I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 25, 2015 MEETING MINUTES

III. VARIANCE REQUEST

   A. Ronald and Faye St. Armand request a variance from Section 5.2.6 Parking, Storage and Use of Recreational Equipment of the City of Conway Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for the property located at 1004 Pineridge Street (TMS# 149-22-01-053 PIN# 38102010018) in order to allow parking of a recreational vehicle on a concrete pad on the property’s front/side yard.

IV. PUBLIC INPUT

V. ADJOURN
I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Hewitt called the meeting to order at 5:25 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Johnson made a motion, seconded by Dannelly, to approve the May 28, 2015 meeting minutes as written. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

III. VARIANCE REQUEST

Because it was felt item B would be less complicated, Hewitt asked the Board if they would approve taking item B first. David made a motion, seconded by Hyman, to approve hearing item B first. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

B. Horry County government requests a variance from Section 5.2.1.B.4 and Section 5.2.1.B.6.c Accessory Structures of the City of Conway’s Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for the property located at 2560 Main Street (TMS #123-00-02-139 / PIN 32513040011).

Mary Catherine Hyman, from Horry County Planning, was at the meeting representing Horry County.
Alex Hyman stated for the record that he was related to Mary Catherine Hyman by marriage. Emrick said the fact did not present a conflict and Alex Hyman did not need to recuse himself.

Emrick said Horry County had requested the addition of a metal carport building at the M.L. Brown Building. He said it was a 30’ x 50’ metal carport to house the County’s special operation vehicle and mobile command center.

Emrick said the County was requesting variances to construct a fifth accessory building at the M.L. Brown Complex and to construct a 1,500 square foot metal carport. Emrick said it was his understanding the windows of the two vehicles to be housed were sensitive to UV rays. He said the structure and vehicles would not be seen from the street.

Emrick cited the sections of the ordinance that prohibited each of those requests. He said the applicants based their hardship upon being centralized and a secure facility. They also believe the M.L. Brown Building complex is unique in this respect.

Emrick said staff recommended that the Board conduct a thorough review of the request and determine if a hardship existed, and if best interests of the City of Conway would be served by granting the variances.

Hewitt asked if any of the public were here for this issue. Ms. Williams said she lived next door to the building and wanted to know which way the traffic would be entering the complex. Emrick said there would be no change in where vehicles would enter the complex.

Alex Hyman asked Emrick if the roof could be metal and the structure be stick built. Emrick said that was acceptable. David asked if this had been considered by the County. Gary Watson, also with the County, said it was a budget issue. Mary Catherin Hyman said the structure would not be seen by the public.

Hewitt told the applicants the Board had to go by four factors determined by the state to be considered before a variance could be granted. He said they were that there were exceptional and extraordinary conditions pertaining to this particular piece of property, that the extraordinary conditions must be peculiar to the particular piece of property, that application of the Ordinance on this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship, and last, if granted, it must not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purpose and intent of the Ordinance or the Comprehensive Plan.
Alex Hyman said the Board had routinely said no to other people requesting metal carports. He said although the request was from the County, the Board could not treat them any differently than they did anyone else. He said he did not mind the structure, and he did not think the structure needed to look like the other two accessory structures on the property.

Hewitt asked Emrick what the nonconformity was with the metal carport. He asked if it was the entire structure. Emrick said a metal roof was permitted, he said it was the base structure that was not permitted. He said if it were clad in another material, it would be permitted. Watson was asked if the County had gotten any quotes for a stick built structure. Watson said they had gotten other quotes and this metal carport was the most inexpensive. Mary Catherine Hyman said the thought process was that this was a secure, private area the public would not be viewing. She said the vehicles needed weekly maintenance and the maintenance area was located at this complex.

Emrick had shown the Board photographs of two other accessory structures on site that were brick. David asked if the other structures were open air. Mary Catherine Hyman said they were open air. She said those particular structures were not large enough to house the two vehicles.

Alex Hyman said because this was a centrally located area, this might be considered extraordinary. He said it was not the average situation a homeowner would face. Hewitt said he was having issues trying to find a hardship with the materials being used. David said he did not want to unduly burden the applicant.

Johnson asked the public if they objected to the structure. Ms. Williams said she did not object. Her concern had been where the traffic would enter.

