

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF FLORENCE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
MAY 28, 2026**

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Larry Chewning, William Edwards, Miriam James-Singley, Deborah Moses, Jermaine Nowline, and Nathaniel Poston
- MEMBER ABSENT:** Oforiwa Gregg
- STAFF PRESENT:** Jerry Dudley, Patty Falcone, Derek Johnston, and Alane Zlotnicki
- CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Chewning called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Chairman Chewning introduced the April 23, 2026 minutes and asked if there were any changes that needed to be made. There being none, he called for a motion. Ms. James-Singley moved that the minutes be approved as submitted, Mrs. Moses seconded, and the motion passed unanimously (6-0).

PUBLIC HEARING AND MATTER IN POSITION FOR ACTION:

BZA-2026-09 Request for a variance from the size requirement for accessory structures at 1505 Madison Avenue in the NC-15 zoning district; identified as Florence County Tax Map Number 90035-12-006.

Chairman Chewning introduced the request and asked staff for their report. Mrs. Zlotnicki gave the staff report as submitted to the Board of Zoning Appeals. She reported that she had received a number of letters and emails in support of the proposal from the neighboring property owners.

There being no other questions for staff, Chairman Chewning opened the public hearing.

Mr. Raymond Kennedy, the applicant, spoke on behalf of his request, explaining his reasoning for wanting such a large building. He explained further that he intends to replace the existing carport with one that is a few feet taller, further obscuring the view of the accessory building from the street.

There being no more questions and no one else to speak for or against the request, Chairman Chewning closed the public hearing and asked for a motion. Mrs. Moses moved that the request be approved as submitted, subject to the following findings of fact:

1. That a variance from the terms of the *Unified Development Ordinance* will not be contrary to the public interest where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions will not, in an individual case, result in an unnecessary hardship.
Without the variance, the applicant can construct an accessory building one third of the size that he has proposed.
2. That the spirit of the *Unified Development Ordinance* will be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done.

The purpose of the size limit for accessory buildings is to prevent the construction of structures that would dominate a lot or disrupt the character of a neighborhood, especially in the case of smaller lots. This lot is 20,500 square feet, which is 27% larger than the required square footage of the zoning district. Because of the size of the lot, they can be allowed to put up a building of this size.

3. That there are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property.
The lot is slightly wider than other parcels on this block, and the locations of the carport and house prevent the backyard from being visible from the street.
4. That these conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity.
This lot is about a third larger than the majority of parcels in the immediate vicinity. It's not a corner lot and it is larger than a lot of the properties in the neighborhood.
5. That because of these conditions, the application of the *Unified Development Ordinance* to this particular property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property as follows.
The applicant is still permitted to have an accessory building in his back yard. However, he is limited in the size he may have.
6. That the authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.
Granting the variance results in a larger than normal accessory structure behind the house, which would be minimally visible from the street. It will be visible from the rear yards of the immediately adjacent properties. But since the neighbors do not have a problem with it and there's a business property behind it, there is no objection to this building.

Mr. Nowline seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously (6-0).

ADJOURNMENT: There being no other business, Ms. James-Singley moved to adjourn the meeting, Mrs. Moses seconded, and the motion to adjourn passed unanimously (6-0). Chairman Chewning adjourned the meeting at 6:22 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for June 25, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,
Alane Zlotnicki, AICP
Senior Planner