3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION **February 3, 2020**

[Members Present: Jason Branham, Heather Cairns, Stephen Gilchrist, Mettauer Carlisle, Wallace Brown, Sr., Christopher Yonke, Gary Dennis, Jr.; Absent: David Tuttle]

Called to order: 3:10 pm

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: While we're waiting on that let me just say to this Commission thank you for allowing me to serve as your Chairman for this past year and I'm excited about the things that we have not only been able to accomplish but the things that we hope to accomplish as we move into this new decade. And so we, I thank you for your support and your guidance and all of those things that are necessary to be a halfway decent chairman. So anyway, thank you for that support for sure. I was trying to extend the time to see if he'd get here, so he hadn't made it yet, but. So Mr. Price, I guess we can wait for another minute for him to get here. Well, we can - why don't we replace Agenda Item No. IV with No. III and then we'll come back to No. III, how about that? Is that him coming through the door? Well, well. There he is, just in time. We were not gonna go forward without your presence today so thank you for being here. We'll give you a minute to get settled – we have already gone through the public meeting call to order and the public announcement and we're not down to our Election of Officers.

MR. DENNIS: Alright, ready to proceed.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright yes, sir, Okay, next on the Agenda is Item No.

III, Election of Officers. Is there a motion?

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, if I may ask, is it, can we re-elect the existing officers? Can the existing officers be re-elected?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir they can, we just ask that you just take them one at a time.

1 MR. BROWN: I move to the re-election of the current Chairman as Chairman. 2 MS. CAIRNS: I'd second that. 3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that you 4 all will allow me to be your Chairman for at least another year. All in favor signify by 5 raising your hand. MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, 6 7 Dennis. 8 [Approved: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis; Absent: Tuttle] 9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And again, let me thank this Commission for allowing 10 me to serve another year as your Chairman. And I think all of you know that I don't do 11 this well without your help, so thank you for allowing me to do that one more time. Next 12 item, Mr. Brown. 13 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the current Vice-Chair be re-elected as 14 Vice-Chair of the Commission. 15 MR. CARLISLE: Second. 16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, moved and properly seconded that Commission 17 Cairns remains as our Vice-Chair of the Commission. All in favor signify by raising your 18 hand. 19 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, 20 Dennis. 21 [Approved: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis; Absent: Tuttle]

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And again, Ms. Cairns, we thank you so much for your leadership for a number of years, but being my right hand over here. Keeping me straight on this Commission. And is that it, Mr. Price?

MR. PRICE: That's it.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Well moving right along, Agenda Item No. IV, Consent Agenda.

MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, and forgive – I never noticed this wasn't on here and we'll make sure we make this addition on the future Agendas where we can have, for items, changes to the agenda. Case No. 2 under Map Amendments which would be IV C 2, which is Case 19-050 MA, that case has been withdrawn by the Applicant.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Is that the only –

MR. PRICE: And I think you see on your package, well I'm not sure if you actually have it on yours, but Case 19-051 MA, which is Item No. 3., Michael Winkler, has been administratively withdrawn also.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Are there any motions on the Consent Agenda?

MS. CAIRNS: I'd like to offer that with respect to the Consent Agenda, so there's items for which we will not have discussion, remaining on the Consent Agenda is the Approval of the Minutes, the Road Names and Case No. 6, which is 6505 North Main, Case 20-003 MA. So those, all the rest of the items, if you're here, if you didn't hear your item it will be discussed. So what we're gonna do is have a motion for approving that one Map Amendment, the Minutes and the Road Names by consent.

MR. PRICE: Just for the Record, there are no Road Names, that was kinda of a placeholder so there'll be no names for you, so.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you. Is there a motion to approve the Consent 2 Agenda? 3 MR. BROWN: So moved. 4 MS. CAIRNS: Prior to the second I would like to offer that I will actually be 5 recusing myself from voting on the Consent Agenda due to a conflict with a client. 6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Ms. Cairns. Is there a second? 7 MR. DENNIS: Second. 8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, all in favor of approving the Consent Agenda 9 signify by raising your hand. 10 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Branham, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis. 11 [Approved: Branham, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis; Recused: Cairns; 12 Absent: Tuttle] 13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, and Ms. Cairns for the Record recused herself 14 from the Consent Agenda. 15 MS. CAIRNS: Just, with regards to the Map Amendment that was on the Consent Agenda there will be still be the Zoning Public Hearing on the 25th of February. 16 17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Right. Okay, first case. 18 CASE NO. 19-049 MA: 19 MR. PRICE: Okay. First item is Case 19-049 MA. The Applicant is Donald Jones. 20 The Applicant is requesting to rezone property located at 7812 Fairfield Road from 21 Rural zoning to Rural Commercial. The parcel, Staff actually recommends disapproval 22 this request as we feel it's not consistent with the recommendations of the 23 Comprehensive Plan for commercial development, as the proposed request does not

fall within a neighborhood activity nor is it located along a main road corridor within an appropriate distance from the intersection of a primary arterial as recommended by the Comprehensive Plan.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

MR. PRICE: And I'm sure this may come up during discussions, the parcel actually has a commercial structure on it, an office. I believe it was used as an accounting office, and that was approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals in '95, it was Case 95-044 SE. During that, I guess during that version of the zoning ordinance there was a provision that allowed for the Board of Zoning Appeals to allow a commercial use up to 5,000 square feet in the rural area. And so that's how the existing commercial use was there. And also Staff was able to determine that a parcel across the street, I think you'll see it's between Owens Road and Winnsboro Road but it's west of the site, also received a Special Exception request, looks like back in 1980; that would've been Case 80-049 SE, for also the same thing, establishment of a commercial use within a Rural District up to 5,000 square feet.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Price, question for you. Is that Special Exception still –

MR. PRICE: It actually, that provision is no longer there for the Board to grant a use such as that, a commercial use in a rural area. However, all of the ones that received that approval and are currently in operation are deemed to be non-conforming, which means they can remain as such. However, any change of use or expansion of the use would require essentially a rezoning of the property.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. But was that Special Exception extended, I mean, was it a period of time or was it something that was just removed by Council or something?

MR. PRICE: I think what, I think Council looked at it. I can't remember the exact case, I been here for a while, but I believe they determined what was eventually happening was it was establishing commercial uses in the rural area and thus when the other property owners were coming in to potentially rezone they would look at the site and say, well I have commercial next to me, and so it was kind of a bit of a conflict. So they actually removed that provision. I know definitely prior to the adoption of our current Land Development Code in 2004, I think that provision was removed.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, sir. Any other questions for the Staff?

MR. BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure. Mr. Branham.

