TOWN OF SUMMERVILLE
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

AGENDA
August 13, 2019
5:00 PM
Town Hall (annex) – Training Room
200 S. Main Street

I. Approval of minutes from June 11, 2019 and July 9, 2019

(For below item, signs posted on property August 2, 2019 and ad on July 28, 2019 in Post & Courier)

II. OLD BUSINESS:
1. No Old Business

III. NEW BUSINESS:

1. TMS # 130-11-00-053, 106 Kahlers Way, zoned R-2 Single Family Residential, owned by Vitor Estanqueiro & Paula Graca – variance request to reduce the required rear yard setback from five feet to one foot and to increase the permitted impervious surface from 35% to 38.5%, Ordinance Section 32-123(e)(5) and 32-123(h)(2).

IV. MISCELLANEOUS:

V. ADJOURN

Posted August 6, 2019
The Board of Zoning Appeals met in the Training Room at Town Hall on Tuesday, June 11, 2019 at 5:00 PM. Present were Denis Tsukalas, Chairman; Don Nye, Elise Richardson and Scott Riddell. Staff present included Tim Macholl, Zoning Administrator and Jessi Shuler, Director of Planning.

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM by Mr. Denis Tsukalas. Mr. Tsukalas asked for any comments or edits for the minutes from the November 13, 2018 meeting. Ms. Richardson made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nye. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Tsukalas asked for any comments or edits for the minutes from the May 14, 2019 meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Riddell to approve the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lawson. The motion passed 3-1.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

The first item under Old Business was TMS # 137-14-09-029, 103 Graham Lane, zoned R-2 Single Family Residential, owned by Summerville Commissioners of Public Works – Special Exception request to allow the construction of a 190 foot telecommunication monopole, Ordinance Section 32-211(4)(b)(2). Mr. Macholl introduced the Special Exception request and explained that the BZA is tasked with determining whether the applicant has met the requirements set forth in the Town’s Ordinance for the issuance of a Special Use Permit. He specifically pointed out that the Ordinance requires that in the case of a Special Exception request there is not a variance reducing the required separation. That required separation does not apply due to the zoning of the property. Because this does not apply, it is the board’s responsibility to determine whether to issue the Special Exception based on the requirements of the Special Use Permit. Mr. Macholl also pointed out that there was additional information provided by the applicant to staff prior to the meeting that applies to the case before them, including a new site plan, as well as some case law regarding the appropriate process for the Board to use in making their decision. Mr. Macholl also provided additional information regarding changes to the proposed plan. The height of the tower had been reduced from 190’ to 170’. The applicants also are in position to purchase the lot located at the corner of Graham Lane and Richland Street to provide additional buffer around the base of the existing water tank.

Mr. Riddell made a motion to disregard all of the late submitted documents and not include them in the decision process. Mr. Tsukalas asked for a second. There was no second and he pointed out that there cannot be any discussion on the motion without a second because the motion would die. For the purposes of discussion, Mr. Tsukalas seconded the motion and asked for discussion. Mr. Riddell pointed out that this was only the second time that a Special Exception request had been made for a telecommunication tower in the Town of Summerville. He expressed a concern for how this was being handled. He wanted to make sure that the right decision was made and without time to read the submitted documents and be able to evaluate them appropriately he didn’t feel that these should be included in the discussion of the proposed request. Mr. Tsukalas asked Mr. Riddell to restate his motion to clarify exactly what he wanted. Mr. Riddell made a motion to exclude all documents that were submitted late. Mr. Tsukalas seconded the motion and the motion passed 3-1 with Mr. Nye in opposition. Mr. Macholl read the required Special Use Requirements into the record.

Mr. Riddell asked if the Town Engineer had reviewed the application. Mr. Macholl explained that the Town Engineer is not qualified to review the structural plans for the tower, they are Civil Engineers not Structural engineers.

Mr. Jonathan Yates presented for the applicants. He recapped that they had applied last month for an identical request at the Graham Lane location that had been approved for the property off of Judith Drive two months ago. Summerville CPW had taken the time since the last meeting to meet with Mr. Ron Boller and the other neighbors and had tried to work out the issues and try to make this proposal work. He explained that the antennas have been on the tank for twenty years and that at this time they are causing more problems for the tank than they are worth. To make this work they had worked with the carriers to get the proposed tower height reduced from 190’ to 170’ still with the additional spaces for future carriers. CPW will remove the existing chain link fencing around the compound. This will be replaced with a 60’X60’ fenced in area around the base of the proposed tower, as well as an 80’X80’ fenced in area around the base of the existing water tower. The area will be heavily landscaped to provide a visual buffer, with live oaks, cypress and azaleas. Mr. Yates told the board that at this time CPW was under contract to purchase the property at the corner, and they were planning on using that property to provide additional space for buffering landscaping. There were also discussions about the possibility of
developing the property for a park, but the residents had expressed concerns and preferred a passive park. Mr. Yates pointed out that South Carolina law provided little discretion in the decision making process for a Special Exception.

Mr. Bob Hill presented to the board the results of their efforts to locate an alternative location for the proposed tower. He stated that they had tried to contact the school board about school district property, but had not received a call back. They had reached out to SCANA about the substation property on Berlin G Myers Parkway and were told no. He pointed out that a number of the proposed locations provided by Mr. Boller are just too far away to provide the needed coverage in the area. He stated that he had been out to the property 2-3 times and had observed that the fence around the property was old and rusty and that there was no landscaping to provide any screening. He had met with a couple of the adjacent neighbors to discuss the project. What they are proposing is that instead of a six foot chain-link fence they would use wood fence around both tower bases. In a couple of years the proposed landscaping will mature and provide better screening for the neighborhood. Mr. Hill pointed out that there is a long history of putting water tanks in residential areas, and a long history of putting cell towers on those properties as well.

Mr. Yates addressed the board, pointing out that Mr. Macholl had explained the request and the required criteria for the decision. He asked if the board would like to turn over the discussion to the public to allow them to address any concerns.

Mr. Tsukalas asked if the tower engineer was available to answer questions about the drop zone, he wanted to know how the top of the tower remained attached to the base. Mr. Ron Glover came to the table to discuss the design. He explained that towers are over engineered and are designed to yield at the attachment point during a catastrophic event. He explained that the exterior tubular structure is designed to bend or break at the flange, and working as a team the cabling that runs up through the interior of the tower then control the fall.

Mr. Riddell asked Mr. Glover what his relationship was to the applicant. He explained that he is a consultant. He reviewed the fall zone letter. He also gave his qualifications and stated that he is the Code Chair of the TIA Code for the design of Telecommunication Towers. Mr. Riddell asked if any other codes apply. Mr. Glover explained that the International Building Code (IBC) 2015 edition would apply and by reference ANSI 222 and the TIA. Mr. Riddell asked if the plans presented met all of the applicable codes. Mr. Glover stated yes. Mr. Riddell asked if he had specific questions about examples in the report. Mr. Glover responded that all of the examples are referenced in the report, and that this design is consistent with the industry standard.

Mr. Hill stated that after the Zoning Approval, there is additional information that that could potentially exclude the site from being built, but that rarely happens.

Mr. Ron Boller of 105 Graham Lane addressed the board. He explained that he lives directly next door and has opposed the tower from the beginning. He directed a question to Mr. Yates and asked if the proposed tower at 190’ was dead. Mr. Yates responded yes they had agreed to lower the height to 170’. Mr. Boller stated that he had asked certain questions and had received adequate clarification on those questions from the applicant. He pointed out that he had not had a chance to review the revised proposal for the 170’ tall tower. But that his questions had been addressed by the engineer of record. He pointed out that the required boundary survey had been completed, and that it showed that the property was smaller than originally thought. He stated that he had sat down with his family to discuss the beautification package and he felt that this was a much better proposal than the last plan. Mr. Boller stated that he had spoken with other neighbors who had also objected to the proposed tower. He said that the proposed compromises were better than the alternative if the tower was going to happen. He stated that overall he is not opposed to the tower per se, but does it need to be at this location. With the compromises and the beautification package he can learn to accept the situation.

Mr. Tsukalas asked Mr. Boller if he was more comfortable with the proposal. Mr. Boller responded that yes it was better, but if it were up to him there would be no new tower and no water tower.

Mr. John Pontieri addressed the board, stating that he was in favor of the tower. He felt that the loss of this location would be dangerous for public safety reasons.

Mr. Benjamin Little addressed the board, stating that he is a representative of Sprint. He pointed out that this location is a main hub for communications and that the loss of this location would be detrimental to service and customers.
Ms. Robin Monnet stated that she is a citizen of Summerville and that she is in sales and she relies on service in this area. She also pointed out that McKissick Field is in the area and that coverage is very important for public safety. She stated that losing cell service would be devastating to her business.

Ms. Belinda Harper stated that she is an employee of SCPW, but that she is a resident of Summerville and that she supports the cell tower at this location.

Ms. Beverly Grooms addressed the board, she stated that she lives adjacent to the tower property and that many things relating to the tower concern her. Specifically, she is concerned about during and after construction, how will storm water be handled. Mr. Glover responded that they will do their best to address runoff appropriately.

Mr. Chris Kahler then addressed the board. He explained that this all started with the antennas. The tower is on annual maintenance and that the tank really needs to be resurfaced. He explained that it would be counterproductive to spend $200,000 to resurface the tank then have to have that new surface be possibly damaged during the reinstallation of the antennas to the tank. Mr. Kahler asked for consideration of this issue and respectfully asked the board for approval of the proposal.

Mr. Nye made a motion for approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Richardson and Mr. Tsukalas asked for any further discussion.

Mr. Riddell opened the discussion asking about some of the criteria in the Town’s ordinance that he didn’t feel had been addressed, specifically about the attempts for colocation and the required documentation. Mr. Yates addressed this by pointing out that this was discussed in the project narrative submitted. He explained that this is an existing colocation on the existing tower, this is by no means a new location. Mr. Riddell asked if it were feasible to leave the antennas on the water tank. Mr. Yates responded that Mr. Kahler had pointed out that it was feasible to put them back on the tank, but it was not what is best for the tank or for the carriers. The tank was never designed for this use, it may have been ok back in 1997 or 1998, but it is no longer a good idea. Mr. Riddell asked what the minimum caliper size is for the proposed landscaping. Mr. Yates stated that all landscaping would meet the Town’s standard. Mr. Riddell started to ask an additional question about the possibility of disguising the tower, but Mr. Tsukalas interrupted and stated that in his experience the Town will ensure that all of the requirements will be met. Ms. Shuler pointed out that disguising the tower would be at the board’s discretion.

Mr. Tsukalas asked for a vote on the previous motion to approve. The motion passed 3-1 with Mr. Riddell opposed.

**NEW BUSINESS:**
There were no items under new business.

**MISCELLANEOUS:**
There were no miscellaneous items.

**ADJOURN:**
Hearing no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:28 PM with a motion by Mr. Nye and a second by Mr. Riddell. The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Macholl
Zoning Administrator

Denis Tsukalas, Chairman; or,
Elise Richardson, Vice Chairman
Board of Zoning Appeals
Tuesday, July 9, 2019
Summerville Municipal Complex –Annex Building Training Room

Members Present:
Denis Tsukalas, Chairman
Elise Richardson, Vice Chairman - Absent
Don Nye
Lionel Lawson
Scott Riddell

Staff Present:
Tim Macholl, Zoning Administrator

Items on the agenda:

OLD BUSINESS:
1. None

NEW BUSINESS:
1. TMS # 137-04-02-004, 709 N. Magnolia Street, zoned B-3 General Business, owned by Classic Construction of Summerville, LLC. – variance request to eliminate the required Class 2 use buffer, Ordinance Section 32-322.

MISCELLANEOUS:
1. None

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM by Mr. Denis Tsukalas. Mr. Tsukalas asked for any comments or edits for the minutes from the June 11, 2019 meeting minutes. Mr. Macholl apologized for the typos in the set of minutes that went out and suggested that the minutes could be tabled to allow for edits to be fully completed to the next meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Nye to table the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lawson. The motion passed 4-0.

OLD BUSINESS
1. None

NEW BUSINESS
1. 709 N. Magnolia Street – The first item under New Business TMS # 137-04-02-004, 709 N. Magnolia Street, zoned B-3 General Business, owned by Classic Construction of Summerville, LLC. – variance request to eliminate the required Class 2 use buffer, Ordinance Section 32-322. Mr. Macholl read the request into the record. He explained that the property had historically been a residential property, and that the current zoning is B-3. Upon a change of use the new use is required to meet the commercial zoning requirements. This includes the addition of use buffers between the new commercial use and the existing residential neighbors. He explained that due to the fact that the existing structure was built at its current location there is not enough room to fit a use buffer on either side. The variance requested would eliminate the required Class 2, 15 landscaped buffer on both the north and south sides of the house. This will allow the applicant to install a drive aisle and parking lot in the rear of the property. Mr. Riddell asked about the existing conditions, and Mr. Macholl responded that the property would be grandfathered in, but the use buffers would not be able to be installed. Mr. Tsukalas explained to the board that when this area was annexed by the town the owners asked for the B-3 zoning in anticipation that the area would eventually change over to a commercial neighborhood. He also pointed out that this is happening now.

Mr. Nye made a motion to approve as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Riddell. The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

MISCELLANEOUS:
1. None
ADJOURN:
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 PM on a motion by Mr. Nye and a second by Mr. Riddell. The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

Respectfully Submitted,                        Date: ________________

Tim Macholl
Zoning Administrator

Approved: Denis Tsukalas, Chairman ____________________________; or,

Elise Richardson, Vice Chairman ______________________________
VARIANCE REQUEST  
TMS#130-11-00-053  
106 Kahlers Way, Summerville, SC  
STAFF REPORT  
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
August 13, 2019  

Request: Variance request to reduce the required rear yard setback from five feet to one foot and to increase the permitted impervious surface from 35% to 38.5%  

Property Zoning: R-2 Single Family Residential  
Surrounding Zoning:  
North: R-2 Single Family Residential  
South: R-2 Single Family Residential  
East: R-1 Single Family Residential  
West: R-2 Single Family Residential  

Ordinance requires: Ordinance Section 32-123(c)(5) - Five (5) feet; and 32-123(h)(2) - 35%  

Background: The owner of the property is seeking to construct a shed on the property.  

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 does not meet all four criteria, and that a hardship is not present.  

  a. Extraordinary conditions do not exist on the property. There is adequate room for the shed to be moved forward to meet the required five foot setback from the rear property line. The additional impervious surface can be mitigated by reducing the size of the proposed shed.  
  b. Other property in the area have this same condition, as can be seen on the supplied plat. Lots 2, 3, 8, and 9 are the same size and dimensions all with similar restrictions and easements.  
  c. Utilization of the property is not eliminated due to moving the shed to a different location to meet the setback requirements.  
  d. Detriment will not be caused to other properties by the issuance of this variance on this property.
PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

The Town of Summerville Board of Zoning Appeals will hold a public hearing on
Date/Time: **TUESDAY AUGUST 13, 2019 AT 5 P.M.**
In Summerville Town Hall, 200 S. Main St.,
to discuss a **VARIANCE TO REDUCE REAR SETBACK FROM 5 FEET TO 1 FOOT & INCREASE LOT OUTFALL TO 58.5%** for this property.
For Information: Planning Department 851-5200

TMS# 150-11-00-053
Address 106 KAHLE'S WAY
Sign Posted on: 8/12/2019
Basemap
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS (BZA)
VARIANCE APPLICATION
Per Town of Summerville Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 32, Article II
(SC Code of Laws 6-29-780)

Date: 06/19/2019 TMS#: 130 - 11 - 00 - 053 Zoned: R-2

Property Owner: Victor Esteveiro & Paulo Grao Phone: (919) 237-5532
Email: pgeao1@hotmail.com/vitor.cws@gmail.com
Mailing Address: 106 Kablers Way Summerville, SC 29483
Site Address: Same as above
Subdivision: Palmetto Village

Representative for Property Owner (If applicable)*:  

Request for variance relating to: (please check one): □ Setbacks □ Buffer yard □ Height
□ Parking □ Other: I request setback instead of 3.5' more imp. buffer

Ordinance Requires: 5' rear setback and 35% maximum imp. surface

Property Owner Requests: 6' rear setback and 38.5% imp. surface

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: ________________________________ Date: 06/19/2019

Signature of Applicant: ________________________________ Date: ______________

*If applicant is not legal property owner, please submit documentation from the property owner giving permission for applicant to represent property owner.*
Vitor Estanqueiro & Paula Graca
106 Kahlers Way
Summerville, SC 29483
(919) 337-5532

Meredith Detsch
200 S. Main Street
Summerville, SC 29483

Subject: Zoning Appeal – Variance Application – TMS 130-11-00-053 - Zoned: R2

June 16th, 2019

Dear Meredith,

It was so nice to meet with you last month, prior to us going on vacation. We really appreciate the time you took to assisting us in this matter.

As requested I am herewith sending you the Variance request letter regarding Summerville’s zoning ordinance.

We understand that you have ordinances in place in Summerville, to keep us safe, but we would like for your zoning team to kindly review our request and reconsider the following points:

A) Extraordinary Conditions;
B) Other Property;
C) Utilization;
D) Detriment.

We respectfully find these ordinances to be overly strict to accommodate our current needs. Please be so kind as to review our reasoning behind our request.

A.1) Even though we do have a 2 car garage we have it fully packed with overflow items in boxes and items needed for my husband’s work - Carpenter. I can only on occasion fit 1 car in the garage, because it is so heavily packed.

A.2) I am currently disabled and if we were to contract a storage unit, that would be an added expense that we aren’t able to afford. Actually part of the reason why we purchased our home here in Summerville, in a neighborhood without HOA, was so we could build a Storage Unit Shed and avoid such extra expenses. We are maxed out. Not only am I not working, due to health reasons, we are also financially supporting my elderly parents in NC and helping my 4 year old nephew with what he needs.

A.3) Our FROG and office are full of boxes which we would like to relocate to the Backyard Storage Unit Shed or Garage.

A.4) We would like the extra space to effectively store our Landscaping & Yard tools, extra boxes, Working Tools and have a carpentry working space for my husband outside of the garage space.
A.5) There is an extremely large easement drainage area behind our property line. As you can see from photos previously provided and from the Official Record of our Plot Plan, there is an almost 8ft no man’s area between our fence line and the easement creek behind us, that goes from left to right of us. No one will ever build there. No one ever goes there.

A.6) Reasons why we wish to build the Storage Unit Shed where we proposed too:

   6.1: First and foremost we want to preserve nature around our property, trees and bushes both inside and outside our property line. We do not wish to be a detriment to the natural environment around us. We love nature and its sounds, sights and scents. We love our trees and wish to preserve them if we can. We intend to attract more wildlife, nurture it and not destroy it.

   6.2: We have built a gate on the right side of the fence which would make it unpractical to build the shed on the right hand side of the backyard;

   6.3: After much deliberation, a lot of thinking, and taking everything into careful account, we have come to the conclusion that the location chosen is the best way to preserve the surrounding natural environment; the best way to maximize our backyard space, and its more aesthetically and architecturally pleasing.

   6.4: Lastly but not less important, we want to be able to enjoy our backyard to its fullest. We do not wish to feel cramped in our own space. This is our Home, and we wish to be able to fully enjoy the privilege of being a hardworking and conscientious Home Owner.

B.1) We have spoken with both our neighbors and they do not oppose to us building the Storage Unit Shed were we wish. We made sure the Storage Unit Shed is orientated in such a way to be pleasant to the eye and not to become a nuisance to anyone.

B.2) Both their lots are considerably larger than ours due to how their houses are laid out on their properties. They are not experiencing the impervious surface hardship like we are.

   Richard & Amanda Kamisky
   108 Kahlers Way
   Summerville, SC 29483

   Williams & Marlene Hidalgo
   104 Kahlers Way
   Summerville, SC 29483

C.1) If we are not going to be able to build the Storage Unit Shed as requested:

   1.2: If we were to move the location of the Storage Unit Shed anywhere else in the property:

      1.2.1: We won’t be able to preserve the natural environment around us, as we wish to do;

      1.2.2: It will be too restrictive for us to enjoy our backyard to its fullest. We won’t be able to have good utilization of our yard for entertaining, grilling nor for just enjoying the outdoors in these beautiful Southern summer nights. We love to sit outside and hear the frogs, crickets and cicadas at night and watch the starry night above us.

      1.2.3: We will have to pay for extra storage space, which we can’t afford.

   1.3: Our Garage/ FROG and Office will be overflowed and copious amounts of dust and possible mold will gather. My husband has Asthma and we wish to keep the house as clean and free of allergens as possible.
1.4: My husband, who is a Carpenter per trade, will not have a place to store his working tools arsenal, nor have his much needed working space onsite.

D.1) We have spoken with 2 of our neighbors and they do not feel that it will be detrimental to their properties for us to build a Storage Shed Unit. Actually on the contrary they believe that it will increase our overall architectural attractiveness, curb appeal and increase Home price value, which will benefits us all on the long run.

D.2) The Storage Unit Shed will be built up on Cement Stilts and NOT on a permanent foundation, so that it won’t adversely impact the water flow and allow it to run freely under it.

D.3: The Storage Unit Shed will be a small structure of 10x16 and with a small eave.

D.2) We are only requesting an increase of just 3.5% of the impervious surface.

D.3) We are also only requesting a 1ft setback instead of the original 5ft rear setback. A decrease of 4ft.

We thank you in advance for your kind assistance and are looking forward for a positive outcome to our request.

Kind Regards:
Vitor Estanqueiro & Paula Graca
Owners

07.15.19
07.15.19

Neighbors
Richard Kaminski: 108 Kahlers Way, Summerville, SC 29483

2/15/19

Williams Hidalgo: 104 Kahlers Way, Summerville, SC 29483

07/15/19
SETBACKS PER PRELIMINARY PLAT AND SHOULD BE VERIFIED WITH GOVERNING MUNICIPALITIES BEFORE CONSTRUCTION OR DESIGN.

DRAINAGE EASEMENT (WIDTH VARIES)

LOT 7
8504 SQ. FT
0.20 ACRES

LOT 8

IMPERVIOUS AREA
2960 sq ft
34.82%

TOTAL AREA FOR DRIVE
704 sq ft

TOTAL AREA FOR LANDSCAPING
407 sq ft

10' POWER EASEMENT

FENWICK I HOUSE PLAN
FTE 825 (SLAB)

10' SETBACK

50' EASEMENT

N 77° 20' 54" W
75.22'

GARAGE

11.50'

W 64° 39' 22" S
11.50'

106 KAHLERS WAY (50' R/W)

THERE IS A MINIMUM 6' OF FALL IN THE FIRST 10' (5.00% SLOPED) FROM BUILDING.

PREPARED FOR CRESSENT HOMES

PLOT PLAN SHOWING LOT 7. TMS #130-11-00-053

PALMETTO VILLAGE SUBDIVISION

LOCATED IN THE TOWN OF SUMMERVILLE, DORCHESTER COUNTY, SC

SCALE: 1" = 20'

DATE: AUGUST 1, 2017

REFERENCE: PLAT RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK M, PAGE 115

LOT MAY BE SUBJECT TO EASEMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS NOT OBVIOUS OR APPARENT TO THE SURVEYOR.

PROPERTY APPEARS TO BE IN FLOOD ZONE X. 450338C 0348 P. REVISED JULY 18, 2017

FLOOD ZONE SHOULD BE VERIFIED WITH GOVERNING MUNICIPALITY BEFORE CONSTRUCTION. FEMA REVISION CHECK 8/1/17

PARKER LAND SURVEYING, LLC
5420 GRIFFIN STREET, HANAHAN, SC 29410
TELEPHONE: (843) 554-7777 FAX: (843) 554-7779

THIS PLOT PLAN DOES NOT REPRESENT A LAND SURVEY, WAS NOT PREPARED FOR RECORDERATION, AND IS NOT SUITABLE FOR DEEDING OF PROPERTY. NO GROUND SURVEY WAS PERFORMED.