

**RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION  
December 2, 2024**

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

Called to order: 4:50pm

MR. PRICE: Chairman Yonke? Chairman Yonke? We can get started.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'd like to call to order the December 2<sup>nd</sup> Richland County Planning Commission Work Session meeting. Staff, 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: Staff, can you please take attendance for today's Work Session?

MR. PRICE: Attendance for the December 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2024 Work Session, Planning Commission, Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

MR. PRICE: Frierson? Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Here.

MR. PRICE: Duffy?

MR. DUFFY: Here.

MR. PRICE: Metts?

MR. METTS: Here.

1 MR. PRICE: Durant? Taylor?

2 MR. TAYLOR: Here.

3 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

4 MR. SIERCKS: Here.

5 MR. PRICE: Grady?

6 MR. GRADY: Here.

7 MR. PRICE: And we have a quorum.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. This takes us to number 3 on our  
9 Agenda, Additions and Deletions to the Agenda. Commissioners, Staff, are there any  
10 additions, deletions for the Work Session?

11 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That will take us right over to number 4, the 2024 Land  
13 Development Code Updates, and I'm gonna pass this over to Mr. Price.

14 MR. PRICE: Okay, so we have identified, you know, as pretty much stated in  
15 your package, certain amendments for the Land Development Code that either need to  
16 be corrected, you know, fixed grammatically or just updated, and some other issues that  
17 were kind of, we didn't, we found that with the adoption of the Code didn't address or  
18 maybe negatively addressed. So we just, we've identified just a few at this time and  
19 we'll probably over the course of the year be bringing more to you. But what we will do  
20 is just kind of go through each, each section or each number that you have on your  
21 Agenda and just talk about it in the Work Session, try to help you get an understanding  
22 of why we are proposing these changes. There will be no action needed from the  
23 Planning Commission today. You will then take this up, looks like probably February we

1 can talk about that upon the adoption of the Agenda in which we will, then you can  
2 actually take action on this and it will be forwarded to County Council for them to take  
3 action on the proposed amendments. Do you have any questions at this time?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any questions, Commissioners, for Staff? No? Okay.  
5 Continue on, Mr. Price.

6 MR. PRICE: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

8 MR. PRICE: Alright, so on page 1 of your packet for §26-1.9(f), these are for the  
9 zoning districts, it was noted that that actually, if you notice throughout the zoning  
10 districts it reads Table 26-1.9(e). So throughout, for pages 1 and 2 we just made an  
11 amendment to change that from (e) to an (f) and that would be the appropriate heading  
12 for it. And also on page 2 under the AHR-O, that's the airport restrictive overlay, correct  
13 spelling of height is gonna be proposed. And also under Table 26-1.9, which would now  
14 be known as (f), zoning district equivalencies, we needed to kinda flip what, the first  
15 column was formerly identified as former zoning district and the second was new zoning  
16 district, those needed to be reversed and so we just made, propose those changes.

17 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

19 MR. GRADY: Sorry, question for Staff on this. So in looking at the copy I have in  
20 front of me and I believe it matches what was in our packet, I see that first former is to  
21 the left and new is to the right, and then they flip and now you're saying they flip back. Is  
22 there an additional typo or am I missing something?

1 MR. PRICE: Alright, so the first column which contains the NCO, neighborhood  
2 character overlay, the MIO, military, that was formerly under the former, that was  
3 formerly identified as former zoning district but those are actually our new zoning  
4 designations. And the second column which has the CRD which is the corridor  
5 redevelopment overlay and the DBWP, Decker Boulevard Woodfield Park overlay, that  
6 was, well I guess under our current Land Development Code that is actually identified  
7 as the new zoning district. So those needed to be changed.

8 MR. GRADY: Okay, sorry. This was, this was a mistake on my part because I, I  
9 did not realize the table was going both directions and I was like, okay so question  
10 withdrawn.

11 MR. PRICE: No problem.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good question though, Mr. Grady, thank you.

13 MR. PRICE: No such thing as a bad question.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Hum-um (negative).

15 MR. PRICE: Okay. If you would turn to page 3 of your packet. So under the  
16 previous, well excuse me, under our current Land Development Code we've identified, if  
17 you will look at the sections that were struck through, for all uses whether they're major,  
18 administrative or minor, it would seem that they all had the same standards in place. So  
19 for, if you were doing a major land development the standards for the density max, the  
20 gross average, the minimum/maximum lot area, the lot width, the front yard setbacks,  
21 side yard setback, rear yard setback and building setbacks would apply across the  
22 board, whether it be a major land development or administrative or minor. It is from  
23 Staff's discussion that that was not the intent. Those sections, especially as we

1 reference a minimum and maximum lot area, actually go to, those are designed for  
2 major land developments. So if someone was coming in to do an administrative or a  
3 minor we just wanted to establish actually what their standards would be. And I'll kind of  
4 give you a, a distinction between the major and administrative and a minor, and this will  
5 kind of carry on through some of the other zoning designations we'll be looking at. So if  
6 someone has a single parcel and you want to do a single lot split, you wanna just  
7 essentially divide that in two, or as we like to say you get one cut, that is what we would  
8 deem to be an administrative subdivision. If someone had some land and they wanted  
9 to cut it, you know, really less than 50 acres but let's say somebody wanted to have,  
10 you know, create three or four additional lots, that is what will fall under a minor if they  
11 already have the infrastructure in place. Typically those lots will front on a, already an  
12 established road, you're not creating anything that's going to be needed for, that would  
13 be dedicated to Richland County for public use. Major land developments on the other  
14 hand will require the development of the site which would include the construction of  
15 roads, which would include typically a lot of detention ponds or retention ponds on the  
16 property. They will also by the Code will require a certain percentage, I believe it's 25%  
17 of open space to be dedicated from the site. So one of the things we were looking at is  
18 if someone has, and I'm just gonna kinda go pretty general here, somebody has four  
19 acres of land and they just wanted to come in and cut it in two, so create two, two acre  
20 lots, the major land development requirements, they wouldn't be a minor, excuse me, a  
21 minimum lot size or a major lot size, it would just be, we're gonna cut the lot and the  
22 minimum lot area for that would be 32,750 square feet. That kinda simplifies it for just  
23 somebody just making a general lot split versus someone coming in to do a major land

1 development in which now they would have to have a gross average of 32,750 with no  
2 lot smaller than 24,500 and no lot larger than 40,000 square feet. Again, I think as I  
3 stated to y'all, you know, we kind of look at this every day so it's a little easier for us,  
4 you know, for us. As we were talking about it if you have any questions at this time or –

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any questions?

6 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

8 MR. GRADY: So I'm just, uniformed question, I mean, is this an issue that has  
9 come up with previous development requests? Is there a rationale behind 32,750 as a  
10 specific number? I'm just trying to get a sense of –

11 MR. PRICE: No, that number comes about based on the density. You know,  
12 once you do the calculations that is the minimum that's required to meet that density for  
13 this zoning designation. Yeah, it's kinda one of those things and, where you know, we  
14 just kinda picture someone coming in saying, hey I wanna subdivide my property and  
15 we say, okay but one lot has to be 24,500 which means the other one has to be at least  
16 40,000 so you can have an average, but that wasn't the intent for, you know, for just  
17 someone to subdivide their property either for family members or, you know, for some  
18 other reason, just essentially an administrative or a minor development. This, the  
19 section that you have before you that's currently in our Land Development Code really  
20 was designed for major land developments and so we just wanted to make a distinction  
21 in our Code for this.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

1 MR. PRICE: Okay. Also, I'm sorry go back, Tommy. So at the bottom, and I  
2 apologize, we're still learning the work when there are links when you make copies, we  
3 get the error!referencesource.found. That actually, that easily can be taken out and it  
4 will be taken out when this comes before you. But the intent was to remove §26-6.3(c)  
5 for lots from this section, and mainly – and Tommy can pull that page up if you don't  
6 mind – the reason why that's being removed and it's being removed from other sections  
7 also, is because this is going to apply regardless of the, regardless of whether it's a  
8 minor or major land development or an administrative. So the §26-6.3(c) for lots which  
9 actually, which identifies, you know, that all lots have to conform to the requirements of  
10 the designation in which they are under – oops, sorry. Okay, sorry.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, so are you saying this is a redundant statement?  
12 That's why it's being removed?

13 MR. PRICE: No, it's really not necessary because it's going to apply throughout  
14 the Code, so just having it in that particular section is, it wasn't necessary.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Um-hum (affirmative).

16 MR. PRICE: So that was the only reason why we just took it off. Because people  
17 would just be flipping back and forth looking and it's just, it's just part of the normal  
18 design standards for development. Okay? Alright, flip to page 5 which is §26-3.3(e),  
19 this is the R2 or Residential 2 District. So two of the changes that we are proposing, one  
20 under the General Description, manufactured homes was identified and that was kind of  
21 a carryover from the original Land Development Code that was proposed, but upon  
22 adoption of the Land Development Code manufactured homes are not permitted uses  
23 within the R2 zoning designation so we just wanted to remove that from the general

1 description. As you go down under the Density and Dimensional Standards, basically  
2 the same thing as we previously looked at under R1. We just made a distinction  
3 between what is a major land development and what would be an administrative or a  
4 minor land development. More for clarity, and the land surveyors are very, you know,  
5 very happy about having this information before them, or at least they will be. And we  
6 also made that same, we are also recommending the same removal of §26-6.3(c) from  
7 this section as again it would apply automatically.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: For the second line, gross average between major and  
9 minor, is that just a math thing where it's 14,500 in the left column, in the right column  
10 it's 14,520?

11 MR. PRICE: It is not. So 14,500 is what was adopted and so we kept that under  
12 major, but in doing the calculations 14,520 is actually the minimum lot size for, based on  
13 the three acre, excuse me, yeah on the density of three.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's not gonna be a problem?

15 MR. PRICE: That's not gonna be a problem.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

17 MR. PRICE: Yeah, we spent a lot of time with the calculators on these things  
18 also. Page 7, again same request or same proposal that we have before you in which  
19 we just make a distinction between major, administrative and minor for the Residential 3  
20 designation.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson.

1 MR. JOHNSON: I apologize but [inaudible] cross referencing this text to what I  
2 normally might [inaudible] where you've got the chart [inaudible] property type, like  
3 under, for example, my disconnect is, typically I'm [inaudible] R1 the district includes  
4 and it specifically says single-family detached, but as you transition to R2 it includes  
5 residential dwellings. But when you, which to me would then say that from a property  
6 type standpoint then you might be able to transition to townhomes, ext., but when you  
7 look at the minimum [inaudible] lot width of 50 then that would not, you would not  
8 necessarily have attached under that.

9 MR. PRICE: And under the matrix, the land use matrix of our Code single-family  
10 detached are the only residential uses that are currently allowed in the R2, the R3 and  
11 the R4 zoning designations. Townhomes, multi-family, quadra-plexes, triplexes are only  
12 allowed in the R5 and R6 zoning designations. And also –

13 MR. JOHNSON: So our change [inaudible] as part of our changes.

14 MR. PRICE: Yes, upon the adoption of the Code yes, sir. Yes, [inaudible] on  
15 board. And also kinda flip it around, R5 and R6, the zoning designations do not allow for  
16 single-family detached.

17 MR. JOHNSON: And so what I would call patio homes then what, that would then  
18 be under R5 and R6?

19 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. If, if those -

20 MR. JOHNSON: If those are detached.

21 MR. PRICE: If they're not attached then they would not be allowed. Because  
22 another thing –

23 MR. JOHNSON: Cause it wouldn't fit the definition for R1, 2 or 3.

1 MR. PRICE: No, it wouldn't fit, so essentially it would not be a permitted use.  
2 And one of the things that was taken out of, during the adoption of the Land  
3 Development Code was what we call cluster housing, so a lotta times the patio homes  
4 that you're referring to fell within those categories and so that was also taken out of the,  
5 from the, that was not a carryover from our previous Land Development Code so those  
6 uses are not permitted.

7 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible] Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: It's a good discussion, go ahead Commissioner Johnson.

