2

1

3

4

5 6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

17

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION February 1, 2021 Zoom Meeting

[Members Present: Jason Branham, Heather Cairns, Stephen Gilchrist, Christopher Yonke, Bryan Grady, Gary Dennis, Mettauer Carlisle: Absent: Beverly Frierson, Terrence Taylor]

Called to order: 3:00pm

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'll try to conduct the meeting and if we go out y'all just let me know and we'll try to figure out something else. Mr. Price, is the Staff ready to go?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, good deal, good deal. Well, let me call then the February 1st Planning Commission meeting to order. Please allow me to read this into the Record: In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was posted on our bulletin board in the County administration office, sent to radio stations, TV stations and newspapers, and persons requesting notification on the County bulletin board. So we certain appreciate all of you joining us here today and the public joining us in our first meeting of 2021. And for all of you who I've not had the opportunity and pleasure to say Happy New Year, I can't even believe that we're already almost in the first quarter of 2021, it's amazing with all that's going on. But I want to thank you again for your commitment to our Planning Commission and we look forward to conducting the public's business here on this February 1st day. The first Item on our Agenda today is the Election of Officers, and let me just say that – before we get into this – that I certainly have appreciated the opportunity to serve as your Chairman. This has not certainly gone without recognizing that you can't be a good chairman unless you have good people that help to support what you're doing, and I recognize

that and we have an awesome team of Commissioners that do what you need to do to ensure that we're supporting the people here in this County, and you've certain supported my administration whatever that looks like and means over the last few years. So I want to thank you and I certain want to thank my right hand, Commissioner Cairns, for being there to make sure that I stay on track with the Planning Commission meetings. So you know, I just wanted to put that out there and say to you that as we continue to move forward there're a lotta great things that this County will be undertaking here with regards to the Planning Commission on the Code rewrite and other things that is going to require us to continue to have a laser focus on what's important to the County. And so with that being said I look forward to receiving nominations from the floor and we will go from there. So at this time Election Officers, Item No. III, the Chair will entertain motions.

MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes.

MS. FRIERSON: This is Commissioner Frierson. One correction, you said that you were a good officer. No, you and Heather were great leaders and we greatly appreciate it. At our December meeting I indicated my interest in seeking leadership but as I thought about it, you are correct about we have so many major challenges before us, we're in the middle of a rewrite, and I think it's crucial that we maintain continuity of leadership at this time. That being said I place in nomination the name of Stephen Gilchrist as our next Chairperson.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. That's one nomination on the floor. Are there others?

1 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chairman? 2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes sir, Commissioner Dennis? 3 MR. DENNIS: Yes, sir. I agree that we do need continuity, however, you're not 4 going away any time soon but your time on the Planning Commission is coming up from 5 my understanding, and I think looking forward I would like to nominate Jason Branham as Chairman. 6 7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Dennis. So that's two 8 nominations on the floor, are there any others? Okay then we will close the floor and 9 ask for a vote. So all in favor signify by, that Stephen Gilchrist will be the new Chairman, 10 or the continuous Chairman, please signify by, I guess we can raise our hands, Geo, is 11 that right? 12 MR. PRICE: No, I think it will be better to do the roll call. 13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, roll call vote. 14 MR. PRICE: Okay. This is a motion for Stephen Gilchrist for Chair. Stephen 15 Gilchrist? 16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye. 17 MR. PRICE: Heather Cairns? 18 MS. CAIRNS: Aye. 19 MR. PRICE: Christopher Yonke? 20 MR. YONKE: Nay. 21 MR. PRICE: Mattauer Carlisle? 22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Carlisle, are you there? Are you on mute?

1 MR. PRICE: Mr. Carlisle is shown to be in attendance, however, I don't see any 2 indication of a microphone so we'll continue on. Gary Dennis? 3 MR. DENNIS: Nay. 4 MR. PRICE: Bryan Grady? MR. GRADY: Aye. 5 6 MR. PRICE: Terrence Taylor? 7 MR. TAYLOR: Aye. 8 MR. PRICE: Jason Branham? 9 MR. BRANHAM: Nay. 10 MR. PRICE: Beverly Frierson? 11 MS. FRIERSON: Aye. 12 MR. PRICE: And I still don't have anything from Mr. Carlisle. However, at this 13 point we have in favor 5 and against 3, so Mr. Gilchrist – 14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Price, can we, just to make sure that we calculate 15 Mr. Carlisle's vote, is there a way we can reach out to him? He may not know that he's 16 not, does not have a microphone showing. 17 MR. PRICE: I will attempt to reach out to him. 18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. I just wanna make sure that we have everybody 19 coded right here. 20 MR. PRICE: I was unable to make contact with him. 21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, alright. 22 [Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Grady, Taylor, Frierson; Opposed: Yonke, Dennis, 23 Branham; no vote: Carlisle]

1 MR. PRICE: I guess we'll go ahead and go through the motion for Jason 2 Branham. Stephen Gilchrist? 3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Nay. 4 MR. PRICE: Heather Cairns? 5 MS. CAIRNS: Nay. 6 MR. PRICE: Christopher Yonke? 7 MR. YONKE: Aye. 8 MR. PRICE: Mr. Carlisle – again, we're having some difficulties getting him. Gary 9 Dennis? 10 MR. DENNIS: Aye. MR. PRICE: Bryan Grady? 11 12 MR. GRADY: Nay. 13 MR. PRICE: Terrence Taylor? 14 MR. TAYLOR: Nay. 15 MR. PRICE: Jason Branham? 16 MR. BRANHAM: Aye. 17 MR. PRICE: Beverly Frierson? Ms. Frierson? 18 MS. FRIERSON: I apologize. Nay. For Branham. 19 MR. PRICE: Okay. That'll be 3 votes for and 5 against for Jason Branham. 20 [Approved: Yonke, Dennis, Branham; Opposed: Gilchrist, Cairns, Grady, Taylor, 21 Frierson; no vote: Carlisle] 22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Price, for going through that for us. And 23 let me thank all of the Commissioners again for allowing me to serve as your Chairman

again and I look forward to serving out my term and preparing to hand the mantle over to our next chairman when that time comes. Mr. Price, we now have to elect the Vice Chairman, is that correct?

MR. PRICE: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

MR. DENNIS: I do have a question though.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes sir, Mr. Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Yes, I know you said when your terms over, I thought the term ended in April of 2021, so that leaves us two to three months, and then are we re-voting again if you are off the Commission? It was my understanding that you had reached your term and you had to go off for a timed bit before you could come back on to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: My term is up in April, is that right, Mr. Price? And it usually takes Council some time to make a decision about whether or not they wanna reappoint a member to the Commission. And so what's happened in the past, Mr. Dennis, is we've elected officers not based upon when their term is gonna end. It's been the fact that we would elect an office and so there may have been some confusion about that, but Mr. Price can certainly shed some light on that. And one of the things that I wanna put on your radar screen today is a conversation about us potentially amending our rules to look at that as we get close to someone's time, particularly if we have a chair that's currently serving, whether or not we should allow ourselves to amend our own rules to address transition of leadership at that time. But Mr. Price, can you weigh in on that, please?

1

2

4

3

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

1920

21

2223

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. As Mr. Dennis stated correctly that the terms for both Stephen Gilchrist and Heather Cairns, they do expire as of April. However, until someone is appointed to those positions by Council then they will continue to serve. And just based on the last couple of vacancies we've had it is taking quite a while for Council to appoint those positions so this could be something that could go on, you know, anywhere from the next month or two, excuse me, from May until maybe the end of the year, maybe even going into next year, because the way Council, the way they do their – what Council would do is they take applications for any vacancy for any board or commission that's in need of someone to be appointed. And they will schedule that their Rules and Appointments Committee interviews with each of those applicants; and again we're talking about not just the Planning Commission, we're talking about all boards and commissions. And they will make sure that until they have interviewed everyone that has applied for that position, they will not appoint someone. So again, you know, just kind of from a I guess historical standpoint this can go on for quite a while before a new member is appointed back to the Planning Commission.

MS. FRIERSON: And may I add also, Mr. Dennis? When my term expired the committee that did the interviews started the process for interviewing those who had applied for the Planning Commission, then they stopped. And then there was a lapse and then they continued again. So as Mr. Price correctly stated, the time period can be several, several months, unfortunately.

MR. DENNIS: I'm well aware of the time period, however, amending rules just to fit our agenda is not the way we should do things here in Richland County. And you know, if Mr. Gilchrist does get replaced, let's say this new County Council is on top of

1 things more than the old County Council and they replace him and Heather, and let's 2 say by August. Well, now we don't have any turnover and it's just a flat out swap and 3 go, and I don't think that's how things should be done. If we're looking at it for the year 4 somebody should at least have that for that whole year, not just for a few months. I 5 really wanna err on the side of caution on this because I really looked at the rules and 6 done a lotta digging for this because I didn't know what I wanted to do. And I think that 7 we really need to look forward to the future, and I think setting up a successful new 8 chair and a successful vice chair with the current Chair and Vice-Chair that we have to 9 do a great turnover if they don't seek to come back on this board or we can't get the 10 rules amended, then we're caught with our pants down per se. I don't think it's right. 11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Dennis, I agree with you. If in fact you have 12 commissioners that may not have any interest in serving another term – 13 MR. PRICE: Excuse me, Mr. Gilchrist, you've gone out. We're having a little 14 trouble hearing you. No, sir. We were unable to hear your last comments, Mr. Gilchrist. 15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Can you hear me now? 16 MR. PRICE: We can hear, going in and out but we can hear you a little bit. 17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: [Inaudible] 18 MS. CAIRNS: Stephen, your voice is incomprehensible. 19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'm gonna have to come back in on another device. Mr. 20 Price, can you let everyone know that I will come back in on another device, please? 21 MR. PRICE: Okay.

MR. YONKE: [Inaudible] off the questions, I was also under the impression that his term limit was set to end when we were talking about this in December. I thought he was on his second time around.

MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, I think that's correct but there is still just this bizarre phenomenon that until you're replaced you continue to serve, I mean, it's just the, you know, it is common and it'll probably be quite a few months after April before we're replaced. Although I suppose it is possible that the new Council moves on these things quicker but historically that's exactly what's happened.

MR. BRANHAM: So Heather, I'm just treating you, you're presiding right now.

MS. CAIRNS: Okay.

MR. BRANHAM: Gilchrist is off. And I think, like theoretically there's no question that you and Stephen are both eligible to be elected officers right now. I guess mechanically maybe you could speak to it with your experience, you've got a lotta tenure on the Commission, how does that transition of power occur if both officers are term limited out at the same time, replacements are found in-between Planning Commission meetings and so, you know, you finish one meeting with both officers in place but before the next meeting happens both officers are gone from the Commission. How does that meeting even start up? I guess it's just like whoever's left has to pick a temporary presiding officer to then conduct an election for new officers? Have you had that happen?

MS. CAIRNS: I'm pretty sure that the timing of how these things occur, that you wouldn't have both of us preside at a meeting with not knowledge that it's our last

1 meeting. And I think you would just elect new officers at the next meeting if that 2 somehow happened, but. 3 MR. BRANHAM: So you would expect a heads up that would happen at least 4 before your last Commission meeting. 5 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. Yeah. And it is just, I mean, with this Code rewrite going on, 6 I mean, that's just, that's such a big undertaking so that was why this, you know, the 7 sense of just keeping leadership in place made sense. But I mean, I have no 8 expectation in life that come April that's my last meeting. Yeah. MR. BRANHAM: And I'm not here to argue anything, it's just a matter of trying to 9 10 get a little bit more context and seeking out that insight as far as how this scenario 11 might've played out in the past. I don't even know that it has happened, maybe it hasn't. 12 I just, I'm not familiar enough for enough years to have seen both officers maxing out 13 their terms at the same time, and I just, almost in a way I wish County Council would 14 provide some sort of assurance that both of you would not have your last meeting occur 15 at the same time. 16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Can you all hear me now? 17 MS. CAIRNS: Yes. 18 MR. BRANHAM: Yes. 19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, great. Thank you. 20 MS. CAIRNS: We lost your mug but we got your voice. 21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, alright, I'll try to get the mug back on here in a 22 minute. 23 MR. BRANHAM: The voice is pretty great.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thanks, man. Well Mr. Branham, I heard your 2 comments and I certainly would agree with you. Heather, let me ask you a question. 3 How many terms have you served on the Planning Commission? 4 MS. CAIRNS: I have no idea. A lot. I mean, when I started I finished an 5 unexpired term so that didn't count. And then I think I did two terms and when I hit the 6 end of my second term Council had changed the rule about that you could stay on. So I 7 think this is, like my third full term? So I mean, it's been like 15 years and it wasn't really 8 something I sought out to do. But I think they've changed it back now to where you 9 can't, you know, they are forcing out after two terms, which I support as a fundamental 10 rule for sure. 11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure. 12 MS. CAIRNS: I just, you know, I think when I stayed on after the second full term 13 there was a lot of staff that was asking me to stick around and I think part of that's 14 because we knew this Code rewrite was coming. So I, you know, agreed to stay on, did 15 not expect to have this go my entire legal career. 16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Right. 17 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, it's been a long time. I've been on a long time. 18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. 19 MS. CAIRNS: And I do know that we've had the, I'm pretty sure that we've had 20 the chair position open up before midyear. 21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, we have. 22 MS. CAIRNS: And it's been no big deal to appoint a new chair. So. 23 MR. BRANHAM: Is that because you still had a continuing vice-chair?

1 MS. CAIRNS: I suppose, but I mean, all I can recall is that, you know, when we 2 got to a meeting without a chair the first thing we did was elect a chair. 3 MR. BRANHAM: Right. 4 MS. CAIRNS: So you know, I mean, I don't see why that wouldn't be, even if both 5 of us somehow did disappear in-between meetings the first thing y'all would do at the 6 next meeting would be to appoint a chair and a vice-chair. I mean, we don't really do 7 anything as chair people between meetings that is distinct to being a chairperson. I'm 8 not gonna say we don't do anything. But you know. 9 MR. BRANHAM: I'm not here to belabor any point or anything and -10 MS. CAIRNS: I think the fact that yeah, it is true that our rolls as chair have really 11 no bearing between meetings, it's really about just helping to run the meeting. I mean, 12 do you disagree, does that sound right, Stephen? 13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: No, I totally agree. You know, and helping to formulate 14 the agenda when asked to do so, but 90% of it is just actually conducting the meeting. 15 MS. CAIRNS: It's conducting the meetings, that's really where our positions 16 come into play. So that's why, yeah if you started a meeting with no chair or vice-chair 17 you'd just elect them and off you'd go. 18 MS. FRIERSON: Point of order, Mr. Chair. 19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes ma'am, Ms. Frierson. 20 MS. FRIERSON: It is 1:23. I understand that some of the new people needed this 21 information, it's been interesting but could we perhaps continue with the meeting? 22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Absolutely. We now have on the Agenda the election 23 of our Vice-Chair. And the Chair will entertain a motion for Vice-Chairman.

1 MR. BRANHAM: I'll nominate Gary Dennis, kind of for some of the same reason 2 that we've already reviewed, just in a [inaudible] create a smooth transition of leadership 3 and I believe Gary's qualified to do that and has the level of commitment requisite to fill 4 that role. And that is by no means a slight to Ms. Cairns. 5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Oh no, no. Not at all. I'll nominate Heather Cairns. Ms. 6 Cairns has obviously served with distinction for the last few years as the Vice-Chair and 7 has certainly brought a wealth of knowledge. No spite to my friend Gary Dennis, but to 8 just maintain some continuity through the process I nominate Ms. Cairns. Any additional 9 nominations for the floor? 10 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chairman, I move the nominations come to a close on the 11 said names. 12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Chair moves for the nominations to come to a close. 13 yes. Ready for a roll call vote, Mr. Price. 14 MR. PRICE: Okay. This would be the nomination for Gary Dennis for Vice-Chair. 15 Stephen Gilchrist? 16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Nay. 17 MR. PRICE: Heather Cairns? 18 MS. CAIRNS: Nay. 19 MR. PRICE: Christopher Yonke? 20 MR. YONKE: Aye. 21 MR. PRICE: Okay, Mr. Carlisle is not on. Gary Dennis? 22 MR. DENNIS: Aye. 23 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry, what was that vote again, Mr. Dennis?

1	MR. DENNIS: Aye.
2	MR. PRICE: Bryan Grady?
3	MR. GRADY: Nay.
4	MR. PRICE: Terrence Taylor?
5	MR. TAYLOR: Nay.
6	MR. PRICE: Jason Branham?
7	MR. BRANHAM: Aye.
8	MR. PRICE: Beverly Frierson?
9	MS. FRIERSON: Nay.
10	MR. PRICE: Okay, we have 3 votes for Mr. Dennis and 5 against.
11	[Approved: Yonke, Dennis, Branham; Opposed: Gilchrist, Cairns, Grady, Taylor,
12	Frierson; no vote: Carlisle]
13	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, that motion fails so, or it didn't fail but we move
14	on to the next vote.
15	MR. PRICE: Alright, this'll be for Heather Cairns for Vice-Chair. Stephen
16	Gilchrist?
17	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.
18	MR. PRICE: Heather Cairns?
19	MS. CAIRNS: Aye.
20	MR. PRICE: Christopher Yonke?
21	MR. YONKE: Aye [sic].
22	MR. PRICE: Okay, Mettauer Carlisle? Gary Dennis?
23	MR. DENNIS: Nay.

