

GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE -- COMMUNITY FEEDBACK ON COVENANT AMENDMENTS

Entry Id	Date Create	1: Elimination of the Developer-Appointed Board Seat	1: Elimination of the Developer-Appointed Board Seat - Comments/Concerns:	2: Expand Authority to Operate an Architectural Review Board	2: Expand Authority to Operate an Architectural Review Board - Comments/Concerns:	3: Expand Mechanisms for Rules Enforcement and Establish an Appeals Process	3: Expand Mechanisms for Rules Enforcement and Establish an Appeals Process - Comments/Concerns:	4: Administrative Updates/Clarifications	4: Administrative Updates/Clarifications - Comments/Concerns:
1	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	Definitely remove their seat	I would probably vote to approve this	Definitely	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
2	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	Dev has too much influence on the island plus not many homesites left to build.	I'm not sure how I may vote	I need clarification for this idea.	I would probably vote to approve this	Rules with no enforcement means nothing. As a former high school teacher I know not enforcing existing rules causes chaos.	I would probably vote to approve these	As a community we need to know clearly what is being decided for us.
3	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote		I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote	
4	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
5	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
6	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this	so long as the expansion (i) is limited to clarifying in detail what rules can and cannot be enforced, (i) provides clear and unambiguous language as to what actually constitutes a violation (iii) provides clear and unambiguous language as to the penalties for violations and (iv) clearly sets out the procedures for requesting an appeal and time frames and manner in which the appeal must be addressed and finalized	I'm not sure how I may vote	I don't know what this is
7	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	The developer owns only a small part remaining of KI. It's time that they no longer hold a seat nor represent 1/7 of votes.	I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote	
8	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote	
9	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	Long overdue. South Street Partners is not a resident of Kiawah. Their interests and the interests of the residents ceased to be aligned years ago. I would ask the developer rep to resign immediately rather than wait for the 2025 meeting. Just because they have a seat doesn't mean they have to occupy it.	I would probably vote to approve this	We need a more effective and accountable ARB. The current board is arbitrary and capricious and largely unaccountable. The ARB should stop abuse of the rules by developers — which they cannot do while on their payroll — not preventing homeowners from taking down dead trees.	I would probably vote to approve this	Its takes a bunch of approvals to improve my property but none to let it rot. We need better enforcement of important rules, not the stray bike left in a front yard. And with that increased enforcement we need fellow residents involved to assure that rules are applied in a common sense manner so that this does not become the HOA from Hell.	I would probably vote to approve these	
10	2024-04-19	I'm not sure how I may vote	What is the objective with this change ?	I'm not sure how I may vote	Without how the ARB would be structured I cannot agree or disagree. KICA has shown a less the stellar performance in govern. Just a transfer of the ARB to KICA would not be an improvement without structural change how the ARB works	I'm not sure how I may vote	Again without knowing how this would look like I do not know how to vote	I'm not sure how I may vote	see above on item 3
11	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	It's about time we took back our Island!	I would probably vote to approve this	Long overdue- we are losing too many of our older trees!	I would probably vote to approve this	Very much needed - without penalty there can be no rule.	I would probably vote to approve these	I like being informed.
