

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
April 7, 2025

[Members Present: Christopher Yonke, Beverly Frierson, Frederick Johnson, II (6:50pm), Brian Grady, Chris Siercks, Mark Duffy, Charles Durant; Absent: Terrence Taylor, John Metts]

Called to order: 6:10pm

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, are you ready?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks. I'd like to call to order the April 7th, 2025 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. Staff, please confirm the following: in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to the news media, persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board located in the county administration building. Is that correct?

MR. PRICE: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Staff, can you please take attendance for today's meeting?

MR. PRICE: Alright, attendance for the Monday, April 7th, 2025 Planning Commission meeting, Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Here.

MR. PRICE: Johnson?

MR. PRICE: Duffy?

MR. DUFFY: Here.

1 MR. PRICE: Metts? Durant?

2 MR. DURANT: Here.

3 MR. PRICE: Taylor? Siercks?

4 MR. SIERCKS: Here.

5 MR. PRICE: Grady?

6 MR. GRADY: Here.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We have a quorum, thank you. Ladies and gentlemen,
8 welcome to the April 7th, 2025 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As
9 Planning Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer
10 our time to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council. Our
11 recommendations are to approve or deny Zoning Map Amendment requests. Per Title
12 VI, Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of Laws* Planning Commission may also prepare and
13 revise plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of unincorporated
14 portions of the County. The County's Land Development Code rewrite process
15 conducted last year is an example of this. Once again, we are a recommending body to
16 County Council and they will conduct their own public hearing and take official votes to
17 approve or deny map amendments and text amendments on a future date to be
18 published by the county. Council typically holds Zoning Public Hearings on the fourth
19 Tuesday of the month. Please check the county's website for updated agendas, dates
20 and times. Please take note of the following guidelines for today's meeting. Please turn
21 off or silence any cellphones. Audience members may come and go quietly as needed.
22 Applicants are allowed up to two minutes to make statements. Citizens signed up to
23 speak are allowed two minutes each. Redundant comments should be minimized.

1 Please only address remarks to the Commission and do not expect the Commission to
2 respond to questions from the speakers in a back and forth style, that's not the purpose
3 of the meeting. Please no audience/speaker exchanges. No audience demonstrations
4 or other disruptions to the meeting are permitted nor are comments from anyone other
5 than the speaker at the podium. Please remember the meeting is being recorded. And
6 please speak into the microphone and give your name and address. Abusive language
7 is inappropriate and will not be tolerated. Please don't voice displeasure or frustration at
8 a recommendation while the Planning Commission is still conducting business. If you
9 have any questions or concerns you may contact the Richland County Planning
10 Department Staff down here below. This moves us on to number 3 on our Agenda
11 today, which is Additions or Deletions to the Agenda. Commissioners, Staff, do we have
12 any of those? Hearing none – yes?

13 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you Staff. Hearing none we'll move on to
15 number 4 which is the Approval of the Minutes from prior meetings. Staff provided us
16 Minutes for our March 2025 meetings. Do Commission Members have any comments
17 or concerns regarding these transcripts? Okay, seeing, hearing none, the Chair would
18 like to make a motion to approve the Minutes from March 3rd, 2025. Do we have a
19 second?

20 MR. DURANT: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Thanks. Staff, could
22 you please take a vote to approve the Minutes?

1 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the approval of Minutes from the March 3rd,
2 2025 Planning Commission meeting, those in favor, Yonke?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

5 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

7 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Durant?

9 MR. DURANT: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

11 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Grady?

13 MR. GRADY: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

15 *[Approved: Yonke, Frierson, Duffy, Durant, Siercks, Grady; Absent: Johnson, Taylor,*
16 *Metts]*

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks again, Staff. This moves us along to number 5
18 which is our Consent Agenda and I always like to explain it. The Consent Agenda is an
19 action item that allows the Commission to approve Road Names and Map Amendment
20 requests where the Staff where recommends approval and no one from the public has
21 signed up to speak against the amendment. And now in our packets it says that the
22 Comp Plan says compliant. No. Our Vice-Chair reminded me that in our, on our Agenda
23 there may need to be a change. You did say that you provided us with February and

1 March Minutes? But I believe we approved those last month, didn't we, for February?
2 Okay, so we still need to approve the second half and that was not provided this month
3 yet, so.

4 MR. PRICE: I apologize, we'll get that to you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. Alright so the Consent Agenda – and no
6 Member of the Commission is in need of further discussion on the request. Let me
7 verify, let's see – do we have Road Names?

8 MR. PRICE: There, that was just a placeholder in case we had some but we do
9 not have any road names for today's meeting.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No Road Names? Now, I wanna ask the people in the
11 audience, do we have anyone who is signed up against the first item today, Case
12 Number 24-055, Wynette Way? I see we have – against, okay. Alright, so that's gonna
13 staff off of our Consent Agenda and we don't have any Road Names so hey, this is
14 different for me for once, we have no Consent Agenda to move along. Don't need to do
15 a motion on that then, right Staff?

16 MR. PRICE: No, we don't.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. So we'll just keep on moving and we'll go to the one
18 I just mentioned. We are, in our Agenda right now we are at 5.b.1., Case No. 24-055
19 MA and we'll flip it back to Staff.

20 **CASE 24-055 MA:**

21 MR. PRICE: Alright, again as stated the next item is for Case 24-055 MA. The
22 Applicant is Stephanie Daniel. The Applicant is requesting to rezone two parcels with a
23 combination of one acre from R3 to GC which is Residential 3 to General Commercial.

1 The location of the subject sites are 101 and 105 Wynette Way. And I apologize, we do
2 have one typo on there where it still says 'Staff recommendation' and again we, that
3 was, should've been changed and I apologize if that is there and going forward. But
4 again, Comprehensive Plan found this to be compliant. And I'll kinda go straight to the
5 conclusion as identified by Staff that the Map Amendment aligns with the overall
6 objectives of the Comprehensive Plan for the community activity center designation and
7 thus is deemed to be compliant. Rezoning for the parcel would allow for land uses that
8 are consistent with the intended mix of uses in this designation. However, we'd like to
9 point out that the proposal conflicts with policy guidance that seeks to buffer residential
10 neighborhoods from more intensive uses. The policy is to protect residential areas from
11 potential negative impacts such as increased light, noise and traffic, by ensuring that
12 higher intensity uses are located away from homes. Now, although the future land use
13 map places the parcels within the community activity center designation, these
14 boundaries are generalized and do not always account for specific physical dividers like
15 roads. In this particular case Aubrey Street functions as a natural separation between
16 the commercial corridor along Two Notch Road, which is a five-lane principal arterial
17 with existing businesses, and the residential neighborhood of Royal Pines.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, do we have any
19 questions for Staff at this moment? No? Hearing none, Commissioner Frierson do we
20 have anyone signed up to speak?

21 MS. FRIERSON: Yes, we have the Applicant, Stephanie Daniel.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down to the podium, both of them are open, and
23 please state your name and address, and you'll have two minutes to speak.

TESTIMONY OF STEPHANIE DANIEL:

MS. DANIEL: Alrighty, good afternoon everyone. My name is Stephanie Daniel, my address is 201 Burmaster Drive, Columbia, South Carolina 29229. So I'm here today in hopes of obtaining a favorable vote regarding the property again located at 101 and 105 Wynette Way, Columbia, South Carolina 29229. So this acre lot is centrally located and surrounded by many businesses and homes. On this property we hope to build our family business, a space that will certainly enrich the local community and residents in the area. Specifically we seek to build a Hispanic supermarket to meet the needs of our community. This project is not just another building, rather it's a project of hope and perseverance for my Latino family. Overall I thank all of you today for listening to my proposal and certainly hope that a favorable vote will allow us to rezone this property which will further allow me to advocate for the needs of my community. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out tonight.

MS. DANIEL: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Next we have Rebecca Nelson.

TESTIMONY OF REBECCA NELSON:

MS. NELSON: Hey, my name's Rebecca Nelson, I'm [inaudible] –

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Hold on a second, let me get the Staff to help you. Thank you.

MS. NELSON: Thanks. I currently own five residential homes in this neighborhood that families live in. The property in question –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm sorry, again, I'm sorry, with your name and address for
2 the Record.

3 MS. NELSON: Rebecca Nelson, 205 Wynette Way.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Got it.

5 MS. NELSON: Is one of them, I own four others in there, rental properties, that
6 families live in. This property in question is at the buffer road, we were assured when
7 the Fresh Market came in and the other businesses came in that they would not pass
8 that buffer. Children, actually there's a bus stop right in front of this on the corner. It's
9 already high trafficked from Aubrey where they're coming through for the businesses
10 that are already located there. And I think that this is just not a good decision for a
11 residential neighborhood. It is Royal Pines, it is a residential neighborhood and it really
12 needs to remain that for the safety of our children. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out tonight.

14 MS. FRIERSON: She's the last person that signed up to speak.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else come a little late because of the rain and
16 missed the sign up? No? Okay. Okay Commission, this is now on the floor for
17 discussion or any questions back to Staff if you're thinking of one. I would just say my
18 thoughts on this one is this does look like a pretty well established neighborhood. These
19 are two parcels inside of a neighborhood. I can see how the Comp Plan could go either
20 way. But with the frontage being Two Notch for the General Commercial and this being
21 the back side it seems kind of like a difference. Thoughts Commissioners?

22 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

1 MR. SIERCKS: I tend to agree. It's, I mean, it is a solidly residential area and if
2 you zoom out a little ways there is no other natural buffer for what looks to be at least a
3 couple blocks. If this were to be made General Commercial I don't really see any, you
4 know, any potential stopping point for further encroachment into the residential. And as
5 well intentioned as the Applicant may be, what the designed or intended use is, our job
6 is not to look at intended uses because as we all know intended uses can change and
7 we have to look at the map as basically a blank slate. And though this is compliant I'm
8 not sure that it meets with the, the overall guidance in what would fit naturally within this
9 space.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks.

11 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Duffy?

13 MR. DUFFY: Just to build upon what Commissioner Siercks mentioned there,
14 you know, if we looked at the surrounding area north, south and east, it's all R3. The
15 rest [inaudible] the rest is General Commercial. If we were to make this change it, you
16 know, would open up the floodgates for additional GC requests all around so I have
17 some concerns about that and obviously north, south and east of the property is all R3
18 so it raises some questions why we would make that change at this time.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Duffy. Anyone else, any
20 thoughts?

21 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

1 MR. GRADY: Yes. So I believe I'm of a somewhat different mind here and that's
2 because I, when I look at the future land use map this is clearly an area that it's within
3 the community activity center, it's very close to multiple mixed use corridors that have
4 been designated. So that seems to me that is the Plan telling, telling us that this is an
5 area that is supposed to experience a, a denser level of development. It's, it's supposed
6 to be compatible with, you know, a wide array of the commercial/office and similar sorts
7 of spaces. So while, you know, while the existing character of the area fits a certain land
8 use, in my opinion there does need to be some thought about if this is an area that has
9 been identified by County Council for redevelopment, whether it is appropriate for us to,
10 in my view somewhat arbitrarily decide against that.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. I think that's a good valid
12 comment. I would say or suggest with the FLUM, the future land use, and it being in an
13 economic node, when we looked at our zoning code last year this area became an R3
14 which would be an area of denser residential. So there could be growth in a residential
15 way versus General Commercial going into this neighborhood. That's just what I see
16 from the map. Would anyone like to make a motion?

17 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair, I have a question before you move to a motion.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

19 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff actually. In your conclusion you say the
20 proposed Map Amendment aligns with the overall objectives of the Comprehensive Plan
21 for the community activity center designation therefore it is deemed compliant with the
22 Comprehensive Plan. Is it the intent of the Comprehensive Plan that all of these
23 residential lots, you know, if they are open to rezoning to General Commercial?

1 MR. PRICE: No, sir. So I'll use the term that we've used quite frequently when
2 we talk about activity centers and that's broadly identified. And one of the things we talk
3 about is, even as a Staff you look at there essentially is a circle that identifies that area
4 so it's gonna bleed over into areas that maybe it wasn't intended to be included in the,
5 in the, within that activity center. So that's why, that's why it's been proposed to you,
6 you know, you take a further look into this and to make a determination, just because it
7 looks, this area kinda falls within doesn't necessarily mean that that is the direction it
8 should go, but it also doesn't mean that it shouldn't go. And one of the things we try to
9 include on page 5 of your packet, it talks about, you know, this is actually a section that
10 we took from the Comprehensive Plan and it talks about the purpose and use of the
11 future land use map. Again, I can pick certain sections of it, second paragraph, future
12 land use categories and the future land use map provides solely with the intention of
13 offering guidance to local decision makers, does not make formal recommendations to
14 rezone properties to align with these future land use designations but provides support
15 for future land use designations during a rezoning case evaluation. If you go down to
16 the fourth, I guess the second paragraph under the second heading, future land use
17 categories were developed by considering development character, utilities, service
18 areas, lines of natural features and roadways, particularly for areas near or on the
19 boundaries of future land use categories. Discretion by the Richland County Planning
20 Staff is needed to determine the appropriate future land use category that should be
21 applied. And again, ultimately the rezoning decisions are for County Council. So the
22 fact that this falls within an activity center is really kind of a guide for that area, but
23 during, you know, during this process which is before the Planning Commission and

1 also for County Council, it really requires you to take a deeper dive into just looking at
2 the area more specifically versus what the overall future land use map is just kind of
3 broadly showing or generally showing you.

4 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Staff, you use that term
6 broadly painted.

7 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We're trying not to use that but we can't get away from
9 that. And so when we look at that being broadly painted and look at it zoomed out just,
10 I've noted, my day job is a map guy and sometimes this label, the map on page 12, isn't
11 perfectly where the actual site is. This one's pretty close but the center of that node is
12 really Two Notch and Clemson Road, so broadly speaking, like it's about a half mile
13 circle we put on this FLUM. And it could be this mixed economic corridor. That's kinda
14 how broad it is. Commissioners, I'd be interested in a motion for or against, if we can
15 just get a vote going.

16 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

18 MR. DURANT: I move that we forward Case 24-055 MA to County Council with a
19 recommendation of disapproval based on the fact that the proposal conflicts with policy
20 guidance that seeks to buffer residential neighborhoods from more intensive uses.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Do we have a second?

22 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I have a second from Commissioner Siercks. We have a
2 motion on the floor for disapproval. Staff, could you please take a vote?

3 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a motion for the disapproval of Case 24-055 MA.
4 Those in favor of the motion, Grady?

5 MR. GRADY: No.

6 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

7 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Durant?

9 MR. DURANT: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

11 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

13 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

17 *[Approved to deny: Siercks, Durant, Duffy, Frierson, Yonke; Opposed: Grady; Absent:*
18 *Johnson, Taylor, Metts]*

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioners. Thank you, Staff. This will be
20 taken up by County Council at their next Zoning Public Hearing. What's the date on that
21 one, Staff?

22 MR. PRICE: That is April 22nd.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. April 22nd 6:00 or 7:00pm?

1 MR. PRICE: 7:00pm.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 7:00pm in these Council chambers.

3 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. We will move on to 5.b.2., and I'll flip it to Staff
5 to introduce it, thanks.

6 **CASE NO. 25-008 MA:**

7 MR. PRICE: Alright, our next item is Case 25-008 MA. The Applicant is Julius
8 Murray. The location is 3236 Congaree Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone five
9 acres from Homestead which his HM to Light Industrial, LI. It has been determined that
10 it is not compliant with the recommendations and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.
11 The Comprehensive Plan designates this area as rural large lot and rural activity
12 centers. Again it's been determined it does not align with the objectives for industrial
13 development within the rural activity center future land use designation. According to the
14 Comp Plan the rural activity centers provide for opportunities at rural crossroad
15 locations for commercial development to serve the surrounding rural community with
16 incorporating context, sensitive designs that locate more intensive uses away from
17 adjacent residential properties and protect these residential properties from negative
18 impacts such as light, sound and traffic. The Light Industrial district provides for uses
19 that do not align with the intended uses and development standards of the rural activity
20 center future land use designation. Additionally, the proposed rezoning conflicts with the
21 rural residential areas designation of the Lower Richland Strategic Community Master
22 Plan which recommends that any new development should be compatible to existing
23 residential and respectful of existing agricultural operations and historic properties.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, any questions for Staff?
2 Okay. Commissioner Frierson, anyone signed up to speak?

3 MS. FRIERSON: Yes, the Applicant, Mr. Julius Murray.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down, sir.

5 **TESTIMONY OF JULIUS MURRAY II:**

6 MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Good evening. Julius Murray II, 1069 Old Bluff Road,
7 Hopkins, South Carolina. I'm requesting that this, well I'm asking that this property be
8 transferred or upgraded to a Light Industrial. I believe it will fall into the plans because
9 they're proposing a hemp processing plant, one which will, what you say, use the
10 agriculture in the area. It is the, the footprint is non-hazardous to the community and the
11 traffic will be very low. As we know hemp is produced, 90 days so the processing plant
12 will probably open maybe six, seven months out of the year based on local farmers. And
13 this also gives the farmers opportunities to, to grow for us and grow for our community.
14 That's it, thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

16 MS. FRIERSON: We have no one else who is signed up to speak on this issue.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else in the audience I may have missed with the
18 weather today? No? Okay. Alright Commissioners, this is on the floor for discussion. I
19 have a question for Staff. We do look at each one as a blank slate but as a question for
20 this type of industry, is there a space in Homestead or another rural zone for this type of
21 complimentary industrial type of work? You know what I'm saying?

1 MR. PRICE: You know, looking at the table 26-4.2b, principal use table for land
2 uses, use types allowed within the Land Development Code, in short that answer would
3 be no, we don't have a category that this will fall under, the proposed use.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This type of use, would it fall in some of the agro, not agro-
5 tourism but agro-like processing?

6 MR. PRICE: I think when you get into the processing part of this is where it kind
7 of leans towards the Light Industrial. Again, so we kinda have two things here and I
8 don't wanna get off topic because what you have before you is a request for Light
9 Industrial at this location, not necessarily what it's going to be used for. However, as
10 proposals are brought before, whether it be Staff or at Planning Commission, maybe
11 even Council, you know, maybe it is a time to kind of reevaluate and determine if
12 maybe, not necessarily the rezoning is needed to achieve a certain use but rather an
13 amendment to the Code to allow the uses in certain zoning designations if it's not
14 identified currently.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Staff.

16 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

18 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff. If I'm looking at the maps of this area correctly
19 more than a half to three quarters of this particular lot is covered by water, correct?
20 What kind of body of water is that, is that a small pond or lake?

21 MR. PRICE: We'll pull this up. That would be wetlands. So the area that you see
22 identified on your map and also on the screen before you, it represents that there's
23 wetlands identified on this parcel.

1 MR. DURANT: Is there any concern with changing this to Light Industrial that
2 whatever is developed there could harm the wetlands?

3 MR. PRICE: Those would be taken in consideration during the time of application
4 for development of the site and which this would have to be presented to the Army
5 Corps for their approval.

6 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Any other questions for
8 Staff or comments?

9 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

11 MR. GRADY: I do recall there was another case somewhat similar to this, I don't
12 know if it was last year or further back, but there was, it was something similar. I believe
13 it was a, somebody wanted to set up a venison processing plant for hunters in the area.
14 And we kinda ran into these same issues where we didn't wanna rezone it Light
15 Industrial because that would allow a whole bunch of uses, but the proposed use itself
16 seems like it was compatible. So I, I believe we probably, I believe what Staff
17 recommended earlier is probably the right idea where we need to identify uses that
18 currently are listed as industrial but would be compatible with a rural community. And I
19 think that's probably something that'll take a lotta work. That's, it's certainly a glitch that I
20 think we've identified with several of these cases at this point, so. I think I'll just kind of
21 put that out there as a thought, but certainly I would have concerns about just allowing
22 this to be any Light Industrial use.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. I kinda lean that directly
2 too, and I remember that case as well.

3 MS. FRIERSON: I do too.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah? You remember the case?

5 MS. FRIERSON: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, we remember.

7 MS. FRIERSON: Um-hum (affirmative).

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Also looking at the map, just a blank canvas similar to the
9 last case, this one is not at an intersection. It's in this rural neighborhood. And Lower
10 Richland has a separate plan that was mentioned in the conclusion; that this proposal
11 would go against it. Commissioners, any motions?

12 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

14 MR. GRADY: I would like to move that we advance Case 25-008 MA to County
15 Council with a recommendation for disapproval.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Do we have a second?

17 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: A second from Commissioner Siercks. Okay Staff, we have
19 a motion for disapproval.

20 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a motion for disapproval of Case 25-008 MA.
21 Those in favor of the motion, Grady?

22 MR. GRADY: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

1 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Durant?

3 MR. DURANT: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

5 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

7 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

11 *[Approved to deny: Grady, Siercks, Durant, Duffy, Frierson, Yonke; Absent: Johnson,*
12 *Taylor, Metts]*

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff, Commissioners. I believe this one will
14 also be taken up at the next Zoning Public Hearing?

15 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: April 22nd, 7:00pm, same location.

17 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Thanks for coming out.

19 MR. MURRAY: Thank you.

20 MR. PRICE: Excuse me, Mr. Chair?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, go ahead Staff.

22 MR. PRICE: Just before we get to the next case I kinda would just like to take a
23 chance to kinda elaborate on something that Commissioner Grady stated, and thank

1 you for kind of almost a reminder of that. And he's correct, that I think either just prior to
2 or during the, when we were reviewing the Land Development Code, the one that we
3 currently are operating under, we did have a case where there was a, I guess deer
4 processing, as you remember that also, Ms. Frierson, came in. And it was kind of, it was
5 in a rural area, which when we had the rural zoning, and so there was some discussion
6 about having a use such as that allowing that in the rural area. And so we kind of put off
7 that rezoning request until such time we had the new Land Development Code. And so I
8 was looking within our Code currently and under manufacturing, assembly and
9 fabrication, intensive, within that definition it does include animal food, animal
10 slaughtering and processing, among other uses. However, it is allowed under the AG
11 zoning designation which is Agricultural, versus the current, the zoning of the current
12 request which is Homestead. So I just wanted to let you know that there is a use, a use,
13 a category that potentially could allow – and there are, I'm sorry, there are other uses
14 within there that may accommodate this, however, it is limited to the Agriculture zoning
15 designation at this time.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Staff. So we're gonna keep rolling to 5.b.3. Go
17 ahead, Staff.

18 **CASE NO. 25-014 MA:**

19 MR. PRICE: Alright, our – thank you. Our next item is Case 25-014 MA. The
20 Applicant is Gale B. Grayson. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 4.89 acres of land
21 designated Homestead, HM, to RT which is Residential Transition. The location of the
22 parcel is at 11321 Monticello Road. According to the Comprehensive Plan it's been
23 deemed to be non-compliant, the request for the RT designation as this, as the request

1 falls within the rural large lot designation of the Richland County Comprehensive Plan.
2 According to the Plan smaller lot subdivisions are not an appropriate development type.
3 The requested zoning allows for a minimum lot size that does not support the
4 recommended or desired land uses for this designation. Additionally, the proposed Map
5 Amendment is inconsistent with the residential/agricultural guidelines and
6 recommendation for this area. While the requested Map Amendment does not comply
7 with the rural large lot designation recommendations for this area, its approval would
8 permit land lot sizes and uses that are consistent with the character of parcels in the
9 nearby area.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Do we have any questions,
11 Commissioners, for Staff? Hearing none, Commissioner Frierson?

12 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, the first person is the Applicant, Gale B. Grayson.

13 **TESTIMONY OF GAYLE B. GRAYSON:**

14 MS. GRAYSON: Good evening. My name is Gale Bright Grayson. My address in
15 upper Richland County is 11321 Monticello Road, we're just a stone's throw from the
16 Fairfield County line. And I'm here today to request the rezoning of my property. I am, I
17 am a farmer and I have received a grant from the South Carolina Community for
18 Economic Development. They awarded me a hoop house or tunnel house and I have
19 put that on the first part of my property, one acre. And this property is for my family and I
20 want to just do something that will provide for my neighborhood and for the surrounding
21 areas of Richland County, Fairfield County, Blythewood. So this hoop house, it does not
22 have any water, it doesn't have any electricity. There is electricity and well water on the
23 land, however, I would love to continue my work to provide for the people in my area

1 because we're in a desert area. And the grant specifies that everything that I grow
2 would provide, would be provided to churches, organizations and families. And I would
3 also like to keep the first portion of my property, that one acre, to be utilized for the hoop
4 house. And I would like to have the remaining properties to be zoned so that my family
5 members could build there still, and myself. I have many dreams and aspirations for the
6 purpose of that property and I feel that it will be a great asset to the community of upper
7 Richland County since we live about 17 to 18 miles from the nearest grocery store.

8 *[Johnson in at 6:50pm]*

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, ma'am.

10 MS. GRAYSON: That's it.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's your time, thank you.

12 MS. GRAYSON: Thank you.

13 MS. FRIERSON: The next person, Matthew G., it's Brill or Grill, I'm not certain,
14 sorry.

15 **TESTIMONY OF MATTHEW GALE BRIGHT:**

16 MR. BRIGHT: It's okay, ma'am. Yes, ma'am, my name is Matthew Gale Bright.
17 I'm a medically retired Veteran. Thank you for volunteering your time today and hearing
18 our proposal for this property. I thank my mother for standing here and allowing y'all to,
19 you know, grace her with the opportunity, you know –

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Are you at the same address, sir?

21 MR. BRIGHT: I'm at, I'm actually at 295 Milton Road, Winnsboro, 29180, excuse
22 me. Yes, sir.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, go ahead.

1 MR. BRIGHT: But definitely we're a family of Veterans and also community
2 service providers. This actual community that you're looking at in that whole area is
3 condensed with all of our family members; not only family members but people that
4 share land as neighbors throughout this big wide community. And for years we have
5 been providing food to this community in the direct area of this property and throughout
6 Fairfield County and Richland County. And we would just definitely like to continue the
7 work that we've been doing. It's not just about providing for the community but also
8 continuing to expend and expound on the legacy that our father left behind, Mr. Mayfield
9 Grayson, Jr., who passed before the, right at the covid-19 pandemic. And so my mother
10 would like for this, for this property to subdivided into four parcels. As of right now it's
11 being zoned as HM it would only allow her to dissect into 1.5 acre lots and we've
12 already had a survey where it was dissected into four lots. And so we're just humbly
13 representing this plan to you all that, you know, that our family is able to, after all this
14 time finally get back settled on this property and continue our work to provide a service
15 to the community.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

17 MR. BRIGHT: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Would it be, is it the 4.89 acres under question for
19 rezoning?

20 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. You can continue.

22 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, the next person is Mr. Leroy Hendricks.

23 MR. HENDRICKS: No, I signed up to the wrong one.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. No worries, thank you. So no one else is signed up
2 to speak for this one then, correct?

3 MS. FRIERSON: Correct.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay Commissioners. Welcome Commissioner
5 Johnson.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This is on the floor for discussion.

8 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

10 MR. GRADY: So I believe, again, a little bit of Deja vu here cause I believe we
11 had a case somewhat similar to this where it was deemed non-compliant and I think it I
12 said something to the effect of a one acre lot seems like a large lot to me. So I would,
13 this certainly does not seem like a request that is at odds with the overall goals of the
14 Plan as I see it. So that can be expressed as a motion if no one else has anything to
15 say, but I wanna throw it out to the group.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. I lean in that direction as
17 well but I would also like to hear comments from the group. Any other comments from
18 the group? Hearing none, Commissioner Grady can move forward with a motion.

19 MR. GRADY: Alright. I would like to make a motion to advance Case 25-014 MA
20 to County Council with a recommendation of approval. The rationale being that the RT
21 designation is, an adjoining parcel has the RT zoning designation and an RT zoning is,
22 in our view, consistent with the rural large lot designation.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Do we have a second?

1 MR. DURANT: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Okay with a motion
3 and a second, we have a motion for approval on the floor. Staff, could you please take a
4 vote?

5 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a motion for the approval of Case 25-014 MA.
6 Those in favor of that motion, Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

9 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Durant?

11 MR. DURANT: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

13 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

15 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

17 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

21 *[Approved: Grady, Siercks, Durant, Duffy, Johnson, Frierson, Yonke; Absent: Taylor,*
22 *Metts]*

23

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you, Commissioners. Once again,
2 County Council will still take this up –

3 MR. PRICE: April 22nd –

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: April 22nd.

5 MR. PRICE: 7:00pm.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

7 MR. PRICE: In Council chambers which is here.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Right here, yes. Audience members again are welcome to
9 stay or leave whenever they'd like. Be careful in the weather. We'll keep moving on.

10 **CASE NO. 25-015 MA:**

11 MR. PRICE: Alright, our next case is, or next item, excuse me, is Case 25-015
12 MA. The Applicant is Mark Glenn. The Applicant is requesting to rezone four parcels
13 which consist of 9.83 acres from, there's a mix of zoning designations of RT, Residential
14 Transition and HM, Homestead, to Light Industrial, LI. The Comprehensive Plan views
15 this as being non-compliant with the objectives of the rural large lot designation of the
16 Comp Plan which this is located within. While this designation allows for light industrial
17 uses that support land conservation efforts, particularly those protecting prime
18 agricultural lands and important natural resources, the requested zoning permits a level
19 of intensity in development standards that do not align with the recommended or
20 desired land uses for this designation. Additionally, the proposed Map Amendment is
21 inconsistent with the residential agricultural guidelines and recommendations for this
22 area. Approving the request would not only allow the permitted uses in the LI district,
23 but also remove the non-conforming status of three of the four subject parcels which are

1 already developed, enabling the expansion of existing structures and uses. However,
2 the requested Map Amendment would introduce lot sizes and uses that are inconsistent
3 with the character and development of surrounding parcels. Additionally, portions of the
4 subject site may not be contextually appropriate, excuse me, it says for but it should be
5 from an arterial road and could be seen as encroaching into a rural area.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Any questions for Staff? I have a
7 question, so there's businesses operating non-conformingly right now?

8 MR. PRICE: That is correct.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: From, they've been there since before the new Code?

10 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And any action today, will that effect their business license
12 and whatnot?

13 MR. PRICE: As stated previously approval of the request would allow for, you
14 know, potential expansions of the structures and uses on the site. Also, it would also
15 allow for new uses to be introduced. Denial of the request would leave these parcels
16 within a non-conforming status which means they would be allowed to operate as is,
17 however, future expansion of the structures and uses would be prohibited.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Ms. Frierson?

19 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, the first person who is signed up to speak is the
20 Applicant, Mr. Mark Glenn.

21 **TESTIMONY OF MARK GLENN:**

22 MR. GLENN: Good evening. I'm Mark Glenn, address 144 Mariners Bluff Road,
23 York, South Carolina. We're seeking to have this property rezoned, to be frank with you

1 I would've thought it had been rezoned at some other point in time. This business has
2 been sitting here for 50 years. It was first opened in 1969. It has evolved to some
3 degree but pretty much has stayed the same. We are a company that reconditions large
4 industrial motors. Like I said it has been there for 50 years. We're seeking to get this
5 rezoned because if you look at the map on the right hand side there is a building
6 running perpendicular to the road, a long slender building. That building is 50 years old,
7 it's antiquated, it, I'm sure the electrical, we're electricians by the way, is not in
8 compliance. But we want to build a building in-between those two to replace that
9 antiquated one. That is our purpose for getting it rezoned. We won't be expanding any
10 of our usage, we will simply be replacing one building with another building. I'm not
11 sure, I heard just a second ago that if it's not approved that we're still able to operate
12 out of conformity. But at this point because of that building and its state, we would have
13 to pick up and move. So that's where this is at this point. We want to develop that on the
14 property and we're seeking to have those four lots rezoned so that we can operate in
15 conformity, even though it's been there for 50 years, and that we can build this building
16 to replace the other.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

18 MS. FRIERSON: Next person is Mr. Justin Glenn.

19 MR. J. GLENN: I'll pass.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. He's gonna pass.

21 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Leroy Hendricks.

22 **TESTIMONY OF LEROY HENDRICKS:**

1 MR. HENDRICKS: I'm Leroy Hendricks. I live at 1312 Cedar Creek Road,
2 Blythewood, South Carolina, probably about a mile from the facility. Hadn't had the
3 privilege of meeting Mr. Glenn. But several, this parcel if you will look, it abuts several of
4 the homesteads around it, and so I can appreciate Mr. Glenn saying we won't build
5 beyond where we are. But if you re-designate they can do what they wanna do, so. So
6 my concern is currently their function has not overly impacted the homesteads, okay,
7 even though there's a road next to the facility that connects to about 165 acres. And so
8 our concern is if it's re-designated it may impact some of the homesteads on that road. I
9 live about a mile from here and so as it is now, even though we're off of 215, big
10 thoroughfare, if the industry, if it's transforms from light industry to something else, it
11 may impact the amount of traffic and access off of Cedar Creek and 215. So that's
12 kinda our concern. If you notice there's also a kind of archival AME Church about $\frac{3}{4}$
13 down the road, there's another Blythewood Church which is also like a archival church.
14 So I'm just concerned if we open that door that it may impact the homestead and some
15 of the other important buildings in that area. So just my take on it. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. And thank you for everyone who came out
17 tonight.

18 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, the last person that we have who is signed up to speak is
19 Pam Johnston.

20 **TESTIMONY OF PAM JOHNSTON:**

21 MS. JOHNSTON: Good evening. My name is Pam Johnston, 419 Mt. Valley
22 Road, Blythewood, South Carolina. I know where this parcel is, I grew up right behind it.
23 My dad still lives there, right behind it. The road that he's on is butted up against it. And

1 our concern is that, you know, being, stuff being washed down, down to his house, the
2 smoke and stuff. Yes, my mom worked there for 25 years so I know all about this place.
3 And we're just concerned about the building and everything, I mean, it's – but as you
4 can see back here in the back behind it right in this area, that's his house. He lives on a
5 well. He has two ponds. And he has health problems. So our concern is everything that
6 goes on right now in this shop area cause we drive by it every day when we go down
7 his road, his road butts up to the property. You know, so that's our concern and his
8 concern as well. He, you know, but we're, he's against it, I'm against it. Like I said I
9 grew up there and, you know, I know all about it. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

11 MS. FRIERSON: She was the last person who signed up to speak on this matter.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. Okay Commissioners,
13 this is on the floor for discussion. And we can always go back to Staff for more
14 questions. Again looking at the map I notice a variety of zones that we have here
15 currently before we make a change, potential change. One that backs up against the
16 homestead some more, help me with the colors, that's the RT? Or is that, that would be,
17 it's bigger so that's the HM. Okay. I'll point that out, thanks. How you doing,
18 Commissioner Johnson?

19 MR. JOHNSON: The Chair looks [inaudible]. The struggle for me on this
20 particular case lies in the core fact that once we rezone we've rezoned, and not
21 necessarily based on what the owner's intent of it is. That's the struggle with this, and
22 you're trying to balance that with a business that's been there for a substantial amount
23 of time. If we rezone almost 10 acres as Light Industrial and just looking at what's

1 around it, the, there's not similar light industrial immediately adjacent that I see. Or
2 something relatively comparable.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Sounds like that would
4 be a big impact to this rural area.

5 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Question for Staff, and this is, this might be a little off the wall, are
8 we allowed, since this is, there are four different parcels under consideration, are we
9 allowed to give different decisions by parcel?

10 MR. PRICE: In short the answer would be no. The request that you have before
11 you is for, it's one case for all parcels. Now had this come in, and you see this
12 periodically where someone will come in, even though the parcels are adjacent to each
13 other, they may come in under separate cases, and so in a case like that you would be
14 able to, however, as this has come in as one basically all parcels are subject to your
15 vote for one decision.

16 MR. GRADY: Okay. So just to clarify, the three parcels that are already
17 developed are the three that are zoned RT?

18 MR. PRICE: Let me click the other piece. Yes, sir. So the three that are
19 developed are zoned, are currently zoned RT, Residential Transition, and the
20 undeveloped portion, kinda serves as a flag lot that's between them, is zoned
21 Homestead, HM.

22 MR. GRADY: Okay. The reason I raised that question was I was contemplating
23 the fact that those three are already developed, whereas if we authorize the fourth

1 parcel to become Light Industrial we are essentially increasing the footprint of the
2 existing facility, not to mention that again, if it zoned for Light Industrial it can be used
3 for any light industrial use. So I was going to suggest a split decision but apparently that
4 is not, not something we can do. I think that's all I've got. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Commissioner Johnson,
6 anything to add?

7 MR. JOHNSON: I was just gonna add, as currently presented.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Um-hum (affirmative). Alright Commissioners, would we
9 like to make a motion as it's currently presented?

10 MR. DURANT: One question, one comment before we make a motion.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant. My apologies.

12 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair. That's alright. I'm sensitive to the fact that this business
13 has operated on this property for 50 some odd years and now it's, depending on what
14 action is ultimately taken by County Council, based on our recommendation or not, it
15 would be harmed if, if this request is not approved. So I just wanted to put on the
16 Record that I am sensitive to the fact that they've been there a number of years and just
17 seek to continue doing what they've been doing and get in line with the zoning
18 requirements of that area.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Any other thoughts?

20 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman? Question.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

22 MR. JOHNSON: I mean, and I don't wanna put words in Commissioner Grady's
23 mouth but if I extrapolate his question I guess – well let me just say it from my

1 perspective, it would be more palatable to make that rezoning for those front three
2 developed parcels and would at least be responsive to the folks who have spoken for
3 the community and not addressing the fourth rear parcel, then maybe that might fall on
4 a better reception if it were presented that way. I know that's not what's before us today.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Right.

6 MR. JOHNSON: But I'm just saying that if I'm the only one who feels that way or
7 if Commissioner Grady feels that way, there may be others.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. I feel as the way Staff
9 has mentioned this, this case has been presented to us in this way so we would need to
10 make a motion as it stands, but go ahead Staff.

11 MR. PRICE: No, I think that's correct. I, I would suggest I guess would be the
12 proper term, that you know, we take the case that is before us and you make your
13 recommendations based on just solely the case. I feel that maybe some of the
14 discussion could be viewed as saying if you make these changes we would approve,
15 and that has, that has occurred before. I think that, that the decisions that you make,
16 you know, will lead to the Applicant to determine whether they will go forward or make
17 any changes prior to the Zoning Public Hearing. But however, I would just caution, you
18 know, any conversation that may lend itself toward what you would be willing to
19 approve.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Well at the end we have to look at this case the way that it
21 was presented to us and we are a recommending body to County Council, they will
22 have their final say on this one. So County Council, they also look at this in the same
23 presentation. We looked at Killian Road many times and lots of those parcels, although

1 they were touching each other, were presented to us individually. This one's presented
2 as a group so we have to look at it in this way.

3 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, do we have a motion?

5 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

7 MR. GRADY: I would move that we advance Case 25-015 MA to County Council
8 with a recommendation of disapproval.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Do we have a second?

10 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: A second from Commissioner Siercks. Okay Staff, we have
12 a motion for disapproval. Please take a vote.

13 MR. PRICE: Alright. We do have a motion for disapproval of Case 25-015 MA.
14 Those in favor of that motion, Grady?

15 MR. GRADY: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

17 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Durant?

19 MR. DURANT: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

21 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

23 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

2 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

6 *[Approved to deny: Grady, Siercks, Durant, Duffy, Johnson, Frierson, Yonke; Absent:*
7 *Taylor, Metts]*

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Again, County Council will take this up as
9 this was presented to us on April 22nd at 7:00pm. Okay Staff, keep on moving, case
10 number 5.

11 **CASE NO. 25-016 MA:**

12 MR. PRICE: Our next item is Case 25-016 MA. The Applicant is Helen Bryson.
13 The location is 1036 Langford Road. The Applicant is looking to rezone 1.82 acres
14 which is a portion of the parent tract from HM which is Homestead to RT Residential
15 Transition. According to the Comprehensive Plan this is deemed to be non-compliant.
16 The proposed Map Amendment is not compliant with the objectives set forth in the
17 Comprehensive Plan for residential development which is within, this falls within the
18 neighborhood medium density future land use designation of the Comp Plan. According
19 to the Comprehensive Plan the neighborhood medium density designation is intended
20 to support medium density residential neighborhoods and neighborhood scaled
21 commercial development designed in a traditional neighborhood format. These areas
22 serve as a transition between neighborhood low density and more intense residential
23 high density environments. The Plan also emphasizes creating medium density

1 residential neighborhoods with a mix of residential uses and densities. The RT district
2 does not support the uses and development standards of the neighborhood medium
3 density designation which prioritizes higher densities and smaller lot sizes. Although the
4 requested Map Amendment does not conform to the neighborhood medium density
5 designation of the Comprehensive Plan it allows, it would allow, its approval, excuse
6 me, would allow lot sizes and uses that align with the character of the surrounding
7 parcels to the west of the site.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Do we have any questions for Staff? Is
9 the recommendation non-compliant cause it's not dense enough?

10 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay Commissioner Frierson.

12 MS. FRIERSON: We have one person who has signed up to speak, Mr. David K.
13 Ballard.

14 **TESTIMONY OF DAVID K. BALLARD:**

15 MR. BALLARD: Good evening. I'm Dave Ballard, 1333 Bear Creek Road,
16 Blythewood, South Carolina 29016. I'm here to speak on behalf of the owner. The intent
17 of what they're trying to do is – let me start over, on the two properties that are shown
18 there, the larger property and the one acre square property, there are three sisters that
19 live on those two properties and they are desirous of building a storage building for the
20 three sisters for the families, but HM zoning only allows a 1200 square foot or lower
21 storage building and RT zoning for the one acre which is RT only allows a 1200 square
22 foot, and they're looking to build a little bit larger footprint than that for the storage for
23 the three families, okay. So the, what we're trying to do is zone that 1.85 acres RT and

1 join it with the one acre so it will be a 2.85 acre parcel, but in order to do that and to get
2 the storage building we have to do the zoning first. So we're just, it's steps, but that is
3 what we are trying to accomplish and I hope that offers clarity in what they're, why
4 they're trying to rezone that property.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

6 MS. FRIERSON: We have no one else who has signed up to speak.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. This is now open for
8 discussion, Commissioners. My thought again to Staff, this is a recommended non-
9 compliant cause it's not dense enough, but it's moving in the right direction according to
10 the Plan? The future land use, is that -

11 MR. PRICE: It could be viewed that way. Yes, sir.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Thoughts, Commissioners, motions? Does
13 anyone see a reason to not? Okay, Commissioner Grady?

14 MR. GRADY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would move that we advance Case 25-016
15 MA to County Council with a recommendation of approval, the rationale being that the
16 requested RT designation is compatible with both an adjacent parcel and several
17 additional parcels in the immediate area.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Do we have a second?

19 MS. FRIERSON: I second.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We got a second from Commissioner Frierson. Okay Staff,
21 can you please take a vote? The motion is for approval.

22 MR. PRICE: Okay, we have a motion for the approval of Case 25-016 MA. Those
23 in favor of the motion, Grady?

1 MR. GRADY: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

3 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

7 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

9 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

11 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

15 *[Approved: Grady, Siercks, Durant, Duffy, Johnson, Frierson, Yonke; Absent: Taylor,*
16 *Metts]*

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you, Commissioners. April 22nd,
18 7:00pm County Council will take this up. Thank you to everyone who came out for that
19 one. In our Agenda we have number 6 as withdrawn, is that still current?

20 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, so we move on to number 6. in the Agenda, the
22 Olympia Neighborhood Character Overlay. We were given an additional handout on this
23 one. Commissioner Johnson, did you get one?

1 MR. JOHNSON: No.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do you have another copy?

3 MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening, Commissioners. At our last meeting when we got
4 together we received several comments from the Commission and at that time you all
5 made the decision, which I think was a good decision, to go back and defer to allow
6 Staff more time to review those comments. We also sent a request out for anyone to
7 email any additional comments and we did receive an additional set of comments that
8 we've gone through. And in the package that you received before the meeting included
9 the updated changes which are in yellow or the red strike-through, and then we also
10 gave you one copy that included the comments we received in our response so that
11 way you can see a cleaner copy and one that also has the comments. Since that time
12 that we've sent you the Agenda packet we have received additional comments from the
13 public. Those comments are not included in your packet and they have not, they've
14 been looked at by Staff but we have not incorporated any of those recommendations or
15 suggestions into what you have received. So we will still proceed with giving you an
16 update today on what changes were made based off the comments we received from
17 you all and then give you an update on a little bit of what we've received from the public.
18 But we also will be open to the recommendation if you want us to defer a vote until
19 those comments could be incorporated as well, because we did not have a chance to
20 get those fully incorporated before meeting with you here tonight. I also wanna let you
21 all be aware that County Council approved first reading by title only for a moratorium on
22 new development, rezones and demolitions in the Olympia Mill district until the
23 neighborhood character overlay is adopted. They also included the Pending Ordinance

1 Doctrine so that way it goes into effect immediately, and that's for up to six months or
2 unless the overlay is approved ahead of six months. So if you do defer it we don't have
3 the worry or concern that someone can still come in and get a new permit application,
4 that moratorium will prevent that from happening while you take more time to review any
5 changes that are presented to you. And if we do have another meeting, if you do defer
6 we would recommend potentially having a work session to go through all of those in
7 more detail. So before, if there are any questions I'll take those, if not then I will turn it
8 over to our Comprehensive Planner Mark Ridlehoover to go through some of the
9 changes that were made since we met last.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, any questions to her based on the process
11 or just in general? Commissioner Grady?

12 MR. GRADY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Question for Staff, and this may be
13 impossible but I figure I'll throw it out there anyway, would you say that the, the
14 comments from the public were overwhelmingly on something specific or were they
15 diffused and on a wide range of topics? And if it's the former would it be possible to
16 characterize that in some way?

17 MS. WILLIAMS: It's a little bit of both. Some of the comments we believe we can
18 address and bring up to you relatively easily; one is related to the handout that was
19 given to you regarding the intent of the overlay and what we're trying to achieve that
20 may require a little bit more discussion with a little bit more feedback from you all.

21 MR. GRADY: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks.

1 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: Alright, good evening Commissioners. So I will I guess
2 divide up my updates into the three parts based on what makes sense for me. We'll go
3 over the changes that are included in your packet, the highlighted and the strike-
4 throughs. Then we'll also touch on some of the public comments that we received that
5 we were not able to incorporate into your packet. And then finally one related to the
6 handout that you were given on a point of clarity that Staff wants to establish in order for
7 us to move forward to any potential updates to the ordinance if the, if it is deferred
8 again. So in regards to the changes that were made based on comments from Planning
9 Commission last month, you'll find those highlighted in yellow and with a strike-throughs
10 for the most part the main points that we wanted to address involved clarifying some
11 language as well as, as well as addressing specific points mentioned in comments. So
12 you can see some of the main points on the first page, we included the Purpose
13 Statement which helps it conform with other zoning districts in the Land Development
14 Code. Other major changes to the, to the overview of the ordinance are the, the – we,
15 we have the overlay standards, we are trying to contain them in that they are applicable
16 to features that are visible from the public right-of-way. This is, this is standard for these
17 types of architectural overlay designations so that's something we wanted to point out in
18 the applicability section, as well as we adjusted the boundaries of the overlay in a way
19 that more properly reflects what was the historic district. So we took the map from,
20 rather than the map we previously had, which was tied to the Capitol City Mill District
21 Master Plan, we tied it instead to the map that's logged in the National Register of
22 Historic Places which has some exclusions from the previous map for parcels that were
23 not included in the historic neighborhood. As far as language in the standards

1 themselves, a lot of the points that we made were for, were for clarity. Another section
2 that is on the first page in section 3(a)(iii), that additions to non-historic structures shall
3 not increase the total floor area by more than 25% based on the floor plan at the time of
4 adoption of these standards. This point is one of the methods that we, we added to the
5 overlay as a way to further the purpose, the part of the Purpose Statement which seeks
6 to encourage any change, whether through renovations and such to contribute to the
7 architectural character of the neighborhood as a way to prevent non-contributing parcels
8 from overwhelming or being treated too differently from those parcels that contain
9 historic structures. Another big point that we tried to incorporate which was based on
10 comments from Commissioner Grady last time in regards to materials and the difficulty
11 that might come about trying to replace or build with specific types of materials which
12 may, may not be as efficient or as affordable, based on guidance we had from the
13 application to the National Historic Register we had clarity that alterations to the material
14 would not necessarily make the, the structure or the neighborhood non-contributing. So
15 that gave us some leeway to expand our language in the ordinance to allow not just
16 materials that match the historic ones, but also ones that simulate the look so that the
17 aesthetics are maintained while not constraining, overly constraining the materials that
18 are allowed in the, in the ordinance. And then also we, we removed a lot of
19 redundancies that are covered from the underlying zoning, so things like the language
20 about chain link fences as well as the language about parking requirements. These are
21 a lot of points that are already covered by the underlying zoning that we removed those
22 from the overlay to not be redundant with the underlying zoning which would still apply
23 in those cases. Okay. So moving on to the comments that we got from the public that

1 were, we were not able to, we discussed it as a Staff but were not able to incorporate
2 them and prepare them for Planning Commission ahead of time, but that we do believe
3 raise some very important points that we will need to go back and address. As I
4 mentioned before one of the things we added in is that public right-of-way stipulation of
5 the Overlay, that comes, from that we had the discussion and comments of many
6 standards within the Overlay still touch on parts of the structure that would not be visible
7 from the right-of-way. So we believe as a Staff we need to go back and look through
8 whether that is something that would be enforceable considering the constraints of the
9 Overlay being restricted to the right-of-way; so things like foot, building footprints,
10 additions and such, that could be, could be done in a way that is not visible from the
11 right-of-way currently the way our language for the standards are written, those would
12 not be, those would not be allowed under certain standards. However, for the language
13 that the Overlay is only applicable for features from the public right-of-way we see that
14 as a contradiction that we would need to address. And then also just some grammar
15 and clarity issues and, are also some of the things that were pointed out from the public
16 that we would need to address. But for the most part we think that those, that public
17 right-of-way constraint is a very foundational component of the Overlay that when, if we
18 see these conflicting points in the standards that we think we need, we should address
19 at this point rather than them coming up later on and causing us issues there where we
20 would need to, we figure we would need to address them later on if we're not
21 addressing them now. So that, because of that when we got these comments from the
22 public that's why Staff is leaning more on to the side of we think that we should take
23 more of a look, look at some of the language of the standards to address those points

1 that could be contradictions later on. And then the final point that we wanted to bring up
2 was something that we wanted for clarity for Staff in order to have a direction on how to,
3 how to frame and build off of some of the language in the Overlay, and that's from the
4 handout that we gave you, and that we are looking for guidance and clarity into the level
5 of preservation that we're trying to accomplish, that's the goal of this Overlay, and that it
6 is the intent of the Overlay to be at a parcel level where each individual parcel in
7 Olympia should have, or should be trying to move towards having a historic structure on
8 it or alternatively is the level of preservation or the goal and intent of the Overlay to
9 restore Olympia as it was originally developed, at least from the right-of-way
10 perspective. And that the, whatever housing type that was on that parcel, is that the
11 specific one that needs to go on that particular parcel or does the house just need to be
12 in line with the character of Olympia overall. So we're looking, we're looking for the
13 direction for us to, when we're going through and adjusting these standards, to what
14 level cause based on, based on which direction we wanna go to can provide different
15 answers that we would, we would address in the standards based on whether we're
16 wanting to maintain a neighborhood level of neighborhood character placing housing
17 types based on the original parcel or whether each individual parcel at the parcel level
18 just needs to be historic. So that's a question we've presented to Planning Commission
19 to mull over to give more clarity on the direction we wanna go as far as the overall goal
20 and intent of the overlay and based on that we would be able to further clarify some of
21 these standards if we, if this is deferred for us to provide further updates. So those are
22 the updates I think needed to be mentioned so I will turn it back over.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: So any questions? I know that was a lotta information thrown at
2 you but we did try to, from the last meeting was to be a little bit more clear and to make
3 sure we addressed the materials question. We got that clarified we believe and
4 responded to some of those comments but, you know, we've gotten the new comments
5 in and then also the overall thought process. The Historic Register tells us what type of
6 historic house was on each parcel originally so that's where the question comes back in,
7 are we looking at restoring it back to the original when it was first established, those
8 houses that were originally on that parcel, that's the look we're going for, or just the
9 overall look of the Olympia neighborhood on the scale, something to consider as well;
10 that'll help us clarify some of these additional questions we received from the public.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks again, Staff, for this thorough explanation and all
12 the hard work you're doing on this. Commissioners, do we have any immediate
13 thoughts or questions? And how would you like, you've given us some time to mull over
14 this, especially this additional handout, how would you like our comments to – I think we
15 did an email format last month. Did that work?

16 MS. WILLIAMS: That did work but again if, if it is deferred we would suggest
17 having a work session. We can do it immediately before this meeting at say around 4:00
18 or 5:00 to give time to go through specifically all the comments that we receive from you
19 and if we receive more from the public. And that way when you go into the regular
20 session, meeting, you've already kind of discussed all that and you can proceed to vote
21 in whatever, which way you feel, having had the chance to discuss it without having to
22 go through all of the previous map amendments that may be on next month's agenda.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That makes sense to me, thank you. Thoughts,
2 Commissioners?

3 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair, just clarification for me. On the last point you asked for
4 the Commissioners to weigh in on as to whether you require a house to be built just like
5 the original house that was on the lot or, and then you said or something that's keeping
6 in character with the neighborhood. What exactly is keeping in character with the
7 neighborhood?

8 MS. WILLIAMS: So for instance in the style guide and the recommendations for
9 the character overlay there's different housing types, so there's the Old Hill housing and
10 then the New Hill house types. And so for instance if you have a vacant lot that you
11 were building on you could pick from one of those Old or New Hill housing types if we
12 go with kind of like the neighborhood scale. But if we go with the parcel scale then we'd
13 go back to the Historic Register and if it was Old Hill type one house that was on that
14 parcel then that's the only housing type that you have to go back to. And you don't have
15 that choice of the different Old Hill types. And so getting some of that clarification on the
16 direction based off of the intent of this can help us also clarify some of the questions
17 we've received from the public.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant, good explanation?

19 MR. DURANT: Yeah, it's a great explanation. It just, on first blush it just seemed
20 requiring the builder to put something that was exactly like what was there before is
21 much more of a pain than just keeping with the character of the neighborhood. Just my
22 opinion.

23 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any thoughts, Commissioners? I mean, are we looking to
2 make a motion of deferral tonight, is that what we're being asked?

3 MS. WILLIAMS: Unless you feel comfortable voting based off of our response to
4 the comments we received and that you received ahead of time in the package, you are
5 welcome to vote based off of that and, you know, we can hash out comments when it
6 goes to Council. Or if you don't feel comfortable doing that knowing we received those
7 additional comments then yes, the recommendation would be to defer it until the next
8 meeting. Or unless we have a work session.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And we've been given additional time now.

10 MS. WILLIAMS: Correct.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, thank you. I like having that additional time to think
12 through this and do this first one the right way, so the Chair will make a motion of
13 deferral. Do we have a second? And with this we'll schedule a work session.

14 MS. FRIERSON: I second the motion.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

16 MS. FRIERSON: For deferral.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, we have a motion and a second. Do we have
18 people in the audience who wanna speak on this?

19 AUDIENCE: There were two that were scheduled to speak.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: To sign up to speak. Do we have a signup sheet for this?
21 Okay.

22 MS. FRIERSON: The first person is Viola Kay Hendley.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down, my apologies.

1 **TESTIMONY OF VIOLA KAY HENDLEY:**

2 MS. HENDLEY: Oh, no worries.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Um-hum (affirmative).

4 MS. HENDLEY: Good evening Chairman and fellow Commissioners. My name's
5 Viola Hendley. I live at 104 Alabama Street, Columbia, South Carolina and I have lived
6 in the neighborhood for 40 years. The Capitol City Mill District area and corridor plan
7 recommended that the historic district protections be provided to the neighborhoods
8 within the district; that includes the Olympia, Whaley and Granby neighborhoods.
9 Unfortunately, Richland County only recently had that designation through the
10 neighborhood characteristic overlay available. It also recognizes the fact that the turn of
11 the century infrastructure really isn't compatible with today's modern infill housing. In 19,
12 in 2023 Historic Columbia commissioned a study on the impact of historic preservation
13 on Columbia's economic health. The study's finding reinforced the importance of historic
14 preservation for the City's economy and support for policies that encourage
15 preservation and reuse of historic buildings. Preserving Richland County's architectural
16 heritage is not simply an exercise in nostalgia, it's an informed strategic investment in
17 the future. For example, in terms of types of houses, in the Granby neighborhood
18 property owners, including investors, have adhered to the City of Columbia's
19 architectural guideline requirements. Infill is required to meet the original footprint and
20 architectural style of the neighborhood homes, so I guess the more restrictive of what
21 you all will be considering. In turn owners have experienced increased property values
22 and are collecting quite lucrative rental income. Average renters are paying about \$950
23 a room for those properties. For these reasons – oh, by the way I'm also representing

1 We Are Olympia and also the Mill District Alliance – we support your taking time to give
2 this extra thought. Thank you so very much.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. And thank you for sticking around a little bit
4 later tonight.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes?

7 MR. JOHNSON: Before the speaker –

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson is recognized.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Could I – ma'am?

10 MS. HENDLEY: Yes. Yes, dear.

11 MR. JOHNSON: Could you, for clarity, repeat the opening sentence or issue that
12 you raised regarding dissemination of the plan? It was your first couple sentences.

13 MS. HENDLEY: So that with the Capitol City Mill District plan, that it
14 recommended that historic preservation, protection be placed on the neighborhoods
15 within the district so that Olympia was absent that protection because we were not in
16 the City of Columbia. But here recently we've had the opportunity to have a
17 characteristic overlay which would provide those protections as recommended in the
18 plan that has been adopted by Richland County as well as the City of Columbia. Thank
19 you.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes?

22 MS. FRIERSON: We also have Matt, and I'm not sure the last name, I'm not sure
23 if it's –

1 MR. CARROLL: Carroll. Thanks for your time tonight.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks for hanging in there tonight.

3 MR. CARROLL: Very informative session.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, sir.

5 **TESTIMONY OF MATT CARROLL:**

6 MR. CARROLL: So I would, I would urge – sorry –

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Name and address, thank you.

8 MR. CARROLL: - Matt Carroll. I have multiple addresses in the Olympia
9 neighborhood. I live in 1118 Blake Drive in Cayce, South Carolina. So I would urge
10 deferring also, which it sounds like that's the direction it's going. I think there's a – and
11 public comments, a lotta the public comments that we talked about were probably my
12 comments. I think there's a lot of contradictions in the, in the ordinance as it currently, or
13 in the overlay as it currently stands. I think that there's a difference in old and historic
14 and I think, you know, in talking about the two different types, whether it's gonna be
15 restrictions on neighborhood or individual lots and having to go back with what was
16 exactly what was there, I would encourage you to think about that. And you know, I'm all
17 for historic preservation. I've been involved in some of the other neighborhoods in the
18 historic preservation, however, I think when it gets too restrictive it can have a negative
19 impact on a lotta things. You know, I think building materials and things like that are, are
20 easily regulated and easily adhered to by builders and developers and renovators. And
21 in my experience in most of the other districts around Columbia that's what the main
22 requirement is is that it's gotta be hardy plank, it's gotta be, you know, wood windows or
23 hybrid windows. But when you get into having to do the exact same floor plan as the

1 house across the street or the exact same floor plan as the house next door or limiting
2 the size based on, you know, the other houses on the street, I think that becomes really
3 restrictive and has a negative impact. I think there's a lot to consider with this in the way
4 of parking as was mentioned earlier, 12' wide parking lots or driveways being – not, you
5 know, houses have to be in the center of the lot but they can only have 12' driveways
6 but you gotta have a two car minimum according to Code, and so there's just a lotta
7 contradictions that I think need a lot more work before this is put into place. You know, I
8 think the neighborhood, Ms. Hendley I think would agree, street parking is a problem
9 and so the driveways being 12' wide, that just provides more cars on the streets in that
10 neighborhood. So more parking and not having to have the house in the center of the lot
11 so that you can get a bigger parking driveway or to get around the house would be, I
12 think better, a better situation in the neighborhood and allow for more cars to be off the
13 streets. So appreciate your time.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. It's great to hear from neighbors coming out
15 and talking about this. Thank you. So we have the motion on the floor for deferral. I
16 don't know if I wrapped this into the motion the right way, but to have a work session on
17 this. When we have work sessions I don't think that's a time where the public can speak
18 but we'll have the immediate meeting where you can sign up. If this is my fault I
19 missed, this was on the Agenda to speak tonight. So Staff, could you please take a
20 vote on our motion to defer? Oh okay, go ahead Commissioner Johnson.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Before we cast that – this is gonna sound like a real third grade
22 question, but we have on the Agenda the Text Amendment and the Map Amendment.
23 That's the portion that we're deferring, right?

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Correct.

2 MR. JOHNSON: So to that end outside of the edits to this text that we have
3 before us, is there something independent else that we're supposed to consider as a
4 part of taking future action on this text once we have this work session?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What I hear from Staff if additional comments that came in,
6 that they still need to work on, yes.

7 MS. WILLIAMS: That's correct.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Um-hum (affirmative).

9 MR. JOHNSON: Then how does this text end up getting integrated into the body
10 of the Text Amendment?

11 MS. WILLIAMS: So the – in order to better incorporate the texts we received from
12 the public we need to know which direction the Commission would like us to go
13 regarding the per lot or overall neighborhood intent. And I've heard one comment that
14 came back that sounds as if the per lot may not be the direction the Commission would
15 like to go. But however, if the Commission has additional comments that you would like
16 to send to us ahead of time or to discuss that more in detail at the work session, the
17 pros and cons of the, looking at it by individual lot or looking at it per intent then we can
18 also do that at the work session next month.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Not to speak for Staff, but what I'm hearing, maybe let me put
20 this as a question. Is it a correct interpretation of what you said my understanding that
21 guidance from the Commission on this would help you make the next set of edits in the
22 text amendment for our work session?

23 MS. WILLIAMS: That is correct.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson.

3 MS. WILLIAMS: And –

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, so if we follow the same procedure as last month that
5 would be helpful where we would mull over this, respond to you via email, then have a
6 work session where you had some more time, or interact with you in this work session.

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Correct. And again, because that Pending Ordinance Doctrine is
8 in place up to six months it does give us – not that we wanna take six months to finalize
9 this because we are so close – but it does give us a little bit more time to be able to
10 incorporate all those comments. And I would like to point out if you could consider that
11 you do have to make the motion to defer on the text and map so if you would like to
12 amend your motion to include 7 a. and b. to be deferred then we could do that and take
13 a vote on them both.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Well I had a follow up question from Commissioner
15 Johnson's third grade question which I thought was good, are there any changes to the
16 map? It would be better to defer both? Is it easier for Staff to work through this or is it
17 appropriate if we wanted to approve the map?

18 MS. WILLIAMS: The map is good. It would be appropriate if you'd like to go
19 ahead and approve the map.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This takes me back [inaudible] we have the text and we
21 have the map and it had to be hand to hand. So if it's helpful to have the map approved
22 and solidified that these are the boundaries?

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Correct, and if you'll, the map is up on the screen now that has
2 the Old and New Hill together, and then the second map was just Old Hill and then this
3 is New Hill.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Comments from Staff on this? Concerns? Mr. Price is back
5 there making faces. We want to do this the right way. If you wanna come to the podium
6 you'll have two minutes to speak. [Laughter]

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Again just because future comments may come in where
8 people may have comments concerning the map itself, then usually do them hand in
9 hand, if you could defer them both.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Commissioners, the Chair repeats the motion of
11 deferral of the 7 a., which is the Text Amendment, and 7b. which is the Map
12 Amendment. Do I have a second?

13 MR. DUFFY: Second.

14 MS. FRIERSON: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second, okay. Commissioner Duffy was quicker there. He
16 gets the second, thank you. Staff, could you please take a vote?

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Yonke?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

19 MS. WILLIAMS: Frierson?

20 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

21 MS. WILLIAMS: Johnson?

22 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

23 MS. WILLIAMS: Duffy?

1 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

2 MS. WILLIAMS: Durant?

3 MR. DURANT: Aye.

4 MS. WILLIAMS: Siercks?

5 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

6 MS. WILLIAMS: Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Aye.

8 MS. WILLIAMS: Motion approved.

9 *[Approved: Yonke, Frierson, Johnson, Duffy, Durant, Siercks, Grady; Absent: Taylor,*
10 *Metts]*

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. This moves us on one more. Okay, would
12 you like to speak on this? Even though we've already voted, I'd love to hear from the
13 neighborhood? Oh yeah, okay, okay. Yes, we're gonna keep moving, I was gonna say
14 that. Alright, because I have the sheet here this time, I recognize that this is here.
15 Alright, so on our Agenda we are on number 8. 2025 Land Development Code Updates.
16 Staff usually presents this and then we ask for the public to speak. So go ahead Staff,
17 present it.

18 MR. PRICE: Alright, thank you Mr. Chair. For the next two hours [laughter]. Yes,
19 so –

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Should we allow the public to speak first?

21 MR. PRICE: No, hopefully this will be quick but we'll kinda go through each one.
22 So what you have before you under Item 8. we have just some Land Development
23 Code updates. We, there are a few that will be coming to you, let's say over the next

1 couple of months, but there were a few that we identified that were very restrictive on
2 the development of property so we felt that these would be too, they should be brought
3 forth to the Planning Commission. The first one under Table 26-4.2(b) and §26-
4 4.2(d)(2)5 for Manufactured Homes, what the point of those, this amendment is to allow
5 manufactured homes in the R3 zoning designation, subject to special requirements. So
6 kinda going back, during the adoption of the current Land Development Code one was,
7 what was done was to look at equivalency designations to, from our previous code to
8 our new code. The, under the previous Land Development Code there was a zoning
9 designation identified as Manufactured Homes and that, it was determined that the
10 equivalency for a new code for the Manufactured Home district which are MH, would be
11 the R3. And I believe that the equivalency was based on lot size. The MH district, the
12 minimum lot size was about 7,260 so it was about the same as what the R3 zoning
13 designation allows. However, what was not carried over from the equivalency
14 standpoint was the allowance of manufactured homes in the R3 district. And I know that
15 was when we were originally proposing the Land Development Code, the current Land
16 Development Code we initially were looking at including, essentially eliminating just
17 single-family use but to include all residential uses within some of our R1, excuse me
18 R2, 3 and 4 zoning designations. It became a bit of a challenge as far as from the
19 community standpoint of allowing a variety of land uses, excuse me, residential uses
20 within what they deemed to be single-family districts. So again, kinda go back to the R3
21 which, again doesn't allow manufactured homes but it allows only single-family homes.
22 However, what we have identified is that there are areas in the county that were
23 previously zoned MH that are now zoned R3 but they don't allow manufactured homes.

1 However, they have been primarily developed with manufactured housing. So to kinda
2 simplify this a bit, you would – Matthew's gonna kinda get to an area – so you would
3 have an area that, again it is primarily manufactured housing but if there was a vacant
4 lot you would not be able to place a manufactured home on that parcel, you would only
5 be able to build a stick built home. And that, you could argue, is not keeping in character
6 with the development pattern of an area. So what you're looking at currently right now is
7 this is the Royal Pines subdivision, just as kind of an example, which was previously
8 zoned MH and as you can see just about all of the parcels in that area are developed
9 with manufactured housing. However, today if someone came in they would not be able
10 to put a manufactured home on the property, it would have to be, do a stick built home.
11 But again, understanding the concerns that were raised on the previous Land
12 Development Code discussions and prior to adoption, what we didn't want to do is just
13 initially open up, I guess you'd call it Pandora's Box for allowing manufactured homes
14 outright in all R3 zoning designations. Thus, what you have before you is the allowance
15 by special requirements that gives a level of protection to existing single-family
16 developed residential areas, but it also will allow a manufactured home to be placed into
17 an R3 zoning designation if it matches the character of that area. On page 65 of your
18 packet is the specific language for the R3 district with the special requirements that are
19 being proposed in which it states, Manufactured homes are permitted where there are
20 manufactured homes on lots that comprise 50% or more of the lots on the same side of
21 the block as the lot in question. Now, so one of the points that was raised by a resident
22 regarding this language, give a little bit of clarity, so if you have a block and it contained
23 10 parcels and only one of the parcels was developed and it had a manufactured home

1 on it and it was zoned R3, that would not meet the special requirement standards to
2 place a manufactured home on a vacant parcel. Again 50% of the lots have to be
3 comprised of manufactured homes in order for this criteria to be applied to a vacant lot.
4 Kinda let y'all look at that right now.

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

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

7 MR. DURANT: What went into that 50% number? Mr. Price, what went into that
8 50% number? Is that just arbitrary?

9 MR. PRICE: I wouldn't call it arbitrary, I think just kind of looking at the fact that if
10 at least half of the parcels on a block are comprised of a manufactured home, in this
11 case that does kind of establish kind of a character for that area, so that's the reason
12 why we went with the 50%.

13 MR. DURANT: Okay.

14 MR. PRICE: And one of the things that we have found is that most of the area is
15 you don't really have, outside of going out into the rural areas, you don't really have
16 areas where there's a true mixture of manufactured homes and single-family homes in
17 the same area. As far as, you know, equivalency of those.

18 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

20 MR. SIERCKS: Question for Staff.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

22 MR. SIERCKS: Just to clarify, when we're talking about a block we're talking
23 from intersection to the next intersection, right?

1 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

2 MR. SIERCKS: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Duffy?

5 MR. DUFFY: Just a point for clarification for Staff, so if there is a subdivision
6 zoned or a tree or, you know, [inaudible] except for two homes, you got a non-compliant
7 mobile home and a stick built home, if this amendment passes would that whole
8 neighborhood then, it just could be, both sides of the road could be open to mobile
9 homes, is that –

10 MR. PRICE: No, sir. No, sir.

11 MR. DUFFY: Okay.

12 MR. PRICE: Again, if you take that, that case, there's one manufactured home
13 and one stick built home, but unless the, unless that block contains at least 50%, it's
14 50% developed with manufactured homes, then no sir, a manufactured home would not
15 be allowed.

16 MR. DUFFY: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright Staff, anymore initial presentation on this or should I
18 – go ahead.

19 MR. PRICE: And also, so you know, again what I wanted to point out was that
20 you'll note on page 63 what is proposed with this amendment is to include an SR, which
21 is Special Requirement, under the R3 zoning designation for manufactured homes.
22 You'll see it in red. And on page 64 it was, we needed to put a little clarification that in, I
23 guess this was erroneously placed there, but as stated in the R1 and R2 districts the

1 following standards shall apply. The R2 was not intended to be there, it should've just
2 been R1. Because the R2 district does not allow manufactured homes. If I'm correct.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That is correct.

4 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Special requirement for R1 but nothing for R2.

6 MR. PRICE: Correct.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

8 MS. FRIERSON: I have a question.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Frierson, go ahead.

10 MS. FRIERSON: On page 64, letter (d), section 1. Except on a corner lot the
11 manufactured home shall be oriented so that the side containing the front entrance door
12 is no more than 20° from parallel to the front property line and it goes on about the living
13 room and the foyer and hall. Isn't that really, really restrictive or is that something that's
14 generally done with reference to how a mobile home can be oriented on a piece of
15 property?

16 MR. PRICE: What it does is it just requires the, the manufactured home to be
17 aligned along, facing a road versus, you know, which I could pull up a couple which
18 someone may just kind of put it at an angle on the property. But what it does is it
19 requires it to be, to face directly to a particular road or street. So I think this is a good
20 example, thank you, as you can see how this home was placed on the property, one at
21 the corner of Clayton Street and Wynette Way. So it wouldn't, that wouldn't be allowed,
22 they would have to kind of orient it towards either Wynette Way or Clayton Street.

1 MS. FRIERSON: The reason I ask that question, we were talking about the
2 historic, you know, properties in Olympia and we don't wanna be too restrictive and
3 when I just read that, you know, letter (d) section 1., it just seems to be so restrictive, it
4 just seemed very odd to me and I was just wondering do we really do that with
5 reference to manufactured homes on various parcels of land.

6 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I would, I probably need to go back and check within our
7 Code but I believe these requirements also apply for stick built homes also or single-
8 family structures also.

9 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Commissioner Frierson. And looking at this for the
11 purpose of the section, the front entrance is the entrance toward leading directly to a
12 living room, foyer or hall. Is that, so that a side door isn't on the front?

13 MR. PRICE: That's correct. You know, sometimes I think our codes are absent
14 of just a little bit of additional language that gives a little more clarity and I believe in this
15 case that this language actually clearly defines what is the front door versus, again it
16 may be a side or a rear, I'm not sure if manufactured homes typically have rear but,
17 whether there be another door.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Would this be an appropriate time for our
19 public session to speak, to talk?

20 MR. PRICE: If y'all, unless y'all have any other questions for Staff, yes sir.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, let's do that. Commissioner Frierson? Oh, we don't
22 have any names, but you signed up?

23 MS. SMITH: No, sir, I didn't make it in time to sign the list but I –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You can still come on down to the podium. Just give us
2 your name and your address and we'll give you two minutes.

3 MR. PRICE: Mr. Yonke?

4 **TESTIMONY OF YAKIMA SMITH:**

5 MS. SMITH: How everybody doing? My name is Yakima Smith and I reside in
6 the Heron Ridge area. Can you hear me?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I can hear you great. Mr. Price, did you need something?

8 MR. PRICE: I was just gonna ask that after she finishes speaking, the speaker
9 finishes, if she wouldn't mind signing the form. That helps us to kinda keep an additional
10 record of who –

11 MS. SMITH: Oh, yes sir.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Absolutely.

13 MS. SMITH: My name is Yakima Smith and I reside in Heron Ridge, my address
14 is 13 McGanza Court. The neighborhood that I live in is homes and mobile homes. It's
15 majority of mobile homes. I got a home built out there but over the past couple years I
16 been buying several lots with the intentions on putting a mobile home on, and now I
17 can't do that because they changed it. I had no idea they was gonna do that. And those
18 lot sizes are not even big enough for mobile homes, the front door gonna face the road.
19 Yeah, and I'm just trying to figure out what I'm gonna be able to do with my property.
20 And that's it. Yeah. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Staff again, this change to the Code would be
22 for areas that are existing, 50% mobile homes in the area for R3.

23 MR. PRICE: On the block.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: On the block.

2 MR. PRICE: On the block in the R3 –

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

4 MR. PRICE: - designation. Yes, sir.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: But this doesn't make a suggestion of a change for R2 or
6 any of the other districts, it's just adding that text for R3.

7 MR. PRICE: No, and the main reason why we went with just the R3 is because
8 that was determined to be the equivalency from the previous MH zoning designation
9 which actually allowed manufactured homes. On single-family lots.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson?

12 MR. JOHNSON: Is that the change that the speaker was referring to?

13 MR. PRICE: That may be, yes, sir.

14 MR. JOHNSON: So that's, so, I'm just – both in terms of our decision making but
15 also in terms of informing the public, so that's a function of the switch in the equivalency
16 tables that resulted in that effect.

17 MR. PRICE: That is correct. So the area that the speaker is referring to, just as
18 the one you had before you that Mr. Smith was showing along the Royal Pines, were
19 previously zoned MH so prior to the adoption or the implementation of this, of the
20 current Land Development Code, manufactured homes would have been allowed on
21 those parcels.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, the previous code, MH, manufactured homes, right –

23 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: - existed in the old code and as the first iteration of that
2 came through that was eliminated. And then we went through and did our restart of the
3 Land Development Code once again.

4 MR. PRICE: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Jenson out there? We put it on the shelf and we went
6 through and we had public participation and we saw where that would be fitting to have
7 mobile homes, manufactured homes throughout the County and this appears to be, to
8 help us maybe a fix in some situations where it was removed and already exists, like the
9 character of the neighborhood.

10 MR. PRICE: Correct. And as stated earlier I believe the intent was when we were
11 looking at equivalency we were looking lot sizes. So the R3 and the previous MH are
12 very similar as far as lot sizes, we just didn't look a little further into the land uses to
13 make that determination because again in the MH, the previous MH zoning designation
14 it was not limited to manufactured homes. Also single-family homes could also be
15 developed in that district.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. What are you requesting from us tonight?
17 Do we need to make a motion?

18 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. I believe Mr. Johnson may have had a question also.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Comments, concerns.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Question and concern is probably more accurate.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price, this is most likely, not most likely, this is beyond the
23 scope of the request of [inaudible] vote, but do I hear between your comments and the

1 public's comments that manufactured home or stick built that we're creating some
2 zones within the County where we're gonna have substandard lots that cannot be built
3 on?

4 MR. PRICE: No, sir. I'm not saying that. What I'm saying is under our current,
5 and hopefully I answer your question correctly, but under our current Land Development
6 Code for the R3, it limits the type of residential structure that can be placed on that
7 property, in which you can only place a single-family or stick built home as we may call
8 it, but a single-family dwelling on that property versus being able to place a
9 manufactured home which actually may be more in character with that area as it's been
10 developed.

11 MR. JOHNSON: But the, not to mention the setbacks would allow sufficiently for
12 a single-family home being built as new construction, to use your term stick built.

13 MR. PRICE: Potentially it could. Again, what we're looking at is establishing what
14 uses are there throughout the County, throughout every zoning designation you may
15 have some parcels that are non-conforming as far as square footage that may not be
16 able to accommodate what is proposed to be there. So right now we're just looking at
17 allowing the use to go back, into the R3 subject to Special Requirements. You, there
18 may be a case that a lot may be deemed to be nonconforming and may offer certain
19 constraints for being able to place the manufactured home on the property. As it would
20 with a stick built or single-family home also.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Price.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. I mean after all the hard work we
23 did with the Land Development Code this seems almost too quick to push this through

1 tonight. I would make a recommendation of deferral to give us more time to wrap our
2 heads around it.

3 MR. DUFFY: I'd second that.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. I wanna hear, as more I mentioned that there's a
5 comment – Commissioners? Are we comfortable with deferring this and giving it more
6 time for the public to see that we're trying to make a change in this part of it? Just from
7 my memory there were two big parts of the new Code that had the public upset and this
8 was one.

9 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

11 MR. DURANT: Yeah, if we feel like we need more public input then I
12 wholeheartedly support deferring this.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: It seems like everyone's looking towards me for deferral
14 being okay. So the Chair makes a motion of deferral on this for time for more public
15 input. Do we have a second?

16 MR. DURANT: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Staff, can you please
18 take a vote for deferral?

19 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a motion for deferral, this would be to the May PC.
20 Mr. Chair?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, yes?

22 MR. PRICE: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: When we defer it seems like it goes to the next meeting.

1 MR. PRICE: It does, I just wanted to make sure.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

3 MR. PRICE: Those in favor of that motion –

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: May I request a later date to June PC or is that too late?

5 MR. PRICE: Again –

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So that we have time to advertise and County Council can
7 maybe have their, I don't think they have meetings or whatever but – just we learned a
8 lotta lessons from the Land Development Code restart and update and this seems like
9 something that when we touch this topic we need to give it plenty of time. Staff, what
10 are your comments?

11 MR. PRICE: We will follow the direction of the Planning Commission regarding
12 this.

13 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chair, [inaudible] wanted to defer the Olympia situation till
14 May so if we did two deferrals in the same –

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Please speak into the mic, Commissioner.

16 MS. FRIERSON: Sorry.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

18 MS. FRIERSON: We'd already stated that we wanted to defer the Olympia
19 situation until May and if we put both of them in May that might be too much on the plate
20 for one month.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I agree with Commissioner Frierson. So the motion for
22 deferral is to defer to our June PC for more public opinion. Do I have a second for this
23 motion?

1 MR. DURANT: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant again has a second. Now Staff can
3 take a vote.

4 MR. PRICE: Sorry, let me update my notes here. So we have a motion for the
5 deferral of Item 8. I guess 1., it should've been a. b., the, for the manufactured homes
6 that will be deferred to the June PC.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, sir.

8 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of that motion, Grady?

9 MR. GRADY: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

11 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Durant?

13 MR. DURANT: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

15 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

19 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

22 *[Approved: Grady, Siercks, Durant, Duffy, Johnson, Frierson, Yonke; Absent: Taylor,*
23 *Metts]*

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. And thank you public for hanging out late
2 with us tonight for this one. So this moves us to number 9. Other Items?

3 MR. JOHNSON: We did 1. we did 2. and 3.?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We just discussed Item 8. on the Agenda which included
5 1., 2., and 3., I believe. Mr. Price, we presented all of that and all of that has been
6 deferred, correct?

7 MR. PRICE: I actually just presented the first bullet.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The first bullet.

9 MR. PRICE: The first one, item 1. I apologize.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm sorry, go ahead with the second part.

11 MR. PRICE: Alright, the next is an amendment for §26-3.3(h) of the Richland
12 County Land Development Code for the Residential 5 district or R5. What this proposal
13 would do is to establish a minimum lot area for the R5 district and it also would establish
14 provisions for the development of a nonconforming parcel in the R5 district. I will, again I
15 have come to realize that this is something, you know, only I can speak for myself that I
16 do every day and have been doing for years, so it sounds a little simpler when I'm doing
17 it. So if there's any questions you have please feel free to ask. I know we're asking a lot
18 to, you know, kinda bring you into the zoning world all of a sudden. So under our current
19 Land Development Code the density for the R5 district is 12 units per acre. What we
20 didn't establish was the actual minimum lot size for that particular district. And so based
21 on the density that minimum lot size is 7,260 square feet, just doing the calculations. So
22 that would be under 2.a. for this section was to establish a minimum area. If nothing
23 else what that, that gives guidance to developers, property owners, surveyors, that if

1 they were to come and subdivide a property that was designated as R5, what the
2 minimum lot size would be. Cause currently we didn't have that in our Code. So that
3 was more just for clarification for future development of the site. However, one of the
4 things that we also took note of is with that minimum, that minimum, excuse me, lot size
5 that if you, if you did not have, have that minimum lot size you would not be able to
6 establish a two family dwelling on the property. So in this particular case the, the – I
7 apologize, in this particular case you, single-family dwellings are not permitted in the R5
8 zoning designation. So if you have a lot that is deemed to be nonconforming due to its
9 square footage we just established some provisions that would allow for a duplex to be
10 placed on that parcel. And that would, and that is found on page 68. So if you don't
11 mind I will kind of give you some quick calculations. So in the R5 zoning designation the
12 density for, based on the density of 12 units per acre, which do your calculations 12,
13 43560 which is a square footage for an acre divided by 12, it comes out to 3630 square
14 feet. So that is what you need for each unit. That's where the 7260 came from. For a
15 two unit dwelling you would need 7260 square feet. If you, in a case where – and I'll just
16 randomly pick a number, let's say the lot was 7000 square feet, so you would not meet
17 the required minimum for each unit. And we've run into some cases where you have
18 existing lots that are zoned R5, and again you could make an argument that this is
19 another kind of carryover from the equivalency zoning because the R5 was previously
20 the RM-MD zoning designation which is multi-family residential, medium density, and
21 that particular zoning designation not only allowed for two family, three family, multi-
22 family uses, but it also allowed for single-family uses. And again with the adoption of the
23 Code and going to the equivalency, the RM-MD became the R5 zoning designation but

1 however the single-family use was not permitted. So in order, again so to go back to
2 what is allowed, to do a duplex or, yeah to do a duplex for each unit, each dwelling unit
3 which they're considered, you would need 3630 square feet which, so the minimum lot
4 area of 7260 would be the minimum to require to put a conforming structure on the
5 parcel. Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So what would happen if we have not enough space?

7 MR. PRICE: Sir?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What would happen if we did not have that, like when you
9 did your example of 7000?

10 MR. PRICE: It, it's there. That's, that didn't change, what – putting it in the Code
11 as before you the 7260 square feet for it as a minimum lot area, again that just provides
12 clarity for going forward, either for what is required, whether it be for Staff looking at this
13 or from future development of the site either by subdivision, by a property owner or
14 surveyor.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So if they only had 6500 square feet they wouldn't be able
16 to put the duplex?

17 MR. PRICE: Right because the minimum residential use type that you could
18 place on the property is a duplex and because those are considered to be two dwelling,
19 you know, separate dwelling units you would need to have the minimum requirements
20 for each of those dwelling units.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So we would have an unbuildable R5 and they would need
22 to go to a different zone in order to develop?

1 MR. PRICE: There's so much behind that but, so you are correct. You would
2 have a lot that would not be, based on the, the density and dimensional standards for
3 that district and also for the land use types, you would not be able to establish a use on
4 that property. You could always ask for a rezoning but typically if the lot is not
5 conforming due to square footage there's a good chance that it would not meet the
6 minimum requirements to apply for a rezoning on the property. So the lot's just sitting
7 there unable to be built.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Can I ask my Commissioners if they have questions right
9 now? Or comments?

10 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

12 MR. GRADY: So when I first read through this before the meeting I was a little
13 confused but through the explanation of, of Mr. Price I think I'm on board with this. This
14 is sort of a, this seems like a very sort of just technical fix to make sure that an R5 zone
15 and then the next one is a similar concept of an R6 zone, that it is developed as multi-
16 family housing because that is the intent of the zoning category.

17 MR. PRICE: Correct.

18 MR. GRADY: And so the minimum lot size is based on the lot size for two units
19 and it just says that if there's a lot smaller than that you can still build a duplex on it
20 because it's supposed to be a multi-family lot, even if it's smaller. So I, I fully support
21 this, this makes sense.

22 MR. PRICE: And which we have Mr. Smith has on the screen before you is that
23 section for a nonconforming lot which is §26-7.4 of the Land Development Code. And if

1 you go, particularly if you go to 6. under Government Acquisition Land, right there, it's
2 not necessarily the, the government didn't acquire the land it's just based on the Land
3 Development Code, adoption of the Land Development Code. But this, this stipulates
4 that, again the use of the lot is permitted in which it is located so the duplex would be a
5 permitted use for a nonconforming lot. Any proposed development complies with the
6 dimensional standards of the applicable district to the maximum extent practical. The
7 development complies with Article 26-5 to the maximum extent practical and that would
8 be the setbacks for it. And the development complies with other standards and
9 requirements of this ordinance. And the last one is the development is designed and
10 located in a way that it's compatible with surrounding developments. So there are
11 provisions in place to ensure that whatever's placed there still has to meet other
12 requirements of the Code but the first thing that we needed to do is to establish that the
13 use would be allowed on that property.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, thoughts or can we go
15 ahead with a motion? Commissioner Johnson?

16 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, based on the through process and rationale
17 outlined by Commissioner Grady as it relates to [inaudible] the proposed
18 recommendation to send to Council for adoption for changes to the Land Development
19 Code move approval on, to forward both 2. and 3. for approval.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson, making a motion for
21 approval. Do we have a second?

22 MR. GRADY: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady seconds. We have a motion and a
2 second. Staff, can you please take a vote?

3 MR. PRICE: Alright, so your motion is for both –

4 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

5 MR. PRICE: For the R5 and the R6 zoning designations?

6 MR. JOHNSON: Correct.

7 MR. PRICE: Alright, thank you. Alright, those in favor of the motion for approval,
8 Grady?

9 MR. GRADY: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

11 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Durant?

13 MR. DURANT: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

15 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

19 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Alright, thank you. That passes.

1 *[Approved: Grady, Siercks, Durant, Duffy, Johnson, Frierson, Yonke; Absent: Taylor,*
2 *Metts]*

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, so in summary for the Agenda today, Item 8. 2. and
4 3. the Commission recommends approval. And that will go to County Council. Will they
5 be ready to take this up in their April 22nd?

6 MR. PRICE: Actually this will go to the May meeting.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: May meeting.

8 MR. PRICE: And the reason why is text amendments require 30 day
9 advertisement for text amendments, text amendments require a 30 day advertisement.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: For the Planning Commission do we not have any
11 additional requirement for public notice? I'm thinking of our manufactured homes topic
12 before?

13 MR. PRICE: No, sir. And that's mainly because the Planning Commission
14 typically has public meetings, those standards, that criteria for advertisement is usually
15 for the public hearing.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Staff, are we ready to move on to
17 number 9?

18 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, Other Items. The Chair has another item from
20 earlier. We need to schedule our work session for the overlay district meeting. We have
21 our next Planning Commission I believe planned for May, is it May 5th, 6:00pm would be
22 our regular next meeting? I'd like to allocate enough time for this meeting so a start time
23 suggestion from Staff.

1 MR. PRICE: Again, we wanna make sure that we can, that if we have the work
2 session that as many Members of the Planning Commission are able to attend. I think it
3 may work just as well if we do it maybe, you know, 4:00 the day of the Planning
4 Commission meeting in May? If that's suitable. It gives us about an hour and just, we
5 can, gives us about an hour to kind of go through everything and also to give you a
6 break in-between, prior to the actual PC meeting.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, comments or concerns
8 for a 4:00 meeting on May 5th as a work session?

9 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

11 MR. GRADY: I was gonna say I don't have my work calendar in front of me but
12 certainly as a public employee it's easier for me if it's 5:00 or later. And I'm not sure that
13 the proposed break is necessary. So if we think there's only an hour of content I would
14 suggest that we start at 5:00. That also makes it easier for member of the public who
15 are getting off work to attend.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good points, Commissioner Grady. Anyone else, additional
17 comments?

18 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

20 MR. DURANT: Just to give you the other side of that argument, if we base what
21 may happen in May on what happened tonight we're gonna go late into the night again,
22 so I would suggest we consider meeting at 4:00.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Can the Chair suggest 4:30? Right in the middle. Anyone
2 else, comments? Otherwise I'm suggesting a 4:30 May 5th meeting. Does that make
3 both parties happy? Okay, do we need to make a motion to schedule this meeting?

4 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Chair makes a motion to have a work session to
6 discuss the overlay district for 4:30pm on May, Monday, May 5th. Do we have a second?

7 MR. DURANT: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Thank you. Staff,
9 please take a vote for the motion to schedule the meeting.

10 MR. PRICE: Alright, so we have a motion for a work session at 4:30pm work
11 session and, I'm sorry, what date is that in May?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: May 5th.

13 MR. PRICE: Thank you. For the May 5th Planning Commission. Those in favor of
14 that motion, Grady?

15 MR. GRADY: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

17 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Durant?

19 MR. DURANT: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

21 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

23 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

2 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

6 *[Approved: Grady, Siercks, Durant, Duffy, Johnson, Frierson, Yonke; Absent: Taylor,*
7 *Metts]*

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, any other items to
9 discuss? Our time is kinda short up here on Planning Commission, we have term limits,
10 four years go by fast. I think I'm down to, like my last two I think. So if there are other
11 items you would like to discuss as topics, this is a good time to think about it and
12 suggest it next month if you don't have one right now. This rolls right into Chairman's
13 Report so I can just keep talking. Thanks to everyone, Staff and Commissioners, for all
14 your hard work each month. The thought of maybe doing, instead of a Planning
15 Commission retreat but a Comp Plan work shop this summer would be helpful. Staff,
16 do you wanna talk through that idea?

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you Chairman Yonke. We are, normally you have
18 your Planning Commission retreat in August. We would like to make the
19 recommendation that we move that to June so that we can go more in detail with the
20 Comprehensive Plan, give you all an update on where we are with that Comprehensive
21 Plan. I believe you were copied on an email, there will be a series of public meetings
22 that'll be held in May where potential future land use scenarios will be presented to the
23 public and we'll be receiving feedback on that. And if we can have this work session

1 with you all in June to really dive deep into that future land use map, those land use
2 scenarios which all of your rezone decisions are based off of, it would make it a little bit
3 easier as we move forward into the latter half of the year with approving that future land
4 use map and the updates to the Comprehensive Plan. So no date has been set yet but
5 if you are amenable to us moving that from August to June then we can send out a
6 suggestion of different dates that the Commission can vote on virtually.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Please send out that information. I know it can
8 be difficult for us to try to find a date to get together but that would be very helpful.
9 Okay. Nothing to do there but this rolls us right into the Planning Director's Report. I
10 was gonna say, would you like to just stay at the podium?

11 MS. WILLIAMS: That was pretty much my report but you also can see the
12 Report of County Council and how they voted at their last Zoning Public Hearing. Thank
13 you.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

15 MR. JOHNSON: To the extent that you can answer this question, there seem to
16 be more deferrals than usual by Council. Was there a common thread, because they
17 weren't necessarily evenly dispersed between our recommendations for approval and
18 our recommendations for denial? They seem to be a mixture but it seemed to be a large
19 number. I don't know if there's any common thread that is sharable.

20 MS. WILLIAMS: Some was based on feedback from the town hall meetings that
21 they may have had in-between Planning Commission and the Zoning Public Hearing or
22 requests from the applicant, so there's no one specific reason. That's why they're so

1 dispersed and we have the different deferrals, unless Deputy Director Price has
2 anything else to add, that's pretty much been what we've been seeing lately.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. This moves us to number 11, which is
4 adjournment. And the Chair would like to make a motion for adjournment. Do we have a
5 second through show of hands? Yeah? I got a second from the group and we'll turn that
6 right into our vote. Staff, can you take a vote of these hands? I'm getting ahead of
7 myself tonight, my apologies.

8 MR. PRICE: So we wanna go the roll call?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead.

10 MR. PRICE: Okay, those in favor of adjournment, Johnson?

11 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Grady?

13 MR. GRADY: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

15 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Duffy?

19 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

21 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: And Durant?

23 MR. DURANT: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Alright.

2 *[Approved: Johnson, Grady, Frierson, Yonke, Duffy, Siercks, Durant; Absent: Taylor,*
3 *Metts]*

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. We are adjourned.

5
6 *[Meeting Adjourned at 8:50pm]*