

THOA Meeting Minutes 9/27/2025

- 1) **Call to Order at 2:38 pm David Mitchler, David Meier, Thea Cox and Kevin Leete in attendance (Bilal Husain Absent)**
- 2) David Meier Moved to approve agenda Kevin Leete Seconded, passed unanimously
- 3) Resident Forum Skipped - no residents in attendance
- 4) Parking Rules and Regulations Visitor Pass amendment and Revision Discussion:
 - a) Kevin Leete led discussion about possible revisions to the existing parking policy. Main concerns discussed were:
 - i) Visitor spots are being used extensively by resident vehicles, so that true visitors cannot find parking. The same Homeowners use the same visitor space every day as if it was their own personal spot
 - ii) Additional clarifications on the sizes of vehicles that can be parked in all marked spots, because not all spots are the same size and cannot be easily changed until lots are resurfaced
 - b) Proposed solutions under consideration:
 - i) Limit to only one visitor pass per Townhome
 - ii) Refresh visitor passes every 3 years, and homeowners must be up to date on all fees and dues to receive theirs
 - iii) Implement a rule where a visitor pass can only occupy a visitor space in the Community for 10 out of every 30 days. Violations could receive a fine
 - iv) Implement a rule where a visitor tag cannot be in use if that homeowner's personal spaces are not already in use by 2 vehicles
 - v) Change the listed size restrictions of vehicles so that they must fit within the lines of their space (including mirrors and such) and must not extend beyond a set number of feet from the curb
 - (1) Perhaps reduce from 21' (current) to 19.5', with exemptions granted by the board for special circumstances. The 21' number is too large for many existing lots, but not all
 - vi) Currently, commercial vehicles are prohibited based on Loudoun County's definition of commercial vehicles. In the governing documents it states that only "passenger vehicles" are allowed. Should we put a more clear definition on what can be classified as a passenger vehicle? Perhaps height or style requirement?
 - vii) Should the bumper be allowed to extend over the concrete? Should there be a limit?
 - c) Kevin Leete tasked with editing parking policy to bring to next meeting for further discussion
 - d) Since it may take a few months to finalize language on new parking policy, David Meier suggested that next meeting, we should propose an amendment to the current parking policy that simply includes item 4)b)ii), so that visitor passes can be refreshed early next after proper notification of homeowners
- 5) Current striping project update

- a) Several complaints were received from homeowners confused about the schedule of striping as well as the absence of tick marks on the concrete
 - b) Tick marks on concrete were not a part of the original scope of work
 - c) David Meier and David mitcher had spoken with Fairfax Paving and received a verbal quote of 5,000\$ for the addition of tick marks on the concrete
 - d) David Meier and David mitcher had spoken with Fairfax Paving and received an explanation of the scheduling confusion.
 - i) If there is extra paint in the sprayer left over after finishing a lot, the workers will jump ahead to other parking lots and paint additional lines for spaces that don't have any cars nearby to not waste paint and to make things go quicker when they have to get to that lot later. This is a normal method and care is taken to not miss any spots when it's that lot's turn to get striped. Homeowners should not be concerned if painting is done in their lot before the designated time.
- 6) MOTION: Kevin Leete Moved to approve Fairfax Paving to paint additional tick marks on the concrete throughout the community, not to exceed 5,000\$ Thea Cox Seconded. Kevin Leete, David Meier, David Mitchler, and Thea Cox all voted Yes. (Bilal Husain was absent, but over the phone had expressed his approval before the meeting started)
- 7) At 4:00pm Kevin Leete left the meeting early.

The following report was provided by Mr. David Meier via email on October 3, 2025, as recorded minutes for the remainder of the meeting after Mr. Leete Left.

The agenda for September 27, 2025, was also submitted on October 3, 2025, at 11:10 am.

Kevin's report on Visitor Pass and Parking Rules and Regulations is attached below.

Kevin's report includes Board members approval of \$5,000. increase to parking lot striping project for tick marks on all curbs. Motion carried unanimously with 4 board members attending and Bilal (absent) by phone. Motion to be entered into the October 8, 2025 Regular Board meeting and then formally passed.

After Kevin left meeting discussion followed on 2 other items.

The consensus of 3 board members remaining at the meeting was that the waste and poop collection cost has exceeded our capacity to maintain the collection sites. It was suggested that the board draft a letter with the signatures of all Board members to the SRHOA Board requesting relief and assistance in the waste station maintenance. Our goal would be a return to the pre-2013 custodial methods. It should be noted that without relief and assistance from the SRHOA, we may need to remove all of the stations.

The Annual Sequoia Contract cost and options to reduce that cost were discussed. The 3 members concurred that the current contract should be cancelled as soon as possible and an alternate contract similar to the 2002 contract with Sequoia be provided to the Board.

Two items were reviewed to assist in the cost of this contract review:

1) The additional of cost \$28,800. for the maintenance service was added to our contract in February of 2013. Prior to 2013 this service was provided by the SRHOA . Since the signing of the contract in February of 2014, this maintenance service has cost our townhouse association \$432,743.

This unwanted expense has bankrupted the reserve funds necessary for the proper maintenance of our parking lots and curbs, our sidewalks, and limited the removal of dangerous trees. Children's playgrounds have been removed from our community for what was labeled "insufficient funds to maintain". The 3 board members concurred that this expense must end with a revised contract.

2) An alternate off-site management company was solicited to provide a competitive bid. It was suggested that this management company should be able to present their contract for the same services at our November 12th Board meeting in a Board-only Executive Session.

The meeting was adjourned with a consensus vote at 4:52 pm.