12	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this	The current system couldn't get more arbitrary or obtuse so I'm really hoping for simplification. Right now I will not do anything at my home that requires the Arb	I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote	
13	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
14	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote	
15	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	The Community Association should strictly support the community not the developer.	I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote	
16	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	Should be eliminated. Has caused power to be usurped led by the partners.	I would probably vote to approve this	Must do	I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote	
17	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	I would like to hear the non developer board members who think the developer member should remain on the board explain why.	I would probably vote to approve this	I assume "an" means that there would still be only one ARB and it would be controlled by KICA and the Board.	I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote	
18	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	The Partners should have been removed from this board seat several years ago. It's a huge conflict of interest and they get away with things and approvals that would never happen if they were not on the board.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
19	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this	This should replace the developer operated ARB, not add an extra ARB	I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote	
20	2024-04-19	I'm not sure how I may vote	The developer has done several egregious things lately, but they are still a part of the Kiawah Community. IF the resort had a seat on the board, then I think the developer should also. The resort, however, does not. Since the ARB is undergoing some changes, maybe the developer's seat on the KICA board should be examined with whatever happens there. I think it is a thorny issue. There are no vetoes anymore so what can it hurt? Unclear.	I'm not sure how I may vote	People on the ARB have a lot of experience. I have said this before, but no one seemed to listen. The ARB needs a clear set of guidelines that are easy to read. All contractors should be aware of these rules. Decisions cannot be arbitrary and capricious. Things should be handled in a timely manner. Does KICA really want to take on such a responsibility? Would things be better? Those are questions that need to be answered before a decision is made.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	Some items are clearly outdated.
21	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	If I were the developer I would want to retain the seat because of my investment on the island. However as a property owner I do not feel that the developer has always acted with the best interest of the island's future in mind. Therefore I believe we would be better off without the developer on the Board. The risk of course to this is how to maintain a good relationship with the developer. I think there would need to be another regular communication forum for KICA and the developer.	I would probably vote to approve this	I believe it is clear that the ARB will come to KICA, therefore KICA has to have the structure to do this work. It will be critically important for KICA to employ experts for the ARB and not just rely on residents as the ARB work is critical to maintaining our property values.	I would probably vote to approve this	I think this is clearly needed.	I would probably vote to approve these	
22	2024-04-19	I'm not sure how I may vote		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
23	2024-04-19	I would probably vote against this	Even when built out, the developer continues to have significant impact on Kiawah with Club facilities, etc. I believe a voice for the developer make sense, and as long as it cannot/is not a majority, is more inclusive and therefore better for the island.	I'm not sure how I may vote	I do believe the ARB is broken - what I mean by that is inconsistent and often changing direction over time. Additionally it operates as a near "bully" to builders - in my case, our contractor changed paint trim without asking me because the ARB said they had to, even before I had a chance to appeal. The subcontractor was clearly under the impression that they had no choice, nor did I. So, in the end, I believe we need a better ARB. Who controls it is less the question for me.	I would probably vote to approve this	I would vote for this, but I also believe this can be a powerful stick and should be used appropriately, and perhaps some controls put in place with the changes.	I would probably vote to approve these	These seem straight forward and administrative in nature.

Entry Id	Date Create	1: Elimination of the Developer-Appointed Board Seat	1: Elimination of the Developer-Appointed Board Seat - Comments/Concerns:	2: Expand Authority to Operate an Architectural Review Board	2: Expand Authority to Operate an Architectural Review Board - Comments/Concerns:	3: Expand Mechanisms for Rules Enforcement and Establish an Appeals Process	3: Expand Mechanisms for Rules Enforcement and Establish an Appeals Process - Comments/Concerns:	4: Administrative Updates/Clarifications	4: Administrative Updates/Clarifications - Comments/Concerns:
24	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote	Only need one ARB-don't want 2. However should not be solely run by or report to KP. Unfortunately KICA has not done a great job with enforcement of existing rules on the books so not sure how they would do with more responsibility in this area.	I'm not sure how I may vote	Existing rules need to be enforced instead of adding new ones. People(both residents and guests) ignore the rules because they can. KICA goes after the easy stuff like hanging towels and bikes in the yards but doesn't do the harder more important stuff like number of cars in driveways of rental homes, number of people in rentals, e-bikes, people biking/walking on roads not paths etc.	I'm not sure how I may vote	
25	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
26	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this	Need to budget for full time professional staff positions and admin support and adequate turnover from current staff Need process for changes but need consistency and maintain high standards.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
27	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	It is past the time to remove the developers seat on the KICA board. There are too many instances of the developer's representative voting only for the good of the partners and NOT the good of KICA members or the island.	I would probably vote to approve this	I represented the KICA Board on the ARB for a year, so am familiar with how it operates. This is another item that is WAY past due to happen. KICA should be operating the ARB.	I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote	
