

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
May 18, 2022

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING

[Members Present: Jason Branham, Christopher Yonke, John Metts, Gary Dennis, Bryan Grady, Beverly Frierson; Unsure/heard no response at roll call: Gilchrist, Carlisle, Taylor]

Called to order: _____

CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, thank you everyone. I'd like to call this meeting to order. This is the Richland County Planning Commission. Today is Wednesday, May 18th, 2022, and this is a work session so there won't be any, there are no action items on the Agenda. There won't be any votes taken to take action, and as a result will be no public input today. There will be public input opportunities at future hearings before any [inaudible] by this Commission. Just as a matter of housekeeping, I wanted to ask Staff to please confirm that the notice requirements under the Freedom of Information Act and our Rules of Civil Procedure have been complied with for this work session.

MR. CROOKS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you, Mr. Crooks. [Inaudible] Alright, and if we can also take roll, please?

MR. CROOKS: Alright. Yonke?

MR. YONKE: Aye.

MR. CROOKS: Carlisle?

MR. CARLISLE: [Inaudible]

MR. CROOKS: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Present.

MR. CROOKS: Metts?

1 MR. METTS: Here.

2 MR. CROOKS: Grady?

3 MR. GRADY: Here.

4 MR. CROOKS: Taylor?

5 MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible]

6 MR. CROOKS: Gilchrist?

7 MR. GILCHRIST: [Inaudible]

8 MR. CROOKS: Branham?

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Present.

10 MR. CROOKS: Dennis?

11 MR. DENNIS: Here.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: We do have a quorum. Alright, are there any motions
13 for additions or deletions to the Agenda? Alright. Hearing none we'll move to Item IV of
14 the Agenda which is the 2021 Land Development Code process, obviously now
15 extending into your 2022. For general informational purposes for anybody who may not
16 have caught it, there was a County Council meeting yesterday evening. The Land
17 Development Code process was an agenda item, however, and it was up for a second
18 reading, the motion being, I believe it was Mr. Malinowski's motion to start the mapping
19 process, which at our last work session the Planning Commission already expressed its
20 will to, you know, follow the vote on the first reading by County Council, which was to
21 restart the mapping process. So that's just for informational purposes. The second
22 reading by County Council, there was no vote on that last night and it's expected that
23 the vote on the second reading on that motion will happen at the June 7th County

1 Council meeting. Nevertheless, as I indicated at our last work session we expressed
2 that desire to follow the vote and as such asked Staff to prepare certain materials for
3 today and Staff also asked for specific input from the Commissioners from last meeting
4 to today. And so at this time I'll turn the time over to [inaudible].

5 MR. JENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Assistant County Administrator Eric Jenson
6 for the Record. So glad to be with y'all today. And if we could que the PowerPoint, I'm
7 gonna walk you all through really quickly what we're gonna do today. Very briefly, we're
8 gonna have a quick PowerPoint presentation that's gonna talk about the statutory
9 obligations and the requirements of the Planning Commission in regards to this process.
10 So it's basically the rules that the state legislature has put together that the Planning
11 Commission and the Council must follow while going through this. We're gonna talk a
12 little bit about that, we're gonna talk a little bit about the restart in the sense that five
13 years ago in 2017 when this process started, the county had a consultant and that
14 consultant prepared some materials based on what the work that they had done for the
15 Comprehensive Plan process and why they were recommending that the Code be
16 rewritten. So we'll go through those materials again, then we're gonna talk a little bit
17 about calendaring, when the meetings will be and where they'll be held. And then we're
18 gonna go into the actual worksheet exercise that the Planning Commission went
19 through earlier this week. And the handout that I gave to the public earlier, it is a slide
20 that'll come up later in the PowerPoint, but I was worried that it might be too small on
21 the screen for everyone so I printed a handout so that you could have it for when we get
22 to that point. So go to the next slide, please. Really quickly, South Carolina, like almost
23 every state in the country, has a Planning and Zoning Enabling Act; that's basically the

1 authority to do zoning and planning. So the state legislature must give counties and
2 cities that authority or they can't do it. And almost every single state in the nation has
3 that authority granted, has granted that authority to their counties and their cities. So,
4 and then of course we found ours, ours here in South Carolina is in Title VI, Chapter 29
5 of the *South Carolina Code of Laws*. Okay, next slide, please? So there's two
6 obligations – whoops, so while we're waiting, so you know, typically a planning
7 commission has two duties; one is to prepare and recommend a comprehensive plan to
8 the county council, so that basically means a document that says the county is going to
9 grow, develop in this form or fashion, that's what the comprehensive plan does. The
10 County completed a comprehensive update or complete update overhaul of it in 2015,
11 so that was the last time that was done. And you have to then update it every five years
12 in South Carolina, or at least you have to revisit it and make sure it's still current every
13 five years. And then when you do it, all of your zoning ordinances, your texts, your
14 maps, everything must conform to the comprehensive plan per state statute here in
15 South Carolina. Not all states are like that but in South Carolina that is the case. The
16 Planning Commission is the body that recommends and prepares the plan to give to the
17 County Council. The County Council is the body that adopts it. And the Planning Staff
18 works for the County Administrator, but they are the Staff to the Planning Commission
19 who are an advisory board in most functions. Okay next slide, please. Again as I
20 mentioned, the Planning Commission is responsible for preparing, amending,
21 recommending your zone maps, your zone texts, your comprehensive plan. The Council
22 adopts it. Sometimes the Planning Commission holds public hearings but typically not.
23 In this particular matter when you're talking about a zoning ordinance, the Council's the

1 one that holds the public hearings, the Planning Commission holds public meetings, and
2 they can solicit and ask for public input but they don't hold a public hearing as required
3 by state law. Next slide, please. So we're gonna jump in right now to the original kick off
4 materials. Again, these were prepared back in 2015 and 2016 by Clarion Associates
5 who was the consultant the County used to update its Comprehensive Plan. Clarion
6 was also later selected to assist with rewriting the land code which resulted in the 2021
7 Land Development Code that was adopted but not enacted by the Council last
8 November. Next slide, please. So we're gonna go through these slides really quickly,
9 again I did not prepare these slides that you're gonna see. These were done in 2016 by
10 Clarion and Associates. Next slide, please. Next slide. So Clarion really quickly had, you
11 know, a work program, they had some project goals, priorities and so forth. This is sorta
12 their process. What we're doing here in our restart is actually kinda similar to that, not
13 gonna use all the same materials cause we're not doing the zoning Code now, we're
14 talking more the map with zoning Code on the side. So next, please. So work program
15 and schedule, we're gonna talk a little bit more about this today but you can kinda see,
16 this is a typical work program and schedule put together by a national consultant who,
17 you know, does tens if not hundreds of these. Okay, next slide please. Potential project
18 goals, so when the Comprehensive Plan was done Clarion and Associates pulled these
19 five bullet point items out of it and said, when you're updating your Land Development
20 Code these are the goals or the things that you should be focusing on; saying you
21 meaning the County and the County Staff and the Planning Commission, and the
22 County Council. So you can see one of the goals of updating the zoning ordinance was
23 to implement the Comprehensive Plan, one was to create a user friendly Code, one was

1 to modernize the zoning districts and development standards, one was to tailor
2 regulations to different contexts, and another was to encourage green building
3 practices. Next slide, please. So I'm not gonna go through these but these are just
4 examples of the ways they said, when you're creating a user friendly code you should
5 do x, y, z. Next slide, please. When you're modernizing zoning districts and
6 development standards here's what your code should look like. Next slide. When you're,
7 if you wanna tailor regulations to different contexts these are the issues and the things
8 that you need to focus on. Next slide, please. If you're encouraging green building
9 practices these are the things you need to do in your code. Next slide. And then this last
10 one here is talking, is more on the mapping side of things, it's sort of the code, the text,
11 but it's also the map. And so here, you know, they're talking about once you have your
12 code, the text, the book, the rule book in place, how do you implement that on your
13 map, which is sort of like, you know, if you like sports like I do, you know, if you can
14 imagine, you know, you have your playbook in football and they say, you know, you're
15 gonna line up and your running back's gonna go here and you can block here, that's
16 what your map is. Your map is not the rules. Your map is how do you implement the
17 rules. Where do you put things? And so that's what we're talking about, when we're
18 talking map we're talking about where does this zone go and where does that zone go,
19 and you know, why do they interact or do they interact or should they interact or is there
20 a conflict. And so you can these here, these are sorta the project goals that you look for
21 when you get into the mapping part of the process. Next slide, please. Okay, next slide.
22 Okay, this is the handout that I gave out to everybody which I was worried wouldn't be
23 big enough on the screen and I was right. So essentially these are the results of the

1 mapping exercise that the Planning Commissioners and Staff did that we talked about
2 at the last meeting, at the work session if you were there. And so on this –

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Mr. Jenson? I'm sorry, can I get you to pause just for a
4 moment?

5 MR. JENSON: Yes, sir.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Before we move on to that section, just wanted to see if
7 the Commission had any questions or comments about the materials that Mr. Jenson's
8 reviewed thus far.

9 MR. DENNIS: The only thing I have, could you email that to us? I'd love to see
10 those slides.

11 MR. JENSON: Yeah, absolutely. I would happy to do that.

12 MR. DENNIS: Thank you.

13 MR. JENSON: In fact we'll post them on the website also so anybody who wants
14 to can – I'll put that in my notes, thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Anyone else? Alright, thank you Mr. Jenson.

16 MR. JENSON: Thank you, Chair. So this is, you know, what we call a heat map.
17 So basically what I did was I collected as many Commissioners' input as I could, as
18 many results as possible and I found the codes or the sections, the zones, excuse me,
19 the zone that they had, that most people commented on. So if it's white that means
20 nobody commented, said that there was, that they had concerns. If it's kinda the lighter
21 pink color then that means one or two people said, you know, we should be talking
22 about these; whether it's where they go or the uses that are allowed in them right now
23 or something else. And then the darker pink color is basically where at least three

1 people said they wanted to talk about this more. So again, this doesn't mean you have
2 to talk about those or you should or shouldn't, it just, letting you know how many of your
3 colleagues felt that we needed to be talking about those particular things. So it kinda
4 gives you a jumping off point of, you know, where you might wanna start your
5 discussion.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: And Mr. Jenson just to clarify again, this is, reflects the
7 gathering of the data from the Commission that was provided to you this past nine days
8 since the last work session?

9 MR. JENSON: Yes, sir.

10 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay.

11 MR. JENSON: And we, Staff also filled one out so theirs is in there also because
12 obviously, you know, since the Code's been adopted but not enacted they've had
13 opportunities to go back and look at it and they have, you know, questions and
14 comments on things, too.

15 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: And again just the darker the color the more interest
16 there was in discussing or revisiting that zoning district.

17 MR. JENSON: Yes, sir. That is correct.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. And I'll just highlight as well, we will be looking
19 specifically at, you know, a draft of a new zoning map during Mr. Jenson's presentation.
20 I think that's intended to be the primary focus of today's work session, but we definitely
21 want to be, you know, incorporating our thoughts and preparing for potential discussion
22 as it relates to the text of the Land Development Code, which includes this table.

1 MR. JENSON: And so in regards to that let me just say a couple things for the
2 benefit of the public more than the Council, the Commission, excuse me. A typical
3 zoning code has two parts, it has the text, again like I said before the rules, and then it
4 has the map which is like the playbook, which is the schematic of how these rules get
5 put into play. And so the Council in November adopted the text, again the rule book. But
6 it's not enacted, it's not "the law of the land", it's not effective right now because you
7 have to have a map or a playbook to go along with it and the playbook isn't adopted yet,
8 which is the map. So if that makes sense that's what we're talking about. So that's, so
9 really today's exercise and the exercise for the next few months as the Planning
10 Commission goes through this, is going to be saying, how do we enact the Code via the
11 map and are there sections of the Code that need to be changed or modified to make it
12 work. [Audience interruption] But I'll just, again the Code was written between 2017 and
13 2021, and it was adopted in November of 2021, so that's when the Code was adopted
14 by the Council. It went to the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission reviewed
15 it, recommended it, Council reviewed it, made changes, approved it. But again, it's not
16 enacted, it's just sitting on a shelf waiting for the zoning map to be finished. And so once
17 the zoning map is adopted that's when the whole thing goes into effect. And so that's
18 where we are right now, so now we're talking the mapping portion of it. But we also will
19 dive into sections of the Code if there are things we notice that need additional
20 adjusting, massaging, modifying, to make the mapping work. So that's kinda where we
21 are. So with that, Mr. Chair, that is all I had in terms of a presentation other than the
22 calendar, and let me suggest we do the calendaring now so that we don't have to deal
23 with it at the end of the meeting, if that's okay? Next slide, please. So really quickly, the

1 Planning Commission typically meets at the beginning of the month on a Monday, and
2 so we are suggesting that we have a series of work sessions following the regular,
3 already calendared meetings, and a series of special called meetings that would be in
4 the evenings so we can get a group of, you know, daytime and evening meetings. And
5 so that is the, the proposed calendar is the one you see on the screen there, so
6 basically today we're having this special called, that's where we are right now. Then
7 Monday, June 6th is your normally calendared meeting so we're recommending a work
8 session following that. Then Monday, June 20th a special called at 5:30. These are all
9 Mondays by the way because that's when the Council chambers are available and we
10 would hope to be able to live stream all of these meetings. And then again on June 11th
11 following your regular meeting. On August 1st following your regular meeting. On August
12 15th a special called at 5:30. And then on Thursday, September 8th following your
13 regular meeting. And so that would give you effectively six more meetings beyond this
14 to talk, and then if you needed more we would schedule more going out. So that is the
15 calendar that is recommended for you. You obviously don't have to make a decision
16 tonight, but we wanted to bring that to your attention so that you can start deciding how
17 often you wanna meet and when.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you. And unless somebody on the Commission
19 has a comment or any input right now I would just leave it as a proposed schedule, you
20 know, subject to change. I guess I would recognize the fact that we talked at the last
21 work session about, you know, a general sequencing that we hope to follow when it
22 comes to a new baseline zoning map being presented today, then us having an
23 additional meeting where we would probably come back with thoughts and input on

1 what we were able to review as presented today. And then potentially, you know, from
2 there seeing a revised zoning map and then moving on to the part of the process where
3 we would probably talk more in-depth about potential amendments to the text of the
4 Land Development Code. So you know, I think it's good to lay this out as these being
5 potential dates, but I don't, you know, I don't wanna commit us necessarily to needing
6 each and every one of these meetings. We may very well, and I think it's four out of the
7 upcoming six would just follow our regularly scheduled meeting anyway, so I think a
8 wait and see approach is probably advisable. Anybody else on the Commission have
9 any comments on that?

10 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Dennis.

12 MR. DENNIS: Yeah, I'm down to meet anytime. I've already moved a family
13 vacation for the July 11th. However, the June 20th, if that does go down I will not be
14 there. That is the anniversary, so. If you guys wanna see me at any more meetings I will
15 need to be at the anniversary dinner.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: We'll cover for you, should be okay. And just for the
17 Record, Commissioner Taylor joined us. Alright. Mr. Jenson.

18 MR. JENSON: Thank you, sir. So we have the map that we can, the draft map
19 today, and again this is the baseline map so this has no changes other than literally
20 what we had on the screen in terms of – there you go – this becomes this, this becomes
21 this – that is what the baseline map does. And since there are a couple of zones that
22 have multiple options or at least two options, we basically on the map left those as what
23 the current zone is called today. So for example, if it was rural we say rural-TBD,

1 because you know, depending on how this ends up, you know, if it gets modified, if it
2 changes from what's in the current Code, we don't know what it could become. But
3 even if it doesn't we don't know which of the two the Planning Commission is gonna
4 recommend and, you know, and maybe you'll recommend something completely
5 different for an area, we just don't know. So again, where you have more than one
6 option on this direct translation, we put the old code, the old zoning name and a TBD to
7 acknowledge that, you know, that the new Code recommends at least two if not more
8 for that same old zoning designation. Yes, sir? If you're ready to put it up. Yes, please
9 sir. So we'll bring up that map now for your review and you can start discussing. Again,
10 this is just a straight translation, this is what the zone map would look like if we followed
11 per the letter what County Council approved in 2021.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Right. Table 26-1.9E from the Land Development Code
13 as adopted.

14 MR. JENSON: Yep, and if it's okay I'm going to step down and I'll turn the time
15 over to the Commission and to Planning Manager Brian Crooks, who prepared this
16 map.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you. Mr. Crooks, whenever you're ready.

18 MR. CROOKS: I mean, I think Mr. Jenson summed it up pretty well in terms of
19 what this is. So basically taking that equivalency table and kind of going from what we
20 had in the, I would say not an exact match, put it that way, so where we were going
21 from either one to one or many to one, then that's what this becomes. Where we had a
22 situation where we're going from one to many then as Mr. Jenson stated that's where
23 we have the current zoning district-TBD. And so that's pretty much, sorry, that's pretty

1 much what we had. Everything that isn't some type of hash symbology here, that's what
2 that's gonna be, and so let me try and do this so that we can get a better look at it. So
3 just kind of, again looking at the legend, you know, how some of that plays out, so
4 where it's one to one or many to one, those get consolidated to just that one in terms of
5 this baseline map. Where we had a one to many, that's where we need a little bit of
6 additional guidance as it relates to determining what that could potentially be. So in this
7 instance where we had RU and that equivalency table where RU is listed as AG or HM,
8 you know, or is it one of those in particular or is it something else in particular that could
9 work better. Same way for the rural residential district, manufactured home district
10 particularly, so you know, some of these others where there is no exact match or it is
11 something that is being deleted altogether and we would need to identify something. So
12 in particular to that being the manufactured home district where really from Staff's
13 perspective could really be a handful potentially on how that plays out, at least as the
14 Code exists now. But based on some of the input and feedback that we've been hearing
15 related to some of those districts, one of those particular candidates particularly the R2
16 may not necessarily be the most appropriate in that case anymore. So how some of
17 that, how some of the ways that the MH plays out currently from a user standard
18 standpoint, you know, that's some of the things that we're gonna have to take into
19 consideration with this. And I will note that, you know, I think one of the things that we're
20 trying to get to is a truer translation table, where presently within the Code we have this
21 equivalency table. So looking at things that are the most similar as it relates to intent,
22 development type, type of character that you would generally get with that district,
23 where a translation table you're looking more so at things related to the district

1 standards and the use standards themselves, where it is something treated as equal
2 versus something that's, it could be but it may not necessarily is. So I think that's really
3 where we're wanting to get with a lotta this as well from a translation standpoint, too,
4 versus having it be considered an equivalent. So I think that's some of the guidance that
5 we're looking for here is really these kind of five districts in particular as well as some of
6 these others to begin building towards that translation table.

7 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you. So as for M1, on the [inaudible] table that
8 would just be [inaudible].

9 MR. CROOKS: I believe in the equivalency table we had it as EMP or LI if I
10 remember correctly. I'm not sure off the top of my head which one it was specifically,
11 but it was I think both of those.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah, double check that, the version of the Code I'm
13 looking at just had it as a straight EMP. So otherwise single to multiples you had rural,
14 you know, "old rural", "old rural residential", and then the OI being the office and
15 institutional. And as you indicated [inaudible] /current Code there is a standalone MH
16 manufactured home zoning district but under the new Code as it's currently drafted that
17 does not exist. And so it would've been intended to be incorporated within other zoning
18 [inaudible].

19 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Taylor.

21 MR. TAYLOR: For clarification, so [inaudible].

22 MR. CROOKS: That would be correct, yeah. So, I'm sorry, I think what I was
23 looking at I was looking at the wrong side of the, the wrong chart. Yeah, so the M1

1 should be EMP, so that one should not be one that we would necessarily need to worry
2 with. At least at this time.

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: You know, first glance, I know this is new to everybody
4 here on the Commission, but everybody on the Commission, anybody got, you know,
5 initial comments or discussion? We'll certainly plan to make time for that at our next
6 meeting or work session. [Inaudible] as you indicated we'll need to work through
7 potentially finding a districts [inaudible]. Do you have any initial recommendations for,
8 you know, the criteria we would use to choose, for example, in the RU district how
9 would you choose between the AG versus the HM.

10 MR. CROOKS: So, so for those I would look at what is the standard of the
11 current district. So in terms of lot width or the density equivalent, how does that look,
12 what are setback standards and then what are the use allowances. So for instance, you
13 know, AG and HM, those are also significantly less dense than what the RU allows for.
14 It also has larger use permissions in certain instances such as the AG versus what the
15 RU would allow for currently. And then, so and from a more facial standpoint, so looking
16 at it almost as a one to one, I think Staff's standpoint on this, RT is the most true
17 translation of the RU district, even though it is a less dense district but in terms of what
18 the standards are, what the use allowances are, and then everything else that kinda
19 goes around with that, RT is the most similar to what the RU is in existence now. And I
20 think it also goes back to, too, is the AG and the HM being special purpose districts
21 versus being a residential district that is very low intensity, more I'll say rural, don't
22 wanna use necessarily rural as a term for it, but more agricultural uses but not to the
23 scale and extent that the HM and AG would allow for, if that makes sense.

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: So potentially we should think about AG and HM as
2 more special purpose districts.

3 MR. CROOKS: Correct. And those are specifically within the text, special
4 purpose districts versus being a residential district as RT through R6 are.

5 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Do you have a sense offhand for what the density is
6 from current RU to RT?

7 MR. CROOKS: It would drop by half, so the RT has a density of .67 versus 1.33
8 or 1.32. So the density drops by half but the land uses, the various standards that go
9 along with it would be the same generally as the RU otherwise. So things from an
10 accessory dwelling standpoint or just an accessory structure or accessory use as well
11 as the use permissions themselves would be pretty comparable, if not the exact same
12 as to what the RU now would be.

13 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay.

14 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: [Inaudible]

16 MR. DENNIS: I just wanted to clear something up for the audience out there. The
17 RT, the old density is 1.32 and this Code brought it down to .67 per acre. So just wanted
18 to let y'all know that, so it's [inaudible].

19 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: The old density for what?

20 MR. DENNIS: The old density was 1.32 and the new density is .67.

21 MR. CROOKS: So for the rural zoning district in the 2005 Code is, would be 1.32,
22 so 33,000 square feet. The RT, so what I'm saying is the most true equivalent, so what
23 is the most to me, from Staff's perspective, the most same district on its face would be

1 RT, even though the density is .67 which is half of the 2005 RU density. So, cause
2 they're – still they're two separate districts so, and I think that's one thing that we still
3 have to keep in mind is, you know, these are gonna be, the RU is gonna be one where
4 there's no true translation. And I think that was one of the issues that we had and that
5 we've seen because, you know, there's really four replacements for RU; R1, so from the
6 straight density standpoint it's the same density from a land use perspective no where
7 near it. So in terms of that case R1 is the most true equivalent to RR because it's the
8 same level of density, same use permissions, etc. So for RU there's no real good case,
9 but RT is the most similar in terms of what the use allowances are, what the density is,
10 in terms of looking at it from a holistic perspective from all of the different points of view.

11 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: How do you feel about the OI to employment or
12 institutional? How would that criteria go, choosing between the two?

13 MR. CROOKS: So INS, again so we're looking at it coming from a facial
14 perspective, is gonna be the most I would say comparable thing. But the issue there lies
15 the standards where the INS has a five acre minimum in this Code. So that would be
16 one thing that we would then need to take a look at as it relates to that district
17 specifically, but in terms of use permissions, the various standards that's allowed within
18 it, very similar to the office and institutional district. So you're primarily looking at, again
19 you know, commercial, office, institutional uses as the name kind of implies, as the OI is
20 now. But that five acre minimum requirement on the INS district, that's really kind of the
21 biggest thing cause the ENP, the employment district, where it also facilitates larger
22 office complexes, that would be the most truer sense to the OI, but the ENP is vastly
23 different than the OI as well in terms of use permissions, the intensity of that district.

1 Where EMP's almost a hybrid heavy commercial/industrial district, where it's intended
2 more so for things like manufacturing but you could still have larger employment
3 complexes as well that were offices, so.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: [Inaudible] look at that EMP, when you look at the
5 current map can you identify parcels that likely should be qualifying as EMP? I mean,
6 it's not like it's – or is that something you see just being implemented proactively and
7 prospectively?

8 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, it would be more of a context based scenario, so it'd really
9 be how is that OI, what is the use and then what is the surrounding characteristics of
10 that. So what are the adjacent land uses, what do those look like? So you know, I think
11 we can zoom in to one of these sections over here, so we'll just, we'll look at Clemson
12 Road for instance. So there's several properties that are zoned HI along Clemson Road,
13 so this is the Hardscrabble, Clemson Road intersection here where the hand is, going
14 towards where we turn into Killian over here at Longtown. So all of these right in here,
15 those are LI, so those would not be appropriate situations where those become EMP.
16 INS would be more appropriate within those cases, or another district entirely
17 depending on what it is, so for instance, one of the MU districts potentially. You know,
18 conversely to that then is we go over to, off of Percival Road where we have some
19 residential right now, but we also have some light industrial, heavier commercial also.
20 So you know, what could that then become as well, but also what is the other policy
21 guidance that we have in relation to some of those things. You know, is there a PIA or
22 anything like that in relation to it? So it would really just depend, you know, what is the
23 circumstances, what's the situation of that site for really what could be the most

1 appropriate district. But again, on its fact INS would be the most true replacement for
2 what it's trying to achieve, but we would need to then make modifications to that district
3 for the zoning district standards themselves.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Are there, I don't know how to say it, like sufficiently few
5 parcels in the county with that OI designation currently that you would be able to review
6 each one?

7 MR. CROOKS: We could, but I would just say most cases INS is, just from a
8 straight translation standpoint, would just be the, I'm not gonna say the easier option but
9 in terms of going through and looking at them without – cause again, if we looked at
10 each site individually without looking at the area as a whole, I mean, I don't know how
11 beneficial that would be cause we wanna be looking at everything in context with
12 everything else around it versus just narrowing in on one site and saying, okay that site
13 could be this, could be that, could be this without taking into consideration what
14 everything else around it might or could be.

15 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Mr. Dennis, do you have something?

16 MR. DENNIS: So the EMP district, that's kinda like all encompass, I mean, you
17 could have some residential in there along with other types of businesses, kinda like,
18 the best way to put it, like Willy Wonka's Chocolate Factory, remember how he had his
19 little town there and the industrial area?

20 MR. CROOKS: Yes and no. So there are two residential uses that would be
21 allowed at this time, one is apartments so multi family apartments/townhomes, and then
22 the other one is townhomes. Both of those are allowed by special exception, so in terms
23 of a residential use as we typically, I think that one from a dwelling perspective, only

1 things that are allowed are, also have to do those additional use permissions. Those are
2 the only two that would be allowed. Everything else from a use standpoint you're looking
3 at pretty much industrial uses or office or heavier commercial uses for the most part. So
4 some limited retail but mainly looking at offices and again, kind of playing into the name
5 you're really looking at job generating and more so those employment type uses, so
6 factories, processing, manufacturing, as well as being able to have those kind of
7 secondary, tertiary uses to support those employment uses as well. So that's where
8 those special exception, permissions for the residential uses come into play.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Under the new Code would those go before [inaudible]?

10 MR. CROOKS: Yes. Yes, so those would go before the Board of Zoning Appeals,
11 those two uses.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: So that, Commissioners, it seems like that's the kind of
13 example of a conversation where maybe that's pointing us to an amendment of the text
14 to suit practical [inaudible]. [Mics are cutting out] I don't know how close I have to get to
15 get it to hear me, but here we are. So yeah, I just was saying that the conversation, it
16 seems like it's pointing us towards, you know, a potential need to amend the text
17 because of the practical, you know, elements involved in applying the Code to a map.
18 So otherwise, it sounds like we need to think on, and if not discuss more today, the
19 conversion of, you know, rural to new zoning districts, one of the two potentially, and
20 then the rural residential to one or two or more. If we followed what I hear from Mr.
21 Crooks and potentially we amended the text on the INS to reduce the minimum lot size
22 that would probably resolve the OI.

23 MR. CROOKS: It'd be the minimum district size.

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Minimum district size, okay. Anything else offhand, like
2 any other further thoughts or comments anybody wants to ask or zoom in on any
3 specific area at the moment?

4 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Chair, just briefly to kinda go back to some of the points you
5 were making a second ago. So I would say for RR in terms of, again facially, R1 would
6 be the most similar. So from, again the standard standpoint and a use standpoint pretty
7 much the exact same thing. There would be some modifications that we as Staff would
8 still recommend for that district and I think as we had, you know, discussions previously
9 this was one of the districts that we were looking at, going to be proposing certain ones
10 and so in this case it would be the lot width requirement where I think it's 50 right now
11 but looking at having that be much greater, whether that's 90, whether that's 120',
12 something along those lines. So there would be potential for that modification but
13 otherwise is pretty much the same exact district that the RR is.

14 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Potentially we would need to increase the lot width -

15 MR. CROOKS: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: - requirement for R1?

17 MR. CROOKS: For it to be a more true match to the RR, yes.

18 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Mr. Dennis?

20 MR. DENNIS: So we're talking about the RR, the most equivalent would, you're
21 thinking RT and R1 versus the homestead?

22 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, R1 more specifically, just from a land use standpoint it
23 would, R1 would pretty much be almost an exact replica of the RR, because RR is the

1 same, pretty much the same district standards as the RU is but it doesn't have the same
2 use permissions, as well as things related to accessory structures and things of that
3 nature. So the RR is pretty much the RU but solely residential uses only. And so the R1
4 keeps the 2005 RU's density, so 1.33 density, but it doesn't have the various land uses
5 that would have made RT or HM or something else more appropriate. R1 then is a,
6 again on its face the most replica of the RR district.

7 MR. DENNIS: Do you think that RSE also fits R1 pretty close as far as land uses
8 and –

9 MR. CROOKS: Land uses, yes. But from a density standpoint it is closer to R2
10 than it is R1, just from looking at kind of what the lot size of the RSE allows for, it's
11 much closer to the R2 in terms of what that density equivalent is than R1. And I will note
12 for RR and RSE that they are really only mapped in a handful of locations so all of the
13 RRs are really in the north central portion of the county, so we'll point them out to you
14 real quick here. So group here, group here, and a group here, and that's the only places
15 that I'm aware of where we do have RR mapped presently. And then RSE, there's
16 roughly 40 something properties throughout the county that are mapped as RSE. We've
17 got this group here that's currently RSE and then we've got this one here that was
18 recently approved by Council. Off the top of my head those are the only ones that I'm
19 aware of but there's roughly 40 or so.

20 MR. DENNIS: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: In light of what we talked about earlier, INS compared
22 to OI, do you still feel good about going from M1 to EMP?

1 MR. CROOKS: Yes. Yeah, I think, again kind of looking at things, trying to be
2 more so an exact match, M1 and EMP are relatively close to what they try to do, what
3 they try to achieve, where M1 in most instances, I mean, really what you're looking at it
4 being mapped and what uses are allowed, it's really kind of this kinda combo
5 commercial with a variety of industrial allowances. Presently M1 does not allow for
6 residential uses though, so that would be kind of one of the differences. But otherwise
7 just from a general land use perspective as well as standard perspective, those are very
8 similar to what it is.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. So you know, just based on kinda looking back
10 and seeing that there is a one to one equivalency there, would you go ahead and
11 update this map to reflect M1 goes to EMP?

12 MR. CROOKS: And Mr. Chair, I would say as we continue conversation if the
13 Commission feels like they may wanna see how some of these things may look, you
14 know, we can create multiple versions of this if that helps continue the dialogue. So we
15 can see, you know, what this could look like if everything that was RU goes to AG, if
16 everything goes to HM, everything goes to RT, you know, what some of that may look
17 like, how some of those things could be played out, stuff like that. Same way with, say
18 RR, if we felt, you know, what would this look like if it was RT, what would this look like
19 if it was R1, things like that. So we could create multiple versions of this as well, if there
20 wasn't one specific one that, say the Commission felt comfortable with, if there was just
21 still a little, wanted to be a little bit more dialogue, a little bit more conversation. And
22 again, I think this is kind of again coming from a baseline standpoint, you know, wanting

1 to get to then a translation map specifically and then look at how we move forward from
2 there.

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah. I think if we can still label it the first iteration of
4 the remap with M1 going to EMP it just takes one more thing potentially off the table that
5 feels wide open.

6 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so I guess just as it relates to that, Mr. Chair, I'd point out
7 so we would just label the next one, once we had a better idea, this would be 0.2.

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay.

9 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Dennis.

11 MR. DENNIS: Technical question. On this map if we edit it and we click on one of
12 the zones and I wanna change it, will it change it all or? I'm only asking because that
13 way I wouldn't have to wait on you guys to do things, I could do things in real time.

14 MR. CROOKS: No, it does not look like it – cause it's all showing as one single
15 layer versus layers individually. I mean, we could do that if you would like, but it's –

16 MR. DENNIS: I ask, I mean, I use it in my work all the time and I know it takes a
17 while. So I didn't know if it was already set up like that, so disregard that.

18 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, I mean, we can if that's really what the Commission would
19 want. I would just probably advise don't because it's a little redundant and two it's, you
20 know, it's –

21 MR. DENNIS: It's a timewaster. I didn't know if it was already set up. I was just
22 gonna ask.

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: And I know again that, you know, we looked at kind of
2 the heat map on the equivalence table, Mr. Jenson shared that earlier. So today is,
3 again, today is not the end of the discussion of this matter and I know that many of us
4 intend to still address the, you know, the two to four-plex question with potential text
5 amendments, but that's not for today. And then again, manufactured home we still need
6 to work on that. Mr. Crooks, you had a recommendation there?

7 MR. CROOKS: That was the one I was gonna bring up next. So I just wanted to
8 see what else, conversation, dialogue, questions Commissioners had before we kind of
9 moved on to that one. But this is one of those that, like I said, there's a couple of
10 potential replacements for it from Staff's perspective. Really we're kinda looking at three
11 potential options; one being R2 at the moment, one being R5, and then the other being
12 R3. So kind of looking at those differently, so the MH district is really, it's kind of a, I'm
13 gonna say it's a special district in the current Code. It's not mapped a whole lot but
14 where we do have it it's mainly looking at either manufactured home as we particularly
15 think about it or a manufactured home park or it's just kind of a middle density lot size if
16 you will. So from a land use and standard perspective, R2 is kind of a, that's the, when
17 we say R2 is a replacement because R2 currently would allow for manufactured homes,
18 it's the highest density district that allows for single manufactured homes. R5 is - yes so
19 that is the most intense district that would allow a single manufactured home, so if
20 you're doing a single site manufactured home, that's the most intense district that you
21 can do that in, again as the Code is currently written. The R5 district is the most intense
22 district that allows for a manufactured home park. So manufactured home parks in the
23 Code, it's R5, I wanna say RT and I think HM, so really only a handful of districts. And

1 so, you know, previously the way that we've been looking at this is R2 and R5 being the
2 most common replacements in terms of how we've been previously recommending the
3 map layout. So that's been one of the most common areas that we've actually, we
4 recommended R5 being was where we have an existing manufactured home park, in a
5 I'd say urban or more intense suburban area. And so that's where we kind of get into a
6 little issue with this is, well for a manufactured home park R5's appropriate, most
7 [inaudible], but for a MH zoned property that's just a single manufactured home, you
8 know, it's R2, because that's gonna be the most intense thing from a lot size
9 perspective and things of that nature because the MH is I think 7,260 square feet or so I
10 think is what the minimum lot size is in the 2005 Code. So this saying the other potential
11 thing is R3 because it has the most similar lot size equivalent from a density standpoint.
12 But it doesn't have any of the use permissions. So this is one of those things where
13 we're probably gonna have to look at a couple of different tweaks textually for whatever
14 we really look at being the best replacement for MH. And I would point out, too, is for
15 the MH district I don't necessarily think that, depending on how that broad, how that
16 replacement looks from a translation standpoint, would be wholly appropriate because
17 of the variety of areas contextually where it is currently mapped. So you have more rural
18 areas, more urban areas, in-between areas, highly urban areas, so the context of where
19 that exists varies significantly throughout the county. So if we mapped everything as R5,
20 well you could have some places within the county that's R5 but, you know, not
21 necessarily appropriate. So that is one thing I would like to point out with some of these
22 things, and I think that's also, again looking at this from an integrative standpoint, if
23 we're gonna be going looking at translation, well then we need to look at being proactive

1 with how certain areas should look, should map, that I think that plays into that
2 conversation as well. But I would just kind of note that as being a potential issue with
3 the MH district, depending on what that replacement is, what that replacement looks
4 like. Definitely gonna probably need textual changes but also how that looks within the
5 map as the whole from a translation standpoint, and then different iterations later on as
6 we look at a map from a whole standpoint and things related to implementing the Comp
7 Plan if you will.

