3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

RICHLAND COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS PUBLIC HEARING

December 3, 2008, 1:00 pm

[Present: Harold Branham, Elaine Perrine, Torrey Rush, Suzanne Cecere, Sheldon Cooke, William Smith; Absent: Joshua McDuffie.]

CHAIRMAN RUSH: For the Record I would like to amend the Agenda. Number 4, Appointments of Officers that was done last month and approval of Minutes. There are, I think there's one more member, Board Member that's not here at this [inaudible] if we could actually move that until [inaudible].

MS. CECERE: I make a motion that that be [inaudible].

?: Second.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: So moved. And all in favor say aye.

MS. CECERE: Aye.

?: Aye.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Any opposed? Okay. Also we wanted to also amend the Executive Session discussion that was also done on last month and that will [inaudible] actually [inaudible]. I think we will at this time start the public hearing. Mr. Price?

MS. CECERE: Mr. Chairman, just one thing to – I missed this in my [inaudible] was it left out this time accidentally or?

MR. PRICE: No.

MS. CECERE: Or are we just doing away with it?

MR. PRICE: That may just have been left out.

MS. CECERE: Oh, okay. Thank you.

MR. PRICE: We do have two deferrals on your Agenda at this time. I'm not sure if you've gotten to those. Case 08-63 and Case 08-64 SE. Those were brought for reconsideration at last month's meeting and speaking to the applicant he just asked for deferral. He wanted to meet with the community and also get some more information. Okay.

CASE NO 08-73 SE:

MR. PRICE: The first item is Case 08-73 Special Exception. The applicant is Charles Medlin(?). The applicant is requesting the Board of Zoning Appeals to establish a manufactured home on property zoned M-1. The location is 1020 Medlin Road and the parcel's about –

MR. COOKE: Excuse me for one second, Mr. Price. There's no one signed up for or against in this case. Are the applicants here?

MR. PRICE: I don't see them here. Could we move this to the end just in case so –

MR. COOKE: Okay.

MR. PRICE: - we can find out?

CASE NO. 08-74 SE:

MR. PRICE: The next item is Case 08-74. It's a special exception. The applicant is requesting the Board of Zoning Appeals to establish a scrap metal processing/recycling facility on property zoned H-1. The applicant is Frank DiNardo(?). The location is at the corner of Shop Road and Beltline Boulevard. The parcel size is 5.72 acres and there's [inaudible] vacant industrial. It looks like it was formerly used as some type of industrial use. I'll get you the pictures in a second. Formerly used for

some type of industrial use. Right now it's been abandoned. The applicant proposes as stated to establish a scrap yard processing/recycling facility on the property. The surrounding area is comprised of industrial structures and uses. Okay. As you can see from the aerial here this is the facility that is highlighted. North of the property is a railroad track and all of these buildings behind, these are all dedicated for industrial uses, even across the street. This is Beltline industrial and going down Beltline also crossing Shop Road. And as you can see the parcels south of the property across Shop Road are vacant at this time or, excuse me, undeveloped. However if you go further down Shop Road you're still in industrial uses and structures. I actually had a nice presentation for you but I do believe that my son decided my jump drive would be of more use to him this morning.

MS. CERECE: I'm sorry.

MR. PRICE: I apologize for that. But we do have these pictures and we'll see what we have here. This is a picture, the actual subject property will be kind of east of this picture. This is a warehouse that's right behind this. So this will be on the other side of the railroad track. This is looking down Beltline Boulevard. As you can see, you know, industrial and, I don't know how well you can make this out but there's industrial uses going back that way.

MS. CECERE: That's South Beltline; correct?

MR. PRICE: Yes.

MS. CECERE: And that's, aren't there – used to be –

MR. COOKE: Anchor Continental.

MS. CECERE: - Anchor Continental but it's something different now I think.

MR. COOKE: I do believe it's still Anchor and across the street is Chatham Steel was the other structure across the street.

MR. PRICE: At this point I'll take your word for that. Well this is the site. The building you see here that's another property. This is a view from Beltline Boulevard looking towards the site. Looking down Shop Road, once again these are some of the existing buildings on the property. I guess this would be the main gate off of Shop Road. There's a little guard shack here. Once again a warehouse and there are other structures on the property. And a nice sign there showing it was advertised. And that'll be it for that.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Okay. And that property is zoned?

MR. PRICE: H-I.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: We've got three in favor of this case. I would like to call the first one. Steve Searcy? Come to the podium and state your name and address for the Record.

TESTIMONY OF STEVE SEARCY:

MR. SEARCY: I'm Steve Searcy, S-E-A-R-C-Y, the attorney for Hogg(?) Brothers Recycling LLC. Frank DiNardo the person on the application is actually an officer of Hogg Brothers Recycling LLC. I have with me today, Jim Drawnermaker(?) who is a representative of Hogg Brothers that can answer any questions related to the actual facility. Hogg Brothers is a full-service, North American scrap recycler that buys, sells, transports, and processes ferrous and non-ferrous metals. They've got customers throughout the United States, Canada, Mexico, and has annual gross sales in excess of \$100 million and currently has around 100 employees. The proposed use of the site is

a facility to receive scrap metal from yard-to-yard transactional businesses and from third-party sources like industrial generators of scrap, automotive manufacturers, demolition contractors, etc., and process that by size, chemistry and density and ship it out for sales on the open market. The subject property is currently owned by Commercial Credit Land II LLC. I think they got it at a foreclosure sale several years ago from the property owner that bought it from Anchor Continental. Their consent is on the application. As Geo mentioned the property is at the corner of Shop and Beltline and it's zoned Heavy Industrial and, you know, I've addressed all the other complaints with the zoning ordinance, Section 26-152(D)(26), the supplemental requirements for this special use exception and I'm just here to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Any questions from the Board?

MR. COOKE: Mr. Price, could you go back to that picture where – right here.

MR. PRICE: This one? I'm sorry. [Inaudible]

MR. COOKE: Yes.

MR. PRICE: - picture that [inaudible]?

MR. COOKE: So the actual facility is going to be located right here on this corner?

MR. SEARCY: Yeah. Right there on the corner. As you can see it's four lanes. The traffic pattern for, on the facility will be to Interstate, not through town but I-77 is, I said a mile on my application. I don't even think it's that far. It's right off the off ramp. And you've got Shop – you've got Beltline there as well but the main entrance will be on Shop.

MR. COOKE: And the facility's going to be within this, within the gate?

MR. SEARCY: Yes.

MS. CECERE: Will it be used in some of the same buildings or will you -

MR. SEARCY: They're going to try to use whatever's there. As you can see, one of the buildings is heavily damaged with the explosion a couple years ago across the railroad tracks and I may get James to address that but I think they're going to use whatever they can on the site but it'll obviously look better than that.

MS. CECERE: I have a question for Staff. For some reason I just, I know it's in the Code but why would that need a special exception?

MR. PRICE: You know, that's a very good question and I believe we spoke –

MS. CECERE: I mean, it's already -

MR. PRICE: - on the phone that day.

MR. SEARCY: Yeah.

MR. PRICE: And we were talking, without even looking in the Code I was saying oh, you won't need a special exception for that until I was actually corrected by the applicant that it does require a special exception, so. Maybe that's something that we'll look at amending with, in the Code.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Any discussion? No? To me it looks like [inaudible] I wonder why it was actually brought before us. I'll entertain a motion at this time.

MS. CECERE: [Inaudible]

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Could I get someone to read the Findings of Facts?

MS. CECERE: I'll do the Finding of Facts. Did you want to hear the other two people or?

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Well unless you need [inaudible] any further questions.

MR. COOKE: Yeah. We don't have any further questions.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: [Inaudible] talk us out of it. [Laughter]

MS. CECERE: Oh, I have one more question for Staff. Will there be like an oversight on regards to like contamination or anything like that? Would DHEC do that?

MR. PRICE: Yes. Before they establish these uses DHEC and other regulatory bodies will be involved with this.

MS. CECERE: Okay. That's all.

MR. SEARCY: We've already, we're in the middle of the environmental process of our due diligence so this is one step and the environmental is another and they're pretty far along with the environmental and they've been hand in hand with DHEC the whole way.

MS. CECERE: Thank you. Okay. Start with number four?

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Yeah.

MS. CECERE: Number four. Specific requirement for the special exception met? Yes. Will traffic be impacted by this proposal? Not any more so than I think there already is on, lots of traffic on Shop Road anyway. Will this proposal effect vehicle and pedestrian safety? No. Is there a potential impact of noise, lights, fumes, or obstructive air flow on adjoining properties? No. Will the proposed use have any adverse impact on the aesthetic character of the environs? No. Is the orientation and spacing of improvement or building appropriate? Yes.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Okay.

MS. CECERE: I make a motion that Special Exception 08-74 -

CHAIRMAN RUSH: There's also some conditions, under conditions Staff has

MS. CECERE: Okay. Any violations to the conditions placed on this approval will require rehearing of the case by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

MR. PRICE: And in this case I don't believe you have any conditions or Staff doesn't recommend any conditions.

MS. CECERE: DHEC would cover that, yeah. I make a motion that Special Exception 08-74 be approved.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Can I get a second? All in favor? Any opposed? [Vote not recorded]

CHAIRMAN RUSH: You have your special exception.

MR. SEARCY: Thank you. Can I ask a procedural question? The attorney mentioned earlier that the, it's not official until the minutes are read and then if there's an appeal there could possibly be another 30 days. Is that only if I appealed it? Could there be an appeal from, I'm trying to find out when it's final.

MS. LINDER: Any person THAT has a substantial interest could appeal it. In your case it looks very favorable to you. I would proceed cautiously at this point but you did receive a unanimous vote. So I would proceed cautiously but optimistically.

MR. SEARCY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: The next case, Mr. Price.

CASE NO. 08-75 V:

22

23

MR. PRICE: The next item is Case No. 08-75 Variance. The applicant is requesting the Board of Zoning Appeals to grant a variance to encroach into the required side yard setback on property zoned RU. The applicant is Ellis Mack and the location is 124 Laurent Way. The parcel size is about an acre and the existing land use is residential. The subject property has 5,620 square foot residential structure which was constructed in 2004. The applicant is proposing to construct a detached two-car garage which would encroach into the required side yard setback. This area is residentially developed. This is a view of the subject property. There if you look to your left of the driveway is where the proposed addition would be, the structure. This is a view looking down Laurent Way toward some of the homes. Kind of give you an idea of what is out there at this time. Once again this is a view of the proposed structure or the site of it. A closer view. If you would [inaudible] I'm trying to get this to freeze somehow. You can actually, if you look there's a property marker that kind of shows you how far it will be - actually that's a better view - how far it will be far from the side property line. And this is a view to the road showing you another view of it. And that's it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN RUSH: How far is it encroaching do you think?

MR. PRICE: They were, asked for a seven-foot encroachment. There's a plat in your packets that actually show it will be 13' from the property line. I believe - the applicant has submitted a letter from the homeowners association that is also in your packet with them approving an encroachment into the side yard setback. However once again the Richland County Code of, Land Development Code would supersede them granting a variance. This property was developed under rural zoning and has the rural setbacks; that's why we're here.

MS. CECERE: [Inaudible] are the regular houses set on like three-quarters of an acre?

MR. PRICE: Yes, ma'am.

MS. CECERE: Oh, they are?

MR. PRICE: Yeah, if you – most of the homes in this particular area especially if you were looking down Laurent Way are under rural zoning so that would require them to be set on at least a three-quarter of an acre lot. As you go around the corner down you get into some RS-LD which only require 12,000 square foot lots. But this home and the abutting homes are in the RU zoning district.

MS. CECERE: I was there when that first was being built and they had like an open house but I didn't realize they set – well with such large houses it's hard to tell that they sit on a three-quarter acre lot I guess. Okay.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Okay. I think the applicant is here, Ellis Mack. Come to the podium and state your name and address for the Record.

TESTIMONY OF ELLIS MACK:

MR. MACK: My name is Ellis Mack, M-A-C-K. My address is 124 Laurent Way in Irmo.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Let us know what you want.

MR. MACK: Well in answer to your question it is a little bit over an acre. It's about 43,000 square foot of the lot so it's just slightly over an acre of the lot. And most of them around there are an acre or more or it could be a little bit, you know, under an acre also. I'm requesting a variance today off of the property line of 13'. My – and I'm going to go back – my covenants, my developer who was Mungo and the covenants

that we have state a 10' off the property line. The county has a 20' from the side, either side yard as a 20' offset off of the property line. And I'm looking to go 13' is what I'd like so I'm looking for a variance of seven foot closer to the property line. As Mr. Price said earlier I got a letter from the homeowners association because when they first gave me approval the architectural board, you know, stated that to make sure that I was 10' off the property line is what their covenants cover. And of course the county has a 20' setback. I didn't get it until last night because my neighbor to this side, on the left side, her and her husband live in North Carolina. The house has been up for sale for about two years and I wasn't able to get in touch with her until last night, her husband is in seminary school, to get a letter from her. Her house sets 50' off the property line. So from her house 50' off the property line and my garage there would be 63' in between the two dwellings. So it wouldn't approach anywhere close and I think Mr. Price had a picture of the adjacent house and you can see how far it was setting back off the property line. But I've also got a letter from my next door neighbor. I know it's by my letter that I received, you know, I needed to have stuff in 10 days before but I wasn't able to get a phone number for them because nobody's at the house next door. But I did get a letter and I don't know if you all would like to see the letter from my neighbor. She faxed it to me last night. May I bring it up? She kind of hand wrote it last night and faxed it to me so the writing, you know, is not that great. Her name is Missy Copeland and she gives, you know, she, by her approval has no problem with me building seven foot closer to the property line. But what we're building, I've got a two-car garage on the right side of that house and we're looking to add a detached two-car garage. The variance that I'm asking for moves the garage if I would have to move it out 20' from my

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

property line, my driveway as you can kind of see in this picture is a single wide driveway. It would hurt, with the turning radius going into the driveway, you know, bringing it closer to the driveway it's going to make more of a 90° turn whereas if we were able to set it back a little bit it would give us more of a rounded turn into the driveway. Also when backing out a side entry garage with two cars in it you have to kind of back all the way out first before you can kind of swing the front end, you know, around because otherwise she'll hit the, you know, you'll hit the side wall. You have to kind of back all the way out and then turn the wheel to be able to straighten up to come down the driveway. So that's mainly the reasons why we're looking for, you know, for a variance to have more of a turning radius into the garage also. Also I wanted to mention I understand my lot is a little bit over an acre but going by the setback rules that the county has imposed on me on my right property line, starting on my right property line going back towards the right part of this street the setbacks for my neighborhood are all 10'. Now starting from my right property line going over everything is 20'. So it changes from my left side to my right side of my property line. But I've also, with the setbacks if you add up, like I told you earlier my property is about 43,500 square feet right now the setbacks that I'm having to abide by the county have a 20' setback on either side, have a 50' setback off the rear and have a 40' setback off the front. And if you multiply that times the length and I think everybody got a copy of the plat, you know, that shows the lengths, that's about 26,000 square foot of property that I'm not able to use basically because of setbacks. That leaves me roughly 16,000 square foot of my property that I can build on. You know, that's barely over a third of my whole property so basically where my house is and a little bit over that is the only land that I'm able to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

build on on that property. So I'm not sure had I, you know, when we built the house four years ago maybe we would have planned a little better and moved the house over to the right more to give us more room in order to come off the property line but of course you never, you know, you never foresee down the road what's going to happen and I've got daughters that are going to be driving in two years so we're going to have, you know, more cars in the family and that's the reason that we are looking to, you know, to add a detached garage.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Okay. Does the Board have any questions?

MR. SMITH: I have one for Mr. Price concerning the setbacks. What are the setbacks? Are they different on both sides?

MR. PRICE: [Inaudible] developments. There is a, especially when Mr. Mack and I were talking – here we go. We were talking and I pulled up the plat for Ascot and I'm not really exactly sure where the line is but somewhere along in here or maybe it runs this way that particular area's zoned RS-LD.

MR. SMITH: Where's that again?

MR. PRICE: LD's to the east of.

MR. MACK: It's my right property line is where it begins and ends.

MR. PRICE: Right but if you get in this area you know, you have larger lots, different setbacks.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Any questions from the Board?

MR. SMITH: A question for you. You're saying that Ms. Copeland actually said this to you on yesterday?

MR. MACK: Yes, sir.

MR. SMITH: Okay. And she was notified about the information about what you were doing and [inaudible] at the time beforehand?

MR. MACK: Oh, yes. You know, her step-father lives in the house but he's retired so he doesn't – his wife passed away early this year so he's not always home and I had mentioned to him before we started the building, you know, I wanted to let him know what was, you know, what was, that, you know, we would building a garage and, because they're never in town so that he could pass it on to Missy Copeland and her husband. So they were aware of, you know, of where the, you know, that we were going to build a garage and of course they've been home, you know, I couldn't tell you exactly when but they have been to the house and have seen because she told me last night that they saw the markings of where the garage, you know, and everything would be placed.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: I guess one more thing. The house that is setback [inaudible] next property [inaudible] she's trying to [inaudible].

MS. CECERE: I mean, I think he said that that – isn't that, the next house where they live, where Missy – what is her name?

MR. MACK: Copeland.

MS. CECERE: Copeland – where the Copelands live is 50' off the line.

MR. MACK: Yes, ma'am. And they have, there was a picture up there. They have, there was, they have, the house has a four-car you know garage built into the house already. So you can see that the garage right there it's kind of a garage and inlaw suite over the top of it, you know, I doubt they would need down the road any more.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: I guess what I'm saying is if [inaudible] that house [inaudible] next owner because they are encroaching on their property will they have [inaudible]?

MS. CECERE: Excuse me. I don't see where it would be encroaching. He is, the homeowners association in Ascot is okay with it and they're saying theirs is like, their requirements are 10' and from, which would make 20, 10' on their side and 10' on their side which would be 20' which in this case we're talking 60' and so, I mean, I don't see.

MR. MACK: There are variances – I know I sent in – I don't know whether it was passed on, a packet of the covenants that were like 150 pages just, you know, just so that you had a whole copy but in the back of them there are variances that have been, and I know they don't apply to me but I'm just saying down the, you know, to other homes in the area to where we have homes that are 10', you know, actual homes that are 10' off the property line and one house is like eight foot off of the property line. You know, but they've gotten variances and it's in the, you know, it's been filed in the covenants.

MR. PRICE: I'm sorry. Staff did receive that information. The reason why it wasn't included is because once again our requirements would supersede any of the covenants that they may have so just I guess to kind of keep from confusing the, what the request was we're going to stick with what is required by the county and not so much what they may approve from the homeowners association.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: I guess the biggest thing is, are there extraordinary exceptional conditions. Would somebody like to go through the Findings of Facts for this Variance? Would you like to go through the Findings?

MR. COOKE: Sure. All right. Are there any, are there extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property? I think he answered that by saying yes. I would answer that by saying yes. And that was speaking from his own words the turning radius will be affected so the turning radius is basically the issue here. I don't know if that's extraordinary or if we can consider that to be extraordinary or not so, I mean, I really would like to move to entertain discussion on

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Discussion on that point? By moving it in, in the garage seven feet -

MR. COOKE: Would that be extraordinary?

CHAIRMAN RUSH: - in. Discussion by the Board?

MS. PERRINE: I think that's, would be – could not be extraordinary and exceptional because it's his own doing, right? That's a hard one.

MR. COOKE: I don't think it is.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Yeah. It's hard for me to find that extraordinary condition in that regard.

MR. SMITH: But looking at the setbacks on each side and behind the property it looks as if there is like you said only a third of the land is being used there and in regards to how it's set to the side with the 50' on one side and the 10', I think you came to the conclusion 60' that it's going to be separating the left side and because the actual

next door neighbor doesn't have a garage that sets at the side of the house it seems as
if it's almost safe to be able to say that the future tenants of the next house will be okay
with the scenario but I don't see the exception really with the radius, as a special
exception that is.

MR. COOKE: Now Mr. Price his covenant has separate setbacks and as far as Richland County is concerned the setbacks are considered to be the same all across throughout the neighborhood; is that correct?

MR. PRICE: Yes. According to the approved subdivision plat for this, this was developed under the RU zoning district which is required to have a certain square footage for a lot, dimensional requirements for a lot and also setback requirements so that is what is required.

MR. COOKE: Is that throughout the entire -

MR. PRICE: For this particular section, yes.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Right down the street is different because –

MR. PRICE: This phase, right. But for this particular phase this is – what's required is 40' from the front, 50 from the rear, 20 from the sides for the principal use and 20 from the side and 20 from the rear for an accessory use. What you have are two phases of different zoning districts that happen to meet.

MS. CECERE: What caused the other section to be different?

MR. PRICE: That's, well how they developed it. I mean, when you're talking about Ascot and some of your larger communities, you know, we can go to Lake Carolina, we can go to the Summit, some of the larger, this wasn't a PDD but the way they develop them they have different types of, you know, units there and lots.

MR. COOKE: And he's researched it and he says the lot next to him setback is 1 considered to be -2 MR. PRICE: Yeah. When we pulled it up -3 MS. CECERE: On that – that's the new developed section. 4 MR. COOKE: No, it's, it's -5 MS. CECERE: No? 6 MR. MACK: It's my right property line. It's not a new section. The houses to the 7 right of me, I'm building on the left side. The house that's to the right of me and my 8 9 property line the offset is 10' there. MR. COOKE: That's what I'm thinking. I mean, if he would have built his house, 10 I mean, one acre over he wouldn't even be here. 11 CHAIRMAN RUSH: Yeah, I understand. 12 MR. PRICE: But it would have been a different phase with different 13 requirements. 14 MS. CECERE: Different phase and what? 15 MR. PRICE: With different requirements. I mean, once again going I guess 16 east, south of the property it's zoned, has a different zoning which has different 17 requirements as opposed to building over here for, you know, you get larger lots and 18 they have different requirements. 19 20 MS. CECERE: Mr. Mack, did you consider in adding this garage on to your house actually? Was that a possibility? I know you have the garage coming off the 21 back and would it somehow -22

MR. MACK: We have looked at that. I don't know, the only place it would go would be on the, right behind the garage that we have now and so it would come, actually the length of the driveway, you know, it would come – you can't – the two windows to the left right there are the garage – yeah, right there is the garage – and the door's right there. It would have to be added on to the back of that and it still has to be a side entry garage so we would have to wind the, you know, driveway out to the left which the driveway would have to encroach on the setback also in order to be able to get into it.

MS. CECERE: So what you're saying is the garage doors could not face the street? That's part of the covenant?

MR. MACK: Yes, ma'am.

MR. SMITH: Looking at the plan there's a back door going to the back side of the garage property. Are you planning to have a porch area behind the home?

MR. MACK: Actually when they did the survey that plat is rotated. Let me make sure. Yes, I'm sorry. I'm telling you. There is a double door out of the back for, in order to have access because I've got a fence that goes off the property, off my house, across my house so that I'll be able to go into the, out the back door into the backyard.

MR. SMITH: So you're going to have a fence that's going to be behind the actual garage.

MS. CECERE: The fence is already there.

MR. MACK: The fence is there but the fence is going to -

MR. SMITH: I see but on the actual, is that with the – looking at the plans here I'm seeing that it's going to be on the backside of it.

MR. MACK: It's going to come 10' forward from the fence so the fence would kind of come off the existing house and then tie into, because I've got dogs in the backyard. So the fence would come straight across and then tie up to the back of the garage to where that door is to the –

MS. CECERE: Those architectural windows would actually face the front of the property?

MR. MACK: Yes. It's got to match the front of the, you know, the front of the – it has to match the house exactly.

MR. COOKE: This is [inaudible].

MS. CECERE: Yeah. That's what he said, it's reversed.

MR. COOKE: All right. So that's –

MR. MACK: This is the, the bottom right, I mean, the bottom left picture will be what is facing the house now, straight at us to where, you know, we would enter straight in this way, turn left off the driveway. But the bottom right would be the back of the garage facing the fence and then of course the top right would be the part facing the street, you know, because where it has to match the house.

MR. COOKE: That makes sense then. But there is going to be no other structure or any type of cement patio that's going to be behind there?

MR. MACK: No, sir. It's all wooded, it's all wooded area.

MR. COOKE: Just to make sure. Okay. Mr. Price, Mr. Mack has stated that there, I don't know if you can speak on this, but he had stated that there were other variances approved in this neighborhood. I know that's going to answer number five,

does this condition generally apply to other properties in the vicinity? [Inaudible] within 1 this neighborhood? We don't know. 2 MR. PRICE: I mean, that may have been something that they may have done 3 through the homeowners association, that doesn't necessarily make it right. So, but as 4 far as the county's concerned I don't recall any other variances in this particular area 5 being granted from the Board. 6 MR. COOKE: Mr. Chairman? 7 CHAIRMAN RUSH: Any more discussion on extraordinary - I think that's sort of 8 9 where we are. MR. SMITH: Yes, sir. That's where we are. So I ask the question again. Are 10 there extraordinary or exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of 11 property? 12 MR. COOKE: I'm saying no. 13 MR. SMITH: Okay. If the answer is no a variance cannot be granted if there is 14 not any extraordinary or exceptional conditions. 15 CHAIRMAN RUSH: Can I get a motion? 16 MR. SMITH: Okay. I would like to move to deny the variance based on the 17 Findings of Facts, Variance 08-75 based on the Findings of Facts. 18 CHAIRMAN RUSH: I'll second that. All in favor? 19 20 [Approved: Perrine, Rush] MR. PRICE: Those in favor are Perrine, Rush. 21 22 CHAIRMAN RUSH: All right. All against? 23 [Opposed: Branham, Cecere, Cooke, Smith.]

MR. PRICE: Those against the motion, Branham, Cecere, Cooke, Smith.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: That motion fails. All right. Well we'll go back to number four. I guess we need to state what the extraordinary and exceptional –

MR. SMITH: A question for you. Are there any other properties in the community, I mean, instead of asking Mr. Price about any other variances, are there any other detached garages in that phase of the community that are similar to what you're looking to incorporate with your –

MR. MACK: There are detached garages, yes, sir.

MR. SMITH: Okay. That are added with the garages that are attached to the property? So these are –

MR. MACK: Yes, detached.

MR. SMITH: - extra garages?

MR. MACK: Yes, sir.

MS. CECERE: Do you know were those garages at that time built when the whole development went in – excuse me, I'm going to address this to Mr. Price. If when this property, when this community was established and that someone would have built a detached garage at that point like let's say when they had the open house thing, would they have had to come before the Zoning Board to request special exception if they were?

MR. PRICE: A variance?

MS. CECERE: A variance, uh-huh (affirmative).

MR. PRICE: Any time you're going to build any type of construction that would require some type of encroachment you are required to come in and get a variance.

Now that's not to say that over the years not just in this community, you know, throughout Richland County, in the unincorporated area of Richland County that there's been some people that have kind of built on their own and maybe has not been caught at this time.

MS. CECERE: But that would not happen in this community for the simple reason that they have a homeowners association?

MR. PRICE: That's not to say.

MS. CECERE: I'm sorry?

MR. PRICE: I can't say.

MS. CECERE: Oh! But you don't remember of any –

MR. PRICE: No.

MS. CECERE: - variance there in this community?

MR. PRICE: No, ma'am. This is actually one of the first times I've been in there for some type of Board action.

MR. MACK: I would also like to say that if you look on that plat up there on the screen not only, you know, does the homeowners association have a 10' setback but there is a perimeter around the sides that actually has a seven and a half foot setback when the plat was originally done and I think I sent in a copy of what the Richland County plat has and it shows that the side and rear property lines are seven and a half foot, 15' total on either side of the property line. Now that's on the original plat [inaudible] bottom part of the, you know, the original plat that Richland County has but it states that it's got a seven and a half foot and if you look there's a dotted line around the inside of that plat that shows a seven and a half foot setback on the inside of the plat.

MS. CECERE: I'm looking at you, Mr. Price.

MR. PRICE: Typically, and what I'll do is I'll just, we'll get a copy of this particular phase so we can actually see that. But typically subdivisions, there's that extra setback that's established and that's usually for easements.

MS. CECERE: Okay, Mr. Mack, here's our problem. We need to have a special, to grant this variance we need an extraordinary circumstance why we should grant you that and at this point we don't have this. So basically even though we'd like to grant this to you I don't think at this point we can do it because there aren't any extraordinary circumstances. I mean, I don't –

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Actually with that being said we voted down that motion.

MR. MACK: And I go back to, I know it's not, I mean –

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Point or order. Excuse me, Mr. Mack.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Price, in regards to spacing I see there's a two-car garage. They aren't going to have, again your daughters are what, 14?

MR. MACK: Fourteen, yes, sir.

MR. SMITH: They're going to be driving in the next two years. When it comes down to exceptions in regards to spacing, can spacing in that regard be considered a special exception in regards to growth of the family lifestyle?

CHAIRMAN RUSH: I think when we're looking at these cases we need to, because it's sort of, it's more so [inaudible] and if the ordinance is saying that there's a 20' setback for garages and they're encroaching into that that's really our perspective on it what we're looking at, not necessarily – it's the property itself not necessarily the other factors or if there are other factors, the other factors pertaining to the property.

17 | 18 | 19 | i

14

15

16

22

23

20

21

MR. PRICE: I mean, it's always a tough one like I said and this, this is kind of the conversation I typically have with applicants when they come in. You're, it seems like you're adding a variance to another variance request because you're getting into well do we need – what about the separation but the real question is and, you know, I'm not trying to persuade you one way or the other is usually when someone comes in for a variance the question is do you need this or do you want this a lot of times. And then you get into well tell me what's extraordinary and I think that's where you were headed, Mr. Rush. Of course and what is extraordinary about the property that would require you to build it over? You know, a case like this there could be a septic tank there. You don't want to build on a septic tank. You need to move it over or there's something on the property that would prohibit you from actually building at that location. Now you have a case, you know, the question is in a case such as this are there other areas that this could be built on the property? Are there any other alternatives to the applicant other than right here? Is this finally the only place and the only way this can be built on the property?

MR. MACK: And I go back to I'm limited to, you know, 16,000 square foot of my property to build on so, you know, basically I've got to build on, either attach it to the house or close to the house to where I won't have, you know, and I know Mr. Price says it's a matter of want and need but you know, I have paid for the land and, you know, and I'm not going to say that, you know, I understand the setback, you know, it's good for the community and all that but, you know, I think that I'm limited down to 16,000 square foot of 43,000 square foot of my property to build on and I'm asking for, you know, for seven foot for a garage that, we go back to want and need. Well if you look at the

1	Richland County police report we've had a ton of break-ins in our neighborhood into
2	cars. They ask you to park your cars in garages. So you know, in a couple years when
3	I am going to have two daughters that are going to be driving, you know, the amount of
4	cars that have been broken in I will need a safe place for my cars to be parked and the
5	garage is a necessity.
6	MS. CECERE: Excuse me. If let's say he added this garage on to his house and
7	would have to move this driveway over would we back in the same situation that, how
8	far would the driveway have to be –
9	MR. PRICE: Driveways can be built up to the property line. There are no
10	required setbacks for driveways.
11	CHAIRMAN RUSH: Okay. I guess we'll continue with the – thank you, Mr.
12	Mack. I guess we'll continue with the Findings of Facts.
13	MR. COOKE: Do these conditions generally apply to other property in the
14	vicinity? Are those conditions that are, we never did find any exceptional conditions
15	really so –
16	MR. MACK: Well it is in variance. It is in the covenants.
17	CHAIRMAN RUSH: One second. We're in discussion.
18	MR. MACK: I'm sorry.
19	MS. PERRINE: Do we have to continue with these if we said up here that the
20	answer was no so a variance?
21	CHAIRMAN RUSH: The problem with that is we did that but just voted that
22	down.

MS. PERRINE: Okay. Gotcha.

23

I would just like to point out one thing in the Code and it's also in the package that you have. I'm not saying, maybe this will make it easier for you but it does state here under the Standard of Review for a variance, "The Board of Zoning Appeals shall not grant a variance unless and until it makes the finding followings [sic]." You know, you're getting to the first one and you've already answered it one way but now [inaudible] you want to argue against that it's [inaudible] you've kind of answered – usually when you get to the first question are there any extraordinary or exception circumstances, you know, and I'm thinking maybe Ms. Linder can you know talk more on that but it seems like if that's the answer's no that there are no extraordinary or exceptional circumstances then you continue to discuss it, trying to find ways around it kind of goes against what's in the Code.

MR. PRICE: [Inaudible] may be a bit out of order before we get to the next case.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Sorry about that.

CASE NO. 08-76 SE:

MR. PRICE: The next case is Case 08-76 Special Exception. The Board is, the applicant is requesting the Board of Zoning Appeals to grant, to convert a non-conforming use which is a commercial, it's a construction company to another non-conforming use commercial which will be a flower shop on property zoned RS-LD. The applicant is Sandra Chastain. The location 853 Universal Drive. The parcel [inaudible] of an acre [inaudible] a vacant structure. The subject property [inaudible] an unoccupied 40 x 50 structure [inaudible]. The rear of the property is fenced. The applicant as stated proposes to establish a flower shop on the property. This is the subject property. This is the existing building that's on the property. As stated before it

was previously used as a construction company. Speaking to the property owner there, they received a certificate of zoning compliance years ago and they've maintained a business license so it is still, it's non-conforming but it's allowed to continue - I'm sorry about that. It is allowed to continue as a construction company currently. And he has a potential buyer that wants to convert this to another non-conforming use in this case will be a flower shop. If the Board were to grant this request the non-conforming use as stated would be a flower shop but any other changes that were, if somebody else were come in and propose a different use it would require them to come back to the Board once again to convert a non-conforming use to another non-conforming use. As stated this is the existing structure. If you look east of this you'll see there's an area for parking. Once again this will be reviewed once by Staff for site plan approval. This is the area potentially for parking. See there's a big fence, there's a gate here and this leads to the rear of the property. This is the parcel that's west of the subject property. You can see it's vacant. Across the street is a church. This isn't directly across the Actually the parking lot [inaudible] this picture's taken from is the street from it. driveway of the proposed site. Down the street is Mill Creek Elementary School. If you look in your aerial this is the neighborhood that actually, east of this is the elementary school and this is the neighborhood and the back of this house is where the actual property is for the proposed flower shop. [Inaudible] side of the neighborhood. This is a view down Universal Drive toward Garners Ferry Road. As you can see there's the church. It's another view. I believe I actually have a picture of the [inaudible] here we go. And this is the rear of the property. As stated before it was used for a construction site and I'm sure this will be cleaned up if the flower shop is granted.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Okay. We have two in favor of. Ms. Sandra Chastain come to the podium and state your name and address for the Record, please.

TESTIMONY OF SANDRA CHASTAIN:

MS. CHASTAIN: I'm Sandra Chastain, C-H-A-S-T-A-I-N. My address is -

MS. CECERE: Please speak into the mic.

MS. CHASTAIN: My address is number nine Gill Creek Court, Columbia, South Carolina. I guess I'll start with, this is actually a lifetime dream of being able to own my own flower shop. I've been in the industry for 19 years and over the years I've learned from where the Big Lots shopping center is on Garners Ferry Road to Sumter there's no flower shops so a lot of your people in Eau Clair, Hopkins, they have no other place to go to that is local except further down Rosewood or in town. So what I'm trying to do is to branch out to that area down in there which is just growing to have a local florist there for people when they do need to have some deliveries made or when they just need to come by and pick up something. My husband he is an importer, he imports flowers into the country so we are basically flower children. This is all we know and we're just at an opportunity now to where we can buy our own building and we're just really, really excited about it and just hope that this can come through for us.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Any questions for [inaudible]? Mr. Tom Williams if you would like to speak.

TESTIMONY OF TOM WILLIAMS:

MR. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. My name is Tom Williams, W-I-L-L-I-A-M-S. I run a small construction company out of this building since 19 -

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Could you state your address also for the Record?

MR. WILLIAMS: 1008 Paramount Drive, Columbia. I own property that adjoins this property. I've operated a construction company out of this little shop for the last 18 years. When we took it over it was, when I was able to purchase the property it was, it was a body shop [inaudible] or a hang out shop and everything else right in front of the church and it was the biggest blessing in the world for us to get the property and turn it into and convert it into a little small office and shop for our construction company. We're phasing out; I'm going out of business and we're phasing out. I've got a few things still at the back of the property that needs to be cleaned out but Ms. Chastain and her husband is buying the property. We've been trying to get this thing [inaudible] personnel and shop personnel but with her taking it over it would beautify the area a little bit more and I would just like to see her get it.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Any questions? Okay. Thank you, sir. There's no one else to [inaudible] or has signed in. I will open it up now for the Board. Would someone like to go through the Findings of Facts?

MR. COOKE: Yes, I would, Mr. Chairman. Were the special requirements for the special exceptions met?

MS. LINDER: May I just say, and Staff can correct me, but I believe that special requirement that has to be met is that you have to find that this new use is more in character with the uses permitted in the zoning district than the prior use.

MR. COOKE: Okay. So that answer is going to be yes. Will traffic be impacted by this proposal? I'm going to say no. Will this proposal effect vehicle or pedestrian safety? Also is going to be no. Does the potential impact of noise, light, fumes or obstruction of air flow on adjoining properties? That's also going to be no. Would the

1	proposed use have an adverse impact on the aesthetic character of the environs? No
2	also. Is the orientation and spacing of improvements or building appropriate? Being
3	nonconforming I would say yes.
4	CHAIRMAN RUSH: So I open it up now for discussion or a motion.
5	MR. SMITH: Let me just ask a question. How much parking lot space was in the
6	front? You said five cars were usually in the -
7	MR. WILLIAMS: There are six parking, six or seven parking spaces in the front
8	and probably four to five on the side of the building.
9	MR. SMITH: Okay. So there's ample enough.
10	MR. COOKE: I'd like to make a motion. I'd like to move to approve 08-76
11	Special Exception based on the Facts of Findings, I mean, Findings of Facts.
12	MR. SMITH: I second.
13	CHAIRMAN RUSH: I have a motion that has been property seconded. All in
14	favor?
15	[Approved: Branham, Perrine, Rush, Cecere, Cooke, Smith]
16	MR. PRICE: All in favor, Branham, Perrine, Rush, Cecere, Cooke, Smith.
17	CHAIRMAN RUSH: All against? Okay. Ms. Chastain, your special exception
18	has been approved. Staff will be in touch.
19	MR. SMITH: Ms. Chastain, congratulations. And what is the name of your
20	company?
21	MS. CHASTAIN: [Inaudible].
22	MR. SMITH: Chastain's Fine Floral.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Okay. The next case, Mr. Price. Or the applicant is still not 1 here? 2 MR. PRICE: I request that the Board, we defer this case so I can get in contact 3 with the applicant. You know, a lot of things tend to happen. 4 CHAIRMAN RUSH: Okay. Based on the fact that the applicant for 08-73 is not 5 here I could I entertain a motion for deferral? 6 MS. CECERE: I make a motion that 08-73 Special Exception will be deferred to 7 our January meeting. 8 MR. COOKE: I'll second that. 9 CHAIRMAN RUSH: I have a motion and a properly seconded. All in favor? 10 [Vote not recorded] 11 CHAIRMAN RUSH: Okay. So 08-73 will be deferred to the January meeting. 12 Next order will be approval of Minutes. 13 MR. PRICE: We have on the Agenda for the approval of the calendar, 2009. 14 CHAIRMAN RUSH: Yeah, as soon as we do -15 MR. PRICE: We want to defer that until the January meeting to give Staff a 16 chance to look at it and make sure all the rooms are secured for those dates. 17 CHAIRMAN RUSH: Okay. So approval of the calendar will be deferred to the 18 January meeting. All right. Now we're in for the approval of Minutes for the November 19 20 meeting. MR. COOKE: I'd like to make a motion to approve the Minutes. 21 MS. CECERE: I'm looking for my Minutes; I've made corrections in it, I can't find 22 23 them. On the Present: it should say Susanne Cecere, not Susan. S-U-S-A-N-N-E.

MS. PERRINE: And I think it should also show that Mr. Branham and I were out. 1 MS. CECERE: I don't see that on here. 2 MS. PERRINE: It isn't on there. 3 MS. CECERE: Huh? 4 MS. PERRINE: It isn't on there but I think it should be. 5 MS. CECERE: Oh, it should say absent. It should say that Mr. Branham, Ms. 6 Perrine were absent. It doesn't say that in the Minutes. 7 MS. HAYNES: So what line was that one? 8 MS. CECERE: It's just in the opening, yeah. Correction of my first name and 9 that Mr. Branham and Ms. Perrine were absent. 10 CHAIRMAN RUSH: Okay. If anyone would like to make a motion to the Minutes 11 for November with those corrections? 12 MR. SMITH: I make a motion to approve Minutes of the November meeting. 13 MS. LINDER: As corrected. 14 MR. SMITH: As corrected. 15 MR. COOKE: I second the motion. 16 CHAIRMAN RUSH: I have a motion that has been properly seconded. All in 17 favor? 18 [Vote not recorded] 19 20 MR. PRICE: Okay. Those in favor – CHAIRMAN RUSH: And against? With that being it -21 MS. PERRINE: Don't adjourn yet. In the Minutes y'all we're talking about having 22 23 a training session or something?

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Monday night. 1 MS. CECERE: And when is that going to be? At first it says December the 8th 2 and then y'all said that you were going to check into it so. I don't want to miss it. 3 MS. HAYNES: You've had your six hours haven't you? I think you have your six 4 hours. I think you're good. Regardless, everybody needs to get – well, let's see. Mr. 5 6 Smith has a year to get his. Mr. Cooke has a year to get his. Torrey? Torrey has a year to get his; correct? 7 MR. PRICE: He should be real close. 8 9 [Inaudible discussion] MR. PRICE: You're still welcome to take the classes. 10 MS. HAYNES: What we're gonna do is we're gonna try to have the classes here 11 at the county before the end of the year. Planning Commission and Staff need it and 12 we're just trying to get a date when we can get everybody together. 13 MR. SMITH: So it won't be Monday? 14 MS. HAYNES: What? It will not be Monday. 15 MR. SMITH: Okay. There we go. 16 17 MS. CECERE: Will it be during the day or in the evening? MS. HAYNES: I don't know. They've discussed both. 18 MR. COOKE: I say during the day, lunch will be provided. 19 20 MR. SMITH: I second that. MR. PRICE: [Inaudible] right down the street. 21 22 MS. PERRINE: You're talking about, it says take training on land use and the 23 law and such. That's what Mr. Kocy was saying. So –

MS. HAYNES: What he means is the training. 1 MS. CECERE: Oh, okay. 2 MS. HAYNES: The mandatory training. 3 MS. PERRINE: Oh, okay. That's one, two, three, four, five, and six; is that 4 correct? 5 MS. HAYNES: Correct. Everybody needs, and if you've had it you know that 6 you've had it [inaudible] yeah. So but I'll let everybody know [inaudible] by next week I'll 7 let you all know who has to take it and how many credits you have already and as I said 8 9 you're welcome to [inaudible] as far as - let's see, Sheldon and William and Torrey between now and next year you need your six hours. So if you want to jump on and 10 take it you can. 11 CHAIRMAN RUSH: Oh, yeah. I will. 12 MR. SMITH: Does that first class go towards the six? 13 MS. HAYNES: Uh-huh (affirmative). 14 MR. COOKE: The first class? Okay. So that was – that's three? 15 [Inaudible discussion] 16 MR. SMITH: I have a question for Ms. Linder. In regards to January, Ms. 17 Linder? Okay. Are we going, in regards to [inaudible] for me to be able to be off the 18 Board for a case. 19 20 MR. PRICE: He has a case coming up and he needs to be recused from that. MS. LINDER: He can get a recusal form for one case. We'll just read it into the 21 Record and you would sit out that case. 22 23 MS. SMITH: I just wanted to make sure it was on the record that [inaudible].

2

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN RUSH: All in favor?

MS. LINDER: We'll do that at the January meeting.

MR. PRICE: I do have a question kind of regarding that, not necessarily [inaudible] Mr. Smith. If you have to recuse yourself for a case of course you can't vote on it, can you present the case to the Board?

MS. LINDER: I would recommend against that. I would recommend having a representative state the case.

MR. SMITH: That would be a conflict I understand but my wife is pregnant and she's going to be in her 8th month and in regards to representation I have an attorney but I really didn't want to have my attorney involved.

MS. LINDER: If any Members of the Board have questions about the ethics, the Ethics Commission at state level will welcome your comments and you can get an official or semi-official ruling from the Ethics Commission. Anybody has a complaint against you that you violated ethics rules it would go to the Ethics Commission and so they are the definitive people that you need to talk to if you have any questions about whether you can or cannot vote or something and I can get you a phone number for the Ethics Commission.

MR. SMITH: Thank you so much. Okay.

CHAIRMAN RUSH: Is that it?

MR. SMITH: I make a motion to adjourn.

MS. CECERE: I second.