

**RECEIVED**

**Sep 14 2026**

**SC Court of Appeals**

# **EXHIBIT B**

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF RICHLAND

South Saluda Property, LLC,

Appellant,

v.

City of Columbia Board of Zoning Appeals,

Respondent.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

C/A No.: 2025-CP-40-07937

**ORDER DENYING APPELLANT'S  
MOTION TO RECONSIDER**

This matter originally came before the Court on May 22, 2026, for a hearing on South Saluda Property, LLC's ("Appellant") appeal of a decision of the City of Columbia Board of Zoning Appeals (the "Board"). On June 16, 2026, this Court entered an Order affirming the Board's decision.

This matter is now before the Court on Appellant's Motion to Reconsider pursuant to Rule 59(e), SCRCF, that was timely filed on June 29, 2026. The motion asks this Court to reconsider and alter or amend its June 16, 2026, decision affirming the Board's decision.

A party may file a motion for reconsideration when it "believes the court has misunderstood, failed to fully consider, or perhaps failed to rule on an argument or issue, and the party wishes for the court to reconsider or rule on it." *Elam v. S.C. Dep't of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 24, 602 S.E.2d 772, 780 (2004). After reviewing the applicable law and ordinances, considering the scope and standard of review, and considering the arguments raised in Appellant's motion, this Court is unable to discover any argument or issue that has been misunderstood, overlooked, or disregarded. Therefore, Appellant's motion to reconsider is DENIED. Pursuant to the discretion afforded by Rule 59 and *Pollard v. County of Florence*, the Court concludes that a hearing is not

necessary to rule on the motion. *See* Rule 59(f), SCRCP (stating a Rule 59(e) motion “may in the discretion of the court be determined on the briefs filed by the parties without oral argument”); *Pollard*, 314 S.C. 397, 401-02, 444 S.E.2d 534, 536 (Ct. App. 1994) (holding there was “no merit in Pollard’s assertion that the circuit court committed reversible error in denying her motion to alter or amend the judgment under Rule 59(e), SCRCP, without first conducting a hearing or allowing [the parties] ‘to fully brief’ the issues raised in [the] motion”).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**The Honorable Thomas W. McGee, III**

*Electronic signature page to follow.*



Richland Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** South Saluda Property Llc VS City Of Columbia Board Of Zoning Appeals  
**Case Number:** 2025CP4007937  
**Type:** Order/Other

So Ordered

s/ Thomas W. McGee III, Judge Code 2786