

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
September 5, 2024

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

Called to order: 6:10pm

CHAIRMAN YONKE: - public notice at the beginning like we normally do, so Staff tells me they're just about ready so we're gonna get started. I'd like to call to order the September 7th (sic), 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: That is correct.

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

MR. PRICE: Alright, the attendance for the Thursday, September 5th, 2024 Planning Commission meeting, Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Here

MR. PRICE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Here.

MR. PRICE: Duffy?

MR. DUFFY: Here.

MR. PRICE: Metts? Durant?

1 MR. DURANT: Here.

2 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

3 MR. TAYLOR: Here.

4 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

5 MR. SIERCKS: Here.

6 MR. PRICE: Grady?

7 MR. PRICE: We have a quorum.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the
9 September 7th (sic), 2024 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning
10 Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer our time
11 to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council. Our
12 recommendations are to approve or deny Zoning Map Amendment requests. Per Title
13 VI, Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of Laws* Planning Commission may also prepare and
14 revise plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of unincorporated
15 portions of the County. The County's Land Development Code rewrite process
16 conducted last year is an example, as well as the Comprehensive Plan process we'll,
17 which should begin shortly. Once again, we are a recommending body to County
18 Council and they will conduct their own public hearing and take official votes to approve
19 or deny map amendments and text amendments on a future date to be published by the
20 county. Council typically holds Zoning Public Hearings on the fourth Tuesday of the
21 month. Please check the county's website for updated agendas, dates and times.
22 Please take note of the following guidelines for today's meeting. Please turn off or any
23 silence any cellphones. Audience members may quietly come and go as needed.

1 Applicants are allowed up to two minutes to make statements. Citizens signed up to
2 speak are also allowed up to two minutes each. Redundant comments should be
3 minimized. Please only address remarks to the Commission and do not expect the
4 Commission to respond to questions from the speakers in a back and forth style, that's
5 not the purpose of the meeting. Please no audience/speaker exchanges. No audience
6 demonstrations or other disruptions to the meeting are permitted nor are comments
7 from anyone other than the speaker at the podium. Please remember the meeting is
8 being recorded so please speak into the microphone and give your name and address.
9 Abusive language is inappropriate and will not be tolerated. Please don't voice
10 displeasure or frustration at a recommendation while the Planning Commission is still
11 conducting business. If you have any questions or concerns you may contact the
12 Richland County Planning Department Staff down below here. This moves us on to Item
13 number 3 on our Agenda which is Additions and Deletions.

14 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes?

16 MR. PRICE: And also a reminder they can go to either podium –

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, you can go to either podium. They, both mics will be
18 live. This moves us to number 3. of our Agenda which is additions or deletions to the
19 Agenda. Are there any motions for additions or deletions to the Agenda,
20 Commissioners? Or any motions to amend the Agenda? Commissioners, Staff?

21 MR. PRICE: There will be – and I think we can take this matter up when we get
22 to the particular case, but one of the cases is identified – it has the incorrect Staff
23 recommendation but we can take that up when we get to the case.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Should we also mention that number 6. is
2 withdrawn? Case Number 24-027, 1463 Ridge Road. So we will not be hearing about
3 that property today. And please excuse my mic, it's cutting in and out. Alright. Okay, no
4 amendments, additions, deletions, we're gonna move on to number 4. on our Agenda
5 today which is the Approval of Minutes. The Staff provided Minutes for us for our July
6 11th Planning Commission meeting. Do any Commissioners have any comments or
7 concerns regarding these transcripts? Alright, hearing none the Chair makes a motion
8 to approve the Minutes unless there's an objection.

9 MR. PRICE: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

11 MR. PRICE: I'm not sure of the version that you received of the Minutes but I
12 believe that the date at the top of, it needs to be corrected.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I do see that, we'll make a change to that. To July 11th.

14 MR. PRICE: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And just to confirm if you look at line 10 of the Minutes
16 when I called the meeting to order it says July 11th, so these are the correct Minutes.
17 With no objections, we're just gonna change the top to say July 11th, 2024, the Chair
18 makes a motion to approve the Minutes. Do I have a second?

19 MR. DURANT: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second, thank you, from Commissioner Durant. Staff, can
21 we take a vote?

22 MR. PRICE: hose in favor of the approval of the Minutes from the July 11th, 2024
23 Planning Commission meeting, Yonke?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

3 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

5 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

7 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Durant?

9 MR. DURANT: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

11 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

13 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

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

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The Minutes are approved. Thank you, Staff. We will now
17 move on to number 5. on the Agenda, which is the Consent Agenda. So I'm gonna take
18 a second to explain this cause I'm going to use this today. The Consent Agenda is an
19 action item that allows the Commission to approve road names and Map Amendment
20 requests where the Staff recommends approval and no one from the public has signed
21 up to speak against the amendment or no Member of the Commission is in need of
22 further discussion on the request. Looking at today's Agenda, 5.b., Case number 3., 24-
23 023, Staff recommends approval; 24-025 approval; 24-029 approval. I'm looking at our

1 signup sheet which I asked everyone to be careful to sign up for the for or the against
2 column for cases 24-023, 25, 29, and 30, they were all recommended approval by Staff
3 and no one has signed up against it. So I'd like to keep those on the Consent Agenda.
4 Staff?

5 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Staff requests that you remove Case 24-025 MA from the
6 Consent Agenda. That is the one where the recommendations are incorrect so the,
7 instead of Staff's recommendation for approval it should be for disapproval so you may
8 want to remove that from the Consent Agenda.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, the public, hopefully everyone's following
10 along, the properties that I pulled off to consent, to approve, recommendation of
11 approval would be 23, 29 and 30. Commissioners, do we [inaudible] explanation on
12 these properties?

13 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, [inaudible] the Consent Agenda?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You want to approve the Consent Agenda? You make a
15 motion?

16 MR. JOHNSON: That's my motion.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. The Consent Agenda which includes Road
18 Names and Case Number 24-023, 24-029, and 24-030, we have a motion for approval
19 by Commissioner Johnson. Do we have a second?

20 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. Staff, can you please
22 take a vote on the Consent Agenda?

23 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the Consent Agenda, Siercks?

1 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

3 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

7 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

9 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

11 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

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

16 MR. PRICE: Motion passes.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Let me catch up my notes. So everything
18 for these properties we had as a recommendation of approval to County Council. They
19 will have their meeting on the fourth Tuesday –

20 MR. PRICE: On the 24th of September.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 24th of September.

22 MR. PRICE: 7:00pm.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. So if you are here to listen to one of those we
2 are going to move on now to other properties. We're going to move along to 5.b.1.,
3 Case Number 24-020. Staff, please take it away.

4 **CASE NO.: 24-020 MA:**

5 MR. PRICE: Okay, as stated we're at Case 24-020 MA. The Applicant is Paul
6 Mishoe, Jr. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 37.7 acres along Community Pond
7 Road from AG which is agricultural to RT, residential transition. Staff recommends
8 disapproval of this request and it's mainly due to the proposed location falling within the
9 conservation land use designation of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan. And as such the
10 desired development plan of the Comprehensive Plan discourages residential
11 development in this designation. So again, for that reason Staff recommends
12 disapproval.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, do we have any
14 questions for Staff? Commissioner Frierson, do we have anyone signed up to speak?

15 MS. FRIERSON: Yes, we do. First we have Amanda Stansel.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Amanda Stansel. Please state your name and address and
17 you'll have two minutes.

18 **TESTIMONY OF AMANDA STANSEL:**

19 MS. STANSEL: Okay. My name is Amanda Stansel. My address is 341
20 Tillinghast Road. The property where my husband and I live has been in his family for
21 over 170 years. I've been out there for about 24 and I moved out there because I
22 wanted to be in the country and not in a populated area. This proposed change would
23 definitely have a significant impact upon our quality of life as we know it. I urge you to

1 deny this request to change the zoning for several reasons; disruption of wildlife and the
2 ecological preservation of course is extremely important, increased traffic congestion,
3 noise, pollution, potential inevitable rise in crime, and higher property taxes to
4 accommodate more residents, the utilities which would be needed to be out there as
5 well as public services such as trash and that kind of thing. It would overall provide a
6 fundamental change in the character of the landscape of our area. So moreover the
7 existing infrastructure in this area is not necessarily conducive to residential transition.
8 And simply put I just don't want to give up my quiet, peaceful country life. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

10 MS. FRIERSON: Next we have Homer Rose.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Homer Rose?

12 **TESTIMONY OF HOMER ROSE:**

13 MR. ROSE: Yes, good evening Planning Commission, Chairman Yonke and
14 Vice-Chairman Frierson. I appreciate you allowing the opportunity for us to come here
15 and speak. And my name is Homer Rose, I live at 1421 Van Boklen Road, which is
16 approximately 100 yards from the proposed piece of property that's up for rezoning. And
17 I'm directly at the end of Community Pond Road. I'm here to also go against the
18 rezoning of the piece of property because like the gentleman stated earlier and how it
19 was passed in September of 1977, this property was meant to be a rural district and I
20 think it's meant to be that way for a purpose; for development of agriculture, horticulture,
21 forestry, so on and so forth, without any damages to property and wildlife. In our direct
22 rural community we've already been impacted by one huge change, the passing and
23 putting in of a 600 acre solar field which has caused the displacement of wildlife, soil

1 erosion, taken away agriculture conservation and created a terrible eyesore in our
2 community. So that is a commercial piece of property now. I don't think our community
3 deserves another change that would impact us to take us away from being the rural
4 community that we've enjoyed. There is one tract of property to the north of me, it's 380
5 acres, that's been placed in the Congaree Land Trust Conservation program and it is a
6 huge, huge benefit to our community for the wildlife and the purpose of preservation, the
7 beauty of everything that's east of Highway 601 and north of the Wateree River, that
8 section in there, and we truly enjoy it. I've lived there 25 years and some of my friends
9 and neighbors are here that's lived there all their life, their entire life, and we would like
10 to maintain the quality of life that we have already, enjoying that rural community. And
11 that's why we went there, that's why we went there. I live on 25 acres and it's next to
12 heaven for me.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you so much, sir.

