

**CITY OF COLUMBIA**  
**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES**  
**February 14, 2017 - 10:00 AM**

City Council Chambers  
 1737 Main Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor • Columbia, SC

**In attendance:** Gene Dinkins, Jr., April Jones, Calhoun McMeekin, Chuck Salley, Regina Williams

**Absent:** Tyler Gregg, Reggie McKnight

**Staff:** Brian Cook, Tabitha Proffitt

**I. CALL TO ORDER and DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Chuck Salley, chairperson, called the meeting to order at 10:15AM. Members of the Board of Zoning Appeals (BOZA) were. Staff introduced. Quorum was confirmed.

**II. OTHER BUSINESS - moved to the end of the Regular Agenda**

1. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

**Agenda amended to move the election of Chair and Vice-Chair.**

Brian Cook, Zoning Administrator, briefed the conduct and order of the meeting. Mr. Cook noted changes to the agenda since publication and proceeded with review of the Consent Agenda.

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

**A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2. Approve January 10, 2017 Minutes

**B. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**C. NEW BUSINESS**

3. 2016-0071-V Dist. 2 1000, 2000, 3000, 4000 Pavilion Towers Circle and 5000  
 Thurmond Mall (TMS# 09011-15-01) Variance to the parking  
 requirements for a multifamily use. (Wes Lyles, Studio 2LR, Inc.)  
 (Pending RG-3, -DD)

No one spoke in favor or opposition of the requests, or requested removal for discussion.

**Motion by Ms. Williams to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.**

**Motion seconded by Mr. Dinkins, Jr. Motion approved 5-0.**

**IV. REGULAR AGENDA**

**A. OLD BUSINESS**

4. 2016-0086-SE Dist. 2 1311, 1401, & 1417 Whaley Street, 226 Bull Street, 101

**& Dist. 3 Pickens Street, 230 & 324 Sumter Street, and Former Marion Street Right-of-Way (TMS#11302-09-02, 11302-09-01(p), 11306-12-01 & -02, 11306-13-01, 11306-01-17(p), 11306-10-01, 11302-07-02, 11302-08-02(p))** Special Exception to establish a public dormitory and parking garage (Derek S. Gruner, University of South Carolina) (C-1, C-1, -PD, and C-3, -PD)

Mr. Cook introduced the request to establish public dormitories and a parking garage. The University of South Carolina is the applicant. The University will demolish Cliff, Bates, and Carolina Gardens (Bates and Bates West) housing sites, as well as large portion of the surface parking lots to construct new public dormitories. The project will be phased over several years and consist of over 3,750 beds and a parking garage with approximately 945 spaces.

Derek S. Gruner, University of South Carolina, presented the request. (The first few minutes of presentation were not heard due to audio difficulties.) The use of the property will remain the same as it has been for the last 45 years.

Current parking included commuter and resident parking however commuter traffic will be eliminated with the new proposal which minimize centralized traffic congestion. It was determined after engaging a traffic engineer that there will be 17% less traffic on Whaley Street after the project is completed.

Mr. Gruner said it is felt that *criterion 1 is met due to the fact that vehicular traffic will actually be reduced and pedestrian safety enhanced.*

It is felt that *criterion 5, to prevent a concentration detrimental to future development, is not a concern as the University owns most of the land around this development as does the single family neighborhoods, so there is not a lot of opportunity for additional development.*

What makes the University unique is that they "weave green spaces with crafted buildings".

A conceptual site plan was presented to show the overall layout of the proposed development.

There will be only one parking garage with the new development away from the neighborhood which will meet half the demand of the development. The other half is met with available spaces throughout campus and other garages.

The pedestrian concourse leading north to the campus will be enhanced with better lighting and a reconstructed bridge across Reed Street fostering more pedestrian and bike access to campus.

There will be common areas such as dining, canteen, living/learning centers, all things needed to make this a place to live but also a village.

The Carolina Gardens site was discussed with neighbors to address their concerns because of the proximity to the neighborhoods. The option chosen was to not develop the eastern one-third portion of that site, and to turn it over to the neighbors as a park. Unhealthy trees will be replaced as well as new sidewalks.

Landscape topology will match the rest of the University landscape.

Simple massing studies were done – to determine the maximum number of beds for the new public dormitory which will be 3,700; height of buildings where buildings will not be taller than six stories to still allow courtyards that will not be cavernous.

Architectural details will be inspired by other University historic buildings. The Honors Building is the best example to follow. South campus will be a more reddish brick, rather than the buff or light grey to blend better with the neighborhood.

The project will be developed in three phases over a period of six years. The first phase will be at the western part of the site, and the towers will be demolished and replaced with 1770 beds. Carolina Gardens also called the Benson site is the lowest density of housing will be strictly apartments; four stories on Benson and two to three on Carolina Gardens.

*Criterion 4 regarding the quality of life and public safety – the University's funding called safety guides, will patrol in concert with City police through this corridor, predominantly on Pickens Street on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights to curtail behavior by students that might be adverse to the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The University will also support the City with code enforcement officers to enforce the newest codes regarding renters.*

The shuttle service will be enhanced to foster the resistance to new driving. The students permitted to park in the garage will not be allowed to park in any other parking garages on campus. The shuttles will drive on designated routes.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor or opposition of the requests.

Toby Ward represented Dick and Jaime Harpootlian and also worked with the neighborhood groups which resulted in the Cooperative Agreement. Mr. Harpootlian asked when Phase III demolition takes place would that property be used to stage construction in Phases I and II.

Mr. Gruner said lay down space and contractor parking were created on the site where that construction would occur. This is being looked at as a public/private partnership and in the agreement with whichever developer is chosen there is a very precise obligation that they are to not park their construction vehicles in the neighborhood, to try not to impair the quality of life in the neighborhood.

Mr. Ward asked that those comments be made as part of the record for the Phase III site regarding lay down space and contractor/equipment parking.

Kit Smith, chair of the Citizens Committee, provided a summary sheet which she felt 'was a good deal' for the City of Columbia, their neighborhood and the University. A meeting was held in the Fall with the three area neighborhoods with an attendance of approximately 200 people. The summary sheet showed the issue, status as of October 2015, and their agreement with the University.

As no one else spoke in favor or opposition of the request, testimony closed for Board discussion.

It was felt by Board members that this was a good plan and collaboration between adjacent neighborhoods and the University to ensure everyone had input in the project and decisions.

**Motion by Mr. Salley to approve the special exception based on the testimony of the applicant who clearly went through a very detailed application to address all eight criteria requirements of the special exception. Approval is subject to the following conditions of staff:**

- **The proposed development shall operate in substantial conformance with the application, submitted materials, and testimony before the board regarding its construction and operation.**
- **The proposed development shall be in substantial conformance with all City of Columbia zoning and land development regulations.**
- **Any conditions or recommendations of staff adopted by Planning Commission's Site Plan Review shall be implemented.**

**Approval of the application shall be subject to a cooperative agreement between the University of South Carolina and the Hollywood/Rose Hill, Wales Garden and Wheeler Hill Neighborhood Associations dated January 20, 2017.**

**The area designated as Phase III on the site plan approval shall not be used for storage of construction materials from the construction of Phase I and Phase II.**

**Amended by Mr. McMeekin to include the document Ms. Smith handed out to be entered as part of the record.**

***Motion seconded by Mr. McMeekin. Motion carries 5-0.***

- 5. 2016-0113-V Dist. 3 Lot 9, Block L, Canterbury Road (TMS# 11415-04-08)**  
Variance to the front yard setback requirements to construct a single-family residence. (Morris Lyles) (RS-1)

Mr. Cook stated recusal by Mr. Dinkins, Jr. from discussion and vote on this item.  
Mr. Dinkins will also be recusing himself from discussion and vote on item #9.

Mr. Cook advised that quorum is still retained, however wanted to make the applicant aware that there is a split vote, a 2-2 tie, the motion will fail. The applicant can move forward with the request or may wish to defer until a full quorum is present.

The applicant is requesting a variance to the front yard setback requirements. A minimum front yard setback of 35 feet is normally required; the applicant is proposing a front yard setback of 17.6 feet instead to construct a single-family home.

Morris Lyles, presented on behalf of his mother Baylis D. Lyles the property owner, who was unable to attend due to illness. Mr. Lyles read a statement on behalf of his mother which provided some background on the property.

The property is currently buildable and a permit can be pulled; however construction of a single-family residence would need to be built on the right side of the lot with garages on the left. The request for a setback variance is to move the house to the front of the lot and center it, allowing a garage to be built on the back of the house if desired.

Plans for the design of the house are still not available. Mr. Lyles said the builder will not provide any plans as they have not been chosen at the time. As a speculative builder, the builder will not commit to any plans until the lot is sold.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor or opposition of the requests.

Those speaking in opposition of the request:  
Eric Powers, neighborhood resident  
Wayne Hornsby, neighborhood resident

As no one else spoke in favor or opposition of the request, testimony closed for Board discussion.

It was felt that a decision could not be made without seeing a site plan to determine that the request is the minimum necessary.

Mr. Cook said the Board can make a motion to defer the request if desired; or if voted on today and denied, a new request for a re-hearing of the same request could not be heard for twelve months.

**Motion by Mr. Salley to defer the request to the next meeting and allow for the presentation of a site plan showing the proposal.**

**Second by Ms. Jones. Motion carries 4-0.**

**B. NEW BUSINESS**

**6. 2017-0002-V Dist. 1 3506 Main Street (TMS# 09112-06-08)** Variance to the parking requirements for a tattoo shop. (Joseph Jakubs, Salty Dog Tattoo, LLC) (MX-1, -NC)

Mr. Cook introduced case #6, request for variance to the parking requirements at 3506 Main Street, and item #7, request for special exception for shared parking at 3506 and 3504 Main Street. Testimony for both requests will be heard separately but are very similar.

Joseph Jakubs, applicant, presented on the request for variance for three parking spaces on-site and the request for special exception to allow shared parking for use of two spaces.

Mr. Jakubs reviewed the criteria required for a variance:

- *Extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertain to the subject property* – this is a small tattoo studio with not that many artists, and do many appointments.
- *Conditions noted above do not generally apply to other property in the area* – the lot is currently vacant and was being used for storage prior to lease by the tattoo studio.
- Because of the conditions noted above, the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use of the property.

Mr. Jakubs and one or two other artists will be on the property at all times, generally two people during the day, an artist and an apprentice, with the possibility of a third person in the evening.

- Approval of the variance would not be of a substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district would not be harmed.
- *Is the variance the minimum necessary?* – yes, three parking spaces are the absolute minimum.
- *Is the proposal in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and will it not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare?* – Yes, and everyone spoken with has provided positive feedback with having the tattoo shop onsite.

Proposed hours of operation will be opening at 10AM until 10PM.

As no one spoke in favor or opposition of the request, testimony closed for Board discussion and/or a motion.

In review of the criteria required, Mr. Dinkins said he had a hard time agreeing that several of the criteria are met. With regard to extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertain to the subject property – it is felt that a lot of the others in this corridor, warehouse or building taking up a large portion of the few parking spaces in front. Practically speaking, he does not feel the tattoo shop will have enough parking.

**Motion by Mr. Dinkins to deny the variance for the parking requirement for the tattoo shop.**

**Motion seconded by Ms. Jones. Motion carries 5-0.**

7. **2017-0003-SE Dist. 1 3506 and 3504 Main Street (TMS# 09112-06-08 & -05)**  
Special Exception to permit shared parking for a tattoo shop.  
(Joseph Jakubs, Salty Dog Tattoo, LLC) (MX-1, -NC)

Brian Cook, Zoning Administrator, introduced the request for a special exception. As the previous request for tattoo shop was looking at the required seven parking spaces and requesting a variance to have three, both properties together would need six. Even with the shared parking, the adjacent use will still require two parking spaces, and the tattoo shop would require seven based on the current square foot for a total of nine needed for both spaces to share without the variance that was previously denied. The parking requirement would not be met therefore the request for the shared parking request would not be viable at this time.

Mr. Jakubs said plans are not to use the entire building for the tattoo shop as it is a small shop. The previous owners removed a large section separating the building which increased the square footage which he does need and should therefore reduce the required parking.

Mr. Salley said the lot to the rear of the property and house next door is extremely large. As the landlord owns both lots, an accommodation for a parking arrangement could be a consideration so that a special exception may not be required.

Mr. Cook stated if the lot was to be used for parking, all requirements for landscaping and parking surface would need to be met. Another option to explore would be to recalculate the square footage that would be used for the tattoo shop as the applicant stated that he would only be using a portion a building.

A motion can be made to deny the request, or the applicant can withdraw the request.

**Motion by Mr. Salley to allow the applicant to withdraw the request for special exception.**

**Motion seconded by Mr. McMeekin. Motion carries 5-0.**

8. **2017-0004-V Dist. 2 202 Gadsden Street (TMS# 08913-07-07)** Variance to the fence height requirements. (Michael Robertson, SC Graduate Investors, LLC) (RS-3, -CC1, -PD, -DP)  
**Moved to be heard after item 9, 1323 Manning Avenue.**

*Mr. Salley apologized to the applicant of this case stating that based on extenuating circumstances which would result in lack of quorum as Ms. Williams would be leaving the meeting after this case and Mr. Dinkins, Jr. would need to be recused from discussion and vote on item 9, a motion be made to hear item 2017-0005-V 1323 Manning Avenue at this time, and then return to hear item 8, 202 Gadsden Street immediately afterward.*

**Motion made accordingly by Mr. Salley. Motion seconded by Mr. McMeekin.**

Mr. Cook stated, for the record on 2017-0005-V, that Mr. Dinkins, Jr. would be recusing himself due to conflict of interest. This recusal was submitted in writing and dually noted at the meeting.

9. **2017-0005-V Dist. 2 1323 Manning Avenue (TMS# 11411-08-04)** Variance to the lot coverage requirements to construct a new single-family residence. (Julia Prater, Columbia Housing Authority) (RS-3)

Julia Prater, Columbia Housing Authority, presented the request to build twelve new homes in the Lyon Street Community on Manning, Washington, House and McDuffie Streets. The lots are quite challenging in this community, and all were made to work with the exception of this one lot. The variance is being requested to retain the design for the front porch of the house. The porch is only

six-feet in design and would not be able to be constructed without the variance. It is felt this would also impact the design of the house, its compatibility and the aesthetics of the neighborhood.

Ms. Prater reviewed the criteria required for a variance:

- *Extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertain to the subject property* –There are houses that front on Washington Street which make this lot a shorter lot, and there are no houses fronting on Youman Street, so no portion of the lots are cut off.
- *Conditions noted above do not generally apply to other property in the area* – as this is new construction, lot coverage requirement is 3% more than existing structures in the neighborhood. To retain similar design structure, additional 3% lot coverage is required.
- *Because of the conditions noted above, the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use of the property* – They do not prohibit the use of the property, however would restrict the design of the house which is being built to be more compatible with the neighborhood designs of homes.
- *Approval of the variance would not be of a substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district would not be harmed.* It is felt because the request is such a small amount it would not impact the neighborhood, but would rather enhance it.
- *Is the variance the minimum necessary?* – Yes.
- *Is the proposal in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and will it not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare?* – Yes. It will not be injurious or detrimental to the neighborhood. This particular home complements the existing structures and community.

As no one spoke in favor or opposition of the request, testimony closed for Board discussion and/or a motion.

**Motion by Mr. Salley to approve the variance based on the testimony of the applicant and the application. Approval is subject to any restrictions or guidelines per staff in the application.**

***Motion seconded by Mr. McMeekin. Motion carries 4-0.***

Ms. Williams left the meeting at approximately 12:15PM. Quorum still retained with four members.

**8. 2017-0004-V Dist. 2 202 Gadsden Street (TMS# 08913-07-07)** Variance to the fence height requirements. (Michael Robertson, SC Graduate Investors, LLC) (RS-3, -CC1, -PD, -DP)

Brian Cook, Zoning Administrator, introduced the request for a variance to the height requirements for a fence that has already been constructed within the required side yard. A fence up to 7 feet is normally allowed within the side yard. The applicant is proposing a fence that varies in height in which it reaches a maximum height of 9.6 feet high and a minimum height of 7 feet high.

A fence has been constructed along the side and rear yards. Due to gradual grade changes and the construction of the fence, each side of the fence varies in height. Since there are areas where the fence exceeds 7 feet high within the side yard, the applicant is proposing a variance to the fence height requirements.

Michael Robertson, managing partner of SC Graduate Investors, LLC, presented on the request. Mr. Robertson said they began replacement of an existing fence that had been on the property since 1990 without paying attention to the height of the fence. A barn door was added and the height of the fence increased up to 9-feet in some areas as built. Mr. Robertson is requesting a variance to allow 8-feet height. No opposition has been received from surrounding neighbors most of whom are rental students.

Mr. Robertson reviewed the criteria required for a variance:

- *Extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertain to the subject property* – fence has been there for over 20 years, and owners replaced what was already there. There is a large slope on the property and applicants are trying to fence entire area as similar in height as possible
- *Conditions noted above do not generally apply to other property in the area* – there are not many fences in the area.
- *Because of the conditions noted above, the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use of the property* – Yes, the fence will allow for more privacy.
- *Approval of the variance would not be of a substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district would not be harmed.* The fence provides security, matches the house, and complements the area.
- *Is the variance the minimum necessary?* – Yes.
- *Is the proposal in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and will it not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare?* – Yes. It will make the property a more secure property.

As no one spoke in favor or opposition of the request, testimony closed for Board discussion and/or a motion.

**Motion by Mr. Salley to approve the variance based on the testimony of the applicant and the written application. Approval is subject to approval and any conditions placed upon the applicant by the D/DRC, and any other comments by staff in the application.**

***Motion seconded by Mr. McMeekin. Motion carries 4-0.***

**10. 2017-0006-V Dist. 1 2238 Sumter Street (TMS# 09016-03-12)** Variance to the buffer yard transition requirements. (Frank Cason, CDG Sumter 1, LLC) (MX-1, -NC)

Brian Cook, Zoning Administrator, introduced the request for a variance to the buffer transition yard requirements for a proposed +/- 1,884 sq. ft. coffee shop in an existing vacant building. The buffer transition yard would be required on the eastern side of the rear of the property, between the parking lot and adjacent residential properties. Since this is a renovation, a 15 foot buffer transition yard is required, and the applicant is proposing 0 feet instead.

Frank Cason, Cason Development Group, presented on the request. There are two separate buildings on site. Work started and is close to being complete on a coffee shop and a small barber shop in the building on the north side of 2238 Sumter, also purchased was 2222 Sumter southside. An existing 8 foot wooden fence currently screens the residential properties adjacent to the subject property. The screening will remain and provide no buffer transition yard. Complying with the 15 foot buffer yard would remove the parking that is currently being provided in the rear portion of the property.

Towards the rear of the lot, the area in between the fence and the smaller building will be used for parking and is approximately 50 feet wide. Therefore, including the 15 foot buffer yard would leave 35 feet to provide parking and allow for adequate vehicle maneuverability.

Mr. Cason spoke with one neighbor who provided a letter of support, and another voiced support of the request.

Three or four Cypress Trees will be placed in the 5 foot area between the asphalt and the fence.



Mr. Cason reviewed the criteria required for a variance:

- *Extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertain to the subject property* –The required buffer would remove all parking in the rear requiring people to park on the streets, and they are trying to lessen the load of parking in the area.
- *Conditions noted above do not generally apply to other property in the area* – other areas do not have a buffer cutting into necessary parking spaces.
- *Because of the conditions noted above, the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use of the property* – to place the buffer would cut about 11 feet into the asphalt which would not leave enough room for existing parking.
- *Approval of the variance would not be of a substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district would not be harmed.* It would not affect the adjacent property negatively and would benefit the neighborhood by allowing people a place to park other than on the streets.
- *Is the variance the minimum necessary?* – Yes, it will make possible the reasonable use of the land.
- *Is the proposal in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and will it not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare?* – Yes. It will benefit the neighborhood by allowing people to park somewhere other than the streets.

Mr. Salley gave background on Mr. Cason saying the WarMouth Restaurant is his restaurant, and is a wonderful restaurant.

Ms. Jones added that she loves the North Main area and it is a fabulous part of Columbia.

Members of the public were then invited to speak.

Jim Daniel, commercial real estate broker, spoke on the uniqueness of the area and parking issues because of the changes in use of many of the properties. He spoke in favor of the project and requested the Board vote in favor of the request.

As no one else spoke in favor or opposition of the request, testimony closed for Board discussion and/or a motion.

**Motion by Mr. Salley to approve the application contingent upon the following conditions:**

- **The proposed development shall operate in substantial conformance with the application, submitted materials, and testimony before the board today regarding its construction and operation, and shall conform to all relevant city development regulations.**
- **Any exterior changes, site improvements, or signage shall obtain design review and approval prior to permitting.**
- **The existing wooden fence must be maintained in an appropriate manner to provide proper screening between the adjacent residential uses**
- **Following vacancy, abandonment, or discontinuance of this use for a period of 12 consecutive months, the special exception shall be considered completed and shall expire.**

**Motion seconded by Ms. Jones. Motion approved 4-0.**

11. 2017-0020-V Dist. 2 1100 Park Street (aka 1001 Senate Street on the Corner of Park Street and Senate Street) (TMS# 08916-03-12)  
Variance to the parking requirements for a mixed use development. (Jake S. Barker, Graybill, Lansche, & Vinzani, LLC)  
(C-4, -DD)

Brian Cook, Zoning Administrator, introduced the request for a variance to the parking requirements

for a proposed mixed-use development on the subject property. The parking requirements for this use would normally be 56 parking spaces. The applicant is proposing 29 spaces to remain instead. The case summary states 30 spaces however this has been changed to 29 to accommodate some future landscaping.

The property currently has three buildings on it, the historic Columbia Fire Station, training tower, and an additional storage building in the back corner of the property.

There are parking options available in close proximity to the use with both the City of Columbia parking garage and available on-street parking. In addition, the property is within the Design/Development Overlay District.

Jake S. Barker of Graybill, Lansche, & Vinzani, LLC, presented the request on behalf of client Wheeler Real Estate Investment Trust. Kevin Maume of Graybill, Lansche, & Vinzani, LLC, was also in attendance to speak on the construction side of the project.

The applicants had been working with Scott Holder, landscape planner, with regard to the landscape plan and changes required resulted in the loss of one parking space. Mr. Barker provided an updated landscape plan to Board members.

The property is designated as a historic parcel limiting what can be done. Entry on the parcel will be from Senate Street and a curb cut will be on the Park Street side to use for exiting the property, which has been approved by SCDOT. The proposed development will be in line with the area.

Mr. Barker reviewed the criteria for a variance:

- *Extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertain to the subject property* – the structures are historical in nature; they cannot alter to increase the footprint, the parking cannot be increased.
- *Conditions noted above do not generally apply to other property in the area* – they apply to historic properties, which this is.
- *Because of the conditions noted above, the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use of the property* – mixed use development would require a variance because it would require more parking.
- *Approval of the variance would not be of a substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district would not be harmed.* No, it would definitely enhance the area, benefit the public good, and the character of the district.
- *Is the variance the minimum necessary?* – Yes.
- *Is the proposal in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and will it not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare?* – Yes, there will be minimal impact to existing structures due to their historical nature and the planned development conforms precisely with the neighborhood. The applicant's plans represent the best possible use of the property.

As no one spoke in favor or opposition of the request, testimony closed for Board discussion and/or a motion.

**Motion by Mr. Salley to approve the variance subject to the following conditions:**

- **The proposed development shall operate in substantial conformance with the application, submitted materials, and testimony before the board regarding its construction and operation and shall conform to all relevant city development regulations.**
- **Any exterior changes, site improvements, or signage shall obtain design review and approval prior to permitting.**

***Motion seconded by Mr. McMeekin. Motion carries 4-0.***

1. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

**Motion by Mr. McMeekin to have Mr. Salley serve as chair.  
*Motion seconded by Mr. Dinkins, Jr. Motion carries 4-0.***

**Motion by Mr. Salley to have Mr. McMeekin serve as vice-chair.  
*Motion seconded by Mr. Dinkins, Jr. Motion carries 4-0.***

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

**There being no further business, motion to adjourn by Mr. Salley. Meeting adjourned at 12:45PM.**

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Wolfe  
Sr. Admin. Secretary  
Planning and Development Services Department  
City of Columbia