

## Website Suggestion Received From Neighbors as of 01/16/2024

**Tue 8/10/2021**

Enter Your Suggestion

We should allow a different type of covering if someone has a current building and wants a large overhang off the one side. Or a pole barn type structure. Times are and materials are changing. Need some different options

**Tue 8/10/2021**

Enter Your Suggestion

Increase the size of shed or outbuildings from 144sq ft - we have acre lots and plenty of room for additional storage/workshops

**Mon 4/10/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

Allow chicken coops

**Mon 4/24/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

Allow a small number of hens to be kept in a coop within the utility yard

**Mon 4/24/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

Increase the allowed size of a "small garden shed" to 150 square feet (commensurate with Hillsborough County's definition of a small garden shed that does not require a permit).

**Mon 7/31/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

Per your mailing I am asking that papers be updated to NOT ALLOW neighbors to park semi-trucks and trailers behind their fences in backyards. 14 feet tall truck cabs and 50feet trailers are awful to look at from a pool deck of our retirement home.

**Mon 9/25/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

My house is 1970 sq feet, and therefore would not be allowed to remain. I don't think the covenants should stipulate minimum square footage at all. We are only allowed one house per lot and no subdivision so the square footage minima do not seem to have a point.

**Mon 9/25/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

PODs or similar should also be permissible during substantial renovation work on the property.

**Mon 9/25/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

I don't think it is necessary to ban commercial vehicles. As written the covenant can effectively ban pick-up trucks that even look like they might be used for business.

**Mon 9/25/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

Many houses currently have fencing less than 50 feet from the edge of the pavement.

**Mon 9/25/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

A size restriction on stand-alone solar arrays is a better idea. I have a small solar panel that I use only to power a security camera but it would not be allowed by these new covenants.

**Tue 9/26/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

I do not agree with the pickup truck governance. My husband has parked his pickup truck in our driveway for 20 years

**Tue 9/26/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

Please consider changing the proposed covenant regarding personal owned trucks over 1/2 ton not being allowed to park in the driveway. There are many residents of SR that have 3/4 and 1 ton trucks as their personal daily driver, myself included. My suggestion would be to keep the current vehicle restrictions as they are. Thank you.

**Tue 9/26/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

There is no need to have 3/4 ton and 1 ton vehicles parked in a garage or utility yard if they are person vehicles. As many residents of SR have vehicles this size or more as their daily drivers. My opinion would differ if these vehicles were work related with advertisements visible.

**Thu 9/28/2023**

Enter Your Suggestion

I believe the proposed references to pickup trucks with a carrying capacity of more (or less) than 3/4 ton are dated and arbitrary given how current pickup trucks are built and their appearance. There is very little visual difference between modern 1/2 ton trucks and trucks with carrying capacity greater than 1/2 ton. In the current generation of Ford trucks, the only difference between a 3/4 ton and 1 ton truck is the addition of one leaf spring on the 1 ton and the badging stating F250 vs F350. There is no other visual difference. Some models of 1/2 ton trucks are wider (Ford Raptor, Ram TRX) and longer (long bed vs short bed) than versions of 3/4 and 1 ton trucks.

Many SR residents use pickups with greater than 1/2 ton capacity for daily personal transportation. Classifying these vehicles as other than "Permitted" or as commercial vehicles would be a hardship to these owners and would have no beneficial impact on the esthetics of the Shadow Run neighborhood. I suggest we remove the references to pickup truck carrying capacity in the proposed changes to Article 14. Based on over 50 comments to a 9/26/23 Facebook post on this issue, many SR residents agree with this suggestion. I appreciate the opportunity to review the proposed language changes to the SR Covenants and to offer constructive/appropriate suggestions. Sincere thanks to the board for their ongoing efforts to improve the SR Community!

Thu 9/28/2023

Enter Your Message

Covenants and Restrictions Discussions Article 2 has in it

"No duplex residence, garage apartment or apartment house shall be erected or allowed to remain on any homesite and no building at any time shall be converted into a duplex residence, garage apartment or apartment house"

There are numerous houses within the community that have additional garage apartments, and / or outbuildings with apartments in them, as a matter of fact they were purchased with that as an additional bonus to the house's initial appeal... think "mother in laws suite" since it is unrealistic to think we are going to force people to tear these out, perhaps this should be updated to reflect where we are now?? Or this part dropped all together?

If someone has a mother in laws suite what business is it really of anyone else's, as long as they are not renting it out.

