

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
May 6, 2024

[Members Present: Christopher Yonke, Frederick Johnson, II, Charles Durant, Terrence Taylor, Bryan Grady; Absent: Beverly Frierson, Mark Duffy, John Metts, Chris Siercks]

Called to order: 6:03pm

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, are you ready? I'd like to call to order the May 6th, 2024 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. Staff, please confirm the following, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to the news media, persons requesting notification and posted on the bulletin board located in the County administration building, is that correct?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Staff, can you please take attendance for today's meeting?

MR. PRICE: Alright, for the Monday, May 6th Planning Commission, 2024 Planning Commission attendance, Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

MR. PRICE: Frierson? Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Here.

MR. PRICE: Duffy?

MR. PRICE: Metts?

MR. PRICE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Here.

MR. PRICE: Taylor?

MS. TAYLOR: Here.

1 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

2 MR. PRICE: Grady?

3 MR. GRADY: Here.

4 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a quorum.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the
6 May 6, 2024 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning
7 Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer our time
8 to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council. Our
9 recommendations are to approve or deny Zoning Map Amendment requests. Per Title
10 VI Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of Laws* Planning Commission may also prepare and
11 revise plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of unincorporated
12 portions of the county. The County's Land Development Code rewrite process
13 conducted last year is an example, so is the Comprehensive Plan. Once again, we are
14 a recommending body to County Council and they will conduct their own public hearing
15 and take official votes to approve or deny map amendments and text amendments on a
16 future date to be published by the county. Council typically holds Zoning Public
17 Hearings on the fourth Tuesday of the month. Please check the county website for
18 updated agendas, dates and times. Please take note of the following guidelines for
19 today's meeting. Please turn off or any silence any cellphones. Audience members may
20 quietly come and go as needed. The applicants are allowed up to two minutes to make
21 statements. Citizens signed up to speak are allowed to two minutes to speak.
22 Redundant comments should be minimized. Please only address remarks to the
23 Commission and do not expect the Commission to respond to questions from the

1 speaker in a back and forth style, that's not the purpose of the meeting. Please no
2 audience/speaker exchanges. No audience demonstrations or other disruptions to the
3 meeting are permitted nor are comments from anyone other than the speaker at the
4 podium. Please remember the meeting is being recorded, please speak into the
5 microphone and give your name and address. Abusive language is inappropriate and
6 will not be tolerated. Please don't voice displeasure or frustration at a recommendation
7 while the Planning Commission is still conducting business. If you have any questions
8 or concerns you may contact Richland County Planning Department Staff down below
9 here. We're gonna move on to number 3. now on our Agenda which is
10 Additions/Deletions to the Agenda. Are there any motions for that today? Anything
11 changing on the Agenda today, Staff?

12 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. We can move on to number 4 which is the
14 approval of Minutes from the prior meetings. The Staff provided the Commission with
15 copies of the transcript of the Commission's April 1st, 2024 meeting. Do any
16 Commission Members have any comments or concerns regarding these transcripts?
17 Okay, hearing none the Chair makes a motion to approve the Minutes unless there's an
18 objection? Do I have a second?

19 MR. DURANT: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second, thank you Commissioner Durant. Staff, please
21 take a vote.

22 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the approval of the April 1st, 2024 Planning
23 Commission Minutes, Yonke?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

3 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

4 MR. PRICE: Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

7 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Grady?

9 MR. GRADY: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

11 *[Approved: Yonke, Johnson, Durant, Taylor, Grady; Absent: Frierson, Duffy, Metts,*
12 *Siercks]*

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. This moves us on to number 5 on the
14 Agenda which is the Consent Agenda. Looking at names signed up today we're not
15 gonna really have any map amendments on the Consent Agenda but we still have Item
16 5.a. which is Road Names. So as long as the Commission agrees the Chair makes a
17 motion for the Consent Agenda to just move forward with a., Road Names. Do I have a
18 second?

19 MR. GRADY: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Grady. Can I, Staff please take
21 a vote.

22 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the approval of the Road Names, Yonke?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

2 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Durant?

4 MR. DURANT: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

6 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

7 MR. PRICE: Grady?

8 MR. GRADY: Aye.

9 MR. PRICE: Motion passes.

10 *[Approved: Yonke, Johnson, Durant, Taylor, Grady; Absent: Frierson, Duffy, Metts,*
11 *Siercks]*

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Okay, this will move us on to 5.b.1. which
13 is Case No. 24-005MA. I'm gonna hand that over to Staff for explanation.

14 **CASE NO. 24-005MA:**

15 MR. PRICE: Alright, the first item of course as stated is Case 24-005MA. The
16 Applicant is Kathy Peake. The Applicant is requesting to rezone a little more than one
17 acre from General Commercial to Light Industrial. The property is located, three
18 properties that are subject to this request, they are located along the 10000 block of
19 Two Notch Road. Staff recommends disapproval of this request as Staff is of the
20 opinion the request does not comply with the intentions of the Comprehensive Plan. The
21 Comprehensive Plan recommends supporting industrial development along economic
22 development corridors and within the identified industrial parks. The proposed zoning
23 does not promote the recommended land uses identified in the Plan. In addition the

1 requested zoning district is not in character with the existing development pattern and
2 uses in the immediate area. Again, for those reasons Staff recommends disapproval of
3 this request.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you Staff. Commissioners, do we have any
5 questions for Staff at this moment? Alright, Commissioner Johnson do we have anyone
6 signed up to speak?

7 MR. JOHNSON: Yes Mr. Chairman, we have three, two people in addition to the
8 Applicant.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead and call the Applicant.

10 MR. JOHNSON: The Applicant, Carolyn Peak and Kathy Peake.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down to the podium. And state your name and
12 address.

13 **TESTIMONY OF CAROL PEAKE:**

14 MS. PEAKE: Carol Peak, 101 Shoal Creek Lane, Blythewood, South Carolina.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thanks.

16 MS. PEAKE: Okay, to begin with I would like to make some changes,
17 adjustments or whatever to the Agenda. The, I have a copy of what was sent to the
18 zoning commission as to what the acreage is on it, attached to this, if anybody is
19 interested in seeing it. But the acreage in total is 3.98 acres and I know that the Light
20 Industrial I think is a two acre minimum requirement, but that's just an adjustment I
21 would have. We have a one acre lot, a 1.97 acre and a 2.97 acre total on that one, but
22 3.98 in all three. Okay, I reviewed the tables for General Commercial and while I respect
23 comments made about not having any light industrial in that area, the – reviewing the

1 tables for General Commercial properties there are many limitations to not being able to
2 utilize this building as it was originally built by my father in the '90s. Kathy and I both
3 inherited the properties. One building is, has a 12 x 14 bay on the side of it for large
4 trucks, boats, etc. to enter. The front of that building has two 12 x 12 roll doors, steel roll
5 doors. And then the other building has a 12 x 12 roll door on the side. So, and these
6 buildings are adjacent to one another and then one piece of land is unimproved. The, of
7 the 202 General Commercial property allowances, what you can use it for, there are
8 limitations; I went through and there's only 34 conducive uses that these buildings that
9 were designed like a warehouse and, you know, the very large area in the back for
10 storage, a fenced in area, so of the 202 there's only 34 that are really conducive. The
11 reason that they would not be, again they're built like, you know, warehouse buildings,
12 shops, there's no central heat and air, just individual heat and air units in the office area.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead and give me your final thoughts since you ran
14 past your time. I'm sorry.

15 MS. PEAKE: Alrighty. Final request is I would respectfully appreciate the
16 reconsideration for Light Industrial. There are renters looking to rent one of the empty
17 buildings right now and under the General Commercial rules they would not apply and,
18 you know, the buildings need to be rented out in order to pay property taxes and keep
19 the buildings viable.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

21 MS. PEAKE: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The next name?

1 MR. JOHNSON: Next speaker signed up is Alfonzo Broughton. Harold Johnson?
2 That concludes [inaudible].

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. This is now on the
4 floor for discussion, any further questions. Commissioner Johnson, question?

5 MR. JOHNSON: Question for Staff, and it might be actually directed to the
6 Applicant, but Staff first. If I understood the Applicant's comments regarding prior use,
7 was there a break in use? Is there not a case that this was grandfathered in by prior use
8 based on the Applicant's comments or did I misunderstand?

9 MR. DELAGE: So originally there was a rezoning that took place in the past to
10 General Commercial. My understanding was it was some nonconforming structures on
11 there. That request was granted. Towing was, a business license for a towing with no
12 outside storage was approved and, for the one site where you currently see the Bulldog
13 Towing on the Google Maps. And then the adjacent property, the new tenant the
14 proposed use would not be permitted in GC which therefore requires a rezoning to be in
15 conformance with the ordinance. So it's not really a grandfathering or nonconforming
16 issue. Did I answer your question?

17 MR. JOHNSON: I heard your answer, I'm just trying to process and make sure
18 I'm tracking, thank you.

19 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson, for the question.
21 Comments, discussion, Commissioners? So Staff, the neighboring properties, do they fit
22 LI in the uses?

23 MR. PRICE: Which parcels are you specifically referring to?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The surrounding properties here on Two Notch.

2 MR. PRICE: It looks, you know, just kind of looking at it, you may have the retail
3 and commercial uses; of course, they would fit under the GC. I believe if you're looking
4 at the LI they, I believe LI would also allow for retail sales. [Inaudible] in your packet
5 also. There are a couple of other uses. Yes, sir, so the, the commercial uses that you
6 see in that area would allow for those uses. There's a, I think a manufactured home
7 park further up but that's not zoned either commercial or the requested LI. So there, all
8 of the parcels that you see that are developed, those uses would be allowed under the
9 GC and also it looks like under the LI also.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff, and thank you for the addition to our
11 packet. This is the first time we've got these additional pages, current uses and
12 proposed. It's helpful. Commissioners, discussion or even a motion?

13 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

15 MR. GRADY: I would like to offer a motion recommending disapproval of this
16 map amendment based on the Staff opinion that it does not comply with the
17 Comprehensive Plan.

18 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady and I hear a second from
20 Commissioner Taylor. With that motion on the floor Staff, please take a vote.

21 MR. PRICE: We have a motion for disapproval of Case 24-005MA. A yes vote
22 would be in favor of that disapproval. Those in favor, Grady?

23 MR. GRADY: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

2 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Durant?

4 MR. DURANT: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

6 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

7 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

9 *[Approved: Yonke, Johnson, Durant, Taylor, Grady; Absent: Frierson, Duffy, Metts,*
10 *Siercks]*

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Again county, this is a recommendation
12 of disapproval for County Council, they will have their meeting the fourth Tuesday of the
13 month, is that –

14 MR. PRICE: Actually it would be the 21st of this month at 7:00pm.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: May 21st, 7:00pm, okay. Thank you. Alright, we will
16 continue to move along on the Agenda for Item 5.b.2., Case No. 24-007. I'll hand this
17 back over to Staff for explanation.