1 MR. PRICE: Bryan Grady? 2 MR. GRADY: Aye. 3 MR. PRICE: Terrence Taylor? 4 MR. TAYLOR: Aye. MR. PRICE: Jason Branham? 5 6 MR. BRANHAM: Nay. 7 MR. PRICE: Beverly Frierson? 8 MS. FRIERSON: Aye. 9 MR. PRICE: Okay, if I'm correct we have that 6/3, 6/2, excuse me, 6/2. 10 [Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Yonke, Grady, Taylor, Frierson; Opposed: Dennis, 11 Branham; no vote: Carlisle] 12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Six/two, okay. And the motion carries, congratulations 13 Ms. Cairns, welcome back as Vice-Chair. And now we have to elect a secretary, Mr. 14 Price? 15 MR. PRICE: No, sir. Normally Staff has served as the secretary for the Planning Commission over the years. 16 17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Well again, to our fellow Commissioners we 18 thank you for your consent to allow us to serve for the additional time as your Chair and 19 Vice-Chair, and we look forward to continuing to work with our Commission. So thank 20 you again for your support. Moving right along on the Consent Agenda, Item No. IV. 21 MS. CAIRNS: In terms of the Consent Agenda we do need to make an 22 amendment, it's of the Map Amendments, there are seven. I believe the only that is 23 gonna remain on the Consent Agenda is Item No. 4. Case 20-044, Capers Avenue. So

1 unless a Commission Members wishes to have discussion on that case I would make a 2 motion that we approve the Consent Agenda, removing Case No. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 for 3 discussion. 4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Is there a second on the Consent Agenda? 5 MR. GRADY: Second. 6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded that we 7 amend the Consent Agenda as amended. All in favor signify by roll call vote. 8 MR. PRICE: Okay, Gilchrist? 9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye. 10 MR. PRICE: Cairns? 11 MS. CAIRNS: Aye. 12 MR. PRICE: Yonke? 13 MR. YONKE: Aye. 14 MR. PRICE: Dennis? 15 MR. DENNIS: Aye. 16 MR. PRICE: Grady? 17 MR. GRADY: Aye. 18 MR. PRICE: Taylor? 19 MR. TAYLOR: Aye. 20 MR. PRICE: Branham? 21 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

22

23

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

[Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Yonke, Dennis, Grady, Taylor, Branham, Frierson; no vote: 1 2 Carlisle1 3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, motion carries, unanimous vote. We'll move right 4 along to our first case. 5 **CASE NO. 20-041 MA:** 6 MR. PRICE: Our first item is Case 20-041 MA. The Applicant is Hossein 7 Alizadeh, hopefully I'm saying that somewhere near correct. The location is 4501 8 Sheraton Road. The Applicant is asking to rezone a parcel a little more than 1/3rd of an 9 acre from RS-HD, which is residential, single-family, high density to NC, neighborhood 10 commercial. Staff recommends disapproval of this request just based on the 11 Comprehensive Plan. The subject property is located within a conservation future land 12 use designation, and again per the Comprehensive Plan commercial development is 13 discouraged within these areas except for limited, low impact development and uses. 14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, are there any questions for the Staff on this 15 case? Ms. Cairns? 16 MS. CAIRNS: No, you can go on. 17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Mr. Price, do we have anyone signed up to 18 speak on this case? 19 MR. PRICE: Yes, we do. Mr. DeLage will read those comments into the Record. 20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Mr. DeLage. 21 MR. DELAGE: Yes sir, Mr. Chairman. So our first comment is from the Applicant 22 and again I apologize if I mess anyone's name up. Hossein Alizadeh, and it says, Dear

Planning Commission Members, this letter is to request to rezone my property located

at the 4501 Sheraton Road, Columbia, South Carolina 29209, tax map number 13416-02-01, from RS-HD to retail. I am confident that my request for rezoning to a community general retail grocery store with healthy, quality food, beverages and organic juices will help the entire community and the health of residents within walking distance. Our customers will most likely bring with them healthy disposable income. In conclusion I urge you to vote yes on this project. It is the kind of redevelopment that is good for the neighborhood and good for the City of Columbia economy. Sincerely, Hossein Alizadeh. And I apologize again for butchering that last name. And then that it is for those in approval, then we have some opposition statements.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

MR. DELAGE: So let's see here. This is from Senator Darrell Jackson, it says, To Whom It May Concern, it has been brought to my attention that the property located at 4501 Sheraton Road, Columbia, South Carolina 29209 is being considered for rezoning as a commercial property. This neighborhood is very dear to my family and myself. I am concerned about the elderly residents, most who have been residents for over 50 years. I along with the residents do not want to change the fabric of this neighborhood. I respectfully request that you consider the many families that may be affected by this and consider my opposition to this rezoning. If you would like to discuss this issue further please feel free to contact me. With kindest personal regards, Senator Darrell Jackson. And then, alright our second opposition letter is from Elijah and Lillian Survivorship – I apologize, that might actually be from – yeah, that's it, and it says, Honorable Commissioners, we are writing this letter hoping it will help make a decision to deny all requests to rezone the 4501 Sheraton Road property from RS-HD to NC. We

are owners who live across from this property. We are over 80 years old. We have lived here over 52 years with no problems. We would like to live here in peace for the remainder of our lives here. Rezoning this property to NC will cause lots of unforeseen problems. Our understanding is that the owners want to establish a convenience store or some type of business on the property that would include the sale of alcohol. Such a store would invite many strange and unnecessary traffic into the neighborhood of quiet and peaceful elderly people. As older residents we would live in fear of the unpredictable and possible unseemly behavior that a convenience store would invite. In conclusion we are asking you for your help to keep our homes and neighborhood guiet. clean, conductive and comfortable living. We ask you to keep our entire area zoned RS-HD. Elijah and Lillian Green. Alright, and then we have a letter from Roger Leeks and that is Eastway Park Neighborhood Association, 45119 Romney Drive, Columbia, South Carolina 29209. It says, Honorable Commissioners, I am our neighborhood president and I am writing this letter hoping it will influence you to deny all requests to rezone the property located at 4501 Sheraton Road from RS-HD to NC. In the overview is that 4501 Sheraton Road is located within the boundaries of the Eastway Park subdivision. Eastway Park is bounded on the east by Bluff Road, on the north by a small stream and woodlands, on the south by woodlands, and on the west by woodlands and a 50' cliff. The development of Eastway Park began in 1963 and was completed in 1970. Most of us living in Eastway Park have made our homes here for the last 50+ years. The neighborhood has been very stable, quiet and safe since the beginning. We have worked hard to protect the value and beauty of our investments, however, during the last 8 to 10 years about 25% of the original owners have died and their children have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

either sold or rented their parents' homes to people who don't care anything about the integrity, the beauty or the upkeep of the neighborhood. This [inaudible] us who are now in our 70s and 80s and 90s, we're too old to move, we're living on fixed incomes but our homes are paid for. We are asking you to keep our surroundings quiet, clean, conductive to comfortable living and zoned RS-HD until after we are dead. Conclusion: we are asking that you deny the request to change the zoning status of the property located at 4501 Sheraton Road from RS-HD to NC. It is our understanding that the owner wants to establish a convenience store to some type of §26-96 states that to make such a change there must be a desire or need by the residents. The residents of Eastway Park do not want nor need the convenience store located inside our residential subdivision. And then it's referring to – it says, please see the attached of the list of residents opposing any changes of zoning from RS-HD to Neighborhood Commercial. And I believe that information was forwarded as well. Alright, and then we have a comment from Daisy and Cynthia Lockridge at 4508 Sheraton Road, Columbia, South Carolina 29209. It says, We are opposed to converting the adjacent property, 4501 Sheraton Road into a commercial property. The community of Eastway Park has been our home for over 50 years. To outsiders it is just another African American community, to us it is so much more. Our community is made up of neighbors, friends and family. It is a place where first, second and now third generations have called home. My mother and I often sit on our porch and regularly enjoy our community and neighbors. It is where we watch children play, where previous generations of children have played. It is a precious gift and Daisy's legacy. It is the gathering place on festive occasions and a haven in times of trouble. It is the love and quiet enjoyment of our neighborhood that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

makes all this possible. Today our quiet enjoyment is threatened. It is threatened by non-indigenous homeowners who want to change the fabric of our neighborhood. We do not want to live next door to a commercial property nor do we want a commercial property in our community. It is a safety concern living next door and a safety concern for the entire neighborhood. This will bring constant traffic flow of strangers to our doorstep and into the neighborhood. We also perceive this action as the beginning of the gentrification of the community. Finally, envision yourself on your front porch enjoying a peaceful afternoon with your family. Imagine your neighbor of 40 years walk over to talk to you as you watch your grandchildren play where your children once played. Envision a peaceful Saturday afternoon. Did you envision a place where anybody would want to live? Now envision that you have to look next door and see a commercial establishment where strangers frequent. Now you can no longer sit in quiet enjoyment and are constantly worried about safety. Would you want to live this way? We are opposed to converting this property from residential to commercial and request that permission is not granted to allow 4501 Sheraton Road to convert to a commercial establishment. Alright, and then our next letter, I, Alvin Champ Smith, oppose the rezoning at 4501 Sheraton Road to NC which is across the street from me. I have lived here over 60 years and have no problems. Our neighborhood does not need any type of stores or any businesses. This change will bring down the value of our property. Furthermore, it would bring all types of people to loiter in our neighborhood. We have people who are elderly living here. The extra foot traffic and loitering into the neighborhood would be really bad and scary for them. Please consider not changing the rezoning policy for 4501 Sheraton Road. Alvin Champ Smith, 4505 Sheraton Road,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 Columbia, South Carolina 29209. And that is the last of the opposition comments and 2 then, of course the comments that were email directly. There's also the opposition 3 petition that was signed as well. I believe it was five pages of that. CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, did all Commissioners receive the email 4 5 notification of the additional comments? Okay, great. 6 MR. DENNIS: I did not. 7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, Mr. Dennis did not. 8 MR. DENNIS: I did not as of noon today. 9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Yeah, it was kinda late this afternoon, which is 10 why I wanted to make sure that everybody had an opportunity to see those. While Mr. 11 Dennis is checking on that are there any additional comments for the Staff on this case? 12 MR. DELAGE: No sir, Mr. Chairman. 13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Commissioners? 14 MS. CAIRNS: Well I have a quick question for Staff. So the conservation land 15 use designation, does that encompass the entire subdivision? Or is it just that it's on the 16 south side of Bluff Road that it got picked up? 17 MR. COOK: Ms. Cairns, so it does encompass that entire subdivision, so we use 18 Bluff Road as that dividing line between conservation and then on the other side being 19 an economic development corridor, center, future land use designation. And so on that 20 south side of Bluff Road, that would fall within the conservation future land use 21 designation. 22 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I just, being that it's a subdivision it sounds a little bit of a

misfit to say because the future use is conservation. I mean, clearly the future use for

this area is residential because that's what it is and unless the whole neighborhood gets taken out, which I don't see. But I mean, I don't therefore support the rezoning request but it just seems like a bit of a misfit for the rationale. I mean, it's also interesting that it's also the zoning that they're asking right there, it just happens to be vacant property. So, any other comments or questions from anybody?

you have a comment to make?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay thank you, Ms. Cairns. Any additional comments from Commissioners?

MR. DENNIS: I did get the email at 2:27, 30 minutes prior to this meeting.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, thank you Brother Dennis. Mr. Branham, did

MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, I just was gonna say I drove by there yesterday and sure enough the house right next to the parcel in question, this was in a cold rain, you had residents sitting under their carport facing that direction, facing that house. So the imagery that was described by some of the communications from the residents sounds very realistic. To me that Eastway Drive is a natural whatever you wanna call it, informal demarcation or place of designation as far as that neighborhood. I mean, it is, from what I can see fully developed, full blocks, fully developed residential. I have a really hard time just thinking in the context of this is an appropriate way to start nibbling away at residential blocks by allowing some sort of a commercial enterprise on that side of Eastway Drive in particular.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Branham. Any additional comments on this case? The Chair will entertain a motion on Case No. 20-041 MA. Any motions?

1 MS. CAIRNS: I'll go ahead and make a motion that we send Case No. 20-041 2 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of disapproval, the reasons mostly being 3 part of what Staff says, but also just that this is a lot within an established residential 4 neighborhood and, you know, there's nearby property that's already zoned for the use 5 so if there's market force it's already there. So I just think that just as Mr. Branham 6 offered there's no need to go into this neighborhood and rezone property commercial. 7 MS. FRIERSON: I second. 8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is there a second? 9 MR. DENNIS: I second. 10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded by I 11 believe Mrs. Frierson and Mr. Dennis. Any additional comments? One comment I would 12 just like to ask the Staff to make a notation of and that is both Ms. Cairns' and Mr. 13 Branham's comments regarding this particular, even though they're supporting the 14 recommendation of the Staff, please note those comments because I think those 15 comments are very relevant to this particular case in light of the additional findings that the Commissioners raised. 16 17 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. 18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, so it's been moved and properly seconded that 19 we send Case No. 20-041 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of 20 disapproval. All in favor signify by roll call vote. 21 MR. PRICE: Okay, Gilchrist? 22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye. 23 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

1	MS. CAIRNS: Aye.
2	MR. PRICE: Yonke?
3	MR. YONKE: Aye.
4	MR. PRICE: Carlisle?
5	MR. CARLISLE: Aye.
6	MR. PRICE: Dennis?
7	MR. DENNIS: Aye.
8	MR. PRICE: Grady?
9	MR. GRADY: Aye.
10	MR. PRICE: Taylor?
11	MR. TAYLOR: Aye.
12	MR. PRICE: Branham?
13	MR. BRANHAM: Aye.
14	MR. PRICE: Frierson?
15	MS. FRIERSON: Aye.
16	[Approved to deny: Gilchrist, Cairns, Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Taylor, Branham,
17	Frierson]
18	MR. PRICE: Okay.
19	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay and the motion carries. And again, we are a
20	recommending Body to County Council and they will meet to discuss this case on
21	February 23 rd and Mr. Price are they still meeting by Zoom?
22	MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

_

•

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, so they will meet by Zoom on that date so for those that are participating via Zoom, please feel free to participate again at that time. Thank you very much.

MR. PRICE: Yes sir, Mr. Gilchrist, I'll kinda chime in. For those who will be submitting comments for County Council, they would have those in by 12:00pm on the 22nd.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you. Alright very good.

CASE NO. 20-042 MA:

MR. PRICE: Alright, our next item is Case 20-042 MA. The Applicant is Gita Teppara. The location is the corner of Sloan Road and Dorichlee Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 6.2 acres from RS-MD which is residential single-family medium density to RM-MD which is residential multi-family medium density. Staff recommends approval of this request, and that was based on the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan that a desired development pattern of medium density residential neighborhoods designed to provide a mix of residential uses and densities within neighborhoods. The proposed rezoning to RM-MD would allow for a mixture of housing types and densities as prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, any questions for the Staff? We do have persons signed up to speak for this or comment on this case, Mr. Price?

MR. PRICE: Yes, we do.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. We'll start with the Applicant and then transition to those that are in support or opposition.

1	MR. DELAGE: And Mr. Chairman, we just have a letter in opposition to the
2	request. Alright, and that letter is from Charles L. Dowey at 125 Dorichlee Road,
3	Columbia, South Carolina 29223. It says, In reference to Case No. 20-042 MA, I am
4	writing to oppose the rezoning of the property to multi-family use. These changes would
5	devalue my single-family property along with my neighbors' investments as well. I hope
6	this opposition will have some impact on decisions made concerning the area.
7	Sincerely, Charles L. Dowey, owner and resident, 125 Dorichlee Road. That's the last
8	one, Mr. Chairman.
9	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Well that's all we have signed up for this
10	particular Map Amendment. Are there any additional comments for the Staff?
11	MS. CAIRNS: I have a question. I mean, Geo can you just, so it's already zoned
12	RS-MD, now the proposal is RM-MD. What exactly does that bring in, additional
13	options?
14	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Price?
15	MS. CAIRNS: You're silent on us, Geo.
16	MR. PRICE: I apologize, I was on mute. It provides for a variety of housing types
17	from single-family detached to two-family attached to multi-family also, which would
18	include, you know, potential to tri-plexes and what we may deem apartments.
19	MS. CAIRNS: Okay so as it currently is zoned it allows a lotta density but they
20	have to be single-family units?
21	MR. PRICE: Yes, correct. Under the current zoning of RS-MD that density for
22	that district is 5.21 units per acre. But you're correct, they would have to be single-family
23	detached.

1 MS. CAIRNS: But I mean, so under the RM-MD is it still 5.2 per acre? 2 MR. PRICE: Under the RM-MD it is 8 units per acre. 3 MS. CAIRNS: Okay. 4 MR. BRANHAM: Could I ask a question, Mr. Chair? 5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure, Mr. Branham. 6 MR. BRANHAM: So on page 10 under the land use and design for the 7 Comprehensive Plan and the designation description for this medium density 8 neighborhood, kinda midway through the paragraph the statement is made, 'multi-family 9 development should occur near activity centers and within priority investments areas 10 with access to roadways with adequate capacity and multi-modal transportation 11 options'. If the zoning is approved for multi-family, I mean, is there any further check on 12 the potential for multi-family development? Because I'm just questioning whether this 13 parcel would qualify as being located near an activity center and within priority 14 investment areas. So if we approve it, I mean, can they go as dense as they want and 15 with whatever type of, I guess, permitted structure type that they want to or is there a 16 potential for Staff to say, this doesn't meet all the parameters for multi-family and 17 therefore multi-family will not be permitted. 18 MR. PRICE: Well no, sir. Just to answer your second point, no sir, once the 19 zoning is in place it is a permitted use regardless so there would be no additional 20 reviews by Staff to determine whether it's appropriate at that location. 21 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Did that help you, Mr. Branham?

2

3

4 5

6

8

7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

MR. BRANHAM: It does. So I'd love to hear the Commission's thoughts on, you know, whether they feel like this location qualifies for those parameters.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional thought from the Commission?

MR. DENNIS: You know, I live up in the northeast and I know exactly where that's at and, you know, if you're putting in, you know, multi-plex units it's really, it's off Hardscrabble, it's set back off Hardscrabble onto Sloan Road. And Sloan just is a mess of a road as it is. I understand that, you know, the SCDOT says we're under capacity on it but I can highly attest that we could go around and around with that. But you know, not being next to a community center or area like that. I'm having a hard time really looking at it, I'm sitting here shaking my head looking back and forth trying to do things, I got the big book here that they give us when we become commissioner, I've been scratching my head with this one and I just, I don't see it in this area when everything else is single-family houses. And the only thing they have is a Sandhills Community Church up there and I think that's half a mile, quarter mile away; other than that it's all single-family houses.

MR. CROOKS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Crooks?

MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir. I just wanted to comment briefly on this. So with this case Staff looked more so in particular at the desired development pattern, so looking at more so providing the mix of uses and densities within the neighborhood, so allowing the plethora of uses that that would provide but still at that medium density character. So I just wanted to add that in as part of that rationale from Staff.

MR. BRANHAM: If I could, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Branham, yes, sir.

MR. BRANHAM: In traveling out there just yesterday yeah, Dorichlee Road is like a one-lane dirt road with really large residential lots on it that are all oriented so that they face this tract of land. And just the fact that it doesn't quite have direct access to Hardscrabble Road, yeah I feel like it's making it difficult to justify further but look forward to hearing from the rest of the Commission more.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Branham and Mr. Dennis. Any additional comments from Commissioners? The Chair will entertain a motion on this case.

MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair, can I get –

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Grady.