MR. BRANHAM: So Mr. Price, the commercial use on the subject property, is it continuing or is it terminated?

MR. PRICE: I believe the Applicant could probably answer that. I believe that he's deceased the use of the business as an accounting firm, but I believe that he's no longer carrying on that particular use. And in order for him to change uses this is one of the things that necessitated the rezoning.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: You good, Mr. Branham? Any additional questions for the Staff? The Applicant, Donald Jones? Okay, sir please feel free to share any information you want with us. You have about two minutes to share whatever you'd like to share with the Commission regarding – either podium. We have one on each side so one should be close to everybody.

TESTIMONY OF DONALD G. JONES:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. JONES: Okay. What I'd like to say on this property is that I was in this property for, first of all this old family property to us. That's my sister over there. You know, that has been in our family, gosh since the 1940's. But anyway, I was using, you know, it was rezoned and I used it as my accounting office. And I was the head of the office, I mean, we had other employees and all that worked there. And last year toward the end of January of '19. I decided I'd spent enough time doing accounting and taxes and all that and I wanted to go ahead and retire. And I did do that. In fact I took my CPA certificate down to the State Board of Accountancy and handed it to them, and so did my business partner. So you know, accounting practice is not going on there anymore. Generally the building stays fairly empty most of the time, let me just – not much use for me to go there no more so than anybody else. But I am pleased and proud, I've been trying – at first I tried to just rent the building and I never came up with anything successful that, you know, that I was pleased with having there exactly. What I've got now, and I'm very pleased and proud of this, is that I've got a gentleman from Wyoming, or he's originally from there, he is a doctor of optometry and he's a professional doctor who does eye glasses and, let's see, eye glasses and contact lenses. His name is Dr. Gary White. And he is, he lives right near where Dubbard Bull Road is, which is very, pretty close to my building. And you know, once I'd put the building up for rent he came in and, you know, checked with me, you know, would you be willing to sell it? Yes, so I'm very proud to say that we can actually have a medical, you know, once it's zoned

Rural Commercial then this building would qualify the doctor to be in there as a medical practice. So I'm really proud to say that because our — I've been living in that area since I was nine years old so I know a lot about it, and we could use more excellent medical facilities or, you know, good medical facilities in our area. And with this, you know, if parents have kids that are going to school and they need eye glasses or contact lenses or other problems with their eyes there'd be a professional office, you know, with a medical doctor in it to provide that service right there in our area, which to me would be a real positive thing for our area. We don't have very much medical practices and facilities in this particular area. And so that's why I'm, like I said I'd be very pleased to — and, you know, he's already ready to buy it, ready, willing and able to buy it and put his practice in there. And he has a staff of people that work with him so I'm just saying this would be an excellent thing to add to our community in that area.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Jones. That's all we have signed up to speak. Are there any motions on this case?

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, is this accounting office grandfathered in or what's, I mean, [inaudible] medical and accounting and so forth?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Or is it still non-conforming?

MR. PRICE: It's non-conforming, so essentially it's the same thing as grandfathered in. If someone came in and wanted to establish another accounting firm then they would be allowed to. It's just that the change of use is what necessitates the rezoning.

MR. BROWN: From accounting to medical.

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

1	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is that good, Mr. Wallace? Sure, go right ahead, Mr.
2	Brown.
3	MR. BROWN: How many square feet is that building?
4	MR. PRICE: If you go by the Special Exception, 2,160 square feet.
5	MR. BROWN: May I ask how much parking is available there?
6	MR. PRICE: According to the Special Exception, eight. We can actually, if we
7	need to we can do a street view and look a little closer but according to the Special
8	Exception eight parking spaces would be provided.
9	MR. BROWN: Eight.
10	MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.
11	MR. BROWN: [Inaudible] What kind of medical practice is this, proposed? If I
12	may just ask him?
13	MR. JONES: Optometrist who, you know, does eye glasses and –
14	MR. BROWN: Optometry.
15	MR. JONES: I don't know if you're talking to me or not, but anyway.
16	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: We appreciate it, yes. And I think the gentleman did
17	mention in his comments that it was gonna be optometry. Mr. Branham?
18	MR. BRANHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So the building value then I see on the
19	tax records is about \$103,000 and my understanding is that the building is, was
20	constructed for commercial purposes. Is that correct, Mr. Jones?
21	MR. JONES: Yes, that is correct. Seem like it was somewhere between
22	\$140,000 and \$170,000 to construct the building [inaudible].

MR. BRANHAM: I'm sorry, Mr. Jones. Would you mind stepping up to the microphone for the Record?

MR. JONES: Sure. Right, when the building was constructed I was there to, I'm the one who had it constructed, caused it to be constructed. It, the building costs somewhere between \$140,000 to \$170,000 but this is a lotta years ago. And I know because I borrowed money to have it constructed and paid all of that back, so it was like, I think it was close to \$170,000 in mortgage payments I made and all of that's been, you know, the mortgage has been satisfied at this point. So like I said, it's got, the internal part of the building would be very adept to a medical practice because there are a number of offices in there that are, you know, sectioned off and so you could set up exam rooms and that sorta thing for the optometry practice and I think the only thing that he would need to do is maybe put a couple sinks on some walls in a couple places, you know, in the exam rooms.

MR. BRANHAM: You operated an accounting firm there approximately 25 years?

MR. JONES: I think so, yes. I'm not sure about the 25, I'd have to go back and count it up, but.

MR. BRANHAM: Thank you. Sounded like the Special Exception or whatever we wanna call it was granted in 1995.

MR. JONES: Well then that would be when it was then.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, sir. Mr. Branham, is that good for you? Just a quick question, Mr. Price. Zoning classifications that allow for the usage of medical facility, that also takes in consideration the amount of space we would need for parking purposes, is that right?

MR. PRICE: From a zoning standpoint? No, sir. But a zoning designation is what you're looking at, you know, particularly the Neighborhood Commercial and the Rural Commercial, they do have square footage limitations per parcel. That's the only restriction they may have just strictly from a zoning standpoint.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you for that. That's all I have. I'll accept a motion on this case, Case No. 19-049 MA. Motions? Comments?

MS. CAIRNS: I mean, to weigh in a little bit, I think that, you know, we sort of have to refocus ourselves every once in a while that the rezoning request is not to put a medical [inaudible] into this parcel, the question is whether or not this property should be rezoned to allow any and all uses allowed under Rural Commercial. As the Staff has articulated this particular property as it sits right now doesn't fit. It's situated in a location that we're currently looking at allowing commercial uses [inaudible] I mean, obviously if the, you know, it's got a use an accounting firm so if the proposed use was close enough to accounting we wouldn't be before us, but it is a significant change to go from accounting to a doctor's office, which then necessitated Rural Commercial which allows [inaudible]. So I would send this matter forward to a recommendation of Council of disapproval.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, there's been a motion. Is there a second? Is there a second on this motion?

