

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

January 8, 2007

1
2
3
4
5 *[Members Present: Julius Murray, Chris Anderson, Marcia Lucius, Wes Furgess, Pat*
6 *Palmer, Howard Van Dine, Gene Green, and Deas Manning; Absent: McBride]*

7
8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I'd like to call the January meeting of the Planning
9 Commission to order. I recognize that we do have a quorum. I'd like to read this into
10 the minutes. "In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the agenda
11 was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification and
12 posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building."
13 Has everyone had a chance to read the December 7th minutes?

14 MR. FURGESS: I move that we accept the December 7th minutes.

15 MR ANDERSON: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor of
17 approving the December 7th minutes please signify by raising your hand.

18 *[Approved: Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Murray, and Manning.*
19 *Abstained: Van Dine]*

20 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, for the record I was not present in December so
21 therefore I will abstain from voting on the minutes.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any agenda amendments?

23 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We would like to move item 10-A, Election
24 of Officers to the beginning of the agenda. I would also like to note that Case 07-04
25 MA, the applicant has requested deferral and Staff has accepted that deferral. And the
26 other note, the zoning public hearing for these applications is February 27, 2007.

27 MR. VAN DINE: February 27th?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

2 MR. VAN DINE: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we have a motion to approve the agenda
4 amendments?

5 MR. VAN DINE: So moved.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Second?

7 MR. GREEN: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor please signify by raising your hands.

9 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Van Dine, Manning]*

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Can we handle all of them at once or we have to do them
11 separately?

12 MS. ALMEIDA: The elections?

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Um-hum (affirmative).

14 MS. LINDER: I would recommend doing them one at a time.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: For secretary we have Christopher Anderson nominated.
16 Any other nominations? The nominations are closed. All those in favor for Christopher
17 Anderson for secretary please signify by raising your hands.

18 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Van Dine, Manning]*

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: For vice chair Deas Manning has been nominated. Any
20 other nominations? Nominations closed. All those in favor of Mr. Manning as vice
21 chair?

22 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Van Dine, Manning]*

23

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And for Chair Mr. Wes Furgess. Any other nominations?
2 The nominations are closed. All those in favor of Mr. Wes Furgess for Chair please
3 signify by raising your hand.

4 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Van Dine, Manning]*

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: There we go. It's your gavel young man.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: For those of us who have been elected to this post for
7 this year for 2007 we wish to thank you and from my colleagues for supporting us.
8 Thank you all so that we do a good job and one of the person that kept me straight on
9 here will be leaving but thank God that she taught me well how to handle myself up here
10 on this podium.

11 MR. VAN DINE: She can always make return appearances to keep you in line.

12 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Please don't say that. [Laughter]

13 MS. LUCIUS: I will.

14 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We'll go down now to new business, zoning map
15 amendments.

16 **CASE NO. 07-01 MA:**

17 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, 07-01 MA, currently it's a two-acre parcel.
18 Current zoning is RU. The applicant has requested to rezone the property to OI. This
19 property is currently located on Two Notch Road with approximately 429 linear feet of
20 frontage. The property is currently an existing farm, which is a predominant use
21 throughout the surrounding area. The applicant was before you, as you can see from
22 the Staff Report, back in October of 2006 with a GC request, which is more intensive,
23 and a larger piece of property, an eight-acre parcel. So she has subdivided and has

1 requested a less intensive use. The road is classified a two lane, undivided minor
2 arterial currently maintained by DOT. And the Staff recommendation is for denial.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions for Staff? Any questions? I have a
4 question. When this came before in October we didn't know – they wanted to put an
5 insurance company there?

6 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

7 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: And so they sectioned or rezoned the whole area. This
8 time they're asking for this part of it right; two acres?

9 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

10 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Let me call some of the person up at this time, the
11 person here about this property. Cynthia Stewart?

12 **TESTIMONY OF CYNTHIA STEWART:**

13 MS. STEWART: Yes. At 10647 Two Notch Road, Elgin, even though we reside
14 in Pontiac. Yeah my Dad and I were back – were here in August and at the time he was
15 looking at just rezoning it as GC, the whole eight acres. But then because of all the
16 conversation about the curb cuts and the zoning we just withdrew and said well -
17 because we were just trying to put a little small family health insurance agency on the
18 two acres there. So we're here today to try to get that rezoned so we can put a family
19 business there. And it's not a State Farm or Nationwide. It's just a small health
20 insurance office. Three of us, myself, my husband and my daughter. Our hours are
21 9:00 to 5:00 so the traffic going into town is pretty much gone before we even open and
22 then the traffic coming out of town towards Elgin will be going back the other way. So
23 the traffic should not be an issue. And I have a picture – I brought a couple pictures

1 because even though it's, she's saying farmland it's just a small strip of land. It's not
2 like a farm if any of you would like to see it. And at the other corner which is about two-
3 tenths of a mile from where we're looking at building there's a little auto/used car sale
4 place. So, you know, which is already right there on Two Notch. And as you go into
5 Pontiac on the railroad track side which is the side that we're talking about because
6 behind this piece of land is the railroad. So there's really nothing else. I mean the cars
7 are right here and the little strip of land and behind the trees is the railroad track. And
8 all the way into Pontiac there's businesses all on that side of the road and then as you
9 come on out of Pontiac then there's Gladden's and then there's just one little strip of
10 land that we were trying to get rezoned but if we can just get the two acres rezoned that
11 would be great. I mean nobody hates seeing the traffic and the growth more than I do
12 because I grew up in Pontiac and I own a farm there. But it's already there. I mean the
13 growth and the traffic is already there anyway. So we would appreciate your
14 consideration in approving this for us.

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions from up here to Ms. Stewart? Thank
16 you. Next person is Donald Stewart.

