AGENDA
February 12, 2019
5:00 PM
Town Hall (annex) – Training Room
200 S. Main Street

I. Approval of minutes from November 13, 2018

(For below item, signs posted on property January 28, 2019 and ad on January 27, 2019 in Post & Courier)

II. OLD BUSINESS:
   1. No Old Business

III. NEW BUSINESS:
   1. TMS # 137-13-08-001, 151 Gadsden Street, zoned R-1 Single Family Residential, owned by Mary and Scott Lloyd – variance request to reduce the required front yard setback from 30 feet to 24 feet, Ordinance Section 32-122(f)(2).
   2. TMS # 154-00-00-034, Springview Lane, zoned PUD Planned Unit Development, owned by Trident Medical Center, LLC. – variance request to eliminate the required Class 2 use buffer, Ordinance Section 32-322.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS:
   1. Election of Officers

V. ADJOURN

Posted February 5, 2019
The Board of Zoning Appeals met in the Training Room at Town Hall on Tuesday, November 13, 2018 at 5:00 PM. Present were Denis Tsukalas, Chairman; Don Nye, Elise Richardson, Lionel Lawson and Scott Riddell. Staff present included Tim Macholl, Zoning Administrator.

The meeting was called to order at 5:04 PM by the Chairman. He asked for any comments or edits for the minutes from the October 9, 2018 meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Nye to defer approval of the minutes to the next meeting due to the packets not being delivered through the mail, and a second was given by Mr. Lawson. The motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:
There were no items under old business.

NEW BUSINESS:
The first item under New Business was TMS# 135-16-00-017; -023; -074; -075; -077; -081, 1605 Central Avenue, commonly known as Knightsville Crossing Shopping Center, zoned B-3 General Business, owned by Knightsville Enterprise, LLC – Kevin Rogers – variance request to allow one shopping center sign per frontage and an additional offsite sign at the intersection of Central Avenue and Orangeburg Road, Ordinance Section 32-246(4). Mr. Macholl introduced the request, and opened the floor to the property developer, Mr. Kevin Rogers of Knightsville Enterprise LLC. Mr. Rogers his case for the approval of the variance request. He pointed out that the redevelopment of the shopping center will increase the amount of landscaping on the property and that with the addition of the Parker’s Kitchen on the corner visibility into the site will be greatly reduced, and that for the tenants in those spaces to be successful they need as much visibility as possible. He explained that previously the sign on the corner had been located on a shopping center owned parcel, because the lots had been “gerrymandered”. With the new parcel layout the corner is no longer owned by the shopping center and they now need the variance to continue the signage at the corner of the shopping center. He explained that they had worked out a reciprocal easement with the parkers for access and parking and signage to allow for this signage to be located at the corner. He explained that they had renewed and extended all of the current tenants in the shopping center at this time. Mr. Frank Valentine of Italian Bistro, located in the shopping center at this time, expressed a desire to have as much signage on the property as possible to help guide customers to his restaurant. Mr. Rogers explained that they have worked with the sign contractor doing the work for the Parker’s Kitchen to get a cohesive sign design to tie the shopping center signage together. Mr. Macholl stated that the signage presented is actually larger than is permitted, and that to obtain the requested size another variance would be required. Mr. Rogers responded that the sign contractor may have miscalculated the floor area for the shopping center, possibly including the outdoor garden center for the hardware store that will be the anchor tenant in the shopping center. Mr. Macholl again presented to the board Staff’s position on the variance request that he felt that there would be an excess of large signage along both the Orangeburg Road and Central Avenue Frontage’s and that the corner sign was not necessary. Mr. Tsukalas asked if an easement would alleviate the need for a variance. Mr. Macholl explained that the Zoning Ordinance prohibits off site signage. Mr. Nye suggested making sure that sight lines are not blocked by the potential sign. Mr. Riddell asked if they have the right to seek the variance on this property. Mr. Macholl explained that the current ownership had granted them the right to seek the variance.

Mr. Tsukalas made a motion to approve the variance as requested, with staff to determine the final size of the signs. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nye. Mr. Riddell asked if more discussion was possible. Mr. Tsukalas opened the floor to further discussion. Mr. Riddell expressed a concern about approving a variance for a condition that was created by the developer themselves by selling the corner property to the gas station therefore reducing the sightlines into the property. He stated that he supported the staff’s position. The motion passed 4-1 with Mr. Riddell voting no.

MISCELLANEOUS:
There were no items under Miscellaneous.
ADJOURN:
Hearing no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 PM with a motion by Mr. Nye and a second by Mr. Lawson. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Macholl
Zoning Administrator

Denis Tsukalas, Chairman; or,
Elise Richardson, Vice Chairman
Request: Variance request to reduce the required front yard setback from 30 feet to 24 feet.

