3:57 PM
17	Covered by County regulations	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
18	This is reasonable. Let's keep it classy in Silverheels.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
19	To vote No would be to allow lots to fill up with junk cars, reducing property values.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
20	You do a disservice to any respondent who references only 3a in the current covenants. Both 7. and 11. contain language related to this new 3.8 section. And, restricting compliance consistent with Park County is more than reasonable.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
21	How do we enforce this? Presently not being enforced.	2/10/2023 8:54 AM
22	Not everyone has a garage or out building. This would cause undo expenses to some owners.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
23	County has these regulations.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
24	very ugly if parked around the properties	2/6/2023 11:58 PM

**Q17 Section 3.9 Animals.** Animals may be kept, but should not be left unattended. For Lots with land on the west side of the Ridge, stables, corrals, or other structures for housing or feeding animals are subject to restrictions on the Plats. For all Lots, no such structures shall be located closer than fifty feet to any Lot line or street. Fences for the containment of grazing animals may be located up to Lot lines, but proper land management of grazed Lots is strongly encouraged. No more than two horses are permitted on a five-acre Lot. For Lots larger than five acres, prior written approval of the Board is required to keep more than two horses, but no Lot may contain more than four horses. Owners of dogs must keep them under control at all times and must comply with Park County leash laws. The keeping, grazing, and enjoyment of animals must not create a hazard or nuisance to any other person or property within the Community. (Compare to Section 8 current covenants)

Answered: 78 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	67%	52
I would vote NO to this section	33%	26
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>78</b>

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	Intention of section is fine, wording is too strong. "not be left unattended" either needs to be defined better or removed - as one example.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	Proper land management should not apply exclusively to animal owners. Also, "nuisance" is extremely subjective.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
3	Same comment as above regarding "Plats". The current section 8 defines "no stables, corrals or other structure for the housing or feeding of horses or animals other than domestic pets shall be ... closer than fifty feet to any lot line or street". The proposed section changes this to "no such structure" and does not have the exclusion for domestic pets. This is overly broad.	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
4	This provision tries to strike a fair balance between the rights and interests of animal owners and the rights and interests of their neighbors in Silverheels. Some of the limitations here simply reflect current County requirements and therefore do not change the rules we already live under.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
5	Who erected the original boundary fence? How was it paid for and is there a single owner or entity that owns it?	3/5/2023 3:27 PM
6	Fences should be 50 feet from lot lines, just like buildings.	3/5/2023 10:32 AM
7	Last sentence: The keeping, grazing, and enjoyment of animals must not create a hazard or nuisance to any other person or property within the Community. This seems like a great way for a neighbor who complains about any little noise to complain about dogs. Barking is part of a livestock dog's job and this needs to be more transparent so ignorant neighbors can't ruin a	3/1/2023 11:40 AM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

homestead. This is not a city community and people need to remember their useless doodle is safer because of the guard dogs who scare off the mountain lions and coyotes.

8	I would prefer a 50 foot setback from property lines of fences for containment of animals unless there are 2 contiguous lots.	3/1/2023 8:45 AM
9	Having experienced.....getting rid of 50 foot setback is contrary to the open space concept .....negatively impact migrating animals and the natural setting.....gives neighbors some space	2/28/2023 10:05 AM
10	What is the purpose of the first sentence? I agree with the rest.	2/25/2023 5:14 PM
11	I do not feel you should be able to tell me how many horses or animals I should have on my property. If I am able to keep them, fed and healthy they should be allowed. Owners can provide hay to feed the horses. The county already has rules and regulations with animals. We need to leave it at that.	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
12	Just talk with your neighbors instead of making more rules/laws.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
13	Nuisance is too subjective.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
14	Follow Park County Land Use Regulations regarding lot size, animals allowed and set backs. We already have one person that is bothered by everything that goes on in this subdivision and there are more	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
15	This is a reasonable and clear addition to our current covenants.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
16	This is simply part of being a good neighbor.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
17	I support this section but disagree with changing the current covenants (which do not allow grazing up to a lot line) and would amend this new 3.9 and go back to the "or closer than 50 feet from any lot line or street" as stated in the current covenants.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
18	When I bought my property here it was specifically because the covenants allowed for up to four horses on five acre lots. I think there are other ways to make sure that lots are well cared for and managed properly than changing this particular covenant.	2/7/2023 11:50 AM
19	Don't like the last sentence. Too vague as far as "nuisance". Opens it up to unreasonable definition of nuisance to some overly sensitive neighbors.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
20	a whole 20+year plus history of barking, unattended dogs and strange dogs showing up on the property	2/6/2023 11:58 PM

