

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

Meeting Held on April 1, 2026

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James “Jimmy” Cobb, Mr. Jerry Miller, Mr. Stephen Truluck, Mr. Charles Cole, and Mr. Gordon Ray

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Jonathan “Blake” Badger & Ms. Tondalicia Sumpter

OTHERS PRESENT: Mrs. Brittany Powell, Mrs. Clarissa Tindall, & Mrs. Jennifer Boyer

I. **Call to Order** “Notice of this meeting has been made in accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws as Amended.”

II. **Approval of the Minutes for the Meeting Held on March 9, 2026:**

A) **Mr. Jerry Miller made a motion to approve the minutes for the meeting that was held on March 9, 2026. Mr. Steven Truluck seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

III. **Public Input on Non-Agenda Items:** None

IV. **New Business:**

A) **Special Exception. V#2026-0007. Special Exception request to allow for the establishment of a structure to accommodate short-term lodging of employees on a commercial property located at 802 Church St. (TMS#: 05-0027-025-00-00), within the General Commercial (GC) Zoning District.**

Chairman Jimmy Cobb disclosed a professional relationship with the applicant for Special Exception Case **V#2026-0007** and formally recused himself from participation in the matter. **Mr. Jimmy Cobb made a motion to recuse himself from V#2026-0007. Mr. Jerry Miller seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote. Vice Chairman, Jerry Miller,** assumed the role of presiding officer for the duration of the case.

The applicant, **Mr. Daniel Temple**, presented a request seeking approval to construct a new accessory structure intended to accommodate short-term lodging for employees on the commercially zoned property. **Mr. Daniel Temple** explained that he and his wife recently purchased the property, which had previously operated as a tax accounting office under Virgil Wynn, and that they intend to continue its use as a tax office. The applicant detailed plans for a new permanent structure to be located behind the existing office building. The proposed building would include a garage and office cubicle space on the

ground floor, with the upper level designed to contain two bedrooms along with a kitchenette, dining area, and living space. The primary purpose of the structure would be to provide overnight accommodation for employees and associates traveling from surrounding areas, including Myrtle Beach and Charleston, to conduct business with clients in Georgetown. **Mr. Daniel Temple** further noted that the structure would serve a dual purpose during the renovation of the existing office, functioning as temporary workspace as needed, with the flexibility to transition between office and residential uses. He emphasized that there was no intention to subdivide the property or operate a separate business under an additional license, and that the design was intended to maintain a cohesive relationship between the existing and proposed structures. The building was described as a permanent construction with an approximate footprint of 2,312 square feet.

Planning staff presented a comprehensive report outlining the zoning and land use considerations associated with the request. The subject parcel is currently developed with a single structure and is located within both the General Commercial zoning district and the Urban Core Design Overlay District. Utilities, including electricity, water, and sewer, are available to the site but would require extension to serve the proposed structure. Staff noted that the design of the building would be subject to review by the Community Appearance Board to ensure compliance with Urban Core Design Overlay requirements if the request were approved. Staff further explained that the future land use map designates the property as neighborhood residential, while adjacent areas include both commercial corridors and neighborhood residential designations. The site lies within an X flood zone, indicating that additional floodplain development regulations would not apply. In evaluating the request, staff initially considered whether the proposal could qualify as an accessory dwelling unit; however, it was determined that it does not meet that definition, as the property is not a single-family residential use. Staff also noted that the current Unified Development Ordinance does not explicitly define or regulate this type of accessory use within commercial districts, creating a gap in the code. Despite the lack of a direct regulatory framework, staff indicated that single-family residential uses are permitted within the General Commercial district and suggested that the proposed use could be interpreted as similar in nature. Applicable accessory structure standards would still apply, including setbacks of 10 feet from property lines, a minimum separation of 6 feet from other structures, a maximum height of 20 feet, and a size limitation of no more than 10 percent of the lot area. Staff also referenced the comprehensive plan, which encourages updates to the ordinance to address undefined housing types and modernize land use provisions, thereby providing additional support for the request. It was noted that no comparable use currently exists within the city, and no public

comments were received regarding the application. Staff recommended that, if approved, the Board refrain from imposing conditions related to setbacks, buffering, or screening, as those matters fall within the purview of the Community Appearance Board and could result in conflicting requirements. Staff also highlighted that while the overlay district encourages mixed-use development, the underlying zoning ordinance does not explicitly provide for such uses.

During Board discussion, members considered whether approving the request might establish an undesirable precedent. Staff responded that each application is evaluated on its own merits and reiterated that the ongoing ordinance rewrite is intended to address emerging and undefined uses such as this. The Board generally agreed that the proposal represented a unique circumstance unlikely to be widely replicated. Members also observed that short-term vacation rentals are already permitted within the General Commercial district, meaning the applicant could potentially utilize the existing building for lodging purposes without requiring a special exception. It was further clarified that residential components, such as bedrooms, could already be incorporated within the existing structure. Board members discussed the appropriateness of the proposed use as an accessory function subordinate to the principal commercial use of the property and found it to be consistent with that framework. Historical development patterns within the city, particularly along Front Street where commercial uses are commonly paired with residential units above, were cited as relevant precedent. The Board also acknowledged the practical benefits of the proposal, including increased flexibility for business operations, the ability to attract employees from outside the immediate area, and the potential for modest economic benefit to the community.

Mr. Gordon Ray made a motion to approve Special Exception V#2026-0007 for the subject property within the General Commercial zoning district and X flood zone. The motion included findings that the request is consistent with the comprehensive plan, compatible with the character of the surrounding area, and will not adversely impact public welfare. It was further determined that the proposal complies with applicable regulations, will not negatively affect traffic or pedestrian movement, and satisfies the criteria outlined in Section 2404.101 for uses not explicitly defined in the ordinance but deemed similar in nature to permitted uses. The Board acknowledged that requirements related to setbacks, buffering, and screening would be addressed through the Community Appearance Board review process. No additional conditions were imposed as part of the approval. Mr. Charles Cole seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

B) Approval of Revised 2026 Application Agenda:

Staff presented a revised 2026 application and meeting schedule standardizing submission deadlines to thirty days prior to scheduled meetings, with implementation beginning in June 2026. A correction was also noted to revise the application deadline for the May 6 meeting to April 8, 2026.

Mr. Stephen Truluck made a motion to approve the revised schedule with the corrections made. The motion was seconded by Mr. Charles Cole; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

- V. Board Discussion:** Staff then provided administrative updates, reporting that a previously deferred application had been deemed denied due to the applicant's failure to meet resubmittal requirements, thereby triggering the applicable waiting period before reapplication. Additionally, staff informed the Board that meeting agendas and packets have been transitioned to a centralized portal shared among various City boards, including City Council, Planning Commission, the Architectural Review Board, and the Community Appearance Board. Approved meeting minutes will continue to be distributed via email and made available through the new system. Board members were reminded of their obligation to complete required continuing education units in accordance with state law. Staff noted that compliance is being more closely monitored, that credits are tracked by term year rather than calendar year, and that members must submit certificates directly to staff to ensure proper documentation.

- VI. Motion To Authorize Chairman and Staff to Type Handwritten Changes on the Orders of the Board:** There was a brief pause while **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** prepared the Board Order, and Board Members and Board Secretary completed their signatures.

Mr. Jerry Miller made a motion to authorize Chairman and Staff to Type Handwritten Changes on the Orders of the Board. Mr. Stephen Truluck seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

- VII. Adjournment:** With there being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

Submitted By:

Brittany Powell

Board Secretary