Mary Catherine Hyman said they felt the extraordinary conditions were that this is was in a location where the public would not see it, and it would be shielded by the other existing buildings. Johnson said if the support poles were other than metal, it would be acceptable. Emrick said from an approval standpoint, it would be acceptable.

Alex Hyman made a motion, seconded by Johnson, based on there being extraordinary conditions that did not apply to other properties in the vicinity, to grant a variance to permit Horry County to have the fifth accessory structure. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.
Watson said the Horry County officials mandated to him to be conscious of the budget. He said they went into this looking for a solution that served the most economical way to accomplish purchasing the structure. Alex Hyman asked what the budget for this structure was. Watson said it was $9,000.00. Watson said a wooden structure would be too expensive. Alex Hyman said the metal posts could be wrapped in another material, and that would be permitted.

Watson told the Board the County had already purchased the metal carport because they had to spend the money before the end of the fiscal year. He said if the Board did not grant the variance, the County could use the structure elsewhere.

David said with the structure would not be seen from the right-of-way or to the public could be extraordinary circumstances.

Hewitt said talking a relatively liberal view of the factors, you could say perhaps that the extraordinary conditions that did not apply to non-government buildings, utilization was taken care of by the need for the vehicles to be shielded from ultraviolet light, and the detriment part had been taken care of. Hewitt said he was not saying the case would carry the preponderance of the evidence burden. He said the alternative would be they could comply with the ordinance just like everybody else.

David made a motion, seconded by Dannelly, to approve the request for the metal shelter based on the fact it had already been purchased, the residents were paying for the structure, the structure was not visible to the public by being within a confined space, which was extraordinary, a factor which other properties did not have, without the variance, it would prohibit and unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property and the protection of the vehicles, and there would be no detriment to the public or the adjacent property. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

A. A1 Signs and Graphics requests a variance on behalf of A&A Management LLC from Section 11.3 Sign Standards by Zoning Districts, Section 5.2.3 Fences and Walls, 8.3 Parking Requirements, Section 6.5.2.I. Landscaping and Buffer Requirements, and Section 12.1.6 Nonconforming Signs of the City of Conway Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for the property located at 618 Church Street (TMS# 137-01-33-001 / PIN 36803010069) in order to add signage, landscaping, reconfigure parking and add a fenced area to accommodate a Pawn Shop.
Emrick said on May 20, 2015, the applicant submitted a site plan for the redevelopment and change of use for a commercial building located at 618 Church Street. The building had formerly been a restaurant and night club and would now be used as a pawn shop.

Emrick said the interesting thing about this lot was that it had four frontages, facing Church Street is what would normally be considered the front, Legion Street would normally considered the rear with Seventh Avenue and Hiland Avenues normally would be considered the sides. He said this configuration presented permitting issues from the standpoint of the UDO.

Emrick said the request consisted our four separate items being:

1. An 8’ high fence, approximately 100’x 100’ in the Hiland Avenue and Legion Street corner section of the existing parking area. He said this would be for outdoor storage. He said they proposed to install landscaping around the outside of the fencing. Emrick said the problem from the permitting standpoint was in normal circumstances, it would be permissible to have a 4’ tall fence in the front. Being on Church Street or any other high volume road, a 6’ tall fence would be permitted. He said this would not apply to the Hiland or Legion side. He said they would have to do 4’ and 6’, which made no sense in terms of the security they would need. The UDO required for outdoor storage a fence to be 7’ in height. He said that created an issue with a 6’ height maximum and a 7’ height requirement. He said the applicants wanted to have 8’ height for maximum security.

He said the reason this was impactful first was that it limited the amount of parking square footage they would have. He said in the Gateway Corridor Overlay if you have over 30,000 square feet of parking area, it changed the type of landscaping buffer that would be required. He said for a 30,000 square foot parking area, a 15’ buffer in the front would be required. Emrick said if it was under 30,000 square feet, a 10’ buffer would be required. He said if the fence was permitted, the parking area would be smaller than 30,000 square feet and only a 10’ buffer would be required. He said they were only required to have 40 parking spaces. He said if the fencing variance was granted, they would not need the parking variance. Emrick said if the variance for the fence wasn’t granted, they would be over the parking maximum.

