RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION May 7, 2018

[Members Present: David Tuttle, Heather Cairns, Stephen Gilchrist, Beverly Frierson [in at 3:08], Karen Yip, Wallace Brown, Sr., Mettauer Carlisle, Ed Greenleaf [in at 3:34], Prentiss McLaurin

Called to order: 3:04 pm

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well good afternoon everyone. I's like to call the Monday, May 7th 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. First item on the Agenda is our Consent Agenda. Motion for the Consent Agenda?

MS. CAIRNS: In terms of the Consent Agenda I would offer that I believe that we should remove the Minutes from April as they are not ready for our review as well as all of the Map Amendments insomuch as the recommendation was disapproval for all of them. So that leaves on the Consent Agenda the Road Names.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Motion for the Consent Agenda.

MR. BROWN: So moved.

20 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we accept the Consent Agenda as amended. All in favor signify by raising your hand. All opposed?

24 | [Approved: Tuttle, Cairns, Gilchrist, Yip, Brown, Carlisle, McLaurin; Absent for vote:

25 | Frierson, Greenleaf]

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

7

10 11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, before we get into the first case Commission Yip wants to make a comment to the Commission so we will allow her to do that and then we'll get going.

MS. YIP: Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure.

MS. YIP: Hello everybody, my name is Karen Yip and as it is no secret I am a real estate broker, an agency owner in Columbia. The reason that I wanted the opportunity to speak today and go on the Record is to address some implications that have been made on some recent votes and how I voted. I felt that it was very important for me to go ahead and address this on the Record simply because, you know, I am one of the newer Members on the Commission and I certainly want to go ahead and clear the air. First of all in my short record I have voted sometimes for and sometimes against certain votes, and I just wanna clear the air that there were implications made on some recent votes that, oh well she's in real estate so therefore she is naturally gonna vote a certain way. And I just wanna go ahead and dispel that because I am a 15 year veteran of the real estate industry here in Columbia, I'm also a native to the area, and most importantly I value my reputation the most. So there is not gonna be a singular vote that I'm automatically going to vote a single way, this way or that, I'm going to do it based on my personal opinion, experience, and knowledge of which I bring to this Commission. And just like all of you I am also volunteering my time to the community to give the community a service and the benefit of my knowledge and expertise. So with that being said I appreciate your audience in this and allowing me to go on the Record to address any votes that I may have in the future, and not to let it be any implications that I'm

going to vote a particular way. Because if something were to come up of which I have a vested interest let it be on the Record that I have no problem of recusing myself from the vote. Okay? Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you madam Commissioner Yip for those comments. Okay. Ready for the first case?

CASE NO. 18-007 MA:

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, Case No. 1. And we'll give Ms. Frierson an opportunity to come in and have a seat.

MS. FRIERSON: I forgot the code to the garage. I apologize.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Take your time. Okay. Case No. 1.

MR. PRICE: Okay, the first item is Case 18-007 MA. The Applicant is Phil Savage and the location is on Dutch Fork Road. The subject parcel is 3.95 acres and the Applicant is requesting a rezoning from Rural to Neighborhood Commercial. Staff recommendation for this request was for disapproval. It is Staff's opinion that based on the Comprehensive Plan this is not consistent with the objectives outlined for it. In this case the Plan recommends Commercial within a neighborhood activity center and with a contextually appropriate distances from the intersection from a primary arterial. The subject property is not located at a traffic junction and is not within a contextually appropriate distance of an intersection or a neighborhood activity center. Also, there were some concerns that in these cases that this will promote a strip commercial development or leapfrogging along this proposed corridor. So for those reasons outlined Staff recommended disapproval.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

20

19

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, are there any questions for our Staff? We do have the Applicant signed up to speak. When we call your name to the podium please come up give us your name and your address for the Record. Phil Savage?

TESTIMONY OF PHIL SAVAGE:

MR. SAVAGE: Good afternoon. My name is Phil Savage, address is 30 Mannis Road, Irmo, South Carolina 29063. And that property, I actually live within less than four miles from the subject property, been there in that same home for 20, over 27 years. Some of you may know I was a past president, two times actually, for the Ballentine Dutch Fork Civic Association, served on the board for many, many years of that association. Been in communication with them, talked to Les Tweed who is one of the major, you know, voices behind the organization, talked to him about this. They were actually very pleased to see I wasn't applying for General Commercial. My original application was gonna be for General Commercial and I came in and spoke to Planning Staff and I actually misunderstood them because I thought when they, you know, the Neighborhood Commercial is what they wanted me to go to, but apparently they've got restrictions and I see on these applicant's, the six items and they're, all six recommended disapproval. So apparently there's some pretty stringent regulations they're working with. Anyway, basically you know, the map that's currently on the board over there, you can see directly across the street from me to the left and to the right is General Commercial. And there's a traffic light at the intersection on the left which is just off of my property; I actually sold the two lots to the left a long time ago. I've had this property for over 20 years and during that time I might tell you that I've probably paid \$70,000 to \$100,000 in property taxes over that 20 year period. The reason is because

the assessor and the assessment office continues to maintain that that's commercial
property. There's one old, old dilapidated house on there that I've come to, where the
resident lives in it and I come to the end of that ability to even lease it out as a
residential community. I mean, kids can't play along there, the dogs could get run over
by the road. In my opinion, and I've been around there a long time with it, it should be.
When I bought the property also it's [inaudible] as 2006 Comprehensive Plan it was, it
was a priority investment area right there. Is that a time limit?
CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir.
MR. SAVAGE: Oh wow. I had a few other things I wanted to say, but anyway car
I point out that what it says in the Staff Report that it, that it's supposed to be four-laned
in the 2035 Codes Plan, it's subject for that, and it's 12,200 cars a day going by on a
road that was designed for 10,000, traffic light on both sides of me.
CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.
MR. SAVAGE: I'll answer any questions if anybody has them.
CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Savage. Are there any questions for
the Applicant? Okay, thank you sir. Alright, are there any comments, motions?
MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, is nobody here in opposition?
CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: There is no one else signed up to speak, no. That's it.
MR. SAVAGE: To my knowledge there has been no –
CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sir, excuse me.
MR. SAVAGE: Oh, I'm sorry.
CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: We've shut the public comment period down. Are there
any motions from the Commission? Comments?

1 MR. BROWN: Across the road from the site, what is all of that development over 2 there? 3 MR. PRICE: Which one are you referring to, Mr. Brown? 4 MR. BROWN: Right across the road. MR. PRICE: The red or the blue? 5 6 MR. BROWN: Across – the red. 7 MR. PRICE: That is a commercial site, I believe that's Stannick's Roofing. Also boxing across the street. 8 9 MR. BROWN: There's a stand-alone facility right up above where it says, Dutch 10 Fork Road, across the street, and across, that looks like residences. Am I correct? 11 MS. HEGLER: That's in the PDD. 12 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry? 13 MR. PRICE: Are you referring to this piece? 14 MR. BROWN: Right across from the piece under discussion. 15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Right there. 16 MR. PRICE: We're gonna check on that. I do know that this particular area at one 17 time did have a lot of rural zoning and then over time there've been requests that come 18 in for commercial. So maybe that piece wasn't included but it's something we wanna 19 just check on right now. 20 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I think, I mean, for me looking at this particular application 21 the comment by Staff about the fact that, you know, trying to not just let these corridors 22 just become continuous commercial corridors and the leapfrogging is that this, you 23 know, the Comp Plan supports that this should not be commercial, it doesn't otherwise

1	sit in an appropriate for commercial development, so I would, my position is to support
2	the Staff recommendation that this not get zoned to commercial uses.
3	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is that a motion, Ms. Cairns?
4	MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I can make a motion to move Case 18-007 MA forward to
5	Council with a recommendation of disapproval.
6	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is there a second?
7	MR. BROWN: I'll second Ms. Cairns' motion.
8	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we
9	send Case No. 18-007 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of disapproval. Al
10	in favor signify by raising your hand. All opposed?
11	[Approved to deny: Cairns, Gilchrist, Frierson, Yip, Brown, McLaurin; Opposed: Tuttle,
12	Carlisle; Absent for vote: Greenleaf]
13	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And sir, we are a recommending Body to County
14	Council, they will meet back in their Chambers on May 22 nd , okay? Feel free to come
15	back at that time. Thank you. Next case.
16	MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, I think –
17	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir.
18	MR. PRICE: - if you don't mind based on the set up of today's meeting,
19	unfortunately we did not have y'all sitting up before us so we just like to do a rollcall just
20	to make sure we get those in.
21	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Great, we can do that. Do we need to take that as a
22	recall?
23	MR. PRICE: I think we got this one, 6/2, but just going forward.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: We'll do it. Thank you. Next case.

