

Von Hollen Investment Llc
PLAINTIFF(S)

Anderson County Planning Commission
DEFENDANT(S)

DISPOSITION TYPE (CHECK ONE)

- JURY VERDICT.** This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.
- DECISION BY THE COURT.** This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.
- ACTION DISMISSED (CHECK REASON):** Rule 12(b), SCRPC; Rule 41(a), SCRPC (Vol. Nonsuit); Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled);
 Other
- ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON):** Rule 40(j), SCRPC; Bankruptcy;
 Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award;
 Other
- STAYED DUE TO BANKRUPTCY**
- DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (CHECK APPLICABLE BOX):**
 Affirmed; Reversed; Remanded;
 Other

NOTE: ATTORNEYS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING LOWER COURT, TRIBUNAL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT RULING IN THIS APPEAL.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED: See attached order (formal order to follow) Statement of Judgment by the Court:


This matter was before the Court pursuant to an appeal from a decision by the Anderson County Planning Commission. The Court considered the filings, arguments of counsel, and the applicable law. The appellant sought to gain approval for the development of an 82.79 acre tract into a subdivision containing single family homes. The Anderson County Planning Commission denied the application. The Appellant alleges that there was no evidence to support the Respondent's decision, making it arbitrary and an abuse of discretion. The Appellant points to references to traffic patterns and an alleged letter from the fire chief that was not made a part of the record but was referenced during the public hearing. Under South Carolina law, a decision of a zoning board will not be upheld where it is based on errors of law, where there is no legal evidence to support denial of the permit, where the board acts arbitrarily or unreasonably, or where, in general, the board has abused its discretion.

ORDER INFORMATION

This order ends does not end the case. See Page 2 for additional information.

For Clerk of Court Office Use Only

This judgment was electronically entered by the Clerk of Court as reflected on the Electronic Time Stamp, and a copy mailed first class to any party not proceeding in the Electronic Filing System on 11/25/2025 .



Jan 05 2026

SC Court of Appeals

NAMES OF TRADITIONAL FILERS SERVED BY MAIL

Court Reporter:

E-Filing Note: The date of Entry of Judgment is the same date as reflected on the Electronic File Stamp and the clerk's entering of the date of judgment above is not required in those counties. The clerk will mail a copy of the judgment to parties who are not E-Filers or who are appearing pro se. See Rule 77(d), SCRCP.

The Court must determine the presence of evidence in support of the decision, not become a new trier of fact and weigh the evidence.

The parties submitted transcripts of the public hearings and other application documentation for review. After review of the materials submitted, the Court finds that the Anderson County Planning Commission had some evidence to support their decision to deny the Appellant's application and did not abuse its discretion. Accordingly, the appeal is DENIED.



Anderson Common Pleas

Case Caption: Von Hollen Investment Llc VS Anderson County Planning Commission

Case Number: 2025CP0400784

Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

s/R. Scott Sprouse, Judge #2752

Tenth Judicial Circuit