2. A total of 40 parking spaces, using the existing asphalt parking area. He said this included 5 handicapped parking spaces.

3. To install the frontage buffer along Church Street only and to allow existing landscape to make up the required buffers along the remaining
street frontages. Emrick said the site had a lot of mature landscaping. He said they had Live Oaks and Crepe Myrtles, which had established an order of magnitude. He said these trees gave the lot the impact the city was looking for. He said the palm trees were also mature trees. He said the reason the landscaping buffers were triggered was because of the change of use. Emrick said the numbers of bushes the applicant proposed facing Church Street equaled what was required. He said they were asking for a variance from having to install the canopy and understory trees. He said they were proposing that the palm trees be accepted in lieu of the requirements to conform with the other mature palms on the site. He said the UDO considered a palm tree decorative tree that did not count for any canopy or understory trees.

Emrick said there were some landscape islands with mature trees. He said usually only 12 parking spaces were permitted and then an island was required. He said they would like to leave the islands as they were since they already had mature landscaping.

Emrick showed the Board photographs of where the fence and the existing landscaping was located on the property from each of the sides of the site.

Emrick said a few things the applicants were doing that were not required by the UDO was ingress and egress with limited curb cuts, which brought the site more into the parking requirements.

4. To install a 208 square foot wall sign on the brick parapet on the existing structure.

Emrick said the applicants had replaced the sign face in the existing road sign, while keeping the height and size of it. The sign does not conform with the UDO thus making it so they could not add anything additional to the current sign.

Emrick said they wished to put an additional sign on the brick parapet. Emrick corrected himself and said the parapet was 208 square feet and the sign would be 82.64 square feet. He said they would normally be limited to 100 square feet or 15% of the wall. He said not only were they asking for a variance to have a second sign, but also for the size of the parapet sign.

At this point, Hyman said he needed to recuse himself due to a civil action with A1 Signs and Mr. Johnson from participation in the sign variance request. He felt he could participate in the other requests.
Hewitt asked any of the public if they wished to speak. Mr. Ronald Jordan asked how long the fence on the back side on Legion would be going toward Hiland. Emrick said the applicant said he believed it was 10' from the corner would be the separation from Hiland.

Johnson asked Mr. Barnes if there would be access from the Hiland Avenue side. He said it would not be a through way, but there would be a dumpster in the area and the trash truck would be able to get in to empty it. Emrick also said the dumpster would have to be screened.

Billy Hughes was also present and said his parents were concerned about visibly seeing the dumpster and the noise involved with trash pick-up. There was a discussion about where the dumpster had been previously and it was determined if the dumpster pad was already in place, the dumpster had been in its current location.

Emrick said staff’s recommendation was for the Board to conduct a thorough review of the request and determine if a hardship existed and if the best interest of the City of Conway would be served by granting the multiple requests.

Hewitt suggested they start with the fence. Hewitt reminded the Board of the four findings they must consider in determining if a variance could be approved. Hewitt said from his perspective the applicant had a strong case for the approval of the storage fence in what would technically be their front yard, but was really their side yard because everyone knew the “front” was Church Street.

Hyman asked if the fence would be chain link. Emrick said chain link was not permitted in the Gateway Corridor Overlay. Barnes said it would wooden slats. Hyman said he saw no issue with the height of the fence especially due to the unusual configuration of the property and since it would be wooden. Barnes was asked about the color of the fence. Barnes said it would be gray like the building. He said it needed to be 8’ for security.

Johnson made a motion, seconded by Hyman, to approve the 8’ fence along the Hiland Avenue and Legion Street sides. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

Emrick said since the fence had been approved, the parking item no longer was necessary.

Hewitt asked Emrick to briefly go over the buffering issue again. Emrick said given the vote on the fence, the buffer would only have to be 10’ on the Church Street frontage. Emrick said he would talk about the
front buffer first. He said the application had requested to allow the palm trees to stand in place of the required understory and canopy trees. He said the reason for that was to allow matching with some of the mature palms already on the site.

Emrick said on the Seventh Avenue side and Legion Street sides the request was to allow the existing landscaping to stand for the required buffer.

Emrick said on the Hiland Street side the fence landscaping would count in that regard.