CASE NO. 18-012 MA:

MR. PRICE: Okay, the next item is Case 18-012 MA. The Applicant is LM Drucker, the location is 1344 Omarest Drive. The Applicant is requesting to rezone the property from OI to RS-LD. Staff's recommendation was for disapproval. And you'll probably see this throughout this Agenda, where this was based primarily on, just if you look at the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. Of course, you know that is a guide for us. So the original, our recommendation is for disapproval, you know, for consistency standpoint cause the Comprehensive Plan requests that the objectives outlined in this designation provide for commercial-scale development, both large and small, offices and high-density development. However, when Staff took a look at this location the home of the site that is the subject of the request actually starts right where the residential begins. There's actually a, if we had a street view you would actually see there is a brick wall that actually introduces the residential portion of this area. So based on that, you know, we just ask that you take that into consideration in making your decision, even though Staff's recommendation is for disapproval.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any questions for Staff? We have a couple persons signed up to speak. The Applicant, James Reed. Again, when we call your name please give us your name and your address for the Record. Two minutes to address the Commission. Is that right? What did I get, I got that first name wrong?

TESTIMONY OF LM DRUCKER:

MS. DRUCKER: I'm here on his behalf.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

1 MS. DRUCKER: He could not be here.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: What is your name, ma'am?

MS. DRUCKER: My name is LM Drucker.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

MS. DRUCKER: And I'm at 6546 Haley Drive, Columbia. When Mr. Reed bought this property it was zoned residential, commercial, bought it in 2005. A couple of years later Richland County changed the zoning to commercial although the neighborhood did not change and has not changed in the past 12 plus years. Mr. Reed's property taxes jumped when it was rezoned commercial and once he retired a few years ago on extremely limited income, he had trouble paying the higher property taxes. He has been trying to sell the property for the past several years but any would-be buyers have trouble meeting the requirements of a commercial loan, commercial zoning loan. This property is surrounded by residential property, therefore Mr. Reed is simply asking that Richland County restore its previous zoning status to residential so that he can more easily sell it and remove his tax burden.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any questions for Ms. Drucker? Thank you, Ms. Drucker.

MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir.

MR. PRICE: Just one other thing to point out. I know there may be some confusion sometimes. The property may still have a certain designation, you know, whether it be residential or rural, a certain zoning designation that typically wouldn't allow commercial. However, based on, it could be a use or because it's not owner

occupied, it could be assessed as being commercial as opposed to actually being zoned commercial. So in this case we believe that it was assessed as commercial because it was not owner occupied as opposed to actually having a use that was commercial.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Got it. Thanks for the clarification on that. Phillip Ruggles?

TESTIMONY OF PHILLIP RUGGLES:

MR. RUGGLES: Yeah, my name is Phillip Ruggles and I live at 1819 Coulter Drive, and I guess I'm here representing Riverside Forest Association who would like to have it rezoned back to residential. We have a nice quiet neighborhood down there and we'd like to keep it that way. They had a roofing company that occupied the home for a couple of years and well they had drug trafficking, felons living there, motorcycles at all hours of the day, so on and so forth. So we don't want that in our neighborhood, we'd like to keep it quiet.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Ruggles. That's all we have signed up to speak on this case.

MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that Case 18-012 MA move forward to Council with a recommendation for approval. And the reason I think it should move forward in opposition with Staff's recommendation, it does relate to the comment made that it is contextually residential in nature and had been residential at one time before, and that the demising wall that separates the commercial from the residential is located on his property.

MS. FRIERSON: I second.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded that we will send Case No. 18-012 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval per the comments from Mr. Tuttle. All in favor signify – what are we, rollcall vote? Okay. All in favor?

MS. CAIRNS: No, raise your hand and they'll call out our names, right? CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: All in favor signify by raising your hand.

MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Tuttle, Cairns, Gilchrist, Frierson, Yip, Brown, Carlisle, and McLaurin.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: All opposed?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Again we are a recommending Body to County Council and they will meet back in these Chambers again on May 22nd. Okay, next case.

CASE NO. 18-013 MA:

MR. PRICE: Alright next item is Case 18-013 MA. The Applicant is Derrick J. Harris, Sr., the location is 7708 Fairfield Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone about 1.83 acres from Rural to Light Industrial. Again, Staff's recommendation was for disapproval, but this was based on, again, the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan which suggests that parcels within this area should be located within a contextually appropriate distance from an intersection of a primary arterial or within a neighborhood activity center. Also in addition the uses allowed by the proposed zoning do not support the desired development pattern of the Comprehensive Plan. Again, one of the things that Staff would like to point out that if you look, you know, looking at the surrounding properties there are a good bit of industrial type uses, maybe even commercial in the

general area. However, just based on the Comprehensive Plan it does not support the objectives outlined for the commercial based on this rezoning request.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRISTs: Okay, any additional questions for our Staff? The Applicant, Derrick Harris?

TESTIMONY OF DERRICK HARRIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HARRIS: Good afternoon, my name is Derrick Harris, Sr. My address is 62 Teaberry Lane, Elgin, South Carolina. I started this process of trying to rezone this property back in 2013 and I been coming back every year, every year, until actually the surrounding, areas around me have changed. The, I have some adjacent property that's 7640 Fairfield Road that just got rezoned and it was from RU to LI. But what is next to us is a junkyard and it's a salvage and scrap yard is what you would call it, so if I could show you pictures of this so you can what this property is next to so you'll understand this is not gonna be residential property. It's gonna be commercial property and that's what we're going more for under LI, Light Industrial, in order to open a business there. And it's just family owned property, it's been in our family for over 30 years and what we end up running to is there's a building sitting there, you can't live in it, it's residential. Now it's locked in between another piece of property that we just got rezoned to LI and now we're on the other side of an HI, which is a huge scrap yard. And so, you know, I'm just proposing that you take a look at what's around us, and there's no, there's a few houses across the street but most of this is all industrial. And so we are requesting that it be changed from, from Rural, RU to LI. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Harris. Any questions for Mr. Harris? Thank you, sir. Okay, Case No. 18-013 MA, any comments?

1	MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion that Case 18-013 MA move
2	forward to Council with a recommendation for approval. And I'm going against Staff's
3	recommendation basically because it's more contextually appropriate for it to be LI. I
4	think with what's surrounding it the odds of it being, you know, demanding RU and
5	being a residence are just diminimus so I think it's appropriate, even though it's against
6	the Comprehensive Plan for it to go LI.
7	MR. BROWN: Second.
8	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we
9	send Case No. 18-013 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval per
10	Mr. Tuttle's recommendation. All in favor signify by raising your hand.
11	MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Tuttle, Cairns, Gilchrist, Frierson, Yip, Brown,
12	Carlisle, McLaurin.
13	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Those opposed?
14	[Approved: Tuttle, Cairns, Gilchrist, Frierson, Yip, Brown, Carlisle, McLaurin; Absent for
15	vote: Greenleaf]
16	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, again sir, we are a recommending Body to
17	County Council. They'll meet back in their Chambers on the 22 nd of May.
18	MR. HARRIS: Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, sir. Next case.
20	CASE NO. 18-014 MA:
21	MR. PRICE: Alright, next item is Case 18-014 MA. The Applicant is Jermaine
22	Johnson, the location is at the corner of 7901 Richard Street and Winfield Road. The

Applicant is requesting to rezone a parcel which is about a quarter of an acre from RS-MD to MH.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: One second.

MR. PRICE: Staff's, again this is another one of those cases, just based on the objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan Staff recommends denial of this request. Again according to the Comprehensive Plan this falls within an economic development corridor and should provide for a mix of zoning districts and commercial and offices in locations that would not minimally affect surrounding properties. Again we point out to you that our recommendation is based on the Comprehensive Plan, however, if you look at the location of this particular request and the surrounding properties that this rezoning request would be in line with the character and the development of the area.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any questions for Staff? Okay we the Applicant signed up to speak, Mr. Jermaine Johnson. Again, two minutes, name and address.