MR. BRANHAM: Second.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: It's been moved and properly seconded that we send Case No. 19-039 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of disapproval. All in favor signify by raising your hand.

MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Brown, Yonke.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: All opposed?

MR. PRICE: Those opposed: Carlisle, Dennis.

[Approved: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Brown, Yonke; Opposed: Carlisle, Dennis;

Absent: Tuttle]

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And sir, we are a recommending Body to County

Council. They will meet back in these chambers on February 25th so you're welcome to

come back at that time. Thank you sir for being here. Alrighty, Case No. 20-001 MA.

CASE NO. 20-001 MA:

MR. PRICE: The next item, Case 20-001 MA. The Applicant is Robert Giles. The Applicant is requesting to rezone two acres of property that's located at Ohio Street and Olympia Avenue from Residential Multi-family High Density to Neighborhood Commercial, which is NC. Staff, as part of Staff's review of this particular case, of course, we look at the Comprehensive Plan to determine if the requested zoning is in compliance, and in this particular case we also looked at the Capital City Mill District which was adopted for this area, and I believe it was adopted around November 2017, and Planning Commission also had a review of this Capital City Mill District, and it is in compliance with both the Comprehensive Plan and the Capital City Mill District. Thus, Staff has recommended approval of the request.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any questions for the Staff? We have a few people signed up to speak on this case. The Applicant, Mr. Robert Giles? And again -

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT GILES:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. GILES: [Inaudible] Mr. Chairman, if I may refer to my brother Jonathan Giles.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure, Mr. Jonathan come on up to the podium. Please give us your name and your address for the Record.

TESTIMONY OF JONATHAN GILES:

MR. GILES: Thank you. Jonathan Giles, I actually live up in Greenville County, up in Simpsonville, 20 Marquette Road, Simpsonville, 29680. Thank you very much for the opportunity to stand before you this afternoon to talk a little bit about this property. We actually had thought, and I actually had thought when we had gone to rezone this property nine years ago that actually three and four was included in the one out on the point that you don't see right now, but it's right at the very point of Bluff Road and Olympia Avenue there. We had a laundromat that we had there with apartments above it that burned down and to redo it, of course, back when that was built there wasn't current zoning in place. Through the 65+ years of owning this property on this property there's been everything from a Shell gas station to a Dairy Bar to a Chinese restaurant to a dry cleaning plant, laundromat, apartments, everything that's basically in the new current zoning of Neighborhood Commercial that we are seeking to do all this property on. As we met basically nine years ago we did meet with the group, We Are Olympia Group, and we went over the, our plans at that time. It's amazing so many years have passed since then and nothing's been done to the property, but it just looks horrible and we're ready to try to figure out what to do with it. As we've gone to meet with different people, different bankers and all that, it's really hard now to, to get a plan in place without having a clear zoning in place, because of all the restrictions there are today, of

1	course, with setbacks, dealing with water, etc. that wasn't a problem 60 years ago.
2	Anyway, so we're trying to move forward with it now. Thank you for your time. I notice
3	my buzzer went off.
4	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure. Not a problem. Any questions for Mr. Giles?
5	Thank you, sir. Mr. Branham?
6	MR. BRANHAM: I've got a question for Mr. Giles.
7	MR. GILES: Yes.
8	MR. BRANHAM: Do you own those four parcels that are subject to this
9	application or does Mr. Robert Giles?
10	MR. GILES: Yes, it's in the family, Robert Giles family, yes.
11	MR. BRANHAM: So it's commonly held, the title to the piece on the point of Bluff
12	and Olympia and the parcels that are subject to this application.
13	MR. GILES: Yes, except for – let me just be clear on one – except for the one
14	that's #2, which is Amy Koon. Amy has asked that while we're doing this that we also
15	move forward to have hers rezoned at the same time. Again, to be able to come back to
16	not only people to find out what we can do there but also to go back to the, the We Are
17	Olympia Group and talk to them and all as well as we agreed years ago that we would
18	keep them involved in it as well.
19	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional questions for the Applicant? Thank you,
20	Mr. Giles.
21	MR. GILES: Thank you for your time.
22	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sherry Jaco? Please give us your name and your
23	address for the Record.

TESTIMONY OF SHERRY JACO:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. JACO: Hello. My name is Dr. Sherry Jaco. I am the director of the Olympia Grandby Mill Village Museum that's located at 1170 Olympia Avenue. My home address is 163 Emerald Lake Road in Richland County, 29209. I'm here, of course, it pains me to be here because I know these gentlemen, I have looked at this property for the last 75 years of my life every day. I certainly understand the dilemma that this family is in, however, I am here today representing the We Are Olympia community organization. When we first saw these notices go up two weeks ago we tried to get in touch with the family, we were very interested in trying to find out what some information was. I contacted Mr. Giles' son in Utah, he told me his sister's address, Mr. Giles' sister's address. I talked with her on the phone, she gave me some phone numbers that I tried to contact last week and have not been able to talk with them about this. As I said, I am here representing the Olympia community. The Olympia community is actually under threat for hanging on to the historic significance that we have, it's an immediate threat. We've been inundated by, we're under siege basically from commercial development and USC student housing that has come. Our concern as a community organization is we thought there should be some dialogue. When we met with our community organization which meets the second Monday of, excuse me, the third Monday of every month, and we met once these signs went up, there was discussion at our meeting and we were saying, what is going on, no one from the Giles family has contacted us, we don't have any information. So therefore we are respectfully requesting that you postpone decision on this possibly for 30 days until we would have a chance to talk with

the Giles family and have them meet with our community organization. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Ms. Jaco. Viola Henley? And please give us your name and address for the Record.

TESTIMONY OF VIOLA HENLEY:

MS. HENLEY: Sure. My name's Viola Henley, I live at 104 Alabama Street in the Olympia community, 29201. Honorable Planning Commission Members, the Capital City Mill District plan was adopted in 2017. Three historic houses are at risk on that property as you can see before you, calls for protection of the Mill Village character will not be afforded with this Neighborhood Commercial zoning. The current code from high density residential to neighborhood commercial may meld with the urban core mixed residential to be presented for approval in the fall, however, the neighborhood commercial is listed as a tertiary use in the new proposed guidelines to be approached in the fall. As the Applicant hasn't shared plans as to what he plans to do with the property we ask that you postpone until new code ordinances are brought before Council for approval providing further protections as outlined in the Capital City Mill District Plan. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you. That's all we have signed up to speak. Mr. Price? The – this was a plan that was the partnership between the City and the County, is that right?

MR. PRICE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: The City actually led most of that, is that –

1 MR. PRICE: I'm gonna let Mr. Crooks, Brian Crooks speak on that. I think he was 2 a little more involved with this particular. 3 MR. CROOKS: Brian Crooks. Yes, sir, my understanding is that most of this 4 planned development had taken place before my arrival, but a lot of it was – so it was a 5 joint partnership with County and the City. So a lot of their input from this plan also 6 includes input from City partners as well. But in terms of adoption and input it was a joint 7 venture, yes. 8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. And it was formally adopted in 2017? 9 MR. CROOKS: 2017 in November, looks like November 14th. 10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. The day after my birthday, okay great. Ms. 11 Cairns? 12 MS. CAIRNS: In terms of the fact that, you know, the County is in the process of 13 a Code rewrite, but it would be, I mean, maybe this is for Mr. Price, most likely this 14 particular area would simply have the recently adopted plan incorporated within 15 [inaudible] separately. 16 MR. PRICE: Correct. 17 MS. CAIRNS: Is it correct that within the joint plan that not only is it zoning but it's 18 also sorta development character that requires that any and all new development under 19 that has a character that reflects the Olympia Mill neighborhood. 20 MR. PRICE: Yes. 21

22

23

MS. CAIRNS: You know, I would just like to sort of offer that, kinda piggybacking over some of the discussion from the last one, is that it is typical that, it is common that an applicant comes in and has a very specific use that they're wanting to incorporate

1 within the property. And while we listen and respect that, the reality is our decision 2 cannot and should not include that because rezoning requests are for a use category 3 under Neighborhood Commercial, which this request is for, would allow a number of 4 uses. So even if the Applicant were to offer that the use will be A, there's no effect of 5 that. I mean, it may become A, it could become B, C or D for all kinds of reasons, and 6 there's no, that's not a problem. So when we rezone it, we rezone for a variety of uses 7 and so we have to look at all those variety of uses for its compatibility with the 8 neighborhood. So I understand the desire to wanna know what's going in, but that's 9 simply not the way our system of zoning and land use works. Right, wrong or indifferent, 10 it's just the way it is. 11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Ms. Cairns, are you finished? Okay. Mr. Brown? No, 12 she's finished. 13 MR. BROWN: Was the City involved with any of this development? Is this 14 connecting with the City's development? 15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I think Mr. Crooks -16 MR. CROOKS: Could you repeat that question, Mr. Brown? 17 MR. BROWN: Is this particular site connected in with any of the City 18 development? 19 MR. CROOKS: Are you asking is it part of the, of any City's jurisdiction? 20 MR. BROWN: Yes, sir. 21 MR. CROOKS: Not at this point in time. No, sir. 22 MR. BROWN: It's totally –

1 MR. CROOKS: If you look at the screen right now, it is directly across from the 2 incorporated area. So that right-of-way on the back side along Bluff Road is part of the 3 City's jurisdiction. So that piece of the, I believe that's the Orchard, that is within the 4 City. Anyway, none of the sites that are currently in question are within the City at this 5 point in time, no. 6 MR. BROWN: The City would have no interest. 7 MR. CROOKS: That would be a question for the City, that's not something that -8 MR. BROWN: But you haven't had any conversations – 9 MR. CROOKS: I haven't spoken with anyone from the City about this. I haven't 10 received any information from them about it. 11 MS. CAIRNS: I think it's important to understand that the plan that we're referring 12 to that was adopted in 2017, because the Olympia neighborhood is a very, I mean, a lot 13 of it's in the County, a lot of it's in the City, but the recognition of it as a neighborhood 14 ignores that as a rule. And so that was why there was a joint plan done between the 15 County and the City so that development in this area would be done under a singular 16 vision. So while the City of Columbia doesn't have any authority over this, these parcels 17 because they're in the County, the guiding land use plan and development pattern will 18 be under the jointly adopted County and City plan. 19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Right, no I get that. I guess my question, so prior to 20 2017, was that still the case? 21 MR. CROOKS: I, rephrase that question, Mr. Chair. 22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well, I mean, Ms. Cairns has made a great point that

once the plan was adopted in 2017 obviously it was –

23

2 t 3 v 4 i

MR. CROOKS: I think that was part of the intent, yes. I think kind of the history of this goes back a little bit, there's been, even before 2017 there was discussions earlier with different Councilmembers, community members, as much as I'm aware. But I think it's trying to get to that shared vision where this is an area that's heavily City, also heavily County. You know, if you look at kinda the service provision area this is definitely a donut hole area, so an area that, you know, pock-marked with City, pock-marked with County, and then Olympia as a whole as just greater unincorporated area that's within the City itself. So it's one of those things where it's our most urban area within the County surrounded by the City. So trying to get that greater vision where it's kinda this unique little pocket of itself versus something like the northeast or the northwest where it's truly more suburban or rural, so getting that unique vision for this unique area.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any additional questions for Staff? Thank you, sir.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible]

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Ma'am, I'm sorry we've closed the public hearing on it, thank you though. Alright folks, I'll accept a motion on this case.

MR. BRANHAM: I just wanna confirm again, so this is the common owner of the point parcel, the parcel that is triangular shaped right next to it which is already zoned NC, kind of looking to expand that same zoning designation to these adjacent parcels with common ownership.

MR. PRICE: Is that a question?

MR. BRANHAM: And so, I mean, I'm just reading again through the Capital City Mill District information in the application. It references certain appropriate opportunities for small and medium scale redevelopment or infill sites. I mean, right now my understanding is just kinda that point parcel is undeveloped, it's burned down, whatever. So that's kind of one way that I'm looking at it is just facilitating redevelopment or infill [inaudible].

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, that was part of my question and concern is that if we're going to do anything jointly between Columbia [inaudible].

MS. CAIRNS: The cooperation between the City and County occurred and the plan has been adopted, so it's not that the City of Columbia is showing interest in this parcel or anything, we have, we the County and we the City adopted a master plan for this region. That's what happened in 2017 so that plan has been adopted.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: So let me ask you a question, Mr. Price. In the current rewrite that we're going through will it have a Capital City Mill District designation?

MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chairman, so what is currently proposed is kinda a blanket overlay district that would be applied to it. However, those, for those individual areas, such as this case and I'll even turn on kinda the neighborhood improvement area, there will be specific zoning standards and criteria that's gonna be listed based off of that plan. It still would have to go through, as well as every other area in the County, a rezoning process but that could potentially be part of it. Another way to look at it, too, is if there are certain overlay just general guidelines, just depending on how the public input goes and y'alls and Council's direction, you know, that could turn into something

else. But the idea right now is to kinda have something unique to each individual master planned area.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, sir. Alright the Chair will entertain a motion.

MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair, I make a motion to send Case No. 20-001 MA to Council with a recommendation for approval.

MR. CARLISLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we send Case No. 20-001 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval. Any discussion? All in favor signify by raising your hand?

MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis.

[Approved: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis; Absent: Tuttle CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And again, we are a recommending Body to County Council and they will meet back in these chambers again on February the 25th. Thank you all so much for being here. We'll give everybody a minute to – go right ahead, Mr. Price? Okay, next case? 20-002 MA.

CASE NO. 20-002 MA:

MR. DELAGE: Alright, so our next case is 20-002 MA. The Applicant is Tommy Wood. The location is 7220 Frost Avenue. It is a 1.46 acre tract currently zoned Residential Single-family Medium Density District. The Applicant is proposing a rezoning to the GC, General Commercial District. And the current Comprehensive Plan designation for that area is neighborhood medium density. The desired development pattern is essentially for primary uses in this area is medium density, residential

1	neighborhoods designed to provide a mix of residential uses and densities within
2	neighborhoods. Neighborhoods should be connected and be designed using traditional
3	grid or modified grid designs with non-residential uses designed to be easily accessible
4	to surrounding neighborhoods and via multiple transportation modes. Staff recommends
5	disapproval of this map amendment as it would not be consistent with the
6	recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan for non-residential development.
7	Additionally, it states that the commercial usage should be located within a
8	neighborhood activity center and the proposed request does not fall within that
9	neighborhood activity center.
10	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any questions for the Staff on this case? Yes,
11	sir, Mr. Branham?
12	MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair, does the Staff have any insight regarding the history
13	of the surrounding parcels which have been zoned General Commercial?
14	MR. PRICE: If you look on page 25 I think the only one that we've referenced is
15	for Case 93-018 MA, which – and those were rezoned to General Commercial. And of
16	course, across the street is a PDD, Richardson Construction. Those are the main ones
17	that we have a record of that go into the history of the other parcels that are zoned
18	General Commercial.
19	MR. BRANHAM: Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, any additional questions for the Staff? We have
21	a couple people signed up to speak. Tommy Wood, the Applicant? And please give us

TESTIMONY OF TOMMY WOOD:

your name and address for the Record.

22

23

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

1718

40

19

20 21

22

23

MR. WOOD: Thank you, sir. I'm Tommy Wood, the Applicant. I reside in Richland County at 78 Hama Court, Irmo, South Carolina. We request, I'm requesting that we go to General Commercial here. I believe it's self-evident that the planning, the comprehensive planning that would be coming forth would take this to be commercial. The portion of Monticello Road here is a five-lane commercial highway near the interstate and there's commercial development all up and down it. As you've already pointed out directly across the street, and this property, I actually own six acres there, I'm only asking to rezone one and a half of it, the portion of it that's on the corner of Monticello and Frost because it already abuts two other properties that are General Commercial. And so my intent is to build a owner-occupied warehouse and small office for my solar business. It'd be less than 5,000 square feet, and again owner-occupied with access off of Frost Avenue. My intent is to build a second building beside it just like it for rental income. So because of the size of these buildings the nature of it would be businesses like mine, say refrigeration, heating and air businesses, things like that that are gonna fit in a 5,000 square foot office warehouse. So for those reasons I would request that we go General Commercial here. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you Mr. Woods. Are there any questions for the Applicant? Any questions for Mr. Wood? Thank you, sir. Pat Vinson? Again, please give us your name and your address for the Record, please.

TESTIMONY OF PAT VINSON:

MR. VINSON: I'm Pat Vinson. I live at 7323 Monticello Road, which is right up the road from where this location is. I just, again I'm not sure I'm against it because I don't know what he's planning and what was going on, but some questions have arisen.

He's talking about a business there. Will he have trucks coming in and out? And you know, and I guess he's gonna use the part facing Monticello Road rather than further down, cause it goes all the way to Bishop Avenue I believe. And that's about all my concerns. And the other thing is has he said anything to the neighborhood association up there? The Denny Terrace Neighborhood Association.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, sir. David Jenkins?

MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, just for the, make sure for the Record they understand the entire almost six acre tract is not subject to this request. This request only pertains to 1.46 acres of the site, so it does not go all the way back into the community all the way to Bishop Avenue I believe as stated.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Price. Mr. Jenkins?

TESTIMONY OF DAVID JENKINS:

MR. JENKINS: Hi, I'm Pastor David Jenkins. We own land in that particular — CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Pastor, if you'd give us your address as well, please? MR. JENKINS: Yes, okay. Our church is at 14, excuse me, 7020 Frost Avenue. We own about 20, a little over 26 acres of land in that particular area, which would be right down the street from where Tommy is talking about building that land. In light of everything that has taken place in that particular area, in light of everything that CIU is also doing in the area, I would favor him having that building built there. I'm for it.

Tommy, not only that he's a part of our church, he's been there for, a part of our church for about 14 or so years. I've known Tommy for over 23 years, Tommy is a person of honesty, truth and integrity. What he says he does, I've known that for some time. But I'm in favor of that and I just wanted to make that known.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, sir.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: John Gregory?

TESTIMONY OF JOHN GREGORY:

MR. GREGORY: Hey, John Gregory. Good afternoon, Planning Commission. I reside in Richland County as well at 1220 Brentwood Drive. My relation to this parcel is I am the commercial agent for Tommy and helped him acquire this property back at the end of 2017. Work locally for NAI Columbia here in town. And over the last, initially he bought it just cause he wanted to hold the land, but again his solar business, he wants to build the structure for that on the front acre and a half. When we met with Geo he did make it known that the current plan called for that to be a more medium density corridor, but he also admitted to the fact that, you know, some commercial properties are up and down that corridor and so per the current use he was gonna disapprove it but just hoping to come up here. And think that the planned development would fit in with the corridor. The access would be off of Frost so we wouldn't be adding any traffic pulling on and off of Monticello, but it'd be a single access that would meet minimum DOT requirements to get access into that. And just knowing the nature of his business, I mean, I would think it'd be minimal traffic, probably a truck a week or so and not a big truck but just some sort of drop off truck for his products that get delivered there. The nature of his business in installing solar panels on rooftops, commercial businesses and also on the ground. We've also talked, like David said, some with the neighborhood. Certainly understand Mr. Vinson's concerns with the access and if he would've thought it was going all the way Bishop – we strategically don't want to ask for this all the way to

Bishop cause we don't wanna intrude into the neighborhood, so only asking for the front portion on Frost and Monticello. Thank y'all.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, sir. That's all we have signed up to speak on this case. Are there any motions?

MS. CAIRNS: I would offer looking at this particular request, notwithstanding the offers of the exact use, that looking at Monticello Road and what's already been rezoned in that area for commercial practically, I mean, Richardson Construction almost looks like it's an industrial. You say it's PUD but it shows as a GC on our map. It's a PUD that's in essence like a GC?

MR. PRICE: It's a Planned Development for a construction business.

MS. CAIRNS: But I mean, I would offer that notwithstanding the Staff recommendation that this is not consistent with the Comp Plan, I think that when you zone in on this level of detail within this area that rezoning the front acre and a half plus or minus that fronts on Monticello Road for this parcel is an appropriate activity. And I guess, so the reasons going against Staff recommendation is the existing development pattern, the existence of General Commercial within the area, and the fact that the request is not – one, I don't feel that it's unduly stretching commercial down a road that doesn't already have it, and two, I don't feel that it's penetrating residential neighborhoods in that I think it's consistent with the development pattern and probably the best use for this property for the area and the community. So I make a motion that we send project 20-002 MA forward to County Council with a recommendation of approval.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is there a second?

MR. BRANHAM: Second.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: It's been moved and properly seconded that we send Case No. 20-002 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval pending the recommendation from Commissioner Cairns. Were y'all able to get that, Staff?

MR. PRICE: That's why we record it, yes I did.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional discussion? All in favor signify by raising your hand.

MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis.

[Approved: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis; Absent: Tuttle]

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay and again, we are a recommending Body to County Council. We meet back in these chambers on February the 25th and you're welcome – we don't but Council does – and we welcome you to come back at that time. Thank you. Next case.

CASE NO. 20-004 MA:

MR. PRICE: Alright next item is Case 20-004 MA. The Applicant is Deborah Stratton. The location is 4133 Clemson Road. The Applicant is looking to rezone 2.17 acres from Rural zoning to Neighborhood Commercial, NC. Staff recommends approval of this request. As stated, we principally recommend approval because, you know, technically this is within the neighborhood, a neighborhood activity center and that particular designation does support the requested zoning. I think just one of the concerns that Staff had on looking at it was it's a flag lot with very limited access to Clemson Road. So you almost could view this almost like a land-locked parcel. And

1	there was some concerns about potentially encroachment into this area because it
2	really hasn't been defined. I think we've had discussions regarding this particular area.
3	You know, at one time this was clearly a rural area but I guess as time has gone on this
4	area is developed and you're looking at the widening and improvements on
5	Hardscrabble Road and the previous improvements along Clemson Road it's kinda of
6	changed this particular area. So we're still trying to make a determination of exactly
7	which direction to take it. But one of our concerns was that it would, this could be
8	deemed to be an encroachment into a residentially developed area, however, there's
9	concerns with Staff that we've noticed that some of the rural parcels that will be abutting
10	this use are not being used residentially. Yet we have no records of them making these
11	parcels commercial so, I'm kinda getting off a bit but there was a lot that went in with
12	this particular decision but we typically, as we stated previously we go by what the
13	Comprehensive Plan recommends for an area, but at times we do like to point out that
14	it's not just extremely clean on some of our recommendations and we, we normally we
15	throw in that principally and we just ask that you take a look at this maybe a little more
16	as you get ready to make your recommendation.
17	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional questions for the Staff?

MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Branham?

MR. BRANHAM: The parcel that's to the front of the flag lot that's currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial, it appears to have [inaudible] property?

MR. PRICE: Yes. That parcel was, it was previously a residential use and when it was rezoned it became, if we're looking on here, it became a rheumatology center. And

I guess they kept the pool, we didn't look in the back of the property when we did our site visit, but maybe they just kept the pool there as part of the development of that site.

MS. CAIRNS: Question. What is the width of that flag?

MR. CROOKS: Ms. Cairns, the road frontage for the flag looks to be about 16, 17', somewhere along those lines.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional questions for Staff? Thank you, Mr. Crooks. We have a couple persons signed up to speak. The Applicant, Ms. Deborah Stratton? Please give us your name and your address for the Record, please.

TESTIMONY OF DEBORAH STRATTON:

MS. STRATTON: Hello, I'm Deborah – you have to excuse my cold today – I'm Deborah Stratton, I am the agent for my client who's purchased this property. I work for Coldwell Banker, 1711 Gervais Street. My client is, as you see the rheumatology is Neighborhood Commercial, if you go to the left, to the very next adjoining property, do you see that one, that is also Neighborhood Commercial, that one. And that one is also owned by the gentleman who purchased this specific piece of property so he will have the 17' access on the other side of the rheumatology and then he also has those other two .8 acres or [inaudible] acres right there. So it'll be an L-shaped piece of property. Now the other part's already been approved Neighborhood Commercial. When this property came up for sale he purchased it also, it will allow more uses for offices, maybe a veterinarian, you know, storage units, all kinds of different things that are used by that community, or would be used. I'm sorry, I've got a bad cough.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: No, you're doing great. Alright, is there anything else you would like to share with us?

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Anything else you wanna share with us, Mr. Hall?

MS. STRATTON: You know, other than it was on the market for two years, if someone didn't want it to be – it was being sold and advertised as commercial. Unfortunately, the seller didn't realize they had to come in; they thought since everything else on Clemson Road was going commercial they could just go commercial, but that's why we're here today is to get approval for Neighborhood Commercial.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any questions for the Applicant? Thank you, Ms. Stratton.

MS. STRATTON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. William Hall? Please give us your name and your address for the Record.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM HALL:

MR. HALL: Alright. I'm Mr. Hall, 2217 Clemson Road, lot 22. And I'm here today to speak for lot 23 and 22. And what we're concerned about here is we have, I'm on the left side and she's on the right side, and we have two lanes going in on this premises here. And each one of them is 25' and this is deeded property. And these two lots, these two roads here is for the lot behind me, lot that I, 30 and lot 29 or either they got it as 41, 33. And that's 25' and they wanna go commercial, okay? And there's no water and there's no sewerage on either one of these. And they will have to get permission from the State Highway Department to put sewer on this one that's been sold and water also, and they've only got 25' of road. And I don't see how they can go commercial on 25' single lane road cause this is the only access they got to that land. That's deeded property and they bought that with the lot when they bought it, the road.

MR. HALL: That's all.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, sir. That's all we have signed up to speak. Any discussion, motions?

MR. BRANHAM: Question for the Staff. [Inaudible] representation regarding the parcel's present zoning?

MR. PRICE: It is zoned Neighborhood Commercial.

MS. CAIRNS: Which parcel is?

MR. PRICE: The parcel that's highlighted. Excuse me, with the aqua blue borders going around it right now that Mr. DeLage has the hand on. That one's Neighborhood Commercial as is the parcel to the east of it with the rheumatology center, it's Neighborhood Commercial.

MS. CAIRNS: What's interesting I feel is if we're sort of, I mean, I know the interplay between pulling permits and zoning cause, I mean, my feeling would be that I could never support this parcel being rezoned Neighborhood Commercial if all it had was 17' of frontage cause I feel that that would just make it fundamentally impossible to support that use. At the same time, you know, we've never had a situation where it's like a rezoning is contingent on the joining of parcels, so then I fall back on the fact that, well if it got rezoned and you couldn't put the road in there, you know, it's just odd. I mean, so I – but you know, Staff is now offering that the parcel highlighted on our graphic is indeed already zoned Neighborhood Commercial. I mean, I find Clemson Road to be one of those challenging roads right now that we have in the County. There's a fair amount of commercial use, I don't like the sprawling of commercial use without, and down resident, down roads. This one seems to have already a significant amount of

development on it. I'll just listen to others, I'm not prepared to make any motion or anything.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Ms. Cairns. Additional discussion?

MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair, yes.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Branham?

MR. BRANHAM: I see two churches to the backside of the subject parcel that front on Hardscrabble, and then another church [inaudible] the other side of [inaudible]. I know we're just a recommending Body so [inaudible] make a recommendation that [inaudible].

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Go right ahead, sure.

MS. CAIRNS: I mean, my thought is that – but I mean, I don't think that we can say that you have to combine with respect to zoning. I think that what my issue was, that if we were to rezone a parcel that only had a 17' piece of frontage, we basically rezoned something into such a manner that it can't be used for its zoning, because I don't think there's any way that you could put commercial property, even Neighborhood Commercial which is not General Commercial which matters in this situation. But the fact that the Applicant has in essence offered, don't worry about that, here's our solution, and I'm like, okay cause otherwise we'd be rezoning something I think into a dysfunctional state. So I think that since this is a request for Neighborhood Commercial and not General Commercial, I think that also does matter in how it fits [inaudible] neighboring areas.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional comments? Alright, so the penny improvements run, is it all the way past this particular piece of property, heading toward

1	I77? Well, I guess the question is, are there any, there are no more improvements on
2	that side of the, Clemson Road, is that right?
3	MR. PRICE: No.
4	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.
5	MR. PRICE: On page 43 of your packet it does state that the County Penny has
6	two improvement projects listed for Clemson Road, and that includes sidewalks from
7	Longtown Road to Market Place Commons and bicycle lanes currently proposed as
8	restriping. But they're currently in the design phase. But those would be the
9	improvements.
10	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright. Are there any motions for this particular
11	case?
12	MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I'll go ahead and make a motion. I think based on the
13	discussion and my concern of the lack of frontage sorta being addressed by the
14	Applicant, that I feel that we should send Case 20-004 MA forward to Council with a
15	recommendation of approval.
16	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, is there a second?
17	MR. CARLISLE: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any discussion? Alright, it's been moved and properly
19	seconded that we send Case No. 20-004 MA forward to Council with a recommendation
20	of approval. All in favor signify by raising your hand.
21	MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke,
22	Dennis.
23	[Approved: Branham, Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis; Absent: Tuttle]

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And all opposed? And again, we're a recommending Body to County Council. They will meet back in these chambers on the 25th of February, so feel free to come back at that time. Thank you. Next case.

CASE NO. 20-005 MA:

MR. PRICE: Okay. Our final map amendment is Case 20-005 MA. The Applicant, Angie Dodson, is requesting to rezone about 1.46 acres located at 1526 Leesburg Road from Neighborhood Commercial, NC, to General Commercial, GC. Staff recommends, again let me throw that word out there for you, principally recommends disapproval cause this falls within the neighborhood medium density future land use designation and that the proposed request is not located along a main road corridor or within an appropriate distance from the intersection of a primary arterial, and you know, as recommended by the Comprehensive Plan for this particular designation. However, it does front along Leesburg Road and a number of the parcels in this particular area are also zoned GC and that, just to point out for the Record that the rezoning would be compatible with the adjacent properties in these areas.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Questions for Staff?

MR. BRANHAM: So, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir?

MR. BRANHAM: The report indicates original zoning from 1977 was GC? Back in the zoning history or the background. And then how did it move from that to NC?

MR. PRICE: We apologize. Looking at it that may have just been a typo. We'll go back and take a look, but our records do show that the current zoning of the parcel is Neighborhood Commercial so we'd have to kinda go back and see why that change

would've occurred. Again, I probably will attribute that to being a typo on our part so my apologies.

MR. BRANHAM: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Branham. Additional comments for the Staff? Have a couple persons signed up to speak. Again, when we call your name please give us your name and your address for the Record. Angie Dodson, the Applicant?

TESTIMONY OF ANGIE DODSON:

MS. DODSON: Yes, sir. Hi, thank you. Angie Dodson, 717 Moss Creek Drive, Cayce, South Carolina 29033. And I am on behalf of the owners, they are an elderly couple, I am their realtor as well as their friend. When I marketed this property I did market it as General Commercial due to the client thought, she told me back in the 1970s it was General Commercial and somehow it was rezoned to Neighborhood Commercial. It has been that, I think, for a while from what I can see on the records. And they are an elderly couple so she was a bit confused. And we do have an offer now and we are asking for approval for General Commercial for this property. And I understand that the recommendation was disapproval, but however it does go in flow with all the other properties that are right surrounding this property and adjacent across the street from the property.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

MS. DODSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you.

MR. BRANHAM: Can I ask a question, Mr. Chair?

