

## **CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS POLICY RELATED TO REMOVAL AND/OR ADDITION OF AN AMENITY TO THE EXISTING AMENITY PACKAGE**

### **HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE:**

At the time of the last major addition, (3<sup>+</sup> tennis courts) to the District's Amenity Package.

The GHCCD BOS was developer controlled. (Developer interests paramount.)

The developer was primarily interested in selling home/lots.

The developer was flush with cash.

Unused common area space was available for development of additional amenities.

Many fewer residents, with many fewer competing interests, resided in the community.

### **JULY 2012:**

The GHCCD BOS is now fully resident controlled.  
(Collective interests of all District residents paramount.)

Your Board's statutory duties include preserving and maintaining the District's infrastructure, establishing District policies, and developing the District's annual budget.

Your Board is pledged to apply the District's financial resources as prudently as possible to achieve the optimal benefit for all the District's residents.

Your Board's budgets have been overrun the last two years by unanticipated major infrastructure problems due to:

- Normal wear-and-tear (up to 15 years in the Florida environment); plus
- Questionable construction materials and techniques not suited for the environment and built "for show", not durability; plus
- Unauthorized over-utilization of amenities (Mass enabled GADs, no BUR compliance.)

No undeveloped common areas exist to construct additional amenities.

Many more residents, with many more competing (and conflicting due to limited resources) interests now reside in the community.

Financial inability to generate revenues necessary to meet everyone's interests, wants.

## **ESTABLISHING A NECESSARY NEW POLICY:**

In consideration of the above, your Board has determined that a fair, balanced and impartial process must be established whenever requests for additions and/or deletions to the amenity package are to be considered.

The following criteria and analytical tools have been proposed and discussed as part of this process:

## **DRAFT CRITERIA FOR ADDITIONS TO THE AMENITY PACKAGE:**

### **A. USAGE ANALYSIS**

#### **1. Demonstrated need established by usage analysis**

- Data to be collected/estimates projected re the number of current/projected users by day, time-of-day, day of week, by season, by holidays, by “school vacation weeks”
- Current/projected user status: resident, overnight guest, renter, day guest, non-owner annual pass holders
- Perceived community usage (interests analysis) (Public Hearing/Survey?, see below)

#### ***Action Items***

Usage data capture forms to be developed by Amenity Manager, six months minimum, to include Snowbird, non-Snowbird, and Holiday time periods. Facilitators, Amenity Manager, and ?Resident Volunteers? to collect data..

### **B. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

#### **1. Space available that complies with zoning, City ordinances, etc.**

- Available space?, Land use zoning, City permitting, ADA compliance, possible later demand for outside non-resident (league/championship, etc.) play, liability exposure, warranties?

#### ***Action Items***

FOM to investigate space availability, zoning and permitting, warranty issues. District Counsel//FOM/Consultants to investigate ADA compliance, liability

issues. Amenity Manager to investigate potential later demand for outside/league play.

## **C. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 1. Can accommodate capital expense within planned capital outlay.**
- 2. Can accommodate increase in operating expense within planned increase in annual O&M expense.**
  - Engineering, consultants, construction/bid documents, bids, contingencies, actual construction costs, ongoing maintenance, warranties, capital and O&M budgetary considerations? Impacts on assessments?

### ***Action Items***

FOM to investigate construction related, projected maintenance, warranty expenses. District Manager Financial Department to report on projected impact on current capital and O&M budgetary conditions, projected impact on subsequent assessment levies.

## **D. COMMUNITY INPUT:**

- 1. Reviewed at public meeting.**
  - What is anticipated community wide use of proposed new amenity?
  - What is current community wide use of existing amenity proposed for removal?
  - Public Hearing?
  - Use of Survey as a **non-binding** tool to elicit community input regarding proposal.

*(Probably impossible to remove bias from organized special interest groups, therefore results helpful, but non-binding, must be clear residents/property owners are not voting on the issue, but providing guidance to the GHCDD BOS as it deliberates and ultimately decides on the issue.)*

***Action Items:***

**The GHCCD BOS** develops survey instruments to assess community input regarding the addition and/or removal of an amenity. If survey: distributed on web, paper versions in Amenity office.

- Ad Hoc Group may be formed by BOS to develop survey questions.
- 
- GHCCD BOS will receive community input at a regularly scheduled public meeting.

**CRITERIA FOR ELIMINATING AN AMENITY:**

- ✓ **No demonstrated need established by usage analysis.**
- ✓ **Removal will either avoid a capital expense or eliminate ongoing operating expense.**
- ✓ **Reviewed at public meeting.**