Property Zoning: R-1 Single Family Residential

Surrounding Zoning: North: R-1 Single Family Residential
South: R-1 Single Family Residential
East: R-1 Single Family Residential
West: R-1 Single Family Residential

Ordinance requires: Ordinance Section 32-122(f)(3) Front Yard Setback: 30 feet

Background: The owner approached staff about the possibility of building front steps within the required front yard setback. This property is located in the Historic District and will be before the Board of Architectural Review on February 5, 2019. The proposal is to demolish the existing home on the property and build a new home. Due to site issues the home is pushed forward on the lot, bringing the proposed porch to the setback line, resulting in the steps encroaching into the setback.

Response: In order for a variance to be issued by the Board of Zoning Appeals, an applicant is required to show that all four of the conditions listed below have been met and an unnecessary hardship must be shown.

(b) Variances. The board has the power to hear and decide requests for variances when strict application of this chapter's provisions would cause an unnecessary hardship.

1. The following standards must apply for finding an unnecessary hardship:
   a. Extraordinary conditions. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property, which could exist due to topography, street widening or other conditions which make it difficult or impossible to make an economically feasible use of the property.
   b. Other property. Extraordinary conditions generally do not apply to other property in the vicinity.
   c. Utilization. Because of these extraordinary conditions, the application of this chapter's provisions to a particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.
   d. Detriment. The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by granting of the variance.

Staff feels that the applicant has met all four criteria, and that a hardship is present.

a. Extraordinary conditions exist on the property based on a topography and soil conditions issue requiring the placement of the home be at the front of the lot to keep the property out of the flood prone area of the property.
   b. Other property may have similar soil and flooding issues, but staff feels that this set of circumstances is relatively unique.
c. Utilization of the property is greatly impacted by the environmental conditions on the property and the granting of the variance will allow this property to be utilized for a single family home.
d. Detriment will not be caused to other properties by the issuance of this variance on this property
Disclaimer: This map is a graphic representation of data obtained from various sources. All efforts have been made to warrant the accuracy of this map; however, the Town of Summerville disclaims all representation and liability for the use of this map.
PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

The Town of Summerville Board of Zoning Appeals will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, February 12, 2019, at 5 pm.

In Summerville Town Hall, 200 S. Main St., to discuss a variance to reduce the front setback from 30 feet to 24 feet for this property.

For information: Planning Department 851-5200

TMS#: 151-1-00-001
Address: 151 Garden Street
Sign Posted on: 11/26/2019
PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

The Town of Summerville
Board of Zoning Appeals will
hold a public hearing on
Date/Time: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 at 6:30 pm
In Summerville Town Hall, 200 S. Main St.,
to discuss a Variance to Increase the Front Setback
for this property.
From 50 feet to 200 feet
For Information: Planning Department 851-5200

TMS# 131-13-06-007
Sign may only be removed by
Authorized Town Employee
Address 851 Common Street
Sign Posted on: 1/25/20
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS (BZA) 
VARIANCE APPLICATION
Per Town of Summerville Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 32, Article II 
(SC Code of Laws 8-29-780)

Date: 11/15/19  TMS#: 137 - 13 - 08 - 001  Zoned: R-1

Property Owner: Mary Jo Scott Lloyd  Phone: 843 953 7432

Email: lloydmb@cofc.edu

Mailing Address: 151 Gadsden St, S'ville, SC 29483

Site Address:  

Subdivision: Town Limits

Representative for Property Owner (If applicable):  

Request for variance relating to: (please check one): ☑ Setbacks ☐ Buffer yard ☐ Height

☐ Parking ☐ Other:

Ordinance Requires: 30-foot setback.

Property Owner Requests:  

Present Use of Property: (please check one): ☑ Residential ☐ Commercial ☐ Institutional

☐ Industrial ☐ Other:

THE FOLLOWING MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH THIS APPLICATION:

☑ 1. Copy of recorded plat of property with proposed site plan demonstrating the requested variance.

2. Non-refundable fee of $100 – check made payable to Town of Summerville.

3. Statement of property owner addressing the State mandated criteria below (please address all four criteria):
   
   (a) Extraordinary Conditions: There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property, which could exist due to topography, street widening or other conditions which make it difficult or impossible to make an economically feasible use of the property.

   (b) Other Property: Extraordinary conditions generally do not apply to other property in the vicinity.
(c) **Utilization**: Because of these extraordinary conditions, the application of this chapter's provisions to a particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.

(d) **Detriment**: The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by granting of the variance.

_I certify that all information required is included and the application is complete. If an application is found to be incomplete, the primary contact will be notified. This approval does not constitute approval by other boards or town departments._

Signature of Property Owner: [Signature]  
Date: 1/15/19

Signature of Applicant: [Signature]  
Date: 1/15/19

*If applicant is not legal property owner, please submit documentation from the property owner giving permission for applicant to represent property owner.
151 Gadsden Street
Summerville, SC 29483
Lloyd Residence

**State mandated criteria**

a. Our property has some extremely low spots. In fact, the lots that are adjacent to our property also have low spots that have created issues. At the completion of our new home, we hope to grant the town some of our lot as part of an easement for drainage purposes that will assist all the neighboring lots. This is if the other neighbors agree to partial easements on their property as well. This issue has been a long-standing one (particularly following the rain of the century and several subsequent hurricanes). My husband and I were going to add onto our home, but we realized that we would forever battle moisture issues if this were the case.

For our proposed new construction, my husband and I had hoped to keep the majority of the living space within the higher part of the lot, keeping a very similar footprint to our original home. As you can see on the survey, if the house is moved back so that the stairs are within the 30-ft setback, portions of the home will be moved into the area with a lower (72) elevation (indicated on the attached survey). We are desperate to stay on high ground; the cost for filling the area at the lower elevations with be considerable (see attached geotechnical report) and the fill dirt will affect the trees in the surrounding area, as adding 4 or more inches of dirt to an area will kill all root systems.

I have included pictures of the mold under the house and pictures to show how the water is an issue in hopes that they will help show why we want the house to be in the most elevated area (close to current footprint) as possible. To us, these seem like extraordinary conditions.

b. While adjacent properties suffer from low-lying areas, these areas are not within their front set-backs. Existing home owners will not need to request variances for their front set-backs and, presumably, nor will property owners wishing to build new or add on.

c. By moving the proposed home back so that the stairs fit within the 30-ft setback, we may affect the existing drainage into the current pipe running through the yard (the only thing really draining all adjacent properties at present). I’m not sure how grading this close to the pipe will impact the utilization of this functional drainage system. See survey and the geotechnical report for more information.

d. We have shared our entire plan and rationale for our project with our neighbors across Gadsden and Salisbury. No one objects. Those who are in adjacent properties will want us to build in a way that decreases run-off from their homes; the less grading that has to be done toward the back left corner of the lot, the less consequential for the adjacent neighbors, as there will be less impact on grading toward the already low back, left corner of the lot.

Adjacent neighbors hope that we will help with their drainage problems in the backs of their lots (aforementioned) by providing part of our land as part of an easement granted to the town for storm water once our home is complete. As this easement will require no more than 5- to 10-ft of the length of our property, it will mean the loss of some of our trees/plants. In addition to the extra costs and environmental effects of moving our proposed home back so that the stairs are behind the 30-ft setback (mentioned in part a), we would be losing again, at least 5 more feet of our back yard, which is the part of the yard that is so valuable from an ecological standpoint and the part of the yard that is utilizable safely for our three small children and dog.

Additionally,
I’m not sure why the steps are counted within the structure, as my current steps are not (one step is within the 30-ft setback; the other is not – see below). Too, I’m curious is the ODU (?????) passed this week allowing for residence of corner lots to choose which side of their lot has a 30-ft and 15-ft setback. If it passed, this will all be moot.
Thank you for your time and consideration in this process.
Sincerely,
Dr. Beth Lloyd

See here how existing stairs are not within the 30-ft setback.

This is a picture of our yard right off of the back, right corner of our current deck after either a hurricane or severe rain.

This is a picture of our yard right off of the back, left corner of our current deck after either a hurricane or severe rain.
Dear Mrs. Lloyd,

I would like to begin by thanking you for this opportunity to be of service. I have inspected the home and the following are pictures of items of concern derived from the inspection. The intent of reporting these items are to inform you of visible conditions that could result in conduciveness to termites, other wood destroying insects and or wood decay. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact our office at (843) 852-0230.
Perryman Engineering, LLC is pleased to submit this geotechnical exploration report for the subject project. The exploration purpose was to obtain site subsurface information and provide foundation support recommendations. This report presents our project understanding, subsurface conditions summary, data evaluation, and geotechnical recommendations.

Project Information: The project site is located at 151 Gadsden Street in Summerville, South Carolina (33.010887, -80.191889). The 0.575 acre parcel is identified by Dorchester County as TMS No. 137-13-08-001.000. The site appears to be located in FEMA Flood Zone X. We expect that finished grade will approximate existing grade to slightly higher.

The three options being considered for proposed construction are listed below. We estimate maximum foundation pier loads in the range of 20 to 30 kips and continuous foundation loads of four kips per linear foot (1 kip = 1,000 pounds).

1. Renovations, master bedroom and porch additions to the existing single story residence.
2. Raze the existing residence and construct a new residence in same footprint.
3. Move the existing residence to the east side of the lot (left of its current location) and construct a new residence on the west side of the lot, along Salisbury Street.

Site Observations: An existing single story residence and other accessory buildings/structures were located on the property. Various trees and landscaping surrounded the residence. The ground surface sloped downward several feet from west to east, ground elevations ranged between 70 and 74 feet above sea level.

