

TOWN OF GEORGETOWN - BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting Minutes April 2, 2025

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Jane Hovington
Tom Baker (Absent)
Ron Howard
Anthony Kline
Robert Oliver

Staff

Brian Olszak
Jamie Donaway
Stephanie Roblero
John Paradee, BOA Solicitor

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chairperson Hovington called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Member Oliver moved, seconded by Member Howard, to approve March 5, 2025, regular meeting minutes as presented. **APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)**

3. PUBLIC HEARING:

A. BOA CASE #2025-09

An application by M and S Limited Partnership, requesting from The Code of the Town of Georgetown, (1) a variance from §230-170.D for the reduction of the required 25' front yard setback to the proposed 19.2' front yard setback for the proposed detached sign; (2) a variance from §230-170.E for an increase in the allowable wall mounted signage from one sign to two signs; (3) a special exception from §230-152.A and 152.D to waive the required loading space, or to reduce the required size of the loading space from 12' x 40' to the proposed 10' x 20'. The property is located at 20859 Dupont Boulevard, identified as SC Tax Parcel 135-14.19-79.00 zoned HC (Highway Commercial District).

David Hutt, with Morris James, presented the application. Also in attendance were Randolph Kazazian and Anthony Varrichicone with M and S Limited Partnership. Mr. Hutt provided the Board with a history of property and stated that the new owners, M and S Limited Partnership, plan to redevelop the property into a Valvoline Oil Change Store with three bays. The property is located along the Route 113 corridor at the corner of West North Street and is zoned Highway Commercial District, the same as the neighboring properties.

The applicant is seeking two variances and one special exception from the Board. The first variance request is to reduce the required 25' setback for the proposed detached pylon sign to the proposed 19.2'. Mr. Hutt confirmed due to the restraints of the property's dimensions, parking requirements, shared access with the neighboring AutoZone Store and meeting the Town's Development Design Standards by keeping the building closer to the front of the property and the parking in the rear have created the difficulty and limitations for the sign location. Mr. Hutt provided the Board with the four specific factors/legal standard for granting variances. Mr. Hutt explained the applicant meets the legal standards as the property and surrounding properties in the immediate vicinity are zoned Highway Commercial, located along Route 113 and are commercial uses. The reduction of the required setback would not seriously affect the neighboring properties. And if the reduction was not granted it would create an exceptional practical difficulty for the applicant.

The second variance request is to allow an additional internally illuminated wall sign. The site has two road frontages, one along 113 and the other along West North Street. Mr. Hutt reiterated that the same four factors/legal standards discussed for the first variance still apply. The nature of the property and surrounding properties does not change. The additional wall sign would not seriously affect or negatively impact the neighboring properties and would not be contrary to the public good if approved.

The third request is a special exception to remove the loading space requirement or reduce the size of the loading space to the standard parking space dimension. Mr. Hutt read from the Town's Code the Board of Adjustment may waive or reduce the loading space requirements when the provision of loading space requirement is impractical under certain conditions, for uses which contain less than 10,000 square feet of floor area. The proposed building will be 2108 square feet. If the building were 109 square feet less, there would be no loading space requirement. The applicant has no need for a loading space, as tractor trailers would not be making deliveries to the property. Deliveries being made to the proposed business would be smaller sized delivery trucks, box trucks or UPS trucks. The standard for the Board to consider is "Would the elimination or reduction of the required loading space requirement substantially affect adversely the uses of the adjacent properties?" Mr. Hutt would argue that it would not affect the use of any of the properties.

Mr. Olszak confirmed no correspondence had been received either for or against the application.

Member Kline moved, seconded by Member Howard, to approve the variance from Chapter 230-70 D. for the reduction of the required 25' front yard setback to the proposed 19.2' front yard setback for the proposed detached sign. The reasoning is that it lies within a Highway Commercial District and the neighboring characters are in alignment with other characteristics of other properties, and it will not seriously affect the neighboring properties and their uses. It would be an exceptional practical difficulty if the variance was not granted, forcing the potential parking lot to move to the front rather than the back of the building as proposed.

Roll call vote:

Member Oliver – Aye, I agree there would be no effect on the community

Member Kline – Aye, for the reasons previously stated

Member Howard – Aye, I agree for reasons stated in the motion

Chair Hovington – Aye, I agree that to deny the request would be more harmful than if approved

APPROVED (UNANIMOUS).

Member Kline moved, seconded by Member Oliver, to approve the variance from Chapter 230-170 E. for an increase in the allowable wall mounted signs from one to two based on the following reasons, it is within the Highway Commercial District as are the properties surrounding it. The property is commercial and in line with the proposed use, the variance will not seriously affect the neighboring properties and their uses and the limitation of one wall mounted sign will create a practical difficulty to the applicant as the normal operation and branding for the Valvoline install oil change across other sites.

Roll call vote:

Member Oliver – Aye, for the reasons stated in presentation and the residential property in the rear will not be affected at all

Member Kline – Aye, as stated in the motion

Member Howard – Aye, as it makes sense

Chair Hovington – Aye, I don't see any harm or detriment with both designs being placed on two walls

APPROVED (UNANIMOUS).

Member Howard moved, seconded by Member Kline, to waive the loading space requirement

Roll call vote:

Member Oliver – Aye, it is so minimal that it will not affect anything

Member Kline – Aye, as it will not affect neighboring properties

Member Howard – Aye,

Chair Hovington – Aye, there is no determinant effect to the neighboring properties

APPROVED (UNANIMOUS).

4. ADJOURNMENT

Member Kline moved, seconded by Member Oliver, to close the meeting at 5:46 p.m.

APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)

APPROVED:


Jane Hovington, Chairperson

ATTEST:


Brian Olszak, Community Development Director