

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT & SERVICES COMMITTEE

Bernice G. Scott
District 10

Joyce Dickerson
District 2

Greg Pearce
District 6

Damon Jeter, Chair
District 3

Doris Corley
District 1

*June 27, 2006
5:00 PM*

**Richland County Council Chambers
County Administration Building
2020 Hampton Street**

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes – May 23, 2006: Regular Session Meeting [Pages 3 – 5]

Adoption of Agenda

I. Items for Action

- A. Purchase of Replacement Vacuum Truck**
[Pages 6 – 7]
- B. Acceptance of Roads in Ashley Ridge Subdivision**
[Pages 8 – 9]
- C. Approval of Construction Contract to Sloan Construction Company, Inc. for the 2006 Roadway Resurfacing Project**
[Pages 10 – 11]
- D. Approval of Construction Contract for Ridgewood Community Infrastructure Improvements Project**
[Pages 12 – 13]
- E. Approval of Construction Contract for the Paving of 2.15 Miles of Dirt Roads in the North Paving Contract**
[Pages 14 – 16]
- F. Ordinances to prohibit the parking of vehicles in the front yard of any property zoned RS-LD, RS-MD, or RS-HD**
[Pages 17 – 21]

II. Items for Discussion / Information

There are no items for discussion/information.

III. Items Pending Analysis

A. Town of Eastover Sewer Collection System

Adjournment

Staffed by: Joe Cronin

**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE**

**May 23, 2006
5:00 PM**



In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, and was posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.

Members Present:

Chair: Damon Jeter (arrived @ 5:25)
Member: Bernice G. Scott
Member: Joyce Dickerson
Member: L. Gregory Pearce, Jr.

Absent: Doris M. Corley

Others Present: Joseph McEachern, Valerie Hutchinson, Paul Livingston (arrived @ 5:07), Milton Pope, Michielle Cannon-Finch, Tony McDonald, Roxanne Matthews, Joe Cronin, Larry Smith, Amelia Linder, Monique Walters, Stephany Snowden, Chief Harrell, Michael Byrd, John Hixon, Michael Criss, Geo Price, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:03 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 25, 2006 (Regular Session) – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the minutes as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the agenda as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

I. ITEMS FOR ACTION

Acceptance of Fee Interest Title for a 77-Acre Parcel Located off Cabin Creek Road — Mr. Jim Wilson of the Conversation Commission briefed the committee regarding this item. A discussion took place.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval pending further review by staff and legal. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Solid Waste Management Plan Revision – Mr. McDonald briefed the committee regarding this item. A discussion took place.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Homeless Commission Item – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval and to amend the language to make funding contingent upon the approval of the agreement by all three parties. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Jackson Creek Emergency Services Station Construction – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to forward to Council with a recommendation that Monteray Construction be awarded the contract and that the contract not exceed the budgeted amount. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Emergency Services Purchase Orders – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Emergency Services Station Site Purchases – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to go into Executive Session. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Committee went into Executive Session at approximately 5:31 p.m. and came out at approximately 5:40 p.m.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to come out of Executive Session.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to direct the Administrator to move forward with the purchase of the two locations. The vote in favor was unanimous.

III. ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS

Town of Eastover Sewer Collection System – This item is still pending.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:41 p.m.

**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE
May 23, 2006
Page Three**

Submitted by,

Damon Jeter
Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Purchase of Replacement Vacuum Truck

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a purchase in the amount of \$244,809.00, for a replacement vacuum truck, consisting of a Sterling truck cab/chassis and a Vactor Manufacturing, Inc. vacuum unit. This equipment will be purchased from Public Works Equipment and Supply, Inc., for the Roads and Drainage Division of the Department of Public Works.

B. Background / Discussion

The vacuum truck is used by Richland County Public Works primarily for the cleanout of storm drains, removing debris, stone, leaves, etc., which cause blockage that results in poor storm water drainage and possible flooding. The current unit (AH001) is a 1997 model, put in service on June 26, 1996. The American Public Works Association guidelines recommend replacement of these units at ten years. This is supported by the expenses incurred by the County in maintaining and repairing this equipment over the last two years – a total of almost \$26,000.00. Perhaps an even greater consideration is the excessive down time associated with the many repairs. Because a single vacuum unit serves the needs of the entire County, it is imperative that the equipment be reliable as well as capable. The new unit will ensure the ability of the Roads and Drainage Division to respond more effectively to these situations by eliminating excessive downtime associated with the older unit. The funding for this equipment is in the Roads and Drainage Division fiscal 2006 budget. As the result of the bid process, Public Works Equipment and Supply, Inc. was determined to be the most responsive and responsible bidder, and acceptance of their proposal was recommended.

C. Financial Impact

The financial impact to the County will be the purchase cost of \$244,890.00, available in the current budget of the Roads and Drainage Division of Public Works. The budget account is 3020735-5313. The financial breakdown is as follows:

Vactor Manufacturing, Inc. vacuum truck unit	\$244,509.00
Sales Tax	\$ 300.00
Total Cost of Equipment	\$244,809.00

D. Alternatives

There are two alternatives available:

1. Approve the request to purchase the Vactor Manufacturing, Inc. vacuum truck equipment. This will increase the efficiency and work capacity of this program within the Division, providing better service to the storm water drainage system in the County.

2. Do not approve the request to purchase the Vactor Manufacturing Inc. vacuum truck equipment. This will force the County to continue to spend excessive funds to repair the older unit, with disproportionate downtime limiting the availability of the equipment and decreasing the ability of the Division to maintain the storm water drainage system and respond to emergency situations.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve the request for the purchase of the Vactor Manufacturing, Inc., vacuum truck equipment.

Recommended by: Bill Peters, County Fleet Mgr. **Department:** Central Garage

Date: 06/02/06

F. Reviews

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 6/23/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Funds are budgeted for this purchase in the FY 06 budget.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Acceptance of Roads in Ashley Ridge Subdivision

A. Purpose

The County Council is requested to consider the acceptance of the roads in Ashley Ridge Subdivision, Phase I, for ownership and maintenance by the County.

B. Background / Discussion

Phase I of the Ashley Ridge Subdivision, located in northeast Richland County, was constructed in 2000, with the subdivision roads being completed in July of that year. It appears to have been the intent of the developer, WRG Development Company, to turn the roads over to Richland County once completed, although the transfer never occurred. The bond that the developer purchased during the construction of the roads was released by the County upon completion of the road construction, but the roads were not accepted by the County due to deficiencies in construction. The roads, therefore, remain under the ownership of the developer.

The roads in Phase II of Ashley Ridge were completed in 2002 and were accepted by the County in that year, along with the storm drainage system in Phase II. The County, therefore, maintains the roads and storm drainage improvements in Phase II.

The residents of Phase I have recently renewed the effort to have the roads turned over to the County for ownership and maintenance. However, the deficiencies still exist, and County staff has been reluctant to accept the roads without having the developer make the repairs prior to the transfer. The developer, represented by Mr. Ronnie Flynn, has been approached on this matter by both the residents and County staff, but has failed to make the needed repairs to the roads.

It has been determined that the storm drainage infrastructure in the subdivision is also not in compliance with County standards. Unlike road compliance issues, the County has an enforcement mechanism for addressing non-compliant drainage systems. Accordingly, an enforcement letter has been sent to the developer allowing until July 21 for corrective action on the drainage system. Fines will likely result if no corrective action has been taken by this date.

The drainage improvements, however, will still not address the road repairs and will not bring the roads to a condition where they meet County standards.

C. Financial Impact

The estimated cost of the road repairs is \$40,000. This, of course, could increase, depending on fuel and asphalt prices.

D. Alternatives

The following alternatives exist with respect to this issue:

1. Continue to pursue having the developer make the needed repairs so that the roads can be accepted by the County.
2. Accept the roads into the County system in their current condition, with the County providing the needed repairs. This alternative should be approached with caution since it would likely set a precedent as to how roads are handled in the future.
3. Have the community pursue this matter privately and work directly with the developer, who continues to own the roads and still has sole responsibility for their maintenance.
4. Take no action and let the roads remain in their current condition.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that the County and the community continue to pursue having the developer make the needed repairs so that the roads can be accepted by the County (Alternative 1 above). In conjunction with this continued effort, the County will proceed with enforcement efforts relating to the storm drainage system.

Recommended by: Tony McDonald **Department:** Administration **Date:** 6/13/06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Agree with Administration recommendation not to accept roads until all County standards are met.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Agree with Administration and Finance recommendations not to accept the roads until all County standards are met.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 6/23/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend that the County and the community continue to pursue having the developer make the needed repairs so that the roads can be accepted by the County (Alternative 1 above). In conjunction with this continued effort, the County will proceed with enforcement efforts relating to the storm drainage system.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Approval of Construction Contract to Sloan Construction Company, Inc. for the 2006 Roadway Resurfacing Project

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the award of a construction contract to Sloan Construction Company, Inc. for the resurfacing of approximately six and one-half (6.5) miles of paved roadway throughout Richland County.

B. Background / Discussion

The resurfacing list was established using the updated Pavement Management System. Each County maintained paved road was given an Overall Condition Index (OCI). The roads with the lowest OCI were re-visited and considered for the resurfacing list. Please refer to the attached resurfacing list and attached location maps.

The LPA Group, Inc. (LPA) completed the design and specifications for the 2006 Roadway Resurfacing Project. The project was advertised on April 30, 2006 for a period of 31 days. A pre-bid meeting was held on May 18, 2006, and bids for the project were opened on May 31, 2006.

Sloan Construction Company, Inc. has been determined to be the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The following information includes the results of the bid opening:

Contractor	Total Bid Amount
Rea Contracting, LLC	\$1,133,179.00
Lanier Construction Co.	\$893,500.00
Sloan Construction Company, Inc.	\$875,811.00

C. Financial Impact

The Department of Public Works requested funding for the 2006 Roadway Resurfacing Project from the County Transportation Committee (CTC) on March 23, 2004. The CTC approved the request for \$800,000.00 for this project and \$600,000 of the 2006 Resurfacing funds for Jim Hamilton Blvd. The lowest bid on Jim Hamilton Blvd. was \$405,000.00 and therefore funds are adequate to pay for the construction of all the Roads in the Base bid for the 2006 Resurfacing.

D. Alternatives

There are two alternatives that exist for this project and are as follows:

1. Approve the award of contract to Sloan Construction Company, Inc. for the 2006 Roadway Resurfacing Project in the amount of \$875,811.00

2. Do not approve the award of contract to Sloan Construction Company, Inc. and forfeit the opportunity to resurface the roads on the attached list.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve the award of contract to Sloan Construction Company, Inc. for the 2006 Roadway Resurfacing Project in the amount of \$875,811.00.

Recommended by: Teresa Smith, PE

Department: Department of Public Works

Date: 06/13/06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Based on Public Works Director recommendation.

Based on Public Works Director

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of the award of a contract to Sloan Construction Company in the amount of \$875,811.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Ridgewood Community Infrastructure Improvements

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the award of a construction contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Ridgewood Community Infrastructure Improvements project. The selected bidder, bid amount and recommendation to award will be presented at full Council on July 11th.

B. Background / Discussion

The project consists of grading, drainage, paving, and miscellaneous construction of Shady Grove Road and Dixie Avenue in District 4 of Richland County. Total length of roadway is 0.23 miles. Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA) completed the survey, design and specifications for this portion of the project. The construction cost estimate for this portion of the project is \$285,476.15 including a 15% contingency.

The project also includes the following major elements: construction of approximately 325 linear feet of 6-inch DIP water main, 12 water services connections, 425 linear feet of 8-inch PVC sewer, 815 linear feet of 8-inch DIP sewer, 7 sewer manholes, 41 sewer service connections, and 4 packaged/pump tank systems. Jordan, Jones & Goulding (JJ&G) completed the survey, design and specifications for this portion of the project. The construction cost estimate for this portion of the project is \$227,530 including a 10% contingency.

The project was advertised for construction on June 4th, 2006. A pre-bid meeting will be held on June 22nd and bids will be publicly opened on July 6th. Bids received will be reviewed and a recommendation to award to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder will be presented to full Council on July 11th.

C. Financial Impact

The project is an activity in the Ridgewood Revitalization project and is funded under Community Development Block Grant through the Community Development Department.

D. Alternatives

There are two alternatives that exist for this project and are as follows:

1. Approve the award of contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Ridgewood Community Infrastructure Improvements project. The selected bidder, bid amount and recommendation to award will be presented at full Council on July 11th.

2. Do not approve the award of contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder and forfeit the opportunity to provide infrastructure improvements to the Ridgewood Community at this time.

E. Recommendation

Approve the award of contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Ridgewood Community Infrastructure Improvements project. The selected bidder, bid amount and recommendation to award will be presented at full Council on July 11th.

Recommended by: Sherry Wright-Moore

Department: Community Development

Date: 06/06/06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: It is my understanding that there will be no cost to the County.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 6/20/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend award of a contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, to be determined once the bids have been received.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: North Paving Contract (Bid 1)

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the award of a construction contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, for the paving of 2.15 miles of dirt roads in the North Paving Contract. The selected bidder, bid amount and recommendation to award will be presented at the Development & Services (D&S) Committee meeting on June 27th.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Paving Program was split into two contracts, North and South, in order to design and construct roads simultaneously. Each contract consists of approximately five miles of roadway (about 30 roads). Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA) was selected for engineering design, construction administration and construction inspection for the North Paving Contract.

Several roads in each contract have been delayed for construction due to right-of-way issues. In an effort to start construction on the roads with completed right-of-way, these roads were separated and make up Bid 1 for the North Contract. Total length of the dirt roads in Bid 1 is 2.15 miles and the roads included are as follows:

Annie Entzminger Court,	District 2
Cliff Anderson Road,	District 2
Dunes Point,	District 2
Overlook Drive,	District 2
London Avenue,	District 2
Murdock Road,	District 7
Payne Street,	District 7
Moonglo Circle,	District 8
Wisteria Lane,	District 8
Baron Road,	District 9
Friar Street,	District 9
Stonearrow Street,	District 9

WSA has completed the design and specifications for first bid of the North Paving Contract. The construction cost estimate for Bid 1 is \$1,504,698.08 including a 10% contingency.

The project was advertised for bid on Sunday, May 7th, 2006 and a pre-bid meeting was held on June 1st. Bids will be publicly opened on June 20th. Bids received will be reviewed and a recommendation to award to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder will be presented at the Development & Services (D&S) Committee meeting on June 27th.

C. Financial Impact

The County Transportation Committee (CTC) has approved the funding of \$1 million per year for the Richland County Paving Program. The selected contractor will be paid with "C" Funds allocated by the CTC and programmed by the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT).

D. Alternatives

There are two alternatives that exist for this project and are as follows:

1. Approve the award of a construction contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, for the paving of 2.15 miles of dirt roads in the North Paving Contract. The selected bidder, bid amount and recommendation to award will be presented at the Development & Services (D&S) Committee meeting on June 27th.
2. Do not approve the award of contract and forfeit the opportunity to pave the 2.15 miles of dirt roads in the North Paving Contract at this time.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve the award of contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, for the paving of 2.15 miles of dirt roads in the North Paving Contract. The selected bidder, bid amount and recommendation to award will be presented at the Development & Services (D&S) Committee meeting on June 27th.

Recommended by: Howard Boyd, PE

Department: Department of Public Works

Date: 06/06/06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Approval based on the County Engineer's assurance that there is enough money in the County Paving Program to fund this request.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

✓ Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation: lowest responsive, responsible bidder.

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council denial

Recommend award of a contract to the

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Parking Ordinance Amendment

A. Purpose

Council is asked to amend Chapter 17 of the Richland County Code of Ordinances to prohibit the parking of vehicles in the front yard of any property zoned RS-LD, RS-MD, or RS-HD. This subsection is not intended to prohibit the temporary parking of a motor vehicle upon a driveway.

B. Background/Discussion

During the Council meeting of June 6, 2006, Councilman Mike Montgomery made a motion to consider the prohibition of parking in front yards in residential areas of the unincorporated county.

Legal staff has crafted an amendment to the current parking ordinance that states:

No person shall park a motor vehicle of any description, including, but not limited to, automobiles, trucks, vans, buses, motorcycles, all-terrain or similar off-road vehicles, recreational vehicles, motor homes, campers or camping trailers, trailers, boats, and jet skis within the front yard of any property zoned RS-LD, RS-MD, or RS-HD. Provided, however, this subsection is not intended to prohibit the temporary parking of a motor vehicle upon a driveway.

C. Financial Impact

There is no direct financial impact associated with this request; however, there will be a marginal impact due to enforcement of the ordinance.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the amendment to the ordinance prohibiting the parking of motor vehicles in the front yard of any property zoned RS-LD, RS-MD, or RS-HD, excluding temporary parking on driveways.
2. Do not approve the amendment to the ordinance prohibiting the parking of motor vehicles in the front yard of any property zoned RS-LD, RS-MD, or RS-HD, excluding temporary parking on driveways.

E. Recommendation

This request was made by council motion, and is therefore at the discretion of County Council.

Recommended by: Council Motion Date: June 6, 2006

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation made because insufficient information provided. The financial impact section states “there will be a marginal impact due to enforcement of the ordinance”. What is the marginal impact? Who will it impact? Can it and how will it be absorbed?

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 6/19/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Both alternatives are legally sufficient; therefore, this request is at the discretion of County Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 6/23/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend first reading approval of the proposed ordinance amendment, with the understanding that the answers to the Finance Director’s questions will be addressed prior to second reading.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ___-06HR

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES; CHAPTER 17, MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC; ARTICLE II, GENERAL TRAFFIC AND PARKING REGULATIONS; SECTION 17-10, PARKING IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES OF THE COUNTY; SO AS TO PROHIBIT THE PARKING OF MOTOR VEHICLES IN THE FRONT YARD IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS.

Pursuant to the authority granted by the Constitution and the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY:

SECTION I. The Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 17, Motor Vehicles and Traffic; Article II, General Traffic and Parking Regulations; Section 17-10, Parking in Residential Zones of the County; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 17-10. Parking in residential zones of the county.

a. It shall be unlawful for a truck tractor, a semi-trailer having more than two (2) axles, or a trailer having more than two (2) axles to be parked on any public street, road, right-of-way or as otherwise prohibited by the Richland County Code of Ordinances in the unincorporated portions of the county which are or hereafter shall be designated as Rural Residential, Single-Family Residential, Manufactured Home, or General Residential under the Richland County Zoning Ordinance and the "Zoning Map of Unincorporated Richland County", as amended. For the purpose of this paragraph, the following definitions shall apply:

1. *Truck tractor* means every motor vehicle designed and used primarily for drawing other vehicles and not so constructed as to carry a load other than a part of the weight of the vehicle and the load so drawn.
2. *Semi-trailer* means every vehicle having more than two (2) axles, with or without motive power, other than a pole trailer, designed for carrying persons or property and for being drawn by a motor vehicle and so constructed that some part of its weight and that of its load rests upon or is carried by another vehicle.
3. *Trailer* means every vehicle having more than two (2) axles, with or without motive power, other than a pole trailer, designed for carrying persons or property and for being drawn by a motor vehicle and so constructed that no part of its weight rests upon the towing vehicle.

b. It shall be unlawful for an automobile, motor vehicle, or wheeled conveyance of any kind required by law to be licensed that is unlicensed, or is displaying an expired

or invalid licenses to be parked on any public street, road, right-of-way or as otherwise prohibited by the Richland County Code of Ordinances in the unincorporated portions of the county which are or hereafter shall be designated as Rural Residential, Single-Family Residential, Manufactured Home, or Multi-Family Residential under the Richland County Zoning Ordinance and the “Zoning Map of Unincorporated Richland County”, as amended.

c. All motor vehicles and/or trailers without a valid state issued license plate permitting operation on public roads and highways, which are stored, parked, or located on a lot in any zoning district in the unincorporated areas of the county, except for those parcels that are five (5) acres or greater in the (RU) Rural zoning district, are required to be kept in a garage, carport, or protected from the elements by a fitted cover; provided, however, in the case of a vehicle protected from the elements by a cover, such covered vehicle shall not be visible from the public right-of-way. Licensed automobile dealerships, persons licensed to conduct businesses involving storage and sale of junk and scrap, trailers utilized as temporary structures in conjunction with construction activities, and vehicles used in agricultural operations and which are not operated on the public roads and highways are exempt.

d. Any motor vehicle and/or trailer that is not capable of operating in accordance with South Carolina law and/or capable of moving under its own power (even if it has a valid state-issued license plate permitting operation on public roads and highways) shall not be stored, parked, or located on a lot in any residential zoning district in the unincorporated areas of the county (except for those parcels that are five (5) acres or greater in the (RU) Rural zoning district) for more than a single period of thirty (30) consecutive days during any calendar year unless it is kept in an enclosed garage, in a carport attached to the residence, or protected from the elements by a fitted cover; provided, however, in the case of a vehicle protected from the elements by a cover, such vehicle shall not be visible from the public right-of-way.

e. No person shall park a motor vehicle of any description, including, but not limited to, automobiles, trucks, vans, buses, motorcycles, all-terrain or similar off-road vehicles, recreational vehicles, motor homes, campers or camping trailers, trailers, boats, and jet skis within the front yard of any property zoned RS-LD, RS-MD, or RS-HD. Provided, however, this subsection is not intended to prohibit the temporary parking of a motor vehicle upon a driveway.

e. f. Penalties: Unless otherwise prescribed by law, any owner and/or operator of a motor vehicle and/or trailer violating the provisions of this Section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor. In addition, any owner and/or occupant of the residential property on which a motor vehicle and/or trailer is parked in violation of this Section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

f. g. Administration and enforcement: The sheriff of the county shall be authorized to enforce the provisions of this Section, and may engage a towing service to

remove any vehicle parked in violation of these regulations, provided the cost of towing services shall be charged to the registered owner of any vehicle so removed.

SECTION II. Severability. If any section, subsection, or clause of this ordinance shall be deemed to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the validity of the remaining sections, subsections, and clauses shall not be affected thereby.

SECTION III. Conflicting Ordinances Repealed. All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be effective from and after _____, 2006.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Anthony G. Mizzell, Chair

ATTEST THIS THE ____ DAY
OF _____, 2006

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Approved As To LEGAL Form Only
No Opinion Rendered As To Content

First Reading:
Second Reading:
Public Hearing:
Third Reading: