

PENNINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
Meeting of July 6, 2021

Lot 3 of Lot D, Murray Subdivision, Section 21, T1S, R5E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

MOVED by LaCroix and seconded by Rossknecht to approve VA 21-14 with three (3) conditions because (1) granting the variance doesn't run counter to the public interest; and (2) special conditions exist, to wit: it conforms to the topography, that excuse literal enforcement of the ordinance in that (a) enforcement causes "unnecessary hardship," to wit: the use of the property, and (b) granting the variance not only observes the ordinance's spirit but also ensures substantial justice is done. Vote: Unanimous.

1. That Variance / VA 21-14 only applies to the 24' x 28' proposed sign identified in the site plan, included as part of this Staff Report;
2. That the applicant obtains an approved Conditional Use Permit for the proposed off-premise sign prior to application of a Sign Permit; and,
3. That the applicant obtains an approved Sign Permit prior to construction or placement of the sign on the subject property.

C. VARIANCE / VA 21-15: Michael and Angela Holmberg; Renner Associates - Agent. To allow for an additional dwelling unit(s) in excess of 40 units on a Dead End Road system in an Agriculture District in accordance with Sections 205, 204-F and 509 of the Pennington County Zoning Ordinance.

Lot 1 Less Dedicated Right-of-Way, Lovell Subdivision, Section 29, T1N, R9E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

MOVED by Rossknecht and seconded by LaCroix to approve VA 21-15. Vote: Unanimous.

D. SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS VARIANCE / SV 21-13: Kathryn Policky. To waive the requirement to submit percolation tests and soil profile hole information for the subject property in a Rural Residential District in accordance with Sections 207, 400.3.1.p, and 700 of the Pennington County Subdivision Regulations.

Tract B of E1/2SE1/4 Less Tract B-1, Section 9, T1N, R6E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

MOVED by LaCroix and seconded by Hadcock to approve VA 21-13 with one (1) conditions because (1) granting the variance doesn't run counter to the public interest; and (2) special conditions exist, to wit: not sure where the home will be located, that excuse literal enforcement of the ordinance in that (a) enforcement causes "unnecessary hardship," to wit: would have to get percolation test twice, and (b) granting the variance not only observes the ordinance's spirit but also ensures substantial justice is done. Vote: Unanimous.