



Richland County Council  
Development and Services Committee Meeting  
**MINUTES**  
March 25, 2025 – 5:00 PM  
Council Chambers  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chakisse Newton, Chair, Jason Branham, Allison Terracio, Gretchen Barron, and Cheryl English

OTHERS PRESENT: Councilman Don Weaver, Anette Kirylo, Patrick Wright, Ashiya Myers, Angela Weathersby, Michelle Onley, Kenny Bowen, Leonardo Brown, Aric Jensen, Jackie Hancock, Kyle Holsclaw, Stacey Hamm, John Thompson, Michael Maloney, Michael Byrd, Quinton Epps, and Synithia Williams

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairwoman Chakisse Newton called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - a. **February 25, 2025** – Ms. Barron moved to approve the minutes as distributed, seconded by Ms. Terracio.  
  
In Favor: Branham, Terracio, Barron, English, and Newton  
  
The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. Barron moved to adopt the agenda as distributed, seconded by Ms. Terracio.  
  
In Favor: Branham, Terracio, Barron, English, and Newton  
  
The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**
  - a. **Neighborhood Improvement Program/Neighborhood Master Plan Discussion** – Ms. Synithia Williams, Community Planning & Development Director, stated the Neighborhood Master Plan Program was established in FY2003/2004. There were no specific goals outlined for the program. Council approved a Neighborhood Planner position and later funded a program to look at the different neighborhoods within the County that needed revitalization or reinvestment. Staff has created goals over time.  
  
The biggest part of the program is the neighborhood master plans, which are detailed studies of a specific planning area and issues related to that subdivision and its commercial components. The steps to establish a neighborhood master plan are similar to those to create a comprehensive plan.  
  
The first priority areas were identified by Council in 2005. The plans have not been updated or revisited since those areas were identified. The current neighborhood master plans include:
    1. Southeast Richland Neighborhoods – January 2006
    2. Broad River Neighborhoods – October 2007
    3. Decker Boulevard + Woodfield Park – July 2007
    4. Candlewood – March 2009
    5. Crane Creek – January 2010
    6. Trenholm Acres + Newcastle Neighborhoods – January 2010

7. Broad River Corridor – December 2010
8. Spring Hill – March 2014
9. Lower Richland – March 2014
10. Capital City Mill District – November 2017
11. Sandhills Neighborhood – June 2021

Ms. Williams pointed out the Sandhills Neighborhood was not one of the ten original areas identified by Council.

Ms. Newton indicated that the criteria for creating the neighborhood master plans seem somewhat flexible. When she looks back, it is unclear what the results of a significant investment of time and resources have been.

Ms. Williams stated the criteria the neighborhood program is currently operating off of was developed in 2016. The current Comprehensive Plan does incorporate all of the master plans by reference. However, because the master plans were done at different times and not updated, the plans and the Comprehensive Plan sometimes conflict.

Some small-scale projects (e.g., monuments, murals, community cleanups) have been implemented over time. One of the plans recommends creating the Olympia Neighborhood Character Overlay District. One challenge has been that the master plans will call out large capital projects that may not be the best fit for the Community Planning & Development Department. For example, the plan may call for a park, but no one is designated to maintain the park.

Ms. Barron asked how to best communicate to the constituents what is and is not appropriate for a master or Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Williams stated the Comprehensive Plan is a comprehensive look across the County. Therefore, we may say there is a need for more parks and recreation. If you identify an area that needs revitalization, a recommendation could be that it would benefit from a park, gym, etc. We would then work with the providers who can support this initiative.

Some priority investment areas align with the previously outlined neighborhood master planning areas. The question is, are those priority investment areas still relevant, or do we need to identify new priority investment areas? If there are areas we want to preserve or protect, there are other things we can do that may not require a neighborhood master plan.

Ms. Newton inquired if staff needed action from Council to move forward.

Ms. Williams responded staff's recommendation is to look at updating plans on a schedule similar to what we do with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, she would like to bring recommendations to Council on how we identify these priority and protection areas.

Mr. Branham indicated that nothing being discussed this afternoon is intended to be a wet blanket on the objectives being worked on in District 1.

Ms. Barron asserted she believes the Comprehensive Plan should be treated as a living, breathing document that is periodically reviewed.

## 5. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/ACTION**

- a. Direct the Administrator to research and present to Council current law and benefits of enacting impact fees in Richland County. The purpose is to help reduce the tax burden on residents by not having to pay the complete cost of development in Richland County [MALINOWSKI/NEWTON, PUGH, and BARRON – January 3, 2023] – Ms. Newton noted Council members were requested at the last meeting to submit their questions regarding impact fees so we could have an additional discussion. Staff's recommendation is to forward the report to Council for acceptance. If we want to move forward with impact fees, hiring a consultant would be required.

Mr. Weaver inquired if the committee is recommending all the possible fees or if that is what we are asking the consultant to do.

Ms. Newton replied the committee would not be recommending all of the fees.

Mr. Branham indicated he would be interested in discussing the impact fee scenario prepared by Assistant County Administrator Aric Jensen.

Mr. Jensen stated he looked at eleven (11) different communities that have impact fee programs. He then plugged the 2023 data from our building permit department into the fee schedules for each community to determine what revenue would be generated. He declared you could do one or several categories, whatever Council feels appropriate.

Mr. Weaver stated for clarification, we are only talking about permits for new construction.

Mr. Jensen responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton received a question regarding why the report did not address schools, parks, libraries, and facilities.

Mr. Jensen replied the scope of the study was specifically for items within Council's stewardship.

Ms. Newton stated, hypothetically, if there were an impact fee where dollars were targeted towards recreation, would the group that manages recreation be the sole determiner of how they were spent?

Mr. Jensen indicated that an impact fee is typically distributed to the organization to which it is assigned, and they determine its use.

Ms. Newton asked if the organizations are able to create impact fees or if Council is the only body with jurisdiction to create impact fees.

The County Attorney Patrick Wright responded that cities or counties could create impact fees, but not other entities.

Ms. Newton asserted if we create a set of impact fees, we are not bound by them forever.

Mr. Jensen replied that the fees could be modified by ordinance.

Ms. Barron pointed out there are specific projects she would like to see funded with the impact fees collected. The challenge is that we are responsible for receiving the dollars, but we do not have any say as to how they are spent.

Mr. Jensen declared that establishing an impact fee program requires substantial planning and documentation. You decide in advance what the funds will be used for. You have to specifically identify and say the need is created by the growth. The program is very structured, and Council has limited control within certain bounds.

Ms. Barron acknowledged she feels comfortable with the areas Council stewards and those projects. It helps us to align with the Strategic Plan.

Ms. Barron moved to forward to Council for further action and guidance as deemed appropriate, seconded by Ms. Terracio.

In Favor: Branham, Terracio, Barron, English, and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS**

- a. I move that County Council direct the County Administrator to research and provide to Council (1) ways to secure title to subdivision roads that were developed but never had ownership transferred to the County and (2) to recommend changes to county ordinances and/or protocols to better assure that future development of subdivision roads includes conveyance of title to the county (unless there is an understanding between the developer and the County that the subdivision roads will intentionally remain privately owned and maintained.) [BRANHAM, ENGLISH, and NEWTON – July 2, 2024] – Ms. Williams provided an updated list of the 42 subdivision roads that remain outstanding. There was a meeting on March 11, 2025, to discuss next steps. The companies or LLCs are willing to give the County title, but there may be connectivity issues if a private citizen holds title to a portion of the road. The Right-of-Way agent is working to reach out to the seven individuals and LLCs with title to the roads.

Mr. Branham asked how many of the remaining roads are in something that looks like a traditional subdivision, and residents have an expectation and belief the roads are county-maintained.

Ms. Williams responded many of the roads are in subdivisions where residents would expect them to be county-maintained. When the citizens called the Public Works Department, they attempted to explain the situation.

- b. I move to direct the County Administrator to commission an analysis of the County's residential development permitting processes and standards related to noise, flooding, air pollution, and other environmental impacts, in order to ensure that the County has adopted and is following the most current industry best practices to reduce negative environmental impacts. This may include recommendations for improving and enhancing the County's Land Development Code, Land Development Design Manual, Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Map, and related documents. [NEWTON, PUGH, BARRON, and TERRACIO – September 10, 2024] – The recommendation is to include the best practices identified during the update of the Comprehensive Plan in the next update of the Land Development Manual and Land Development Code.
- c. For the purpose of preserving the historical character of the Olympia neighborhood, I move to within 12 months create a neighborhood character overlay in tandem with an update to the neighborhood plan for the Olympia neighborhood. During this time a moratorium on new construction, rezoning, demolition, and substantial rehabilitation (50% or more of lot area, building square footage, change in use) will be in place [TERRACIO and ENGLISH – October 15, 2024] – Ms. Williams stated a draft moratorium ordinance will be on the April 1, 2025, Council agenda. She noted the Planning Commission had additional questions regarding the overlay district at their March 2025 meeting. Those questions will be addressed at the next Planning Commission meeting.
- d. I move that the county consider developing a Neighborhood Master Plan that establishes policies and goals related to preservation and development in the Ballentine community with the goal to preserve and promote the desired character of the community while also conserving and protecting the waters and watershed of Lake Murray. [BRANHAM – November 19, 2024] – Ms. Williams stated Community Planning & Development staff met with Assistant County Administrator Jensen and Mr. Branham to gather additional information about a potential master plan for the Ballentine area. In addition, there was a discussion regarding the possible development of a Commercial Corridor Overlay District along Highway 76 and utilizing the current Water Resource Overlay district in the Land Development Code to protect Lake Murray.

7. **ADJOURNMENT** – Ms. Barron moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Terracio.

In Favor: Branham, Terracio, Barron, English, and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:54 PM.