**Q18 Section 3.10 Signs. Subject to such Rules or Regulations as may be adopted by the Board, no advertising signs shall be erected, placed, permitted, or maintained in the Community. Political signs are permitted only to the extent required by Colorado law. (Compare to Section 10 of current covenants)**

Answered: 75 Skipped: 3

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	65%	49
I would vote NO to this section	35%	26
TOTAL		75

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	Reflect change to "Policies".	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
2	The phrase "as may be adopted by the Board" excludes SROA members from due process and does not provide definitive guidelines.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
3	The board should not be given this additional power.	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
4	Does this mean no permanent, or temporary signs, as in yard sale signs?	3/7/2023 12:52 PM
5	We need to protect our community from being overrun with signs. This provision actually gives the Board some flexibility to deal with particular situations, but hopefully those will be few and far between.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
6	So long as this includes real estate sales and similar signage, this would be acceptable. If signs from realtors and similar were exempted, then no.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
7	A sign for deliveries helps eliminates doubt, why restrict.	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
8	We would also like to prohibit all political signs, but unfortunately that may not be allowed by law.	2/19/2023 2:07 PM
9	If there are small businesses in the neighborhood they should be able to have a sign at the bottom of their driveway! If the sign is on private property, there's no need for ARC to get involved!	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
10	The next iteration will say that we can't put up signs for a party (ex., happy birthday, happy anniversary)	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
11	Last line should be worded in "... to the extent ALLOWED by Colorado Law".	2/14/2023 12:40 PM
12	Undecided.	2/13/2023 3:57 PM
13	If I want to have a yard sale, I should be able to put up signs to advertise it.	2/12/2023 8:58 PM
14	Reasonable and aligns with SROA's current signs policy.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
15	Owners should be allowed to name their property with a sign as long as it conforms to other guidelines in the covenants (i.e. natural colors, conforms to natural environment, designed, etc.).	2/10/2023 9:14 PM
16	This is already an existing policy.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
17	I support this section fully. But it will only work if residents are mandated to use county approved address signage.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
18	Private property, private drive, as well as no trespassing signs should be at the lot owner's	2/8/2023 10:36 AM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

discretion.

19	Already voted No against Rules and Regulations adopted by the board. Other than that, it's OK	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
----	---	------------------

**Q19 Section 3.11 Nuisances. No activity shall be conducted on any Lot that is a nuisance or obnoxious to residents of other Lots. No light shall be emitted from any Lot which is unreasonably bright or causes unreasonable glare. No sound shall be emitted from any Lot which is unreasonably loud or annoying. No odor shall be permitted from any Lot which is noxious or unreasonably offensive. (Compare to Section 7 of current covenants)**

Answered: 76 Skipped: 2

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	59%	45
I would vote NO to this section	41%	31
TOTAL		76

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Still seems worded too strongly, but ok with it. What happens if this section is violated? Probably same question for other questions.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	I'd like to see us supporting Dark Skies communities by reference here or elsewhere in the Covenants. The idea of lights being unreasonably bright or causing unreasonable glare could be extended to encourage lighting that is "dark skies compatible". Refer to this site for guidance: <a href="https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/lighting-for-citizens/lighting-basics/">https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/lighting-for-citizens/lighting-basics/</a>	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
3	Highly subjective. No activity...no light...no sound..no odor.... Too restrictive.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
4	The word "unreasonable" is too vague	3/8/2023 2:32 PM
5	This section appears to change the intent of the existing Covenants from a nuisance as defined by the neighborhood to a nuisance as defined by another resident. Furthermore, "unreasonable" is too subjective and varies substantially from the existing language of "obnoxious or offensive".	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
6	Metal buildings cause a definite glare!	3/7/2023 12:52 PM
7	While it would be nice if everyone would simply follow the Golden Rule on matters like these, having more explicit guidance should help Owners understand what actions and activities probably cross the line.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
8	Bugger off, Karen.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
9	Is this a retirement community? Oh Gosh....	3/5/2023 6:54 PM
10	Again I don't understand why the original section wasn't ok.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
11	What is unreasonably loud noise? Is this a county regulation that can be cited or is this subjective based on the neighbor's opinion of what is loud? Chainsaw, machines to manage the forest, there are a lot of "loud" activities that take place when you properly maintain your property.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
12	Such a ridiculous thing. How are you going to define what it "obnoxious"? Everyone has it's own definition of this word and what it means. It is too subjective.	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
13	The county has regulations for this. Annoying sound is relative. What is annoying to you may not be to me.	2/25/2023 5:14 PM
14	Loud and light can be relative and could allow for discrimination against people the board doesn't like.	2/21/2023 11:18 AM



SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

15	What is considered a nuisance is dependent on many different peoples opinion! The ARC does not need to get involved in this! I would hate to have the neighbors next to me that are overly uptight about everything!	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
16	This should be governed by Park County	2/16/2023 6:35 PM
17	Not necessary. Go meet your neighbor, become friends and ask them nicely if something bothers you.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
18	Words like annoying and unreasonably offensive are too subjective. Chain saws or back up beepers on excavating equipment can be annoying to some.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
19	Light and sound would be judgemental by whom?	2/13/2023 3:57 PM
20	Covered by County Land Use Regulations. What is a nuisance to one may not be a nusiance to another.	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
21	These are easy guidelines to follow, especially with a 5 acre lot minimum.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
22	this is very subjective. what is unreasonable to some is not to others.	2/10/2023 7:00 PM
23	The County won't enforce this, so it is our duty as neighbors to do so. I moved here so that I can enjoy my personal freedoms without interference from neighbors. I just want to be left alone, and this Section ensures my rights are protected.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
24	Only the light reference is new here and it's reasonable to expect dark skies in such a development as SR. The county has guidelines for lighting. Perhaps a reference to them is needed.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
25	Follow local health, safety, and building codes. No need to add into covenants.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
26	Some people consider chainsaws unreasonably loud and wood smoke offensive	2/7/2023 10:27 AM
27	Anything that intrusive is most likely a county violation. The vagueness of this opens up complaints for even the simplest things.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM

**Q20 Section 3.12 No Hazardous Activities, Materials, or Chemicals. No activities shall be conducted on a Lot, or within any Improvement on a Lot, which are or might be unsafe or hazardous to any person or property.**

**Reasonable precautions shall be taken against fire hazards, and no outdoor burning of any kind is allowed except as permitted by Park County regulations. No hazardous materials or chemicals shall be located in as**

**Dwelling Unit or elsewhere on a Lot except for household products customarily kept in a residence for the use of its occupants, in such limited quantities as to not create a hazard or danger to person or property. (This section is new and not in current covenants)**

Answered: 77 Skipped: 1

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
I would vote YES to this section	69% 53
I would vote NO to this section	31% 24
TOTAL	77

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	Herbicides are used freely within Silverheels for control of noxious weeds.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
2	What about automobile products?	3/8/2023 2:32 PM
3	Who would monitor hazardous materials? Does this include gas cans? It seems a bit vague.	3/7/2023 12:52 PM
4	These are simply common sense rules.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
5	Unsafe to you is not unsafe to someone qualified. You're being a Karen. Keep it to yourself.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
6	Covered by Park County.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
7	Typo: "in as Dwelling Unit" should be "in a Dwelling Unit"	3/5/2023 8:00 PM
8	Items mentioned in this section could have been addressed in previous mentioned sections.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
9	Not sure what is considered unsafe or hazardous activity This really needs to be clarified for the STR owners as they are usually the lot owners with visitors causing truly unsafe activities like fireworks, riding ATVs, sledding down other lot owner's hills, etc.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
10	Park county has it's own regulations. There are fire bans enforced by the county along with being able to secure the fire permit and burn according to their rules. Why are we adding granulated rules to what is already enforced by the county itself?	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
11	Majority of this covered under LUR	2/25/2023 5:14 PM
12	Does not account for MOT (Materials of the Trades).	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
13	modify type and amount to keep consistent with our proposal for section 1.2 where commercial "arts and crafts" type activities at a small scale are permitted; also Q15 (Section 3.7)	2/19/2023 2:07 PM
14	Don't really feel like the ARC has any reason to tell me what I can store on my property!	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
15	"Outdoor burning". Does this mean burning of brush or camp fires or all burning? Maybe needs some clarification. I would be in favor of both. Don't want my neighbors having recreational fires.	2/17/2023 8:46 AM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

16	This is ridiculous, not necessary.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
17	Park County already has regulations on this - not needed in our covenants.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
18	Park County land use and Fire Department have regulations. No new section is needed.	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
19	No brainer.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
20	i would agree to the hazardous materials or chemicals portion but i believe sometimes the fire restrictions are way overboard and restrictive. property owners should be able to have a small fire that is managed and built with safety and precaution, Chimeneas etc . some fire bans include propane BBQs. Often fire Marshalls overly restrict even when conditions do not warrant those restrictions.	2/10/2023 7:00 PM
21	Sad but true. Common sense is dwindling in our world and the safety issues this section addresses is important and a necessary part of the document.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
22	"No hazardous materials or chemicals shall be located in 'a' (delete 'as') Dwelling Unit or elsewhere"	2/10/2023 8:54 AM
23	This is a health and safety issue. So I agree here.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
24	Isn't this a county reg already?	2/7/2023 8:42 AM

