Meeting agenda
Monday March 27, 2023 6:00pm

# Oconee County 

Board of Zoning Appeals

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes: $01 / 23 / 2023$
3. Board of Zoning Appeals procedure/process
4. Brief statement about rules and procedures
5. Variance application \#VA23-00001- Kathy O'Brien is requesting a 5' variance to the 5' side setback along the northwest property line. TMS 111-12-03-011, address 55 Par Harbor Way Salem SC 29676
6. Variance application \#VA23-00002- Kerry S Smith is requesting a 9 ' variance to the 25 ' front setback. TMS 120-00-01-058 address 675 Pickett Post Rd Walhalla SC 29691
7. Variance application \#VA23-00003-Randy Moore of Y\&R Construction LLC is requesting an 18 ' variance to the 25 ' front setback. TMS 045-00-02-166, address 289 Jocassee Ridge Way Salem SC 29676
8. Variance application \#VA23-00004- Karuiam Booker of Civil and Environmental Consultants INC is requesting an additional $3^{\prime}$ variance to the 25 ' front setback from the original variance approved as VA22-00009. TMS 176-00-01-155, address 102 Lusk Dr. West Union SC 29696
9. Variance application \#VA23-00005- Jody Smith is requesting a 2.36 ' variance to the vegetative buffer in the lake overlay. TMS 193-02-01-012, address 210 Honeysuckle Dr. Seneca SC 29672
10. Adjourn

# OCONEE COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS 

#  <br> Minutes 

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

## Members in Attendance

Gwen Fowler
Jim Codner

Bill Gilster John Eagar

## Staff

James Coley, Planning Director

## Media

NA
ITEM 1 - Call to Order - Mr. Coley called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.
ITEM 2 - Election of officers - Mr. Coley called for nominations for Chair. Mr. Eagar made a motion that Mr. Codner continue as Chair; seconded by Mr. Gilster with no discussion. Mr. Coley called for a vote. The motion was approved 4/0. Mr. Codner called for nominations for Vice-Chair. Mr. Gilster made a motion for Mr. Eagar serve as Vice-Chair; with no discussion. Mr. Codner called for a vote. The motion was approved 4/0. Mr. Eagar made a motion that Mr. Coley serve as Secretary; seconded by Mr. Codner with no discussion. Mr. Codner called for a vote. The motion was approved 4/0.

ITEM 3 - Approval of 2023 calendar - Mr. Eagar made a motion that the proposed 2023 calendar be adopted; seconded by Mr. Mays with no discussion. Mr. Codner called for a vote. The motion was approved $5 / 0$.

ITEM 4 - Motion to approve the minutes from August 22, 2022 - Mr. Eagar made a motion to approve the minutes from August 22; seconded by Mr. Gilster. Mr. Codner called for a vote. The motion passed 4/0.

ITEM 5 - 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 6 - 1. Special Exemption SE22-008, Ron Taffer of Bob Hill Realty- for a new commercial boat dealership in the Lake Overlay for TMS 209-00-01-015, 210 Worth St Seneca SC 29672.

Applicant's opening statement and provision of evidence: Mr. Ron Taffer representing Bob Hill Realty. Mr. Taffer stated he is representing the buyer. The buyers are interested in the property because of its location on 123 and the special exemption is required due to the position of the second tract within the overlay. The applicant presented a sketch plan for how the parcels would be used. The

## Staff comments:

Mr. Coley stated the parcel is in the overlay, and as a result a special exemption is required for any commercial purpose. The hearing is only for the parcel outside of city limits.

Public Comment: Ms. Cocella- neighbor with concern with access to Worth Street, due to traffic and family safety concerns.
Mr. Teat- neighbor concerns with safety and access to Worth Street. Would like a natural barrier separating the uses.

Applicant rebuttal: Mr. Taffer stated no access to Worth Street is planned and plan landscaping to enhance the property. Mr. and Mrs. Levandowski want to add natural buffer between the residential and commercial uses. They are only planning to use the overlay property for storage. The business is only operating in the Seneca property.