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: 2021 draft of the LDC, it allows for single manufactured
9 homes in R2 and manufactured home parks in R5 by right, is it permitted? There's no –

10 MR. CROOKS: Well, special requirement. So by right but they're gonna have
11 additional standards of the [inaudible].

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: And the special requirement doesn't go to Board of
13 Zoning Appeals, right?

14 MR. CROOKS: No.

15 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: That's just Staff?

16 MR. CROOKS: Yes. Staff reviewed to meet those requirements.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: [Inaudible] have a recommendation?

18 MR. CROOKS: Well, I think this is, this is one of the things at least from the R2
19 standpoint and I think we've heard a lotta feedback as it relates to the manufactured
20 home use within that, and I think from our standpoint, you know, maybe moving those
21 allowances to more intense districts. So you know, whether that is having R5 and R4
22 and R6, have those, I think from just, you know, from a professional standpoint for me
23 I'm one of those people, I'm okay with it kind of in every district because it is, at least in

1 Richland County, how we look at it, that's an affordable housing option in most cases
2 because it does allow you to purchase your land but you're not having to buy an
3 expensive house that goes along with it. It also could allow you to have a lower lot or
4 lower priced lot that you can purchase, do that. So it really opens up a lotta housing
5 choice as it relates to that, but I know that's not always gonna be the politically
6 expedient, you know, route to take. But it's gonna be one of those things that's
7 interesting as how we can handle it. I do think R4 and R5 textually again, having that
8 use permission, could be appropriate. I really don't have necessarily a good answer. I
9 think it's really looking at probably splitting the two. So basically where we have a
10 manufactured home park when it's in, let's say a, you know, more urban, you know,
11 more intense suburban area, R5 where we have, say single site development right now,
12 I'd say R2. If we do make textual changes to remove that use we're gonna have to find
13 another replacement for that instead. And that's the similar process that we've taken so
14 far as Staff throughout this mapping process related to that district as well. That's also
15 some of the guidance that we received from the consultant when we started the drafting
16 process for this, how to potentially look at handling the MH district. So that kinda follows
17 their guidance and follows the same process that we've taken, but I do think, you know,
18 this is gonna be a point where we're gonna have to have a lot more conversation, a lot
19 more kind of deep dive if you will into how that replacement could go. And it may not be
20 that we have a good translation replacement for this. Maybe it is just, you know, it's just
21 a deleted district and then as we go through the process, you know, where we have it
22 mapped maybe that's part of iteration 2, iteration 3 when we're looking at other factors
23 besides just straight translation.

1 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Mr. Dennis?

3 MR. DENNIS: So how many, for a manufactured home park, how many is in one,
4 like five or more, four or more or?

5 MR. CROOKS: I think the density is capped at six per acre. I think that's – yeah,
6 let me, give me a second, Mr. Dennis.

7 MR. DENNIS: I couldn't find it on my homework that I was doing.

8 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so it's on page 4-15, Mr. Dennis. So subsection 6(A)(i) and
9 (ii), so you're gonna have to have a required site acreage of at least five acres and then
10 maximum density of a manufactured home park shall be six units per acre. So even if
11 you were in the R5 where you could have a density of 12 you're still, for a manufactured
12 home park, be limited to six units per acre.

13 MR. DENNIS: Do we have to have or can we just [inaudible] SE determination or
14 an SR determination on another district? Such as, you know, R5 on here is showing, on
15 the use table, is showing SR which is permitted by right, subject to special
16 requirements.

17 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, I mean, I think that's something that the Commission could
18 look at for sure, and I think that's probably the approach that we're gonna have to take
19 is looking at those use permissions for what may be a more appropriate district. So
20 maybe that's where, you know, if we feel like, say R3 is an appropriate district from a
21 land use, or excuse me, from a district standard perspective but it doesn't have that land
22 use but, you know, Commission, Council, whoever's not comfortable with allowing it by
23 right, well maybe that's where we have a special exception but we make sure that we

1 have the appropriate standard that goes along with that for that review. That's also
2 things where we can look at, related to, say, you know, desired farm standards or
3 compatibility standards as part of the general development standards as well, and those
4 are some of the things that we as Staff have discussed as relates to some of this so far.
5 But yeah, I think use permission is a good way to try to look at this and I think that's
6 gonna be the route that we're gonna take no matter what.

7 MR. DENNIS: So we could look at an area that already has it zoned and then
8 see what's around there and kinda base the footprint off of that, instead of just creating
9 a whole new area for it.

10 MR. CROOKS: So, sorry Mr. Dennis, so in terms of, yeah, how that use
11 permission looks and how that use permission works. Yeah, I think that's something that
12 we can look at. So I guess to your point, not having to create a new district or not having
13 to necessarily overly modify, I guess, yeah so, but I think we do wanna necessarily be
14 clear to, you know, what some of those differences between, say a special requirement
15 and a special exception are. You know, special exception, yes you're going before the
16 Board of Zoning Appeals and there may be certain standards or additional criteria that
17 have to be met, but it's one of those things where, you know, if those standards are met,
18 those standards are met. Same way with the special requirements, it's just that level of,
19 I guess I'm gonna say review, you know, there's additional notices and things that go
20 along with that then, versus it being a by right use. So I just wanna say that it couldn't
21 still be established, it's just that the way that it is established is a little bit different and
22 there's a couple more hoops and hurdles that you have to jump through in that case. So
23 I mean, that's something we can definitely look at is use permissions, but I do think that

1 we'll probably wanna have a larger discussion then on some of those differences
2 between special requirement and special exception and how those work and how those
3 play out.

4 MR. DENNIS: Thank you.

5 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Mr. Grady.

7 MR. GRADY: Thank you. Just for point of clarification, maybe for the benefit of
8 the audience and to refresh my memory, what exactly is the definition of a
9 manufactured home in the Code? Does that include modular construction, is it anything
10 where any part of the home is built off-site, or is it exclusively like mobile home/trailers,
11 your stereotypical –

12 MR. CROOKS: So it does not include, say a modular. But give me just a second,
13 Mr. Grady, and I'll read you the definition that we have in here. So manufactured home
14 is a factory built single family structure that is manufactured under the authority of 42
15 USC §5401, National Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards Act, is
16 transportable in one or more sections, is built on a permanent chassis and is used as a
17 place of human habitation. The term manufactured home shall not include pre-
18 fabricated modular dwellings placed on a permanent foundation nor shall it include
19 travel trailers, campers or similar units designed for recreation or other short-term uses.

20 MR. GRADY: Okay, that was my assumption but that's clarifying, thanks.

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, since we're on the topic, too, could we talk about,
22 you know, people that may currently be living in a manufactured home, you know, would
23 they be grandfathered in as a non-conforming use?

1 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so they would, yeah anybody, so say it went to, no
2 changes in use permissions or anything and everything that is MH gets translated to R3
3 because it's the most similar lot standard, they will all just be grandfathered in at that
4 point. So as long as that use was legally established they're able to continue on doing
5 that use. So this is also where we have, you know, I think just manufactured homes in
6 general throughout the county, we have a lot of non-conforming ones, just by nature
7 and how the use permissions and a lotta things are set up within the Code. So it would
8 pretty much be the same process as we have now. So.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Would they need to apply?

10 MR. CROOKS: In terms of?

11 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: To be a non-conforming use?

12 MR. CROOKS: No. No.

13 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: No, they would not. Alright, thank you. That's a lotta
14 good information, Mr. Crooks, and thank you for your work on that. Once you make that
15 one "correction", would you be able to post this to the county's website?

16 MR. CROOKS: Yeah. We can do that.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Estimated time of arrival for that posting?

18 MR. CROOKS: I'm not gonna be overly aggressive here cause I don't wanna
19 promise anything and not deliver, so I would probably say at least close of business by
20 Friday.

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, by Friday? Alright. Thank you.

22 MR. CROOKS: That'll be on the Planning Department webpage. I'm not
23 necessarily sure where it's gonna be going on there yet, we may try to move everything

1 up a little bit higher to the top, but it'll at least be on there and we'll probably try to call it
2 out a little bit more specific to something related to the restart versus the information
3 that's on there currently.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. Yeah, I think it's a lot to think about. Any other
5 discussion this evening? If not, you know, we could just move ahead to talk about our
6 next meeting. Alright. Our next regularly scheduled meeting is, is it June 4th?

7 MR. CROOKS: It should be June the 6th.

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: June 6th. Okay, thank you. June 6th. I mean, unless
9 somebody really wants it, I would say let's just plan for our next meeting to be on June
10 6th. What time do we have on the –

11 MR. CROOKS: 3:00.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: 3:00 for the proposed calendar. Okay, alright, yeah.
13 And at that meeting, I guess let's talk about, you know, whether we wanna, we can go
14 ahead and create an opportunity for public input on this topic. I think we should probably
15 do that just in case we wanna make any motions as to the map at that meeting. I
16 believe the FOI requirements would have us, you know, have a public input at that
17 meeting. Alright.

18 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Dennis.

20 MR. DENNIS: So the next meeting we're gonna seek public input on that and
21 then as far as changing anything, if we have anything that we wanna try to make a
22 motion on then, should Commissioners bring it at that [inaudible]?

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: I'd say definitely as to the map, right? Trying to focus on
2 the map but definitely the map is causing us to, you know, look at potential needs for
3 text amendments.

4 MR. DENNIS: Cause I think a few things, if we do some text amendments might
5 help inline the map.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah. Okay.

7 MR. DENNIS: I got some things but I really need to look at it and see how the
8 text would change the map. So I mean.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah, if we could just ask Staff, let's plan on putting on
10 the Agenda for the next meeting both, you know, the zoning map as well as potential
11 text amendments.

12 MR. DENNIS: I'm hitting that as kinda like the manufactured home area
13 [inaudible] one way or another, that way we could make the text amendments to align
14 and then we don't have to make a new district. If we decide to go that way. But it gives
15 us the chance.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, so –

17 MR. CROOKS: Sorry, Mr. Chair. Just to clarify, so for next meeting wanting to
18 have an area on the Agenda for public input on the map, and then also having items on
19 the Agenda for discussion of text and map amendments. Is that correct?

20 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah, I think so.

21 MR. CROOKS: Alright. So I just wanted to clarify that I heard that correctly.

22 MR. DENNIS: I mean, we might not bring anything to the text amendments, but if
23 we do find something after this we might be able to –

1 MR. CROOKS: That's why I wanted to clarify to make sure we have it on the
2 Agenda, on there. Cause it's the same way with, like how we've had, you know, pretty
3 much the last, what, six, seven meetings we've had the, on there as part of the
4 discussion for action the one section we've been talking about for seven months. So it's
5 on there to be able to discuss and so if there is a motion from you all as a body to direct
6 Staff to do x, y, or z thing, we would be able to do that as part of the Agenda.

7 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah, I hope everybody's got a sense for, you know,
8 what we ought to look at next time around. I know we definitely, I definitely need to look
9 at RU and RR, and then manufactured home, and then again I know we'll get [inaudible]
10 discussion as well. [Inaudible]. Can we get an update on the posting of the Minutes of
11 prior meetings to the county website? Mr. Price, you wanna update us on that?

12 MR. PRICE: Presently the Minutes, and we've, we went back a few years, up to
13 2018 to have all of the Minutes from the Planning Commission posted on the county
14 website. I believe there've been a few placed now, at this time, but my contact in IT is
15 continuing to work to add those to the website, so kind of expect towards the end of the
16 week, maybe early next week they should be complete. Now with the understanding
17 there will be some gaps in there and so the Planning Commission Members will
18 probably be seeing me in the next couple of days bringing a number of Minutes to you
19 that you have not approved, primarily from last year and some this year, bringing those
20 to you so that at your next meeting you can go ahead and give approval, you know, if so
21 desired. And then we will then place those on the webpage.

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. Good, we are making progress and got a timeline
2 there. Sounds pretty reasonable to me. Alright, well anything else from Staff? If not,
3 Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn. A

4 [Inaudible]

5 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, we have a motion. Is there a second?

6 ?: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, all in favor please raise your hand.

8 *[Approved: Branham, Yonke, Metts, Dennis, Grady, Frierson; Unsure if present:*
9 *Gilchrist, Carlisle, Taylor]*

10 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Vote's unanimous, we're adjourned.

11

12

[Meeting adjourned _____]