



Richland County
Development & Service
MINUTES
December 16, 2021 –5:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29202

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Allison Terracio, Chair, Derrek Pugh, Gretchen Barron, Cheryl English and Chakisse Newton

OTHERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Bill Malinowski, Joe Walker, Chakisse Newton, Anette Kirylo, Michelle Onley, Tamar Black, Angela Weathersby, Kyle Holsclaw, Justin Landy, Dale Welch, Leonardo Brown, Lori Thomas, Aric Jensen, John Thompson, Patrick Wright, Chris Eversmann, Ashiya Myers, Syndi Castelluccio, Randy Pruitt, Stacey Hamm, Brian Crooks, Steven Gaither, Dwight Hanna, John Ansell, Michael Maloney, Geo Price, Quinton Epps and Michael Byrd

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Ms. Terracio called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 PM.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. November 18, 2021 – Mr. Pugh moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Pugh, Terracio, Barron, and Newton

Not Present: English

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Pugh moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the agenda as published.

In Favor: Pugh, Terracio, Barron, and Newton

Not Present: English

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**

a. **Move to direct staff to evaluate current zoning laws that permit zoning designations for large residential developments to remain in perpetuity and present options to re-evaluate and/or rezone those properties if they are not developed within 7 years. Recommendations should include processes to ensure that zoning and the comprehensive plan remain consistent with**

Development & Service Committee
December 16, 2021

the lived character of the community [Newton – July 13, 2021] – Ms. Newton noted, in her district, there are very large properties that were zoned for large scale development decades ago, and are suddenly being developed. She wanted the County to proactively reevaluate those properties to ensure we are not doing something that might have been right for the past, but does not match the lived character of the community now. Based on advice from legal, we could not implement her motion, as originally written, but staff has looked at changing process to bring the information to Council more frequently and in a more visible manner.

Mr. Crooks stated a lot of what they are doing with the code rewrite will address the intent of the motion. Basically, they will be able to reevaluate an area as whole to see what makes sense, in terms of the comprehensive plan, and the Council district as a whole. The code rewrite, as a whole, will look at the districts, and County, to determine what makes sense. Many times, we have been reactionary and not go back to look at the surrounding area. Staff plans to be more proactive so they can provide recommendations to Council and the Planning Commission in order for everything to change in concert. Staff will also do the comprehensive plan evaluation every 5 years, and update the plan every 10 years.

Ms. Newton stated she understood staff was going to be more proactive, but she inquired how this is going to be instantiated and documented. She would like to see this as a policy. The problem with the current policy is the onus in on Council. The process needs to happen administratively to institutionalize the process that comes out of this motion.

Mr. Price stated, when they come before Council, and look back to reevaluate the comprehensive plan, they will look at areas in which rezoning has taken place and evaluate if the development has actually taken place. Development of a rezoned property may take years, and if an area has not been developed we could look at making some changes to zoning, or the comprehensive plan, to scale back what is allowed to be developed.

Ms. Barron inquired if the motion is on hold until the comprehensive plan has more detail.

Mr. Price responded it is not necessarily on hold. The motion was to request staff present the comprehensive plan to Council to provide better information to show what has occurred in different areas.

Ms. Barron inquired if they are taking all this information into consideration as they create and write revisions to the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Price responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to direct staff to work to codify the proactive processes discussed, and bring back to this body with the understanding that it takes into account what they are doing with the land development code rewrite and future updates to the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Price stated they could incorporate the policy and make it part of the comprehensive plan on how reviews will take place.

In Favor: Pugh, Terracio, Barron and Newton

Not Present: English

The motion in favor was unanimous to direct staff to work to codify the proactive processes discussed, and bring back to this body with the understanding that it takes into account what they are doing with the land development code rewrite and future updates to the comprehensive plan.

- b. **Division of Solid Waste & Recycling - RC Code of Ordinances, Chapter 12 Re-write** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the rewrite of the Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 12, renamed “Solid Waste, Recycling and Public Sanitation.”

Ms. Newton stated, the policy for backyard pickup service provided to disabled persons, appears to state they have to live next door to a relative.

Mr. Eversmann responded there are two aspects of enhanced service that is provided to those with a handicap. He noted they could get enhanced service, at no extra charge, or if they live next to a relative they could use their relative’s roll cart and be exempt from the fee.

Ms. Newton inquired if there are any opportunities to strengthen enforcement. She noted, in her area, she receives complaints about big trucks headed to landfills that cause more litter.

Mr. Eversmann responded most of the enforcement provisions were brought forward from the existing ordinance. Going forward, loads are required to be covered. He noted they could speak with their refuse control officers and Solid Waste staff about additional recommendations.

Ms. Newton requested those conversations happen before this comes before Council.

In Favor: Pugh, Terracio, Barron and Newton

Abstained: English *(Due to not being present during the discussion)*.

The motion in favor was unanimous to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the rewrite of the Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 12, renamed “Solid Waste, Recycling and Public Sanitation.”

- c. **“Move to invite Richland County Conservation Commission to present the Lower Richland Tourism plan to Council” [Newton and English – November 16, 2021]** – Mr. Brown stated Chapter 2-236 of the County’s ordinances relates to Conservation Commission. He noted, under Section 7, it states, “The Commission shall prepare and submit annually to the County Council a plan for the protection of significant resources in the county. Such plan shall include a list of significant natural, cultural, or historical resources in the county, which are recommended to the County Council for acquisition, lease, or development. A financing strategy shall accompany each recommendation, with emphasis being placed upon minimizing the utilization of public monies and maximizing the utilization of other sources, such as grants, public donations, etc.” In Section 8(d), it states, “The Richland County Council may adopt the list of significant resources submitted by the Commission, in whole or in part, and may add to or delete additional properties and significant resources to the list of significant resources submitted by the commission. The list shall be reviewed and, if necessary, amended not less than annually by the commission.” He noted this is before Council as part of the ordinance, which speaks to the commission, which allows them share, or hear from them, what they believe is be important in preserving the resources they oversee and allows Council to give input on whether the commission’s recommendation aligns with Council’s

vision.

Ms. Newton inquired if staff would like to address the outcome of the presentation, in terms of incorporating it into the master plan.

Mr. Jensen stated there is a universal process for land use adoption, and for action, when it comes to acquiring and disposing of property. The County has adopted such policies, and one of the policies is that certain actions need to include information contained in a master plan, general plan or a comprehensive plan adopted by the County. It is proper, or fitting, for Council to incorporate all, or elements, of this document, if Council decides to eventually approve it, so in future actions, you have a foundation upon which to render your actions. That is why it is requested, should you agree to accept this document, you incorporate the appropriate elements of it into the comprehensive plan and other action plans, so action can be taken in the future.

Mr. Grego presented The Lower Richland Tourism Plan to the committee.

Ms. Newton noted the plan has many steps and different components to each part. She inquired if the tourism plan was incorporated as part of the master plan, would it be verbatim or a conceptual adoption and agreement to the goals of the plan.

Mr. Brown stated, when it is voted, it would be something you would need to make clear, because the intent may not be carried over without that expression made.

Ms. Newton inquired, in terms of implementing this plan, what authority does the Conservation Commission have to do on their own, and what would need to come back to Council for approval.

Mr. Brown responded, once the plan is approved, the idea would no longer be just a commission plan, it would be a County plan the commission would partly implement. From the commission standpoint, they have funds they can carry out as much, and as far as they feel they can do, separate and apart from the County. Their understanding would be that the County would partner with additional funding to continue to move it down the line.

Ms. Barron noted she would hate for the County to sign off on something that is not obtainable or not prioritized in some case. She would like to see the plan prioritized to streamline the plan to connect to big picture items.

Mr. Grego noted the plan lists items that can be done right away. They talk about branding, wayfinding, partnership building and those sort of things. He noted the 1st year goals would not cost that much, and we could see where they go from there. There are opportunities to leverage things, such as using the magistrate's office as a gateway to a greenway. The budget is \$17M-\$24M over a 10-year period.

Ms. Barron stated she would like to see more concrete information. We need to be realistic on what can be done and accomplished.

Mr. Grego stated it will be a part of the annual plan they plan to submit to Council in 2022.

Ms. Newton stated, based on some of the questions, a work session may be needed.

Ms. English stated she likes the idea working plan over a 10-year period, which gives us date points

and allows us to reevaluate. She understands the idea of having a more concrete plan, but nothing was ever set in stone, especially in her district where they are bringing in water and sewer. She noted things could change as the plan is developing and things are implemented.

Mr. Malinowski noted the report was from 2017. In his opinion, there have been a lot of lifestyle changes in recent years, and he would like to see more updated figures. He also requested the return on investment.

Mr. Grego noted, at Congaree National Park, they are going to break their visitation record by 35%. The annual economic impact from the park two years ago was \$9M and he expects it has increased since then.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to hold this item in committee, while we schedule a work session.

In Favor: Pugh, Terracio, Barron, English and Newton.

The motion in favor was unanimous.

- d. **Richland County Conservation Commission – Cabin Branch Property Purchase** – Mr. Epps stated the Conservation Commission requested Council approve a purchase agreement for 60 acres of land adjacent to existing County-owned property for conservation purposes. The purchase will be funded by the Conservation Commission, and will include a budget transfer of \$312,000.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the final purchase agreement for 60 acres (R24600-01-33) adjacent to County-owned property for conservation purposes.

Ms. Terracio inquired if they considered ongoing responsibilities associated with the acquisition.

Mr. Epps responded, since they already own approximately 60 acres in the area, the maintenance cost would be minimal.

In Favor: Pugh, Terracio, Barron, English, and Newton.

The motion in favor was unanimous to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the final purchase agreement for 60 acres.

5. **ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED**

- a. **I move to direct the County Attorney to work with the County Administrator to research and draft an absentee landlord ordinance. The ordinance should provide potential remedies for individuals who violate county ordinances and provide, via supplemental documentation, a comprehensive review of the legal impacts [potentially] associated with the adoption of such an ordinance. [NEWTON and DICKERSON]** – Ms. Newton stated, at the last meeting, staff presented a schedule to present their proposal early next year.

6. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:52PM.