Standing water was noted behind the existing residence, eastern property corner. The water source appeared to be a pipe or subgrade drain outlet near the middle of the back yard, significant flow was noted during our site visit, location indicated in photo on the following page. Where the pipe originated is not known, but it may be tied into the drainage ditch along Salisbury Drive. Site conditions are indicated in the accompanying photographs.
Subsurface Conditions: Six Dynamic Probing Medium tests (DPM-1 to DPM-6) were performed at the approximate locations indicated in Figure 1 - Boring Location Plan on the following page. Hand auger borings were excavated adjacent to the DPM tests. DPM tests were driven eight to eleven feet below the ground surface; hand auger borings extended three to six feet below the surface. DPM test equipment and procedures generally conformed to ISO 22476-2 Geotechnical Investigation and Testing - Field Testing - Part 2: Dynamic Probing, 2005. Static cone penetration tests were also performed at selected locations. Test locations were selected by our field personnel based on the client description of the proposed construction.

Subsurface conditions encountered are summarized below:

- Dark brown silty sand with organics was noted within one to two feet of the ground surface.
- Loose silty/clayey SAND was noted through the depths excavated. Relatively soft soil conditions were noted near the ground surface at locations DPM-1 and DPM-3. Soil conditions on the west side of the property were notably more firm than on the east side of the property.
- Groundwater depth measurements ranged between one and five feet. Groundwater was notably more shallow for measurements made after heavy rainfall. The shallowest groundwater was noted at DPM-3, less than a foot below the ground surface.
Comments and Recommendations

Based on the hand auger boring and DPM test results, the subsurface soils are typical for the locale and should have adequate shear strength to support shallow spread foundations for the proposed residence/s; though some soft near surface soils will need remedy. Items to consider during design and construction are presented below:

Site Preparation: Site preparation should consist of stripping surface organic soils and roots from the building areas. We estimate that stripping depths will range between one and two feet. This material should be removed from the construction area and can be re-used as non-structural fill in landscape areas. Excavations resulting from the removal of tree root systems, existing foundations, or other subsurface features should be cleaned of loose soil and water and backfilled with compacted structural fill.
The source of the existing pipe noted in the back yard should be determined. Significant water flow was noted at the pipe outlet. Depending on the final construction configuration, the pipe may need to be relocated. If the pipe was installed to relieve springs or other groundwater conditions, a new pipe and/or subgrade drain may be warranted. Again, please note that significant ponded water and shallow groundwater conditions were noted in the eastern property corner.

During stripping and rough grading, positive surface drainage should be maintained to prevent ponding water. The subgrade soils have significant clay content. These materials will be difficult to work and will lose strength when wet. Controlling surface drainage will be essential in protecting subgrade soil strength and integrity. Construction traffic should not travel on saturated subgrades to prevent rutting and soil strength degradation. Low ground pressure tracked equipment should be used during site clearing to help limit strength loss.

Soft subgrade soils were noted in the areas of DPM-1 and DPM-3. If the existing residence is to be razed and new residence constructed in its footprint (Option 2) or if the existing residence is to be relocated north and east of its current location (Option 3), we would expect that one to three feet of soft/organic soil excavation (mucking) would be required prior to fill placement and foundation construction. The undercut excavation should be backfilled with compacted structural fill. Groundwater will likely be encountered within this excavation and groundwater control measures will be needed to excavate the soft soils and backfill with compacted structural fill. Raising finished grade on the east side of the property is recommended for either Options 2 or 3. Soft soil conditions may be encountered elsewhere on the site.

Groundwater Control: Measurements indicated groundwater roughly one to five feet below the ground surface. Groundwater will be more shallow during wet weather. Occasional groundwater encountered during construction can be maintained by gravity flow or pumping from open ditches, subgrade drains, or sump pits. Well points or other active dewatering methods may be required for excavations made below the groundwater table. Site grading plans should allow for sloping grades and subsurface drainage away from the residence and paved areas. Groundwater fluctuations of several feet will occur with seasons, rainfall variations, construction operations, surface runoff, and other factors.

Structural Fill Placement and Compaction: Import soil used for structural fill supporting foundations, concrete slabs on grade, or other structural elements should be predominately sand having five to ten percent non-plastic or low plasticity fines. Onsite soils are not acceptable for use as structural fill. Structural fill should be constructed by spreading acceptable soils in loose layers not more than a foot thick. A vibratory roller should be used to compact the sandy structural fill. Structural fill should be compacted in thin lifts to at least 95 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by the Modified Proctor method (ASTM D1557). Trained geotechnical personnel should perform soil density testing on structural fill supporting foundations and concrete slabs.

