

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 2, 2025

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

Called to order: 6:01pm

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, are you ready?

MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. I'd like to call to order the June 2nd, 2025 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. Staff, please confirm the following: in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to the news media, persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board located in the county administration building. Is that correct?

MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

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

MR. DELAGE: Alright, Metts?

MR. METTS: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

2 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

3 MR. SIERCKS: Here.

4 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Here.

6 MR. DELAGE: And just for the Record, Taylor? Duffy? Alright, you have a
7 quorum.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the
9 June 2nd, 2025 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning
10 Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer our time
11 to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council. Our
12 recommendations are to approve or deny Zoning Map Amendment requests. Per Title
13 VI, Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of Laws* Planning Commission may also prepare and
14 revise plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of unincorporated
15 portions of the County. The County's Land Development Code rewrite process
16 conducted last year is an example of this. Once again, we are a recommending body to
17 County Council and they will conduct their own public hearing and take official votes to
18 approve or deny map amendments and text amendments on a future date to be
19 published by the county. Council typically holds Zoning Public Hearings on the fourth
20 Tuesday of the month. Please check the county's website for updated agendas, dates
21 and times. Please take note of the following guidelines for today's meeting. Please turn
22 off or silence any cellphones. Audience members may quietly come and go as needed.
23 Applicants are allowed up to two minutes to make comments. Citizens signed up to

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

14 *[Duffy in at 6:03pm]*

15 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. We'll go ahead to number 4., which is Approval of
17 the Minutes. Staff provided the Commission with copies of the transcripts of the
18 Commission's May 2025 meeting Minutes. Do Commissioners have any comments or
19 concerns regarding these transcripts? Okay, hearing and seeing none, the Chair would
20 makes a motion to approve the Minutes. Do I have a second?

21 MR. DURANT: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Thank you. Staff, can
23 you please take a vote?

1 MR. PRICE: Those in favor of the approval of the May 5th, 2025 Minutes, Yonke?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

4 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

6 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

7 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

8 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

9 MR. PRICE: Metts?

10 MR. METTS: Aye.

11 MR. PRICE: Durant?

12 MR. DURANT: Aye.

13 MR. PRICE: Taylor? Siercks?

14 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Grady.

16 MR. GRADY: Aye.

17 MR. PRICE: Alright, the motion passes.

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

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. This moves us to item number 5., which
21 is our Consent Agenda. I like to explain the Consent Agenda. It's an action item that
22 allows the Commission to approve Road Names and Map Amendment requests where
23 the Staff recommends approval, and no one from the public is signed up to speak

1 against the amendment. Now instead of Staff approval it's compliant to the Comp Plan.
2 Or no Member of the Commission is in need of further discussion of the request. So our
3 Case Number 1 in our Agenda is deferred so we'll leave that on the Consent Agenda as
4 deferred. Case Number 2 is compliant with the Comp Plan and there is no one signed
5 up to speak against it. So the Chair makes a motion to pass the Consent Agenda with,
6 verifying there are no road names, yep, 5.a. and b.1. and 2.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Got a second. Who was that? Alright, Commissioner
9 Johnson. With a second for the Consent Agenda can the Staff please take a vote?

10 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the Consent Agenda – and it would just be
11 for the second case, correct, Case 25-021 MA.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, for approval.

13 MR. PRICE: Okay. Alright, those in favor, Yonke?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

16 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

17 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

18 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

19 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

20 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Metts?

22 MR. METTS: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Durant?

1 MR. DURANT: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

3 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Grady.

5 MR. GRADY: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Motion passes.

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

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thanks Staff. This will move us right along to 5.b.3.,
10 Case No. 25-022, and I'll pass it to Staff for more information.

11 **CASE NO. 25-022 MA:**

12 MR. PRICE: Alright, this first item is Case 25-022 MA. The Applicant is Josh
13 Williamson. The Applicant is requesting to rezone parcels, it'll be three parcels along
14 Bluff Road and Joe Louis Drive which would be 1822 and 1838 Bluff Road, and 1508
15 Joe Louis Road. Again, 8.16 acres from GC and R5 to MU3. It's been determined that
16 the request is noncompliant with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. It
17 does, excuse me, according to the Comprehensive Plan the mixed residential, high
18 density designation provides that commercial and office development should be located
19 approximate to or within activity centers and in mixed use corridors. The subject parcels
20 are not located in an activity center nor are they located in a mixed use corridor. Thus,
21 again the recommendation based on the Comprehensive Plan is, it's been determined,
22 excuse me, according to the Comprehensive Plan that it is noncompliant with the
23 recommendations and objectives.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you Staff. Commissioners, do we have any
2 questions for Staff? Okay, hearing none, Commissioner Frierson, anyone signed up to
3 speak?

4 MS. FRIERSON: Yes, we have Jarvis Morant.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down, sir. Either podium is open. And start with
6 your name and address and you'll have two minutes.

7 **TESTIMONY OF JARVIS MURANT:**

8 MR. MURANT: My name is Jarvis Murant, my address is 638 Sugar Hill Lane
9 29201. I think my question was answered back, because it says it's not compliant it
10 means it may not go through? But my concern would have been with the changing of it
11 how would that really affect the community because I don't know how, right now it
12 seems to be, like commercial and would that be able to allow more housing? But my
13 understanding of mixed use means it would have to have certain things within all of it to
14 be considered use as far as building, correct? So I don't know if I, that was a question.

15 MR. PRICE: Yeah –

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead, Staff.

17 MR. PRICE: Yes, so I'll interject. It sounds like Mr. Murant?

18 MR. MURANT: Yes.

19 MR. PRICE: Am I saying that correct? It sounds like he has some certain
20 questions and I believe that Councilwoman English who represents this area will have a
21 town hall on this and that will allow the Applicant and the community to come in and
22 actually have a little more dialogue regarding what is being proposed and what some of
23 their concerns may be.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we have a date on that yet?

2 MR. PRICE: I don't have a date. I'll be happy to get your information and we can
3 give you a call.

4 MR. MURANT: Okay. Alright, thanks. That helps a lot.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, well thanks for coming down today. Anyone else to
6 speak, Ms. Frierson?

7 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Murant was the only person who signed up to speak.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. As we discussed this is a recommendation to
9 County Council. Commission, this is on the floor for discussion and questions again to
10 Staff. I always feel like I can read Commissioner Johnson's face and I wanna hear from
11 him.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Well Mr. Chairman, I think I was just, my face was struggling
13 with the fact that we're not gonna have a, the input meeting after our action but I wasn't
14 sure if the speaker understood that while that is Staff's recommendation we are charged
15 with making a decision. So if you had an opinion one way or another this is the time to
16 do so.

17 MR. MURANT: I don't have enough to go off to make an opinion.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you.

19 MR. JOHNSON: I just wanna make sure the public had a chance to –

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Exactly.

21 MR. JOHNSON: - express themselves.

22 MR. PRICE: Yes, excuse me Mr. Chair, just –

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

1 MR. PRICE: - for clarification, it is not Staff's recommendation.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

3 MR. PRICE: It's –

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: It's the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan, 2015
5 which we are renewing, working on for 2025.

6 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, thank you.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Well, as us volunteers, we care about our county, this is
12 our opportunity to discuss this so it's open on the floor. What are our thoughts about
13 this? Staff, could you clarify some differences we would find on this parcel versus how
14 it's zoned already? With it being mixed use going from GC. My understanding is as you
15 zone up more uses are allowed. So does this actually restrict the lot a little bit?

16 MR. PRICE: So, you know, of course we try to include the Table of Permitted
17 Uses for what the current zoning is and also what the proposed zoning is also. In your
18 packet on page 21 and page 22, page 21 has the General Commercial – I apologize it
19 looks like we don't have the R5 in currently for this, but we also, but we do have what
20 the zoning designation neighborhood mixed use, MU3, allows. I think one of the, kind of
21 in a nutshell the General Commercial is a little more open as far as the uses that it
22 allows. You, typically you find those in some of your major corridors, basically allows the
23 whole gamut of commercial uses, also it allows for multi-family also. You know, we've

1 had a, we kind of had a debate or discussion, excuse me, regarding the MU3 zoning
2 designation which is new. And while it is designated as a neighborhood mixed use
3 district, I guess mixed use, I think the, the, Mr. Murant was, I think one of his questions
4 was does it have – it doesn't have to be a mixed use development, that's just the, that's
5 just the title of the MU3 district. It can be a single use as outlined on page 22 of your
6 packet. But kind of going back, one of the things that we have noticed with this district,
7 the MU3, is that it allows for a little more, a higher density than the GC or any of our
8 other zoned, commercial zoning designations as far as for multi-family. There is no
9 density cap. And also there's no parking. And this is something we were gonna look to
10 put in, but there are also no – I just want to make sure I put that in there – there, on
11 page 15 of your package, one of the things we pointed out there's no minimum parking
12 requirement for residential development in the MU3 designation, thus excluding a
13 live/work dwelling or family group home or rooming and boarding house. So one of the
14 things that we looked at, again, as a Staff, we are still working with an older
15 Comprehensive Plan but new zoning including new zoning categories. So sometimes
16 trying to put them together it can be a little difficult. But one of the things that was clear
17 that we noticed is that this area was not within an activity center and so when you start
18 looking at uses where there's really not a cap on the, the density or number of units that
19 you would be allowed and also where there are no, there's no minimum parking
20 requirement for a use, we kind of look at that as being something more, I guess you
21 could say more in the urban area or someplace where, you know, higher density is
22 meant to be more, I guess maybe closer to the City of Columbia versus getting, moving
23 out more into the suburban and rural areas of Richland County.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. With MU3 in the equivalency table when
2 we updated the Code, did it have an equivalency to the old Code? Or was this a new
3 zone?

4 MR. PRICE: No, sir, it was a new zoning designation. So you know, again the
5 difficulty trying to match a new zoning designation with an old Comprehensive Plan of
6 where ideally it's been identified, you know, as the most appropriate location, it's a little
7 difficult now but hopefully by the end of the year we'll have this addressed.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, comments, questions from the Commissioners? Yes,
9 Commissioner Johnson?

10 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I apologize. I have three questions that go in
11 three completely different directions so Staff, if you'll be patient with me. One, did I miss
12 the Applicant?

13 MR. PRICE: No, sir. The Applicant is not here. We did reach out as we typically
14 do prior to the meetings to make sure they're aware of the meeting, but we have not
15 received any, any, you know, heard back from the Applicant regarding their attendance
16 or their inability to attend.

17 MR. JOHNSON: The other two questions, if you don't mind just a little bit of
18 context to, and I'm just gonna ask them both at the same time and let you respond as
19 you see fit, but under the zoning history that second paragraph that the GC parcel of the
20 rezoning request be rezoned from residential multi-family medium density under Case
21 No. 11-017 MA, I'd be curious to get a little bit of context. I know you just talked about
22 the older Comprehensive Plan and new zoning, but to understand the interplay that, of
23 that change in relation to this request. And then the other question is under parcel

1 characteristics, south of the site, the last line, is undeveloped M1, MU1 district parcels,
2 but when I look at the color coding of the map and look at the MU1, that doesn't match
3 up.

4 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry, what page are you looking at Mr. Johnson?

5 MR. JOHNSON: So on page 19, I will admit I'm color blind but the orange is MU1
6 but on page 15 the text under parcel area characteristics. I just don't see it, that's what
7 I'm -

8 MR. PRICE: That, what you're looking at is M1, not MU1, so on page 15 it's M1.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Oh, so that's a typo, so it's just a typo in the text. Okay, it's just
10 a typo. Now I'm not looking at the chart, below the chart in the text it just says MU, that's
11 okay, I see it now as a typo.

12 MR. PRICE: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I just see M1 but –

14 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The pink parcel across from Blair Street?

16 MR. JOHNSON: Oh, I see it, I'm saying but the text, the text –

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Oh, yes.

18 MR. JOHNSON: - is, it's not, I mean, I'm good now, I understand.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You are correct, good job. Thank you, Commissioner
20 Johnson. Any other questions?

21 MR. JOHNSON: No. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. This is on the floor for discussion and a motion as
23 well. If anyone has any motions.

1 MR. PRICE: No, I'm sorry, it is correct, what you're looking at. So you're looking
2 at the zoning history that's on page 14 which they said a General Commercial parcel
3 immediately southwest of the sites on Bluff Road were rezoned from Neighborhood
4 Mixed Use MU1 under Case 24-04 [sic], so those parcels that you see southwest of
5 this, they were formerly MU1 but now they're General Commercial.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So for all my mapping, GIS friends out there, the map on
7 page 19 is correct. The colors are correct?

8 MR. PRICE: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you. Further discussion Commissioners or a
10 motion? Based on the Staff information this MU3 seems to be a catchall without so
11 many rules it seems like, parking and density and whatnot. I'm not sure if it fits in the
12 area. Does anyone wanna state a motion and we could just see which way it goes?

13 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks.

15 MR. SIERCKS: I make a motion to forward Case No. 25-022 MA to County
16 Council with a recommendation of disapproval.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do I have a second?

18 MR. METTS: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Metts. Correct, yes. Okay
20 Staff, we have a motion for disapproval with a second, so can you please take a vote?

21 MR. PRICE: As stated we have a motion for disapproval for Case 25-022 MA.
22 Those in favor of the motion, Grady?

23 MR. GRADY: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

2 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Durant?

4 MR. DURANT: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: Metts?

6 MR. METTS: Aye.

7 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

8 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

9 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

10 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

11 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

12 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

13 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

15 *[Approved to deny: Grady, Siercks, Durant, Metts, Duffy, Johnson, Frierson, Yonke;*

16 *Absent: Taylor]*

17 MR. PRICE: Alright, motion passes.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioners, thank you, Staff. This is a

19 short night for Item No. 5 in our Agenda. We are moving ahead to Item 6., which is

20 Overlay. We have a, this is an action item so we do have a signup sheet. So we have

21 Staff present and then have the public speak, that's usually how we do this.

22 MS. WILLIAMS: Alright, thank you Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. Just following up from our last meeting last
2 month when we had the work session. We went through the comments that were
3 received from additional residents in the area and all of the additional comments and
4 the changes that were made to the Overlay District based off of those comments. So in
5 your packet you have the draft that we went through during the work session, but if you
6 also remember in May you made a motion to accept the comments that were discussed
7 and the changes that were made during the work session and have a clean copy
8 brought before you this month for your final recommendation, unless there are
9 additional questions that you may have. I'd also like to point out that if approved tonight
10 the recommendation will go to Council and Council will still again have the opportunity
11 to hold any additional town halls or work sessions or public meetings they may like to
12 have. They have to go through the final three readings and, and approvals before it
13 would be final, so again tonight this will just be a recommendation that will go to County
14 Council and they still have the opportunity to make any additional comments. The
15 question came up last month as well about adding tree protection to the ordinance, the
16 Overlay. We did go back and discuss that a little bit more internally. Although we do
17 understand the need to protect the trees and we do appreciate the comments received
18 related to that, based off our current staffing levels and with this being the first overlay
19 district, it would be a challenge to try to add additional tree protections with the current
20 Overlay. We do believe this should be a separate tree protection ordinance that could
21 be fully vetted and looked at, how we actually could implement that successfully. And
22 we are open to continue to meet with the neighborhood and residents to talk about a
23 different method to try to handle any tree protections and keep the Overlay specifically

1 to the architectural standards. So I did wanna touch on that specifically because I know
2 that came up as an additional comment when we met last month. And so if you have
3 any specific questions we can do that or if you would like us to go through the, some of
4 the comments that we received and the changes that were made from the work session
5 we'd be willing to do that or answer any additional questions you may have.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, do we have any
7 questions as we get going on this?

8 MR. DURANT: Yes, Mr. Chair.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

10 MR. DURANT: Just a question. You said maybe it's, I think you found it'll be a
11 better course of action to have a separate tree ordinance done regarding protection of
12 the trees in the Olympia District. Is that gonna happen, how much time between
13 approval of this Overlay District and any tree ordinance being drafted and approved,
14 how much time would that be between the two?

15 MS. WILLIAMS: I, I do not have a timeline with that, that's why I said we'd be
16 willing to continue to work with the residents in the area to talk about that, because we
17 do have some staffing constraints right now and also we still need to continue to work
18 on building up the advisory committee and the internal procedures related to the current
19 overlay. And so it'd be challenging to also include the landscaping so that's why it
20 would have to be a separate project and because we don't have a timeline related to the
21 separate project right now, so I don't wanna say it'll be adopted at the same time
22 Council would adopt the Overlay District, it would have to be a separate project that we
23 look at.

1 MR. DURANT: Is there any risk that trees will start coming down before you
2 have a chance to put a tree ordinance into effect?

3 MS. WILLIAMS: Obviously there would still be potentially a risk if somebody
4 wanted to go out there and cut a tree. We have certain protections related to new
5 development that are out there, but if we try to include the, incorporate the tree
6 protection standards in the Overlay now that's something we can continue to go back.
7 But it would just further delay getting the architectural protections in place.

8 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Can we go through
10 some of the edits for the public and anything that might be new?

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, we can go through that. I'll turn it over to Mr. Ridlehoover.

12 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: Alright, so I can go through some of the main changes
13 that have happened throughout the course of developing the Overlay. The changes
14 most recently made were the ones based off of the work session that we just had so
15 there won't be any, anything new for the Planning Commission but I'll just kinda go
16 through the different aspects that, just review what we did in the work session last
17 month. And that, we made a number of just language changes; these are all highlighted
18 in your packet in the, the blue-ish/aqua color, and the changes regarding setbacks as
19 well as making the, making the Overlay more strictly corresponding to the bounds of
20 what is visible from the right-of-way. So any, any language that was previously in the
21 Overlay that we felt overstepped the bounds of restricting or protecting the façade and
22 what's visible from the right-of-way was, was changed there, as well as including some
23 oversights such as existing historic houses, housing styles that were not explicitly

1 included in the draft previously, the example I'm mainly referring to as far as roof
2 shapes and that there are hipped roof shapes and, on historic houses in the
3 neighborhood. And beyond that one of the other notable changes I believe happened
4 before the previously work session but as far as materials, there was a concern from
5 Planning Commission previously that as long as the visible characteristics of a, visible
6 characteristics of materials used to repair or build any, any structures as long as those
7 materials visually looked a historic style, we removed any restrictions to, that would be,
8 require specific materials. And I believe that is, those are the main highlights. Like I said
9 these were, these were discussed in the work session so you can see in our, you can
10 see the changes throughout in the edit, the version that you have with the edits and
11 then the clean version has, has all of the, the changes and edits that Planning
12 Commission has seen and developed in the work session previously.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Questions, Commissioners? Commissioner
14 Frierson, let's open it up to the public for, to speak.

15 MS. FRIERSON: We have Ms. Vie Hendley.

16 **TESTIMONY OF MS. VIE HENDLEY:**

17 MS. HENDLEY: Good evening again, Commissioners, appreciate your time. My
18 name is Vie Hendley. I live at 104 Alabama Street, Olympia, South Carolina 29201. I
19 want to remind the Commission and Staff that we do have a six month moratorium in
20 place and we have concerns, primarily about the fact that when you add to a historic
21 structure you are changing the historic view shed of the neighborhood. And I didn't
22 know anything about view sheds until I started kinda delving into it, but essentially if you
23 had a house that from the street was just one room and then in the back of the house all

1 of a sudden you have something jutting out the back or rising up above it, you've taken
2 away the original look of the neighborhood. Granby, Whaley are City neighborhoods.
3 They have these protections in their historic overlays or their historic protections so that
4 the actual footprint of the house remains the same. And so you can't, you drive through
5 Granby and many houses have been renovated and many houses house adequate
6 numbers of students for profit for landlords, but you wouldn't be able to tell the
7 difference between a new build and an old build because they all look exactly the same
8 and they didn't allow for modifications that would alter greatly the shape or the view
9 shed of the neighborhood. I wanna appreciate your time considering Staff the tree
10 protections. I'm hopeful that perhaps with the rewrites some folks will be taking that
11 more seriously because as we lose trees we're going to get hotter, we're going to lose
12 clean water and I really appreciate the time that you all spent on that. Thanks so very
13 much for your consideration.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for your participation in this. Anyone else signed
15 up to speak?

16 MS. FRIERSON: No.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. So our objective tonight is a recommendation to
18 County Council. We could approve the draft or defer the draft, but when we do that we
19 would ask for more edits to be made, or I guess we could reject it all entirely, after all
20 this work, right? So Commission, do we have any motions? Or a discussion about what
21 we wanna do?

22 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

1 MR. GRADY: Thank you. I would like to give Staff the opportunity to comment on
2 the member of the public who just spoke because the concerns that she expressed
3 about a building footprint, you know, being higher than the preexisting building or jutting
4 out to an extended degree. It was certainly my impression from reading the Overlay
5 language that that would not be permitted, is that, would that be an accurate
6 assessment or not?

7 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: So it is accurate to an extent. Our language, while
8 restricted to the right-of-way as far as an addition jutting out, any additions would have
9 to be to the rear of the property and it would have to either be flush with the current side
10 of the structure or it would have to recess in. So as far as the building footprint is visible
11 from the right-of-way you wouldn't see, you wouldn't see any structure jutting out from,
12 from the historic façade.

13 MR. GRADY: And based on the visual instruction from said member of the, the
14 public, there's not the ability to build an expansion of the home that is substantially taller
15 than the existing property, correct?

16 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: We do have a specific line in, in the Overlay and that is, is
17 that if a historic is of a building type that is one story, they could have a two story
18 addition in the rear and two stories would be the limit and the, the roofline would need to
19 be as low as possible.

20 MR. GRADY: Okay, thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. That is enough of a
22 visual that would make the original property look different. We have a one story front
23 and a two story back.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: I'll jump in a little bit, too, from –

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff.

3 MS. WILLIAMS: - the last, the work session, too, we talked about going from
4 different Old Hill types from the one story to two story, it still has to match the
5 architectural look of, and feel of the, the architectural style of the neighborhood as well.
6 So if it can be visible from the right-of-way and they're going from a one story Old Hill
7 type to a two story Old Hill type, it still has to match the architectural look and feel of that
8 housing type.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, I have a question. Let's, what if we, for an example,
10 use this draft and said someone came in and wanted to do that, where do we refer them
11 and say, oh this works with the Overlay or this doesn't? What part of it?

12 MS. WILLIAMS: We're putting together an architectural review board, I'm sorry
13 I'm cutting you off.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No, that's okay, go ahead Staff, thank you.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: My apologies.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That was open ended.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: But we are working to put together an architectural review board
18 so any additions, any demolitions, those would have to go in front of the architectural
19 review board to make sure that they meet the architectural requirements in the Overlay
20 District. We're working right now to look at individuals who could potentially fill the slots
21 for that review board and Council would have to appoint individuals on that board as
22 well.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Further discussion, Commission? Or a motion?

1 MR. DURANT: Question, Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

3 MR. DURANT: For Staff. In, on page 27, §3(D)(ii), I see we marked out, and I
4 remember this discussion we had last month, we marked out the section that said the
5 building footprint of a new build should reflect that of the house across the street, if that
6 house is a historic building. So with that struck are there guidelines for how new builds
7 should look with respect to the historic pattern of the neighborhood?

8 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: Yes, sir. So we will have a guide of what specific housing
9 types are in the different parts of the neighborhood. While we won't have the restriction
10 of, of a historic home needing to match the one across the street, we do still have the
11 restriction of not having, not having building types side by side. So we are maintaining
12 the, we are trying to maintain the rhythm and the, the character of the neighborhood, at
13 least on that particular side of the block, but we won't restrict any, any builder to a
14 specific home type because it's across the street or the, or there's a specific house
15 across the street from them.

16 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Good discussion. What
18 else, Commission? Hearing nothing else this is when we look at a motion. What does
19 this mean, for the six month moratorium that, is that –

20 MS. WILLIAMS: The six month, the moratorium is in place for six months and it's
21 Council's third reading, I'm sorry that date alludes me at this moment, or until they have
22 third and final reading on the Overlay. So if the Overlay is approved before the six
23 months are up then the moratorium would be lifted, if the Overlay is not approved it'll

1 stay in place until that six month date. Which does give Council still time to work on it,
2 so like I said before if you do make the recommendation to move it forward, if Members
3 of Council have any additional questions, comments, concerns, that still gives them
4 enough time to bring back their comments related to the ordinance as well.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks. So I understand even if we push this through
6 there's still time with Council with this moratorium, correct?

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Correct. The moratorium remains in place until the Overlay has
8 third and final reading approved by County Council.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And they will have public sessions.

10 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, they will also have their public meetings and if they choose
11 to have a town hall like they do with a rezone request then we would obviously entertain
12 that as well.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff for your hard work on this. We've walked
14 through this and created a pretty solid draft. Unless we want any other edits to the draft
15 I feel like it might be time to pass this forward to County Council. But I'd like to hear the
16 thoughts of my Commission on that. I see head nods but no words. Okay.

17 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

19 MR. DURANT: I'm sorry, I have one more question.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant, go ahead.

21 MR. DURANT: And I apologize, Staff, if what I say now means I just haven't read
22 enough detail of what you put here. But what is the protection against new builds,

1 somebody coming in with a new build and making a contemporary house there, that's
2 totally outside of the style of the neighborhood?

3 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: So for the most part that would not be allowed but with any
4 new build it would go before the board of architectural review that we're putting in place
5 and so the board would interpret the, the Overlay that we have to determine whether
6 whatever style that a builder is, is planning to put in the neighborhood, that it fits within
7 the guidelines of the Overlay.

8 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner. Question Commissioner
10 Johnson? Comment?

11 MR. JOHNSON: I'm, I was prepared to, I am prepared to advance this on. I'm
12 not proposing additional questions but, or changes, but Commissioner's, for the
13 response to the Commissioner's question just raised implementation concerns. As
14 someone who goes before a board of architectural review on a regular basis, we talked
15 about the windows a few months ago but the way that it's written it says, and I'm grossly
16 paraphrasing but, to, as much as possible, emulate or something similar, and I will say
17 that board is going to, there's not a lot of guidance other than just saying, or similar, and
18 so you leave to interpretation the members that are on that board at that particular point
19 in time as to whether or not the 'or similar' is sufficient versus the original materials. And
20 in other jurisdictions those boards could exercise a lot of power without specific
21 constraints as to, or guidelines as to how that's to be done. So I just, I just raise that as
22 a, as a point of concern.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good point, Commissioner Johnson. Commissioner
2 Grady, I see a lotta head nods, any thoughts?

3 MR. GRADY: Yeah, I would say, like I broadly agree with both your remarks, Mr.
4 Chair, and from my colleague to my right. I definitely would agree that there is a, a risk
5 here, and we do not wanna have a, an instance of government overreach, so that's
6 certainly a concern. But I would also be inclined to, to move this forward so I can make
7 a motion to that effect if that is in the interest of the group.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I have a question for Staff, is there any other things we
10 could do about this review board before we pass the recommendation to County
11 Council? Is there anything within our guidelines as the Planning Commission that can
12 help steer the creation of this or any words in this draft? You said 'or similar' is a, one
13 that can cause some issues.

14 MS. WILLIAMS: Well we are working on the guidebook which is based very
15 heavily off of the architectural standards that were originally presented that we used
16 before drafting the ordinance. So one of my goals is to take the design standards and
17 the architectural standards along with the recommendations for the, how the board
18 should be set up to Council so that they can also review it at the same time while we're
19 going through the ordinance, Overlay voting process, so that they can see, set up the
20 board and see what the guidelines will be at the same time. If that's something Planning
21 Commission wants to see then you would potentially defer your vote until that all is put
22 together and brought back to you to review as well. But I don't know if, I can't speak to a
23 regulatory requirement for that.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I have a suggestion, maybe one of my Commissioners, as
2 we make our recommendation, usually if we go against the Comp Plan on something
3 we have to have some sort of statement to go along with that; maybe we approve or
4 deny and then have a statement that goes with it to County Council that, you know,
5 please address this concern of this architectural review board. Do you think either one
6 of, Commissioner Grady, Commissioner Durant, Johnson, could make that statement in
7 their motion? Follow me?

8 MR. GRADY: I could but I am not a, not a real estate developer so I feel like I'd
9 be a bit out of my depth.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Commissioner Johnson, as someone who goes to a
11 lotta these review boards? Do you think you have just a couple of words? Let's say for
12 instance if we said let's approve and with this approval we'd like whatever?

13 MR. JOHNSON: Council to take careful consideration of the guidelines that are
14 provided to the architectural review board so that there's some consistency in how
15 those are being implemented.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's a motion for approval?

17 MR. JOHNSON: That would be in support of a motion to approve Item 6.a.,
18 Overlay District, 6.a. and b., for the Olympia Neighborhood Character Overlay Map
19 Amendment and Text Amendment, yes sir.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Do I have a second?

21 MR. GRADY: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, did you catch all of that? That's a second from
23 Commissioner Grady. Did you write down that lovely statement?

1 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I almost forget that we have Minutes and that all this gets
3 typed out.

4 MS. WILLIAMS: I paraphrased in my notes.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. You got it? Thank you. Okay, we have a motion
6 for approval of the Overlay and the map, a. and b., and a second from Commissioner
7 Grady. So Staff, please take a vote.

8 MS. WILLIAMS: Yonke?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

10 MS. WILLIAMS: Frierson?

11 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

12 MS. WILLIAMS: Johnson?

13 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

14 MS. WILLIAMS: Duffy?

15 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

16 MS. WILLIAMS: Metts?

17 MR. METTS: Aye.

18 MS. WILLIAMS: Durant?

19 MR. DURANT: Aye.

20 MS. WILLIAMS: Taylor? Siercks?

21 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

22 MS. WILLIAMS: Grady.

23 MR. GRADY: Aye.

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

3 MS. WILLIAMS: Motion approved.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioners and thank you, Staff for all the
5 hard work on that. And this goes as a recommendation of approval to County Council,
6 just so the public can hear. They're still gonna have public input and the process
7 continues. Thank you.

8 *[Siercks out at 6:54pm]*

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. Let's all take a breath and we'll move on to number
10 7. Number 7. on our Agenda today is 2025 Land Development Code Updates. We have
11 an a. and a b. so I'll flip this over to Staff so we take this apart correctly. And then I know
12 we have names signed up to speak.

13 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Alright, the first item is, was an amendment to Table 26-
14 4.2(b) and §26-4.2(d)(2)5, Manufactured Homes, of the Richland County Land
15 Development Code. This came before you before you wanted this to be deferred during
16 that time so it's back before you. So basically when we were doing the, when we were
17 looking to adopt the current Land Development Code it was decided to go with the
18 most, the equivalency of the current zoning, you know, which matches the new zoning
19 designations of our Code. And so it was determined that the MH District which was
20 Manufactured Housing, the most equivalent zoning designation under our new Code
21 would be the R3. And a lot of that discussion was really based on the lot sizes. The lot
22 sizes, the minimum lot size in the MH3 is basically the equivalent of what we have in our
23 R3 at this time. But one of the things we didn't take into consideration were the land

1 uses, and so the MH District, of course, Manufactured Housing, you know, allowed
2 manufactured housing but it also allowed for stick built homes also, as we like to term it.
3 But, but it allowed for, like I stated it allowed for manufactured housing but when we
4 adopted the Code the R3 District does not allow for manufactured housing. So you
5 know, we were aware as we have some discussion regarding how to correct this,
6 because what you have are certain areas of the County in which were primarily
7 developed under the old MH designation that's primarily a manufactured housing
8 community, subdivision, neighborhood, just however community, whichever you wanna
9 use, but they're basically all manufactured homes. So we're trying to find a way to make
10 this work, we looked at a couple of options and it was decided that to allow
11 manufactured homes in the R3 provided that there are manufactured homes on lots that
12 comprise 50% or more of the lots on the same side of the block as the lot in question. I
13 mean, the thinking was if they're already 50% of the homes, the lots on that block are
14 comprised of manufactured homes, the likelihood is that's what's going to be placed
15 there, you know, not to offend or anything but typically you aren't gonna find a
16 community of manufactured homes and someone builds a house next to it. So that's
17 one of the reasons we went with that, with that option. So that's what you have before
18 you today. You know, we did take into consideration and I believe you raised this,
19 Commissioner Yonke, and that was something that during the adoption of the current
20 Land Development Code we were initially going away from what was deemed single-
21 family designations and within the R2, R3, R4 designations and so on, you would be
22 able to do a variety of housing types from manufactured housing, duplexes, triplexes,
23 those type uses. I know that was a bit, a good bit of pushback from the community

1 regarding that, so it was decided by Planning Commission, ultimately adopted by
2 Council, to just go back to the single-family designations. So again, one of the things
3 that we ended up leaving out was what happened to the previous MH District. Some of
4 the things that we could have actually done was create a new zoning designation. We
5 could've created a whole new MH district or whichever term you wanna use it, but then
6 that would've required us to go back through the whole process, we would've had to
7 identify parcels, basically do a whole rezoning throughout the County. That was one of
8 the options that we had. So, but we found that this was probably the, based on what has
9 come before us, what we have seen, what we've discussed with people, that this is
10 probably the best approach. But that's what you have before you now.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. I'm gonna speak on that in the past
12 cause I was part of the rewrite process. We were just taking into account what came
13 before us from the public as we walked through that, as early as Covid and our Zoom
14 meetings, the original time; then through coming back in here and taking it on the shelf
15 like Mr. Jenson would like to say and going through the rewrite. So I know we looked at
16 a lot of the equivalency table and looking at the Land Development Code that way.
17 Staff, could you pull up the map, I see you have a tab there, so we can visualize. Is it
18 called the Royal Pines neighborhood? That's kind of a good example.

19 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright.

21 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry, one of the things that we did look at, and I apologize
22 cause I don't have it here in front of us at this time, you know, I know there's some
23 concern about, you know, having an area that happens to be zoned R3 and now

1 everybody's just gonna put a whole bunch of manufactured homes there, that may open
2 it up. There aren't many areas in the County that are zoned R3 that haven't been
3 developed. For example, Mr. Smith, he pulled up just the northwest part of the County
4 of all of the parcels that were zoned R3 and they were all developed. So you, there's not
5 a chance that someone could wait – and I know this is a little frightening for some
6 people, again Commissioner Yonke, you went through this process and I think Ms.
7 Frierson you were also a part of this also, where you know, somebody wakes up one
8 morning and you know, your single-family community, you look outside and there's a
9 use that you weren't expecting to be there. I don't think in this particular case that if
10 someone is in an existing residential community of homes that, you know, as we term
11 them stick built homes, that, to meet the criteria to establish a manufactured home, that
12 that's not going to occur. Again, you have to have, at least 50% of the lots on the block
13 have to be developed with manufactured homes. So in the case, if the property was
14 zoned R3 and somebody was gonna put a manufactured home there, that means that
15 that area is already comprised of manufactured homes so it wouldn't be something
16 brand new introduced into an area.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Correct, I appreciate that. Do you mind turning on the
18 zoning layer just for a minute for the map? This area that Staff zoomed into is R3. And
19 when we zoom in, that's a good example, there's about 10 lots between each street.

20 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And when you look at it some that have manufactured
22 homes already it's about 50%. So if someone came into an empty lot, which is near like

1 the middle of your map right now, and wanted to put a manufactured home there this
2 would be a location where under special, what's it special requirement?

3 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That the Comprehensive Plan, well not the Comprehensive
5 Plan, the zoning would recommend approval.

6 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Right? Thank you.

8 MR. PRICE: It would be a permitted use subject to special requirements.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Exactly. No, I'm trying to walk it through for the Staff
10 because I do wanna stand on what we did last month or the month before where we
11 asked for deferment to give more time for public input. Any time we're looking at
12 adjusting the Land Development Code I wanna make sure there's time for public input
13 since I've been through all that.

14 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. See, now walk us through an example here if
16 you can.

17 MR. PRICE: Okay, so I think – alright so what you have before you it's just, it's
18 kind of like the classic example of what we're dealing with. So this is the Royal Pines
19 subdivision, kinda help you out here. Alright, so the area in the green that you see here,
20 this is the Royal Pines subdivision and over here is the Woodlands, so this is a good
21 example. And this is the Woodlands, Woodlands Green subdivision next to it. They just
22 happen to be zoned R4 so this wouldn't apply. But right now if someone came in and
23 was, they had a parcel in the Royal Pines subdivision and they wanted to place a

1 manufactured home there, under our current Code as written we would deny that
2 application because the Code clearly states, you know, in R3 manufactured homes are
3 prohibited. So they would be forced to, if they were going to occupy that from a
4 residential standpoint they would have to actually build a home, you know, construct a
5 new home, as we like to say a stick built home, on that parcel. Again, typically not a
6 practical use of land when the two residential uses are really not typically deemed to be
7 compatible, especially in an area like this. But you know, we just kind of use this as an
8 example.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So if you had turned off the zoning and zoomed in you'd
10 see there's some mixed uses of R3 here already. We have manufactured homes and
11 stick built.

12 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, so, I mean, basically everything here is R3 in this area.
13 Now this is, what you have next, in this section, and let me put on the subdivision layer,
14 this section of the Woodlands Glenn subdivision is also zoned R3, however, none of the
15 lots here will qualify for a manufactured home, again 50% of the lots on the block would
16 have to be comprised of manufactured homes, so we feel pretty safe that this ordinance
17 doesn't just open it up for uses that some people would deem to be incompatible.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. I like that example. Commissioners, any
19 questions off this discussion? No? Okay. I'm ready to open it up to the public.
20 Commissioner Frierson?

21 MS. FRIERSON: Kim Murphy?

22 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

23 MS. MURPHY: Good evening. I know you approved an amendment –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Please start with your name and address.

2 MS. MURPHY: Oh, this is, yeah okay. When does this go to Council, cause I
3 don't know that the April one did, but Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel Lane, Chapin, South
4 Carolina. If you could answer that question at some point that'd be great. First of all I'm
5 opposed to using the block as the, as the guide, and I actually have three options that I
6 think would be better since there is this quandary; is take back that legacy MH zoning,
7 anything that was MH everyone knew was going to have either a stick built or a
8 manufactured home. If that's too much work, but it seems like the easy way out, then if
9 the lot was previously zoned MH allow for a mobile home. And then the least desirable
10 is to expand it, instead of just one block and one side of the street it's the whole street
11 on both sides or 50% of the subdivision. There was an issue a woman brought up at the
12 April meeting that her subdivision, which was zoned MH and is now R3, the MH allowed
13 for mobile homes and there are mobile homes, and stick built homes and there are a
14 lotta vacant lots there, she wanted to place a mobile home on the lot but she can't now
15 because of the orientation that's required in R3; you can't have a front facing, there's
16 not room to have a front facing mobile home but when it's zoned MH it can be turned so
17 that the end is facing the road. So I think that neither the parties who, property owners
18 whose property was for stick built should suffer and neither should the families whose
19 property was MH should suffer. I think there should be a better delineation between the
20 two. I think there's, we had discussion with Geo that, you know, potentially there could,
21 they could ask for a Variance to be able to allow for their home to be placed front facing,
22 but I don't think, I don't think that's the way to go. I think that if it was once MH allow it to

1 be MH, it resolves the orientation problem, it resolves allowing mobile homes. Was that
2 my time?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: It was.

4 MS. MURPHY: Okay, thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

6 MS. FRIERSON: Yakima Smith.

7 **TESTIMONY OF YAKIMA SMITH:**

8 MS. SMITH: Hello Commissioners, my name is Yakima Smith. My address is 13
9 Maganza Court 29203. I'm talking in particular of the neighborhood of Hebron Ridge. I
10 built the house out there, like five years ago, it may be 10 homes out there but the
11 majority of the neighborhood is mobile homes. It's no mobile home that is uniform. It's
12 only about 10 lots that are left out there. When I bought this property it was zoned for
13 mobile home and to get that changed or taken right from up under me was very
14 disappointment [sic]. And the lots are not big enough to, like for the front door to face
15 the road so if it did get approved I would hope that that would not be a stipulation
16 because the lots are not big at all. Yeah. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

18 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commission Johnson.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Just before – the area that the speaker was referring to, that's
21 currently R3?

1 MS. SMITH: Hebron Ridge, they changed it. I'm not sure, I know it's zoned
2 [inaudible] you can't put a mobile home there, but when I was buying the property it was
3 —

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You would need to come back to the podium so we can
5 hear you. Thank you. And maybe we would direct that question to Staff.

6 MS. SMITH: It was always zoned mobile homes in the neighborhood, Hebron
7 Ridge, which is off of Dubard Boise, you guys can look up the map if you like. But it's
8 majority of trailers out there. I don't understand, like why stopping the last 10 lots for
9 putting a mobile home, I don't know what difference that would make. Or why they
10 changed.

11 MR. JOHNSON: Well Staff, help me, if, if her statement regarding the current
12 zoning is correct, that's not applicable for what we're doing here, right?

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Right. Give me a cross street. What was a street that Staff
14 can —

15 MS. SMITH: Maganzar, Peregrine. I live on Maganzar, Peregrine is behind
16 Maganzar which I own two lots on that street.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. Let's look at it on the map.

18 MS. SMITH: Please.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Cause this is what I requested when we began the
20 conversation, let's look at some examples. Any final thoughts in your two minutes?
21 Cause I wanna give you your two minutes.

22 MS. SMITH: I just hope we can reach a decision today. I've been waiting, like
23 seven months.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. I'll ask you to go ahead and take a seat then.

2 MS. SMITH: Okay, thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm trying to be fair to everybody, appreciate you.

4 MS. SMITH: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Which zoning is this, Staff?

6 MR. PRICE: R3.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, that's what I was thinking. The zoning colors. Staff,
8 go ahead and talk us through this. If someone came in and wanted to build a
9 manufactured home here under this new special requirement, what would the guidance
10 be?

11 MR. PRICE: It would be the same. We would look at what is, what we would
12 deem to be a block and if there are at least 50% of the homes on that block that come,
13 that are comprised of manufactured homes they would be able to place one there. If
14 one is not there or if it doesn't meet that criteria then they wouldn't be able to put it, you
15 know, I think parts of this area do have sections that are primarily single-family
16 residential homes and others have the manufactured homes, so the criteria would still
17 be the same. They would have to meet at least 50% on that, on a block.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Where the map is now I see two homes, I
19 can't tell from the aerial if it's stick built or manufactured in that block, two, four, six,
20 that's like 10 lots right there, so it's not developed yet. What would you recommend?
21 Yeah, and if they request for someone to build a manufactured home in that block that
22 we're pointed at, Egret and Heron? And don't make me pronounce this, Peregrine
23 Court? Thank you, so in that block?

1 MR. PRICE: Yes, so what you're looking at, there's a chance that on one side
2 that you may be able to put manufactured homes and on the other side you might not
3 be able to.

4 MS. SMITH: It's on both sides.

5 MR. PRICE: I'm just, you know, you may run into those instances, but I mean, to
6 be consistent with if this, if this ordinance is passed then that may be the case.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: If the ordinance is passed this doesn't come back to the
8 Planning Commission if somebody wanted to build a manufactured home there cause
9 it's gonna have a special requirement. And would that be a Board of Zoning Appeals or
10 just no issue?

11 MR. PRICE: The only time it would go to the Board of Zoning Appeals, and I
12 think that with, Ms. Murphy kind of raised a point if there was a bit of, an inability to meet
13 the orientation requirements due to the configurations of the lot, then they could go to
14 the Board of Zoning Appeals and potentially ask for a Variance from that provision. So
15 that, that's one option. And then there may be some cases where if they don't meet the
16 requirements for 50% of the lots being developed with manufactured homes on a block
17 there may be another option, in some cases it may be to, or for a rezoning to a zoning
18 designation that would allow manufactured homes.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's how it would come back to us. Thank you. Yes,
21 Commissioner Johnson.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price, when we had the conversation the last time on this
23 subject I had a question that was on my mind and it's still on my mind and the first

1 speaker raised it so I'm just gonna go ahead and ask it. But I feel kinda like a 3rd grader
2 asking this question, but why the distinction of, based on the side of the block as
3 opposed to the block in itself? Help me understand what's the rationale or what's the
4 approach thing on that side of the block?

5 MR. PRICE: So I think this is kind of a good example and you may find some
6 maybe on one side, and you don't, this doesn't occur very often but you may actually
7 have on the opposite side of the road, for example, it could be primarily stick built
8 homes and on the other side it would just be manufactured homes. The reason why we
9 talked about the block was to provide a level of consistency of what that section of an
10 area is developed.

11 MR. JOHNSON: I understand at the block level but I'm saying, but when you split
12 the difference between the left side versus the right side or north or south side of the
13 block.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is that the same as saying the same side of the street.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Correct, I'm sorry, yes, same side of the street. Thank you, I
16 misspoke, yeah same side of the street. I misspoke.

17 MR. PRICE: So, so, I'm sorry, Commissioner Johnson, with understand, you
18 know, we try to come up with language and bring it before you, but this isn't something
19 we're saying, hey take our language and either approve it or deny it. We would like to
20 have good discussion and if there's a point that you, that you feel may be more
21 appropriate for what we're proposing, we just ask that you bring that forward and then
22 we may be happy to incorporate that into language going forward.

1 MR. JOHNSON: In my case if in fact, for example, (e)(1) said, manufactured
2 homes are permitted where there are manufactured homes on lots that comprise 50%
3 or more of the block as the lot in question.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson, as you're stating, if some of these
5 words were omitted that would work better for this text amendment is what we're
6 suggesting?

7 MR. JOHNSON: Intuitively that's what, my thought process, but that's why I was
8 trying to ask the question, what was the rationale, I'm trying to get understanding as to
9 what the rationale for adding in the clause that says, on the same side of the block.

10 MR. PRICE: You mean as opposed to taking out the word 'block' essentially –

11 MR. JOHNSON: As opposed to taking out the, 'on the same side'.

12 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Let's speak in the mics, Commissioners, and sidebar less.
14 Cause this is a good discussion. So Commissioner Johnson, did you speak everything
15 you wanna say?

16 MR. JOHNSON: I'm just trying to make sure that I'm making sense. Cause, I
17 mean, cause it depends on – and the determining factor depends on, it seems in some
18 of these situations is if you're on this side of the street you might be able to and if you're
19 on this side of the street you might not, and you could be in the same block. So I was
20 just trying to, I'm not saying that what I, my language would be better than what the
21 language is here, I'm just trying to understand why we added which side of the street
22 we're on as the determinant.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, I understand.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Cause if a community is mixed, if there's half and half it's half
2 and half. If three quarters are on this side of the street and a quarter on this side of the
3 street, I mean, the, the feel of the neighborhood is still mixed.

4 MR. PRICE: Okay. How would you, and I'm asking, I'm not asking you to do our
5 work for us, but how would you amend this language that you have, that's before you?

6 MR. JOHNSON: Just striking between, basically 'on the same side of'. So it's just
7 basically where this, whether or not the manufactured homes comprise more than 50%
8 of the lots. Or more, 50% or more.

9 MR. PRICE: Staff is very receptive to that change.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. I've got a comment
11 over here from Commissioner Durant.

12 MR. DURANT: Just a clarification. What is the definition being used for block?

13 MR. PRICE: It's pretty standard. The Code reads that if it's not defined within our
14 Code then we go to the standard dictionary meaning.

15 MR. DURANT: Okay.

16 MR. PRICE: Block as defined by the Richland County Land Development Code
17 is a unit of land bounded by roads or by a combination of roads and public land, railroad
18 right-of-way, waterways or any other barrier to the continuity of development.

19 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Duffy.

21 MR. DUFFY: Question for Staff. Just on the block point, why are we, where it
22 says 50% or more of the block why are we not saying just, on the points raised earlier,

1 why is it not 50% of the entire block or 50% of the entire subdivision? Why did we not
2 tighten up the language in that respect?

3 MR. PRICE: Again, this was our initial approach to it and again, whichever, if the
4 Planning Commission can help offer an alternative to this language, again as a Staff
5 we're being, we're more than receptive to that. And as stated previously, I know there
6 was a lotta discussion that went on during the adoption of the Land Development Code
7 about certain uses being allowed in certain designations, and so maybe we were just
8 looking at ways to provide extra layers of protection. But if there's, you know, as I'm
9 hearing from some, Commissioner Johnson and Commissioner Duffy, maybe the
10 language may be a little bit too restrictive in some way and that we should amend it.
11 And again the Staff is very receptive to that.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else before I try to read this the way that I hear that
13 I'm, the way I'm picking it up? Okay. So this would be, someone would make a motion
14 for deferment cause Staff would need to rewrite. So the public has a chance to hear it –

15 MR. PRICE: [Inaudible] just make this change – excuse me – we can easily
16 make this change and take this to Council. It won't go to Council until July, but you
17 know, we deem this to be more of an edit, not something that needs to come back and
18 go back through a whole public, a public meeting process.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Very touchy piece of the Land Development Code that we
20 survived. Okay. So if it read, manufactured homes are permitted where they are
21 manufactured homes on the lots that comprise 50% of the subdivision. Would that be
22 sufficient for this special permit for R3?

23 MR. JOHNSON: Well, Commissioner –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone from the Commission?

2 MR. JOHNSON: - I think it said of the block or the subdivision.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Of the block –

4 MR. JOHNSON: Or of the subdivision.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: - or of the subdivision.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Correct.

7 MR. DUFFY: I think just to add a –

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Duffy, go ahead.

9 MR. DUFFY: I think I said the entire block or whatever just to make sure we're
10 clear on –

11 MR. JOHNSON: Entire block.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Commissioner Duffy, you phrased that so well.
13 We're gonna have you state it, but first discussion from the Commission? We don't
14 wanna get pushed into anything. We would feel comfortable making a recommendation
15 of approval if we edited the text, is that what I'm hearing so we could discuss that point?
16 I see head nods. Alright. Okay Commissioner Duffy, can you make that as a motion of
17 approval with, in those words, and make sure Staff picks up on it correctly.

18 MR. DUFFY: So Mr. Chair, I would go ahead and make a motion for, to table 26-
19 4.2(b) under the manufactured homes, point 1, manufactured homes are permitted
20 where there are manufactured homes on lots that comprise, should be 50% of the entire
21 block or street or 50% of the subdivision. I may have missed something there.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we have a second on Commissioner Duffy's motion?

23 MR. GRADY: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Grady. Staff, did you pick up
2 on that edit?

3 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Read it back to us and then take a vote.

5 MR. PRICE: Alright. Manufactured homes, the language as amended would
6 read, manufactured homes are permitted where there are manufactured homes on lots
7 that comprise 50% of the entire block or subdivision.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Motion with a second, so please, that's correct, go ahead
9 and take the vote.

10 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the motion for the approval of 7.a. which is
11 the, which is the amendment to Table 26-4.2(b) and §26-4.2(d)(2)5, Manufactured
12 Homes, those in favor, Grady?

13 MR. GRADY: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Siercks? Oh. Durant?

15 MR. DURANT: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Metts?

17 MR. METTS: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

19 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

23 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

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

5 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, for members of the public that goes as a
7 recommendation of approval with that edited text for County Council where they will
8 have a public meeting, correct, what do they call it?

9 MR. PRICE: Public hearing.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Public hearing.

11 MR. PRICE: Yes, and because it's a text amendment we give a 30 day notice so
12 this won't appear at the June Zoning Public Hearing but it will go before Council at the
13 July Zoning Public Hearing.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you for helping us walk through
15 that. We are still in Item 7., but now 7.b.

16 MR. PRICE: Yes. Appreciate the input from the Planning Commission. So our
17 next item is, and hopefully this is a little simpler, but the next item is a proposed
18 amendment to §26-4.2(d)(2)a.2, Dwellings, Townhouse. I will, I will give you kind of a
19 simple version of this. If you have any questions please feel free to ask. Our current
20 Code requires any parcel created in the R5, excuse me, in the R6 zoning designation,
21 the minimum lot size is, the minimum lot width is 50'. And so while that may work for
22 single-family homes or maybe even duplexes or triplexes, when you're doing
23 townhomes essentially what that's also saying is that your townhome must be, the

1 structure itself must be 50' in width, which goes really against what a townhome is.
2 Townhomes typically go between 18 to 24, 25' in width. So in a nutshell that provision of
3 the Code that requires a minimum of 50' for each parcel, and remember you're doing a
4 townhome you are creating individual parcels even though the units are attached,
5 essentially it eliminates the ability to be able to do a townhome unless you do a rear
6 alley that's associated with it. And also, we also included some additional provisions
7 that if a rear alley was developed as part of the townhome development that it also
8 amended the setbacks. Just to, just to let you know, this language isn't something that
9 Staff just sat around and said, hey let's try to create some additional language for the
10 townhomes, again when we adopted the current Land Development Code we only took
11 out certain provisions of the existing townhome ordinance, or at least the townhome
12 ordinance that was in place prior to, I guess the 2015 version, excuse me, the 2005
13 version of our Land Development Code. So we basically took some of the language that
14 was missing as far as your setbacks, lot width, minimum lot area and also building
15 footprint requirements, and just carried that over to our current Code. And those are
16 outlined under, on page 43 under Proposed Amendment Overview, basically it tells you
17 what we've, what the new regulations would be.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, you just took text that existed in the 2005 Code?
19 That we're putting back in.

20 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. Yeah, the current Code didn't give a minimum lot
21 area which we're introducing a minimum lot width. Again, well it did give a minimum lot
22 width but it was 50', so what we were proposing is to have a minimum lot width that's
23 specific for townhomes, and also introduce setbacks other than the traditional setbacks

1 that typically apply to more single-family type developments or other type residential
2 uses, and also, and also establish what a minimum building footprint, excuse me, a
3 maximum building footprint.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This has nothing to do with zero lot lines. I see 5'.

5 MR. PRICE: This has absolutely nothing to do with zero lot lines.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Just for clarity.

7 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Thank you, Staff. Questions, Commissioners?
9 Hearing none, they're deep in thought. We do have, we had one sign up sheet for the
10 Land Development Code updates and I know someone wanted to speak again. So
11 Commissioner Frierson, would you read off the name again? And we'll, anyone else that
12 may have wanted to on this topic we'll give them two minutes. Kim Murphy wanted, she
13 wrote that she wanted to come down and have two minutes on this one.

14 MS. FRIERSON: Kim Murphy.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. State your name and address again, Ms.
16 Murphy.

17 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

18 MS. MURPHY: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

20 MS. MURPHY: Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel Lane. I would ask that you defer this
21 like you did with the mobile home proposed amendment to give us a chance to
22 understand it. This was, I guess it was Friday that the packet was published so we
23 learned of it and there really wasn't a good explanation. We have some of an

1 explanation now which is helpful, now I can go back and do some homework. The other
2 thing is in the Agenda packet there were two other provisions related to R5 and R6, but
3 they weren't listed on the Agenda. So I don't quite understand why they were in the
4 packet. So on the Agenda you list one Code section but in the packet itself you have
5 two other sections with amendments on this with the, you know, the red and the
6 strikethrough and so I didn't quite, I couldn't understand what was the purpose of those.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other comments, Ms. Murphy?

8 MS. MURPHY: No, but I'd love for you to defer it so I can get a better
9 understanding.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Thanks for coming out tonight. I notice on page
11 44 and 45 we have, I'll have Staff explain it but it's our Residential 5 district and
12 Residential 6 and this is where townhomes would fall into, correct?

13 MR. PRICE: Actually –

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So that's why you see §26-4.2 would be added to these
15 pages.

16 MR. PRICE: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Right?

18 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. So yes, sir so §26-3.3(h) and 26-3.3(i), that's, this is where
19 we included the provision for the townhome development standards.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Questions, concerns, Commission? Anyone in, the public
21 in the audience here who hasn't signed up to speak on this wanted to? Okay. Not
22 seeing anyone. So the public part of this will be completed and now it's, Commission,
23 on the floor for discussion.

1 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

3 MR. DURANT: I have a question for Staff. In the edits for the townhouse
4 dwelling, in part f. it says the building footprint of the principal structure shall not cover
5 more than 50% of the lot area. What was the thought process that went into that
6 number, 50% of the lot area?

7 MR. PRICE: Again, that was kind of a carryover from the previous Code. I would
8 have to go back when we first adopted this. Kind of, we just kinda picked from other
9 jurisdictions and how they applied their standards for townhomes. And essentially what
10 it does is you still provide a certain area for, if the minimum lot area is 1500 and what
11 that allows you to put a certain size townhome or structure, but at the same time it also
12 leaves a yard in the rear and the front versus someone coming in and building directly
13 to the setback lines.

14 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Thank you, Staff.

16 MR. PRICE: And again I want to make sure I point out that if the Planning
17 Commission were to take action on this there would be, this won't appear before
18 Council until July, the end of July, the fourth Tuesday. So there will be plenty of time for
19 people to have a chance to look at this and review it.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thoughts Commission? Commissioner Johnson.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, if there's no objection from anyone I'll go ahead
22 and move Agenda Item 7., Land Development Code Update action 7.b, §26-4.2(d) to
23 a.2 Dwelling Townhouse as a recommendation to affirmatively approval for Council.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Did you say deferment or approval?

2 MR. JOHNSON: Approval.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Approval. Okay, we have a motion for approval, do we
4 have a second?

5 MR. METTS: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, Commissioner Metts with a second. Alright Staff,
7 motion for approval with a second –

8 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a motion –

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: for this text amendment. Please take a vote.

10 MR. PRICE: - motion of approval for Item 7.b. for townhome dwellings, those in
11 favor of the motion, Grady?

12 MR. GRADY: Aye.

13 MR. PRICE: Siercks? Oh, he's not here. Durant?

14 MR. DURANT: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Metts?

16 MR. METTS: Aye.

17 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

18 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

19 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

20 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

22 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I see this as we're placing more information back in to the
2 text so I vote aye.

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

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

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you, Commissioners. That's our
7 last action item for the night. But we go into number 8., which is Other Items.
8 Commissioners, do you have any other items to talk about? Our time is, goes by fast up
9 here on the Commission so if you ever have any topics we need to discuss this is a
10 good time to talk about it. Okay, hearing none, Chairman's Report, number 9. Thank
11 you, Commissioners, for all that you do with your time, effort as you review this
12 information, go around the County and again we're volunteers but everyone's been up
13 here for a while now and I do appreciate everything that you do. This will flip right into
14 our Planning Director's Report. I see we have a date set for a Comp Plan
15 meeting/training/retreat, whatever we're gonna call it as soon as next week. So please
16 discuss and give us information.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, based off of the previously sent Doodle Poll June 12th, the
18 afternoon, seemed to work best. It'll be at 1:00 so it's not a whole day, we're just doing
19 the afternoon on June 12th. It'll be at Midlands Tech, Beltline Boulevard, in their
20 conference room. So we have planned to have a deep dive into the updates to the
21 Comprehensive Plan going over the various land use scenarios that were presented at
22 the public meetings to get Planning Commission's feedback before we present a final

1 land use scenario, a/k/a the future land use map that will guide decisions related to
2 upcoming rezone requests.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Can you send out more information to the Commission as
4 this approaches so we know where to go and all of that stuff?

5 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes, we'll definitely do that for you.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Reminders. Commissioners, any questions on that? We did
7 send like our scheduling preferences to them and I know this date has snuck up on us
8 so I hope everyone can attend, and we do need a quorum for it.

9 MS. WILLIAMS: There won't be a vote taken, it would be good to have a quorum,
10 so you know, when we bring the land use map to you all for review and approval you
11 fully understand the methods behind it and what went into the updated land use map.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Price, in the past with off sites you did, you did like a
13 quorum but I know it's a public meeting, it goes out to the – the meeting?

14 MR. PRICE: We still advertise but as Director Williams stated since you're not
15 taking any action a quorum is not necessary.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Please try to attend though, Commission.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

18 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes?

20 MR. DURANT: Should we eat lunch before we attend that?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good question.

22 MS. WILLIAMS: I am working on getting that approval for lunch as well.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Please send that in the email.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Once that is finalized tomorrow I will send the email out at the
2 end of the week.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Awesome. Does that complete our Planning
4 Director's Report?

5 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, thank you. Usually the last page has, page 48 our
7 notes from County Council. Okay. Alright, unless we have any other business number
8 11 is Adjournment and that's a lot of, everyone's favorite item. Alright, we'll do a show of
9 hands as a vote, as a motion for adjournment. I see everyone. Staff, can you take a
10 vote? So it's official.

11 MR. PRICE: Motion for adjournment, Yonke?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

13 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

14 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

16 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

17 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

18 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

19 MR. PRICE: Metts?

20 MR. METTS: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Durant?

22 MR. DURANT: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Grady?

1 MR. GRADY: Aye.

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

4 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, we are adjourned.

6
7 *[Meeting Adjourned: 7:45pm]*