TESTIMONY OF JERMAINE JOHNSON:

MR. JOHNSON: Jermaine Johnson, 18 Regis Court, Columbia, South Carolina. Yes, I'm trying to get that rezoned. Two lots down is my mother-in-law, directly across the street is my uncle, my, my other uncle is a deacon of the church which is Sweet Home down there. This is a family community. I'm not trying to rezone anything that wouldn't be in my family's community. I'm trying to get my mother and my father moved out here from California and I was gonna put a home on it. They can't afford to build a whole new house, they can't afford any of that stuff. They wanna have a place in my family's community with my, my in-laws. If you look at all those homes and all the pink there it fits with the community. It's nothing I'm gonna try to do, I went to the

neighborhood community association and I spoke to everybody in the community and they said, you know, well welcome your parents to come on out here and move in with us, and anything that you need to get us to support they would actually do it. So I lived in this same community for about five years before I moved out and bought a house with my wife, who like I said, my mother lives down there. But this is where my children play every weekend when they're with grandma, so this is, like I said a very close-knit family community and it's nothing that, you know, I'm not just going into any other community and trying to do something different in anybody's community. This is a family community.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any questions for Mr. Johnson?

MS. YIP: I have a question. So the size of this lot, how many manufactured homes would be able to fit on there? Would it just be singular, would it be two or three, how many?

MR. JOHNSON: I'm just putting one on there. I believe there's only one. Right now if you actually were able to look at the geo mapping you would see that it was, it was built up, it was like a forest all around it, everything was covered up and it was a abandoned, half built building on this thing. So I actually paid \$4,000 to have the trees and all the overgrowth cut off already, so if you go down there now you can see that it's cleared up, and actually I had quite a bit of the community members that came to me and said, thank you for clearing off this lot because it's been like that, they said it's been a lotta crime that, like people would go in that little half built building and do drugs and things and spray paint and stuff like that. So what I actually did was clear it off so now you can actually at least see over there. So it would just be one lot that would be right

1	there and I plan on, like making it nice for my parents because obviously they're in their
2	close to their 70's now and it's just, it would be more beneficial for them to be able to
3	walk up and down the street to my mother-in-law's house and have dinner and all that,
4	so.
5	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any additional questions for the Applicant?
6	Thank you, sir.
7	MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, as you just go along with your request, the MH district
8	allows 7,200, that's the minimum lot area.
9	MS. YIP: Okay.
10	MR. PRICE: And based on the existing acreage he would be able to put one
11	manufactured home or one residential structure on this property.
12	MS. YIP: Great.
13	MS. CAIRNS: But it couldn't be cut into two.
14	MR. PRICE: It couldn't be cut into two, they would not have enough acreage.
15	They would have to acquire more acreage to get, to be able to subdivide it.
16	MS. CAIRNS: So it appears that the lot across the street is probably
17	nonconforming.
18	MR. PRICE: Yes. [Laughter]
19	MS. CAIRNS: Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional comments? Motions?
21	MS. CAIRNS: I'll make a motion to send Map Amendment 18-014 MA forward to
22	Council with a recommendation of approval. The reason for going against the Staff, it's
23	largely based on the fact that this, the only change will be to change what type of home
	1

1	can go on there, whether it has to be stick built or a mobile home, and given the
2	character of the neighborhood allowing the introduction of another mobile home into this
3	neighborhood does not appear to be detrimental to the neighborhood. And as Staff
4	offered that it was, it is contextually appropriate for this area.
5	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.
6	MR. BROWN: Second Commissioner Cairns' motion.
7	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we
8	send Case No. 18-014 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval per
9	the recommendation from Ms. Cairns. All in favor signify by raising your hand.
10	MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Tuttle, Cairns, Gilchrist, Frierson, Yip, Brown,
11	Carlisle, McLaurin.
12	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: All opposed?
13	[Approved: Tuttle, Cairns, Gilchrist, Frierson, Yip, Brown, Carlisle, McLaurin; Absent for
14	vote: Greenleaf]
15	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And again we are a recommending Body to County
16	Council. They'll meet back in their Chambers on the 22 nd .
17	MR. JOHNSON: Thank you so much.
18	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir. Moving right along. Next case.
19	CASE NO. 18-015 MA:
20	MR. PRICE: Okay. Next item is Case 18-015 MA. The Applicant, Charlotte and
21	Randy Huggins. The location is on Horrell Hill Road. The Applicant is requesting to
22	rezone .59 acres from Rural to General Commercial. Staff – okay, this particular site lies
23	within two plans adopted by the County and one is of course within the Comprehensive

Plan, the neighborhood, medium-density designation. And it's also within the Lower Richland County Strategic Community Master Plan. It is actually consistent with the recommendations outlined in the Lower Richland County Strategic Community Master Plan as stated as it will not encroach upon an existing neighborhood, agricultural resource, or historical resource. It is also consistent with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan for nonresidential development to be considered for location along main road corridors and within a contextually appropriate distance from the intersection of a primary arterial. Staff recommended denial primarily because as stated although the request is consistent in regards to the location objective of the Comprehensive Plan, it is not consistent with the type of commercial development promoted by the designation as the permitted uses are more intensive than recommended which would be neighborhood scale. So to go back, the Comprehensive Plan recommends a neighborhood scale type of commercial, the request is more intensive as it is General Commercial. So that was the reason for Staff's recommendation for denial.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any questions for Staff?

MS. YIP: I have a question. Can you tell me the, there's already properties that are already GC existing, can you tell me – I'm sorry, that's an area of town that I haven't been to recently – can you tell me what is there existing now? Is there, cause I mean, there's, you know, General Commercial.

MR. PRICE: The portion in front of them was a, some little building, it's been used as a commercial store, I believe as a restaurant previously before. This is the fire station.

MS. CAIRNS: It's currently vacant, right?

1 MR. PRICE: Yes.

MS. CAIRNS: The little, yeah.

MR. PRICE: I believe this is the fire station. And to go here, this was a parcel that was actually rezoned by Council, by the County not too long ago. If you remember, I believe it was gonna be a doctor's office and then they ended up going, I believe the original request was for General Commercial and they ended up rezoning it to OI, it fit there. Yes, this is –

[Inaudible discussion]

MR. PRICE: Yes, this parcel is, there's an existing structure on this property and we've had a few requests to develop this site. There's some development issues meeting certain requirements of our Code, but again that's, that is also zoned commercial. And I believe according to what's in your package, it doesn't state how long so evidently it's been there for, the zoning of commercial has been there for quite a while.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is that good, Ms. Yip?

MS. YIP: Yes. Thank you, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Absolutely. Any additional questions for our Staff?

Okay, the Applicant, Charlotte Hudgins?

TESTIMONY OF CHARLOTTE HUDGINS:

MS. HUDGINS: Good afternoon. Charlotte Huggins, 273 Old Congaree Run Road, Eastover, SC 29044. Maybe to further address your question, the building right before was a restaurant for many years and it just closed in December and went up for sale. And then the other red spot is Ace Hardware, and then we're surrounded by GC.

When we bought this the property in question here is a back lot to the front lot, it was a package deal by the owners out of Tennessee, and so yes the first lot with the store or was a restaurant is GC. And we met with Norman Jackson and the realtor before buying and he didn't seem to be a problem to have it as a parking lot extension for a car lot for our inventory. And also we, of course, talked with Mr. Price and his office as the car lot extension for inventory, because you have so many, you know, for handicap and visitors so it takes away where we could put inventory. And so therefore, like I said we are surrounded by GC and would like this to also, a recommendation to be GC so we can have it, you know, for that cause it takes away from the, you know, the car lot extension for the inventory. And prior to it being a restaurant for many years it was a magistrate's office, quite a few other businesses have been in there and it is in a primary intersection with a red light.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

MR. MCLAURIN: Is that property at the top of Horrell Hill?

MS. HUGGINS: Yes, sir.

MS. CAIRNS: So I have a question for Staff. Is this a split zoning lot? I mean, is it one lot that fronts on Garners Ferry with split zoning or is it two separate lots?

MR. PRICE: Two separate lots.

MS. HUGGINS: Two separate.

MS. CAIRNS: Okay.

MS. HUGGINS: But it was a package deal, the family sold it, they were outta state and they sold it as a package deal.

1	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Huggins. Any additional
2	comments? Let me ask a question about the Lower Richland County Strategic
3	Community Master Plan, is that one of those plans some years ago where the County
4	was doing all these various plans across in various districts?
5	MS. HEGLER: Yeah, it's one of our nine adopted Master Plans.
6	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, okay. And just refresh my memory on this, these
7	Master Plans were based off of the Comprehensive Plan, is that right?
8	MS. HEGLER: No, I would say it's actually a little more of an area focused way of
9	doing comprehensive planning. So these are areas around the County that the Council
10	identified as needing a little bit of extra care to their long-range planning. In some places
11	it's redevelopment, in others it's more how to maintain, say a rural character. So to the
12	degree that it's a more focused area than the Comprehensive Plan, it's still pretty high
13	level recommendations.
14	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.
15	MS. HEGLER: They do start to get to the level of trying to plan at the parcel level
16	so it's a little more detailed, but it doesn't go so far as to recommend zoning.
17	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I was just curious whether or not some of the
18	community Master Plans conflict in any way with –
19	MS. HEGLER: No, in fact – well no, in fact the Comprehensive Plan that we've
20	just updated, it folds in the recommendations of the Master Plans, so there should not
21	be any conflict at this point.
22	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you. Any additional comments from the
23	Commission? Motions? Recommendations?

MS. CAIRNS: Well, I'll make some comments. I mean, I find this case particularly vexing. I never like seeing commercial wrap down side streets but at the same time this one does and doesn't. If it makes the front lot sort of more viable, but as my mind goes back and forth between seeing commercial wrap down off main streets versus making sure something's viable, I fall back on the fact that the request for General Commercial is an intensity of commercial that, you know, that's what Staff is saying is that there's a lotta things that look positive on it, but the Comp Plan did not call for that level of commercial development in terms of General Commercial. So if I were to make a – no, I'll make a motion, I won't be that challenging. I mean, I make a motion that we send this forward to Council with a recommendation of disapproval for, I mean, it's interesting that the front lot is already GC, but by being very small it limits its use. And so by making it larger it would allow that to become more like a GC, so that's, I just think that the Staff's take on this in terms of the density of, the intensity of the commercial development is not consistent, so therefore I'm supporting the Staff recommendation.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. We have a motion, is there a second? Is there a second for Case No. 18-015 MA? Okay, the motion dies for the lack of second. Is there another motion?

MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion that Case 18-015 MA move forward to Council with a recommendation for approval. I feel going against Staff's recommendation is based upon the adjacency of GC in several directions, and the size of the parcel in front and this, obviously potentially enhancing the whole area for the proper growth right there. That's my motion.

MS. YIP: I'm gonna second that.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we 2 send Case No. 18-015 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval per 3 Mr. Tuttle's recommendation. All in favor signify by raising your hand. 4 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Tuttle, Gilchrist, Frierson, Yip, Brown, Carlisle, McLaurin. 5 6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: All opposed? 7 MR. PRICE: Cairns. 8 [Approved: Tuttle, Gilchrist, Frierson, Yip, Brown, Carlisle, McLaurin; Opposed: Cairns; 9 Absent for vote: Greenleaf] 10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And again, we are recommending Body to County 11 Council. They'll meet back in these Chambers on the 22nd. 12 MS. HUGGINS: Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, ma'am. Mr. Greenleaf, if you wanna come join 14 us? 15 MR. GREENLEAF: Sure. 16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you. 17 **CASE NO. 18-016 MA:** 18 MR. PRICE: Alright the next item, the last case, is Case 18-016 MA. The Applicant is Kamal Shlon, I hope I've said that correctly. The location is 825 Hallbrook 19 20 Drive. The Applicant is requesting to rezone a little more than 16 acres from Rural to 21 RS-HD. Again, Staff recommended disapproval for this. One of the things I wanna point 22 out is that if you look in your package, we, the site is shown as that rectangular area but 23 it actually is the entire highlighted area that you have in there. So just for clarification.

Again, Staff's recommendation for disapproval and this is just based on it not being, what we feel is not consistent with the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed request would introduce a density which conflicts with the land use recommendations for medium-density housing, which is what was outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. In addition the policy guide for this designation proposes to locate intensive uses away from adjacent residential neighborhoods. Staff also looking at this was concerned that this request for a high-density zoning district would not be in character with the existing surrounding development pattern and zoning districts found along Hallbrook Road, Drive, excuse me. And so again for these reasons Staff recommends disapproval.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, any questions for Staff? Okay, we have persons signed up to speak. Moe Baddourah.

TESTIMONY OF MOE BADDOURAH:

MR. BADDOURAH: Hey everybody, how are you? I just wanna make sure that I clear the Record that I have no financial interest in this project whatsoever. My uncle and my brother are the one whose doing this project. Just to make sure we're clear, this is an area that my brother and my uncle have purchased about 18 months ago to build a subdivision within a gated community. Right now if you see behind it there is apartments and then right in front of it is the Bi-Lo supermarket. We decided, we followed Norman Jackson's recommendation into what we can use for that parcel and we thought the community, a gated community will be best fit for that area. And it's, actually it was recommended by the Comprehensive Plan that I was in Brian's office that he showed me that heavy density is part of that Comprehensive Plan

recommendation. And the reason we decided to go with heavy density, it's more economic reasons more than anything else. We felt like the investment we're gonna put into that property and to clean it up and to build beautiful homes to enhance that neighborhood will have to be about 80 houses and that's what we, we kinda adapted the square footage, the number of houses to comply with your planning zonings and codes that you have for that area. Now right now it's a vacant lot and it actually has a lot of drug activities on it. Every time we go over there we have to clean up the property. We've seen, you know, needles and fires and campfires and stuff like that. And it really kinda seals the bad area, or I shouldn't say bad area but an area where it's open for a lotta bad activities between two residential areas. And with us putting a residential neighborhood in the middle of it it will really clean up and enhance that whole neighborhood, and we feel it's a really good project for us to take on and for Richland County to endorse.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Baddourah. Any questions for the Applicant? Thank you, sir.

MR. BADDOURAH: And we appreciate approval. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any questions or comments? Recommendations?

MR. GREENLEAF: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir?

MR. GREENLEAF: On the slide there this site is mentioned, it's a square box and then the larger oblong space, looks like the, [inaudible] of the city almost. Tell me this, is that, are we sure about that, 100% sure? One hundred percent sure that this is the proper designation, the smaller or the larger?

1 MS. CAIRNS: It's 16 acres and so I think -2 MR. GREENLEAF: Yeah, so it's gotta be the larger spot. Yeah. 3 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. 4 MR. GREENLEAF: Okay. It just looks so different. And 16 acres with 80 homes 5 on it, that's gonna be pretty tight, how tight? 6 MS. HEGLER: But that's a gross density, right Geo? 7 MR. GREENLEAF: Yeah. 8 MS. HEGLER: So that doesn't account for taking out for infrastructure, that's just 9 by the map numbers so it's, you have to interpret some. 10 MS. CAIRNS: The gross was 141. 11 MS. HEGLER: Is that right? I didn't know. Yep, no gross is 141. 12 MR. GREENLEAF: How much is it? 13 MS. CAIRNS: Eighty is a net. That was what the Applicant offered. 14 MS. HEGLER: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay, yeah. So 141 is what you could get by the 15 numbers. 16 MR. GREENLEAF: Okay. 17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, they've closed the public – 18 MR. TUTTLE: Well so, so perhaps the argument that's in front of us is a density 19 argument, right? You could be completely dense or for a designation slightly less dense, 20 and the reality is you never develop to your gross densities, regardless. So you end up, 21 you end up having this, this argument over a few homes one way or another. I'm 22 comfortable with the designation because it is between a multi-family high-density and a 23 GC spot. Granted the neighbor to the, I guess what would be to the west, is a slightly

1	lower density, I'm not sure that net taking that in that would really change my opinion
2	much. So I would be inclined to be in favor of this particular rezoning. And with that in
3	mind I'll make a motion that Case 18-016 MA move forward to Council with a
4	recommendation for approval. And I'm gonna go against Staff's recommendation
5	because I do think it is appropriate here in this particular spot since it's sandwiched
6	between high-density, multi-family and GC to have a greater density is, is sort of a
7	transition between the General Commercial on down to lower density residential.
8	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, is there a second?
9	MR. GREENLEAF: I'll second that.
10	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, great. It's been moved and properly seconded
11	that we send Case No. 18-016 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of
12	approval per Mr. Tuttle's recommendation. All in favor signify by raising your hand.
13	MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Tuttle, Gilchrist, Frierson, Yip, Brown, Carlisle,
14	Greenleaf, McLaurin.
15	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: All opposed?
16	MR. PRICE: Cairns.
17	[Approved: Tuttle, Gilchrist, Frierson, Yip, Brown, Carlisle, McLaurin; Opposed: Cairns;
18	Absent for vote: Greenleaf]
19	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And again, we are a recommending Body to County
20	Council. They'll be back in these Chambers on the 22 nd . Or their Chambers. Thank you
21	Alright guys. Moving right along, I think that is it.
22	MS. HEGLER: We have just a quick little presentation for you and leave you with
23	a lot of information.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Great. You passing it out?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. HEGLER: Yeah, you may. So just wanted to go over a very high level today some work Staff has been doing for two different departments on developing, we're calling the Land Development Manual. It's a very technical document, lotta hard work has gone into this and I just wanted to again kind of give you some really high level thinking about it, tell you sorta the why, the what's and how, leave it with you. It is something we're going to be presenting to you in June with some ordinance changes, so but that's not what you have before you. So what you have before you is a manual and let's be very clear on the terminology of a manual, the manual is not a adopted as it is. Ordinances are what you make recommendations about and that ordinance is what Council adopts as code and law. Those ordinances will refer to this manual, meaning the manual is more in the way of guidance, you know, than it is law and policy. So there's good reasons for that. The purpose of it is to establish minimum standards for design, and I think this is hilarious, constriction of site grading, that should be construction but I'm sure that there's a lot of folks that might think it's constriction [laughter] so that's probably a Freudian. Again so these are the established minimum design standards. I mean, I love those things, I mean, you just can't make this up. [Laughter] This would be used by Public Works and Community Planning and Development, yours truly on our end, and then of course Public Works as they do maintenance of the storm water system, so that both departments were heavily involved in doing this. And of course, just like anything we do it's intended to protect and promote the general welfare of all citizens. Just kinda give you a quick overview of what's included, obviously we go through our plan process, how to actually get projects done

and constructed in Richland County, your submittal requirements are outlined in there. Guidelines for designing and construction of roads in accordance with DOT standards, roadway testing requirements these are all things that are important for us as we take over roads and maintain them after developers have completed them. Storm water best management practices and storm water management after the fact. So the objectives are to reduce storm water impacts on water quality and quantity, those are two different statistics, things that we are, you know, care about here in Richland County, protect our downstream areas from the adverse impacts of development. You've heard a lotta folks over the last few years come to you often in opposition to a rezoning because they're concerned about the impacts of that development on them. This manual attempts to address that in a way that we think is, I don't necessarily wanna say business-friendly, but is tolerable to the development community but also does something more than we're currently doing today to try and meet and bridge that gap between concern. It does help us develop roads that are to the quality that we think will last 25 years since your county and your taxpayers' dollars are taking them over for maintenance. We do hope that we have some standards in place that will do that. And again, explain all those internal processes because it can be fairly difficult to get through this system as they perceive it. We've actually done a lot over the last few years to streamline and make our processes more efficient, this is just another way to provide that information to them. The organization of the manual in front of you has 11 chapters and it really kind of focuses on two I would say broad items, technical engineering procedures, things like roads and those design elements that you see in that infrastructure. And then of course things that we need to do to stay compliant with state law as it relates to storm water and what

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

DHEC expects of us. So some of that technical information, again I'm not gonna go into a lotta detail, there is a lot in this document but we go into the detail of what those roads should look like, their widths, we even go into detail about what the subgrade should look like. Again, we want these roads to last for many years, and our ability to maintain them to be more efficient and responsible. A lot of other technical stuff here that again I won't detail but one of the main reasons we're doing this is because we do fall under DHEC's requirement of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, that's a long word for NPDES. And they monitor us through this permit, okay, so that permit is what allows us to do construction and monitoring in Richland County. DHEC does periodic audits of that, they did one most recently and because this is a response to that to make sure that we have some design standards in place. Focusing mostly on areas of new development and redevelopment and construction site runoff, so this is during construction, making sure that we are doing the best we can to contain water. I'm not go, again these are a lotta charges just to show you that there's a lotta work that's already gone on, a lot of things have already been delivered to DHEC to make sure we stay complaint. And there are a lot of things we have to do throughout the course of our five year permit, they're gonna check us every five years on things that we have to report on annually. What I think this manual really does, it's due to them sometime in July, they wanna know that we have actually taken the recommendations and the audit and the results of that seriously and we have put together, you know, design standards and minimum requirements in this manual that address those. So that's what we have to do coming up in July which is why we're before you now. Again, we're here today just to give that to you, let you take it home. It is in draft form, there are maybe five or six

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

outstanding items that Staff is still working on. When we have those finalized I will send them to you in an email but they're, the bulk of it's in there, they're not really substantive differences. I think you'll get the gist of what we're trying to do with what's before you. So I wanted to give that to you today as just an update and information. What's gonna happen is we have to amend probably multiple chapters of our ordinance, 26 is what you oversee. We will make amendments to that ordinance that make it consistent with the manual before you. There are other chapters that go before Council so I think we're gonna have to do kind of a dual path of ordinance updates, so I do intend to go to committee at the end of the month to Council for those other chapters. We'll hold a public meeting, Council asked us to do this, it's still – I'm still not really sure how we're gonna present such technical information to the public but we're working on that. But we will in fact hold a meeting, we will put this out there for public viewing. I do know that we have collected some stakeholder input and have a lot more to still get. We've been working with the development community, we have promised that over the years that we would never throw anything out there that they are not aware of. They have read this thoroughly I assure and have vetted it and have come back with comments. We will do the same with the conservation community, and again the public. So the way that we really process those things, we attempt to work out as much of the details as we can. It'll never be a fully 100% consensus document I doubt, I always am optimistic that we can do that but I think there're gonna be a couple of elements that we as Staff just feel are the absolute best recommendations we can make and that's what we're gonna present. But for the most part we are able to work with all the stakeholder communities and come up with recommendations that work, but still actually progress this and have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	us do better development in Richland County. So our intention is to bring this back to
2	you in June so a month from now, ask you to actually act on those ordinance
3	amendments. Really I think it's gonna reduce the size of 26 because we're gonna say,
4	just refer to the manual in places instead of repeating what's in the manual. So you're
5	just gonna see, I think, a lot of reduction in text, not a lotta change. So it is important to
6	know what's in the manual when you are voting on that which is why it's before you.
7	With our goal of going to Council at the end of June for zoning public hearing on first
8	reading. We do have Staff here that have worked on the technical components of it if
9	you have any questions at this time, we can take it and get back to you. They may be
10	able to answer it today. I know you've just gotten it so I do not know if you do, but we
11	certainly wanted to lay the foundation, the context of this for you before you have to act
12	on it.
13	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Did I hear you correctly in saying that this was in
14	response to a DHEC audit?

MS. HEGLER: Well, I mean, not an audit, I mean, audit's probably not the right word but they do review our permit every five years.

?: The changes are due to being issued a new permit and they give us a timeframe to get the new designs implemented.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Got it. Okay.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. GREENLEAF: May I ask what was that deadline?

MS. HEGLER: July. But we've been working on this for, I mean, Staff has been working on this for a very long time. We could've gone forward with just the DHEC storm water part of it but we also had already begun working on road standards and

1 other parts of development so it just, it's gonna be better for the community if we just 2 have this all together in one source. If we have contention at either part of what we're 3 talking about we will pull the storm water stuff out to meet that deadline if we have to. 4 but we've worked a lot on both pieces that I think we're at a pretty good point. CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well have we share it with the consultants that are 5 6 working on the -7 MS. HEGLER: Yes, sir. 8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. 9 MS. HEGLER: Yes, sir, that's been already done. On the Code rewrite? 10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes. 11 MS. HEGLER: Yes. Yes. 12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Um-hum. Alright. Thank you all. I'll just simply ask 13 everybody to go home this weekend and [laughter] make sure you get some comments 14 back to Staff. Thank you guys. 15 MS. HEGLER: And absolutely, send us emails, questions as you go. Again it is 16 highly technical so if there's, if you want us to just kinda explain a Cliff Note's version to 17 you on something you've read let us know. I've attempted to do the Cliff Note's today, 18 but we can -MS. CAIRNS: But you were constricted? 19 20 MS. HEGLER: But I was constricted [laughter]. But yeah, we'll try to – it will be 21 good practice for us cause we need to do this for the public anyway. So do not hesitate 22 to ask us, like please explain what this means. 23 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Ms. Frierson?