Soil backfill placed in confined areas in accessible to larger vibratory drum rollers will require smaller compaction equipment. Small vibratory plate compactors are not sufficient to compact fill to the requirements above. Small walk behind vibratory rollers or jumping jack type plate compactors generally achieve better compaction results. Backfill should be placed and compacted in thin lifts not exceeding four inches loose thickness. Clean sand with limited less than seven percent silt and clay fines is recommended for backfill in confined areas.

Foundations: With exception of the soft near surface soils at DPM-1 and DPM-3, the subsurface soils had adequate shear strength to support shallow spread foundations designed for a net allowable bearing pressure of up to 1,500 pounds per square foot. Individual column footings and wall footings should have minimum widths of 24 and 18 inches, respectively. The foundation bearing depth is expected to be roughly two feet below adjacent exterior grade, foundations bearing in firm natural soils or compacted structural fill. In the case of Options 2 and 3, we anticipate that soft near surface soils will be undercut and replaced with compacted structural fill.

Total foundation settlement under the static loading conditions considered was calculated to be less than one inch. Differential settlement across the building pad or between piers is expected to be less than one half inch.

In the case of Option 1 where additions to the existing residence are planned, we recommend that the footings be over excavated three feet below the existing ground surface and backfilled with washed granite stone up to the planned foundation bearing elevation. The over excavation would be required to remove soft near surface soils and provide a less compressible bearing surface to limit differential settlement between the new addition and existing...
residence. We recommend that the washed granite stone be wrapped in a filter fabric to limit soil migration into the voids between aggregate.

Foundation excavations should not remain open during inclement weather. Foundation soils softened by water intrusion or exposure should be removed before placing concrete. Groundwater or surface water infiltration may be encountered during foundation excavation and pumping from sump pits or other methods may be needed to lower the groundwater table and permit concrete placement. A two to three inch layer of crushed granite can be placed on the bearing surface to minimize disturbance/softening during dewatering efforts and reinforcing steel placement. The geotechnical engineer should observe foundation excavations prior to concrete placement.

Detailed settlement calculations, seismic/liquefaction analyses, or evaluation of soils at depths greater than eleven feet below the ground surface have not been performed. Settlement due to soil placed for a raised slab has not been evaluated due to the limited boring depth. We can provide these additional services upon request.

Construction Observations and Testing: Additional services can be performed as requested prior to and during construction. These services are described below:

- Review the project plans with respect to the geotechnical recommendations provided.
- Observe/Test the prepared subgrade prior to structural fill placement.
- Perform soil density testing on structural fill supporting foundations, concrete slabs, or other structural elements.
- Observe/Test the foundation bearing soils prior to concrete placement to evaluate soil conditions between test locations and confirm the recommended allowable bearing capacity.

The recommendations provided are based on our field test results and project information provided to us. Regardless of the thoroughness of a geotechnical exploration, there is always a possibility that conditions between test locations will be different. This geotechnical exploration was performed using that degree of skill and care ordinarily exercised under similar conditions by reputable members of the profession practicing in the same or similar locality at the time of performance. No other warranty, express or implied, is made or intended and the same are specifically disclaimed.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide geotechnical services on this project. If you have any questions about this report, or if we may be of further service, please contact us at 843-693-2227 or by email john@perrymengineering.com.

Sincerely,
Perryman Engineering, LLC

John J. Perryman, PE
Principal Engineer

Distribution
1 Client Mail Email lloyd@cofc.edu
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>Photo Log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8 Moist, dark brown silty fine SAND (SM) with roots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7 Moist, brown silty fine SAND (SM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.9 Moist, brown and orange clayey SAND (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.0 Moist to wet, grey and orange clayey SAND (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hand Auger Boring Terminated 6 feet.

**Notes:**
- DPM = Dynamic Probing Medium
- N10 = Blows to Drive a 15 cm2 (1.7" diameter), 90° cone penetrometer 10 cm (*4") with blows from a 30 kg (*66 pound) hammer falling 0.5 meter, Unit Point Resistance \( r_d = \frac{EM*AE}{tff} \), Dynamic Point Resistance \( q_d = \frac{EM}{(m+m'h')/r_d} \), SPT N60 = Estimated Standard Penetration Test Blow Count at 60% Energy Efficiency based on local CPT data correlation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>Bottom</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>Photo Log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist, dark brown silty fine SAND (SM) with roots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist, brown silty SAND with clay (SM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist to wet, grey orange clayey SAND (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet, grey orange clayey SAND (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hand Auger Boring Terminated 6 feet.

Notes: DPM = Dynamic Probing Medium, N10 = Blows to Drive = 15 cm2 (∼1.7" diameter), 90° cone penetrometer 10 cm (∼4") with blows from a 30 kg (∼66 pound) hammer falling 0.5 meters; Unit Point Resistance rd = EM/Ae (tsf), Dynamic Point Resistance qd = (m/ln+mv)/rd; SPT N60 = Estimated Standard Penetration Test Blow Count at 60% Energy Efficiency based on local CPT data correlation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>Bottom</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>Photo Log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist, dark brown silty fine SAND (SM) with roots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moist to wet, brown clayey SAND (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet, brown grey clayey SAND (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet, grey orange clayey SAND (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hand Auger Boring Terminated 6 feet.