After reading through all the covenants, I am a little concerned. I know I personally chose to buy here because it was not over the top ridiculous with its HOA like most of the others. After reading the revisions, I kind of feel we are trying to micromanage people on properties they bought and paid for, when before we just made sure no one was having a direct affect on other people's property values. Which I am of the opinion is what an HOA is for. If I had wanted a managed community, I would have bought in Fish Hawk, I have always told people part of the fabulous appeal of our community is that our HOA is not ridiculous, and micromanaging, I would like to keep being able to say that, so these updates worry me a little.

Fri 9/29/2023

Enter Your Suggestion

I am not sure of the reasoning of limiting use of an RV for a limited time "not even 24 hours"(if contained in the utility yard) for temporary stays. When my parents were alive they drove their Motor home down from Indiana and spent a week in our back yard before they traveled on. It was convenient for visiting and was always an enjoyable time for our daughters. We used to own an RV and was kept in our utility yard. It was convenient for other family members who visited and spent a few nights. I would suggest certainly that wording restricting a time frame of 1 or 2 weeks of visits is practical and also need to confine to the utility yard. Thanks for considering my request.

Tue 10/3/2023

Enter Your Suggestion

No Homesite may leased for a term of less than 6 months. No more than three (3) leases may be made for any twelve (12) month period for each Homesite provided that the Board of Directors may approve exceptions to this restriction in cases where the tenants are unable to occupy their property based upon a condition which occurs after the time that they moved into the Homesite. Examples of potential hardship exceptions include job transfers, accidents, tenant evictions that are requested or agreed with by the Association, or medical situations which prevent the tenant from occupying the Homesite, or other similar hardship situations. A lease is defined as any permitted occupancy of a

1) If 6 months is the minimum time frame. There could only be (2) leases signed in a 12 month period. Example: 1st of Jan to June 30, Second Lease July 1 to Dec 31. That would be 2 leases and within 12 months not 3. I have been renting to tenants for years, (27 separate units) give them an excuse for being confused and they will take it and rent 3 short term leases.

2) Also, just a suggestion: The leases should maybe include a copy of the covenants and lease approved by Board. I have had many property managers for some properties and they must have my signature approval re: their lease. There has been many issues in the past with this. It will be very easy for a tenant to say they did not know of any rules and the eviction could take months if the homeowner is out of town for example etc.

3) Suggestion: I do not know but this should be a question for an attorney. If homeowner is not available, will or should they allow SR Board sign in behalf of the owner to initiate and complete the eviction process. I have this article in my contract with property managers in case I am not available.

Mon 10/23/2023 1:35 PM

Enter Your Suggestion

Why is a pickup truck excluded as a "permitted vehicle" that may be parked in driveways? I don't agree that pickup trucks should be excluded from being parked in a driveway.

Mon 10/23/2023 1:35 PM

Enter Your Suggestion

Upon reviewing all the current mailboxes installed in Shadow Run I would say that only about half of the homesites comply with Article 24. Mailboxes. This section should be updated to remove mailbox should be similar style, construction and color of main residence since the majority of the mailboxes in the neighborhood do not comply. Can we just have this updated to indicate "All Mailboxes must be well maintained and meet the approval of the U.S. Postal Service?"

10/10/2023

Enter Your Suggestion

My concern has to do with the last sentence of article 6 as revised. "Portable equipment must be moved to a utility yard after each use". My family and I own a portable basketball goal. Due to buried cable and a buried gas tank along the perimeter of our driveway, the portable goal is the best thing for our family. My concern with the language as revised has to do with the obligation that the equipment be moved to a utility yard after each use. These portable basketball hoops, like the one I have, generally have a fillable base for stability that, once filled, can weigh a great deal and are too heavy for my eight year old or even my eleven year old to transport on their own. The upshot of this is that they are going to have to rely on their parents' availability (ie at home and not working) every time they want to use the basketball hoop. We would love for our kids to be able to play basketball whenever they want. They don't play a lot, but I want it to always be an available option for them. Distracting our children from video games, streaming and other screen-based content, is a daily struggle for all parents. I ask the drafters of the covenants to draft language that encourages physical activity rather than stymies it. I'm not sure what the current problem is that this language is attempting to address. I strongly doubt that it has anything to do with property values. The base of the basketball hoop is the only distinguishable difference between a portable and a permanent basketball hoop and that can hardly be characterized as an eyesore. Maybe there has been a past incident where basketball hoops have been left in an inappropriate location -- say, too close to the road. If that's the case, then I request language that is more narrowly tailored to the solution. For example, the covenants could require that the basketball hoops remain X number of feet away from the road.

I appreciate the effort that you all have made toward updating our covenants, and I respectfully request that you consider the above concerns.

Fri 11/10/2023 3:17 PM

Article 2 & Mentioned Again in Article 7 and Again in Article 13 and 20 (Little obsessive here)

In my opinion, this just needs to be removed. #1 There are so many violations of this, it seems pointless. I know for a fact that not only do I have one as part of my property, but there are at least 4 people along my block -- let alone the entire neighborhood that have an additional apartment on their home site. #2 It actually increases the value of a home site. I would agree that it should not be allowed to be rented out separately, but in this day and age, the relevancy and need for many families to have

one is becoming greater and greater. My hospice mother stayed with me and needed me to care for her until she passed. I am sure my husband's parents may end up needing the same. My son who will be coming of age will probably be with us until he is drinking age, if not longer with the way today's economy is going. More and more people are working from home, and having a separate office with a bathroom slightly away from the regular living quarters is desirable to give some separation of home and business. We live in Florida, I have family visit all the time, I am sure many others do as well. I feel strongly that this specific restriction is not only already non-compliant for a number of residents all ready, but that the times dictate that this be struck as well. The community is looking to be family oriented, which sometimes means having more family with you than you want to share primary quarters with, A Mother in Law Suite is the perfect answer. They should not be banned.

Also in Article 7

My outbuilding is larger than this, and I own one of the smaller outbuildings in the neighborhood. My outbuilding is 900sq ft, and it is easily half the size, maybe even less than a few more recently built outbuildings/detached garages. I believe in allowing people to create outbuildings to support their hobbies, family needs, and to enhance the overall property values as long as they are done in a manner that matches the house and retains curb value. Perhaps this size restriction needs to be either struck, or increased significantly, as I said, my outbuilding is 900 sq ft and is 1/3 of the size of other much more recently constructed structures. This definitely needs to reflect what is already in existence, and what was approved by many of the members of this board, just recently. Why keep such inconsistencies between what the board approves and what the "rules" say.

Article 10

This also I do not necessarily disagree on, discretion is a necessary thing, we cannot possibly guess all the situations... however what I do not see anywhere are two key things: #1 Protections for anyone/any property ALREADY built in the community that ALREADY has "non-compliant" architecture based on the covenants going forward. There is an assumption of grandfathered in, but it is not specifically outlined that I have seen yet. Maybe I have not gotten to it yet, or I missed it. But if we do not remove things we know are already non-compliant for many, then we need to explicitly protect those people/properties from any harassment in the future from some other board. #2 Protections for anyone that gets a discretionary variance or exception - going forward. 15 years down the road with an all new board in place. That too must be specifically protected as an accepted non-harassable exception until the end of time. I would like to see that in writing as well as the concept of the board having discretion and exception powers.

Article 11 Architectural Control Procedures

This article seems to be saying, ANY changes to the homesite or sizeable outbuildings of any kind need to be approved by the board. Why? I understand curb appeal items. Front Lawns, turning a broken pool into a garden (ugh).. putting up a cheap ugly homemade lean to as some kind of carport. Curb Appeal -- Got it --- Things that have affect on my neighbors property. Why do I need board approval to remodel my kitchen? Why do I need board approval to add on an addition on the backside of my house for a new Master Suite? What business is it of theirs. As long as all county permits and building codes are met, and the addition can and will be cited for violation if it does not externally remain cohesive with the property, why is it the boards business how I remodel or refurbish the inside of the house?? Is this not a bit overbearing? If the item in question is not something the "auditor" can spot while driving around from the street, or the neighbors have right to complain about due to encroachment, or affecting their home values then it gets a violation and we go from there. Why should the board have anything to do with it, otherwise? Whether I choose to put an island and breakfast bar in my kitchen which changes the floor plan a little is not something anyone can see from the street, and certainly does not have an affect on the curb appeal of my home or more importantly the ones around me...so why does the board need to control it? IF this paragraph does not intend to give that impression, and really

only is giving such authority to items visibly seen from the curb, then it should be a bit more succinct in saying that I think.

#### Article 12

WHAT??? SERIOUSLY?? I do understand the board is all volunteers, and they all have lives just like the rest of us, but they did actually willingly volunteer. No one held a gun to their head. If they did not have the time to commit to such tasks, they should not have. Waiting 45 days to assume you were disapproved is total Rubbish. It is also indicative of a non-communicative board. It may be that this board never does such things, but why give permission for ANY board to treat its residents in such a way. If someone puts in a request they should receive an answer back, ONE WAY OR ANOTHER. I think 45 days is a bit much, but I do understand the idea of it has to be addressed at next board meetings, so that is 30 days if you submit the day after the board meeting, and administrative time etc.... but the audaciousness of not being given a response at all.....I find that absolutely insulting, and unacceptable.

#### Article 13

States every house must have a garage. THEN... I am guessing this was supposed to say permitted only on homes with separate garages? Or else, if they are allowed on any garage, and all houses require a garage, then they are just simply allowed, No?

#### Article 15:

Just Why?? Who cares if someone wants an AC unit in their garage, workshop, an extra one in the bedroom? WHY?? Curb Appeal, how about no Window AC units permitted in any window facing the street??

#### Article 20:

So, I understand the idea here, and I personally do not care if someone is building a home and lives in a temp residence on the site until it is complete, I do not have an issue, but this here "even for an overnight stay" I own an RV, we do use it for sleep overs for my kids, as well as an extra guest house on occasion. It is properly stored behind a utility wall. It meets all the other rules concerning RV's within Shadowrun, it is NOT parked in my front yard. What business is it of anyone's if I occasionally allow for it to be used as a guest house when I have lots of family in. I also have family that own RV's and drive down to visit on occasion, they pull into our backyard, they prefer to sleep in their RV while they visit. What business is it of the boards? Perhaps this should be worded more like for any stays longer than 2 weeks?? I think that would be more reasonable.

11/16/2023

#### Covenant Article Number

#### Article 14

#### Enter Your Suggestion

I mentioned this last night. I am not sure it was heard so I am requesting this through the suggestions form.

I would like to see the commercial signage of vehicles removed from the covenants. At this point there are 5 commercial vehicles parked visibly in the Shadow Run Community.

On Shadowrun itself is a Progressive vehicle that has been there since I moved in.

These vehicles are not harming anything and if we are not willing to violate them why have it in the covenants.

Hope this helps to clarify my request from last night.

09/28

Covenant Article Number

14

Enter Your Suggestion

I believe the proposed references to pickup trucks with a carrying capacity of more (or less) than 3/4 ton are dated and arbitrary given how current pickup trucks are built and their appearance. There is very little visual difference between modern 1/2 ton trucks and trucks with carrying capacity greater than 1/2 ton. In the current generation of Ford trucks, the only difference between a 3/4 ton and 1 ton truck is the addition of one leaf spring on the 1 ton and the badging stating F250 vs F350. There is no other visual difference. Some models of 1/2 ton trucks are wider (Ford Raptor, Ram TRX) and longer (long bed vs short bed) than versions of 3/4 and 1 ton trucks.

Many SR residents use pickups with greater than 1/2 ton capacity for daily personal transportation. Classifying these vehicles as other than "Permitted" or as commercial vehicles would be a hardship to these owners and would have no beneficial impact on the esthetics of the Shadow Run neighborhood.

I suggest we remove the references to pickup truck carrying capacity in the proposed changes to Article 14.

Based on over 50 comments to a 9/26/23 Facebook post on this issue, many SR residents agree with this suggestion.

I appreciate the opportunity to review the proposed language changes to the SR Covenants and to offer constructive/appropriate suggestions. Sincere thanks to the board for their ongoing efforts to improve the SR Community!

09/25/2023

Covenant Article Number

4 & 5

Enter Your Suggestion

My house is 1970 sq feet, and therefore would not be allowed to remain. I don't think the covenants should stipulate minimum square footage at all. We are only allowed one house per lot and no subdivision so the square footage minima do not seem to have a point.

12/04/2023

Enter Your Suggestion

when reading the section on appearances of the property I noticed that there was no section or mention of keeping your front yard well-trimmed and manicured to a level that reflects our neighborhood, or did I miss it ?? Specifically nice landscaping and most importantly a well-manicured lawn !! Yards that are nothing but dirt, sand or full of weeds should be unacceptable. This devalues our homes when our neighborhood looks like that. who cares what kind of grass you have but it needs to be thick and lush to an acceptable level as not to be an eyesore. Big dead areas and patches need to be taken care of. I think this should also fall into the area of our board to step in and correct at the owner's expense if needed. It's ridiculous and embarrassing what many of our property's look like. When we have friends and family, or other guests come to visit, these property's make our neighborhood look bad!

11/16/2023

Covenant Article Number

29

Enter Your Suggestion

Article 19, titled Apperance of Homesites, was amended by the insertion of the following sentence "Notwithstanding the foregoing, any unimproved lots need not be kept free of normal detritus material found in the natural state, except for the area within 15 feet of the roadway; however, dangerous debris and manmade litter must be cleared..."

The amendment of Article 29 is not only in contravention of the Declaration of Protective Covenants, but is also in violation of Hillsborough County ordinances. Therefore, please delete the addition.

10/17/2023

Covenant Article Number

ARTICLE 14. Boats and Vehicles

Enter Your Suggestion

Why is a pickup truck excluded as a "permitted vehicle" that may be parked in driveways? I don't agree that pickup trucks should be excluded from being parked in a driveway.

10/17/2023

Covenant Article Number

ARTICLE 24. Mailboxes



Enter Your Suggestion

Upon reviewing all the current mailboxes installed in Shadow Run I would say that only about half of the homesites comply with Article 24. Mailboxes. This section should be updated to remove mailbox should be similar style, construction and color of main residence since the majority of the mailboxes in the neighborhood do not comply. Can we just have this updated to indicate "All Mailboxes must be well maintained and meet the approval of the U.S. Postal Service?"

10/10/2023

Covenant Article Number

6

Enter Your Suggestion

My concern has to do with the last sentence of article 6 as revised. "Portable equipment must be moved to a utility yard after each use". My family and I own a portable basketball goal. Due to buried cable and a buried gas tank along the perimeter of our driveway, the portable goal is the best thing for our family. My concern with the language as revised has to do with the obligation that the equipment be moved to a utility yard after each use. These portable basketball hoops, like the one I have, generally have a fillable base for stability that, once filled, can weigh a great deal and are too heavy for my eight year old or even my eleven year old to transport on their own. The upshot of this is that they are going to have to rely on their parents' availability (ie at home and not working) every time they want to use the basketball hoop. We would love for our kids to be able to play basketball whenever they want. They don't play a lot, but I want it to always be an available option for them. Distracting our children from video games, streaming and other screen-based content, is a daily struggle for all parents. I ask the drafters of the covenants to draft language that encourages physical activity rather than stymies it. I'm not sure what the current problem is that this language is attempting to address. I strongly doubt that it has anything to do with property values. The base of the basketball hoop is the only distinguishable difference between a portable and a permanent basketball hoop and that can hardly be characterized as an eyesore. Maybe there has been a past incident where basketball hoops have been left in an inappropriate location -- say, too close to the road. If that's the case, then I request language that is more narrowly tailored to the solution. For example, the covenants could require that the basketball hoops remain X number of feet away from the road.

I appreciate the effort that you all have made toward updating our covenants, and I respectfully request that you consider the above concerns.

01/16/2024

Covenant Article Number

6

Enter Your Suggestion

New language regarding basketball hoops is unnecessary (what problem is it trying to solve?) and unreasonable. The proposed requirement to store any portable basketball hoop in a utility yard is particularly egregious. Portable hoops weigh 300-400 lbs with counterweights. Expecting a child to move a 400 LB portable hoop from a utility yard to the driveway and back to the utility yard any time they want to shoot baskets is beyond unreasonable. There are dozens of these portable hoops throughout Shadow Run. The entire language on basketball hoops should be removed.

01/16/2024

Covenant Article Number

20

Enter Your Suggestion

Proposed language barring use of an RV for “even for an overnight stay” is overly restrictive. We have used our RV as an emergency/overflow sleeping quarters on 3 occasions (when home AC was out of service for 3 days in August, during Covid for quarantine, at Christmas with a full house and nephew was stuck in Tampa due to multiple Southwest airlines cancellations). Some consideration should be made for emergency/short term use. Suggest at least removing the language “even for an overnight stay”.

01/16/2024

Covenant Article Number

6

Enter Your Suggestion

Update/clarification of my previous suggestion regarding basketball hoops...

The redline version of proposed changes shows the paragraph on basketball hoops as double-underlined, indicating new proposed language. In reading a clean version of the exiting covenant's, I see that the language on portable equipment is in the existing document.

Regardless, the requirement was probably written before portable hoops were in common use and is unreasonable in present day. This language should be removed as part of the proposed changes/enhancements.