

# **TOWN OF GEORGETOWN - BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

---

## **Meeting Minutes February 5, 2025**

### **ATTENDANCE**

#### **Board Members**

**Jane Hovington  
Tom Baker  
Ron Howard  
Anthony Kline  
Robert Oliver**

#### **Staff**

**Brian Olszak  
Jamie Craddock  
Stephanie Roblero  
John Paradee, BOA Solicitor**

### **1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

Chairperson Hovington called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

### **2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Member Kline moved, seconded by Member Baker, to approve the September 4, 2024, regular meeting minutes as presented. **APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)**

### **3. PUBLIC HEARING:**

#### **A. BOA CASE #2025-01**

An application by John Roach, on behalf of Realspring, LLC., requesting from §230 Attachment 1 Height Area and Bulk Requirements of the Code of the Town of Georgetown, (1) Proposed Lot A a variance for the reduction of the required 120' lot depth to the proposed 119.94'; (2) Proposed Lot B a variance for the reduction of the required 120' lot depth to the proposed 116.86'. The property is located at 220 East Market Street, identified as SC Tax Parcel 135-15.17-68 zoned UB2 (Neighborhood Business District).

John Roach presented the application on behalf of the property owner. The existing property is approximately 120' wide by 240' deep and is currently being used as a residential property. The property owner is requesting to subdivide the parcel into two lots. Mr. Roach provided a map, believed to be from the late 1700's, that confirmed the lots in the area were previously 60' wide by 120' deep. When preparing the subdivision plans it was discovered that the lot depths will not meet the required 120' depth per the Town code. Mr. Roach believes that as the Town developed from the 1700's to now some erosion has occurred, and the streets may have been laid out differently from the previous map.

Member Kline requested Mr. Roach to explain to the Board what the implications would be for the applicant if the variances were not approved. Mr. Roach stated that the owner would not be able to subdivide the property into two lots, which would provide the Town with additional income from impact fees, water and sewer and additional taxes.

Board Solicitor, Paradee, confirmed with the Board the legal standard for an area variance is whether the relative harm to the applicant if the variance were denied would be greater than the relative harm to the neighbors if approved. The presenter has testified what the harm to the applicant would be in the variance was not approved.

No correspondence was received either for or against.

No public comment was made either for or against.

**Member Baker moved, seconded by Member Oliver, to approve the application.**

**Roll call vote:**

**Member Oliver – Aye, the request is so minimal it would not harm the neighborhood.**

**Member Kline – Aye, the harm to the applicant if denied would be greater than harm to the neighboring properties.**

**Member Baker – Aye, the harm to the applicant would greater if it was denied.**

**Member Howard – Aye, the harm to the applicant if denied would be greater than harm to the area.**

**Chair Hovington – Aye, the request is not in contrary to the public interest and would not do harm to the neighborhood.**

**APPROVED (UNANIMOUS).**

#### **4. ADJOURNMENT**

Member Kline moved, seconded by Member Howard, to close the meeting at 5:21 p.m.  
**APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)**

**APPROVED:**

  
Jane Hovington, Chairperson

**ATTEST:**

  
Jamie Donaway, Planning Department