1 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you so much. In the packet for today on page 27 there's 2 a reference to the Economic Development Center/Corridor. Could we get some 3 information, Geo or – about that? 4 MR. PRICE: That is actually in your Comprehensive Plan, but I'll be happy to cut 5 those pages for you and just send that specifically to you. 6 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you. 7 MS. HEGLER: Ms. Frierson, that is a designated future land use area just like 8 neighborhood or promotional – 9 MR. PRICE: Yeah, we don't run across it that often but we'll get that to you. 10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I circled that in my packet today, too. Any other 11 questions? 12 MR. TUTTLE: You're talking general or related to this? Cause I have a question. 13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir? 14 MR. TUTTLE: So this [inaudible] relate to this Body and I'm sorry this is gonna be 15 kinda wonky, but I think we're gonna see sewer service change in the County. With the 16 tax law change -17 MR. BROWN: I can't hear you, I'm sorry. 18 MR. TUTTLE: I think we're gonna see, this might change the Comprehensive 19 Plan on some level, I think we're gonna see some changes in sewer service and sewer 20 service providers. In the new tax law it used to be that developers would donate the 21 sewer system they put in to the private utility contractor. And the IRS had an exemption 22 and it was tax free. And now when we contribute we build the sewer system for a 23 neighborhood and we contribute it to a private entity that does sewer service, they have

to count it as income which means that they are charging us the tax, for the developers they're charging a tax burden related to that. So you have to actually pay now to donate a private sewer system to a private sewer provider. This levels the playing field for municipalities much more so than it has been recently to be in the sewer business and I would hope that Council is aware of this and Staff is aware of it so that it might change or alter any plans they may have relative to the new 208 Plan or anything else that might arise, because you will see developers shy away from areas where they have to pay, they have to not only give the infrastructure but then pay the taxes for the provider. So it's a pretty big deal that's going on and it's kinda flown under the radar but there are now, I think five states that it's come to a head and there are cases now in all five states. So it'll be really interesting to watch it unfold, but I think it might ultimately impact the Comprehensive Plan.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is there a timeline on the implementation of that, acting on that?

MR. TUTTLE: Well, there's the, the Public Service Commission currently is taking them one at a time as each utility would come for a rate increase, at the rate hearing. Although one utility provider in the County has already gone before them kinda in the, very quickly and had it passed. So Palmetto Utilities has already gotten the ruling passed midstream, so. It doesn't affect anything today but I think as we look at this Comprehensive Plan I think you will see where there are other utility providers, I think you'll see people start to gravitate towards public utility providers.

MS. FRIERSON: That's interesting.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Tuttle. I like the idea that it allows local governments to get back in the game at some level.

MR. TUTTLE: Well, it's certainly –

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. Let's get to Rules and Procedures, then we'll get to – yeah, yeah, we got one more.

MS. FRIERSON: I apologize.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Oh yeah. Land Development rewrite?

MS. HEGLER: I have no updates on that.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. Rules and Procedures.

MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, I just ask that we take that up in June. Upon looking at some of the changes that were proposed at the last meeting, one of the things I did, I've looked at some other boards and commissions and there were a few ideas I wanted just to pull from there and include those, you know, for y'all, for your determination. And so we'll have that for you before the June meeting.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Chairman's Report. Not a whole lot, just Ms. Frierson just mentioned to me that she would like for us to consider doing a retreat again. And I certainly think in light of some of the recommendations that we should be getting from the consultants real soon that that may be a good opportunity to begin to have a conversation around that and potentially doing a retreat. I thought the first time we did it that was really good, I learned a whole lot. For new Commissioners that are on the Commission I think that'll be very good, so Mr. Tuttle, we certainly appreciate the last time you graciously —

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

1920

21

22

23

MR. TUTTLE: Well, we'll certainly make that facility available again if people wanna meet there. I know it might be a little hot for folks with, you know, no air conditioning, but we're certainly willing to provide it.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: It's on the lake so we can deal with the heat.

MS. FRIERSON: And then we can go dip into the – [laughter] I'm just sayin.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: You know, one of the things I wanna bring back, put on the Commission's radar screen, and I know I've been told many times that this is not an area that we even get involved in, but it is an area that you need to be aware of. And I brought this, I think I sent to you all about a year or two ago an article that I had received from, it was either *The State Newspaper* or someplace in Tennessee, I can't remember where it was. But it was called, the title of it was called *The HOAs From Hell*, and it talked about just how unyielding some of this had become in states across the country. And what needed to happen, particularly in local governments, to begin to take a look at this. I know this is not something that we typically dive into but I just wanna make this Commission aware that we got some HOAs from hell right here in South Carolina, in Richland County that, and there's some major issues going on with some of this stuff that needs to be addressed. And so as I become a little bit more aware of what's happening in this arena, I certainly wanna bring it back before you as information. But I'll encourage all of us with our Councilmembers, both City and County, to begin to make them aware that you do have some HOAs from hell right here in Richland County that we need to begin to, to pay some attention.

MS. CAIRNS: I'd be curious what characteristics does an HOA exhibit to get such a classification.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well, I think that's been part of the, I think that was the whole purpose of the article was, how did they end up getting that kind of designation to be able to have that type of power among people within a community. And so I'll be happy to resend that to you all just so that you can become familiar with it. But I do think as we get into even our conversations about the rewrite, you may remember I brought that up, to say that I think we need to – part of why we made a case of saying, let's include neighborhood groups into some of these conversations is because I think some of them need to be aware. And I've had a conversation with some of them who clearly didn't know that some of these third parties were doing some of the stuff that they were doing. So I don't, I'm not gonna get into some of this but I'm gonna resend all of you that article and then I would love to get your, seek your advice – for those of you who've bene involved with some of this stuff on a, on a, much longer than I have, just help me understand kinda why we, why this is occurring.

MS. CAIRNS: It sounds as if it's overzealous enforcement of rules. Cause I can, I mean, I'd like to see the article again, I'm sure I read it. But just, I'll toss out one of the things that I've done for the County for many years, I haven't don't it for a year or so, was to speak to neighborhood groups and sometimes come up here to the Council building about homeowner's associations and their enforcements of covenants and stuff. And I don't practice that area of law but I, you know, I come from a development background and [laughter] coastal development, but I would offer that many of the homeowners that would come to the talks that I would give were frustrated at having covenants that couldn't be enforced or weren't enforced. And so I think that, that even overzealous enforcement of covenants to the point where neighborhoods become

1	hostile is not a good thing. But also, you know, my take on a lotta this, again having
2	talked to many, many groups is that a lotta times those covenants are what I would
3	describe as elusory, that they'll give you the sense that you're in a community that's got
4	rules and regulations and support how you wanna a community to operate. But when
5	push comes to shove at the end of the day they aren't enforced and they aren't really
6	enforceable and so, you know, I mean, I'm always willing to offer I'm basically a city kid
7	I currently live in unincorporated Richland County but you know, that sometimes
8	ordinances to establish community baselines are not a bad way to go as well.
9	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I totally agree.
10	MS. CAIRNS: And so, you know, the –
11	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: There's a balance in that and I think that, you know, I
12	did some research when that article first came out and I found out that we have
13	neighborhood covenants in Richland County that were developed back in 1953.
14	MS. CAIRNS: Oh, the racial ones?
15	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And some of those indicated that black folk couldn't
16	live in certain communities. So, and some of these covenants are still in existence
17	today. So I know we don't wanna enforce that.
18	[Inaudible discussion]
19	MS. CAIRNS: The Supreme Court took care of that for you, US Supreme Court.
20	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: But I think – well I understand that but all I simply say,
21	all I say is, all I'm saying to you is those covenants are still in existence.
22	MR. BROWN: Oh, they're in existence but as Commissioner Cairns pointed out
23	they're unenforceable.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

1920

21

22

23

MS. CAIRNS: Well, but that's, but it's interesting though, the unenforceability of the racial covenants, and there are also Jewish covenants and things like that, that's based on the US Supreme Court Constitutional Standards. What I'm talking about is unenforceable covenants because it take a neighbor suing a neighbor as opposed to, you know –

MR. BROWN: Oh, okay.

MS. CAIRNS: - like in a city if – let me think of a good example – I'll just, I'll use the example from where I lived up north, okay, if you, you know, parked your - oh, if you drove a commercial truck like a pickup truck with, you were a painter and you had ladders on your truck and stuff like that, you had to park your truck in your backyard. You couldn't park in your front yard. Okay, that was an ordinance in a community I lived in. Well, my next door neighborhood was a commercial painter, so if he parked his truck up front I could pick up the phone and call City Hall and the police would come by and knock on his door. Whereas a lot of the covenants, if the covenant says you can't park your truck full of ladders in your front yard and my neighbor continues to do it and I call City Hall they say, sorry it's not an ordinance. The only way you can enforce that is you go to court and you sue your neighbor for the violation of that covenant. That's what makes a lotta covenants unenforceable is the pragmatic reality of what it takes, and that's based on what the document says the enforcement mechanism is. You know, some of the larger communities have HOAs that have more functioning boards and ways to do it and punishments within the HOA or within the community that may them enforceable because something can be taken away; maybe it's your swimming pool rights or maybe it's something else.

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

14

13

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

MR. TUTTLE: Well, some of them go as far as the lien rights and you can actually foreclose on the lien.

MS. CAIRNS: Right. So I mean, there's just, there's so many layers to that.

MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, so the State House has been contemplating and working on HOA reform for the last three sessions I know of, both on the House and Senate, and haven't been able to get it across the line. And what, and when you talk about HOAs you have to understand they run the whole gamut so you have high rise condos at the beach that are governed under an HOA so they have painting and roofs and AC equipment that has to be replaced based upon that group, and then you have, you know, five houses on a street that are in an HOA. So to talk about them generically is tough, it's a really broad spectrum, but what we found when we started an HOA management company years ago and sold it, I think they probably managed 30,000 rooftops across the state today, and the apathy from the residents in general, a lotta times we can't form – it's time to turn a neighborhood over and we can't get three people to volunteer to be on a board in a neighborhood. We're turning one over now that has 600 houses and can't get, been trying for four months to get three people to volunteer. The HOA management company just told me there was another one we have nothing to do with somewhere else in South Carolina that they couldn't get anybody to serve on the board so there's a procedure where you go to the Secretary of State and you just hand everything over and say, here are the covenants, here's our bank account, here's everything else, and the State has to manage that property. So it's a really tricky thing and it's hard, and I think that's why you see the County run from

wanting to be in any part of the enforcement arm on that cause it's so convoluted and so difficult to manage and, you know –

MS. CAIRNS: And it's interesting because my take on a lotta that is there should be fewer of them because they don't run for a long time well.

MR. TUTTLE: Right.

MS. CAIRNS: I mean, there's exceptions.

MR. TUTTLE: But for instance, so when they first started talking about it at the State House a bunch of people went and testified and they wanted mandatory training for every board member of HOAs. And on some level that sounds great cause they need to, you know, maybe they haven't been involved with this, maybe they don't understand debits and credits and balance sheets and that kinda stuff, and they needed the knowledge, they didn't understand how a meeting works and all that. Well, ultimately we went to them and said, guys we' can't get people to volunteer, if you require that they go take a mandatory two day class you'll never get anybody to serve on a board, right? But their intention was good, right, they wanted people to be better educated in property management.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Why do you think people won't volunteer?

MR. TUTTLE: You know, that's a –

MS. CAIRNS: I think, you know, it's just weird cause I mean, I think about, you know, my experience living in communities, you know, the very first community I grew up in it had paint color restrictions as ordinance, it had the height of your playground equipment, it had ordinance you had to maintain the sidewalk out in front of your house and if you didn't they would do it and bill you. This is the city, okay. And so I think that,

you know, maybe as more northerners move down here we're used to having the level of community standard based on ordinance. And we pay for it, I mean, we pay for it in taxes, I mean, the taxes on the house I grew up in I think are around \$25,000 a year now, and I mean, it was a nice house but like, yeah, taxes up north are nothing like taxes in the south.

MS. FRIERSON: You know, you asked about why people won't serve. I've served as a homeowner association president for a number of years and on the board. One of the reasons is because, and I'm not trying to be facetious, we are so good at what we do that some people just say, you know, I'm satisfied, I'm not gonna volunteer. Another reason is that some people think that if you are a neighbor and you're enforcing something it's gonna cause some acrimony, they don't even understand that there's a management company frequently that deals with those late fees and so forth. And some people are just so complacent it's almost like voting, you know, you should do it but some folks don't, this apathy sets in, you do it, I'll come, I'll help, but I don't wanna be in charge, I don't wanna take on the major responsibility.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, and I think – I certainly appreciate all those comments and guidance on that because I think one of the things that we hear often is whether or not, has it become less about neighborhoods and more about business. And I think the question becomes whether or not that becomes a delicate balance on that, how do we deal with that in the most prudent way. I don't know the answer to that, but I know I got a lotta folks sitting around this table who do and have been involved with that work and can provide some guidance. I'm just telling you that I'm hearing more and more of, of issues with that, even the [inaudible] Commission in South

Carolina has gotten engaged in that work and looking at the Fair Housing Act to say
whether or not this is even legal. So this is coming outta our State and we need to just
be aware of it.

MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, one of the things that we started noticing and we have a few people from certain communities in the County and when they don't have an HOA, they don't have any covenants, and what they're asking the County to do is in some ways to enact ordinances that would essentially address a number of the issues that your typical HOA or their management company would deal with. So that may be something for –

MS. CAIRNS: Or, or as I would offer, what you'll typically find in communities that have a level of density that's suburban or urban in style, it is common to have ordinances that set a standard of, of behavior and property management such that – so, you know, it's just weird, I mean, I come from that. I come from when you're in dense areas you tend to have lots of ordinances that maintain order, it's not that you turn to HOAs, it's not that you turn to covenants, and I think that's where the County has this enormous challenge because we go from farms and, you know, this sort of rural/residential living stuff, and I spend the last weekend driving through the mountains of North Carolina so I've seen a lot of that, you know, to really dense suburban development that right now that standard of behavior and care of your property is by HOAs, not by ordinance. And I think that's where –

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I totally agree.

MS. CAIRNS: - you know, and I've mentioned this to Staff before that I'd love – and I know there's enforcement issues and all this kinda stuff, but I just think for

Richland County to maintain dense neighborhoods of residential development that the residents sort of expect that they're living in a city and expect that they're having ordinances, that we need to figure out how to do that. We need to figure out how to let the rural/residential people be rural/residential and do the things that they like doing with their land and their property and nobody complains about, but yet we have ordinances that set a standard of living in denser areas.

MR. PRICE: Yeah, and a lotta those are coming from older neighborhoods. I wanna make sure I point that out. Those that have been coming in they come from older neighborhoods where the covenants are just are – well they say they don't have them or they just don't exist anymore, not from your, you know, I guess your newer subdivisions that have those.

MS. CAIRNS: Right.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, but I think what I hear Heather saying though is, I do think our local governments need to have some measure – yes, there's gotta be –

MS. CAIRNS: Well, cause it's only a matter of time till the newer subdivisions become the older ones. I mean, I'm in one of those transitional neighborhoods right now where, you know, it's the 50 year old neighborhood. And so the fact that we're in unincorporated Richland County some of those houses that are getting abandoned or left behind cause residents are in nursing homes and this and that, I mean, you guys, code enforcement, I mean, it was a lotta years to get one house turned. And you know, so that's the thing is yeah, it doesn't happen in newer communities, okay well in 40 years guess what, those are the older communities.

1 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I was just pointing out that, you know, that that request has 2 come from a few of the communities or at least residents of communities for certain 3 enforcement, whether it be parking on grass or overgrown lots particularly, you know. 4 those issues that they want the County to come up with ordinances to enforce those. 5 MS. HEGLER: I think you've gotta bring that up during the Code rewrite and we 6 said this for a lotta different things. There's gonna be a variety of ways to tackle it, it's 7 not gonna be one site solution. 8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Right. 9 MS. HEGLER: And so I like the way you just framed it, there's gonna be this 10 rural/residential kinda let that be, those overgrown can be a lot higher than they can -11 MS. CAIRNS: You know, I think that's actually, that's a great example. 12 MS. HEGLER: - and, as suburban and even an urban neighborhood. There's 13 three levels of every ordinance we put out. 14 MS. CAIRNS: Overgrown grass in the County is, what, 12" right now? 15 MS. HEGLER: Right, but that's – 16 MS. CAIRNS: That doesn't work in the suburbs. 17 MS. HEGLER: - and if you try to change that to -18 MR. PRICE: No, I think it's 24. 19 MS. CAIRNS: Oh, oh, that's – 20 [Inaudible discussion] 21 MS. HEGLER: Well they wanted, neighborhoods, suburban neighborhoods 22 wanna bring it to one cause two feet in a suburban neighborhood – 23 MS. CAIRNS: Well, one I'd want it to be six.

whole County and it just doesn't make sense.

MS. CAIRNS: You can't.

MS. HEGLER: Right. We can't, we're trying to do one measurement for the

MS. HEGLER: I remember the bagging of leaves conversation many years ago, I mean, that, the problem, the reason it never went anywhere is because what you would do in the rural parts of the County just didn't make sense in urban. You have all this, I mean, you've gotta identify these things. This is a time to do it. It's gonna come down to how we define –

MS. CAIRNS: Where which ordinance applies.

MS. HEGLER: Correct. And then you've got to figure out how that gets cross-communicated with all these enforcers. And then you've gotta make sure you have enough enforcement. So it's a thing we've gotta build up but certainly, I mean, it comes up too often to not have the conversation.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Commissioner Yip?

MS. HEGLER: And so, yeah, I mean, you've gotta, you also have to incorporate, I think, a timing thing where you transition from one to another so that we're not enforcing a private party contract. I mean, so you've gotta figure all that out too as you move forward, but now's the time to do that. I mean, I think that'd be probably a great conversation for your retreat to provide really good guidance to the consultants about what are those things that you think are community quality of life issues and that make sense to have three standards and then how would you go about doing that. That'd be a great retreat topic.

MS. YIP: I think this is a great discussion to have. I have the benefit of seeing it from both sides because we offer property management at my agency and we also do sales, and so I see the pro side of HOA and having rules and regs to help maintain the integrity of a property and help keep neighborhood values and stuff. But I also live in an unincorporated part of Richland County where I live in an older neighborhood and there is not, there's a voluntary HOA and I gotta tell you when some neighbors moved up the street and decided to use their front lawn as a parking lot, I took exception with that because we take a lotta pride in our house, right.

MS. CAIRNS: And there's nothing you can do.

MS. YIP: There was nothing I could do. So this is a very thoughtful conversation that I would say yes, this is a perfect time to address it and I might even suggest, you know, cause we can't ever make everybody happy, that's like herding cats, right, that's just never gonna happen. So I wondered if it would be a possibility, do you guys ever go – and this might sound like a silly question – but do you guys ever go to conferences and talk with other city planners in other parts of, you know, the State or whatever?

MR. PRICE: They don't let me go.

MS. YIP: They never let you go? [Laughter] And here's why I'm asking is because, you know, surely this has been traveled by other, you know, counties, right, and they too have been faced with this. And being that this is the perfect opportunity for us to have the Code rewrite which would obviously impact the future of our community, you know, I wondered what do other communities do so that we can make it, or have a basis or a benchmark to, to work by. I mean, is that a reasonable suggestion rather than

us trying to, you know, recreate the wheel? It's just, it's been applied by other communities, it's worked for them, I mean, is that possible to get that information?

MS. HEGLER: Yeah, we can definitely do that. I mean, you have the examples that Ms. Cairns already gave, I mean, -

MS. YIP: Right.

MS. HEGLER: - when you talk to northern communities they know when you get a certain sticker on your sidewalk your monthly payment's about to go up because they're gonna come change your, they're gonna fix your sidewalk. And you know, there's ways of – we have to find the balance that works here.

MS. YIP: Absolutely.

MS. HEGLER: Because again, not a one size fits all, but yeah we can bring some examples.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, and I think it might be – and I'm willing to help with this – it may be worth revisiting the Fair Housing Act that in some ways speaks to some of this stuff at a level, and so I'm willing to help get some folk in here who can have that conversation. For sure. Because I do think it is an alarming issue in South Carolina and just in Richland County it's become, it's almost become predatory to the point where we have thousands of people being impacted by this. So I don't want anybody to think that this is, this is just something that I just happened to wake up this morning and talked about, it's a real issue. And so anyway, I appreciate all the healthy conversation here today about it and as a Commission I'm glad to –

MR. PRICE: That'd be a good thing to add to the retreat, to have somebody come.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, and so we'll have to come up with some dates. 2 MS. CAIRNS: I was gonna say, you gotta float some dates soon. Summer's 3 coming, the calendars are – 4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Last time we did it in September, did we not? It was still hot. 5 6 MS. HEGLER: It was beautiful in the morning, if we'd gone another 30 minutes it 7 would've been unbearable. 8 MS. CAIRNS: Well, we can start at 6:00am [laughter]. I'll be there. 9 MS. HEGLER: Or consider probably [inaudible] there too. 10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: We've got some time but can we come back at our 11 next meeting and everybody think about some dates, maybe a little closer to the fall? 12 And I guess it would be more consistent with when the consultants will be – 13 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, I mean, I think we can – yeah, I would give us a couple 14 months then, I mean, to organize the speakers and what all you wanna talk about. Mr. 15 Price, are they taking August off? 16 MR. PRICE: Council has and so typically what we do is we don't take it off the 17 Planning Commission agenda, but we'll talk about it around June, so rather than just 18 wait till July to determine if you, if there are map amendment cases it's not a big issues, 19 but usually if there's some other business that needs to take place that will be the only 20 reason we would meet in August. 21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright, that's all I got. That's enough. Tracy? 22 Planning Director? 23 MS. HEGLER: I think that's in the packet for information.

1 MR. PRICE: Yes -2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Price? 3 MR. PRICE: - just two things. One I did send out a, I sent out an email to 4 everyone to see, there's training on May the 17th at the South Carolina Bar Association. 5 It's put on by the South Carolina Association of Counties. If you're interested in 6 attending please email me and I'll sign you up, and if I need to I'll just, I'll send that back 7 out. One of the featured speakers will be our own -MS. HEGLER: Oh no, I think it's gonna be our own Zoning Administrator. 8 9 MR. PRICE: Your name is on there. 10 MS. HEGLER: I know. 11 [Inaudible discussion] 12 MS. CAIRNS: I was gonna say are there CLE credits, it's at the Bar? 13 MS. HEGLER: I think there are, I mean, it's the planning credits that -14 MS. CAIRNS: I know, but can I get CLEs? 15 MS. HEGLER: I don't know, I'll have to find out. 16 MS. CAIRNS: If I can double dip, I'm gonna, I mean – 17 MR. PRICE: And also everybody – I think y'all received these, I sent these to you 18 by email, except for you Mr. Brown, sorry, I have yours here, but this is regarding, I think 19 last month there was a case that was deferred by the Planning Commission to allow the 20 applicant and the community to speak, and we won't go into that one as much. But just 21 to let you know you didn't get the conclusion but the applicant did come in and

withdraw, that's why they were not on this particular agenda. They withdrew their

22

1 request and they're going to come back in in June for Neighborhood Commercial. So 2 just letting you know what the conclusion of that particular request was. 3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: That's interesting. I'll comment on that at the next 4 meeting. [Laughter] 5 MS. YIP: I just also wanted to say thank you to all of you guys, Staff, Tracy, Geo, 6 all of you guys, just because I know, you know, this is real fun stuff right here. But no, I 7 mean, seriously it's a lotta work that goes into these meetings so I just wanted to say 8 thank you, you know, for all that you guys do for our communities so that we can make 9 better decisions with the responsibility we've been given to make conscious decisions 10 for the future of our County. CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: They're a great team. Thank y'all for what you do, for 11 12 sure. Alright. 13 MR. TUTTLE: Motion to adjourn. 14 MS. YIP: Second. 15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, see y'all next month. 16 17 [Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm]