Meeting agenda
Monday, August 22, 2022 6:00pm

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes: 07/25/2022
3. Board of Zoning Appeals procedure/process
4. Brief statement about rules and procedures
5. Variance application \#VA22-009 - Signarama Anderson - Jamie Smith is requesting a 93 squarefoot increase variance from the 75 square-foot limit for stacked signs. TMS\# 222-00-02-046, 1631 Sandifer Blvd, Seneca, SC 29678.

Oconee County Board of Zoning Appeals

Council Chambers 415 South Pine Street
Walhalla, S.C. 29691
www.oconeesc.com
YouTube: "YourOconee"
Staff contact
846-638-4218
planninginfo@oconeesc.com
6. Variance application \#VA22-011 - Civil \& Environmental Consultants Inc Karuiam Booker is requesting a $+/-7^{\prime}-15$ ' variance from the required 25 ' front setback. TMS\# 176-00-01-155, 102 Lusk Dr. West Union, SC 29696.
7. Adjourn

# OCONEE COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS 



TEL (864) 638-42I8 FAX (864) 638-4168

Minutes
6:00 PM - July 25, 2022, 2022

## Members in Attendance

Gwen Fowler
Jim Codner
William Decker

Bill Gilster
John Eagar
Marty McKee

## Staff

James Coley, Planning Director Vivian Kompier, Senior Planner Kyle Reid, Assistant Director of Public Works

Media
NA
ITEM 1 - Call to order - Mr. Codner called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.
ITEM 2 - Motion to approve the minutes from June 27, 2022 - Mr. Eagar made a motion to approve the minutes from May 23; seconded by Mr. Decker. Mr. Codner called for a vote. The motion passed $4 / 0$ with 2 abstentions (absent at previous meeting).

ITEM 3 - Brief statement about rules and procedures - Mr. Codner outlined the proceedings of the meeting going forward:

- Applicant will provide a presentation to state their request (5 minutes).
- Staff will be asked to make any comments regarding the request.
- The public is allowed to voice their approval or opposition to the proposed.

Please do not repeat opinions that have already been stated into the record (3-5 minutes).

- Applicant rebuttal
- Board members will discuss in detail.
- Voting

ITEM 4 - 4. Variance application \#VA22-006 - Brooks Engineering Associates Zachary Wortman is requesting a road variance from the required 150' tangent between curves. TMS\# 099-00-02-002, an unaddressed parcel with the closest address of 395 Keowee Town Landing Rd., Salem, SC 29676.

Applicant's opening statement and provision of evidence: Mr. Wortman discussed the request to allow for the reduced straight tangent between the two curves. The developer desires to use the existing gravel road layout. The Cliffs community will have private security enforce speed limits. Their design speed is 15 mph .

## Staff comments:

- Mr. Reid confirmed that the requirement for straight line tangents between curves is a County standard and not an AASHTO standard. The transition between curves handled through other regulations. The other concern is drivers reacting, making two separate driving movements quickly, without a recovery time. Other issues would be off tracking with trailers. There are signage options available that are available. S-curve and advisory speed limit reductions


## Public Comment:

- Mr. Codner read an email into the record in favor of the variance

Applicant rebuttal: The applicant stated their experience in developing roads in North Carolina. Project manager stated they are a low impact developer.

## Board questions and discussion:

- . The Project Manager was asked about speed bumps, there is a mixed community response
- The Project Manager was asked about an advisory speed limit of 5 mph on the curves, not adverse


## Consideration of VA22-006:

1. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property:
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gilster. No discussion.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
2. These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity:
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gilster. No discussion.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
3. Because of these conditions, the application of this chapter to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property; and
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gilster.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
4. The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent uses or to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion; seconded by Mr. Gilster. No discussion.
b. Vote


Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
5. Mr. Codner asked - Based on the evidence presented to the Board, do I hear a motion that the proposed variance be Approved.
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion; seconded by Mr. Gilster. Discussion, require S Curve Signs with an advisory speed limits of 5 mph be added.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that variance request was approved with the condition that $S$ Curve signs with advisory speed limits of 5 mph be added.

ITEM 5-5. Variance application \#VA22-008 - Brooks Engineering Associates Zachary Wortman is requesting a road variance from the required 150' tangent between curves. TMS\# 056-00-03-022, an unaddressed parcel with the closest address of 15740 N. Hwy 11, Salem, SC 29676.

Applicant's opening statement and provision of evidence: Mr. Wortman discussed the developer desires to use the existing gravel road layout. There is an issue with the curves, as well as the stream crossing that the road is crossing, and turn radiuses', and straight line tangents between curves. The Cliffs community will have private security enforce speed limits. Their design speed is 15 mph .