Hyman asked what the requirements were based on. Emrick said it was based on the linear feet of the frontage. Hewitt said new trees might adversely affect the mature trees. Johnson said she thought the Seventh Avenue and Legion Street landscaping looked fine as it was. Johnson said Church Street was very busy and the trees would eventually become overgrown. She said the palm trees would not affect the traffic.

Hyman made a motion, seconded by Johnson, to grant the landscape variance for the sides and front on Church Street and to allow the palm trees to take place of the canopy trees. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

The Board moved on to the signage request.

Hewitt said there was an existing, nonconforming sign. Emrick said the face panel had been changed a week ago and he thought it looked nice. Hewitt said under the UDO, rehabbing a nonconforming sign would limit other signage to 100 square feet. Emrick said it actually did not permit any other signage. Emrick said there could be no secondary signage. He said the applicant was asking for a variance for that aspect, and then another request regarding the size of sign permitted on the parapet.

Hewitt said they first had to decide if they could grant a variance for the secondary signage and then how big it could be. Emrick said that was correct.

Hewitt stated for the record that Hyman was recused for this agenda item. Hyman said that was correct.

Dannnelly asked why a nonconforming detracted from a new sign on the building. Emrick said the motivation was that the city was trying to encourage conforming signage. He said you can have a second sign if you bring the nonconforming sign into conformance. He said to bring this particular sign into conformity, they would have had to bring it down to 14’
in total height. He said the overall size of the sign would have had to have been reduced substantially. Emrick said the other motivation was that they already had a giant sign and was a second sign really necessary.

Hewitt said he struggled with the issue that although there was no opposition, they did have the four findings to address. He said he personally struggled with what the extraordinary conditions would be. He said the nonconforming sign was there when they took the space and they had rehabbed it as they were permitted to do.

Dannelly said he was trying to remember, but he thought Thorny’s had a sign on the parapet. Johnson agreed. Emrick said once the sign was removed from the parapet, another one could not just be placed back. Hewitt asked if any of the original structure was still there. Emrick said the brick wall still remained. Emrick was asked if the brick wall was not part of the sign structure and the letters just removed. Emrick said that was up for the Board to interpret. The Board noted that the brick structure had been there before and had recently been painted white. Dannelly asked if there would be lighting for the signage. Barnes said if approved, he wanted to have channel letters. It was discussed that the parapet wall was shielding the air conditioning units from being seen from Church Street.

Johnson said most businesses had wall signs, but she said she did not know how common it was to have one at the road as well.

Hewitt said the parapet was already there and it might be considered by some to be rather heinous. David said if they were inclined to permit a second sign, then they had to determine the size of that sign. Emrick said that was correct. He asked what would be permitted under the UDO. Emrick said it would be 15% of the face or 100 square feet, whichever was less. He said in this case, 15% it would be 32.2 square feet. He said what they had drawn was 82.64 square feet. He said another way to interpret the building face was to measure the whole building face toward Church Street and not just the parapet. He said in that case, the 100 square feet would be the lesser size.

Dannelly asked if it was had been the history of the Board to grant a variance in a situation like this. David asked if the sign could not just go back up because the letters had been removed. Emrick said he did not consider the parapet a sign structure because it was put up to hide the air condition units not necessarily to house a sign. Johnson asked why the sign couldn’t be used to decorate the parapet. She said it looked better with the lettering. Emrick said that was a possibility. Dannelly asked if the UDO had been written after it had been Thorny’s. Emrick said it had been rewritten in 2011. Emrick said the Community Appearance Board approved it before. Dannelly said using common sense, if it was
acceptable then what could have changed so much. He also agreed the parapet looked better with something there rather than nothing on it.

Hewitt asked Emrick if there had been any opposition. Emrick said only from Mr. Johnson and it was not about the signage.

Johnson made a motion, seconded by Dannelly, to approve the secondary signage and to approve the size of the secondary signage. The vote in favor was unanimous, with Hyman having recused himself. The motion carried.

IV. PUBLIC INPUT

There was none.

V. ADJOURN

David made a motion, seconded by Hyman, to adjourn the meeting. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Signed this 27th day of August, 2015.

Blake Hewitt, Chairman
ISSUE:

Ronald and Faye St. Armand request a variance from Section 5.2.6 Parking, Storage and Use of Recreational Equipment of the City of Conway Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for the property located at 1004 Pineridge Street (TMS# 149-22-01-053 PIN# 38102010018) in order to allow parking of a recreational vehicle on a concrete pad on the property’s front/side yard.

