TOWN OF SUMMERVILLE
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

AGENDA
July 9, 2019
5:00 PM
Town Hall (annex) – Training Room
200 S. Main Street

I. Approval of minutes from June 11, 2019

(For below item, signs posted on property June 24, 2019 and ad on June 23, 2019 in Post & Courier)

II. OLD BUSINESS:
1. No Old Business

III. NEW BUSINESS:
1. TMS # 137-04-02-004, 709 N. Magnolia Street, zoned B-3 General Business, owned by Classic Construction of Summerville, LLC. – variance request to eliminate the required Class 2 use buffer, Ordinance Section 32-322.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS:
1. Election of Officers

V. ADJOURN

Posted July 2, 2019
The Board of Zoning Appeals met in the Training Room at Town Hall on Tuesday, June 11, 2019 at 5:00 PM. Present were Denis Tsukalas, Chairman; Don Nye, Elise Richardson and Scott Riddell. Staff present included Tim Macholl, Zoning Administrator and Jessi Shuler, Director of Planning.

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM by Mr. Denis Tsukalas. Mr. Tsukalas asked for any comments or edits for the minutes from the November 13, 2018 meeting. Ms. Richardson made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nye. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Tsukalas asked for any comments or edits for the minutes from the May 14, 2019 meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Riddell to approve the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lawson. The motion passed 3-1.