## Board questions and discussion:

- Confirmation of the overlay parcel will only be for storage
- Lights will have shields
- Stipulation that access would be off 123, and boat deliveries to go west through the back access
- Require landscaping buffer

Consideration of SE22-008:

1. In accordance with the comprehensive plan and is 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 in the affirmative, seconded by Mr. Gilster. A brief discussion followed.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 | 0 |

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

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passes
3. Suitable for the property in question, and designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so as to be in harmony with 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. Gilster. A brief discussion followed.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the criterion passed.
4. 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. Gilster. A brief discussion followed.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 | 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 with the following condition: Normal egress shall be through 123 and no access shall be allowed to the east from Worth Street. Occasional delivery traffic will be permitted to exit through Worth Street to the west. A landscape barrier sufficient to obscure the residential property from the commercial property shall be installed between the business and existing residential property. If a fence is installed the landscaping shall be on the residential side of the fence.
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion in the affirmative, seconded by Mr. Gilster. A brief discussion followed.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that the special exception was approved with the following conditions: Normal egress shall be through 123 and no access shall be allowed to the east from Worth Street. Occasional delivery traffic will be permitted to exit through Worth Street to the west. A landscape barrier sufficient to obscure the residential property from the commercial property shall be installed between the business and existing residential property. If a fence is installed the landscaping shall be on the residential side of the fence.

ITEM 7- 2. Variance application \#VA22-0014 - Wesley White of Ridgewater Engineering and Surveying is requesting a 5' variance allowing the side setbacks to be reduced to 0 ' thus allowing for single family attached homes. TMS\#'S 225-00-06-008. Closest address of 111098 Watson Dr. Seneca 29672

Applicant's opening statement and provision of evidence: Mr. Jamie Turner of Ridgewater Engineer presented for the applicant. The owner is interested in developing 3 five unit townhomes for individual platted sale.

Staff comments: This is consistent with individual townhome projects for individual sale. The ordinances have not been updated to allow for exemption from setback requirements for individually platting townhome units for sale.

Public Comment: Mr. Brown, owner of the adjacent property, stated his concern with the project building on the lot line.
Mr. Hall left prior t making his comments
One email from Ms. Binder against the variance.
Applicant rebuttal: The lot setbacks are being followed. The variance is only for the side setback requirements on the shared walls to allow for the individual platting of the units for sale. Mr. Turner believes the owner will do landscaping as part of the project.

Board questions and discussion: None

## Consideration of VA22-014:

1. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property:
a. Motion - Mr. Eagar made a motion in the affirmative, seconded by Mr. Gilster. A brief discussion followed.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 | 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 in the affirmative, seconded by Mr. Gilster. A brief discussion followed.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 | 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 in the affirmative, seconded by Mr.

Gilster. No discussion.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 | 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 in the affirmative, seconded by Mr. Gilster. A brief discussion.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 | 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. No Discussion.
b. Vote

| In-favor | Opposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 | 0 |

Mr. Codner noted that variance request was approved.

Item 8 Discussion of rules regarding timeline for applicant submittals - Mr. Coley presented the change to require applicants to submit all materials 3 business days ahead of the hearing date. A brief discussion followed. Mr. Eagar made a motion to adopt the change; seconded by Mr. Gilster. Mr. Codner called for a vote. Motion passed unanimously 4/0.

Item 9 Adjourn - Mr. Eagar made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Gilster. Mr. Codner called for a vote. Motion passed unanimously 5/0.

Kathy O'Brien - 678-682-4313
55 Par Harbor Way
Salem, South Carolina

Permit Number: VA23-000001 File Number: 23-000227

Describe the extraordinary and exceptional condition (such as size, shape, and topography) that pertains to the subject property that does not generally apply to other land or structures in the vicinity.

Our objective is to cover the existing deck to make it more useful year-round. It is an enjoyable space that gets the western sun in the afternoon so adding a roof would make the deck more usable and comfortable. The proposed footing and corner of the roof line on the left side encroaches on the 5 ' setback but does not cross our property line. The opposite proposed footing and roof line does not encroach the $5^{\prime}$ setback. The variance request is really for the western corner where it encroaches into the setback along chord N39 $42^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ E. The existing deck is an odd shape with 5 rails all different lengths.