## Staff comments:

- Mr. Reid went over the same items from the previous application


## Public Comment:

- Mr. David Lowery is concerned with the lot size, density, and congestion

Applicant rebuttal: The applicant stated the only issue under consideration is the road variance. The Project Manager stated the density is low, 35 lots on 60ish acres.

## Board questions and discussion:

- . The Project Manager was asked about speed bumps, there is a mixed community response
- The Project Manager was asked about an advisory speed limit of 5 mph on the curves, not adverse


## Consideration of SE22-008:

1. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property:
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mckee. No discussion.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
2. These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity:
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion, seconded by Mr. Decker. No discussion.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
3. Because of these conditions, the application of this chapter to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property; and
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion, seconded by Mr. Decker.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
4. The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent uses or to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion; seconded by Mr. Decker. No discussion.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
5. Mr. Codner asked - Based on the evidence presented to the Board, do I hear a motion that the proposed variance be Approved.
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion; seconded by Mr. Gilster. Discussion, require a guard rail on the north side at the stream crossing, S Curve Signs with an advisory speed limits of 5 mph be added.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

a. Mr. Codner noted that variance request was approved with the condition that require a guard rail on the north side at the stream crossing, S Curve Signs with an advisory speed limits of 5 mph be added.

ITEM 6 - 6. Special Exception application \#SE22-006 - HSB, PA - Sarah Spruill is requesting a special exception hearing for a Communications Tower. TMS\# 016-00-01-001 with an address of 100 Bad Creek Road, Salem, SC 92676.

Applicant's opening statement and provision of evidence: Ms. Spruill presented on behalf of Duke Energy for a tower for their Bad Creek Hydro station. Duke will remove the current tower as part of this project. According to Duke this is only viable site for the tower. The Tower is designed to break and fall in a smaller area. Duke will include ATT Firstnet (emergency response network/service) with the tower. Technical aspects of the design were discussed.

## Staff comments: NA

Board questions: Mr. Coley was asked about public comments. There have been phone calls asking about service improvements, some from NC, no opposition calls.

## Public comment:

- None


## Applicant rebuttal: NA

Board discussion: NA

## Consideration of SE22-005:

1. Is in accordance with the comprehensive plan and consistent with the spirit, purposes, and the intent and specific requirements of this chapter, to include the definition and intent of the district in which the special exception is being requested;
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gilster.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
2. Is in the best interests of the county, the convenience of the community and the public welfare Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion in the affirmative, seconded by Mr. Decker. A brief discussion followed.
a. Vote


Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
3. Is suitable for the property in question, and designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so as to be in harmony with and appropriate in appearance to the existing or intended character of the general vicinity;
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion in the affirmative, seconded by Mr.

McKee. A brief discussion followed.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
4. Is suitable in terms of effects on highway traffic, parking and safety with adequate access arrangements to protect streets from undue congestion and hazards.
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion in the affirmative; seconded by Mr.

Decker. A brief discussion followed.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
5. Mr. Codner asked - Based on the evidence presented to the Board, do I hear a motion that the proposed special exception be approved.
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion; seconded by Mr. McKee. No discussion.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed
Item 7 - 7. Variance application \#VA22-0010 - HSB, PA - Sarah Spruill is requesting a 185' height variance (175' maximum) and 215' fall zone variance from the required 360' requirement. TMS\# 016-00-01-001 with an address of 100 Bad Creek Road, Salem, SC 92676.

Applicant's opening statement and provision of evidence: Ms. Spruill stated they had previously addressed these items in their initial presentation.

## Staff comments:

- Mr. Coley - the fall zone is also the setback for the tower, and the this is also addressing the setback with the fall zone variance


## Public Comment:

- none

Applicant rebuttal: NA
Board questions and discussion: NA

Consideration of VA22-0010:

1. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property:
c. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion, seconded by Mr. Decker. No discussion.
d. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
2. These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity:
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion, seconded by Mr. Decker. No discussion.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
3. Because of these conditions, the application of this chapter to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property; and
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion, seconded by Mr. Decker.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
4. The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent uses or to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion; seconded by Mr. Gilster. No discussion.
b. Vote


Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
5. Mr. Codner asked - Based on the evidence presented to the Board, do I hear a motion that the proposed variance be Approved.
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion; seconded by Mr. McKee. No discussion.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that variance request was approved.

Discussion- Mr. Codner asked for policy to be added to the agenda for next month's meeting

Item 8 Adjourn - Mr. Decker made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Gilster. Mr. Codner called for a vote. Motion passed unanimously 6/0.