OLD BUSINESS:
The first item under Old Business was TMS # 137-14-09-029, 103 Graham Lane, zoned R-2 Single Family Residential, owned by Summerville Commissioners of Public Works – Special Exception request to allow the construction of a 190 foot telecommunication monopole, Ordinance Section 32-211(4)(b)(2). Mr. Macholl introduced the Special Exception request and explained that the BZA is tasked with determining whether the applicant has met the requirements set forth in the Town’s Ordinance for the issuance of a Special Use Permit. He specifically pointed out that the Ordinance requires that in the case of a Special Exception request there is not a variance reducing the required separation. That required separation does not apply due to the zoning of the property. Because this does not apply, it is the board’s responsibility to determine whether to issue the Special Exception based on the requirements of the Special Use Permit. Mr. Macholl also pointed out that there was additional information provided by the applicant to staff prior to the meeting that applies to the case before them, including a new site plan, as well as some case law regarding the appropriate process for the Board to use in making their decision. Mr. Macholl also provided additional information regarding changes to the proposed plan. The height of the tower had been reduced from 190’ to 170’. The applicants also are in position to purchase the lot located at the corner of Graham Lane and Richland Street to provide additional buffer around the base of the existing water tank. Mr. Riddell made a motion to disregard all of the late submitted documents and not include them in the decision process. Mr. Tsukalas asked for a second. There was no second and he pointed out that there cannot be any discussion on the motion without a second because the motion would die. For the purposes of discussion, Mr. Tsukalas seconded the motion and asked for discussion. Mr. Riddell pointed out that this was only the second time that a Special Exception request had been made for a telecommunication tower in the Town of Summerville. He expressed a concern for how this was being handled. He wanted to make sure that the right decision was made and without time to read the submitted documents and be able to evaluate them appropriately he didn’t feel that these should be included in the discussion of the proposed request. Mr. Tsukalas asked Mr. Riddell to restate his motion to clarify exactly what he wanted. Mr. Riddell made a motion to exclude all documents that were submitted late. Mr. Tsukalas seconded the motion and the motion passed 3-1 with Mr. Nye in opposition. Mr. Macholl read the required Special Use Requirements into the record. Mr. Riddell asked if the Town Engineer had reviewed the application. Mr. Macholl explained that the Town Engineer is not qualified to review the structural plans for the tower, they are Civil Engineers not Structural engineers. Mr. Jonathan Yates presented for the applicants. He recapped that they had applied last month for an identical request at the Graham Lane location that had been approved for the property off of Judith Drive two months ago. Summerville CPW had taken the time since the last meeting to meet with Mr. Ron Boller and the other neighbors and had tried to work out the issues and try to make this proposal work. He explained that the antennas have been on the tank for twenty years and that at this time they are causing more problems for the tank than they are worth. To make this work they had worked with the carriers to get the proposed tower height reduced from 190’ to 170’ still with the additional spaces for future carriers. CPW will remove the existing chain link fencing around the compound. This will be replaced with a 60’X60’ fenced in area around the base of the proposed tower, as well as an 80’X80’ fenced in area around the base of the existing water tower. The area will be heavily landscaped to provide a visual buffer, with live oaks, cypress and azaleas. Mr. Yates told the board that at this time CPW was under contract to purchase the property at the corner, and they were planning on using that property to provide additional space for buffering landscaping. There were also discussions about the possibility of developing the property for a park, but the residents had expressed concerns and preferred a passive park. Mr. Yates pointed out that South Carolina law provided little discretion in the decision making process for a Special Exception. Mr. Bob Hill presented to the board the results of their efforts to locate an alternative location for the proposed tower. He stated that they had tried to contact the school board about school district property, but
had not received a call back. They had reached out to SCANA about the substation property on Berlin G Myers Parkway and were told no. He pointed out that a number of the proposed locations provided by Mr. Boller are just too far away to provide the needed coverage in the area. He stated that he had been out to the property 2-3 times and had observed that the fence around the property was old and rusty and that there was no landscaping to provide any screening. He had met with a couple of the adjacent neighbors to discuss the project. What they are proposing is that instead of a six foot chain-link fence they would use wood fence around both tower bases. In a couple of years the proposed landscaping will mature and provide better screening for the neighborhood. Mr. Hill pointed out that there is a long history of putting water tanks in residential areas, and a long history of putting cell towers on those properties as well. Mr. Yates addressed the board, pointing out that Mr. Macholl had explained the request and the required criteria for the decision. He asked if the board would like to turn over the discussion to the public to allow them to address any concerns. Mr. Tsukalas asked if the tower engineer was available to answer questions about the drop zone, he wanted to know how the top of the tower remained attached to the base. Mr. Ron Glover came to the table to discuss the design. He explained that towers are over engineered and are designed to yield at the attachment point during a catastrophic event. He explained that the exterior tubular structure is designed to bend or break at the flange, and working as a team the cabling that runs up through the interior of the tower then control the fall. Mr. Riddell asked Mr. Glover what his relationship was to the applicant. He explained that he is a consultant. He reviewed the fall zone letter. He also gave his qualifications and stated that he is the Code Chair of the TIA Code for the design of Telecommunication Towers. Mr. Riddell asked if any other codes apply. Mr. Glover explained that the International Building Code (IBC) 2015 edition would apply and by reference ANSI 222 and the TIA. Mr. Riddell asked if the plans presented met all of the applicable codes. Mr. Glover stated yes. Mr. Riddell said that he had specific questions about examples in the report. Mr. Glover responded that all of the examples are referenced in the report, and that this design is consistent with the industry standard. Mr. Hill stated that after the Zoning Approval, there is additional information that that could potentially exclude the site from being built, but that rarely happens. Mr. Ron Boller of 105 Graham Lane addressed the board. He explained that he lives directly next door and has opposed the tower from the beginning. He directed a question to Mr. Yates and asked if the proposed tower at 190’ was dead. Mr. Yates responded yes they had agreed to lower the height to 170’. Mr. Boller stated that he had asked certain questions and had received adequate clarification on those questions from the applicant. He pointed out that he had not had a chance to review the revised proposal for the 170’ tall tower. But that his questions had been addressed by the engineer of record. He pointed out that the required boundary survey had been completed, and that it showed that the property was smaller than originally thought. He stated that he had sat down with his family to discuss the beautification package and he felt that this was a much better proposal than the last plan. Mr. Boller stated that he had spoken with other neighbors who had also objected to the proposed tower. He said that the proposed compromises were better than the alternative if the tower was going to happen. He stated that overall he is not opposed to the tower per se, but does it need to be at this location. With the compromises and the beautification package he can learn to accept the situation. Mr. Tsukalas asked Mr. Boller if he was more comfortable with the proposal. Mr. Boller responded that yes it was better, but if it were up to him there would be no new tower and no water tower. Mr. John Pontieri addressed the board, stating that he was in favor of the tower. He felt that the loss of this location would be dangerous for public safety reasons. Mr. Benjamin Little addressed the board, stating that he is a representative of Sprint. He pointed out that this location is a main hub for communications and that the loss of this location would be detrimental to service and customers. Ms. Robin Monnet stated that she is a citizen of Summerville and that she is in sales and she relies on service in this area. She also pointed out that McKissick Field is in the area and that coverage is very important for public safety. She stated that losing cell service would be devastating to her business. Ms. Belinda Harper stated that she is an employee of SCPW, but that she is a resident of Summerville and that she supports the cell tower at this location. Ms. Beverly Grooms addressed the board, she stated that she lives adjacent to the tower property and that many things relating to the tower concern her. Specifically, she is concerned about during and after construction, how will storm water be handled. Mr. Glover responded that they will do their best to address runoff appropriately. Mr. Chris Kahler then addressed the board. He explained that this all started with the antennas. The tower is on annual maintenance and that the tank really needs to be resurfaced. He explained that it would be counterproductive to spend $200,000 to resurface the tank then have to have that new surface be possibly damaged during the reinstallartion of the antennas to the tank. Mr. Kahler asked for consideration of this issue and respectfully asked the board for approval of the proposal.

Mr. Nye made a motion for approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Richardson and Mr. Tsukalas asked for any further discussion.

Mr. Riddell opened the discussion asking about some of the criteria in the Town’s ordinance that he didn’t feel had been addressed, specifically about the attempts for colocation and the required documentation. Mr. Yates addressed this by pointing out that this was discussed in the project narrative submitted. He explained that this is an existing colocation on
the existing tower, this is by no means a new location. Mr. Riddell asked if it were feasible to leave the antennas on the water tank. Mr. Yates responded that Mr. Kahler had pointed out that it was feasible to put them back on the tank, but it was not what is best for the tank or for the carriers. The tank was never designed for this use, it may have been ok back in 1997 or 1998, but it is no longer a good idea. Mr. Riddell asked what the minimum caliper size is for the proposed landscaping. Mr. Yates stated that all landscaping would meet the Town’s standard. Mr. Riddell started to ask an additional question about the possibility of disguising the tower, but Mr. Tsukalas interrupted and stated that in his experience the Town will ensure that all of the requirements will be met. Ms. Shuler pointed out that disguising the tower would be at the board’s discretion.

Mr. Tsukalas asked for a vote on the previous motion to approve. The motion passed 3-1 with Mr. Riddell opposed.

**NEW BUSINESS:**
There were no items under new business.

**MISCELLANEOUS:**
There were no miscellaneous items.

**ADJOURN:**
Hearing no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:28 PM with a motion by Mr. Nye and a second by Mr. Riddell. The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Macholl
Zoning Administrator

Denis Tsukalas, Chairman; or,
Elise Richardson, Vice Chairman
Request: Variance request to allow the purchaser to eliminate the use buffer on the property to allow the installation of a driveway on the south side of the property.

Property Zoning: B-3 General Business

Surrounding Zoning: North: B-3 General Business
South: B-3 General Business
East: B-3 General Business
West: B-3 General Business

Surrounding Land Use: North: Residential
South: Residential
East: Commercial
West: Residential

Ordinance requires: Ordinance Section 32-322, Class 2 planting area

Background: The applicant approached staff before the sale of the property. The interested purchaser intends to occupy the existing building and open a hair salon. The change in landuse from residential to commercial requires that the new use provide the required use buffers per Section 32-322. The current property owner has decided to move forward with the request for variance to allow the use buffer to be removed or eliminated on the south property line for the first 65 feet, and to reduce the buffer yard on the north property line to match the existing conditions of six (6) feet for the first 63.12 feet of the property.

Response: In order for a variance to be issued by the Board of Zoning Appeals, an applicant is required to show that all four of the conditions listed below have been met and an unnecessary hardship must be shown.

(b) Variances. The board has the power to hear and decide requests for variances when strict application of this chapter's provisions would cause an unnecessary hardship.

(1) The following standards must apply for finding an unnecessary hardship:

a. Extraordinary conditions. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property, which could exist due to topography, street widening or other conditions which make it difficult or impossible to make an economically feasible use of the property.

b. Other property. Extraordinary conditions generally do not apply to other property in the vicinity.

c. Utilization. Because of these extraordinary conditions, the application of this chapter's provisions to a particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.

d. 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 of the variance.
Staff feels that the applicant has met all four criteria, and that a hardship is present.

a. Extraordinary conditions exist in the form of the existing conditions, where the structure placement on the property prevents the implementation of the required use buffers.

b. Other property in the area are residential uses, with B-3 zoning. This situation may occur as other properties are converted from their historic residential uses to commercial uses. Once the balance of properties have converted to the commercial use only the five foot landscaped border will be required between the commercial uses.

c. Utilization of the property is greatly impacted by the placement of the house on the lot, preventing the full utilization of the property from being converted to commercial use, because parking will not be able to be provided.

d. Detriment will not be caused to other properties by the issuance of this variance on this property.
This map is a graphic representation of data obtained from various sources. All efforts have been made to warrant the accuracy of this map; however, the Town of Summerville disclaims all representation and liability for the use of this map.
This map is a graphic representation of data obtained from various sources. All efforts have been made to warrant the accuracy of this map; however, the Town of Summerville disclaims all representation and liability for the use of this map.
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS (BZA) 
VARIANCE APPLICATION
Per Town of Summerville Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 32, Article II
(SC Code of Laws 6-29-780)

Date: 6/4/19  TMS#: 187-69-E7-C04  Zoned: B3

Property Owner: Classic Construction of Summerville  
Phone: 843-871-721

Email: SamsWise@gmail.com

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 1621  Summerville, SC 29483

Site Address: 763 W Magnolia St  Summerville, SC 29483

Subdivision: ☐

Representative for Property Owner (if applicable):

Request for variance relating to:  (please check one): ☐ Setbacks  ☑ Buffer yard  ☐ Height

☐ Parking  ☐ Other:

Ordinance Requires: ☐ Use buffer on each side of property for commercial use

Property Owner Requests: ☐ The cost to the applicant would be excessive
Present Use of Property:  (please check one): ☐ Residential  ☐ Commercial  ☐ Institutional

☐ Industrial  ☐ Other:

THE FOLLOWING MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH THIS APPLICATION:

1. Copy of recorded plat of property with proposed site plan demonstrating the requested variance.

2. Non-refundable fee of $100 – check made payable to Town of Summerville.

3. Statement of property owner addressing the State mandated criteria below (please address all four criteria):

   (a) Extraordinary Conditions: There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property, which could exist due to topography, street widening or other conditions which make it difficult or impossible to make an economically feasible use of the property.

   (b) Other Property: Extraordinary conditions generally do not apply to other property in the vicinity.
(c) **Utilization:** Because of these extraordinary conditions, the application of this chapter's provisions to a particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.

(d) **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 of the variance.

I certify that all information required is included and the application is complete. If an application is found to be incomplete, the primary contact will be notified. This approval does not constitute approval by other boards or town departments.

Signature of Property Owner: [Signature] Date: 6/5/19

Signature of Applicant: [Signature] Date: 6/5/19

*If applicant is not legal property owner, please submit documentation from the property owner giving permission for applicant to represent property owner.*
Statement Regarding Variance Application:

Property:
709 North Magnolia Street
Summerville, SC, 29483

(A) Extraordinary Conditions:
The existing building is sitting 7 feet from the property line on the left side and 13’ from the right side property line. Leaving no room for a 15’ Buffer area on either side of the building. The right side will be used to access the rear of the property where parking will be placed. Parking is not an option in the front as the front property line is only 13’ 7” from the building. The rest of the property in the front area is SCDOT Right of Way and not usable.

(B) Other Property:
Other properties in the area have more space and are not facing this same issue of buffer areas.