17 **TESTIMONY OF DONALD STEWART:**

18 MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I would like to request
19 respectfully that you rezone this property for us to put our agency there. It makes it
20 more convenient for us as far as traffic coming and going. Already there are
21 approximately 300 apartments being built across the road from where we want to place
22 our insurance agency. At an average of two cars per apartment you already have a

1 problem with 600 cars moving into Two Notch Road or Old National Highway. Any
2 consideration you could give us would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Ms. Carol Wilson?

4 **TESTIMONY OF CAROL WILSON:**

5 MS. WILSON: Hi. I'm a resident at Old Field which is right across the street.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I'd like you to give your name and address.

7 MS. WILSON: Oh, I'm sorry. Carol Wilson, 535 Hay Hill Court, Elgin. We have
8 an entrance to our subdivision that's Old National Highway that looks directly onto that
9 property and I'm requesting that you deny the request because of the 300 plus
10 apartments coming up. I've noticed here in the notes that are printed off the website
11 that you haven't done a traffic survey since May 2005. I'm requesting before you
12 change this wait until the apartments are occupied; do another traffic survey because
13 traffic has really increased. You cannot get out there in the morning and getting out on
14 the other side. We have to typically go up Greenhill Parrish Parkway, turn out on
15 Spears Creek Church Road and get to the traffic light. Also the reason we moved out
16 there was because it's a country setting. There are plenty of other strip malls that have
17 been left vacant where businesses can move into. We don't want this part of Two
18 Notch Road to become like the other part of Two Notch Road by Target, Wal-Mart, and
19 all that. It's crowded and we don't want Two Notch Road to become Harbison. So
20 that's my feeling. So I ask that you deny it. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: All right. Jenn Scott? Will you please give your name
22 and your address?

23 **TESTIMONY OF JENN SCOTT:**

1 MS. SCOTT: Yes. Thank you. My name is Jenn Scott. I live at 313 Hay Hill
2 Court in Greenhill Parrish, Old Field and I'm here to respectfully ask that you reinforce
3 your Staff's recommendation that this zoning be denied. I specifically built my home; I
4 came here as a widow and I wanted a very pastoral setting and that's why I built in Old
5 Field. And to change this zoning, while there may only be one insurance agency now
6 being built, what is to say that other businesses will not go there and we do not want
7 additional traffic. We're already upset that there's 300, approximately 300 apartments
8 going out there and we're going to get all that noise and all of that traffic. So we don't
9 want to see anything to compound out situation. So again I would ask that you deny
10 this zoning request. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions for Staff? Since there are no question
12 are we going to take a vote on this? Make a motion?

13 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair, I live out in this area. You know, the thing I struggle
14 with – I know, you know, our philosophy about commercial development and expanding
15 down corridors which I think is a consideration here. I guess I'm torn because if you
16 look at this kind of island of land between Two Notch Road which is a national highway
17 and the railroad track other than making a decision to permanently preserve it with an
18 RU zoning in an area that's growing fairly quickly, you wonder what other appropriate
19 less traffic generating uses could be put there. And about the least intensive uses is
20 office. I fully recognize the traffic that occurs early in the morning going to work and
21 going to school but in this particular case that traffic is pretty much gone by the time the
22 business is opened in the morning. So while I would have been opposed to the
23 extension of general commercial down this way I find the office institutional use a nice

1 step down from what's going on at Spears Creek Church Road and Two Notch Road.
2 And again because this is kind of an island where I would expect that alternative uses
3 for this property between the railroad track and a major route, I would make a motion
4 that we send this to Council with a recommendation for approval.

5 MR. PALMER: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other discussion?

7 MR. MANNING: You know, initially Mr. Chairman I was opposed to the C-3
8 zoning classification. Far too many uses would have been allowed in that and it was a
9 larger parcel with multiple potential curb cuts and I would have to agree with Mr. Green
10 that one use with a limited traffic amount for a piece of property that potentially doesn't
11 have any other use. You'll never see residential between the railroad tracks. I think
12 that is a more appropriate zoning classification than C-3, GC.

13 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, if I could? I don't disagree with a number of
14 things that have been said in support of the motion. My concern is we are – if this were
15 to pass we are opening this area to the domino effect that is going to take place on each
16 and other parcel that's down there. I recognize that this has been divided into a smaller
17 piece but the next time somebody comes in, I can guarantee you what they're going to
18 hear is, 'well there's already an OI in that spot so therefore this isn't like out of character
19 with everything else'. So I think we have to be seriously concerned about the extension
20 of what we are going to be doing in an area like this which is residential in – I mean,
21 excuse me, rural in nature up Two Notch Road. Having said that I don't disagree with
22 the railroad backing up to it like it is that they're not going to get residential in there and
23 you're not going to get some of the other less intrusive things. So I am torn between

1 this [inaudible] I can foresee that this area is now going to be under pressure to
2 continue that commercial development down that road. That is the concern that I have
3 for approving this particular request. I don't have a resolution to the problem. That is
4 something I'm struggling with on this request.

5 MR. PALMER: Mr. Chair, I'd have to agree with Mr. Green that - from what I
6 know of real estate office, especially a single-tenant use building which is not an office
7 complex like is proposed for this site would be least amount of traffic generated. This
8 site in my opinion could possibly make for a great multi-family site, which is something I
9 don't think that any of us would want to see an additional 1,000 units or so go up on this
10 site which will increase the traffic amounts astronomically. But with traffic being a
11 concern out there and different things I think that the OI district - as we all recognize this
12 is no longer a farming piece of property - that the OI would be the least intrusive zoning
13 classification that we currently have to make available to the landowner which is the
14 reason for my second.

15 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, if I could make one last comment there. I think
16 that one of the things we have to recognize as well, the proposed use that has been
17 expressed is for the insurance office. When it goes to a district it picks up every use
18 that shows up in that district, not just the proposed use. So when we are making the
19 vote on this particular - we are also voting for all of the other uses that are in our table of
20 uses on an OI district. And so I may not have a problem if it were simply limited to the
21 insurance. I'm looking beyond that to what happens if in fact they decide they don't
22 want to use that for an insurance office any more, what other type uses can be placed
23 on that property. That's a concern when we go with these straight rezonings especially

1 in areas where I think we're expanding something that has not previously been
2 [inaudible].

3 MR. PALMER: Sure. Which is why we have in the past year slimmed down our
4 booklets to not include the purposes for rezonings.

5 MR. GREEN: You know, we are, Mr. Chair, there are other uses permitted in OI
6 in an office institutional district but I just glanced real quickly at rural commercial and if
7 they were to come in under rural commercial it would have opened it up to three times
8 the number of uses. So I think all things considered, you know, either this area stays
9 permanently RU and it's right down the road from what is rapidly becoming a major
10 commercial node in the northeast, I think the OI district is the least intrusive that is going
11 to be there other than the RU zoning. And I think everybody can see this isn't going to
12 be a residentially developed piece so – just wanted to add that to the conversation.

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Anybody else?

14 MS. STEWART: Could I just say one more thing? Keep in mind we live right
15 behind the railroad track so we don't want just anything up there, okay? We're going to
16 be real particular about what is going to go there. We live right on the other side of the
17 railroad track if you'll please keep that in mind. And it used to be all rural, you know.
18 There were no homes or anything out there so.

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Ma'am, at this time.

20 MS. SCOTT: Okay. Because if she gets to speak again I'd just like to have
21 another comment.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Well, she was involved with this, this is her project
23 that's why we let her speak. We don't like people to pop up in the audience. We try to

1 keep that to a minimum. Thank you. Ready for the vote, take the vote? All in favor of
2 01 MA raise your hand. Those are against?

3 *[Approved: Murray, Palmer, Furgess, Green, Manning; Opposed: Anderson, Lucius,*
4 *Van Dine]*

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. It was four to three.

6 MR. VAN DINE: Three to five.

7 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Five, three. Thank you.

8 MR. VAN DINE: And if again –

9 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Again if you –

10 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, if we could make sure that the vote itself is
11 provided to Council so they know the specific breakdown of the vote I'd appreciate it.

12 MS. ALMEIDA: That's how we've been doing it.

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Also this will go before County Council February the
14 27th at 7:00 o'clock. They have the final approval. We're just a recommending body to
15 County Council. Thank you. Next case is 05-MA.

16 **CASE NO. 07-05 MA:**

17 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, this application is located on Old Road. This is
18 off of Richard Franklin Road. It's approximately 3.93 acres. It's a parcel that has been
19 subdivided into four lots. The applicant is requesting to have it rezoned from RU to RS-
20 LD. Old Road has approximately in front of this lot 447 linear feet of frontage. Old
21 Road is a two-lane local road currently maintained by DOT. The level of service is A
22 and Staff's recommendation is for denial due to the fact that the applicant has a
23 hardship as far as setbacks, not necessarily a zoning issue.

1 MR. MANNING: I have a question. Anna, was this – it looks like a flag lot. This
2 parcel carved out of an adjoining parcel?

3 MS. ALMEIDA: It was one parcel carved into four.

4 MR. MANNING: Okay.

5 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

6 MR. GREEN: Is Staff recommendation – repeat again. Staff is recommending
7 denial because they really are faced with a setback issue.

8 MS. ALMEIDA: A setback problem. Yes.

9 MR. GREEN: If the setback issue was not an issue and this were a straight
10 rezoning and that issue wouldn't come up, would Staff still be recommending for denial -

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes. Because –

12 MR. GREEN: - for RS-LD in this location?

13 MS. ALMEIDA: - the area. Yeah. The area's predominantly RU.

14 MR. PALMER: I have a question. The PDD area to the north.

15 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

16 MR. PALMER: Do you see it? Do you see it?

17 MS. ALMEIDA: The PDD area to the north? Um-hum (affirmative).

18 MR. PALMER: Right. Do you know what size those lots were? What they would
19 be equivalent too?

20 MS. ALMEIDA: No, I don't. Not off – not without looking in our files.

21 MR. GREEN: We have four separately platted lots?

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

23 MR. GREEN: That could be developed under RU?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

2 MR. GREEN: And they're looking to just keep the same four lots but rezone
3 them RS-LD?

4 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

5 MR. GREEN: There's been no subdivision requests or -

6 MS. ALMEIDA: Not as of – since their previous - they had subdivided back in
7 July of 2005.

8 MR. VAN DINE: But that doesn't stop them from coming in with a subdivision
9 request once it's been approved?

10 MS. ALMEIDA: No, sir. They can reconfigure that. Put a road and –

11 MR. VAN DINE: So in other words if we change it we're providing the potential
12 for smaller lots –

13 MS. ALMEIDA: 12,000 square foot lots. Yes.

14 MR. VAN DINE: It amounts - a three to one ratio?

15 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct. They're now requested – they're now required 33,000
16 square foot so it's three-quarter acre.

17 MR. GREEN: Can you enlighten us to the nature of the setback issue?

18 MS. ALMEIDA: From what I understand there are existing homes around the
19 lake and they're older homes for the most part and of course they're set quite close to
20 the waterline. And in fact due to, as you can see on the screen, you know, we've got
21 floodplain issues but obviously with the setbacks the front yard is actually – when you
22 have lots that back up onto the lake the front yard is actually the lake. So there is in

1 rural that 40' requirement setback in the front. Therefore, it does push the proposed
2 house footprint back into the lot so you don't have as much view.

3 MR. GREEN: And there's one house on these four lots at present?

4 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes. There is one existing.

5 MR. PALMER: So the front yard switches to the lake instead of the street?

6 MS. ALMEIDA: That's correct.

7 MR. PALMER: Is that because of the way the house may or may not be situated
8 or what's the ruling for that?

9 MS. ALMEIDA: That would be up to the Zoning Administrator but that's how we
10 interpret the setback on the lake.

11 MR. PALMER: Is that with any lake?

12 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

13 MR. PALMER: Pond?

14 MS. ALMEDIA: Not a pond, apparently a lake. I don't know what the difference
15 is between the pond and the lake.

16 MR. MANNING: What is the process to seek a variance?

17 MS. ALMEIDA: The applicant would need to go before the Board of Zoning
18 Appeals and obviously state their hardship.

19 MR. PALMER: Could they construct a home in the floodplain?

20 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes they could but they would need to get approval for that and
21 they'd have to meet all the criteria.

22 MR. PALMER: Could they fill to do it?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: I'm not at this point at liberty to really discuss that. That would
2 have to be the floodplain manager and the flood plain coordinator's determination.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: The applicant is here?

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, we are, sir.

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Come forward, please. Tom Kendall?

6 **TESTIMONY OF TOM KENDALL:**

7 MR. KENDALL: Good afternoon. My name's Tom Kendall and I live at 11
8 Heather Lane in Hilton Head, South Carolina. I did personally develop this property. In
9 2004 I purchased it. It was just slightly under four acres, had one large vacant house
10 that had been sitting there for a number of years. A rather large old home about 6,000
11 square feet single story but you wouldn't want to walk in there without a gun I don't
12 think. It was a pretty scary home. My plan involved taking down the house and initially I
13 was going to go for five lots and originally came back after thinking that through, went to
14 the Planning Commission and suggested that four lots probably made more sense. It
15 kept kind of in the spirit of the community surrounding it. So each lot there is at least
16 three-quarters of an acre. The lot on the upper portion, lot number one has been sold.
17 The next lot down, lot number two has been sold. Those are both three-quarter acre
18 lots. The third lot is still on the market. The fourth lot is about an acre and a half, that
19 larger lot but obviously has much less lake frontage than the other lots. My intent here
20 was to really basically put together kind of an upper class, larger home, low-density
21 project. When I came to the Planning Commission, I came here once back in '05,
22 presented the plan, the Planning Commission approved it. Said they were very pleased
23 that it was such a low-density project in the area. And then I went about the

1 development project of bringing in sewer and water, basically to that whole community.
2 They could now tap into that all up and down Old Road. The reason – it was stated
3 earlier – the reason is very specific that we’re requesting the zoning change and it is
4 strictly for the setback issue. I have no desire, no intent nor do the two homeowners
5 that have already bought and are ready to build actually in terms of increasing density.
6 That’s not the plan here. We realize we could let everyone of the homeowners go
7 through that process of going through variance but after talking with the two of the lot
8 owners we thought it was best just to come in and ask for one fell swoop to try and give
9 us the ability – it’s really flexibility what we’re looking for – the ability. Those are all pie
10 shaped lots. They’re kind of odd oriented lots so we’re trying to give the homeowners or
11 the home – people that will be building homes the flexibility to build a good sized home
12 and orient it properly without being too concerned about the setback issues. When it
13 was one house on four lots – I’m sorry, when it was one house on four acres rural
14 seemed to make sense. And now as we think through this that’s why we applied for the
15 low-density residential. I understand Staff’s recommendation to not approve it if there
16 was a feeling that our desire here was to increase density. The covenants are in place
17 that say that this is four lots, four lots only and four houses, four houses only. One lot
18 per house. That’s all that’s allowed based on the covenants. Again, buyers want to
19 build nice homes. They really want to, based on the prices they’re paying for these lots,
20 they really want to have an upper-class community. Oddly and I didn’t really realize this
21 until I received the package a couple of days ago about this meeting, if I’m reading this
22 correctly the 2020, Year 2020 Richland Comprehensive Plan – if I read this right
23 establishes this as exactly what we’re asking, residential low-density. So in essence I

1 guess it's a snapshot into the future in terms of what we're requesting. Again I have
2 absolutely nor do the two homeowners, because I have a proxy to represent the other
3 homeowner that couldn't make it here today, and you'll hear from the other homeowner
4 in a minute, I have no desire to increase density here, absolutely none whatsoever. If
5 that is an issue with you and I didn't think about anything other than looking at
6 reasonable setbacks. If that's an issue I would suggest that or ask that you consider
7 instead of residential low-density, consider residential estate. It's not as forgiving for
8 those that want to build but it's also not as restrictive as the rural setback issue. So
9 maybe that's a reasonable compromise if at all you struggle with moving forward with
10 that 2020 recommendation of low-density residential.

11 MR. PALMER: But you'd only be picking up five feet.

12 MR. KENDALL: No, no. That's not the case. In essence what you pick up is –
13 currently rural is 40' in front and 35 if we change the zoning. That's front.

14 MR. PALMER: To RSE?

15 MR. KENDALL: To RSE.

16 MR. PALMER: Right. So it's only five feet difference?

17 MR. KENDALL: On just the front. The back is 50%. It's 20 to ten.

18 MR. PALMER: So [inaudible] the rear than you are front even though -

19 MR. KENDALL: Well I don't mean to challenge anybody here but I don't think the
20 back becomes the front on the lake.

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Well according to the Zoning Administrator who interprets the
22 code that is how he is interpreting that.

1 MR. KENDALL: Well, again, you'll here from a gentleman in a moment that's
2 already gone through the part of the permitting process and I don't think that's been
3 reflected there so. But let me carry that out a little bit further. It also – whether you
4 figure it's the front or the back, the building capsule itself, those setbacks are going to
5 be impacted and well it says that the rear would go from 50 to 30' setback. So even if
6 that's the front and you flip it in the back it's obviously a 20' differential. The front,
7 whether that's the front or the other front, goes from 40 to 35 and the side setbacks go
8 from 20 to ten. Now that's not as forgiving obviously as the low-density residential but it
9 does offer them some ability to orient their buildings properly to get maximum lake view
10 and to put a decent sized home on their lots.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. When you come up to speak you're
12 allowed three minutes, okay? Two minutes [inaudible].

13 MR. VAN DINE: While he's coming up, I need to ask a question. Do we have in
14 our records approvals from the two homeowners who own the other two lots to allow -

15 MS. ALMEIDA: I have no idea. I'm having Mr. Price come up, the Zoning
16 Administrator.

17 MR. VAN DINE: All right. Because I want to make sure that we're not – we're
18 talking about all four and if these gentlemen don't have the authority for all four lots then
19 – and they're not reflected in our records then I'm not sure we can take up all of those
20 items –

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

22 MR. VAN DINE: - at this stage. And it's not just whether you hold them. It's
23 whether they're in our records available to -

1 MR. KENDALL: I have that for you and I'll give you a copy today?

2 MR. VAN DINE: Okay.

3 MR. KENDALL: So that's one lot, two lots, and I own the other two lots so that's
4 all four.

5 **TESTIMONY OF TONY BUCK:**

6 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, my name is Tony Buck and I – my residence is 121
7 Emerald Shores Circle, Chapin. I own the – purchased the property from Mr. Kendall
8 that the arrow is on which is lot number two. And Mr. Kendall basically summed
9 everything up and said everything that I think myself and the other homeowner would
10 like to say. But I am probably the gentleman who instigated the initial come to you. I
11 spoke to Mr. Price and he kind of guided me in the direction that maybe I wanted to go.
12 Our 100% - let me say first of all, not that this really matters to anyone here but I am –
13 I'm a business owner in the area. I came to Columbia three and a half years ago and
14 I'm moving from a 52-acre farm that I owned up in York County with a home on it. And
15 three years ago was offered a pretty substantial amount of money for that farm to
16 develop. It's in York County. And so I know where everyone is coming from when
17 you're saying we don't want apartment buildings going here. We don't want more
18 homes coming here than there currently are. But my entire reasoning for doing this is
19 that I architected a home that I basically need a little more setbacks on the side than I
20 have. My front and rear is not a problem. My side setbacks are my only problem. Let
21 me answer a couple questions that the young lady was not able to answer. You can
22 build a single-family residence on this property in the flood zone as long as it's a crawl
23 space residence. There can be no living space below. I'm assuming that the brown

1 area on your map is a 100-year floodplain? Yes. The brown area's actually the line,
2 correct?

3 MR. VAN DINE: Correct.

4 MR. BUCK: Right. So you can build a single-family residence here on this
5 property as long as it's a crawl space property. It cannot be a slab unless it's a slab on
6 crawl not used for living. The other question that was asked was whether it could be
7 built up. That property cannot be built up to come up to that 100-year floodplain. I've
8 had several conversations with Mr. Harry Reid and he has told me exactly what I need
9 to do and how I need to handle this. And I think the third question was what was the
10 difference between a pond and a lake. And obviously that is – the difference is is the
11 water on the lake is owned by SCE&G and the water on the pond is owned by an
12 individual so you can build out as you see fit. But our purpose of being here is not to –
13 we're not trying to build nine homes here. We're just – we want to build four homes on
14 four lots and decrease our setbacks.

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions?

16 MR. PALMER: I just have one question. So you were not allowed to fill – only
17 allowed to build on pillars, correct, to get two foot above the floodplain line?

18 MR. BUCK: Or a poured concrete wall. I mean you can build a basement home
19 here but there cannot be – there can be no living space. The basement has to be 100%
20 storage.

21 MR. PALMER: Did you have to have break away walls under the crawl space or
22 it could be brick?

23 MR. BUCK: It can be brick.

1 MR. PALMER: Thanks.

2 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Mr. Price?

3 MS. ALMEIDA: I need to make a correction. Apparently the front yard is not the
4 lake as previously stated.

5 MR. MANNING: I was confused about how you came to that interpretation. So
6 the problem here is not the sideline setbacks. It's the front and rear setbacks?

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct. But clearly it's a setback issue.

8 MR. PALMER: I think the previous gentleman said he has a problem with the
9 side yard setbacks not the –

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

11 MR. PALMER: - front and rear.

12 MS. ALMEIDA: All the issues surround setbacks.

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We have one more person signed up to speak. Russell
14 Jacobis?

15 **TESTIMONEY OF RUSSELL JACOBIS:**

16 MR. JACOBIS: My name's Russell Jacobis. I'm at 1127 Old Road. I'm the
17 property just south and adjoining the properties in question. If Mr. Kendall – I mean I
18 really appreciate him conforming to the lot sizes with the adjoining properties. I mean
19 this, I mean I think this plan is – I like the plan. The four houses I think conform to the
20 rest of the community around there. However my only concern is if you look to the
21 south of that look at all them little properties there at Murray Point, okay? I don't know
22 what they were – what the zoning was on those properties there but that's just
23 something I'm trying to avoid and I'm wondering if the rezoning could possibly turn into

1 something like that. I mean if we're just talking about the four properties and four
2 houses – no more than four houses there, I wouldn't have any objections to that. But if
3 we're talking about – if the rezoning might allow them to build more houses there then I
4 think the entire neighborhood would have a problem with that. That's about all I got to
5 say.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you.

7 MR. PALMER: I think this is clearly a case for the Board of Zoning Appeals. I've
8 never seen one more clear than this. This does not require, in my opinion, a rezoning.
9 This is what the Board of Zoning Appeals is here for. That's what their job is and that's
10 what our code sets forth as part of their duties. This is clearly, in my opinion, would be
11 an overkill for a setback issue and would possibly open up to whether or not these other
12 landowners some time down the future may want to get together and sell to one
13 developer and do another Murray Point. But to handle a setback issue through zoning
14 is, in my opinion, not what it's there for. So I would make a motion to send this forward
15 to Council with a recommendation of denial.

16 MR. VAN DINE: I'll second that motion.

17 MR. GREEN: I think Mr. Palmer said it about as clearly and succinctly that I
18 could imagine.

19 MR. VAN DINE: I would like the record to reflect that I'm agreeing with Mr.
20 Palmer. [Laughter]

21 MS. LUCIUS: I would like the record to reflect my complete shock.

22 MR. VAN DINE: I agree with Mr. Palmer that this is a Board of Zoning Appeals
23 issue. Setbacks should be handled through them not through rezoning which could

1 open it up to a whole lot of other things. And the gentleman in the back was absolutely
2 correct. I mean what you see at Murray Point could in the future, although I understand
3 that you don't – you gentlemen don't want to do it, somebody else owning it later may
4 decide that that's what they want to do with it. So I think the Board of Zoning Appeals is
5 the proper place to address this issue.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the motion, we'll have the vote. All
7 approved, it goes to Council.

8 MR. VAN DINE: For denial?

9 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: For denial.

10 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Van Dine, Manning]*

11 MR. VAN DINE: For denial.

12 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: For denial. Is there a certain date that they go before
13 zoning appeal?

14 MR. PALMER: You have to make a request to do so.

15 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. This can go to County Council February 27th but if the
16 applicant chooses to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals they can put in their application
17 and go to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, sir.

19 MR. PALMER: You may find that route's a little easier, too.

20 MR. VAN DINE: I would think that the Board of Zoning Appeals, if I were sitting it
21 would seem to be something that –

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Clearly there are hardships, yeah.

1 MR. VAN DINE: - would be easy to resolve and I understand your reasoning and
2 I don't – not sure why the [inaudible] was going this route but.

3 MR. KENDALL: So February 27th is the earliest.

4 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: It goes before County Council.

5 MR. VAN DINE: For County Council to hear it. If you want to have the Board of
6 Zoning Appeals you'll have to talk with Staff about getting that assigned onto their
7 calendar.

8 MR. PALMER: Your option now may be to withdraw your motion to go to
9 Council. You're more than welcome to go to Council if you want to to continue this
10 process but if you'd like to withdraw it and then try the Board of Zoning Appeals
11 measure first that might be an option as well.

12 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Next on the agenda's 06 MA.

13 **CASE NO. 07-06 MA:**

14 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, this application is two point five two acres. The
15 applicant is requesting to go from an RU zoning to a GC zoning. The site is currently
16 located on Hardscrabble Road. It has approximately 318 linear feet of frontage.
17 Hardscrabble Road is a two-lane minor arterial in this section maintained by DOT. The
18 level of service existing is a Level of Service F. The site actually is about 900 linear feet
19 from the major intersection of Clemson Road and Hardscrabble, which is currently a
20 hub for general commercial uses. The commercial uses are concentrated north and
21 south along Hardscrabble Road but they do remain close to that node. Staff is
22 recommending approval.

1 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, it doesn't appear to me anybody's signed up for
2 or against this request so I would make a motion we send this forward with a
3 recommendation of approval. I think if you look at the zoning map everything else in
4 that area is commercial including directly across the street. It seems that that is where
5 we like to keep commercial is at the node. I recommend that we approve the request.

6 MS. LUCIUS: Second.

7 MR. PALMER: I just have a question. The tract that is – would kind of U this
8 thing off from Clemson Road to Hardscrabble – you see right where the word "site" is
9 written at?

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

11 MR. PALMER: That appears to be a commercial business but it's in an RU
12 district if you look at the aerial.

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Adjacent?

14 MR. GREEN: That's a church.

15 MS. ALMEIDA: Yeah. There's a church.

16 MR. PALMER: Those churches go anywhere they want to go, don't they?

17 MS. LUCIUS: They do.

18 MR. GREEN: I'm virtually positive that's a church there.

19 MS. ALMEIDA: It is a church.

20 MR. VAN DINE: Where is Mr. Corboy's development in relation to –

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Further south.

22 MR. GREEN: West

23 MS. ALMEIDA: Or?

1 MR. VAN DINE: You keep going down the road further?

2 MR. GREEN: Right.

3 MR. VAN DINE: Okay.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: Which one; he has two?

5 MR. VAN DINE: Well there's one that I remember we did a couple of – maybe a
6 year and a half ago, two years ago where it sort of straddled between Hardscrabble and
7 Clemson. Is that further down or is that -

8 MS. ALMEIDA: It is.

9 MR. VAN DINE: I just didn't know whether this map had not reflected that
10 change on our zoning map.

11 MR. GREEN: I'm wondering if our zoning map on page 24 isn't totally up-to-date
12 on the extreme left portion of the map. It may well be.

13 MR. VAN DINE: That's what I was wondering whether or not - where that
14 boundary - I know we've done some other things in that area.

15 MS. ALMEIDA: His subdivision is much further down off this zoning map page.

16 MR. VAN DINE: Okay. Wasn't that green on the north side of Clemson, isn't
17 that where the church had attempted to come in just to the west of Halsberry(?) Lane?

18 MR. GREEN: I'm almost thinking it was that yellow area -

19 MS. LUCIUS: I think you're right.

20 MR. GREEN: - Howard.

21 MR. VAN DINE: The yellow area?

22 MR. GREEN: I thought their piece was bigger than what those three parcels are
23 and I thought it was the yellow area.

1 MS. LUCIUS: I think it is.

2 MR. VAN DINE: I'm not sure it matters for this one but can somebody just check
3 in that area and make sure our map is up-to-date in case something more comes in.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: We'll check but I believe our map is up-to-date.

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions? You heard the motion [inaudible]
6 that we send this with approval to County Council. [Inaudible]

7 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Van Dine, Manning]*

8 MR. GREEN: Just out of curiosity in this particular application, did the applicant
9 discuss the possibility of using OI, which permits funeral homes?

10 MS. ALMEIDA: No. He did not.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: I notice with this - I see ya'll gentlemen sitting back
12 there. Are ya'll supposed to talk on this? Say anything? Or are ya'll just here visiting?

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: If you'd like to have us address it we'll be happy to

14 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: But no one's signed up. So that's why we didn't call
15 any names.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We were leaving it to a very professional board to make
17 the right decision. [Laughter]

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you, sir.

19 MR. VAN DINE: That's a very scary proposition.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you, sir. Next on the agenda is Comprehensive
21 Plan review Status Report.

22 MS. TIA RUTHERFORD: Hello. You guys were mailed the Decker Boulevard
23 Master Plan some time last year, say November. And we wanted to go ahead and get a

1 vote from you to have it adopted into the Comprehensive Plan. I will accept any
2 questions that you have. Did everyone receive their copy of the Comprehensive Plan –
3 I mean of the Master Plan?

4 MR. PALMER: We did. We did. I would not want to take that to a vote today
5 because I remember specifically at our public meeting we had where Mr. Criss and Ms.
6 Brady were at that the public was specifically told that they would have a chance for
7 further input at the Planning Commission level through at least one work session and
8 that has yet to have been – to be scheduled or notified or a public hearing or anything
9 else. And people in that room were very much in favor of having that occur.

10 MR. CRISS: The County Council of course will be holding a public hearing but
11 you are welcome as a Commission to hold as many public meetings as you desire.

12 MR. PALMER: Well that was the wish of the people and I think this has been
13 sold the whole time as something that comes forward from the community and it was
14 very clear to me that they wish that to occur – the meeting that I was attending. I would
15 not be in favor of holding a vote on it today.

16 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, I want also to once again agree with what Mr.
17 Palmer says. It's a red letter day. Not only if in fact they were requesting public
18 hearings but this is not actually advertised as being something on the agenda for people
19 to listen to or to hear anything about. All it says is Comprehensive Plan Revision Status
20 Report and I didn't bring my copy of this because I didn't assume it was on our agenda.

21 MR. CRISS: That was an oversight in the agenda publication.

1 MR. VAN DINE: So I would suggest that we delay anything on this until an
2 opportunity has been had and the public has had the ability to at least be notified that
3 we're going to be discussing this particular plan.

4 MR. MANNING: One of the things too I'd like to discuss when we do have that
5 public hearing or further discussion on it is revolving around this being conceptual and
6 I'd like to address flexibility in the plan more specifically. I think one of the problems I've
7 had with the Southeast Plan is that we have gone forward, adopted something by
8 ordinance and all the details now – the real teeth in the ordinance are still left to be
9 determined. And I think we – I'd hate to make that mistake twice. I'd like to see more
10 details attached to this so that you know really - there's some great things in this plan
11 but there's also some things I think need to be addressed and hopefully we'll have that
12 opportunity at the next meeting.

13 MR. PALMER: I'd be in favor of scheduling a work session either between now
14 and the next meeting or perhaps the month after, whenever the Commission would see
15 fit, publicly advertise that and also submit flyers or whatever we did for our last meeting
16 that was last over at RNE to people in the community to be able to attend that meeting
17 as well. Because, you know, from what I can tell and from what I hear and see and talk
18 to people they have an extreme interest in this plan and want to be heard at the
19 Planning Commission level before it gets to Council.

20 MR. CRISS: A work session may indeed be the best format for inviting more
21 public comment but you wouldn't be in a position actually to take action so it would
22 appear on your formal agenda at a subsequent meeting.

23 MR. PALMER: Sure.

1 MR. VAN DINE: To the extent that – do we not have a work session scheduled
2 for January?

3 MR. CRISS: We do not have any scheduled for 2007 at present.

4 MR. PALMER: Because nobody showed up in 2006.

5 MR. VAN DINE: I mean I would like, you know, so that we don't delay to the
6 extent that we can get something scheduled for a work session, discussion with public
7 input at the end of January so we can deal with it in our February meeting. I think that
8 would be an appropriate step, so. And I also think we need a mechanism at that work
9 session to allow people the opportunity to say something not just to sit and listen.
10 Because I think that if in fact they want to be heard we have an obligation to let them be
11 heard at that meeting as well.

12 MR. CRISS: The next Planning Commission meeting is February 5th. Monday of
13 course. The last full week in January is the week of the 22nd.

14 MR. PALMER: How much time do we need before it needs to be posted on an
15 agenda?

16 MR. VAN DINE: Could we not just post it on the agenda as happening in
17 February and just schedule the meeting? I mean we don't have to wait until after the
18 public session – the work session to post it. We can post it beforehand.

19 MR. CRISS: You could have a work session in front of your regular session if
20 that's what you're referring to.

21 MR. VAN DINE: No. What I'm suggesting is we post it as being something to be
22 discussed in February. We don't need to wait for the work session in order to say we're

1 going to talk about it in February. We can hold the work session having already
2 advertised for the February meeting.

3 MS. RUTHERFORD: And in the February meeting would you like the consultant
4 to come and present the plan to you and the public at that time?

5 MR. PALMER: I would like the consultant to come to the workshop.

6 MR. VAN DINE: Yeah. I think they need to be at the workshop and then we can
7 address whatever needs [inaudible] here in the work session – I mean in the meeting.

8 MR. MANNING: So Howard, what you're suggesting is we have a workshop
9 prior to the February 5th meeting –

10 MR. VAN DINE: Yes.

11 MR. MANNING: - and that we do, take action on the plan but it is a public –
12 there's a public forum at that.

13 MR. PALMER: But not just like a couple hours before – I mean a couple of days
14 before.

15 MR. MANNING: Right. Okay.

16 MR. PALMER: A whole separate work session just for this.

17 MR. CRISS: Maybe Thursday, the 25th of January or Thursday, the 1st of
18 February?

19 MR. VAN DINE: I think the first of February gets a little close to it. If there are
20 things that somebody might want to make a change to then that's a little close to our
21 meeting time. I would rather have it in that week of the 22nd, whatever it is.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: January the 25th, a Thursday.

1 MR. CRISS: And would you prefer to have that in the fourth floor back
2 conference room?

3 MR. PALMER: I think if we're going to have input from the public this is probably
4 the best setting to do it because we can do it at a podium. We could have a sign-up
5 sheet and everything else. And if we do it on the fourth floor it's kind of a [inaudible]
6 type situation.

7 MR. MANNING: I thought we were talking about the fourth floor for the
8 workshop.

9 MR. PALMER: We are. I'm talking about having the workshop in here if we're
10 going to have a sign-up sheet and speaking and that type stuff.

11 MR. CRISS: The public address system

12 MR. PALMER: Right. That's my only thinking. Plus the presentation with the
13 screen.

14 MR. VAN DINE: I think you'll have a better control of everything in this chamber.

15 MR. CRISS: And more room here than upstairs.

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: What time on the 25th.

17 MR. CRISS: So we will request this chamber Thursday, January 25th. You've
18 normally had your work sessions 4:00 to 6:00 in the afternoon. What's your start time?

19 MR. PALMER: I think the later the better to get the more public input as
20 possible.

21 MR. VAN DINE: I think you ought to start at 5:00 and you ought to plan on being
22 here longer than two hours because there's going to be more people than two hours are
23 going to allow.

1 MR. CRISS: Five o'clock plus.

2 MR. PALMER: What are your plans for public notification?

3 MR. CRISS: Well we've had fairly extensive public input through the [inaudible]
4 process and public presentations so we'll use the same distribution list that Tia has
5 developed in her neighborhood improvement program for this work session.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: So you're scheduling it for 5:00 o'clock on the –

7 MR. CRISS: Five o'clock Thursday, January 25th, Clerk of Council permitting.

8 MR. VAN DINE: Can I ask someone on Staff to please send an e-mail to
9 everybody verifying that particular meeting because I don't have my calendar here and I
10 guarantee you when I get back I will have forgotten everything that we've talked about.

11 MR. CRISS: We'll send you an e-mail.

12 MR. VAN DINE: Thank you.

13 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, just for the record, I will be out – I will be traveling
14 that week and won't be here but I think it's an appropriate time in advance to have that
15 session but I wanted to let you know I will not be able to attend.

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: That'll be part of your [inaudible] Make sure that you
17 keep up with the time. Thank you, young lady. Next is – Marcia, the roads -

18 MR. CRISS: There's another item, Mr. Chairman, under the Comprehensive
19 Plan that should have made it to the agenda as well. And that is to give you the status
20 of the Comprehensive Plan update. And specifically to give you the third in a series of
21 five and your future land use maps for this time north central. And of course Brenda
22 Carter, our GIS Services Manager and her staff have put this composite together so that
23 you can see how the three areas, northwest, north central and northeast come together.

1 North central obviously feeling the affects of suburbanization of the I-77 corridor and we
2 also expect the I-20 corridor. The City of Columbia also has annexation ambitions into
3 lower north central. Extensive floodplains but not large nodes of conservation areas
4 identified yet though there are significant timberlands there that might become available.

5 [Inaudible]

6 MR. VAN DINE: Have we taken into account, have we taken into account on
7 those that map what appears to be Irmo's latest foray into the annexation?

8 MR. CRISS: Irmo?

9 MR. VAN DINE: Yeah.

10 MR. CRISS: Yeah. Indeed. Betty Etheridge is our annexation guru who keeps
11 up with all the municipal annexations, changes in county boundaries [inaudible]
12 Richland County and posts them as soon as she gets the information and she has to
13 actively solicit that [inaudible] mechanisms [inaudible]. Her network of contacts is pretty
14 reliable and we know about the [inaudible] annexation [inaudible] and she reflected that
15 [inaudible] Irmo a couple miles outside of town that's connected to the existing
16 municipal boundary [inaudible] that they use to provide continuity. Irmo has since
17 annexed some properties out to the shore of Lake Murray. And of course there is now a
18 [inaudible] incorporation effort amongst the Ballentine community to - how shall I say it -
19 respond to Irmo's recent annexation. And that's yet to be determined of course. We
20 don't show proposed Ballentine boundaries on our maps yet because it really doesn't
21 have official status. I don't think a formal application's been made yet to the Secretary
22 of State. There are intensive negotiations going on between Ballentine residents and
23 Irmo town officials. And if the Town of Irmo were to accept the new Town of Ballentine

1 closer to it than the law otherwise provides then the incorporation can proceed for
2 [inaudible]. But if Irmo objects then Ballentine has to keep its perimeter I think five miles
3 away from Irmo's [inaudible] which makes it harder for the proposed Town of Ballentine
4 to capture the necessary population and density for incorporation. So a lot of map
5 making going on behind the scenes. The county is an observer in this not a direct
6 participant. I'm trying to keep up with it to inform you as part of the Comprehensive
7 Plan [inaudible]. It's going to be a land use issue out there. Who's going to control the
8 future growth ten years out [inaudible]. So you have now a more manageable sized
9 map of the north central of ten-year future land use and the corresponding current land
10 use as best we can determine. Of course that current land use is not to be relied upon
11 in absolute faith. It's an approximation based on the tax assessor's records as best we
12 can understand them. We'll try to improve their accuracy over time but this is as close
13 as we can get for now. So we'd like for you to take these maps home and study them
14 and make your suggestions and recommendations back to the Staff. You'll notice that
15 Gene Green's recommendations on the northeast area have already been incorporated
16 into the revised maps where we now have the suburban/rural boundary at the
17 [inaudible] lines then going further out through the northeast. And there's a patch of
18 rural over here south of Blythewood that we've [inaudible]. Geo confirmed with Clerk of
19 Council that the January 25th meeting date is available. Thanks, Geo. So that's your
20 homework assignment and that's all I have to report today. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. The next on the agenda item is Road
22 Name Approvals.

23 MR. PALMER: I move to approve.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Ms. Lucius, do you see any names that you think that
3 we should not approve?

4 MS. LUCIUS: They weren't any fun this time.

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the motion. All in favor raise your hand.

6 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Van Dine, Manning]*

7 CHAIRMAN. FURGESS: Next is adjournment.

8 MS. LUCIUS: Move to adjourn.

9 MR. VAN DINE: So moved. Second.

10

11

[Adjourned at 2:07 p.m.]