MR. GRADY: I have a comment. Yeah, I just, I certainly sense some hesitation here. I'd like to sort of speak in favor of the proposal. You know, when I look at the land use map we're looking at a county where we've decided that we're going to try to limit growth and development in large swaths of the County, and this is one of the few areas where the Comprehensive Plan speaks to, as Mr. Crooks articulated, a mixture development type. So obviously we didn't want to say, you know, you can't build single-family housing here, but I believe it's designed to have, yeah, to have a mix, to have some single-family, to have some missing middle housing, and yeah, I think it's entirely appropriate in a suburban area that's growing, that the County's plan has articulated should grow and develop. There'd be apartment housing in that area and we're looking at a situation where the County, the region are growing and there needs to be

development to support that and development that supports a variety of different household types. So I would suggest that we approve this request.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Grady. Any additional comments from Commissioners?

MR. YONKE: This is Chris Yonke here. I kinda feel the same way. If you're looking at the roads here DOT does have a widening project going on for Hardscrabble and for Sloan. I'm looking at an aerial view map right now that's, you know, in progress. Then you take this area versus on Two Notch Road that's already really built up, cramming more multi-family properties there. This area looks like it could handle that, like it has the infrastructure being put into place right now to handle more people. So it seems like a growing [inaudible]. And traffic's gonna come on and off of Sloan Road. The other street, Dorichlee, that is a dirt road but I can't imagine that would be its main access way.

MS. CAIRNS: I totally appreciate all the comments that Commission Members are making, this is great discussion. And you know, I look at this, just again I'm looking at the County aerial photograph and you've got a lot of density around this and then you've got this little pocket that somehow is just, I guess withstood the changes within the neighborhood. And I mean, I too, I will be supporting this rezoning largely for the reasons of what the other Commission Members have said in support of it. But it is sort of this interesting kind of left behind little spot of not yet developed – but I mean, we are a community in growth and I do think the promotion of variety of housing types is good, you know, that not everything got a single-family housing, that there be some options in housing types.

1	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Ms. Cairns. Are there any other
2	comments? Great discussion today on this case. If not the Chair will entertain a motion
3	for Case No. 20-042 MA.
4	MS. CAIRNS: I'll make a motion that we send Case 20-042 MA forward to
5	Council with a recommendation of approval.
6	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, is there a second?
7	MR. YONKE: I'll second that.
8	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, I think that was Mr. Yonke.
9	MR. YONKE: Yes, sir.
10	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Very good. It's been moved and properly seconded
11	that we send Case No. 20-042 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of
12	approval. All in favor signify by roll call vote. Mr. Price.
13	MR. PRICE: Gilchrist?
14	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.
15	MR. PRICE: Cairns?
16	MS. CAIRNS: Aye.
17	MR. PRICE: Yonke?
18	MR. YONKE: Aye.
19	MR. PRICE: Carlisle?
20	MR. CARLISLE: Aye.
21	MR. PRICE: Dennis?
22	MR. DENNIS: Nay.
23	MR. PRICE: Grady?

1 MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Branham?

MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

[Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Yonke, Carlisle, Grady, Taylor, Branham, Frierson;

Opposed: Dennis]

MR. PRICE: Okay, that motion passes 8/1.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. And for those that are watching, again we are a recommending Body to County Council and they will meet back on the 23rd of this month to make a determination on this case. So thank you very much for tuning in and joining us, and Commissioners thank you for not only a healthy conversation but very good perspectives about this particular case. Moving on to the next case, Mr. Price.

CASE NO. 20-043 MA:

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. The next item is Case 20-043 MA. The Applicant is Jeff Baker and the location is 1630 and 1636 Leesburg Road. The Applicant is asking to rezone .8 of an acre from Neighborhood Commercial to General Commercial. Staff recommends approval of this request as we feel it's consistent with the objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. According to the Comprehensive Plan, non-residential development should consist of neighborhood scale, commercial scale development designed in the traditional neighborhood format. Also the request is

1 consistent with the character of the existing commercial development pattern and 2 zoning districts along Leesburg Road. Again, for these reasons Staff recommends 3 approval. 4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, any comment for the Staff? 5 MS. CAIRNS: Question, Geo, sorry to always put you on the spot. But, okay so 6 it's now Neighborhood Commercial, it's going to General Commercial, what exactly 7 does that add into the options? 8 MR. PRICE: Neighborhood Commercial, they have limitations on the square 9 footage, so in the Neighborhood Commercial the maximum square footage is 6,000 for 10 the footprint, 12,000 total. So essentially if you do a two-story building you can have 11 12,000 square feet. There are also some limitations as far as drive-thrus within those 12 areas. And essentially the main difference, you know, to kind of give a summary of it is 13 that the Neighborhood Commercial prevents the big boxes from coming in that the 14 General Commercial would allow. 15 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, but these are little lots so I don't think you're gonna get big 16 box so it must, and is gas stations another difference? 17 MR. PRICE: Actually a convenience store or gas pumps, those are allowed in 18 both zoning designations. 19 MS. CAIRNS: So it's the drive-thru and the footprint. 20 MR. PRICE: Yes, mostly it's the footprint. I think we've actually, you know, 21 historically we've had some uses come in before the Planning Commission and also

County Council where Neighborhood Commercial probably would've allowed the use,

however, the limitations on the square footage called for them to rezone to a General

22

Commercial. Typically we'll find that with a lot of the Family Dollars or Dollar Generals that would come in where the 6,000 square foot just didn't work for them so they would have to go to another zoning designation.

MS. CAIRNS: I think we've had this a couple times on Leesburg and I see more and more of these coming on Leesburg Road. I mean, do we just have – hmm. I mean, from what I can see right now it looks as if this should be a reasonable easy rezoning, I'm just kind of fearing, like what, you know, Neighborhood Commercial has to have some use but, I mean, has Leesburg just simply become a non-neighborhood commercial area? Probably. Curious as to other people's thoughts.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional comments from Commissioners? Mr. Price, do we have people signed up to comment on this particular case?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. We have a comment submitted from the Applicant and we also have one in opposition.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Do we have any additional comments from the Commission at this time?

MR. DENNIS: You know, looking at it – sorry, this is Dennis – looking at it, pretty much everything around there when I drove down through there is, you know, General Commercial mixed with non, you know, Neighborhood Commercial. And it, I think it's just them going down for that footprint of what they're wanting in there. Some of those areas really kinda surprised me with what's in there versus, you know, what the zoning was. I mean, everything looked to fit but I think, you know, they're just looking to open up the market a little bit more for them possibly to do something different. And I'm sure we're about to find that out in the comments.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Absolutely. Any additional comments from Commissioners? Okay, we'll hear from the Applicant.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DELAGE: Alright Mr. Chairman, this is from Jeff Baker, the Applicant. He's at 1 Harmon Road, Hopkins, South Carolina 29061. He said, My name is Jeff Baker and I am the son and Power of Attorney for my parents, Fred and Gladys Baker of Hopkins. My parents are the owners of 1636 and 1630 Leesburg Road. My parents have owned and operated Curls and Swirls Beauty Shop at 1636 Leesburg Road since the early '70s. Due to age, mom 87 and dad 93, and health issues, they decided to close the shop permanently last year when the Covid-19 shutdown was ordered by Governor McMaster. We had been trying to sell the properties together in hopes that a new business would come to the area and continue the growth of Eastern Richland County. We have had some interest in the properties for new business development. Due to the properties not being zoned as GC like other properties on Leesburg Road, the interested parties are not able to bring their new business in. It is my humble request on behalf of my parents, Fred and Gladys, that the two properties be rezoned from NC to GC so that we can bring more business opportunities to the Leesburg Road area. Thank you for your time and attention, Jeff Baker. And then we also had a comment in opposition. It says, Dear Planning and Zoning Commission, I received a letter stating that there is a request for a zoning change for the above property. After doing some research I found that the request is to rezone for commercial and that it is planned to put an automotive service company/tire and wheel service on the property. I own the property at 7013 Helo, which shares a property line all along one side. My property is a residential home. I am strongly against any plans to put an automotive service company

at this location. It would mean that my property would be subject to huge amounts of noise as well as odors emanating from the establishment, directly affecting the quality of life and property value of my property. Please inform me on any potential legal means of avoiding this change immediately. For any questions or comments I can be reached at the email and address below. Kind Regards, Thomas Marfield. And that's the last comment, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, Mr. DeLage, thank you very much. Comments from the Commission?

MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes sir, Mr. Branham.

MR. BRANHAM: I would just again add my experience. I lived on, watched, driven Leesburg Road my whole life. Went over and looked at the property yesterday. You have Curls and Swirls on the corner and then next to it you have what looks like a totally abandoned residence, former residence perhaps, and then to the right of that you have a building that has held at least one business of questionable reputation. We've had some really bad experiences happen there, several crimes have taken place in that building. I'm really hopeful that maybe a rezoning would promote the redevelopment of these two tracts of land. I think the area as a whole would greatly benefit from redevelopment. The guy right behind the parcel, sure enough, he would be the person who would probably suffer the most if it is some sort of business of the nature that he described. I do not discount or ignore that, but that area has just been, in my opinion, I think it's really struggled and I would just hope that this sort of thing might help boost at least that block. And you know, that is absolutely the impact that that resident would

1	experience is what we would predict might happen when you happen to be a property
2	owner who lives one lot away from a pretty major thoroughfare. I'll just leave it at that for
3	now, thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Branham. Any additional
5	comments from Commissioners? If not the Chair will entertain a motion on this
6	particular case.
7	MR. DENNIS: I'd like to make a motion.
8	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'm sorry? I'm sorry, Mr. Dennis did you make a motion
9	on that?
10	MR. DENNIS: I said I'd like to but then some weird noises came through my
11	speaker so I don't know what's going on.
12	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.
13	MR. DENNIS: But yes, I wanna make a motion. I would like to make a motion to
14	send this to County Council for approval as Staff said and also the comments that
15	Commissioner Branham said. I think this would be a great chance to revitalize this area.
16	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Absolutely. Any additional comments?
17	MR. BRANHAM: I'll second the motion.
18	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. It's been moved and properly seconded that we
19	send Case No. 20-043 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval. Any
20	additional comments? All in favor signify by roll call vote, Mr. Price.
21	MR. PRICE: Okay. Gilchrist?
22	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.
23	MR. PRICE: Cairns?

1	MS. CAIRNS: Aye.
2	MR. PRICE: Yonke?
3	MR. YONKE: Aye.
4	MR. PRICE: Carlisle?
5	MR. CARLISLE: Aye.
6	MR. PRICE: Dennis?
7	MR. DENNIS: Aye.
8	MR. PRICE: Grady?
9	MR. GRADY: Aye.
10	MR. PRICE: Taylor?
11	MR. TAYLOR: Aye.
12	MR. PRICE: Branham?
13	MR. BRANHAM: Aye.
14	MR. PRICE: Frierson?
15	MS. FRIERSON: Aye.
16	[Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Taylor, Branham, Frierson]
17	MR. PRICE: Okay, that passes unanimously.
18	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.
19	MS. CAIRNS: Sorry Stephen, I'm gonna cut you off for a second. I'm gonna
20	speak a little out of turn and I think that what we have is a challenge cause Leesburg
21	Road is a road that I agree with Mr. Branham that, you know, where it's heading and
22	stuff. But I think it's gonna be the quality of our design requirements that are gonna
23	make this type of rezoning in these types of corridors either positive or negative. So I

think that's where our challenge lies is to make sure that we have design requirements that keep the proximity of retail and commercial and residential positive for all. That's all.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well noted comment and it's so interesting that as we go through these cases like this and we, over the years talking about areas like Leesburg Road, Two Notch Road and others, that the comment you made is very consistent. And it's our hope that as we get this new plan, the rewrite, that it'll help to address some of these concerns, so. Comments well noted, thank you both for those comments. Alright, moving forward, next case.

CASE NO. 21-001 MA:

MR. PRICE: Okay. Case 20-44 was under the Consent Agenda and that was approved so our next item is Case 21-001 MA. The Applicant, Richard Miskie and Brian C. Keane, are requesting to rezone from Rural to RS-LD, which is residential single-family low density. Their parcels are 1.81 and 1.96 acres respectively and the properties are located along Old Road. Staff recommends disapproval of this request as we felt it was not in compliance with the recommendations or consistent with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan as this area is located in the neighborhood medium-density designation. And the zoning designations that that particular designation recommends are rural, rural residential and rural – oh excuse me, or RSE which is single-family estate. So the requested zoning designation did not fall within those categories thus Staff made a recommendation of disapproval.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay thank you, Mr. Price. Are there any comments for the Staff on this case?

MS. CAIRNS: Just a quick question. So basically the zoning that they're asking for is too dense than what the, or not dense enough?

MR. PRICE: It would be too dense. So yeah, the request they're asking for, the single-family low density, has a density of 3.61 units per acre and the other zoning designations that the Comprehensive Plan tends to recommend rural, 1.32 units per acre, rural residential is the same, 1.32 units per acre, and the RSE which is 2.2 units per acre.

MS. CAIRNS: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Ms. Cairns, Mr. Price. Any additional comments? Mr. Price, do we have any persons signed up to speak on this case?

MR. PRICE: Mr. DeLage, do we have any?

MR. DELAGE: No, sir. Mr. Chairman, we don't have any comments for or against.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, alright. Any additional comments from the Commission on this particular case?

MS. CAIRNS: I'm just amazed that there's no comments from the public.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah Mr. Branham, go ahead.

MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, I drove out there, I don't live that far from that area.

What's there is in perfect harmony with everything that's around it, big ol lots, houses [inaudible] we'd all love to have on Lake Murray. And it occurred to me as I was staring down these lots on Old Road and thinking to myself, like they stacked these in here kinda like maybe sideways oriented, I don't know, going towards the lake. And whatever it was I just thought to myself, it would be, I guess the word that came to my mind was

like jarring, it would be kind of visually jarring. So it sounds like the Comprehensive Plan is appropriate as far as what it's looking to have there, estate sized lots and stuff like that to be in harmony with the area, so that's where I'm leaning but I do wanna hear from the rest of the Commission if there's discussion.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Branham. Ms. Cairns?

MS. CAIRNS: I'm just, I mean, I would think that medium density would usually, the Comp Plan concept of medium density I think is consistent with RS-LD. I mean, I'll let Geo correct me if I'm wrong. And I'm not really, I mean, I think this is probably one of these areas where, how many of the lots are really conforming to rural. I can see that the whole area is pretty much zoned rural. But at the same time I think I support the concept of disapproval because of the incongruitiveness with the rest of the neighborhood which is pretty much built out. So Geo, am I wrong that RS-LD would be incompatible with medium density in a generic setting?

MR. PRICE: Okay, this is a conversation we had. So I'm looking at the Comprehensive Plan under neighborhood medium density designation, and under designation the existing zoning districts of similar character to support the neighborhood medium density designation are RS-LD, RS-MD, MH and a PDD. So that's what we based ours on. I think one of the things that you may have also alluded to, hopefully I didn't miss what you were saying, but yeah a number of the parcels out there already are nonconforming. And I believe, Ms. Cairns, as a former Member of the Board of Zoning Appeals you're aware of the number of cases that we would get from residents living up on the lake asking for variances due to the nonconformity of their lots.

1	MR. BRANHAM: The materials from the County say that this area under the
2	Comp Plan is designated as neighborhood low density, right? I mean, is that the
3	discussion we're having here? Is it supposed to be a transition from rural and
4	neighborhood medium density?
5	MR. CROOKS: That is correct, it should be neighborhood low density, Mr.
6	Branham.
7	MS. CAIRNS: Okay.
8	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any additional comments, Commissioners? Mr.
9	Dennis, go right ahead, please.
10	MR. DENNIS: This could go either way. I mean, a quarter mile up Old Road you
11	do have some actual RS low density areas I'm pretty sure. And if I'm not mistaken I
12	wanna say it's around Murray Point if I'm not mistaken. And then I know there's some
13	more up there but, I mean, we don't have anything from the Applicant so, I mean, as it
14	sits, I mean, I gotta go with Staff.
15	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yep. Nothing from the Applicant. Thank you, Mr.
16	Dennis. Any additional comments? If not the Chair will entertain a motion on Case No.
17	21-001 MA.
18	MR. BRANHAM: I make a motion to send it to Council with a recommendation of
19	disapproval.
20	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is there a second?
21	MR. DENNIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we 1 2 send Case No. 21-001 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of disapproval. 3 Any discussion? If not the Chair will entertain a roll call vote, Mr. Price. 4 MR. PRICE: Okay. Gilchrist? 5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye. MR. PRICE: Cairns? 6 7 MS. CAIRNS: Aye. 8 MR. PRICE: Yonke? 9 MR. YONKE: Aye. 10 MR. PRICE: Carlisle? 11 MR. CARLISLE: Aye. 12 MR. PRICE: Dennis? 13 MR. DENNIS: Aye. 14 MR. PRICE: Grady? 15 MR. GRADY: Aye. 16 MR. PRICE: Taylor? 17 MR. TAYLOR: Aye. 18 MR. PRICE: Branham? 19 MR. BRANHAM: Aye. 20 MR. PRICE: Frierson? 21 MS. FRIERSON: Aye. 22 [Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Taylor, Branham, Frierson] 1 2 a re

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, unanimous vote and this will go to Council with a recommendation of disapproval based upon the Staff's recommendation. And again, we are a recommending Body and the Council will take this matter up on the 23rd of February. So thank you very much. Moving right along, next case.

CASE NO. 21-002 MA:

designated for multi-family.

MR. PRICE: Alright, the next case is Case 21-002 MA. The Applicant is John Swistak. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 2.6 acres from Planned Development, which is a PDD, to residential multi-family high density, which is RM-HD. The property is located off of Rice Meadow Way. Staff recommends approval of this request as the proposed rezoning would be consistent with the objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan for the mixed residential future land use designation.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, any additional comments for the Staff?

MR. BRANHAM: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Branham, yes, sir.

MR. PRICE: On other parts of the PDD certain multi-family was designated within this PDD. As part of the PDD not only do you get to identify your uses but you also designate where those uses would occur. And in this particular area it was not

MR. BRANHAM: Under the current PDD designation is multi-family permitted?

MR. BRANHAM: Okay. So presumably it's designated for single-family? I was just wondering if it was already maybe zoned for multi-family medium density and they were just seeking a high density.

1 MR. PRICE: No, sir. Excuse me, allow me to pull that up. Yeah, that area was 2 designated for commercial. 3 MR. BRANHAM: Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Price, I missed that. That area was designated for what? 5 MR. PRICE: Commercial. 6 7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Commercial, okay. 8 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. 9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional comments for the Staff? Do we have 10 persons signed up to comment on this particular case? 11 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, I believe Mr. DeLage does have comments for this request. 12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. 13 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, we have one person in opposition and it is 14 Carolyn Kennedy, homeowner, 101 Cottonwood Way, Columbia, South Carolina 29229. 15 Dear Sir, the area around Lee Road and Rice Meadow Way is already congested and 16 overpopulated, numerous car accidents have happened in this one area and my 17 property has been damaged on several occasions. Bumper to bumper traffic makes it 18 difficult to get to and from work in the morning and evening. Excessive noise and 19 speeding from cars is nerve wracking daily. The roads are not able to handle the 20 massive amount of people living here. Transportation wants to expand the roads and 21 cut into my property to accommodate these wrongful situations. I am requesting that this 22 case not be approved for these reasons. This area is overpopulated with people. Putting

1 up townhomes and bringing in more people will only make the present situation worse. 2 Kind regards, Caroline Kennedy. And that's it for the comments, Mr. Chair. 3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: No comments from the Applicant? 4 MR. PRICE: No, sir. CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright, so that's all we have commenting on the 5 6 case. Are there any additional comments from the Commission regarding this case? 7 MR. BRANHAM: I just wanna say it's frustrating, we've got nothing from the 8 Applicant? And you know, one of the things we're supposed to factor in is a need and 9 justification? Otherwise I'm just left to, like theorize a needed justification. 10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I agree. 11 MR. YONKE: I agree and I'm looking at the map. And this was part of a PDD so 12 it's going to be developed into something and all I know is that at one point it was gonna 13 be commercial and now residential. So I have [inaudible]. 14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Yonke. Are there any additional 15 comments from Commissioners? MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair? 16 17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Grady. 18 MR. GRADY: You know, I would submit that while the back story's a little 19 different I think in terms of what the Comprehensive Plan and the future land use plan 20 have to say, I think this falls in the same category as the previous request for multi-21 family zoning, also in the Northeastern part of the County. You know, I think that I would 22 be in favor of proving this and again, there's a clearly demonstrated need for additional 23 housing of a variety of different development types in the area.

1	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you Mr. Grady. Any additional comments
2	from Commissioners? Staff has recommended approval of this Map Amendment so I
3	will entertain a motion from Commissioners on sending Case No. 21-002 MA forward to
4	Council with a recommendation. Any motions?
5	MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I'll make a motion to send this case, 21-002 MA forward to
6	Council with a recommendation of approval.
7	MS. FRIERSON: I second the motion.
8	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we
9	send Case No. 21-002 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval. All in
10	favor signify by roll call vote, Mr. Price.
11	MR. PRICE: Alright, Gilchrist?
12	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.
13	MR. PRICE: Cairns?
14	MS. CAIRNS: Aye.
15	MR. PRICE: Yonke?
16	MR. YONKE: Aye.
17	MR. PRICE: Carlisle?
18	MR. CARLISLE: Aye.
19	MR. PRICE: Dennis?
20	MR. DENNIS: Aye.
21	MR. PRICE: Grady?
22	MR. GRADY: Aye.
23	MR. PRICE: Taylor?

1	MR. TAYLOR: Aye.
2	MR. PRICE: Branham?
3	MR. BRANHAM: Aye.
4	MR. PRICE: Frierson?
5	MS. FRIERSON: Aye.
6	[Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Taylor, Branham, Frierson]
7	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, and the motion carries. Again, for those that are
8	listening we are a recommending Body and Council will take this matter up again on
9	February the 23 rd . Thank you for joining us. Next case.
10	CASE NO. 21-003 MA:
1	MR. PRICE: Yes, our last item is Case 21-003 MA. The Applicant is Walter L.
12	McLaughlin Jr. and Mr. McLaughlin is requesting to rezone property zoned Rural to
13	General Commercial and it's about a third of an acre. The property is located at 10400
14	Broad River Road. Staff recommends approval of this request as it is consistent with the
15	objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and it's also consistent with the character and
16	existing commercial development pattern of the area.
17	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Were you going to say something else, Mr.
8	Price?
19	MR. PRICE: No, I was gonna say that was it, Mr. Chair.
20	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Are there any comments for Mr. Price or the
21	Staff?
22	MR. BRANHAM: If I could get a point of clarification.
23	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Branham.

1 MR. BRANHAM: That the references to Leesburg Road made in the parcel/area 2 characteristics paragraph and the traffic characteristics paragraphs I assume we can 3 just switch those out for Broad River Road and it's accurate, right? 4 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. MR. BRANHAM: And then we would also delete the last sentence of the 5 6 parcel/area characteristics, north and east of the site of the site are a convenience store 7 with pump zoned GC, west of the site is a place of worship, that's not accurate, that 8 should be deleted, correct? 9 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. 10 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. 11 MR. PRICE: Thank you for pointing that out. 12 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah. 13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Branham for pointing that out. Any 14 additional comments for the Staff? Do we have somebody signed up to speak on this, 15 comment on this, Geo? 16 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. We have actually a letter, of course, it would be of support, 17 from the Applicant, Mr. McLaughlin and I believe his wife Donna McLaughlin. 18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Please, go right ahead. 19 MR. DELAGE: Alright, My wife and I were to retire after fiscal year 2016 in 20 preparation for what we found, a qualified restaurant operation to take over our very 21 desirable corner location with little effort. While beginning negotiations for the lease of

the restaurant we got the notice Richland County Penny Tax Program announced the

widening of Broad River Road. The project illustration showed the removal of most of

22

23

our parking lot, thus losing leasing opportunity for the grandfathered zoning situation of our property as its only use is that of a restaurant. No parking, no business, no lease. With my wife having health issues we closed our restaurant in 2017, continuing to correspond with the PDT engineers. The project was to take and use our entire property and we would be compensated for a relocation. As you know shortly after the Broad River Road widening project 2019 was approved, PDT was terminated and the project went back to the design board with the new in-house engineering staff with a new design which calls for scaling down the project which might create an opportunity for us to rent our property for retail that would require less parking. Our rezoning request would enable us to offer our different business options. We appreciate your consideration. Donna and Walter McLaughlin. And that's the last comment.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. I appreciated the Applicant's perspective about this case. Any additional comments from the Commission?

MS. CAIRNS: You know, we get so many of these cause obviously it had been nonconforming and use could've continued under a grandfather, and I think this one of the nice opportunities that we get to sort of pull it into proper zoning and have it be consistent with the Comp Plan. So sort of not something we see all the time but I think that, you know, approval of this is completely consistent with everything that we wanna accomplish in the County.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Correct.

MR. BRANHAM: Yeah Mr. Chair, I feel the same way. Again I live over in that area and to hear how this played out, being impacted by the plans to widen Broad River and then the plan changing and having such an impact on that, permitted the continuing

1 use, I agree with what Ms. Cairns said. And the residents of this area are accustomed to 2 that corner being a commercial enterprise, a restaurant as it were, right next to it a tire 3 repair shop. So again, I'm in support but I do wanna hear from the rest of the 4 Commission if there's more to be said before a motion is made. 5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Branham and Ms. Cairns. Any 6 additional comments from the Commission? 7 MS. FRIERSON: I, too, agree with the Staff recommendation and I'm very 8 pleased that this couple who initially faced disappointment and was kinda bounced back 9 and forward by no fault of their own might have an opportunity to be restored if we vote 10 for approval. This makes me happy – if we vote that way. 11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Ms. Frierson. Any additional comments 12 from Commissioners? If not the Chair will entertain a motion on Case No. 21-003 MA. 13 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, I'll move to send it to Council with a recommendation of 14 approval. 15 MR. GRADY: I second. 16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we 17 send Case No. 21-003 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval. Any 18 additional comments? If not the Chair will entertain a roll call vote, Mr. Price. 19 MR. PRICE: Okay, Gilchrist? 20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye. 21 MR. PRICE: Cairns? 22 MS. CAIRNS: Aye. 23 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

1 MR. YONKE: Aye. 2 MR. PRICE: Carlisle? 3 MR. CARLISLE: Aye. 4 MR. PRICE: Dennis? 5 MR. DENNIS: Aye. 6 MR. PRICE: Grady? 7 MR. GRADY: Aye. 8 MR. PRICE: Taylor? 9 MR. TAYLOR: Aye. 10 MR. PRICE: Branham? 11 MR. BRANHAM: Aye. 12 MR. PRICE: Frierson? 13 MS. FRIERSON: Aye. [Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Taylor, Branham, Frierson] 14 15 MR. PRICE: Passes unanimously, Mr. Chair. CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, and again we are a recommending Body to 16 County Council and they will meet on February 23rd to take this particular case up. So 17 18 thank you very much to the public and thank you Commissioners for a very thorough 19 conversation today on Map Amendments. Other Business, discussion on opportunity 20 zones, Mr. Price. I remembered we talked about this and I thought we were gonna 21 discuss actually placing it on the Agenda at some point where we can potentially have a 22 larger conversation about it. Is the Staff prepared to discuss this today?

MR. PRICE: No, sir. I think as we have discussed, I know this was kind of put on as a placeholder for a while now to determine whether we were going to discuss this. But I think from Staff's perspective that any discussions on opportunity zones or creating those, it may be more appropriate for us to take up after the adoption of our Code rewrite and also after the Map Amendments, to take that up then as opposed to trying to take that up at this point.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Yeah, I thought that's kinda what we had talked about, so. Do we need to take action on deferring this item or?

MR. PRICE: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright. Well then under the Chairman's Report let me – two things real quick – let me thank the Commission again for entrusting in me to serve again as your Chairman and I look forward to serving you again and seeking your advice and consent as we continue to move forward in serving the people of this County. One of the things that I wanted to just mention as I listened to cases the last couple of times we've had our Commission meetings via Zoom is that we've had persons who are the applicants not submitting any testimony or any comments. And I think, Mr. Price, you shared with us about how that process, how Staff has kinda thought about requesting that applicants submit the information, and I just wanna remind us that, particularly for cases where in some cases we need to hear thoughts from the applicant, that we encourage people to – those that are seeking some type of approval from the Planning Commission – to try to submit at least some information to this Commission as applicants, particularly while we're doing this on Zoom, just so that we can have some better understanding of the applicant's perspective on some of these

cases. And so I would just encourage the Staff if you can, I mean, I know sometimes that's tough to do but I think it will certainly help us to frame the conversations that we're having as Commissioners regarding these cases. And the only other thing that I'll just say to or ask the Staff is just get an update on where we are with the Code rewrite. Are there any planned meetings coming up for any of that? Do we have a sense of timeline on where we're going with this? Just any information that the Staff may have. How long have we been working on this rewrite?

MR. CROOKS: About two years.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Two years. So do we have any update from them about where we are and are we getting close?

MR. CROOKS: Mr. Chair? Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir.

MR. CROOKS: I just wanted to address that. We were, in case y'all are not aware, the Land Development Code rewrite was a significant topic at County Council's retreat this past week and there were a lot of questions about timeline and the next steps. And essentially, and Clarion did a presentation, more of a brief overview, and so the timeline really is for us to begin reaching out to Council Members to discuss their individual districts and obtain input on the remapping as far as that goes, as well as to review text changes for submission back to the consultant. And so we anticipate bringing this back to you all in either your March or April meeting with a public review draft available. So the first step is really for us to meet individually with Council Members. They asked several questions as you are asking now and so a lot of that was addressed for them at their retreat as well.

O

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Great, fantastic. Well, thank you so much for that update and I'm glad to know that Council was briefed on the rewrite. And so we'll certainly look forward to hearing more about that here in the not too distant future, for sure. That's all I have on the Chairman's Report. Planning Director's Report.

MR. CROOKS: I don't have anything else to report. You actually beat me to the punch because I was going to address that in my report, so.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, well great job, we killed two birds with one stone. That's fantastic.

MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, good deal. If there's nothing else to claim the attention of this Commission the Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. DENNIS: I've got a few things.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yep, go right ahead Mr. Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Yeah, since I've been on here we've been talking about these opportunity zones and we keep kicking the can down the road. And I understand we're doing a rewrite and stuff like that, but I think we can go ahead and, I think the next meeting we really need to start talking about it and getting serious and kinda figuring out what we're gonna do so that when that rewrite is done we'll know where to go with it. I think we're wasting too much time and before they're taken away from us, if that is the case for the future, I would rather try to help the Council Members get something on the books to help some of these areas. I really think we need to do that. As far as the voting of election or officers go, I'm perfectly fine with that. I wanna clarify my thing, why I was the way I was with it is simply because I'm looking towards the future and I don't want to

get caught without leadership. And I know you guys just do the meeting but I think there is a learning curve there and I really, really was looking forward to seeing the future and looking more into it instead of if something does happen and you guys are replaced, because I don't know what County Council's gonna do and we don't know, if they do do something and they go, welp you know what, they didn't get it done in time, then I just didn't want to be caught out in the cold. You know, I really think that, I think we need to come together a little bit more and kinda tighten down a few things for the future so we can all get a grasp of it. When are we gonna do our next retreat?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: That's a good point. Obviously with Covid being front and center that has delayed our ability to actually do our annual retreat. But you know, my hope is that as soon as we're, you know, we get through the pandemic stuff that we could potentially look at doing an in-person retreat, but I'm not opposed to us finding a way to potentially do something via Zoom. I mean, I don't like that but it does give us at least an opportunity to have a conversation about some of the very things you point out. Dennis. And more specifically thinking, you know, thinking of having a larger conversation about the terms on the Planning Commission, because you know, one of the things that's happened in the past with regard to leadership, which has always been a hallmark of any board, has been the need to have staggered terms. And of course with that it should create an environment where we have capacity on the Commission, people who've been on the Commission for a guite some time, that would still be able to offer some level of leadership if, in fact, something occurs with regard to a sudden leadership change. And so obviously we want to keep that in mind and, you know, it'd be great to get some idea – and Staff might be able to submit this to us cause

periodically we would often get a document laying out exactly when everybody's term is up, and that might be very helpful to have just so that we can see not only whose term will be up when but also whose been on the Commission long enough to be able to provide that type of leadership capacity if, in fact, we happen to end up in a situation where we need to fulfill a leadership void immediately. And so I would ask Staff if you will to send that around to all of the Commissioners so that we can have that. But you know, I welcome an opportunity to hear from the Commission on your thoughts about a retreat. The retreats have always been helpful and very encouraging and, you know, it's something that we started a couple years ago and it's worked very well and I would love to be able to find a way for us to continue that real soon, Mr. Dennis. Thank you for bringing that up. For sure.

MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chairperson, I agree with you that ideally a retreat should be an in-person experience and I would hold out that we still do that. However, in the interim what might be helpful is that we do schedule additional training, especially in terms of orientation and just the basics for our newer Members and refresher courses for those of us who've served a long time if we would so like to participate.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure, and that brings up another point, Mr. Price, does the Association still provide training opportunities for Commission Members?

MR. PRICE: Yes, they do. And we're on the lookout for those and if anything comes up we'll be sure and, you know, send out reminders as we've done in the past.

We'll go ahead and start looking again as we get into this new year and also make contact with them to see what other trainings they may be looking to offer to, not only,

you know, the Planning Commission but other boards and commissions throughout the County.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you very much. That training is often very helpful and very good and very detailed, and if Commissioners have the opportunity to participate I would encourage any of you and all of us to do that because it's very, very good. And I've learned a lot when I've had the opportunity to participate in the past, so thanks for that update. Any additional comments from the Commission?

MS. FRIERSON: One more comment.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, ma'am, Ms. Frierson.

MS. FRIERSON: In addition to the required training I remember there was a time when additional training was offered that was not required, and I would try to participate in that as well and that's magnificent. So I just wanna invite all of you to take advantage of as much training as possible. It's very helpful.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Ms. Frierson. And just to button that up, you know, we do have a very new Commission with a lotta new people and this is a lot to consume, particularly in the midst of going through a Code rewrite. And so, you know, this is the opportunity for all of us to exercise as much, you know, opportunity as we can for any type of training opportunities that will present themselves. Covid has certainly placed a monkey wrench in some of that, but the Council will probably be yielding to us quite a bit and I'm glad to know that they had a lotta questions about the Code rewrite and that the Staff will be meeting with them individually. I think that's a good thing and I'm hoping that they will have more input into what some of that will look like as we move forward. And Mr. Dennis, thank you also for the comment regarding opportunity

zones. You know, I, too, don't want that to be a missed opportunity in the County and, but I agree that I don't think that needs to be a missed opportunity and to the degree that we can make sure that's included – very similar to what other counties have done – we're not the only county that's looked at this or the only municipality, there's municipalities in the state and around the country that have looked at this. And they've not made it, not that cumbersome and so I would encourage Staff as you're thinking about this to continue to look at Charleston and some of the other places where they've just allowed that to be a tool that could be used in their arsenal for potential development and other opportunities within the county. So thank you for that. Any additional comments? If not –

MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, yeah I would like to say again, I don't think any of us really knew how long we were going to be doing, you know, Zoom meetings as such, and I know y'all did express some concerns about what you're actually getting from the applicant. So as a Staff, well we touched on this previously, I think what we'll do is we'll kinda get together again and maybe look at revamping our applications again. And I'll speak, you know, to Mr. Branham and Ms. Cairns who've previously served on the Board of Zoning Appeals for the County, and as you kinda remember any application that went before the Board, whether it be a Variance or Special Exception or even an Administrative Appeal, really the Applicant really had to be specific on a number of issues that they would, you know, bring in before the body before it even got there. It wasn't pretty much fill out a quick application and then just verbalize what it is you wanted, because a lot of the information needed to be provided prior to, so that might be something where we can look at on our applications and maybe make some

amendments so that we can, you know, put that information on there and you as a Planning Commission will have that prior to the meeting. Because, you know, I think what we've discussed before is, you know, a lotta times applicants can bring before you what it is they're looking to do, but a lotta times those are just specific to a use, and being that you're not similar to the Board of Zoning Appeals they look at a particular use, you know, you have a zoning and everything that goes along with it. I believe a lot of that information can be outlined on that application, you know, in lieu of them having to come before you and speak specifically about their request.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: No, that's good. And thank you for taking that on as a project. We certainly need to do that, particularly in these times and hopefully, you know, we don't have to endure this long-term, but we need to be prepared and certainly we need to make sure that the applicants recognize that so that we can be fair in our deliberations with everyone. So thank you for that. Any additional comments? If not, the Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.

MS. CAIRNS: So moved.

MR. CARLISLE: I second.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright everybody, have a good week and we'll talk to you soon.

[Meeting Adjourned _____]