BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

MINUTES

May 7, 2026 - 4:00 P.M.
City Hall, 3rd Floor, Council Chambers, 1737 Main Street, Columbia, S.C.

KATHRYN FENNER • COLTON DRIVER • SHERARD DUVALL
JONATHAN VANG • SYDNEY LANHAM • JOSH HARDING • DOUG THOMAS

In attendance: Kathryn Fenner, Colton Driver, Sherard Duvall, Jonathan Vang, Sydney Lanham, Josh Harding and Doug Thomas
Absent: N/A
Staff: Andrew Livengood, Erica Jaen and Madelyn Bowden

I. CALL TO ORDER and DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Ms. Fenner, chair, called the meeting to order at 4:00 P.M.

Members of the Board of Zoning Appeals (BOZA) were introduced along with staff. Quorum was confirmed.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend the agenda to add discussions regarding *South Saluda Property, LLC v. Board of Zoning Appeals* to the Executive Session. Mr. Driver seconded the motion. All aye. Motion passed (7-0).

II. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Receipt of legal advice relating to a pending claim or other matters covered by attorney-client privilege pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-70(a)(2)

Newman, et al v. Board of Zoning Appeals

Mr. Driver made a motion to enter Executive Session. Mr. Duvall seconded the motion. All aye. Motion passed (7-0).

Ms. Lanham made a motion to resume the regular agenda. Mr. Harding seconded the motion. All aye. Motion passed (7-0).

Applicants and others who wished to speak were sworn in.

Andrew Livengood, Zoning Administrator, reviewed the consent agenda.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. April 2, 2026 Minutes

B. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

C. NEW BUSINESS

2. 2026-0007-V 1616 Two Notch Road & 1717 Bernardin Road (p/o) (TMS# 11412-09-20 & 11412-08-01 (p/o)) Variance to the maximum fence height standard (Thomas Goforth III., WTC of Two Notch, LLC) (O-I)

Mr. Duvall made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Ms. Lanham seconded the motion.
All aye. Motion passed (7-0).

IV. REGULAR AGENDA

A. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

B. NEW BUSINESS

3. 2026-0006-V 7461 Richard Street (TMS# 16305-05-01)(p/o) Variance to the vehicular surface area planted medians within a laydown yard for a commercial use (Joey Williams, WS Holdings, LLC) (LI, OV-FP)

Mr. Livengood introduced and summarized the requirements of the landscape variance request. The applicant was then invited to the podium to present the case.

Mr. Williams, applicant, came up and gave a brief overview of the case. He advised that he met with neighborhood leaders to alleviate any concerns. He then offered to answer any questions from the Board members.

Mr. Duvall asked the applicant to elaborate on the neighborhood meeting. Mr. Williams advised that it went well and they had no concerns regarding his business.

Mr. Thomas asked if there are any extraordinary or exceptional conditions about this property that is different from other laydown yards. Mr. Williams stated that it is just like others in the area. Mr. Thomas then followed up with a question regarding whether or not they had considered putting the median on the side perimeter. Applicant stated there will be landscaping around other perimeters of the property, just not this area.

Members of the public were invited to speak. Seeing and hearing none, testimony closed and Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Driver stated that the applicant had explained that if there was a planted median it would hinder vehicular movements due to the large amount of storage area required and that is an extraordinary condition pertaining to the property or to the use of the property.

Ms. Fenner asked for a motion.

Mr. Vang made motion to approve the variance subject to staff comments. Motion seconded by Mr. Harding. Motion passed (6-1) with Mr. Thomas voting nay.

4. 2026-0008-V 2221 Devine Street (TMS# 11312-02-03) Variance to the maximum building height standard (Steve Denton, Goodwyn Mills Cawood Architecture) (CAC)

Mr. Livengood introduced and summarized the requirements of the height variance request. The applicant was then invited to the podium to present the case.

Mr. Bachman and Mr. Warren, representing the applicant, came up and gave a brief overview of the case and offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Bachman stated that the request is necessary to add an second egress per building code and is a life safety issue.

Mr. Duvall asked staff to clarify the exact request for building height and stairwell location. Mr. Livengood stated that stairwell location exceeds two maximum building heights. The neighborhood compatibility's 55' and the zoning district's 75' maximum heights.

Mr. Warren then clarified the nonconforming secondary egress that was permissible at the time the building was constructed will now need to be brought into current building code compliance due to the extensive renovations they plan for the building.

Members of the public were invited to speak. Seeing and hearing none, testimony closed and Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Driver stated that the case meets the factors and since the building is existing and they are just up-fitting it for a conforming use.

Mr. Harding noted the extraordinary amount of grade change on the site can make the height seem like a big change depending on vantage point.

Ms. Fenner asked for a motion.

Mr. Vang made motion to approve the case, with staff comments. Mr. Harding seconded the motion. All aye. Motion passed (7-0).

5. 2026-0009-SE 1116 House Street (TMS# 11410-06-27) Special exception to permit a residential care facility (Rosalind Smith, New Beginnings Recovery Living) (MU-1)

Mr. Livengood introduced and summarized the requirements and conditions of the special exception request. The applicant was then invited to the podium to present the case.

Ms. Rosalyn Smith, New Beginning Recovery Living, applicant, came up and gave an overview of the case. She advised that she has been working with the City's rapid shelter overflow and transitional homes. She is offering structured living in an effort to provide shelter and keep her clients off the streets so they will not fall back into addiction.

Mr. Vang asked the applicant to clarify whether this is an emergency shelter. Applicant advised that the clients will have case workers that will refer her clients and she will offer emergency shelter if necessary.

Mr. Duvall confirmed with staff that the residential care facility conditions were addressed in the application. He then confirmed with the applicant that she spoke with the surrounding neighborhoods and the pastor of the nearby First Nazareth Church.

Members of the public were invited to speak. Seeing and hearing none, testimony closed and Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Thomas asked staff to clarify the reasoning for the denial of the residential care facility in 2013. Mr. Livengood stated that it was denied based upon pedestrian safety.

Ms. Smith returned to the podium to address the safety implementations she will provide including fencing, surveillance cameras and police safety checks.

Mr. Driver then asked for clarification of the licensing requirements for the house manager. Applicant advised she will meet Department of Health requirements and have 2 staff members.

Mr. Vang asked the applicant if this is a nonprofit and how she intends to make money. Ms. Smith stated at this time she is not making money. Once her business locations are approved, she will contract with different programs for funding opportunities.

Mr. Thomas asked the applicant to elaborate on the residents. Ms. Smith advised that there will be veterans but also regular residents referred by the City of Columbia and other agencies that are enrolled in a recovery program.

Ms. Fenner asked for a motion.

Mr. Duvall made motion to approve the case, with staff comments. Motion seconded by Mr. Driver. All aye. Motion passed (7-0).

6. **2026-0010-V** 2131 Slighs Avenue (TMS# 11506-09-57) Variance to neighborhood compatibility standards and the minimum parking standard (Lucinda Herrera, Columbia Housing Authority) (RM-2)

Mr. Livengood introduced and summarized the requirements of the neighborhood compatibility and parking variance request. The applicant was then invited to the podium to present the case.

Ms. Julia Gibbs and Mr. Daniel Taylor, applicants, came to the podium and introduced themselves.

Mr. Taylor stated that they are doing this through the Small Rental Development Program (SRDP) which has design guidelines through South Carolina Housing. The funding is dependent on meeting those guidelines for affordable housing. He stated that there will be an 8 foot tall fence will hide the patios that are facing the single family homes adjacent to the property.

Mr. Taylor then stated that the 1.5 parking spaces per unit variance request is the minimum necessary for the individuals that typically rent these units. Also, with the SRDP, there are size requirements for the apartments to increase living standards for all people. The individuals these apartments are marketed to generally require less parking and the variance is appropriate for this type of housing.

Mr. Driver asked for clarification regarding the SRDP design guidelines. Mr. Taylor stated that the guidelines are required by SC Housing to ensure the apartments are of good quality.

Mr. Harding asked if the apartments were single story. Mr. Taylor advised they are 2 story, but will have patios at ground level behind the 8-foot-tall buffer fence.

Mr. Thomas asked what extraordinary conditions pertain to this property that require the less parking spaces. Mr. Taylor advised that the irregular shape of the lot made it difficult to layout the 24 apartments that the community needs. They had tried multiple iterations of the site plan but this was the most fitting.

Members of the public were invited to speak. Seeing and hearing none, testimony closed and Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Driver stated that the size of the property and the other design constraints allow them to meet the criteria.

Mr. Duvall stated that this area needs housing and these ongoing improvements to the area are good to see.

Ms. Fenner asked for a motion.

Mr. Vang made motion to approve the case, with staff comments. Motion seconded by Mr. Duvall.
Motion passed (6-1) with Mr. Thomas voting nay.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

NONE

VII. ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn the meeting made by Mr. Vang
Motion seconded by Mr. Driver. All aye. Motion passed (7-0).
Meeting adjourned at 5:22 P.M.