Notes: DPM = Dynamic Probing Medium, N10 = Blows to Drive a 15 cm (1.7" diameter), 0.8" cone penetrometer 10 cm (4") with blows from a 30 kg (66 pound) hammer falling 0.5 meter, Unit Point Resistance $r_d = \frac{EN/Ao}{(t_{sf})}$, Dynamic Point Resistance $ed = \frac{[t_{r}](mvw^m)}{[t_{sf}]}$, SPT N60 = Estimated Standard Penetration Test Blow Count at 60% Energy Efficiency based on local CPT data correlation.
Date: 7/18/18  
Time: 10:44  

Project: 151 Gadsen Street  
Project No.: 18-3821  
Performed By: EL & DV  

Weather: Cloudy  
Temperature: 85  
Lat/Long: 33.010686, -80.191669  
Equipment: Pagant TG 30/40 - DPM  

Groundwater Depth: 3 feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>Photo Log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Moist, dark brown silty fine SAND (SM) trace clay and ORGANICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Moist, brown silty fine SAND (SM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Moist, brown orange clayey SAND (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Moist to wet, grey orange clayey SAND (SC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hand Auger Boring Terminated 6 feet.

Notes:  
DPM = Dynamic Probing Medium, N10 = Blows to Drive a 15 cm3 (~1.7” diameter), 90° cone penetrometer 10 cm (~4”) with blows from a 30 kg (~66 pound) hammer falling 0.5 meter. Unit Point Resistance rd = EM/A4 (tsf), Dynamic Point Resistance qd = (m/(n+1))/rd, SPT N60 = Estimated Standard Penetration Test Blow Count at 60% Energy Efficiency based on local CPT data correlation.
### Dynamic Probing Medium Record

**Date:** 7/18/18  
**Time:** 11:23  
**Weather:** Cloudy  
**Groundwater Depth:** 5 feet  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>Photo Log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 0.0</td>
<td>Moist, dark brown silty fine SAND (SM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 0.6</td>
<td>Moist, brown grey silty SAND (SM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 1.6</td>
<td>Moist, dark brown silty fine SAND (SM) trace clay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 2.2</td>
<td>Moist, brown orange clayey SAND (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 4.8</td>
<td>Moist to wet, grey orange clayey SAND (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **DPM =** Dynamic Probing Medium, **N10 =** Blows to Drive a 15 cm×2 (6"×1") diameter, 50° cone penetrometer 10 cm×4" with blows from a 20 kg (44 pound) hammer falling 0.5 meter, Unit Point Resistance rd = E/h/Ae (t/ft), Dynamic Point Resistance ed = [m/(t*ft^2)], SPT N60 = Estimated Standard Penetration Test Blow Count at 606 Energy Efficiency based on local CPT data correlation.

---

**Hand Auger Boring Terminated 6 feet.**
Dynamic Probing Medium Record
DPM-6

Date: 7/18/18  Time: 12:02
Project: 151 Gadsden Street
Project No.: 18-3821
Performed By: EL & DV

Weather
Cloudy
Temperature
85°F
Lat/Long
33.010896, -86.191669
Groundwater Depth
4.8 feet
Equipment
Pageant TG 30/20 - DPM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>Photo Log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Bottom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 - 1.6</td>
<td>Moist, dark brown silty fine SAND (SM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 - 4.3</td>
<td>Moist to wet, brown orange SAND with clay (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 - 6.0</td>
<td>Moist to wet, grey orange clayey SAND (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hand Auger Boring Terminated 6 feet.

Notes: DPM = Dynamic Probing Medium, N10 = Blow for Drive a 15 cm2 (~1.7" diameter), 90° cone penetrometer 10 cm (~4") with blows from a 30 kg (~66 pound) hammer falling 0.5 meter, Unit Point Resistance rd = EM/Ae (tsf), Dynamic Point Resistance qd = [mv/([m^2][s^3])]/rd, SPT N60 = Estimated Standard Penetration Test Blow Count at 50% Energy Efficiency based on local CPT data correlation.
### DPM-1: Near Front Left Existing Residence Corner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>Test Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Static Cone Penetration Resistance (tsf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Moist, dark brown silty SAND with ORGANICS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Moist to wet, brown grey silty fine SAND with clay (SC-SM)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Wet, grey brown orange clayey SAND (SC) to sand CLAY (CL)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groundwater estimated at 1.5 feet below the surface.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DPM-3: Back Yard, Southeast of Existing Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>Test Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Static Cone Penetration Resistance (tsf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Wet, dark brown silty SAND and ORGANICS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Wet, dark grey to grey with orange brown clayey SAND (SC) to sandy CLAY (CL)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Groundwater measured 0.5 feet below the ground surface 8/8/18.

**Notes:**
1. The strata and test depth were referenced from the ground surface.
2. The penetration resistance is expressed in tons per square foot and is limited to a maximum reading of 18 tons per square foot.
3. Equipment: 3.25" Hand Auger and one square inch, static cone penetrometer.
4. Soil description in accordance with USCS, Unified Soil Classification System.
### DPM-4: South of Existing Residence Back Right Corner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>Test Depth(^1) (feet)</th>
<th>Static Cone Penetration Resistance(^2) (tsf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0 1.6</td>
<td>Moist to wet, dark brown silty SAND with ORGANICS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 2.1</td>
<td>Wet, brown silty SAND (SM)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 4.0</td>
<td>Wet, brown clayey SAND (SC) with silts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 6.0</td>
<td>Wet, brown grey orange clayey SAND (SC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groundwater estimated 1.5 feet below the ground surface.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Groundwater estimated 1.5 feet below the ground surface. |

Notes:
1. The strata and test depth were referenced from the ground surface.
2. The penetration resistance is expressed in tons per square foot and is limited to a maximum reading of 18 tons per square foot.
3. Equipment: 3.25" Hand Auger and one square inch, static cone penetrometer.
4. Soil description in accordance with USCS, Unified Soil Classification System.
VARIANCE REQUEST
TMS#154-00-00-034
Springview Lane, Summerville, SC
STAFF REPORT
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
February 12, 2019

Request: Variance request to allow the developer to eliminate the use buffer on the east side of the property.

Property Zoning: PUD Planned Unit Development

Surrounding Zoning:
- North: PUD Planned Unit Development
- South: PUD Planned Unit Development
- East: PUD Planned Unit Development
- West: PL Public Lands

Ordinance requires: Ordinance Section 32-322, Class 2 planting area

Background: The applicant approached staff before the Commercial Design Review Board approval process concerning the elimination of the buffer area. Due to the large drainage easement that exists on the east side of the property, the applicant is asking that the buffer requirement be eliminated. The drainage easement prohibits the planting of the use buffer landscape requirements within the easement. The applicant feels that if they were required to install the use buffer where they would be permitted to install it, the property would no longer be buildable.

Response: In order for a variance to be issued by the Board of Zoning Appeals, an applicant is required to show that all four of the conditions listed below have been met and an unnecessary hardship must be shown.

(b) Variances. The board has the power to hear and decide requests for variances when strict application of this chapter's provisions would cause an unnecessary hardship.

1) The following standards must apply for finding an unnecessary hardship:
   a. Extraordinary conditions. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property, which could exist due to topography, street widening or other conditions which make it difficult or impossible to make an economically feasible use of the property.
   b. Other property. Extraordinary conditions generally do not apply to other property in the vicinity.
   c. Utilization. Because of these extraordinary conditions, the application of this chapter's provisions to a particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.
   d. Detriment. The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by granting of the variance.

Staff feels that the applicant has met all four criteria, and that a hardship is present.

a. Extraordinary conditions exist in the form of a 45 foot wide drainage easement on the eastern property line.

b. Other property in the area have this same condition, but this is uncommon overall throughout town, and would not necessarily be setting a precedent.

c. Utilization of the property is greatly impacted by the easement and if required, the required use buffer would further impact the buildable area of the lot.

d. Detriment will not be caused to other properties by the issuance of this variance on this property.
Disclaimer: This map is a graphic representation of data obtained from various sources. All efforts have been made to warrant the accuracy of this map; however, the Town of Summerville disclaims all representation and liability for the use of this map.
Disclaimer: This map is a graphic representation of data obtained from various sources. All efforts have been made to warrant the accuracy of this map; however, the Town of Summerville disclaims all representation and liability for the use of this map.
PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

The Town of Summerville
Board of Zoning Appeals will
hold a public hearing on
Date/Time: Tuesday, February 12, 2019 at 5 pm
In Summerville Town Hall, 200 S. Main St.,
to discuss a variance to overcome the required use
limitation for this property.
For Information: Planning Department 851-5200

TMSR 154-110-30-004
Address: Shenandoah Lane
Sign may only be removed by
Authorized Town Employee
Sign Posted on: 1/22/2019
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS (BZA)
VARIANCE APPLICATION

Per Town of Summerville Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 32, Article II
(SC Code of Laws 6-29-760)

Date: 1/22/2019  TMS#: 154-00.00-034  Zoned: PUD

Property Owner: Trident Medical Center, LLC  Phone: 615-344-5605
Email: ron.woods@hcahealthcare.com

Mailing Address: 1100 MLK Blvd, Ste. 500, Nashville, TN 37203
Site Address: Springview Lane
Subdivision: N/A

Representative for Property Owner (if applicable): Cypress Engineering

Request for variance relating to: (please check one): ☐ Setbacks  ☑ Buffer yard  ☐ Height
☐ Parking  ☐ Other:

Ordinance Requires: Class 2 Rear Buffer Area (15' wide) per section 32-322

Property Owner Requests: No rear buffers for reasons specified in attached letter.

Present Use of Property: (please check one): ☐ Residential  ☐ Commercial  ☐ Institutional
☐ industrial  ☑ Other: Undeveloped

THE FOLLOWING MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH THIS APPLICATION:

1. Copy of recorded plat of property with proposed site plan demonstrating the requested variance.

2. Non-refundable fee of $100 – check made payable to Town of Summerville.

3. Statement of property owner addressing the State mandated criteria below (please address all four criteria):
   (a) Extraordinary Conditions: There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the
       particular piece of property, which could exist due to topography, street widening or other
       conditions which make it difficult or impossible to make an economically feasible use of the
       property.
   (b) Other Property: Extraordinary conditions generally do not apply to other property in the vicinity.
(c) **Utilization:** Because of these extraordinary conditions, the application of this chapter's provisions to a particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.

(d) **Detriment:** The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by granting of the variance.

I certify that all information required is included and the application is complete. If an application is found to be incomplete, the primary contact will be notified. This approval does not constitute approval by other boards or town departments.

Signature of Property Owner: [Signature]  
Date: 1/22/19

Signature of Applicant: [Signature]  
Date: 1/22/19

*If applicant is not legal property owner, please submit documentation from the property owner giving permission for applicant to represent property owner.*
Attn: Summerville Planning Department

From: Trident Medical Center, LLC

Re: TMS #154-00-00-034

January 22, 2019

To whom it may concern,

I am an authorized agent of Trident Medical Center, LLC which owns TMS #154-00-00-034 along Springview Lane and I authorize Lowcountry Women's Specialists and Cypress Engineering to submit for land development permits for the proposed medical office building.

Please contact me if there are any questions.

Regards,

[Signature]

[Date]

Nicholas L. Paul

Printed Name
January 18, 2019

Jessi Shuler / Tim Macholl
Summerville Zoning Department
200 South Main Street
Summerville, SC 29483

RE:  Variance Request for February 12th Meeting
LCWS Springview Lane (TMS #154-00-00-034)
Summerville, South Carolina
CYP #18053

On behalf of the property owner, Cypress Engineering is applying for a variance for the subject property. This letter of intent states the reasons why this request should be granted based on the Approval Criteria.

Approval Criteria:

A. Extraordinary Conditions: There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property, which could exist due to topography, street widening or other conditions which make it difficult or impossible to make an economically feasible use of the property.

The Zoning Ordinance (Section 32-322) requires a Class 2 Rear Buffer (15’ wide) for this property. This variance requests to have no rear buffer for the property

- As shown on the recorded plat and Concept Plan, the property has a 70’ wide drainage easement along the rear property line (45’ of which is on the subject property). This easement contains a large drainage canal that is approximately eleven feet (11’) deep (See attached Photo 1). The site is rectangular with the longer dimension along Springview Lane so the 45’ of drainage easement on this property further restricts the development of this parcel.

- The property is currently undeveloped and wooded. The owner has performed a trees survey as well as engaged a Certified Arborist to identify the healthy trees on-site. The Concept Plan utilizes larger tree islands where possible to protect healthy trees. Additionally, a front buffer of existing trees along Springview Lane is protected to maintain the character of adjacent medical office developments.

B. Other Property: Extraordinary conditions generally do not apply to other property in the vicinity.

This 70’ wide drainage easement applies only to this property and a few adjoining properties and is not generally a condition of properties in the vicinity.
C. Utilization: Because of these extraordinary conditions, the application of this chapter's provisions to a particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of this property.

Because of the existing 70' wide drainage easement, rectangular shape of the property and desire to preserve healthy existing trees, the requirement to have a rear buffer would unreasonably restrict the utilization of this property.

D. Detriment: The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by granting of the variance.

The authorization of this variance to not have a rear buffer would not adversely affect the adjacent multi-family development because:

- The 70' wide easement provides more than adequate separation between the opposing developments.
- The proposed situation with no rear buffer exists on the property to the south (TMS #154-00-00-065). The existing property to the south has an existing medical office building that is situated similarly at the back of the lot and has no rear buffer plantings (See attached Photo 2).
- The proposed development seeks to preserve healthy trees and provide a front buffer similar to the adjacent properties which will preserve and enhance the character of the district.

Thanks for your consideration and please contact me if you need additional information or have questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William Rogan, PE  LEED AP
Cypress Engineering, LLC
President

ENCLOSURES

- Site Photos (2)