Variance application \#VA22-009 - Signarama Anderson - Jamie Smith is requesting a 93 squarefoot increase variance from the 75 square-foot limit for stacked signs. TMS\# 222-00-02-046, 1631 Sandifer Blvd, Seneca, SC 29678.

Order includes basic design with a maximum of 2 proofs.

## Additional customer change requests will incur added charges



I verify that all sizes, colors, spelling and overall concept of this layout to be correct. I agree that any changes made after this approval are my responsibility and subject to additional charges.

4130 - A Clemson Blva. • Anderson, SC 29621
864-964-0029 • www.signarama-anderson.com

Customer Stop-A-Minit \#34
Item Pylon Sign

Date 02-09-22

This layout is the property of Signarama Anderson and may not be reproduced in any way without written permission.

Order includes basic design with a maximum of 2 proofs. Additional customer change requests will incur added charges


Order includes basic design with a maximum of 2 proofs. Additional customer change requests will incur added charges


I verify that all sizes, colors, spelling and overall concept of this layout to be correct I agree that any changes made after this approval are my responsibility and subject to additional charges.

Customer Signature
$\qquad$
Order No. 15758
Date 02-09-22 $\qquad$

This layout is the property of Signarama Anderson and may not be reproduced in any way without written permission.

Order includes basic design with a maximum of 2 proofs. Additional customer change requests will incur added charges


I verify that all sizes, colors, spelling and overall concept of this layout to be correct. I agree that any changes made after this approval are my responsibility and subject to additional charges.

Customer Signature
$\qquad$ Item Pylon Sign

Date 02-09-22

This layout is the property of Signarama Anderson and may not be reproduced in any way without written permission.


Variance application \#VA22-011 - Civil \& Environmental Consultants Inc - Karuiam Booker is requesting a $+/-7^{\prime}-15^{\prime}$ variance from the required 25' front setback. TMS\# 176-00-01-155, 102 Lusk Dr. West Union, SC 29696.

July 15, 2022

Oconee County Planning
Board of Zoning Appeals
Attn: James Coley
415 S. Pine St.
Walhalla, SC 29691
Dear James Coley:

Subject: Board of Zoning Appeals Variance Request<br>Family Dental Health of Golden Corner<br>CEC Project 324-251

It is our pleasure to present this variance request to the Board of Zoning Appeals on behalf of Golden Corner Dentistry located at 102 Lusk Drive in West Union, SC. This variance is to petition a building setback waiver to allow the construction of a building addition to add seven patient operation rooms, laboratory, and sterilization area to the existing facility. Upon further inspection of the site, it is our determination that this location warrants consideration of a variance to construct a building expansion to the existing facility in the $25-\mathrm{ft}$. building setback (setback) based on guidelines set forth in Sec. 38-7.1 Variances as provided in the Oconee County Planning Ordinance.

Civil \& Environmental Consultants Inc. was commissioned by the owner's authorized agent to perform a study of the site. The study concluded that the existing facility is currently located in the setback and that the proposed building expansion would also be constructed in the setback. Sec.38-7.1 Variances allows an applicant to petition an appeal to grant variances in individual cases based on four criteria. This analysis was performed based on the parameters set forth in Sec.38-7.1 Variances of the Oconee County code.

1. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property.

Based on our professional opinion this site warrants unnecessary hardship. The front of the building faces Lusk Drive with ADA access to the lobby. The western side of the building immediately faces out to a $68-\mathrm{ft}$. Duke Power R/W, which houses a three-phase power line that extends power further into the City of West Union and the City of Walhalla. While parking lots are allowable in Duke Power R/W, structures of any kind are completely restricted. Also, the most efficient use of the interior space is to add to the building in a linear manner rather than to the side that would take a considerable amount of interior renovation to the existing building to accomplish. Finally, while the existing building was constructed approximately 16 ft . into the R/W at the southernmost corner of the building, it is angled to where the proposed building addition would only encroach approximately 7 ft . in the R/W at the northernmost corner, reducing exposure to the highway and setback.
2. These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity.

The neighboring properties to the southeast; Classic Pool \& Patio and Walhalla Lumber Supply, respectively, do not face this condition. The single-family homes on Magnolia Drive to the north do not face this condition, nor do any properties across South Carolina Highway 28 (SC28). The reference property was constructed approximately in the year 1985, before community planning was put online through Oconee County. Prior to construction of the refenced building, SC28 was widened with approximately 1.10 acres of R/W obtained by SCDOT. Subsequently, during the year of 1985 Duke Energy obtained the 68 ft . of R/W and Oconee County Roads obtained prescriptive road R/W as depicted on the referenced ALTA survey. These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity and based on the buildable area after all site encumbrances were evaluated the proposed building addition is the only viable option.
3. Because of these conditions, the application of this chapter to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.

