

**RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**March 6, 2017**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

*[Members Present: Ed Greenleaf, Heather Cairns, Stephen Gilchrist, Christopher Anderson (in @1:30), David Tuttle, Wallace Brown, Sr.; Absent: Pat Palmer, Beverly Frierson, Bill Theus]*

Called to order: 1:15 pm

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'd like to call the March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2017 Planning Commission meeting to order. Please allow me 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, and persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board located in the County Administration office. First on our Agenda is the Consent Agenda.

MS. CAIRNS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we remove all three Map Amendments from the Consent Agenda.

MR. BROWN: Second.

MR. TUTTLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded that we remove all three Map Amendments from the Agenda. Signify by raising your right hand if you agree with that.

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

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright, is there any amendments to what we're doing today?

MS. HEGLER: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Then we'll begin with case number one.

1 **CASE NO. 17-003 MA:**

2 MS. HEGLER: Case 17-003 is at 10958 and 10962 Two Notch Road, totaling  
3 about 3 ½ acres, currently zoned OI, Office and Institutional and proposed rezoning or  
4 the request is for GC, General Commercial. The OI was given as a rezoning back in  
5 2014 and more recently in 2015 the parcel was also part of a rezoning request for Light  
6 Industrial. That was denied by County Council. As you know the General Commercial  
7 District is intended to accommodate a variety of commercial uses and non-residential  
8 uses that are characterized primarily by retail, office, and service establishments. They  
9 should be oriented primarily to major traffic arteries or extensive areas of predominately  
10 commercial usage. Surrounding the parcel the existing zoning is all Rural, most of that  
11 is undeveloped and there is a use, it is a legal non-conforming private club across the  
12 street or to the north. The Richland County Comprehensive Plan designates this area  
13 as neighborhood, medium density in its future land use. Those are areas where medium  
14 density residential neighborhoods and supporting neighborhood commercial scale  
15 development are the primary intended uses. Non-residential development may be  
16 considered for location along main road corridors and with a contextually appropriate  
17 distances from an intersection. Given the information I've just provided you, Staff is of  
18 the opinion that the request is not in compliance with the intentions of the Comp Plan.  
19 The Comp Plan recommends again supporting neighborhood commercial scale  
20 development in these areas, particularly the neighborhood medium density future land  
21 use. And the plan also discourages fragmented leapfrog development along its  
22 corridors. From the Staff's perspective the request does not provide for neighborhood  
23 scale development as the General Commercial could allow for more intense uses than

1 that. In addition the request would introduce the zoning designation that's not  
2 compatible with the area around it. For those reasons we recommended disapproval.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Questions for Staff? And the Applicant is not  
4 available? Okay. Any questions? Motions?

5 MR. GREENLEAF: Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, I move that we follow Staff's  
6 recommendation to disapprove this rezoning request.

7 MR. BROWN: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Motion and properly seconded. Further  
9 discussion? All in favor signify by raising your hand?

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

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And we are a recommending Body to County Council,  
13 they will meet again in these Chambers on March the 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017. Next case?

14 **CASE NO. 17-004 MA:**

15 MS. HEGLER: Case 17-004 is at 1646 Horseshoe Drive, about half an acre,  
16 currently zoned Office and Institutional. The request is for RM-HD, that's our multi-  
17 family, high density district. The original zoning was adopted in 1977, been there a  
18 while. In 2015, let me see, let me get my notes here, residential multi-family, high  
19 density parcel directly to the north was recently approved in 2015. The RM-HD District  
20 is established to provide for high density residential development, allowing compact  
21 development consisting of the full spectrum of residential uses. It's intended to allow a  
22 mix of residential types to provide for a balance of housing opportunities for the citizens  
23 of Richland County, including multi-family. Existing zoning around the parcel, there are

1 two parcels that are zoned similarly RM-HD, and others that are Office and Institutional.  
2 Those sites are either used residentially, undeveloped, or there is one multi-family  
3 dwelling unit adjacent to the parcel. The Richland County Comprehensive Plan  
4 designates this area as neighborhood, medium density but further also articulates that  
5 it's within a community activity center. Similar to the last case medium density  
6 residential neighborhoods and supporting neighborhood scale commercial development  
7 is what's expected within this future land use area. Multi-family development should  
8 occur near activity centers and within priority investment areas with access to roadways  
9 that adequately provide for them. Again, this is within a community activity center;  
10 community activity centers provide the goods, services and facilities which are possible  
11 only with a critical mass of population by a larger community scale market shed. These  
12 centers supply anchor support and junior retailers, smaller retail establishments, office  
13 space and high density residential uses such as what's being proposed here. Staff is of  
14 the opinion that the request is in compliance therefor with the intentions of the Comp  
15 Plan. Approval of the rezoning request would be in character with the existing  
16 surrounding area. Staff further believes that approving a multi-family zoning would be  
17 appropriate and it's an appropriate transitional zoning between the commercial uses  
18 south and the multi-family uses to the west and north. For those reasons we  
19 recommend approval.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Additional questions for Staff? We do have a  
21 couple persons signed up to speak. The Applicant, Fremont Nelson? Would you like to  
22 come up to the podium, please? Please give us your name and – if you have anything

1 to say or add you're welcome to do so, if not – but if you do please come up. Give us  
2 your name and your address for the Record, please.

3 **TESTIMONY OF FREMONT NELSON:**

4 MR. NELSON: My name is Fremont Nelson, my address is 116 Gills Crossing  
5 Road, Columbia, South Carolina 29223. I'm representing the owner of this property,  
6 they would like to rezone it to residential multi-family high density. That's all.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Appreciate it. Any questions for the Applicant?  
8 Thank you, sir.

9 MR. NELSON: Okay, thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Nancy Canady?

11 **TESTIMONY OF NANCY CANADY:**

12 MS. CANADY: My name is Nancy Canada, my husband and I own the property  
13 adjacent, just before you get to this lot. We're seniors, we've been renovating the  
14 property, and we're opposed at this time because we just got the notice on Saturday  
15 and do not understand. It's a small lot, half an acre, what's gonna go there?

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Canady. That's all we have  
17 signed up to speak. Questions, comments, motions?

18 MS. CAIRNS: I just have one question for Staff. If you could just remind me,  
19 under the OI District is residential use allowed at all under OI?

20 MS. HEGLER: Mr. Price?

21 MS. CAIRNS: And if so, to what density?

22 MR. PRICE: [Inaudible]

23 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Price, could you speak into the mic for us?

1 MR. PRICE: Oh, I'm sorry. I believe we took all of the residential uses out of the  
2 OI. I'm just gonna confirm that real quick. Single-family and multi-family uses are not  
3 permitted in the OI zoning designation. Under the residential category, fraternity and  
4 sorority houses, group homes for 10 to 15 individuals, rooming and boarding houses by  
5 special exception, and special congregant facilities are allowed.

6 MS. CAIRNS: Okay.

7 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, Mr. Brown?

9 MR. BROWN: What are the facilities surrounding this property? These  
10 residences are – what's the zoning and what's the current use?

11 MS. CAIRNS: So in our packet it indicates that the lot to the south is zoned OI  
12 with a residence, so that's currently a non-conforming use?

13 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

14 MS. CAIRNS: Based on what you've offered, correct?

15 MR. PRICE: Yes.

16 MS. CAIRNS: Okay. I mean, just –

17 MR. BROWN: Yeah, I saw that, that's the reason I was asking.

18 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. I mean, this area I've driven around this area, it's primarily a  
19 residential little loop. There's one business that's on the lake in the corner, but – at least  
20 it was a few years ago – but it's primarily a residential loop in that area, even though it  
21 was zoned for OI.

22 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question?

23 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Tuttle.

1 MR. TUTTLE: What's the height restriction on RM-HD? Two stories or three  
2 stories?

3 MR. PRICE: Three stories, I believe 45' is the maximum height.

4 MR. TUTTLE: Thank you.

5 MR. PRICE: I'll confirm that for you. The maximum height of structures in the –  
6 you want them for the OI District or for the RM?

7 MR. TUTTLE: RM-HD. And the only reason I'm asking is cause to really obtain  
8 the eight units on that particular half acre would be very, very difficult with setbacks and  
9 so forth. In the real world you won't get that density.

10 MR. PRICE: Right. The maximum height of structures in the RM-HD District shall  
11 be three stories or 45', whichever is taller.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Thank you.

13 MR. PRICE: In addition, high rises are permitted subject to special requirements  
14 or special exceptions, just depending on the height.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any additional questions for our Staff? Motions?

16 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion that we send Case 17-004 MA  
17 forward to Council with a recommendation of approval.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is there a second?

19 MS. CAIRNS: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we  
21 send Case No. 17-004 forward to Council with a recommendation of approval. All in  
22 favor signify by raising your hand. All opposed?

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

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And we are a recommending Body, Council will meet  
4 back in these Chambers again on March the 28<sup>th</sup> if you choose to come back at that  
5 time. Thank you. Alright. Next case.

6 **CASE NO. 17-005 MA**

7 MS. HEGLER: Case 17-005, Screaming Eagle Road, five acres, it's currently  
8 zoned Rural. The request is for HI, Heavy Industrial. The subject parcel was part of a  
9 previous rezoning request to Rural Commercial in 2013, the case was denied by  
10 Council. And the Heavy Industrial parcel west of the site was rezoned in 2012 to HI as  
11 well. The proposed zoning Heavy Industrial is intended to primarily accommodate uses  
12 of a manufacturing and industrial nature, secondarily uses that are functionally related  
13 to those uses such as distribution, storage and processing. The site is predominately  
14 surrounded by rural zoning, there are some – a mix of uses including a landfill, Ft.  
15 Jackson, a mining extraction area, and again, the Richland County Landfill surrounds it.  
16 Screaming Eagle Road is a two-lane undivided collector without sidewalks. The  
17 surrounding area is characterized by, again, undeveloped parcels, industrial mineral  
18 extraction, and landfilling uses. The 2015 County Comprehensive Plan designates this  
19 area as Rural, large lot. These are areas of mostly active agricultural uses and some  
20 scattered large lot rural residential uses. Limited rural commercial development occurs  
21 in rural activity centers only and those should be located at rural crossroads. The  
22 desired development pattern for this land use then is active working land such as farms  
23 and forests and large lot rural residential developments. Commercial development is

1 appropriately located again only within rural activity centers. We'll let you know that we  
2 did reach out to Ft. Jackson, that is a requirement of state code that any rezoning  
3 request within 3,000' of a military installation we do need to alert them to that. If it's not  
4 in here my guess is we have not heard a response from them. The Staff felt that the  
5 intent of the HI District is to accommodate uses of a manufacturing and industrial  
6 nature, that doing so would be out of character – it's not out, I'm sorry, is not out of  
7 character with the existing uses in the area but would be inconsistent with the future  
8 land use intent of the Comprehensive Plan. So that's one of those tricky ones that the  
9 desired development pattern and the way we're trying to move into the future as a rural  
10 large lot area would be inconsistent with the rezoning request, even though we  
11 understand those uses are currently present throughout. So for that reason Staff did  
12 recommend disapproval.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Questions for Staff? Yes.

14 MS. CAIRNS: I have a question for Staff. In terms of the – and again correct as  
15 I'm mistaken – but with the proximity to the Fort my recollection is that they discourage  
16 residential development right on their borders.

17 MS. HEGLER: They discourage a lot of development along their borders,  
18 particularly of a more high, you know, intensity nature. So industrial would concern them  
19 probably more than residential, but. Correct, they don't really want much along the  
20 border if they can – within the immediate proximity. Now as we get further away then  
21 those can change. Currently there's a recommendation for an activity zone surrounding  
22 Ft. Jackson which really speaks to outdoor lighting, not zoning or land use; trying to  
23 minimize the light impact to their night operations at that part of the Fort.

1 MS. CAIRNS: So it's their desire, alright so just, I heard what you said I just, I'm,  
2 you know, a little slow I think. So in their perfect world we'd have just buffers of no  
3 development around the Fort. Or farming.

4 *[Anderson in at 1:30]*

5 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, I think the preference if all else being equal is farming and  
6 little impact. And as you get further away from the Fort that would change in terms of  
7 intensity. Nothing has been adopted that would –

8 MS. CAIRNS: No, I understand that. I just, I mean, I think I just had it in my head  
9 that the desired – and I think it was cause of the noise issue – that the desire was just to  
10 keep residential away but other types of development would not seem as noxious. But I  
11 was mistaken, that you're saying that basically it would be the Fort's desire that there be  
12 little development.

13 MS. HEGLER: I mean, there's a concern about encroachment of any sort.

14 MS. CAIRNS: Of any sort.

15 MS. HEGLER: But probably the least populated – I understand what you're  
16 saying – is, is more ideal for them, but encroachment is a concern of theirs in general.

17 MS. CAIRNS: Okay. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is there a timeframe on when they're supposed to  
19 respond to us when we're asking for their –

20 MS. HEGLER: I don't know. I'm sorry Tommy's not here, I know he sends those  
21 letters. Geo, assuming there's no comment in here we didn't get a response?

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'm just curious to know.

1 MR. PRICE: Normally I know Tommy sends these out pretty much as soon as we  
2 get the application and he's getting ready to prepare the Staff Reports. And I agree that  
3 if we haven't received anything that's maybe they just don't have a comment.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

5 MS. HEGLER: I would hazard to say that if there was concern we would have  
6 heard from them.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, that's –

8 MS. HEGLER: I think that's a fair statement.

9 MR. PRICE: And may I also add that they will have opportunity to respond to us  
10 between now and the Zoning Public Hearing.

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Got it, okay. Any additional questions for the Staff? The  
12 Applicant, Ryan Horton? Sir, if you'd like to come up to the podium. Please give us your  
13 name and address for the Record.

14 **TESTIMONY OF RYAN HORTON:**

15 MR. HORTON: I'm Ryan Horton, live at 5130 Lakeshore Drive, Columbia. This is  
16 a, kind of a unique property in the fact that it's got two stinky neighbors beside it and a  
17 guy that likes to blow things up across the street. Most people don't, most people  
18 wouldn't wanna be here. What I like about this property is it's 700 or 800' deep, it's got a  
19 beautiful buffer on the front of it of pine trees now, and I can put an office right in the  
20 back. The problem I had with zoning before is, is trying to get an office that's big  
21 enough. All I want is a 5,000 square foot warehouse to put my construction office. I  
22 wanna be hidden back in the back of this property because it's surrounded by landfills  
23 on both sides, no one will ever know I'm there and that's consistent with what I wanna

1 do. I like it that it that it's Rural. One of the problems with a construction business is you  
2 have to have out – if you have outside storage you have to go with an HI. There's not a  
3 lotta HI that I would feel comfortable stuff out in an area that, you know, in the  
4 community that people can see that are existing. And I just like this piece of property for  
5 some reason. I've been in the construction business since I was a kid and one of the  
6 early things I did was go to a dump and take our dump truck, my family's dump truck to  
7 go dump things in landfills, and I don't know, seems like it's a small weird connection.  
8 But it's strategically placed for us, we're always going to dumpsites anyway, so it just  
9 works out great. And we're looking at landfills that have many, many years for capacity  
10 to be filled. And we're also isolated so that I think a lotta the problem is what does HI  
11 happen when you put it in the middle of something? That's part of Town & Country, you  
12 don't want things that are separated by themselves. Well, there's a landfill to the right  
13 and left of me, they're my borders. Ft. Jackson's across the street. HI can't spread  
14 further than this one property. And I think you could rest assured that nobody's gonna  
15 buy a landfill for high intensity development later on. So this is why I would love to get  
16 HI for me in Richland County as a business owner here to build a small warehouse in  
17 the back and that's my proposed use.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, sir.

19 MR. HORTON: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Questions for the Applicant? Motions, comments?

21 MR. ANDERSON: Apologize for being late. Geo, what other type of zonings do  
22 we have that allow exterior storage?

23 MR. PRICE: For construction [inaudible]

1 MR. ANDERSON: For construction, correct.

2 MR. HORTON: If you have a truck that's parked outside that's considered HI.

3 MR. PRICE: Looking at our Code everything looking from a heavy construction  
4 with outside storage, even special trades with outside storage, special trades  
5 construction, excuse me, with outside storage. They're all allowed outright by the HI  
6 zoning designation and they're allowed by special requirements under the M1, however,  
7 you can't rezone to M1, and the LI designation.

8 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. And I'm sorry I missed this, so Staff disapproved this  
9 based on the Comp Plan?

10 MS. HEGLER: We recommended disapproval.

11 MR. ANDERSON: You recommended.

12 MS. HEGLER: Based on the future land use designation, correct.

13 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Just to, and again I apologize for being late but I did  
14 read these before I got here. This one is a unique bird and I could see how Planning  
15 Staff has a hard time with this seeing as how the existing use – I mean, again it's all  
16 green when we look at it on the zoning map, but a landfill across the street – I feel  
17 confident that this is a good zoning change. And I'd like to put a motion on the table that  
18 we move Case No. 17-005 MA ahead to Council with a recommendation of approval.  
19 Now again, I didn't really hear what the discussion was prior to, so.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Can you give us a rationale based upon –

21 MR. ANDERSON: Well, the rationale that I would put forth is the current zonings  
22 surrounding the property all have a commercial use. And also Ft. Jackson, it's my

1 understanding that Ft. Jackson, what was it, the Adjutant General's plan? What was the  
2 plan that Ft. Jackson put out?

3 MS. HEGLER: The Joint Land Use Plan?

4 MR. ANDERSON: The Joint Land Use. I mean, this is something they're looking  
5 for, this type of zoning, correct?

6 MS. CAIRNS: Just to interject for a second. I want your question answered, but  
7 in terms of the existing landfills, they're non-conforming use, correct? Are they allowed  
8 by right in Rural?

9 MR. PRICE: By special exception.

10 MS. CAIRNS: So they – would they be a by right use in HI? Or are landfills  
11 always special exceptions?

12 MR. PRICE: I was just looking at that. I believe it is a, it's allowed outright in the  
13 HI. Landfills are allowed by special exception in the HI zoning designation.

14 MS. CAIRNS: And, and rural by special –

15 MR. PRICE: Correct.

16 MR. ANDERSON: So we have landfills as a special exception in Rural zoning  
17 classifications?

18 MR. PRICE: Yes.

19 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. That's interesting.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, it is interesting.

21 MR. PRICE: Very.

22 MR. ANDERSON: When was the last time that Code was looked at, that  
23 particular piece?

1 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry, what was that?

2 MR. ANDERSON: When was the last time we looked at that in the Code  
3 change? Cause we gotta Code rewrite coming up.

4 MR. PRICE: 2004. With the Code we have.

5 MR. ANDERSON: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: We have a motion on the table. Is there a second?

7 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded that we  
9 send Case No. 17-005 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval per  
10 Mr. Anderson's recommendation and rationale. All in favor signify by raising your right  
11 hand. All opposed?

12 *[Approved: Greenleaf, Cairns, Gilchrist, Anderson, Tuttle, Brown; Absent: Palmer,*  
13 *Frierson, Theus]*

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright.

15 MS. HEGLER: Mr. Chairman, if I might, just make sure I have your reasonings  
16 correctly cause Mr. Anderson said he was confident, so I don't think that's what he –  
17 that the surrounding parcels are commercial uses and I think what you were getting at  
18 with the Fort is that this is a more compatible neighbor. Am I making proper use of your  
19 thoughts?

20 MR. ANDERSON: Correct. That sounds good. Feel free to elaborate and put  
21 some good fancy words in there.

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Price?

1 MR. PRICE: I was just gonna point out, I know we throw that word 'commercial'  
2 around a lot, but do you – just kinda looking, do you mean industrial more so than  
3 commercial?

4 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, the – yeah, let's say a non-retail use.

5 MS. CAIRNS: It's industrial.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Industrial, yeah. And maybe we should, we should also take a  
7 look at this particular area when we do our Comp Plan rewrite. Because this is a  
8 uniquely tucked away –

9 MS. HEGLER: Agreed.

10 MS. CAIRNS: I also think – what I think would be interesting is, is from the Fort's  
11 perspective in terms of the concern they have for development around the edges. I  
12 mean, if it's light we could address that with overlay issues. If it's a concern of light  
13 spillover and stuff like that, and yet allow development. Because, like I said I always  
14 thought a lot of it was the houses, keeping houses away cause of the noise that they  
15 generate. Well, I don't think the warehouse is gonna care about noise. So it seems to  
16 me that this would actually fit nicely with being a compatible use of property near the  
17 Fort, even though it is an intenser use than residential. So I just, you know, again if we  
18 can get down to the details exactly, is it light spillover, is it – what is it that they don't  
19 want property near the Fort doing? Or is it just being trees?

20 MS. HEGLER: Well yeah, I mean, certainly I think we'll get into that when we do  
21 Code rewrite. It goes two ways; I think they would be concerned about a heavy  
22 industrial, imagine a massive industrial operation that's got – which I know is not what  
23 we're talking about here – but in terms of just generally speaking to zoning –

1 MR. TUTTLE: You mean similar to a landfill? I mean, I'm not being smart but  
2 that's clearly intensive industrial use, right?

3 MS. CAIRNS: But I mean, if somebody wanted, if somebody wanted to build a  
4 manufacturing plant, a huge manufacturing plant that was completely self-contained,  
5 why would that be incompatible with being next to the Fort?

6 MS. HEGLER: They would be concerned about their potential impacts on that  
7 and the cost and the –

8 MS. CAIRNS: Like their impact in terms of the fact that they'd be making –

9 MS. HEGLER: I know McEntire particularly is concerned about what if there is  
10 some accident right off the runway and you have a \$500,000,000 industrial operation  
11 there. It's an encroachment of almost any sort. And it's not fair for me to, you know, try  
12 and put words in their mouth but –

13 MS. CAIRNS: But that's why I'm curious, so it's the economic investment of the –

14 MS. HEGLER: Correct, I mean, if you think about the impact they might have on  
15 something else. It's not only the impact to them.

16 MS. CAIRNS: Which is, like they may love landfills because there's not a lotta  
17 damage if someone crashes into a landfill.

18 MS. HEGLER: Correct, so I mean, I think – being funny about it that makes  
19 kinda, it makes sense.

20 MS. CAIRNS: Right so that's what I'm trying to figure out, is it that they wanna  
21 make sure that –

22 MS. HEGLER: Right, they're concerned about economic –

23 MS. CAIRNS: - if they damage the property they're not –

1 MS. HEGLER: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: More liability.

3 MS. HEGLER: I mean, they're concerned about humans primarily, but there's  
4 also the concern over a major massive in height and the size and bulk of a facility and  
5 the cost of such.

6 MS. CAIRNS: But would it be different for an air base versus –

7 MS. HEGLER: Probably.

8 MS. CAIRNS: Cause I don't think they fly many planes in and outta Ft. Jackson.

9 MS. HEGLER: At Jackson they do not. Which is, again, probably why we have  
10 not heard from Ft. Jackson so you're probably.

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Tuttle?

12 MR. TUTTLE: Having been involved in the BRAC process when we went through  
13 that the last time, in the meetings I was involved in they had many concerns, but the  
14 one that reached the highest level was the noise. Whenever they have an exercise the  
15 General said, you know, they get no less than 20 or 30 calls and it's the same exercise  
16 they did three days earlier but they continue to get that. And one of their concerns was if  
17 they continue to grow and get more and more calls like that, then this may not be the  
18 best base because there're other places where there's nothing for 20 miles around the  
19 perimeter.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Got it.

21 MR. TUTTLE: So I kinda – nobody fall outta their seat – I kinda agree with  
22 Heather [laughter] in that I do think that the noise and I think this zoning classification

1 and the uses associated with this are probably in better concert with the wishes of the  
2 Fort than maybe some others would be.

3 MS. CAIRNS: Well, I do get to listen to the, the troops marching every morning  
4 out where I live. It's been a change in my environment. It was so funny the – I'm like,  
5 what is that?

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Anderson?

7 MR. ANDERSON: When was the last – I'm actually looking at the JULS [sic], the  
8 last one, when was this written?

9 MS. CAIRNS: The Joint Land Use.

10 MS. HEGLER: 2012 potentially?

11 MR. ANDERSON: 2012? Okay. I mean, really I think the big thing in this from  
12 what I'm reading is they're abstaining heavily to residential.

13 MS. CAIRNS: Okay. But you have your rationale, do you have it down  
14 sufficiently?

15 MS. HEGLER: I think so.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. We don't have to restate the motion.

17 MS. HEGLER: I would note that rural large lot and primarily farming and  
18 agricultural zoning is probably far more in line if you're worried about the Fort's  
19 considerations than any other zoning. So I think you're considering a major suburban  
20 application of the zoning and the future land use around the Fort and that's not what's  
21 proposed here, so I just wanted to make it clear that I don't think the difference is, or the  
22 opposition is that we're looking at a 500 home development, that wouldn't be compatible  
23 with that future land use designation either.

1 MS. CAIRNS: But to a certain extent, I mean, if the Fort's desire were to have  
2 agricultural and/or large lot, this isn't zoned for large lot residential, ¾ acres are not  
3 large lot.

4 MS. HEGLER: Correct.

5 MS. CAIRNS: So in some ways putting this into five acres of heavy industrial  
6 warehouse storage is less intense use than what its existing use is.

7 MS. HEGLER: Correct.

8 MS. CAIRNS: Potentially.

9 MS. HEGLER: Without a good rural zoning designation which hopefully we will  
10 create.

11 MS. CAIRNS: Right. And when you factor in the neighboring uses, this is the, you  
12 know, so long as it doesn't trigger issues with the Fort this is the best –

13 MS. HEGLER: Right.

14 MS. CAIRNS: - use of this property I believe.

15 MR. ANDERSON: Which brings me to a question when we start getting into  
16 Code. Is that something we wanna introduce?

17 MS. HEGLER: What's that?

18 MR. ANDERSON: Is some type of larger lot – do we need to finish this –

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well yeah I was gonna say, let's wrap this up and,  
20 because I think we're getting into discussions about the Code rewrite here in just a  
21 minute. So we don't need to restate that motion, is that right?

22 MS. HEGLER: I'm good.

23 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Yes, sir, Mr. Price?

1 MR. PRICE: I think you've already voted on the [inaudible]. I'm sorry. If you'll  
2 note in your package that a previous request was denied, I believe, for Rural  
3 Commercial for this site, if I'm correct. Okay, so what we did was Ms. Moore kindly  
4 pulled the file from that and so there is a letter in here from a Michael, I guess it's  
5 Greece? He's a Colonel with the US Army Commanding and he responded, this is back  
6 in '13, without reading the entire letter, remember the request was for Rural Commercial  
7 – changing a zoning district from Rural to Rural Commercial would allow more  
8 commercial activities that would potentially oppose the noise created by future or,  
9 excuse me, by current or future South Carolina National Guard and Department of  
10 Defense training activities. The proposed Rural Commercial District intended for  
11 inclusion in or adjacent to neighborhoods would encourage residential development in  
12 the area, which would be incompatible with military training and operations. In addition,  
13 increased artificial lighting could interfere with some military training. So I'm not sure if  
14 that addresses all of it, but that's how they responded from the previous rezoning  
15 request for commercial.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you for the information.

17 MR. HORTON: Can I elaborate on that?

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: We've actually closed the discussion on it.

19 MR. HORTON: It wasn't with me.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: We appreciate it, yeah definitely. Okay.

21 MS. HEGLER: Did you mention when the Zoning Public Hearing would be?

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, the Zoning Public Hearing will be March 28<sup>th</sup> in  
2 these Chambers, so feel free to come back to that at that time. Thank you. Land  
3 Development Code rewrite.

4 MS. HEGLER: So we're ready to start.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Very good.

6 MS. HEGLER: You have before you a schedule for our kickoff for what we're  
7 calling our first set of discussions in a forum. The consultants will be here March 27<sup>th</sup>  
8 through 29<sup>th</sup>, so we put together a pretty aggressive use of their time you'll see on the  
9 schedule before you. I wanted to coincide their kickoff with a Council Zoning Public  
10 Hearing which is why we're holding it at the end of the month. And would ask of you,  
11 you'll see your next Agenda item is to get you together at that time so they can meet  
12 with you as well. It's not your normal first Monday but trying to coincide again with the  
13 Council Zoning Public Hearing became difficult. So in front of you is the schedule, we'll  
14 have them interview Planning Staff, other departments, certainly we wanna get them  
15 combined with our Legal group, the County's Legal Department, that's proposed for  
16 early Monday, March 27<sup>th</sup>. Then I'd like them to sit down with you during a working  
17 lunch if you would be so inclined to meet at that time, so that'll be an action I'm asking  
18 of you. Several Councilmembers have asked to meet with them individually so we have  
19 time scattered throughout these three days to do that. Then we'll host three public  
20 meetings; one in each of the three more unique parts of the County, we'll do one in  
21 Lower Richland, we'll do one in the Northeast, and we'll do one in the Northwest. Given  
22 the constraints of time we'll have two Monday nights so we'll have to sorta split Staff  
23 and split consultants. So we'll have one in Lower Richland and one in the Northeast that

1 night. Tuesday we will meet with a committee, I've worked with administration to put  
2 together a committee that will help kinda guide this, that will help you keep everything  
3 on track, help keep us keep everything on track. I do not have that fully formed yet but  
4 will let you know when I do have the consultants meet with them. Some more  
5 Councilmember meetings, just continuing to go down the list. Suggested three  
6 stakeholder groups based on discipline. Stakeholder group number one would be your  
7 development, your building, real estate, economic development. Stakeholder group  
8 number two would be your conservation and environmental groups and proponents.  
9 Stakeholder number three is kind of my catchall for service groups, water, utility  
10 providers, schools, even the military installations, everybody that's sort of outside of that  
11 commercial component or that environmental component, have them meet as well. So  
12 those are opportunities for larger interest stakeholder groups to provide their input.  
13 Again, Tuesday night, of course, will be the Zoning Public Hearing where we'll have the  
14 official kickoff with County Council. Continuing our meetings with the stakeholders and  
15 Councilmembers on Wednesday, and our last public meeting would be Wednesday  
16 night in the Northwest. So again, a very aggressive use of their three days here, kind of  
17 a charrette style, they usually get a lot out of that, we get a lot done. This is just really  
18 where they're gonna start introducing the concept of a Code rewrite, what does that  
19 mean, and then starting to get input and feedback from everybody, kind of a hopes and  
20 fears, what would folks want to see, what would folks be concerned about. Particularly  
21 you can imagine if we're talking to folks in the Northeast, we've already started to  
22 assemble the folks that have been so active lately in some of the rezonings and making  
23 sure that they are heavily represented and know about these meetings so that they can

1 attend and be a part proactively of what kind of happens when folks get concerned  
2 about the use of land. So real excited about this, again requesting you all agree to meet,  
3 I don't know if you wanna call it a work session or if you wanna have a special called  
4 meeting, but certainly they wanna spend a couple hours with you to get started. And  
5 again that's proposed for Monday, March 27<sup>th</sup> at 11:30.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: This is certainly an aggressive agenda and we  
7 certainly appreciate you guys putting this together. How are we getting the word out to  
8 folk about this?

9 MS. HEGLER: So we're massively starting that marketing campaign. We have a  
10 lotta list serves, a lotta ways to email folks. We've got a lot of HOA contacts so we'll  
11 probably mail information to them that they can share with their citizens. It's hard to get  
12 one-on-one information to 400,000 people, it's almost impossible, so you know, mailing  
13 a postcard to every citizen would be cost prohibitive.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well, media can help.

15 MS. HEGLER: But we will actually, we will definitely use the media. Again this list  
16 serve was pretty powerful in getting folks out during the Comprehensive Plan. We're  
17 gonna do some press releases in the news. We, you know, we interview our citizens  
18 and not one source seems to rise to the top as the predominant way folks get their  
19 information. We still have some digitally disconnected folks, so email's not gonna be,  
20 not the only way we can reach out to them. So we've gotta still use a little old school  
21 tactics, we go to our rec centers and some major churches, major places of public  
22 activity, libraries, and we will post some information there as well. And open to any other  
23 suggestions and ideas you might have.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well, I guess one comment I'll make with particular  
2 sense to the restructuring that's going on in County government that you have certainly  
3 a lot more outlets at your disposal to help get that word out through some of the CDBG  
4 efforts that's going on with community development. So that certainly can hopefully be  
5 helpful to spread the word. The meeting with the Planning Commission that is set for  
6 lunch on the 27<sup>th</sup>, is that right?

7 MR. BROWN: Where?

8 MS. HEGLER: We would host that here.

9 MR. BROWN: In these Chambers or?

10 MS. HEGLER: We're still finalizing the best location. We're trying to utilize –

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: But it will be here at 2020?

12 MS. HEGLER: More than likely. I will get that information to you as soon as  
13 possible. It will be no further than here or some downtown facility that could host us.

14 MS. CAIRNS: I'm just curious, the two days where it's site visits on the way, what  
15 types of sites are you visiting?

16 MS. HEGLER: Well, you know, they just asked, I mean, these are out of town  
17 consultants, although they did help us with the Comp Plan so they've been here before,  
18 but they like to just drive around and get a lay of the land, see some things. So you  
19 know, we'll take some of the major commercial corridors, we'll go out and show them  
20 some of the countryside, if there's anywhere else you would recommend. But typically  
21 as we're driving to those locations for that night public meeting we'll –

22 MS. CAIRNS: Take a circuitous route kind of thing.

1 MS. HEGLER: - correct, we'll add some time to see things, some of the hot topic  
2 areas that we're faced with.

3 MS. CAIRNS: So this is the same group that did the Comp Plan.

4 MS. HEGLER: It is, so they have the – it's Clarion Associates, they have code  
5 writers, you know, attorneys that help with this portion of it. You may not've met this  
6 particular person last time, but it's their expertise so they do comprehensive planning as  
7 well as code writing and -

8 MS. CAIRNS: And, I mean, is the – I feel like we've some discussion just you and  
9 I sometimes about is this a total, I mean, are we planning to just have an entirely new  
10 code, structure wise and everything, not just a tweak?

11 MS. HEGLER: Correct. Yes, ma'am.

12 MS. CAIRNS: But it's gonna be based on, at least in the beginning, a uniform  
13 code concept that then we modify to ourselves?

14 MS. HEGLER: Yes, ma'am. It's a start from scratch, no attempt at rewriting what  
15 we currently have, just starting from scratch.

16 MS. CAIRNS: Have any of the other municipalities around here, or jurisdictions,  
17 done this already with this uniform code as a basis?

18 MS. HEGLER: I mean, the City of Columbia is rewriting their Code.

19 MR. TUTTLE: The City's in the process, yeah.

20 MS. HEGLER: Mr. Tuttle's been a part of that and might wanna speak to that a  
21 little more.

22 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah. The City's been in process, gosh for a year?

23 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, probably a little longer.

1 MR. TUTTLE: And I think they've probably got another six – you'd be surprised at  
2 how slowly it moves.

3 MS. CAIRNS: They're starting from a uniform code.

4 MR. TUTTLE: They started from scratch, yes, with the uniform code. I guess the  
5 uniform code's form-based, right?

6 MS. HEGLER: Well, uniform code meaning we have a joint zoning and land  
7 development regulations so yeah, we'll start – I mean, the City of Columbia specifically  
8 asked the consultant to entertain a Smart Code rewrite, but we're not held to that, they  
9 were not necessarily requiring that. I think they're learning throughout the development  
10 of the code that that would be difficult to do. We did not propose any particular style of  
11 code. I think we will come out from this with similar to what we have now in terms of  
12 regulations and the zoning will be tied with some components of form-based coding if  
13 we can, you know, in places where it make sense would be my vision of good rewrite at  
14 this point for the County.

15 MR. TUTTLE: How ultimately will the consultants zero in on how much form-  
16 based and how much – I mean, is that from a consensus process or is it just from input  
17 and they're gonna come back with a recommendation or?

18 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, I mean, I think what they will do is bring to the table  
19 experience on where it might work given what they start to learn about us. There're a  
20 couple places I have kind of in the back of my mind that might be places to start and so  
21 it'd be more like an overlay or it'd be more like something just specific to a particular  
22 part of the County to help us learn how to navigate a form-based code instead of  
23 making it County-wide. So hopefully they'll bring experience to the table and say, yeah I

1 think that would be a great place to start. They would make the recommendation, of  
2 course it's up to y'all and Council to actually adopt it.

3 MR. TUTTLE: So in theory though there could be no linkage between the current  
4 zoning classifications and the proposed zoning classifications, they could be completely  
5 different nomenclatures, completely different numbers, completely different definitions,  
6 etc.?

7 MS. HEGLER: Right, so that would be the heaviest lifting portion of this, of  
8 course, is new zoning categories and Mr. Anderson was already hinting at this. I think if  
9 you follow directly the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan, you know, it  
10 stipulates and it recommends that we move to density-based zoning which we currently  
11 do not have, and that we introduce new zoning designations that better represent the  
12 future land use vision that we have in the Comprehensive Plan. So the conversation we  
13 had today is absolutely perfect and spot on for what I'm hoping will come out of this  
14 code rewrite is that we potentially do have better articulated zoning categories and  
15 designations than we currently do that help us better achieve the vision in the  
16 Comprehensive Plan. I say that like it sounds like the easiest thing in the world and it is  
17 absolutely not.

18 MS. CAIRNS: Oh my gosh, it's huge heavy lifting.

19 MS. HEGLER: Yeah. We will probably end up somewhere in-between this and  
20 that.

21 MS. CAIRNS: Well, and isn't this also just the rewriting of all the ordinances in  
22 terms of fence height –

23 MS. HEGLER: Everything.

1 MS. CAIRNS: And will we as Planning Commission, I mean, any ordinance that  
2 has anything to do with land at all, does that, is that gonna be under our – I remember  
3 like trailer parking, like we're gonna see that stuff.

4 MS. HEGLER: Yeah.

5 MS. CAIRNS: Okay.

6 MS. HEGLER: And Mr. Gilchrist also alluded to this to, I mean, given the  
7 reorganization, I mean, there are departments that have their regulatory parts of the  
8 code that currently are separate from what you do and what we do in planning. There  
9 may be opportunities for bringing some of those together if the reorganization holds that  
10 you might be looking at things that currently might've been regulated and enforced by  
11 some other –

12 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, so in theory some of the manuals could ultimately get  
13 modified or reinvented based upon what –

14 MS. HEGLER: Right.

15 MR. TUTTLE: - comes outta here ultimately.

16 MS. HEGLER: Right. The stuff that today would be done by Engineering and  
17 Public Works are now part of the Planning group. To the degree that that gets folded  
18 into this code rewrite I'm not sure yet, but we would be silly not to investigate whether or  
19 not that made sense. So, you know, and in terms of process there will be this  
20 committee, there's of course Staff, there's a consultant, we need to be funneling up to  
21 you, at that point I see you getting a really well vetted set of recommendations and that  
22 we would be talking to you monthly about what we've done and giving you monthly

1 updates about, you know, so we can kinda pick this apart and not come to you in six  
2 months and have you be reviewing a colossal piece of code.

3 MS. CAIRNS: I was gonna say what's the idealized timeline to the end, I mean,  
4 when's the, what's the end date that we visualize today for this?

5 MS. HEGLER: Right, it's a two year process.

6 MS. CAIRNS: So in that two year process in terms of our role as Planning  
7 Commission when do you see our heaviest lifting?

8 MS. HEGLER: I think in terms of making a recommendation for adoption would  
9 be nearer the end of that, but you're going to –

10 MS. CAIRNS: So the last year would be –

11 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, but you're gonna be reviewing things, I hope, all along so if  
12 there's things we can check off and move on, we're not giving you a whole lot at the  
13 end. But you, but I don't foresee there being a lot for approval until that last six to nine  
14 months.

15 MR. TUTTLE: But in theory, though, I mean, you know, from the onset you have  
16 a chance to mold and help understand how much –

17 MS. CAIRNS: Oh yeah, no I'm just –

18 MR. TUTTLE: - is, you know, so I mean.

19 MS. CAIRNS: I think she knows where I'm coming from. Just so you know I'm set  
20 to rotate off in April. Right now in my personal side of things I'm a lotta boards and doing  
21 a lotta stuff. I've been thinking I needed to step off this.

22 MR. TUTTLE: Well, that's gonna be tremendous for those boards to lose you but  
23 we're gonna appreciate you seeing this process through. [Laughter]

1 MS. CAIRNS: And the most time consuming one will end in December though,  
2 and so that's why I'm thinking if I can juggle these both for six months or so I could  
3 entertain staying on. Cause I know Staff has indicated an interest in having me stay on.  
4 So that's been my concern is that this would be too much with everything else I have  
5 going on, but maybe not.

6 MS. HEGLER: Yes, so for the first six months is there a – no, I don't think there  
7 would be a huge –

8 MS. CAIRNS: Change in our workload.

9 MS. HEGLER: - burden, yeah, on your workload.

10 MS. CAIRNS: Next year when I'm letting go of my other commitment you'll make  
11 sure to suck up that time.

12 MS. HEGLER: Correct. [Laughter] I would save and retain your energy.

13 MS. TUTTLE: Yes, Mrs. Chairman. [Laughter]

14 MS. HEGLER: So again, if I could get from y'all concurrence that that's a good  
15 time to meet and then it's at your pleasure whether you want it to be a work session or  
16 call it a special called meeting. I'm inclined –

17 MS. CAIRNS: What's the difference to us? Can you just –

18 MS. HEGLER: Well historically, I mean, a special called meeting you are  
19 supposed to be in attendance.

20 MS. CAIRNS: So that goes on our ledger.

21 MS. HEGLER: Correct.

22 MS. CAIRNS: And the other one does not.

23 MS. HEGLER: Correct.

1 MS. CAIRNS: So why don't we make it a not? Unless, do you feel that that helps  
2 increase attendance if it's a must?

3 MS. HEGLER: It historically does.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: It needs to be a must.

5 MS. CAIRNS: Okay. I will defer to the Chairman on that.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, it needs to be a must. And you know, I wanna  
7 just say this because I think that this is a huge undertaking I think. And certainly it's  
8 gonna require that we be involved, I was looking at this list of all of these things that are  
9 gonna be happening for those three days, and I think for purposes of us getting a really  
10 good handle on what the code rewrite should look like, you know, I'm always nervous  
11 about doing things in a vacuum and having at least as much interest from our side of  
12 the aisle as possible in some of these meetings because obviously when I hear our  
13 discussions up here over the last few years about what the Code is, you can clearly  
14 hear that, you know, there have been discussions all over the place about what the  
15 Code in this County should look like. And as a result of that, you know, and there's  
16 always some ambiguity in that process, but I think we have an opportunity this time to  
17 really be engaged in this at the onset and I appreciate the agenda that you put together  
18 because that helps us. So I'm asking all the Commissioners to please ma'am and  
19 please sir, let's spend the time necessary to be engaged in this process going forward  
20 so that we can have a code that we can all appreciate and that makes sense for where  
21 we're trying to go in the County. And Tracy I would just, you know, I would just echo  
22 what you just said earlier, I mean, even from the standpoint of all of the additional  
23 capacity that you have in your office now, I mean, I think all of that is critically important

1 to be engaged in this process going forward so that everybody kinda knows – I reflect  
2 back to our retreat and it was very interesting to hear folk at our retreat talk so much  
3 about, we didn't know that this is what the Planning Department did and some of the  
4 things you guys were involved with. So I think to the degree that we can engage as  
5 many players and partners in this as possible is a good thing. And so I appreciate this  
6 type of agenda. So what do we need to do?

7 *[Greenleaf out at 2:06pm]*

8 MS. HEGLER: If you will actually make a motion for the special called meeting  
9 and that way we can advertise it appropriately.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, motion, special called meeting?

11 MR. BROWN: What we're in now?

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: It's gonna be on the 27<sup>th</sup>?

13 MS. HEGLER: From 11:30 to approximately 1:30.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: From 11:30 until what?

15 MS. HEGLER: 1:30.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: 1:30?

17 MR. BROWN: So moved.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Second?

19 MS. CAIRNS: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, all in favor signify by raising your hand.

21 *[Approved: Cairns, Gilchrist, Anderson, Tuttle, Brown; Absent for vote: Greenleaf;*

22 *Absent: Palmer, Frierson, Theus]*

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. So that's done. And for those that are not here  
2 I'll also try to send out something to say, please, please ma'am, please sir, be here at  
3 this special called meeting.

4 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, and once we get this finalized and the location we can send  
5 that around, too. And I would highly encourage you to attend any of these public  
6 meetings, I think it will help you to hear from other citizens.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Oh yeah. No question about it.

8 MS. HEGLER: This early in the process. It'll be interesting.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Very good.

10 MS. HEGLER: The next item is an update on the Capital City Mill District Master  
11 Plan. We met, you know, some time ago, I think the last time we discussed this might've  
12 been at 701 Whaley. So a lot of work has been going on, we have not been in a vacuum  
13 as Mr. Gilchrist mentioned earlier. There has been a lot of activity, just an appropriate  
14 time to get back in front of you and tell you where we are. And for that, is it, Latasha's  
15 doing it for us? Latasha Green has been managing that project, she's our Neighborhood  
16 Planner.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, great. Thank you.

18 MS. GREEN: So what you have before you is a presentation of the Capital City  
19 Mill District Master Plan and it's gonna be a brief update of the process thus far. I want  
20 to say that we're really excited about this plan and we introduced this project before you  
21 back in July 2016, so it's been a while. And we've hosted, that was a joint work session  
22 with the City of Columbia's Planning Commission, and since then we've continued our  
23 efforts with public meetings and had various conversations up to this point where we are

1 almost near completion. This project is a partnership between the City of Columbia and  
2 Richland County and we've enjoyed our work together thus far on the Master Plan. I  
3 would like to note that we've had support from our County Councilmembers in this  
4 process and we've been grateful for them as well, and of course your support in this  
5 Master Plan project. We're working with our consultant team, the Boudreaux Group,  
6 who has a multi-faceted approach to the Master Plan process. We have different  
7 consultants who are working in Complete Streets, Green Infrastructure, Economic  
8 Development, Greenway and Railroad Management. Also we have our PAC members,  
9 our Planning Advisory Committee, and they consist of our local business leaders,  
10 neighborhood residents, and also other organization leaders who are really interested in  
11 the process, and they've got the input, the process thus far as well. Before you right  
12 here on this screen is a map of the study area. The brown shaded area is  
13 unincorporated Richland County which is approximately 508 acres, so it takes up a  
14 majority of the study area. The purpose of this project is to create a plan that has a set  
15 of recommendations and implementation strategies to achieve the overall vision for the  
16 area since it is within both jurisdictions. A majority of the study area is within District 10  
17 and also Richland County District 5. In our next slide we are in phase 3 of our Master  
18 Plan process as indicated by the star. We've updated County Council last December  
19 about the project and now we're here updating you all, of course, just where we are so  
20 far. We've engaged with the public as far as input and received enormous amount of  
21 feedback. We've also had numerous Staff meetings and we will receive a draft this  
22 coming March, and then we'll go before our PAC members again to have them look at  
23 that draft, and then we will open it up to the public for a final round of input, and we'll

1 have that online. And we hope to come back before you in July hopefully or sometime  
2 late summer for action on the Master Plan. Also interesting to note that the City is also  
3 giving an update to their Planning Commission today on the update of the process. One  
4 of the highlights, some of the values that came out of the Master Plan thus far, that the  
5 community said these are really important to them, and these values echo opportunities  
6 of, areas of opportunities for the Master Plan and some areas for homeownership  
7 collaboration and cultivation of culture. So these values are what really the Master Plan  
8 will speak to of the Mill District being a place and not a pass through is what we  
9 continuously heard throughout the public meetings thus far. And so from those values  
10 and our meetings we came up with four big ideas and these big ideas are the  
11 recommendations and strategies that we will tease out to carry forth the Master Plan in  
12 the area. And those big ideas deal with place-making, traffic management, connectivity,  
13 and water quality. In place-making we have, okay how this district should be defined,  
14 what is the land uses that we would recommend, how or where should investment  
15 occur, how the County and the City should work together even if that means adopting  
16 some similar regulations at this point, we're not sure, but those are some  
17 recommendations that we've, the Planning Team has created out of our research with  
18 the big idea as far as place-making. And you can see here is an example of some  
19 gateway signage. This is what can encourage that place-making, could encourage that  
20 sense of place and unifying the district since there are three distinct neighborhoods in  
21 the area; you have Whaley, Granby and Olympia. Our next big idea is connectivity,  
22 focusing on street connections. And those include potential infrastructure  
23 improvements, road [inaudible] streetscaping and walkability. Here on this map are

1 some specific target locations on how we could improve and increase the street  
2 connectivity which would create that sense of place, would connect to the greater urban  
3 fabric in the whole entire area. So you connect to the City of Columbia and to  
4 unincorporated Richland County. Our third big idea which has been a highlight of the  
5 planning process thus far is traffic management and also consolidation of railroads.  
6 There's a large amount of cut-thru traffic in the area from what we've seen with our  
7 analysis and also heavy train volume in the area. So therefore there's a  
8 recommendation to consolidate those rail lines which could reduce railroad at-grade  
9 crossings, of course improving safety and increasing traffic flow. I would like to note that  
10 we've had a very in-depth conversation with our PAC members to ensure that we've  
11 gained some consensus about this since this has been a hot topic in the Master Plan  
12 process. On this slide right here it's really interesting to note the areas, the circles in the  
13 purple and black represent the daily train volume at each location. So we can see that  
14 there is a high percentage of that train traffic throughout the day, and so the Master  
15 Plan is really gonna focus on how can we alleviate that and improve it, make it better for  
16 all users in the Master Plan area. And our last big idea focuses on greenways and water  
17 quality. Many areas of the Mill District are low lying, they are within the Rocky Branch  
18 Watershed so this recommendation will focus on green infrastructure and also reducing  
19 storm water runoff and increase water quality. As you can see here there's some  
20 drawings and examples of how that green infrastructure could look, of how we could  
21 improve the existing boulevards to capture that storm water runoff and also create some  
22 areas for bicyclists and pedestrians to, for beautification and for safety.

23 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman? May I ask a question?

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir.

2 MR. BROWN: Are you specifically in that area going to deal with flood control  
3 and so forth? Because that was a big issue there, all of this is nice and good, but if that  
4 is not a priority then all the rest of this really is not gonna make any sense.

5 MS. GREEN: Yes, sir. The Master Plan will look at flood control and particularly  
6 we understand that the flood control is outside of this area, so we're gonna look at how  
7 we control that upstream as well as it flows into the Master Plan areas. So we are  
8 working with our consultants on having recommendations that deal with that.

