

**Minutes**  
**Regular Meeting of the Florence County Planning Commission**  
**Tuesday, February 27, 2018 at 6:00 p.m.**  
**County Complex, Room 803**  
**180 N. Irby St., Florence, South Carolina 29501**

The Florence County Planning Department staff posted the agenda for the meeting on the information boards at the main entrance and the back entrance of the County Complex and on the information board in the lobby of the Planning and Building Inspection Departments office.

The agenda was also mailed to the media.

**I. Call to Order:**

Chairman Lane called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

**II. Attendance:**

**Commissioners Present:** Jody Lane, Chairman  
Cheryl Floyd, Vice-Chairman  
Allie Brooks  
Doris Lockhart  
Karon Epps  
Mark Fountain  
Ted Greene

**Commissioners Absent:** Dwight Johnson  
Linda Borgman  
Jeffrey Tanner

**Staff Present:** J. Shawn Brashear, Planning Director  
Derrick Singletary, Senior Planner  
Lisa Becoat, Secretary

**Public Attendance:** See sign-in sheet on file with the Florence County Planning Department.

**Review and Motion of Minutes**

- **Meeting of January 23, 2018**

Motion to approve minutes as presented – Commissioner Allie Brooks / Second – Commissioner Ted Greene / Unanimously approved 7 to 0.

**III. Public Hearing**

**Zoning Map Amendment:**

**PC#2018-02 Map Amendment requested by Raynette McFadden to change the zoning district designation for property located on 321 E. Main Street in Scranton,**

**SC, as shown on Florence County Tax Map No. 00194, Block 03, Parcel 031 from Single Family Residential District (R-1) to Rural Community District (RU-1).**

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear presented the staff report to the Commission. He also indicated that there had been one telephone inquiry regarding the zoning map amendment. Staff recommends disapproval of the zoning map amendment as submitted.

(Copy of staff report available at the Florence County Planning Department)

Chairman Lane opened the floor up for questions/discussions. There were considerable questions by the Commission. There is a singlewide to the left of the property and to the front of the property there is another singlewide with an addition added onto the length of the front of the mobile home. The original request was to replace one of the homes, the home on the left to a doublewide. But the actual request before the Commission is to change the zoning from an R-1 to an RU-1, which is not contiguous with another RU-1 district, which would be potentially spot zoning if deemed by a court and that would be illegal.

Chairman Lane inquired if there was any public who desired to speak opposed to the requested zoning map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak opposed to the requested zoning map amendment.

Chairman Lane inquired if there was any public who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

Mrs. Raynette McFadden, 321 E. Main Street, Scranton, SC 29590, was present and spoke in favor of the requested zoning map amendment. My husband and I live in the singlewide to the left of the property and want to replace that home with a doublewide, because of the need for additional space. We were informed that the parcel would have to be rezoned because we were not allowed to replace the singlewide with a doublewide, and thus submitted the application to have the parcel rezoned. If we are allowed to have our new home the doublewide, it is our intention to put the singlewide that is on the left in place of the singlewide that is facing the road. So it will still only be two homes on the property, the singlewide and a doublewide. So we just need the rezoning so that we can get a bigger home, we just need more space. If we don't need to have the property rezoned, then we would still just like to replace one of the mobile homes with a doublewide mobile home. We are trying to get a brand new manufactured home, have it bricked in on the bottom so that it will not be offensive to any of our neighbors. We have already spoken with our neighbors and they are all okay with us having a newer home on the parcel.

Chairman Lane reviewed and went back to the aerials of the houses and Mrs. McFadden showed him how they intended to move the houses around and where they intended to place the manufactured home when purchased. The new doublewide house would go where the grey home is now, moving the grey singlewide where the yellow singlewide is and getting rid of the yellow singlewide all together, as it is no longer needed.

Mr. Jeffrey McFadden, 321 E. Main Street, Scranton, SC 29590, was present and spoke in favor of the requested zoning map amendment. The grey home is where my wife and I are staying now. We intend to move that home to the spot where the yellow home is and get rid of that home all together. We need a bigger home and like my spouse indicated we were told that the parcel had to be rezoned in order to do it

and that we would have to go through this process. At first I was told to add on to our existing home, but that is not my desire. I prefer to place a new home on the parcel and get rid of the home that is not being used.

Mrs. McFadden indicated that she did not understand the difference that if they could add onto the home which would make it larger, then why couldn't they just replace the home. They had no desire to add onto an older home when they could replace the older home with a brand new home, which would be more expensive and could only help the property value on the parcel and around it. The property is owned by Mrs. Millie Jones, my mother, but she does not live on the property. No one resides in the yellow home, it is empty. It is owned by family members. My aunt used to live in the home, but she has since moved to Florence, SC. My mother and uncles purchased the home from my aunt so that it could stay in the family and be used as a vacation home for family members who visited from out of the area. But because the home needs work and no one stays there, it is better that it is torn down and the other one moved over to its spot which would allow us to purchase our new home, if that is acceptable to the County.

Mr. Brashear indicated the request is not about the number of homes or the placement of homes, the request is to change the zoning to an incompatible zoning district which is not contiguous with any adjacent zone. The question related to which home they intended to replace would amount to a more than ten percent improvement, because we were told that the singlewide that was on the left was the home that was going to be removed and then replaced; and that is not what is being presented today. With the information presented today it opens up additional questions regarding moving the mobile home with modifications. The owners cannot just take the home away, there is a process the owners would have to go through to have the property listed as derelict and removed from the property. It is a fairly simple process that can be completed through the magistrate's office. But we are not aware if the present applicant's listed as agents, on the application, have the permission from the homeowners to remove the home.

Mr. and Mrs. McFadden indicated that the singlewide on the left of the property is a 1995 model. They could place the new doublewide in the same spot where they intended to move the singlewide with modifications but in their discussions with family they offered to place their singlewide where the other home is so that no one would have to spend any money on repairs on the singlewide with modifications. If the county allows them to replace the mobile homes, it would not be a problem putting the new doublewide in the same spot where we intend to move the singlewide with modifications. The problem is we were told that we could not replace anything on the property because it was grandfathered in as two singlewides on the property; and we could not replace it with a doublewide. That is the reason we filed the application for rezoning. Had we been told to tear down this home or that home and replace them, then it would not have been a problem. We would have gone ahead with our purchase to have our home placed on the lot. But we were told that we could not replace either one of the mobile homes without having to go through planning and zoning. There are two singlewides on the property. A 1977 Champion that was modified with an addition by my uncle Mr. Leroy Jones a general contractor and that home would have to be torn down because there are no axles or anything up under it. My mom and uncles together own the home and my mom owns the entire parcel. The family would be acceptable of us placing the new doublewide in the same spot that the singlewide with modifications is now, that would not be an issue with them. They have offered to assist us with anything we may need. When we found out about the zoning issue, we got all of the family members together and discussed the issues with the home and the land with them. We have already agreed that once the homes were switched, we would transfer ownership of the singlewide to my mom and uncles just like the singlewide with modifications is presently in their names.

Mr. Brashear indicated that giving the information that was presented tonight if staff had to make a recommendation, he would recommend that the applicant's appeal to the Board of Zoning Appeals regarding the staff's interpretation of the ten percent improvement, rather than attempting to rezone the property. It didn't appear that the applicants were increasing the foot print of the parcel but, that would also depend on the size of the house the McFadden's decide to put on the property. Due to the complexity of the various items the office deals with on a daily basis, it is staff's recommendation with the applicant's blessing that this request be cancelled and appear before the Board of Zoning Appeals to challenge staff's interpretation of the ten percent increase which would allow the applicant to place a doublewide in the place of that unit. This would give the community better curb appeal, because now I have a new doublewide facing the road. Mr. Brashear further explained that if the item passes tonight and goes to County Council and possible the zoning does not pass then the applicant's would have to wait twelve months before their case could be heard again at the planning commission. He feels the applicants would have a better chance if their request went before the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Chairman Lane indicated that he thought it would be best if the Commission deferred the request until next month to allow staff and the applicant time to review their options of what they desired to do.

Mr. Brashear indicated that he thought that was the best course of action to take as it would allow the applicant and staff time to get together to see the most appropriate course of action to obtain the results Mr. & Mrs. McFadden desire. If there was an act of nature that destroyed one of the singlewide mobile homes, with the zoning that is there now they still could only replace the destroyed home with a singlewide mobile home, because of the ten percent increase in a nonconforming use. Deferring the request would also allow time for the applicants to retrieve any documents necessary from family members that would need to be presented to the Board of Zoning Appeals to move the request forward.

Vice-Chairman Cheryl Floyd made a motion that **PC# 2018-02** be deferred to allow staff the time to personally meet with the McFadden's to discuss their options with them concerning other alternative boards or for them going forward with their request. / Second – Commissioner Allie Brooks and Commissioner Doris Lockhart / Unanimously approved 7 to 0.

Chairman Lane explained to the applicant's that they are an advisory board and that their request was being deferred to allow them time to personally get with staff to see what is the best course of action regarding their request and the moves they are deciding to make. He further explained that their best interest is for the county and the public and that they thought this would be the best option and would benefit them to hopefully obtain a better resolution and not delay them in moving ahead with their desired plans.

The Public Hearing was closed.

#### **IV. Director's Report:**

Mr. Brashear's comments were as follows:

- **Summary Plat Reports for (January 2018)**
- **Building Reports for (January 2018)**

The summary plats and building reports were attached and presented; and, staff was available to answer any questions.

There were no further discussions and Chairman Lane called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**V. Adjournment:**

Motion to adjourn – Commissioner Allie Brooks / Second Commissioner Ted Greene / Unanimously approved 7 to 0.

The Meeting adjourned at 6:29 p.m.

---

Lisa M. Becoat  
Secretary

Approved by:

---

J. Shawn Brashear  
Planning Director

\*These minutes reflect only actions taken and do not represent a true verbatim transcript of the meeting.