9 MR. JOHNSON: So while we don't have the same pricing pressures as Beaufort,  
10 Dorchester, Charleston, we still at this point don't have any carve outs for developments  
11 that are specifically targeting any particular area median income.

12 MR. PRICE: No, sir it doesn't seem that way. I guess – well, you know, I think  
13 that's what you're bringing up is, as I stated earlier, we were going to look to introduce  
14 some amendments to our Code. This one's more of a correction, this particular version  
15 we have before you is more of a correction. I do believe that a further discussion may  
16 be needed to discuss whether some of the uses or the development standards that we  
17 have within our designation to allow certain uses is warranted. And so that's something  
18 that we may be, we will need to discuss later on.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Did that answer your questions? Yes? Good, thanks  
21 Commissioner Johnson.

22 MR. PRICE: Yeah and again, I just wanna make sure of something – those are  
23 things that, you know, as a Staff that we've talked about; how we wanna bring these

1 forward to you, we'll just, you know, kinda get this one going first and then we'll look into  
2 those other issues that you've been bringing up. And also we would like to hear from the  
3 Planning Commission Members also of future changes you would like to see us to look,  
4 to address and bring before you.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, sir.

6 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You can move on, please.

8 MR. PRICE: Okay. Again, so we were on Residential 2 and, excuse me,  
9 Residential 3, but again the change is very similar. So on page 9, so during the adoption  
10 of our, of the current Land Development Code we went with the, for many of our zoning  
11 designations we went with an equivalency. So if you were R1, I'm sorry, R1, RS-LD,  
12 what was the last one? Yeah, I apologize, I've been through a couple of codes now.  
13 But, so the residential low density –

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: RSE.

15 MR. PRICE: RSE became R1. What was RS-LD became R2. RS-MD became  
16 R3, RS-HD became R4, and so on. We had a zoning designation that was called  
17 Manufactured Housing and it was identified as the MH designation. And it basically is  
18 exactly what it sounds like, it was a district allowed for essentially individually  
19 manufactured homes. Of course, stick-built homes could also be built within that district.  
20 It would also allow for manufactured homes, excuse me, manufactured home parks  
21 also. During the creation of, I guess the equivalency table the MH designation fell into  
22 the, what is the currently the R3. The R3 zoning designation does not allow for

1 manufactured homes. So really the only place for manufactured homes would be either  
2 in an AG, HM or the RT, is it R1 also, and I believe the R1.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Back on page 1 of your packet MH, manufactured homes,  
4 is MA.

5 MR. PRICE: Right, because it was, it was, it essentially became the R3 zoning  
6 designation.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I believe it was placed in a [inaudible].

8 MR. PRICE: So we don't have, so what happens is we don't have a single-family  
9 use designation for manufactured homes. However, there are a number of  
10 developments in Richland County in which were formerly zoned MH and most of the  
11 homes in those areas, I mean, most of those parcels in those areas were, are occupied  
12 by manufactured housing. So the only way in the, what is now the R3 zoning  
13 designation that a manufactured home can be placed on that property is if it's a  
14 replacement. But if it's new, say you had a vacant lot and you wanted to put a  
15 manufactured home there you would not be able to, even though you could look around  
16 and everybody else in that area has a manufactured home on their property. So we kind  
17 of saw that as a problem. And for those of you who, also who were on the Planning  
18 Commission when we first, when we were still working on the Land Development Code,  
19 I believe that you had said that that was a bit of an issue for a lotta people that within  
20 the single-family designations that manufactured homes would be allowed, especially  
21 people within the existing subdivisions or neighborhoods. So that became an issue and  
22 then, of course, it was removed. What Staff is proposing is to allow manufactured  
23 homes within the R3 zoning designation as a special requirement. And if you would turn

1 to page 11 of your package, that would be the criteria for the special requirement, in  
2 which in the R3 district the following standards would apply: Manufactured homes are  
3 permitted in the R3 zoning designation where there are manufactured homes on lots  
4 that comprise 50% or more of the lots on the same side of the block as the lot in  
5 question. So what this does is allows if, you know, you go into a particular area and  
6 there are manufactured homes around and 50% of the lots on that block are comprised  
7 of manufactured homes you would be able to place one there. And what that also does  
8 is kind of keeps, kind of keeps, let's say you have an existing subdivision of homes,  
9 stick-built homes, single-family detached structures, that you would, that won't allow  
10 manufactured homes to be built on those lots even though they have the R3 zoning  
11 designation.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This would build consistency and unity –

13 MR. PRICE: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: - in the neighborhoods.

15 MR. PRICE: Yeah, if you're familiar with Royal Pines subdivision, is anybody  
16 familiar with that, right off of, it's off of Two Notch Road near the Village of Sandhills. I  
17 think Mr. DeLage is gonna pull it up.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Map is pulling up.

19 MR. PRICE: Yes. So I think this is a good example of this area. So as Tommy's  
20 kind of showing, okay so that area in green which is Royal Pines Estates, that is a, that  
21 entire development is primarily manufactured homes. But again right now if somebody  
22 wanted to replace a manufactured home they could within six months, that's what the  
23 Code allows. However, if there's an existing lot that's vacant or a home was removed

1 more than six months ago, they would not be able to put a manufactured home on the  
2 property but instead they could build a house. And so from a practicality standpoint,  
3 you know, most people aren't gonna build a house in an area that's primarily  
4 manufactured housing. So what we're proposing hopefully will allow manufactured  
5 homes to be placed, you know, in areas where that's, where it's primarily comprised of  
6 manufactured homes.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any questions for Staff? Commissioner Johnson?

8 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Price, just curiosity question, the  
9 example that you've shown it looks like it would, that that would be compliant with the  
10 setback and minimum lot size and width requirements under R3 but just my gut just  
11 seems to say that if there was a mobile home on the parcel and they cannot come back  
12 with it that they're gonna need some type of variance in terms of either setback or lot  
13 width and lot coverage; not in this particular, I mean, these lots appear to be of a  
14 sufficient size, but [inaudible].

15 MR. PRICE: Scale one of these lots if you don't mind.

16 MR. JOHNSON: I mean, I'm just, you know, the example that we're showing  
17 [inaudible] seem to be compliant but I just [inaudible] lots that I see mobile homes on,  
18 manufactured housing on [inaudible] the owner would have difficulty complying with the  
19 new Land Development Code for [inaudible].

20 MR. PRICE: I mean, I think there are some lots that that might be the case. In the  
21 former, the MH zoning designation that was, again not carried over from the previous  
22 Land Development Code, the minimum lot size was, just going off the top of my head,  
23 it's like 7,600 and some change, in which actually would have been close to the medium

1 density designation for single-family housing. So it actually would've allowed for a  
2 single-family home to be built. So you know, this is another section that has come  
3 across our, that has come before Staff in which someone wanted to put a manufactured  
4 home there and had they done it prior to March 1<sup>st</sup> of this year they would've been able  
5 to do it. However, as of March 1<sup>st</sup> they weren't able to put a manufactured home there  
6 but yet they didn't feel it was practical for them to build a single-family, you know, stick-  
7 built home on that property. So this is another one of the ones that came before us that  
8 we realized that we need to make certain amendments to the Code.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: As I read on page 9 on the table, manufactured homes are  
10 similar with the special requirement for RT, R1, now you're suggesting R3. Then we  
11 also have manufactured home park which is under R5.

12 MR. PRICE: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any more questions for Staff? Commissioner Grady?

14 MR. GRADY: Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. So I'm just looking at this, this excerpt on  
15 page 10 and it says, In the R1 and R2 Districts the following standards apply in addition  
16 to the standards in subsections (a) through (c) above, but as we just discussed R2 is  
17 not, manufactured is not supposed to be permitted in R2 Districts or?

18 MR. PRICE: What that is is called a good catch Commissioner Grady. And so  
19 we'll be, that section would need to be amended to only talk about the R1. Thank you.  
20 Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady.

22 MR. PRICE: On page 13 as we continue on, we did not have a minimum lot area  
23 under the R4 zoning designation and so, you know, rather than always having to do

1 calculations, excuse me, for the public they have to do calculations to try to figure out  
2 what, you know, what size lot can they create, we just wanted to simplify it and put  
3 down what the minimum lot area is and that is, of course, based on the density for that  
4 zoning district.

5 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: So I saw this and I did some quick math. So 4840 is, so it seems to  
8 me that that number certainly needs to be the average, but is there a reason why every  
9 lot has to be that size? Basically the 4840 is  $1/9^{\text{th}}$  of an acre and we see the maximum  
10 density is nine units per acre, but certainly there's a, there's a possibility that a  
11 developer could have lots of various sizes that complies with the maximum density but  
12 could potentially have a lot area that is smaller than 4,840 square feet. So I guess I'm  
13 asking is this, this feels like it's a restriction that doesn't, I guess I'm missing the intent of  
14 why we need to have a minimum here. So question of Staff.

15 MR. PRICE: Again, this provides a little clarity for, not for a major land  
16 development, and maybe that's something we can look at for a major land development.  
17 I get what you're alluding to now, but if someone just wanted to come in and add a  
18 parcel that was zoned R4, they wanted to just do a simple subdivision of it, what this  
19 does is actually establishes what that minimum lot size is. So again, we can go back  
20 and again like what you're saying create another column for major land developments  
21 and so in that one we would then need to either look at, is there going to be a minimum  
22 for that or, and should there be a maximum for, in the R4 designation. But again just as  
23 I was stating to Commissioner Johnson a while ago, those are some of the things we've

1 seen and we've identified but we thought we would take those up at a later time when  
2 we have a little more time to really kind of talk through these things and – because most  
3 of the changes I think that we are making, I don't think that most of the public is, would  
4 find issues with. I think that once you start going into numbers and lot sizes and uses  
5 you'll probably hear a little more and so we'll probably need to address that differently  
6 than we would with any of these changes.

7 MR. GRADY: Okay, thank you.

8 MR. PRICE: Page 15, very similar to what we just did for the R4 within the R5,  
9 we've established what the minimum lot area is. However, if you take note we do kind of  
10 have a, clause, okay I'll go with that, number 2 under Notes number 2 where it says,  
11 Two family dwellings shall be permitted on a non-conforming lot subject to §26-7.4.  
12 Tommy, you can pull that up if you don't mind, 26-7.4. So the reason behind that, and  
13 again these are things that I don't, I don't think these were intended, that based on the  
14 density in the R5 zoning designation it doesn't allow, the R5 zoning designation does  
15 not allow for single-family detached structures. It only allows for at least at a minimum a  
16 duplex or a two-family unit. One of the things that we found is there are existing lots that  
17 are zoned R5 that don't meet these minimum requirements so if you just base it just on  
18 the density you could not, you couldn't put a two-family unit there but you also can't put  
19 a single-family because the zoning designation doesn't allow it. So that note that we  
20 have at the bottom states that if there is a non-conforming lot that's subject to §26-7.4,  
21 which Mr. DeLage has pulled up, you can place a two-family unit there provided you can  
22 still meet all the required setbacks for that designation. And there may be a case where  
23 someone does have some setback issues and they would then be eligible to go to the

1 Board of Zoning Appeals for a Variance. So just for note, you couldn't go to – the  
2 reason why we had to include this section is because you can't go to the Board of  
3 Zoning Appeals for a Variance request for a use that's not permitted within the Code so  
4 the Board would not be able to take that up. Alright, any questions?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone? [Inaudible]

6 MR. PRICE: Okay, on page 17 under the R6, very similar to what we have done  
7 for the R5 or proposal for the R5 in which we established a minimum lot area. And we  
8 also put in a little note for when a, for a non-conforming lot the conditions in which a, a  
9 two-family dwelling could be placed on that property. Alright. So we'll move on. Page  
10 19, under the Military Installation Overlay District, we just had to make a change  
11 because the section was incorrectly identified as 26-3.7(g). The correct section is 26-  
12 3.8(g). So those, kind of a simple change to the Military Installation Overlay District to  
13 correctly identify it.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, just a minor admin change.

15 MR. PRICE: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: For that. Okay, thanks.

17 MR. PRICE: And that goes all the way through to page 27. Okay. Alright so on  
18 page 27 as you go down to, it's under 26-4.2(d)(2)(5), in this case (d) is gonna be 26-  
19 4.2(d)(2)(5)(D), it says, In the R1 and R2 districts the following standards would apply,  
20 similar to what we just discussed, the R2 zoning designation should not apply, should  
21 not be, is incorrectly identified here because that district does not allow for  
22 manufactured homes. So we would strike that from this section.

23 MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible]

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Microphone please, Commission Taylor? Thanks.

2 MR. TAYLOR: I was just saying that [inaudible] same district, right?

3 MR. PRICE: Right.

4 MR. TAYLOR: Drop the S?

5 MR. PRICE: I'm not sure what happened there cause if you look at it it looks like  
6 it was struck through so I'm not sure if that S was there before –

7 MR. TAYLOR: I follow you.

8 MR. PRICE: Yes, there was an S there so I just, that actually was struck through  
9 so it's –

10 MR. TAYLOR: I don't have my glasses.

11 MR. PRICE: I understand. Okay, page 29. Tommy, can you go back to – so this  
12 section, I'm sorry, under 26-4.3(b) General Standards for All Accessory Uses and  
13 Structures, under (b)(2), location, (b)(2)(c), it states here, Rear Yard, accessory uses  
14 and structures are permitted in rear yards provided an accessory use or structure  
15 should not be located within five feet of any property line, provided that their placement  
16 – so what we're proposing is the removal of the line that says, provided an accessory  
17 use or structure shall not be located within five feet of any property line, and replace that  
18 with, provided that their placement shall comply with the minimum required side yard  
19 setback in the district in which they're located. Reason for that, Tommy can you go to  
20 the jump drive? Go back, yeah right there, accessory uses, setbacks. Okay, so I'll give  
21 you an example, and I just randomly chose a district so I chose the RT or the  
22 Residential Transition District, so the box on the right, excuse me, on the left is what  
23 the, the A, the box with the A which will stand for accessory structure, that would be

1 what the Code currently allows. So you have to be at least 20' from the side but you can  
2 go all the way up to five feet, up to the five foot mark on the rear. You know, especially  
3 when you're looking at areas, I don't think that that was the intent for it to be that far, the  
4 close to the rear property line. And how we've always kind of enforced this, and I'm  
5 going on 20+ years, all of our Codes have read this way in which your side yard for that  
6 district for an accessory use established what the setback would be for both the side  
7 and the rear. And so the box that you see in the red which is on the right is what our  
8 proposed version of the Code would be in which we would now show if the side yard  
9 setback in the RT is 20', so it would be 20' from the side and 20' from the rear, and it  
10 kinda keeps it relatively uniform in that area, especially when you're talking about the  
11 distance from a property line. Questions?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any questions?

13 MR. PRICE: Alright, and we get to the last proposed amendment on page 31. So  
14 under Temporary Events, Temporary Events were only allowed, or currently only  
15 allowed in basically commercial zoning designations, basically all commercial zoning  
16 designations. They are not allowed in any of the former rural zoning designations which  
17 would be the AG, HM or the RT, and they are not allowed in any single-family zoning  
18 designation. So what we're proposing is to allow them in the AG and the HM  
19 designations. And the reason behind that, and – yes, the reason behind that is because  
20 we get a number of Temporary Event applications, you know, during the year and I'm  
21 actually reflecting on years for me having to deal with these. And being that a majority of  
22 Richland County is still a lotta, you know, formerly the rural zoning designations where  
23 you have people that want to use things such as, you know, fields or some of the parks,

1 many of our recreation parks so, like for example the Sweet Potato Festival, anybody  
2 familiar with that one, North Springs Park which is actually off Clemson Road, they're all  
3 zoned either AG or HM. And so what we're proposing is by just putting in, allowing  
4 temporary events to take place in those zoning designations they would still be able to,  
5 you know, come through the County and be approved, cause right now they would not  
6 be allowed.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Does that include temporary structures for the event?

8 MR. PRICE: Yes. So just kinda going through the process in which any time  
9 someone applies for a temporary event they have to provide us kind of layout including  
10 number of people that would be working the event, how many people they anticipate  
11 coming to the event, what structures would be there, whether it be tents or a stage, and  
12 we take that information and we share it with the Fire Marshal, the Building Department  
13 and also the Sheriff's Department in which we go back and we look through to make  
14 sure all requirements are being met for, based on their respective reviews.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] question is where you would find Halloween  
16 stores or firework stands?

17 MR. PRICE: No. No, sir.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

19 MR. PRICE: No, sir. Not, the Halloween stores are to be always in a commercial  
20 area.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: See, that's my question, are they gonna start popping up in  
22 HM now if we do this?

1 MR. PRICE: Usually the Halloween stores already wanna be within a building so,  
2 and if you know a large –

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: More so firework stands.

4 MR. PRICE: Yes, firework –

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Where they come and park it in the Walmart parking lot  
6 and –

7 MR. PRICE: Well they do.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: They do.

9 MR. PRICE: Yes. I mean, if someone wanted to use one of the other sites, again  
10 they would need to give us enough information so that during our reviews we can  
11 ensure that there's a level of safety, whether the location of the structure, the access,  
12 whether impeding any structure, where the pedestrians may come to actually purchase  
13 any of the, you know, the materials that they're selling, so we will still have some  
14 oversight over that.

15 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, question Commissioner Taylor?

17 MR. TAYLOR: Is temporary defined in the Code?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Like length of temporary?

19 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: In time?

21 MR. PRICE: Not necessarily. It gives more examples. So, and Mr. DeLage I'm  
22 sure he'll pull that up, but under a Temporary Event it's defined as, Temporary uses  
23 such as circuses, carnivals, fairs, festivals and religious events in a temporary structure

1 and similar types of events. Now I can tell you and I'm sure it's a concern, like more how  
2 long can somebody there. If I were to go back and pull every temporary event that  
3 we've approved over the last, over the last few years at least, let's say five, 10 years,  
4 they typically are day events or at worse may be a two-day event. You know, you don't  
5 have, like a weeklong event that takes place. We haven't had, we haven't had the old  
6 revival -

7 MR. TAYLOR: The tent revivals?

8 MR. PRICE: - yeah, we haven't had that in quite a while to compare.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you Mr. Price. Anything else?

10 MR. PRICE: No, I believe that's it unless y'all have any questions.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, any questions before we wrap up the work  
12 session?

13 MR. PRICE: Yeah, so just on, you know, again these are some of the things that  
14 as Staff we noted and these are, most of the recommended changes that we are  
15 proposing are things that we come across on a day to day basis, you know, just dealing  
16 with the public and, oh we didn't realize that was an issue and these are things that  
17 need to be addressed. But we do want to make sure we work with the Planning  
18 Commission, if y'all can come up with some other things that we should be addressing  
19 in our Code, that the Code maybe just didn't address at all or should be amended in  
20 some way, please if you would let us know we'll be more than happy to take those into  
21 consideration and prepare some amendments based on your suggestions.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I suggest maybe in our future Planning Commission  
2 meetings some other things to discuss, we can continue to discuss the LDC updates. I'd  
3 like to [inaudible] temporary uses and have more time to ask questions about that.

4 MR. PRICE: You said the temporary uses?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah.

6 MR. PRICE: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And structures, yeah. First time that I really focused in on  
8 this in our Code and what could that mean, so. That's all. Any other comments,  
9 concerns, Commissioners? Okay. Is that it from Staff on Item Number 4 in this Agenda  
10 for the Work Session?

11 MR. PRICE: That is it, sir.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. So Item 6 (sic) Additional Discussion? Or 5? We  
13 seem okay? Alright. Item 6, Adjournment for the Work Session. Do we need to do that  
14 as a motion? Motion of hands to adjourn the Work Session? It appears to be  
15 unanimous.

16 MR. PRICE: Yes.

17 *[Approved: Yonke, Grady, Johnson, Taylor, Siercks, Metts; Absente for vote: Duffy;*  
18 *Absent: Frierson, Durant]*

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you. Work Session concluded.  
20

21 *[Work Session Adjourned at 5:45pm]*