9 MR. BROWN: The last great storm we had this area was very heavily impacted.

10 MS. GREEN: Yes.

11 MR. BROWN: That's the reason I'm raising this, of course.

12 MS. GREEN: Yes, sir, thank you. And I will wrap up with just saying that we do  
13 have a website for the Master Plan if you really wanna take more in-depth here at  
14 [imaginemilldistrict.com](http://imaginemilldistrict.com). We also are on Facebook so like us on Facebook. And when  
15 we have released our draft to the public it will be online as well for commenting at that  
16 time. So thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Great. Just a question, what's the timeline on  
18 completion of this?

19 MS. GREEN: So the timeline, we're expected to receive our final report in June  
20 to Staff, and then go before, of course, the process to come before you all again and the  
21 regular adoption process this summer, late this summer.

22 MR. BROWN: Are you gonna have cost projections and so forth?

23 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: That was my next question.

1 MS. GREEN: Yes, sir. We will have cost projections. Also potential partnerships  
2 to carry out these projects, and also a timeframe.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

4 MS. GREEN: You're welcome.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Very good.

6 MR. TUTTLE: I have one question.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir.

8 MR. TUTTLE: So obviously we're gonna enter into a joint agreement relative to  
9 regulatory environment since it's kind of an overlay district with two different  
10 municipalities governing different sections. How would you set that up relative to the  
11 rewrite that's getting ready to take place? Would it, would we have the ability to modify  
12 that or would that be kinda etched in stone permanently and not really conform to our  
13 new code once it's adopted?

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Good question.

15 MS. HEGLER: Both? I mean, I think – ideally this will be written in such a way as  
16 the – it will be compatible with what the code's rewrite would recommend. You know, so  
17 I'm envisioning that if we have a solid set of land use regulations and zoning categories  
18 for this area within the County we could just sort of adopt that, fold that into the code  
19 rewrite. There may be some tweaks we have to make here or there. Hopefully the MOU  
20 or whatever kind of agreement we have with the City would allow us to do that. They  
21 understand we're embarking on this as well, so to the degree that this would be the  
22 most sophisticated and most recent language we have I hope it would not conflict too

1 much with whatever we do in the code rewrite. But I think we have to leave it open to  
2 possibly amend.

3 MR. TUTTLE: And with the City's current position on more aggressive  
4 annexation it looks to me like this would be an opportunity where everything's in writing  
5 and that would make it easy for them ultimately to annex part of this. I think we should  
6 kinda have some understanding what the goals are there because I know they have a  
7 new annexation coordinator trying to go out and actively pursue some things, so. I'm not  
8 sure where the County would fall in that and what position the County might take but I  
9 certainly see it coming.

10 MS. HEGLER: We are monitoring that, we are working on a position. We have  
11 always sort of uncomfortably talked about this during this particular project that while we  
12 go through this wonderful process and you go ahead and annex it. It's certainly a  
13 potential. I hope what we're putting in place though are practices that would not make  
14 that seem so necessary to the City. You know, really the issue for the citizens of that  
15 area is the feeling that we have inconsistent regulations that you know, there's a  
16 different color trash can on the other side of the street. We can mitigate that through  
17 good regulations through an MOU and through joint work. If we can do that I think the  
18 citizens will be happy and we will have met the objectives of the Master Plan. If  
19 annexation still becomes a priority of the City it will be for some other reason that we  
20 didn't find a way to accommodate the citizens in this area. So I understand, that is on  
21 the table, we are monitoring it actively and are engaged with the City and are kind of  
22 working to formulate a position just in general, but this is clearly an area that is being  
23 heavily eyed by the City for, for many reasons. Some obvious, some not, but. We're

1 going forward I think in good faith that we can come up with an approach that's best for  
2 the citizens that doesn't necessitate annexation.

3 MR. TUTTLE: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional questions? Well thank you so much for  
5 your presentation.

6 MS. HEGLER: Thanks, Latasha.

7 MS. GREEN: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: We look forward to hearing the future updates on this,  
9 absolutely. Chairman's Report, nothing, just except to remind all of the Commission  
10 Members of these very important dates by the end of the month. I think it's important for  
11 us to make sure that we're participating in what we've all indicated is important to us,  
12 which is this new code rewrite. And so to the degree that we can I would certainly  
13 encourage all of us to be here. So that's all I have on the agenda for today.

14 MS. HEGLER: I have two more quick things if I may.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes.

16 MS. HEGLER: I know that you all heard about the request not to park in Council  
17 spaces. I know that you have in the past, that was encouraged. We have, some of you  
18 heard me at the beginning, a very active Council who is present here for many hours of  
19 the day and need those spaces. I don't know if that was historically the case. So for the  
20 meantime please park in the public parking. I'm gonna work with administration to see if  
21 there's another place we might be able to identify for boards and commissioners, but  
22 please do not park in the Council spaces as you might have before.

1 MR. BROWN: Parking in the yellow or the other parking spaces since we have  
2 those County things, they won't tow us off? Cause they've got two hour limits, that's why  
3 I'm asking.

4 MS. HEGLER: I don't know where you're talking about.

5 MS. CAIRNS: The public, you know –

6 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, you'll be fine in public parking.

7 MS. CAIRNS: But the public parking does indicate a two hour limit.

8 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, I think you would be fine with your stickers. You have  
9 stickers on your cars. I will confirm that but I believe you would be fine.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: We probably need new stickers. [Laughter]

11 MR. ANDERSON: See if you can negotiate no parking spots and lunch.

12 MS. HEGLER: Lunch instead of parking spots? Okay. [Laughter] Anyway,  
13 appreciate your patience on that. It's important to our Councilmembers that they can get  
14 here and come and go. The second item is I have a request from McEntire, we talked a  
15 lot about our military installations today. They are embarking on an Installation Complex  
16 Encroachment Management Action Plan, good timing, called ICEMAP. Awesome.  
17 Anyway they will have their consultants in town next week and they have asked for us to  
18 meet with them and potentially the Chairman or anyone else from the Planning  
19 Commission that would be available. And that is scheduled for the 15<sup>th</sup>, that's  
20 Wednesday, from 10:30 to noon. And that will be in my conference room. Chairman  
21 Gilchrist, I would encourage you to be there and if you would like to invite anyone else  
22 from the Planning Commission I would let you open that up.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Absolutely. And who wants to join me in that meeting?

2 Don't speak now, just for those that would like –

3 MR. BROWN: I'd love to but I have a conflict.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: - for those that would like to attend we certainly would

5 –

6 MS. CAIRNS: It's March –

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: March 15<sup>th</sup>, yeah.

8 MS. CAIRNS: - 10:30 to –

9 MS. HEGLER: And I can – 10:30 to noon.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: 10:30 to 12:00. Only an hour and a half.

11 MS. HEGLER: I can send out a meeting invite if that's your –

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: You weren't here last meeting so we voted you in as  
13 Vice-Chair.

14 MS. CAIRNS: I saw that on the Minutes. [Laughter]

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: So, duty calls Heather, huh?

16 MS. HEGLER: I could send out the invite.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah okay, that'd be good. Any of us that can  
18 participate in that though, please.

19 MR. ANDERSON: And I think that's great because the –

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I do, too.

21 MR. ANDERSON: - I did a project outside using the JLUS and it's interesting, I  
22 mean, they generate a lot of economic development for us and brings a lotta people into  
23 this City. County.

1 MS. HEGLER: And that's all I have, Chairman.

2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

3 MR. TUTTLE: Motion to adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

4 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: It's been moved and properly seconded. See y'all next  
6 month. Thank you.

7

8 *[Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm]*

9