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir. 2 MR. BRANHAM: Ms. Dodson, do you mind stepping back up? 3 MS. DODSON: Yes. 4 MR. BRANHAM: One of the factors that we're asked to consider is the need and 5 the justification for the requested change. Can you elaborate on that? 6 MS. DODSON: For? 7 MR. BRANHAM: Why do we need to rezone this from Neighborhood Commercial 8 to General Commercial? 9 MS. DODSON: Due to the type of business that the offer, the buyer who has the 10 offer in, he would need it General Commercial for the type of business he would have 11 there. 12 MR. BRANHAM: Okay, thank you. 13 MS. DODSON: Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Betham Reed? Is that right? 15 MR. REED: Yes, sir. 16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, good. 17 TESTIMONY OF BETHAM REED: 18 MR. REED: I'm Betham Reed, 861 East Liberty Street in Sumter, South Carolina 19 29153. I'm the one buying the property and the reason for General Commercial is I'm 20 planning on doing a little equipment rental business there. And, but this road, it's over 21 25,000 cars a day, they're about to widen Leesburg as far as I understand. The 22 properties on both the left and right are General Commercial and the properties all 23 across the street are General Commercial. And it's in line with, you know, the other

Those opposed

MR. PRICE: Those opposed: Branham.

properties around being General Commercial, and I just don't see it, you know, ever really going back to residential or anything like that, being the traffic count on that road and with them widening it and everything. And it's real close to 77 also.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, sir. That's all we have signed up to speak.

Any discussion on this case?

MS. CAIRNS: I'll speak up once again. I'll just simply offer that I'm gonna make a motion for approval. The reason for a variance from the Staff recommendation is that I feel that this is sort of bringing this parcel almost into conformity with its neighboring parcels. I mean, it's almost as if the Neighborhood Commercial is almost an arbitrary distinction without a difference; the existence of General Commercial in this block, particularly in this block on Leesburg Road. So I would make a motion that we send Case 20-005 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval based on, you know, differing from the Staff was again, getting into this level of detail that this is pulling this parcel into consistency with its neighbors.

MR. BROWN: Second.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we send Case No. 20-005 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval based upon Ms. Cairns' recommendation. Any discussion? All in favor signify by raising your hand.

MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: All opposed?

[Approved: Cairns, Gilchrist, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis; Opposed; Branham;

Absent: Tuttle]

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And again, we are a recommending Body to County Council. They will meet back in these chambers on the 25th of February, you're welcome to come back at that time. Okay? Thank you. I think that is all of the map amendments.

MR. PRICE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, Other Business?

MR. PRICE: I don't think we have any. I know, Mr. Chair, you and I have, I believe we probably spoke about this earlier, but just to state for the Record, we have, the Planning Commission is actually, you know, a nine—member body and so we're, they're still doing interviews for one of the vacant positions and also I think we have two positions that have, the term is technically expired but the couple of members have, so far have agreed to continue to serve until such time as appointments have been made. And so just always wanna thank, you know, Mr. Brown and also Mr. Tuttle, who was unable to be here today, for you know, just continuing to serve until such time — I can't tell you when, at this point when their services or somebody will be appointed to this position, but I just wanna thank them for continuing to serve.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well, we certainly appreciate that, Mr. Brown and Mr. Tuttle, for continuing to serve and we need you to serve and we don't want you to leave but we know at some point that will be the case. So thank you for your continued service for sure. And we were just chatting about that a little bit earlier, just we'll keep

tabs on what Council plans to do as we move forward. And I think there's a vacancy, is that right, Mr. Price?

MR. PRICE: Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: That we have to address as well. So we'll certainly keep you posted on those developments. Anything else on Other Business?

MR. PRICE: No.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Chairman's Report, just want to welcome everybody back to another decade. And thank you again for asking me to serve as your Chairman for another year. I'm excited about what I think this year holds for us, particularly as we get an update on where we are with the Code rewrite, and more specifically what's happening with that. Also I wanted to just remind Staff and share with the Planning Commission, there is a designation that I think the last time we had our Planning Commission meeting I mentioned to you all that the federal government has come up with this designation for development within communities and counties all across this Country regarding something called Opportunity Zones. Opportunity Zones is, the quick two minute version, it's an opportunity to do development within areas that have been designated through census track by every state's governor to address low income blight. And so as a consequence of that a company or an individual can choose to make an investment in these areas to do housing development or commercial development or whatever the case may be by deferring capital gains. So obviously a company or an individual that has significant gain, this is a no brainer for many of those folk. I think at the time we talked about this before treasury had not released the final regs, but in December the regulations had been, are not released and local governments are

certainly trying to figure out what that means. But I think I mentioned back last year that as we think about our rewrite, this is, this designation is one of those things that I think certainly is beneficial as we think about what the Code will look like in the County going forward. And I would ask the Staff to begin to research whether or not we should have a Code designated Opportunity Zones within Richland County. I think it certainly helps with the interest of development in the County, both commercial development and housing development and any other development. But I certainly think it begins to highlight areas where there has been blight, historical blight, and this may be another added opportunity to be able to address that. So anyway, I'll be happy to share more about that with you if we need to have a conversation about it, but I do think it's, you know, and I'll be happy to bring some information back to the Commission so that you guys can dive into it. Then the last thing that I want to go ahead and get scheduled this year is our little Planning Retreat so that we can plan that early this year. I think that's been a very good thing and you guys did a great, Staff did an awesome job in helping us to put that together, but if we can plan it early and can make sure that it's on all of our calendars we can make sure that we are there in full numbers and able to participate, so. I think that's all that I had. I didn't know y'all were gonna vote me back as Chairman so I didn't put too much down on my list today, so. But next month I'll have a much larger list. So anyway, thank you for being here today and we'll keep you posted on some of these things. Alright, anything else?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. PRICE: Yeah, I noticed, okay under the Planning Director's Report, his report but, that was not included as part of your package. I think kind of enjoying that

14

15

16

18

17

19

20 21

22

23

month off, so I apologize but you will have the report from the Actions of Council in your next Agenda for December and also February.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: No, we get it. So what's, and I guess that's what I should've asked during the Chairman's Report. What's the update on the rewrite? I mean, do we know kind of where we are?

MR. DELAGE: So Mr. Chairman, basically the consultants have sent a, basically a rough draft of essentially everything that was there and questions that they had. Staff took a look at that, checked for typos, things of that nature, and then sent it back to the consultants so they can kinda flesh out those areas that they had questions for. So the result of that will be our, basically what'll be released to the public for input. That is not in a hardened schedule right now, but shooting for a March timeframe, probably with those meetings, we have stuff that's kind of penned in, but you know, of course we wanna make sure that we give folks enough time. But the idea is that should be turned around fairly quickly by Clarion and then released out for public comments with those stakeholders coming near the end of March.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well, we should have a new Code this year.

MR. DELAGE: Ideally, yes. So we would definitely like to have one by the end of this year, actually by the middle of this year, if possible, but.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Fantastic. Thank you all so much for the work that you've been doing on that and we'll stay tuned. Alright, that's all I have. Anything else, Mr. Price? Motion to adjourn?

MR. BROWN: So moved.

MS. CAIRNS: Second.