28	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	no need for that seat	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
29	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	This change is long overdue. The Developer often has conflicts of interest with KICA. It is inappropriate for them to have a seat on the Board.	I would probably vote to approve this	The faster the transition the better.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
30	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
31	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote	
32	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	Currently it is a conflict of interest	I would probably vote to approve this	We still need a review board to ensure continuity through the Island.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
33	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	I agree with this.	I would probably vote to approve this	ARB should be handled at a street or neighborhood level.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
34	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	Long past time- this was the intent of the agreement to be exercised at the level (%) of development a number of years ago.	I would probably vote to approve this	There has been a double standard of approval concerning Developers projects and owners request. This is apparent in both what has been allowed and timely notice -to the detriment of owners and original of the master plan. I have been associated with Kiawah since 1976 and seen the developer/KICA/Resort work together to protect Kiawah's beauty and civility to the benefit of each. the last 6-8 years we have failed to keep cooperative goal.	I'm not sure how I may vote	My approval would be influenced by specific items- in general I support enforcement of reasonable and necessary rules and a simple appeals process.	I'm not sure how I may vote	
35	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
36	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	The developer's priorities and intentions may not be coherent with the KICA priorities and approval or not of further development of property on Kiawah	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote against this	I am by nature against the ever increasing intrusion of Government Entities into property and personal freedoms.	I would probably vote to approve these	
37	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this	I would definitely vote to eliminate the developer appointed board seat.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote	
38	2024-04-19	I'm not sure how I may vote	Over the years, the developer rep to the board has provided immeasurable knowledge, expertise and support. I recognize that the developer owns very little property now and has not appeared to develop properties in keeping with the vision of its predecessor or with Kiawah guidelines, but I also think Amanda Mole has decades of experience that it would be a shame to lose. I also know that there is no guarantee that she will continue to be the rep. Furthermore, I think the Resort as the largest landowner deserves a seat at the table. I'd like to think that there is a creative way to incorporate developer and Resort knowledge and concerns into the board. I also think a larger board is in order. I fear that this amendment will be short-sighted and that I will therefore be unable to support it.	I'm not sure how I may vote	My major concern is how to ensure continuity. With rapidly changing boards and town councils, how will the amendment provide a long-term solution that cannot be easily changed? How will the amendment prevent a faction from temporarily subverting guidelines that most members cherish, or at least support?	I would probably vote to approve this	I thought the 2018 amendment was good.	I would probably vote to approve these	
39	2024-04-19	I'm not sure how I may vote	I am unclear as to what developer this is and what land on Kiawah they own for future development. Needs more of a description for clarity.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote	Completely unclear as to what this is... needs further description.
40	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote	
41	2024-04-19	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote		I would probably vote to approve these	
42	2024-04-20	I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote	

Entry Id	Date Create	1: Elimination of the Developer-Appointed Board Seat	1: Elimination of the Developer-Appointed Board Seat - Comments/Concerns:	2: Expand Authority to Operate an Architectural Review Board	2: Expand Authority to Operate an Architectural Review Board - Comments/Concerns:	3: Expand Mechanisms for Rules Enforcement and Establish an Appeals Process	3: Expand Mechanisms for Rules Enforcement and Establish an Appeals Process - Comments/Concerns:	4: Administrative Updates/Clarifications	4: Administrative Updates/Clarifications - Comments/Concerns:
43	2024-04-20	I would probably vote to approve this	My understanding is that the developer seat should have been eliminated some time ago, and now that development is mostly complete I am strongly in favor of eliminating the developer seat. Also, at a minimum, it clearly creates the perception of a potential conflict of interest and I would like to completely remove any such opportunity for the developer to have undue influence on the KICA board.	I'm not sure how I may vote	Our personal experience with the ARB has been limited but it seems like there is unfair an unbalanced application of ARB standards, fines, and requirements. The Cape development clearly violated ARB rules and when challenged the response was wholly unsatisfactory. Some of the problem lies with the Town, but the ARB played a role as well. That said, it's very important to maintain high standards to keep what's special about Kiawah. I am strongly in favor of changes to eliminate all possibilities of special treatment for the developer and to ensure fair and balanced treatment for all property owners while maintaining high standards. I'll need to read and think more about the specific proposal before deciding how I will vote, but I do want to see changes.	I'm not sure how I may vote	I haven't had time to study the proposal yet so I'm not sure how I will vote. I am concerned about rules enforcement becoming too heavy handed and bureaucratic. Personally, I don't see much of a problem with rules enforcement and I see some people complaining about too much enforcement and others complaining about too little enforcement which suggests we might have things about right as they stand.	I'm not sure how I may vote	I'm not sure what the proposal is - I need to study it to form an opinion. I will say I'm against overly complex and rigid processes. I think it's important to give the board and employees the ability to use their judgement to make decisions that are aligned with high level strategies and goals to benefit the community. In return, the board should be fully committed to transparency, follow the rules that we do have, and avoid any appearance of "backroom dealing" which has happened in my opinion.
44	2024-04-20	I would probably vote against this	The developer pays approximately 2% of total revenue. They are a significant partner and should be included in decision making. Importantly, I hope these revisions are voted on separately, because one issue could undermine the entire effort.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote against this	This seems redundant to the existing bylaws. If it is not redundant, a better explanation is required.	I would probably vote to approve these	
45	2024-04-20	I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote	
46	2024-04-20	I would probably vote to approve this	We were stunned to find out the developers, who've done so much to destroy what makes Kiawah unique and magical, have a permanent representative on the KICA board. That goes a long way to answering the question, how could projects like The Cape, Timbers, etc have been approved. It's too little/too late, but we are 100% in favor of removing the developer's rep.	I'm not sure how I may vote	We would need to have a lot more info on how this would work, what qualifications KICA members would be required, and what costs would be incurred by KICA taking over all responsibility.	I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote	We're unclear on what this entails
47	2024-04-20	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this	I would want to see the specifics on this before voting	I'm not sure how I may vote	Need more information
48	2024-04-20	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
49	2024-04-21	I would probably vote to approve this	The undeveloped property left on the island is now minimal. With the issues that have arisen, it is a conflict of interest that the developed still maintains a board seat	I'm not sure how I may vote	I'm not sure that I fully understand this	I would probably vote to approve this	While we don't want a police state, we don't want too many strings in place to prevent adequate enforcement. And it seems logical to be able to appeal a decision.	I would probably vote to approve these	This is another oddly or cryptically phrased question which I don't understand
50	2024-04-22	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
51	2024-04-22	I would probably vote to approve this	It is time.	I would probably vote to approve this	Need to have more objectivity with regards to implementation of designing with natures when this occurs versus the subjectivity and desires of a few.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
52	2024-04-22	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
53	2024-04-22	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
54	2024-04-23	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
55	2024-04-23	I would probably vote to approve this	Eliminate the developer appointed seat. No longer relevant.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
56	2024-04-24	I'm not sure how I may vote	I am not clear on the responsibilities or why the elimination would be beneficial.	I would probably vote to approve this	We have had horrific contradictory approvals with the existing system. I would be interested in how this authority would streamline and make home improvements, yes improvements to increase the value of our home as well as remain congruent to our natural habitat and expectations of life on the island, an easier process,,, including getting rid of a tree that is in the middle of my deck!	I'm not sure how I may vote	Not clear on the appeals process as explained in writing or in a meeting held today by the Task Force.	I'm not sure how I may vote	Today it seems as if the issues are pragmatic changes but would be interested in having a compare and contrast list or pros and cons list.
57	2024-04-25	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote against this	Not narrowly tailored. Would allow drastic penalties to	I would probably vote to approve these	
58	2024-04-25	I would probably vote to approve this	I do think there are actually some benefits to having a voice at the table that is thinking strategically/long term without worrying about being popular with their neighbors. The time has probably come for the developer not to play this role but we have an awesome community and they deserve some of the credit.	I would probably vote to approve this	I am opposed to an ARB that is completely and perhaps even majority comprised of homeowners with no experience in architecture, landscaping, building, etc. We have an incredibly unique island and a large part of the reason we have the quality we do is because of high ARB standards. Yes the developer abused their privilege on their condo projects at West Beach. And yes the ARB stubbornly enforces rules regarding repainting houses and removing dead trees. But we need to maintain the existing high standards on lot coverage, building heights, material types, colors, etc and that means someone has to be the "bad guy" and enforce the rules. We do not want to go to a system where who you know or how you ask allows you to violate our high standards.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	I would be for reducing the quorum necessary for routine annual elections so you don't have to worry about a remote.
59	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
60	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote		I would probably vote to approve these	

Entry Id	Date Create	1: Elimination of the Developer-Appointed Board Seat	1: Elimination of the Developer-Appointed Board Seat - Comments/Concerns:	2: Expand Authority to Operate an Architectural Review Board	2: Expand Authority to Operate an Architectural Review Board - Comments/Concerns:	3: Expand Mechanisms for Rules Enforcement and Establish an Appeals Process	3: Expand Mechanisms for Rules Enforcement and Establish an Appeals Process - Comments/Concerns:	4: Administrative Updates/Clarifications	4: Administrative Updates/Clarifications - Comments/Concerns:
61	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this	No concerns. Get rid of him/her now.	I would probably vote to approve this	I would hope that some items that are now required to go through the ARB are not required. Simple tasks for the homeowner to handle without getting permission would allow more homeowners to have work done (or do it themselves) without all of the bureaucracy. This is personal property, and the homeowner should have more power over his/her own property. I am not referring to structural changes, but simple things like painting, rot repair, planting trees, etc...	I'm not sure how I may vote	Appeals process should be required. The ability to put a lien on property should not be only carefully considered. I could see where a lien could be very subjective (not objective), unless very very clear rules are in place and a clear process if followed. I understand if someone is not in compliance with rules on Kiawah and perhaps not paying fines, etc... However, in the past there seems to have been arbitrary decisions made by individuals on the ARB, not a collective decision by the entire ARB and Town. What I'm saying is that there needs to almost be a full vote before liens are put in place, not an individual decision.	I would probably vote to approve these	
62	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I'm not sure how I may vote		I would probably vote to approve these	
63	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this	There have been problems with this Board for years. Countless complaints have been made & should be reviewed.	I would probably vote to approve this	Make it independent.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
64	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this	It would be helpful to understand the contours of any new ARC guidelines, process, procedures and staffing	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
65	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this	I am not concerned if the developer has input, but the member should not have voting privileges.	I'm not sure how I may vote	The current developers use of the ARB has demonstrated a clear and pressing need to have the town control on a consistent basis for development and future residential modifications.	I would probably vote against this		I would probably vote to approve these	
66	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
67	2024-04-26	I would probably vote against this	I believe that all parties involved in the creation of improvements should have a say in how and what is built for the betterment of the community.	I'm not sure how I may vote	I need to understand the directives that is to be outlined before I agree to have a governing body manage public affairs for our citizens.	I would probably vote against this	From my experience with government and agencies, the problems they create many times overwhelmed the benefit of their purpose. We need to clearly state their purpose and their objective. Also, the homeowner should have ample and equal protection for their rights and desires.	I'm not sure how I may vote	I don't have enough information to discuss this proposal.
68	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
69	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this	Yes - it is about time!	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote against this		I would probably vote to approve these	
70	2024-04-26	I would probably vote against this	Some members see a developer-Appointed Board seat as an opportunity for the Partners to monitor actions of the board closely and even influence some votes. I think that is less problematic than keeping them out of the flow of information and policy matters. The Partners can respond to inquiries made by their representative on behalf of the KICA Board in a more cooperative and collaborative manner. Without such a channel, all discussion and negotiations are delayed and more strained. In the past members of the development team outnumbered property owners on the Board. Just one representative is little threat.	I'm not sure how I may vote	Recent decisions of the ARB have moved so far from the concept of designing IN nature, preserving trees, beach and naturally landscaping properties that mega-mansions have become the norm even on fairly modest lots. Witness the giant house going up on Bufflehead at present which fills almost the entire lot and will leave very little room for any landscaping. Witness also large condo developments at Beachwalker Drive, and even the Sandcastle broke all rules by constructing their adult pool into the dunes. Kiawah cannot remain a natural treasure if similar projects are allowed to be constructed.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
71	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this	Long overdue.	I would probably vote to approve this	Long overdue.	I would probably vote to approve this	Looks reasonable.	I would probably vote to approve these	Looks reasonable.
72	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this	The Island is very heavily developed already. This dedicated seat for developers was more appropriate for a time when there was much more undeveloped land.	I would probably vote to approve this	Island architecture is very similar in regards to color, size, and style. A coherent look to island structures is important.	I'm not sure how I may vote	There needs to be some teeth to the rules. I'm really not sure what the non-compliance issues are and if more muscle is required to solve them.	I would probably vote to approve these	Not sure this update feels meaningful to me.
73	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this	It is time to remove the Developer controlled board seat.	I would probably vote to approve this	ARB oversight should be under control of KICA.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
74	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this	Appointed by who Whoever has the highest \$\$\$	I would probably vote against this	The ARB does not seem to be in sync with other entities on the island, except home owners with cash	I would probably vote against this	No Basic SC building codes has been a very difficult concept for code enforcement to adhere to or even understand. It appears they have created rules that deviate from the building inspectors.	I would probably vote to approve these	
75	2024-04-26	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
76	2024-04-28	I would probably vote to approve this	I understand that Jimmy forgot to record the ability to enforce security and safety issues. I also remember that board members all took the pledge to eliminate the E member.	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	
77	2024-04-28	I would probably vote to approve this	Not sure why it requires a vote of homeowners. I believe this has been previously approved and planned for. Seems BOD should be able to make this change.	I would probably vote against this	ARB has been a contentious issue. Seems it should be an independent group of homeowners and not a function of the board itself.	I would probably vote against this	Some of these enforcement provisions seem heavy handed. Such as entering a home or property for basically anything KICA deems necessary. Enforcement of by-laws has been uneven at best in past. This seems like too much of a power grab. Attorneys fees paid by the homeowner, fines levied, etc. without notice, suspension of use of community facilities, etc.	I would probably vote to approve these	
78	2024-04-28	I'm not sure how I may vote	I believe that the KICA board has made a grave mistake here. This action should not be an amendment for member voting. This is the KICA Board's fiduciary duty to pursue and finalize the elimination of the Developer-Appointed Board seat. This is long overdue. This is what you were elected to do. Please consider your duty and uphold the rights of the community with our past agreements.	I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote		I'm not sure how I may vote	
79	2024-04-28	I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve this		I would probably vote to approve these	

Entry Id	Date Create	1: Elimination of the Developer-Appointed Board Seat	1: Elimination of the Developer-Appointed Board Seat - Comments/Concerns:	2: Expand Authority to Operate an Architectural Review Board	2: Expand Authority to Operate an Architectural Review Board - Comments/Concerns:	3: Expand Mechanisms for Rules Enforcement and Establish an Appeals Process	3: Expand Mechanisms for Rules Enforcement and Establish an Appeals Process - Comments/Concerns:	4: Administrative Updates/Clarifications	4: Administrative Updates/Clarifications - Comments/Concerns:
80	2024-04-28	I would probably vote against this	<p>I was unable to attend the workshop given the notice, but listened to most of it on-line. Part of it was inaudible, and the video locked up.</p> <p>An initial comment, having been on the by-laws task force, I did not appreciate the opening comment that the work on the covenants was harder than the by-laws, but the task force is handling it in less time. Unlike the current effort, the by-laws team rewrote the entire bylaws, and set the state for the covenant changes. You are only proposing a few changes at the Board direction. And some of those changes are not complete. The process seems rushed to a vote prematurely.</p> <p>I also agree with the comment that the members should see the comments posted and the responses. The answer was deferred. For the By-Laws changes we maintained transparency and responded to questions and comments publicly. The members deserve to see what comments have been submitted and what the task force response is.</p> <p>I agree with the comments made at the workshop concerning the limited nature of the proposed changes regarding the Type E developer director. There is no good reason to only withdraw the reference to the Type E director director, and not withdraw all other references to type E members. The panel's response that they were not sure if there were other places where the Type E Director was mentioned and feared inadvertently missing it.</p> <p>However, if the Covenants are stripped of all references to type E, it would not matter if there was a conflicting statement. Also, it is my understanding that under the ARDA, this does not need to be taken to a vote. This could be addressed immediately, but there is still on-going discussions on that topic. Those discussions should be completed before we set up the membership for an unnecessary vote. BY going through this process, the Developer Director representative continues to be able to vote which should not be allowed.</p> <p>A member asked whether the panel would share the legal opinion they relied on to make this proposal. At first the answer was no, give me an example when we did that. It was pointed out this is not an attorney-client privileged document or work product prepared for litigation. When an example was given this led to the amazing response from the Board Chair, that they like to keep things as simple as possible since they need to get 60% of the vote. Membership deserves to have as much information as possible to make informed decisions. To assume that it would make it difficult to get 60% of the membership to agree whatever that means, is inappropriate.</p> <p>And I am not sure what was meant by this, but at some point it was mentioned that employees of the Developer had access to all facilities. Does that mean they are treated as if they are members? Surely that was not the intent. In the end this provision is not ready to move forward and should be rewritten to remove all references to the Type E membership. The Board should follow their fiduciary duty and eliminate the the Type E developer seat immediately under the ARDA.</p>	I would probably vote against this	<p>Similar to the Type E Director issue, this proposal is not ready to vote on for different reasons though. The proposal is just an introduction to the process without any substantive details. I recognize that there are many unknown details that will need to be developed. This proposed change should wait until the framework for the operation of the ARB has been worked out.</p> <p>In the interim, once the operational structure is identified, then this new ARB could phase in its responsibilities.</p> <p>A comment was made during the workshop that the task force wanted to make sure that KICA had the authority to implement the ARB. Is there a question as to whether KICA has that authority now?</p> <p>It is time for the Board to stop deferring to the ARB for every decision they make. Staff has made it clear that they only seek ARB review on almost every project even though they do not believe the ARB has that authority. They do it because the Board has not taken a firm position on this, even though it has been raised to a vote. Identifying the actual scope of the ARB current authority would make the transition easier.</p>	I'm not sure how I may vote	<p>I understand what happened with the 2018 version of the enforcement rules. We discussed this a lot in the bylaws committee while trying to find a resolution.</p> <p>MY concerns are similar to what has already been raised at the workshop. Who would make enforcement decisions? What level of staff would make the decisions. How would they be made?</p> <p>Another issue is what if you do not know you have violated some rule? For example, I recently purchased some pine straw from KICA. I do not get an invoice or notice that I have an outstanding balance. Under this proposal, I could be fined for missing the deadline I did to know existed unless I opened my account to look.</p> <p>I understand that the system they currently use does not allow them to send out notices, or monthly bills.</p> <p>I wonder how many other rules or regulations will be enforced without the member knowing they are in violation?</p> <p>Consistency - It seems that many rules have the potential to be "enforced" in a less than consistent manner. It is critical to have enforcement implementation rules established before the new enforcement proposal is voted on.</p>	I'm not sure how I may vote	<p>I appreciate the list of suggested changes, but as pointed out in the workshop, there are other terms that need to be cleaned up. A full sweep of all the covenants should be done so all teams can be addressed at the same time.</p> <p>It seems we are rushing into this.</p>