14 MR. ROSE: Thank you. Have a good day.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Appreciate it.

16 MS. FRIERSON: Next we have Dorothy Kendall.

17 **TESTIMONY OF DOROTHY KENDALL:**

18 MS. KENDALL: Good evening, can everyone hear me? Great. I'm Dorothy
19 Kendall of 329 Tillinghast Road, Amanda's neighbor. And also, which I believe is
20 pertinent, I also own land nearby that is zoned agricultural which is what this current
21 parcel in question is. So I believe I have another stake in the issue. I wanna thank the
22 Planning Commission for all their hard work and also for all the neighbors in Lower
23 Richland for coming out. I moved into my great grandparent's home in Eastover in 1992,

1 and over the years have been involved in many community meetings about land use
2 planning. And it's my understanding that zoning and exemptions can sometimes be
3 appropriate when there's an overwhelming public benefit. This is not that case. The only
4 people I can see who would benefit from this, there's two parties, the seller who's
5 abandoning Lower Richland and moving away, if they even live here, I don't know the
6 person, and the buyer/developer, neither of whom are invested in our rural quality of life.
7 I just would second, I don't wanna be repetitive but everything that Amanda said and
8 everything that Mr. Rose said I agree with, taxes, traffic, crime, and it is in the very
9 environmentally important Cowasee Basin. And speaking of history the reason we're
10 called Richland County is because of the soil in that area, the first settlers said, this is
11 rich land and that's why we're called that, and we have a dwindling supply of agriculture
12 land. And also speaking of history my grandmother, late grandmother, lived to 100 who
13 I'm named after, but she told me when she was a child that Two Notch Road was rural
14 and they used to go fishing out there and swim in Arcadia Lakes. And I just wanna tell
15 you that it can all disappear in a generation if we don't have planning so, you know,
16 nobody wants to take your land away we just want to all come together as a community
17 and support each other. And thanks for your time and your hard work.

18 MS. FRIERSON: Next we have Carol Fowles.

19 **TESTIMONY OF CAROL FOWLES:**

20 MS. FOWLES: Good evening, thank you for having me, I'm Dorothy Kendall's
21 mother and I did not grow up in the country. I always thought when my husband and I
22 moved down here, my deceased husband, 28 years ago that we would retire at the
23 beach. And he said, no we're going to Lower Richland, and we moved our family house

1 on a dirt road near my daughter and we had been living in downtown Columbia between
2 Eastover, not Eastover, between Five Points and Main Street. And I moved to the
3 country to get away from people. I love the country, I wanna die in the country. And
4 please don't change it. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

6 MS. FRIERSON: How do you pronounce your last name?

7 MS. FOWLES: Fowles, F-O-W-L-E-S, sorta like a chicken.

8 MS. FRIERSON: Okay. Like my name, Frierson, like fried chicken. Now we have

9 —

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Ms. Frierson, do we need the address from her?

11 MS. FRIERSON: 140 [Inaudible] Road?

12 MS. FOWLES: Yes.

13 MS. FRIERSON: In Eastover.

14 MS. FOWLES: It used to be Lane but they changed it to Road when we moved
15 there.

16 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you. Mr. Keith Spivey.

17 **TESTIMONY OF KEITH SPIVEY:**

18 MR. SPIVEY: Good afternoon Council people. I hope everyone is doing well
19 tonight. I came here to talk tonight about, with my family, about the proposal to change
20 the 37 acres of land on Community Pond Road in Eastover from agricultural to
21 residential, to tell you a little bit about myself and about the rural area of Richland
22 County. I'm 53 years old and for all but five years of my life I've lived on Community
23 Pond Road, which if you look out my front door I'm looking at this piece of land. I've

1 been a member of the Webber Lunch Buddy Program, a chaperone for school trips and
2 a Scout leader. After my wife and I graduated from Lower Richland High School we
3 briefly lived in Hopkins before moving back to Eastover to be around our family and
4 raise our kids. We are vested in and love our little community. We bought an old home
5 that was recommended to be tore down, and restored it. We are part of a crime watch
6 community and actively take care of the road by picking up trash, cleaning up debris
7 that people throw out and cutting the ditch banks so people can safely pull out on to Van
8 Boklen and 601 Highway from Community Pond Road. In all these years there's been
9 three houses added to our road. That equates to basically 17 ½ years per house, and
10 the newest one is being built right now. Now we're looking at the potential to have 37
11 more homes added in a very short timeframe. Also consider that this area was recently
12 impacted by, I thought it was a 750 acre solar farm but maybe it wasn't. But I just wanna
13 say I'm not against growth or development. I just wanna see it done in the right way and
14 with some good planning for the future. I'm here today to ask the council to consider the
15 impact on the land, the community, the wildlife, and the property values of the neighbors
16 with this proposal. Please consider if this rural area has proper infrastructure to support
17 these changes in zoning, and also please help regulate smart growth for not only this
18 proposed area but all rural areas in southeast Richland County. Thank you for your
19 time. Keith Spivey.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

21 MR. SPIVEY: And I live at 1651 Community Pond Road.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you so much. It helps our Staff out so much if you
23 guys state your name and your address, thank you.

1 MS. FRIERSON: Next we have Richard Stansel.

2 MR. STANSEL: I would be repeating what my wife said.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Sounds good, thank you.

4 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, Jessica [Inaudible]?

5 MS. (?): We would just be repeating what everybody else is saying.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Excellent, thank you. Yes.

7 MS. FRIERSON: Sandy O'Connick.

8 MS. O'CONNICK: Ditto.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

10 MS. FRIERSON: Rick O'Connick.

11 MR. O'CONNICK: Same, also.

12 MS. FRIERSON: And Eddie Spivey.

13 MR. SPIVEY: I couldn't say it any better than the rest of them have said, so ditto
14 to me too.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, everyone. Okay, so that ends public input. We
16 are now open for discussion. Staff?

17 MR. PRICE: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

19 MR. PRICE: The Applicant for this request is here. He didn't sign in.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, come on up. Yep. You get two minutes as well. State
21 your name and address as well.

22 **TESTIMONY OF PAUL MISHOE, JR.:**

1 MR. MISHOE: Hey, good evening Commissioners and Staff. My name's Paul, I
2 live here in Columbia, and I mean, my address is 3101 Gadsden Street. So we're
3 requesting here the residential transition zone which is a minimum of one acre lots, so
4 like the gentleman said it would be a maximum of just 37 homes here. Right now my
5 design is trying to reduce any kind of interior infrastructure so I'm just proposing 29 lots
6 which would be street frontage, and then a seven acre community pond. It would be a
7 wet pond, fishing pond, that would be available to the residents and then depending on
8 how they work it out in the HOA if the other residents on Community Pond would be
9 welcome there as well. So the lot took on an agriculture zone just because it's over 35
10 acres and as you can see the lots around it, they are RT and HM, they go by the old
11 Code where they could get a lot on 2/3rds of an acre. So we'll be following the old Code
12 if you saw fit, except these lots would have to be a bit bigger and they would all be a
13 minimum of one acre in size. So yeah, we're not asking for any kinda high density here,
14 just yeah about 30 homes on one acre lots and if the Commission sees that this is fit
15 and if not, you know, we appreciate your time.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thanks for coming out.

17 MR. MISHOE: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else wanna speak that missed the sign up for this?
19 No? Okay, so now this is open on the floor to the Commission for discussion and
20 questions again for Staff. Staff, can you pull up the interactive map again? And just for
21 fun zoom out a bit. That is a huge change to this neighborhood, the solar farm. Staff,
22 could you turn on the zoning layer? Okay Commissioners, what are your thoughts on
23 this one? Commissioner Johnson?

1 MR. JOHNSON: Question, Mr. Chairman, question. Mr. Price, I believe that the
2 Applicant may have answered my question but if I'm looking at the zoning map
3 correctly, the color scheme, [inaudible] Rye Road [inaudible]?

4 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

5 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Taylor?

7 MR. TAYLOR: Staff, can you pull up page 13? Am I correct that part of the
8 recommendation for disapproval was also because it falls within a Conservation as
9 outlined on this particular page, is that correct?

10 MR. PRICE: Yes, actually that was the justification for the disapproval.

11 MR. TAYLOR: Okay, so it does fall [inaudible]. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is there further discussion or a motion?

13 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

15 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff. Mr. Price, the area that's just south of the
16 [inaudible], how long has that been RT?

17 MR. PRICE: Well, it would've become officially RT March, well sorry, just prior to
18 March 1st, 2024. I'm not sure if there's 30, 31 days in February – oh is it 28 days in
19 February? So the, March 1st is when we, our new Code came into place so that's when
20 it would've become RT.

21 MR. DURANT: Mr. Price –

22 MR. PRICE: Prior – I'm sorry, yeah prior to that all of the property that you see,
23 you know, regardless of what shade of green that's before you would've been zoned

1 RU. And as you remember part of the recommendation from the Planning Commission
2 upon the adoption of the maps was the separation of the rural district in which it became
3 essentially three separate zoning designations. So we got rid of the RU which would've
4 been required 33,000 square feet per parcel. And based on the existing acreage of the
5 land it would fall into one of three categories, either AG, HM or RT, 35 acres or more
6 would be AG, less than 35 but at least three would've been HM, that's 1.5, I'm sorry, let
7 me look up, AG requires three acres per parcel, HM requires 1.52 per parcel, and
8 anything less than three acres defaulted to RT which is one acre per parcel. So that
9 would explain why you see those different shadings in that area, but it all came in effect
10 as of March 1st when the new Land Development Code came into effect.

11 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price, that's a good explanation. [Inaudible]
13 ask for a motion, Commissioners?

14 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks.

16 MR. SIERCKS: Hopefully a quick question for Staff. Mr. Price, with regard to the
17 Staff recommendation for disapproval it's I think you said based entirely on the fact that
18 this falls within the conservation designation outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and
19 that this designation discourages residential development. Is that just a blanket
20 discouragement outlined in the Comprehensive Plan or are there any –

21 MR. PRICE: Yeah, alright so we have this conversation, it seems like we have it
22 a little more frequently now, but one of the things about when the different designations
23 for the Comprehensive Plan were placed on the County map, you know, you try to

1 create dividing lines, usually by specific roads maybe or in a river or something that
2 would separate it. Again it was kind of more, kinda broadly applied which allows
3 Planning Commission and ultimately County Council to kind of have a further look on
4 really is that the appropriate designation within those areas. It's just, you know, cause
5 right now if you really look at it, you know, most of the homes that you see in that area
6 do fall within that conservation designation, so really it goes against the
7 recommendations or desired development pattern of the Comprehensive Plan. It does
8 state here that under the desired development pattern subdivision of land for
9 commercial and residential development is discouraged within these areas, so that's the
10 direct language from the Comprehensive Plan for the conservation designation.

11 MR. SIERCKS: I just wanted to see if there was any other context provided in the
12 Comprehensive Plan, any other sort of guidance that we could look to.

13 MR. PRICE: No, sir. You know, one of the things that we're gonna see and you'll
14 probably see in some of these other cases that will come before you, it just happened to
15 where the line fell, so again is it, it is a guideline in the Comprehensive Plan, everything
16 from the land use from the desired development pattern, everything within the
17 [inaudible] including where, what the designations are or just guidelines, and it allows
18 you to look into it further to really kinda get an understanding of what that area really
19 may be, cause sometimes the Comprehensive Plan doesn't get it exactly right. But
20 again, from a Staff standpoint whenever we're making our recommendation, we call it
21 Staff recommendation but it's really Comprehensive Plan, we may need to call it
22 Comprehensive Plan compliance, start saying that next time. But it is what the
23 Comprehensive Plan's calling for based on what we have before us.

1 MR. SIERCKS: Thank you. Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks.

3 MR. SIERCKS: I make a motion at this point to forward Case Number 24-020 MA
4 to County Council with a recommendation for disapproval.

5 MR. DUFFY: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I was gonna ask for a second, Commissioner Duffy
7 seconds. We have a motion for disapproval with a second. Staff, would you please take
8 a vote?

9 MR. PRICE: Alright, the motion was for disapproval of Case 24-020. Those in
10 favor of that motion, Siercks?

11 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

13 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Durant?

15 MR. DURANT: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

17 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

19 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

21 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: So that motion passes.

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

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff.

5 MR. PRICE: Yeah, Mr. Chair and Planning Commission, Councilwoman, the
6 Honorable Cheryl D. English who represents this district, will be having a town hall
7 meeting with the Applicant and also for the community on Monday, September the 23rd
8 from 6:00 to 7:30pm at the Bluff Road Park at 148 Carswell Drive, to discuss this and
9 some other cases that are in her district. So the public is welcome to attend. Also they
10 may get more information regarding the specifics of the project that typically aren't
11 discussed at the Planning Commission or Council levels.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff.

13 MR. TAYLOR: What time was that meeting again, please?

14 MR. PRICE: It will be 6:00pm to 7:30 on the 23rd of September. Bluff Road Park.

15 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, we're gonna move on to our second case. The
17 public is free to stay and listen to more properties if you'd like or go ahead and take off.

18 Thank you for coming out.

19 **CASE NO. 24:022 MA:**

20 MR. PRICE: Alright, our next item is Case 24-022 MA. The Applicant is Kevin
21 Meetze. The location is 1925 Kennerly Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 3.17
22 acres from PD which is Planned Development, to RT, Residential Transition. Staff
23 recommends disapproval of this request. According to the Comprehensive Plan this falls

1 within the neighborhood medium density designation of the 2015 Richland County
2 Comprehensive Plan. This designation actually calls for a higher density than what is
3 being requested so that's the main reason for Staff's recommendation for disapproval.
4 As stated the desired development pattern of the Comprehensive Plan recommends
5 medium density residential neighborhoods as the primary use within this designation
6 and it is felt that the RT designation doesn't, would not be supportive of that, of those
7 recommendations.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, I have a question. So as a PD requesting to change
9 to RT are there any specifics to this PD that we need to be aware of?

10 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, I'm glad you asked. This is one of the things we've looked
11 at, I wish we had a little more information to provide for you, but this was during a time
12 when Richland County had, one of the zoning designations was a Planned
13 Development which was called a PDD at that time. And that was really more of a site
14 specific zoning request. So what you would do is you made your request to rezone your
15 parcel but you were very specific as to what would occur on the property, typically you
16 were very specific as to square footage of any buildings that were gonna be there, any
17 access points. I think you could almost argue it was almost a site plan review for a
18 rezoning request. So every so often you'll find some PDs out in areas which is how they
19 were able to get that rezoning and that use located on that property by coming as a PD.
20 It actually gave some, allowed the community to have a, you know, an understanding of
21 what was gonna go there and not worry about future, you know, when you typically do a
22 rezoning it's usually very broad as to uses that will be allowed, but usually with a PD it's
23 very specific so the community knows exactly what's gonna be there, and Council in

1 their approval knows what they're approving. That was the good part of it. The bad part
2 of it, and I [inaudible] the applicants may be here is it locks that property into exactly
3 what you said that you were going to have. So in the future if you decided, I wanna add
4 an extra 100 or so square feet to my structure, you would have to go back through that
5 process. If you wanted to change the use that you did not identify as part of your
6 planned development, you would have to go back through the full process again. So I
7 believe in this case the Applicant may be just trying to take it out of the Planned
8 Development which has kind of locked them in to a specific use.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, any questions for Mr. Price?
10 Commissioner Duffy?

11 MR. DUFFY: For Mr. Price, just two points for clarification. Do we know for the
12 Planned Development existing zoning, was that for just one unit or is that for multiple
13 units? Do you have any context on that, I suppose to the current plan, is it, how many
14 units?

15 MR. PRICE: I'm gonna pull that –

16 MR. DUFFY: So I suppose I'm asking, will we be going from one to three or
17 would we be squeezing more in the space?

18 MR. PRICE: So looking at the file for the PD, seems like it was limited to a 4,000
19 square foot structure and the sole point of access to the site was confined to Charlie
20 Griner Road. And it also stated that all parking for the proposed facility shall be located
21 behind the structures. So that, what I read to you really is what was, limits what could
22 happen on that property. And again if it wasn't specified in, you know, maybe what
23 you're asking, Commissioner Duffy, like they wanted to add a home, if that wasn't

1 specified then that would not be allowed use. If they wanted to, you know, put another
2 barn on the property that would not be allowed either because again the PDD is very
3 specific as to uses.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson, did you have a question?

5 MR. JOHNSON: He asked the question I was gonna ask.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I can say Staff from doing this on my phone I just pulled up
7 the street view cause I'm just curious what's there now. This looks like a single family
8 residence.

9 MR. PRICE: I'll pull this up also.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, please pull it up Tommy, thanks. Speaking for myself
11 questions come with this one because we've been seeing lately some PDDs that are
12 quite large like the [inaudible] property [inaudible]. This one you're saying is kind of an
13 older one with really set parameters to a smaller lot.

14 MR. PRICE: Alright so, going back to when I first started under the Land
15 Development Codes that was in place, or the zoning ordinance, there was a PUD that
16 was just a Planned Unit Development, I think there was a Planned Development 1, 1R
17 and such. That's what you're referring to when you're looking at some of the larger ones
18 that you've seen where there's a true mixed use component to it. So whether you're
19 thinking about the Oak Hills that we recently looked at, the, when you think of a
20 Woodcreek Farms or the Summit, Lake Carolina, you know, just using those as
21 examples, those actually were the PUDs that came in. But the PDD or the PD was the
22 site specific zoning designation. Upon the adoption of our new Land Development

1 Code, actually under our previous Land Development Code, we did away with the PD
2 and really even did away with the PUDs, and everything was known as a PDD.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So this one still sits as an outlier.

4 MR. PRICE: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Any further questions before we move into public
6 comment? Hearing none, take it away Ms. Frierson.

7 MS. FRIERSON: Okay.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me [inaudible] sign up?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] How are you?

10 MS. FRIERSON: First person is the petitioner, Kevin Meetze.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Please state your name and address. And you have two
12 minutes.

13 **TESTIMONY OF KEVIN MEETZE:**

14 MR. MEETZE: Kevin Meetze and I live at 109 Charlie Griner Road which is the,
15 actually the parcel adjacent to the one we're discussing. Thank you Chairman, Vice-
16 Chairman and Commissioners. So this all came about, my mother had this zoned many
17 years ago to PD, she was gonna make a general store there. They have, they've given
18 me the property, I actually live next door. I'm selling my home, staying in Richland
19 County, but I'm selling my home and in part of doing that sold it to a, or got an offer out
20 from a Veteran, I was going to expand one of the lots into a lot which is zoned as PD.
21 When we tried to expand the lot size we found out that it was zoned PD and that the
22 purpose had to be specifically for what it was designed. I'm asking that it be rezoned
23 back to what it was before which is rural transition, also considering that, like you

1 mentioned, that the homes, there's a mobile home that the tenant, or not a tenant, a
2 person's been living there for many years, even prior to this zoning designation. So my
3 ask is just to revert back to what it was originally so that this gentleman that has made
4 the offer to buy the land can buy a little bit more, a larger portion of the lot which is my
5 house adjacent to that property. Not asking for anything special, just want it to go back
6 to rural transition; not developing anything, not adding anything, not building sheds,
7 barns or businesses, it's just a rural community and looking to sell a parcel of property
8 to a gentleman and their family and in order to do that I need it to be, that designation to
9 be changed for that parcel. And that's all I have, thanks.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

11 MS. FRIERSON: Next we have Randy Gilbert.

12 MR. GILBERT: Yes, I'm the buyer. Same thing, whatever he said, ditto.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you.

14 MS. FRIERSON: Kim Murphy?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Kim Murphy, please come on down. State your name and
16 address.

17 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

18 MS. MURPHY: Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laura Lane, Chapin. I'm not necessarily
19 opposed to this but I wanna ask that you defer it. It really can't be evaluated because
20 you don't have that PD ordinance in front of you. As Mr. Price said it was a specific
21 zoning that was customized by the Planning Commission and Council in 2002, and was
22 codified in an ordinance which has the effect of law. So I don't know how you can really
23 make a decision without seeing actually what was approved. In the 2023 Code the

1 parcel based on 3.17 acres is actually, would be zoned HM which may not matter to the
2 Applicant, depending on what they're trying to do with it but it didn't sound like it did. But
3 I also request that you have in your packet both the permitted uses for the proposed
4 zoning and the current zoning. Right now for this item it only shows the proposed
5 zoning. On all other cases in the Agenda it lists the current zoning permitted uses. It
6 may be actually helpful to have them both in your packet so you can see. And also
7 maybe include the density if, specifically if it's a rural area that has the three different
8 categories. And I'm wondering if you might also consider putting your draft Minutes in a
9 public Agenda packet like County Council does. It would be helpful to see those in
10 advance of the meeting. But thank you for your consideration.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Ms. Murphy. Is there anyone else signed up to
12 speak? No? Okay, this item is now open on the floor for discussion, Commissioners, or
13 any further questions for Staff. I have a question for Staff. How will we manage these
14 three rural zones with 3.17 acres, that is larger than what RT would be? So [inaudible]
15 but that's not what the request is here today.

16 MR. PRICE: No, sir. It would actually just be a larger RT version. It doesn't make
17 it nonconforming in any way, at least not as I see it. It'd just be a larger tract of land
18 that's zoned RT.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That answered my question, thank you. Commissioner
20 Johnson, what are your thoughts? I'm gonna call you guys out.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I mean, my first line of defense looking at these
22 cases, it appears that the [inaudible] side of this are zoned RT, correct?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's what I see from the map. Is that correct, Staff?

1 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You wanna say that as a motion?

3 MR. JOHNSON: Well I mean, it does appear problematic. I mean, the requested
4 zoning is flanked on either side. So from that standpoint [inaudible] –

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: These mics are frustrating today.

6 MR. JOHNSON: There is a basis for a recommendation of approval. Having said
7 that, Mr. Price, if you'd just repeat the rationale on the [inaudible] again, please?

8 MR. PRICE: Yes. Again, this parcel falls within the neighborhood medium density
9 designation of the 2015 Richland County Comprehensive Plan. And the neighborhood
10 medium density recommends a higher density, medium residential development that the
11 requested zoning we feel does not help meet.

12 MR. JOHNSON: So, and within this particular sub area, I'm just talking about my
13 analysis in my mind, the majority of the immediately surrounding property doesn't fit with
14 the desired outcome for that area.

15 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. I think it's very similar I think the last case that we had in
16 which you could look at the parcels in the area, at least definitely in the immediate area
17 of the request, and they would not meet the requirements of the future land use map as
18 far as the neighborhood medium density designation in its recommendations.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

20 MR. JOHNSON: I mean, I welcome my colleagues' thoughts on this, but I mean,
21 I'm inclined to say that since it's flanked on both sides that there's rationale, that's why I
22 wanted to understand the perspective. It's an interesting dilemma.

1 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Let me just chime in a little bit more, probably more than I
2 need to on this, but had this parcel come in for, I'm just gonna say R3, Residential 3,
3 Staff would've recommended approval for it because it would've been in compliance
4 with the Comprehensive Plan as far as those recommendations. But then at the same
5 time you could've looked at this and said, but it's not in character with the surrounding
6 properties. Now you flip this around to what you have before you, you have a request, I
7 think as you stated Commissioner Johnson, that it seems to be in compliance with the
8 existing parcels in the, you know, immediate area of this but it's not in compliance with
9 the Comprehensive Plan.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price and Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I think the
11 interesting thing about this particular case is, as Mr. Price just really well articulated is,
12 typically the battle and the fight is someone trying to make it more dense and the fight
13 against a higher level of density, and here it's a request for less density than what is
14 desired for the area. So it's a little bit of a paradox of the argument that we're usually
15 facing. Cause the Applicant could come in, I don't wanna say of right, but an easier
16 approval with a higher density.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. It looks like there's
18 people over here. Commissioner Duffy?

19 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Price, just to follow up on what Commissioner Johnson said
20 there, yeah just for clarification them coming in with R3, sorry, RT rather than R3, that
21 actually, it's tighter on the number of potential dwellings than say if it was an R3
22 application where there would be higher density. Is that accurate?

1 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Yes, R3 would allow six units per acre versus the RT which
2 allows one unit per acre.

3 MR. DUFFY: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Taylor? Did I see your hand go up a little
5 bit?

6 MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible] I did have a question though. And maybe I
7 misunderstood but I'm thinking in previous meetings do we, do we consider what's
8 going to be done when we're looking at these? I thought we were told it doesn't matter
9 what they're doing, we just kinda look at it at face value what the request is, is that
10 correct?

11 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, because any zoning designation outside of this PD has a
12 multitude of uses that are allowed. And so what we've always, you know, cautioned
13 every, whether it be the Planning Commission or even Council, is you know, not
14 necessarily to focus in on what the applicant may be intending to do on the property
15 because we cannot hold them to that specifically. They're allowed to use any of the
16 broad uses that are allowed within that zoning designation.

17 MR. TYALOR: Okay, thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, any other comments or a motion?

19 MR. JOHNSON: I think I'm actually –

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir. Commissioners, I make a motion that actually goes
22 against my initial gut but Mr. Price makes a very compelling argument, in the case of tax
23 map number R04200-06-13, I'd like to make a motion to forward this to County Council

1 with a recommendation consistent with the Staff recommendation for disapproval for the
2 sole reason that if we rezone that to RT it makes it harder for future cases to go to a
3 higher density in that area, which is the stated desire for the land use plan pattern in
4 that area.

5 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, the motion is for disapproval in line with Staff and we
7 have a second by Commissioner Taylor, correct?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Correct. But again, I think it's important that simply because, as
9 Mr. Price pointed out, that made me change my mind cause I was going to support the
10 approval of it. But I think it does, if the intent in this corridor is to create medium density
11 we're not, it's going to make it harder for the next project to request approval for a
12 zoning consistent with the desired area for the district. And I just think that rationale is
13 important to have on the Record.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. We have a motion and
15 a second so we need to take a vote. Staff, please.

16 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a motion for the disapproval of Case 24-022 MA.
17 Those in favor of that motion, Siercks?

18 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

19 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

20 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Durant?

22 MR. DURANT: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

1 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

3 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

5 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

7 *[Approved to deny: Siercks, Taylor, Durant, Duffy, Johnson, Frierson, Yonke; Absent:*
8 *Metts, Grady]*

9 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. And the 4th Tuesday which we have down
11 to September what, as their meeting?

12 MR. PRICE: September 24th at 7:00pm.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We are now looking at the back page of our Agenda as we
14 go to Case 5.b.4., Case Number 24-024. Take it away, Staff.

15 **CASE NO. 24-024 MA:**

16 MR. PRICE: Alright, next item is Case 24-024 MA. The Applicant is Madison
17 Pickrel. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 14.71 acres at 812 Bookman Road from
18 Homestead which is HM to R5. Staff recommends disapproval of this request. The
19 subject site lies within the neighborhood medium density designation of the
20 Comprehensive Plan. We feel it's not consistent with the objectives of the neighborhood
21 medium density zoning designation as it does not meet the location recommendations
22 which recommends high density developments to be located near activity centers and

1 within priority investment areas. As the subject site it not located near an activity center
2 or within a priority investment area, Staff recommends disapproval.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, questions for Staff
4 before we get started? Hearing none, Commissioner Frierson?

5 MS. FRIERSON: We have the Applicant, Madison Pickrel.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down. Same reminder, two minutes to speak,
7 state your name and address.

8 **TESTIMONY OF CRAIG WAITES:**

9 MR. WAITES: Yes. Well I'm not Madison Pickrel so, Madison is at home with a
10 newborn so she asked me to step in for her. Yeah, she's a week old, so. My name is
11 Craig Waites, I'm with Colliers Commercial Real Estate Company here in Columbia. I
12 live here in Columbia at 738 Abelia Road. Yeah, the application is for transition from HM
13 to R5, residential. The property is bounded by general commercial to the south which is
14 the skating rink, heavy industrial to the west which is a mini storage facility. It's, the
15 land, the 75 acres back behind it is actually in a conservation easement. And then you
16 have a residential, single-family residential property to the north and then a church to
17 the north. We have met with each of the adjacent property owners and each of them are
18 satisfied with the plan to put in townhomes. We, we actually agreed to an additional
19 buffer with the northern property owner, the single-family residential owner there, so.
20 Really the question became what, what is the utility of this property given the fact that
21 it's got commercial zoning right up next to it, it's got heavy industrial across the street.
22 And we felt like that a little bit denser residential project would be a good buffer between
23 this and the, the neighborhoods that extend further out Bookman Road. Regarding the

1 Comprehensive Land Plan which I've heard a lot of, based off of the Comprehensive
2 Land Plan that was put in place in 2015, it does not meet that, but neither does the
3 property to the south of us, neither does the property to the west of us or any of the
4 properties along Spears Creek Church Road. So I would actually contend that the 2015
5 Comp Plan is probably getting out of date and generally not consistent with the patterns
6 of development at this point. But that's neither here nor there. We kindly ask you to –

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Final thought.

8 MR. WAITES: We kindly ask your consideration. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

10 MR. WAITES: Yep.

11 MS. FRIERSON: Paul G. Tyler?

12 **TESTIMONY OF PAUL G. TYLER:**

13 MR. TYLER: Good evening. I'd like to thank y'all for the opportunity to address
14 this. I live in a neighborhood near there, not adjacent to it but it's very near. Bookman
15 Road –

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We need your name and address, sir.

17 MR. TYLER: Pardon?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What's your address?

19 MR. TYLER: Oh, I'm sorry. 432 Plantation Pointe Drive. Bookman Road cannot
20 handle the traffic from condominiums. It just, it's not possible. Give you an example
21 now, and this doesn't sound like a long time, Tuesday I left my house at 6:45am, it took
22 me five minutes to get to Two Notch Road. That's less than a quarter of a mile. Normal
23 circumstances, and that was light traffic. Thirty minutes later you're probably looking at

1 another five minutes and it goes up until about 9:00's when it finally thins out. There's
2 more than just storage units across from it. Kroger's has a food factory where they
3 make coffee, spices across the road from it. There's, I'm not sure exactly what it is but
4 there's a warehouse. There's several things, a couple, there's at least three commercial
5 manufactured style across from it. Bookman, the only thing I'm gonna say is Bookman
6 Road just cannot handle the traffic. If you got a train coming you might as well pack a
7 lunch because you're gonna be there all day. And that does happen on occasion where
8 a train comes during the heavy traffic. Coming home at 5:00 in the evening traffic is
9 backed way up turning left or traffic coming off of Spears Creek Church onto Bookman.
10 It's taking me a while, I've never timed it, to get in that way. That's all I've got. Thank
11 you.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out, sir.

13 MS. FRIERSON: Richard Priheim?

14 **TESTIMONY OF RICHARD PRIHEIM:**

15 MR. PRIHEIM: Hey, I don't have any prepared statements. My name is Richard
16 Priheim. I live at number 1 Plantation Pointe Way, which is the property adjacent to the
17 one we're talking about. The gentleman said they contacted community members,
18 nobody contacted me to talk about this. But I agree with Deputy Dave, there are no way
19 that increased density is gonna benefit our community. Bookman Road is a nightmare
20 which he kind of explained. The other thing is, I don't know if you can expand the view
21 of that, I moved here 12 years ago and all of the realtors I talked to, you know, they talk
22 about the highlights of why you would wanna live in this area, and one of them was
23 Richland 2 schools for people who have school aged children. The other one was easy

1 access to shopping along Two Notch Road. And the third thing was access to a public
2 park where you could walk and hike and bike, and that was Clemson Extension. Well,
3 Clemson Extension is not public anymore. What we need to do is be proactive in this
4 area and we need to make sure that the infrastructure is ahead of any development that
5 we do. The density is already too much in our area, we've had Jacobs Creek, Forest
6 Creek, a whole bunch of new developments out there and again the infrastructure is just
7 not kept up. So I would ask you as a council to please be proactive and make sure the
8 infrastructure stays ahead of any development. And I would like to suggest that if you
9 wanna constructive use of this property turn it into the green space that we lost because
10 Clemson became not a public area anymore. There are thousands of people who live in
11 the communities that surround Clemson Extension and they were very happy people
12 because they had access to a green space. If anything, that's what we need in this area
13 is a green space, not more residential. Thank you for your time.

14 MS. FRIERSON: Cheryl, it looks like Cheryl Turner?

15 **TESTIMONY OF CHERYL TURNER:**

16 MS. TURNER: Hi. Thank you for listening to us today. My address, my name is
17 Cheryl Turner and I'm at 3 Spanish Moss Court, it's in Plantation Pointe.

18 MR. TURNER: And I'm Phil.

19 MS. TURNER: And my husband. We don't think we need this either. We don't
20 need any more residential right now. Also schools are overcrowded, there's too much
21 development too quickly in that area. We've lived there for 30 years. When we first
22 moved there we could go down Bookman Road, didn't even have a light at the, at
23 Pontiac, we could just look both ways and cross. Now I have to wait for somebody to let

1 me out of my neighborhood and then I wait for that light and it's on and on and on. We
2 came to a meeting when they were planning Jacobs Creek which is a huge
3 neighborhood right down the road and said the same thing, that we needed more
4 infrastructure before they built this neighborhood because the roads weren't gonna be
5 able to handle it. And we were right, the roads are not able to handle it. Pulling out of
6 neighborhoods is very dangerous there and we just don't need anymore. And I worry
7 about our schools, I know our schools are becoming overcrowded also. Anything you
8 wanna add?

9 MR. TURNER: We've had a lot of accidents at that intersection. When we went
10 to a meeting recently at Northsprings Park about the, with DOT, about highway
11 improvements and it's like they've forgotten about our road. We tell them about the
12 accidents that occur right in front of our neighborhood, they've plowed our sign down
13 twice, our brick entrance. They tried to make improvements there with a turning lane but
14 that just made it worse, between our entrance in our neighborhood and Old Two Notch
15 right there at the church. Traffic backs up easily a mile in the morning. I know that
16 railroad crossing will not be improved because that's CSX, they're not gonna improve
17 that railroad crossing to allow more traffic going through there. So we already know
18 that's not gonna happen. The road will not be widened because of CSX.

19 MS. TURNER: Okay, and that space used to be a green space. It was a baseball
20 field.

21 MR. TURNER: Right.

22 MS. TURNER: And the community –

23 MR. TURNER: Three fields.

1 MS. TURNER: - three fields, and the community did use it before until it was
2 closed down.

3 MR. TURNER: And it was owned by the [inaudible].

4 MS. TURNER: So I'd like to see it go back to a green space. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. We're having a hard time reading your name,
6 434 Plantation Pointe Drive?

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: She had to leave.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: She had to leave, okay. Anyone else on the signup sheet?
9 [Inaudible] There's no one else signed up to speak so this is open on the floor for
10 discussion. I see zoning history we have in our packet. This has been [inaudible] 2021
11 Code rewrite. Correct, Staff?

12 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: If you look on the Richland County map, the application
14 you just had, and you do go back in time a little bit you can see how it was [inaudible]
15 baseball fields. It was like a park. Is that correct, Staff?

16 MR. PRICE: It looks that way, sir.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: My day job is looking at maps so doing my homework I did
18 cycle through every time [inaudible] you can look at and I saw how it was a baseball
19 field, kind of abandoned, kinda cleaned up maybe around 2009(?) it looked pretty nice?
20 So there is a history of that being a park. Commissioners, open for discussion.

21 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

1 MR. SIERCKS: Question for Staff. If we had looked, go back to the GIS map and
2 see that, there you go, and if you could zoom it back out and have the zoning overlay.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I have a question or comment from listening to the public.
4 The property to the east, that's AG, private property, right?

5 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

7 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor?

9 MR. TAYLOR: Question for Staff. In our packet we have the traffic characteristics
10 outline, does that go into your consideration at all or is it just [inaudible]?

11 MR. PRICE: Usually we stick with the Comprehensive Plan.

12 MR. TAYLOR: One question then [inaudible] under traffic characteristics in that
13 first paragraph, it says that Bookman Road is currently operating at a Level of Service,
14 LOS E, what does that stand for?

15 MR. SMITH: So the level of service is actually, is indicated by not how many cars
16 go by at a certain time of day but how many cars go by continuously throughout the day.
17 So it tells you whether it's free flowing or if there's constant cars at slow moving pace,
18 and so the higher the letter the more traffic essentially. And so once it becomes an F it
19 becomes unstable and that's when improvements usually become –

20 MR. TAYLOR: So if becomes an F it becomes –

21 MR. SMITH: - it, once it becomes an F, SCDOT usually gets involved to do
22 improvements.

23 MR. TAYLOR: So it's one letter below.

1 MR. SMITH: Right, and that's up to SCDOT for their determinations.

2 MR. TAYLOR: Right. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for the explanation, that's a useful piece in our
4 packets, thank you. [Inaudible] question, Commissioners? Commissioner Johnson. I
5 can tell you want to say something, I love it.

6 MR. JOHNSON: This is my last comment for the evening, how about that?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This is great.

8 MR. JOHNSON: And truly just an observation, Commissioners, I mean, because
9 there's not immediate residential adjacent to it as I look at the three adjoining area, the
10 one in the corner at, yes, that subdivision is a PD so we really can't tell without looking
11 at that what the density. The, coming across state road on this side the bright yellow
12 and then the other on the other of Two Notch are lower, they appear to be at least R3
13 and R2, yeah – no, the subdivision, yes that one. R3. Well I guess either way what I'm
14 saying is those, the subdivisions immediately around it that are closest are not at R5,
15 they're R3 and R2. And so I mean, just another factor to kind of take into consideration
16 as we look at this.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Any other comments,
18 Commissioners, or a motion?

19 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

21 MR. SIERCKS: I make a motion to forward project number 24-024 MA to County
22 Council with a recommendation of disapproval.

23 MR. DURANT: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, we have a motion for disapproval from
2 Commissioner Siercks and before I could ask a second I hear a second from
3 Commissioner Durant.

4 MR. DURANT: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Correct. Okay, Commissioners with a motion and a
6 second, Staff please take a vote.

7 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a motion for the disapproval of Case 24-024 MA.
8 Those in favor of that motion, Siercks?

9 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

11 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Durant?

13 MR. DURANT: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

15 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

19 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

22 *[Approved to deny: Siercks, Taylor, Durant, Duffy, Johnson, Frierson, Yonke; Absent:*
23 *Metts, Grady]*

1 MR. PRICE: Alright, so that motion passes.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So that's a recommendation of disapproval.

3 MR. PRICE: Disapproval, yes sir.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: September 24th. Okay. Just giving the room a minute as
5 people are stepping out. We're gonna move on to 5., which is 24-025. Take it away,
6 Staff.

7 **CASE NO. 24-025 MA:**

8 MR. PRICE: Alright, we'll get to this part but there was a correction in the Staff's
9 recommendation. But we're here for Case 24-025 MA. The Applicant is Mike Crandall.
10 The location is 1765 Dutch Fork Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 1.3 acres
11 from Institutional, INS, to General Commercial, GC. Again, Staff recommends
12 disapproval. Staff is of the opinion the proposed rezoning is not consistent with the
13 objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan for the parcel located within a
14 neighborhood low density designation. According to the Plan commercial development
15 should be located within nearby neighborhood activity centers and may be considered
16 for location along main road corridors and within a contextually appropriate distance of a
17 primary arterial. The subject property, parcel is located along a main road corridor but
18 the proposed zoning designation would allow for commercial uses that are more intense
19 than the neighborhood scale recommended by the Plan. For these reasons Staff
20 recommends disapproval of the Map Amendment. However, the proposed zoning
21 request would be in character with the adjacent zonings on the, and uses on the
22 adjacent properties.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, any questions for Staff?
2 Hearing none, take it away Ms. Frierson.

3 MS. FRIERSON: We have the Applicant, Mike Crandall.

4 **TESTIMONY OF MIKE CRANDALL:**

5 MR. CRANDALL: Good evening, thank you for your time. Mike Crandall, 947
6 Stradley Lane, Chapin, South Carolina. So we purchased this property in December,
7 we're residential contractors and so when we purchased it it was under the OI zoning
8 which would allow us to use it as a construction office for some small equipment and to
9 put up a building for storing material. So by the time we got around to rezoning or to pull
10 a permit to do our intended use which was in May, unbeknownst to us in March the
11 zoning had changed. And so Mr. Price and his Staff were great to work with, we tried
12 every way to work it within the intended use and ultimately decided that it was gonna
13 have to be rezoned. So we reached out to Mr. Branham our Councilman, and he was
14 kind enough to meet us at the property. So for us that, I mean, that was kinda the gist
15 of it, when we bought it it was under the OI and when it changed over to Institution we
16 were no longer able to do our intended use, and really the only way to do it would be
17 General Commercial. And so we were hoping by staying in line with the General
18 Commercial around us and to stress that we would not be, this isn't a retail site, as a
19 residential contractor we would not be adding any traffic to the area. So thank you for
20 your time.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

22 MS. FRIERSON: Toby Ward.

23 **TESTIMONY OF TOBY WARD:**

1 MR. WARD: Good evening, Commission Members. Toby Ward, I'm an attorney
2 and I represent the Applicant, and I just wanted to point out a few things. First of all –

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Could we have your address as well?

4 MR. WARD: Yeah, and I do live in the City of Columbia, 3012 Glenwood Place
5 and my law office is in Five Points at 534 Congaree Avenue. First of all I, with all due
6 respect I think Mr. Price got it right when he recommended approval and he disagreed
7 with me, but I think the reason for that is his closing line [inaudible] the proposed zoning
8 request would be in character with the adjacent land uses. And if Staff could pull up the
9 colored map with the adjacent zoning designations, what you'll see from looking at that
10 map is that on either side the property is basically a business use. We would just
11 expand the General Commercial a little bit. So, and as Staff notes the immediate area is
12 characterized by commercial and industrial uses. There's a vet office, there's a
13 residence at the back, but on either side is an office construction company and two
14 general commercial zoned districts. As was noted earlier the Comprehensive Plan calls
15 for neighborhood low density but given the traffic characteristics of this road which is at
16 an F, I don't believe the type of uses that would be allowed under the INS would really
17 be suitable and as Staff notes DOT's got no plans to do anything nor does the County. If
18 you look at some of the uses that could come in under the current INS zoning, you
19 could have a recycling facility, you could have a bar or restaurant, you know, you could
20 have numerous uses, a correctional facility, all of which would tax the already
21 overburdened road. And I understand you don't, as a policy you don't look to the
22 intended use but this property as a General Commercial has a house that would be
23 used as an office and I would ask you to pay attention to the realities of the situation.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Final thoughts, sir. Got to keep it fair.

2 MR. WARD: And also, you know, pay attention to what Geo said that the
3 proposed zoning request would be in character with the adjacent uses and with, and
4 disregard the Staff recommendation and send it to County Council with a
5 recommendation of approval of the change.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

7 MR. WARD: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else signed up to speak? No? Okay. Okay
9 Commission, this is on the floor for discussion.

10 MR. DUFFY: Just a question for Staff.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Duffy?

12 MR. DUFFY: The current, the existing zoning, just following off of the most
13 common under INS, what is that allowed to be on the property under the current
14 zoning? Could you give some clarification on it?

15 MR. PRICE: I don't have that one directly in front of me, but again it is
16 Institutional. The Institutional use typically is, doesn't have retail uses.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And Staff, we see in our package we have page 52.

18 MR. PRICE: I appreciate that.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We appreciate you. This is an addition this year and it's
20 very helpful. Note we could have an arena or stadium permitted. Any questions,
21 Commissioners, based off of looking at the [inaudible]?

22 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I think to answer your question, Mr., Commissioner Duffy, one
23 of the things you'll notice is that the uses that you'll find within the Institutional or the INS

1 district are typically more neighborhood center type uses, neighborhood scale type
2 uses, whereas when you get to the GC it's a lot more open, a lot more intense as far as
3 the allowances.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, could you please pull up the interactive map again
5 with the zoning turned on?

6 MR. PRICE: Just kind of looking, I think we had this discussion earlier while we
7 were talking about a PD designation. So if you take a look at the parcel that's zoned,
8 that's Coogler Construction, that is zoned PD also. As stated before it was kind of used
9 previously as a means to allow a use but yet not allow a broad use of a property.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And we no longer do that in our 2021 Code.

11 MR. PRICE: We haven't done that in a number of years, even before that, yes
12 sir.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, could you zoom [inaudible]? I'm looking for a pattern.
14 I see Ballentine is red, General Commercial [inaudible] we're in the red area again. I
15 admit from looking at the map it looks like this would be in character with what's going
16 on in the area. And defer to my Commissioners for any comments or a motion.
17 Commissioner Siercks, looks like he's getting ready.

18 MR. SIERCKS: I am just, I am just – give me a second to fully form my thoughts.
19 I mean, on the one hand it's similar to a lot of the, I would say the closer calls that we've
20 had in the past where it's one or the other, it's in character with surrounding properties
21 but inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan or vice versa. And, and you know, also
22 without taking intended use into account, you know, the fact that this is a low density,
23 classified as a low density neighborhood, I'm starting to run out of hands, but on the

1 other hand the, you know, I think about how, you know, the Comprehensive Plan lays
2 out a long term vision for what we as a community, at least at one time, thought was an
3 appropriate future for this area to have. And in making even well intentioned or, you
4 know, well-meaning exceptions to the Comprehensive Plan or, you know, what would
5 be in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan is how over time we end up with some
6 areas in which we've seen these, you know, sort of pattern-less zoning designations,
7 because bit by bit we've made exceptions whether or not with an eye towards the
8 intended use but because for one reason or another it seemed to make sense. And I
9 don't necessarily have a point that I'm driving at other than to say that I'm, you know,
10 conflicted for those reasons on this one.

11 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks, good discussion is
13 useful. And Commissioner Durant.

14 MR. DURANT: [Inaudible]

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant, is your mic on?

16 MR. DURANT: Oh, sorry. I said I'm less conflicted cause as I look at this the
17 overall trend tends to be going toward General Commercial and I, I would accept Staff's
18 final statement that the proposed zoning request would be in character with adjacent
19 land uses.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do either one of you wanna phrase that as a motion?

21 MR. DURANT: I move that we forward project 24-025 MA to County Council with
22 a recommendation of approval, based on Staff's statement that the proposed zoning
23 request would be in character with the adjacent land uses.

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

2 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: A second from Commissioner Taylor. Thank you. Staff,
4 with a motion and a second can you please take a vote?

5 MR. PRICE: Okay, so we have a motion for the approval of Case 24-025 MA.
6 Those in favor of the motion for approval, Siercks?

7 MR. SIERCKS: Nay.

8 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

9 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Durant?

11 MR. DURANT: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

13 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

15 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

17 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE:

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

22 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff and Commissioners. September 24th,
2 7:00, 6:00?

3 MR. PRICE: 7:00pm.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 7:00pm, County Council, our recommendation is for
5 approval on that one. If I'm reading the packet correctly we jump down to the last case,
6 number 9., Case 24-031 MA. Staff?

7 **CASE NO. 24-031 MA:**

8 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Again as stated we're on item 24-031 MA. The Applicant is
9 Pastor Levern McKenny. The location is 438 Rabon Road. The Applicant is proposing to
10 rezone six acres from Residential 2, R2 to MU1 which is mixed, I'm sorry, which is
11 Neighborhood Mixed Use District. Staff recommends disapproval of this request as the
12 proposed rezoning is not consistent with the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. This
13 particular location lies within the neighborhood medium density designation of the
14 Comprehensive Plan and according to the Plan nonresidential development may be
15 considered for location along main road corridors and within a contextually appropriate
16 distance from the intersection of a primary arterial. The parcel is not within a
17 contextually appropriate distance from a primary arterial. For this reason Staff
18 recommends disapproval.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Any questions for Staff, Commissioners?
20 Hearing none, Ms. Frierson?

21 MS. FRIERSON: We have Alexia Singleton.

22 MS. SINGLETON: Yes, ma'am, that's correct.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down.

1 **TESTIMONY OF ALEXIA SINGLETON:**

2 MS. SINGLETON: As stated my name is Alexia Singleton speaking on behalf of
3 Pastor McKenny, 438 Rabon Road. We spoke with Councilwoman Gretchen Barron and
4 she recommended this rezoning. We are looking to have a daycare added to the current
5 facility which is a house of worship. We've been here in the community serving over a
6 year. We recently purchased the property from Apostle Turner who had that property
7 there for 17 years. Our ministry has been in existence for over 33 years and we've been
8 serving the community and even here at Rabon Road. We've been having community
9 events as well. And with the youth gymnasium that is across the street from our church,
10 right across the street, and then all of the developing properties that are going up, we
11 feel as if a daycare would be beneficial for the community and we are looking to
12 continue to serve the community through faith as well as in the area of child care. That's
13 pretty much it, that is the purpose for the rezoning and that is what we're seeking.

14 Thank you for your time.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out tonight. There's no one else
16 signed up to speak. This is open on the floor for discussion and questions. Question for
17 Staff, so Rabon Road is not considered a main road?

18 MR. PRICE: No, sir. So -

19 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair? Oh go ahead, go ahead, Mr. Price.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead, Staff.

21 MR. PRICE: Okay. So kinda interject here. So going back to previous discussion
22 the Planning Commission had, I think Commissioner Johnson was part of this
23 discussion, in an ideal world, I mean, ideally whenever there is a, an amendment that

1 goes against the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan we should go back and
2 look at the Comprehensive Plan, that designation for that area because a lotta times
3 we're not just rezoning parcel by parcel, it's really kind of the area. So if you, when you
4 go against the Comp Plan what you're also saying is that it needs to change. And I think
5 one of the things that has not happened over the years is we've not made changes. And
6 so I think as Commissioner Johnson was stating earlier at least alluding to, you know,
7 often we will take a position, either approval or disapproval, but especially if you go
8 against the Comprehensive Plan but we don't go back and do anything with it so the
9 next applicant comes in and is asking maybe the same thing or something different,
10 there really isn't any guide. And the only reason I bring that up is because, you know,
11 this section along Rabon Road over the years has undergone a number of rezonings. I
12 think if we were to expand out you would see, you know, there have been other parcels
13 that have been zoned commercial and other developments that have taken place
14 whether, you know, from Flora Drive going all the way down to Farrow Road. Put the
15 zoning layers on, Tommy? Right, so you can kind of see some of the commercial that
16 has taken place – what's the purple, excuse me, light industrial that has taken place in
17 this area. But again when we don't start – and I believe the gymnastic studio some
18 years ago and their property rezoned for parking, for a parking area, and the piece that
19 Tommy has, if he moves his mouse down just a little bit, right there, yeah right there,
20 that piece you actually rezoned, your recommendation was for I think approval of that
21 parcel, and it's actually a portion of it, to go to R5 for development. So I think, you know,
22 again as we, as we often as a Staff we give you the recommendations of the
23 Comprehensive Plan, what we don't take into consideration is some – you know, we try

1 to put in the previous history of it but we probably allude to it or elaborate on that
2 enough at times, just you know, to show you that there have been a number of changes
3 that have been approved at the higher level that maybe should have had some effect
4 upon the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We wanna go back to Commissioner Taylor?

7 MR. TAYLOR: It was real quick [inaudible].

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, go ahead.

9 MR. TAYLOR: So question for Staff as – does the Applicant always speak
10 concerning what [inaudible]?

11 MR. PRICE: Yeah, so one of the, one of the requirements for a map amendment,
12 of also accepting the application, is they have a pre-application meeting. Again, the
13 applicant may, you know, in some cases they know exactly what it is they want to do,
14 you know, they've been doing this for a while in some cases and they'll just come in and
15 say, I just wanna rezone the property, it's really not much of a discussion. The main,
16 one of the main reasons we do have these discussions with applicants, or the pre-
17 application meeting, is to ensure what they're looking at is going to meet their needs.
18 Now again, we don't bring that to you as a Planning Commission and we don't bring it to
19 Council, but what we try to avoid is someone coming in making a request and then
20 finding out later that was the wrong request for what it was they wanted to do. So that
21 was one of the, that's one of the main reasons we have the pre-application meeting but
22 it is a requirement for any amendment.

1 MR. TAYLOR: Okay, and along those lines just out of curiosity, when you have
2 that discussion I see daycare facility is a special requirement, do you go over those
3 special requirements as well or, so that they understand that it might not even get
4 approved under – I'm assuming that's what requirements means – even with that
5 designation it may not get it, is that correct?

6 MR. PRICE: Yeah, day care facilities special requirements. I'll tell you what, I'm
7 gonna go ahead and turn to that real quick if you don't mind.

8 MR. TAYLOR: On page 93 I think. That's what I'm basing it on.

9 MR. PRICE: No, I wanted to go to the actual special requirement.

10 MR. TAYLOR: Alright, but I wanted to [inaudible].

11 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Yes, just to let you know what those special requirements
12 are for a day care facility, there are three, the client pick up and drop off shall not
13 obstruct traffic flow on adjacent public roads, any outdoor children's play area shall be
14 fenced or otherwise enclosed on all sides and shall not include driveways, parking
15 areas or land otherwise unsuited for children's play space, and finally day care facilities
16 shall comply with all applicable state and federal regulations. But no, we, typically we'll
17 have that conversation if we see that special requirements or something else that may
18 affect them after the zoning, because we'll let them know, you may get the rezoning,
19 however, you have to take other things into consideration. It could be how the sites
20 developed, maybe we see some issues with it, so to kinda keep them from just going
21 through an unnecessary process we try to go over the entire development process in
22 most cases, but again that's a little separate from the rezoning.

23 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

2 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] a major road. Actually when you zoom the map
4 out and you see how it's one of the few roads that connect between, what Farrow Road
5 and Two Notch?

6 MR. PRICE: I'm gonna let Mr. DeLage discuss that a bit cause he'll be able to tell
7 you why and when's the last time things were updated.

8 MR. DELAGE: Thank you, Mr. Price. So the roadways are based on the
9 functional classification from SCDOT. Typically your major roads are gonna be your,
10 classified as your major and minor arterial roads, so your Farrow Road, your Two
11 Notch, those type of roads versus your collectors or thoroughfare roads. In this case
12 Rabon Road, and just because I'm going off memory I don't want to do that in this case,
13 the traffic count or the functional classification for Rabon in this case is a collector,
14 which is kinda exactly what it sounds like, it's gonna collect the traffic and funnel those
15 towards those arterials. If you kinda look at these internal streets within the subdivisions
16 those are your local roads which sounds exactly, it's for local traffic to be funneled into
17 your collectors. So, but I'll be happy to answer any other questions. And it's also, that
18 functional classification is based on the number of lanes and whether it's divided or
19 undivided.

20 MR. PRICE: I want to point out his thank you was a little sarcastic. [Laughter]

21 MR. DURANT: That came through loud and clear.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'll throw another one out there that you guys love, the
23 Comp Plan was drawn with a broad paintbrush.

1 MR. PRICE: Correct.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You saw that coming. [Inaudible] pointing just outside of
3 the circle. So if this was inside we would say that this would be in compliance
4 [inaudible].

5 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. I'll let Mr. Smith answer that, but I mean, I think it's very
6 similar, it's very similar to when we, the parcel across the street that I was referring to
7 that was rezoned to R5, it fit, we recommended disapproval of that if I'm correct
8 because it fell just outside of the circle.

9 MR. SMITH: The primary reason we gave the recommendation of disapproval
10 wasn't because of the proximity to the, you know, the economic development corridor
11 the priority investment area. The reason why we gave a disapproval was because the
12 road was not a primary arterial and that is for traffic reasons. A collector doesn't hold the
13 same volume and that's why these kind of recommendations for mixed uses are
14 designated for higher volume roads like primary arterials and not collectors.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I think I'm just [inaudible] Planning Staff, so. But
16 Commissioners, comments, motion?

17 MR. JOHNSON: I just –

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

19 MR. JOHNSON: - do wanna share a comment, but actually your comment just
20 made me ask a question. Is the existing church considered nonconforming?

21 MR. PRICE: That's a good question.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I believe it's allowed. Place of worship is a special
23 exemption.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So just my thoughts, I mean, each
2 case tonight has been, it seems uniquely difficult more so than typically in one single
3 night where almost either case could go either way. And in this case, you know, my first
4 look at it that there's nothing surrounding that's in that mixed use district, in that corridor.
5 However, with it being adjacent or being a part of a church campus it just seems to
6 make a natural sense and fit but we're not allowed to consider the Applicant's use as a
7 part of our rationale for decisions. So then looking at it a little bit further I was saying,
8 well you've got the GC across the street so why didn't they bring it in as GC? And,
9 because at least then it makes it easier on the argument, but as Mr. Taylor pointed out
10 not only the MU but the GC also for the use of what they wanna do is still a special
11 requirement. So they'd be in the same boat even if they'd gone under General
12 Commercial and tried to match what was across the street. I mean, I know that doesn't
13 give an answer but it just, it just outlines why it seems like it's a very difficult case.

14 MR. YOUNG: Excuse me. I didn't sign up to speak but can I speak in favor of it?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] typically we don't –

16 MR. PRICE: I'm not sure about him. That'll be fine. It's really up to the
17 Commission.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, come on and take two minutes.

19 **TESTIMONY OF PRESTON YOUNG:**

20 MR. YOUNG: Thank you. My name is Preston Young, I live at 100 Deer
21 Crossing Road, Elgin, Richland County side. And I can tell this is a, it is kinda a unique
22 situation but just to give you a little backdrop on how we got here, the church wanted to
23 do a daycare so I think they reached out to the Councilwoman and eventually met with

1 Mr. Price to kinda discuss the situation. They had no idea about what zoning was what,
2 so getting here was kinda at the guidance, not a really a recommendation or anything,
3 but we didn't just come here, we were kinda pointed in this direction to seek this zoning
4 within this district. Knowing about the circle and the economic thing, but we're right
5 outside of it and if you're familiar, and I like you said, Chair, with Rabon Road it's hard to
6 believe that it's not considered a primary with the amount of traffic through there. And
7 with the General Commercial being right across the street and all the recent
8 development, the residential development around it, it kinda seems like a perfect fit. And
9 timing is right for the church to wanna move forward with offering a day care to serve
10 the community. If you're familiar with that area you'll kinda, it's kinda had not to see it as
11 a perfect fit for what's happening with the growth in that area, with the General
12 Commercial, the residential nearby, the hospital being within a half mile, multiple
13 medical facilities, offices and, you know, within a half a mile so it just seems like the
14 perfect fit even though the perfect fit may not be in align with the Comprehensive Plan
15 that was done several years ago, so. That's all I have, thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

19 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. Follow up with, in general
20 but since the Applicant or one of the representatives of the Applicant indicated that the
21 Councilperson from that district was supportive of this, is there a community meeting in
22 the pipeline for this?

23 MR. PRICE: There was a community meeting held last Thursday.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Any feedback from that community meeting?

2 MR. PRICE: I don't have any. I know a number of applicants who had cases in
3 District 7 which was Councilwoman Gretchen Barron's district, she represents that area,
4 were able to present to the community and answer questions, but I did not, I personally
5 did not leave with, you know, a specific direction in which she may wish to, you know, to
6 make a motion at the Council meeting, at the Zoning Public Hearing.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I make a statement?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The public input time is over, we did that earlier. I'm sorry.

9 MR. PRICE: You know, so –

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Tommy, do you mind pulling the map up again? The parcel
11 to the west, I believe that's R2? What's its acreage, what are we doing to that?

12 MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chairman, yes, it is currently zoned R2 and, which of course
13 is a residential district, the acreage is, it's coming up as blank; unfortunately we fall on a
14 Thursday when the Assessor's database is typically running in the background to
15 update the Assessor's information which is why it keeps pulling up as a blank
16 sometimes on here. As you can see in the top right corner, no data. So you know,
17 unfortunately I don't have necessarily the acreage as the Assessor has them, but just a
18 quick rough –

19 MR. JOHNSON: Quick measure will be great.

20 MR. DELAGE: - approximation. Six acres. And then to the east –

21 MR. YOUNG: Thirteen acres, 12.93.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What's the density again for R2 with six acres?

23 MR. PRICE: R2?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Um-hum (affirmative).

2 MR. PRICE: Three. R2 is three units per acre.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That'd be 12 homes that are developed to the west.

4 MR. PRICE: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We're making an R2 island, you know, if we change this.

6 That's what I see on the map.

7 MR. PRICE: Yeah. Yeah, I can't say for sure but I don't believe that you're gonna
8 have a lot of R2 developments coming in so the likelihood is you'll probably get a fair
9 request to amend that zoning, that zoning designation from R2 to either something with
10 a higher residential density or maybe more of a commercial development.

11 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, [inaudible] Commissioner Johnson?

13 MR. JOHNSON: I was, in the interest of trying to advance the item I will say this,
14 based on the rationale of having the GC across the street and having the Applicant
15 requesting a lower level of density I will, for the Commission's consideration, offer a
16 motion of approval for Case 24-031 MA for those reasons.

17 MR. PRICE: And Commissioner Johnson, I also wanna point out that it's not just
18 the commercial across the street, you know, if you look at the other purples on there,
19 there's a lot of industrial so a lot of, other than the R5 of the adjacent properties are
20 non-residential.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Price.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's what I'm pointing out on the map too, it doesn't
23 seem like R2 belongs right there. So we have a motion for approval which goes against

1 the Staff recommendation. Do you want to add another sentence to that since you're
2 going against Staff?

3 MR. JOHNSON: Well I gave my rationale on the front end, was that based upon
4 the surrounding uses in that area is the rationale for why we're going against Staff.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. Do we have a second?

6 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Taylor seconds. Okay Staff, with a motion
8 and a second can you please take a vote? This would be for approval.

9 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a motion for the approval of Case 24-031 MA.
10 Those in favor, Siercks?

11 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

13 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Durant?

15 MR. DURANT: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

17 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

19 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

21 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

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

3 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Recommendation of approval goes
5 September 24th, 7:00. This is the end of Item 5. on our Agenda tonight, of the Map
6 Amendments. I wanna thank the public for coming out tonight. Part of 5. was letter c.

7 MR. PRICE: Yes. Also I wanted to point out that Mr. – he was a former Board of
8 Zoning Appeals Member for the County so he's also served here. Preston, didn't you
9 also serve with the City of Columbia?

10 MR. YOUNG: Yes. Zoning Board there, too.

11 MR. PRICE: Yeah, so he gave his time also.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for serving the County, we appreciate you. You
13 spoke the lingo very well, I could tell.

14 MR. YOUNG: I was trained by a good teacher.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Letter c. as a part of 5. is Administrative Review, you have
16 this in big letters that it's deferred so we're gonna move along. So we go to number 6.,
17 which is Other Items.

18 MR. PRICE: Yes. So –

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, do you have any other items?

20 MR. PRICE: Yes, the LDC updates. You know, we knew that this time would
21 come where we would need to make some amendments to the Code. In some ways
22 some of them may be simple, you know, maybe changing up, you know, a deletion of a
23 zoning designation in an area that shouldn't of been, just more of a cleanup. And there,

1 there are gonna be some other times where we're going to have to sit back and really
2 look at, I guess you could argue some unintended consequences as a result of the
3 adoption of the Land Development Code. We kind of felt that that one may be too much
4 to take on just from a discussion standpoint at a regularly scheduled Council meeting, I
5 mean excuse me, Planning Commission meeting, so we were looking at, you know, it's
6 Staff's request that we do a work session to go over a number of items that we feel
7 should be amended in some way. You know, we'll have our recommendations but of
8 course it would be up to the Planning Commission on how you want to accept those or
9 how you would like to have those forwarded to County Council. And I think some of
10 them may require a little more discussion than just us bringing forth, you know, a
11 proposed amendment to you and just say, hey this is for you to make a choice. But I do
12 believe there are some things that may require a little more information. And I can give
13 you, you know, one example that within the, when we adopted an equivalency zoning
14 designations we included what was the MH zoning designation from our previous Code
15 and that is the Manufactured Housing. And that allowed for manufactured homes in
16 addition to other residential homes to be built on lots about 7,200 square feet, that was
17 the minimum lot size. And I think that goes, yeah about six units per acre. Well, when
18 we adopted the equivalency zoning, MH fell into the R3 designation and the R3
19 designation does not allow for manufactured homes. So there are certain areas within
20 the County, you can use, I think Royal Pines is a good example right off of Two Notch
21 Road near the Village, where it was zoned MH previously and it's primarily developed
22 with manufactured housing. At this point if there's a vacant lot someone would not be
23 able to put a manufactured home there, they would only be able to build a house. Now

1 there are some provisions in our Code for the replacement of manufactured homes but
2 we're talking about vacant lots where they wouldn't be, of course, a replacement; that
3 those could only be used for stick built homes or modular building units. So you know,
4 so one of the reasons we would like to have discussion is not just as simple as saying,
5 okay well we'll just include MH or manufactured housing in the R3 because those of you
6 who were here from the beginning or at least early on knew that was a lotta push back
7 from the community, so that's something we would need to look at. It's just a matter of
8 what time or date, you know, from the Planning Commission; you may like to come in
9 [inaudible] or we could also meet earlier than your 6:00 meeting to have a work session.
10 That way you wouldn't lose a day, you know, out of your normal professional lives.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We need [inaudible] calendar and –

12 MR. PRICE: Right, it would, it really is, I guess what I'm just asking is would you
13 like to just do it sometime before the next Planning Commission meeting or would you
14 like to try to do it earlier during the day than your Planning Commission meeting. Do we
15 have a lotta cases, Tina, so far? Okay, so so far it looks like we have about five cases
16 for the October Planning Commission. Overall it may not be a lot, it's just a matter of
17 what type of request it is and, you know, how we look at it. But we could, you know,
18 maybe come in, you know, 3:00, 4:00, and that would be, you know, in advance of your
19 meeting and, you know, have the work session. And then at 6:00 go into the, go into
20 your regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, would you like to double load a meeting
22 like that or find another time when we can come? [Inaudible] our old time of 3:00. This
23 wouldn't really require public input. The public would be invited to come out.

1 MR. PRICE: Yeah, for a work session the public can actually, they can come
2 and view but there's no participation for them, it would just be with the Planning
3 Commission and Staff.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] so the public can be very involved [inaudible] for
5 us from you, and if people wanna come out they can, we'll post.

6 MR. PRICE: Yeah, so anything that comes about from the work session will
7 eventually go to one of your Planning Commission agendas and then the public would
8 have an opportunity to then speak on it.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, do you have the flexibility to add another
10 date in October [inaudible]?

11 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chairman?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes?

13 MR. DURANT: Did you just throw off the option of doubling up?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I haven't thrown it off but, what do you guys think about
15 that? You wanna double up on a day or pick another date where we meet for like an
16 afternoon session and then that's it? And so we have fresh minds.

17 MR. DURANT: I'm in favor of doubling up. [Inaudible]

18 MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible] I say double up.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Bring your coffee and your snacks. Hopefully a bathroom
20 break between meetings.

21 MS. FRIERSON: Y'all can buy some snacks.

22 MR. PRICE: We'll look into providing something for that meeting.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So we're looking at October 7th.

1 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

3 MR. PRICE: So if we did October 7th at 3:00, again we have some items I think
4 they're worth discussing. We probably aren't gonna get to everything but we're gonna
5 point out more the ones that we feel are really necessary to get addressed at this time
6 or at least have a thorough discussion on, and then you know, hopefully we'll have a
7 little break in-between and like I said we can –

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we need three hours?

9 MR. PRICE: That's what I was saying –

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 4:00?

11 MR. PRICE: 3:00, 4:00, it's really up to you.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 4:00 Commissioners?

13 MR. TAYLOR: 4:00 is fine.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

15 MR. PRICE: Alright.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible], do we have to make a motion on this or you –
17 what do we do?

18 MR. PRICE: I think we can just – I think we can go ahead and schedule, it'd
19 probably, let's just go ahead and vote if you don't mind.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

21 MR. PRICE: Just to –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So under 6., Other Items, we're going to take a vote on
2 adding a work session to October 7th at 4:00pm to get a deep dive into the LDC
3 updates. I'll make a motion for that. Do we have a second?

4 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Taylor. Staff, please take a
6 vote.

7 MR. PRICE: Alright. Those in favor, Taylor?

8 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

9 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

10 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

11 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

13 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

14 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

16 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

17 MR. PRICE: Durant?

18 MR. DURANT: Aye.

19 *[Approved: Taylor, Frierson, Yonke, Duffy, Siercks, Durant; Absent for vote: Johnson;*
20 *Absent: Metts, Grady]*

21 MR. PRICE: Alright. Alright, so the next item is – a lotta things going on – the
22 Olympia Mills District tour. Again, you know, we thought about other ways of doing this
23 but I do think that it will be, I think it will give you a better perspective by actually doing a

1 tour, being able to actually go through, out to see Olympia so you can actually see what
2 these amendments will actually result in. We just need to really get a date in mind that
3 works for the Members of the Planning Commission.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Can we possibly double load November, the 4th?

5 MR. PRICE: If that's a, if that's a time you would like to do it, yes that'll be fine.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What do you guys think? I'm flexible. Commissioner Duffy?

7 MR. DUFFY: Yeah, I'm flexible I just know my availability on the 4th is more
8 challenging November 4th but I can be flexible.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Are there any dates in December that works?

10 MR. PRICE: I mean if you would like, I mean, if you don't wanna double up on
11 those days I guess from Staff we can send out something again, you know, it's just
12 easier when y'all are here as a body making that decision. But if we need to we can
13 always send something out.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What if I toss out the date Monday, the 16th? Does that
15 work for Staff?

16 MR. PRICE: For September?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah.

18 MR. PRICE: Okay. Does that work for the other Planning Commission Members?

19 MR. SIERCKS: At what time?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What time would work for you, sir? Commissioner Siercks?

21 MR. SIERCKS: For me it's later in the afternoon the better on the 16th.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] go into the evening while we still have the sun
23 out?

1 MR. PRICE: We're starting to lose it a bit now so probably around, I guess 7:00
2 is when it really starts to get dark, 7:00, 7:30 at least.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: How about, like 5:00? Does that –

4 MR. PRICE: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Or 5:30.

6 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I was gonna say –

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners [inaudible]?

8 MR. PRICE: Yeah, 5:30 may be better, it kinda helps us avoid at least that initial
9 traffic that'll be coming out at 5:00.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I know avoiding conflicts with work, I would also say 4:00,
11 it's up to you guys.

12 MR. DURANT: [Inaudible]

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Looking at the date September 16th. I'd like to note that
14 September 23rd is a Bluff Road neighborhood meeting. We talked about that earlier. I
15 don't wanna conflict with that.

16 MR. PRICE: Yeah, actually there will also be a meeting on the 19th for District 11,
17 I believe that's Councilwoman Chakisse Newton, yes it is. She will have a meeting also
18 on that date to cover some of the cases that y'all have previously heard but also ones
19 that may be incoming for October.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do you have a time and location on that?

21 MR. PRICE: It will be Thursday, September the 19th from 6:00 to 7:00pm at the
22 Garners Ferry Adult Activity Center.

23 MR. TAYLOR: How long is the tour gonna take?

1 MR. PRICE: You know, I'm hoping not more than an hour, hour and a half. It just,
2 you know, traffic can get in the way, but definitely not more than an hour and a half and
3 I expect that we could probably get it done within an hour.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Should we try to meet before rush hour then, 4:00?

5 MR. PRICE: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So that we get there.

7 MR. PRICE: So you wanna leave at 4:00?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We will meet here, 4:00?

9 MR. PRICE: Meet here to leave at 4:00?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm saying a meeting time to get the Commissioners here
11 at 4:00. And then the party bus goes when we're all here.

12 MR. PRICE: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, 4:00 on the 16th. Okay. Okay, for Item 6., Other
14 Items, I'm gonna make a motion to schedule our Olympia Mills tour, 4:00pm on
15 September 16th. Can I get a second?

16 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Taylor. Staff, please take a
18 vote.

19 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the Olympia Mill District tour on the 16th at
20 4:00pm, or the meeting at 4:00pm, Taylor?

21 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

23 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

4 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

6 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

7 MR. PRICE: Durant?

8 MR. DURANT: Aye.

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

11 MR. PRICE: Okay. Motion passes.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So we will just meet outside these chambers if the room's
13 in use.

14 MR. PRICE: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And you'll take us to where, you'll provide transportation.

16 MR. PRICE: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. And snacks.

18 MR. PRICE: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Staff, any other items?

20 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Commissioners, other items? No? Okay, number 7.

22 then, Chairman's Report. A little later than usual so just thank you everybody, you're

1 awesome, really good discussion tonight. I'm sure we'll hear from Staff about Comp
2 Plan workshop meetings coming up.

3 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I'm sorry –

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And we'll roll right into number 8., which is Planning
5 Director's Report and you can speak.

6 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, thank you. Alright, I'm gonna turn it over to Mr. Smith here.

7 MR. SMITH: I promise I won't keep you guys too long. This is a little important.
8 Seeing that we went through so many different discussions this evening concerning the
9 Land Development Code and how it aligns with the Comprehensive Plan, which brings
10 us to this conversation. The 2025 Comprehensive Plan is now beginning. What I mean
11 by that Newline Consultants is our consultant company that we have chosen to pursue
12 our Comprehensive Plan. We are currently in the data gathering and housekeeping
13 stage of this plan. Those items pertaining to GIS data and demographic, infrastructure
14 assessment, environmental assessment, land use assessment, plan studies,
15 ordinances, etc., etc. I could go into a lot more detail, probably would bore you to death.
16 The Plan is to have this first kickoff meeting with Staff and the consultants within the
17 next week or so. Planning Commission would be recommended from our consultant, or
18 the consultants have recommended some of our Planning Commission Members be a
19 part of the advisory committee to be formed at a later date. Stakeholder interviews will
20 begin soon after the kickoff meeting and then a website for the plan will be up soon for
21 additional updates and schedules. The timeframe for this plan is expected to last
22 approximately 12 months. This is just the first stage of many. Lots of public meetings
23 will be occurring in different districts pertaining to different things, charrettes, public

1 input and what have you. But we will continue to update you at our monthly meetings at
2 Planning Commission as well as County Council. If y'all have any questions I'd be
3 happy to answer them if I can.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Looking forward to beginning this process.

5 MR. PRICE: Yeah, and so yeah, I know everybody's ready to go, kickoff starts in
6 two minutes. [Laughter] Sorry. But no, I think it's important, I thought this was, like, I
7 think as Matthew just stated I thought today's meeting is probably a prime example of
8 what the Comprehensive Plan, why we probably really need to pay attention to how,
9 you know, our participation's gonna be in this and what it is we're gonna be looking for.
10 You know, cause the idea is that it's gonna help guide, you know, future development in
11 the County, yet you know, we may have areas we just refuse, you know, we've
12 designated but we don't wanna essentially pull the trigger on future development in an
13 area. And eventually it's going to have to go someplace, and I think some of the things
14 we wanna look at is some of the language of the designations. I know a lotta times we
15 look at, you know, you can look at some of the ones we just had where we're talking,
16 where there's a certain road or if it's within a contextually appropriate distance, those
17 type things, you know, we really need to look at that language also and how we may
18 want certain areas to grow. So you know, we look forward to this. I think this is gonna
19 be probably one of the more important Comprehensive Plans that we'll have to do,
20 especially as this area is continuing to see an uptick in growth, not only just in Richland
21 County, but you know, State of South Carolina.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Over my time on the Commission the public usually asks,
23 what about environmental studies and traffic studies and educational studies and all

1 that, so this is our opportunity to ping, like other agencies to bring [inaudible] together
2 [inaudible]. Is that what you were saying?

3 MR. SMITH: Yes, those will be stakeholder interviews that we'll be having,
4 SCDOT, Conservation, School Districts, I mean, the list is, I mean, I've got lists and lists
5 of these guys that we're gonna be reaching out to for input and interviews to make sure
6 that we get this right.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] pull DOT as much as possible. That's usually
8 what we hear from citizens, where's the infrastructure, why is it not there yet? Yeah.
9 Alright, anything else? [Inaudible] Planning Director's Report? [Inaudible] finish your
10 statement but you do have something on the last page of our Agenda which is how
11 County Council voted.

12 MR. PRICE: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. That's usually back there, thought I looked at it.
14 Alright. Number 9, the Chair would like to make a motion for adjournment, do I have a
15 second?

16 MR. DURANT: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second. Mr. Price, please take a roll call vote with hands.

18 MR. PRICE: Yes, those in favor?

19 *[Approved: Yonke, Frierson, Duffy, Durant, Taylor, Siercks; Absent for vote: Johnson;*
20 *Absent: Metts, Grady]*

21 MR. PRICE: Unanimous.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you.

23 *[Meeting adjourned at 8:41pm]*