## Q21 Section 3.13 No Discharge of Explosives. No explosives, firearms, fireworks, or similar devices shall be discharged within the Community except for explosives used in connection with an approved and fully-permitted building project. (Compare to Section 15 current covenants)

Answered: 78 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	72%	56
I would vote NO to this section	28%	22
TOTAL		78

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	I think this section is really important, especially considering how many short term rentals are now in the neighborhood. I understand that those of us who understand South Park and the dangers that fires pose know how to use these items in accordance with law (when permitted) however, with so many short term renters in the area I'm hesitant to trust their ability to safely use these items. I also feel that not allowing firearms keeps us all much safer as so many of our homes are within range, and again, many people are not aware of the safe and correct way to use firearms.	3/7/2023 12:44 PM
2	The current covenants preclude "firearms" only. This expansion to "explosives" protects us all from other kinds of activities that could be dangerous to life, limb, or property, especially with regard to fire hazards. Fireworks come particularly to mind.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
3	What's wrong with the original section and now once a year on 4th of July you can't have fireworks.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
4	Shooting cannot be allowed in subdivision!!! We are too close together....	2/28/2023 10:05 AM
5	Again regulated on the county level. No need for this section being updated.	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
6	It is legal to shoot on your property in a subdivision with a proper back stop. The county has regulations for this. By adding a wish list that go above and beyond county ordinances and law unnecessary calls are made by residents to law enforcement asking for enforcement for something not enforceable by law. This is a waste of time and resources. Explosives and fireworks that leave the ground illegal in the state so that can stay.	2/25/2023 5:14 PM
7	I think the county already has rules and regulations on this?? If so, no need for the ARC!	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
8	If the owner (s) has (have) a proper berm to shoot at, they should be able to safely practice shooting firearms.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
9	The various stages of fire bans regulate this.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
10	Unsure why this entire section is in red, as our current covenants prohibit discharge of firearms within Silverheels Ranch. The addition of explosives and fireworks is reasonable too; fire safety is a growing concern in Park County.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
11	I highly value my personal freedom to walk about my land without risk of stray bullets. Disallowing explosives and fireworks are crucial to the fire safety of everyone's home. This is a REAL concern.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
12	No-brainer on this one.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
13	How do we enforce this. Presently not enforced. Numerous gunshots fired in our community on Sunday evening, 2/5/23.	2/10/2023 8:54 AM

**Q22 Section 3.14 Garbage; Scrap Materials; Junk; Dumping.** Garbage or trash shall be kept and disposed of in a sanitary manner. All outside equipment for storage or disposal of garbage or trash shall be kept in a clean and sanitary condition, in bear-proof containers and secured from access by other wildlife. Notwithstanding the foregoing, safe and reasonable composting is permitted. No scrap lumber, metal, bulk materials, or similar items shall be stored or allowed to accumulate outside on a Lot where it is visible from a public road or an adjacent Lot. No junk may be stored on a Lot except in an enclosed structure. No dumping is permitted anywhere in the Community. (Compare to Section 4 of current covenants)

Answered: 78 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	72%	56
I would vote NO to this section	28%	22
TOTAL		78

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	Still seems worded too harshly - something about the quantity and visibility should be changed in the wording.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	Too restrictive. Current Section 4 is much more reasonable.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
3	Again, these are common-sense restrictions that are consistent with Section 1.2's intent for our community. If somebody wants to have fewer limitations on their garbage containers or piles of scrap, limber, or junk , there are plenty of other communities in Park County where they can live that way.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
4	Most do not have a bear issue.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
5	This is too subjective.	3/5/2023 6:54 PM
6	There needs to be more clarity around storing building supplies while in the building process. This seems like yet another way for a nosy neighbor to get involved in something that isn't their business. If a building permit is currently active, the lot owners should be able to manage the build of their property in a way that does NOT create a burden to "hide" materials. That is ridiculous.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
7	How are you going to enforce it? For the last few years I have Been trying to get a bear proof container and the company keeps telling me I am on the waiting list? We use wood/lumber as a main heat source of our house. The way our lot is designed and accessible from the main road only allows to store the wood in a manner that is visible from the road. Ridiculous. Wood is part of the natural environment anyway.	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
8	What one person considers junk is not to another person. I believe people have the right to do what they want to do on their own land!	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
9	The original covenants are perfectly fine.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
10	One man's junk is another man's treasure. Junk is not defined.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

11	Another no brainer.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
12	This is crucial to maintain this neighborhood's beautiful mountain scenery	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
13	Again, you reference only 4 of the current. 7. also references junk. A thorough treatment of garbage et al.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
14	I am against dumping and garbage. But storing of materials should be allowed.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
15	Might want to clarify "junk". There are at least two lots currently that have piles of logs/lumber and appear to be running a business processing them. What will be done about these?	2/7/2023 12:38 PM
16	"No junk..." Who defines junk?	2/7/2023 8:42 AM

**Q23 Section 3.15 Restrictions on Mining or Drilling. Except as provided in Section 3.5, no real property within the Community shall be used for the purpose of mining, quarrying, drilling, boring, development, or exploring for or removing oil, gas, or other hydrocarbons, minerals, rocks, stones, gravel, earth, or water. (This section is new and not in current covenants)**

Answered: 75 Skipped: 3

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	71%	53
I would vote NO to this section	29%	22
TOTAL		75

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	This is asinine. No one has mineral rights.	3/10/2023 3:49 PM
2	Why "real" property - seems incorrect.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
3	Well-intentioned, but technically this prohibits the use of my own natural materials for legitimate purposes (landscaping, patching a driveway, etc..)	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
4	Hopefully this one is obvious. Anything less than this is totally inconsistent with the vision for our community as expressed in Section 1.2.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
5	Covered elsewhere by law.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
6	"or exploring for or removing [...] water" is the definition of a well. So the word "water" should need to be removed, otherwise every homeowner is in violation.	3/5/2023 8:00 PM
7	Has this had a legal check...I know property own the surface land but not what is underground. Something to consider.	3/5/2023 3:27 PM
8	Do we have to have this section? I don't understand why mineral rights have anything to do with the community. Does this extend to owners who like to rockhound and find rocks on their property? If we are going to start attacking everything our neighbors do or build, we better be very specific.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
9	LUR do not permit this so I feel it is unnecessary verbiage	2/25/2023 5:14 PM
10	too restrictive and ambiguous. Not clear about where technologies such as geothermal heat pumps, which mine heat from extracted water, fall. Indeed, as written this basically says "you cannot use water from you lot for drinking or watering a horse". Critically, this section requires an Owner to purchase landscaping materials from off their lot, which may/will be different to the natural geology. (Re)Using, for example, material "quarried" for a home or other Improvement or even extracting material from their land for on property uses, provided they don't run afoul of "true" mining rights, shouldn't be restricted. The crux is the meaning of "used" vs. "removing". Can quarry for use on our land? We think this should be a yes but the clause as written is ambiguous. oil, gas or other hydrocarbons,... why not just state "hydrocarbons" that covers every one of them. The word "development" is unnecessary. Here's our version "... no real property within the Community shall be used for any purpose involving the exploration and/or exploitation and/or permanent removal of natural materials, including but not limited to, hydrocarbons, minerals, rocks, stones, gravel, earth* or water** from the property, except by pre-existing natural systems such as streams." Exceptions are made where it is necessary to remove such materials for ARC/Board & County approved Improvements.*** * isn't minerals, rocks, stones, gravel, earth removed for a home site/Improvement unintentionally failing this rule? ** could add flora and fauna here as well, but that opens whole other cans of worms. *** added this to mitigate the issue identified for *	2/19/2023 2:07 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

11	Get rid of this. So who's going to police the kids or grandkids when they decide to dig for a nugget of gold after watching gold rush.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
12	This is regulated by all levels of government and not needed in our covenants.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
13	Vacant lots would have a need to drill for water.	2/13/2023 3:57 PM
14	This is addressed in the Park County Land Use Regulations. No new sections is needed.	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
15	Is this necessary in a residential area? And people need to drill for wells.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
16	Clarify the section does not apply to small scale, individual rock hunting.	2/6/2023 7:40 PM



**Q24 Section 3.16 Damage to or Destruction of Improvements on Lots. Any damage to or destruction of any Improvement located on a Lot shall be remedied consistent with applicable State and County regulations and to the reasonable satisfaction of the Board. The cost of such remedy shall be the sole obligation of the Owner(s) of the Lot. (This section is new and not in current covenants)**

Answered: 76 Skipped: 2

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	59%	45
I would vote NO to this section	41%	31
TOTAL		76

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	The owner should have the option of removing the damaged improvement. There needs to be a timeframe associated with this. We are having more high wind events and potentially wildfire - this section seems too strongly worded for things like that.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	...to the reasonable satisfaction of the ARC and the Board.	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
3	Any rational person already knows they have to attend to property damage.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
4	Without understanding the purpose of new section, I would not vote for it. Also, why would the ARC not be the agency in charge of determining whether remediation of an improvement was performed reasonably?	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
5	The board does not need to have a say in this if the owner is following state and county regs.	3/7/2023 9:20 AM
6	It should be the individual Owner's responsibility to deal with any problems arising on his or her lot. The rest of the community should not be required to bear this burden.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
7	Does not take into account all potential situations, and requires the lot owner to be responsible for damage to one's lot caused by others.	3/6/2023 6:27 PM
8	The Board should not be involved.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
9	This is too subjective.	3/5/2023 6:54 PM
10	Again what's with the dwelling on the improvement part throughout these sections.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
11	What does damage mean? Does this mean the siding is sandblasted and needs a paint touch up? Does this mean the windows are broken and boarded up with cardboard? What are we talking about when we say damage to improvements? Very much so dislike the language "to the satisfaction of the Board" as it brings us back to subjective opinions on building preferences. It also ties us back to the question regarding financial hardship. If something is broken in a storm, it may be unreasonable to expect a neighbor to fix it immediately if it is a costly item. Not everyone here has multiple homes and lawyer money.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
12	A loss for words on this one.	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
13	Not necessary.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
14	Why would a homeowner have to meet the satisfaction of the board? What experience do they have in building and building codes? State and County regulations are understandable.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM
15	Again this is addressed by the county. No new section is needed.	2/12/2023 8:42 AM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

16	As a community, the condition of all properties impacts the value and enjoyment of our property and each owner needs to be responsible for maintaining the standard of the community.	2/11/2023 4:30 PM
17	A necessary section and not unreasonable in burden to a lot owner. I only wish there could be a fair timeframe for remediation. An open ended obligation could drag on and on, impacting a neighbor's lot/view etc.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
18	Only need to follow State and County laws.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
19	Not necessary.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
20	Clarify "sole responsibility of the owners, subject to insurance claims, claims against the person or entity that caused the damage "	2/6/2023 7:40 PM

**Q25 Section 3.17 Temporary and/or Moveable Units. All motor homes, mobile homes, and other temporary and/or moveable living or ancillary units are subject to all applicable County ordinances and regulations, but shall not be allowed for extended or permanent use. (Compare to Section 3a of current covenants.)**

Answered: 74 Skipped: 4

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	59%	44
I would vote NO to this section	41%	30
TOTAL		74

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	We probably need to define "permanent"- if someone lives in their RV for 5 years, that isn't permanent but we probably don't want that. We also want to ensure that we allow newer "tiny homes" and other new environmentally friendly types of structures.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	Current Section 3a addresses this issue sufficiently.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
3	Define extended	3/8/2023 2:32 PM
4	This is an important section in terms of keeping our community sanitary and safe. As an owner of a camper, and someone who travelled and lived in it extensively, I support folks using their land and campers in a responsible way however long term and permanent use is not responsible.	3/7/2023 12:44 PM
5	HA! this isn't followed now!	3/7/2023 9:20 AM
6	This is another section that primarily educates Owners that there may be County ordinances that they need to pay attention to. The last clause should keep our community from the risk of looking like a trailer park.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
7	Covered by Park County.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM
8	I would vote YES, but I feel this needs an "temporary exception per request to the ARC" clause, for temporary housing, such as for a construction dwelling. Just my two cents.	3/5/2023 8:00 PM
9	Let's abide by current county rules.	3/5/2023 6:54 PM
10	This should have been addressed in previous section.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
11	Again regulated on the county level!	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
12	I know several persons who lived in their RV while building a home taking 2 years or longer to do so. Not allowed for extended use I object to.	2/25/2023 5:14 PM
13	We do not need any more rules and regulations regarding RVs and camping. There's plenty already! And what is considered extended anyways? If people want to camp all summer on their own property, I have no problem with that.	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
14	Original is fine. Not all lot owners have the financial means to build a 3000+ square foot "cabin" or second home. We are perfectly fine with our 800 sq' cabin and would happily come up and stay in a camper if that's all that we could afford.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
15	Define extended - some folks stay in a mobile home while their permanent home is being built.	2/14/2023 12:40 PM
16	How long is an extended use? Too subjective.	2/13/2023 8:10 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

17	Timeline should be inserted for extended/permanent use.	2/13/2023 3:57 PM
18	Addressed by Park County.	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
19	This is a single family residential home neighborhood, not a trailer park.	2/11/2023 3:44 PM
20	storage for some of these should be permitted if not visible to other owners or from public roadway	2/10/2023 7:00 PM
21	The trailers by the pond have been a nuisance for over 2 years now. The County has repeatedly failed to enforce their own policies. Silverheels Ranch is meant for single-family homes and camping. Living in several RVs for years on end is not the intended use of this neighborhood.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
22	But would hope for a more clear term than "extended" which covers too much ground.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
23	I would remove, "but shall not be allowed for extended or permanent use". I think it suffices to say, "are subject to all applicable County ordinances and regulations".	2/10/2023 8:54 AM
24	Even if not in use you should be allowed to store on your own property.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
25	End the sentence after "county ordinances and regulations"	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
26	Clarify " not allowed for more than 1month"	2/6/2023 7:40 PM
27	"not be allowed for extended or permanent use" definition required.	2/6/2023 7:05 PM

**Q26 Section 3.18 Camping; Short Term Rentals; Bed & Breakfasts. All uses of real and/or personal property within the Community for purposes of camping, short-term rentals, or bed and breakfasts must comply with all applicable Laws. However, the Board is specifically authorized under Section 3.2 to establish and enforce Rules and Regulations on these matters that are more restrictive than any otherwise applicable Laws. (Compare to Section 3a of current covenants.)**

Answered: 78 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I would vote YES to this section	49%	38
I would vote NO to this section	51%	40
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>78</b>

#	COMMENTS:	DATE
1	I think we need to address Short Term Rentals in a more comprehensive way.	3/10/2023 1:44 PM
2	Reflect change to "Policies"	3/10/2023 1:41 PM
3	This authorizes the Board to "establish and enforce" more restrictive rules. Gives the Board too much power and control.	3/10/2023 10:02 AM
4	I'm a little confused as to why this is needed when it says basically the same thing as Section 3.2.	3/8/2023 9:46 AM
5	I do not believe in giving the Board additional powers.	3/7/2023 1:09 PM
6	We agree with the additions as included here. These additions were well reasoned and allow for possible future considerations as necessary, should situations present themselves. We truly appreciate the hours SNACC spent on reviewing, revising and creating a framework for the future of our beautiful community.	3/7/2023 11:44 AM
7	If the owner has gone through the county with any approvals, applications, payments, etc. then the HOA needs to stay out of it.	3/7/2023 9:20 AM
8	Important: this Section does not include the final text approved by the Covenants Committee. This Section was amended at the final meeting of the Committee on 2/15/23 meeting to the following: "All uses of real and/or personal property within the Community for purposes of camping, bed and breakfasts, or short-term rentals ("STRs") must comply with all applicable Laws. However, the Board is authorized under Section 3.2 to establish and enforce Policies on these matters that are more restrictive than any otherwise applicable Laws. The Board has the specific authority to comprehensively manage all aspects of STRs within the Subdivision, including but not limited to the authority: to require registration of each STR by its Owner(s); to promulgate reasonable Policies related to the rental and use of STRs; to issue STR permits; to revoke such permits for violations of STR Policies; and to restrict and/or limit the size, location, density, frequency of use, and total number of STRs, to assure that the objectives of Section 1.2 are always protected and preserved." This Section should be re-surveyed in the second segment of your survey process. It is critical for our community to deal with the STR issue. The Board needs to understand what the community wants on this challenge -- the views probably will vary a lot, but nobody will know for certain until a reasonable survey is conducted. The Board must have the advice of competent lawyers about what must go into our Covenants to accomplish what is needed on the STR issue.	3/6/2023 7:22 PM
9	The Board shall not have any authority over how land is used beyond Park County regulations.	3/6/2023 11:54 AM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New  
Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

10	My opinion is that this is too generic and the Board should not be authorized to make such broad decisions. Such restrictions as worded should only be by the majority votes of the entire community.	3/5/2023 8:00 PM
11	I did not purchase this land far away from a restrictive community, just for it to become more restrictive than say...Highlands Ranch. Give it a rest folks!	3/5/2023 6:54 PM
12	I am certainly see why it has taken the committee so long to go through the covenants.	3/2/2023 11:37 AM
13	WHY DID WE NOT CLARIFY THIS IN THE BUSINESS SECTION?! RENTALS ARE HOTELS AKA BUSINESSES! Last thought: this isn't going to be anon if you expect us to put our names and lot numbers down. The SNACC committee was a waste of time from the start. We have a group of community members who have too much time on their hands and have created unnecessary hassle for the rest of us. We completed this survey to make sure our voice was heard, however, we do not believe the excessive meetings or discussions created by this committee were useful at all. The updates to the covenants should have been completed a long time ago. At the end of the day, being able to enjoy the lot we spent a ridiculous amount of money on is up for question when the HOA needs to insert themselves into our home. Why can't we focus on enjoying the community we all own in and supporting each other instead of picking apart what someone wants to live in? We see certain neighbors now and want nothing to do with them because all they have done is create undo stress and burden for the community they don't even stay in 24/7/365. It would have been more productive to start spending our money on a community BBQ and making friendships.	3/1/2023 11:40 AM
14	Too restrictive. Already regulated on the county level.	2/27/2023 9:30 PM
15	The legal cost from this enforcement is a concern. Camping on my property is not the boards concern.	2/25/2023 5:14 PM
16	This section has been revised since this printing. Will the new revision be included in the next Survey?	2/22/2023 11:24 AM
17	Until I know what the more restrictive rules and regulations are - I can't say I would vote yes.	2/21/2023 11:18 AM
18	The STR's and B&B's foster many other local businesses.	2/20/2023 10:24 PM
19	It's none of the ARC's Business, whether someone has a short term rental, long-term, or uses their lot for camping!! All short term, long term , camping should be allowed! The ARC does not need to establish more rules and regulations. As I said, before, the county already has plenty!	2/18/2023 7:57 PM
20	We agree to following the park county rules and short term rentals need to be licensed. We disagree with leaving the door open to add other rules that could make it impossible for us to operate. We do live full time at our home and manage all guests to make sure rules are followed. Please have someone call us to explain what the board's intentions are with short term rentals. 970-310-5169	2/17/2023 8:46 AM
21	The board/HOA/ACC/ARC doesn't need any more power. If someone has a financial hardship and needs to VRBO or Airbnb to make ends meet, rather than having to sell; then so be it, let them do it. If we decided to do this with our lot/cabin, I would tell my neighbors and let them know when renters will be at our property. We would also have strict rules for this activity and ensure the renters knew the Park County fire rules as well as any other applicable county regulations. The next iteration of covenants will probably say that we can't have friends or family stay on our property unless we're there to supervise them and ensure that they abide by ALL HOA/ACC/ARC rules and covenants.	2/15/2023 10:46 AM
22	The ARC sounds like an over-reach. Private property should be developed according to county rules only.	2/14/2023 8:12 PM
23	Until the State and the County have definite rules and regulations and definitions regarding this section and legal use of residential property we should not address it and Jim B agreed that this should move on to the board to be reviewed by the attorney's.	2/12/2023 8:42 AM
24	We need legal advice before mentioning short-term rentals in our covenants. That said, it makes sense to specifically allow the Board to add necessary Rules and Regulations for Short Term Rentals. At the 2022 Annual Meeting, we learned that 48% of 911 calls in Park County are short-term rental related. As the Town of Fairplay and surrounding areas begin to place restrictions on the amount of allowed short term rental units, more business owners will flock to Silverheels Ranch to build or run their short term rental. The 2022-2023 SROA Board needs to find out how SROA members feel about short term rentals before finalizing the amended	2/11/2023 3:44 PM

SROA Board Questionnaire regarding proposed covenants prepared by the Silverheels New Amended Covenant Committee (SNACC) Part I

covenants document; this is the best opportunity to add a restriction if it's wanted. A good compromise would be to limit rentals to 3 months minimum in Silverheels Ranch.

25	I would still like to see the Board include regulations on STR. Any effort to limit the numbers of units in the subdivision must be addressed and put in writing now to be in place for future years.	2/11/2023 11:43 AM
26	Conforming to the new county laws are now more than sufficient for owners to manage their own property for STR use.	2/10/2023 9:14 PM
27	it should not be more restrictive than laws. if it is not visible to the community what harm is it if owners want to camp on their land.	2/10/2023 7:00 PM
28	STRs are a purely for-profit enterprise and should be zoned Commercial. Short-term renting is not Residential use, and this is a Residential neighborhood. They are taking all of our good-will to make this neighborhood a great place to live and turning it into a profit.	2/10/2023 6:52 PM
29	We am glad to hear that questions/comments pertaining to STRs will be addressed in the 2nd questionnaire. From what we have seen (we have 5 within close proximity to our lot) and heard from others their impact is primarily dependent on a person's lot location, but as their numbers grow this may affect all of us. Attention needs to be paid to this growing phenomenon.	2/10/2023 6:47 PM
30	Short of more specific language concerning STR, this section does address issues.....for now.....but much more in-depth research and thought (along with a county that gets serious about the subject) is needed for the future.	2/10/2023 6:02 PM
31	Leave to the county and state laws. No need for a board to get involved. Other than maybe filing with the county a complaint. Only after talking with lot owner. We need to work with each other bot against each other.	2/8/2023 10:36 AM
32	Again with the unreasonable assumption the board can make up its own rules and regulations.	2/7/2023 8:42 AM
33	Where is the section that allows the board to enforce the covenants?	2/6/2023 7:40 PM

### General Comments

overall there were no section for general comments, so I will put it here. The general idea to update this document was to bring to compliance with the limited community aspect of it. As far as I am concerned this can be just addressed in one paragraph. No need to update the entire document and bring all the restrictions to our rural, mountain community just to please other people agenda. This whole thing is absolutely ridiculous. I didn't buy a property here for other people to tell me how to live. If i would like to do so , then i would live at the front range. Lastly, it is totally unacceptable that the majority of the people that try to enforce all those new rules, live full time at the front range and other location and don't even live here full time, but still want to impose their agenda on our community. People who do not live here full time, shouldn't even be involved in updating those documents.