

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
October 10, 2014

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

[Members Present: Heather Cairns, Beverly Frierson, Patrick Palmer, Stephen Gilchrist, Christopher Anderson (in at 1:08), Wallace Brown, Sr.; Absent: Marilynn Joyner, David Tuttle, Bill Theus]

Called to order: 1:05 pm

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, ready? Alright, we'll call the October meeting of the Richland County Planning Commission to order. Please allow me to read this into the Record. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, as well as posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration building. Did we get a chance to take a look at the September Minutes? Any motions?

MS. CAIRNS: I make a motion to approve.

MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: A motion and a second. All those in favor say aye.

[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Palmer, Gilchrist, Brown; Absent for vote: Anderson; Absent: Joyner, Tuttle, Theus]

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any Agenda amendments?

MS. HEGLER: Good afternoon, Chairman. Just some typos; the seventh Map Amendment in your Agenda, that's Case No. 14-31, the TMS # should be ending in 40, not 04. And you do have a new exhibit for that case as well from within your packet. So you got some wrong pictures and the TMS # is actually 40, not 04. And that's all.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Do we have any motions on the Agenda?

MR. GILCHRIST: So moved.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion to approve. Do we have a second?

2 MS. CAIRNS: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor say aye.

4 *[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Palmer, Gilchrist, Brown; Absent for vote: Anderson;*
5 *Absent: Joyner, Tuttle, Theus]*

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We don't have any road name approvals? Is that correct?

7 Okay. Map Amendments, Case No. 14-25 MA?

8 **CASE NO. 14-25 MA:**

9 MR. LEGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Applicant for our first request is Mr.
10 John May. The property is located at 10461 Wilson Boulevard. It's about a quarter acre
11 in size, currently zoned RU, Rural District. Mr. May is requesting the RC, which is our
12 Rural Commercial District. That current zoning classification is the original zoning from
13 1977. You might remember approximately a year ago the property adjacent to the south
14 was rezoned from RU to RC. There have been a number of other zoning applications
15 approved in the vicinity in the county as well as in the City of Blythewood. The City of
16 Blythewood city limits is in close proximity and almost all around the subject property.
17 To the north we have property zoned RU, it is occupied residentially in the City of
18 Blythewood. To the south we have property zoned RC as I mentioned, it's a convenient
19 store with gas pumps and automobile repair, rezoned last year. To the east and to the
20 west the property is zoned RU, Rural, and occupied residentially. The property is
21 currently occupied by what appears to be a commercial structure, cinderblock building,
22 you can see windows on the front and very near the road frontage. The Comprehensive
23 Plan recommends suburban in this area which calls for commercial rezones to be near,

1 near other nonresidential rezoned [inaudible] commercial and office. As that is the case
2 the Staff has recommended approval of this Application at this time.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? When I call your name if you'd
4 like to come up and take the podium. If you'd give us your name and address for the
5 Record and try to keep your comments to two minutes we would certainly appreciate it.
6 John May.

7 **TESTIMONY OF JOHN MAY:**

8 MR. MAY: I'm John May. I live at 1131 Shirley Street, Columbia. I'm just here to
9 answer questions.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Mr. May is the Applicant so if anybody's got any
11 questions for him. We appreciate it, thank you.

12 MR. MAY: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's all we've got signed up to speak.

14 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we send project 14-25 MA
15 forward to Council with a recommendation of approval.

16 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chairman, I second that motion.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion?

18 All those in favor say aye.

19 *[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Absent: Joyner, Tuttle,*
20 *Theus]*

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And folks, we're a recommending Body to County
22 Council. They will take up these cases, everything that we see today, on the 28th of
23 October in these same Chambers at 7:00, so I recommend if you've got interest in the

1 case to come back then and see them for the public hearing on it. Next case, Case No.
2 14-26 MA.

3 **CASE NO. 14-26 MA:**

4 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Applicant in this case is
5 Eddie Roberts. The property is located at 10203 Two Notch Road. It's about a third of
6 an acre in size, currently zoned M1, Light Industrial District and Mr. Roberts is asking for
7 the GC, General Commercial District there on Two Notch Road. The M1 District is
8 original zoning from 1977, and in the vicinity we have to the north, well actually in all
9 directions property zoned M1, but to the north we've got railroad right-of-way and part of
10 the property there is the Sandhills shopping center, or part of the shopping center which
11 is currently vacant. And to the south we have a Veterinarian's office, another office, and
12 retail establishments on Two Notch Road. Most of Two Notch Road, as you know is, is
13 retail, shopping or some sort of commercial/office use. The subject property has a small
14 strip retail center on it with parking to the front along Two Notch Road. The
15 Comprehensive Plan recommends priority investment area where properties should be,
16 to be commercial, should be near other commercial and office uses and on an arterial
17 road. That is the case in this instance because of the commercial and office use in the
18 area and the arterial design of the road, the Staff recommends approval of this
19 application as well.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Edward Roberts?

21 **TESTIMONY OF EDWARD ROBERTS:**

22 MR. ROBERTS: Good afternoon. Eddie Roberts, I live at 2502 Greenhill Road,
23 Elgin, South Carolina. I'll take questions.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for the Applicant? Appreciate it, thank you.

2 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Richard Spurgeon and Katherine, I can't make out the last
4 name. If y'all are just in agreement you can certainly just tell us that, or if you got
5 something you wanna add you're certain welcome to do so. Okay.

6 MS. HINSON: I'm actually the owner of the property and I would like for it to go
7 forward. We pay a lotta taxes, [inaudible].

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, ma'am, if you, if you got something you wanna put
9 on the Record we can, you need to come down and take the podium for us.

10 **TESTIMONY OF KATHERINE HINSON:**

11 MS. HINSON: I'm actually part owner of the property and we own other strip
12 malls in the area; one right down the street from it. And what we want to rent there is
13 basically about the same thing we have now but it is classified as, as a different rating,
14 so hope it will be approved to someone that has the same type business real close by,
15 across the street and down a little bit. You might know it but that we want to rent to
16 somebody of equal, that has the same type business, so it will not change it. And I live
17 very close to it, I live behind Target so I would never want anything that would be a
18 hazard or be anything that anybody would object to in that property anyway.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Can you give us your name and address real quick,
20 for the Record?

21 MS. HINSON: My name is Katherine Hinson, I live at 904 Valhalla Drive,
22 Columbia 29229.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Great, thank you.

1 MS. HINSON: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's all we've got signed up. Any motions?

3 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we send Case No. 14-26
4 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval.

5 MR. BROWN: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion?
7 All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

8 *[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Absent: Joyner, Tuttle,*
9 *Theus]*

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Next case, Case No. 14-27 MA.

11 **CASE NO. 14-27 MA:**

12 MR. LEGER: The Applicant in this case is Mr. Daryl Jones [sic]. The property is
13 located at 5430 Lower Richland Boulevard. It's about a half an acre in size, currently
14 zoned RS-LD, Residential Single-Family, Low Density District and Mr. Barnes is asking
15 for NC, which is our Neighborhood Commercial District. The residential zoning
16 classification is the original zoning district from 1977. And it was changed in 2005 to RS-
17 LD, though. In the vicinity we have properties zoned RU to the north, which is
18 undeveloped, agricultural. To the south we have RS-LD, which is a subdivision of a
19 residential nature. To the east and west we have property zoned RU, both currently
20 remaining an agricultural use. The subject property contains what appears to be kind of
21 a commercial structure, I'm not quite sure what it was at some point in the past,
22 although it does appear to be commercial, it's signage out front. Most of the area is
23 either agriculturally used or residential in nature, with the Alban Park subdivision to the

1 south as I mentioned. The Comprehensive Plan recommends Rural in this area where
2 commercial and office use should be on major traffic junction or near other office and
3 commercial. The Staff has found that not to be the case and is of the opinion that
4 rezoning this site would encroach on the residential nature of the subdivision to the
5 south. We also have the Lower Richland Neighborhood Master Plan that recommends
6 for this area to kind of maintain a rural type use in the vicinity. Based on the types of
7 uses in the area and the agricultural and residential nature of the vicinity, the Staff
8 recommends disapproval of this Application at this time.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I have a quick question. And I know this comes up from
10 time to time. Our two acre requirement, is that just for General Commercial or is that
11 any commercial zoning?

12 MS. HEGLER: Tommy might answer that better, but it's, it's – we passed an
13 amendment not too long ago that if you were next to certain types of zonings then you
14 could be under that too, so.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. But I see this surrounded by rural and residential.
16 So there's no commercial to attach it to.

17 MR. DELAGE: Right. The addition of a Neighborhood Commercial zoning
18 contiguous to an existing commercial or residential zoning district. OI is another one, the
19 Office and Institutional. GC can be if it's an industrial and contiguous to that. Or an
20 addition of the Light Industrial zoning contiguous to an existing Industrial zoning.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So why do we even need that in the ordinance if Rural
22 Commercial can go next to commercial or residential?

23 MR. DELAGE: NC?

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, Neighborhood Commercial.

2 MR. DELAGE: Right, okay. Sorry, I heard Rural Commercial, I just wanted to
3 make sure.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So if NC can go next to residential or commercial, what
5 are we saying, we don't want it next to industrial? So it's, so that's the only one it would
6 be ruled out from? Anything less than two acres.

7 MR. DELAGE: That's correct, if it's commercial or residential.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Just not industrial. Okay. Alright.

9 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman? May I ask the, what is the building on the corner of
10 Abilene Drive and Lower Richland Boulevard?

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All of those are zoned RS-MD, which is 8500 square foot
12 lot.

13 MR. BROWN: I understand, but what, what is that facility that's next, there that's
14 got the vehicle in the yard?

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It –

16 MR. LEGER: There, there are homes on the, on the north and south side of that
17 drive into the neighborhood.

18 MR. BROWN: And secondly, the facility that is being pictured here, is that a, an
19 existing building?

20 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir.

21 MR. BROWN: On the property in question?

22 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir.

23 MR. BROWN: What kind of facility is that?

1 MR. LEGER: It's a brick structure, what it's, it's currently not being used.

2 MR. BROWN: What was it used for?

3 MR. LEGER: I, I really don't know.

4 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask that question when the –

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure, absolutely.

6 MR. BROWN: - the Applicant presents?

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is, would it be possible to pull business licenses from this
8 address?

9 MR. DELAGE: Anything from 2005 and above when we started actually doing the
10 business license process, from when we took it over from the city, we would have a
11 record of it. Since then, if it had been active. When we initially came in we did research
12 to make sure that it couldn't be used under that nonconforming, grandfathered kinda
13 status and unfortunately we had no active business license to –

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But, so did you find a business license for this location
15 from 2005 on?

16 MR. DELAGE: Not that I'm aware of. That was probably the reason why we
17 invited the Applicant to come in and kinda have a preapplication conference to make
18 sure what they wanted to do would fit in whatever district they wanted to go to, that it
19 was able to go to under the two acre minimum.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. So it's reasonable to assume then that there hasn't
21 been a business here since 2005?

22 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Alright. Any other questions for Staff? Daryl Jones
2 [sic]?

3 MR. BARNES: My name's William Barnes, I'm representing my son, his name is
4 Daryl Barnes. And I'm representing him.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

6 **TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM BARNES:**

7 MR. BARNES: I think I can answer some of the questions here. Number one, the
8 building was - well let me start, my name is William Barnes, I live at 204 Salem(?) Club
9 Drive, Columbia, South Carolina. The building was originally built as a restaurant, and
10 on top of that when the, when it, when the structure was build [sic] there were no other,
11 there was no subdivision there. And, so we all assumed that it would continue to be
12 grandfathered, even though it's been, it hasn't been in use, like she said, since 2005.
13 Number two, the building cannot be renovated as a resident [sic]. And number three, we
14 are still paying taxes at the commercial rate.

15 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, I'm not sure why you're paying taxes at a
17 commercial rate if there's no commercial business in there and it's zoned Rural.

18 MS. CAIRNS: Because it doesn't have residents with a legal occupant.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But it still shouldn't be appraised at a commercial value.

20 MS. CAIRNS: Well, appraised is different than tax ratios.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, the taxes are based on the appraised value.

22 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, but I mean, the ratio, the fact that it's being taxed as
23 commercial is simply because it's not somebody's home.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, it's –

2 MR. BARNES: Also, let me say this. My son, them, they inherited this so it was
3 my father-in-law's.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

5 MR. BARNES: And they going through the, the, this is a part of a probate, too.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

7 MR. BARNES: Okay, so, and this is what we found when we got involved.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright.

9 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask –

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure.

11 MR. BROWN: Is this property, has it always been commercial?

12 MR. BARNES: Yes.

13 MR. BROWN: The owners –

14 MR. BARNES: It was built, my father-in-law was a sub, my father-in-law was a
15 subcontractor, he was a brick mason so that's the way he built it.

16 MR. BROWN: Okay, but under the current ordinance that you're paying, the way
17 that you're paying your taxes is for commercial.

18 MR. BARNES: Well, all I know is that we're paying at the commercial rate. I don't
19 wanna say something I don't know. But I know we're not paying at the residential rate.
20 That much I do know. I know that those taxes there were roughly about \$1,300, \$1,400
21 a year and I think if it's a residence it's gonna be cheaper.

22 MR. BROWN: What is the intended purpose, use?

1 MR. BARNES: Well, we would like for it to stay as a resident [sic] or commercial,
2 because if they want to, to sell it, see, it is impossible, we can't sell it as a resident [sic]
3 and we need to be able to sell it so that it will have a commercial use.

4 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Any other questions? Thank you. Ray O'Neal?
6 Yes, sir, would you like to –

7 **TESTIMONY OF RAY O'NEAL:**

8 MR. O'NEAL: We are, you pulled me up on [inaudible].

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, you wanna speak on the next one? Is that right?

10 MR. O'NEAL: Yeah, the next one.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. I'll put you down.

12 MS. HEGLER: He's an Applicant on another case.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Are you the Applicant on, which one, on Clemson Road,
14 Greenhill Parrish?

15 MS. HEGLER: Garners Ferry.

16 MR. O'NEAL: 6505.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, those are out of order. I got it.

18 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, while you're looking at – if in fact this property is
19 being taxed at a commercial rate but it's zoned something different, is that what I'm
20 understanding?

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Geo?

22 MR. PRICE: You, typically you pay a commercial rate on property where you do
23 not have your residence. So if you have, like two pieces of property, where you live

1 you're gonna pay the 4% that's your residential, but the other piece you'll pay a
2 commercial rate.

3 MR. BROWN: Okay, so this has nothing to do with use. It has to do with –

4 MR. PRICE: Correct.

5 MR. BROWN: - whether you live there or not.

6 MR. PRICE: Right, the owner does not reside on that property.

7 MR. BROWN: I gotcha. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Okay. Alright, that's all we've got signed up to
9 speak on here. And I got those in order. Alright. Any thoughts?

10 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, given the facts of the matter the only issue here is,
11 is what the owner wants to sell, what, because it is, wants to sell it for commercial
12 purposes, which again does not comply with the zoning that's already there in that
13 particular neighborhood. So as a result it would seem to me that we would have to
14 recommend this go to Council as a recommended by Staff of disapproval.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I would agree. Is that in the form of a motion?

16 MR. BROWN: Yes, it is.

17 MS. CAIRNS: I second.

18 MS. HEGLER: Mr. Chairman, we did not hear him very well.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a, Mr. Brown made a motion to send this
20 forward to Council with a recommendation of denial. And Heather seconded. Any other
21 discussion? All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

22 *[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Absent: Joyner, Tuttle,*
23 *Theus]*

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Next case, Case No. 14-28 MA.

2 **CASE NO. 14-28 MA:**

3 MR. LEGER: Mr. Chairman, the Applicant in this case is Mr. Thomas Crowther.
4 The property is located at 3533 Broad River Road. It's almost 12 acres in size, is
5 currently zoned, well it's split zoned GC, General Commercial on the frontage of Broad
6 River Road, and RM-HD kind of to the west with frontage on, on Beatty. The
7 [inaudible]G was the original zoning from 1977, as well as the C3 District from, C3
8 District in 1977, and C3 was changed to GC in 2005 with the update to the Land
9 Development Code. In the vicinity you have a number of different zoning classifications.
10 To the north we have property zoned NC and GC, which have residences nearest the
11 property. To the south we have property zoned RM-HD and C3 in the City of Columbia.
12 There are residences in the form of it appears townhouses or, or apartments. And there
13 is also a car wash and Laundromat on the frontage of Broad River Road. To the east we
14 have property zoned RM-HD, which is the St. Andrews Park and there are a number of
15 residential structures on Beatty Road as well. And, let's see, sorry, that's to the west.
16 And to the east if I'm not mistaken we've got GC and M1 on Broad River Road and
17 there are commercial structures on Broad River Road as well. The property has what
18 appears to be a fire wood sales location on Broad River Road as well as a number of
19 residential structures, manufactured homes on Beatty Road. Like I said there's
20 apartments to the south. For the most part the commercial structures are located with
21 frontage along Broad River Road. Everything to the, to the west or to the, yeah to the
22 west is, appears to be residential or park property. The Comprehensive Plan
23 recommends suburban right at this area, calls for commercial to be on major arterials or

1 where, or traffic junctions or near office and commercial use. Based on the residential
2 use along Beatty Road and the park on Beatty Road, with the frontage of Broad River
3 Road remaining commercial the Staff did not support the rezoning request that far back
4 into Beatty Road. We felt that it would be an encroachment into the residential nature
5 and the park area of, of that vicinity. For that reason the Staff recommends disapproval.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, I gotta question for Staff. So your reasoning
7 behind the disapproval is that it encroached too far back into a neighborhood?

8 MR. LEGER: Essentially yes, sir.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: A neighborhood that's zoned RM-HD?

10 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And where the property directly across the street, all the
12 way down the whole frontage of this property down Beatty is all zoned commercial,
13 even past this site?

14 MR. LEGER: Is zoned commercial or M1 –

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But everything along Beatty all the way down the
16 frontage, the distance of this site, is zoned commercial.

17 MR. LEGER: That's correct.

18 MS. HEGLER: But it's also surrounded by commercial and M1. For the distance
19 that you're referring to.

20 MR. LEGER: And those properties that are zoned NC are occupied residentially.
21 There're homes there.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right, but we have this discussion back and forth all the
23 time that the zoning is what carries the day on these pieces of property cause they

1 could become anything under that commercial zoning. Is there a traffic signal at Beatty
2 and Broad River?

3 MR. LEGER: No, sir, I don't think so.

4 MS. HEGLER: I don't think so.

5 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, on the property in question are there residences or
6 what?

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: From my understanding it's a vacant piece of land that's
8 zoned, the frontage is already currently zoned General Commercial and behind it is
9 zoned for apartments, 16 units per acre. Is that correct?

10 MR. HEGLER: Um-hum (affirmative). RM-HD.

11 MR. BROWN: What's the structure in the middle of this property, kind of in the
12 woods?

13 MR. LEGER: On the, on the part of the property that's zoned General
14 Commercial, you have a, a manufactured home that's being used as, as an office for a
15 firewood sales place. They've got lots of logs and cut up wood and they're selling
16 firewood. Behind that on Beatty, the remainder of that parcel, and I don't know the
17 acreage but it's pretty substantial, is, is, is, there are, is a mobile home park, there are
18 manufactured homes in there and, and residential structures.

19 MR. BROWN: Okay, and the facility that seems to be in the woods and just on
20 the edge of the woods near a field that's in there, what is that structure?

21 MR. LEGER: That's a residential structure.

22 MR. BROWN: Residential, okay. Thank you. That's what I was trying to –

23 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. So it's Staff's thought that this parcel is serving the
2 best purpose for it currently?

3 MS. HEGLER: That's not –

4 MS. CAIRNS: That the zoning is proper for the area.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The, the, that it's, it would, it's best suited for multi-family?
6 For a multi-family site? I guess?

7 MS. HEGLER: That was the wisdom of the prior zoning. We just do not support
8 the commercial, you know, creeping that far into being surrounded by residential.

9 MR. LEGER: The, we've got the Broad River Road Corridor Master Plan that
10 applies in this area as well. It, it talks about multi-level structures with non-residential on
11 the first floor and residential on the second floor. You know, that's a long range plan for
12 this area so it's, it's more of a transitional mixed use recommendation coming out of the
13 Neighborhood Master Plan.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I, I'm just having trouble with this site because all I see on
15 the zoning map that's around this site and all I see on the aerial are commercial
16 applications all the way down to Crestland Drive. You've got multi-family all around this
17 area. I don't know what the City of Columbia zoning is across the street, but it's not on
18 our map, but it looks to be commercial in use. You've got self-storage units, you've got
19 all of this stuff down Broad River Road are massive buildings. You know, I mean, I – our
20 zoning classification calls for major arterial roads, is Broad River Road classified as a
21 major arterial?

22 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Alright, any other questions for Staff?

1 MS. CAIRNS: No, but I think it's interesting that you would characterize it as
2 surrounded by commercial when it's mostly surrounded by residential zoned property. I
3 mean, I understand across Beatty is zoned commercial but –

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, I mean, I guess technically 16 units per acre is
5 residential, but at the same time it generates –

6 MS. CAIRNS: It generates traffic but it's residential.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right, I understand.

8 MS. CAIRNS: It's very different than commercial.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. But a lotta times when you live in a multi-family
10 complex you don't expect the same peace and tranquility as if you lived on a two acre
11 site out in the country.

12 MS. CAIRNS: No, but that doesn't mean that putting commercial in an area with
13 high density residential is not, is the same as putting more residential in.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Oh no, I understand. I just –

15 MS. CAIRNS: But, I mean, I think it's not, it's not zoned commercial around it. It
16 is zoned residential predominantly around it, high density residential but residential
17 nonetheless.

18 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask this –

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure.

20 MR. BROWN: - of Staff? The parcel in question is currently zoned residential, is
21 that –

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Correct, the front, the front portion is zoned General
23 Commercial and behind that is zoned multi-family.

1 MR. BROWN: Okay. So the, all that side of the street then, and I don't see the
2 name of the – I guess Beatty Road, is that right?

3 MR. LEGER: Beatty Road yes, sir.

4 MR. BROWN: Yeah, Beatty Road, all on that side of Beatty Road is residential
5 and the commercial is across the street, is that right?

6 MR. LEGER: Correct.

7 MR. BROWN: Okay, and that's part of what you took into account?

8 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, that's correct.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, any other questions for Staff? We've got a few
10 signed up to speak. Thomas Crowther?

11 **TESTIMONY OF CAMERON HADERHOLT(?):**

12 MR. HADERHOLT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Planning
13 Commission. My name's Cameron Haderholt. Thomas Crowther is here as well as the
14 rest of our team to answer any questions if they come up. I'm vice president of
15 development at Cypress Equities. We're a former development arm of the Staubach
16 Company, which is Roger Staubach's real estate company. We're based on Dallas.
17 We've been around about 19 years and in that time we've built about 18 million square
18 feet across the country, across all asset types. We pride ourselves in our retail
19 expertise, strong reputation for responsible and sustainable development. What we're
20 proposing is a 41,000 square foot grocery store and along with that we'll have a drive-
21 thru pharmacy and a six pump gas station, all of which we believe will be amenities to
22 the area. And it represents a \$12 million investment into the community. With that I'd
23 like to turn it over to Ryan McKay whose our architect and he'd like to address some

1 specific points that were brought up in the Staff Report, unless you have any other
2 questions for me.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you.

4 **TESTIMONY OF RYAN MCKAY:**

5 MR. MCKAY: Good afternoon Members of the Commission, my name is Ryan
6 McKay with BRR Architecture, working in accord with Cypress Equities on this proposed
7 neighborhood scale retail project. This proposal is for a neighborhood grocery use
8 intended to serve the immediate vicinity of Beatty Road and Broad River. The request to
9 allow a grocery include a request to rezone from multi-family and General Commercial
10 as was previously stated, to strictly General Commercial. As the Staff Report suggests
11 in front of you we are compliant with the objectives in the Comprehensive Plan related
12 to the suburban designation. The grocery use, in our opinion, also conforms to the
13 Corridor Neighborhood Master Plan. Although it's not a mid-rise building it is a favorable
14 use in the fact that it is a grocery use according to the Plan. This neighborhood use
15 would possibly create additional opportunities on site for different forums and uses as
16 the market responds to this important investment. The building, as Cameron said, is a
17 full service grocery with drive-thru and a fuel use as well. It's approximately 40,000
18 square feet in floor area, which is on the smaller end of, of the retail spectrum when
19 you're talking about neighborhood grocery type of uses that generally range from
20 40,000 up to 80,000 and even, even larger than that, square feet. We do have
21 conceptual site plans here with us today, they should also be in your package, as well
22 as elevations that we're willing to speak to in more detail as time would allow. There is
23 an important distinction I would like to make at this point. I know some of the concerns

1 of Staff centers around the fact that, that we're getting a little bit too far back into what
2 seems to be dominated by different forms of residential use. If I may just step around
3 and, and speak to this. I believe this is –

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Go ahead.

5 MR. MCKAY: - I believe this is the, the road, Howard Circle, that comes around
6 here. That generally aligned with our access to the rear of the store. That's essentially
7 where the, the built portion of the site ends, it is aligned with this Howard Circle. Back
8 here these are ponds intended to serve as detention for the proposed retail use with the
9 appropriate landscaping and treatment would be a nice buffer, in addition to, this is all
10 excess property that we are currently planning to utilize as, as a tree, existing tree
11 buffer. So, so I don't wanna make that distinction that the development of the site
12 essentially comes to this point where the detention then would be treated appropriately
13 to buffer from any residential concerns that may arise.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

15 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman? May I ask, did I understand correctly that there are
16 modular units on that property?

17 MR. MCKAY: Yes.

18 MR. BROWN: Are they occupied?

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I -

20 MR. MCKAY: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, there are mobile homes currently existing on
21 that property.

22 MR. BROWN: Are they occupied?

23 MR. HADERHOLT: We don't know the answer to that, sir.

1 MR. BROWN: Let me ask Staff, are they occupied?

2 MS. HEGLER: One looked like a sales –

3 MR. LEGER: They appear to be, at least from the road frontage they appear to
4 be. We, as Staff we didn't drive back into the, the little drive that goes back into there, in
5 the forested area, we did not go on site into the property.

6 MR. HADERHOLT: Excuse me, the seller of the property has represented that
7 there are no issues with, with any of the people on site, any of the residents.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So even if there are people that live there, if the owner
9 does something with the property they're not under lease or –

10 MR. HADERHOLT: Yes, sir they're, they're able to –

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: They're able to –

12 MR. HADERHOLT: Correct.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, develop this site as they need to.

14 MR. MCKAY: Another important distinction before we progress too far into the
15 discussion. There were some concerns brought up about the, the intersection and
16 whether or not, whether or not that is signaled and, of course, it is not but we are willing
17 to work with Staff through that issue if we need to, to signalize that intersection to make
18 it a safer environment in terms of traffic, we're willing to, to do that as part of this
19 development.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, I mean, I think that's just, that's just dictated by DOT
21 and what they –

22 MR. HADERHOLT: That is our preference and we're working with DOT to –

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah. Yeah, I was just wondering if it was existing or not.
2 I mean, whatever you gotta do in the future you gotta do in the future once you develop
3 the site. Alright. Any other questions? Mr. Fuller?

4 MR. FULLER: I'm not planning to speak this afternoon.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. And then we have one more, I can't quite make it
6 out. Is it Mink? Mark?

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just reserved for any questions y'all might have
8 [inaudible].

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Any other questions for the Applicant? I do find it
10 somewhat interesting that there's no one signed up to speak against the rezoning. So,
11 that's all we got signed up to speak.

12 MR. HADERHOLT: If I could add one more thing. We mentioned the, the road
13 that would be cutting across our access point. The excess lane in the back we would
14 like to, to talk to the park and see if they could use the additional space back there
15 cause we, we have no use for it, it might be a nice amenity to the park as well.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, great. Thank you.

17 MS. FRIERSON: I have a question.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure.

19 MS. FRIERSON: What type of grocery store, is it a national chain or some local
20 type of grocery store?

21 MR. HADERHOLT: Yes, ma'am, it's a national chain.

22 MS. FRIERSON: Are you at liberty to say?

23 MR. HADERHOLT: Not at this time.

1 MS. FRIERSON: Oh, okay.

2 MR. HADERHOLT: No, ma'am.

3 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright.

5 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I guess I want the Record to state that I find that
6 the, troubling that you have residents living on that property and no one seems to know
7 that much about the arrangements with all of that. Which means that those folks would
8 have to be dislocated and relocated should the property be used for the purposes that
9 are requested. It is, based on what I understand, it is residential as it stands now
10 because people are living on the property. There're apparently more than one family or
11 two or three families. I don't know how many.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

13 MR. BROWN: I don't know if anybody can answer that or not.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well here's the thing, Mr. Brown, in my opinion the people
15 who perhaps are living on that site, number one, don't own the property and are
16 possibly renting.

17 MR. BROWN: Um-hum (affirmative).

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And if they are renting then the current owner would have
19 to honor whatever lease they have in place through that term. And let's say they're on a
20 month to month lease, but I also find it interesting that if there is someone living on that
21 site that where they've been living has been posted that there's a rezoning going on.

22 MR. BROWN: Yeah. No, I agree with you.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, and did not, did not have a problem with either
2 moving or wanted to say they wanted to stay there, whatever. But at the same time the
3 owner of this site has the ability to make application for a rezoning of their parcel to do
4 with what they want to and, you know, that's, for me, if there are people living there
5 they're not the owners of those, those mobile homes or whatever they're in, then they
6 are either a, renting a space on a short term basis or something, so that – while they
7 may be there currently, you know, they don't have the long term right to that property
8 unless they're under some form of lease, which the owner would then have to honor
9 anyhow.

10 MR. HADERHOLT: If I may add.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, sir, we, we got it. Appreciate it.

12 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chair, I have a question. The, the structures on Connie
13 Drive, are those, I mean, I know those are, I mean, I know those are residential but is
14 that an apartment complex, single-family dwellings, condos?

15 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, those apartments. I think it's called Trenton Court, Trenton
16 Court Apartments.

17 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. And the uses behind this, I mean, just speaking here, I
18 – with the park there, I mean, I have no problem with, with this particular zoning right
19 here. I mean, it, it does conform to the overall commercial aspect of the area. I mean, if
20 you look in a 360 radius I really don't see a huge problem. And I understand the Staff
21 not wanting to encroach too far back in the back and I know we can't, applicants can't, I
22 mean, this is just a straight rezoning, they can tell us they're gonna do something and
23 then switch it later, but even if they did, I mean, we have ball fields with light pollution. I

1 mean, I just, I see this as good arterial road off Beatty, this, you know, this rezoning
2 could service the area for the, you know, with that commercial aspect. Whether it be a
3 grocery store or a gas station, whatever it may be I, you know, with everything across
4 the street. And I don't, the City of Columbia zoning is kind of across the street and I
5 guess that would be to the southeast off Shivers Road, I mean, that seems to be
6 relatively commercial in nature also. Would y'all agree?

7 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir.

8 MR. ANDERSON: I personally think that this zoning fits the conformity of the
9 neighborhood. And again, the applicant saying they'll buffer, of course, they always
10 have to buffer based on the zoning backing up to residential, I think this is a great way
11 to keep the buffers in place. Because we're not dealing with any type of commercial
12 behind it. So those are my thoughts and if there are no other objections I'd love to make
13 a motion. Mr. Chair, I'd like to make a motion that we send Case No. 14-28 MA ahead
14 to Council with a recommendation of approval. And my reasoning for going against the
15 Staff's disapproval is the fact that it fits the actual neighborhood, there's a good arterial
16 road on Beatty, and the residential structure beside it could serve their need, the
17 commercial aspect could serve their need, and that's the reasoning.

18 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. I just wanna say real
20 quick, you know, I agree. With this much multi-family around I think a parcel like this that
21 could deliver some of those services to these folks and keep them from going further
22 out on Broad River and adding to the congestion further down the street, if they're able
23 to get some of those services locally on a main arterial road like this at an interstate, at

1 an interchange, it just seems like it would actually help with the congestion further
2 downstream. And I got one more question, the park, is that owned by the county?

3 MR. LEGER: It's a Richland County park, yes, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Alright. We got a motion and a second. Any other
5 discussion? All those in favor of the motion say aye. Any opposed?

6 *[Approved: Frierson, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Opposed: Cairns; Absent:*
7 *Joyner, Tuttle, Theus]*

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, we got one nay. Alright. So the next case. Case
9 No. 14-29 MA.

10 **CASE NO. 14-29 MA:**

11 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, the Applicant in this case is Thomas
12 Crowther, the property is located on Clemson Road near Hardscrabble Road. It's about
13 15 ½ acres in size, currently zoned RU, Rural District, and Mr. Crowther is asking for
14 the GC, General Commercial District on this site. The Rural zoning currently on the
15 property is the original zoning from 1977. There have been a number of rezoning
16 applications in the vicinity. The property to the north is zoned Planned Development
17 District and RS-MD, which is Residential, Single-family, Medium Density. There are
18 commercial developments over near the intersection of Hardscrabble and Clemson, but
19 to the immediate kind of north central of the property is undeveloped and zoned RS-MD.
20 To the south we have residential neighborhood, subdivision zoned RM-HD, it's the
21 Brookfield Development. To the east the property is zoned RS-LD, it is a residential
22 subdivision as well, Copperfield. And to the west the property is zoned RM-HD, the
23 Brookfield Subdivision. The site is, is currently heavily wooded, there is a proposal to go

1 into the site by South Carolina Department of Transportation to build a new road as
2 access for the subdivision to the south due to road improvements that will happen on
3 Hardscrabble Road, which will be problematic for the existing entrance into that
4 development. So the new drive will be built. Otherwise the property is, currently remains
5 vacant and, and wooded. The Comprehensive Plan recommends suburban on this site
6 where commercial and office should be at traffic junctions or on arterials or near other
7 office and commercial developments and should not encroach into or near residential
8 areas. The Staff felt that the site was not at the intersection and would encroach on the
9 residential nature of the, of the residential developments on three sides. Because of the
10 existing zoning in the vicinity and the undeveloped nature of the site the Staff
11 recommended disapproval of the rezone at this time.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, any questions for Staff? Alright, Thomas Crowther,
13 the Applicant?

14 **TESTIMONY OF CAMERON HADERHOLT:**

15 MR. HADERHOLT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This would be another small
16 neighborhood grocery store. We have a meeting with the HOA Board of Brookfield this
17 afternoon. And we've had a number of conversations with Justin Robinson whose the
18 head of the HOA Board. All those conversations so far have been positive. He's seen
19 our site plan, we've talked through our overall development plan. We've also met with
20 Department of Transportation and would actually like to take over the road construction
21 efforts just to, to expedite that road construction. We think we could, we could deliver
22 that road within six months of zoning approval, whereas we understand that it might
23 take, you know, two or three years for the DOT process to, to work through. So we think

1 that's a benefit for the residents nearby and again, we think the, the drive-thru
2 pharmacy, grocery store and gas station will be an amenity to the area. And then I'll turn
3 it over to Ryan again unless you have any questions.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thanks.

5 **TESTIMONY OF RYAN MCKAY:**

6 MR. MCKAY: Again Ryan McKay with BRR Architecture and as Cameron stated
7 just a moment ago this is a very similar proposal that's in front of you, proposed
8 commercial use specifically a neighborhood grocery scale type of use with pharmacy
9 and fuel, approximately 40,000 square feet. And we are requesting rezoning from Rural
10 to General Commercial which is an acceptable use according to the Comprehensive,
11 the suburban designation of the Comprehensive Plan. The concern then really boils
12 down to the proximity of that in relation to the traffic junction or the major intersection to
13 the west. I think it's fair to note here that, that the four corners of the Hardscrabble and
14 Clemson Road intersections are, are not fully developed as commercial; three of them
15 are, the southeast corner is, is developed but we, we feel like the development is
16 somewhat limited there because of the encroachment of the residential neighborhood
17 immediately adjacent. We have small pockets of residential that do extend further into
18 that section of, of the intersection, but the property in question, the subject property in
19 front of you in reality is only about 500' from that intersection where it begins. The
20 grocery store then is still less, where it falls in relation to the overall site, the proposed
21 site, is only, is less than a quarter mile from that intersection. Your Comprehensive Plan
22 also speaks much to the issue of, of sprawl, suburban or urban sprawl. We could
23 choose to develop in an area that is largely undeveloped with direct access right on an

1 intersection, but we're choosing to locate in a largely developed area where there is a
2 precedent for commercial and residential use, where that precedent already exists. And
3 that's what makes this a truly neighborhood use. Furthermore, we're locating along a
4 minor arterial that is designed to serve such uses as that. So knowing this, we must look
5 then at the items related to the adjacency of uses and address any concerns that, that
6 arise there, and that's what we're gonna be doing in detail later on this afternoon with
7 the homeowners association. So again, we'll have plans that we can speak to if you
8 have any, any questions.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions?

10 MS. FRIERSON: I have a question. I'm somewhat familiar with that area. How
11 close is your proposed site to the Post Office on Clemson or the storage facility that
12 recently opened on Clemson, on that right side of the road?

13 MR. HADERHOLT: To the east of our property? Are you speaking to the east of
14 our property?

15 MS. FRIERSON: No, not to the east of it, I'm just trying to get in my mind, I know
16 where Rose Creek is.

17 MR. HADERHOLT: Right.

18 MS. FRIERSON: And Clemson and all of that. I'm trying to get in my mind how
19 close is your proposed site to that new storage facility and to the Post Office that's
20 already on Clemson?

21 MR. HADERHOLT: We are 500' from the Hardscrabble intersection, the property
22 itself is. So just 500' off of that intersection. And the store itself is less than a quarter
23 from the intersection, I don't know the exact [inaudible].

1 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, cause I know where Rose Creek is, okay thank you.

2 MS. HEGLER: Ms. Frierson, I think it's the PDD so it's the blue, and then it – no?
3 Is it further down?

4 MS. FRIERSON: Well, it's not that green part.

5 MR. PRICE: The two blue parcels that you're, on your, in your booklet?

6 MS. FRIERSON: Uh-huh (affirmative).

7 MR. PRICE: You'll see the blue parcels to the east.

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

9 MR. PRICE: That's the Post Office and the daycare.

10 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, I know exactly where you're talking about.

11 MR. PRICE: And then as you go a little bit down that's when you run into the
12 warehouses which is zoned PDD.

13 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, thank you so much for that clarification.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other questions for the Applicant? Thank you. Mr.
15 Fuller? David Hancock? I've actually gotta run down these names, I know some of you
16 have spoken, Ryan McKay, and Mark the same? Okay. Tracy Barnes?

17 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry, just wanna, if you're looking at, on this, the little green
18 corner, that is actually where the daycare starts and the, the Post Office is not visible on
19 that. The two blue areas were part of a PDD and there's I think a State Farm office in
20 one of those.

21 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, thank you very much.

22 **TESTIMONY OF TRACY BARNES:**

1 MS. BARNES: [Inaudible] I'm sorry, and I live in Rose Creek. I've lived there for
2 25 years. And when I moved there I checked out all the zoning, I did all the things that
3 you should do when you buy a house. We called it Clemson Road at the time, we now
4 call it Clemson Expressway. We do not need any more commercial development
5 between Hardscrabble and Rhame Road. We just don't need it. There's an empty spot
6 on Clemson and Hardscrabble where Food Lion used to be. People couldn't get in and
7 out of the Food Lion, it closed, almost all those businesses are closing.

8 MS. FRIERSON: You talking about Piggly Wiggly?

9 MS. BARNES: Oh, was it a Piggly Wiggly?

10 MS. FRIERSON: Piggly Wiggly.

11 MS. BARNES: Well no, no, there was a Food Lion, now the Piggly Wiggly. I
12 understand that they're gonna widen Clemson and Hardscrabble, which is great.
13 Brookfield residents can barely get out of their neighborhood now. You're only going just
14 a little bit farther down and putting the grocery store and we expect that to be a safe
15 area where people can get in and out. I can barely get out of my neighborhood on high
16 traffic time and I'm a good ways from this. Also, in fairness, and I get real emotional
17 about this, but Rose Creek worked with, not this group I don't think but other people that
18 were on your Board, to go along with a PUD. And the developers and Mr. Fuller, do you
19 remember me? I know you do. The developers brought the pretty drawings and told us
20 things you wouldn't believe; no clear cutting and they clear cut almost immediately.
21 Now, I know this isn't about the PUD, but I cannot trust the developers or Mr. Fuller who
22 are meeting with Brookfield people as we speak, and they don't know what they're
23 getting into, and frankly I didn't trust the group that used to sit here to make sure that all

1 the covenants that we agreed to, an 8' wall, hum-um (negative), a stucco wall, hum-um
2 (negative), concrete block. We just don't need any more commercial. The property that
3 is, like the Post Office and all, that wasn't changed to commercial, that was under rural,
4 and so were the other things. So I am representing just 94 families in Rose Creek
5 subdivision. It's bad enough to get down Clemson Road as it is, please do not rezone
6 this area to General Commercial.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. That's all we've got signed up to speak.

8 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir.

10 MR. BROWN: On the corner of Hardscrabble and Clemson isn't there a church
11 that's there.

12 MR. LEGER: That's correct.

13 MR. BROWN: Okay, and then across from that church there are, there's a
14 McDonalds on one side and then there's a, a service station I believe that's there, and
15 then you have some road dividers that, that have been put up right there in that
16 intersection. Is that correct?

17 MR. LEGER: That's correct.

18 MR. BROWN: Okay. So now looking at all of that, if you were to, if the
19 Commission were to overrule the Staff and recommend to the Council on this piece of
20 property, what would be added on this parcel? How many businesses? How many
21 businesses would be added to this parcel?

22 MS. HEGLER: The piece in question?

23 MR. BROWN: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, it's a 15 acre site, 15 ½ acres.

2 MS. HEGLER: That's up to the owner and the developer.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. There's, there's really no limit as to the square
4 footage size.

5 MR. BROWN: So where, where the McDonalds is going north up Clemson Road
6 there're several businesses, is that correct, on that side of the street? And then when
7 you cross the street you have a service station on that corner and then you have
8 businesses including doctor's offices and so forth, up to an elementary school if I
9 remember correctly. Killian Elementary.

10 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, and the commercial uses I think in the, in the intersection
11 have been fairly well established to about half a mile out from each of the –

12 MR. BROWN: Okay, so what's basically –

13 MS. HEGLER: - on each approach.

14 MR. BROWN: - what basically brought, blocked in is this Brook, Brook Holland
15 subdivision and I guess it's Sunny Court, I don't know the names of those subdivisions
16 but there's subdivisions that are there. And then on both sides of the Hardscrabble
17 going west on, on Hardscrabble and Clemson, is that right? And everything across
18 Clemson Road and Hardscrabble until you get to the set of apartments and subdivision
19 is commercial, is that right?

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir, they're showing you there on the screen, or were
21 showing you the, the names of the subdivisions.

22 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman?

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: They're showing you here on the screen the names of the
2 subdivisions, the parcel in question is between Brookfield and Copperfield. On the
3 screen there.

4 MR. ANDERSON: So this, this particular parcel has come before us before,
5 correct? Or not? No?

6 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

7 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman?

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir.

9 MR. GILCHRIST: Do, do we know what the timeline is on the widening of
10 Hardscrabble Road going down?

11 MS. HEGLER: I mean, it's one of the, I, I don't know the exact project ranking but
12 it is one of the projects funded under the penny and it's got design so it's, I mean, I think
13 it's one of the first projects that will be handled.

14 MR. CROWTHER: Good afternoon. My name is Thomas Crowther. A few weeks
15 back we met with DOT to discuss the widening of Clemson Road and the new lean into
16 the subdivision. Those are all planned in 2016.

17 MR. GILCHRIST: Thank you.

18 MR. HADERHOLT: One thing, I'm not sure if it was mentioned but we are, we
19 are proposing a traffic light at the new intersection that we are creating, so hopefully that
20 will address some of the traffic concerns.

21 [Inaudible discussion]

1 MR. CROWTHER: Maybe we can talk, maybe we can talk to a little bit more
2 detail in that. What, what DOT currently has in their preconstruction department is the
3 widening of Clemson Road and the additional road here.

4 MS. HEGLER: It's the widening of Harden [sic] but it's an improvement of the
5 intersection. Hardscrabble.

6 MR. CROWTHER: Yes. So our intent is actually to go in and partner with the
7 Brookfield and Copperfield subdivisions, expedite this road, which will alleviate some of
8 the traffic concerns that the neighbors have. And in addition to that add a proposed
9 traffic signal. So all of that will help relieve some of the concerns and the pause that the
10 neighbor has with traffic signals.

11 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Crowther, if the anticipated date of widening Clemson Road
12 is 2016, what's the anticipated completion time?

13 MR. CROWTHER: For DOT it's a two year project. If we were to take it over and
14 partner with the, the neighborhood and the subdivisions, we could do it within a six
15 month timeframe.

16 MS. FRIERSON: The entire thing?

17 MR. CROWTHER: Yes.

18 MS. CAIRNS: Just the access road, not the widening.

19 MS. HEGLER: You are not gonna take over widening on Hardscrabble.

20 MR. CROWTHER: Not the widening. So we would do –

21 MS. FRIERSON: Just the access.

22 MR. CROWTHER: - our development, the grocery store and fuel station and this
23 road –

1 MR. GILCHRIST: Be clear on that one.

2 [Laughter – inaudible discussion]

3 MR. HADERHOLT: A six month timeframe, we have taken measures [inaudible].

4 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman? Is there a neighborhood association for those
5 subdivisions?

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: There is, it's a little, I, and to your point Mr. Brown, it's a
7 little disconcerting that those meetings haven't occurred before you came before the
8 Planning Commission.

9 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

10 MR. HADERHOLT: We've been reaching out to them and I had some bad
11 information [inaudible] and I finally made contact on Friday. [Inaudible]

12 MR. BROWN: What is concerning to me, Mr. Chairman –

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We don't –

14 MR. BROWN: - I'm sorry, excuse me.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, go ahead.

16 MR. BROWN: What is concerning to me, Mr. Chairman, is it was stated before us
17 that agreements were reached with developers with respect to what was supposed to
18 occur in that particular area and none of that actually happened. So it seems to me that
19 with something as important as all of this and what is already developed in that area,
20 there needs to be some concrete agreements between those residential associations
21 and this commercial development before further development occurs.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Mr. Brown, I think what we've gotta take into
23 consideration here on this case is that we are not, we, we have nothing to do, this Body

1 has nothing to do with any sort of a development agreement that these folks would put
2 together with any neighborhood association. What we've gotta take a look at is
3 completely absent of what they plan to do on the site, what their layout is, what their
4 road infrastructure, when they're gonna do it, all that kinda stuff, that's all nice and great
5 to hear but they're not tied to any of that stuff with what we take action on today. If these
6 guys decide to do all that stuff, that's, that's wonderful. But we gotta take a look at is, is
7 this site now ready to be a General Commercial site at the location it's at, irrespective of
8 what they plan to do. Because, because they're not tied to that stuff.

9 MR. BROWN: And I would agree with you, Mr. Chairman, and that's part of, and
10 your key word is ready.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

12 MR. BROWN: And so I would question whether it's ready or not for that, absent
13 people in that area coming to some agreement on these matters. Because whatever we
14 decide to do here and Council decides to do, they've gotta live with it.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

16 MR. BROWN: And you have folks who've made a substantial investment in that
17 area in their homes and, and they did that thinking that they were going to be in an area
18 that would be good for them to live in, not just a commercialization of their
19 neighborhoods. So that, that's the reason I raised the concerns.

20 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chair, I do have – so, and I just wanna gets these
21 neighborhoods right, could you, could we pull back up the neighborhoods? So we have
22 Brookfield, what's to the right? Copperfield. And then Rose Creek I'm assuming is just
23 tied in, and then we have Wellington. So we have basically –

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Gentlemen, we appreciate your help. You can take a seat
2 for us if you like.

3 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. So we have three neighborhoods that are gonna be
4 potentially negatively impacted by this rezoning from RU, which I'll go on the Record
5 saying I love to see RU but this is definitely not an RU piece of property, not by the
6 truest definition of what's considered Rural. But, and again, Mr. Palmer stated, we can't
7 hold anything to any developer, I mean, we cannot hold a developer to what they say
8 they're gonna do. They could put up, you know, a strip mall there that, that's all purple,
9 and we can't do anything to change that. I, as it stands right now without, and I
10 appreciate the representation from Brookfield, but, and I know that things are posted,
11 but I think it's a responsibility of development a lotta times to reach out to these
12 neighborhoods that they can enhance lives, and also possibly negatively impact them
13 via traffic count. So I, I think y'all heard my, my last motion and, and I think there's a
14 little bit more responsibility to the developers on this particular site when it comes to be
15 surrounded by living, or people that are living there; Brookfield, Copperfield, Rose
16 Creek, Wellington. Do I think this is an RU zoning, do I think it should stay RU? If there's
17 not a good reason to change it then yes, it should stay RU. But I, I just, again I
18 encourage communication across the road maps to all, all, all neighborhoods and, and
19 people that can be affected. And we are a recommending Body that just does rezone
20 things, so there could be a purple subdivision or a purple strip mall there and we can't
21 do anything about that. So anyways, I, I wanted to make that statement so everybody
22 stands that, that I think communication is key when these, when we get some larger

1 tract rezonings in some highly condensed areas with some future changes coming
2 when it comes to traffic count.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, sir, we're not gonna open it back up, I appreciate it.

4 MR. BROWN: He stated my, what I, my concerns are better than I could. Thank
5 you.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other thoughts?

7 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman, I, I certainly agree with Mr. Anderson and I too
8 would encourage that there be more discussions about this large piece of property. I
9 would like to make a recommendation if I can, I would like to recommend that we defer
10 this until such time as some of those discussions take place and not take any action
11 until some of those discussions that Mr. Anderson brought up and Mr. Wallace brought
12 up, just so that we are clear about what is actually happening with, within the community
13 and the interest there.

