

1 **RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **November 5, 2014**
3

4 *[Members Present: Heather Cairns, Beverly Frierson (in at 1:19), David Tuttle, Patrick*
5 *Palmer, Stephen Gilchrist, Bill Theus, Christopher Anderson, Wallace Brown, Sr.]*

6 Called to order: 1:04 pm
7

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We'll call the November meeting of the Richland County
9 Planning Commission to order. Allow me to read this into the Record. In accordance
10 with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio and TV
11 stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, as well as posted on the bulletin
12 board located in the lobby of the County Administration building. Has everybody on the
13 room had a chance to sign up? Because once we start this we're not gonna allow
14 anybody else to come in late and, and speak to a case, so if – yes, ma'am. Would you
15 like to sign up for a case? Please come down and, if you would, will you pass those
16 down there to Heather, and whichever case you wanna speak on if you would sign up
17 for it, either in the for or against column and we'll call you. Has everybody had a chance
18 to read the October Minutes? If so, do we have a motion?

19 MR. BROWN: Move approval.

20 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second to approve the October
22 Minutes. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

23 *[Approved: Cairns, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Abstained: Tuttle, Theus;*
24 *Absent for vote: Frierson]*

25 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, let the Record reflect I wasn't, I was not here last
26 week [sic] therefore I can't vote.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. That's Mr. –

2 MR. THEUS: Nor was I.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Do we have any Agenda amendments?

4 MS. HEGLER: Good afternoon, Chairman. No changes to the Agenda. I would
5 just make a, a note or a reminder that the Board of Zoning Appeals has their regularly
6 scheduled meeting at 4:00 today, so if we are still in session at 3:50, we'll need to
7 recess for their short meeting.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, thank you. Do we have a motion on the Agenda?

9 MR. BROWN: Move approval.

10 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say
12 aye.

13 [Approved: Cairns, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Abstained: Tuttle, Theus;
14 Absent for vote: Frierson]

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Road Name approvals?

16 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we accept the Road Names
17 as submitted.

18 MR. THEUS: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say
20 aye?

21 [Approved: Cairns, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Abstained: Tuttle, Theus;
22 Absent for vote: Frierson]

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, Map Amendments, Case No. 14-29 MA.

1 **CASE NO. 14-29 MA:**

2 MR. LEGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is an application that came before
3 the Commission last month, Case No. 29. The Applicant is Mr. Thomas Crowther. The
4 property's located on Clemson Road, very near the intersection of Hardscrabble Road.
5 It's a little over 15 acres in size, currently zoned RU, our Rural District, and Mr.
6 Crowther is asking for GC, our General Commercial District. The RU District is original
7 zoning from 1977. As far as I know from the Staff perspective, nothing has really
8 changed on our end, the recommendation remains as it was last month for disapproval.
9 That is based on the surrounding zoning classifications and the nearby development
10 types being residential in nature to the east and west, and based upon the
11 Comprehensive Plan calling for commercial to be located at intersections where
12 commercial should not encroach in residential use zoning. From that perspective our
13 recommendation remains at disapproval.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Thomas Crowther? And folks,
15 what we'll, what we'll do is we'll call your name and I'll probably call two or three at a
16 time, and if you would like to come down and kinda line up against the bannister it'd
17 help us out with timeframes. And if you could give us your name and address for the
18 Record, and try to limit your comments to two minutes we'd appreciate it. Thanks.

19 **TESTIMONY OF THOMAS CROWTHER:**

20 MR. CROWTHER: Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission,
21 and constituents. My name is Thomas Crowther, I live in Dallas, Texas. Last time we
22 were here was October 6th. Just a little bit of background on who we are and why we're
23 here today. Cypress Equities was founded in 1995 as a development affiliate of the

1 Staubach Company, formerly owned by former Cowboy great, Roger Staubach. We
2 currently have six offices throughout the country and we're a full service real estate
3 development firm. We're here to you and before you today to request a rezoning from
4 Rural to GC on the Clemson Road site. The total acreage that we wanna develop is
5 roughly about 10+ acres; 6.7 acres of that will be for a grocery store, fuel station, and
6 drive-thru pharmacy component, 2.9 acres of that will pretty much be for future use. The
7 site itself will include a neighborhood market grocery store about 41,000 square foot in
8 sizes, a fuel station component, and a pharmacy drive-thru. This represents an initial
9 investment into the community of \$12M. Some additional benefits that the community
10 will receive from our client is, one, healthy, fresh produce with over 11% of that produce
11 being sourced from local South Carolina farmers. Two, accessibility, convenience and
12 competitive pricing for every day pharmaceutical and those items. Three, 95 competitive
13 paying jobs. The average hourly rate of our tenant is \$12.79 per hour. In addition, our
14 tenant boasts that 75% of its onsite management staff started as boots on the ground.
15 With our development there's also some benefits that the community will see. One, it
16 will actually aid in traffic improvements that without the development the area would not
17 see. For example, there's a proposed road that's actually under consideration by DOT
18 now that will go into the subdivision adjacent and behind our development. With our
19 involvement, we've conducted studies that our development would actually warrant a
20 traffic signal that will actually aid to relieve some of the traffic congestions at the site.
21 There's also some additional improvements that we've actually talked with the Broad,
22 the Broad [sic] Field subdivision such as additional security lighting, sidewalks, trees, an
23 entry feature along the road, safety and convenience, and some additional requests

1 requested by Brookfield. We're all willing to partner on these issues. So last time we
2 were here the Commission said we want you to defer and reengage with the
3 community. On October 21st we had a neighborhood meetings with the Brookfield
4 residents and collaborated on many of the solutions to address the impacts of traffic,
5 lighting, noise, buffering, and security concerns. Following that meeting we had a much
6 larger meeting with the surrounding neighborhoods, such as Brookfield, Rose Creek,
7 Copperfield, Winchester, and Wimberley. There was some other concerns that was
8 brought up. Most of the feedback and concerns that the neighborhoods brought up was
9 related to the access road, the timing of the new road, the impacts to Crane Creek,
10 movements at the intersection, and restricted access to neighbors. So I wanted to take
11 a few minutes just to address some of those concerns. One, traffic. Today we've
12 brought our traffic engineer with Wolverton & Associates to talk to you about some of
13 the benefits that you'll see with our development as it relates to traffic. I'll let him dive
14 more into that. Secondly, there was a concern about, why can't we develop in existing
15 grocery stores or existing vacant grocery stores? We also explored those options.
16 Unfortunately, when a grocer vacates an area there's actually a, an agreement in place
17 in that area that restricts new grocers from coming in. So none of those options work for
18 us. Thirdly, there was concerns about Crane Creek. We've also brought our civil
19 engineer that's responsible for the design of the development to talk to how our storm
20 water system, detention, and any concerns regarding existing habitats will not be
21 impacted by our development. Fourth, there was a concern about accountability. Hey,
22 we don't know you, so to speak to that a little bit we actually engaged with the
23 Brookfield residents and sent them a proposal that said, look upon developing this area

1 here's the things that we've heard you said to us, and here's the things that we're willing
2 to do. In the spirit of partnership and actually going above and beyond, we're willing to
3 take that proposal upon closing and file a declaration with the HOA as benefactors to
4 say, hey if we develop on this site all the items that we stated in our proposal will be
5 implemented. As it relates to the future land use and the Staff Report, also last time the
6 Staff Report said, hey the proposed commercial does not conform to future land use
7 plan which organizes commercial at the intersection artillaries [sic]. We feel that while
8 we may not meet the letter of the plan, we still meet the objective and the land use goal
9 in that due to the encroachment of the residential area and the church facility on the
10 southeast quadrant of the intersection, we are still only 200' from the center of the
11 intersection at the closest point. And where the grocery portion begins only 1,000' from
12 the center point of the intersection. The larger commercial development to the north
13 overlaps our site along with the western portion. While others might like to see a less
14 intrusive use developed here, there is no guarantee that they will be planned in a way to
15 mitigate adverse impacts. We are committed to this community, we're committed to this
16 subdivision, and we would like the merit of our efforts done to stand before Council
17 today. Thanks.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Keith Alexander? Followed by Bob Cates, Dr.
19 Florence Folks, and Deanna Wild?

20 **TESTIMONY OF KEITH ALEXANDER:**

21 MR. ALEXANDER: Good afternoon. Keith Alexander, 310 Andon(?) Hall. I would
22 like to say I support this development. Reason being, it impacts local economy. The

1 developers had agreed to work with women and minorities for business; that's the local
2 footprint and the heartbeat of a strong economy so, you know, I support their efforts.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Bob Cates?

4 **TESTIMONY OF BOB CATES:**

5 MR. CATES: Well I'm Bob Capes, but I'm not for it. Do you have me under the
6 'for' column?

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, sir.

8 MR. CATES: Okay. Excellent. Alright. And I've been timing Thomas and
9 [inaudible] folks and I think I got about seven minutes on them, so it's gonna be hard for
10 this southern boy to say anything in two minutes, so.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir, typically we allow the Applicant a little bit of
12 leeway in there since they're presenting.

13 MR. CATES: That's good. And I've met Thomas, he's got a Gamecock lawyer
14 now, that says a little bit of something coming out of Dallas, too. But you know, all this is
15 a bunch of bologna, it's not gonna help any traffic. Let me tell you I'm Bob Capes, I live
16 with my wife Kathy and three rescue dogs at 5 Copperwood Court, in not the
17 Cooperfield but the Copperfield subdivision, okay? We think that if you classify this
18 property as commercial, general commercial, that there will be an encroachment of
19 nothing but negative consequences that will come out of this. The most intrusive, and
20 there are several of these we've kinda listed, they're gonna be disruptive, they're gonna
21 be unwelcome aspects that are involved here, obstructive. One of the most to us is we
22 have a walkable neighborhood. The wife and I walk the dogs, we walk in the
23 neighborhood, and we ride bicycles in the neighborhood. With all of the people and the

1 vehicles that are gonna be coming through the subdivision, coming through our
2 subdivision as shortcuts, okay? It's gonna be intrusive to us. They're gonna be speeding
3 through the process, somebody will come up with an idea to have speed bumps and
4 that's gonna take things away, just going to be a lotta havoc and problems for us within
5 this process. The others gonna be the safety issue. Now this safety issue is with, from a
6 crime standpoint because I've heard the grocery store, I've heard some of the things
7 that are involved, and, but it doesn't mean that that's all that's gonna go there; there
8 could be massage parlors, there could be [inaudible], there could be all kinds of
9 nightclubs going in there. And that's gonna cause crime and it's gonna cause problems
10 for our neighborhood. In addition to the process of that we've got lighting issues, okay?
11 Now I love the fair and I love Carolina stadium but I don't wanna live next door to it from
12 dusk to dawn with all the lights. You can't built a retaining wall tall enough to keep those
13 lights outta there. There's gonna be noise, probably aroma un, unwanted odors coming
14 from all of the dumpsters that are involved with all of the grocery store, food, etc. So,
15 you know, we had a report I think in 2013 that said, this community area is already
16 exceeded from a traffic standpoint. So I appreciate the opportunity to come and just
17 speak to you. I hope there's something that's positive that comes out of this that keeps
18 you from rezoning it. Thank you very much.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Florence Folks?

20 [Frierson in at 1:19]

21 **TESTIMONY OF FLORENCE FOLKS:**

22 DR. FOLKS: Hi, my name is Dr. Florence Folks and I stand here in favor of the
23 development because as a pastor of Only God's Word located at 4145 Hardscrabble

1 Road, I think that, I know that it would be more easier for the parishioners there to have
2 easy access to the church located near the corner of Clemson and Hardscrabble Road.
3 It's a very dangerous situation as it is now for the children trying to get to the church, but
4 if the road is widening and more traffic lights as he said will be developed there, I think it
5 would be much better for the parishioners and for the children of the neighborhood that
6 attends the church on a three to four time a week basis. And that's why I stand here for
7 the safety of the children and definitely the economic development of it for the
8 increasing of jobs and, and just a working area. Other than that, that's what I stand for,
9 for the churches that's located, about five churches, on Hardscrabble Road, I think it
10 would be, make it more easy access for the parishioners and mainly for the children.
11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Geo, can you grab those for us, yeah, can we
13 pull those?

14 **TESTIMONY OF DEANNA WILEY:**

15 MR. WILEY: Hello, my name is Deanna Wiley and I will be representing
16 Brookfield as well as Brookfield HOA and the residents in my [inaudible]. I'm all for
17 economic development as well, I'm an econ major so, but can't we just move that a little
18 bit further down the road, maybe towards, I don't know, the Killian side? It still would
19 give us jobs, it will still impact the community but just not right here within the mix of the
20 neighborhoods. I'll try not – I'll be brief. We are opposed to the rezoning of this property
21 to general commercial. We believe that it would be a negative impact on the
22 surrounding neighborhoods and especially ours with it being in our back door. And I will
23 say that Cypress has reached out to us and they have listened to us as well as listened

1 to the other neighborhoods and they have said that they will make promises here and
2 there. But we have been very clear with them from the beginning that we prefer to not
3 have general commercial there, we would like to keep it either the way it is or maybe a
4 lesser level or district, maybe OI, office and institutions, that would be a lot, fit a little bit
5 better with the surroundings of just the logistics of the traffic flow and everything else.
6 The two shopping centers across the street, yes they are vacant and as Thomas did
7 say, I understand that Food Lion does still own that property and they do not wanna see
8 a competitor come in since they're right down the street on Hardscrabble. However, the
9 Piggly Wiggly is not owned by Piggly Wiggly, I actually spoke to that broker, Hance
10 Jones, and he said that they welcome any grocery store, they can come into that area
11 and he's talked to a, a couple actually, and that anyone can come if they have any
12 questions, and I have his telephone number. The other thing is the intersection already
13 at Hardscrabble and Clemson Road is already GC, is already zoned that way, it already
14 sees 25,000 plus vehicles per day. We don't need to move that additional traffic
15 however many feet Thomas said, 1,000, amongst the neighborhoods. It causes safety
16 issues, it causes lighting issues and noise issues, just as the ones before me have
17 already specified. So I understand that the area is growing rapidly, like I said, and I do
18 want to see the area grow but like I said I would prefer it to be developed in that specific
19 area on a lower level of zoning. And these are my concerns and a lot of the other
20 Brookfield residents do not want to see a six pump gas station or grocery store,
21 restaurants or whatever might get put in there in their back yards. So, that's my
22 [inaudible]. Thank you for your time.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Joseph Butler followed by Deborah Short,
2 Glenn Jones and Pat Adams. Yes, sir, Joseph Butler?

3 **TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH BUTLER:**

4 MR. BUTLER: Good afternoon. Good afternoon. I am for this supermarket in, in
5 our community. I'm from Richland County, Northeast, and the possibility of, of it bringing
6 more jobs and, and gainful employment for the community as well as conveniences for
7 the community, is, everybody that I've spoken with concerning this is, they're, they're
8 just thrilled about it. And I see it as a positive move for the whole community.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you.

10 MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Deborah Short? And if y'all could give us your name and
12 address when you take the podium too, we'd appreciate it.

13 **TESTIMONY OF DEBORAH SHORT:**

14 MS. SHORT: Hi, thank you. And unfortunately I can't be this friendly and sweet.
15 My name is Deborah Short, and I reside with my family at 29 Winding Creek Lane in the
16 subdivision of Brookfield. In February, my son, his family and myself transferred here
17 from Long Island and after an exhausting search for the perfect house we came across
18 our home. It was calming and serene as the wildlife made themselves known to us. We
19 have had many visits from deer which have become the most enjoyable part of our
20 residence. Coming from Long Island, building is rapid and I am more than familiar with
21 the zoning issues and have had my property verified and checked the zoning for my
22 home before purchasing it, and felt it was a good investment. The zoning [inaudible] for
23 being examined on Clemson Road is in my beautiful back yard. Besides the

1 environmental impacts and the changes to the landscape our neighborhood that is, that
2 is only part of the impact that it will have on our lives. On Clemson there are many
3 residential homes as well as two schools which are being sandwiched between this
4 property. The additional noise pollution where the noise ordinances are involved, the
5 increasing crime as well as the accidents that will occur are only part of the issues
6 facing these changes. To not have our neighborhoods monopolized by big business for
7 the sake of money is our challenge today. We ask that you give consideration to the
8 homeowners that work hard to keep the value of their residence. If this proposal should
9 be passed, the homeowners impacted by this will have home evaluations done on their
10 homes and before and after the completion of this project. If the value of our homes are
11 decreased and are not of fair market value due to this project, I will bring a petition to
12 seek legal counsel which could lead to litigation. Flooding is another issue. With more
13 parking lots come less drainage. There's plenty of acres of land on Clemson where the
14 zoning is already permitted for this type of project. To change the zoning laws for this
15 area is absolutely disheartening. I have only one question I propose to the zoning
16 commission, how many of you have or would like to have a six foot retaining wall for
17 your back yard landscape? I wish to state that the zoning permit being sought for here
18 be denied due to the many different severe issues. To ask us to go through months and
19 months of construction and upheaval for the sake of corporate America where we have
20 no stand where the South Carolina homeowners are badgered to where we have no
21 voice is our struggle today. Please hear our plea to vote no on the proposal of rezoning
22 for this project. Ask for the developer to go down the road where the zoning is
23 permitted. Clemson is not a highway and already has many vacant areas of real estate

1 for building and leasing. I thank you for the opportunity to share my perspective on this
2 proposal and hope you will take it into consideration while making your decision. Thank
3 you.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Glenn Jones?

5 **TESTIMONY OF GLENN JONES:**

6 MR. JONES: My name's Glenn Jones, I'm 1980 Lake Carolina Drive. I'm in favor
7 of the proposal because I'd like to see as the father of three daughters and a couple of
8 grandkids now who are running out of opportunities close to the home for even
9 employment. So what I'd like to see is, as I send my kids through school and as they're
10 going through college to, to get a chance to come home and take advantage of an
11 opportunity that's out there for them. Much less, the economic impact it'll have on our
12 area. As with one grocery store leaving if you are a grandfather and a father as I am,
13 you see prices going up because the competition is leaving out of our area. Competition
14 drives costs and price. Another one would drive those costs down as to where they
15 were before when the grocery store left us. And so this and a couple of the other entities
16 that were mentioned in the, in the proposal, I do agree with and I'm, and that makes it,
17 makes me be for the project. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Pat Adams?

19 **TESTIMONY OF PAY ADAMS:**

20 MS. ADAMS: Thank you. My name is Pat Adams and I live at 4 Wilshire Circle in
21 Columbia, that's the Wellington subdivision which is north, on north side of Clemson
22 Road, immediately northeast of this proposed development. And I appreciate the
23 opportunity to speak to you today and am very grateful that you deferred decision on

1 this last month because we did not know about it. The sign that was posted was lost in
2 the blizzard of campaign signs. And I'm very sad that that one sign on Clemson Road
3 does not give notice to the people that are affected by this project. This project is
4 neighboring Crane Creek. Crane Creek runs through the Winchester development and
5 the Wellington development, goes across Clemson Road, and runs through this
6 proposed property and affects Brookfield and Rose Creek, and then all the properties
7 down between Hardscrabble and North Springs Road, all the way down to Brickyard. If
8 you look on the map at the watershed for Crane Creek, that is a very large area. And
9 the people that are affected by that area don't know about this one piece of property. I'm
10 here representing the Board of Directors for Wellington and many of the homeowners of
11 Wellington are here and asked me to speak on their behalf to save you some time. We
12 have several objections to rezoning this property. We are very concerned about traffic
13 on Clemson Road. Like most of the developments on Clemson Road, because we have
14 no stop lights, we cannot make left turns out of our development. We are directly across
15 from the Post Office. We cannot turn left out of the, our development. Brookfield and
16 Copperfield cannot make left turns. When they need to do it they turn right and then
17 they turn in our subdivision. I spent the last two nights on the corner in our subdivision
18 collecting signatures for a petition for the County Council, and there were at least a
19 dozen cars in one hour that used our subdivision to make a U-turn. I was asking them,
20 are you a resident here, oh no, I'm just turning around. Because they can't make a left
21 turn. If you put a business in-between our development and Hardscrabble within, what
22 did you say it was 200' of, of the intersection? I doubt the DOT's gonna approve a stop
23 light. And I doubt that tractor trailers making left turns across Clemson Road traffic is

1 gonna do anything other than cause more traffic accidents and more congestion. Our
2 bigger concern than traffic, from my perspective, is the impact on Crane Creek. We
3 already have a significant flooding problem with Crane Creek. In 2009 you may know
4 that FEMA redrew the floodplain map. Twenty homes in Wellington were affected by
5 that redraw. It took us multiple hours and lots of money to get our land surveyed and get
6 letters of map amendment from FEMA so that we didn't have to pay flood insurance.
7 With the widening of Clemson Road and worse with the widening of Hardscrabble, it's
8 needed, it's coming, there's more pavement, more water. It's the storm drainage that is
9 affecting Crane Creek; the sand, the debris, from the roads are clogging the creek. It's
10 never getting cleared out. If we take 15 acres right next to that creek and you clear cut
11 nine acres of trees and you put in, what, five, six, seven acres of payment, and you put
12 a gas station immediately next to the creek, the environmental impact is, potential is
13 very great, and it's going to flood homes all through that area. We're gonna be lucky if
14 the Hardscrabble Road doesn't cause flooding to that area. I understand they're gonna
15 put retention ponds in to delay their water going to the creek. I don't think their retention
16 pond is going to wait for the water above this property to drain. When they drain we are
17 gonna back up more, we are really gonna flood. And that's gonna cause a significant
18 problem. We are –

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Ms. Adams, if you could wrap up for us we'd appreciate it.

20 MS. ADAMS: Pardon me?

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: If you could wrap up for us we'd appreciate it.

1 MS. ADAMS: Thank you. We believe that the commercial businesses should be
2 located at zoned commercial sites. There's plenty available and we are strongly against
3 rezoning this. We appreciate your time.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you.

5 MS. ADAMS: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: John Quigley, then Todd Devoss, Tracy Barnes.

7 **TESTIMONY OF JOHN QUIGLEY:**

8 MR. QUIGLEY: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity. John Quigley, 4
9 Idlebrook Circle. I do not live on Clemson Road, thank you. I came here about 12 years
10 ago from the northeast part of the country and I appreciated working and living in a rural
11 environment. Since that time we have had Sandhills and every vacant lot between
12 Sandhills and Route 20 sold and building and commercial enterprises, and there's still
13 plenty of room on that side of Clemson. Very nice section coming out at Rhame Road to
14 the right, which is mostly residential, until you hit Hardscrabble and then from
15 Hardscrabble to 77 is heavily commercial. Again, I think we have enough commercial
16 space surrounding our nice little residential area that suffices for all the needs that were
17 mentioned here today. I'm not taking up any more of your time, thank you very much.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Todd Devoss? And if you could give us your
19 address as well we'd appreciate it.

20 **TESTIMONY OF TODD DEVOSS:**

21 MR. DEVOSS: Yes, my name is Todd DeVoss, I'm in [Inaudible], Georgia, I'm
22 the traffic engineer for the site, professional registered traffic engineer. This, as we've
23 heard Clemson Boulevard or Clemson Road has a lotta traffic, there's no doubt about

1 that, it's a five lane roadway with a two-way left turn lane. Roadways such as that can
2 handle in the low 30,000 vehicles per day. The intersection of Hardscrabble as we've
3 also heard is, is not operating at the level that everybody would like it to. That
4 intersection is also going to be reconstructed with some additional turn lanes at that
5 intersection in the near future, in fact in the next few years. As part of that project a
6 median will be constructed a little ways down Clemson, blocking the, or cutting off the
7 full access roadway into Brookfield. As part of that a, a back entrance or a second
8 access would be provided to the east on the east side of the site here that we're looking
9 at, that will provide the, the full access, left in, left out access to the Brookfield
10 subdivision. This site would border up to that. Without any development that roadway
11 itself would not warrant a traffic signal cause there's not enough traffic coming out of the
12 subdivision currently, and moving it over to this new intersection would not warrant a
13 signal. When you add the, the development here with the grocery store that would then
14 bring it, bring the traffic volume up to a level that would warrant a traffic signal at that, at
15 that driveway, which would provide access and, and stoppage of traffic on Clemson
16 briefly to allow traffic to come out. These two traffic signals along with this signal, as
17 along as the, along with the one at Hardscrabble be interconnected to each other,
18 therefore working together, therefore you're not stopping at both signals along Clemson
19 Road. So this signal would, would only turn green, sorry, green for the side street when
20 traffic comes up on it, it is not a signal that would stop Clemson Road 60% of the time or
21 anything like that. You're looking at probably 15 seconds or so of red then the traffic
22 would proceed on, on Clemson, so. And this signal, like I said, would be coordinated
23 with the signal at Hardscrabble, therefore not making an adverse effect with an

1 additional signal. Majority of the traffic for a development such as this, such as a
2 grocery store and fueling station, a lotta that traffic is pass-by traffic, in other words it's
3 traffic already on the roadway. It's on Clemson or Hardscrabble currently so it's not
4 attracting traffic from I-77 or anywhere else. So therefore, a lotta that traffic is already
5 out there, you're not add, you are adding some traffic, there's no doubt, I'm not saying
6 that no traffic will be added to the roadway system, but a lot of it is already out there as
7 people going to and from their neighborhoods or work or wherever they're going. So a
8 lotta that traffic is already out there, therefore it's not making a large impact on the traffic
9 volume that's out there on the roadway. And that's it.

10 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure.

12 MR. TUTTLE: On the civil drawing if you could pull that over, in our package we
13 don't see, there's an access road that's not depicted in our package and I know this is
14 proposed – yeah, can you hold that up? We can't see. Yeah, so where does that road
15 terminate? Obviously on one end is Clemson, but where does it -

16 MR. DEVOSS: It terminates in the subdivision [inaudible]. Currently this end
17 where the current access to the subdivision, the median will block any left in, left out, so
18 you're left with a right in, right out so vehicles accessing the subdivision from the east
19 who are wanting to go west but –

20 MR. TUTTLE: So that's DOT's proposed solution –

21 MR. DEVOSS: Exactly.

22 MR. TUTTLE: - to, to that, regardless of whether this development takes place or
23 not?

1 MR. DEVOSS: Whether the development goes in or not that's –

2 MR. TUTTLE: And that is not on your, on the proposed parcel, that's a – it's not
3 on your land or it is?

4 ?: My, if I'm not mistaken [inaudible] the entire tract. And it is gonna be on their
5 parcel, that is one advantage as Thomas had mentioned before that that can be
6 accelerated forward versus what the DOT schedule was [inaudible].

7 MR. CROWTHER: We're in discussions currently with the existing land owner to
8 work in partnership to develop the road and expedite it. So if DOT did the road, the road
9 would just be a, a basic DOT road. Because if Cypress does the road we're able to do
10 some additional things for the development such as sidewalks, safety lighting, the traffic
11 light, that DOT really would not explore. So that's a benefit that actually having Cypress
12 involved would be.

13 MR. TUTTLE: Okay, thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Tracy Barnes?

15 **TESTIMONY OF TRACY BARNES:**

16 MS. BARNES: Good afternoon, I'm back. I was here at the last zoning meeting
17 and I'm Tracy Barnes, I live at 120 Rose Creek Court. And I just don't think the
18 Brookfield folks, I, I heard the young lady talk a minute ago, I don't think they want the
19 fancy road that they're proposing. The road's gonna go in, DOT's gonna put it there.
20 They don't want it to be any fancier, they want to keep the quality of their neighborhood
21 the way it is. And so I just want you to understand that it, it is gonna happen and we
22 know that's gonna happen. I represent Rose Creek and I'm the president of the
23 homeowners' association. Our group is opposed to it. I also have a letter from the North

1 Spring homeowners' association, which is pretty far down the road but they're also
2 opposed to the development. I hear what the folks have said about economic
3 opportunities. They can just go a mile down the road closer where Clemson turns into
4 Killian. We don't have to have a grocery store there so people can have jobs. I, I just
5 think that's, that's just not something that we want. And we certainly don't need a gas
6 station, there're two on the corner, and it's almost impossible to get in and out of those
7 gas stations as it is. I just think there's a better use for that property, I'd like to see it stay
8 rural, possibly a church could go there. I'm leaving the neighborhood actually because
9 we need to go to a patio home, I'd love to see some nice patio homes in that small 15
10 acre parcel. Also, you said you don't, you know, you don't know the community, well we
11 don't know you. One of y'all said that.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Ma'am, if you could address comments to us we'd
13 appreciate it.

14 MS. BARNES: We don't know these developers, although I Googled them and
15 learned as much as I could about them. I'm sure they're very honest and trustworthy
16 people. They talked about having some kind of legal document where they would
17 promise all the things that they are promising Brookfield that they're going to do them,
18 that same thing was given to Rose Creek over 10 years ago. We are still fighting to get
19 some of the covenants that were in, legally in writing, filed and everything, and they
20 haven't been done. So you, you can tell I, I have a sore spot when it comes to promises
21 made by developers. And I just hope that you will disapprove this, like your paid
22 professionals over here did. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. We got Mark Woolrich and then Katina
2 Williams I think was, said she did not want to speak, is that right? Okay. And then
3 followed by Angela McFelder, McFadden? And Cheryl Shifron. Yes, sir.

4 **TESTIMONY OF MARK WOOLRICH:**

5 MR. WOOLRICH: I'm Mark Woolrich with Wolverton & Associates. I'm the civil
6 engineer for this project. It's at 745 Sugarloaf Parkway, Duluth, Georgia. I just wanna
7 tell you a little bit about the civil engineering side and some of the other measures that
8 we're gonna take on site, on site to meet what the Code requirement is. The detention
9 on site is provided in three ponds disbursed among the site. The site naturally drains
10 towards the east, towards Crane's Creek, so the detention facilities will provide
11 detention for the 100 year storm. Current Code requires the storm up to 50 years so I
12 would say that's twice in length or half the frequency in a statistical manner. We also will
13 have water quality measures provided within the detention system to take care of any
14 sediment, any trash, any kinda debris that washes off the parking lot will be then
15 captured into the pond and will not be allowed out of the pond, and then through
16 maintenance that's done on the system on a routine basis, you know, when they're
17 cutting grass and doing that stuff, those type of materials will be collected and disposed
18 of. I understand about some concerns about flooding along the creek. Part of the
19 process that we undertake when we do the detention system is to look at the size of the
20 basin and work with the engineering staff at the county to determine if we need to make
21 adjustments to the release timing or the rates from this site so that we don't time our
22 peak release with that of the creek. So we take all those measures to, to prevent
23 flooding so the site does not cause any kind of flooding. Landscaping, we'll provide

1 landscaping on site and per the city requirements we'll work with, I mean, the county
2 requirements we'll work with the county staff on the landscaping. We'll have a 10' buffer
3 along the back as well as a fence for security and for screening. Lighting will be LED
4 lighting, we'll have shielded lighting that's directed down, it's directed so it doesn't spill
5 out to the sides or up in the air. It's very efficient, you know, no one is into wasting light
6 anymore by shining it all over the place and it's not secure when it's done that way.
7 Parking in the lots close to the, the entrance, all of it's, most of it's within about 200' of
8 the parking lot. The gas station, as far as any concerns about spills or leaking of the
9 tanks, they, these are double walled, self-contained systems, they meet all the federal
10 and state guidelines for any kind of containment should there be any kind of issues.
11 Then as far as any kinda concerns with impacts to wetlands and such the, the creek is
12 to the east of the connector road that goes to Brookfield, the same road that either the
13 developer would put in if the project goes forward, or that the DOT puts in, any
14 wetlands on this site are closer to the creek. We are not impacting the floodplain,
15 floodway, or the wetlands associated with the creek with this development. And I can
16 answer any other questions you might have on the engineering side.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Anybody got any questions? Thank you.

18 MR. WOOLRICH: Okay, thanks.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Katina Williams? Angelina McFadden? Cheryl Shifman?

20 **TESTIMONY OF CHERYL SHIFMAN:**

21 MS. SHIFMAN: Thank you. My name is Cheryl Shifman, I live at 104 Old Park
22 Drive, that's in Wellington, and I moved into my home there about a year and a half ago.
23 And I, I agree with my colleagues, I am also against this. We've talked a lot about the

1 impact on us. I guess the only other appeal I would make is just the, the quality of area,
2 not just for the homeowners but for the northeast. The northeast has been a beautiful
3 area, heavily wooded. Mr. Geo helped us understand when there are many homes, and
4 there are many homes in this stretch, commercial, you know, other kind of development
5 will follow, but it is so, it's solid now and the, the, whatever the new mall is that's going
6 to go in up to Hardscrabble and then from Sandhills down. And so it's like there's this
7 oasis and I guess I'm just appealing to, really on behalf of even people who drive
8 through there, that the whole area does not become like Two Notch, like Decker, but
9 there is a, this, this oasis of green and homes and some development. We understand
10 that. But just not solid commercial development. Thank you very much for considering
11 this.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Robert Fuller followed by Peggy Merrill.

13 **TESTIMONY OF ROBERT FULLER:**

14 MR. FULLER: Mr. Chairman, my name is Bob Fuller, I'm a lawyer here in
15 Columbia and I represent the developer or the potential developer for the site. I'll be
16 very brief with you this afternoon, which is not usually what I say. But I will tell you that
17 they have engaged me for the purpose of committing to whatever documentation is
18 necessary, the pledges, warranties and declarations that they have made to neighbors
19 to assure their intent is honorable and will be followed through with. There are ways to
20 impose upon the property restrictions by deed and otherwise that can be enforced, that
21 will be enforced. The planning propositions for the county's superintendents assure
22 storm water control, the other infrastructure considerations on the site. The private deed
23 restrictions will be imposed on the property prior to the final action by County Council if

1 the matter moves forward, and it appears that it would move to a closing where there
2 would actually be development of this project on the property. Cypress Equities cannot
3 pledge beyond its own project what it will or will not do. Whatever happened before
4 happened before and is in a posture that is either pleasing or not pleasing to some or all
5 of the neighbors. I think I'm familiar with one of the projects that has been mentioned
6 here and it was a Planned Development District, so there was an extremely long litany
7 of things that were imposed by the ordinance itself that had to be done. If those things
8 haven't been done the county can enforce them. There's a declaration of covenants and
9 restrictions that applies to the property. If they're not being followed they can be
10 enforced. But from this project perspective you all concurred that, last month, it would
11 be beneficial for the developer to talk with the people who were most concerned about
12 what they were going to do. That has been done at long length and I'm simply here to
13 tell you that there are ways and will be ways that will assure that what they have
14 promoted and promised to be done will be done by written declaration and not simply
15 relied on by oral comment.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Peggy Merrill?

17 **TESTIMONY OF PEGGY MERRILL:**

18 MS. MERRILL: Thank you for allowing us to have this opportunity. This is my
19 statement on behalf of the board and residents of the Brookfield Homeowners
20 Association in regard to the development proposal on Clemson Road. I am a board
21 member of that development. We would propose a lesser level of commercial
22 development such as OI instead of GC, which again is the office and institution versus
23 the general commercial, which is a much higher level of development for the property

1 immediately in front of our Brookfield homes. And I'd like to point out on the map the
2 brown area is Brookfield and you can see how many of our homes back up to the green
3 area that's going to be developed. So it's significant, significant impact on our residents
4 of, of Brookfield. Our residents have had mixed reactions, the majority being negative.
5 The impact of a 24 hour operation with a gas station seems to us to be something that
6 would attract people that would not be of the best character being out in the middle of
7 the night. Frequent deliveries would occur at all hours of the day and night. Heavy
8 commercialism is concentrated at the intersection of Clemson and Hardscrabble. This
9 level of commercialism with traffic, noise and lighting does not belong this close to a
10 residential community, the residential community of Brookfield. OI is preferable since
11 this would call for tenants who conduct business during the day and have a smaller
12 amount of traffic and commerce. We would prefer the road enhancements that Cypress
13 is offering. This would be a beneficial safety and light addition, however, the benefit of
14 this road comes at a cost. We're also concerned about the fact that that road would go
15 right into our subdivision, so how would that impact the neighborhood traffic with
16 children playing and that kind of thing. Because we're, again we're concerned for safety.
17 We are also concerned about mosquitos in the ponds that would be created and how
18 that would be managed because we already have a significant mosquito problem in our,
19 our development. If a GC permit is granted to this, to this proposed developer the
20 Brookfield Homeowners Association board agrees with Cypress as they have desire to
21 truly listen to our concerns and accommodate us. We want to protect ourselves and get
22 what is being promised. And again, they have been up front with us on things they can
23 accommodate us with and very open to our suggestions and as a board member I

1 would congratulate them on being that way with us. Good integrity, high integrity. Thank
2 you.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Well, that is the last person to speak so that
4 concludes our public input session for this case. What are your thoughts?

5 MR. ANDERSON: I have one quick question for Staff. I think this is right, the
6 green arrow on our packet, that's where the traffic count was done, correct?

7 MR. DELAGE: Correct. On the map, that's the aerial, that's where the traffic
8 count station is. At least according to our records.

9 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir?

11 MR. BROWN: How enforceable are those covenants and agreements that the
12 developer has put forward and said that they would in fact memorialize in the legal
13 agreement?

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: They are very much enforceable, but what's in front of us
15 today I, I understand that conversation and what goes on but, but, and each Planning
16 Commission Member is free to take into account whatever they, whatever they wish.
17 But for me, my thought process is, is this piece of property, irrespective of what they
18 plan to do on the site, is this piece of property proper for a General Commercial zoning
19 whether it's these guys that do this development or somebody else who does any other
20 development on the site.

21 MR. BROWN: And I understand that, Mr. Chairman.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

1 MR. BROWN: And I, I agree with what you're saying. I was just asking the
2 question.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Absolutely, they, those are, those can be done and are
4 enforceable but it's, but it's outside of the Planning Commission purviews to how all that
5 stuff occurs.

6 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Did you have something, Tracy?

8 MS. HEGLER: I would just add it's also outside of county if it's a private
9 agreement. That's a private covenant. It's enforceable by the parties to that covenant.

10 MR. TUTTLE: You're, Ms. Linder, I would assume that we have a mechanism in
11 the State of South Carolina called a development agreement that could be used to, to
12 require somebody to do something on a particular site.

13 MS. HEGLER: Yes, but we, we don't use that to enforce, you know, these sorts
14 of requirements.

15 MR. BROWN: I apologize, I can't hear her.

16 MS. HEGLER: I'm asking Amelia. You know, there's a difference between a
17 covenant, a development agreement, and then an ordinance in a PDD. And Mr. Fuller
18 was correct, there was a reference today to a PDD ordinance that yes, the county does
19 enforce cause it's our ordinance. Private agreements that may be covenants between
20 two parties are not enforceable by the county. Development agreements, were we to
21 enter into them, are used a little differently.

22 MR. TUTTLE: Well, with the Supreme Court taking away the PDD option in this
23 particular case which historically would've given us an opportunity to tie certain

1 requirements to an approval, we don't, we don't have that mechanism anymore. So I've
2 seen development agreements used to tie a developer to certain commitments relative
3 to the development of the project. Maybe Richland County hasn't done it as often as
4 others, but it's certainly available.

5 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, and it would just depend on what those requirements were
6 if we had the ability to enforce them and who would do that at the county. Amelia, what
7 do you, what is your opinion on development agreements?

8 MS. LINDER: It's been a while since I've looked at the statute on development
9 agreements, but as Mr. Price just mentioned to me there are acreage requirements and
10 I, I'm not sure that the, this particular site would have the acreage needed to enter into a
11 development agreement. But again, I have not looked at development agreements in a
12 while. That would also be done outside of the Planning Commission.

13 MR. TUTTLE: No, no, I agree I just, I didn't, if any Members are, are weighing
14 that I wanted to make sure that it's either legally obtainable or it's not. Cause that might
15 lead them to make a decision or not.

16 MS. LINDER: I, I would have to get back on you as far as what the legal
17 requirements are for them.

18 MR. TUTTLE: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other thoughts or questions?

20 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman, I've got a question. The, for Staff, the current
21 zoning, RU, can you all give us some idea of what falls in, what could, at this point, what
22 type of uses would go into that particular zoning?

1 MS. HEGLER: Well, Geo's coming down, it's not in the table, is it? The table just
2 tells you the difference.

3 MR. PRICE: Without going through the Land Development Code, typically the
4 RU District allows for agricultural uses, manufactured homes, single-family homes,
5 residential uses, and no multi-family, and recreational. Those are some of the main
6 uses for the Rural District.

7 MR. GILCHRIST: And manufactured homes I would assume that's mobile
8 homes, is that right?

9 MR. PRICE: Manufactured homes. Yes.

10 MR. THEUS: I don't think anybody sees this land remaining zoned Rural. I would
11 think it would be multi-family or OI at some point, if not GC. I do have a, just reading
12 from the, the text provided us by the future, by the Staff on the Comprehensive Plan,
13 which is sort of our guide, it says, these uses should not encroach on established
14 residential areas, and I can't, I have trouble getting over that. Because it, it clearly, it
15 does. The first part of that you can, you can argue that it's within an area where existing
16 commercial and office uses are located. But you can't really argue it's not encroaching
17 on established residential area.

18 MR. TUTTLE: Well, I guess the counterpoint there is that if commercial follows
19 residential, if you can't ever encroach on residential then you can never create
20 commercial, because in theory you have to have residential to –

21 MR. THEUS: Yeah.

22 MR. TUTTLE: - do commercial, so it's a, it's a tough, how far you go.

23 MR. THEUS: Well, I guess you get in what's the definition of encroach.

1 MR. GILCHRIST: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think, I think for me I agree that this area's not gonna
3 stay what it is, Rural, it, it does have a commercial application to it. This site, we, is
4 within an, if it's not within, in this current Comp Plan it will be within our new Comp Plan
5 which will be passed within the next several months, two or three months, be an area
6 that is designated as a commercial area for people to look at for commercial uses. What
7 we've, what we've got here is, is a traffic problem that is on Hardscrabble Road, this
8 site's on Clemson. It's a four-lane center divided road which is one of the largest that we
9 have in the county. Our, our Code has in it setback requirements and buffering
10 requirements between General Commercial and residential uses that are currently in
11 the Code. If those requirements are not stringent enough we need to address those
12 setback requirements. If the 10' is not enough and it needs to be 30 or whatever it
13 needs to be, that needs to, we need to address those within the Code. But taking a look
14 at this site and being at a major intersection on a four-lane center divided road it's very
15 difficult for me not to see this as a General Commercial parcel. And so that's kinda
16 where my thoughts are and that the, the widening of Hardscrabble is coming, it's
17 funded, it's allocated, it's part of the penny sales tax and it's in the process of getting
18 accomplished now. If it was just on some wish list that DOT had set out for some 10
19 year plan I would be more skeptical about it, but since, since it is part of the penny sales
20 tax I do have faith that it's gonna get done.

21 MR. THEUS: How do you see the widening of Hardscrabble impacting it?

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Because it'll transition the, the traffic off of Clemson in a
23 quicker manner onto Hardscrabble, whereas now you see the backup on Clemson

1 because you can't get onto that two-lane road quick enough. If you had a four-lane with
2 the turn lanes and –

3 MR. THEUS: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - and excel and decel coming on there, that's how I see
5 that alleviated traffic on Clemson and moving traffic quicker. So I understand the issue
6 with the residents that are there, but taking a look at this piece of property, and maybe
7 it's an issue with our buffering, maybe our buffering's not where it needs to be but, but,
8 but our Code does allow for that to occur because the buffering requirements are in
9 there.

10 MR. THEUS: Is the buffering requirement 10' between – who would know?
11 Tracy?

12 MS. HEGLER: Would it not be greater because it's General Commercial next to a
13 – yes, 10'.

14 MR. THEUS: Different degrees of planting, depending on the –

15 MS. HEGLER: How close they are and compact.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And I know that we have worked in the past and it's in our
17 Code now, that I understand lighting's an issue. But we have worked and we have
18 passed stuff in our Code to where we have directional lighting and there's no light
19 spillage from one piece of property over to the other. So the old days of the car lots with
20 the lights going everywhere that, that doesn't occur anymore. So we have directional
21 lighting on these sites that can't get into the neighbor's property, but. It is, it's, it's a
22 tough case but at the end of the day, not taking into account whose going there or what
23 they plan or anything else because I, I look at these simply as a rezoning with this piece

1 of property with the surrounding zoning classifications as well as the close proximity we,
2 we constantly we say that we want to put General Commercial at nodes. This is at a
3 node. And so for that reason I will be in favor of the rezoning.

4 MR. THEUS: How is a node defined?

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's a major interchange and in my opinion –

6 MR. THEUS: Within reasonable –

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - within a reasonable distance to that interchange is, is
8 what you have to use. It can't be, in my opinion it can't be just one parcel at that
9 interchange it's got to be a reasonable distance to support the people in that, that area.
10 And you know, the reasoning for that is number one, that's where the, the traffic occurs,
11 and number two, hopefully it'll keep people more centralized in that area and keep them
12 from going out further and getting on the roads and causing more traffic. And as the
13 traffic engineer said, most of the traffic that's gonna visit this site is, is of local means,
14 it's from the people that are around the area and they are already on the road already
15 and coming back to their homes or leaving their homes, and it's a place for them to stop
16 on the way to do that. I'm not sure that this is a destination draw from someone whose
17 outside of the area with this current user, but in the end that, that plays into some
18 thinking for some folks, but for me this is, I see this is a General Commercial tract since
19 it's within close proximity to a, one of the major interchanges in the northeast area of
20 Columbia.

21 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I would, in this situation I would support Staff's
22 recommendation of disapproval. There's, I mean, the, the shape of the lot, the way that
23 it penetrates into the residential neighborhood. I know that it's close to the intersection

1 on Hardscrabble and Clemson but with that residential development coming out onto
2 Clemson there's already a natural break so it's not part of that intersection, and won't
3 ever be a part of that intersection because there's already residential that comes all the
4 way up to Clemson. It's a part of the Brookhaven [sic], or Brook Hollow [sic] subdivision.
5 But also I, you know, this area there's lots of retail out there. I don't see any need for
6 there to be any more conversion of land into retail, you know, with the two vacant
7 grocery stores as they are. And there's, you know, that, I mean, that's my thing is that I
8 think it's not at a node. We, I will never support, like it's on a divided four-lane road
9 therefore it's commercial. That's gonna make for just a horrendous county if that's our
10 standard. And I just, I think keeping it, I mean, Rural, whatever, Rural just means
11 residential, it's, you know, it's probably gonna go to some kind of residential or OI use
12 but I don't think that there's been anything that shows that we need more GC in this
13 area. And so I, I support the Staff's recommendation of disapproval.

14 MS. FRIERSON: I too support Staff's recommendation of disapproval. I am
15 aware that that area contains residential and commercial usages and I noted that when
16 Ms. Barnes spoke to us last time and this time, when you live in an area for many years
17 and you remember how it used to be, unfortunately the reality is that things change.
18 However, I'm very familiar with the area, the congestion is a problem, and one Member
19 of the Planning Commission mentioned that it might not attract people from other areas
20 but it might just be used by the people in that area. We don't know that. And that's
21 definitely a residential area and those communities would be, in my opinion, adversely
22 impacted by putting General Commercial usage there. And as you just stated there are
23 other areas of commercial uses near there and vacant places. I'm just really opposed to

1 changing it to General Commercial usage. I am in favor of what the Staff recommended,
2 that we not change it.

3 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I can think of many examples in northeast
4 Columbia where commercial is directly adjacent to residential and not necessarily
5 having affected those areas adversely. I mean, you look at where the Kroger is and the
6 Woodlands and there's commercial adjacent to, you know, Wildewood. There's
7 commercial adjacent to, to many neighborhoods. Where the, where the former Food
8 Lion was backs up to a residential neighborhood. For that matter I, I make a
9 recommendation we send Case 14-29 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of
10 approval.

11 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second to send the case forward
13 to Council with a recommendation of approval. Any other discussion? All those in favor
14 raise their hand? All those opposed?

15 [Approved: *Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown*; Opposed: *Cairns,*
16 *Frierson*]

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So folks, we are a recommending Body to County
18 Council. County Council will see this case on November the 25th in these same
19 Chambers at 7:00, and they will take your public comment as well. Folks, we'll give y'all
20 a, you know, one or two minutes to clear Chambers if you'd like to. We've got other
21 business we need to conduct so if you'd like to have conversations if you would please
22 do that outside. Alright, next case.

1 MS. LINDER: Mr. Chairman, before you go forward, could you give Staff some
2 reasons why you went against their recommendation so we can put that in our Report
3 going to Council?

4 MR. TUTTLE: Sure, I do, I believe it's, it actually is located at a node. Is that fair
5 enough.

6 MS. LINDER: Is that the only reason?

7 MR. TUTTLE: Well, and it's, and by my definition it's also contiguous to
8 commercial.

9 MS. LINDER: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Next case, Case No. 14-32 MA.

11 **CASE NO. 14-32 MA:**

12 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, Commission. The Applicant in this case is
13 Everett Smith. The property's located at 1224 Broad River Road, it's about ½ acre in
14 size, currently zoned RS-MD on the, sort of the northeast portion of the property, and
15 commercial on the front side. The Applicant is requesting OI which is our Office and
16 Institutional on the rear portion of the property, not the commercial but the RS-MD
17 portion. This is the original zoning from 1977, having been changed in 2005 to the
18 current language, but it is original zoning on the front portion and the rear residential
19 and commercial. In the vicinity you have a number of different zoning classifications. For
20 the most part you have commercial zoning along Broad River Road and residential
21 zoning along Greenville Circle; that either being GC or RS-MD. You have a number of
22 different commercial type uses along Broad River Road; insurance offices, car sales, all
23 sorts of things going on along Broad River Road, strip commercial and what have you.

1 Along Greenville Circle it's primarily residential in nature. This property contains a, what
2 appears to be a single-family residential structure at one time, having been converted
3 into some sort of an office for the Palmetto [inaudible] Services Company. As you can
4 see on the photograph there the site on the rear is remaining vacant. They are
5 operating this transportation service on this site with these small mini buses providing
6 transportation. Our Comprehensive Plan recommends priority investment in this area
7 where commercial and office should be located along arterial roads, traffic junctions and
8 so forth. We feel like the, the request for rezoning is on the back side of this property on
9 a residential service street are really not conducive to commercial zoning classifications,
10 given that it is near and adjacent other residential use. We felt like it would encroach
11 upon the residential established neighborhood to the north and east. For those reasons
12 we felt like the application was not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan or in the
13 best use of the neighborhood in the vicinity. For that reason we recommended
14 disapproval.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Everett Smith?

16 **TESTIMONY OF EVERETT SMITH:**

17 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon. Can you hear me? Alright. I'm the property owner
18 along with my wife Joan. We live at Edisto Beach. We moved there in 1999. And leaving
19 there this morning with not even a traffic light I'm like a fish out of water here today. But
20 honestly, if the realtor back in 1993 when we purchased the property had done what we
21 expected, I wouldn't be here today. We bought the, the property with the contingency
22 that it was thoroughly zoned commercial and up until a couple of months ago I, I thought
23 it was. I've been paying Richland County taxes on a commercial basis since 1993. The,

1 everything that I've ever seen; plat, tax notice and otherwise suggests that the two lots
2 are combined as one. However, I have learned as of September 10th that this is not the
3 case and I'm hereby requesting permission to park vehicles in the back space of my
4 office. Which actually is, is a rental property now. I, I was a good neighbor there in the
5 community up until 2010. I ran an insurance claims business there with anywhere from
6 10 to 12 associates that parked in the back. Nobody had a problem with that. We used
7 the back gate right-of-way to Greenville Circle to come back out on a, a traffic light
8 which is on Means Avenue approximately 50, not more than 100' away from the
9 driveway. So the, the area of road traveled from my property to Means Avenue to exit
10 onto Broad River Road at a traffic light is less than 100'. In January I, my tenant who is
11 operating Palmetto Omni Transportation, she couldn't be here today, Sylvia Baxter, but
12 she's operating a business as has already been described, providing transportation
13 throughout South Carolina. It's my understanding that, that the, the day might begin as
14 early as 6:00 in the morning for some of the drivers as they have to travel to Aiken and
15 Greenville and wherever in South Carolina to transport their, their passengers via state
16 contracts as I understand it. Honestly, I've been fighting cancer this year, since January.
17 I was diagnosed with metastatic melanoma and I've been back and forth to Charleston
18 just about every day of the week since January, so I haven't had time to do a lotta
19 research on this. And again, I didn't think I had a problem until a, a neighbor by the
20 name of Bert Easter decided to start harassing the tenant, making malicious threats,
21 and this can all be documented through the Richland County Sheriff's Department,
22 which I think is probably why Sylvia didn't wanna be hear today cause she does feel
23 threatened. But there has been threats made to knock her windshields out, flatten her

1 tires, do this and that, repeatedly. She's trying to be a good neighbor but the
2 neighborhood doesn't want her there apparently. I don't understand it. Again, I live two
3 and a half hours away, she runs her business, I do my business. She pays her rent on
4 time, I'm thankful for that because the house sat empty there for two years when I was
5 trying to sell it and the market bottomed out. And I guess your choice neighborhood is to
6 have a, a respectful neighbor in there taking care of the property, or homeless people
7 tearing the property up like what I had to deal with.

8 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Smith?

9 MR. SMITH: Yes.

10 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: If you could wrap it up for us.

11 MR. SMITH: Okay, I'm done. Thank you.

12 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you. Next person, Brent Flashnik?

13 **BRENT FLASHNIK:**

14 MR. FLASHNIK: Alright, my name is Brett Flashnik, I live at 1227 Greenville
15 Circle, the property directly adjacent to the proposed rezoning parcel. I have some
16 photographs here today that contradict a little bit of what has been described I'd like to
17 pass down for you folks to look at. Each one of these photos has been taken through
18 March of this year. Unfortunately, the photo that was taken with the, by Staff is a more
19 recent photo when they were, I think moved the vehicles for the purpose of the photo
20 being taken. As you can see on the last photo in that stack of this morning, I look at two
21 buses of questionable operability out of my kitchen window every single day. The day
22 typically starts at 5:30 in the morning when car lights, diesel buses, alarm systems
23 come through my bedroom window, which is about 40' away. As you can see in the

1 secondary photo I have a detached garage guest house which is less than 12' away
2 from these vehicles. So initially what I'd more so like to talk to you about is that I don't
3 feel that this is in, the rezoning of this property is in line with the neighborhood itself.
4 Typically as you can see up here, most other blocks have a ratio of at least three
5 residential properties to every one OI. This property would turn my property into the sole
6 residential property on the 1200 block. Additionally, I think there's a precedent that was
7 set by City of Columbia Planning Commission on June 2nd when the owners of the
8 property at 1012 and 1014 Broad River Road petitioned for similar zoning changes that
9 was unanimously voted down. And I have those case numbers and, if you guys needs
10 that. You know, additionally I would like to say, you know, the, the type of use that
11 they're using this for, as well as any potential future uses, is very intensive, increases a
12 lot of sound, commotion, noise, light, at all kinds of times of the day. Finally, I'd like to
13 just wrap up by saying, you know, while I very much feel for Mr. Smith's condition as my
14 mother was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer about the same time as he received his
15 diagnosis I've been in a very similar situation, however, I have owned this property
16 since 2009, I have not seen him there nor has it been maintained on a regular basis.
17 You know, there's continually trash piling up on the roadside, feral weeds being grown
18 up in the back yard, underbrush falling on power poles, and in addition to that, you
19 know, he's now known about this illegal usage since September and has refused to do
20 anything about moving his tenant. There are plenty of other places available on, along
21 Broad River Road that would really suit her business more so than his property. Thank
22 you very much for your time.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Michael Hagler?

1 **TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL HAGLER:**

2 MR. HAGLER: My name is Michael Hagler, I live at 1529 Elm Abode Terrace. I'm
3 also serving as the president of our neighborhood association, we have about 300
4 homes in this neighborhood. And we have consistently tried to agree with county and
5 city in your policies against encroachment into residential neighborhoods, and this is
6 just another example. We try to oppose that at every occasion that it comes up to try to
7 protect our neighborhood. So we would appreciate your continued support of that policy.
8 We appreciate that Staff's recommendation against encroachment. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Ina Fort? Followed by Jean Jackson and David Bolton.

10 **TESTIMONY OF INA FORT:**

11 MS. FORT: My name's Ina Fort and I live at 1810 Carl Road, at 1801 Carl Road
12 in the Elm Abode subdivision. I am the secretary for the homeowners' association for
13 Elm Abode and Huffman Heights, it's a joint association, and I've held that position for
14 the past 10 years. I also own residential property on Greenville Circle, about a half a
15 block from this property and we can hear the buses when they crank up. And they
16 actually warm up at about 5:00 am in the morning and sit there and idle. I can't imagine
17 buying a house, remodeling it, these are a young professional couple, wonderful
18 neighbors, you should see what they've done to that house. The Flashnik's recently
19 hosted a neighborhood barbecue and we went, I was thunderstruck when I went inside
20 that house. It looked like something you'd see in New York City. It is absolutely
21 gorgeous, right down to the original photography. And they were getting ready to start
22 on the outside of the house when all of this happened. But I can't imagine just almost
23 under cover of darkness these huge buses moving in, cranking up every morning at

1 5:00 am under your bedroom window, no signage, no hearing, a legitimate complaint
2 made almost a year ago, and they're only just now getting here? I don't, I can't even get
3 my head around it. We're looking to you for protection and hope that you will keep the
4 tradition on the county who has pretty traditionally protected homeowners in intact
5 neighborhoods, existing intact neighborhoods. We, we're looking to you for that
6 protection and Staff, and thank you for your work on this case.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Jean Jackson? Followed by David Bolton and
8 Thomas Fore.

9 **TESTIMONY OF JEAN JACKSON:**

10 MS. JACKSON: Good afternoon, I'm Jean Jackson. I live at 1924 Elm Abode
11 Terrace. And I'm here to speak for Barbara Tobias, she was unable to be here because
12 she's a teacher. 'To Whom It May Concern' I'm reading her notes and we have a copy
13 available to you if you'd like it. 'To Whom It May Concern, I am writing in opposition to
14 the rezoning of property in the Huffman Heights neighborhood from residential to
15 commercial use. This area is home to many people and families who want their
16 neighborhood to remain just that, a neighborhood. Although our neighborhood abuts
17 commercial properties and has the highly traffic and trafficked area on Broad River
18 Road as our main thoroughfare, this is still very much a hidden gem of a neighborhood
19 where people talk to and watch over each other, walk their animals and raise their
20 children. The residential properties in Huffman Heights should be for the people who are
21 the customers of these local businesses. These local businesses should not want to
22 displace those who would be their customers. Additionally, as anyone familiar with the
23 Broad River area knows there are multiple commercially zoned properties in that area,

1 many of whom stand already empty and available for use. When there is a surplus of
2 commercially zoned properties available pushing out residents through rezoning makes
3 absolutely no sense. Please do not take my absence from this hearing as not caring
4 about the rezoning of this property. I teach kindergarten at the elementary school that
5 the property you are discussing is zoned for. I live and work in this neighborhood. My
6 students live, learn and grow up in this neighborhood. I respectfully ask that you allow
7 us to continue to enjoy our neighborhood without the intrusion of further commercially
8 zoned properties. Sincerely, Barbara Tobias.' And as an added note, my husband and I
9 have lived in this area for 14 years. It's a lovely, eclectic neighborhood with large lots,
10 old trees, lovely homes and warm, welcoming people. We are against any
11 encroachment into, of any businesses into our neighborhood. We are against any
12 rezoning that has the potential to lower the value of our homes and property. And we
13 respectfully request that you deny the rezoning of this property and keep our subdivision
14 as the lovely place it is. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. David Bolton?

16 **TESTIMONY OF DAVID BOLTON:**

17 MR. BOLTON: Good afternoon. I'm here basically just to read a letter, so it's not
18 my letter, alright? 'To Whom It May Concern,' oh, and I live at 1820 Cheryl Drive, which
19 is the neighborhood next to Elm Abode. 'My name is Carol Thomzac, I live at 1303
20 Greenville Circle, two lots down from the transport business. The street is a very quiet,
21 beautiful street. It seems as if it's in the county but only one block from Broad River.
22 Everyone owns the homes on this street and it is well-kept, and then you see a parking
23 lot in the middle of the length of the road. Buses and cars parked in this long lot that

1 starts on Broad River and goes to Greenville Circle. It is very ugly having a parking lot
2 on the street. My husband and I have been living in this, on this street for three years
3 and we love our home. We do not want our property value to go down due to this
4 parking lot. Sincerely, Carol Thomzac.' Thank you for listening.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thomas Fore?

6 **TESTIMONY OF THOMAS FORT:**

7 MR. FORT: Good afternoon. My name is Thomas Fort, I live at 1801 Carl Road. I
8 am the past president of the neighborhood association for almost 10 years. I've lived in
9 this neighborhood for over 35 years. I am here to speak against any encroachment into
10 this neighborhood. As you can see from the map the, the commercial areas are on
11 Broad River Road, which is where they are, should be. Broad River Road has vacant
12 commercial properties now. If you would think about Broad River Road, the corner of
13 Broad River Road and I-20 next to the, the frontage road is a filling station, then there's
14 a vacant, there's a vacant lot next to the Lizards Thicket. Enterprise Rental Car is
15 vacant. Ethel's Fashions is for sale. The other areas that this, this enterprise, rental
16 place could, could go, plenty of places on Broad River Road that are already zoned
17 commercial. If you look at the yellow, yellow is our neighborhood, our neighborhood
18 does not need any encroachment into it. The, we're on the second row, the second row
19 has traditionally been residential. We would like to keep this residential. We don't have
20 any hard feelings against these people, they, but there are plenty of commercial places
21 that they could go to that are available for them, and that's where we would ask them to
22 go. We'd ask you to deny this.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. That's all we got signed up to speak. Do we
2 have any comments or motions?

3 MR. THEUS: Mr. Chairman I'd like to move that we move this matter forward with
4 a recommendation of disapproval.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is there a second?

6 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

7 MS. HEGLER: Mr. Theus, we didn't hear you. Could you repeat yourself? We
8 couldn't hear you.

9 MR. THEUS: I would like to, I move that we move this, this matter forward with a
10 recommendation of disapproval.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And a second by Mr. Tuttle.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other discussion? All those in favor of the motion say
14 aye? Any opposed?

15 [Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Brown; Absent for vote:
16 Anderson]

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Next case, Case No. 14-33 MA.

18 **CASE NO. 14-33 MA:**

19 MR. LEGER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Applicant in this case is D. R. Horton-
20 Crown, LLC. The property is located on Old Tamah Road, it's almost 50 acres in size,
21 currently zoned RU, which is the Rural District, and D.R. Horton is requesting the RS-
22 LD, Residential, Single-family Low Density District. This 50 acres is, is located
23 immediately to the east of the Dutch Fork High School and near to the Dutch Fork

1 Middle School as well. This property was originally zoned Rural in 1977, so it is a, the
2 original district applied to it at that time. Much of the property in the vicinity is zoned
3 rurally, either occupied residentially or by the high school and middle school. Contrary to
4 that, to the south is the Palmerston North subdivision which is zoned RS-LD. The
5 property is currently vacant and mostly heavily wooded, slopes downward to the north
6 toward the creek, and is really undeveloped at this time. Our Comprehensive Plan
7 supports this density in this vicinity as it recommends for suburban residential use in this
8 area. Because of the residential use in the nearby vicinity being of a similar density and
9 because of the Comprehensive Plan recommendation the Staff recommended approval
10 of this rezoning at this time.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff?

12 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir.

14 MR. BROWN: All [inaudible] Thomas Road, I guess I'm pronouncing that right, is,
15 are there any plans for widening that road? Is that part of any of the county's plans or
16 state plans?

17 MS. HEGLER: No, sir.

18 MR. PALMER: The, are there subdivisions now coming in on that road that's
19 near this development? I know it's near the high school but I'm saying other
20 developments that are coming on that road.

21 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, one second, let's see. Carol, do you know of any? Let us
22 go to the aerial and see if we can zoom out and see anything going on there. But on the
23 top of our heads we don't recall.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Mr. Brown, I don't think this site would even come up on
2 the radar for a road widening. It's, very seldom do we see a road operating at a Level A,
3 which is fantastic, because currently the vehicle trips per day is 2,400 and it is designed
4 to hold a capacity of 9,800 so it's, there's no need for a road widening. It's not even
5 close.

6 MR. BROWN: My concern, Mr. Chairman, the number of subdivisions that come
7 in on –

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

9 MR. BROWN: - on to that road as well as –

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What's in the cue?

11 MR. BROWN: - on the road between that road and Broad River Road.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's kinda what's in the, what's in the hoper coming out?

13 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

15 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, again we don't, we can't think of any at the moment, but if
16 we pull up the aerial we might be able to see if there's been something programmed.
17 But I, I don't think so.

18 MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, do we have any other questions for Staff? Is there
20 anybody here from, nobody's signed up from D.R. Horton or Crown. Is anybody here for
21 the – okay. If you gentlemen would like to come and –

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible]

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, ma'am, for the Applicant.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, no.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The Applicant, is anyone here on behalf of the Applicant?

3 Yes, sir if you – is there anything you'd like to add to the – just here to answer any
4 questions? Okay. Great. Greg Irvin?

5 **TESTIMONY OF GREG IRVIN:**

6 MR. IRVIN: My name is Greg Irvin. I live at 1240 Old Tamah Road. My property
7 is on the other side of this property we're discussing from the high school. Ladies and
8 gentlemen, this proposed piece of land falls between my land and Interstate 26, which is
9 a distance of 2.1 miles. Within this distance there are five neighborhoods with a total of
10 approximately 700 homes. I'm glad you brought up your question earlier. With this
11 proposed neighborhood adding up to 175 new homes, it would bring a grand total of
12 900 homes connected to or living on this short stretch of road, and this is a rural county
13 road. In addition and also within this small stretch there is Dutch Fork Middle School
14 with a population including student and staff of approximately 1,200. And there's also
15 Dutch Fork High School with approximately 2,200 students and staff. Add all this traffic
16 up along with the drive-through traffic that's going to the Walmart Superstore at the end
17 of the road and you have a rural road not made to handle this traffic and congestion. I
18 live 3/10ths of a mile from the high school parking lot and student traffic backs up to a
19 stop beyond my driveway every school day morning. The 2009 Richland County
20 Comprehensive Plan is a 10 year plan and we are not yet halfway through its span and
21 we are already trying to change it. There are numerous goals and implementation
22 strategies mentioned in this plan such as population growth should not result in the loss
23 of natural resources, and the need to protect natural resources near neighborhoods for

1 our residents. I take a quote from the plan, "Insufficient land use patterns are an
2 increasing problem in the northwest resulting in traffic congestion, crowded schools and
3 overextended infrastructure." Most importantly the neighborhood master plan and area
4 revitalization has defined implementation strategies to develop new land, and I quote,
5 "Identify locations of vacant lands with adequate existing public water service, public
6 sewer service, and acceptable road capacity." This proposed land, subdivision does not,
7 does not have public water service to its property boundaries, and Old Tamah Road
8 does not have the acceptable road capacity based on my earlier statements. Old
9 Tamah Road is used frequently by high school athletic teams for running and also by
10 local cycling enthusiasts. Adding these additional homes and their associated vehicular
11 traffic just makes the road that much more unsafe for our students and local residents. I
12 personally enjoy the visits in my back yard every day by deer, turkey, foxes and raccoon
13 that make their home in this particular piece of property we're discussing. Allow this
14 subdivision to come to our neighborhood and their habitat is gone. D.R. Horton has no
15 concern for the infrastructure of this area. If approved they will develop the land, build
16 homes for three to five years, make their huge profits, and then abandon the area,
17 leaving us with traffic and congestion problems. We purchased this dream home site for
18 the joy of living in a rural area. This development will destroy our rural setting and more
19 significantly decrease the value of our biggest personal investment. I thank you for your
20 time.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Michael Cook?

22 **TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL COOK:**

1 MR. COOK: Good afternoon, I'm Michael Cook and I live in the Tamah Woods
2 area there on 101 Indian Ridge Court. And he's pretty much said everything that most of
3 us feel out there. I've been there for 24 years and I've seen all the other development,
4 which is all great development, but I just don't feel that we can really afford to have that
5 many homes in that, in that area. Old Tamah is a, is a very busy as is Old Brickyard,
6 which goes down from Old Tamah, down to Eleazer. These roads are very narrow. I just
7 don't see how you can put 175 to 200 homes and not, you know, account for the
8 infrastructure. I also am friends with a fireman in the Irmo area and he says as far as he
9 knows right now there are no plans to add staffing. We are concerned with police
10 protection, again fire protection. There are no fire hydrants even down in this area. And
11 overall the, the rural, the rural atmosphere is something we all moved out there for, and
12 these other subdivisions are very nice and I just don't see a need, and I think I agree, I
13 think most people agree with me, we just really just don't see a need to, to add that
14 many homes in that short of, short of area there. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Julius Soggs?

16 **TESTIMONY OF JULIUS SAGGS:**

17 MR. SUGGS: My name is Julius Suggs, I live at 1217 Old Tamah Road. Thank
18 you for the opportunity. It's already been mentioned the biggest concern that I have is
19 our traffic problem. This is a, a two-lane road and we have no less than eight
20 subdivisions within one and a half miles of this high school and middle school. In order
21 to appreciate the problems of traffic you'd have to be there about 8:00 in the morning
22 and 3:00 in the afternoon. We have a hard enough time just maintaining, the state to
23 maintain the road, much less build or add on to it. So I would ask your consideration for

1 keeping this property under a rural zone rather than increasing it or changing it so that it
2 could be developed. Adding more property, or adding more homes to this location right
3 now, there is, there's no left or right turn signal there, there's nothing that could improve
4 the traffic flow, it would only worsen it. So thank you very much.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. That's all we got signed up to speak.
6 Unfortunately, any neighborhood where I drop my kids off at at 7:45 in the morning and
7 where I pick them up at at 3:00 in the afternoon, if there's a school there, there's a traffic
8 problem. Anywhere there's a school, at 8:00 in the morning, 3:00 in the afternoon
9 there's a traffic problem. There's, I'm sure smarter folks than, than we have ever tried to
10 figure out how to do that. I know we try to maintain a lotta that on site now, but it's just
11 impossible. From the data that I see, this road is operating at a Level A, it's significantly
12 lower vehicle traffic per day than what the road is designed to hold. Some of the
13 surrounding subdivisions are RS-MD which is a much more intense, 8,500 square foot
14 lot, these folks are looking for a 12,000 square foot lot on this site, which is the LD
15 zoning classification. And it's directly adjacent to the school, the infrastructure's in place
16 to handle it. My, my vote would be in favor of the rezoning.

17 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman? Let me just state for the Record that my concern is
18 the road system. The number of subdivisions that you have coming out on Tamah Road
19 now, notwithstanding the schools, I understand and agree with you on what you said
20 with respect to the schools, but I am concerned about the number of subdivisions, the
21 amount of traffic, the number of families, and what this will add to it. It just seems to me
22 that with the development in that area, and I know this is probably outside the purview
23 of this Commission, but for the Record I wanna state that it seems to me something has

1 to happen with respect to that road, Koon Road and Brickyard if you're gonna continue
2 to approve subdivisions going and having access to those roads. I'll just state that for
3 the Record.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I understand. And the, I think sometimes, sometimes what
5 occurs is we, we see these high traffic times but the data that we've got tells us that
6 there's 2,400 vehicles per day at the nearest traffic count station and the road's
7 designed to handle 9,800, which is triple that amount.

8 MR. TUTTLE: That's 24%.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So, four times that amount, so I understand that there's,
10 when you look at the picture it says, but you know, those homes are already out there,
11 those are already part of that 2,400 number and we've still got room to grow up to
12 9,800. I know we don't wanna see 9,800 but still, we're significantly less than what the
13 road is designed to handle.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: May I [inaudible]?

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, sir. No, sir.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just wanna what the year, what the year of your traffic
17 data is.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, sir, I appreciate it. We just, once we open it up to that
19 kind of comment.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible].

21 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for Staff. Would you clarify what
22 year the traffic study was done, please?

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: 2013.

1 MR. TUTTLE: It's right there.

2 MS. HEGLER: And to be clear, it's not a study it's, it's a, we're just relaying to
3 you the information that we get from the South Carolina DOT traffic count system.

4 MR. TUTTLE: Right, I'm sorry, not study. Right, the traffic county was done
5 according to our package in 2013, is that correct?

6 MS. HEGLER: [Nods yes].

7 MR. TUTTLE: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. And I apologize, once we open it up and we start
9 fielding questions it gets out of control, so I, I appreciate that. So that's, that's kind of
10 where my thoughts are on it.

11 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, I would want one more clarification. In our package it states
12 that the, there actually is water service to the Dutch Fork school, high school.

13 MS. HEGLER: Yes, sir.

14 MR. TUTTLE: And that's where it terminates at this point, evidently the city
15 water? So it's adjacent to this property.

16 MR. LEGER: That's correct.

17 MR. TUTTLE: Okay, thank you. And in your research the sewer capacity, was
18 sewer capacity available for this development?

19 MS. HEGLER: I, I don't see –

20 MR. TUTTLE: That's what it says.

21 MS. HEGLER: And we make sure that it's available within adjacent –

22 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, that's, I mean, cause they don't have access to this so I'm
23 just trying to get on the Record for those that hadn't seen what we see. Your report says

1 that map amendment would not negatively impact public services or traffic, water is
2 provided by City of Columbia and sewer provided by Richland County.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. And our Comp Plan actually calls for four to eight
4 dwelling units per acre and this development would allow for 3.6. So our Comp Plan
5 actually calls for a more intense, more homes for what is planned for the site?

6 MS. HEGLER: Under the suburban category.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

8 MR. THEUS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that we move this matter forward
9 with a recommendation of approval.

10 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion.
12 All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

13 [Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown]

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. And again folks, we're a recommending Body to
15 County Council. They'll be back in these same Chambers on the 24th, or 25th of this
16 month to hear this same case, and they have final say on the matter. Next case, Case
17 No. 14-34 MA.

18 **CASE NO. 14-34 MA:**

19 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Applicant in this case is Mr.
20 Michael Smith. The property's located on Old Leesburg Road, south of Ft. Jackson off
21 of Leesburg Road. It's almost 30 acres in size, currently zoned RU, which is the Rural
22 District and Mr. Smith is asking for MH, which is our Manufactured Housing District. The
23 Rural District is original zoning from 1977. This is, this property is, is very far removed

1 from the City of Columbia, very far out onto Leesburg Road. Much of the development
2 in the vicinity, if there is any, is residential nature, either single-family, manufactured
3 housing, or remaining wooded and very sparsely developed. Again, most of the
4 development in the area, if there, if there is any to be found, is, is large residential lots,
5 manufactured homes, undeveloped agricultural, forested properties. Our
6 Comprehensive Plan recommends rural development for the area, calling for $\frac{3}{4}$ acre
7 lots. You know, that's lots of 33,000 square feet in size. The zoning classification
8 proposed would allow lots of approximately 7,000 square feet in size. The Staff has
9 found that to be contrary to the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan. We also
10 have recently completed a Neighborhood Master Plan, the Lower Richland
11 Neighborhood Master Plan this year, in March of this year that supports the continued
12 recommendation coming from the Comprehensive Plan, and that is for low density
13 residential use. Based upon the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan and the
14 call for approximately 1.3 dwelling units per acre as opposed to six or seven, the Staff
15 recommends maintaining the low density residential and agricultural use proposed for
16 the area and recommends disapproval.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Michael Smith?

18 MR. THEUS: I, I have a question. Remind me, can you, can you have a
19 manufactured home in a Rural District?

20 MR. LEGER: It would just have to be on that $\frac{3}{4}$ acre lot size.

21 MR. THEUS: But here we're talking about septic tanks. So the lot would have to
22 be a minimum of an acre anyway I believe.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Three quarter.

1 MR. BROWN: Three quarter.

2 MR. THEUS: Three quarter of an acre.

3 MR. BROWN: Thirty thousand square feet.

4 MR. THEUS: So –

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And we don't approve subdivisions on dirt roads anymore.

6 But I, but all that being said, again it falls back to the point of, this is just a rezoning, not
7 getting into the development side of it yet.

8 MR. THEUS: But is it a moot point?

9 MR. TUTTLE: I, I believe it is.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

11 MR. TUTTLE: I mean, I –

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I would agree, yeah.

13 MR. TUTTLE: - I guess, you know, I think it would be arduous to try to attempt,
14 but I guess you could do communal – but I don't think that's practical.

15 MR. LEGER: Mr. Theus, I did not sit in on the pre-application meeting. Other
16 Staff were in attendance there, but it's my understanding that many of these similar
17 topics were explained with the Applicant, you know. The project moving forward, the
18 road would have to be brought up to county standards and so on and so forth.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Michael Smith? Richard Walls? Michael Smith's the
20 Applicant. Yes, sir? Come on down for us. If you'd like to take the podium and give us
21 your name and address and limit your comment to two minutes for us, we'd appreciate
22 it.

23 **TESTIMONY OF RICHARD WALLING:**

1 MR. WALLING: Good afternoon. My name's Richard Walling, I live at 211
2 Eastover Road. If you look at the map the, where it says the Aspen Hill Court, I live at
3 the end of Aspen Hill Court. There's nothing there, I, I bought right at nine acres there
4 back in '98. We love where we at, we don't want a mobile home park in our area. We
5 don't mind if they put a house or two in there, don't care, but a mobile home park, all
6 that's gonna do is bring theft, all that to, to our area where we don't have any problem
7 down there now. We don't need this problem. So my recommendation is to vote no on it
8 and I appreciate your time. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But you already signed up in the for column.

10 MR. WALLING: Well, I'm sorry, sir. When I

11 [Laughter – inaudible discussion]

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I'm kidding. I'm kidding.

13 MR. WALLING: Really, really, we do not need anything. We love it where we at
14 down there.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I gotcha, I appreciate it.

16 MR. WALLING: We already have McEntire, not McEntire, but the Ft. Jackson
17 over there with all that traffic and stuff over in that area. We don't need anything else
18 over in there.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I gotcha. I gotcha moved over, I appreciate it.

20 MR. WALLING: Alright, thank you, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Lloyd Ash, followed by Marvin Dawson and Christopher
22 Lyons.

23 **TESTIMONY OF LLOYD ASH:**

1 MR. ASH: My name is Lloyd Ash, I live at 573 Beaver Hut Trail, which is the
2 Wilson Mill Pond development. We, we live, Raccoon Trail runs up to the north and
3 Beaver Hut Trail runs parallel to Old Leesburg. The photograph that came up earlier
4 showed a single lane dirt road and it truly is a single lane dirt road. There are no
5 infrastructure on this road other than the co-op electric that has a single phase line that
6 runs down this road. A hundred plus trailers at this location is going to be a nightmare.
7 There are no plans at present to pave any part of this section of Old Leesburg Road.
8 The rural classification for this area is correct and it does not need to be changed.
9 That's as much as I've got to say.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Marvin Dawson?

11 **TESTIMONY OF MARVIN DAWSON:**

12 MR. DAWSON: Marvin Dawson, I live at 22 Aspen Hill Court, which is next to
13 Richard over here. I did sign in the right column, I'm against. I didn't know I was gonna
14 speak so I just signed. I will say I'm a land surveyor, intimately familiar with
15 development. When I moved out here I actually developed those eight lots with the
16 intention of a larger lot, but I do live in a mobile home. I'm like Richard, I just, I just feel a
17 mobile home park wouldn't really do us justice out there, and the, the nature of that area
18 is more rural. So anyways, thank you for your time.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thanks. Christopher, followed by Rose Wingate and
20 Rebecca Kline.

21 **TESTIMONY OF CHRISTOPHER LYONS:**

22 MR. LYONS: My name's Christopher Lyons, I'm actually gonna speak on behalf
23 of me and Rose Wingate, which is my wife. We just moved to Richland County less than

1 two months ago, on Leesburg Court, which is on the other side of Wilson Mill Pond, just
2 above where the picture is showing right now. We bought this house, we just moved
3 from Sumter County, she's in the Air Force, I'm law enforcement, been a law
4 enforcement officer for over 10 years, been a fireman for over 14. This is a single-lane
5 dirt road that we're talking about of adding 100 plus trailers to. There's no water service
6 out there, it's gonna have to be a well, so you're gonna have to dig over 100 wells out
7 there in order to put these trailers in there. You're gonna have to have septic tanks in
8 order for your waste that's gonna come from these trailers. The land is not gonna be
9 able to support it. The pond will be drained with all these extra wells being added this
10 close to what we have. We don't want this kind of development brought in there. We
11 purchased a single-family home, that's what we would like to see out there, not a big
12 trailer park. That's not why we moved to Richland County to live next to a trailer park
13 when we just bought a nice single-family home. Going back to the dirt road, like I said I
14 been a fireman for 14 years. It's very unconducive for a fire truck to get down there if
15 you have to have service in there when you put that many homes in there. The single-
16 lane dirt road's gonna have to be widened cause it's not gonna support that much traffic
17 in and out. The environmental impact of removing all these trees from this land, the
18 waste, where's all this waste gonna go? Talk about increased criminal activity, when
19 you build trailer parks, we live on a private pond, we already have, in the two months
20 we've been there we've had a theft on the pond by one of our neighbors, his boat was
21 out there and somebody came onto the pond and stole his boat. I realize I'm out of time.
22 Thank you for your, listening to me. I hope that y'all vote to disapprove this.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Rebecca Kline and Bill Kline? And then
2 Douglas Drake?

3 **TESTIMONY OF MR. KLINE:**

4 MR. KLINE: My wife left and she signed my name on the line so I guess I need to
5 say something. We have a, a 50 acre farm at the corner of Congress Road and Old
6 Leesburg Road, and we have a nice home there, and we have good neighbors. It's a
7 fairly quiet place, which at this stage of my life I really look forward to, and I'd like for
8 that to continue. Lower Richland, and I'm not gonna editorialize, but Lower Richland is a
9 growth area for Richland County. It's just simply because of the space that's there.
10 What you do today with this trailer park is gonna predicate what happens to Richland
11 County, Lower Richland County in the future. We're struggling down there now but
12 there're a lotta good people moving in, nice people, people who have mobile homes and
13 they have them on separate lots that they own, and I don't discourage that at all, but I
14 do discourage putting however many lot, however many trailers that that area would,
15 would accommodate, and I understand it's quite a number. So thank you for your time
16 and I encourage you to keep the zoning Rural.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Douglas Drake?

18 **TESTIMONY OF DOUGLAS DRAKE:**

19 MR. DRAKE: Good afternoon. My name's Douglas Drake, I live at 565 Beaver
20 Hut Trail. Just sitting up here today, this is my first time in any kind of environment like
21 this, I learned a little bit, what you guys were looking for. I hear a lotta people sitting
22 down here saying what they want, what they don't want. I read the paper on this, 161
23 trailers on almost 27 acres, that's 17 trailers per acre. And you're looking at sewerage,

1 you're looking at water issues, the small roads. I just, my basic opinion, I don't feel it's
2 conducive to this small of an area. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thanks. That's all we got signed up.

4 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion that we send Case 14-34 MA
5 forward to Council with a recommendation of disapproval.

6 MR. BROWN: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion?
8 All those in favor say aye.

9 [Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown]

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, next case. Case No. 14-35 MA.

11 **CASE NO. 14-35 MA:**

12 MR. LEGER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is the last zoning application for the
13 afternoon that I know of. The Applicant in this case is Mark Jeffers. The property is
14 located at the intersection of North Springs Road and Mill Field Road, it's almost an
15 acre and a half in size, currently zoned RS-MD, which is medium density, single-family
16 residential. Mr. Jeffers is asking for NC, which is our Neighborhood Commercial District.
17 The current zoning classification is original from 1977. If you had the opportunity to drive
18 in the vicinity you will find that we have basically three different zoning classifications in
19 the area; RS-LD to the northwest, RS-MD to the northeast, and HI Industrial to the
20 south, further along Two Notch Road. There are a number of subdivisions located in the
21 area, Spring Valley, Wind Mill Orchard, those are fully developed. The site basically is
22 undeveloped and sparsely vegetated, has a general slope downward to the north, to, to
23 the North Springs Road. Our Comprehensive Plan recommends suburban on this site

1 where we call for office and commercial to be located at traffic junctions or areas where
2 existing commercial are located. The, the Staff felt like this would be in compliance with
3 our Comprehensive Plan as it is really kind of a transitional site, more or less awkward
4 in nature in that it's, it's vacant, it's been vacant for years, it's between residential
5 properties to the east, west and north, but also adjacent to the heavy industrial to the
6 south. Probably not conducive to [inaudible]. Given the fact that it's of a transitional
7 nature and between residential and heavy industrial, the Staff felt like it met the
8 Comprehensive Plan and we supported the application and recommended approval.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Mark Jeffers? Okay. Paul
10 Spencer? Followed by Carl Vogess?

11 **TESTIMONY OF PAUL SPENCER:**

12 MR. SPENCER: Paul Spencer, 109 South Branch Road. I have the pleasure of
13 serving as the president of the Spring Valley Homeowners' Association, and I'll speak
14 briefly as I can. It's been a long afternoon. First is the traffic issue, that's a blind corner
15 and it's an awkward intersection as you can, it's not a T it's kind of a Y shape. Some
16 concerns about the heavy traffic on North Springs Road already. But the, the major
17 concern was that, and I understand the NC commercial district that would allow services
18 for the neighborhoods or the residents in that area, but if you're familiar with that area,
19 within a mile of that piece of property there's every service and goods to be purchased
20 that you would need; doctors, lawyers, dentists, food, clothing, hardware, that's all
21 available on Two Notch Road. And I read in the commercial district is says, where small
22 neighborhoods oriented businesses are useful and desired. Speaking for several
23 thousand residents, I talk to them on a regular basis, when they call me I've never had

1 anybody in five years call me up and say they really desire to have that piece of
2 property developed in a commercial sense. Because the goods and services that they
3 would need on a daily basis is readily available within a mile of that location and little
4 more than a mile is the largest mall in northeast Columbia. So we would ask that you
5 not change that. I don't know if they're here today but that piece of property does back
6 up to three or four houses. I'm assuming when those people bought those houses in the
7 last 20 or 30 years that they asked what would be in their back yard, and it was zoned
8 residential and their expectations would be that that would be zoned residential and
9 single-family homes would be in their back yard. And I don't see any reason why that
10 should change today. So we'd ask you not to approve the change. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you.

12 **TESTIMONY OF CARL VOGESS:**

13 MR. VOGESS: Carl Vogess, 129 Pond Ridge Road. I'd like to, with that picture
14 up there I'd like to make some comments about the infrastructure involving that
15 property. The, the wooded area which right now is, is all trees and, and sand, it tilts from
16 the right to the left, and runs downward. Mill Pond is, is a very narrow road and it comes
17 from Sparkleberry and just runs downhill and so when it gets to this property there's
18 basically a hole there. Then there's a drain that the DOT has to keep opening up, and
19 that drain runs under the property, under North Springs, then comes into the drainage
20 system for Spring Valley and ends up in, in Clark Lake. And if we get a rain that's say
21 an inch from a thunderstorm, that whole area just floods out and there's sediment all
22 over the road because all that wooded area just, just drains off into that direction. So
23 there's major problems with, with Mill Pond as a road. It's only use right now is that it's a

1 great shortcut if you're going over to the Kroger. But in terms of, of taking care of the
2 drainage and all, it really, it needs some serious engineering in order to, to make that
3 right. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Bill?

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible]

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Howard Miller?

7 MR. MILLER: Same.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's all we got signed up to speak on this.

9 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, what is the buffer between this property and the
10 residential?

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Ten foot, right?

12 MR. BROWN: That it's –

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Ten feet.

14 MR. BROWN: - it's 10'? And, and what kind of buffer is it, if I may ask?

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's pretty vegetated I would imagine. It's gotta be. What
16 type of buffer?

17 MS. HEGLER: It is vegetated with trees and landscaping and bushes.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Trees and bushes and that kind – when you put
19 commercial next to existing residential it's a more intense amount of trees and buffer
20 that's gotta go in there.

21 MR. BROWN: Okay, but what was described as the runoff and the issues,
22 environmental issues on that, has that been looked at or is it relevant?

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: If they were to develop the site they'd have to put a
2 detention pond in, retain that water on site, and release it back into the storm water
3 system at no greater rate than was there prior to them developing the site. They have to
4 detain the water on site and then release it back in the storm water system.

5 MR. BROWN: And that's regulated and inspected by DHEC?

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's correct. Other comments, concerns, motions?
7 Anyone?

8 MR. TUTTLE: I'll make a motion that Case 14-35 MA gets sent forward to
9 Council with a recommendation for disapproval.

10 MR. THEUS: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is there a reason for that, cause Staff's recommendation's
12 for approval.

13 MR. TUTTLE: Just a second.

14 MR. THEUS: I see it encroaching on two neighborhoods.

15 MR. TUTTLE: I'll withdraw my motion. If you'd like to make a motion. Since
16 you've already formulated a reason.

17 MR. THEUS: Well, I have some practical reasons but if we have to – a, I'd love to
18 see the Applicant here, b, it's an odd shaped piece of property, it's probably
19 undvelopable. But c, I move that we move it forward with a recommendation of
20 disapproval because there's too much encroachment on the surrounding residential
21 areas.

22 MR. BROWN: I second.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: A motion and a second. Any other discussion? Will that
2 chuckle be on the Record?

3 MS. CAIRNS: I find it interesting that this encroaches into residential
4 neighborhood, whereas Clemson Road didn't. According to the Commission Member.

5 MR. TUTTLE: Having driven past this site for the last 20 years of my life, it's a,
6 it's an awkward little piece in an awkward area –

7 MS. CAIRNS: Oh, I don't disagree with that.

8 MR. TUTTLE: - and personally I just don't think that it makes sense to convert it
9 to Neighborhood Commercial.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor of the motion say aye. Any opposed?
11 Nay?

12 MS. CAIRNS: Nay here.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright.

14 MS. CAIRNS: Oh come on, you didn't get that? [Laughter]

15 MR. TUTTLE: What was that, what was that vote, just for the Record?

16 [Approved: Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Brown; Opposed: Cairns,
17 Anderson]

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright.

19 MS. FRIERSON: Can we take that again? I, I was trying to vote for disapproval
20 and I don't know if I said the right thing.

21 MS. CAIRNS: That was the motion was for disapproval.

22 MS. FRIERSON: Yeah.

23 MS. CAIRNS: You said yes.

1 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, you're a yes.

2 MS. FRIERSON: Oh, okay.

3 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, I was questioning Mr. Brown's vote.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor of sending this forward to Council with a
5 recommendation of denial please signify by raising your hand. All those opposed?
6 Christopher and Heather. Correct.

7 MR. ANDERSON: Cause sometimes the whole shout out thing –

8 [Inaudible discussion]

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Text Amendments? Mr. Price.

10 MR. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is a motion from Council where Council
11 essentially wanted to identify a use and to place regulations on them as far as where
12 they would be placed and how we would regulate them. So this is to identify sludge, to
13 define it, and also to establish the districts that [inaudible] sludge field also, and to
14 identify the districts that it would be placed in, which would be HI and simply that it
15 would be regulated by state, federal laws also.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Nobody signed up to speak on it. We got a motion?

17 MR. TUTTLE: Sure. Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we approve the, here
18 again we don't have an ordinance [inaudible], the only ordinance in our package.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Text Amendment #1.

20 MR. TUTTLE: Text Amendment #1.

21 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Motion and second. All those in favor say aye. Any
23 opposed?

1 [Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown]

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, Comprehensive Plan update. Let's talk about this
3 for a second. Do we have, does anybody on the Planning Commission have issues with
4 stuff that they'd like to run through, that's in the Comprehensive Plan?

5 MS. FRIERSON: I just have a few things [inaudible]

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

7 MS. FRIERSON: - word, you know, editorial things.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Let's see if we can run through, and then if -

9 MS. HEGLER: Should I do a time check? It's 3:13.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

11 MS. HEGLER: We do have to break at 3:50.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah. Let's go over a couple of things this afternoon and
13 then since we gotta get outta here and stuff, if anybody's got stuff they can send it to
14 Tracy between now and next month. If there's any significant changes we'll shoot it out
15 between now and then and we'll just vote on the thing next month.

16 MS. HEGLER: If [inaudible] next month I'm happy.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do y'all agree?

18 MR. ANDERSON: I, I did want to just bring up one thing on the mixed use
19 corridor and just get y'all's thoughts on the mixed use corridor as it's laid out in this plan
20 in looking at the Clemson Road –

21 MS. HEGLER: Yeah.

22 MR. ANDERSON: - and, and –

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Let's let Ms. Frierson run through and then –

1 MR. ANDERSON: Oh! I'm sorry!

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - then give yours.

3 MR. ANDERSON: I took your spot. I apologize.

4 MS. FRIERSON: Okay folks, I'm an English teacher so these are really picky
5 things, okay? Anyhow on page 1, the right hand side under Balance Land Planning.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Did you say, did you say a few things? And you're coming
7 in at page 1? [Laughter]

8 MS. CAIRNS: You gotta start somewhere.

9 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, we have a, a upper case C for county, it should be a
10 lower case C [laughter]. You see what I'm talking about?

11 MS. CAIRNS: Fourth line down.

12 MS. FRIERSON: Yes, fourth line down.

13 MS. HEGLER: Oh, I actually disagree.

14 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, and the next page, well the same thing, every time you
15 see that upper case County, if it doesn't have Richland County with it, it should be lower
16 case. On page 2, under Support, the continued viability, that section, do you see what
17 I'm talking about?

18 MS. HEGLER: No, we have not caught up yet, there's too many people talking to
19 me. I'm sorry. Page 2.

20 MS. FRIERSON: Right hand side it says, Support the continued viability, that
21 section.

22 MS. HEGLER: Uh-huh (affirmative).

1 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, after Horticulture, I think it should be, insert a comma
2 and then insert the word 'and' and then delete a period after forestry and delete from,
3 and the like. Delete, these businesses are as important as any other enterprise
4 operating in Richland County, and then continue with the next sentence with, the
5 county, lower c, lower case c.

6 MS. HEGLER: Oh so, I mean, you're removing the statement that agriculture,
7 horticulture, forestry and the like are as important as any other enterprise in the county.

8 MS. FRIERSON: Not the whole sentence just deleting the part that says, these
9 businesses are as important as.

10 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, Gilchrist are you chairing the meeting now?
11 Gilchrist?

12 MR. GILCHRIST: Sir?

13 MR. BROWN: Are you chairing the meeting now?

14 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I guess I am.

15 MR. BROWN: Okay. May I ask Ms. Frierson a question?

16 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure.

17 MR. BROWN: Is it possible for you to submit these for the Record and give them
18 to the Staff?

19 MS. FRIERSON: It is, it's just that when I asked the last time if that's what you all
20 wanted done I was told, no that you wanted everything kinda in the open, so that's why I
21 didn't.

22 MS. HEGLER: Well, I, I, what I, if I might offer, if they are more in line with
23 grammatical corrections –

1 MS. FRIERSON: Well, some are and some are just –

2 MS. HEGLER: Like that last one actually was, and I think that that was –

3 MS. FRIERSON: - some are editor, but I don't mind doing it that way to be faster.

4 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, it's the Chairman's call.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: However y'all wanna handle your corrections.

6 MS. FRIERSON: I'm sorry, what'd you say?

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: However you wanna handle them, you wanna shoot them
8 over to her?

9 MS. FRIERSON: The first time they said if it was editorial in nature it was okay to
10 send it by email. Substantive they said do it in the open meeting. I could just do it all,
11 you know, through email and then if you think it's substantive, I don't mind.

12 MR. THEUS: [Inaudible] I think probably email [inaudible] would be a better way
13 of going about doing it.

14 MS. FRIERSON: And then some of them are not grammatical, some are just
15 editorial to make it flow better, but I don't mind doing it by email.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, you wanna run through your substantive once?

17 MS. FRIERSON: No, these are – well again, it's, it's more in terms of just making
18 it read better so that's not really substantive, no.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Mr. Anderson?

20 MR. ANDERSON: So this is just about the mixed use corridor section in here.
21 And I, I think we have a great case that we just talked about that, that maybe we can
22 look to see why Staff recommended disapproval when a lotta of the verbiage that we
23 have in here would support that particular project. So, I mean, I'm just looking over

1 some of this and, and I just, again this is just old versus new. What's gonna be different
2 when we're looking at old and getting y'all's recommendation versus new getting y'all's
3 recommendation based on this text here? And this is kinda one of the things that I
4 always struggle with, with the Comp Plan is, alright there's so much language in here,
5 what's actually different, what's gonna change y'all's mind on, on your
6 recommendations?

7 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, you know, Staff, we talked about that with that particular
8 rezoning. What we, what we did currently and what we're doing today is looking at
9 what's established. I mean, I think, I think Staff recommended denial on that because
10 there was very clearly an end to the commercial zoning at that corridor.

11 MR. ANDERSON: Um-hum (affirmative).

12 MS. HEGLER: And so those, in our opinion there had been established a place
13 where the commercial ended and the residential began on three of the four quadrants.
14 This being, you know, that one being the one in question. Moving forward, I mean, Mr.
15 Palmer had a lot of good questions about that corridor last time as well and I think that
16 we need to get more specific that this would be how it's different in saying, you know, so
17 many feet from an intersection that is identified as a commercial node, commercial
18 activity is allowed, and then we taper it off.

19 MR. ANDERSON: Um-hum (affirmative).

20 MS. HEGLER: So, I mean, I was hoping to potentially get that kind of a
21 recommendation from y'all today, and we could rework that. But we've also gone back
22 to our consultant and talked to them a little more about this, that particular land use
23 cause it is the most difficult I think and complex even for Staff to interpret. So I think we

1 have to get a little more specific and if you're in favor of that then I, you know, I would
2 propose that we put some of that language together and –

3 MR. ANDERSON: Well –

4 MS. HEGLER: - and present that to you as a, as a reflection next month, but.

5 MS. CAIRNS: And one of the things that I'd like to see and, you know, taken into
6 account cause we have it in the front of our plan about redevelopment –

7 MS. HEGLER: Right.

8 MS. CAIRNS: - of any use, that we have in that particular intersection a lotta
9 empty square footage.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, let me tell you about that square footage. The Food
11 Lion is still paying their lease, Piggly Wiggly is still paying their lease. You cannot go on
12 the, what they propose to do cannot go in the Piggly Wiggly site, number one because
13 they do still, no matter what [inaudible] says, Piggly Wiggly will not allow a grocer to go
14 in there. But number two on that site, CVS has that site tied up for drugs so they can't
15 put what they want to in the Piggly Wiggly because of the drug restriction on the site.

16 MR. TUTTLE: Pharmaceutical.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Pharmaceutical. [Laughter] And because the Pig won't
18 allow it. Same thing, both, those folks have contacted both those sites and would go into
19 both those sites, either one, if they could. But they can't because of what's currently
20 there.

21 MS. CAIRNS: But, I mean, there's gotta be, I mean, somehow there has to be a
22 solution to that because it's ridiculous that we can allow empty square footages and
23 say, well they're paying their taxes, they're paying their this and so –

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, they're paying their rent.

2 MS. CAIRNS: But, I mean, but it, I mean, the taxes are getting paid obviously,
3 too.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

5 MS. CAIRNS: But, I mean, we've got a problem with that. I mean, I don't know
6 how you fix that.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: You don't! They're paying their rent.

8 MR. THEUS: These are business decisions outside of our control.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

10 MR. THEUS: I mean, I'm not, I hear your frustration.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Oh, I do, too! But, and, and it hurts the center when they
12 go dark, it hurts the center, it kills it and everybody moves out and, but that's the
13 decision of the business people who built that shopping center made. Now it's gonna
14 hurt them financially but they're paying for their space so those folks cannot put another
15 grocery store in those folks, in those spots as it is today.

16 MS. HEGLER: You know, the building on that, I think what this corridor does and
17 one of the recommendations that we could put forward and, and develop more if it's
18 adopted is making sure we're making redevelopment as easy as possible, setting that
19 aside. That we are encouraging redevelopment of these vacant lots. No, we can't do
20 anything particularly about that issue, but make sure everything else is clean and clear
21 on the table that we do support redevelopment, we support the reuse to certainly better
22 these aging corridors. Make sure there's nothing from a county perspective that's
23 holding that up, make sure that our regulations, the things that we can enforce, are

1 corrected and, and made simpler for that redevelopment question. You know, I don't
2 think we can overcome that but we can at least make it easier from a county
3 perspective.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, here's what, here's what we talked about before,
5 years ago, and I know that the county encourages the redevelopment of sites, and that
6 sounds good. But the end of the day, and the county went in and eventually bought this
7 site, but it's the Kroger on Decker Boulevard.

8 MS. HEGLER: Um-hum (affirmative).

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's all pavement, very little landscaping. If someone, if a
10 private sector were to go in there and buy that site and try to redevelop it, they'd have to
11 bring it up to the current landscaping codes, you have to put in the detention and the
12 setback buffers, the lighting. They'd have to make it look like new. And when a
13 developers looking at doing that and they're looking at a virgin piece of ground versus
14 tear down, rebuild, asbestos and everything else that's with the old site, it doesn't make
15 financial sense to do a redevelopment site as opposed to going on to the virgin ground,
16 financially. So unless the county can come up with something other than saying, we
17 encourage it, if –

18 MS. HEGLER: Right, but that's, I mean, that's what I –

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - if the county can say we're, but, but at that time there
20 was no will of the Planning Commission or the Council to say, our desire was, no we
21 want the county to look beautiful everywhere, we're not gonna let these old places - you
22 know, my thought process was, let's relax those standards and let them reuse the
23 structure and not have to come up to the current. I mean, you had to go in there and

1 you had to tear out the asphalt, put in islands, you had to put sprinklers in there and,
2 and you had to make it look like it was just brand new. But if we could relax some of
3 those and say, if, if you –
4 yeah-huh.

5 MS. HEGLER: It's not true if it's the same use.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, no, no, you would.

7 MR. PRICE: No, you wouldn't. It's the same use. Before when we talked about
8 this it was about the change of use, it was not for the same use.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But change of use is so defined in that, it can still be a
10 commercial use but if any of those businesses, let's say it was a cell phone store before
11 and now it's an insurance office, that's a change of use.

12 MR. PRICE: If you kinda take a look at that Kroger, that area, that has such a
13 mixed use component within there, I can't think of a use that would've gone in there that
14 wasn't retail in some capacity that would've triggered –

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But that doesn't matter, the, the way the county looks at it
16 is there's individual spaces that are in those shopping centers, that's a change of use,
17 they have to be brought up to current Code.

18 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's the way they treat me.

20 MR. PRICE: No. [Laughter]

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Every single space – yeah, it's gotta -

22 MR. PRICE: Like what? Give me an example.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: When somebody moves into a shopping center, if it
2 doesn't have two bathrooms, a mop sink and a high/low water fountain, it's got a, you
3 now gotta put an extra bathroom and –

4 MR. PRICE: Building Code, that's the Building Code and there are certain uses
5 after a certain period of vacancy or certain changes, the Building Department will have
6 you do interior work. But if you, we deal mostly with the exterior of the property, so
7 going back to what you previously stated, if the uses are relatively the same, then they
8 would not have to make improvements to the parking, to the lighting or the landscaping.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But they would to the interior. They'd have to bring all that
10 stuff up to Code.

11 MR. PRICE: The building, just depending on the, the period of vacancy or
12 abandonment, or, or just really non-use, then they will have to make certain –

13 MR. TUTTLE: It's also tied to the percentage of renovation. If you exceed a
14 certain percentage of renovation then everything has to come up to Code. If you weren't
15 sprinklered and you do 70% renovation, you have to sprinkle the whole –

16 MR. PRICE: Right, but see you're talking interior.

17 MS. HEGLER: Which goes back to what I said, which is, for us the things that we
18 do have authority over, we can't handle, you know, I can't do anything about those
19 leases, I can't really do anything about the Building Code. But making sure that from a
20 zoning perspective those things that are inhibitors now to, you know, redevelopment,
21 making sure that they don't exist. I think it's just about what we would be attempting to
22 do is making it as easy as possible from a zoning perspective. Only within the realm of
23 what we can, what we can impact.

1 MS. CAIRNS: The other thing, I mean, the thing about these leases and the idea
2 that we can't touch them, they, I mean, not every private agreement is enforceable. You
3 can have unenforceable private agreements. And, I mean, it probably is gonna have to
4 start at the State House level on something like this, but I mean, I think it's ridiculous
5 that we have a system that a grocery store can force two grocery stores to sit empty
6 when they vacate them. I mean, they, it's like it's a non-compete clause, I mean, there
7 can be reasonable non-compete causes and there can be extran, you know, you're
8 working for a company and they say if you leave my company you can't go open up
9 within a certain distance or time, so there's a reasonableness.

10 MR. THEUS: Well, it's out of, out of our purview. I mean –

11 MS CAIRNS: But I think it's absolutely – I know but I just –

12 MR. THEUS: - yeah, I know, I mean, I hear you.

13 MS. CAIRNS: - you know, we've got to figure out –

14 MR. THEUS: There are big empty, big box regulations that are in other states
15 and such, a lotta tax incentives to do things with them, that sorta thing.

16 MS. CAIRNS: We've got, I mean, I just, I think it's ridiculous that the best solution
17 is to, is to push into a residential area, build another grocery store while across the
18 street and catty-corner sit two empty grocery stores. That's the best we can come up
19 with?! I'm sorry, there's gotta be a better solution. There has to be.

20 MR. ANDERSON: Does Staff have any ideas or any control to push stuff in front
21 of County Council with monetary, economic incentives? Cause that's what it boils down
22 to.

23 MS. HEGLER: Right.

1 MR. ANDERSON: It boils down to money.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

3 MS. HEGLER: We can. I mean, we've just gotta identify where it comes from.

4 Yeah.

5 MS. CAIRNS: But I mean, we can't just, we can't keep it always being easier –
6 and I agree, I'm sure it's easier to take the greenfield, I have no doubt about that.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

8 MR. ANDERSON: Well, but, but -

9 MS. CAIRNS: But that's not gonna win, we're gonna lose in the end if we just
10 keep chopping up –

11 MR. ANDERSON: What would something like the, what would something like
12 that look like from Staff?

13 MS. HEGLER: Well, I'll tell you right now there's before, Council has made a
14 motion to do a preservation land management plan.

15 MR. ANDERSON: Uh-huh (affirmative).

16 MS. HEGLER: To protect the rural parts of the county and to, you know, in many
17 ways incentivize those large lot owners, the farmers, the foresters, to keep their land in
18 that production and that, and for that an entity would provide a resource; be it monetary,
19 or you know, education, to help them better manage the production of that land so
20 they're actually more profitable than they would be otherwise. So that's, I mean, that's
21 an example of what would come out of, as an actual implementation strategy, of the
22 recommendation of the Comp Plan? Remember at this level we're still just really
23 providing guidance. So if the guidance is, we want rural to stay rural that's the goal, the

1 strategy is, you know, find ways to incentivize that to happen. The preservation land
2 management plan is an option for that. I mean, there are other sorts of land banking, -

3 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, I'm talking about redevelopment, I'm just talking about
4 what are some of those things to think about as opposed to talking about we need it?

5 MR. TUTTLE: And I wanna go back to the example we had a minute ago, but
6 the, the, really the only incentive, and this would be very difficult, the county would have
7 would be a development in lieu of taxes.

8 MS. HEGLER: Um-hum (affirmative).

9 MR. TUTTLE: That's really the biggest carrot they have. And whether you could,
10 with the budgetary restrictions and so forth we have now, whether that could ever fly or
11 not, but there, if you believe there's inherent value in infill development versus further,
12 you know, I don't wanna call it sprawl –

13 MR. ANDERSON: Um-hum (affirmative).

14 MR. TUTTLE: - but sprawl, then there's some monetary value associated with
15 doing that for the greater good and for the county. And if you could monetize that and
16 then provide that in a reward, then you might convince somebody to go put sprinklers in
17 when they didn't have to. But the other side of the argument that we're not addressing is
18 the owner of that property on a five-lane divided highway at a commercial node has the
19 right to put that property forward as a commercial property. Here again, today we were
20 rezoning the property for a commercial, general commercial use, we weren't describing,
21 it may not end up ultimately becoming a grocery store, and we have to be cognizant of
22 that. Just cause they draw a grocery store we don't know whether it's gonna be a
23 grocery store or not, and that isn't what we voted on, we voted on it for being anything in

1 the GC classification. So we can't get hung up that there's a vacant grocery store
2 across the road because it may not become that. We have no guarantee that's what
3 they're gonna do. So I think that's important to note, cause if we go solve for X, if we
4 haven't solved for Y we're no better off.

5 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, but I mean, there's also been a lot of vacant GC, you know.

6 MR. TUTTLE: So, so, but, but why is it not fair for the guy that owns the parcel
7 that's become a viable commercial parcel not to be able to sell that as a commercial
8 parcel?

9 MS. CAIRNS: I understand that, but at the same time how does it help us as a
10 county to just keep building and walking away and abandoning properties?

11 MR. TUTTLE: Well, then, then we should've been contiguous to Main Street
12 since the inception of Columbia and never had any commercial anywhere other than
13 Main Street.

14 MS. CAIRNS: Well, once there's need and demand.

15 MR. TUTTLE: Clearly, this, this, Roger Staubach's group is gonna invest \$12M
16 because they think there's a demand there.

17 MS. CAIRNS: I understand, but I mean –

18 MR. TUTTLE: But we, but we as Planning Commissioners are gonna determine
19 when there's a demand and not a demand? I mean –

20 MS. CAIRNS: No, but I mean, the –

21 MR. TUTTLE: - that's what the market does.

1 MS. CAIRNS: - we've never had it, we've never had that as a, as a need or a
2 standard, but I just – I mean, I'm always gonna have a hard time, oh it's a five-lane
3 road, commercial on both sides all the way out.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Nobody's saying that just because it's a five-lane road
5 that it needs to be changed. That's one piece of the puzzle that is a plus factor in it
6 getting rezoned. That's the reason it's mentioned.

7 MR. TUTTLE: I don't know what the average – I'm sorry.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, no, go ahead.

9 MR. TUTTLE: I don't know what the average daily trips are at Assembly and
10 Elmwood, but it's probably not far from that at Hardscrabble and Clemson. So if you're
11 CBD can support it, Hardscrabble and Clemson oughta be able to support it, in my
12 opinion.

13 MR. ANDERSON: So I just wanted to go back to the Comp Plan and the mixed
14 use corridor. So we have the ability to go and make up some distance? I just wanna see
15 how this is defined. I mean, and I don't like the distance –

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I don't wanna get into a distance. Because then you get
17 into, well I'm 1,001' so I'm a negative. The Comp Plan is -

18 MR. ANDERSON: Well, agreed.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - supposed to be there as a guide. And for you to say,
20 okay this is generally what we're looking for, at this interchange do we see that it needs
21 to go out this far? Do we see that it needs to be tighter than this?

22 MR. ANDERSON: Sure.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And as it grows and grows, but if, if we start making the
2 Comp Plan code, then we're starting to get into an area I don't, I don't like.

3 MR. ANDERSON: Well, and I, and I completely agree with that, but I'm just,
4 again back to my original question was, what in this Comp Plan would have made
5 Staff's approval, or made Staff's recommendation an approval based on this piece
6 being so close to all the general commercial, and at that node with, I mean, ingress,
7 egress off highways? I mean, you got tons and tons of people that are funneling through
8 here and those services are basically needed. So that's what I'm looking for in the
9 Comp Plan, cause I'm trying to grasp around, I mean, I can see why y'all disapproved it,
10 or recommended disapproval, but I wanna see something, like what would've made y'all
11 approve it? I'm looking for some guidance cause this is very vague here.

12 MR. LEGER: I mean, I think one of, one of the instances, I mean, just because
13 our new plan showed red –

14 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah.

15 MR. LEGER: - and it says, mixed use doesn't mean that it has to be GC.

16 MR. ANDERSON: Um-hum (affirmative).

17 MR. LEGER: It could be –

18 MR. ANDERSON: OI.

19 MR. LEGER: - OI or NC or any of these grades in-between, you know, residential
20 and, and high intensity commercial.

21 MR. ANDERSON: Um-hum (affirmative).

22 MR. LEGER: So I think that's, that's part of, you know, as a Staff what we would
23 look at is, is that maybe it's best used as an office but not the wide open [inaudible].

1 MS. HEGLER: Which is why I said whether we would actually put a distance on it
2 or not, I think we would be looking at transitions.

3 MR. ANDERSON: Um-hum (affirmative).

4 MS. HEGLER: We would be looking at, I mean, and I think that we could make
5 this speak better to that, that when we started out with this process we just had the
6 corridors and we had the same kind of questions you're having.

7 MR. ANDERSON: Um-hum (affirmative).

8 MS. HEGLER: Like, so does that mean that all along the corridor –

9 MR. ANDERSON: Should be GC here –

10 MS. HEGLER: - everything would be rezoned to, could be to its highest intensity.
11 No, that's not the intent. So then the second iteration included these, these nodes if you
12 will, to say that, alright here's probably where we should concentrate that, the highest
13 intensity, then we start to transition. But the whole corridor itself is appropriate for a mix
14 of uses as, as Holland said, so we would, I mean, we would look at all of that. I don't
15 know that we would've supported GC even with the new Comp Plan.

16 MR. ANDERSON: What about OI, would you have supported OI?

17 MS. HEGLER: I think so.

18 MR. ANDERSON: You would've supported OI, which is the only difference in that
19 is a gas station.

20 MS. HEGLER: No, there's a few more.

21 MS. CAIRNS: Grocery store.

22 MR. ANDERSON: Well not, I mean, a grocery store would fit there.

1 MR. PRICE: One of the main things is, with looking at that is the OI is really
2 absent of mostly for retail and office. Office and institutional, so we may have services in
3 there, but you do not have, it's absent of retail. That's one of the main differences
4 between that zoning and the NC, RC and the GC.

5 MR. ANDERSON: Okay.

6 MR. TUTTLE: Right, but all the objections of the, the neighbors would be the
7 same. You still have lighting, parking, storm water entrapment, right?

8 MS. HEGLER: I don't know because -

9 MR. PRICE: I don't know. I had a meeting with them, I had a meeting with them
10 and I think some of them even stated when they were presenting to you today that, you
11 know, you did hear the argument, keep it rural, but then you also heard some of the
12 other ones also state that they just wanna a less intense commercial there, if that was
13 going to be the decision of the, well of the county, you know, they put us all together. So
14 it's not necessarily that they would've been, you know, the same, they would've been
15 against anything going there.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But here's the thing, if, you've got an entrance into this
17 subdivision, you've got general commercial, you've got an entrance into the subdivision,
18 which granted has a row of houses on it, but then you've got this parcel and in reality
19 the entrance to the subdivision is going to be, the main entrance is gonna be shifted to
20 the other side of this parcel which we recommended for general commercial. So if, if this
21 brown area was red just along the street, just those first three houses just along the
22 street, would you have seen this as a general commercial, and the entrance to the
23 subdivision was on the other side?

1 MS. HEGLER: I would say that it would now be adjacent to, but it still would be
2 expanding further from that intersection than the other quadrants had already
3 established where GC should end.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But we don't see the other, the other side's GC further
5 down.

6 MS. HEGLER: No, it goes down exactly the same on three quadrants, about
7 1/15th of a mile.

8 MR. PRICE: And y'all have recently –

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, you've got –

10 MR. PRICE: - the recent rezonings –

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - Wendy's way down there.

12 MR. PRICE: - that y'all have done going down that way have been neighborhood
13 commercial or OI.

14 MS. HEGLER: The commercial stops and it either turns into a transitional office
15 or a residential.

16 MR. PRICE: I think a good example is that piece right there, kinda where you
17 have the, where it's OI right now, I think that was the last rezoning you had in that area.
18 And that was for the assisted living facility.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What's that Wendy's?

20 MR. PRICE: Wendy's is GC.

21 MS. HEGLER: Where is it, further down?

22 MS. CAIRNS: It's right there.

23 MR. PRICE: Yeah, it's right there.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right where the –

2 MR. PRICE: See, it stops, to be honest with you, if you kinda go in the direction
3 y'all took today, instead of OI for the assisted living facility that could've been general
4 commercial. No, it's right – no, that's the Wendy's but I'm just saying, very similar when
5 they go right there, that's where we did the assisted living. That could've been general
6 commercial.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, no, no, look how close this site is.

8 MR. THEUS: A piece of this site is directly across the street from general
9 commercial, the site we recommended approval today.

10 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, on the, if, if you, that is the northeast quadrant, it goes
11 further down Clemson than where this parcel starts. Right?

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, this is about the same as the distance from the
13 Wendy's and everything else across the street from Wendy's. Look at where it starts!

14 MS. CAIRNS: Where it starts, yeah.

15 MS. HEGLER: I mean, when you talk about penetrating.

16 MS. CAIRNS: [Inaudible] unintense part of its use.

17 MR. THEUS: We can all disagree on this forever.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

19 MR. THEUS: How do we deal with, I know this isn't in this plan, but the buffer
20 requirements seem pretty sparse.

21 MS. HEGLER: And you mentioned that earlier. I mean, I think that that's, so
22 many of the goals of the Comp Plan, should they be, you know, adopted, require an
23 update to the Code. And it would require that those things be investigated and, and

1 reviewed. It may be that we are able to provide more intense uses in more places along
2 these corridors if we increase the buffers.

3 MR. THEUS: Yeah.

4 MS. HEGLER: I mean, that's, I mean, all that can go together very, very easily. I
5 mean, whatever suggestions you would have for, I mean, it's the first foray we've ever
6 taken into having this kind of a land use. I mean, we currently don't have it. I mean, it, it
7 could be completely absent and we could just stick to rural, suburban and urban
8 paradigms, but you know, the idea here is to provide a place where we are attempting
9 to promote redevelopment. We heard so much from the public about working on those
10 aging corridors. You know, the detail I think has to follow but if we support that in
11 concept then we've gotta work out, I think some Code specific regulations that would
12 make that happen. And offer some incentives, and I think the answer to so many of
13 these questions is that this has to be for a very, for the very near term, move elective
14 than, you know, required.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

16 MS. HEGLER: In terms of – and that's what this preservation land management
17 plan that I keep referring to would do. I mean, it would be elective, it would be an
18 opportunity for you to remain profitable by keeping your land the way the county's
19 saying they would like that vision to, to stay. And we could do that at any, you know,
20 layer of this, of this plan.

21 MR. ANDERSON: I'll email you some of my stuff. We're getting close on time.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Just did wanna ask one other thing though, real quick, sorry.

2 What does it say when you say to create a more of a main street form of development?

3 What are you talking about when you say, Main Street form of development?

4 MS. HEGLER: You know, the idea that it's mixed use, you know, bottom floor
5 retail, top floor residential.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, I just don't want that to be like some, oh well the Main
7 Street we've defined as brick columns.

8 MS. HEGLER: No, I mean, I wouldn't see it as having architectural –

9 MR. ANDERSON: Uh-huh (affirmative).

10 MS. HEGLER: - flavor as much as it is that use and, and style of, or you know,
11 type of intensity, type of design.

12 MR. ANDERSON: Okay.

13 MS. HEGLER: But nobody's proposed architectural standards at this point.

14 MR. ANDERSON: You came close to saying it though.

15 MS. HEGLER: Um-hum (affirmative). I stopped. Nobody has.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Is that good?

17 MS. HEGLER: So just getting to timing, you meet again December 1st. County
18 Council is hopeful for a recommendation on the 16th. Any comments that you get to me,
19 I mean, I wanna create a redline document for you to be reviewing, that's what you
20 would be voting on in December. So, I mean, I need those comments very quickly. If I
21 need to come get them from you or if you have the ability to scan them. Otherwise, we
22 just keep delaying and, and I think the public is, the public's eager, Council's eager. I

1 want you to be comfortable with it, that's obviously, you know, why we've spent this time
2 on it. But I just, I need those comments so I can turn around the document to you.

3 MS. FRIERSON: Let me ask you a question. I have my little notebook, but is this
4 available, but it's in PDF format so I could just make the quick, make the changes that
5 way?

6 MS. HEGLER: I have it in Word, if that would be easier.

7 MR. FRIERSON: Okay, could you send that to me, and then I'll do it that way.
8 Thank you.

9 MR. TUTTLE: The Chairman's gonna rewrite the document in Word now.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Send it to me in Word. [Laughter]

11 MS. HEGLER: It's going to be tracked changed.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: As long as it's a, as long as it's a four-lane center divided
13 road it will be commercialized and [laughter].

14 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion –

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Wait, wait, wait. Other business? January's Planning
16 Commission meeting?

17 MS. HEGLER: The question is when do you wanna meet? We have to set up the
18 calendar so we wanted to ask you what date you wanted to meet. If you wanna do it
19 that next Monday or a different day of the week.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Let's defer that till our December meeting.

21 MS. CAIRNS: Why wouldn't it be the first?

22 MS. HEGLER: [Inaudible] set the calendar now with Council?

23 MS. CAIRNS: What's the problem with January 5, is that?

1 MR. THEUS: Does the ordinance require a Monday meeting? That's a bad day,
2 1:00.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Why don't we just readdress then next month, see what,
4 everybody come with a time, a date and a time that works for the Planning Commission.
5 If we need to move it we move it. If Monday's don't work.

6 MS. HEGLER: I, I'm sorry, actually the reason we need a date is because we
7 have, we're speaking to applicants now about January's Agenda, so anybody who
8 comes in now for a rezoning –

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What's wrong with January 5?

10 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, what's –

11 MS. HAYNES: We just haven't adopted it.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Oh.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Oh.

14 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we have our January meeting
15 on January 5th.

16 MR. THEUS: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor say aye.

18 *[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown]*

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. We got a motion to adjourn?

20 MS. CAIRNS: Yes.

21 MR. THEUS: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor say aye.

23 *[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Theus, Anderson, Brown]*

1

2 *[Meeting adjourned at 3:45pm]*