2

1

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11

13

12

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION May 4, 2015

[Members Present: Heather Cairns, Beverly Frierson, David Tuttle, Patrick Palmer, Stephen Gilchrist (in at 1:05pm), Bill Theus, Christopher Anderson, Wallace Brown, Sr.1

Called to order: 1:02 pm

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, we'll call the May meeting of the Richland County Planning Commission Order. For the Commission Members, just to let you know we've got new microphones so for you to be heard you have to turn your microphone on in front of you, push the button so it turns on. Okay? Alright, please allow me to read this into the Record. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification. and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration building. The April Minutes? Do we have a motion?

MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we approve the Minutes as submitted.

MR. THEUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye.

[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Theus, Anderson, Brown; Absent for vote: Gilchrist]

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any Agenda amendments?

MS. HEGLER: Chairman, no amendments but would ask that the Commission consider moving the Neighborhood Master Plan Update before Other Business. At your discretion.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we have a motion to that effect?

MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we adopt the Agenda as modified.

MR. THEUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor say aye.

[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Theus, Anderson, Brown; Absent for vote: Gilchrist]

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, first Map Amendment, Case No. 15-18 MA.

CASE NO. 15-18 MA:

MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon everyone. The Applicant for Case 18 is Mr. Elton Johnson. The property's located at 6423 Monticello Road, the north central part of the county. About an acre in size currently zoned General Commercial, and Mr. Johnson is requesting RU, which is our Rural Residential District. The original zoning was C-3 in 1977, and with the 2005 update of the Land Development Code that was changed to General Commercial District. We have some rezoning or rezoning applications in the vicinity of this site. But the zoning in the area, to the north we've got CC-3 which is a mixed use commercial district in the Crane Creek Neighborhood Master Plan Area. To the south along Monticello road we have property zoned OI, it is occupied residentially. To the east we also have the CC-3 District. And to the west we've got some General Commercial, or northwest more or less along Monticello Road, which is kind of a non-conforming used parts and supply and kind of a junkyard situation. Monticello Road if you've been out there is a four-lane road with a center turn lane. The property is really occupied by a residential structure, red brick, it is

currently unoccupied. It's my understanding the Applicant wishes to reuse the property for residential purposes. Our Comprehensive Plan for this site recommends Neighborhood, Medium-density, which is basically designed for traditional neighborhood development with limited commercial in certain locations. Basically the, the primary use for this category of the Comprehensive Plan is residential type uses. The Staff felt that the change from GC to RU would not be consistent with the development pattern along the road, given the fact that there are some new commercial developments and existing commercial zoning in the vicinity, and for that reason felt it would be out of character to rezone back to the Rural Residential District, and for that reason recommended disapproval at this time.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff?

MR. THEUS: I have a question. This always perplexes me, this is a .97 acres, how is this not spot zoning? There's no Rural adjacent to it, right? I thought it had to be two acres or more under most circumstances.

MR. LEGER: There, there actually is, you really can't see it on the map, there's a, kind of a utility substation which is zoned RU. It's a very miniscule piece of property, you can't even see it on the zoning map.

MR. THEUS: Okay.

MS. HEGLER: It's directly across the street, correct.

MR. LEGER: You can see it in the picture on our screen, it's a little cinderblock building, that's zoned RU.

1	MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I have a quick question. The, the structure that's
2	there, is it, can it be occupied in a residential use as a non-conforming use under the
3	current zoning or does it have to remain?
4	MS. HEGLER: No, it cannot be used as a residential structure cause it has not,
5	it's been –
6	MR. DELAGE: It's been utilized as an office prior, so it lost its non-conformity.
7	MR. TUTTLE: Okay.
8	MS. CAIRNS: I thought you were allowed to have, you're allowed to have
9	apartments in GC, dwelling up to 16, right? So he can't have a single-family home in
10	GC?
11	MS. HEGLER: Correct.
12	CHAIRMAN PALMER: Wait, I'm, I'm sorry, you can't, you cannot have a single-
13	family residence in General Commercial?
14	MS. CAIRNS: I thought you could.
15	MS. HEGLER: Geo?
16	MR. PRICE: You're allowed to have the single-family, zero lot line common
17	single-family structure in the General Commercial District.
18	CHAIRMAN PALMER: So it has to be at least a duplex?
19	MR. PRICE: No, it's, common just means it just needs to be on that, on the
20	property line.
21	MS. CAIRNS: So it has to be zero lot line to be acceptable?
22	MR. PRICE: Yes. To be in the, in the General Commercial District.
23	MS. CAIRNS: That's bizarre.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Now, why would that, why would that somehow get put in 2 there? I, I don't, maybe I'm confused on that. 3 MR. PRICE: Probably another carryover from the previous Land Development 4 Code. MR. THEUS: I move we amend the Code. 5 6 [Laughter] 7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Any other questions for Staff? Elton Johnson? And 8 when I call your name if you would come down to the podium and give us your name 9 and address for the Record, and if you could limit your comments to two minutes we 10 would appreciate it. 11 **TESTIMONY OF ELTON JOHNSON:** 12 MR. JOHNSON: Good afternoon. I didn't hear the response to that last question 13 of you're not allowed to have the single-family dwelling in GC. Could I hear that again? 14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir, you can't reside in the residence unless it is 15 actually, the structure is built on the property line. So because this structure is not built 16 on the property line, it's somewhat in the center of the lot you can't live there. No one 17 can live there. 18 MR. JOHNSON: And if, what is the criteria for built on a property line, is that 19 within 10' of the property line, 20'? 20 MS. CAIRNS: Zero.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Zero. On the property line.

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

1516

17

18 19

20

2122

23

MR. JOHNSON: On the property line. Okay. Alright, as I understood it when I applied to have it rezoned it did qualify due to the piece of property that is obscure across the street that was just mentioned. It does qualify for rezoning, correct?

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Correct.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. I've had that building up there for 21 years and in the last 21 years I've only seen one piece of commercial property come up that this is a recent development which was the Dollar General Store about 1/8th of a mile down the road. But right now there are, just to make a point there, there are a lotta stagnant, vacant lots, vacant building all along the road there and the development is not happening and it will become another abandoned building for Richland County if we can't sell it as a home. I've had the Council people, Richland County to look at it and say they didn't see a problem with it, because they walked through it and stuff and it is a house. It just ran a sales office outta there, there was no manufacturing or assembly or, we had no retail traffic there. So right now I'm trying to get the property sold and I have offers on it, granted that it would be residential, but I can't even sell it commercial. And again it would become an eyesore to the county. It seems like the county would want to have somebody there living, paying taxes, buying food and groceries and, you know, participate in the county and have kids there, so that, that's why we're trying to get it rezoned back to RU. If you look at the pictures that you saw up there, an acre of land sitting in the middle of pine trees, it doesn't look commercial at all. And it wouldn't affect any of the surrounding businesses or homes for it to be rezoned as RU.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Mr. Johnson, did you take into consideration an RS-MD zoning, which is what is surrounding this property, instead of an RU zoning?

1 MR. JOHNSON: Can you give me the definition? I did not consider that, an RS. 2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: RS-MD allows 8500 square foot lots, which I know is 3 more than what you have here, you would be looking to sell it as a single structure. I 4 think perhaps the issue is putting a rural zoning classification in the center of property 5 which is, has different zoning classifications other than Rural, as a planning tool, and 6 that the RS-MD zoning, if it were able to be asked for, was wondering if that, if you had 7 taken a look at that option or not. 8 MR. JOHNSON: If, if that classification would allow me to sell it as a residence, 9 then I would have no problem applying that way either. 10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. 11 MR. THEUS: There's no maximum lot size under RS-MD is there? 12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. Okay. Thank you. That's all we have signed up to 13 speak. Mr. Price, I know that this is, he's, that that's not what's before us to consider, 14 would an RS-MD zoning classification be able to be applied for on this site as far as you 15 know? I know you haven't done all the investigation on it. 16 MR. PRICE: We were just discussing that just now and the answer is yes. 17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. 18 MR. THEUS: What'd he say? 19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It would be able to be applied for. 20 MR. ANDERSON: So could the Applicant defer his request?

CHAIRMAN PALMER: You would need to withdraw this and make a new application if they wanted to apply under a new zoning classification, have the property reposted.

21

22

23

1 MR. ANDERSON: So the Applicant would need to withdraw his application. 2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: If he wanted to. But he can, but this can always move 3 forward to Council and that can take place any time between now and then if, if he 4 would wanna do that. 5 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, does the Applicant understand what the difference 6 is between those two? 7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I don't, I don't know, but I think what we, what we have to do at this point is to address the RU classification and then whatever our 8 9 recommendation is to Council and then I'm certain that Staff will get up with the 10 Applicant and explain to them what the difference in the two is and, and give them their 11 scenarios going forward as to what they can and can't do. But what we have to decide 12 on today is the RU zoning classification that's before us. 13 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Commission support the 14 recommendation of Staff. 15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we have a second? 16 MS. FRIERSON: I second. 17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other discussion? All those in favor of sending this 18 case forward to Council with a recommendation of denial signify by saying aye. Any opposed? 19 20 [Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown] 21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And we are a recommending Body to County Council. County Council will hear these cases that we have in these same Chambers on the 26th 22

of this month at 7:00, and Mr. Price if you would get together with the Applicant and kinda go over what we just talked about. Great. Next case.

CASE NO. 15-19 MA:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, the next case is project number 15-19 MA. The Applicant is Mr. Jim Woodhill. The property's located at 16001 Garners Ferry Road, it's in the far, far, far reaches on the county, beyond Highway 601, almost to Sumter County line. It's about five acres in size, currently zoned RU, Rural, and Mr. Woodhill is asking for RC, which is our Rural Commercial District. The property was zoned RU in 1977, which is the original zoning district, and the nearest commercial zoning classification is at the intersection of 601 and Garners Ferry Road, about approximately two miles to the west. Surrounding this property is really mostly undeveloped parcels, some residences scattered, and manufactured housing. All the zoning in the vicinity is Rural. The property does have frontage on Garners Ferry Road and Garners Ferry Way which is a very small unimproved and dirt road that goes, follows along the western side of the property to the south. The property contains what appeared to be a non-residential structure, it looked like it would be cinderblock in nature, maybe a warehouse or some type of a non-residential use. I'm not quite sure what it was used for over the years but it is nonresidential. To the south we've got a very large tract of land which my understanding in driving by there is the Good Will Plantation site, and it is mostly undeveloped. Our Comprehensive Plan calls for commercial, I'm sorry, conservation on the site, looking for the preservation of agricultural and horticultural and forestry type uses with limited residential. Basically subdivisioned land for residential development of a rural nature. The Lower Richland Master Plan calls this the Cowasee Corridor, which basically

repeats that, looks for outdoor recreational type uses that maintain environmental sensitivity in this portion of the county, which is really, really rural in nature. Again, the nearest commercial is at the intersection of McCord's Ferry/601 and, and Garners Ferry, about two miles to the east. Basically the Staff did not feel like this site met the intent of the RC District as it was in the far reaches of the county and not really near a major intersection. The Comprehensive Plan does not support it, the Lower Richland Master Plan does not support it as it recommended for environmentally uses. So with that in mind the Staff recommends disapproval.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? James -

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir?

MR. BROWN: The Vanboklen is the main road into Eastover, is that correct?

MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, that's correct. It comes from Garners Ferry Road and travels southwest.

MR. BROWN: And just up from Vanboklen on Garners Ferry are commercial businesses, I think Mr. Bunky's and –

MR. LEGER: Well, Mr. Bunky's is, is a lot further –

MR. BROWN: A lot further out?

MR. LEGER: - a lot further west.

20 MR. BROWN: Okay.

MR. LEGER: Yes, sir.

22 MR. BROWN: Alright.

MR. ANDERSON: Just a question. So there's a, just for my own kinda mindset,
where is, there's a gas station and the hill goes down, there's a gas station kinda at the
bottom of the hill, then it goes back up. You know which one I'm talking about?

MR. BROWN: It's down below Vanboklen.

MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, it's, yeah -

MR. THEUS: Near the old Sike's Barbeque.

MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, that's it. That's it, where Margaret's is now. Okay. And this is a very rural area sometimes.

MR. BROWN: There's a church before you get to that on the right.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. BROWN: And then further down is the gas station that he's referencing.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay, alright.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other questions for Staff? James Woodhill? Yes, sir, if you'd like to add anything you're certainly welcome to. If you'd give us your name and address.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES WOODHILL:

MR. WOODHILL: James Woodhill from Riverhead, New York. My partner and I purchased this a few years back and we're looking for a use. The main thing that people approach us with is they'd like to put a restaurant there. It has been a restaurant in the past, that's the last use I can see of the property. We are looking for the RC change simply because that would allow it to be a restaurant. We're open to ideas, we'd like to make it something useful for the community. If you have any good suggestions we're, be glad to hear them.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. That's all we've got signed up to speak.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Applicant probably needs to talk to Staff about that, the various types of uses of what could go in there, and then the Applicant make up their own mind, and in view of that I move that we send this recommendation forward as proposed by Staff.

MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion?

All those in favor say aye. All those opposed?

[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown]

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Next case.

CASE NO. 15-20 MA:

MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, our next case is project number 15-20 MA. The Applicant is Ashley Chason. The property's located at 1551 Dutch Fork Road. It's almost four acres in size, currently zoned RU, and the Applicant is requesting OI, Office and Institutional District. The RU District was original zoning from 1977. There have been several other zoning applications on this property; one back in 2001 for General Commercial where the previous applicant withdrew the case. We had another more recent application for General Commercial in 2013 that was denied by County Council. This really is kind of in the heart of Ballentine on Dutch Fork Road. Along Dutch Fork Road you've got some commercial development, primarily fronting on the north side of Dutch Fork. Much of the southern side of Dutch Fork Road is undeveloped. There are some scattered single-family residential properties along there. The property as you can see in the picture is basically a residential structure currently or having been used as an

office, real estate office in the past and the Applicant would like to reuse the property in an office type nature. Our Comprehensive Plan calls for Neighborhood Activity Center which is kind of one of our basically development nodes where we call for increased development which would allow for a limited type of office and commercial type use within that general vicinity of Ballentine. Because the Comprehensive Plan supports the request and there are other commercial zoning, properties zoned commercially and used as, that way, we supported the application and recommended approval.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Ashley Chason?

TESTIMONY OF ASHLEY CHASON:

MR. CHASON: Ashley Chason, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes.

MR. CHASON: Ashley Chason. I believe the, you're shooting for an approval so I don't wanna unmake this sale here. But we've essentially, my father owns the property, lives on adjacent property, and this building has been used commercially for the last 25 years for various businesses that have expanded and several businesses have gotten their start here in this building, like Dutch Fork Animal Hospital, which is a major business in Ballentine there. This was where they first started many years ago, and barber shop and batting cages, but for the most part for the recent history it's been a real estate office and they have, they have tried to get the General Commercial zoning about a year ago and were denied, so they have moved on elsewhere and we, we just wanna get the property rented again to any local business. Not really trying to do anything major, we just wanna continue what we've been doing for the last 25 years. But since Ballentine has grown up so much the original zoning was Rural and I guess

it's been getting through with Rural with exceptions in the past, so I would just like to continue to, to do what we have been doing and getting the OI seemed to be the logical, lease evasive zoning choice to choose so we could continue as soon as possible. My father's retired and he uses this money to help pay the taxes on the property that he owns there. On that particular side of Highway 76, which is five lanes there, there's really only one other residence that's not owned by my father, and if you step on the end of the driveway there you can see 10 other businesses, commercial businesses and, before you see any residential. So I just would like to move forward with getting the zoning approved. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. That's all we've got signed up to speak.

MR. THEUS: Mr. Chairman, I move we send this request forward with a recommendation for approval.

MR. TUTTLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other discussion? All those in favor say aye.

[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown]

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Next case?

CASE NO. 15-21 MA:

MR. LEGER: Alright, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The next case is Case No. 15-21 MA. The Applicant is Ms. Deanna Shealy. It's a little over two acres in size, currently zoned RU, and Ms. Shealy is requesting the RS-LD, which is Residential, Single-family, Low-density District. The RU District zoning classification is original zoning from 1977. This again is a residential property in the very, very far reaches of the northwest portion of the county on Lake Murray. To get there you go out Dutch Fork Road, almost to

Chapin, exit on, I think it's Hiller Road, kinda travel southwest and eventually you'll get to Island Trail. Most of this area is residential in nature. Right in the vicinity all the property is zoned RU on this peninsula of Lake Murray. All of the properties on the island or peninsula are residential in nature, kind of low density. The property to the west across Island Trail is developed residentially as well, it also has frontage on the lake but it is in the, in Lexington County not in Richland County. Our Comprehensive Plan calls for low density residential uses for the property for which this currently meets that classification, really designed to be a transition between rural and medium-density type uses. Basically the Staff in looking at the type of homes and the lot sizes and development in the vicinity, the fact that this peninsula of the lake is fully developed with residential homes, and we felt like the Comprehensive Plan supported it, so we recommended approval at this time.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Deanna Shealy? Yes, ma'am, if you'd like to come up and add anything you certainly can. Staff has recommended approval.

TESTIMONY OF DEANNA SHEALY:

MS. SHEALY: All I wanna say is thank you, I appreciate the professional manner in which the Planning Commission worked with me on this, and, Planning Staff, excuse me.

[Laughter]

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. We have [inaudible]? Chandler Garrett? Okay. That's all we've got signed up to speak.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we send item number 15-21 MA forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown]

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, next case.

CASE NO. 15-22 MA:

MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, the next case is project number 15-22 MA. The property is located on Garners Ferry Road at an intersection with Century Oaks Lane, which again is a, a very limited surface, limited developed dirt road in the southeastern portion of the county off of Garners Ferry. The property is located near the Schneider Electric manufacturing plant, they're to the east of the site. The original zoning was RU from 1977. In the vicinity primarily what you'll see going out Garners Ferry Road is the new Garners Ferry Recreation Complex which is basically to the northwest of the site on Garners Ferry, that's really the predominant feature along with the, the Schneider Electric plant. Most everything else out in the immediate vicinity is either undeveloped and covered in pine trees or agriculture of some sort, limited residential development. Across, directly across and adjacent to the Garners Ferry Recreation Complex is a Planned Development District which runs from this point all the way back over to Lower Richland Boulevard. The, that Planned Development is somewhat mixed in its character, it's really undeveloped at this point but to the, basically to the north of the Garners Ferry, off the frontage of Garners Ferry and to the north is residential. It's planned for residential but the frontage of Garners Ferry in this PDD is proposed for commercial. Basically the property is undeveloped, it's covered in pine trees and not used at this time. The Comprehensive Plan calls for Neighborhood, Medium-density at this site, calling for medium density residential use with some supporting commercial uses of a limited nature. The Southeast Richland Neighborhood Master Plan, which was our first neighborhood master plan done almost 10 years ago, really did not have a specific recommendation for this site other than calling for the development and preservation of buffers along Lower Richland Boulevard. Like I said this is a neighborhood master plan which was one of the original ones, but the, the Comprehensive Plan calls for a limited amount of commercial in this, in this area. Because of the Schneider Electric zoned M-1 to the immediate east, the Planned Development District to the north calling for commercial on the frontage, the Staff could support this request and recommended approval.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Craig Waites?

TESTIMONY OF CRAIG WAITES:

MR. WAITES: Good afternoon. My name is Craig Waites and I'm a commercial real estate broker with Colliers here in Columbia. I am here today representing the Dunbar Family Limited Partnership in their petition to rezone the approximately 15 acres of land on Garners Ferry from RU to GC. The subject land sits directly adjacent to Schneider Electric as Staff pointed out. In February of this year the Dunbar family was approached by Davis & Floyd, a local engineering firm, to acquire right-of-way on behalf of Richland County to create a new intersection at Garners Ferry and Century Oaks. The specific request of the Dunbar's was the sale of 2.14 acres as shown on the plan

before you in order to construct those new roads. The intended results of these planned improvements are as follows: to improve the access to Schneider Electric for its employees and for truck traffic; to improve the access for Richland County's Garners Ferry Road Sports Complex; and to create an additional outlet to Garners Ferry from those residents living off of Rabbit Run Road. The Dunbar property is currently zoned RU, or Rural, which is intended to provide for low intensity agricultural uses and very low single-family uses. With the realignment of this road system and also the industrial traffic that will be rerouted from Schneider, the RU zoning or any other residential zoning for that matter no longer seems appropriate or viable for this portion of the Dunbar property. As a result the Dunbar family is seeking to change to General Commercial classification which can accommodate more retail services such as convenience stores, grocery stores, restaurants and banks, but it'll also allow for other types of businesses that may be complimentary to Schneider and the Richland County Sports Complex. Thanks for your time and consideration of this request. Please let us know if you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Jack Jordan?

TESTIMONY OF JACK JORDAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. JORDAN: My name is Jack Jordan. I would like a clarification. Case 5, it says RU to GC, my letter inviting me to this meeting said RU to Light Industrial. Is that the same?

CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, sir, it's not the same. They're completely – no, sir, it's not the same; one's an industrial use and the other is a commercial application.

MR. JORDAN: Well so you understand my confusion.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure. Yes, sir, I do. 2

MR. TUTTLE: Can – Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of Staff?

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. HEGLER: Sounds like there was a conversation at one point to rezone to LI and those letters went out and they were not corrected when the Applicant changed to GC. So our apologies, just a mistake in the letter.

MR. TUTTLE: What was posted? Do we have evidence of what was posted?

MS. HEGLER: GC should've been. We can look at pictures, but.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Yes, sir, the letters are a courtesy that we send out to different property owners who we think may be affected by it, but are nothing legal that we have to do. The property posting is what we, what we have to do so, what the site is being zoned for, being requested to be zoned for is General Commercial.

MR. JORDAN: Thank you. My name is Jack Jordan. I live at 155 Century Oaks. My house was the property that was shown on the dirt road there. I live on 10 acres and I'm basically surrounded on three sides by the Dunbar property. I'm opposed to changing from Rural to GC because of the negative effect it will have on my property values and those of my neighbor, who obviously are zoned Rural. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you.

MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, if I could start the discussion. As you know, I'm generally a proponent of, of construction but I do feel that, that GC here in this location is, is a little bit outta context and would adversely affect those property owners that certainly being 6-800' off Garners Road never anticipated they would have truck

1 traffic adjacent to their property. So I do think we need to take that into consideration as 2 we move forward. 3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other thoughts? 4 MR. WAITES: [Inaudible] CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, sir, Mr. Waites, we typically don't reopen it. 5 6 MR. WAITES: Okay. 7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Unless a Commissioner has a question for you. 8 MR. ANDERSON: So the, so the Richland County, or the sports complex, let me 9 just, and again maybe I shouldn't be looking at this, so what are the planned traffic light 10 implementations in this area? And again, I, I saw the Applicant's sketch but has DOT 11 made any, has DOT made anything aware to us, when it's going in? 12 MS. HEGLER: No, I understand that this, this project is a part of the penny being 13 implemented by the county. It's part of the Southeastern Neighborhood Master Plan 14 [inaudible] one of the projects that's proposed in that Master Plan. I'm not aware of the 15 traffic details, the Applicant potentially might be. 16 MR. ANDERSON: Well I just, I have a question. So I mean, I'm looking at his 17 map so I'm seeing some, some red areas where there's potentially gonna be, I don't 18 understand. Then I see the -19 MR. TUTTLE: Would it be okay to ask Mr. Waites to – 20 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, yeah. 21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes. 22 MR. WAITES: So, I apologize I didn't clarify that. That map was actually, that is 23 Richland County's map that was given to us and that is their plans that they have

presented to us in, in requesting the right-of-way acquisition. So that's, that's the plan that Davis & Floyd came up with on behalf of the County and they came to the Dunbar family asking them to sell that land for those roadways. So that's, that's not a plan that the Dunbar's have, that was presented to them and that's part of the, the Master Plan that's gonna be used with the penny, part of the penny tax.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: So even so, whether this rezoning moves forward or not, these trucks are coming through this area.

MR. WAITES: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

MR. TUTTLE: Wait, wait, wait, wait, no, no, I'm not sure I understand it. The proposed road here on the Dunbar's property is a new road that is not currently traveled by the truck traffic, is that correct?

MR. WAITES: That's correct.

MR. TUTTLE: The truck traffic goes on our page to the right and comes in at the entrance of the Schneider Electric.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: But Richland County's putting that road in whether or not you rezone it or not.

MR. TUTTLE: I don't know, this is obviously number three of several alternatives so I'm not sure that, that that's what before us.

MS. CAIRNS: And it does seem, I mean, I, I think I'm a well-known not supporter of just sprawling commercial pieces down major corridors. But I do think that there'd be many alternatives to this road that wouldn't push commercial that far back off Garners Ferry. So it does seem like a deep penetration of commercial that doesn't need to

happen. I mean, this isn't the only potential road alignment to fix the Rabbit Run problem. You know, it's hard to support pushing General Commercial that far back into residential areas that sit pretty far off a major road.

MR. TUTTLE: Just let the Record reflect that Heather and I are agreeing today. [Laughter]

MS. HEGLER: I have already done so.

MR. TUTTLE: I thought we might, the sky might fall or something.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir.

MS. CAIRNS: You guys are bad.

MR. BROWN: [Inaudible] these roads are proposed and there are others proposed, or are these accomplished facts because of the investment of the, or monies from the penny tax?

MR. WAITES: This is what has been presented to us and this is what the Dunbar family's been asked to convey to the County. So I'm assuming that those are, would be close to final if not final.

MR. BROWN: But Staff speak to that?

MS. HEGLER: I've, I've only attended one meeting. This is obviously implemented by the Transportation Department, and I've attended one meeting where they did try several alignments, this being the most optimal given the, the grade of Garners Ferry in terms of having a crossing and being able to see as you make those turns. So that's why you see that there's multiple alternatives, they were looking at the best place for visibility. And the red hashing, of course, is, Mr. Anderson, where they're

actually going to now close that crossing. So I, as I understand it this is what they have proposed as the best alignment for use for safety.

MR. BROWN: When you say 'they' who is 'they'?

MS. HEGLER: The Transportation Department with their consultant, the penny, the penny –

MR. BROWN: Has the county adopted this, Mr. Chairman? That's really my question.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, sir, I don't think it's been adopted yet but I think it's, it's, from what I understand from Staff this is what they would like to have occur. And it really, if they wanna do it they, they have condemnation powers they can, they can do it. But the initial steps are to try to get with the landowner and get right-of-ways to do this.

MR. BROWN: So we don't know that this is part of the county's development plan, this is something that's being discussed.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: I don't know where it is in the process but I know that it's on their map of things to do. I don't know if the funds have been allocated yet for it.

MS. HEGLER: Most of the, most of the penny projects are very specific and are non-negotiable. They are part of the referendum that, that citizens voted on. The projects for the nine neighborhood master plans, there is some flexibility within those plans as to what the projects could, you know, what projects could be funded. They have to be a part of the adopted master plan though. So in terms of alignment or what actually does get funded for each master plan is not set in stone, this is a discussion option at this point.

MR. BROWN: With, with respect to this, these parcels, with respect to these road projects, what are you saying? I wanna make sure I'm understanding and I apologize if I'm being dense.

MS. HEGLER: There was a, in the referendum for the penny, there was really just neighborhood master plan sort of a, a pot of funding for recommendations that were in the county's approved master plans, of which we have nine, seven of them were approved by the time the penny passed. So no specific project was in that line item, only that it had to be applied towards neighborhood master plans.

MR. BROWN: And it affects these properties.

MS. HEGLER: And it affects the master plan and these properties happen to be within it.

MR. TUTTLE: So if I can interject if I would. So when the penny passed they, they didn't specify that there was gonna be roadway configuration A, B, C, or D, because those probably hadn't been contemplated, and they maybe wanted to allocate some, some monies to Rabbit Road and having a better intersection. But there's no way this was held in a public forum prior to the penny that this road was gonna be X feet, cause you imagine comprehensively over the county it would be impossible to get all those detail upfront. Does that —

MS. HEGLER: Yeah, I mean, I think if your original question is has this been adopted? No, this is not an approved alignment with an approved cross section.

MR. BROWN: So we cannot rely on this.

MR. THEUS: We don't know that it's a certainty. If that's your question.

MR. BROWN: Yeah, that, that's –

1 MR. THEUS: Is this road a certainty or not, and I think what I'm hearing -2 MS. HEGLER: It's the best alternative for the project that was being proposed. 3 MS. CAIRNS: But it sounds like it's the best alternative in terms of where 4 Garners Ferry gets a full crossover, but in terms of how the road traverses through the 5 Dunbar Family Partnership road, that's not, I mean, I wouldn't give that the same 6 weight. I can understand that they've determined this is the best point on Garners Ferry 7 for a four-way, but not the road alignment through the property. I would imagine that 8 that's not as firm. There'd be a lot of options for that. 9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well Heather, it's gotta connect back in to the other road that's back there. 10 11 MS. CAIRNS: I, well yeah, to the road, the dirt road. 12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No. There's another – what is that Century Oaks Lane? 13 MS. CAIRNS: That's the only road it's connected to. 14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Which is where it's gotta connect back into. 15 MR. ANDERSON: Century Oaks Lane, yeah. 16 MR. TUTTLE: Right, but, but – 17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So there's, I mean, it's not gonna come in and take a 90° 18 turn. 19 MR. TUTTLE: Well, it could come in 300' instead of coming in at 1,000' and 20 connect to the same parking lot. 21 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. 22 MR. TUTTLE: I understand that changes the residual configuration of the 23 proposed development in the GC but clearly that's not the only way the road can be

1 configured and I think personally that's the most invasive pattern of the road to the 2 adjacent property owners. 3 MS. CAIRNS: Cause it also doesn't indicate what, I mean, is Schneider Electric's 4 existing crossing gonna be vacated? Cause that's what's weird, too. 5 MR. WAITES: I don't, I, I don't think so. We asked that question of Davis & Floyd 6 who are the engineers and they intend to keep that open and, and add this one as well. 7 From what we understand. 8 MR. TUTTLE: So there're no plans to make that right in, right out or anything? 9 MR. WAITES: Not, not -10 MR. TUTTLE: It'd still have all the same crossover issues – 11 MS. CAIRNS: So, yeah so it's the maximum invasiveness and is an alternate 12 route. 13 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah. So, so just for argument sake, so in theory you could've 14 come cross from the existing Schneider exit and gone across the road and go through 15 the farmland there and tied back into the Rabbit Run and solve the same thing in a 16 different way. So I'm just saying there're different ways to solve it, maybe some are less 17 invasive to adjacent owners. And then you have the contextual of whether you think 18 GC's appropriate right here or not, too. Forget the roadway configuration cause maybe 19 we shouldn't be privy to this or not privy, but is GC the appropriate thing here? We, we 20 have a hard time getting NC and RC approved, much less 15 acres of GC right there, 21 SO. 22 MR. THEUS: I think the zoning is, the best zoning is gonna be based on what the

23

final road plan is.

1 MR. TUTTLE: Well, but, but, so if the ultimate goal is to do this for the road, I 2 mean, in theory you could do that with RU. 3 MR. THEUS: No. I, I can buy into some of the arguments that you're up against a 4 manufacturing facility, but I, but until we see the final layout of the road I don't really 5 wanna get into rezoning the entire tract GC. 6 MR. BROWN: That's part of my concern. 7 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chair, I'll make a motion that we send 15-22 MA forward to 8 Council with a recommendation of disapproval. 9 MR. BROWN: Second. 10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And since it's against Staff's recommendations, what are 11 your reasonings? 12 MR. TUTTLE: Because I believe that the GC is not contextual with the adjacent 13 properties and this is currently not at a node. 14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion? 15 All those in favor say aye. Are there any opposed? 16 [Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Brown; Opposed: 17 Anderson] 18 MR. ANDERSON: One. 19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Was there someone opposed? 20 MR. ANDERSON: Me. 21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, Mr. Anderson was opposed. Alright, next case?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

> 20 21

22

23

MS. HEGLER: Real quickly, can I make sure I, I got Mr. Tuttle's motion? It was not contextually appropriate to the adjacent properties and I thought I heard an 'and' but I didn't hear -

MR. TUTTLE: And it's also not at a node, that's one of the main components –

MS. HEGLER: Okay, I did miss that.

MR. TUTTLE: - each time we try to do this. Thank you.

MS. HEGLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, next case.

CASE NO. 15-23 MA:

MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, the next case, project number 15-23 MA. The Applicant is JR LEX 2. The property is located at 7746 Bluff Road, again in the very far reaches of the county, down toward Gadsden. The property is a little over two and a half acres in size, currently zoned RU, and the Applicant is requesting RC, which is Rural Commercial. The RU District was the original zoning from 1977. In this vicinity we have to the north, well all the properties in the vicinity are zoned RU. To the north we have residential use. To the south across the intersection we have a place of worship. To the east undeveloped and residential property. And to the west at the intersection is a nonconforming commercial, small scale convenience store. This property has a couple of structures on it, a little difficult to tell what they were at one time. One of them may have been residential, the other is obviously non-residential, it has garage doors to it, probably some type of commercial use that has been there for quite some time. Our Comprehensive Plan recommends Rural, Rural Activity Center in particular, calling for limited commercial at specific crossroad locations. And I believe this is a pretty good location for the RC District as it is Rural, there's already commercial there. Our Lower Richland Master Plan calls for agricultural use in this area, primarily enhancing the farming community lifestyle and the rural character of the area, but it is also designated as a rural crossroads in this Neighborhood Master Plan calling for, again, limited commercial use of a rural nature. Basically due to the reasoning that the property is at an intersection, is near other commercial use, is one time having been commercial, the Comprehensive Plan recommends for it, the Lower Richland Master Plan recommends for commercial development at crossroads, the Staff could support the request, recommending approval.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Tony Cates?

TESTIMONY OF TONY CATES:

MR. CATES: My name is Tony Cates, I'm here representing JR LEX, the Applicant for this. I just want to reiterate what Staff said. The three major points of the Land Development Code for Rural Commercial; one that it be isolated, we're eight miles from Eastover which is the closest commercial area, we're 10+ miles to the nearest grocery, which is at 378 and Lower Richland Boulevard, and we're 15+ miles from all other commercial uses, so it is an extremely isolated area. A Rural Commercial would be great to just add something here. Two, that it's beyond the limits of service. There's no water, there's no sewer within 10 miles of this location so again, Rural Commercial fits perfect here. And last, that it's at or near an intersection. This is the center of Gadsden, it's the only real major intersection in town, and it's near other businesses. The Gadsden Community Store is across Congaree Road, and the US Post Office is 50 yards down the road, across Bluff Road, so we feel as Applicants that this site fits Rural

Commercial, it fits the area, and, and we think it'd be a great addition for what Gadsden needs moving forward as a community and, and for future uses in this area. So we ask you to approve Staff's recommendation, thank you.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Great, thanks. Ronnie Lovitt?

TESTIMONY OF RONNIE LOVITT:

MR. LOVITT: My name is Ronnie Lovitt, I live on 2530 Congaree Road, Gadsden, South Carolina. I once ran a beauty supply store on 2116 Congaree Road in Gadsden. I closed down in 2011 and decided in 2013 that I wanted to open a jewelry store. I went to the zoning office, they told me I could, I could reopen my beauty supply store up again. I told them that I do not want to open a beauty supply store right now. They stated that no more retail store would be open in this area because of the zoning. All I want is to, all I want is the opportunity to open my store, making my jewelry and producing it my store. Also selling it. I do not want Dollar General in our community because it only takes away the resources we need to make our community grow. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. John Lloyd?

TESTIMONY OF JOHN LLOYD:

MR. LLOYD: Good afternoon. My name is John Lloyd, I live at 2353 South City Peak Road, Gadsden, South Carolina, and I own two business in that, on 7727 and 7730 Bluff Road, approximately 1/10th mile from the location you're looking at. And my point is we welcome Rural Commercial in the area because in that area the only commercial section is approximately where that, that location that's about a, about 2/10th miles on down Bluff Road. That's the only commercial property in Gadsden and

right now my point is we can't expand, do no improvement really, you don't wanna do no improvement if we can't, if something happen to the building and we can't rebuild. So it take away the initiative to do improvements on your property. And, but just like I said, I don't wanna get it wrong, we welcome Rural Commercial but not to bring another, a Dollar General, the rumor going around saying another Dollar General coming in here taking away from the community. The business that we have in the community right at this point, we are support the schools, the senior citizens, different things like that. Dollar General come in the area they gonna take over it, all that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Julius Murray?

TESTIMONY OF JULIUS MURRAY:

MR. MURRAY: I'm Julius Murray. I live at 1068 Old Bluff Road in Hopkins, but it's really Gadsden, it's right beside the Congaree Swamp. I've been there for about 35 years now. I am the seller of the property that's in question today. I have heard rumors about whose coming and I don't know. There are many things, a funeral home might come I heard you all talking about Dunbar a minute ago, so one of the funeral homes may be buying the, could be buying the property from the new owner. I am in favor of the property be zoned as Rural Commercial. If I was on a commission, I served on many of them, I would be in favor of Rural Commercial because it opens up the opportunity for rural people. Rural people hasn't had the opportunity to participate in many of the functions that has occurred in other areas. So I'm here simply to recommend that it be approved. It be zoned from Rural to Rural Commercial. I own the next property over and right down Congaree Road I have five more acres near the Bibleway Church down there. I have no problem with progress. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Willard Steed?

TESTIMONY OF WILLARD STEED?

MR. STEED: Willard Steed from 1203 South Cedar Creek Road in Gadsden. I'm here to complain to the same as Brother Lloyd just complained about. And if I make no mistake, if I'm wrong correct me, if something happen to my property I own on 1203 South Cedar Creek Road, can I rebuild? I understand that the zoning law says that if, if my construction is destroyed that I cannot rebuild. And I wanna know why you allow this commercial property to come in on this, this one that Brother Murray was talking about, why you allow them to come there and build and we can't rebuild? We already own our, already own the property.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's part of the zoning code currently, you, you cannot, if you have a non-conforming structure and you can rebuild exactly what's there but you can't expand the structure.

MR. STEED: And can I build anything else on that property? Am I allowed to do that?

CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, sir, you have to conform to the zoning ordinance, what is allowed under your current zoning code. You can continue to operate what you have. You can't change the use, but if what you have burns down you can build back what you have.

MR. STEED: What I have.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir.

MR. STEED: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: You just can't expand it.

MR. STEED: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Eugene, and I'm sorry I can't get the last name, is it Watts or?

TESTIMONY OF EUGENE WASHINGTON:

MR. WASHINGTON: Good afternoon, I'm Eugene Washington. This is a wide discussion here. You know, you have to consider the rural area where it's been the last 50 years, the possibilities where it can go now. I'm an organic farmer, I do biofuel research in that area. My address is 1219 Old Bluff Road, it's Hopkins. In reference to the Cedar Creek area, this is where I was raised, went off to school and back, and I'm in favor of new business, absolutely. But also, you know, you have to consider what's at hand and the people, you know, what they're considering and what their worries are about a business as such coming in. But also I'm here to represent the young kids in this rural area of Hopkins/Gadsden area, on particular this intersection, it's a major intersection. You know, my church is a couple a hundred yards down the street. But my main concern is bringing a business in, new ideas, you know, training the younger kids, the kids that are in the area now, to inspire them is probably a better word. You know, someone to come in and train, inspire the kids that are here. We have three pharmacists in the area. About eight years ago one of the young ladies that's directly across from me was going to pharmacy school so I, I recommended that she get her doctorate. This is what we need, you know, we need people to inspire the young kids and support, you know, what's there and coming. New business gonna arise, business come in, they buy businesses, they relocate, this is, this is growth. I'm for new business and also understand, you know, what's at hand, the concern that, you know, the

members here, which we all related, you know, in the neighborhood so there's concerns on both sides. But I'm here for the younger kids till after I'm gone. You know, I see, I see pharmacists, I see pharmacies coming on that corner or thereafter. My pastor is the Bishop of the Bibleway Church in that area, so you know, we're looking for good things in that area. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Robert Garrick? Followed by James Butler?

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT GARRICK:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. GARRICK: Good afternoon. My name is Robert Garrick, I'm originally from Gadsden. The gentleman over here say it's only one business in Gadsden and that's at 7742 Bluff Road, that's not true. I own that business, my wife own that business. The other business is right down the street, 7815 Bluff Road, which is a convenience store, a liquor store, a service station with a grill in it. Within a quarter of a mile from that corner. I'm against a Dollar General because they telling us we can't build anything. I own the only commercial property in Gadsden right there, those eight acres, that's mine on each side of 7815 Bluff Road. I wanted to build another place there. I dug the foundation, still have the blueprint, I was denied. It wouldn't be fair to me and the community to let a Dollar General come in and not give the residents of the community to do something with our own neighborhood. I support Gadsden school house, just about everything, I give back more to the community than every other business ever been in Gadsden, I still do that today. Dollar General's gone come in Gadsden, if a kid come in my store right now, don't have a quarter, \$.50, \$1.00, I reach in my pocket and hand it to them. A senior citizen I does the same thing. Dollar General not gonna give Gadsden one penny. I stay down the road [inaudible] but not now. We don't need a

Dollar General there. What they gonna do is bleed the community worse than what it is today. They not gonna give one dollar back to anything in Gadsden, South Carolina. And that's the way I feel. I understand Mr. Murray wanna sell his property. I'm not against that, but give us a chance to develop our neighborhood before you let an outsider come in and telling us we can't do anything. That wouldn't be fair to us. And I'm speaking for all these people up here and maybe 200 or 300 more, I could pack this place with people against the Dollar General. We don't want it in Gadsden. The school teachers at Gadsden Elementary School tell me to please come up here and speak today and ask, beg y'all not to let the Dollar General come in, cause when they have events at that school we support that school, I send \$200 and \$300 worth of hotdogs, sodas and everything round to that school. They're not gonna give nobody one dollar back. We don't need that. We don't need nobody rob our community without a gun, and that's what they'd be doing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. James Butler?

TESTIMONY OF JAMES BUTLER:

MR. BUTLER: Good evening, my name is James Butler, I'm a resident of the Gadsden community. I guess I'm with these guys as well. I'm, I'm all for growth but I wanna also develop what we already have before we go into growth. We have some businesses down there like Mr. Freeman's business, JD's business, we got businesses down there already and I, I heard you say that they have to conform with the Commission in order for them to, to rebuild or expand, so I, I guess I'm asking now, cause I, I came here for information and that's how we can help our community by having us getting ourselves informed. And if, if he have to, if businesses have to do

certain thing I would ask that the Council up there or that the Staff would give them information that they need so that they can help, so they can grow. Cause we did, these are homegrown folks, we're doing homegrown business in our community and I'm all for growth, I'm all for growth, but help what you already have before you go out and help someone who is not gonna contribute to the community. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir, that's all we've got signed up to speak but if anybody has any questions in the audience about what they can or cannot do with their property, Richland County has an Ombudsman's Office that you can call and ask them, please get me in touch with the Planning Department or the Zoning Department, and our Staff is very knowledgeable about what can or can't be done under your zoning or what your options may be if your site were to get rezoned. They can answer those questions for you as well. So the number's, what, 576.8000? Is that right?

MR. PRICE: 929.6000.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: 929.6000, great, okay. Thanks y'all. That's all we got signed up.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask, tell me the zoning difference between a jewelry store and a beauty supply store?

CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think the problem there with that particular case was that there was currently a jewelry store in the facility and it was a non-conforming use so the change of use was not allowed without a zoning change. So it's not that it's, it's still a commercial use but there's a change of use which triggers a lot of our codes and ordinances to come into play, so if you, if you're operating a jewelry store and the zoning has changed on it, you can continue to operate your jewelry store. But if you

1 wanna change to a liquor store, you can't do that. So it's a change of use that, that was 2 the problem there from what I can imagine. Am I incorrect in that? 3 MR. PRICE: Correct. 4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Do we have any comments? That's all we have 5 signed up to speak. 6 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I always have to remind myself that when we 7 look at these cases, we can't really pay attention to what particular business may or 8 may not be coming, we have to look at the whole zoning classification and the 9 underlying merits of zoning because we, we really don't comment on what may or may 10 not be coming. We've had people show us pictures of what may come and they can do 11 anything under the zoning classification once the zoning's changed, so we just, I just 12 always have to remind myself not to pay too much attention to that. 13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other comments? 14 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chair, I'd like to make a motion that we send Case No. 15-15 23 MA ahead to Council with a recommendation of approval. 16 MR. TUTTLE: Second. 17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion? 18 All those in favor say aye. Are there any opposed? 19 [Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown] 20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. And folks again, just cause we're on the back end 21 of the meeting, we're a recommending Body to County Council. They'll meet back in these same Chambers on May the 26th at 7:00, if you'd like to come out for that as well. 22

38 1 Next case, well what've we got here? Alright, so we got the presentation next, is that 2 right? 3 MS. HEGLER: Chairman, one guick Text Amendment. 4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. 5 MS. HEGLER: And Mr. Price will introduce that real quickly. 6 **TEXT AMENDMENTN #1:** 7 MR. PRICE: I'm just here to answer questions. This is one where it's, as 8 previously stated every so often we have requests come before Staff and it does, and it 9 can't be done in that particular zoning district or there's some changes that may be 10 needed to the Code, but once they become pretty repetitive we actually look into 11 amending the Code. In this particular case we took a look at the LI District and some of 12 the uses that weren't permitted. You have some, many of them were allowed in the M-1 13 District from our previous Land Development Code, so we actually identified a few and 14 most of those had a lot of outdoor usage and storage, and so we just were proposing an 15 amendment for you. 16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we have a motion? 17 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we approve the ordinance that's in

front of us today.

MS. FRIERSON: Second.

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any other discussion? All those in favor say aye.

[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown]

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Alright. Do we have the presentation?

1	MS. HEGLER: Yes, Chairman, our two Neighborhood Planners Ashley Powell
2	and Latoisha Green will present the status of our adopted master plans. This is
3	something the Commission requested a couple months ago, I think during our
4	discussion of the Comp Plan and its adoption. So they're gonna go briefly through nine
5	adopted plans, just a little bit of a refresher on what they are for some of you who are
6	new, when they were adopted, and really the status of them, where we are now.
7	CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Just as a head's up, unfortunately l've got to leave
8	in about 10 minutes, but if we can get that presentation in PowerPoint form I can review
9	it that way as well. Yes, ma'am.
10	MS. HEGLER: [Inaudible] your pleasure on the last items? Discussion items,
11	summary of Rural Commercial District and the topic of having a consent agenda.
12	MR. TUTTLE: Do you wanna postpone those or do you wanna –
13	CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, let's postpone those.
14	MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chair, I make a motion that we send items 1 and 2 under
15	Other Business to the next meeting.
16	CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we have a second?
17	MR. GILCHRIST: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, all those in favor say aye. Any opposed?
19	[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown]
20	CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.
21	MS. HEGLER: Thank you. Sorry. Oh, I'm sorry, Holland's going to introduce it.
22	MR. LEGER: Just briefly. You all know who I am, the Planning Services
23	Manager. I work with Neighborhood Improvement Division to work on neighborhood

master plans. We, the Neighborhood Improvement Program began in about 2004, 2005, and has grown slightly from a single planner to several neighborhood planners and Michelle Johnson who assists us with that. We now have nine Neighborhood Master Plans and we will be soon working on the next Neighborhood Master Plan which is Olympia, and the young ladies will introduce that in just a moment. Basically we've worked with neighborhoods to enhance the quality of life in those identified 10 neighborhoods through the county, and to do so we have three Staff including myself and the first Staff is Ms. Cheryl Johnson, she's one of our —

MS. JOHNSON: Good afternoon.

MR. LEGER: - administrative assistants. And with that I'll leave it to Ms. Green to introduce the rest of our Master Plans.

MS. POWELL: I'm Ashley Powell, I'm the Neighborhood Planner who oversees implementation of the master plan districts.

MR. BROWN: Can't hear you.

MS. POWELL: Sorry. I oversee implementation of the Master Plans in Districts 1, 3, 7 and 8, so today we're gonna give you an overview and an update of all Masters Plans and Latoisha's gonna go ahead and get us started.

MS. GREEN: Good afternoon, Planning Commission. As Ashley has said before I'm Latoisha Green the other Neighborhood Planner who is responsible for the additional Masters Plans for Richland County. As Holland said earlier we do have nine adopted Master Plans with one in progress, Olympia, so that'll be 10 Master Plans in the Neighborhood Improvement Program. And those Master Plans are Southeast Richland Neighborhoods, Broad River Neighborhoods, Decker Boulevard, Woodfield

Park, Candlewood, Crane Creek, Trenholm Acres/Newcastle, Spring Hill, Lower Richland, Broad River Corridor and of course Olympia. As you can see on the map our Neighborhood Master Plans span much of the county where nearly every Council District has a Master Plan in its area. Along beside the Master Plan creation and implementation, NIP, we do several other things such as hosting the annual Neighborhood Planning Conference, neighborhood leadership training sessions. We support the Richland County Neighborhood Council. We also fund the Neighborhood Improvement Matching grants, and we also do neighborhood/community outreach. As you can see here in our picture collage, I would like to show you a different, well show you some of the events that we do within our job, which are community, excuse me, career day, our conference, Decker Boulevard, and our holiday drop in. So this is just a visual of some of the activities that we do every day. One important piece of the Neighborhood Master Plans is, of course, the transportation penny and it's been one way that we can fund those transportation projects that our outlined in our Master Plan areas. The transportation penny has over \$1,000,000,000 allocated for transportation improvement projects, particularly the Neighborhood Master Plans fall underneath the roadway projects and that is \$656,000,000 allocated for, as you can see, dirt road pavings and road widenings, but specifically neighborhood improvement is a part of this roadway. And narrowing it down a little bit more, neighborhood improvement has \$63,000,000 allocated for transportation projects within those neighborhood master plans. We do have a total of \$97,000,000 worth of transportation projects that are within seven of our adopted Master Plan areas but of course we only have \$63,000,000 allocated for funding for those projects at this time through the transportation penny.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And many of those transportation projects include streetscape and greenway design. So I'm gonna get started a little bit and tell you about what my first master plan assignment, which is the Southeast Richland County Neighborhood, which is the [inaudible] as you all were talking about a little bit before with the case that was presented. Of course, that's represented by Council Norman, District 10, and that plan was adopted January 3, 2006 as our first Master Plan. It is a one mile radius from Lower Richland Boulevard, including Garners Ferry Road and Air Base Road. One of the major projects that has come out of [inaudible] as we call it, is the Hopkins Medical Family Practice Center that was funded by CDBG Funding, which opened a year or two ago. And some of the inprogress projects that we are currently working on is naming, branding the community, also a Lower Richland greenway park. Recently a few months ago in September 2014, residents in that area voted for a new road construction which is the Rabbit Run connector which is now being designed and scheduled for construction in 2017. As you can see here in this map, it's at the green line. So moving on, my other assigned Master Plan area is the Broad River Neighborhoods which is comprised of Riverview Terrace and Broad River Heights, and Council Representative Paul Livingston is the representative for that area, District 4, and that plan was adopted October 19, 2006. And this area is bounded by River Drive, Broad River Road, Broad River and Clement Drive. In this Master Plan area there are some projects that have been completed such as identifying the neighborhood entrance sign locations, and also we're in the progress of identifying demolished homes, which is a lotta vacant properties in that neighborhood, and also street lighting upgrades. There are many transportation penny projects proposed for this area such as a neighborhood sidewalk design, a new

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

pedestrian pathway down to Broad River, and also a streetscape design. And those are scheduled for 2018, with over \$1,000,000 allocated for that project, for those projects.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. POWELL: Our next Master Plan in order of adoption is Decker Boulevard and Woodfield Park, represented by Councilman Jim Manning, District 8, and that plan was adopted July 10, 2007. The study area for this plan is approximately 731 acres, including properties that reach about a quarter of a mile on either of Decker Boulevard, and the study area is bordered by Two Notch Road and Columbia Place Mall to the north, Forest Acres and Trenholm Road to the west, and Percival, I-77 and Ft. Jackson to the south and east. Here we have a list of some of the major projects that have been completed in the Decker/Woodfield Master Plan, most recently has been the demolition of the old bank building at 2765 Decker Boulevard and currently in progress is a proposal for a community garden which will be sited at Faraway Drive and East Boundary Road. Like many of the other Master Plans Decker has quite a plethora of penny projects proposed in this area but the majority of them are streetscape improvements. There's also a pedestrian connecter proposed for a total of about \$13,000,000 to be expended in this Master Plan area. Also represented by Councilman Jim Manning, District 8, is the Candlewood Master Plan which was adopted on March 12, 2009. The Candlewood Master Plan is comprised of two main neighborhoods which is Kanebreak and Candlewood, and is approximately 240 acres located about 15 miles northeast of downtown Columbia. The Master Plan area is bordered by I-77 to the west, I-20 to the south, and the Sandhills is just east along Northsprings Road. Candlewood projects completed by NIP so far include neighborhood signage and street lighting, they're also a recipient of the Neighborhood Improvement Matching Grant that Latoisha

mentioned, and currently we are working to acquire about nine acres for the purpose of the Candlewood Park as proposed in the current Master Plan. Transportation penny projects are primarily streetscape in this neighborhood and it does apply to all of their major streets, proposal of about \$2,000,000 expenditure in Candlewood. Our next Master Plan is Crane Creek which is represented by Councilman Torrey Rush, District 7. This plan was adopted January 19, 2010, and the study area is approximately 31,000 acres and includes seven major neighborhoods, which are Bookert Heights, Crane Crossing, Crane Forest, Haskell Heights, Lincolnshire, Pine Forest, and Rock Gate. The Master Plan study area is bordered by Heyward Brockington Road to the northwest, Crane Church Road to the northeast, Monticello Road to the southeast, and I-20 to the southwest. Here we have a list of several of the projects completed by Neighborhood Improvement in Crane Creek. It is important to note that Crane Creek is home to the Neighborhood Improvement's first major master plan implementation which is Crane Creek Park which was just completed in the fall of 2014. We are currently developing an action plan to implement the remaining projects in the five year plan which include storm water and sanitary sewer for the area. Penny projects include streetscape design, a neighborhood sidewalk design, and pedestrian pathways for a total of about \$14,000,000 proposed expenditure in Crane Creek. Trenholm Acres and Newcastle would be our next Master Plan and was adopted January 19, 2010, and is represented by Damon Jeter, District 3. The study area is approximately 1,050 acres and is located just southeast of Highway 277 and south of I-20. The study area is bound by Two Notch Road at the south, Parklane Road to the east, and Fontaine Road to the west. The most recent undertaking in the Trenholm Acres/Newcastle Master Plan area has been the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Improvement is currently working in partnership with Community Development to acquire that land and form a public/private partnership for the development thereof. Penny projects include streetscape designs primarily and the allocation is about \$5,000,000 for this Master Plan. Lastly of my master plans is the Springhill Master Plan represented by Councilman Bill Malinowski, District 1, and this was recently adopted March 18, 2014. Springhill is about 16 square miles and is located about 22 miles from downtown Columbia, bordered by Broad River and Fairfield County to the north, Newberry County to the northwest, Lexington County to the south. As you can see the Master Plan was just recently adopted so there are not very many projects to list, but we did want to point out that land development regulations have been drafted, although not yet adopted by Council. And currently Neighborhood Improvement is reworking the five year Master Plan to include both Springhill and the Lower Richland plans as they are the newest adopted plans.

MR. TUTTLE: I'm sorry, can I stop you there, I had a question?

MS. POWELL: Sure.

MR. TUTTLE: You said there's the land development regulations plan, would that go through this, is that something that would go through this Body?

MS. HEGLER: It was proposed with, as a separate piece to the adoption of the plans, so we have language available should we choose to pursue it. We have not chosen to do so at that time, but it would come to you just like [inaudible].

MR. POWELL: Springhill penny projects have not yet been prioritized as the Master Plan was just recently adopted but here are a list of several penny project

improvements that are in the area of Springhill which include intersection improvements, sidewalk improvements and roadway resurfacing.

MS. HEGLER: Let me clarify that real quickly. That plan had not been adopted when the penny was passed, so there are not specific projects in the penny. But there are things that were also in the penny that just happen to be in this area, so that's what you noted here, right?

MS. POWELL: Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. GREEN: Which is similar for the Lower Richland Plan as well. And the Lower Richland Plan, Master Plan is represented by Kevin Washington, District 10 and Norman Jackson, District 11. And that plan was also recently adopted March 18, 2014. The Lower Richland Plan is one of our larger study areas with approximately 326 square miles, and is bounded by Ft. Jackson, the Congaree River, Leesburg Road, and the Wateree River. As we're also in the process of updating the five year plan to include the projects that are recommended from Lower Richland, out of that also came the Land Development regs that Tracy just clarified for us. And also the Joint Land Use Study was created by the Central Midlands COG, but also received active input from Neighborhood Improvement at that time. Specific transportation projects have not been prioritized at this moment as well for Lower Richland but that area is a part of the county-wide dirt road paving program. And our last, well not our last but second to our last master plan area is the Broad River Road Corridor which is represented by Joyce Dickerson, District 2 and Seth Rose, District 5. And that plan was adopted December 14, 2010. And the Broad River Road Corridor is approximately five miles long from Greystone Boulevard to the Harbison State Forest. One of the major projects that has come out of the Broad River Road Corridor Master Plan thus far is the street lighting that placed new street lighting along the Broad River Corridor, about 53 lights I think. And also in progress right now we, NIP received funding from Palmetto Pride organization to do a clean-up the corridor campaign and right now we are doing, working with the Councilmembers to do a corridor litter pickup, we just had one this past Saturday. And also community forums, and we're also gonna place recycle bins or waste bins at the bus stops along Broad River Road. There are a list of different transportation penny projects for that area as well; Greystone Boulevard, Broad River Road Bridge, around the Dutch Square Mall area, and St. Andrews Road, totaling over \$19,000,000 worth of projects. There isn't a timeframe for those projects as well at this moment, but I'm pretty sure they'll come forth with some more information. And our last in progress Neighborhood Master Plan that we have on our schedule right now is the Olympia Neighborhood and that's represented by Councilman Kevin Washington, District 10. And the study area is bounded by Assembly Street, Congaree River, Rosewood Drive, and the Vista. Many neighborhoods in this area have received our Neighborhood Matching Grant thus far and while this plan is a progress with Richland County, we're also partnering with the City of Columbia because the study area falls within both jurisdictions. As the plan was underway there were no specific transportation projects prioritized for this area, but there are some current ones that's in the vicinity such as the Smith Rocky Branch Greenway, the Assembly Street Sidewalk Project, and the Assembly Street Bikeways that are part of the current transportation penny projects. So we do have some upcoming events that are open to the public and we invited all our community residents and anyone else who is interested to come out and join us. We

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

have our block party, celebration block party for all Richland County neighborhoods which will be held June 4th, and it's an open event and it's to celebrate all the accomplishments and to showcase what the neighborhoods have accomplished since July 2014 to now before the end of the fiscal year. So this is gonna be a celebration, it's a free, we're gonna have food and music, so it's a good time to invite our residents to come out and fellowship with us. And also during the year we have our Neighborhood Leadership Training sessions which are open to the public as well where we invite out different speakers and they discuss different topics that are of interest to our residents. And those are held every other month on the 2nd Thursday. We just had one this past April about grant writing which is a topic that everyone was, a lot of our residents are interested about. And we'll have one in August about how they can become a 501(C)(3) organization. And in conjunction with our leadership trainings we also host the Richland County Neighborhood Council which is every month, every fourth Thursday here in Council Chambers. We just our recent one in April and we'll have our next one May 28th, and that will be a joint meeting actually with the Columbia Council of Neighborhoods which is the sister group to the Richland County Neighborhood Council.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. POWELL: Lastly we wanted to let you all know that we will be joining with Community Development to host a conference named Upgrade Together June 13th, 2015, from 8:00am until 2:00pm at Richland Northeast. This is a conference that we normally do in October and we normally do a neighborhood planning conference but this year we'll be partnering with Community Development and moving it to the summer in hopes to appeal to more people. We will be touching on what is housing to me, we'll do an update of the Comp Plan now that it has passed, and we'll also have a

collaborative town hall where Torrey Rush will address the community. And Cheryl has flyers about both of those events for you all.

MS. GREEN: Thank you.

MR. TUTTLE: Thank y'all, well done.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Great job. Yes, sir?

MR. BROWN: I'd like to raise a question.

VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Um-hum (affirmative).

MR. BROWN: One of the concerns I have, this is the second time we've had people from the Gadsden community, business people come and basically their complaint is they're not part of the development, they're not part of the discussion and so forth about what's going on in their community, or are they being blocked and all the rest of it. Are they included in these meetings? Are they having input? How, and, how do we — I hate to have that continuously come. This is the second time now when a business has tried to move into that area that we've had the same people basically come and present.

MS. HEGLER: Mr. Brown, I'll try to take that, anybody can jump in. When we did the Lower Richland Master Plan which is actually the area that they are, that they reside in in terms of a master plan, there were dozens of public meetings, we did have a lot of public input. Since last Planning Commission meeting though where we did hear from this group first, we have kind of taken them off to the side and said, let's get together, let's talk about some of your concerns. Councilman Washington has heard them as well, suggested we get with them. I think they're at a really unique, they have a unique

opportunity because they are at this crossroads where both the Master Plan and the Comp Plan was just adopted, identified this area as a potential Rural Commercial node. So we do hope to work with them and help address some of their issues that have apparently been longstanding. We didn't know that, we had not heard of them until recently, so we have been reaching out to them. I know they have Mr. Price's contact information and, and Councilman Washington's as well, so I do foresee a meeting in the future. So it, sometimes, it's hard for us to know what we don't know. I'm glad we've heard from them, I'm glad that there is a rezoning that brought them out so that we could hear from them, but certainly we'll use the Master Plan as an opportunity to educate them on what could happen in the future, what direction we think we're going in, and see if that's compatible with what they're trying to do.

MR. BROWN: I believe that they're in Mr. Washington's district, is that right?

MS. HEGLER: They are, yes, sir, and that's what he, he was, he's been contacted by them as well and is keenly familiar with some of the issues and did not seem to be aware of them before now either. So we are looking forward to having that conversation.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any other questions for Staff? Well Ms. Powell and Ms. Green, we thank you for your presentation today. Great job on that, and I would hope that you will continue to keep the Planning Commission abreast of the developments with the master plans. We've been hearing since I've been on the Planning Commission so much about these master plans and I guess the penny now has given some life to some of these master plans and so I'm very much interested in

1 hearing a little about the progress of this as we move forward. So thank you again for 2 your time. Also, can we get a copy of the PowerPoint sent to all the Members of the 3 Planning Commission? 4 MS. HEGLER: Yes, sir. VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I think that would be great. 5 6 MR. BROWN: And that's the total plan, is that right? 7 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is that right, it's the, it's the total plan? MR. BROWN: It's the total plan for the county on the use of the - cause some of 8 9 this dovetails back and is stuff we're considering as a Commission? 10 MS. HEGLER: Correct. 11 MR. BROWN: And we just need to know it. 12 MS. HEGLER: What we presented to you today were the nine adopted Master 13 Plans which are area-specific. 14 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Right. 15 MS. HEGLER: We will send you this presentation, of course, and if you could 16 download those plans online. Are you referring to the Comprehensive Plan, county-17 wide? But you have not yet received -18 MR. BROWN: The one, yes, that's affected by the penny tax. 19 MS. HEGLER: Correct, you have not received a final copy of the Comp Plan -20 MR. BROWN: Okay. 21 MS. HEGLER: - because the consultant is still putting the bow on that. 22 MR. BROWN: Thank you. 23 MS. HEGLER: But you will when it's ready.

1	MR. BROWN: But we will get it, is that right?
2	MS. HEGLER: Yes, sir.
3	MR. BROWN: Okay, thank you.
4	MS. HEGLER: You'll get both. We'll give you any kinda information you want,
5	you just tell me.
6	MR. BROWN: No, no, we appreciate it, I just wanted to ask that because we're
7	bumping up against it now, okay.
8	MS. HEGLER: Yes, sir. Yes, sir, we will get you this presentation and the, and
9	the Comprehensive Plan as soon as it's complete.
10	VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Fantastic. Yes, sir? You had a comment? Oh, I'm
1	sorry. Great, thank you. Director's Report.
12	MS. HEGLER: Those are for information only.
13	VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, great. I think we had an artificial
14	adjournment. Motion to adjourn?
15	MR. BROWN: So moved.
16	MR. THEUS: Second.
17	VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: All in favor aye.
18	[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown]
19	VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank y'all.
20	
21	[Meeting adjourned at 2:35pm]