14 MR. BROWN: And I second that motion.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Just to be a little more clear, it's sometimes difficult
16 for us to defer a matter when it's, the owners and their representatives, you know, just
17 because, you know, we may wanna hear more or wanna have them meet with
18 somebody or something, you know, with a neighborhood group, we can't make them do
19 that. If there's, if there's something else that you guys, you need some more information
20 from Staff or, but I think we've gotta have more of a reason to defer the matter.

21 MR. GILCHRIST: I withdraw that motion, Mr. Chairman. I'll make a second
22 motion, though.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

1 MR. GILCHRIST: If I may.

2 MR. MCKAY: Just a clarification question for us, not a statement. Is it appropriate
3 at this point to ask for this item to be tabled until the next meeting to give us time to do
4 that?

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: You, you certainly can. Yeah, you can ask for a deferral.

6 MR. MCKAY: Then that would be our official request at this time is to table this
7 until the next Planning Commission, regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting
8 to give us more time to discuss, not just with the, the Brookfield immediately adjacent,
9 but the three that you mentioned.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And it's up to the Commission if, if you folks would like to
11 consider their request for a deferral, certainly can do that. We've gone both ways on this
12 before in the past; agree with it, not agree with it. But it's up to you folks what you'd like
13 to do.

14 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a problem with tabling the matter until
15 the next meeting, provided that adequate notification is given to those neighborhood
16 associations so we can also hear from them and get broader input to make sure that
17 we're not creating a monster they cannot live with. That's just my statement on the
18 matter.

19 MS. CAIRNS: I think it's important that we only require that what the law requires
20 in terms of notice and notifications and developers' choices in terms of who they talk to
21 regarding the neighborhoods, it's actually their choice.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

1 MS. CAIRNS: I don't think it's of paramount, I don't think it's a paramount factor
2 for us to consider even. I mean, what we've got is land use, we've got existing land
3 uses, we've got, we've got policies from the county in terms of when we think
4 appropriate rezonings, you know, a particular zoning is potentially appropriate for an
5 area. And I think we have enough information to make a determination today in terms of
6 whether it's appropriate to allow general commercial development to go up Clemson
7 Road in this area, given the factors presented. I mean, so I think that we need to caution
8 asking/requiring applicants to do things beyond what is required and frankly bring in
9 information that isn't all that relevant. I mean, I'm not saying neighbors don't matter, but
10 it's not a matter of who can come and shout more. I mean, if you look at the previous
11 property and the comment was made that, well none of these people living in these
12 mobile homes came to complain so they must not care, they also might have jobs. I
13 mean, so we can't decide that based on the level of furor that the public happens to
14 bring to us, or the level of agreement. We're charged with giving our vision of the county
15 going forward, existing land uses in the area, and the potential impact of a rezoning to
16 decide if it's appropriate or not. We're charged with that authority and, you know, that
17 ability so I, you know, I think that this is something that we can rule on. I mean, my
18 looking at this, I think there's a lotta retail already in the area. I think the area is serviced
19 and I will, as you know, is common, tend to stand against just the continual retail sprawl
20 up and down our corridor roads. I don't think it's making a good county. So, you know,
21 my idea is that I would agree that Rural is maybe not, $\frac{3}{4}$ acre lots is maybe not the
22 proper zoning but to convert this to commercial, I, I could not support this becoming

1 commercial. I think that there's sufficient square footage of commercial and retail in the
2 area to support the neighborhoods.

3 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask, would it be appropriate then for Staff to
4 make sure that the neighborhood associations are notified of our next meeting?

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Oh, absolutely. I think first, first we need to take a look at
6 what we're gonna do, but –

7 MR. BROWN: No, I understand but I'm saying, I'm just asking the general
8 question.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The, the Staff, doesn't the Staff notify neighboring
10 associations of rezonings that occur?

11 MS. HEGLER: We follow the requirements for posting, it's in the paper, you
12 know. We do not reach out to individual folks, it's posted all around the property and it's
13 –

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We don't, we don't notify adjacent property owners
15 anymore?

16 MS. HEGLER: Oh yeah, it does go out, letters do go out –

17 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, but within a certain distance, whatever the Code requires.

18 MS. HEGLER: Yeah.

19 MR. BROWN: See, that's, that's part of what I'm troubled about, Mr. Chairman,
20 cause you're talking about three major neighborhoods that are impacted by our
21 recommendation. They, they're not aware of all of this and that's the concern I have.

22 MS. HEGLER: We, we used to in the past send out letters for adjacent owners,
23 it's not a requirement though.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

2 MR. ANDERSON: But you do not do that anymore.

3 MS. HEGLER: It is not a requirement.

4 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah.

5 MS. HEGLER: No, so I mean, we post, we're in the newspaper.

6 MS. CAIRNS: And that's what's been deemed sufficient by law.

7 MS. HEGLER: And that's what's consistently been done all over. So, so to ask

8 Staff to start making individual phone calls –

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, no, no, no, I just know that we had done that in the
10 past.

11 MS. HEGLER: We had, there was a program that did it, sort of just punched out
12 some letters and I, I wasn't aware it stopped. I will look into why that did.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

14 MS. HEGLER: But it still was never a requirement.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

16 MS. HEGLER: IT was, it was an additional courtesy.

17 MS. CAIRNS: And I would, I would, yeah I mean, just this idea that somehow
18 we're gonna elevate a neighborhood because it has a neighborhood association and
19 therefore would deserve more notice –

20 MS. HEGLER: I'm not in favor.

21 MS. CAIRNS: - than people who don't live in neighborhood associations is, is
22 not, I mean, whatever the law requires is what they do, and posting in the newspaper is
23 the public notice of these events.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, ma'am.

2 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chair, just for clarification, if we deferred, I know we've
3 heard Brookfield mentioned, that you all plan to meet with them tonight, specifically
4 what are the other neighborhood associations that we're referring to? Is it Rose Creek
5 and what else? Specifically?

6 MR. HEGLER: Ms. Frierson, I think that was a Commissioner's suggestion to
7 reach out to certain neighborhoods.

8 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, and I, I suggested –

9 MS. FRIERSON: I'm just curious, you know, cause I'm really familiar with that
10 area, so I'm just trying to get the specific names of the other impacted areas. That are
11 represented by neighborhood associations. Cause I remember the lady spoke about
12 Rose Creek and I know exactly where that is, and Brookfield. I just wanted to know the
13 specific names of the others that are impacted that do have neighborhood associations.

14 MR. HADERHOLT: I'm not sure if you're asking that to us or not.

15 MS. FRIERSON: Whomever can answer it.

16 MR. HADERHOLT: I, I've written down the Rose Creek, Wellington, Devon
17 Green, and the Winchester neighborhoods, unless you think we should be reaching out
18 to more.

19 MS. FRIERSON: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Probably Brookfield, Copperfield, I mean, if you wanted to
21 – yeah.

22 MR. HADERHOLT: Brookfield we've got set up for this afternoon.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

1 MR. HADERHOLT: And then Copperfield, Rose Creek, Wellington, Devon Green
2 is nearby and Winchester. I'm just writing down the names that are immediately close
3 by.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

5 MS. FRIERSON: Okay. Thank you.

6 MS. CAIRNS: The thing is, is that, I mean, one thing I'd like to say is that, okay I
7 don't live anywhere near this but what happens here affects me. It affects me cause
8 one, I may drive through there on occasion, which I do, but it also affects me because I
9 live somewhere else in the county and the decisions and precedents that we set in
10 these rezonings affects what happens to the land around me too. So somehow again,
11 elevating those particular neighbors, and I like to hear from neighbors, it's not that I
12 don't like to hear from the public. But again, I think the notice requirements required by
13 law and I think we need to take into account what we're charged with taking into
14 account.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. I understand. I, and you know, I think typically over
16 the years I've been pretty consistent that if, if it's perceived to be some sort of a
17 delaying tactic by whoever's requesting the rezoning and, you know, the rooms full of
18 people that are in the neighborhood and then they go through the complete list, and
19 then the developer or the applicant asking for rezoning asks for a deferral, I'm typically
20 not in favor of that because it's just some sort of a delay tactic or you don't wanna get
21 those people back out again the next month. This is not the case here. In my opinion I
22 would like to, to see what kind of discussions could take place. I think it's a significant
23 enough tract in that area that obviously does not need to stay RU. I mean, it definitely

1 could but I, I think it has potential as another site and would, this is a little bit different
2 than the previous rezoning, the case right before this, in that we have single-family
3 residential directly abutting this parcel and requires a little more work in my opinion. So I
4 think I personally would be in favor of deferral to our next meeting to give these folks a
5 chance to, to see kinda what their thought process is and, and it may or may not play
6 into the thinking on the rezoning. But I think that there's a significant enough piece of
7 property in this area which is challenged, where a 30 day deferral would be adequate
8 here for us to, to step back and take a look at it.

9 MS. FRIERSON: And Mr. Chair, I really appreciate her comments and yours, and
10 in that I do live in, not necessarily that area, but I'm really familiar with that area, my
11 concern is that of the lady, Ms. Barnes, in terms of she has lived in a particular area and
12 has a unique perspective, and I would just like to see a situation wherein if the
13 developers are sincere, I wanna see if they really do come back and if they really have
14 reached out to the other citizens. And I know you can't make people show up for a
15 meeting, but I just wanted to find out the specifics –

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure.

17 MS. FRIERSON: - and give people an opportunity. And I was also impressed by
18 what you said about what used to happen in terms of notification. And so with all of that
19 in mind that's why I am leaning toward the deferral with the opportunity for people to
20 have their impact, I mean, input.

21 MR. ANDERSON: Well, and I agree too, cause I just looked and counted the lots
22 and there's 20 some odd homeowners that would be directly adjacent to this piece of
23 property. So a lot of people affected. And again, I definitely appreciate the point, you

1 know, what is done, you know, what's the minimum that has to be done. And I, I'd love
2 to hear when we stopped sending those notifications and why we made that decision.

3 MR. GILCHRIST: And, and for the Record, and you guys have heard me say this
4 quite a bit, but I wanna see whatever law that we consistently raise about not having
5 discussions about community groups being involved in development. I, I need to see
6 that. Because I consistently keep hearing, well that's not our job and we shouldn't be
7 engaged in some of this. So if there's something that we need to see as a Commission,
8 I don't care if we have to do a work session about that, but that's something that I'm
9 very much interested in. So somebody needs to get that for me.

10 MS. HEGLER: We can get the law for you, but the law states what you are
11 required to do, it –

12 MR. GILCHRIST: Right.

13 MS. HEGLER: - doesn't say what you don't have to do.

14 MR. GILCHRIST: I, I understand.

15 MS. HEGLER: So that's not, you know, the –

16 MR. GILCHRIST: But it's important for me to –

17 MS. HEGLER: - the same thing.

18 MR. GILCHRIST: - to have that.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Karen?

20 MS. CAIRNS: I also –

21 MS. BARNES: May I speak to that issue?

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, ma'am.

23 MS. BARNES: You let them speak again, several times.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, ma'am, because we had questions for them. But, I, I
2 appreciate it.

3 MS. BARNES: Would someone ask me a question up there?

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you.

5 MS. BARNES: I'd like to speak to it.

6 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, one of the things I'd like to, again, just sorta draw a
7 parallel to the last section, is that, you know, I appreciate the investment homeowners
8 make in their own homes, not all that different than what I do. I find it offensive that
9 because the other property was bordered by apartments we didn't really care about
10 those residents, because they don't deserve protection. I find that a horrendous
11 concept.

12 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I don't think that's the case.

14 MS. CAIRNS: I think that's what was offered.

15 MR. BROWN: [Inaudible] the point on the other one was that those, not only
16 were modular but they – leases had to honored and so forth, and they may be very
17 temporary situations. It wasn't a lack of concern. It's that they weren't property owners.
18 They were basically in leased property.

19 MS. CAIRNS: No, that was true for the, for the mobile homes that sat on the lot
20 that was being decided. I have no issue with that because renters have whatever vested
21 right they have in the term of their lease, and when that ends that ends. My concern
22 was that the neighboring property were apartments and it was asked, were they condos
23 or townhouses or apartments, and it was determined they were apartments and so

1 there was this tenor, and it was sort of reinforced by what was offered here, is that
2 because they were merely apartment dwellers we didn't really have to worry about
3 protecting their community from what happened next door because they were only
4 apartments and they didn't deserve any of our protection. That's what I heard.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And I'm sorry you heard that, that's not –

6 MS. CAIRNS: And the, the existing property –

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - that's not what was offered, but I'm sorry that's what you
8 heard. That's just, that's not what anybody said.

9 MS. CAIRNS: That's what was said.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But anyhow. So do we have a, any motions on this?

11 MR. ANDERSON: I think, I think we have a motion to defer.

12 MS. HEGLER: No, you have a request to defer.

13 MR. GILCHRIST: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we, I'm sorry, make
14 a motion that we defer Case No. 14-29 MA until our next meeting.

15 MR. BROWN: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion?
17 All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

18 MS. CAIRNS: Yes.

19 *[Approved: Frierson, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Opposed: Cairns; Absent:*
20 *Joyner, Tuttle, Theus]*

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have one opposed. Alright, next case.

22 **CASE NO. 14-30 MA:**

1 MR. LEGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our next case is Richland County
2 project no. 14-30 MA. The Applicant is Mr. Ray O'Neal. The property is located at 8505
3 Garners Ferry Road, it's a little over a half acre in size. It's currently zoned RU, Rural,
4 and Mr. O'Neal is asking for the GC, General Commercial District. [Inaudible] original
5 zoning from 1977. If you happen to be out to the site or nearby, we had a rezoning just
6 to the east of this site, there was a little nonconforming commercial type structure that
7 the Applicant had converted to do a restaurant and wanted to proceed with that. There's
8 also a, I believe it's an insurance sales office there in the red to the east of the
9 restaurant. It's since gone out of business, but it remains commercial, it was rezoned
10 about a year or so ago. To the north we have commercial, General Commercial as well,
11 it is a brick building, an office. To the south is undeveloped, wooded. I've already
12 described the east, zoned General Commercial. And to the west, Rural and
13 undeveloped as well. I've described the property to, to the east of the subject property.
14 The subject property is, is somewhat vacant, has recently been cleared, has kind of an
15 accessory structure, small building to the rear but mostly undeveloped and clear at this
16 point. The Comprehensive Plan recommends suburban on this site as it did on the site
17 adjacent. Like I said there are commercial and office uses in that vicinity. Garners Ferry
18 Road is a major arterial, divided in the center with two lanes going in each direction.
19 Because of the arterial nature of the road and the non-residential zoning classifications
20 in the vicinity and the recent rezoning of the property to the east having more or less set
21 a precedent for the approval of commercial, the Staff recommends approval of this
22 application at this time.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Ray O'Neal? Sorry about that.

1 **TESTIMONY OF RAY O'NEAL:**

2 MR. O'NEAL: No problem. My name is Ray O'Neal, I'm 7100 Cabin Creek Road
3 in Hopkins, South Carolina. I'm just here for questions if y'all have some.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for the Applicant? Thank you. Any
5 motions?

6 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chair, I make a motion that we send Case 14-30 MA
7 ahead to Council with a recommendation of approval following Staff's recommendation.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

9 MR. BROWN: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor of the motion say aye. Any opposed?

11 *[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Absent: Joyner, Tuttle,*
12 *Theus]*

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Next case.

14 **CASE NO. 14-31 MA:**

15 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, this is the last of our zoning applications for the afternoon.
16 Project no. 14-31 MA, and the Applicant is Mr. Bill Dixon. The property is currently
17 zoned Planned Development District, and Mr. Dixon is asking for a change to that
18 Planned Development District. The property is about 66 acres in size. The original
19 zoning was RU in 1977. The Planned Development District was approved in 1999. To
20 the north of the property is Two Notch Road and a railroad right-of-way. Two Notch
21 Road has some commercial development on it, some residential, conservation
22 easement, not a whole lot of development until you get nearer to Spears Creek Church
23 Road. To the south we have Planned Development District as well, mostly Greenhill

1 Parrish development. To the east Planned Development District and there's a school
2 over that way and some apartments, Legacy Hill, Sandhill Apartments and some
3 undeveloped parcels also. To the west over to Spears Creek Church Road properties
4 are RU and GC, residential and somewhat undeveloped. Again, this is a change to the
5 Planned Development District. We discussed this probably about a year ago. The total
6 acreage in the site is 330 acres, and again I think I mentioned the application is to
7 change about 65 acres of [inaudible]. The current residential yield is 1,026 units and
8 5.22 dwelling units per acre. My understanding they're gonna go up to 1,098 units with a
9 development density of 4.5 units per acre. The Staff reviewed the request, essentially
10 you're changing 10 acres of RG-2 and 53 acres of C-3 to some open space, about 15
11 acres, and about 55 acres of additional residential in the form of RS-HD. The
12 Comprehensive Plan has found, or the Staff has found that the application is in
13 compliance with the Comprehensive Plan for residential development density. Because
14 the site offers a mix of uses, some open space and residential, we recommended
15 approval of this application with the contingencies listed there on page 68.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Any questions for Staff? Mr. Dixon?

17 **TESTIMONY OF BILL DIXON:**

18 MR. DIXON: Good afternoon. I'm Bill Dixon with Mungo Homes. This zoning
19 request or a similar one was before you about a year ago. We deferred it for several
20 reasons but have come back with a, a similar request with a couple minor changes. We
21 removed the commercial that was along Two Notch Road, replaced it with residential.
22 We added language to the PDD that allows churches in that area of the PDD. We've
23 limited the access, the main access to the property to Two Notch Road with a 66' right-

1 of-way to a central traffic circle that shows on our plan. And we, because of removing a
2 main access to Greenhill Parrish Parkway, have replaced that with a gated emergency
3 access to the existing traffic circle on the Parkway. That's it. I'm available for questions
4 if you've got any.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, I can tell you this is a prime example for what we
6 had on the previous case when getting together with the neighborhood and working out
7 a solution works. Because this time at our last rezoning this room was full of people that
8 did not want this project to go forward and now there is no one signed up to speak
9 against. So I just thought I would throw that out there for you, Mr. Dixon.

10 MR. DIXON: And we did take their input into account with this new request.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Great. Any questions for Mr. Dixon? Thank you. Any
12 motions?

13 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we send Case No. 14-31
14 MA forward with a recommendation to Council for approval.

15 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is that subject to the conditions on page 68?

17 MR. GILCHRIST: Yes, subject to the conditions on page 68, a-f.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. We have a motion and a second. Any other
19 comments? All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

20 *[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Absent: Joyner, Tuttle,*
21 *Theus]*

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright.

1 MS. CAIRNS: One of the comments I'd like to offer a little bit in terms of the,
2 talking to the neighborhood here, I think it's very different when you're inside a PDD as
3 opposed to just in the general community. But I do think it was great that they were able
4 to reach an agreement on this.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Great. Yes, sir?

6 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I did have one question, agree with Heather on that aspect of
7 it. But as far as when we have situations, and this doesn't occur very often, but when,
8 when it's deferred at the, by the Planning Commission for the Applicant to meet with the
9 communities –

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think we just deferred based on their, based on their
11 request, not, not for them to meet but based upon their request.

12 MR. PRICE: Well, what role do you want Staff to have in that?

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Oh, I don't think Staff has any responsibility or role. I think
14 that we just honored the, the Applicant's request for a deferral for 30 days.

15 MR. PRICE: Okay, just wanted to make sure.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

17 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman? I do think, however, and I think Mr. Gilchrist kind of
18 raised this, we need to see what the actual law says with respect to that and then make
19 sure our rules include input from the community.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, I think we can go above and beyond what the law
21 says if we'd like to for notification.

22 MR. BROWN: Yeah, and I agree but I think we need to see it first.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

1 MR. BROWN: And then determine whether, how far we wanna go with that, and
2 how far we wanna ask the Staff to go. So that we avoid some of this stuff in the future.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What's –

4 MR. GILCHRIST: I would agree.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, let's do this, let's take that up at the end of our
6 meeting today and see if we would like for Staff to bring us back any language for doing
7 something like that, to that, to that effect. You agree?

8 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Alright, Comprehensive Plan update.

10 MS. HEGLER: Well, you do have Other Business, do you want to swap those
11 around or do Other Business now?

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Oh, we can do Other Business.

13 MR. HEGLER: Okay. Well I have two items, sounds like you're adding a third.
14 The first is that we've had some space conflicts with our November 3rd meeting, it is the
15 day before the elections and they really need a place to do absentee voting. So at the
16 attempt to be helpful with a sister agency would you be interested in moving your
17 November 3rd date to another time? The only other, we could attempt to hold it on the
18 3rd and use another conference room in the facility. It's just small and you never really
19 can gauge how many folks you'll have in the audience, and I'd hate to just be totally
20 packed and, and folks not to be able to come in and hear what's going on. So I would
21 ask you to consider meeting on a date other than November 3rd.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What do y'all think about that Thursday of that week? The
23 elections on Tuesday.

1 MR. BROWN: Thursday, the 6th?

2 MS. HEGLER: Um-hum (affirmative). Another option is Wednesday, we already
3 to have this room, BOZA meets on Wednesday, we can change them around, but either
4 one.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We could do Wednesday. What do y'all think?

6 MS. CAIRNS: Wednesday the day after?

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, we're supposed to meet on Monday and then
8 Tuesday's the election, and then meet Wednesday of that week? Is that okay with
9 everybody? What time does BOZA meet?

10 MS. HEGLER: BOZA's at 3:00, but they only have one case so we would
11 consider asking them to meet at 4:00 so we had ample time.

12 MR. ANDERSON: How many cases do we have?

13 MS. HEGLER: We only have four at the moment.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Are we supposed to do some significant work on the
15 Comp Plan in November?

16 MS. HEGLER: I mean, I'll be asking you for a recommendation if, if, if you're
17 ready.

18 MR. ANDERSON: Does BOZA wanna meet before us?

19 MS. HEGLER: Actually that would actually probably be much better, except that
20 they just recently moved their time to later because they were having trouble getting
21 together at 1:00. So they might not be willing to do that with a –

22 MR. BROWN: What was wrong with November the 10th?

1 MS. HEGLER: We could do November 10th, and we passed that around. I would
2 ask y'all if that's a comfortable date that is a Monday of a holiday weekend. Tuesday
3 being Veteran's Day.

4 MS. CAIRNS: See, I already have it down on the 10th.

5 [Inaudible discussion]

6 MS. HEGLER: We did talk about it and I think that we sent those dates around,
7 but.

8 MS. CAIRNS: It's on my calendar for the 10th, so I'm good.

9 MR. ANDERSON: Hold on, hold on, hold on. For November the 10th, I've just got
10 a piano lesson.

11 MS. CAIRNS: You have a piano lesson?

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Are you trying to learn piano now? [Laughter]

13 MS. FRIERSON: Are you serious?

14 MR. ANDERSON: For my daughter.

15 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah.

16 MR. ANDERSON: But I have to be keyed into her life. [Laughter]

17 MS. HEGLER: The 10th is an option but that's definitely, I think, up to y'all. That is
18 a potential long weekend for folks – who doesn't have to work on Tuesday already.

19 MR. BROWN: A long if it were on Monday.

20 MS. HEGLER: But it's your leisure. Or it could be even longer, four days.

21 MR. ANDERSON: I mean, I think we, just based on our attendance now, we
22 need to make sure that it's a date that works with everybody so we can at least have a
23 quorum if everybody's, you know?

1 MR. GILCHRIST: It's true.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is the 6th bad for everybody? Just keeping the same week
3 but not mess with that holiday weekend? Are the kids out of school? Are the kids out of
4 school the 6th and 7th in Richland Two? Are they outta school that weekend? Are the
5 kids outta school that weekend?

6 MS. HEGLER: I don't think so.

7 MS. CAIRNS: On the weekend, probably. [Laughter]

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well the – thanks. [Laughter]

9 MS. HEGLER: Thursday the 6th?

10 MR. ANDERSON: I could do Thursday the 6th.

11 MR. GILCHRIST: I can do the 6th.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

13 MS. FRIERSON: I can do the 6th.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Heather?

15 MS. CAIRNS: It's open now.

16 MS. HEGLER: Lock it down.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Mr. Brown?

18 MR. BROWN: Yes, sir?

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Can you do the 6th?

20 MR. ANDERSON: 1:00?

21 MS. CAIRNS: I move the 10th.

22 MS. FRIERSON: You said 1:00?

23 MR. GILCHRIST: 1:00?

1 MS. HEGLER: Yes.

2 MR. GILCHRIST: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I'm sorry to bring this up, guys, but I am out of town that
4 weekend. I thought I was not but I am. I'm out of town that Thursday and Friday. So.
5 But, but don't do it around me.

6 MS. CAIRNS: We're gonna break your perfect string?

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Huh?

8 MS. CAIRNS: You're gonna break your perfect attendance?

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I miss one a year. [Laughter]

10 MS. CAIRNS: Whether you have to or not?

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I know I, it just falls that way.

12 MS. FRIERSON: Is Wednesday is better for you?

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Wednesday would be better.

14 MS. CAIRNS: But it messes up with BOZA, right?

15 MR. PRICE: It's a quick meeting. One of the things that we talked about, it really
16 is relatively quick, it's a cell tower. You're familiar with that. Jonathan Yates is gonna
17 present so you know how that pretty much goes. I think if for some reason we ran into,
18 over potentially, because I can get the Board to push it far down, but I mean, worse
19 case scenario I think we can do similar to Council where you can go into, I guess a
20 recess, if that's the right term, let the Board slide in and then slide out, then you
21 continue on.

22 MS. HEGLER: In the unlikelihood you would need more than three hours.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, cause the Comp Plan's, I mean, we need to give that
2 time some time if we're gonna be –

3 MS. CAIRNS: So we're back to the 5th?

4 MS. FRIERSON: Should we start at 12:00 instead of 1:00?

5 MS. CAIRNS: No.

6 MS. FRIERSON: No?

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, so y'all okay with the 5th at 1:00?

8 MR. ANDERSON: Cancelling –

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Wednesday the 5th at 1:00.

10 MR. GILCHRIST: Alright.

11 MR. BROWN: We settled on that now?

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think so.

13 MS. CAIRNS: Sometimes we don't – do we think we're gonna be as late as
14 5:00? Who knows, right?

15 MS. HEGLER: Maybe we'll know after today's discussion. We can revisit that.
16 The other item under Other Business is just a reminder or maybe this is the first time
17 we've mentioned it to you, the 10th Annual Neighborhood Planning Conference that we
18 host every year, this is our 10th, is this Saturday. I think you have some flyers in front of
19 you. It does offer the certification y'all will need so if you're interested in coming,
20 wonderful speakers, we're talking about making our neighborhoods happy. And that's at
21 the Metropolitan Convention Center from 8:30 to 2:30.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Is that all the Other Business?

1 MS. HEGLER: You wanted to discuss notifications or maybe we bring back, I
2 mean, the statute's very short so we could bring that back.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I mean, I think the statute says what it says. I, I, y'all
4 wanna talk about the notification real quick?

5 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, I'd love to.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

7 MR. ANDERSON: I'd love to.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I mean, I think the statute says what it says. It's just
9 whether or not this Body sees the need to continue what has been a practice in the past
10 of notifying adjacent property owners.

11 MS. HEGLER: I'll figure that out, but that, I mean, that is clearly, I mean, if it's not
12 been happening it's not been happening for a very short amount of time, so. I mean,
13 that is not –

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What I'm saying is –

15 MS. HEGLER: - I think the issue before –

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - if it has occurred in the past I don't know of any reason –

17 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, [inaudible].

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - yeah, I don't know of any reason why we should stop it.

19 MS. CAIRNS: Cost?

20 MS. HEGLER: I believe it was a, it was a program that we were using. We
21 changed programs and what I'm hearing is that IT had not fixed it or corrected it or
22 come up with a new one. So I can find that out. But that's just a general, I think it's a half
23 mile or a mile radius around the site, so it's, that's what makes it, it's an automatic –

1 MS. CAIRNS: Right.

2 MS. HEGLER: - it, it, you know, issues letters to those folks, which is I think far
3 easier. We can get that corrected far easier than trying to locate individual names of
4 folks if there are neighborhoods. I mean, I don't even have access to that kind of - I
5 don't have -

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure.

7 MS. HEGLER: - every HOA president.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No.

9 MS. HEGLER: I don't have information on that. That would be far more
10 complicated. So, I mean, I would agree if you would allow me to go back and figure out
11 what has happened with that notification, to bring that before you.

12 MS. CAIRNS: But I'd also, if -

13 MR. BROWN: I think, I think a mile radius would be better than, you know -

14 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, it was, like I said, it was an automatic mapping program.
15 We've changed programs with the new system that we're using and I have a feeling it
16 was just a flaw in that. And because it wasn't required we, we probably just said it was
17 okay till we figured it out.

18 MS. CAIRNS: The other thing I'd like to, if you're just sort of checking into it is
19 that whether it goes to the property address or whether it goes to the tax address?

20 MR. PRICE: Tax address.

21 MS. CAIRNS: It should go to the property address too if it's different I think.

22 MR. PRICE: We go wherever people receive their tax bill for that property.

23 MS. HEGLER: We go with whatever address is on file.

1 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, but I mean, what it means therefor is any renters would
2 never get notice.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But the property owner is the one that needs to receive
4 the notice.

5 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, but if you're, if you're looking at who does the changing land
6 use effect it would include tenants. And they're the ones who get to vote actually, not
7 the property owners. So the precedent is set for noticing occupants as opposed to
8 owners. That was the big thing that came up down in the, not the Rosewood area, the,
9 Whales Garden was the issue about occupants versus owners. You don't get the right
10 to vote somewhere because you own property. You get the right to vote somewhere
11 cause you live there.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, but this isn't a vote.

13 MS. CAIRNS: Well I know, but I mean, it means that there's a concept of
14 responsibility for your area. But I think that, you know, if we're gonna notice the people
15 about changes going on around their residence, it shouldn't matter whether they're the
16 owner of the residence or not. It's affecting their home.

17 MS. HEGLER: And remember there are still posters and signs.

18 MS. CAIRNS: I know, I know that. I'm just curious if, you know.

19 MS. HEGLER: I'll have to look. I mean, I'm sure it went to the, the tax address on
20 file cause it was just an automated –

21 MS. CAIRNS: Sure.

22 MS. HEGLER: - system, so. Yeah, I'll definitely look into that. I was unaware.

1 MR. ANDERSON: I think the spirit of that is, take that extra effort so that more
2 communication, I mean, equals more participation and, and I think we just saw that. And
3 I know that was probably a little different with a PDD, but I mean, again, you know, I've
4 sat in here when the whole place is just completely packed. And it does, it does make a
5 difference. Landowners and, and even tenants, their input's appreciated. So again, it's,
6 we can only go so far before we just spill over and it becomes a slippery slope and
7 we're just notifying the entire county.

8 MS. HEGLER: Right, and, and time and cost and, you know, it is costly, it is time
9 consuming. We do quick turnarounds right now, so if we were to do much more than
10 that automated system we'd have to look at our timelines.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: You guys good with that?

12 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah.

13 MR. GILCHRIST: Good with that.

14 MR. ANDERSON: I mean, yeah I think it's just a, it's a general gesture to try to
15 get more communication.

16 MS. HEGLER: I agree, we had been doing that.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, Comprehensive Plan update?

18 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, y'all received the draft Plan. I've got a [inaudible]. I'll try to
19 be brief with the presentation because I'm hoping we're capable of having some
20 discussion today. Just wanted to go through really how we got to where we are. Again,
21 just recapping how we got here. I wanna go over, again, the public process which has
22 been robust. I wanna highlight all the information that we have presented to you
23 monthly, what we've learned and then that you do in fact have these drafts and, and

1 potentially get some feedback from you. Alright, so the public process, we had 15
2 meetings again. Oh, I'm sorry. You've seen this a couple times, we had four
3 opportunities for public input. We have just completed our third set of meetings and you
4 see how close we are to, to the end. But of course, the last opportunity for the public to
5 speak, which we have been advertising this every time we do get with them, is that they
6 can show up at the Planning Commission and at plan adoption by Council during the
7 public hearing. We had 15 public meetings around the county, we had three sets of
8 them and one in each of five different planning areas. That's just kind of demonstrates
9 that we tried to get all over the pretty vast county that we have. The first set of meetings
10 were held April 7th through 9th, we called those our Community Conversations
11 Workshops, and here we really just introduced the idea of what this plan is, what it does
12 for them, started to get some feedback from them. We had some table work sessions
13 and we asked them two main questions. We asked them really what areas we should
14 protect in the county, and this has all been presented to you before. We heard a
15 resounding desire to protect our water systems, also to actually access them, wanted to
16 maintain the permanently protected areas around the county such as the Congaree
17 National Park, Sesqui Centennial. Lots of love and care for the schools, military
18 installations, they love the rural parts of the county but they also love the urban places,
19 too, so. The statement behind you continued to ring true with the folks we met with. We,
20 the second question we asked them at that first set of meetings was if, you know,
21 knowing we are going to grow and now that you've identified places that you wanna
22 preserve and protect, how do you wanna grow? There are really three ways that we
23 described to them that you can grow; you can redevelop places that have already, you

1 know, had some life, some use, infrastructure's probably in place for it, you can build in
2 green fields, you can go out to where, you know, the infrastructure probably isn't in
3 place and, and access raw land, or you can build through infill, and this just may be a
4 pocket of some area that's not been developed but basically surrounded by
5 development. And folks resoundingly supported redevelopment, they wanted to really
6 utilize their aging corridors and the aging facilities that we have and better maximize use
7 of existing infrastructure and then they were kinda split on those other forms as well.
8 But, you know, what that says to us is that 75% of the folks we queried would prefer to
9 use existing infrastructure [inaudible]. Alright, our next set of meetings, our second was
10 held in July, we called those Community Choices Workshops. So we presented to them
11 some options for the land use categories and maps, and we presented to them some
12 guiding principles; here's an example of one which y'all helped us develop. And those
13 were, again, those were, this was a choice workshop so we asked them to vote, and if
14 you remember you guys practiced with the keypad polling and we did that with the
15 citizens and Commissioner Frierson attended one of those meetings and saw how that
16 went. So we did ask a lotta questions of the citizens that were there, overall opinion on
17 the guiding principles, we asked them about the different land use elements that we
18 were proposing, and this is just sort of an example of the feedback we got and, and, you
19 know, this is the question of whether we should support the guiding principle that
20 Richland County will balance land planning and development goals with property rights.
21 We had a lotta conversation about that. And you can see from the chart, I mean, we got
22 a resounding amount of support for that. At our last and third set of public meetings that
23 we took out to the communities was just recently held in September and we called that

1 Viewing the Plan. And in this exercise we really just presented the land use maps that
2 y'all have seen a couple times now and then the description of those land use
3 categories. We presented the priority investment areas and a good discussion of those
4 and just had sort of a leisurely, you know, spend your time reviewing those maps and,
5 and Staff were posted at each of those sessions and receiving feedback from them. Not
6 a lot of, oh no that's definitely not what we were talking about, so it seemed to have
7 confirmed everything that we had been doing so far. We also had a number of
8 stakeholder meetings throughout this process with all the folks you see listed here, and
9 not just one, we've had multiple with all of them. We've had open houses where what
10 we were presenting to the public we provided a time that we asked these specific
11 stakeholder groups to come by and, and review what we were talking about as well. So
12 we got input from a lotta different factions as, as we proceeded. Y'all have received
13 monthly updates, I'll just recap those very quickly. We started in April I think and here
14 we outlined this public process, let you know what we intended to do. You helped us
15 with some, you know, tweaking of that process. And then, of course, we were gearing
16 up at that point for our very first of public meetings in early April and told you what we
17 would be doing there. In May we told you what we heard at those April workshops and
18 that we were hoping to expand our public engagement through the creation of this
19 networking committee, which Ms. Frierson also helped with that a lot. We presented to
20 you draft guiding principles and tweaked the language on that and got some
21 concurrence and continued to talk about next steps. In June we drafted the policy
22 framework for, for the land use and presented that to you as well as the priority
23 investment areas, and that was the first, I think, opportunity that you probably saw the,

1 the plan itself and the future land use map. We took your comments back from that as
2 well as the community conversations and updated some of the mapping and showed
3 you – oh, it was in July that we showed you the polling exercise and the Choices
4 Workshops that we were getting ready to have, that's when you did your little polling. So
5 again, we continued to refine the guiding principles, refined the future land use map with
6 feedback that we were getting from you. August, just a couple months ago, we had at
7 that point had the second set of meetings so we provided the results of that to you, and
8 that some of the major changes that we had made to the future land use map based on
9 our, our overall meetings with you were presented as well. And then September, just
10 last month, we provided to you what we were going to do in our last set of meetings with
11 the public, discussed the draft land use plan. At that point I think you had had it
12 electronically but not in hard copy and started to receive some feedback from you then
13 as well. Which brings us to today, we sent you the draft plan as we have it. Again, it's
14 just, we focused mostly on updating the land use and the priority investment area
15 elements put in your packet. You also received the appendix which is sort of all of the
16 data, all of the existing conditions. It's kinda the practice now to put that in the appendix
17 instead of the adopted part of the plan, which is your policy and your goals and how you
18 actually want to proceed with [inaudible]. The appendix is also in there, that way if
19 trends change or, or some of the data changes you don't have to redo the Comp Plan
20 unless you feel like you should change your strategies. So, you know, with that we're
21 hoping to get some feedback from you today. You know I'm hoping to get a
22 recommendation in November and take it to the County Council for first reading at the
23 end of November.

1 MR. ANDERSON: I wanna say this real quick cause I, I look at a lotta
2 presentations, and this is very well done. So thank y'all for making this as easy, an easy
3 layout. I love to see goals on there, very, very well done, well put together, good
4 pictures. I mean, I, I really, I hope that all the pictures are from Richland County though.

5 MS. HEGLER: I, I hope so too but I guess we –

6 MR. ANDERSON: Okay, good. There seem to be some pretty generic photos in
7 here, but –

8 MS. HEGLER: Well, you know, we actually had a gentleman go out and some of
9 the pictures within the document itself you're talking about?

10 MR. ANDERSON: Uh-huh (affirmative).

11 MS. HEGLER: We did actually have somebody go out and take pictures.

12 MR. ANDERSON: Okay, good.

13 MS. HEGLER: We, we did not have a library of pictures, sadly enough. So we
14 had somebody go take some professional photos, but the Public Information Office
15 actually helped us with that. They hired somebody to go out and take pictures.

16 MR. ANDERSON: Again, I can't tell you how great this looks. I mean, I look at a
17 lotta presentations throughout the – so y'all did a very, very good job on this.

18 MS. HEGLER: Thank you.

19 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you. I do have a question though.

20 MS. HEGLER: The layout is, we were pretty specific with the consultant that the
21 layout be easy to read –

22 MR. ANDERSON: Very user friendly.

23 MS. HEGLER: - effective –

1 MR. ANDERSON: I love the –

2 MS. HEGLER: - use pictures as much as we could.

3 MR. ANDERSON: - great. I love the goals and I think the goals are very well laid
4 out.

5 MS. HEGLER: Okay.

6 MR. ANDERSON: So, can I bring up just this whole aspect of the rural large lot?

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

8 MR. ANDERSON: Or large lot? We've brought up this at maybe two or three
9 meetings ago, and this is a little pie in the sky, this is like throwing darts at a barn
10 blindfolded, but to kinda keep some of that rural large lot, to keep that a big aspect of, of
11 Richland County. And, and this is outside of this particular document but what are the
12 things that we can do, other than public input, to keep some of that, I mean, zoning
13 wise? I mean, I think it was brought up, can there be an existing, another zoning
14 classification for a rural type large tract of 50 plus acre? Maybe it's 10 plus acre, I don't
15 know. Did Staff discuss any of that and thoughts of that?

16 MS. HEGLER: We did, and if you recall the, when we first brought that to you we
17 did have some proposed densities, I mean, zoning and density is one way to do it.

18 MR. ANDERSON: Sure, sure.

19 MS. HEGLER: And we wanted to back out of that discussion for this sort of pie in
20 the sky, long range vision. You, you could do it through zoning. We currently don't, in
21 my opinion, have a zoning that does truly rural large lots. You could do it through
22 conservation, you can do it through, I know Councilman Washington has a motion on
23 the floor right now for some preservation/land management plans. I think those would

1 be elective opportunities for a landowner who wants to keep the land in a certain level of
2 preservation and conservation to maybe receive some sort of incentives for doing so.

3 So those options are –

4 MR. ANDERSON: But that would be, that wouldn't be more of zoning though.

5 MS. HEGLER: No, but that –

6 MR. ANDERSON: Okay.

7 MS. HEGLER: - but those are the options that we'll explore. If we, if we continue
8 to receive the feedback back and you support it and Council supports the idea of that
9 character, then we'll need to put some tools in place to actually, to do it. But it's always
10 been, I guess, our, our goal as Staff to get that balance.

11 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah.

12 MS. HEGLER: I think the more we can do that selective on the part of the owner
13 the better we'll probably all be, and I believe that's, that's kind of the position that
14 Council's interested in, too.

15 MR. ANDERSON: Well yeah, and the reason I brought that up is cause I was just
16 looking at this traffic count that y'all have in here for, and of course I can't find it now, it's
17 with the dots, which of course were very difficult to measure, but I get the point. But if
18 you look at that, the dots on 35, page 35 in Transportation, I mean, that dot is going way
19 out 378, as far as the traffic count goes; 10 to 25,000 cars pass by, and I don't even
20 know the name of the intersection cause it's such a broad view.

21 MS. HEGLER: Oh, yeah.

22 MR. ANDERSON: And, you know, I guess there's just some part of me with the
23 Lower Richland rezoning that area, just protecting that aspect. I mean, I can tell you

1 right now I can think of four or five landowners that with something like Councilman
2 Washington's proposed, would take advantage of that in a heartbeat. And if there's
3 anything that we can do on the zoning side or land use side, I think that's just, again,
4 helping preserve that rural characteristic. I'm finished.

5 MR. BROWN: Let me raise one of the, the concern that I've been raising. Do we
6 identify anywhere in here where landfills are? And any potential growth of those?

7 MS. HEGLER: We have, and in fact, Mr. Brown, I had a conversation with the,
8 he's the interim director but he's been serving in that role for a while, Solid Waste &
9 Recycling for Richland County. I would propose that you get with him, I asked him just
10 the general question about growth and what we were taking in from other jurisdictions,
11 are we nearing some capacity concerns? And that was just kinda too much to put in the
12 form of an email, and he would feel much more comfortable, I think, getting with you or
13 even coming here and talking to you to better understand what your concerns are.
14 Because I don't think I fully understand what you're asking in the land use plan to put
15 down there. So maybe you need to, maybe, I mean, he needs to come and talk to you
16 about it.

17 MR. BROWN: What is the current, where are current landfills, which basically are
18 involved in land use? Okay?

19 MS. HEGLER: Right.

20 MR. BROWN: I don't see them in here and I'm, and maybe I missed them.

21 MS. HEGLER: No, they're not in here yet, we just got the listing of them, so we
22 can map those. But are you proposing any policy or decision-making?

1 MR. BROWN: Well see, until I know that, and then if there are any, if there are
2 any plans to expand them or add more.

3 MS. HEGLER: Right.

4 MR. BROWN: I mean, what would we, you know?

5 MS. HEGLER: It doesn't sound like he had a simple answer to that question. So
6 he probably needs to come here and talk to you.

7 MR. BROWN: He needs to come and tell us.

8 MR. GILCHRIST: Yeah, let me ask a question on that. So do Comprehensive
9 Plans typically include landfills?

10 MS. HEGLER: I think – yes and no, I mean, if it's a concern that you wanna add
11 to it. We didn't have it, I mean, we don't speak to it currently in our current
12 Comprehensive Plan so, I mean, you would have to be very specific about what, what of
13 that is a land use concern and what is it that you're going to recommend in terms of how
14 you're going to guide growth based on that. So, I mean, it can be, nothing's preventing it
15 from being in there, they just, we, we haven't discussed it before. There was no
16 precedence for us and, you know, the consultants hadn't really done it in much of their
17 other places either. But I think you certainly could.

18 MR. ANDERSON: I think it's a valid point cause you've got natural resources in
19 there and then you have unnatural resources.

20 MR. GILCHRIST: Sure.

21 MR. ANDERSON: Inversely related, but I mean, I could see the runoff from some
22 of the landfill, you know, negatively impacting -

1 MS. HEGLER: Well, and that is all in there. I mean, water quality is obviously a
2 major focus of this plan. Compatibility continues to be, that always has been, so you
3 know, if those are the sorts of policy decisions that you wanna put forward based on it,
4 then yeah.

5 [Inaudible discussion]

6 MS. HEGLER: I mean, it's just we've had trouble identifying and getting all of the
7 -

8 MR. BROWN: Well, maybe that fellow can work with you to help identify.

9 MS. HEGLER: List them, so. That was kinda late breaking, so.

10 MR. BROWN: And then he oughta know what their plans are going forward so
11 that we can see how that impacts on this plan. Because if you're asking people to invest
12 a half million dollars in property, which a lot of the current investments are, then we
13 need to, we need to identify where all this is so they will know.

14 MS. HEGLER: Well so, I mean, is that what you're asking Staff to do? I guess
15 that's what I'm not -

16 MR. BROWN: Yeah, I'm asking you to identify. I'm asking.

17 MS. HEGLER: Right, but I'm saying are you asking for the plan to suggest that -

18 MR. BROWN: Yes.

19 MS. HEGLER: - we notify potential owners through, you know, the Comp Plan
20 itself?

21 MR. BROWN: I would like that.

22 MS. HEGLER: Which, if there's a map in here that identifies the, the landfills, is
23 that, does that meet what you're trying to do?

1 MR. BROWN: You have a map that does that, and any potential growth or
2 planned growth, and yes so the public knows. So that when people are making a major
3 investment, which is most of what we deal with encompasses, then folk will know, you
4 know, if, if I build here it might have the impact of this particular landfill, or I'm gonna
5 have an impact of a landfill. Because the person you're talking about who I've never met
6 knows where they are and what the potential growth is, they know that.

7 MS. HEGLER: I know. I just, I'm not sure what that would say in a Comp Plan.
8 But I'll, I'll continue to think about it. I'm looking for, when you see how they, specific the
9 goals and the strategies are in here, what, what do you want that to say?

10 MR. BROWN: The kind of goal to put in there would be to limit landfills and the
11 effect of them on neighboring properties or properties in the area. Again, if you drive out
12 20 towards Kershaw County, on the right of that is a major landfill, on the left of that
13 there are major [inaudible] of that interstate. I don't live out there so it doesn't affect me,
14 but I'm sure it affects them, and if you look at where Ft. Jackson is and the National
15 Guard property is, Leesburg Road and 601 and all of that, which moves over to the next
16 county, and impacts on them.

17 MS. HEGLER: Alright, so [inaudible] that we would want to limit the effects.

18 MR. BROWN: That's correct.

19 MS. HEGLER: Of landfills on development and limit their expansion. I mean,
20 that's a –

21 MR. BROWN: Yes. That's what I would like.

22 MS. HEGLER: I just –

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I mean, I think that could go under Section 11, the
2 community facilities and the services element. You know, not the over expansion, you
3 know, on time delivery of landfill. I have a question. A lotta the stuff in this Section 11,
4 the community facilities and services element, we don't, we don't, we don't have any
5 control over any of that stuff, we don't, I mean, it sounds good in a book but we don't
6 have any control over what the school districts do, we don't have any control over what
7 the City of Columbia does for water, what Palmetto Utilities does for sewer. I mean, I
8 think all this stuff sounds good but in reality it doesn't need to be in there because we
9 can't do anything about it, and they very seldom want to give us any information on
10 anything.

11 MS. HEGLER: It is a section that's required by state law.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, I understand the section's required but it sounds
13 like we put a lotta fluff in there of things that we can't do. It makes it sound better than
14 what we can actually do. I think if people understand, we don't have any control over the
15 City of Columbia water, I mean, people complain all the time. Well, once the water and
16 the sewer's out there then it opens it up for development. We don't control that. I mean,
17 you got stuff in here like coordinate with the City of Columbia Water Utility ensuring
18 adequate capacity is reserved serving the magnitude and timing of anticipated
19 developments in the future land use map. [Gesture] that ain't gonna happen.

20 MS. HEGLER: Well, I mean, we've heard actually differently from everybody
21 we've met with. I mean, they want that coordination to happen. That's simply saying to
22 coordinate and, and make sure, if we have a plan in place that we are enforcing for
23 where we grow and how we grow and that is shared appropriately with these folks who

1 do provide those, those facilities and those services, you know, it is the, it's the intent,
2 it's the practice and it does work, that then things don't get run without knowing that
3 there's a demand for it. These services don't, or these facilities don't just pop up
4 overnight, which is what we've continued to hear from folks, without knowing what the
5 vision is. So, you know, there's certainly no harm, I don't think, in communicating and
6 coordinating that we have a plan for growth and this is what it says. So where do you
7 intend to expand, where do you intend to provide this capacity, and how can we better
8 coordinate so it's going in the right places?

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, take a look at Winnsboro water. You got people
10 clamoring for water out in the Blythewood area, can't get it.

11 MS. HEGLER: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: They don't care. I mean, what good does it do to try to
13 coordinate anything with the Town of Winnsboro for their water?

14 MS. HEGLER: I don't think you wanna take the position that we shouldn't
15 coordinate with other municipalities -

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, what I'm saying is -

17 MS. HEGLER: - on what's going on.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - what I'm saying is -

19 MS. HEGLER: No, we can't control it -

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - when an outsider comes and looks at this, they're gonna
21 assume that we, we have, if we have these priority investment areas then it's, we're
22 talking about coordinating with the City of Columbia Water Utility, ensuring adequate
23 capacity is reserved, serving the magnitude and timing of anticipated developments. If I

1 read that and I lived in Springfield, Missouri and I'm looking to do a development here,
2 I'm gonna think, ahh, Richland County has already coordinated with the City of
3 Columbia to reserve capacity for these areas that they've designated as priority
4 investment areas.

5 MS. HEGLER: That's completely the intent of them, we're supposed to be doing
6 that.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So the City of Columbia will hold capacity for Richland
8 County for this area?

9 MS. HEGLER: It says to coordinate with them, I mean, hopefully they –

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I don't understand that.

11 MS. HEGLER: - we are attempting to establish this growth framework.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, I'm fine. I, I just –

13 MS. HEGLER: Including priority investment areas. Maybe it hasn't happened in
14 the past, I mean, maybe it –

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

16 MS. HEGLER: - doesn't, but we heard, I mean, just over and over again this
17 desire to better coordinate. I mean, I, we've, we've taken this plan around, we've talked
18 to all these other municipalities. I've got a meeting in Blythewood tonight. You know, I've
19 met with the school districts multiple times, hey is this in line with your growth plan?
20 Yes, what is yours? I mean, they've shared their plan with their boards. I mean, I think
21 the idea is the more we start to have this institutional knowledge of everybody's growth
22 framework [inaudible].

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So we know where the school district is planning new
2 schools?

3 MS. HEGLER: We, I mean, we took into consideration where the school districts
4 are, we presented to them what we've shown. We do know of the schools that are, you
5 know, currently on, online, and offered them as much input as anybody else, is there
6 anything in this plan that's contrary to your, to your plans? And you know, no, we never
7 heard anything so, I mean, it's –

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

9 MS. HEGLER: - but the idea is simply to coordinate. I think you can't, you can't
10 pretend to have a long range vision unless you're actually talking to all the other people
11 who do in fact hold those, we certainly can't make them but I, I hope moving forward
12 that those priority investment areas are that somebody in Missouri says, hey I'm looking
13 for growth, I'm looking to expand, the whole point of those is that we do attempt to bring
14 that growth here and it's strategically where we want it and it's strategically where we
15 have put our public investment to take care of them. So it may sound idealistic but that
16 is the true intent of this.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, I just know in the past there has not been an
18 availability of information from anybody outside of the Richland County, outside of 2020
19 Hampton –

20 MS. HEGLER: Right.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - for them to give us any information of what their
22 thoughts are. They'll take ours as information, that's great, then it goes in a drawer
23 somewhere. But –

1 MS. HEGLER: I think that's, and there's a lot of that been built into this plan too,
2 this idea of just more regional coordination. I mean, it's, it's supposed to be happening,
3 that change is supposed to be –

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

5 MS. HEGLER: - occurring.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: If you're getting a different read from the school districts
7 and from the utilities and City of Columbia that they wanna work with you that's great. It
8 just hadn't been that way in the past.

9 MS. HEGLER: And they've certainly been at the table and they haven't had, said,
10 they've not voiced any opposition to anything that we've presented.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But have they give you any information on what they're
12 planning?

13 MS. HEGLER: Not so much in the way of, like here's where our, you know –

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Where our water lines are going or where our water
15 towers are going or where our new schools are going or?

16 MS. HEGLER: No.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Cause that'd be very helpful to know where the
18 water lines are going. Cause that is the beginning of –

19 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I also think it'd be advantageous to know where the
20 new schools are going because of the impact that it has on the development of those
21 areas.

1 MS. HEGLER: But you see, they're starting to say things to me like, it's good to
2 know where we are putting growth. I mean, our future land use map can drive their
3 growth decisions as well. That's the intent of that coordination is just to kinda have the –

4 MR. BROWN: And I agree with you it needs to be a mutual sharing, you know,
5 what do you have in mind. How many times have we had people come in here, they're
6 upset because of the impact on their neighborhoods on two lane roads, for example,
7 because of the new schools that are going in, and then the new subdivisions that are
8 going in. Okay, so it would be good –

9 MS. HEGLER: Oh, all that is supposed to be coordinated.

10 MR. BROWN: - if the school district would coordinate with us and let us know
11 what they have in mind as well, that compliments all of that.

12 MS. HEGLER: They are required to present those to you at the time of
13 development by state law, so I mean, it maybe isn't a long range plan but they are
14 required to come before you –

15 MR. BROWN: I, I understand that, but –

16 MR. HEGLER: - and tell you when they're –

17 MR. BROWN: - there's a part, if we're gonna have a long range plan and they
18 have one, if we could see them all it would be helpful with the overall.

19 MR. GILCHRIST: Yeah, and I think certainly when I think about Northeast
20 Richland, for example, there has to be some parameters somewhere set to begin to
21 make the development that's taking place out there make sense.

22 MS. HEGLER: Right.

1 MR. GILCHRIST: And, and so I'm hoping as we look at something like this that it
2 begins to kind of help set that stage for the type of development that we're seeing –

3 MS. HEGLER: Right.

4 MR. GILCHRIST: - across the county. So it does include school districts, it does
5 include water and sewer, it includes everything.

6 MS. HEGLER: Right. And I think that's all that goal is saying, I mean, we've gotta
7 start doing it. I'm not gonna sit here and tell you it's definitely going to happen, but –

8 MR. GILCHRIST: No, but somebody's gotta lead it.

9 MS. HEGLER: - somebody, I mean, and it's, it would be, I think, quite missing if it
10 were taken out. But we didn't, we didn't update that piece, that was an element that we
11 didn't update so if there's any changes you would wanna make to it. We didn't update
12 the goals anyway.

13 MR. BROWN: And I think Mr. Gilchrist raises the point, somebody's gotta lead it
14 and the issues need to be raised, put on the table and made known that at least we
15 tried. And County Council needs to know that as well.

16 MS. HEGLER: Right, and that was, if you see, one of the guiding principles, and
17 I'm sure some, a lotta the goals revolved around this coordination with other – you
18 know, we have eight municipalities, I think we presented those to you last time, there's
19 eight different jurisdictions, including Richland County. You've got five public, five
20 private, you know, water and sewer sources, I mean, you've got the DOT, you've got
21 three school districts, it's, it's a lot of different players with the, their own rules that, you
22 know, we heard from the citizens, we've heard from Council, we've seen it kind of a
23 regional scale, this desire to do better coordination.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The neighborhood, these, there is outlined in the front
2 here the rural large lot, rural small, small lot, neighborhood low density, neighborhood
3 medium density, mixed residential, are these new? These are new categories you're
4 proposing? And we're gonna do away with all the old ones? Is this gonna replace
5 everything?

6 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, the only thing we have right now for future land use is rural,
7 urban and suburban.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, and so these would be the ones that would be
9 implemented.

10 MS. HEGLER: Correct.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And these are gonna get very specific as far as property
12 lines and where they are and –

13 MS. HEGLER: No, but there's flexibility where the lines cross or connect or
14 where you've got two different land uses coming together. We'll, you know, we're able
15 to be more flexible I think in how we interpret, say, rezoning requests. But they, I mean,
16 they run along some property lines, they run along thoroughfares, they run along natural
17 resources. But wherever two touch, I mean, I think we have more flexibility than we
18 even do today, I mean, rural touches suburban, those are so, so different we're not
19 really able to make a, those two touch these. I think there's enough, there's not that
20 large a degree between the, them. I mean, it's, you can have like zonings I guess where
21 these, where these land uses will touch, we can make better decisions. So we didn't get
22 parcel specific, I think that would be very, too difficult. I mean, that's a zoning, at that
23 point we're doing zoning.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Let's take, for example, mixed use corridor. Let's say
2 something along one of these tracts comes in for a rezoning. I see here we've got
3 Clemson over to I-20, I guess, and then down Two Notch all the way into downtown as
4 a mixed use corridor?

5 MS. HEGLER: Um-hum (affirmative).

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is that right?

7 MS. HEGLER: Yes, sir.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So if one of these, what it says here is, suburban
9 commercial corridors should be transformed over time from traditional strip commercial
10 development to mixed use corridors connecting activity centers. Between activity
11 centers corridors should be redeveloped to provide a mix of medium to high density
12 residential, professional office uses and retail uses and retail uses. Now, explain how
13 that works to me. Does that mean that anything that would, that the Comp Plan would
14 be in agreement with any rezoning of any parcel that is a medium to high density
15 residential, professional office use or retail use, or does that mean that if it's not a mixed
16 use on the parcel that it's not gonna be in conformity with the Comp Plan?

17 MS. HEGLER: It's a mix along the corridor no on the parcel.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Not on each parcel. So that means that along that corridor
19 any of those uses would comply with the Comp Plan.

20 MS. HEGLER: Correct, these are areas where we're concentrating, kinda like the
21 priority investment areas.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

23 MS. HEGLER: As certain –

1 MS. CAIRNS: I think if it's supposed to be mixed, if, if the current was almost
2 exclusively one of the potential uses and somebody wanted to come in and make yet
3 another parcel the same as the rest, would it be consistent with it being a mixed use
4 corridor for the request? Does that make sense?

5 MS. HEGLER: Right, like they couldn't be next to each, to –

6 MS. CAIRNS: Well, I mean, not hard and fast but, I mean, if, you know, it does
7 seem to me that if, if the goal was mixed use and you only had one use, and somebody
8 said, well I wanna join that use everyone else has got, it would be hard to say that was
9 in support of the plan.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I mean, we're constantly having the battle of, just like
11 today, residential means commercial stay away; commercial in an area, that means
12 don't put residential next to it. And you know, we tried to have something today where
13 you have commercial next to intense residential and it's still thought process of, this is a
14 residential area, you can't have commercial in it. So I don't know how the mixed use,
15 forcing those things together works.

16 MS. HEGLER: This would allow for those things to take place more, I guess, in a
17 more, in a better planned environment. What we're using today for those decisions, it
18 was just, it was so, just blunt. The tools we have right now just, are just blunt; you're
19 either suburban, rural or urban, and then you get one single factor such as you have to
20 be at an arterial to, to rezone. We're actually trying to take that, that really big blunt –

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right, but, but that wasn't the reason –

1 MS. HEGLER: - away and provide more opportunities for the kind of growth that
2 y'all did approve today. We're just, we're just putting it in places where it makes sense
3 to be along with other compatible uses not surrounded by –

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But that wasn't the reason for the Staff's recommendation
5 for denial today on that site out on Broad River, was that it encroached too far into
6 residential. There was high, an intense residential.

7 MS. HEGLER: It was because the current Comp Plan tells us not to do that, so
8 this would be embellishing that, offering us more places to do the sorts of things that
9 we've been doing rather bluntly currently. So, you know, the, the current Comp Plan
10 requires that you don't encroach, that you be at an intersection –

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, this site –

12 MS. HEGLER: - so if you had a site coming in along one of these mixed use
13 corridors, and I mean, I get Ms. Cairns point, I mean, I think that we may need to decide
14 how mixed we can get, but, or how mixed we should get.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, how much does medium density residential want to,
16 number one wanna be on a commercial corridor, and number two can afford to be on a
17 commercial corridor?

18 MS. HEGLER: I mean, it's a, it's a redevelopment opportunity. I mean, it's a
19 place where if that, you know, as where, I mean, the market's changing we're finding to,
20 you know, prefer this sort of redevelopment, be in places where you do have a mix of
21 uses, you can walk to the store like y'all just did today. Your argument was, now those
22 folks can not get out on Broad River Road. The idea is to create more of those
23 opportunities around –

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

2 MS. HEGLER: - the county where those mixes of uses could occur.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So let's take a look just as an example one of the cases
4 today, the Clemson and Hardscrabble that is somewhat surrounded by mixed use
5 corridor, yet there's a certain radius around that interchange that is a neighborhood.

6 MS. HEGLER: Yes, neighborhood. And, I mean, it's not purely commercial, it's
7 not your strip center type of development, it would be a neighborhood style mix of uses,
8 two, three stories –

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, so –

10 MS. HEGLER: - potentially, if we were to include something like that as a, as a
11 Code. The idea's just to start to create a character framework for what we're trying to
12 achieve at some of these major intersections. So I think that if, if this gets adopted the
13 rezoning we dealt with today probably would have been in compliance with the Comp
14 Plan.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But that would fall under –

16 MS. HEGLER: Not today.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - a neighborhood activity center, right?

18 MS. HEGLER: Um-hum (affirmative).

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So we'd take a look then at what does the Comp Plan say
20 for a neighborhood activity center? So really a grocery store wouldn't fit into a
21 neighborhood activity center rezoning I guess, right? I mean, if you're looking for
22 residential and centers, you know, neighborhood activity center.

1 MS. HEGLER: And retail uses, yes it would fit. I mean, it would, it's attempting to
2 redevelop these aging corridors into something that's more robust. It has more, more
3 potential uses than what our, our current Comp Plan just doesn't provide for that, and
4 that's what we're hearing there's a desire for. No, it can't be everywhere, that's why we
5 have a map that identifies where to locate those, those sorts of uses. And again, it's still,
6 rezonings will be taken up on an, on an individual basis.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, so let's take a look at that interchange. I just
8 wanna see how this is gonna play out. You've got two grocer anchored shopping
9 centers at that interchange.

10 MS. HEGLER: That are vacant.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That are vacant. And then, so this site comes in and they
12 wanna put a grocer anchored shopping center on this site, would you guys then look to
13 see if there were limited local office space, medium density housing for the
14 neighborhood, and if not then that's what this site should be? In other words, I'm
15 reading from the land use and design, it says, the activity center should also supply
16 limited local office space demanded by neighborhood businesses, right? So if there's
17 none of those in this area and they come in for a rezoning, there's none in this
18 neighborhood section, neighborhood activity center, then you're gonna say, well there's
19 already two grocer anchored shopping centers, we don't have any office space and we
20 don't have any medium density housing, so that's what this tract needs to be?

21 MS. HEGLER: Unless we were, until we create different zoning and update of the
22 Land Development Code, no I don't think we could do that.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, how's it gonna be –

1 MS. HEGLER: I think we would be still, we're still dealing with GC, so I don't think
2 we would get, we're still dealing with the current zoning even if you adopted this today,
3 we're still dealing with the same zoning categories we have. This would, I think, allow
4 for more rezonings to occur of a commercial nature where we have identified
5 commercial corridors. But what you're proposing would be a far more, I guess it would,
6 it would be more bifurcation of the zoning districts that we have, which we, we haven't
7 done that yet, so we couldn't come in and say, you can be commercial if you're a bank
8 but you can't be commercial if you're a grocery store, that, we don't have that zoning
9 designation.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But how is anything gonna be in compliance with the
11 Comp Plan then?

12 MS. HEGLER: Cause it's still, I mean, it's, it's a mix of uses, I mean, without any
13 hard and fast numbers or without Land Development Code –

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But I guess to Heather's point, it's not a mix of uses if the
15 other things –

16 MS. HEGLER: Are all commercial or it's all –

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

18 MS. HEGLER: I, I, that's a good point, and it may be intended that there be some
19 sort of a percentage here that we look at where we say, this [inaudible] living, mixed
20 use. Maybe we put some percentages in there. I think this is the hardest one, we talked
21 about this with the consultants a lot. We were actually trying to encourage, incentivize
22 and find places around the county where we felt it was ideal to, to develop at that, at
23 that scale; that we were redeveloping the corridors, which is what we heard

1 resoundingly from citizens they wanted to do, we were using our existing infrastructure,
2 trying to make it easier to have mixed uses in the places that we identify to put them.
3 Whereas, today we would say no because we, our Comp Plan doesn't allow for that, our
4 Comp Plan doesn't allow currently to have the situation we're looking at on Clemson
5 Road right next to the neighborhoods. But if we're redeveloping, and remember this is
6 long range, then these are just identifying places where you could probably do some
7 more rezoning, you could upzone more than we would currently under the Comp Plan.

8 MS. CAIRNS: One of the things about the Clemson Road example from today is
9 that there's two shopping centers. I mean, are they robust, economically approved,
10 functioning areas that there's a need for yet a third grocery store?

11 MS. HEGLER: Right.

12 MS. CAIRNS: Or is one of them, one of them was offered as empty, so what, so
13 –

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But there's a lot of factors in those decisions that the
15 general public and people that are not in the industry do not understand as to why those
16 are empty.

17 MS. CAIRNS: Well, I understand but if we're looking at being stewards of the
18 land and land planning and this and that, I'm not so sure that we just say, oh you know,
19 I know there's some economic realities involving that owner and that parcel for why it's
20 not functioning, so let's just cut down a whole bunch of more land and make it
21 commercial while we abandon this commercial. I don't think that's a good store point. I
22 think there's gotta be more than just, well it's not mine or this and that, I mean, I think

1 there needs, I mean, yeah and maybe it takes some incentive to help redevelop stuff
2 which I can appreciate –

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: There are market –

4 MS. HEGLER: And that's what I think this is attempting to do.

5 MS. CAIRNS: Right.

6 MS. HEGLER: If you don't like the line or you don't like where it's drawn, I mean,
7 that's always been up for debate but the idea is to try to focus that kind of growth where
8 we think it's appropriate and why, and places where it can capitalize on redevelopment
9 of aging structures like that where, and if a structure's already in place, versus it
10 continuing to seep somewhere else. I mean, that's the idea here, so.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think we're, I think what you're fixing to step over in my
12 mind is into the, where we wanna have that balance between property owner rights and
13 what the local governing body says should happen with your property, even though the
14 market conditions are not even anywhere close to being what needs – I mean, telling
15 somebody they need to redevelop a shopping center when there's no market to do it or
16 else you can't do anything with it, that's foreign to me, I don't understand that.

17 MS. CAIRNS: But, I mean, if, if it wasn't so easy to convert green fields into new
18 commercial, wouldn't that then help the aging infrastructure? I mean, that's the balance.
19 You know, if you, if you're looking out there and you're like, here's an abandoned
20 shopping center I could redevelop and here are the problems with that, and here's some
21 land that's just sitting there and there's like virtually no impediments to me going here,
22 well yeah. But if, if we don't make this so easy and we somehow figure out to incentivize
23 that, don't we end up winning in the end when we reuse our corridors? So let's address

1 the issues but let's not make it so easy to go turn the green fields into development just
2 because there's some problems over here and it's not easy, so it's just easier to walk
3 away. And that's where, you know, right you can't force it, you can't just say no, but you
4 can work on tweaking it and I just, you know.

5 MS. HEGLER: And there's still a lot of, I mean, the zoning is still always an
6 option, I mean, I don't think that anybody's –

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, what you've got, in that case today you've got the
8 public demand for this product, you've got demographic demand for this product of what
9 they wanted to do, and you have no place for them to go to put it.

10 MS. CAIRNS: I don't know that.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I know that. I'm telling you that. There is no place to put
12 what they wanna put out on that site at any of those corners. They look vacant but
13 they're not vacant. And there's demand from both the public, from the market, from the
14 demographics, and there is not demand half a mile in or back at the intersection of
15 Parklane and Decker for it. There's availability but there's no demand for it, so, so that's
16 where you have to take a look at it and say, well why are they even here for the
17 rezoning, why, why are they, I mean, what's the purpose in this? I mean, I would
18 imagine do you think that they have tried to identify other locations that they could come
19 rather than a rezoning on a piece of property? Do you think this is their first choice or
20 their last choice, I guess, Heather, is what I'm asking?

21 MS. CAIRNS: I don't think it's either.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I assure they have investigated everything around that
23 area, I would imagine. I can't assure you cause I don't know them, but I would imagine

1 they've investigated everything around there and they know what the general public
2 knows about those other parcels and they can't go on them. So, you know, I guess at
3 some point we just say, I understand, community, this is what you want, this is what the
4 marketplace is willing to bring to you, but because of our infinite wisdom we think that
5 those tracts should be developed as single family residential, even though the pricing is
6 too high on the property to be able to build single family residence on it.

7 MS. CAIRNS: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I mean.

9 MS. HEGLER: I will say we, as Staff we were very, very careful not to make
10 market assumptions. We don't know that. Other than the fact that we do know trends
11 from a land use perspective, like what's, what's happening, we're building more
12 apartments than we are single family homes right now –

13 MR. GILCHRIST: Nor should that be the driving piece.

14 MS. HEGLER: What's that?

15 MR. GILCHRIST: I said, nor should that be your driving motivation.

16 MS. HEGLER: Right, so we know that there are, you know, mixed use places, I
17 mean, mixed use developments taking off, mixed use is working in other places. We
18 currently don't allow that, I mean, I actually see this is a broadening of, of an expansion
19 of options for development, quite frankly. I think that this is way more than we have
20 today –

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I know, but what I'm seeing is, what I'm seeing is, is your
22 tying of your hands, maybe not knowingly when you take a look at these and just like
23 you have today you say, we can't recommend, the Comp Plan won't allow us to

1 recommend, I think you're, you may be going down the same path with these circles
2 and these neighborhood centers and some of this mixed use corridors where it has to
3 be mixed use. Mixed use has not historically worked in Columbia.

4 MS. HEGLER: It's also hardly been allowed.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's what?

6 MS. HEGLER: It's also hardly been allowed by our current Comp Plan. It's hard
7 to do. I mean, we've made it hard for it to happen.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, that's –

9 MS. HEGLER: So we're trying to actually –

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's a good thing thus far –

11 MS. HEGLER: - make it easier.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - because it doesn't work in Columbia right now.

13 MS. CAIRNS: That's not the, that doesn't make sense.

14 [Inaudible discussion]

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, let's force it, let's just force some bankruptcies then.
16 I mean, I don't understand that.

17 MS. HEGLER: Then, then I would, I would ask you what you would want that to, I
18 mean, that's what we're here to talk about, how, how would you characterize or how
19 would you propose –

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think you would allow –

21 MS. HEGLER: - that we better incentivize –

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - I think, I think you would allow any of those uses in that
23 area but not force the mixed use of the property.

1 MS. HEGLER: Okay. And I think that for a very long time, probably the life of this
2 plan that would be the case. I mean, I can't see that we're at such a, we have such a
3 redevelopment boom that only one thing occurs along that corridor. I think that what
4 you're worried about would not happen. I mean, I think we would be in a position where
5 we would probably support most rezonings in those places to whatever it is since we
6 don't have a hard and fast you have to have 25% this or 50% that.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So anything from medium density up through general
8 commercial would be –

9 MS. HEGLER: You know, unless we got more, unless we got more specific. I
10 don't, you're right, I don't see how we could, could approve that. But I, you know, if we
11 get a boom and we're turning these corridors into completely one thing then we can
12 certainly revisit it, but the idea was to expand the choices. So if you have any thoughts
13 on how you would –

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, and that's –

15 MS. HEGLER: - rewrite that, then that's what, then that's the point of this.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, I saw the same thing that Heather saw and, I
17 mean, that's two people reading it. There may be other people that read it the same
18 way. And that's the only concern I had with the mixed use stuff.

19 MS. HEGLER: I think we're always gonna kinda have –

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

21 MS. HEGLER: - subjectivity, which is why –

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

23 MS. HEGLER: - we make a recommendation, you make one.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I understand. But from time to time the positions of the
2 county roll over and different people think different ways about what their interpretation
3 of it is.

4 MS. HEGLER: It, it's, it is intended to expand but give us better guidance so if
5 you don't think it does that then I would, I would implore you to help us out.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I understand.

7 MR. GILCHRIST: Just one question for me. The section that, is there a section in
8 here that speaks to big boxes, vacant boxes that are just sitting around the county?

9 MS. HEGLER: Kind of this one, but.

10 MR. GILCHRIST: I mean, I didn't see anything.

11 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, unless the, I don't know if there's a goal. I mean, there is a,
12 there are goals to redevelop. I don't know if they call out big boxes specifically. What
13 would you want to see?

14 MR. GILCHRIST: Well, I mean, I need to think about exactly what kind of
15 language it needs, but I was just curious whether or not there was any language in there
16 currently that would speak to that.

17 MS. HEGLER: There might be one, we can look. I mean, clearly it's supporting
18 redevelopment, that's a conversation we just –

19 MR. GILCHRIST: Right, yeah.

20 MS. HEGLER: - I'll look for that. I don't recall.

21 MR. GILCHRIST: Okay, I'll, I was just curious.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Talk to me about the tree ordinances in here.

23 MS. HEGLER: [Inaudible]?

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It is, I thought we already had a tree ordinance, we don't?

2 MS. HEGLER: We have requirements for tree replacements during development
3 and what's considered grand.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Hold on a second, let me find it.

5 MS. HEGLER: Yes, we [inaudible] a tree ordinance under –

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What page is it on?

7 MS. HEGLER: Eighty. It's under the natural resources. That's in our Comp Plan
8 today. The goal is to protect trees throughout the county, one way you could do that is
9 update the Land Development Code. We have done that, you know, we did that a
10 couple years ago by requiring the six to one replacement instead of the three to one.
11 Collaborate with developers on preserving and protecting trees, seek to maintain scenic
12 vistas, and then the core strategy is to create a tree ordinance.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So we don't already have a tree ordinance, we need to
14 create one, a new one?

15 MS. HEGLER: We do not have a standalone tree ordinance. We have
16 replacement requirements in development.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What is, what would the other tree ordinance have to do
18 with?

19 MS. HEGLER: Well, Council's proposed them before that we do, they've asked
20 for a tree inventory and then additional measures for, it would just be additional
21 measures on, on development and protection of trees.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Would it be on development or would it be on private
23 residents?

1 MS. HEGLER: You could have, well like Lexington has canopy road tree
2 ordinances, we don't have anything like that.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So would we be talking about expanding the tree
4 ordinance where currently it applies to development sites to private residents' homes?

5 MS. HEGLER: No. I mean, it's the Land Development Code, it says, create a tree
6 ordinance within the Land Development Code.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Well, we are –

8 MS. HEGLER: And we are, we do already do that.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

10 MS. HEGLER: But it's not a standalone, in my mind, tree ordinance. I mean, it's
11 just a replacement value. But there has been some talk about doing a standalone, I
12 don't know if that will ever politically take off, but.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, if we vote for this then you're voting to do that, right?

14 MS. HEGLER: It's in there now so if you would like to strike it.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. When do we, when do you wanna go through this
16 and take a vote on different issues that may or may not be in there? When do you
17 perceive that happening?

18 MS. HEGLER: You wanna vote on every one of these goals –

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think if they're contentious, yeah. Because we have to
20 put a vote forward as the Planning Commission recommending this whole document.
21 We can't recommend piecemeal.

22 MS. HEGLER: No, you're not.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So we have to vote on recommending the document as a
2 whole.

3 MS. HEGLER: Correct.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. So if there are –

5 MS. HEGLER: November, I mean, you wanna do, you wanna do every single –

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

7 MS. HEGLER: - goal, even in the ones that haven't been changed? We weren't
8 directed by Council to change –

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, I think we go through each page and if somebody has
10 an issue on any item that they wanna bring up, they can go, they can bring up that item
11 and then we can vote on it.

12 MR. ANDERSON: What was it, what were you just saying about the tree
13 ordinance again?

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: This states that we're gonna create a tree ordinance
15 within the Land Development Code. I would image it's something, by creating
16 something it means we need something different than what we currently have, correct? I
17 don't think we need anything different than what we currently have.

18 MS. HEGLER: So, I mean, you could strike it.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But it's not just, I mean, I, we need to ask everybody
20 about it, so. So you're looking to establish a new staff person to consider the impact of
21 new developments upon natural resources and natural conditions, including scenic
22 areas, unique plant and animal habitats, wetlands and prime agricultural forest lands?
23 Under strategy 2.1?

1 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, I mean, we, we kinda do that now. We don't have it as a
2 separate staff person but we do, we, we take in a natural resource inventory on every
3 major development, so we are doing that.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right, but you wanna establish a staff person to do that,
5 and then that's, so that would then be their role would be to take a look at just these
6 items and say, okay I don't think we should approve this because it impacts the scenic
7 area.

8 MS. HEGLER: That's what that says.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we protect grand trees now?

10 MS. HEGLER: We do.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But, but we need more protection for grand trees? Is that
12 what 4.1 says? Yes?

13 MS. HEGLER: It doesn't say that, it just says to update, creating protection of
14 existing grand trees. This is currently in our Comprehensive Plan.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

16 MS. HEGLER: We were not asked to update these sections. We certainly may
17 since we're looking at them.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I'm just, I'm just asking you if this is what, so update the
19 Richland County Land Development Code creating protection of existing grand trees.
20 We already have protection of grand trees, correct?

21 MS. HEGLER: So you could change that to say, continue to –

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But why address it if –

23 MS. HEGLER: - protect grand trees.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - if, what's the purpose to address something if it doesn't
2 need to be addressed?

3 MS. HEGLER: So how would you vote, would you take it page by page? You
4 wanna go by every goal and strategy?

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think if somebody has an issue with it, yeah then we –

6 MS. HEGLER: Page by page?

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - we bring it up. I guess it's better suited to do it at our
8 next meeting.

9 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, my, my – because today was not for action, today was –

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

11 MS. HEGLER: - simply to start having a dialogue. Whatever I can make changes
12 between now and then, whatever you tell me you see needs to be changed we can
13 make before the November. This was a, this was a built in session so we could discuss
14 what's being proposed. So I can take markups, I was kinda hoping to get a, hey take
15 this out, change this, you know, markups would work. I could sit here and write down
16 what you wanna tell me.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I guess for me it's just a overall, some of this stuff and I
18 understand that maybe it's gotta be in there, I don't know, it just, but once it gets in here
19 then it becomes, like it's part of the Comprehensive Plan of where we see we want
20 things to go.

21 MS. HEGLER: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The strategy 4.2, collaborate with developers, focusing on
23 preserving and protecting existing trees by meeting or exceeding landscaping

1 requirements. In my mind we as a governing body have landscaping requirements. This
2 is what we require on a site. I don't expect when you come in to develop a tract of land
3 for the Staff to say, this is what our ordinance says but we'd really like for you to
4 consider doing x plus 2.

5 MS. HEGLER: That's what the adoption of the natural resource inventory clause
6 allows though, we, you know, adopted the natural resource inventory requirement.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: See, this is what I'm talking about, see? You take a look
8 at something and you say, you know, two years from now you're gonna say, well this is
9 what the Comprehensive Plan says, so, so when you pass it –

10 MS. HEGLER: But that's the Code, so in Code we do receive, we do get a
11 natural resource inventory on major developments. So we do have within that part of the
12 Code, not, not the Comp Plan, but in that part of the Code, the ability to work with
13 developers to attempt to create more protections. If there's something very pristine,
14 something very wonderful on the site, that was the whole point of accepting the natural
15 resource inventory. So, I mean, it's just, it just says to collaborate. We can and, and are
16 allowed by our Code to do that.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, you're allowed to do that anyhow.

18 MS. HEGLER: Right. This is just saying we're actually, we're placing an
19 emphasis on protecting trees throughout the county, it's a goal. And these are the tools
20 that we would use to get there. I mean, we can totally go through and strike the ones
21 we've done if we think they're perfect, but I would, I would argue that the whole point of
22 updating the Land Development Code, which is what this strategy is -

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright.

1 MS. HEGLER: - is clearly gonna be a next step. Cause they don't, [inaudible].

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Anybody else got anything? I guess we'll just go
3 through all this at our next meeting, just plan to stay for a while if we can and we'll just
4 knock out page by page to the Comprehensive Plan and –

5 MS. HEGLER: And any feedback you wanna provide beforehand would be fine
6 too.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

8 MS. CAIRNS: I have a question, just, it's a little – just curious, like cause I've had
9 some experience with this, with the historical stuff, with historical properties, that it's my
10 understanding right now the only way to have a property in the county deemed historical
11 is to let it get on the National Registrar. Where like in the City of Columbia you can get a
12 deemed historical based on the City of Columbia standards, which is less than the
13 National Registrar cause of the Bailey Bill phenomenon. But like if you've got property in
14 the county I think the only way it can be deemed historically is to get on the National
15 Registrar.

16 [Inaudible discussion]

17 MS. HEGLER: We actually updated our standards to be similar to the cities,
18 didn't we? Didn't we get those fluid?

19 [Inaudible discussion]

20 MS. CAIRNS: Okay, so I'm glad to hear that there's something.

21 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, we did that not too long ago.

22 MS. CAIRNS: Cause the National Registrar standard is very, very high.

23 MS. HEGLER: We made ours comply with the cities, or [inaudible] the same.

1 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, cool. Okay. Thank you.

2 MS. HEGLER: I mean, any changes you want me to make before November.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

4 MS. HEGLER: Or any discussion.

5 MS. FRIERSON: Would you prefer that we email you information prior to the
6 meeting or just wait until the meeting to discuss everything?

7 MS. HEGLER: I think it would depend on the context of the comment. You know,
8 if it's a grammatical error or just fix this word or that one, I think that that would be fine to
9 send me to, but if it's something that you imagine –

10 MS. FRIERSON: Substantive.

11 MS. HEGLER: - substantive conversation would be better had with the group.

12 MS. FRIERSON: Okay.

13 MS. HEGLER: I would hold that. And then we'll just go by them and vote.

14 MR. ANDERSON: I agree.

15 MS. HEGLER: Not doing anything in the dark.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Sounds good. Anything else?

17 MR. ANDERSON: Motion to adjourn?

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion, do we have a second?

19 MR. GILCHRIST: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All in favor say aye.

21 *[Approved: Cairns, Frierson, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Absent: Joyner, Tuttle,*
22 *Theus]*

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Thank y'all.

1

2

[Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm]