

In Response to “Various 26”:

I suppose that if the economy were booming and we could get a much more elaborate building for under a million dollars, with a 30-year loan at a fixed rate of 2%, there would still be letters of opposition coming in. I accept this as a fact of life. However with so many votes being cast by people who don't live here (yet), there is a risk that some of them may actually believe what you've written, so here goes:

You should have taken a look at the scheduling book for the clubhouse before claiming that “most days and evenings the clubhouse is empty and simply not in use.” I recently organized a duplicate bridge club and, after poring over the schedule, found that there was only one morning time slot we could reserve on a weekly basis. And we still have to share the space with the Architectural Standards Committee twice a month. In every issue of the Lockwood Lines (except this latest one) there is a listing of regularly scheduled and special events (left-hand side of the centerfold; green background). Many of these events take place at the clubhouse, and the list doesn't even include board meetings or committee meetings. Further, it is not just the number of activities that are scheduled, but the attendance limits for each event that have become problematic. Case in point: the annual Susan G. Komen luncheon. Over the years, Lockwood Folly has raised tens of thousands of dollars for this and other charities. It's something we can all be proud of. But not everyone who wants to participate can get a ticket. Last year, some ladies who had tickets were still excluded at the last minute, leading to hard feelings in many quarters. Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind: a new space is by no means “more of a wish than a need”. And the need will only become greater as more folks build here.

In the last issue of the Lockwood Lines, there was a two-page article summarizing the process that the clubhouse committee went through which resulted in the proposal before us. If you had read that, you would know that the “renovation or expansion of the current clubhouse” HAS been “revisited”, and in great detail, by the committee. They brought in outsiders for advice and concluded that it wasn't the most reasonable solution for us, in part because of the requirements to bring the whole building up to current codes. But you know what? Even if the committee had concluded that we could fix up the old place for half the price of a new community center, there would still have to be an assessment of \$2250, and there would be those who would oppose it. (See paragraph one, above.) If you are so concerned about POA dues increases and assessments, it would be in your best interests to consider what sort of an assessment you will face when the septic system fails. Since many signers are LFCCI members, may I also add that the condition of the clubhouse/café building is doing nothing to keep your golf fees low, and could well be the cause of future assessments over and above your golf fees.

Finally, I feel I must address your tone with regard to the board of directors. Some of these people have spent their careers dealing with financial issues. In my personal dealings, I have found them to be more than competent, and I also find that they take very seriously their fiduciary duty to the property owners. Do you really think they would saddle us with a variable rate balloon loan? As for opening the ballots in public: what are you suggesting? That the votes won't be counted and recounted for accuracy? That we will be lied to about the outcome of this vote? If you don't want a new clubhouse, just vote “no”. The majority will carry the day. No matter the outcome, life will go on. But to try to influence the outcome of the vote with specious arguments and innuendo is beyond the pale.