BACKGROUND:

On June 25, 2015, Ronald and Faye St. Armand were sent a notice of violation letter regarding the parking of a recreational vehicle in a front/side yard driveway at their home located at 1004 Pineridge Street in the Pecan Grove subdivision.

Section 5.2.6 “Parking, Storage & Use of Recreational Equipment” of the City of Conway Unified Development Ordinance, states that “No major recreational equipment shall be parked or stored on any lot in a residential district except in a car port or enclosed building or the rear yard, provided however that such equipment may be parked anywhere on residential premises not to exceed twenty-four (24) hours during loading or unloading.” As the recreational vehicle was not parked in the rear yard, in a garage or in a carport, the vehicle was found to be parked in violation of 5.2.6. The St. Armands were given 14 days to cure the violation.

On July 1, 2015, the St. Armands filed their request for a variance from the strict application of the UDO for the following reasons:

1. The Pecan Grove HOA allows the parking of RVs and boats on cement pads in side yards.
2. To construct a carport or garage would take away from the appearance of the neighborhood.
3. There is no backyard access due to drainage, a pond, and a protected tree line.

The Applicant is requesting a variance to allow them to continue to park their recreational vehicle on the concrete pad in the front/side yard of their home.

The applicants base their hardship request based upon the constrained rear yard of the home and the prior permission of the Home Owner’s Association of Pecan Grove Subdivision.

CITY OF CONWAY UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO)

In Section 14.2.1 of the UDO, the duties and powers of the Board of Zoning Appeals reflect Section 6-29-800 of the South Carolina Code of Laws.

According to Section 14.1035, the Board of Zoning Appeals duties are “to hear and decide appeals for variances in specific cases when a strict application of the zoning ordinance would cause an unnecessary hardship, and approval of such variance would not be contrary to public interest or undermine the spirit of the zoning ordinance. The fact that property may be used more profitably if a variance is granted is not grounds for a variance. The Board may attached conditions to a variance that address location, character, or other features of a proposed building, structure, or use, in order to protect the established property values in the surrounding area or to promote the public health, safety,
or general welfare of the community. The Board may grant a variance for an unnecessary hardship if it makes and explains in writing all of the following findings.

1. **Extraordinary Conditions:** There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property.

2. **Other Property:** The extraordinary and exceptional conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity.

3. **Utilization:** Because of the extraordinary or exceptional conditions, the application of the ordinance to a particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.

4. **Detriment:** The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by granting a variance.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the BZA conduct a thorough review of the request and determine if a hardship exists and if the best interests of the City of Conway will be served by granting the request.
July 1, 2015

Ron St Amand

1004 Pine Ridge St

Conway, SC 29527

Lot# 102 +103

To: Mr. Adam Emrick

ATT: TMS#14-22-01-053

I have attached explanations of the recent letter on parking my Coach alongside my home, and earnest explanations on why.

The Value of this unit and the necessary plug-ins make very important to do so.

I appreciate the understanding of you all and once you see the overall plan the concern of others should not be an issue.

I assume you need the $100.00 fee for this application so it as well is enclosed.

If there is anything I can do to help in this matter in any way please call me @ 843-775-0026 (home) or 704-989-2179 (Cell)

Sincerely

Ronald St Amand
City of Conway
Board of Zoning Appeals
VARIANCE/ APPEAL REQUEST

City of Conway Planning Department
P.O. Drawer 1075, 29528
Phone: (843) 488-9888
Conway, South Carolina
Fax: (843) 488-9890
www.cityofconway.com

Property Address: 1004 Pine Ridge
Meeting Date: TMS # 149-22-01-053

Property Owner: Ronald & Fay St. Amant
Daytime Phone:

Applicant: Ronald & Fay St. Amant
Daytime Phone:

Applicant's mailing address: 1004 Pine Ridge St.

City: Conway
State: SC
Zip Code: 29527

Requested Action:

☒ I am requesting a variance from the strict application of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Please continue to the following section.

☐ I am requesting an administrative appeal of the action or decision of the Zoning Administrator, which I believe to be contrary to the meaning of the Conway Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Please continue to page three.

VARIANCE REQUESTS:
Please demonstrate how you satisfy the following CRITERIA FOR VARIANCE (see §14.2.1 of the Conway Unified Development Ordinance).

Please describe your proposal in detail:

HOA allows RV parking on cement pads, to put up a tall car port or building, we feel, would take away from the appearance of the neighborhood.

TMS # 149-22-01-053/PIN 381.020.10018

This proposal does not conform to the Unified Development Ordinance in the following way:

UDO Section and Requirement:

1. Proposed Instead:
2. 
3. 
4. 

Application Requirements:

☐ Completed BZA application
☐ A filing fee of one hundred dollars ($100.00)
☐ A completed application including all required signatures, incomplete applications will not be processed.
☐ A site plan drawn to scale illustrating all property lines, existing structures, proposed structures and any other relevant site information.
1. Describe the extraordinary conditions pertaining to your particular piece of property:
   No backyard access due to drainage, catch pond and tree line that is protected preserve.

2. Are the conditions described above particular to your piece of property? Explain.
   All homes along the tree line have limited back yard access.

3. Would the strict application of the Zoning Ordinance prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use of your property? Explain.
   Yes, we complied with the HOA allowing RV parking on a cement pad. This allows us to keep battery levels stable, have a secure parking area, clean and well kept.

4. Will the granting of the variance harm adjacent property, the character of the area or the public good? Explain:
   No, we own the adjacent lot. It is a beautiful, empty lot adjacent to the common area.

   and; "Is the variance request initiated because of hardship and not to increase the profitability of the property?"
   No, we wish to maintain the integrity and beauty of the area and not to have a negative impact on the environment.

I hereby acknowledge by my signature below that the foregoing application is complete and accurate and that I am the owner of the subject property or the authorized representative of the owner. I authorize the subject property to be inspected, and that all required material will be submitted to the City of Conway Planning Department no later than thirty (30) days prior to the meeting date. Board of Zoning Appeals meets the fourth Thursday of each month at 5:30 P.M. in City Hall, 229 Main Street. I understand that it is my responsibility to obtain all necessary approvals from other city departments. A REPRESENTATIVE MUST BE PRESENT AT THE MEETING TO HAVE YOUR REQUEST HEARD.

Applicant's signature: ___________________________ Date: 7/1/2015

Print name legibly: Fay St. Amand
DECLARATION OF Covenants and Restrictions

WHEREAS, the Declarant is the owner of certain real property in Horry County, South Carolina, more particularly described in Exhibit "A", which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference (the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, the Declarant intends to develop on the Property a residential subdivision known as Pecan Grove, containing detached home site lots together, with possible future Common Area Properties as more fully described herein (the "Subdivision"); and

WHEREAS, the Declarant wishes to accomplish the following objectives for its benefit and for the benefit of Owners of property in the Subdivision by the imposition of the covenants and restrictions set forth herein:

(a) To maintain the value and the residential character and integrity of the Subdivision and to maintain the quality and value of any Common Area Properties of the Subdivision;

(b) To minimize or eliminate the possibility of any disruptions of the peace and tranquility of the Subdivision;

(c) To protect and prevent the cutting, abuse or unwarranted alteration of the, trees, vegetation, and lakes within or adjacent to the Subdivision;

(d) To prevent any property Owner or any other persons from building or carrying on any other activity in the Subdivision that would detract from the Subdivision or that are contrary to this Declaration; and

(e) To maintain property values in the Subdivision; and

(f) To maintain, improve, and landscape the Common-Area Properties within the Subdivision as hereinafter provided; and

WHEREAS, the Declarant, as hereinafter provided in this Declaration, has retained and reserved the right, privilege and option to submit to the provisions of this Declaration at a later time and from time to time as a part of the Subdivision all or any portion of real property to be described at a later date or any other adjacent or nearby property (the "Other Property"). NOW, THEREFORE,

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that the Declarant hereby declares that the property described in Exhibit "A" shall be held, mortgaged, transferred, sold, conveyed, leased, occupied and used subordinate and subject to the following easements, restrictions, covenants, charges, liens and conditions which are hereby imposed for the purpose of protecting the value and desirability of the Subdivision and which restrictions, easements, charges, liens, conditions, and covenants shall touch and concern and run with title to the real property subjected to this Declaration and which
Section 5. Re subdivision. No lot shall be subdivided or reduced in size nor any lot lines altered without the prior written consent of the Declarant, its successors and assigns. Before an Owner attempts to combine two (2) or more adjoining Lots to create one Lot for the construction of a single residence thereon, there must be prior written consent of the Declarant and from that date forward the resulting combined Lot may not be subdivided or its boundaries changed without the written consent of the Declarant or the Board.

No residence or building, including porches and projections of any kind, shall be erected so as to extend beyond, over or across the setback lines shown on the recorded plat of the Subdivision which includes that particular lot.

Section 7. Temporary Structures. No structure of a temporary nature shall be erected on or allowed to remain on any Lot without written permission for the same by Declarant, the ARB or the Board. At no time shall there be any structure of any kind permitted other than those that are installed to the dwelling including, but not limited to, garages, storage buildings, dog houses, or any other like structure.

Section 8. Vehicle Storage. No inoperative or unlicensed vehicle or vehicle in a state of noticeable disrepair shall be kept or stored upon any Lot or Common Property nor may any repair work be done to any motor vehicle, boat or trailer except for very minor repairs work requiring less than one day’s work. Boat and camper storage shall be permitted provided that they are stored on concrete pads and shall be stored only in side yards. All vehicles shall be parked either on a concrete driveway or on a concrete pad located in the side yard of the dwelling.

Section 9. Water and Sewer Systems. No individual water or sewer system shall be installed on any Lot and each Lot shall be connected to a public water and/or sewer system if it is available to the Lot. Nothing herein shall be construed so as to prevent the construction and operation of a “shallow well” for lawn irrigation purposes.

Section 10. Outside Antennas. No outside radio antenna, satellite dish or television antenna shall be erected on the Lots unless and until approved by the Declarant in writing. Declarant may withhold such approval for any reason, including, but not limited to, purely aesthetic ones.

Section 11. Clothes Drying. No drying or airing of any clothing or bedding shall be permitted outdoors on the Lots or houses or over the deck railings of any dwelling.

Section 12. Completion of Construction. The exterior of all houses and other structures must be completed within six (6) months after the construction of the same shall have commenced, except where such completion is impossible or would result in great hardship to the Owner or builder due to strikes, fires, and natural emergency or natural calamities. House or other structures may not be temporarily or permanently occupied until the entire had been completed and the applicable governmental authority has permitted such occupancy. During the continuance of construction, the Owner shall require the contractor to maintain the Lot in a reasonably clean and uncluttered condition. Upon completion of construction, the Owner shall cause the contractor to immediately remove all equipment and tools and shall require that all construction be completed within sixty (60) days of the occupancy or substantial completion, whichever date shall first occur. Nothing contained herein shall preclude a
REAR YARD
DATE: 07/06/2015       RECEIPT #:  41072

RONALD ST AMAND

DESCRIPTION: 1004 PINERIDGE ST  CONWAY SC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARGE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIANCE</td>
<td>103440067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 100.00

TENDERED: 100.00

CHANGE: 0.00

CASH: 0.00
CHECK: 100.00
CREDIT CARD: 0.00
Ronald St. Amand  
1004 Pineridge Street  
Conway, SC 29527  

Re: Violation of Parking Recreation Vehicle – TMS #149-22-01-053 / PIN 38102010018  

Dear Mr. St. Amand:  

The City of Conway Planning Department has received a complaint about the recreational vehicle located in the driveway at 1004 Pineridge Street and which has been determined to be in violation of the City of Conway’s Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).  

In Section 5.2.6 – “Parking, Storage & Use of Recreational Equipment” of the City of Conway Unified Development Ordinance, it states that “No major recreational equipment shall be parked or stored on any lot in a residential district except in a car port or enclosed building or the rear yard, provided however that such equipment may be parked anywhere on residential premises not to exceed twenty-four (24) hours during loading or unloading.”  

Please assist us in maintaining the beauty and character of the City of Conway by removing the recreational vehicle to a permissible location on your property within (14) days of receipt of this letter. Failure to comply could result in receiving a summons to Municipal Court. Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.  

Please call me if you have any questions or concerns.  

Sincerely,  

Adam Emrick  
Planning Director