18 **CASE NO. 24-007 MA:**

19 MR. PRICE: Alright again, this item is Case 24-007MA. The Applicant is Gunil G.
20 Kim. The location is 105 Weir Road. The Applicant is making a request to rezone a
21 quarter of an acre from R3 which is Residential 3 to GC, General Commercial. Staff
22 recommends approval of this request as it's deemed to be consistent with the objectives
23 of the Comprehensive Plan for this designation. One thing Staff did point out that this

1 area does transition from commercial as you leave Two Notch Road going back along
2 Weir Road into residential. Just wanted to kind of bring that to your opinion [sic] but
3 based on the commercial designations east of the subject site it may not be deemed to
4 be a true encroachment into the residential character of the Weir Road area.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, any questions for Staff?
6 Okay, hearing none I'll go back to Commissioner Johnson here to call some names.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Is the Applicant present?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Gunil Kim?

9 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

11 MR. PRICE: Before Mr. Kim speaks just as a reminder if you could let everyone
12 know both podiums are in operation so they can choose whichever one they want to go
13 to.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Alright sir, please state your name and address
15 and you'll have two minutes.

16 **TESTIMONY OF GUNIL G. KIM:**

17 MR. KIM: Gunil G. Kim, 188 Thatcher Loop, Elgin, South Carolina 29045.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Would you like to speak anything about your property?

19 MR. KIM: No, I'm just here to apply for rezoning the residential property 105 Weir
20 Drive [sic] to general purpose, parking lot purpose for the adjacent business right next to
21 it which is 8605 Two Notch Road.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you sir, anything else you want to tell us about the
23 property?

1 MR. KIM: That property had house a long time ago and it was demolished for the
2 purpose of additional use of parking lot for the business just adjacent to it. And it's been
3 a while and I just recently found out that I had to have rezoning done. So that's what I'm
4 here for, thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Good. Okay. If you don't have anything else
6 you can take your seat.

7 MR. KIM: Yeah, thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

9 MR. JOHNSON: We have one, excuse me, one speaker signed up against, Ted
10 McDaniel.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We'll check the microphone for you.

12 **TESTIMONY OF TED MCDANIEL:**

13 MR. MCDANIEL: Test, test.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

15 MR. MCDANIEL: So my name's Ted McDaniel, I own the property at 108 Weir
16 Drive which is across the street from the property that Mr. Kim owns. Basically that
17 property has been illegal for many, many years. It never has been rezoned from R3 to
18 GC, it was just made into a parking lot. When I purchased that property back in 1993,
19 there was a house on there and the house was not destroyed, the house was removed
20 from the property after the latest tenant was on there, and then all of a sudden it just
21 became the parking lot for the night club. Now everybody in Columbia knows this night
22 club cause there's been more shootings there, there's been more stuff go on at this
23 place than you could shake a stick at. And me and the other neighbors that live in this

1 neighborhood, not necessarily live in the neighborhood but are part of this
2 neighborhood, are sick and tired of this night club. And you know, we're, we have had to
3 pick up trash there every single day, every time that club is opened there's more red
4 solo cups than you can shake a stick at. My question is, I'm a contractor and when I
5 built my place across the street I had to come before y'all and I had to have it rezoned
6 commercial, C3 and I had to put in retention ponds and I had to pave and I had to put
7 curbs in, I had to put landscaping in, I had to do all this stuff. But this has never once
8 been done. All the dirt has washed out into the road, I'm constantly having to take
9 equipment and clean the dirt out of the road because it's not properly done. Okay?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Final thoughts? Can you give me your final thoughts since
11 your time's up?

12 MR. MCDANIEL: My final thoughts is I'm totally against this. I'm tired of picking
13 up women's underwear in my parking lot, I'm tired of them using my place of business
14 as a restroom, urinating all over my building and all that stuff, and I want this place shut
15 down.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Thank you for coming out tonight. Are there
17 any other names, Commissioner Johnson?

18 MR. JOHNSON: No, that's all. Anyone else that wants to address this?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone maybe came in late? Okay. Commission, this is
20 now on the floor for discussion, further questions. I feel like at the beginning of the
21 meeting I mentioned that we are a Planning Commission, we look at zoning requests so
22 we have to keep it to the zone, purpose of the land itself, like what's around it, does it fit
23 in character with the neighborhood. Questions or discussions, anyone have a motion?

1 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

3 MR. GRADY: Just a brief comment and then I will offer a motion. I understand
4 the thoughts of the man who came out and as you said I think this, that there may be
5 matters here for Code Enforcement or potentially law enforcement, depending on the
6 situation, but as you say we do need to follow the structure of the Comprehensive Plan.
7 I believe this request is squarely within that, so given that I will make a motion to
8 advance 24-007MA to County Council with a recommendation of approval.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Do I have a second?

10 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, I hear a second from Commissioner Taylor. So with
12 a motion and a second on the floor, Staff can you please take a vote?

13 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a motion for approval of Case 24-007MA. A yes
14 vote is in support of that motion for approval. Alright, those in favor, Grady?

15 MR. GRADY: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

17 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Durant?

19 MR. DURANT: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: That motion for approval of Case 24-007MA passes.

2 *[Approved: Yonke, Johnson, Durant, Taylor, Grady; Absent: Frierson, Duffy, Metts,*
3 *Siercks]*

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you Staff. Comment you have?

5 MR. JOHNSON: I was just gonna make a comment.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

7 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

9 MR. JOHNSON: The Chair always emphasizes that we are a recommending
10 body and that it's got to go to Council. And there are some, like my colleague explained
11 based on the facts and what we have in front of us where [inaudible] to go. [Inaudible]
12 Just wanted to add that.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. We'll keep the
14 meeting moving along, we're still in Item 5.b., Case 3, which is Case Number 24-
15 008MA. Staff, I hand it back over to you.

16 **CASE NO. 24-008MA:**

17 MR. PRICE: Alright, so Mr. Chair I think you, as you normally do, this matter will
18 be heard by County Council on the 21st of May in Council chambers at 7:00pm.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, thank you.

20 MR. PRICE: Alright, the next item is Case 24-008MA. The Applicants are
21 Heather Bounds and Christina Tran. The Applicants are requesting to amend a current
22 PDD so it's a PDD to PDD, comprised of 64.95 acres. The location is along Crane
23 Church Road, Fairfield Road and also another section of Crane Church Road. As stated

1 this is an approved PDD previously as stated in the zoning history portion of your
2 packet. It was originally zoned to Planned Development in '94 and there was a
3 subsequent amendment to that in 2007. So you can just kind of take a look on page 22
4 of your packet, we tried our best to kind of give a comparison of what the previous
5 zoning designation, the previous PDD would allow or the current PDD and what the
6 proposed would do. In a nutshell there will be an increase in single family units but in
7 totality there will be a reduction in the total number of units allowed. I believe the current
8 PDD allows for 1,700 total residential developments and I believe the proposed
9 amendment to the PDD would take this down to about 1,500. In addition to the
10 residential lots there's also a proposed, we have it as a recreation area which would be
11 recreational lagoon with 200 apartments, a 150 room hotel, 10,000 square feet of retail
12 and 5,000 square feet for a restaurant. Also within your package you will note that there
13 is a, there should be an ordinance, there are two ordinances that are in there on page
14 31, would be the, if adopted this should be the actual ordinance that would be for the
15 amendment to the PDD and in the rear you will find the old ordinance from 2007 which
16 is found on page 57. So the two ordinances on 31 for the proposed PDD and 57 for the
17 current PDD. One other thing too, also as part of the PDD the Applicant has identified a
18 number of additional uses including many of the uses found in the 2024 General
19 Commercial zoning designation of the Richland County Land Development Code, and
20 that is found on page 24 of your packet, of the proposed uses. So, and we don't really
21 get a lot of PDDs anymore, so this is one of the things you can look at and as part of
22 your recommendation you can make, like your typical rezoning requests, you know,
23 whatever that zoning designation is, all uses that go with it are allowed. With this one

1 there are things you can look at and make recommendations that, for what you'll be
2 forwarding to County Council of any recommended changes that you see from what is
3 proposed, and that would include uses or anything else. And that would be it for Staff.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. We have several names signed up to
5 speak so let's get to this. Yes.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Let's begin with the Applicant, Heather Bounds, Christina Tran.

7 **TESTIMONY OF CHARLES HOWELL:**

8 MR. HOWELL: Sorry, I'm Charles Howell, I signed up as the speaker.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

10 MR. HOWELL: Sorry.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Name and address and two minutes.

12 MR. HOWELL: Charles Howell with the Land Planning Group South, I'm at 11
13 Rosemount Court in Blythewood, South Carolina. I'm a consultant for the owner. Again
14 like Geo said it's basically the PDD that we prepared in 2007. Obviously with the
15 recession and everything that fell through to new owners and they wanna make a
16 change for basically a pretty exciting change for that lower left portion, that's why the
17 unit numbers changed. That was all slated for all apartments and now it's gonna be, like
18 Geo said, lagoon, mixed use retail, some apartments, that's the net change of total units
19 by about 12%. Obviously we're excited about it, it's finally happening. Again, it's minor
20 tweaks, I think Geo brought up some of the changes there. And we have met with Ms.
21 Barron, she got us together with the stakeholder committee of local community leaders,
22 we had that meeting. And then we also had an open house community meeting and a

1 HOA meeting and that seemed positive. So with that the owners here also if you have
2 questions for them, too.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks for coming out tonight.

4 MR. HOWELL: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. Would the owner like to come down and speak?
6 No, you're good? Okay.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Emily Drake?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. You're good? Okay.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Becky Harris?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is that Patrick Harris? Alright.

11 MR. JOHNSON: We have two names signed up as against. Rose Perez.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down.

13 **TESTIMONY OF ROSE PEREZ:**

14 MS. PEREZ: My name is Rose Perez, I live on the [inaudible] Road.

15 MS. JOHNSON: State your address, please.

16 MS. PEREZ: The Barboil Road, my name is Rose Perez. I do understand that
17 this is something positive but at the same time I kinda wanna know, like what's gonna
18 happen with, like, I do know that they wanna do a lotta buildings but we have really bad
19 roads. The more buildings they have the more traffic and like I say our roads are really,
20 really deteriorated. As well, that being said, are they gonna have, are they gonna
21 expand, like the roads, what's gonna have for, like all the other community, like for our
22 area as well because like I said the more people we live there the more horrible traffic

1 it's gonna get there as well. So that's all I have to say, like I kinda want them to think
2 about, you know, the residential people that are still there. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out tonight.

4 MR. JOHNSON: We also have signed up Dubard Boyle.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Oh, got it. Thank you. Alright, thanks for coming up to
6 speak. Okay Commission, this is on the floor for discussion and questions back to Staff.
7 Again with a PDD we have more work to do up here if we wanna give any revisions or
8 recommendation.

9 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, I mean, you have, you know, a number of options. You
10 could approve it as proposed and that's what would be forwarded to Council. You can
11 also recommend approval subject to recommended changes on behalf of the Planning
12 Commission also.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Did Staff have any editorial comments to the proposed plan?

14 MR. PRICE: No, sir, I think we looked at this. Staff did have an opportunity to
15 speak with the developer or the Applicant and their design professional Mr. Howell and
16 look at some of the uses that you found on page 24 of that, of your packet that would be
17 allowed within the PDD. I mean, I think if there was anything you may wanna look at
18 some of the uses but overall there wasn't much that Staff recommended, any additional
19 changes.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair?

21 MR. DURANT: I'm sorry, go ahead.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson's gonna defer. Commissioner
23 Durant, go ahead.

1 MR. DURANT: Just a couple questions for the Staff. This is an existing Planned
2 Development District and the proposed change is for a Planned Development District.
3 Why does the owner have to come to the County to seek to make any changes since
4 it's already a Planned Development District?

5 MR. PRICE: Alright, so one of the things about a Planned Development District is
6 you're able to essentially craft your own zoning designation. You know, as I think I may
7 have stated before our Land Development Code that we have, currently have, and I
8 think we've passed this on to y'all over the years, this is the, the Land Development
9 Code, it could actually almost be twice as big if we were to include all of the PDDs that
10 we have because actually a PDD, each PDD could be, PDD Oakhill, PDD Woodcreek
11 Farms, PDD Lake Carolina, you kinda see where I'm going, cause you get to craft your
12 own. But one of the caveats of approving a PDD is that any major changes, and a major
13 change is typically identified uses within the PDD, when those are gonna change then
14 that requires, that's considered to be a major amendment and it requires to go back
15 through the process of going to the Planning Commission and going back to the County
16 Council and having a public hearing for those changes.

17 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Back to Commissioner
19 Johnson.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price, is it my general understanding that however many
21 years ago state law changed such that a PUD requires a commercial element at this
22 point, correct?

1 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, it requires a true mixed use, a true mixed use so it could be
2 a single use planned development. So, and so looking at this, this one still maintains a
3 mixed use component within the whole PDD from residential, commercial uses that
4 have been identified.

5 MR. JOHNSON: So the combination of uses, would that be sufficient if it was
6 only single family and multifamily or would that still be considered a single use?

7 MR. PRICE: That would be single use.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. So, and in the event that a proposed use is not feasible
9 then what happens to that designated use?

10 MR. PRICE: You mean if they decide to develop it –

11 MR. JOHNSON: Correct. I mean, and again this is, I mean, looking at the
12 location for what's shown for retail and hotel, if I'm reading the map appropriately if that
13 use falls out as not being actually able to be developed, what happens, are they gonna
14 have to come back and redo the PUD, and is that just a way of getting around a fully
15 residential development by sticking in a corner of commercial?

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, with this being a PDD could the Applicant come back
17 and address any questions or -

18 MR. PRICE: I'm sure if need be. So to answer the question by Commissioner
19 Johnson, yes so over the years we've had a number of PDDs that have come in that
20 I've seen and you're right, there's some occasions, some have actually just stuck, you
21 know, maybe a commercial component to the PDD that never gets developed and so it
22 just really turns out to be a one use development. Now, that area, the area of the PDD
23 that they designated for a specific use, so let's just say a commercial section, that is all

1 that can be used for. So it's either gonna, it would either remain vacant or it would be
2 developed commercially, or they would have to come back in for some type of
3 amendment. But again, they would still, even with an amendment they would still need
4 to maintain a mixed use component for the development.

5 MR. JOHNSON: I mean, at that point our hands are tied because the rest of the
6 PDD would be –

7 MR. PRICE: It could be. I will say that over the years, you know, there have been
8 some things that Staff has looked at also, so one of the things that could happen is
9 there could be a, you could establish points in which a certain percentage of residential
10 would have to be built or commercial would have to be built, you know, prior to taking
11 the next step. That's always a tough one but that way you just don't have a true
12 residential development in this case, and then later on you don't have the commercial
13 so in some cases you could say once, upon 25% build out of residential a certain
14 percentage of commercial must be established, along those lines. You know, one of the
15 tough parts about that, I'm gonna point this out, that usually PDDs are typically large
16 tracts of land and it's usually something, it takes a while to completely build out, again if
17 you look at some of the ones that we currently have in the county. So a lotta times
18 market conditions could change but I think as we stated, if that were the case that the
19 option of coming in to amend the PDD is always there.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. And so today Staff
21 we're actually looking at the ordinance for this PDD, this is what we approve when we
22 recommend approval, is that correct?

1 MR. PRICE: To a degree, yes, sir, because ultimately that's what will be the
2 binding document on this, if this PDD gets approved; the ordinance along with any
3 references such as to the general development plan or any other exhibits.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's page 31 of our packet again, that's what we would
5 recommend approval for, or disapproval. And this is where, as a Planning Commission
6 we can also put in a recommendation to piggyback off of Commissioner Johnson if we
7 wanted to say at 10% completed this, you would have to do 10% commercial if that was
8 viable.

9 MR. PRICE: It could be but, you know, again you also should take in
10 consideration market conditions and, you know, not arbitrarily just pick a percentage of
11 build out. There should be a reason behind it.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Does the Applicant have any thoughts on this? We'll bring
13 the Applicant down for a second. This is a large tract of land that we sign off on as, you
14 know, a collective piece. Good comments were made here so I feel like we'll give you
15 the floor for another minute to have good discussion, it's worth it.

16 MR. HOWELL: Sure. Yeah, and I'm not sure if the whole thing is, this is not the
17 only commercial piece, there's a commercial piece on 321 at the entrance. There's also
18 a commercial piece near Boyle[inaudible] Road, so this is not a PDD that will be, just
19 have one little piece of commercial and not be done. They're currently working on the
20 lagoon so we're hoping that gets built, like this fall with phase one which is off of Crane
21 Church Road so I'm not really sure about, I'm not really worried about the commercial
22 piece not coming. But as Geo said you can't, what I'm worried about is what I heard is
23 that I hear tying commercial into a number of lots. You've gotta have the lots to bring the

1 commercial and no one will come if there's no lots there. So usually in a development
2 we find that as you build the lots people will come. And so, but I think just the three
3 different commercial areas is example enough that we want to have the commercial at
4 this part of the development obviously.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, I'm hoping to see this on the map. I see them
6 scrolling.

7 MR. HOWELL: Yeah, go down – one more.

8 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I'm not sure, I do know it printed in the packet so I'm not sure
9 what's going on with –

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Well there's the retail hotel, the south part of the property
11 and the east – Tommy's going up and down but I see it. I think I see what you're saying.

12 MR. PRICE: Go back.

13 MR. HOWELL: Yeah, so the original golf course entrance is off 321 and so all
14 that's prime commercial obviously. And so we show a lotta commercial there as part of
15 that. There's no doubt there will be commercial as part of this development if that's the
16 concern.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I aim for honest development so when the people come out
18 there they're getting what they're expecting.

19 MR. HOWELL: Absolutely.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Especially if we're going to approve it as a
21 recommendation. Thank you.

22 MR. HOWELL: Sure.

23 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff.

2 MR. PRICE: Tommy, go back to 54. Yeah, so we'll just use this even though it's
3 mostly for the open space, but you can see the commercial sections of this which would
4 be along Fairfield Road. There's also the area that we identified as the recreation area
5 with the lagoon, the apartments and the retail there. And also across the street along
6 Crane Church Road there's another commercial section. And also north of the property
7 there's another section. So there are at least four sections for commercial use within
8 this PDD. And I think as the Applicant stated one of the things they have begun the
9 submittal of plans for the commercial developed section for the recreation area at this
10 time so I'm not sure if that addresses your concerns but just to let you know that the
11 commercial –

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm thinking of those future, future families will come down
13 to come live near this lagoon and we say it's coming in the plan. Commissioner
14 Johnson?

15 MR. JOHNSON: Just making sure I'm understanding the text of the ordinance.
16 Under B(1)(d), 225 lots, 20 x 100? Am I reading that correctly?

17 MR. PRICE: What page are you looking at, sir?

18 MR. JOHNSON: Page 31.

19 MR. PRICE: You said B – yes, sir. Yeah, the 225 lots, those are for townhomes.
20 The 225 lots that are 20 x 100, those are gonna be for townhomes.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Townhomes.

22 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Would you like to see their location on the plan again? I
2 might. Sorry, Tommy. Can you open another tab or duplicate?

3 MR. JOHNSON: While he's pulling that up let me just say this –

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead, Commissioner Johnson.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Our commissioner who's no longer with us during the map
6 amendment process raised considerable issues and concerns with respect to density
7 which I supported and agree with. We cannot – well let me not make it a statement –
8 under the current zoning allowances what zoning would be allowed to achieve that kind
9 of density? That would have to be, what, R3, I mean, 6?

10 MR. PRICE: It's interesting because that – it would vary on the acreage which is
11 gonna be developed. So that could range anywhere from the R3 which would be six
12 units per acre up to R5, excuse me R5 and R6. Now one of the differences in our Code
13 is R5 and R6 which are our higher density zoning designations which are 12 and 18
14 respectively in the R5 and R6, they do not allow for single family, they only allow for
15 either two, three or multifamily developments. So it's a little different than our previous
16 Code, Land Development Code in which even the higher zoning designations allow for
17 both single family detached along with multi family. But under our current Code it only
18 allows –

19 MR. JOHNSON: Just to paraphrase, Mr. Price, make sure, say it in my words, to
20 achieve that level of density under other aspects of our Code with the PDD they would
21 be in a multifamily zoning.

22 MR. PRICE: In some areas.

23 MR. JOHNSON: In some of these areas.

1 MR. PRICE: In some areas. And others would be potentially higher, yeah so
2 looking at this, I'm trying to think how to tell you, so the lots that are designated as, if
3 you turn to page 22 in your packet, I think it's a little easier to follow there, at least for
4 me, so under the proposed where it says 824 single family detached units, 363 lots at
5 75 x 135 which is about 10,000 square feet, that would need to fall, that would fall under
6 the R2, I believe the R2 zoning designation. For the 401 lots which come out to about
7 7,200 square feet, that would need to be R3. And as you start to get into the 225 lots
8 that would require much higher designation for the 2,000, that would probably need to
9 fall in more in multifamily. So in order to achieve this you would have to have a number
10 of zoning designations within it which would also include commercial also.

11 MR. JOHNSON: I'm not trying to beat this horse but just, we spent considerable
12 time establishing a new map amendment to decrease the level of density. In my opinion
13 this seems to be increasing the level of density.

14 MR. PRICE: I'm not sure I would say that y'all did, the result was to decrease
15 density because there are a number of our zoning designations that the Planning
16 Commission did recommend to Council which was subsequently adopted, they do allow
17 for what you consider relatively high density for developments. So I wouldn't say that
18 y'all have decreased it. We still need the rezoning requests to occur.

19 MR. JOHNSON: I mean, I'm not saying we eliminated it, I may not have
20 articulated myself very well, but – and we can talk about this outside the bounds of this
21 case, but what, I guess what I'm trying to say is that in order to achieve, for example,
22 like the townhouses, you can't do that in R1 and R2.

23 MR. PRICE: Correct.

1 MR. JOHNSON: And so there were some of the lower zoning perimeters that
2 allowed for higher density that now have, we increase the requirements that then means
3 that you have to rezone for a higher density. That's really what I mean when I say – I
4 don't mean across the board, so I spoke with, I did not speak in a precise way but for
5 our lower level zonings.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Commissioner Taylor,
7 Grady, how are you guys? Any thoughts?

8 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

10 MR. GRADY: Just one point of clarification to make sure that we have the math
11 right here. So on page 21 the sort of summary of the project indicates 64 acres and then
12 on page 22 there's a total 713.8 acres. Could we just get a clarification from Staff on
13 which of those numbers or if another number is accurate?

14 MR. PRICE: Yes, thank you for bringing that to our attention. I think as I was
15 reading that in the beginning it kinda caught me a bit. I believe that we, what did we
16 have, Tommy? It, the total is 708 and 13, point, that is the correct amount, acreage,
17 excuse me.

18 MR. GRADY: Thank you.

19 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

21 MR. DURANT: Just a clarification question. Earlier Commissioner Johnson asked
22 a question on the proposed ordinance and §2(B)(1)(d), 225 lots, 20 x 100, 2,000 square
23 feet and the answer was that those were for townhomes but they're listed under the 824

1 single family units. And then number 2 says 290 townhomes. So is that, are those 225
2 lots for townhomes or single family units?

3 MR. PRICE: Those are for the townhomes. I'm sorry, so looks like what we would
4 do is we would remove (B)(2).

5 MR. JOHNSON: You would delete the reference to (B)(2)?

6 MR. PRICE: Yes. And so it would be 225 for the townhomes.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Just to clarify, Staff. That'd be 1(D) is correct, 225 lots, 2 x
8 100, but (B)(2), we're just gonna strike that and take away those 290 townhomes.

9 MR. PRICE: That is correct. That wouldn't be an amendment necessary by the
10 Planning Commission, that was a correction that needs to be made by Staff.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good catch, Commissioner Durant. Any other comments,
12 questions, Commission?

13 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

15 MR. GRADY: I just wanna make sure we're not, like ripping up the developer's
16 plans without knowing it. Is that, I'm seeing a shake of the head, just trying to clarify that
17 striking that 290 townhome item, is that in –

18 MS. TRAN: That's correct.

19 MR. GRADY: Okay. Alright, just wanted to make sure we weren't making some
20 massive change without knowing it. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: My comment based off Commissioner Johnson earlier, yes
22 we had a major zoning change since the 2005 Code and the 2021, but this was a PDD
23 that was approved back in 2007 so looked at differently at a bunch of zoning, different

1 zoning types as Staff explained to us, all into one piece. But we are looking at what
2 would be less units total is what I've summarized from it, with 1,700 down to about
3 1,500 when you do the math.

4 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah.

6 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor.

8 MR. TAYLOR: Question, on page 22 [inaudible] in light of the recent [inaudible]
9 290 on that page also need to be –

10 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

11 MR. TAYLOR: - stricken through?

12 MR. PRICE: That's also been identified, that will be corrected also.

13 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Again good eye, Commissioner Taylor.

15 MR. JOHNSON: It's still a net increase from 204 to 225.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So the current is 204 town units and then we're striking out
17 290. Okay, but it's gonna go up to 225. I see that now. So in general are we doing less?
18 No, there's some more single family and some more multi family. So does that math
19 total out –

20 MR. PRICE: Say that again?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Would they developer like to come back up for one more
22 minute? We want to clarify this. And for everyone here and listening online instead of

1 looking at one parcel right now we're looking at several thousands of parcels so that's
2 why we're giving it good diligence.

3 MS. TRAN: Yeah, so it is, it may be more townhomes but overall in the whole
4 community we're reducing the number of units if you include multifamily and single
5 family. And townhomes count in that single family.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Does that make sense Commission? Yes? Commissioner
7 Taylor?

8 MR. TAYLOR: I was trying to find it before I said it. Yeah, also under, on page 31
9 the total number of dwelling units are subject change up to 20%?

10 MS. TRAN: That's for grading purposes. Typically we usually lose lots when we
11 grade. I can't guarantee we'll lose lots but it happens when it comes to construction.
12 Most construction projects you see a 10 to 20% built in.

13 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Taylor, I did not read that sentence, you said up to, not for a
15 decrease

16 MR. TAYLOR: Right, under page 31, §2(B) there's an * [inaudible].

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Are we all on the same page? Commissioners, are we on
18 the same page with the information?

19 MR. GRADY: Certainly –

20 MR. JOHNSON: That leaves, I mean, I understand from a grading standpoint but
21 now that you're leaving yourself 20% so basically add another 50 units of townhouses,
22 275 [inaudible] of townhouses the way that's written.

1 MS. TRAN: It's a plus/minus and that's still less than the PDD that's currently
2 approved, sir. Total units. Correct, it's total units overall, apologies. Yeah, so just to
3 clarify the plus/minus is for total units overall and it's still a reduction down in density for
4 total units overall.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any further questions, Commissioners? Or clarification
6 needed? How are you, Commissioner Durant?

7 MR. DURANT: I'm good, thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thanks.

9 MR. JOHNSON: I don't have a question but it gives me heartburn because
10 there's tremendous increase in density once you factor in the commercial elements in
11 terms of the net add. And then I will say, which buttresses up against I think one of my
12 other concerns which is part of our responsibility but it also gets more to the policy
13 element though is the neighborhoods that we're generating and creating based on the
14 stated sizes and square foot, that we're not making larger lots and so the impact on the
15 economics of that neighborhood of the smaller footprint of lots. So Mr. Price, maybe if
16 you can give me a correlation of, for those in the 363 lots and the –

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming down.

18 MR. JOHNSON: - 401 lots in R2 and R3, how does that lot size compare to what
19 would be eligible under R2 and R3 in terms of lot sizes? So let me not make it as a
20 statement, let me make it as a question.

21 MR. PRICE: If you could rephrase that question, I'm sorry.

22 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible] proposed use on 22.

23 MR. PRICE: Okay.

1 MR. JOHNSON: It's not exact but it's saying we have a rough correlation
2 between R2 and R3 for the 363 lots at 75 x 135 and the 400 lots at 60 x 120, how does
3 that correspond with our average lot size requirements in those jurisdictions? If I was
4 gonna outright approve those R2 and R3, what would my lot sizes correspond to?

5 MR. PRICE: Okay, I'm gonna turn to this page cause it comes up a good bit.
6 Okay, so looking here, and this kinda goes to a conversation that I think we had, excuse
7 me, with Chairman Yonke earlier, as a Staff one of the things that we did when we
8 adopted our current Land Development Code, I believe that you can make an argument
9 that there were some gaps within our zoning designations. So as I'm looking here in our
10 Code whether it be R2 under a major land development, you would have a minimum lot
11 size of 11,000 and a maximum lot size of 18,000, that would be if the property was
12 zoned R2 and you were trying to develop it with an average size, average lot of 14,500.
13 Under the R3 your minimum lot size is 5,500 with a maximum of 9,000, average size of
14 7,260. Now you'll kinda take note that I did leave out a certain square footage of lot
15 which is 10,000 so there's a good chance that if you're looking at our Code, if somebody
16 wanted to do a 10,000 square foot lot in Richland County, as I'm looking at this right
17 now that they couldn't. That would be prohibited.

18 MR. JOHNSON: So 2(B)(1)(a) would not be prohibited under an R2.

19 MR. PRICE: Yeah, so if you – under the R2 the 363 lots, the 10,125, if this was
20 just coming in under your standard zoning designation that would not allow 10,000
21 square foot lots and if they wanted to go to R3 that would not allow 10,000 square foot
22 lots either. So again, you know, with this discussion it does show that there is a bit of a
23 hole when it comes to our Code.

1 MR. JOHNSON: And B(1)(b), 401 lots, the 60 x 120 is even smaller.

2 MR. PRICE: Right. Now that, of course, that would fit neatly under our R3 zoning
3 designation. That would fit neatly under R3 as would, as potentially would the 89 lots,
4 the 42 x 135 would also fall within there. So I think the biggest one is the first one, the
5 363 lots which would come out to about a 10,125 square foot parcel. So none of our
6 zoning designations would allow for a lot of that size, but then I guess that's one of the
7 points of a PDD, you are kinda creating your own zoning designation.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, one final question and I will be quiet.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Under discussion, go ahead Commissioner Johnson.

10 MR. JOHNSON: So using the 363 lots as an example, we're at 10,125 square
11 feet, are the corresponding setbacks that would go along with R2 coming along with this
12 PDD? How are we impacting in terms of setbacks in implementing this?

13 MR. PRICE: That, I don't think that has been identified also.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I have a piggyback question, Staff, just it seems like with
15 this being a PDD does the Code address that? You know, if we're looking at, like Lake
16 Carolina PDD, right, they, the developer sets the setbacks based off of the perimeters of
17 the PDD, not the individual R2, R3s.

18 MR. JOHNSON: I'm saying, but –

19 MR. PRICE: That is correct.

20 MR. JOHNSON: - I don't see any, I don't see any references to the setbacks in
21 the PDD is my point though.

22 MR. PRICE: No, you're correct.

1 MR. JOHNSON: And I'm not saying that the setbacks should be the R2 setbacks,
2 I'm just saying the setbacks should be spelled out.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Johnson, would you like to see a recommendation from
4 Planning Commission to write in setbacks to this ordinance?

5 MR. JOHNSON: With the Staff's guidance. And I'm not trying to be obtuse,
6 Commissioners, I'm just – we've got a fair amount of density here and I am concerned
7 about –

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down again. We are speaking on 1,500 parcels in
9 our County, this is worth the time.

10 MR. HOWELL: Yes, sir. Again it's Charles Howell. They're in there, they're in the
11 PDD. I can't remember what they are but they are set for the whole development. There
12 are separate setbacks for the townhomes cause they're zero lot lines. I'm sorry, can you
13 hear me now? The setbacks are in the PDD and I can't remember specifically what they
14 are but there are two sets of setbacks; there's one set for the townhomes and one set
15 for the residential lots.

16 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir and I apologize cause Mr. Howell and I did have this
17 discussion. So if you would turn to page 41 of your packet. And if you note near the
18 bottom where it says, 'The following guidelines for residential units will apply in
19 commercial areas and areas using alleys as access.' The front setback will be 1' from
20 the front property line and the rear and side setback a minimum of 10' from the lot line.
21 And if it's a corner lot it would be a minimum of 3' from that lot line. Also it states that the
22 following guidelines for residential units will apply in areas where front access and front

1 driveways parking as access in Oakhills, unless otherwise stated, front setback 20' from
2 the lot line, rear 10' from the lot line and on a corner lot it would be 3' from the lot line.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

5 MR. JOHNSON: A question for Mr. Price. The section that you read as it relates
6 to the residential units, help me, are we making a distinction between – cause the
7 Applicant pointed out that they were treating the townhouses the same, I mean, under
8 the same classification as single family – are we using the same setbacks for
9 townhouses and for single family detached?

10 MR. HOWELL: Sorry, it's me again. Sorry, I misspoke, the townhomes have a 20'
11 setback so they're in the residential section, sorry. Cause it'll have front, they'll have, I
12 think it's one car garage and then a one car off street parking space so it'll be 20'
13 setbacks for townhomes.

14 MR. JOHNSON: So I guess, so that's my question, the section that Mr. Price just
15 read on your page 7, our page 41, is that setback solely for the townhouses or are we
16 using the same setback for detached units?

17 MR. PRICE: The second part would be for all residential units. So it would be for
18 both single family detached and for the townhomes, unless they're using alleys and then
19 the first portion would apply.

20 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible] feet's aggressive.

21 MR. PRICE: Twenty feet?

22 MR. JOHNSON: I said 3' is very aggressive.

1 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Now I will say that, and again this is something that the
2 Applicant can speak on, a lotta times, especially when you're talking about detached
3 units, that will affect the type of rating, the fire rating they have to have on the building.
4 They usually have to have a 5', usually most developments try to have 5' from the
5 property line -

6 MR. JOHNSON: That's what I mean.

7 MR. PRICE: - rating, but if it's going to be closer that will require additional
8 building standards for the structures.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Also for someone who's trying to make that turn, the line of site
10 of 3' versus 5', but anyway I'm not -

11 MR. PRICE: Yeah, and again other things would apply and I know exactly where
12 you're going, so you know, things such as visibility triangle, there are other parts of the
13 Code that would default to this type of development if it's not referenced to ensure that it
14 doesn't impede visibility along those corners.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright Staff, housekeeping question again, if we
16 recommend approval we're recommending this on page 33 or 31, the ordinance that
17 reflects back to the Oakhills Planned Development District.

18 MR. PRICE: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: If we're concerned about setbacks do we make a
20 recommendation, them needing to be larger?

21 MR. JOHNSON: I'm one person but I mean, my thought is that those setbacks
22 are appropriate for a townhouse but it just seems a little bit, I would expect more on the
23 detached units is what I'm trying to say.

1 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, other comments or a motion?

3 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

5 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion to advance Case 24-008MA to
6 County Council with a recommendation of approval per Staff recommendation.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Are we gonna note B(2) is scratched out, §2(B)(2), it would
8 be updated by Staff?

9 MR. PRICE: So, yes, so on page 22 under proposed, those are identified as
10 proposed [inaudible] sites surrounding Oakhills Golf Course that will, the removal of 290
11 townhomes will be made and also on page 31 it would be the same in which the
12 removal of (B)(2) which also references 290 townhomes. Both of those will be removed
13 from the ordinance going to County Council.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Does Commissioner Grady need to restate his motion?

15 MR. PRICE: He can.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Or is that part of your motion, Commissioner Grady?

17 MR. GRADY: Yes, I would amend my motion to move that the scrivener's errors
18 that have been identified in this discussion be corrected.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Given that I'll second. I'm allowed to do that as Chair,
20 right? With a motion and a second can we take a vote? Recommendation of approval
21 with the Staff's updates.

1 MR. PRICE: Those in favor of, we have a motion, excuse me, we have a motion
2 for the approval of Case 24-008MA for the amended PDD. Those in favor of the motion,
3 a yes vote is in favor of the motion for approval. Those in favor, Grady?

4 MR. GRADY: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

6 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

7 MR. PRICE: Durant?

8 MR. DURANT: Aye.

9 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

10 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

11 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

13 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

14 *[Approved: Yonke, Johnson, Durant, Taylor, Grady; Absent: Frierson, Duffy, Metts,*
15 *Siercks]*

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. After a healthy discussion that is an
17 approval recommendation going to County Council who will meet on the 21st of May,
18 correct? If I remember that right?

19 MR. PRICE: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you. We'll move on to our next case, that
21 would be 5.b.4., Case Number 24-009MA. Staff, whenever you're ready, back to you.

22 **CASE NO. 24-009MA:**

23 MR. PRICE: Alright. Next item is Case 24-009MA. The Applicant –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, we'll give it a minute for people to step out quietly,
2 please. And I'll take a moment of privilege to say thank you Commissioners for good
3 discussion on this one. This is a lot of property we're looking at for the County. Yes,
4 1,500 now possibly.

5 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I had a joke but I can't say it now. We'll talk about it after the
6 meeting. Alright, you ready? Okay. Mr. Chair?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, ready when you are. Hey guys, you wanna keep it
8 down so we can move on with the meeting, thank you.

9 MR. PRICE: Alright, thank you. The next item is Case 24-009MA. The Applicant
10 is Aaron Breeden. The location is along Hard Scrabble Road. The Applicant is
11 requesting to rezone 9.18 acres from HM which is Homestead zoning to GC which is
12 General Commercial. Just let me correct this as I go forward. Staff recommends
13 disapproval of this request, and if you note under the conclusion under the second
14 paragraph it actually should read, the subject site does not meet the recommendations
15 of the Comprehensive Plan. I apologize for that and goes along with the disapproval. So
16 again, Staff recommends disapproval as it will not be consistent with the objectives
17 outlined in the Comprehensive Plan which calls for nonresidential development to be
18 located along main road corridors and within a contextually appropriate distance from a
19 primary arterial. However, the requested map amendment would be compatible with the
20 commercial development patterns of the adjacent parcels along Hard Scrabble Road. In
21 addition, the current zoning is inconsistent with the recommendations of the
22 Comprehensive Plan designation for this area also. But again principally Staff

1 recommends disapproval of this based on the current language found within the
2 Comprehensive Plan.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioner Johnson, do we have
4 anyone signed up to speak?

5 MR. JOHNSON: We have, under the Applicant we have Jake Simco?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down and state your name and address.

7 **TESTIMONY OF JAKE SIMCO:**

8 MR. SIMCO: Simco, as a typical engineer my handwriting's terrible so I apologize
9 for that. Jake Simco, I'm at 459 Thoroughbred Drive, Cleveland, Tennessee, so it was a
10 long drive this morning. Not much rain though so we're good. Yes, I'm representing the
11 Applicant on this and it seems like Homestead was kind of a placeholder for the existing
12 zoning. It's vacant, it's got a big hill in it, and looking at the surrounding properties it's all
13 commercial basically, you know, with the exception of the subdivision to the south of us.
14 But we're seeking to zone to commercial, that just gives us the most flexibility on the
15 property to develop it. We're looking at some, you know, restaurants or something like
16 that along the frontage and then the back is still kinda up in the air to be determined.
17 We're looking at a couple of different options there. But I would love the opportunity
18 answer any questions you guys have.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks for making the drive and coming out.

20 MR. SIMCO: Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else?

22 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, there's no one else signed up.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is there anyone else in the audience that wanted to sign up
2 for this one and just walked in later? No? Okay, this is on the floor for discussion and
3 questions for Staff, Commissioners. Questions in general. Yes, Commissioner Taylor?

4 MR. TAYLOR: Can we pull the map up some? I just wanna see – yeah, right
5 there. So the GC below that neighborhood, yeah, [inaudible] are those qualified GCs, do
6 they meet the requirements? Or is it had to say?

7 MR. PRICE: No, I mean, they do. The GC doesn't have specific as it relates to
8 lot size or anything, so those would fit. And those were actually recently rezoned to
9 commercial also. And one thing also to point out, kinda small, if you take a look at the
10 parcel south – zoom in a little bit – so if you take a look at the parcel south of that
11 commercial area that we were just looking at, I think that you referenced, where you see
12 the Murphy USA and the Walgreens, and can you come down a little bit more, Tommy?
13 And the O'Reilly's and going all the way down to the Sonic, those are zoned PDD, PD.
14 That was part of the Summit Planned Development in which they identified that area for
15 commercial uses. So even though it has a Planned Development zoning designation
16 they are, it was identified for General Commercial uses.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price, the Publix, what is that zoned?

18 MR. PRICE: The Publix? I believe the Publix is also zoned PDD. Yes. And to go
19 back to something you mentioned earlier, you know, that a while ago you could – and
20 when I say a while ago I don't mean like five years ago, but you know, years ago, you
21 could come in with a single use Planned Development. And so I think as this area in the
22 northeast part of Richland County was developing just to kinda allow certain uses to
23 come in but yet at the same time not open up the floodgates for all commercial uses.

1 You will see a lot of the, these identified as Planned Development including where the
2 Publix shopping center is, across the street where the Spinx convenience store is also,
3 and I believe that the portions just south of where the Spinx was, a piece of that was
4 also PDD that was rezoned to General Commercial. So that's how a lot of the PDDs
5 came about in that particular area.

6 MR. TAYLOR: And the reason for my question is that I know a lotta times we're
7 looking at these and we're trying, I don't know if it's a word, I'll make it up now, but we
8 try to avoid, like that zoning creep where we start letting things in. But if, again I guess
9 the main reason for the question is the parcel that seems to sandwich this particular
10 neighborhood, yes that one, if that one's good, that's why I was asking.

11 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson?

13 MR. JOHNSON: Prior to Mr. Taylor, Commissioner Taylor's comment, I mean,
14 looking at the original zoning map it looked like an outlier but to your point once you look
15 at that corridor moving south that it doesn't appear to be out of line with the exception of
16 that one little portion where the residential comes all the way out. But the rest of that it's
17 not immediately apparent because those are done as PUD development, as PD
18 developments. So I mean, it really walked in here very much in alignment with Staff's
19 recommendation, but seeing the point that you raise, that corridor is arguably a GC
20 corridor. So I mean, I, it changed my viewpoint on it.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson and Commissioners, I see the
22 same thing; it's the nature of the character of this area. It's one of the factors we look at

1 with our recommendations. Any other comments, Commissioners? Anyone interested in
2 making a motion?

3 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: I move that we advance Map Amendment 24-009 to the County
6 Council with a recommendation of approval based on Staff's comments that the
7 requested Map Amendment would be compatible with the commercial development
8 pattern of the adjacent parcels on Hard Scrabble Road.

9 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you Commissioner Durant, and we have a
11 second from Commissioner Taylor. I'm just understanding the bottom part of the
12 reasoning is based off the however statement, that the Map Amendment would be
13 compatible with commercial development patterns of adjacent parcels. Okay, with a
14 motion and a second, Staff could you please take a vote?

15 MR. PRICE: Also, I mean, just gonna add to your – but I did take a phrase you
16 used, Mr. Chair, where you said that it fits the nature and character of the area also.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

18 MR. PRICE: So if you don't mind we would also include that as part of the –

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant, are you okay including that in your
20 motion?

21 MR. DURANT: Yes, I am.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. Commissioner Taylor, you're still okay seconding
23 that?

1 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Correct.

3 MR. PRICE: Alright, thank you. Alright, so we have a motion for the approval of
4 Case 24-009MA. A yes vote would be in favor of that motion. Those in favor, Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

7 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Grady?

9 MR. GRADY: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

11 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

15 *[Approved: Yonke, Johnson, Durant, Taylor, Grady; Absent: Frierson, Duffy, Metts,*
16 *Siercks]*

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. That's our recommendation of approval
18 and it'll be seen by County Council May 21st. We can move along to 5.b.5., Case
19 Number 24-010, right? Wessinger Road?

20 **CASE NO. 24-010MA:**

21 MR. PRICE: So on page 71 of your, in the Agenda that actually should be,
22 instead of 24-003 it should actually be 24-010MA. Okay –

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff, I see that now.

1 MR. PRICE: Thank you. Alright, so the next item of course is Case 24-010MA.
2 The Applicant is Dawson Yandle. The location along Wessinger Road. And the
3 Applicant is requesting to rezone 13.48 acres from M1 which is Light Industrial which is
4 a legacy zoning designation from our previous Code, to R2 which is Residential 2. Staff
5 recommends disapproval of this request. The requested Map Amendment would not be
6 consistent with the objectives of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan for the neighborhood
7 low density future land use designation. According to the Plan lower density, single
8 family neighborhood developments are the preferred development type. In addition
9 while the requested amendment will provide for uses that are similar to those that are in
10 the adjacent area the development standards of the requested R2, meaning lot size, lot
11 width and density, are not compatible. For these reasons Staff recommends disapproval
12 of this Map Amendment. Again, this is one where, you know, upon adoption of the
13 current Land Development Code we went with the equivalency zoning designations and
14 so as we're preparing to update our Comprehensive Plan we're still relying upon the
15 2015 and so within the neighborhood low density designation that actually supported
16 the, you know, I'll go back to our previous zoning designations, rural, rural residential,
17 RSE as the recommended zoning designations for property found within a
18 neighborhood low density. The RS-LD which was again under our previous Code will
19 support it in the neighborhood medium density. So again going back to, as we adopted
20 the equivalency, this R2 is in line with the RS-LD so that's one of the reasons why
21 Staff's recommendation was against this particular request.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, are we following? It
23 doesn't seem like it's, though the density's lower than expected, or higher –

1 MR. PRICE: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: - for the request is what you're saying?

3 MR. PRICE: Yes, so the density for the R2 which is three units per acre is higher
4 than the adjacent zoning designations in this area which they range from one unit per
5 acre, basically 1.5 units per acre and also three. Excuse me, not three units per acre,
6 yeah three acres per unit. I said that incorrect, so it was .66, .33 and one. Yeah, versus
7 the proposed request which is, which has a density of three.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, is the County map updated, RT, is that correct?

9 MR. PRICE: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

11 MR. PRICE: Yeah, so again for those listening, all parcels of 35 acres or more
12 became AG, anything less than 35 but more than three became HM, and anything less
13 than three became RT. That was previously zoned rural.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioner Johnson, do we have
15 anyone signed up to speak?

16 MR. JOHNSON: We have two people signed up to speak. No one is listed in the
17 Applicant slot, is the Applicant present?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down first. Your name and address.

19 MR. PRICE: Excuse me, and we will also need the Applicant to also sign that
20 before they leave today if they have not signed up.

21 **TESTIMONY OF PAUL MICHELLE:**

22 MR. MICHELLE: Yeah, I'm Paul, I had listed just below it as an agent of the
23 Applicant.

1 MR. PRICE: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, Paul, you have two minutes. Go ahead.

3 MR. MICHELLE: So my name's Paul Michelle. I'm at 3101 Gadsden Street and
4 yeah, I was born and raised in the County. When we were brought on by the owner for
5 this project the objective was to develop something that the County and the community
6 would be proud of, and it still is. So initially looking at the surrounding zonings we
7 applied for a GC rezone but based on the feedback that we received from the, from
8 Staff and the community the, a low density residential zoning was more fitting. So we
9 withdrew our GC application and when I resubmitted I actually submitted for RS-LD but
10 since the Code change we looked at the equivalency and it looked to us like that
11 would've been R2. And so based on that we started the design, we're just looking at 25
12 street frontage lots. We're in coordination with DOT for any kinda street improvements
13 that they would require and DHEC for the septic and other approvals that they'll need.
14 There's a 12" water main that's right out front and so it's, yeah basically we're just
15 asking the Commissioners at this point to take just a somewhat less restrictive
16 interpretation of how the Code has changed and to allow the R2 rezone. We're also
17 working with Ms. Barron, Councilwoman Barron on this, we have a town hall meeting on
18 the 20th and from what she's indicated so far she likes the design and yeah, so we're
19 hoping that we can keep the R2. I'm not sure if R1 would still be able to work with this
20 but yeah, it's just 25 street front homes that we're asking for.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, perfect time. Thanks for coming down.

22 MR. MICHELLE: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff could you confirm that, in the notes it says they could
2 have up to 40 dwelling units. Did you say that already? Page 71?

3 MR. PRICE: That is correct.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

5 MR. PRICE: The density of three, of course times 13.48 give you up to 40, yes,
6 sir.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson, anyone else?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. We have one person signed up against.
9 Roberto C. Portee.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down. We have someone else who wants to
11 speak?

12 **TESTIMONY OF ROBERTO C. PORTEE:**

13 MR. PORTEE: How y'all doing? My name's Roberto Portee, 1157 Wessinger
14 Road. I'm against it because when my wife and I bought this property, we stay in the
15 subdivision now, and it's like back off the road, it's real quiet, hardly no traffic at all. If we
16 bring in these 25 homes which could possibly be up to 40 homes now that I hear now,
17 that's a lotta traffic. That's a lotta traffic, it's not gonna be quiet as it is now. Also our
18 roads are very small off of Wessinger, they're really not up to par, and actually off of 321
19 that's a high traffic area so if these homes were to come the roads itself will have to be
20 redesigned because it's a four-lane highway. So if you're gonna actually be coming off
21 of 321 off of Wessinger side you wouldn't only be entering into two-way traffic, you'll be
22 entering into four-way traffic cause it goes up and down. And that's a hazard right there
23 so that tells you that the roads will have to be redesigned also. And then also you have

1 to look at the schools, if you bring in 25 to 40 homes, is the schools on that part of town
2 gonna be able to handle, you know, kids that may be brought up in those houses, cause
3 in some areas, like in Kershaw County they're not issuing any permits to build because
4 the schools are just overpopulated now. So you just have to, it's more than just building
5 houses cause the property's just vacant. And I appreciate y'all for listening.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thanks for coming down.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Anyone else who wanted to speak on this item if you would give
8 your name and address, please. And you have two minutes.

9 **TESTIMONY OF TODD CORLEY:**

10 MR. CORLEY: Hello, my name's Todd Corley and I own the property at 7562
11 Fairfield Road and 1050 Wessinger Road. It's 150 acre heavy industrial site. We crush
12 concrete at that location, we run an incinerator at that location, we do metal recycling at
13 that location. And we also run our construction business and dumpster service at that
14 location. We chose that location because of the zoning and the surrounding property
15 which included commercial property, industrial property. But residential development
16 moving right across the street from us would have a negative impact on our business as
17 well as other businesses in that area. And during the time when we purchased that
18 property we understood that the County was, it was the County's intentions to keep that
19 area, we're only heavy industrial but an industrial setting in that area, which would
20 potentially provide job opportunities to an area that's already in need of jobs, and a high
21 crime rate in the area already. So I am not in agreement with it.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Would you repeat your last name, please?

23 MR. CORLEY: Corley, C-O-R-L-E-Y.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, sir.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks for coming down. Okay Commissioners, this is on
3 the floor for discussion or questions. Oh, you'd like to speak? Yeah, come on down, sir.
4 Again state your name and address. We'll give you two minutes.

5 **TESTIMONY OF HENRY GOODSON:**

6 MR. GOODSON: My name is Henry Goodson, I stay on 127 Murdough. I live
7 probably in the middle of these, the Oakhill and the Wessinger, and I'm kinda torn
8 between both. We fought the landfill for probably 20 years, so it wasn't always
9 commercial. And I would think that using the pond would be great but it's no water and
10 no sewer there so small homes probably is not the right, you know, there are a lotta
11 mobile homes out there but if you, we're in walking distance of the Oakhill area that y'all
12 just discussed, so I'm kinda like, we didn't want the landfill or what they call the
13 incinerator but nobody wants to build in there with it so I would like kinda really look at,
14 you know, spread it out and say, I don't know if I'm for or against it. I hate to say it that
15 way. The building of homes would be nice but if they're gonna build real small homes
16 then, I don't know like you said that may induce more crime. That's all I have to say. But
17 I stay in-between both of that, on the back end.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. I appreciate your comments. I like to hear
19 from the community.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Question of Staff. If you put the cursor over the parcel that Mr.
21 Corley was referring to, okay.

22 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

1 MR. GRADY: Question for Staff. So I'm trying to grapple with this a little bit
2 because as you state in your explanation through the equivalency process when the
3 Code was updated, what is now designated as R2 was previously RS-LD, correct?

4 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

5 MR. GRADY: And RS-LD stood for residential single family low density, correct?

6 MR. PRICE: Correct.

7 MR. GRADY: So the question I have is, how is zoning that was previously called
8 residential single family low density incompatible with a planning area that is labeled
9 neighborhood low density?

10 MR. PRICE: Again, just going by what was within the Comprehensive Plan it
11 gives a lotta guidelines for where development should take place and how development
12 should also take place. But it also identifies certain zoning designations that are found
13 to be compatible for that use. So again, we've always used that in making our
14 recommendations for rezoning requests that take place within a neighborhood low
15 density designation as identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

16 MR. GRADY: So was it the case that when the plan was initially approved, when
17 we had the previous set of zoning boundaries, that a zoning category called low density
18 was not appropriate in a low density area? I'm seeing a nod.

19 MR. PRICE: Yes.

20 MR. GRADY: That seems very weird. So I would note that as a potential indicator
21 that perhaps this is a more appropriate zoning type than the Staff would suggest. The
22 other thing that comes to mind is that on page 71 under zoning district summary it says
23 the R2 residential district provides lands primarily for low to moderate intensity

1 residential development. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clarified. I'd like to
2 see if the Commissioners have some thoughts.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

4 CHAIRMAN YONK: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Commissioner Johnson,
5 yes.

6 MR. JOHNSON: To walk Mr. Grady's point a little bit further, stepping away from
7 the Code, can you all clarify, can Staff clarify the properties along Wessinger Road
8 further to the north that are CT, no, yeah that and coming back this, across the street,
9 the – yes, those that are RT, describe the primary use of those parcels along that
10 corridor right through there.

11 MR. PRICE: Residential, residential, you know, a couple of parcels that are
12 undeveloped but looks like it's primarily residential.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Primarily residential notwithstanding the zoning classification,
14 but [inaudible].

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other discussion? Staff, could we pull the map back
16 out again? There's no stupid questions, right? If we zoom out and look up, is this the
17 area we're just talking about, this golf course looking – okay, so things are – I like to
18 give each property its individual attention. So we are looking across the street at the
19 1,500?

20 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. And this corner here right now is M1 and there's
22 existing industrial. The parcel, is it that that speaker just identified? What's your
23 address, sir?

1 MR. PORTEE: Heavy industrial.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: It's the one that's highlighted on the map, correct?

3 MR. PRICE: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. What's the parcel next to it again, to the west?

5 MR. PRICE: You mean next to the heavy industrial?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, that – you were correct, the one that you had
7 highlighted before, that's right next to it. Thank you. I'm just piecing the puzzle together,
8 thank you. Commissioners, back to you? Yes, that's M1. I guess the dark purple is
9 heavy industrial, correct?

10 MR. PRICE: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: There's a lot of different zoning types going on in this area,
12 I think we can all see that.

13 MR. JOHNSON: There's a little bit of a gray area, I'm sorry, Mr. Chair?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson, go ahead.

15 MR. JOHNSON: There's a little bit of a gray area question but Mr. Corley, is the
16 primary ingress and egress in and out of that site coming off of which road?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, please come down to the podium so we have you on
18 the microphone. Thank you.

19 MR. CORLEY: Coming in off of Fairfield Road but it proceeds up Wessinger, so
20 all the trucks that enter our site go up Wessinger Road, I mean, parallel to Wessinger
21 Road, so basically their houses are gonna be facing a heavy industrial site with trucks
22 going up and down the driveway all day long.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Currently no screening along Wessinger even though the trucks
2 go back out Fairfield.

3 MR. CORLEY: That's correct. There's just a fence there.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. I'd like to offer an opportunity for the
5 Applicant to come back down for one more minute if you want to respond to any of the
6 discussion. Just try to be fair to both sides.

7 MR. MICHELLE: Thank you. Yeah, I did wanna say that we're currently
8 proposing, or the lot size would be almost half acre lots so the homes would not be
9 small. There's also enough space for around three acres of open space and yeah,
10 Wessinger Road, Ms. Barron, she identifies this area a place that, it needs help and I
11 think that this design really works towards that. And so that's why I would ask the
12 Commissioners to recommend approval if you see so fit.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

14 MR. MICHELLE: Thank you.

15 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair?

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff. Mr. Price.

17 MR. PRICE: So only because this is starting to come up a little bit more and I
18 think, you know, again we've had some discussions on this, just listening to what the
19 Applicant just stated, you know, what they're proposing to do, half acre lots, but as a
20 reminder, and this is more for the Applicant, the decision they may wanna make, but
21 under the R2 zoning designation there is a maximum lot size of 18,000 square feet for a
22 parcel in that designation. So, just say a half acre lot would not be allowed. That would
23 have to actually fall to the R1 zoning designation. And again, I'm not suggesting they

1 go either one, I just wanted to make sure I point that out from a development standpoint.
2 The R2 has a minimum and a maximum along with an average but none of those
3 equate to a half acre.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson?

5 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price, I'm assuming that the proffer of the appropriate larger
6 lot size, the limits that you spelled out, that the driving issue there is septic drain field?

7 MR. PRICE: For the larger lots?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

9 MR. PRICE: I think it, I think, I mean, that may be the case for them. I'm
10 assuming that there is water, sewer available, it's just a matter of along Fairfield but it's
11 a matter of just running it to the site. But if not the, if they have to go well and septic tank
12 that may require larger lots than that district would allow.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Different question.
15 Staff, could you pull up the street view? This is the lot that's not developed that we're
16 talking about, right? And then across the street I wanna see the relation to the heavy
17 industrial. So as requested today it could be up to 40 houses cause we look at the
18 zoning Code and then when the DOT does numbers or ours maybe [inaudible].
19 Commissioners, comments, questions, motions?

20 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff.

22 MR. PRICE: One of the things that we, you know, at least take note that in the
23 Staff Report, page 71 we're talking about the 40 dwelling units, it specifically states that

1 based upon a gross density calculation that does not take into consideration any
2 infrastructure that would be installed on the property, also it does not take in
3 consideration any open space set aside that is required by Code for a major land
4 development. And because we no longer have the provision for open space, or some
5 people would identify as cluster housing, the parcels would have to have, fall within that
6 range and also achieve that average for the R2 zoning designation. So I think you can,
7 you could say that there's a good percentage of, while it's showing 40 is the gross, I
8 think once you take all those other things into consideration there's, the likelihood of
9 achieving, you know, near that number is unlikely.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So the Applicant states 25, I was going based off of your
11 numbers. So the picture I'm painting is possibly 50 cars coming and going off of that
12 road and across the street from the heavy industrial. So does it seem like it fits for the
13 area? Asking my Commissioners, so looking for a motion or further discussion.

14 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair, just one comment.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant go ahead.

16 MR. DURANT: We're looking at possible intent of putting –

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You can take a seat, sir, thank you.

18 MR. DURANT: - 40 houses in here, did I hear that term correctly?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Well, Staff recommends that it's probably gonna be less
20 and the Applicant states about 25.

21 MR. DURANT: Twenty-five families are gonna be right across the highway from a
22 heavy industrial site, am I reading that right?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's the picture I'm seeing. Yes. Thank you,
2 Commissioner Durant. Commissioners, motion? If not the Chair will make one.

3 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, go ahead. I was moving that we – excuse me?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: One more – comments are good. Commissioner Johnson,
6 go ahead.

7 MR. JOHNSON: As my colleague spelled out, I mean, there's the, I guess
8 today's a tough day of tough cases, I mean, because I agree that there's industrial right
9 across the street which presents an issue, but I mean, from a land use standpoint we
10 have a predominately residential area just to the north and then we just approved a fair
11 amount just across the street. So I mean, [inaudible] definitely a tough case. There's
12 arguments for both sides is what I'm saying.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Back to you, Commissioner Durant. Thank you,
14 Commissioner Johnson.

15 MR. DURANT: Yes, Mr. Chair, I move that we forward Map Amendment 24-010
16 to County Council with a recommendation of disapproval in accordance with Staff's
17 conclusion that the Map Amendment will not be consistent with the objectives of the
18 2015 Comprehensive Plan for neighborhood low density future land use designation.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Do I have a second?

20 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That came from Commissioner Taylor. Okay, we have a
22 motion on the floor with a second. Staff, please take a vote.

1 MR. PRICE: Alright, so we have a motion for disapproval of Case 24-010. A yes
2 vote is in support of disapproval of the request. Those in favor, Durant?

3 MR. DURANT: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

5 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: No.

8 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

9 MR. JOHNSON: No.

10 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No.

12 MR. PRICE: That motion fails.

13 *[Approved: Durant, Taylor; Opposed: Grady, Johnson, Yonke; Absent: Frierson, Duffy,*
14 *Metts, Siercks]*

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I think I voted incorrectly but I think it would've failed
16 anyways. I was yes for disapproval.

17 MR. PRICE: Yes.

18 MR. TAYLOR: Actually [inaudible].

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Can we do the vote again, Staff, I'm sorry. Let's make sure
20 we're clear for everyone.

21 MR. PRICE: Okay, so again the motion was for disapproval.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Disapproval.

23 MR. PRICE: So if you vote yes you're in support of the motion for disapproval.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes means disapproval.

2 MR. PRICE: So those in favor for the disapproval of Case 24-010, Durant?

3 MR. DURANT: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

5 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: No.

8 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

9 MR. JOHNSON: No.

10 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: That motion passes 3/2.

13 *[Approved: Yonke, Durant, Taylor; Opposed: Grady, Johnson; Absent: Frierson, Duffy,*
14 *Metts, Siercks]*

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: My apologies for that confusion there. With a small
16 quorum we recommend this to, following the Staff for disapproval to County Council
17 where they will take up this case May 21st, and I hear Councilwoman Barron is going to
18 be having a meeting on the 20th?

19 MR. PRICE: She will also have a town hall meeting to discuss the cases in her
20 area which would include this case, also Case 24-007 which is 105 Weir Road even
21 though it's kind of on the other side. They would not include the PDD because she's
22 already had a town hall regarding that, but that meeting would be 6:00pm on the 20th at
23 the – Tommy –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What's the location?

2 MR. PRICE: Go back to the, go to the map. Go to the – right there, yeah click
3 that. Sorry. Yeah, the Richland County Recreation building off of Crane Creek Church
4 Road.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 6:00pm May 20th, town hall, more participation from the
6 public. Great.

7 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. We're gonna move on to our last case today.
9 I'll speak slowly to give people time to – have a good night everyone, thanks for coming
10 out. We're gonna be looking at 5.b.6., which is Case Number 24-012. I'll hand it over to
11 Staff for explanation.

12 **CASE NO. 24-012 MA:**

13 MR. SMITH: Case Number 24-012MA, Applicant Jeff Ruble, location 605
14 Blythewood Road. The existing zoning is HM, Homestead, and the proposed zoning is
15 LI, Light Industrial. Staff is in a recommendation of disapproval for this Map
16 Amendment. This request is not consistent with the objectives of the nonresidential
17 development within the neighborhood low density future land use designation as
18 industrial development with significant community impacts, noise, exhaust, odor, heavy
19 truck traffic is discouraged. However, industrial uses allowed under the LI district would
20 be compatible with the current developing pattern of the general area.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Do we have anyone signed up to speak
22 for this one?

23 MR. JOHNSON: We do not.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone – we have the Applicant, right? Come on down,
2 state your name and address again, please.

3 **TESTIMONY OF JEFF RUBEL:**

4 MR. RUGEL: Yeah, thank you. My name's Jeff Rubel, I'm the Director of
5 Economic Development for Richland County. This parcel is a six acre parcel that the
6 County has under contract. The purpose of the parcel is to relocate a Fairfield Electric
7 Cooperative substation from the Scout Motors site over to a new site to accommodate
8 that growth. While this parcel is Homestead as are the two neighboring parcels, a nine
9 acre parcel and a 13 acre parcel, they're the only parcels that are in unincorporated
10 Richland County. The 30 acre parcel to the left is Fairfield Electric Cooperative which is,
11 that's their headquarters but it has a huge yard where they store transformers, trucks,
12 etc. The remaining 1,600 acres surrounded this is all in the Town of Blythewood and
13 that is owned by Richland County and is leased to Scout Motors on a long-term lease.
14 We have gone through a long, long process of rezoning this property with the Town of
15 Blythewood so these are the last remnant properties from, you know, years ago when
16 these were all, when it was residential rural area along Blythewood Road. We have, so
17 the land owner, Ms. Cooper, I'm sorry, Ms. Palmer, has relocated off the site, I think
18 she's in assisted living. We're planning, what we wanna do is subdivide the site so that
19 we would only rezone the rear away from Blythewood Road, the front her husband
20 would remain at the house for another couple years, and then we would close on that
21 property. The two neighboring parcels are relatives, they support both the sale and the
22 rezoning, probably with the outlook that long-term this will all be part of the Scout site.
23 I'm certainly open to any questions.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Okay Commissioners, questions,
2 comments, discussion for Staff? This is open on the floor. We'll have you take a seat for
3 now. Commissioner Durant?

4 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair, one question –

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

6 MR. DURANT: - for Staff. As I look at the map on page 88, that shows the parcel
7 in question and a couple additional parcels, all designated HM, surrounded by the Town
8 of Blythewood which is in all white, what's happening in those sections of Blythewood
9 that surrounds this property?

10 MR. PRICE: Scout basically. You can see that a portion, everything south of
11 Blythewood Road and east of this site, that's the Scout Motors. The pieces across,
12 north from the subject site, right down there in the Town of Blythewood, I'm not sure if
13 we have any applications or if the Town of Blythewood has received any applications for
14 any map amendments, but I do know that the, everything east of this site and south of
15 Blythewood Road is Scout Motors.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Did that answer your question?

17 MR. DURANT: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Question for Staff, did
19 Mr. Rubel say that there was a residence next door or?

20 MR. PRICE: I believe he stated there's a residence on the parent tract in which
21 this piece would be coming from, so you did see it there.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: But the map doesn't show it being subdivided, but it would
23 be? A portion of –

1 MR. PRICE: Yes, this portion of it.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. I just wanna make sure we're not rezoning
3 someone's home. Like the movie "Up". Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor?

6 MR. TAYLOR: Also, is it Rubel, Mr. Rubel? Mr. Rubel stated that others would be
7 in favor of this. Is that, do we have that in writing? I know sometimes we'll get, whether
8 it's emails or formal written notification that they're okay with it, but I'm just, I guess I'm
9 leery to say that they're in favor of it if we don't have that documented anywhere, just
10 out of curiosity.

11 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

12 MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible]

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. Any other thoughts,
14 discussion or a motion?

15 MR. RUBEL: Just a couple items of add in.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, Mr. Rubel, go ahead.

17 MR. RUBEL: This is not, this substation is not specifically for Scout, it's for the
18 neighborhood to the north, so Cobblestone. The property to the right, there's a 300'
19 buffer off Blythewood Road which we've agreed to maintain. Any powerlines would go
20 through the middle of that buffer so right through the middle of the 150' on either side so
21 that any powerlines are shielded from any neighbors. We agree to either meet
22 standards or exceed standards on all screening and buffers.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

1 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

3 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion that we forward 24-012MA to County
4 Council with a recommendation for approval and the rationale for that approval being
5 that the character of the properties within the Town of Blythewood is compatible with the
6 proposed Light Industrial use.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Do I have a second?

8 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Taylor. This is for a
10 recommendation of approval based off of the character matching the Town of
11 Blythewood zoning. Staff, would you please take a vote?

12 MR. PRICE: So we have a motion for approval of Case 24-012MA. A yes vote is
13 in support of the motion for approval. Those in favor, Grady?

14 MR. GRADY: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

16 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

17 MR. PRICE: Durant?

18 MR. DURANT: Aye.

19 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

20 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

1 *[Approved: Yonke, Johnson, Durant, Taylor, Grady; Absent: Frierson, Duffy, Metts,*
2 *Siercks]*

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. This will be heard May 21st, I think you
4 guys know by now, at County Council. This gets us away from Agenda Item 5, that was
5 our last case so we move on to number 6, Other Items. Commissioners, are there any
6 Other Items for discussion?

7 MR. TAYLOR: I did have one question.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor.

9 MR. TAYLOR: I had one question for Staff. I was looking up something in the
10 Land Development Code [inaudible] the residential two district, it's on page 3-18, and
11 then the corresponding principal use table. I may not be understanding it correctly, I just
12 wanted to see.

13 MR. PRICE: Yeah, if you can go ahead with your question we'll see if we can pull
14 that up.

15 MR. TAYLOR: It has, so on 3-18, residential 2 district provides land primary for
16 low to moderate intensity, residential development, development allowed in this district,
17 residential dwellings and then manufactured homes. And then if, under the permitted
18 use tables or the principal use tables, 4-4 -

19 MR. PRICE: I know exactly where you're going.

20 MR. TAYLOR: Okay, I didn't see -

21 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, you know, and if you don't mind me jumping in, Mr. Taylor,
22 that -

1 MR. TAYLOR: Well let me finish it for the Commissioners, too, just so we're all
2 on the same page. So 4-4, R2, at the very top, the classification, and if you go down to
3 manufactured homes it, there is no P there I guess for permissible, or there's no
4 designation at all, it's blank. Should those match or am I reading it incorrectly?

5 MR. PRICE: You're reading it correctly. Now the question is should they match,
6 that's something that we will have to take up. Again, from a Staff standpoint one of the
7 things we were just trying to let a, if we could let a few months go by so we can kinda,
8 you know, kinda go through the Land Development, whether it be through Staff through
9 our day to day, you know, interactions with the public or development, but also with the
10 Planning Commission so when meetings like this, when you know, you come across
11 these so that – and we are keeping a log of all of, you know, these such instances so
12 that we can bring these back to have this discussion with you. So you know, to kinda go
13 back so it's not just a simple yes or no on this, this will be something, and I'll just use
14 this as an example, again thank you for bringing that up, is do we need to amend
15 essentially what is the purpose statement for the R2 or do we amend the matrix, the use
16 matrix for the R2 to allow it. And so those are some of the things that we will have
17 discussions on kinda going forward. But again, it may be some time, maybe September
18 cause that'll kinda, you know, get us to a certain point where we'll start looking at text
19 amendments for the Code; some we'll probably start with more clean up items, you
20 know, just things that clearly we forgot to put in a zoning designation here or something
21 and then we will then start, go forward with really kinda making some amendments that,
22 for certain uses that weren't allowed, maybe looking at why we don't have a 10,000

1 square foot acre lot or something along those lines, in which we'll probably have to
2 really have a little more discussion on.

3 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor, good find. Any other
5 items for discussion?

6 MR. JOHNSON: Just one.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr. Price and my Commissioners, I
9 did not speak with great specificity earlier in our previous case and I just wanna just
10 make a general comment. What I was trying to articulate as it relates to the fact that in
11 most of the cases achieving a higher density we pushed our self to go into a higher
12 residential code than what was previously in place to achieve some of those densities.
13 And it gave me heartburn in that particular case because you have a higher density
14 which part of the concern was what does that translate into economically when you
15 have, when you were basically circumventing that from a policy standpoint in some
16 communities that might historically have been considered marginalized or underserved.
17 And so I just don't, I just wanna be mindful when we start looking at strategic ways of
18 working around the Code that we just adopted. I mean, we spent a year and a half
19 doing that and then we come and we've got in, you know, one community densities that
20 are in, I don't wanna say juxtaposition but that, I voted for it and I, you know, went along
21 with it but I'm just saying that I just want us, policy-wise just to kinda just make sure that
22 we're consistent from that standpoint. So I just, I didn't speak very clearly earlier so I
23 just wanted to just take that second just to [inaudible].

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Any other items?

2 MR. PRICE: Yes. I think you'll notice that we do not on this particular Agenda
3 have anything related to the Olympia Mill overlay, and the reason behind that as I've
4 stated before we were at one time gonna bring an ordinance essentially to you so you
5 could see what that would look like within the Land Development Code. But you know,
6 just kind of looking back at this we thought it might be better that prior to bringing
7 something for you to fully adopt that we kinda give a, you know, kinda create a
8 summary of everything that we've been talking about and looking at and prepare for a
9 tour. And I think this was mentioned previously, you know, just take you around to
10 Olympia and identify some of the things that we've talked about within the overlay, you
11 know, point them out to make sure that everyone has a clear picture and also can
12 maybe kind of get an idea of what the, you know, true character of the Olympia area is
13 and what it is they're trying to achieve before we actually bring something for you to
14 vote on, and then take that back to the people. At this point we're still looking at which
15 method of transportation and where we would get that from to let you know, but as soon
16 as we identify that we will be sending out some correspondence to all of the Planning
17 Commission Members to try to secure certain dates, you know, to potentially do a tour.
18 And you know, if need be we may just need to do, you know, maybe two tours. You
19 know, I'm sure everybody can't make it the same time but we wanna make sure that we
20 at least offer opportunities for all of the Planning Commission Members to go on the tour
21 and see, you know, have an idea what we're creating the overlay for and where.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff, sounds good. Any other items? Okay.
23 Good participation. This rolls right into 7., Chairman's Report where I usually, you know,

1 thank you guys for a great participation and with a low quorum here too, an extensive
2 Agenda. I appreciate everyone. Just for anyone out here still, like as a Commission we
3 spend time volunteering, traveling and reviewing cases and in addition to jobs and
4 everything else and family, so thank you cause we love our county, you know, we're
5 trying to do the best that we can. Commissioners, I sent out a Google spreadsheet to try
6 to track a little bit of our summer schedule, try to line some things up so that we could
7 do this tour or workshops for the upcoming Comp Plan, and eventually a Planning
8 Commissioner's retreat which we usually have in August. So if you guys can fill in, like
9 your availability on this spreadsheet, that helps out, you know, black out the dates for
10 your family, of course, and then make sure that we've got maybe a few that line up that I
11 can pass on to Staff. And Staff you're copied on that as well so you can keep up on it.
12 So thanks again. I'm not gonna take any more time for me today. Back to Mr. Price for
13 the Planning Director's Report.

14 MR. PRICE: Other than the Report of Council from their last Council meeting on
15 the cases that you forwarded your recommendations on, that's on page 93 of the
16 Report.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

18 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant?

20 MR. DURANT: A question on that Report, Mr. Price. Should we read anything
21 into bold, red letters denying unanimously of map amendment requests that we put
22 forward for approval?

1 MR. PRICE: No, sir. The only reason why I just put that in red, did I hear
2 adjournment? No, the reason why I put that in read is just so that it'll be clear what the
3 action was. You know, sometimes you may look at that, somebody could look at that
4 and not necessarily for the Planning Commission, but anyone could look at that and
5 say, oh that's just another agenda. But we wanted to highlight what the action was of
6 Council.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The Comp Plan, as the Chair I guess I'll speak, is an
8 opportunity for us to align things with Council and the future. I came aboard about five
9 years ago and the first things Staff showed me was this great GIS analysis, I'm a GIS
10 guy by trade so I loved it, and it took votes of the past to where County Council voted
11 one way and Planning Commission went another and where the Comp Plan laid in the
12 middle of that. So we should see our County going in I would hope a unified direction
13 and we see some differences here in your report here, so. Yeah.

14 MR. PRICE: Excuse me, Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff?

16 MR. PRICE: Just as you're bringing that up there are a number of things that,
17 you know, as a Planning Commission if there are some things y'all would like to see,
18 you know, such as what you just referenced, it doesn't have to necessarily always be,
19 okay we're in preparation of the Comprehensive Plan, let's bring that to you. There may
20 just be some things you wanna see kinda what the trends have been over, you know,
21 the year or two that we can easily bring and present to you at a meeting.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Well let's get our schedules lined up so we can workshop.
2 It's a great time to form the future of the County. If there's no other comments or
3 concerns from the Commissioners I'm gonna make a motion for adjournment.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I got a second from Commissioner Johnson. And we will do
6 a vote through hands.

7 MR. PRICE: Unanimous.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Unanimous. Thank you, Commissioners. Thank you, Staff.

9

10

[Meeting adjourned 8:30pm]