Because of these previously referenced conditions, the application of this chapter to the property would prohibit and restrict the full utilization of this parcel as well as the adjacent property. As previously noted, the existing building was constructed at an angle approximately 16 ft . into the R/W and the proposed building addition will be placed approximately 7 ft . from SCDOT R/W which would be consistent with the existing orientation of the building. In addition, per Sec. 38-10.2 - Control free district (CFD) zoning guidelines from the Oconee County Code of Ordinances, the nonresidential use parameters are as follows:

| Minimum Lot Size  Minimum Yard Requirements Max. <br> Height |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lot Size | Min. <br> Width <br> (ft.) | Front <br> Setback <br> (ft.) | Side <br> Setback <br> (ft.) | Rear <br> Setback <br> ft ) | Structure <br> Height <br> (ft.) |
|  | Greater <br> than or <br> equal to $1 / 2$ <br> acre | N/A | 25 | 5 | 10 | 65 |

* These setback requirements shall not apply to subdivision plats that were recorded in the Office of the Oconee County Register of Deeds prior to May 7, 2002.

Oconee County Planning - Board of Zoning Appeals
CEC Project 324-251
Page 3
July 15, 2022
4. The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent uses or to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.

This variance will not be of any detriment to adjacent uses or to the public good, and the character of the district will be improved by the granting of the variance. Through approval, this project will increase current capacity of the dental staff in Oconee County, will create jobs, and will add to the beautification of the SC28 corridor.

Thank you for your time in review and please refer to the attached documents for additional information.

Sincerely,
CIVIL \& ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS, INC.


Karuiam Booker, EIT
Project Manager
Enclosures:
BZA Appeals Package
ALTA Survey
ZV-01 Exhibit
A1-Rendering Golden Corner
Sec.38-7.1 Variances


Bryan Lightweis, PE
Senior Project Manager

## BZA APPEALS PACKAGE

## ArcGIS Web Map




## 영qPublic.net ${ }^{\text {" }}$ Oconee County, SC



Sales

| Sale Date | Deed Book / Page | Plat Book / Page | Sale Price | Reason | Grantor | Grantee |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7/16/2021 | 2707196 | B786 3-4 | \$350,000 | 0 : Valid Arms-length | GOLDEN CORNER REAL ESTATE HOLDINGSL | DMOF LLC |
| 6/21/2019 | 2477198 |  | \$150,000 | O: Valid Arms-length | WEST UNION DENTAL LLC | GOLDEN CORNER REAL ESTATE HOLDINGSL |
| 8/5/2015 | 2121317 |  | \$140,000 | 0:Valid Arms-length | MARCINAK C FRED JR REVTR | WEST UNION DENTALLLC |
| 12/16/1999 | 1064238 |  | \$0 | 0:Valid Arms-length | MARCINAK CFRED JR | MARCINAK C FRED JR REV TR |

## Sketches



ALTA SURVEY


## ZV-01 EXHIBIT



## A1-RENDERING GOLDEN CORNER

Lusk Drive




Exterior Elevation Front


Exterior Elevation Back


Exterior Elevation Left


## Schedules



Reference

Cross Section View


SEC.38-7.1 VARIANCES

## Sec. 38-7.1. Variances.

The board of zoning appeals may grant a variance in an individual case of unnecessary hardship if the board of zoning appeals makes and explains in writing the following findings:
(1) There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property;
(2) These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity;
(3) Because of these conditions, the application of this chapter to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property; and
(4) The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent uses or to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.
a. The board of zoning appeals may not grant a variance the effect of which would be to allow the establishment of a use not otherwise permitted. The fact that the property may be utilized more profitably, should a variance be granted, may not be considered grounds for a variance.
b. The board of zoning appeals may grant a variance to extend physically an existing nonconforming use provided that the expansion does not adversely affect the character of the community and is designed so as to minimize any negative secondary impacts.
c. In granting a variance, the board of zoning appeals may attach to it such conditions regarding the location, character, or other features of the proposed building, structure, or use as the board of zoning appeals may consider advisable to protect established property values in the surrounding area, or to promote the public health, safety, or general welfare.
The developer shall have the burden of providing evidence to the county of compliance with the general requirements of this chapter and the specific requirements of the applicable section. The board of zoning appeals may impose whatever reasonable conditions it deems necessary to ensure that any proposed development will comply substantially with the objectives in this chapter.
(Ord. No. 2012-14, § 1, 5-15-2012)

