

**RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**March 4, 2019**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

*[Members Present: Beverly Frierson, Prentiss McLaurin, Heather Cairns, Stephen Gilchrist, Mettauier Carlisle, David Tuttle; Absent: Karen Yip, Wallace Brown, Sr.]*

Called to order: 3:05 pm

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'd like to call the March 4<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting to order. Please allow me to read into the Record, In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio, TV stations, newspapers and persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board located in the County administration office. Thank you all for being here with us today. First item on the Agenda is our Consent Agenda.

MS. CAIRNS: Good afternoon, everybody. I just wanna make sure, just to explain, for Map Amendment applications for which the County has recommended approval and there is nobody here either in the audience or on the Commission to object, we approve those by consent. And there are three of those and that's why I just wanna make sure that either no Commission Members nor no one in the audience is here to speak against either, I'll do the street names cause I think that's how most of them are known, Anna Fonseca on Farrow Road and Plantation Drive, so if nobody's here to speak against that or no Commission Members that will stay on the consent, as well as the Bickley Road, I don't have anyone signed up against on that one, or the Clemson Road, 2241 Clemson Road, Ms. Stratton's application. So is anyone here to speak against those or do any Commission Members want those up for discussion. I see one hand, which? Yes, so you spoke up in opposition or in support?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I guess in opposition.

1 MS. CAIRNS: Okay, so we will – okay, so for the Consent Agenda we’re gonna  
2 approve the last month’s Minutes, the Road Names and Case No. 5, which is Bickley  
3 Road as well as Case No. 7, which is Clemson Road.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: We’ve got a motion, is there a second to approve the  
5 Consent Agenda?

6 MS. FRIERSON: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: All in favor signify by raising your hand?

8 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Tuttle.  
9 *[Approved: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Tuttle; Absent: Yip, Brown]*

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And for those of you who are on the Consent Agenda  
11 you are free to leave if you wish. Thank you for being here today. Excellent. Alright, first  
12 case.

13 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, the Applicant for the first case is not here now. We’ve  
14 reached out to him to get him to come in to speak on this request. We would just ask  
15 that if you could move this case to the end of the Agenda.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, we can certainly do that. Second case.

17 **CASE NO. 19-002 MA:**

18 MR. PRICE: The next item is Case 19-002 MA. The Applicant, okay Ms. Singh,  
19 I’ll let her help with the first name, but the Applicant is requesting to rezone 2.9 acres  
20 from Rural to Neighborhood Commercial. This property is located off of Hardscrabble  
21 Road. Staff has recommended disapproval of this request. The request does not meet  
22 the Comprehensive Plan’s recommendation of locating nonresidential development  
23 along main road corridors or within a contextually appropriate distance from the

1 intersection of a primary arterial. Currently Hardscrabble Road is classified as a two-  
2 lane, undivided minor arterial. Approval of the rezoning would be out of character with  
3 the surrounding development pattern and zoning districts for the area. In addition the  
4 request would initiate the spread of commercial zoning districts along this section of  
5 Hardscrabble Road. Again, so Staff recommends disapproval. A couple of things, you  
6 know, again this is another request that we have along Hardscrabble Road and I think  
7 we've kind of discussed some potential options that we should look into, I guess maybe  
8 as a County, on how to address these, as opposed to these coming in kind of nickel and  
9 diming, or maybe taking more of a comprehensive look at the area. Also, one question  
10 that did come up previously was, would the widening of Hardscrabble Road change the  
11 classification, make it more in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, and that  
12 answer is no.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any questions for the Staff? The Applicant, Ms.  
14 Singh? Or Mr. Singh? Okay, please. If you'll please come up to the podium and give us  
15 your name and your address for the Record.

16 **TESTIMONY OF SUKHIJINDER SINGH:**

17 MR. SINGH: Hello, I'm Sukhijinder Singh. I live in Richland County. And I try to  
18 turn into Neighborhood Commercial, 2.9 acres on Hardscrabble Road.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. Any questions for the Applicant? Thank you,  
20 sir. Mr. Price, what was that you mentioned a moment ago? You said the answer was  
21 no, what was no again on this?

22 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. I believe one of the questions and I believe it came from  
23 Commission Member Tuttle at one of our previous requests along Hardscrabble Road

1 was, would the road classification change with the widening of Hardscrabble Road. And  
2 the answer is no it would not change, it would continue to remain a primary arterial. Yes,  
3 it's a primary arterial and that classification would not change.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Got it. Okay, any questions for the Staff. Any motions?

5 MS. CAIRNS: I make a motion that we send this forward to the Council with a  
6 recommendation of disapproval.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is there a second?

8 MR. CARLISLE: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we  
10 send Case NO. 19-002 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of disapproval.

11 All in favor signify by raising your hand.

12 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Tuttle.  
13 *[Approved to Deny: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Tuttle; Absent: Yip,*  
14 *Brown]*

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Again sir, we are a recommending Body to County  
16 Council. They will meet back in these Chambers again on March the 26<sup>th</sup> and you're  
17 welcome to come back at that time. Okay? Thank you. Next case.

18 **CASE NO. 19-003 MA:**

19 MR. PRICE: Alright, the next item is 19-003 MA. The Applicant is Anna Fonseca.  
20 The location is at the intersection of Farrow Road and Providence Plantation Drive.  
21 Providence Plantation Drive leads into a subdivision, Providence Plantation. The  
22 Applicant is requesting to rezone about one and a half acres from OI, Office and  
23 Institutional, to RS-HD, which is Residential, Single-family, High-density. Staff

1 recommends approval as it is consistent with the recommendations of the  
2 Comprehensive Plan. Per the Comprehensive Plan Neighborhood, Medium-densities  
3 are intended to provide a mix of residential uses and densities within a neighborhood,  
4 while serving as a transition from higher density areas to lower density areas. So again,  
5 Staff finds this to be in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and we recommend  
6 approval.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any questions for the Staff? The Applicant, Anna  
8 Fonseca? Not here? Okay. Nola Thornton? Ms. Thornton, for the Record please give us  
9 your name and address.

10 **TESTIMONY OF NOLA THORNTON:**

11 MS. THORNTON: Nola Thornton, Providence Plantation and [inaudible]. I along  
12 with a couple of more residents of Hopkins Plantation, we've been residents there for 15  
13 years, a major concern of ours is the front entrance that leads to Farrow Road there.  
14 Any time we leave our homes as it is right now that's a major traffic and fatalities out  
15 there on a daily basis. So with the rezoning to high density comes more traffic into that  
16 area without any infrastructure. So we'd like the Council to consider at least some type  
17 of infrastructure upgrade out there. There are accidents out there daily and any time you  
18 or any family member in that community leaves there they're taking their lives in their  
19 own hands.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Ms. Thornton.

21 MS. THORNTON: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: That's all we have signed up to speak. Any comments  
23 on this case? Commissioners?

1 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chair if I could I just want to reiterate to the folks in attendance  
2 that our job is solely to recommend an up or down vote relative to rezoning. We don't,  
3 sometimes I wish we did, but we don't have the power to regulate infrastructure, etc., or  
4 even cause it to be a condition of any rezoning. But I just want to make that clear so you  
5 understood. Thank you very much.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Tuttle. Any additional comments? Is  
7 there a motion in this case?

8 MS. CAIRNS: I'll make a motion that we send Case No. 19-003 MA forward to  
9 Council with a recommendation of approval based on the consistency of the Comp Plan  
10 and the lack of control we have over any traffic matters.

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is there a second?

12 MR. MCLAURIN: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we  
14 send Case No. 19-003 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval. All in  
15 favor signify by raising your hand?

16 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Tuttle.  
17 *[Approved: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Tuttle; Absent: Yip, Brown]*

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And I think she's already left but we are a  
19 recommending Body to County Council and some of those issues she brought up  
20 around infrastructure, and she certainly can feel free to share that with Council on the  
21 26<sup>th</sup> back in these Chambers. Thank you, sir. Alright.

22 MR. PRICE: Being familiar with that area, and I know a lot of questions that come  
23 about, especially with traffic signals in that particular area, and of course, that's a DOT

1 road and so a lot of those issues will need to be addressed with DOT. I'm not sure if any  
2 of the improvements that are taking place in that area will come up this far, but again  
3 this is something that will need to be addressed with the Department of Transportation  
4 as opposed to Richland County.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Price. Next case.

6 **CASE NO. 19-004 MA:**

7 MR. PRICE: Okay. Okay, the next item is Case 19-004 MA. The Applicant is  
8 James E. McGrew, location is 8816 Wilson Boulevard, but it does comprise a few other  
9 parcels. The acreage is two acres and it consists of mixture of GC and RS-LD, which  
10 would be General Commercial and Residential, Single-family, Low-density zonings. The  
11 Applicant is proposing to rezone the property to LI which is Light Industrial. Staff  
12 recommends disapproval of this particular request and it's based on not being  
13 consistent with the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan as the Comprehensive Plan  
14 feels that non-residential development should be within this neighborhood low-density  
15 land use designation and also due to the intensity of the uses allowed under the  
16 requested LI zoning designation would be out of character with the existing uses in the  
17 surrounding area as industrial development with significant community impacts is  
18 discouraged according to the Comprehensive Plan. So for those reasons Staff  
19 recommends disapproval.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Questions for the Staff? We do have several persons  
21 signed up to speak and when we call your name please give us your name and your  
22 address for the Record. The Applicant, Mr. James McGrew? And give us your name  
23 and address for the Record, thank you, sir.

1 **TESTIMONY OF JAMES MCGREW:**

2 MR. MCGREW: My name is James McGrew, 3527 Main Street is our current  
3 location, Columbia. I may as well tell y'all I built your dais. My name is James McGrew  
4 and I'm a cabinetmaker. I've operated in Columbia for close to 30 years. I've been  
5 contiguous to three neighborhoods including Cottontown, Elmwood, and now  
6 Earlewood. We've always been contiguous because we're a downtown cabinetmaker.  
7 We're one of two AWIQCP firms in Richland County. We perform, right now we're  
8 getting ready to do your new magistrate's office out there on Two Notch, we did this  
9 dais last summer. And any situation I've ever been involved in, which I've done this  
10 before, I've had to move three times. Never moved more than four miles from downtown  
11 Columbia. You have to first address the respect of the neighborhood around you.  
12 There's no way around it. And I sent you a small document to try to simplify my two  
13 minutes. Respect for the area neighborhoods and residents. McGrew Woodwork has  
14 operated – well I've told you this so I'm gonna pass on past that. For the first time since  
15 1995 we've been classified as a manufacturer which we feel we are not. We are  
16 subcontractors to general construction specialty trades which falls under General  
17 Commercial zoning and we've been licensed that way in Columbia and Richland County  
18 for well over 25 years. I met with Donnie Brown who lives at 1309 Hardscrabble, he is  
19 the direct contiguous neighbor who would have a problem with the rezoning of this  
20 property. I met with him twice, he has expressed a genuine and legitimate concern for  
21 the rezoning to LI. His reasoning is that he's worried of encroachment and where will it  
22 stop was he told me. I think he's right to be honest with you. It was through the  
23 classification and suggestion of the Planning Staff an application of how to obtain two



1 acres, how to make this application, whereas this building was historically used for the  
2 exact same purposes that we are. From 1981 to 1995 those two buildings and  
3 properties were operated by the Rossi Companies, general mechanical contractor, and  
4 Johnny Rivers Sheet Metal and Bass Company. Those properties operated until 1999  
5 when Ray Rossi passed away shortly after buying the 1305 property. The neighborhood  
6 has some serious concerns of which I've to learn how to address over the years.  
7 Hardscrabble Road is a problem. They need a light, they need a light twice a day; in the  
8 morning and in the evening. Traffic backs up, you're only gonna sit there from 4:00 to  
9 5:00 and you'd be interested what happens, especially in the mornings. We propose to  
10 close the Hardscrabble side of this property. I've been trying to buy this property since  
11 2013, which is kinda how we really didn't understand this zoning process changing in  
12 2015 cause even the property owner wasn't notified. The property had been historically  
13 a manufacturing type property, however, it is General Commercial now and if we can  
14 work with it we should find a way. We should find a way to get along with the  
15 neighborhood. He's got problems such as, number one he wants that traffic closed on  
16 Hardscrabble and no additional traffic. We wanna close the Hardscrabble side. I could  
17 not buy the property until 8808 became available so we could have a Wilson Boulevard  
18 entrance. I'll try to finish up I know you wanna rush me along. He would have issues  
19 that has brought up about outside dust collection, outside use of the property, which we  
20 have no outside use, we have no outside storage, we have one dumpster, three cars.  
21 We would make an impact of four cars a day. We are asking, I'm scared to ask for a  
22 change in zoning, I would really prefer to approach this the same as I have in all the

1 others which is General Commercial with a Special Exception limiting my use to my  
2 occupation of that building. Thank you, I hope I've made my case.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. McGrew. Freddie McConnell? You  
4 don't wanna speak? Okay. Alright, we'll keep it moving. Is that Jerry Sharpe? Mr.  
5 Sharpe, give us your name and your address for the Record, please.

6 **TESTIMONY OF JERRY SHARPE:**

7 MR. SHARPE: Jerry Sharpe, I reside at 9104 Wilson Boulevard. I'm familiar with  
8 this property, I knew it when, as a commercial property Johnny Rivers had it, my family  
9 member was the superintendent there. And I really feel like if Jim McGrew and company  
10 got this thing back it would be an eyesore in the community like it is now, it'd be a place  
11 of business instead of a vacant, empty building that's not being very well maintained.

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you, sir. Ken Stone?

13 **TESTIMONY OF KEN STONE:**

14 MR. STONE: Good afternoon. My name is Ken Stone. I live at 109 Fairlawn  
15 Court which is about a mile up the street from this property. I'm against the rezoning it to  
16 commercial. It's kinda what the gentleman said earlier, it doesn't fit with the community  
17 and I'm totally against it. It's a neighborhood, it is not designed for commercial  
18 businesses. As far as the building being an eyesore, anything's an eyesore if it's not  
19 being utilized, but rezoning it doesn't fix one problem, it simply creates another problem.  
20 So I'm totally against rezoning it for industrial use, it's already zoned as a business. If  
21 you got a business that fits in with the current zoning we don't have a problem with that,  
22 but I am totally against the rezoning. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Stone. Chris Johnson?

1 **TESTIMONY OF CHRIS JOHNSON:**

2 MR. JOHNSON: My name's Chris Johnson and I live at 1608 Hardscrabble Road  
3 in Columbia. I just about hate to say anything cause I love Mr. Stone to death and Linda  
4 and all them, they all my neighbors, but I've watched that corner up there just  
5 deteriorate and fall to pieces, and there is a lotta traffic, if we can get a traffic light in  
6 there it'd be great. I think it would be an asset, it'd make it look better, it'd be a business  
7 down there and some people could get some extra jobs. And I've seen the type of  
8 operation he has down on Main Street which is always clean, it's not trashed up. You  
9 don't see no dust. I just think it would be a great asset to our neighborhood. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, sir. Kevin Stone. Rusty DePasse.

11 **TESTIMONY OF RUSTY DEPASSE:**

12 MR. DEPASSE: Thank you, sir. My name is William DePasse and I live at 1338  
13 Sinkler Road in Columbia. This property, I became familiar with this property right after  
14 Ray Rossi bought it and I had been working with him on his office property, which was  
15 behind it, next door. He unfortunately died about three months after he bought this  
16 property and he had filled it up with boats and cars that he was gonna restore within this  
17 building. It took his family some eight years to come to grips with his death to the extent  
18 of selling all those boats and cars and creating a piece of property that we could market  
19 for sale. In the meantime, of course, the property has suffered, as many vacant  
20 properties do, from just general deterioration and also, of course, we had the case of  
21 the copper thieves in Richland County which ripped out the main service, all the  
22 electrical wire and so forth and so on. It is frankly not practical for most businesses, and  
23 certainly more often than not it has been churches who have looked at this property to

1 buy it, but it is so expensive to restore that unless you can find a business like Mr.  
2 McGrew's that can make something almost literally out of nothing the blight that this  
3 property is today is certainly going to continue to be a blight on Richland County. This is  
4 an opportunity to turn the property so that it faces Wilson Boulevard, it would no longer  
5 face Hardscrabble Road, and all the neighbors who might object to it would be behind it  
6 and they frankly would never see it. And I understand the restrictions but I think an  
7 exception is warranted in this case. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, yes, sir. Samuel Latta?

9 **TESTIMONY OF SAMUEL LATTA:**

10 MR. LATTA: My name is Samuel Latta. And I live at 211 Lincoln Elizabeth Drive.  
11 I stay walking distance from the area that has been presented here today. I have been  
12 living in Lake Elizabeth for almost 30 years, since 1992, and I've seen the area, you  
13 know, grown but this business area will cause an impact on the community because the  
14 traffic and in and out of that area from Wilson Boulevard and also from Hardscrabble. It  
15 will cause us to be really concerned about that and I'm against rezoning.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, sir. Danny Brown?

17 **TESTIMONY OF DANNY BROWN:**

18 MR. BROWN: Good afternoon. My name is Danny Brown. I live adjacent to the  
19 property in question. I live right beside the building. The gentleman, Mr. DePasse over  
20 there, has quoted one thing wrong. If they did locate the entrance on Wilson Boulevard,  
21 I would still see all of this from my property. I would like to say that my father-in-law built  
22 this house, it was the first house in the area. My wife, Linda, grew up in the house.  
23 There's been River Sheet Metal, ductwork or metal installation in there, they never

1 caused a problem. They had certain hours they would work, they would go home, come  
2 back the next day, it's not a problem. This particular situation, it's uncommon for me to  
3 understand how in the world a man can make cabinets and not create saw dust.  
4 Somehow or another you got to attach aluminum on here and that requires glue. This is  
5 gonna actually cause fumes in the neighborhood. I don't care what the building looks  
6 like now as far as appearances, it's evidently gone downhill, but there's no way that this  
7 building needs to become light industrial. I just don't see – DOT is gonna be involved in  
8 it, it is a state road I understand that and I'm sure that they will justify their beliefs  
9 accordingly. But this is not an intersection that would be able to take any kind of  
10 industrial situation. If it were this guy goes ahead and makes it industrial and then he  
11 turns around and he says, okay I've got industrial now let's make this part industrial.  
12 That's not what the neighborhood wants. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Brown. Commissioners, that's all we  
14 have signed up to speak. Are there any comments to the Staff about this case?

15 MS. CAIRNS: I have just a couple questions. So it appears that cabinetmaking is  
16 specifically listed as a light industrial use in our Code? I mean, I just ask because, I  
17 mean, within that my question is also just sort of, you know, what is the nature of a light  
18 industrial use? I mean, typically we talk about trucking and outside storage as things  
19 that make uses more noxious.

20 MR. PRICE: Yeah, a lotta times if it's not specifically referenced in our Code and  
21 we do look at the operation, we look at uses that, when you start talking about maybe  
22 noise, lights, fumes, dust, smell, those move into the industrial categories. And a lotta  
23 times just depending on the intensity of it, it may make it either heavy industrial or light

1 industrial. And this is not the first request that we've had for essentially this same type  
2 use. And I think we've gone through the same process where they needed an industrial  
3 zoning as opposed to an existing commercial.

4 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, just offering that this is – I do remember, recall a previous  
5 cabinetmaker having this similar type of issue. I mean, certainly General Commercial as  
6 a neighbor can be a nuisance in terms of the amount of traffic and activity that goes on  
7 around a General Commercial which is what the area is currently primarily zoned as.

8 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I mean, it's not specifically referenced but manufacturing  
9 pretty much is a catchall for all other type manufacturing uses always fall into the  
10 industrial districts. So if we look to put it in a General Commercial there's no category  
11 that would've allowed a use and so we default to the manufacturing or otherwise not  
12 listed, and in this case it would be an industrial zoning.

13 MS. CAIRNS: I can offer also to the speakers in favor of this amendment is that  
14 when we review applications it's not for your specific company that we can evaluate it  
15 as, you know, if this property were to be rezoned Light Industrial, any potential use  
16 that's allowed in Light Industrial could go there. So that is under the context that we  
17 have to look at it. So we're not making any type of judgment as to how you run your  
18 business and how noxious that specific use would be. But if it's determined that  
19 because you are manufacturing, you're taking raw material and turning it into something  
20 else, very nice other things, but other things, that it falls into Light Industrial. And so  
21 that's what we have to look at it as, is that, you know, cause you could be there for a  
22 couple of years, move on, and then somebody else could come in with a more noxious  
23 type of Light Industrial. So we have to context it in that framework.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Ms. Cairns, any additional comments? I was just  
2 noticing – usually our conclusions we will reference the fact that certain requests are  
3 either consistent or not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In this particular case  
4 what was your, I mean, did I misread that?

5 MR. PRICE: It stated it is not consistent.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

7 MS. CAIRNS: The view of the Comp Plan is that this area would be low-density  
8 neighborhoods. Which would, you know, the fact that it's commercial, somebody could  
9 put a commercial use out there. You know, so to a certain extent the Applicant – I don't  
10 know at all what happened the last time but we did have an almost exact application a  
11 couple years ago with a different cabinetmaker. You know, it's whether or not  
12 cabinetmaking should be something that should be allowed in other uses, that's not  
13 something we can decide. But that's always another just angle. But I, you know, that's  
14 what we're hamstrung with is that, you know, on a blush look, is this a good spot to put  
15 industrial uses? And you know, I can offer that I have a hard time supporting this corner  
16 as a good spot for an industrial use.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any other comments, Commissioners? Any motions?

18 MR. MCLAURIN: Mr. Chairman, I recommend that we take Case 19-004 MA,  
19 send it to the Council for disapproval. It's not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is there a second?

21 MS. CAIRNS: I'll second the motion.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I has been seconded. Any additional questions or  
2 comment? Okay, all in favor of sending Case No. 19-004 MA forward to Council with a  
3 recommendation of disapproval please signify by raising your hand.

4 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Gilchrist.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: All opposed?

6 MR. PRICE: Those opposed: Carlisle, Tuttle.

7 *[Approved to deny: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Gilchrist: Opposed: Carlisle, Tuttle;*  
8 *Absent: Yip, Brown]*

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. We are again a recommending Body to County  
10 Council. They will meet back in these Chambers on the 26<sup>th</sup> of March, please feel free  
11 to come back at that time. Thank you.

12 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, before we go to the next case just kinda one of the things  
13 I guess we could kinda point this out a bit. I know that there are times when, you know,  
14 of course y'all are not unanimous in your decisions so you do have those who either are  
15 for or against the actual motion. However, I will tell you that Councilmembers at times  
16 will ask questions such as, what were the two dissenting votes for a request, why did  
17 they vote this way, so it would help that if you feel that you're voting against something  
18 or whether you're on the prevailing side or not, that you could at least state that for the  
19 Record and that way we can relay that information to Council because it may be some  
20 reasons that they may wanna take into consideration.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure.

22 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, if I might. I can give you a brief statement on my  
23 beliefs is it seems as though it operated in similar capacity for, gosh, 20 or 30 years



1 without a whole lot of problems for the neighborhood, etc. I understand that rezoning  
2 into the Light Industrial could open up some uses that weren't there, but historically it  
3 was a sheet metal plant for 25 years or something. So I kinda felt like the impact from  
4 that would be diminimus and I think from a traffic perspective, whether it's GC or Light  
5 Industrial, they're probably six in one, half a dozen in the other, so that wasn't really a  
6 determining factor in my head. Thank you.

7 MR. PRICE: Thank you.

8 MS. CAIRNS: Just one question/comment. I mean, our graphics show Lake  
9 Elizabeth in the background but I'm pretty sure Lake Elizabeth is no more and will be no  
10 more. And so I think we really do need to eliminate that as a lake on our graphics. You  
11 know, it just sorta makes for a misnomer cause we're not turning lake front property.

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And I'll just comment, Mr. Price, that one of the things  
13 that this gives justification to is our work around the rewrite of the Code.

14 MR. PRICE: Correct.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: This clearly indicates that there is a conflict there  
16 between what should be an obvious consideration in light of the fact that our Code  
17 happens to be something that we have to use as a guide to determine our votes on  
18 something like this. So this is another reason why what we're doing and what the  
19 Council has approved regarding our rewrite is important, so.

20 MR. PRICE: Right, and I think the other part that – again, I think this was actually  
21 mentioned at a previous meeting, I think it's a little difficult sometimes when there are  
22 existing structures and a previous use that was on the property. Had this been just  
23 vacant land, maybe just wooded land, I think your decisions might've been a little easier

1 than had there not been, you know, a use that was there 25 years ago that has lost any  
2 conformity, it's non-conforming, maybe, or it's just not appropriate at this particular  
3 location. So maybe that's something that we could also address into the Code rewrite.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Great, thank you.

5 **CASE NO. 19-006 MA:**

6 MR. PRICE: Okay, the next item is 19-006 MA. The Applicant is Charlotte  
7 Huggins. The location is 10510 Garners Ferry Road. The Applicant is proposing to  
8 rezone 2.8 acres from Rural to General Commercial. Staff recommends disapproval of  
9 this particular request as we feel it is not consistent with the objectives outlined in the  
10 Comprehensive Plan and recommends disapproval of this map amendment. According  
11 to the Comprehensive Plan it's recommended that residential development on large  
12 lots, open space subdivisions, and smaller agriculture operations for areas designated  
13 as Rural; that's within the Comprehensive Plan. The plan also recommends the  
14 commercial development be located a rural crossroads or within rural activity centers.  
15 The site's not within an activity center nor an intersection of a rural crossroads.  
16 Likewise, the proposed zoning designation would allow for potential uses or greater  
17 intensity than the adjacent surrounding properties as recommended by the  
18 Comprehensive Plan. Staff again, recommends denial of this request.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any additional questions for the Staff?

20 MR. TUTTLE: We have not seen a request on this property before, have we?

21 MR. PRICE: Yes.

22 MR. TUTTLE: It looked familiar, okay.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: The Applicant, Charlotte Huggins. Please give us your  
2 name and your address for the Record, please Ms. Huggins.

3 **TESTIMONY OF CHARLOTTE HUGGINS:**

4 MS. HUGGINS: Good afternoon. Charlotte Huggins, 273 Old Congaree Run  
5 Road, Eastover. We had bought this property five years ago and yes, I've been here  
6 four or five times now, it was commercial prior to our buying and some of the  
7 commercial uses in the past have been a daycare, a boat shop, and a restaurant. And I  
8 even have a Special Exception that was issued by the County prior to our buying years  
9 ago. Like I said we are surrounded by commercial properties and anyway, it originally  
10 was 1.86 over the years that I've been coming here and was just told this last time that it  
11 was a principle arterial or, I mean, I don't understand that, but either way we had to  
12 have the two acre minimum. So we hired a surveyor, Laverne Steadman, to pull from  
13 our acreage next door to now give us the 2.80. And we actually had met with Norman  
14 Jackson last year and he didn't see a problem with it. So now we have, you know, just  
15 been paying taxes and using it for personal storage all these five years and haven't  
16 been able to utilize it. But like I said we just had it resurveyed to give us the over 2 acres  
17 which I was told by Zoning I had to have the 2 acres and that was why we were being  
18 turned down, you know, time after time. And so we'd like to be able to utilize this after  
19 now having it for five years. Like I said I've been here four or five times now and so  
20 that's what they said I needed was over 2 acres now, and there are adjacent  
21 commercial properties, three matter of fact.

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Huggins. Any questions for Ms.  
23 Huggins? Okay. Sara Burnside? Please give us your name and address for the Record.

1 **TESTIMONY OF SARA BURNSIDE:**

2 MS. BURNSIDE: Yes, Sara Burnside, 1500 Benson Road, Columbia. When Bob  
3 and I first got married we lived one mile from this property. In 1980 Tommy Cotton had  
4 the property as a boat repair shop. Then he turned it into a restaurant. Then when the  
5 paper plant was being built on 61 he saw the necessity for rental properties, he built the  
6 tri-plex in the back and he turned the front commercial building into a boarding house.  
7 After a while Tommy then turned it into a daycare center. Then the people across the  
8 street that have since built the embroidery shop rented it for quite a while for an  
9 embroidery shop. Then when Tommy Cotton finally sold the house that he lived in,  
10 which was bought by Finlay House and turned into a nursing home, which is next door  
11 to this property, the Arie Dehuess bought it and was an engineer and an inventor in the  
12 property. And in 2008 I was hired by Cheryl Roofin Millender as a real estate agent to  
13 list this commercial property. We had it on the market for years and since it was going  
14 through estate, the contracts we had on it they were turned down through the estate.  
15 But then finally the Huggins bought it once it was out of the estate and it was sold as a  
16 commercial property, I was hired as an agent from an attorney's office to list it as a  
17 commercial property. You've got Mr. Bunky's across the street, the landscaping  
18 business, the embroidery shop and Richland County also has a dump site directly  
19 across the street. The Finlay House Nursing Home was directly adjacent to this  
20 property. You've got commercial totally surrounding this property and everybody that  
21 lives out there, and I was one mile from this property, we have large acreage and we do  
22 with it as we want. I had a horse farm for 18 years out there. But this should continue to

1 be a commercial property because it always has been one since 1980 that I can go  
2 back to. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Ms. Burnside. That's all we have signed up  
4 to speak, Commissioners.

5 MS. CAIRNS: Regarding this parcel in reading the conclusion that it should be  
6 within a rural activity center, which I know we have specifically designated such places,  
7 but in terms of *de facto* I would say this is a rural activity center because of Mr. Bunky's,  
8 the embroidery shop as well as the transfer station for the Richland County Landfill. I  
9 mean, I support this being rezoned as General Commercial. I think that we do have a  
10 little node down there off Garners Ferry. The fact that it fronts on Garners Ferry and is  
11 across the street from significant General Commercial I don't feel that it's inconsistent  
12 with the Comp Plan because I do feel that this is, in essence, a rural activity center just  
13 by its actual use, even if it hasn't been so designated.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is that a motion?

15 MS. CAIRNS: My comments in case anybody else has comments.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Are there any other comments from the Commission?  
17 Are there any motions?

18 MS. CAIRNS: I'll make a motion that we send Case 19-006 MA forward to  
19 Council with a recommendation of approval based on the comments I offered prior to  
20 my motion.

21 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we  
2 send Case No. 19-006 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval. All in  
3 favor signify by raising your hand.

4 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Tuttle.  
5 *[Approved: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Tuttle; Absent: Yip, Brown]*

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, and we are a recommending Body  
7 to County Council. They will meet back in these Chambers on March 26<sup>th</sup>. Thank you.  
8 Alright, moving right along. Next case, 008.

9 **CASE NO. 19-008 MA:**

10 MR. PRICE: Okay. The next item is Case 19-008 MA. The Applicant is Robert  
11 Fuller. The location is Oscar Amick Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 8.77  
12 acres from Rural to Rural Commercial. Staff recommends disapproval of this particular  
13 request as we feel that the rezoning does not meet the objectives of desired  
14 development patterns of the Comprehensive Plan which guides us toward  
15 neighborhood, medium-density future land use. The proposed request permits  
16 commercial uses that would be out of character with the Comprehensive Plan's  
17 recommendations for limited commercial development to remain on main road corridors  
18 and within a contextually appropriate distance from the intersection of a primary arterial.  
19 And in addition the rezoning is not in character with the existing residential uses and  
20 zoning districts in the immediate area. So for this Staff recommends disapproval.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any questions for Staff? Robert Fuller?

22 **TESTIMONY OF ROBERT FULLER:**

1 MR. FULLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Bob Fuller. I'm the  
2 applicant here and I'm also an attorney in Columbia representing the proposed contract  
3 purchase of this property for the purpose of having it zoned from its current Rural  
4 configuration to the district that would be Rural Commercial. Just to lay the groundwork  
5 for you a little bit, the intentional design to take it to Rural Commercial instead of trying  
6 to request this property for a General Commercial classification was specifically to  
7 choose a commercial designation more in character with the general vicinity of the  
8 property as it lies there than would be the case with a General Commercial designation  
9 that allows for a wide array of many, many types of commercial uses, some of which  
10 would be clearly not compatible with the general area. I will submit to you that in looking  
11 at the Comprehensive Plan, the original zoning for the property in 1977 as Rural, while  
12 the classification of Rural Commercial might not fit totally within the Comprehensive  
13 Plan of definition of what it ought to be, neither does the activity that has been taking  
14 place all around it for the past years, since 1977. There is very little out there that would  
15 truly be rural in nature. Oscar Amick Road is a unique piece of travel way in Richland  
16 County. It fronts on this property for approximately one mile. Its sole purpose other than  
17 to hold the earth together is to connect Highway 176 to Shady Grove Road running  
18 essentially parallel to I-26 through there. I-26 is the vista of the northern boundary of this  
19 8.77 acres and is the rationale and the reason for the purchaser wanting the property. It  
20 is to obtain the interstate visibility. There is no access to the interstate at Shady Grove  
21 Road, but this property essentially fronts or backs up to a long run on I-26. As best I can  
22 determine on Oscar Amick Road there are only two uses in place which are across the  
23 street from the property in question here, both of which I believe belong in the same

1 family unit. One is a very attractive older farmhouse residence with a number of large  
2 outbuildings on it, and the other is a smaller plot that has a mobile home residence on it  
3 and I believe the families of the residents of both of those locations are connected one  
4 to the other. There is utterly nothing else that fronts on this approximately one mile long  
5 stretch which is Oscar Amick Road. I thought it was curious that the designation in the  
6 Staff Report indicated and talked about Oscar Amick Road as if it were a road. It is a  
7 goat track, it is not paved except in a small portion and it is in deplorable condition.  
8 There is very little about this property that would not be improved by having something  
9 useful placed on it. And I would submit to you that while it is clearly not in compliance  
10 with the specific verbiage of the Comprehensive Plan, the location of the business  
11 proposed for there would be more in keeping with the general area than anything else  
12 might be.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Fuller, we thank you so much for being here with  
14 us today and sharing that perspective. Thank you, sir.

15 MR. FULLER: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Royce Amick?

17 **TESTIMONY OF ROYCE AMICK:**

18 MR. AMICK: How y'all doing today? My name is Royce Amick, 124 Oscar Amick  
19 Road. I have two children and we already have too much traffic going by on my house  
20 on that road. And like he said, it is a terrible road cause of all the rain, of course. And  
21 people come up in my driveway as it is, and if it does do well there'll be even more  
22 traffic on my road and that'll be more people probably coming up in my yard. I mean,  
23 with the interstate, you have to drive over a mile to get to where it is off the interstate, so



1 I don't see why this is such a good place to have a golf cart business. That's all, thank  
2 you.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you, sir. That's all we have signed up to  
4 speak.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mr. Chair? I'm sorry, I didn't sign up to speak but I feel  
6 like I need to say something. May I speak?

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure, come on down. What's your name, sir?

8 **TESTIMONY OF BRIAN LONG:**

9 MR. LONG: My name's Brian Long. Brian Long, 1525 Shady Grove Road. I'm  
10 one of the other two people that live in the vicinity of this. I'm actually I think the closest  
11 residence to this tract. You know, this is tough for me because I live on  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an acre,  
12 very close to this. It's a very small tract, there's big large landowners all the way around  
13 me. I'm meeting with the planning architect this week to get house plans to build a  
14 house where I am on this  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an acre right here. So to me, I mean, I almost wish that  
15 either this would all go commercial and buy me out and send me somewhere else or it  
16 would stay country for the rest of my life. I just, you know, that's all I really have to say is  
17 it's, I'm at that intersection with two small children, a 3 year old and a 6 year old, and the  
18 DOT has been very difficult to deal with the last 10 years and I just wanna let y'all know  
19 that in 2011 they started knocking on my door, pushing me to sell some of my property  
20 to them so they could do highway improvements and relocate the bridge across here.  
21 All of which have not happened yet and they were very, very pushy back then. So I  
22 wanted y'all to know how hard this is for a small family right here. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you. Okay, I think that's all we have signed up to  
2 speak on this case. Any comments from Commission? Motions?

3 MR. MCLAURIN: Mr. Chairman? I recommend that Case No. 19-008 MA go to  
4 Council with disapproval.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: It's been moved, is there a second?

6 MS. FRIERSON: I'll second.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we  
8 send Case No. 19-008 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of disapproval.  
9 Any conversation, discussions? All in favor signify by raising your hand.

10 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Carlisle, Tuttle.

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: All opposed?

12 MR. PRICE: Opposed: Gilchrist.

13 *[Approved to deny: Frierson, McLaurin, Cairns, Carlisle, Tuttle; Opposed; Gilchrist;*  
14 *Absent: Yip, Brown]*

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Again, we are a recommending Body to County  
16 Council and they will meet back in these Chambers on March 26<sup>th</sup>. Well, I mean, I just  
17 think my comments on why I'm opposed to this, I guess it's very similar to what I said  
18 earlier. As I think about the Comprehensive Plan and more specifically how we seek to  
19 develop the County, the rewrite should give us a little bit more guidance about cases  
20 like this. So that would be my comment. And I certainly look forward to having that  
21 conversation with Council, too, by the way about why we even want to forge ahead with  
22 wanting to have a modern Code that speaks to some of what we think are opportunities

1 to develop the County more appropriately, so anyway. And we're a recommending Body  
2 to County Council, they'll meet back in these Chambers on the 26<sup>th</sup>.

3 MR. PRICE: The Applicant for the case that we deferred to the bottom of the  
4 Agenda is here.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Oh, okay. I was about to say I got one more case I'm  
6 looking at here. Alright, last case.

7 **CASE NO. 19-001 MA:**

8 MR. PRICE: Alright, the next item is Case 19-001 MA. The Applicant is Michael  
9 Niermeier. The location is along Lower Richland Boulevard. First case, yes. The  
10 Applicant is requesting to rezone 33.16 acres from Rural to Office and Institutional, OI.  
11 Staff recommends disapproval of this request. We feel that the requested zoning is not  
12 consistent with the objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. Also the Staff  
13 believes that the proposed zoning is not consistent with the prescriptions of the Lower  
14 Richland Community Strategic Master Plan as it would not respect the current rural,  
15 residential standards of that Plan. The rural small lot future land use designation, which  
16 this parcel is located in, recommends commercial/office uses at rural activity centers  
17 unless it is integrated as part of a residential development. The subject parcel is not  
18 located at a rural activity center nor is it located at the intersection of a primary arterial.  
19 Staff is of the opinion that the approval of the proposed district could contribute to the  
20 random and scattered un-concentrated effects of commercial/office uses in the rural  
21 area. In addition the approval of the rezoning request would not be in character with the  
22 existing surrounding agricultural and residential development pattern zoning districts.  
23 Thus, for that reason Staff recommends denial. Or excuse me, disapproval.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. Any questions for the Staff? Okay, the  
2 Applicant?

3 **TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL NIERMEIER:**

4 MR. NIERMEIER: Hi, good afternoon. I appreciate you letting me slip in at the  
5 back. I got my days crossed. Michael Niermeier, I'm the Capital Projects Program  
6 Manager for Richland County, and I guess for today's purposes I'm at 2020 Hampton is  
7 my address. We completely agree with what the Staff is saying cause their mandate  
8 dictates that the Comprehensive Plan views this a rural area. Looking at future planning  
9 for the County and development of this particular location which happens to be between  
10 a suburban activity center and a rural activity center on basically the corner of Lower  
11 Richland Boulevard and Air Base Road, sometimes needs dictated by public safety  
12 such as our intended use may weigh in favor of a rezoning. Of this 33 acres, there's  
13 about seven and some change of useful ground along that lower portion of the parcel,  
14 there's an access road that goes back to a radio tower, the County intends or is looking  
15 at developing that particular seven acres for use as a magistrate facility which currently  
16 does not exist in that magistrate district. The existing magistrate that was in Hopkins  
17 was closed, it was leased space and relocated up to Decker Center off of Decker  
18 Boulevard, the Central Magistrate Offices, so now anyone from in that area needs to  
19 travel anywhere from 10 to 14 miles in order to be seen at the Hopkins Magistrate. So  
20 what we're asking for is for that rezoning; does it set a precedent? It may but sometimes  
21 the needs of the public safety I think would be more important than actually what the  
22 Comprehensive Plan may say. There have been things developed and developing  
23 through the Richland Renaissance that would develop this area slightly more. The

1 County bought this property and others over the last several years for a lot of intended  
2 uses. Some of the visioning plans called for some kind of light commercial or  
3 restaurants, actually a magistrate. Other areas are intended to be used for conservation  
4 of which most of this property is used for that, and would be used for parks and other  
5 activities by the folks down that way. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, any questions for Mr. Niermeier? Mr. Niermeier  
7 let me ask you, who are you with again?

8 MR. NIERMEIER: Richland County.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. I'll ask the Staff about that later. I thought I heard  
10 that right, I was just –

11 MR. NIERMEIER: Yeah, I'm the Capitol Projects Manager for Richland County.

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Okay, any questions for Mr. Niermeier?

13 MR. TUTTLE: Let's see how this holds up, I'm gonna make a motion that we  
14 recommend Case 19-001 MA sent forward to Council with a recommendation for  
15 approval. And I'm going against Staff's recommendation because I do feel that this  
16 opportunity is for the public good to supersede the Comprehensive Plan in this  
17 particular case.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Tuttle, before we make that, I think we had, is a  
19 Wayne Adams here to speak? Okay, alright.

20 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, just in terms of speaking of this, I don't feel that I have any  
21 basis for which, that this is a good location for a magistrate's office. I mean, I agree that  
22 Decker Boulevard is not the best place for that current magistrate, although I find it  
23 convenient for myself, but. I just I think just plunking a magistrate's office in the middle

1 of a totally rural/residential area, I don't, I just haven't seen anything that offers that in  
2 this district for a magistrate's office that this is the best location. I mean, to me it's just a  
3 totally anomaly as a fit, so I would support the Staff recommendation of disapproval.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Just for purposes of reference Staff members, there  
5 was a magistrate's office at Lower Richland at one point, was it not?

6 MR. PRICE: Yes. Yes, right across from the elementary school.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. There's a motion on the table, is there a  
8 second? Mr. Tuttle made a motion to go against Staff's recommendation for approval.

9 MS. FRIERSON: Could you state your reason again, please?

10 MR. TUTTLE: I relied on the testimony of the Applicant largely that sometimes  
11 the needs of the County and the people might supersede the perceived needs of the  
12 Comprehensive Plan.

13 MS. FRIERSON: You're asking for a second?

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes.

15 MS. FRIERSON: I second.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded that we  
17 send Case No. 19-001 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval.  
18 Based upon the recommendations from Planning Commission Members against the  
19 wise advice of the Staff recommendation. All in favor signify by raising your hand.

20 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Frierson, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Tuttle.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Opposed?

22 MR. PRICE: Cairns, McLaurin.

1 *[Approved: Frierson, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Tuttle; Opposed: Cairns, McLaurin; Absent: Yip,*  
2 *Brown]*

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Again, we're a recommending Body to County Council.  
4 They'll meet back in these Chambers on the 26<sup>th</sup>. So feel free to come back at that time.

5 MS. CAIRNS: I will say on that one, I just have to say I find that one amazing.  
6 There was absolutely nothing offered as to why this is where a magistrate's office  
7 should go. I mean, I understand overriding the Comp Plan, I have no problem with that.  
8 But I didn't see anything that offered that this was, I mean, to put a courthouse into a  
9 totally residential area, I don't get it. I go to lots of courthouses, you don't find them in  
10 the middle of nowhere. I mean, you find them in the middle of nowhere if you're  
11 someone like me who's from the City, but they're in areas that make sense when you  
12 get there. So I just, I'm sorry, but I'll stop.

13 MR. TUTTLE: I don't know that this eases your pain any at all, but I'm not sure  
14 that we can only view it as a courthouse. It's a rezoning and we're not sure what the  
15 ultimate use could be, it could be anything within that zoning category.

16 MS. CAIRNS: Well, but. It doesn't make it, that does nothing to offer anything  
17 about why it should be Office Institutional in this location.

18 MR. TUTTLE: So if we wanna have the debate then, so any institutional use  
19 should only be in a densely populated area, so therefore we couldn't have fire  
20 departments in rural areas, we couldn't have hospital services in rural areas.

21 MS. CAIRNS: No! That's totally not relevant, first of all those have different types  
22 of zonings and classifications.

1 MR. TUTTLE: They're institutional. You're talking about institutional so we  
2 shouldn't have schools in rural areas either cause those are institutional uses.

3 MS. CAIRNS: This is silly.

4 MR. TUTTLE: Are those not institutional uses?

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: But here again is where I think our plan is just not  
6 consistent with how we now think about planning and development in the County, and  
7 this another great example of what that looks like. What I am curious though, this is the  
8 first time that I've ever had the pleasure of seeing someone from the County come  
9 before any Planning Commission to propose a rezoning, so that was quite interesting.  
10 Being a former, you know, administrator, that's interesting to me, so. Anyway. The  
11 Planning Commission has spoken. Alright guys.

12 MR. PRICE: Okay. Previously, and you were given the handout – at your last  
13 meeting you were provided a briefing document regarding a motion by County Council  
14 that Planning Commission look into reviewing impact fees. And again, those were  
15 handed out to you I believe at the last meeting. There was some discussion about  
16 having some stakeholders involved in this particular, I guess before you decide to  
17 proceed with either going forward with or against having impact fees for the County, or  
18 making that recommendation to Council. Am I kind of correct with that? One of the  
19 things, I guess, you know, as we talk about this as a Staff is when you have your  
20 stakeholders it would help and really from the Planning Commission if you kinda identify  
21 who you are looking to come forward, because typically I think you're gonna hear more  
22 from the building industry more so than anyone else. So just kinda opening it up to,  
23 saying we want stakeholders I don't think you'd have a whole bunch of people from the



1 communities, maybe even the Conservation Commission, just some of the other ones,  
2 they may not be quite as involved as the building industry. So if you would just at least  
3 provide us a little more guidance as to specifically who you're looking for to come and  
4 participate with any discussions that you have, you know, whether we should or should  
5 not do the impact fees.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay yeah, we certainly can do – Mr. Tuttle, you know  
7 a lot about this arena, can you give the Commission just a quick synopsis of a, how  
8 impact fees are collected in the County, and then I think that would give us some good  
9 guidance about who we should probably have as a part of a larger conversation on this.

10 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, so we need to be clear, what's before the Planning  
11 Commission now is approval to further study, correct?

12 MR. PRICE: What would happen is the Planning Commission would have to  
13 make a recommendation to Council that we would look into incorporating impact fees.  
14 Council, by Resolution, would then send this back to the Planning Commission and  
15 that's when you will start work on this.

16 MS. POWELL: What's before you now is whether or not Council should do the  
17 necessary studies to determine if impact fees are feasible, not that we implement  
18 impact fees in the County.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Got it. So what's the current scenario here in Richland  
20 County?

21 MR. TUTTLE: There is no, there are no impact fees in Richland County. There  
22 are counties in the State that have tried to implement impact fees; some have been in  
23 litigation for, God close to 10 years maybe, others have recently passed impact fees, I

1 think York County was one and that's completely put a stop to new development in York  
2 County. There's been some misapplication I think the courts would hold in some areas  
3 of the municipalities not understanding them, they've evolved a lot so I'm not sure that  
4 would be an issue going forward but it has been in the past. But, and I certainly have a  
5 very biased opinion from my life's work relative to the whole process. Others, you know,  
6 have a different view on it.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. So what the Staff is asking us to do is to give  
8 you guidance about what the stakeholder meetings should look like, is that right?

9 MR. PRICE: That was mentioned by the Planning Commission at the last  
10 meeting about that, so if that is something that you desire, a little more guidance would  
11 be helpful. But I think as Ms. Powell just stated, ultimately you know, you're to make a  
12 recommendation to Council.

13 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, so Mr. Chair, it might be appropriate for us just to have  
14 some dialogue to see where we think this Body might land on that, because there may  
15 be a need or no need for the stakeholder meetings, and that might be in step 2 rather  
16 than in this particular step. It wasn't clear last time as to exactly what was in front of us,  
17 but if you went that route my personal direction would be from all sides to have  
18 stakeholders be involved once you decided you were going to try to move forward with  
19 an impact fee. It may not be germane to this particular discussion, I don't know how the  
20 Commission feels.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any other Commissioners wanna weigh in on that?

22 MS. CAIRNS: So I'm just curious but I mean, so I'm trying to read state code  
23 which is always a dangerous thing to do, but the impact fees, it appears that the

1 statutory, there's statutory limitations specifically for capital improvements, so it'd be  
2 within this and I guess that's also why it's hard to find stakeholders who get excited  
3 about funding capital improvements cause it tends to be all of us as individuals, not a  
4 group. Okay. But that's the context under which the Council's looking at it, is it would be  
5 within obviously the statutory construct.

6 MS. POWELL: Yes, ma'am. It's essentially capital improvements and/or if you  
7 classify this as such, the infrastructure that's necessary to support new development.

8 MR. TUTTLE: And there have been numerous – and here, you know, I share one  
9 perspective, but there've been numerous studies, in fact we commissioned one that we  
10 shared with Lexington County Council as they were looking at this similar issue and the  
11 National Association of Homebuilders has put together a white paper that shows that  
12 new development actually is a financial net benefit to municipalities, that there's a  
13 presumption that there's a cost of new development to the county that people assume  
14 that you have to have, you know, a new fire station and a new school and so forth, but  
15 when you actually put the pencil to the pen you'll find that if you were to draw a magic  
16 line in the sand and do no development in the county that the property taxes would have  
17 to go up because they're using this development money and the increased value of the  
18 land and taxes to do some of these government services that if you cut it off, you'll see it  
19 soon in York County, that they're having deficits now. The Town of Mt. Pleasant did a,  
20 not an impact fee but their moratorium on permits has caused a shortfall in their income  
21 because there is no new development and they're using development money to do the  
22 other. Because if you really think about development in its purse sense most of the  
23 developers are dedicating roads they paid for, sewer systems they paid for, water

1 systems them paid for and storm water systems they paid for, free and with certain  
2 infrastructure projects we even have to pay, once we've dedicated the system, for the  
3 right to go back in and pay to use the system, i.e., a water tap fee, sewer tap fee, storm  
4 water improvement fee, etc. So that's one of the reasons why I think you haven't seen it  
5 widespread here in South Carolina, but here again I certainly have a very specific  
6 perspective on this.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Do you have any idea of where Council was trying to  
8 go on this other than what you have in this document? Was it, I mean, the last time we  
9 talked about this I brought up the whole idea of, you know, looking at affordable  
10 housing? Historically, you know, we've seen that, now granted, I mean, I get the other  
11 side of the discussion on that. But, you know, do you have any –

12 MS. POWELL: Mr. Chairman, I think that's a loaded question I would love to be  
13 able to offer you some insight on where Council's trying to go with several things, to  
14 include this, but I can offer that this was a conversation that I think that Council feels  
15 that they've had several times amongst themselves and as the Body that makes  
16 recommendations on land use and like issues, they thought that it would be a prudent  
17 course of action to hear from you all, as they were not able to achieve ready consensus  
18 about it. So I think that they're just looking for some more opinion from people who  
19 know the Code well and perhaps can speak to the impact that this might have on  
20 developers and citizens.

21 MR. TUTTLE: Just to split hairs there, I believe as statutory it has to come to the  
22 Planning Commission before Council could move on it, right?

23 MS. POWELL: Yes, but –

1 MR. TUTTLE: It wasn't that they, I mean, it could've been –

2 MS. POWELL: They could have taken a vote that they wanted to look at the  
3 impact fees and it would then have to come to you all to draft a Resolution, but that's  
4 not what's been done. They've asked you all to recommend whether or not they should  
5 even take that vote.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: So what I would suggest then, why don't we have a  
7 roundtable, whatever, just a discussion among the Commission Members, a work day,  
8 to just have a conversation about this?

9 MR. TUTTLE: What kinda timeline do you feel like Council's on?

10 MS. POWELL: There was no timeline established. As you see, this is a motion  
11 put forward by outgoing Councilmember Norman Jackson, so I think that we could  
12 probably take the time that we need and just report back to County Council what our  
13 status is.

14 MS. CAIRNS: I think as a Commission, I mean, I totally respect the developer's  
15 angle of it, but I don't feel that we really have, I mean, if there were to be sides in a  
16 impact fee discussion there really isn't anyone who can really speak to the benefits of  
17 impact fees. I mean, if indeed, and I have no reason to doubt that Mr. Tuttle offers there  
18 are few and far between in South Carolina, if most of us have our development  
19 experience here in South Carolina we're not gonna have anybody who knows the  
20 benefits of impact fees readily available. I mean, I can't speak to the benefit of impact  
21 fees cause I've never, I don't live where they exist. You know, so that's kind of an odd,  
22 so yeah we can certainly have those who can offer all kinds of things that the  
23 Homebuilders Association can say are bad. I mean, I saw in the little thing you gave us,

1 like comments from the APA, but we don't, you know, and I totally can appreciate the  
2 communities that don't have development are challenged. I mean, I come from  
3 communities where the development all ended decades ago and they learned how to  
4 exist with a little bit of redevelopment, but not the constant growth that we have. So you  
5 know, I mean, to me to try to reach sustainable tax base with the recognition that we are  
6 gonna be a growing community for decades to come just cause of demographics of the  
7 country – but yeah, it's hard for us to have anybody who can speak in favor. I don't  
8 know if I'm in favor or against, I have no idea. You know, I mean, I just.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Would the Association of Counties be able to help us  
10 with that, maybe? In counties where there are impact fees?

11 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, do we even know if there's any counties with impact fees  
12 that, you know, other than York County which you've offered –

13 MR. TUTTLE: Well yeah, York and like I said I forget whether it's Berkeley or –

14 MS. POWELL: Dorchester County.

15 MR. TUTTLE: That was the one that went to the Supreme Court, right?

16 MS. POWELL: Um-hum.

17 MR. TUTTLE: Cause they thought it applied to schools and there's an argument  
18 whether schools are –

19 MS. CAIRNS: Cause I know, like Hilton Head and/or Beaufort County there were  
20 additional, like transfer tax fees that went to help build amazing park systems. That's  
21 why Hilton Head's got some of those great parks.

1 MR. TUTTLE: So there was crazy stuff, like in York County, and I might have the  
2 numbers wrong it was either \$18,000 per single-family lot and \$16,000 for multi-family  
3 lot, which you know, is more than you pay for land in multi-family districts.

4 MS. CAIRNS: That'd be some major capital improvements.

5 MR. TUTTLE: And I think one of the places that people forget is, you know, with  
6 the affordability crisis that we're having, and this applies equally to all, so you just put an  
7 \$18,000 tax on an affordable home, well depending on the price of the home that could  
8 be, you know, 15, 20%, depending on – it's significant.

9 MS. CAIRNS: Oh, for sure. I just, you know, that's my challenge back to Council  
10 is, you're asking for something that I don't think we even begin – they're asking for  
11 something that I don't think we really can offer in any rounded basis.

12 MS. POWELL: Understood. Mr. Chair, I would offer that if this is the course of  
13 action you would like to take, Staff could do some research to see if there's someone  
14 from a neighboring jurisdiction or perhaps the South Carolina Association of Counties  
15 that could come in and speak to both sides of impact fees, pros and cons, to give you  
16 something to work with.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I think that certainly is a good starting point.

18 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, and I mean, I think that I would offer just as a resident of the  
19 County that I think, and a citizen of the Country frankly, is that we have an infrastructure  
20 crisis and we have an underfunding crisis. I have no idea if impact fees are the way to  
21 address it. I'm not saying that. But the fact that Council is trying to seek means a  
22 funding of infrastructure improvements, which I think would be capital projects, I'm in

1 favor of. If this is a viable way to do it I think we should listen. I have no idea. I mean, I  
2 just, yeah.

3 MR. TUTTLE: Here again, it's been, York County thinks they, they did X number  
4 of homes last year so they multiply that by \$18,000 and this year they have a 10<sup>th</sup> of  
5 those homes so they actually have gone backwards in their process of where they were.  
6 Cause people will go to where, you know, so if Richland County passes it they're gonna  
7 go to Kershaw County, they'll go to Lexington County, they'll go to, you know. That  
8 would be the only thing I would caution.

9 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, like I say I'm not saying that this is the right way at all. And I  
10 know we also have this huge problem, way too many of our roads being state roads.  
11 You know, so.

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well this is also the issue here, I shouldn't probably  
13 say this, but this is also the issue of counties raising taxes so much. Because when we  
14 continue to raise taxes what's wrong with an impact fee? And I think unfortunately that  
15 puts us in a position where we have to now say, well you know, that tax is not a good  
16 tax. Well no tax when it comes to trying to develop to the degree that we need to,  
17 Richland County already has one of the highest taxes in the Country when it comes to  
18 development and everything else.

19 MS. CAIRNS: That's not true.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Oh yeah, it is. No, that's true. Yeah, that is true.

21 MS. CAIRNS: You're talking about residential real estate taxes?

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'm talking about combined taxes are unbelievable. It's  
23 the highest, one of the highest in the Country.



1 MS. CAIRNS: I don't buy that.

2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Oh yeah, Heather, I promise you.

3 MS. CAIRNS: Let's just say my home back home the residential taxes are about  
4 \$25,000 a year.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: If you go back and look at the last time we had a major  
6 industrial development announcement in this County and you go back and do the  
7 research on why some of that has not occurred, clearly it is a result of taxes. I'm not just  
8 talking about, I'm talking about bonds, property taxes, you name it, it's pretty bad.

9 MR. TUTTLE: Well Heather, so it falls back to Act 388 which when Governor  
10 Sanford was there he took and they put the responsibility of schools on the commercial,  
11 6% assessments.

12 MS. CAIRNS: Oh yeah, I would agree that's a horrible law.

13 MR. TUTTLE: And that's when the residential tax was lower, relatively speaking.  
14 So all of the businesses that would come into town, including multi-family developments  
15 are all taxed at the 6% rate. And if you look that's why, you know, if you get behind the  
16 doors and you wanna understand why we've missed some industries, it is because our  
17 taxation is higher than other areas.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: One of the highest in the Country.

19 MR. TUTTLE: And you're competing with other counties that might not be as  
20 prosperous as we are so they can charge less and have more tools in the arsenal. But  
21 here again, taxation in Richland County's a really, really big deterrent.

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: It is.

1 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I would have no problem supporting the idea that that  
2 state tax that transferred all the school taxes onto commercial property was not the right  
3 thing for the State.

4 MR. TUTTLE: It's almost impossible to unwind that though.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: So anyway back to the conversation at hand, yes let's  
6 do that, contact the Association and see if they can come in and give us a briefing on,  
7 and maybe a work study, whatever we call it, work session, that's what I was trying to  
8 say, work session, a work session with the Planning Commission. And because we're  
9 not up under a timeline just whenever we can get that. We'll schedule something and try  
10 to go forward with that. Make sense?

11 MS. POWELL: Yes, sir.

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: In the meantime I would ask all the Commissioners if,  
13 we all need to review what the Council has asked us to consider in this document just  
14 so that we can become familiar not only with the state law and statute on this but any  
15 additional language they had in here.

16 MR. PRICE: Yes. Mr. Chair and the rest of the Planning Commission, one of the  
17 things, we can look, there are a number of things from a Staff standpoint we can do to  
18 assist you with this. You know, we can bring in someone to speak on some of these  
19 issues, and I know maybe we could even have work sessions, but one of the things that  
20 we're looking at is that there are four Members on the current Planning Commission,  
21 well two of them their terms will be up and they've served their full two terms so they're  
22 not eligible currently unless Council amends those rules to come back. And that would  
23 be Mr. Tuttle and Mr. Brown. Also, Mrs. Frierson and Yip are both up for reappointment

1 and it's really, I guess, at their discretion on whether they're gonna come back or not, or  
2 at least reapply. So we could have, you know, let's say a meeting next month but  
3 potentially we could have four new people in May or after that to come in, and maybe  
4 they're starting behind the 8-ball because they were not privileged to that presentation.  
5 So maybe it's something to think about, maybe we don't take this up next month but at  
6 least wait until May until we actually have the new Commission so everyone will have all  
7 the information.

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: What's going on with the current vacancy, do we  
9 know?

10 MR. PRICE: I didn't see it on the upcoming Rules and Appointments, I don't  
11 remember seeing that but I do know they've been taking in a number of applications so  
12 it's my understanding that they will, at least my expectation they'll have someone new to  
13 replace I guess Mr. Greenleaf from, next month's meeting.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, ma'am, Ms. Frierson, please go right ahead.

15 MS. FRIERSON: I didn't know if I was gonna reapply, what's the process?

16 MR. PRICE: You would just contact the Clerk of Council's office, I can give you  
17 that information, and just tell them that you're interested in reapplying. And they'll  
18 schedule you for interviews.

19 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'm fine with, since we're not under a timeline, I think  
21 that's what you all said earlier, so I'm fine with that until we figure out who's gonna be  
22 back with us, so. We can defer the conversation until that time. Unless Council comes  
23 back and gives us some –

1 MR. PRICE: Yeah, so what we can do – well, you know, in May we will then  
2 have, we can just schedule someone to come in and speak. At least we'll attempt to.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Great. Alright, is that it on impact fees? Land  
4 Development Code rewrite? Action on that?

5 MR. PRICE: There is no action for you to take. We kind of put that as a  
6 placeholder every month just in case. But I believe all of you were present at the  
7 presentation by the consultants on the 25<sup>th</sup>. And again, if you have any questions or any  
8 comments please feel free to relay those to Staff and we can get that to the consultant.

9 MS. CAIRNS: I have one comment for Staff to take to the consultant. I just have  
10 this funny feeling that the photo on the front shouldn't be Downtown Columbia looking to  
11 Lexington.

12 MS. POWELL: That was identified by the consultant team when last they were  
13 here and they are updating it.

14 MS. CAIRNS: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional comments regarding? Chairman's  
16 Report.

17 MR. PRICE: Okay. We probably need to schedule a work session with the  
18 Planning Commission so we're running into this thing about trying to get your times  
19 together so that we can go over the module a little closer and really get your input.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sounds good, so do we need to do that?

21 MR. PRICE: We can do that now. I know it's tough when we ask you to all pull  
22 out your calendars and give us a date. I guess from a Staff standpoint we could send  
23 out a couple of dates for you cause, you know, it does help that we have a room

1 reserved and an area, but we can send out a few dates for you to come and have the  
2 work session.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: That'd be great. Everybody please try to respond if we  
4 can when they send the dates out cause we need to do that fairly quickly I think. Okay.  
5 Anything else?

6 MR. PRICE: I assume that the afternoons work better for everyone or mornings?  
7 Does it make a difference?

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: It doesn't make a difference, just as long as we've got  
9 ample time to plan. Alright. Just a couple of things real quick, let me thank all of the  
10 Commissioners for coming out to the briefing that we had with the rewrite. I thought it  
11 was a very good briefing and obviously have some questions and I shared some of the  
12 my thoughts with the consultants when they were here, but I will be sharing that in a  
13 more formal way with the Staff so that we can make sure that some of that is taken in  
14 consideration as we continue to go through it, particularly during our work session. So  
15 we had a great attendance and I thank all of you for your involvement on that and your  
16 comments during that time. One of the things that I, and you know, it's interesting to go  
17 back into the impact fee conversation, since I've been on this Planning Commission one  
18 of the things that I've consistently asked for is, what is our role when it comes to  
19 economic development in the County. And I think when we had our retreat, our first  
20 retreat, by the way we need to schedule that again sometime soon, but one of the  
21 things that was clear to me was that there was a tremendous disconnect from the, a  
22 number of the County agencies when it came to understanding what we do and vice  
23 versa. But yet there were lots of intersections when it comes to those things, when it

1 comes to economic development and many other organizations within the County. Mr.  
2 Price and I were having a brief conversation about this and I was asking him, and some  
3 of you may know this, but I don't know what happens in the County, I mean, I don't have  
4 any idea of what is being proposed in the County or what potentially happens in the  
5 County when it comes to economic development. We just happen to see something  
6 happen. Unless we happen to be involved with it on the planning side. And so there  
7 were two things that I asked the Staff to consider and I would love some input from the  
8 Commission on this, is to maybe either have Jeff Ruble to come before us and give us a  
9 briefing, you know, periodically about what's going on economically in the County,  
10 because I don't understand how we can plan as a Planning Commission if we don't  
11 know what's happening on the economic development side of the aisle, it just doesn't  
12 make a lotta sense to me. It never has since I've been in this County and that's probably  
13 cause of my experiences but historically it's been a connection there at some point to  
14 understand it. So don't know if it's appropriate or if it's something that we should  
15 consider but I would ask this Commission to consider allowing Jeff to come in  
16 periodically so that we can have some idea of what's happening on the incentive side in  
17 the County, if there are any, so when we're asked to look at things like impact fees and  
18 we're looking at that in a vacuum without really understanding some of the other things  
19 that are going on, I think it'll help us when we get briefings from somebody about  
20 something like impact fees as an example. Those kinds of things will help us, so I think  
21 the Staff's gonna be working on trying to come up with some way of during our Planning  
22 Commission meetings at least we have some idea of what's going on with some of that  
23 stuff, and periodically have the economic developer come in and brief you about what's

1 happening in the County economically. Does that make sense? I mean, we all want, I  
2 guess we want the County to grow and we obviously, we've spent two years working on  
3 a new Code, it is impossible to do that and have those documents and we not have  
4 some intersection with economic development. That's just impossible. So hopefully we'll  
5 be hearing more about that as we continue to move forward. And maybe a little bit later  
6 on in the summer when we have our retreat we can do that. But my first point would be  
7 to ask Jeff Rubble to come in and brief us on some of that. Second thing, we haven't  
8 gotten an update on the Penny Tax in a while, projects. And it'd be good to kinda get  
9 some sense of where some of that is, I'm curious to know just what's happening. I see a  
10 lot of that referenced in our reports but to the degree that, I don't know, I can't even  
11 remember the last time we had a briefing on that, but I would ask that we consider that  
12 so that the Commission would at least have some idea of what's going on with that, so.

13 MR. PRICE: You want just kind of an overall briefing on, you know, where we  
14 started, where we are now kind of type?

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure, absolutely. Kind of an update, up to date on  
16 where we are.

17 MR. PRICE: Yeah, one of the things that we were kind of discussing, in 2020 you  
18 will have a chance to revisit the Comprehensive Plan. So hopefully y'all will still be here,  
19 that – you know, when you look at some of these areas that are coming, you know, I  
20 guess for example Hardscrabble Road's a good one, you know, you have people  
21 coming in and you look at how it's currently designated, you know, maybe we need to  
22 start looking at particular areas of the County where you see certain growth occurring or

1 certain type of requests coming in and see if that's, the current designations are  
2 appropriate or maybe we should look at other ways to amend it.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well that was one of the encouraging things I saw  
4 about the new Code, too, that allows us to be able to take some of those proactive  
5 steps I think and looking at some of that. But I mean, I've heard we don't wanna be too  
6 proactive about zoning, but I do, I mean, I just think that at some point to get a really  
7 good comprehensive understanding of what we're doing, you know, some of that may  
8 help. Mr. Tuttle, were you going to say something?

9 MR. TUTTLE: No.

10 MS. POWELL: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes.

12 MS. POWELL: If I might offer a response to that, Brian Crooks, our  
13 Comprehensive Planner who's seated behind me is working on a presentation for you  
14 all to sort of do exactly what you're asking for, say what the role of the Planning  
15 Commission is and the Comprehensive Plan, when you should be looking at updates to  
16 that and what updates you might consider pursuing.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Perfect, that's great. Thank you for that. Absolutely.

18 MS. CAIRNS: One of the, just sorta pondering the review of the, what is this,  
19 module 1 of the Land Development Code, I mean, sort of an impossible request but one  
20 of the things that I would find helpful, and like I said I know this is request is gonna be  
21 impossible, but to the extent, is you know, something that would, you know, if I open this  
22 up and read a section that says, this is what the setbacks will be, well how does it differ  
23 from the old Code. You know, I mean, like cause I don't have the Code in my head and,



1 you know, one of the things is, like what are we changing, what's the differences. I know  
2 this is a total rewrite so there's not always a comparative paragraph from the old Code,  
3 but then, you know, kinda like what's the rationale, why are we changing this so  
4 dramatically, like within the sections, you know, are there issues that we're solving, are  
5 there potential issues in the future we're trying to avoid? I mean, it's just typical, you  
6 know, when I'm looking at statutory changes you usually have what the old is, what the  
7 new is, what the goals are, what you're trying to do whether it's footnotes or whatever  
8 else. I mean, it's just – and I'm certain that this is such a massive rewrite that there's  
9 almost no way to do that but I can tell you when I sit here and just read this I have, you  
10 know, some of the things I'll know immediately that they're different from what we have,  
11 but there's a lotta other stuff, I don't know if it's exactly the same. I think we've seen this  
12 sometimes when we have statutes come in here for approval, we have no idea what the  
13 existing one is and we start nitpicking all kinds of stuff that have been in place forever  
14 because we don't know that. So I don't know if there's any document out there or  
15 anything out there that attempts to try to show us as we review this, what are we  
16 changing, why, what are we not changing and why are we changing the things we're  
17 changing? What are we hoping to accomplish? So I mean, I'll sit down and read it and  
18 go through it but there's just times it'll be very vacuous and hard to respond to. Cause  
19 I'm just not, I don't know the Code to the level of intimate detail that this is asking us to  
20 review it at.

21 MS. POWELL: Commissioner Cairns, there are comments in the footnotes and in  
22 notes that specify what changed. I don't think it gets to the level of why so we could

1 flesh that out a little bit more if that's not substantial enough. But there are footnotes and  
2 endnotes.

3 MS. CAIRNS: Okay. I see occasional footnotes. I mean, obviously I haven't read  
4 this yet I just was handed it, but you're saying that as I read this I will see what we're  
5 trying to do?

6 MS. POWELL: Yes, ma'am. In addition to the footnotes there's endnotes at the  
7 end of the sections where the consultants give you a breakdown of what's changed  
8 from the current Code to the proposed language.

9 MS. CAIRNS: Awesome. Obviously I didn't know that was there, that sounds  
10 great. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. Anything else, Commissioners? Anything else,  
12 Staff?

13 MS. POWELL: I would just offer you quickly that this will be my last meeting  
14 sitting in this spot with you all. It's our expectation that we hire a full time Community  
15 Planning and Development Director in the next several weeks. So I will join you at the  
16 next Planning Commission to introduce that person as they join Staff, and I will be going  
17 to Admin as the newest Assistant County Administrator.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Very good. Well, you've done an outstanding job in  
19 your interim role.

20 MS. POWELL: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And certainly we look forward to working with you as  
22 Assistant County Administrator.

1 MS. POWELL: And I might mention that if you all know Dr. John Thompson, he'll  
2 be in ACA as well, so John has all of the hard assets and I have everything soft, like,  
3 planning, he's utilities, public works, things of that nature. And that concludes my report.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Great. Congratulations, well anything else? If not I'll  
5 accept a motion to adjourn.

6 MS. FRIERSON: So moved.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST:

8 MS. CAIRNS: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank y'all.

10

11

*[Meeting adjourned at 4:50pm]*