Are the circumstances affecting the subject property the result of actions by the applicant/owner? Explain.

The existing deck and walkway are very close to the property line requiring us to set the proposed footing on the left side only within the 5 ' setback.

Describe the ways in which application of the requirement(s) of the ordinance effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the subject property.

The existing deck and walkway are very close to the property line requiring us to set the proposed footing on the left side only within the 5 ' setback.

Will the proposed variance result in an activity that 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. Explain.

The section of our property in question abuts to Keowee Key owned property which is an out of bounds area of the golf course measuring about 25 yards beyond the out of bounds designation. Because the home is positioned shotgun style on the property, the deck is not visible from the neighbors on either side. The variance request through Keowee Key Community Architectural Review Board was approved and we have received positive comments from neighbors within 200' of said property who were contacted through that review process.

## SITE SURVEY FOR

## CONNIS M. NORWOOD \& KATHLEEN J. O'BRIEN

KEOWEE TOWNSHIP, OCONEE COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA
STEPHEN R. EDWARDS \& ASSOCIATES, INC.
330 SOUTH HWY. 11- WEST UNION, S.C.- 29696

## REVISED: 01-10-202



I HEREBY STATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, INFORMATION, AND BELIEF THE SURVEY SHOWN HEREON WAS MADE IN ACCORDANCE WI
THEREQUREMENTS OF THE MIMMUM STANDARDS MANUAL FOR THE RACTICE OF LAND SURVEYING IN SOUTH CAROLINA, AND MEETS O XCEEDS THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A CLASS BSURVEY AS SPECIFII D SETBACKS AFFECTING THE PROPERTY OTHER THAN THOSE SHOWN.

NOTES

1) REFERENCES
-D.B. 1840 PG. 244
TAX MAP NUMBER: 111-12-03-01
2) ACREAGE SHOWN INCLUDES ALL RIGHT-OF-WAYS AND OR EASEMENTS
3) THIS PROPERTY IS SUBJECT TO ANY AND ALL EASEMENTS, RIGHT-OF-WAYS AND OR RESTRICTIONS THAT A CURRENT TITLE SEARCH MAY DISCLOSE.
4) SEE D.B. 14-B/264 FOR BUILDING SETBACKS
5) REVISED 02-18-2020 TO SHOW P/O LOT 11 TO BE DEEDED TO KEOWEE KEY PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC. PIO LOT 11 AS DEPICTED ON THIS PLAT IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR CONNECTION TO A SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM OR FOR SEPTI
TANK APPROVAL, NO BUILDING PERMITS CERTIFICATES OF OCCUPANCY OR ANY OTHER DEVELOPMENT PERMIT BE ISSUED, NOR SHALL ANY PERSON CONSTRUCT OR INSTALL UPON THI LOTAN BUILX
6) REVISED 08-10-2020 TO ADD NOTE PER OCONEE COUNT PLANNING DEPT.: P/O LOT 11 SHALL NOT EXIST FOR MORE THAN BING THAS LOT INTO COMP LANCE FAILURE TO DO SO WIL RESULT IN THE VOIDING OF THIS
NON-CONFORMING L
ADDITIONAL NOTICE.
7) REVISED 01-10-2023 TO SHOW PROPOSED ROOF ADDITION. ALL INFORMATION LABELED "PROPOSED" ON SURVEY HAS BEN PROVIDED BY OTHERS AND IS NOT CERTIFIED OR IS BEING PROVIDED FOR INFORMATION ONLY.


PAR HARBOR WAY




## Keowee Key Property Owners' Association, Inc.

 January 24, 2023010011
Kathleen O’Brien \& Connis Norwood
55 Par Harbor Way
Salem, SC 29676

RE: Unit 010, Lot 011 - Variance Request at 55 Par Harbor Way
Dear Kathleen O'Brien and Connis Norwood:
At its meeting on January 24, 2023, the Committee for Architectural Review and the Environment (CARE) approved your variance to encroach up to $2.5^{\prime}$ into the $2.5^{\prime}$ side setback along the chord $\mathrm{N} 39^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}$ for a proposed roof over existing deck, as submitted on proposed survey dated August 26, 2016, revised January 10, 2023.

Please note that adjacent neighbors have the right to appeal the CARE decision in writing to the KKPOA Board within 10 days of the date of this letter.

At this time, you can submit your variance to Oconee County for approval.
Having been granted a variance, you, the owner, are responsible upon completion of your project to notify the Oconee County Registrar of Deeds of this variance. Failure to do so could result in problems when or if you choose to sell this property.

To support you in this effort, the CARE requires that a final "as built" survey be prepared by a Registered South Carolina Surveyor that:

- Shows the bulilding setbacks (including alternative 15 foot and $\mathbf{1 5}^{\prime}$ rear setbacks (prescribed in the covenants for the lot);
- Complete footprint of building including foundations, roof overhangs, porches, patios and decks, outside stairways, driveways, turnarounds, sidewalks, parking areas and retaining walls;
- Show dimensions from point of structure (roof, overhangs, decks, etc.) to each setback line;

After you receive this "As Built" survey, CARE will prepare a Notarized Letter of Variance, which you should deliver to the Oconee County Courthouse with the "As Built" survey.

If you have any questions, please contact the CARE Office (864) 944-1267.

## Sincerely,



Chair of Committee for Architectural Review and the Environment
cc: E-mail (Epstein/Keith - CARE Co-Chairs, Pye-MRC, Cook - KKPOA Board, and Belcher - CM, Master File)

| start new search | (6-10 of 73) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23-000259 | VA23-000002 | 675 PICKET POST Rd |
| $23-000227$ | VA23-000001 | 55 PAR HARBOR WAY |
| $22-003227$ | VA22-000015 | 261 JENKINSVILLE Rd |
| 22-003469 | VA22-000014 | Watson Dr |
| $22-003267$ | VA22-000013 | 415 S PINE ST |




ICC 113.2 Limitations on authority: An application for appeal shall be based on a claim that the true intent of this code of the rules legally adopted there under have been incorrectly interpreted, the provisions of this code do not fully apply
or an equally good or better form of construction is proposed. The board shall have no authoirty to waive requirements of this code
Comments: I would ask that the board review the information and allow me to erect the Carport shed as an improvement to my property and also to help in the future as my wife and are aging.



February 24, 2023
Darran and Cheri Vaughn
677 Pickett Post Road
Walhalla, SC 29691
Reference: Kerry and Diane Smith
Oconee County Variance Appeal

To Whom It May Concern,
My Wife and I own the property next to Kerry and Diane Smith and have been neighbors for the past 30 plus years. We have been advised by Kerry and Diane that they had submitted a permit to erect a carport shed on their property and have been delayed due to having to submit a Variance appeal for approval to add the carport.

We are aware of the plans to erect the carport shed and do not have any issues with the addition to their property and this will not have any adverse impact to our property. The Smith's own their land, so please allow them to improve their property so that they can commence their work as soon as possible.

Of note, we were unaware of the said variance that may impact Oconee County taxpayers.

Sincerely,



March 9, 2023

Dartanya D. Vaughn<br>678 Pickett Post Road<br>Walhalla, SC 29691

## To Whom It May Concern:

1 own the property dwelling across the road from Diane and Kerry Smith. They have been my neighbors for the past 25 years. I am aware that Kerry and Diane have submitted a permit to erect a carport shed on their property and this has been delayed due to having to submit a variance appeal for the approval of adding a carport. First, I was not aware of the mentioned variance that could impact Oconee County taxpayers.

I am aware of the plans to erect the carport shed and I do not have any issues with the addition to their property. This will not have any impact to my property. Kerry and Diane Smith own their property, so I am asking that you allow them to continue increasing the value of their property by allowing them to start the process for getting their carport as soon as possible.

Sincerely,


February 24, 2023
Justin and Jessica Vaughn
673 Pickett Post Road
Walhalla, SC 29691
Reference: Kerry and Diane Smith
Oconee County Variance Appeal
To Whom It May Concern,
My Wife and I own the property next to Kerry and Diane Smith and have been neighbors for the past 10 years. We have been advised by Kerry and Diane that they had submitted a permit to erect a carport shed on their property and have been delayed due to having to submit a Variance appeal for approval to add the carport.

We are aware of the plans to erect the carport shed and do not have any issues with the addition to their property and this will not have any adverse impact to our property. The Smith's own their land, so please allow them to improve their property so that they can commence their work as soon as possible.

Of note, we were unaware of the said variance that may impact Oconee County taxpayers.


March 10, 2023
Josh Vaughn
669 Pickett Post Road
Walhalla, SC 29691

## Reference: Kerry and Diane Smith

 Oconee County Variance AppealTo Whom It May Concern,
I own the property near Kerry and Diane Smith and have been neighbors for the past 13 years a been neighbors all my life. I have been advised by Kerry and Diane that they had submitted a p erect a carport shed on their property and have been delayed due to having to submit a Varia for approval to add the carport.

I am aware of the plans to erect the carport shed and do not have any issues with the addition property and this will not have any adverse impact to our property. The Smith's own their lan please allow them to improve their property so that they can commence their work as soon a

Of note, we were unaware of the said variance that may impact Oconee County taxpayers.

Sincerely,


Josh Vaughn

23-000633 VA23-000007 642 E FAIRPLAY BLVD
23-000434 VA23-000006 256 S PORT BASS DR
23-000363 VA23-000005 210 HONEYSUCKLE DR
23-000360 VA23-000004 102 LUSK DR
23-000343 VA23-000003 289 Jocassee Ridge Way



ICC 113.2 Limitations on authority: An application for appeal shall be based on a claim that the true intent of this code of the rules legally adopted there under have been incorrectly interpreted, the provisions of this code do not fully apply
or an equally good or better form of construction is proposed. The board shall have no authoirty to waive requirements of this code.

## Comments:



OCONEE COUNTYS APPROVAL, PERMITTING, AND/OR INSPECTION(S) OF THIS PROJECT DOES NOT MEAN THAT THE PROJECT IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE SUBDIVISION AND/OR HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, OR SIMILAR ENTITYS, BUILDING AND LAND USE REQUIREMENTS OR RESTRICTIONS. BY SIGNING BELOW YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT COMPLIANCE WITH ANY SUCH STANDARDS IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY.


## Architectural Committee Variance Approval Letter

To: Oconee County Planning and Zoning Department

RE: 289 Jocassee Ridge Way, Salem SC 29676-Lot N-18

Variance Being Requested by Owner/Builder: Meeting required building setbacks would render this lot unbuildable.

If the Applicant complies with the setback provisions of the Oconee County Building Ordinance, the property owner can secure no reasonable return from, or make no reasonable use of his property, and hence request that this variance be issued due to the following circumstances:
A. The existing conditions and circumstances are not the result of the actions of the Applicant or his/her agents but are due to the nature of Smeltzer Mountain and the ridge's topography. This is a mountain view development that often requires building closer to the street than normal due to steep drop offs.
B. Special conditions and circumstances affecting the land (lot) for which the variance is being sought. This lot in Jocassee Ridge Subdivision: There is an extreme drop off at the back of the proposed building site and there is not enough usable ground to back the house further from the street.
C. Strict adherence of the provisions of Oconee County's criteria would deprive the Applicant of reasonable use of said land and that a genuine hardship exists.
D. The proposed variance is in harmony with the general purposes of Oconee County and Jocassee Ridge Subdivision and is not contrary to the public interest, health, safety, or welfare, considering the drainage and water management characteristics of the surrounding properties.

E . The proposed variance is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land to build a single-family home with no adverse impacts on the county's ability to perform its duties under its charter.
F. There are five (5) homes within the vicinity of this lot that sit closer to the road's edge. Allowing this home to be built at +/- 22 feet from the edge of the road (right of way) would not affect any of the existing homes.

Because of all the above noted special circumstances and after duly researching this hardship, the Architectural Committee feels that allowing this variance is a reasonable compromise with the residents
of Jocassee Ridge Subdivision. The Architectural Committee also feels that the variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the ordinance and preserves its spirit.


David Griffith, Architectural Committee Member


Laura Eliason, Architectural Committee Member Vice-President JRHOA Board of Directors

Thidx: SuNDeal 356 pg. 305

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { To. G. Alan Bal Bell } \\
& \text { Judithe Boll } \\
& \text { oconee counn. Sourn chroumn }
\end{aligned}
$$






## Print Screen

Are the
circumstances

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 affecting the subject property the result of actions by the applicant/owner?
Explain::
Describe the ways
in which application
of the
requirement(s) of
the ordinance
effectively prohibit
or unreasonably
restrict the
utilization of the subject property:: Will the proposed variance result in an

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 the SC28 corridor
activity that 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. Explain.:
General Rockwell South LLC - Matt Aho v ...

Contractor:
ICC 113.2 Limitations on authority: An application for appeal shall be based on a claim that the true intent of this code of the rules legally adopted there under have been incorrectly interpreted, the provisions of this code do not fully apply
or an equally good or better form of construction is proposed. The board shall have no authoirty to waive requirements of this code.
Comments: no comment

OCONEE COUNTYS APPROVAL, PERMITTING, AND/OR INSPECTION(S) OF THIS PROJECT DOES NOT MEAN THAT THE PROJECT IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE SUBDIVISION AND/OR HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, OR SIMILAR ENTITYS, BUILDING AND LAND USE REQUIREMENTS OR RESTRICTIONS. BY SIGNING BELOW YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT COMPLIANCE WITH ANY SUCH STANDARDS IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY.


February 10, 2023

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


It is our pleasure to present the $2^{\text {nd }}$ variance request to the Board of Zoning Appeals on behalf of Golden Corner Dentistry located at 102 Lusk Drive in West Union, SC. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ variance is an additional from \#VA22-009. 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. This variance request is being made due to a situation that arose during final building design in which the layout of the floorplan had to be changed to meet ADA accessibility. The additional variance will allow the current dentist office the ability to stay open during construction. 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 5.01 ft . outside the $\mathrm{R} / \mathrm{W}$ at the southernmost corner of the

February 10, 2023
building, it is angled to where the proposed building addition would only encroach approximately 6.93 ft . outside the $\mathrm{R} / \mathrm{W}$ 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 6.93 ft . outside the $\mathrm{R} / \mathrm{W}$ and the proposed building addition will be placed approximately 5.56 ft . from SCDOT R/W. 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 |

[^0]February 10, 2023
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:

ALTA Survey
ZV-02 Exhibit
A1-Rendering Golden Corner

ALTA SURVEY


## ZV-02 EXHIBIT



## A1-RENDERING GOLDEN CORNER



| start new search |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23-000633 | VA23-000007 | (1-5 of 73) |
| 23-000434 EAIRPLAY BLVD | VA23-0000006 | 256 S PORT BASS DR |
| 23-000363 | VA23-000005 | 210 HONEYSUCKLE DR |
| 23-000360 | VA23-000004 | 102 LUSK DR |
| 23-000343 | VA23-000003 | 289 Jocassee Ridge Way |




Contractor:
ICC 113.2 Limitations on authority: An application for appeal shall be based on a claim that the true intent of this code of the rules legally adopted there under have been incorrectly interpreted, the provisions of this code do not fully apply
or an equally good or better form of construction is proposed. The board shall have no authoirty to waive requirements of this code.

## Comments:



OCONEE COUNTYS APPROVAL, PERMITTING, AND/OR INSPECTION(S) OF THIS PROJECT DOES NOT MEAN THAT THE PROJECT IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE SUBDIVISION AND/OR HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, OR SIMILAR ENTITYS, BUILDING AND LAND USE REQUIREMENTS OR RESTRICTIONS. BY SIGNING BELOW YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT COMPLIANCE WITH ANY SUCH STANDARDS IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY.


DUKE POWER CO.
D.B. 9-Q/17
P.B. W/130



X 210 Honeysuckle Dr


[^0]:    * 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.

