

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
November 4, 2024

1
2
3
4 *[Members Present: Christopher Yonke, Frederick Johnson, II, Charles Durant, Terrence*
5 *Taylor (in at 6:42pm), John Metts, Brian Grady; Absent: Beverly Frierson, Mark Duffy,*
6 *Chris Siercks]*

7
8 Called to order: 6:00pm
9

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, are you ready?

11 MR. PRICE: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, I'd like to call to order the November 4th, 2024
13 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. Staff, please confirm the following: in
14 accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to the
15 news media, persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board located in
16 the county administration building. Is that correct?

17 MR. PRICE: That is correct.

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

20 MR. PRICE: Alright, attendance for the Monday, November the 4th, 2024
21 Planning Commission, Yonke?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

23 MR. PRICE: Frierson? Johnson?

24 MR. JOHNSON: Here.

25 MR. PRICE: Duffy? Metts?

26 MR. METTS: Here.

27 MR. PRICE: Durant?

1 MR. DURANT: Here.

2 MR. PRICE: Taylor? Siercks? Grady?

3 MR. GRADY: Here.

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

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Ladies, and gentlemen, welcome to the
6 November 4th, 2024 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning
7 Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer our time
8 to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council. Our
9 recommendations are to approve or deny Zoning Map Amendment requests. Per Title
10 VI, Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of Laws* Planning Commission may also prepare and
11 revise plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of unincorporated
12 portions of the County. The County's Land Development Code rewrite process
13 conducted last year is an example as well as the Comprehensive Plan that we'll look at
14 next year. Once again, we are a recommending body to County Council and they will
15 conduct their own public hearing and take official votes to approve or deny map
16 amendments and text amendments on a future date to be published by the county.
17 Council typically holds Zoning Public Hearings on the fourth Tuesday of the month.
18 Please check the county's website for dates and times. Please take note of the following
19 guidelines for today's meeting. Please turn off or silence any cellphones. Audience
20 members may come and go quietly as needed. Applicants are allowed up to two
21 minutes to make statements. Citizens signed up to speak are allowed up to two minutes
22 as well. Redundant comments should be minimized. Please only address remarks to
23 the Commission and do not expect the Commission to respond to questions from the

1 speaker in a back and forth style, that is not the purpose of this meeting. Please no
2 audience/speaker exchanges. No audience demonstrations or other disruptions to the
3 meeting are permitted nor are comments from anyone other than the speaker at the
4 podium. Please remember the meeting is being recorded. Please speak into the
5 microphone and give your name and address. Abusive language is inappropriate and
6 will not be tolerated. Please don't voice displeasure or frustration at a recommendation
7 while the Planning Commission is still conducting business. If you have any questions
8 or concerns you can contact the Richland County Planning Department Staff down
9 below here. This puts us at number 3 on our Agenda today which is Additions and
10 Deletions. Commissioners, are there any motions for additions or deletions to the
11 Agenda today? Okay, hearing none, I feel like we can move on to number 4 which is the
12 approval of Minutes from prior meetings. The Staff provided the Commission with
13 copies of the transcript of the Commission's October 2024 meeting. Do Commissioner
14 Members have any comments or concerns regarding these transcripts? Hearing none
15 the Chair makes a motion to approve the Minutes unless there's an objection. Do I have
16 a second?

17 MR. DURANT: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. With a motion and a
19 second, Staff could you please take a vote?

20 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the approval of the October 7th, 2024
21 Minutes, Yonke?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

1 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Metts?

3 MR. METTS: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Aye.

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

10 MR. PRICE: Motion passes.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. That takes us to number 5, the Consent
12 Agenda. I'll explain it. The Consent Agenda is an action item that allows the
13 Commission to approve road names and Map Amendment requests where the Staff
14 recommends approval and no one from the public has signed up to speak against the
15 amendment or no Member of the Commission is in need of further discussion on the
16 request. Commissioner Durant, do we have any cases on our Agenda where the Staff
17 recommends approval and no one is signed up to speak against it?

18 MR. DURANT: [Inaudible]

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That would be this one. Okay. Looks like Map Amendment
20 24-043 MA.

21 MR. DURANT: That's the only one.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, would anyone like to engage on this one?

2 The Chair makes a motion to approve the Consent Agenda with Road Names and 24-
3 043 MA for approval. With that do I have a second?

4 MR. GRADY: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Grady for the Consent
6 Agenda. Staff, can you please take a vote?

7 MR. PRICE: Those in favor, excuse me, we have a motion for the approval of the
8 Consent Agenda which would be for the Road Names which will be Item 5.a, Road
9 Names, and also for 5.b.2, which is Case 24-043 MA. Those in favor, Yonke?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

11 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

12 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

13 MR. PRICE: Metts?

14 MR. METTS: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Durant?

16 MR. DURANT: Aye.

17 MR. PRICE: Grady?

18 MR. GRADY: Aye.

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

21 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. This moves us, still in Item 5.b, our Map
2 Amendments. We'll go ahead and look at our first case for the day which is Case
3 Number 24-042 MA. I'll hand this over to Staff for explanation, please.

4 **CASE NO. 24-042 MA:**

5 MR. PRICE: Alright. Again, our first item is Case 24-042 MA. The Applicant is
6 Christopher Knight. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 52.71 acres which is located
7 at 5801 Bluff Road, tax map 18600-01-01, which is a portion of, from agricultural district,
8 AG to heavy industrial district, HI. Upon Staff's review of the Comprehensive Plan as it
9 relates to this case it was determined that this falls within the, according to the 2015
10 Richland County Comprehensive Plan, this falls within the conservation designation. As
11 such Staff recommends disapproval of this request as it is not consistent with the
12 objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan for this designation which states that
13 parcels within a conservation future land use area should consist of primarily non-
14 developed uses such as forestry, agriculture, or natural open spaces. The uses
15 permitted in the requested zoning designation of heavy industrial are not supportive of
16 the uses recommended in the plan for a conservation designation. So again, for those
17 reasons Staff recommends disapproval. Again, I will point out, however, that the
18 proposed zoning designation would be consistent with the existing land use and zoning
19 of the adjacent industrial development which is Westinghouse.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, do we have any
21 questions for Staff? Hearing none, Commissioner Durant can you please give us our
22 speaker, the Applicant?

23 MR. DURANT: The Applicant is Christopher Knight.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Please come down to, either podium is
2 open tonight, and state your name and address. You have two minutes.

3 **TESTIMONY OF CHRISTOPHER KNIGHT:**

4 MR. KNIGHT: So my name is Christopher Knight and I'm the systems
5 engineering manager for Westinghouse located at 5801 Bluff Road. So I'm here to ask
6 for approval for the 53 acres. Our existing site is consistent with adjacent land usage for
7 the existing facility. Our current site is a total of 1,151 acres; currently 245 of that is
8 currently zoned for heavy industrial use. So we are asking for an additional 53 or a total
9 of 298 approximate acres to be zoned for heavy industrial use for expansion project at
10 Westinghouse. The expansion project is for manufacturing of LU plus fuel which is a
11 higher enriched fuel, to allow our customers, which are the utility providers, to provide,
12 you know, cheaper and, you know, green fuel for, you know, the public. Based on those
13 numbers 25.9% of the total acreage would be zoned heavy industrial which is only less
14 than a 5% increase from the current heavy industrial usage for the entire site. We still
15 will have 853 acres left as agricultural with 600 of that being pristine wetland
16 environment behind our site which will be conserved as wetlands. Due to our recent 40
17 year license application we did go through a full environmental impact study based on
18 our current production facility that was based on a 1,600 metric tons of uranium at our
19 facility. This project will not encroach upon that limit so the existing environmental
20 impact statement that was performed is still bounding, even adding on this additional
21 capacity or additional process at the facility. In addition, this process is considered a dry
22 process versus wet process which means we have less emissions and from air impact
23 and from water impact than our current processing facility on a kilogram per uranium

1 process produced. In addition, this project which is estimated to be several hundred
2 million dollars for the construction, will bring significant economic opportunity and
3 benefit to the area through construction jobs and –

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Your final thoughts, sir.

5 MR. KNIGHT: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Because you're over your time. Thank you.

7 MR. KNIGHT: You know, to sum it up we're here to answer questions. I've got a
8 team of folks from Westinghouse here behind me to answer questions from the public.
9 We want to ensure that they feel safe, you know, that is a priority to us of being a good
10 steward with our community and with our neighbors, and to be good stewards of the
11 environment is our top priority, so. Alright, thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Commissioner Durant, next speaker?

13 MR. DURANT: Next we have Robert Reese.

14 MR. PRICE: Excuse me, Mr. Chair, you may want to point out, I think you did
15 earlier on, the Applicant just stated he had a team here to answer questions for the
16 public on whether this is the proper format for that to occur.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, we don't typically go back and forth in that style. The
18 Commission hears discussions from people who are signed up to speak. Anyone else
19 who's here can also sign up for a few minutes to speak, so let's go with the names that
20 are signed up already and I'll see if anyone else on the team over there wanted to take
21 two minutes. But definitely not in a back and forth style. Alright. Okay, thank you sir,
22 please start with your name and address.

23 **TESTIMONY OF ROBERT REESE:**

1 MR. REESE: My name is Robert Reese, my address is 204 Sonoma Drive,
2 Hopkins, South Carolina 29061. Like the County Staff I urge the Board to reject
3 Westinghouse's request for zoning change from agricultural to high industrial for this
4 portion of its property. We all know that zoning is the bedrock of environmental justice.
5 For your information I live less than five miles from the current Westinghouse plant. I
6 applaud them for the efforts over the years to employ my relatives, my neighbors, my
7 friends, many of whom have made an excellent living working at that very plant. I'm not
8 reflectively opposed to Westinghouse, however, I am currently opposed to the
9 Westinghouse expansion of a portion of their surrounding acreage from agricultural to
10 high industrial. This change is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and should
11 be denied. First, we all understand the current activity at Westinghouse includes high
12 industrial activity. I'm not here to attempt to have that activity halted. Rather, I support
13 retaining the current agricultural zoning designation for the surrounding acreage as a
14 continued buffer around high industrial activity to ensure that the site retains the delicate
15 balance between its industrial activity current and the rural nature of the community in
16 which it sits. Indeed, County Staff has reviewed the request for the additional 53 acre
17 conversion to high industrial, they recommend rejecting that request as inconsistent with
18 both the County's regulation and the current Comprehensive Plan. I agree
19 wholeheartedly. If in the future Westinghouse renews its request to appeal the current
20 Staff decision I urge this zoning board to convene work sessions so that you can better
21 educate yourself and the public could be better educated about the actual activities
22 included in this request. I know you gave them some additional time.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I am, I was gonna say give me your final thoughts, sir.

1 MR. REESE: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Absolutely.

3 MR. REESE: It might be appropriate to go back to the Staff and the community to
4 discuss the rezoning expansion. The community itself has already garnered its own
5 nuclear expert so that we can gain better insight ourselves into the activities that would
6 be consistent with what Westinghouse is proposing. We ask that you also be better
7 educated about the impact of this zoning request to not only that space in that
8 community, but also the health impacts, the environmental impacts, and I think that Staff
9 has done their due diligence in helping you to understand that this is not a consistent
10 request with the Comprehensive Plan.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you so much, sir. Appreciate it.

12 MR. REESE: Thank you.

13 MR. DURANT: Next we have Ms. Pamela Greenlaw.

14 **TESTIMONY OF PAMELA GREENLAW:**

15 MS. GREENLAW: Good evening, how are you? Hi, my name is Pamela
16 Greenlaw, I do not any longer live in Richland County, however, I work with an
17 environmental organization who does work with environmental justice communities in
18 Lower Richland and we've had a couple of projects. I'm gonna not go into that cause my
19 time is limited.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Could we have an address to put down?

21 MS. GREENLAW: Yes sir, I'd be glad to do that. Yes, sir. I live at 916 Ontario
22 Drive in West Columbia. Thank you. Mr. Knight has already brought up some items that
23 the public does need to understand before a final decision is made by the Commission.

1 There needs to be a public meeting before November 21st, whether it's a presentation,
2 there can be Q and A with Westinghouse and the community, and it would help the
3 community understand what's happening and get answers. Just coming and giving a
4 three minute speech is not gonna be sufficient for this. I think you might recall that
5 during the 40 year license renewal process, a good deal of pollution remains, has not
6 been cleaned up at the present site and people are very concerned about a new facility
7 when the old one retains a lot of pollution that is being removed. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out tonight. I do typically offer this at
9 other meetings as well, did someone miss the signup sheet and need to speak on this
10 subject? Okay. Alright, come on down, sir. You'll get two minutes, state your name and
11 address. Commissioner Durant will, he's gonna write it down so please give him a
12 minute.

13 **TESTIMONY OF STUART WHITE:**

14 MR. WHITE: Excuse me, I think I probably put my name on the wrong sheet so
15 you'll see my name later. My name is Stuart White, I live at 4845 Carter Hill Drive in
16 Columbia, Richland County.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Say that again, please?

18 MR. WHITE: 4845 Carter Hill Drive in Columbia, Richland County.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And your name again?

20 MR. WHITE: Stuart White.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Stuart White. Okay, thank you.

22 MR. WHITE: Thank you for the time to speak tonight, and I'll keep my comments
23 short because they'd be redundant. A lot of folks have already mentioned some of the

1 things that I was going to mention, but I wanted to point out that, again not only did
2 Richland County in their wisdom zone this area as conservation area but if you'll recall
3 this is also part of the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources Cowasee
4 Basin, the designation focus area within our region of importance. It's also a Man in the
5 Biosphere International Biosphere Reserve, the Congaree Biosphere Reserve as it's
6 noted and it's a totally important biosphere from an international perspective. So any
7 additional high industrial use in this area is not appropriate in light of those types of
8 designations and also in light of the zoning requirements that have already been placed
9 there. So we just ask that you continue to support and that the Council will take the
10 recommendation of the Staff to deny. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Okay. Last call for speakers? Yeah, come
12 on down. Alright, come on. Sure. If you will state your name and address.

13 **TESTIMONY OF NANCY PARR:**

14 MS. PARR: I'm Nancy Parr. I live at 3117 Wilmot Avenue, Columbia, South
15 Carolina. I am the environmental protection manager for the Westinghouse site and I
16 did want to provide some additional information. We have engaged with the community.
17 We recognize that in the past we did have some onsite impacts to the environment and
18 we signed a consent agreement with the State of South Carolina to clean up those
19 impacts voluntarily. And we've been aggressively working on that plan since 2019. We
20 also have worked had to build relationships with our neighbors in the community, as
21 Chris said, to make sure they feel safe and that they understand what's going on at the
22 site and understand that we care about them. We did have a community meeting on this
23 rezoning, actually we've had several. We had a community engagement board meeting

1 on August the 15th and we also spoke at the Hopkins Community Crime Watch meeting
2 on November [sic] the 14th. So we've encouraged the community to reach out to us,
3 they have my cell phone number to ask questions. We're happy to meet one on one
4 with them as we have routinely been doing.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

6 MS. PARR: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else out there that missed the signup sheet and
8 wanna talk about this? Okay. Seeing none I'm gonna open this up to the floor for the
9 Commission for discussion. And back to Staff for questions. As you're gathering your
10 thoughts I'll remind the public that this is a Planning Commission meeting for zoning.
11 We look at the current zoning and what's being requested and compare it to the
12 Comprehensive Plan and we then make a recommendation to County Council. I do
13 know lately Councilmembers have had meetings, public meetings of their own and we
14 have no control over those dates, if they happen before our meeting or not, but what
15 happens for us is we make our recommendation to them strictly based off of zoning.

16 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant.

18 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff. The site that Westinghouse is currently located
19 on, was that rezoned at some point from AG to HI?

20 MR. PRICE: Just a moment we're gonna kinda go through this.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, I always think out loud, Westinghouse was there
22 before our 2021 Land Development Code rewrite so it would've been an HI. Heavy
23 Industrial in the equivalency table? Staff is reviewing our robust Richland Maps website

1 which has a load of information and I recommend citizens to check it out, just
2 richlandmaps.com.

3 MR. PRICE: We don't specifically have the date that it was constructed,
4 Westinghouse, looks like the property was actually owned by Westinghouse going back
5 to '67 so we don't have the exact date of it being constructed. We do have building
6 information I believe, what was that '99, I believe that was shown. So that was the sale
7 history and the building history, Tommy? So no, sir, we don't, I'm sorry, we don't have
8 that specific information but there've been, as stated there have been a couple of
9 rezonings so if you were to go by what's in your packet where there was a rezoning of a
10 portion of the, of the property that's before to heavy industrial that was done in '09, so if
11 nothing that tells us that Westinghouse is, heavy industrial zoning was in place during
12 that time.

13 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. I saw a hand earlier
15 from Commissioner Johnson.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, two questions, please. One for – well
17 both for Staff, but the Applicant has made reference to, in my interpretation, attending
18 some public meetings but has Staff or elected officials hosted an official community
19 engagement session for this subject?

20 MR. PRICE: Staff has not attended an official I guess Town Hall is what, the term
21 that Council Members have used as of the date of this hearing. And typically Staff is
22 present at all of those meetings, so I think you could say that there has not been a
23 public meeting in which the Council Representative for this area has been present.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Alright second question, if you don't mind if you would humor
2 me and go to page 9, please. So on our copy the site is highlighted, my question is, yes,
3 based on the current location Staff makes a recommendation in part it not being in
4 compliance with the Plan, and I'm not sure the darker color coded area just below, how
5 far are we before we change the land use overall area within that map?

6 MR. PRICE: I think it's safe to say that you would almost have to go up, kind of
7 northwest along Bluff Road, past Montgomery Lane to get to a designation of the
8 Comprehensive Plan that may be supportive of industrial uses. Everything pretty much
9 east and kind of southeast of this, of that area along Bluff Road is, like I say the pink
10 area, Tommy if you could just point to that one, that pink area, that designation is zoned
11 for either some type of rural large lot or conservation. And again none of those
12 designations would be supportive of light industrial.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Commission, more
15 discussion?

16 MR. METTS: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Metts?

18 MR. METTS: Question for Staff. Just curious about how y'all handle public
19 meetings and stuff like that moving forward for things like this? How have you handled
20 that in the past?

21 MR. PRICE: Any public meeting that's held for a rezoning request is done at the
22 discretion of the Council Representative for the area of the request. So typically a
23 Council Member will want to have what they call a Town Hall meeting in which a facility,

1 typically a gym or a public facility is made available and the public is then allowed to
2 come and have a discussion with the applicant regarding their request, again to gather
3 more information on what is actually being proposed; something that we typically don't
4 do during the Planning Commission meeting and I think you could argue even at a
5 Council meeting where we don't get into the specifics because as we've stated
6 previously, all zoning designations have a multitude of uses and during the rezoning
7 process you cannot limit an applicant to a specific use. That zoning designation, all uses
8 that are allowed. However, at the Town Hall meetings they can be a little more specific
9 as what they're proposing. Typically you may actually have some type of depictions of
10 what they're going to do on the property and some additional discussion that's typically
11 not held in a public forum.

12 MR. METTS: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Metts. Any further discussion or
14 possible motions?

15 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

17 MR. GRADY: Question for Staff. Are we as a Commission allowed to provide
18 commentary to Council beyond just a simple approval, disapproval, deferral decision?

19 MR. PRICE: Typically you do that already, Commissioner Grady. A lotta times
20 when you go against Staff's recommendation you actually do provide some level of
21 commentary. That does not mean that you cannot do the same even if you were in
22 agreement with the request or some other means that goes along with your
23 recommendation to Council.

1 MR. GRADY: That's helpful. I think with the discussion it seems like, it seems like
2 there's a sense that this is something that requires more deliberation either by us or by
3 County Council. So I'm not sure that I have a motion but I just wanted to get [inaudible]
4 moving this forward but having recommendations attached to it that would encourage
5 Council to hold public meetings and otherwise ensure that this gets [inaudible], because
6 to be honest this feels a little bit above my pay grade.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady, my commentary would say that we
8 look at this based off the Comprehensive Plan, and if we feel like it goes along with it or
9 not, and if we disagree with Staff's approval based off of that. And then County Council
10 would have, typically they have three readings when they look at map amendments, is
11 that right?

12 MR. PRICE: In order for a request to be approved it needs three approval
13 readings, three readings of approval, of course.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I believe there's a lotta weight that goes with the
15 Comprehensive Plan. That's why we're gonna take a lot of time in 2025 as we update it.
16 So when Staff gives us a recommendation it's not their, it's not Mr. Price's
17 recommendation, it's the Comprehensive Plan's recommendation. So we hold that to
18 the value or to the scales as we look at each map amendment. I do also agree that
19 there should be public meetings where the public can speak to the applicant more, but
20 that's not what this meeting's for. Question, motions? Typically as Chair I try not to
21 make motions but I think I just gleaned my motion, so I'm gonna make a motion for
22 disapproval based off of the Comprehensive Plan. Is there a second on that and we can
23 take a vote?

1 MR. METTS: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Metts?

3 MR. METTS: Yeah, I'm working through it in my head just because I hear
4 Westinghouse and I also hear the residents. I kinda feel like, just hearing what
5 everybody's saying, just thinking through this, like maybe more discussions in the
6 community makes sense. So I don't know if I like the idea of disapproval or approval, it's
7 almost like I'm trying to figure out a way to defer it to – I just wanna know how to do that.
8 So that's why I'm stumped and looking down, just trying think through what does that
9 look like.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, could you answer that for Commissioner Metts, what
11 would that look like?

12 MR. PRICE: Well, I know typically, whether it be with the Planning Commission
13 or Council, you know, usually a point of deferral is to gather additional information.
14 Usually it's something that's either missing or something that may help you out in
15 making your decision. I think a lot of times those deferrals of these requests, I guess
16 kinda going along with Chairman Yonke was stating where what you have before you is
17 really the appropriateness of this zoning designation at this location. Of course, going
18 along with you, Commissioner Metts, I kinda get an idea of what you're looking at, but
19 being that Council is the body that actually approves and disapproves these requests
20 typically the Town Halls and needs for public meetings, again remember they're also the
21 elected officials for those areas, they're typically done by them at their discretion.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

23 MR. JOHNSON: So Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Applicant.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Sure. Come on down, Applicant.

2 MR. KNIGHT: Yes, sir.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Is there a regulatory or timing deadline associated with this
4 request that would prevent [inaudible] friendly deferral for more public input and then
5 return?

6 MR. KNIGHT: So I'll make a general statement on that. So I mean, we have
7 directly contacted Ms. Cheryl English who is our County Council Member, and asked,
8 you know, what provisions she would like for us to be involved with for community
9 engagement meetings which is why we got invited to the community Crime Watch
10 meeting. That is the extent that she has asked us to do a public meeting, but we are
11 more than willing and able to do such public meetings. From a timing perspective in
12 being able to support our customers we do have some commitments on being able to
13 get the facility up and operational for our utility providers to continue to provide, you
14 know, reliable and efficient electricity. So there is some sense of urgency and, you
15 know, we would like to, you know, work through this process, you know, as expediently
16 as possible.

17 MR. JOHNSON: I mean, we are, I don't want to say simply, but we are a
18 recommending body as the Chairman stated, you know, and so the final action would
19 be at Council. So, and we certainly can't speak for Council, but just reading the
20 sentiment so far it just seems that it might be beneficial to speed the process up.

21 MR. KNIGHT: Yes, sir.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Commission, so we still have this on the floor and our
2 options are typically to approve or deny, and a few times we have deferred. But Staff
3 has just said that that would be for more information if we choose deferral.

4 MR. JOHNSON: And if I remember correctly there's a motion on the floor. Has it
5 been seconded?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: There's no second on the motion that I made to agree with
7 the Comprehensive Plan for disapproval. So I'll say that motion again, the Chairman
8 makes a recommendation for disapproval in agreeance with the Comprehensive Plan.
9 Do we have a second? No second, that motion fails. So Staff, I mean Commission, do
10 we have a motion then?

11 MR. GRADY: I'll put a motion on the floor.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady.

13 MR. GRADY: I will make a motion to advance Case 24-042 MA to County
14 Council with a recommendation of approval, and the rationale would be that a rezoning
15 to heavy industrial would be consistent with the adjacent land use of the current
16 Westinghouse facility.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, we have a motion for approval. Do we have a
18 second? With a second we could at least hold a vote. You could vote approve or deny
19 it. And another question, this is just gonna be added here – Staff, Commissioner Taylor
20 has just joined us. Welcome.

21 *[Taylor in at 6:42pm]*

22 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: At this point does he abstain a vote? What do we typically
2 do, Mr. Price?

3 MR. PRICE: Ultimately you would hope that anybody that's making, or voting on
4 a matter or even have, making a motion, feels like they were fully informed of the
5 discussion from both, you know, what they've heard from the Applicant, what they've
6 heard presented by Staff, and also from the, those citizens who may have come in,
7 whether they be in support or disagreement with the request. Probably, if in this
8 particular case, if Commissioner Taylor who has just come in does not feel comfortable,
9 you know, being able to participate without hearing, you know, some of the previous
10 discussions then he should recuse himself for this matter.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, can you also explain to the public our packets that
12 you give us and all the information we have here, we do get this in a timely manner
13 before the meetings for our own review. True?

14 MR. PRICE: Yes. They do.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Taylor, how you doing?

16 MR. TAYLOR: I'm doing good, thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I don't want to throw you in the deep end but we're looking
18 at the Westinghouse/Bluff Road property right now.

19 MR. TAYLOR: Okay.

20 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Earlier. In the beginning of the meeting, yes.
22 Commissioner.

23 MR. JOHNSON: On this item.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No, we still do not have a second. [Inaudible] update
2 everybody.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, it feels a little – this is not our normal path. I
6 mean, usually it's fairly, it's approval or disapproval. I think there is a state of
7 unreadiness and I do think that the absence of really understanding where the
8 community's position given the magnitude of the impact of the decision, I think there is
9 [inaudible] for additional information. So if I could try a third resolution to defer the
10 matter subject to getting some public input through a Town Hall process would be my
11 motion if there's a second for that.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, the Chair recognizes a motion for deferral. Do we
13 have a second?

14 MR. METTS: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Metts. Staff, can you please
16 take a vote for deferral?

17 MR. PRICE: Alright, so we have a motion of deferral for Case 24-042 MA. Those
18 in favor of the motion, Yonke?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No.

20 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Metts?

23 MR. METTS: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Durant?

2 MR. DURANT: No.

3 MR. PRICE: Grady?

4 MR. GRADY: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: And Taylor?

6 MR. TAYLOR: I abstain.

7 MR. PRICE: Alright, so we have, that motion passes 3/2.

8 *[Approved: Johnson, Metts, Grady; Opposed: Yonke, Durant; Abstained: Taylor;*

9 *Absent: Frierson, Duffy, Siercks]*

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, would it be typical that we'll see this on our next
11 month's agenda or whenever the Applicant is ready?

12 MR. PRICE: Yes. I guess at this point as the motion has passed is there
13 something that the Planning Commission has any expectations to take place between
14 now and the December Planning Commission meeting? Between the Applicant and the
15 community or –

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson, it's your motion.

17 MR. JOHNSON: So from a rationale standpoint just for the Record I think, from
18 my vantage point I think typically, not typically, as a matter of law a change, an
19 approved recommendation that comes in, an approved map amendment regardless of
20 who [inaudible] carries with the property, so fundamentally when we look at something
21 and it's not based upon what the applicant's proposed use is as opposed to what the
22 zoning entitlement would provide. In this particular case I think we have a very
23 [inaudible] a different situation in the sense that we have a very fixed user once we put

1 that in place, but we also don't have real information as to any of the feedback
2 [inaudible] that process. [Inaudible]

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Say that last statement again in your microphone, please.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Coming back to the public, the Town Hall process and public
5 input into the process is still I think in this particular case extremely a weighty
6 component of our, our process. And so I think that's one thing that I think we need to
7 have happen before we take a motion on this.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Any other comments?

9 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair, a question.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

11 MR. DURANT: What information do we expect to have by the next meeting or
12 next time we take this matter up? I guess I direct that to Staff [inaudible].

13 MR. PRICE: I believe that was the same question Staff had.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I would direct that to the Commission, those who voted yes
15 for deferral.

16 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

18 MR. GRADY: So I, my vote to defer was in hopes that – well, had we had three
19 consecutive motions that all failed we would've been sitting here for a very long time. So
20 I think that the – well let me ask a question of Staff. Are we empowered to hold a
21 meeting to solicit further public comment on this issue in a manner that is comparable to
22 a Councilmember Town Hall or would, should we contact the Councilmember directly to
23 collaborate on this question? I think that a lot of the items that Commissioner Johnson

1 noted are relevant here, that this is, it is very hard for us to sort of put the blinders of
2 justice on when we know exactly what is going to happen on this site. And as I said this
3 does feel somewhat above my pay grade, it's not the role of Planning Commissioners to
4 play environmental commissioner. But I'm, I'm asking Staff what options we have and,
5 and how do we make use of this so that we don't come back here in December and
6 stumble over ourselves again with the same, same question, the same input?

7 MR. PRICE: I will say, I can't, I can't go back over my 20+ years and remember
8 every case but this is a new one for me in which I can't remember the Planning
9 Commissioner necessarily ever holding, wanting to hold their own Town Hall to get
10 additional information.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff. I didn't mean to cut you off but can you explain to the
12 Commission and to the public how a Council meeting, their process? I've attended them
13 and people come and are able to speak there and that's more of a public hearing. Am I
14 right?

15 MR. PRICE: You mean at their Town Halls?

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

17 MR. PRICE: I wouldn't call it a public hearing. Again, I think it's the, a number of
18 the Councilmembers have used the Town Hall as a way to just bring the request to their
19 district to allow the public to come in for an area that's within their, that district, to come
20 in and speak, to gather, to get information, to talk, you know, speak to the applicant.
21 Most of the ones, well I'll say just about every one I've gone to the applicants have
22 actually presented what the request is, and again they're able to go a little bit beyond
23 the rezoning request, they actually get into the specifics, they can talk about, you know,

1 if it was residential, the number of units, the type of homes, the price points. If it's
2 commercial or industrial they could talk about, you know, the size they're gonna put
3 there, you know, just answer the very specifics regarding their use, something that we
4 typically don't do in a format such as what the Planning Commission has before you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I misspoke, Mr. Price, I'm sorry. The next step in this
6 process so people know, typically it goes to County Council.

7 MR. PRICE: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And then people, the public has time to sign up to speak
9 there as well.

10 MR. PRICE: So it's very similar to what, you know, how you function here where
11 when it goes to the Planning Commission, excuse me, the County Council and County
12 Council receives the recommendation of Staff or the Comprehensive Plan, and they
13 also receive the recommendations of the Planning Commission. At that time applicants
14 are allowed, or excuse me, the applicant is allowed to present to County Council and
15 anyone who wants to sign up either it be for or against or just to voice their opinion
16 regarding the matter is also allowed to come and speak for two minutes. And at such
17 time that that's concluded Council will then make a decision to either, you know,
18 approve, disapprove or in some cases defer for a potential Town Hall matter. And one
19 of the practices they've also done is if they know they're going to have a Town Hall they
20 will not open up the public hearing and instead just defer prior to the public, to the public
21 hearing session being opened so that that will be available at the next meeting after the
22 Town Hall.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. I think that's what I've been trying to
2 express. It would be their point to defer so they can then ask for more information and
3 then see that they need to have a Town Hall. Where Planning Commission typically, we
4 don't host a Town Hall, it's up to the County Councilmembers to do so. So when we
5 deferred like we just did, it's just gonna go to next month, people can come back out
6 again, speak for two minutes, but then we will then need to make a recommendation,
7 we're a recommending body, it goes to them to make the final decision, we're just part
8 of the process. Any final thoughts Commission before we move on to the next case?
9 Cause we went ahead and deferred this.

10 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant?

12 MR. DURANT: This Planning Commission meeting is, is the venue for, we give
13 the public an opportunity to speak for two minutes on, related to the map amendment
14 request [inaudible]. And our job as a recommending body is to either approve or
15 disapprove the map amendment request. For some reason this one seems harder than
16 normal. I don't know why, but deferring it is not gonna get us, I'm not sure it's gonna get
17 us anything new. But again, our role is to approve or disapprove and make a
18 recommendation to the County Council and for some reason we are unable to do that in
19 this case.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Commissioner
21 Johnson?

22 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman – I don't know why I'm fighting my mic tonight –
23 but, and Commissioner I concur with you. I think just for context, to understand for you

1 and for the public, if you remember as we went navigating through the magnitude of the
2 map amendment, I mean, the Code update rewrite, update process, one of the things,
3 that process had to be approved and it had to move through but where we received
4 criticism was those who felt that they were not having an opportunity to have their
5 voices heard. And I heard a disconnect between the community voice and the
6 Applicant's voice in terms of the extent and engagement from a community process. So
7 my hope from, based on where we stood was that they could go ahead and at least
8 let's, I'm not check the box for checking the box sake, but we could engage in some
9 public process so that that could be done and at least then there's an opportunity to be
10 heard. I think there's some inevitability in the sense of the magnitude of what needs to
11 happen but I wanna make sure that there's full and fair opportunity for that public
12 process to happen and it doesn't feel like it was just rushed and put through. And that
13 was kinda of the feeling was that, the way that I heard the Applicant say, well we
14 showed up at a public meeting and that was in our mind a public engagement. As
15 opposed to the public being notified and having an opportunity to come forward. I mean,
16 obviously this site's been posted. But that was my intent in terms of bringing forth a
17 potential deferment was to provide an opportunity for a Town Hall type conversation.
18 And it may not change the ultimate action that we take but I didn't [inaudible].

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Going over to Staff.

20 MR. PRICE: Yeah, again I just wanna go back to what the motion does. I think,
21 you're right, I think you've given an opportunity for a Town Hall, a gathering between the
22 Applicant and community, so that's what you've done. It's not necessarily required by
23 the Planning Commission, you are just, you're saying, you know, you wanna just kind of

1 defer and just put a little window in there in which they could meet. However, once it
2 gets to the Council level, being that they are the legislative decision makers and that
3 they are the ones that are gonna have the final say, when they make a deferral to have
4 a Town Hall it is basically almost required, you know, especially by the Applicant if they
5 would like to at least incur favor with the Council when they do it. I would say at this
6 point, again we, you know I will go back to what I asked previously, we've deferred it but
7 for what, what is to occur from today until the next public hearing, excuse me, public
8 meeting by the Planning Commission that you expect will help you in making your
9 decision in December?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Question for Staff. Is there an additional line of text or
11 statement we need to give you since we did go against the, Staff's recommendation?
12 Usually when we do we have to give you a reason why, so we went against that so for
13 those who voted 'aye' on the deferral, do we need to state what we're looking for, is that
14 what you're asking? Cause this is still gonna be provided to County Council as our
15 recommendation of deferral.

16 MR. PRICE: No, you've deferred it which means there's no action taken by the
17 Planning Commission so it will not appear on the November 21st Zoning Public Hearing
18 agenda. It will come back to you in December. Now, Council could I believe by the Code
19 and I could flip through it, not right now, but Council could after the matter is before the
20 Planning Commission regardless if you don't take any action after 30 days they could
21 pull it and put it on their agenda, regardless whether a recommendation has been made
22 or not. But in this particular case, you know, we're not within that 30 day window.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioner Johnson, go ahead and
2 speak in the mic for what you're saying.

3 MR. JOHNSON: I was just saying, we can, we do have the ability, I mean,
4 obviously as a recommending body, is to send it with no recommendation [inaudible].

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Well we already deferred it, Commissioner Johnson, so I
6 think we should just move on to our next Map Amendment request.

7 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We voted on the deferral.

9 MR. JOHNSON: We did but I'm saying, we're still in session we could [inaudible].

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, what happens with that? We had a map amendment
11 request, we could've approved, denied it, we chose deferral, that one's in the books this
12 meeting. Are we ready to move on to the next like we typically do?

13 MR. PRICE: Yes, unless there's something else that you wanted to do. We were
14 looking, I could, I'm not sure, in which a matter's been voted on one way or the other,
15 what happens, you know, if there's a change later. I mean, right now you've voted to
16 defer it and so we have it in the books right now as this will come back on the agenda in
17 December.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Back on the agenda in December. As Chair I'm gonna go
19 ahead and move us on to 5.b.3., Case Number 24-044 MA. And I'm gonna flip it back to
20 Staff for more information. And for the public, again that goes as deferral and we'll be
21 looking at this again in December. Thank you.

22 **CASE NO. 24-044 MA:**

1 MR. PRICE: Okay. I believe we're at Case, well Item 24-044 MA, which is, the
2 Applicant is Gene Pierce. The location, there are two parcels, parcels at 1519 and 1525
3 Hardscrabble Road, tax map numbers 14600-03-25 and 14600-03-63. The Applicants
4 are requesting to rezone a combined 51.52 acres from a zoning of AG and HM to
5 Residential 3 which is R3. So Staff recommends disapproval of this request. So the
6 reason, the reason for Staff's recommendation is that we actually had nice long
7 discussion on this and looking at the parcel itself, the parcel, the two parcels actually
8 split between zoning designations. It seems one half of it is zoned neighborhood low
9 density and the other side falls within the economic development center corridor. The
10 neighborhood low density designation is not, does not support the requesting zoning
11 request as essentially the densities of the zoning designations that it would support for
12 this particular case, this is too low. And so for that reason it is not consistent with the
13 recommendation of the neighborhood low density designation. However, the proposed
14 rezoning is consistent with the objectives of the economic development center corridor
15 designation which recommends residential uses should be located along primary road
16 corridors approximately to employment centers. So Staff in looking this, just read
17 verbatim from the Staff Report, The split in designations may suggest that the area of
18 the rezoning request is transitional. Staff believes that a more thorough site level analyst
19 is necessary to determine which future land use category best aligns with the subject
20 parcels and in turn which subject parcels, districts are most supportive of the
21 recommendation and objectives of the determined Comprehensive Plan designation. So
22 again for those reasons Staff recommended disapproval. Tommy, can you go to the
23 aerial for this location? Can you go to the map? Yeah, there we go. Alright, so that's

1 perfect. So if you were to take the parcel that Mr. DeLage has highlighted and the one
2 above it and you basically draw a line down the middle then that would show where the
3 split occurs; where the parcel on the left is low density, I mean, the section on the left
4 would be low density neighborhood and the parcel, portion on the right would be, fall
5 within the economic development corridor. One of the things that we were looking at
6 was what has happened over the past rezoning requests, and those, you know, again
7 this is part of the discussion that Staff has had. So the parcel, that development that
8 you see right adjacent to it on the right, the Jasmine Place, that section, that right there,
9 that was rezoned, I think it was in, records go back to about 2003, so it was rezoned to
10 what would have been RS-MD under the previous zoning ordinance. And the
11 equivalency zoning designation under our new Land Development Code is R3, is that
12 correct, yeah. And so, then the parcel that Tommy has – there, you can highlight that
13 one if you want to, click on it – that parcel was rezoned to formerly the RSE which is
14 residential estate zoning designation. During that request Staff recommended against
15 that zoning designation because it was not in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan,
16 but it was, I think it's safe to say the applicants thought that would be something that
17 Council may be more willing to support because it essentially kind of under-zoned that
18 property. So again, that went against the Comprehensive Plan and then the parcels that
19 – will you go to those next ones, Tommy – those three parcels that are adjacent to the
20 interstate are before Council at this time. There have been a couple of deferrals and
21 Council has not made a decision on the direction of whether those parcels should be
22 approved, I believe as R4, is that correct, I believe it was R4. So that decision has not
23 been made, so Staff was really kinda unable to determine actually what the pattern of

1 development was based on the decisions ultimately by Council along this particular
2 corridor. So again, and then going out looking at the sites the parcels south of the
3 subject request are basically low density developments – what are these about an acre,
4 Tommy? Yeah, there’s typically acre sites. And the parcels left along Nina Lee, I believe
5 it’s known as Lake Elizabeth Estates, those are zoned single-family, well they were
6 zoned single-family low density or R2 now. However, a number of them have developed
7 larger than the minimum requirements for the R2 zoning designation. So as you can see
8 it gets a, the lots become a little more lower density going to the west and there are
9 some going right that really, there hasn’t been a consistent pattern established. So
10 again, so for those reasons, a lot of discussion by Staff, so we really wondered how we
11 wanted to present this to you, and again we sympathize with you from your last request,
12 but again these are some of the things that we’ve had as a Staff and so we thought it
13 would be more prudent to recommend disapproval to allow further study of this by the
14 Planning Commission before a recommendation is forwarded.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, any questions for Staff after
16 that? No? Alright Commissioner Durant, can you read the people who have signed up to
17 speak?

18 MR. DURANT: The Applicant, Gene Pierce.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Please state your name and address and
20 you’ll have to minutes.

21 **TESTIMONY OF GENE PIERCE:**

22 MR. PIERCE: Thank you. My name’s Gene Pierce. I live at 436 Running Fox
23 Road West in Columbia, South Carolina. I’m here tonight –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] Mr. Price? Start over again, sir. Thank you.

2 MR. PIERCE: Gene Pierce, 436 Running Fox Road West. Gene Pierce, 436
3 Running Fox Road West, Columbia, South Carolina. I work with Kimley Horn, we're a
4 local engineering firm. I'm here tonight on behalf of our client. As Staff has outlined
5 we're requesting a rezoning to the R3 designation. And just a couple things I'll add, they
6 covered it pretty well, but as part of the rezoning request we developed a concept plan
7 for future development. As part of that plan the existing property owner, which is the
8 church, the House of God Church would retain approximately 5.3 acres so they could
9 continue to exist on the site and operate. Additionally we go through the concept
10 planning process, we strive to be good stewards of the County's land, of the land that
11 we develop in the County, we take a pretty close look at the surrounding areas just as
12 Staff did. We looked at the Jasmine Place development, it's currently zoned R3 with the
13 new Land Development Code, that was the zoning that it was designated and that's the
14 neighborhood immediately to the east of our parcel. Immediately to the west is the
15 Crane Landing planned development and a review of those plans which are currently,
16 recently or currently under review for land disturbance permitting with the County, the
17 lots in that planned developed are in line with the R3 zoning as well; they're
18 approximately 55' wide by 120' deep which is between 6,000 to 7,000 square feet which
19 is right in the range of an R3 zoning size lot. Minimum lot size I think in R3 is 5,500 a
20 maximum of 9,000 for an average 7,260. So we took a look at both of those
21 developments, tried to model our concept plan after that since those were on either side
22 of us. We also looked at the proposed rezoning that was on y'all's agenda adjacent to
23 the interstate, which I think is at Council now. That is proposed to be rezoned to R4

1 which was recommended for approval. And the last thing I'll add in light of the
2 conversations y'all just had about public involvement, we are working with
3 Councilwoman Barron to review this with her. We have a meeting scheduled with her
4 next Tuesday, the 12th. Our past experience with her lends us to believe that she will
5 most certainly host a Town Hall meeting as I know she likes to do that. So we are willing
6 to engage with the community and are working through that process now.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

8 MR. DURANT: The next speaker is Terrence Green?

9 [Inaudible]

10 MR. DURANT: Next is Fred Brown.

11 **TESTIMONY OF FRED BROWN:**

12 MR. BROWN: My name is Fred Brown. I reside 915 Stevenson Drive in Florence,
13 South Carolina. I'm a trustee for the House of God Church and we're just here to see
14 what the outcome of this decision is. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

16 MR. BROWN: But I would like to say, the two parcels, I had some questions on
17 the green line and the yellow line. The first survey that was done, that's where you see
18 the entire, the two parcels was together in the first survey that we had to put it, put that
19 separation in there. But I don't have time to explain all the details that went with that.
20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

22 MR. DURANT: The next speaker is Cecil Banks.

23 [Inaudible]

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Anyone else signed up to speak?

2 MR. DURANT: That's it, Mr. Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, gotcha. Okay, that's everyone who has signed up to
4 speak. Anyone else in the crowd miss the signup sheet? Okay. This is now open on the
5 floor for the Commission for discussion. Discussion or motions.

6 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady?

8 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion for approval of the requested
9 rezoning, 24-044 MA, the rationale being that an R3 zoning designation is consistent
10 with the adjacent residential property as well as being broadly consistent with the
11 residential zoning on the north side of Hardscrabble Road.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. We have a motion for
13 approval. Do we have second?

14 MR. METTS: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We have a second from Commissioner Metts. With that,
16 Staff, we have a motion and a second, can you please take a vote? Motion for approval

17 MR. PRICE: Taking my notes here, sorry about that. Alright, so we have a
18 motion for approval of Case 24-044 MA. Those in favor, Grady?

19 MR. GRADY: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Durant?

21 MR. DURANT: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Metts?

23 MR. METTS: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

2 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: That motion passes – and Taylor? I'm sorry.

6 MR. TAYLOR: That's okay. Aye.

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

9 *[Johnson out at 7:15pm]*

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Public, that goes to County Council as a
11 recommendation of approval and they'll have their meeting – what's the date on that
12 Staff?

13 MR. PRICE: The 21st of November, that's out the norm because of the
14 Thanksgiving holidays; instead of the fourth Tuesday it'll be held on Thursday,
15 November the 21st, 7:00pm, Council Chambers.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. That takes us to our last case of the
17 night I believe which is 5.b.4., Case 24-045.

18 **CASE NO. 24-045 MA:**

19 MR. PRICE: Alright, the next item, again 24-0, excuse me, is Case 24-045 MA.
20 The Applicant is Alecia W. Garrick. The location is at 4540 Leesburg Road. The
21 Applicant – tax map number is 28100-02-14. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 2.99
22 acres from Homestead, HM designation, to Residential Transition which is RT. This, the
23 subject parcel falls within the neighborhood medium density future land use designation

1 according to the Comprehensive Plan. As such, as such the request is not consistent
2 with the objectives that are outlined for this designation, thus Staff recommends
3 disapproval. Also, the proposed rezoning would also conflict with the recommendations
4 of the Lower Richland Strategic Community Master Plan for this area also. You know,
5 again just a little bit more, we had last, at your meeting in October we had two cases
6 that also fell, they weren't too far from this I guess, but they both fell within the
7 neighborhood low density, excuse me, neighborhood medium density in this area of the
8 Lower Richland County. Tommy, you can just zoom out a little bit, a little bit more, yeah.
9 So that, if you know, looking at your package you can see where that yellow – Tommy,
10 are you able to kinda highlight where that is in that area, I wanna show them where the
11 future land use kinda goes – so as you can see a good portion of the area down on
12 Lower Richland, going from Leesburg Road all the way over to Air Base Road falls
13 within the neighborhood medium density designation, and again on top of that the
14 Lower Richland Master Plan which seems to basically encompass all of Lower
15 Richland, also recommends that it be more, higher dense uses in the area. Again, that's
16 not supported by the requested zoning designation of RT. So again, for those reasons
17 Staff recommends disapproval.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Questions for Staff. This looks like the broad paintbrush
19 that we talk about.

20 MR. PRICE: Correct.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Then it sounds like the map is somewhat confusing to call it
22 neighborhood medium density. In our packet on 39 when it's printed, and I can tell from
23 earlier in the meeting, the pointer can get moved around, that's a light green in our

1 packet as rural. And then you're saying that it's not dense enough is what the request is.
2 Is that what you're saying?

3 MR. PRICE: Yeah, so if you were to kinda follow, you know, Harmon Road all the
4 way down from Leesburg to Air Base Road, all of that area falls within the neighborhood
5 medium density designation according to the Comprehensive Plan.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do you see any difference from the map?

7 MR. PRICE: No, it's about the same, it was just, it's a little easier to show it to
8 you on the [inaudible] versus the map. But Tommy, if you go to the map – can you draw
9 a line basically.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So Staff, you're suggesting that this request is not dense
11 enough.

12 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. I'm eating up a lotta time today, I'm sorry.

14 Commission, questions for Staff?

15 MR. TAYLOR: I have one.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor?

17 MR. TAYLOR: I'm not sure if that was to your point or not, maybe it's just, on
18 page 38 it seems to already be [inaudible]. Is that a mistake? [Inaudible]

19 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry, it's probably the wrong color cause that property's zoned
20 HM, so thank you.

21 MR. TAYLOR: And then on page 40, is that truly, the zoning district has got AG
22 [inaudible] characteristics for AG or should it be –

23 MR. PRICE: It should be HM.

1 MR. TAYLOR: Is it HM or – is it a typo or is it the wrong –

2 MR. PRICE: No, that's – you should have the, I apologize, you should have the,
3 the land uses for the HM in there instead of the AG.

4 MR. TAYLOR: Okay.

5 MR. PRICE: I apologize, let me just mention if you, for reference if you're just
6 kinda interested in uses if you'll turn to page 31 of your packet the HM zoning
7 designation uses is there.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. I was gonna suggest that, I see that,
9 page 31.

10 MR. METTS: Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Metts?

12 MR. METTS: Wait, so time out. It's changing from, it's HM to RT, right?

13 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

14 MR. METTS: Okay. Alright, cool, I'm just getting a little lost.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, any other questions for Staff before we go to
16 our speakers? Okay, Commissioner Durant?

17 MR. DURANT: We just have the Applicant, Alecia W. Garrick.

18 **TESTIMONY OF ALECIA GARRICK:**

19 MS. GARRICK: Good evening. I'm Alecia W. Garrick. Address is 10912 Garners
20 Ferry Road, Eastover, South Carolina 29044, but we're talking about the property that's
21 listed. This is a church that we acquired and we have 2.99 acres and the only thing that
22 we're looking to do is to add outreach for our child development center.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anything else you wanna share about your property?

1 MS. GARRICK: No, that's pretty much it.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No? Okay. Thank you for coming out tonight.

3 MS. GARRICK: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant, anyone else signed up to speak?

5 MR. DURANT: No, sir.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. This is open on the floor for discussion,
7 Commissioners. We are looking at, I see a lot of us turning to page 31 now. So I'll give
8 time for that.

9 MR. PRICE: Again, we don't typically just go, identify a specific use. I think the
10 reason the Applicant is here is because the HM zoning designation does not allow for a
11 daycare facility, but the RT does.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Quick question for Staff. The suggestion is that the future
13 land use map, the Comp Plan would say this area should be denser, thus R1 or 2 –

14 MR. PRICE: R2, R3.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Right, right. Would be in –

16 MR. PRICE: R4.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We don't look at uses, we look at the land. Staff, can you
18 pull the map back up? Comments, concerns, questions? Commissioner Metts, I see you
19 thinking.

20 MR. METTS: Yeah, he did exactly what I wanted him to do [inaudible].

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Excellent, thank you. Thank you, Staff. I do notice as I drive
22 through this area it's a unique position. It's not at the corner, there's another parcel at
23 the actual corner. The Staff alluding to it needing to be denser, imagining more houses

1 there is what the Comprehensive Plan would suggest. But being familiar with the
2 character of the area I don't know if I would agree with it.

3 MR. METTS: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes?

5 MR. METTS: What do you mean by that?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The suggested change matches better than more density
7 that's being requested, yes.

8 MR. METTS: I tend to agree with that.

9 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

11 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion on Case 24-045 recommending
12 approval of the zoning change, and the reason for that being that a RT zoning
13 designation is in keeping with the surrounding land uses and would be contextually
14 appropriate.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second. We have a motion and a second by Chair here.
16 Staff, can you take a vote please?

17 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a motion for approval of Case 24-045 MA. Those in
18 favor of the motion, Grady?

19 MR. GRADY: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Durant?

21 MR. DURANT: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Metts?

23 MR. METTS: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Johnson? Taylor?

2 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

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

7 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. So this one will be Thursday at 7:00pm,
9 November 21st, County Council, recommendation of approval. Thank you.

10 MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chair, did you second?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I seconded, thank you. Looking at our Agenda, 5.c.,
12 appears to be deferred. And we would not move on to Item number 6. Other Items. I'm
13 gonna hand this over to Staff.

14 MS. WILLIAMS: Alright, good afternoon. I'm Synithia Williams, Director of
15 Community Planning and Development. Related to the Olympia Overlay, at your
16 October meeting you agreed to proceed with trying to notify and update the public on
17 the proposed guidelines. We were invited to the We Are Olympia meeting which will
18 happen on Monday, November 18th. That'll be the first time we go out and talk to the
19 community about the proposed changes and based off of the feedback from that
20 meeting we'll be looking at better ways to further reach out to the community; other
21 meetings and direct mailers. So just wanted to give you that heads up that we will be
22 attending that We Are Olympia meeting in November to give them those updates.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Is that a public meeting for the residents of the
2 area or for anyone in the county?

3 MS. WILLIAMS: I honestly do not know. I know that's their kind of neighborhood
4 meeting that they put together so I don't – it'll be my first time attending myself so I don't
5 know how welcoming they are to everybody else but we were invited as Staff. But we do
6 plan to hold additional meetings out there as well. But I can find out if they have a
7 problem if others want to attend.

8 MR. TAYLOR: What was the time?

9 MS. WILLIAMS: 5:30.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Also under Other Items we have 6.b., Work Session – LDC
13 Updates. Mr. Price?

14 MR. PRICE: Yes. You know, we previously had a work session scheduled for, to
15 go over the Land Development Code updates, unfortunately we were unable to have
16 that work session, we did not have a quorum to hold that meeting. So I think it was
17 decided at that October meeting to bring this back before the Commission at the
18 November, which is today's, November 4th meeting to determine another date for a work
19 session.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, can we spend some time to calendar and
21 put a date out there? Staff, do you have any suggestions of dates? November or
22 December even?

1 MR. PRICE: You know, we could try again to have a work session, you know, a
2 couple hours before the December meeting. I'm not sure how that works for everyone.
3 We could try that versus you coming in here on a, you know, twice in December. I
4 believe trying to do something probably right now in November, there are a lot of things
5 going on, a lot of meetings so that may be a little tight, especially for tight, especially for
6 Staff, I think at this point. But you know, right now we're looking at either, what day is
7 that, the 2nd of December or any other time that the Planning Commission is willing to
8 come and meet and we can have the work session on the updates.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, thoughts? Head nods meaning December
10 2nd?

11 MR. METTS: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, how much time do you want to carve out for this
13 meeting.

14 MR. PRICE: I think the last time we were, we shot for 4:00pm if I'm correct. I
15 think that would be appropriate. That would give us time without feeling rushed to kind
16 of go over a few items, and then there may be a few other additions to the updates that
17 will be coming before you. And you know, there may be some time for a little break in-
18 between and prior to starting the actual Planning Commission meeting on that same
19 date at 6:00pm.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, 4:00pm December 2nd. Shall we take this as a
21 motion?

22 MR. PRICE: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, the Chair makes a motion to hold a work session
2 meeting December 2nd at 4:00pm for LDC updates. Do we have a second?

3 MR. METTS: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: A second from Commission Metts. Staff, please take a
5 vote.

6 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of having the work session for the Land
7 Development Code updates on December the 2nd at 4:00pm, those in favor, Yonke?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

9 MR. PRICE: Metts?

10 MR. METTS: Aye.

11 MR. PRICE: Durant?

12 MR. DURANT: Aye.

13 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

14 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Grady?

16 MR. GRADY: Aye.

17 *[Approved: Yonke, Metts, Durant, Taylor, Grady; Absent for vote: Johnson; Absent:*

18 *Frierson, Duffy, Siercks]*

19 MR. PRICE: Alright, motion passes.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, do you have any other
21 items for discussion today under number 6? Hearing none – Staff, no?

22 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, number 7., Chairman's Report. I'll speak off my
2 notes. I think everyone's doing a great job, thanks for showing up here, having good
3 discussions. When we disagree or agree it's all good, I appreciate everyone's hard work
4 every month. I still have a dream of a Planning Commissioner training or retreat, even
5 though we're past that time, maybe we do one in the spring and we can coincide that
6 with the Comprehensive Plan updates, whatever we need to do. Cause again, I feel like
7 my time up here is going by very fast. So thank you and thanks for having me as Chair
8 this past year. I know we look at elections in December. We'll move on to number 8.,
9 Planning Director's Report.

10 MR. PRICE: Yeah, even before we, I think before I turn it over to Director
11 Williams, for 8.a., that is just a Report of Council, so the actions that they took of all
12 matters that were heard by the Planning Commission. And also before, again before
13 Director Williams speaks, do all of the Members of the Planning Commission have this
14 book, the Comprehensive Plan?

15 MR. METTS: No.

16 MR. GRADY: I don't believe I have a hard copy, no. I have an electronic version.

17 MR. PRICE: Okay, well we'll make sure that you have this, I thought everyone
18 had that. And I think just looking at today's meeting and something that we've talked
19 about as a Staff, I think one of the things that may kind of help you on page 25 and
20 within the Comprehensive Plan, that's something you can also find online, but we'll
21 make sure we get this to you in the next couple of days. It talks about the purpose of
22 the future land use map and how it's used and how it was developed. I think that may
23 kind of help you out kinda going forward with some of the cases.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Alright, so the Comprehensive Plan update, last week on
2 October 31st we, with the Planning team and the consulting group, we took them on a
3 tour of Richland County so they got to see some of the areas that you all have been
4 discussing that have had recent rezones. We talked to them about some of the
5 challenges that we face with the Land Development Code not actually being consistent
6 with the future land use map so they are aware of that. We showed them areas that are
7 prime for redevelopment areas for conservation areas that will fill in the development
8 pressures so they could take of that into consideration, so it was a really good tour and
9 it was good for them to be able to see it. We'll be holding our first stakeholder group
10 meetings, they're gonna be virtual meetings scheduled on November 20th and 21st, and
11 those are broken down by different sections. So we'll be having six one-hour
12 stakeholder meetings, they'll all be virtual within that time so we'll be talking to the
13 development community, the economic development community, the conservation
14 community, citizens, municipal groups, as well as – and I know I'm leaving out one, but
15 we're talking to six different groups and giving them about an hour to just get some
16 feedback that we'll be bringing back to the advisory committee. And so the first advisory
17 committee meeting is scheduled for November 26th, this is a tentative date. We just got
18 all of the recommended members to the advisory committee, I mentioned that to you all
19 at your last meeting, that County Council will be nominating people to serve in an
20 advisory capacity to kind of go through the feedback we get from the public and the
21 surveys related to the Comprehensive Plan and to also give their input as we update the
22 Comprehensive Plan. So we're tentatively scheduled for November 26th at 6:00pm. This
23 may change, we realize it's Thanksgiving week and once we reach out to all the

1 advisory committee members now that we've gotten their names, so we'll just hold that
2 as a tentative date of when we'll first have that. And all these meetings will also be
3 virtual. And we're also looking tentatively to have the first public forum on December
4 12th, but this will be depending on logistics. We know it's the holiday season, we've got
5 to find a location that'll work really well for a public forum. So those are to just give you
6 that heads up of what's happening with that but as those dates are finalized we'll give
7 you some more information at your next meeting.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you very much. Yes, questions? Commissioner
9 Taylor.

10 MR. TAYLOR: How many members are there on the advisory committee?

11 MS. WILLIAMS: We asked for each Councilmember to give us one name and
12 then an alternate in case somebody had to drop out or couldn't participate for whatever
13 reason, so the goal is to have 12. Knowing that we may get a couple at-large members,
14 people who may not represent a certain district, but we don't want it to go more than
15 about 15 people total.

16 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Um-hum (affirmative).

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Staff, anything else for the Planning Director's
19 Report?

20 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, that takes us to number 8/9 on the Agenda which is
22 Adjournment. The Chair would make a motion for adjournment, do I have a second?

23 MR. METTS: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Metts. Staff, take a vote,
2 actually show of hands. I see unanimous hands. Staff?

3 MR. PRICE: Yes, I apologize. Adjournment –

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Adjournment passes.

5 MR. PRICE: Yes.

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

8

9

[Meeting Adjourned at 7:40pm]