(C) Utilization:
These extraordinary conditions prohibit the reasonable use of the property as a B3 Business as this Buffer ordinance cannot be met without the variance.

(D) Detriment:
The Authorization of this variance will not be a detriment to the adjacent properties, the public good or the character of the area. This area is all Zoned B-3 Commercial property.

6/19/19
**MARGARET L BAILEY**
**DORCHESTER COUNTY**
**REGISTER OF DEEDS**
201 Johnston Street ~ Saint George, SC 29477  (843) 563-0181

*** THIS PAGE IS PART OF THE INSTRUMENT - DO NOT REMOVE ***

*** ELECTRONICALLY RECORDED DOCUMENT ***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument #:</th>
<th>2019004001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receipt Number:</td>
<td>60035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded As:</td>
<td>EREC-DEED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded On:</td>
<td>February 20, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded At:</td>
<td>03:07:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded By:</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book/Page:</td>
<td>RB 11751: 306-310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pages:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Received From:** SIMPLIFILE

**Parties:**
- Direct: ESTES, LILLIAN H
- Indirect: CLASSIC CONSTRUCTION OF

**RECEIVED**
2019 FEB -26 AM 09:27
DORCHESTER CO ASSESSORS OFFICE

**RECEIVED 28th Day**
of FEBRUARY 2019

JAMES MESSERVY, JR
Auditor Dorchester County SC

---

**Margaret Bailey**

Margaret Bailey - Register of Deeds
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF DORCHESTER

TITLE TO REAL ESTATE

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, Lillian H. Estes, by Claire Swan her attorney-in-fact (hereinafter "Grantor") in the State aforesaid in consideration of the sum of One Hundred Thirty Two Thousand and 00/100 Dollars ($132,000.00), Grantor in hand paid at and before the sealing of these presents by Classic Construction of Summerville, LLC (hereinafter "Grantee"), in the State aforesaid, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, have granted, bargained, sold and released, and by these Presents do grant, bargain, sell and release unto the said Grantee, Classic Construction of Summerville, LLC, the following described property, to-wit:

ALL that certain piece, parcel or lot of land, situate, lying and being near the Town of Summerville, County of Dorchester, State of South Carolina, and measuring and containing 0.27 acres, more or less, and being designated as "TMS 137-04-02-004 Lillian H. Estes, Existing Ac 0.26 + 0.01 from TMS 137-04-02-005, NEW total Ac 0.27" as shown on a plat entitled, "PLAT SHOWING PROPERTY LINE ADJUSTMENT FOR TMS 137-04-02-004 OWNED BY LILLIAN H. ESTES AND TMS 137-04-02-005 OWNED BY THOMAS D & ANGELA PHELPS. DETMOLD BLOCK 104. IN THE TOWN OF SUMMERVILLE, DORCHESTER COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA," prepared by John David Bass, PLS dated October 4, 2018 and recorded on November 16, 2018 in the RMC Office for Dorchester County in Plat Book M at page 158. Said tract having such size, shape, dimensions, outbuildings and boundaries as will more fully appear by reference to said plat.


ALSO BEING the same property conveyed to Lillian H. Estes herein by deed of Thomas Phelps and Angela Phelps dated November 29, 2018 and recorded December 12, 2018 in the ROD Office for Dorchester County in Book 11656, page 357.

This conveyance is made subject to any restrictions, reservations, zoning ordinances or easements that may appear of record and/or on the recorded plats or on the premises.

Address of Grantee: PO Box 1021, Summerville, SC 29485
Property Address: 709 N. Magnolia St
Summerville, SC 29483

TMS: 137-04-02-004

TOGETHER with all and Singular, the Rights, Members, Hereditaments and Appurtenances to the said premises belonging, or in anywise incident appertaining.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD, all and singular, the said Premises before mentioned unto the said Grantee, the Grantee’s Heirs, Successors and Assigns forever.

AND, subject to the exceptions set forth above, the said Grantor does hereby bind Grantor and Grantor’s Heirs, Executors and Administrators, to warrant and forever defend, all and singular, the said Premises unto the said Grantee, the Grantee’s Heirs, Successors and Assigns, against Grantor and Grantor’s Heirs, Successors and Assigns and against all persons whomsoever lawfully claiming, or to claim the same or any part thereof.

WITNESS Grantor’s Hand and Seal, this 14th day of February, in the year of our Lord 2019.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED
IN THE PRESENCE OF:

[Signature]
Witness #1

[Signature]
Witness #2

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
)
COUNTY OF Dorchester
)

I, the undersigned, a Notary Public of the County and State first above written, do hereby certify that Lillian H. Estes, by Claire Estes her attorney-in-fact, personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the due execution of the foregoing instrument.

Witness my hand and official seal, this 14th day of February, in the year of our Lord 2019.
CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE
CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT
(CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE § 1189)

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Riverside  

On February before me, Stephen Lucka, Notary Public  
(Date)  
(Here Insert Name and Title of the Officer)

personally appeared Claire Swan  
who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s), on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature of Notary Public  
(Notary Seal)

ADDITIONAL OPTIONAL INFORMATION

Description of Attached Document
Title or Type of Document: ________________________________  Document Date: __________________
Number of Pages: ________  Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: _____________________________
Additional Information: ___________________________________________
CONSIDERATION AFFIDAVIT

County of Dorchester

PERSONALLY appeared before me the undersigned, who being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I have read the information on this Affidavit and understand such information.

2. The property being transferred is located at 709 N Magnolia Street, Summerville, South Carolina 29483 bearing Dorchester County Tax Map Number 137-04-02-004, was transferred by Lillian H. Estes to Classic Construction of Summerville, LLC on February 20, 2019.

3. Check one of the following: The deed is

(a) [ ] subject to the deed recording fee as a transfer for consideration paid or to be paid in money or money's worth.
(b) [ ] subject to the deed recording fee as a transfer between a corporation, a partnership, or other entity and a stockholder, partner or owner of the entity, or is a transfer to a trust or to a distribution to a trust beneficiary.
(c) [ ] is exempt from the deed recording fee because EXEMPTION# _______ AND EXPLANATION FOR EXEMPTION ___________________________. (If exempt, please skip item 4-7, and go to item 8 of this affidavit.)

4. Check one of the following if either item 3(a) or item 3(b) above has been checked:

(a) [ ] The fee is computed on the consideration paid or to be paid in money or money's worth in the amount of $132,000.00.
(b) [ ] The fee is computed on the fair market value of the realty which is $ ___________________________.
(c) [ ] The fee is computed on the fair market value of the realty as established for property tax purposes which is $ ___________________________.

5. Check Yes ___ or No _____ to the following: A lien or encumbrance existed on the land, tenement, or realty before the transfer and remained on the land, tenement, or realty after the transfer. If "Yes" the amount of the outstanding balance of this lien or encumbrance is: ___________________________.

6. The deed recording fee if computed as follows:

(a) Place the amount listed in Item 4 above here: $132,000.00.
(b) Place the amount listed in Item 5 above here: $ __________.
   (If no amount is listed, place zero here)
(c) Subtract Line 6(b) from 6(a) and place result here $132,000.00.

7. The deed recording fee is based on the amount listed on Line 6(c) above and the deed recording fee due is: $0.00

8. As required by code Section 12-24-70, I state that I am a responsible person who was connected with the transaction as the purchaser.

9. I understand that a person required to furnish this affidavit who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent affidavit is guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Classic Construction of Summerville, LLC

Samuel I. Swails
Its Member

Sworn to and subscribed before me this February 20, 2019

Notary Public
State of South Carolina
My Commission Expires: 4-11-25
PLAT SHOWING PROPERTY LINE ADJUSTMENT FOR TMS 137-04-02-004 OWNED BY LILLIAN H. ESTES AND TMS 137-04-02-005 OWNED BY THOMAS D. & ANGELA PHELPS. DETMOLD BLOCK 104. IN THE TOWN OF SUMMERVILLE, DORCHESTER COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA.