

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
May 5, 2014

1
2
3
4 *[Members Present: Heather Cairns, Beverly Frierson, Marilyn Joyner, David Tuttle,*
5 *Patrick Palmer, Bill Theus, Christopher Anderson, Wallace Brown, Sr.; Absent: Stephen*
6 *Gilchrist]*

7 Called to order: 1:03 pm
8

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We'll call the May meeting of the Richland County
10 Planning Commission to order. Please allow me to read this into the Record. In
11 accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio
12 and TV stations, newspapers, and persons requesting notification, as well as posted on
13 the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building. Did
14 everyone get a copy of the April Minutes? Do we have a motion?

15 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion we approve the April
16 Minutes as submitted.

17 MR. THEUS: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say
19 aye.

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

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Agenda amendments?

23 MS. HEGLER: No amendments, but I do just want to make a note. I think that the
24 Commission has the appropriate street names sheet. What was sent out I guess two
25 weeks ago does not have number 7, Lethabie on there, but I believe you do have the

1 appropriate one in front of you. So just wanted to make a note for the Record that you
2 will be voting on that as well.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. No Agenda amendments. Road Names, do we
4 have any motions?

5 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we approve the road
6 names as submitted on the sheet today, May 5th.

7 [Road names: Buckland, Cobden, Mackintosh, Maybeck, Ruskin, Stickley,
8 Lethabie]

9 MR. BROWN: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say
11 aye.

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

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Map Amendments, Case No. 14-09.

15 **CASE NO. 14-09 MA:**

16 MS. HEGLER: Yes, this is an amendment to the Greenhill Parrish PDD. The
17 parcel was zoned PDD back in 1999. Just to orient you in the general area is also the
18 Woodcreeks Farm PDD. As you know the PDD District is intended to allow flexibility in
19 development that will result in improved design, character and quality of new mixed use
20 developments. The site is surrounded by residential uses of different densities; single-
21 family low density and multi-family high density is also surrounded, again by another
22 PDD. The PDD has frontage along Spears Creek Church Road and Jacob's Mill Pond
23 Road. The site that's in question today is currently undeveloped, and what is actually

1 being proposed is a change to the existing RS-1, which is a residential use, to decrease
2 that by 6.81 acres and actually create a new use of OI, religious, so Office Institutional,
3 Religious. This area in the future land use map of the county Comprehensive Plan is
4 suburban and as you know institutional uses should be located in appropriate locations
5 along major roads serving the community, and further they should reinforce
6 neighborhoods and communities. With that we felt, Staff felt that the proposed use was
7 in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, it provided a good transition between the
8 different residential neighborhoods, and that it would be located in an area where it
9 could actually serve the surrounding community. So Staff recommended approval of this
10 PDD amendment.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Okay. Michael Boulware?

12 MR. BOULWARE: Yes, sir.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir, if you have anything to say, if you'd like to come
14 down and take the podium for us, and if you'd give us your name and address for the
15 Record, we'd appreciate it. And if you could keep your comments to about two minutes.

16 **TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL BOULWARE:**

17 MR. BOULWARE: My name's Michael Boulware, I live at 150 Woodcreek Road,
18 Elgin, South Carolina 29045, and I basically agree with pretty much everything they said
19 here.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Manning?

21 **TESTIMONY OF DEAS MANNING:**

22 MR. MANNING: My name is Deas Manning, I'm at 100 Parrish Walk, Elgin,
23 South Carolina 29045. We sold the property to the Lutheran Church in 2003. As a part

1 of their due diligence they wanted to verify that the zoning was such that a church could
2 be built on the property. I wrote a letter to Mr. Hicks who was at the time the Zoning
3 Administrator, and got a – asking him whether we need to go through the rezoning for a
4 church. He said no because it was a PUD that it had, you know, exceptions in the
5 ordinance that allowed churches in residential and in PUDs so there was no need for a
6 rezoning. This just cropped up recently and I'm just coming back to support the church
7 that originally was intending to go there.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, thank you. Melba Boulware? Yes, ma'am, if you
9 have anything to say you can come down and take the podium, but –

10 MS. BOULWARE: Nothing but I'm in agreement 100%.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Great, thank you. That's all we've got signed up to speak.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we recommend that
13 Case 14-09 MA be sent forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

14 MR. THEUS: Second.

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

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

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. And folks, we are a recommending Body to County
20 Council. They'll meet back in these same chambers on the 27th of this month and so
21 that's when the rezoning will be heard by Council. On the 27th, thank you. Text
22 Amendment?

23 **TEXT AMENDMENT #1:**

1 MS. HEGLER: Mr. Chairman, you have one Text Amendment before you today.
2 It provides a revised definition of the existing residential use which determines what kind
3 of buffer is required as a buffer transition yard. And the amendment also allows an
4 exception to the 25' buffer that's required in the open space code. Again the open space
5 code requires a minimum 25' buffer transition yard when the subject parcel is adjacent
6 to an existing residential use. This was done to overcome any potential incompatibilities
7 between an existing neighborhood and a new development that was using the open
8 space code. If you recall this was a concern of Council, that there be compatibility
9 between these two types of neighborhoods. In our recent practice, however, we felt that
10 we needed to better define what existing meant, so that's the first amendment you see
11 here or the first item in the same amendment is to actually amend the language to say,
12 the land use is considered existing on an adjacent property when a plan has been
13 approved by the Planning Department for that use. So that's the first thing. We also
14 encounter situations when we were applying the open space code over the last couple
15 months, whereby the subject parcel was actually connected to an existing neighborhood
16 and would be connected to that neighborhood, so we felt a need for an exception to that
17 buffer requirement. Thus, you see in front of you that we suggested an exception to the
18 25' buffer when the two developments are connected by the same street network, is
19 being developed by the same developer, and the parcels within both developments are
20 similar in size. That would allow someone to actually add on to an existing project and
21 use the open space code without that odd 25' buffer in-between it.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff?

23 MR. BROWN: Yes. Mr. Chairman?

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir.

2 MR. BROWN: Can you tell me what is meant when it says, its use shall be
3 determined by assigning it the highest level of impact in its zoning classification, what
4 does that mean?

5 MS. HEGLER: The way that a buffer is determined now is by taking the two uses,
6 what's currently there and then what is being proposed, and it was a different, there's
7 different categories for whether it's a low impact use, medium or high. And that
8 determines how wide that buffer should be. So for instance if you were a high impact
9 use and you're locating next to a lower impact residential, the buffer that you are
10 required to set in place between you and that other property is higher. For the open
11 space code, which I think was adopted probably about a year ago, we proposed the
12 highest use impact, thus the highest or the largest buffer of 25' between two
13 neighborhoods. And again, that was at, that was because of the concern Council had
14 for these open space projects potentially having a different density, different character
15 and different look, and then wanting to protect the established neighborhoods that were
16 already there.

17 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I have one question for Staff. Are these, are the plans
19 available on a website somewhere for someone who doesn't see something on the
20 ground and they're interested in an adjacent parcel, for them during their due diligence
21 period, to be able to easily find a plan that's been approved as opposed to just going by
22 the zoning that's out there and seeing what their buffers are?

1 MS. HEGLER: Just an approved sketch plan, no. Though we do keep those on
2 file as having been approved they're not mapped. They're not mapped until their platted,
3 so you wouldn't be able to look at the map of the county and see an approved concept.
4 But those are kept on record, we do approve large concept plans at the DRT, the
5 Development Review Team level, and those are kept on record in the form of a report,
6 like a report you get in your packet.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is, but is there a way to keep a, a list of that somewhere
8 so that someone who's looking to buy an adjacent tract, you know, typically what they'll
9 do is they'll go with the zoning and say, okay this is zoned RU so –

10 MS. HEGLER: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - my buffer's X. And they have no way of knowing that this
12 is what's planned on that site that's been approved through the county.

13 MS. HEGLER: Geo, is there a list? Yeah, I mean, I guess – it is, there is a list of
14 it though, I mean, in the way of the records we keep from our Development Review
15 Teams. I mean, you'd have to – I don't know that there's a way to search that though
16 other than going through and reading them all.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And because I know this, those plans can be approved for
18 as much as, what, seven years?

19 MS. HEGLER: Well, that's the, that's the point that we were making as Staff is
20 that if you waited until a permit was issued, you have kind of forsaken the intent of that
21 site as being residential at the time of a, of a plan. The DRT projects are posted but
22 they're not a running list that you could easily search by address.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right, so you'd have to go back –

1 MS. HEGLER: I'd have to think about that.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - you'd have to go back six or seven years and see if
3 there was something approved on the site –

4 MS. HEGLER: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - and look at each one.

6 MR. TUTTLE: Or just come in and have a meeting with Staff.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But they have to do the same thing. They're not gonna
8 remember –

9 MR. TUTTLE: Well –

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - six or seven –

11 MR. TUTTLE: - no, but I mean, they would pull it for you.

12 MS. HEGLER: No, we do, we do remember more often than not that there has
13 been a site, or you know, project proposed for a site. Yeah, we do a pretty good job of –

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But I guess this is –

15 MS. HEGLER: - but we could do that as a running list.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - I think, yeah that's –

17 MS. HEGLER: For sure.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - that's what I'm asking. Is if, for the general public that
19 goes out and takes a look at a site, and –

20 MS. HEGLER: You know what, now that I say that actually we do have our, our
21 plan reviewers do have a running list of projects that are brought in. And they can
22 search that, they can query it by address. I mean, it's like a spread sheet.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: If we could put something like that on our GIS site for
2 people to be able to get access to that data to know that this plan was approved
3 December –

4 MS. HEGLER: Long before they would see a permit.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - 30th.

6 MS. HEGLER: Okay, yeah let me think about the best way to do that.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Cause if not you're gonna have to retrain the civil guys
8 and whoever does these plans and all this stuff to when you do layouts you also have
9 another level that you've gotta check now.

10 MS. HEGLER: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And –

12 MS. HEGLER: In due diligence, you're right.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - than what you would normally historically have had to
14 check.

15 MS. HEGLER: Yeah. But, I mean, it would have to be a situation where you
16 called and asked the question, though, we're looking at this site, is there anything on the
17 adjacent site? And we could find that.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But I guess what I'm, what I'm –

19 MS. HEGLER: You're wanting it online.

20 MR. TUTTLE: It's gonna be disclaimed on GIS anyway, though, Patrick. I mean,
21 you can't –

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It will be, but it'll give you a good idea as to what's, what's
23 been approved. I mean, if they have a list of the sites that are approved it's very easy to

1 update that list, and if something goes off and something falls of, just update that list
2 once a month after the meetings that these four projects are now approved on these tax
3 map sheet numbers. I mean, you don't have to do a whole bunch of stuff, you can just
4 say there's a project approved on this tax map sheet number.

5 MS. HEGLER: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: You know, and that, then that cues them in to, hey I need
7 to go down and find out what this project looks like.

8 MS. HEGLER: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But just a list of –

10 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, we'll think –

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - approved projects on certain tax map sheet numbers.

12 MS. HEGLER: You're okay with it being a list or do you want it mapped on GIS?

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, no, no, just a list.

14 MS. HEGLER: Seems like we could – are there any –

15 MR. PRICE: I mean, if we wanted to we could probably put it on our website, just
16 a list of currently approved projects.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, that's all I'm saying.

18 MS. HEGLER: That seems to make sense, yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

20 MR. HEGLER: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

22 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I had one other definitional question.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir.

1 MR. BROWN: On page 8 at the top the word "similar", it says "similar in lot size",
2 how are we – can you give me, tell me how you're using that or?

3 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, that's – we thought the same thing. Really we're looking for
4 similar characteristics, I mean, within a range of sizes. I mean, it is somewhat subjective
5 but not, not too strict. We talked a lot about using density but density could be a tricky
6 number too. Really we're gonna be looking at making sure whatever is proposed is
7 within, you know, several hundred feet of the same lot size than the others.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, why don't you just drop a percentage in there?

9 MS. HEGLER: We could, that would be a good –

10 MR. BROWN: That's too broad a term, that's –

11 MS. HEGLER: It is. It's a bit –

12 MR. BROWN: - [inaudible].

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What do you think, Geo, 15%?

14 MR. PRICE: What?

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The lot size, the same between different parcels, same
16 developer?

17 MR. BROWN: It's on page 8 at the top.

18 MR. PRICE: 15%?

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I don't know, [inaudible]. It's arbitrary, capricious.

20 MR. TUTTLE: That's a tough number cause I think you could argue that a 60'
21 wide lot neighborhood is very similar to a 75' lot wide neighborhood.

22 MS. HEGLER: But that, they present a difference, yeah.

23 MR. TUTTLE: Well, that's what I'm –

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But I agree though, I mean, putting generalities in the
2 Code is never good.

3 MR. PRICE: Well, sometimes. I mean, I – once again, I think that there are times
4 when you're right, if you put it in there in that way it can be a problem, but really the way
5 we kind of use our Code, I think we use it to kind of benefit people more, so it does give
6 Staff a lot more discretion to help out as opposed to hinder. And I think –

7 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, I think the percentage gets tough because, I mean, I think if
8 you have a neighborhood with 200' wide lots and 150' wide lots were proposed next
9 door, I would argue those are very similar but from a percentage basis you're not gonna
10 come up with a number that makes that make sense. So I'd prefer Staff discretion there
11 than I would to pin it down.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Why don't you just to it by the, I mean, cause you're
13 going, what, 8500 square foot lots up to 12500? Just using the zoning code.

14 MS. HEGLER: What's our smallest, 5000?

15 MR. PRICE: Five thousand – well –

16 MS. HEGLER: You can't use the open space code on that though, can you?

17 MR. PRICE: Under HD? No.

18 MS. HEGLER: You're between 8 and 12.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

20 MS. HEGLER: And 33. Eight, 12 and 33.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So you're talking a 50% increase.

22 MS. HEGLER: The point being though that we would not, we would not allow
23 medium density lot sizes – we would not consider those similar to Rural.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So why don't you just put within the same zoning
2 classification?

3 MS. HEGLER: And really the open space code kind of –

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is that not good?

5 MS. HEGLER: - is written – yeah – so that it doesn't, say, just jump you up to the
6 next zoning. Which is actually how the open space code is written. It, even if you were
7 to exercise the density bonuses you can't leap a whole zoning district by applying that
8 density bonus.

9 MR. TUTTLE: I hadn't thought – sorry, I hadn't thought that completely through.
10 I'm sure there's -

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But if the Code already is you have to be within the same
12 zoning classification why don't we just put in here that that's what this similar means is –
13 within the same parameters of the –

14 MS. HEGLER: Within the ranges of that.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, you can –

16 MS. HELGER: Like up to –

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - yeah, you can't increase or decrease zoning
18 classification. Isn't that right?

19 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, let's take that and do some, run some numbers or some –

20 MR. TUTTLE: Okay, so if I understand what Pat's saying is that, that basically
21 you would have to be in a different zoning classification to be dissimilar.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

23 MS. HEGLER: Right.

1 MR. TUTTLE: Right. So you don't get down to the [inaudible] the 100' lot, the 70'
2 lot, etc., as long as you're in that range then you're considered similar and you don't
3 have to buffer. And if you skip a category then you do have to buffer. Is that what we're
4 saying?

5 MS. HEGLER: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

7 MS. HEGLER: Which is really the intent. And if you – that's really our measure
8 for compatibility anyway within the Code is that jump in zoning districts. The very first
9 project we're gonna have though will be a site that's actually zoned medium density
10 next to rural. I'm sure there isn't such a case but we'll find it. That would be the problem
11 is that it's already dissimilar and then they would be trying to attach it, but in that case
12 they may need to do a buffer. I mean, it may be more appropriate to do a buffer, so I
13 think that probably gets at it.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I don't know.

15 MS. HEGLER: Mr. Price, anything? I think that provides the – a standard, but
16 there's a good range within there to be flexible. Cause the whole point of the open
17 space code, of course, is to have no minimum lot sizes, that you can use the land more
18 wisely and more uniquely and conserve more of it.

19 MR. PRICE: And I think clearly, you know, when you try to come with numbers
20 and try to get it, it's so hard to get it perfect because we're gonna come up with a case
21 where maybe our Code is too restrictive on something coming in, but then you leave it
22 too loose something's gonna happen where we have to come back to you anyway.

1 MS. HEGLER: Which actually is what this was. We felt it was too restrictive, it
2 didn't allow folks to come in and add on to projects, but use what we want them to use,
3 which is the open space code. I'm good with that.

4 MR. TUTTLE: So you would just change similar in lot size to say similar in zoning
5 classification, or overall square footage?

6 MS. HEGLER: In that range, a range of zoning, yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So we just, we just strike the words "are similar in lot size"
8 and replace with "are the same as the underlying zoning classification", "are the same
9 as what the underlying zoning classification allows for".

10 MS. JOYNER: I think –

11 MS. HEGLER: I don't think you could say that because then you wouldn't have
12 the flexibility in the sizes. I guess you would say –

13 MS. JOYNER: - similar in zoning classification.

14 MS. HEGLER: The size does not exceed the next zonings. You couldn't exceed
15 or decrease your lot size so much so as to be in the next – now you're putting a lot size
16 – you see? Now you're putting a lot size minimum on what was intended not to have
17 one.

18 MR. TUTTLE: And you could have multiple lot sizes within that, right?

19 MS. HEGLER: Correct.

20 MR. TUTTLE: So you, how would you know which one to even pick to compare it
21 somewhere –

22 MS. HEGLER: We would pick an average. We ask for an average lot size on the
23 sketch plans.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I'll tell you what –

2 MR. TUTTLE: It wouldn't be the adjacent lot size?

3 [Inaudible discussion]

4 MR. TUTTLE: Where you could see a scenario where you started maybe smaller
5 and then as you got back to the older neighborhood that maybe had bigger lots, that's
6 where you would go bigger. But you'd hate to have to compare the smaller to the bigger
7 if you're already –

8 MS. HEGLER: Even an average would be askew.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, I'll tell you what, I know we never like to use the
10 word "similar" in Code, but it seems like to me unless we've got, we get a complaint
11 from a citizen or from the Staff that in this case it may be best to just get this one
12 through with "similar".

13 MS. HEGLER: And what we do too internally –

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And if we have problems with it later, see if we can fix it.

15 MS. FRIERSON: A suggestion. Maybe we could say "consistent in lot size with
16 adjacent [something]". Consistent instead of similar.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's the same gray area.

18 MR. PRICE: It's gonna –

19 MS. FRIERSON: I know it's gray, but – well, okay.

20 MR. PRICE: And there are mechanisms that if someone, if our decision is made
21 that, let's say we say, well they are similar, that there are ways for them to appeal that
22 decision. And I believe the Development – does it come to the Planning Commission or
23 the –

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

2 MR. PRICE: - so it probably would come back to you. And so if nothing else you
3 would actually get a firsthand understanding of what we're looking at and then we could
4 make adjustments to the Code from there.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Mr. Brown?

6 MR. BROWN: The concern that I have is in some of the developments we now
7 have, you have 235 homes that are impacting upon larger homes in the same
8 development. And those lot sizes are much smaller for those 235 structures. I'm not
9 opposed to 235s, but what I'm concerned about is their impact where people have
10 made larger investments and so forth, and all this was was to accommodate the
11 developer and not the people who were purchasing the larger lots and building the
12 larger homes. That's why I'm concerned with the word similar. I understand the difficult
13 with coming up with a concrete definition but I just want that on the Record.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure. And I think this is an overall point of discussion.
15 Typically in this county we've looked at lot size equating to house value.

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

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And where I see, and I'm sure a lot of other folks see, is
18 that as the population gets older they don't want as large a lot so there may be just as
19 nice a house on a smaller lot as opposed to a larger lot. So I think some of that mindset
20 needs to change within the county that, you know, just because this is a small lot means
21 that it's not a very nice house. I think that as the baby boomers get older and they start
22 to see some of this occur, I think we'll see some of that in the market. Which is just
23 something to kind of keep your ears to the ground is when you're out talking to folks

1 that, well these are small lots; well a small lot doesn't necessarily equate to, you know,
2 cheap house, so.

3 MR. TUTTLE: Well, just so I'm clear. This would be adjacent parcels, this
4 wouldn't have anything to do with lots within an existing neighborhood.

5 MS. HEGLER: No.

6 MR. TUTTLE: So it's not gonna be that you're gonna go to an infill site and be
7 able to reduce anything cause that doesn't relate, right?

8 MR. BROWN: No, I'm not inferring that. I'm looking down the road at
9 undeveloped areas where you have left over property you're trying to fill with, with
10 buildings. And in order to accommodate selling a piece of property, you got a much
11 smaller lot that is, that's there, so you build a much smaller home. And that impacts on
12 the whole neighborhood. It's permissible if we pass this as similar, it's in that area,
13 depending on how you define it. That's all I'm saying. What's happened has happened,
14 I'm not talking about that.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure.

16 MR. BROWN: I'm looking down the road.

17 MS. HEGLER: Well, it's permissible only if they use the open space code, which
18 has a number of other requirements within it that still have to be met. This is just one
19 small piece of it. So if it's its own parcel and it is infill and they can apply the Code and
20 meet the standards of it they could do it. But they would have to be literally connected to
21 the adjacent parcel by way of street, same developer, and now also, also, and, these
22 are all three requirements, similar lot sizes. So the likelihood of that happening in infill is
23 probably not as likely as it is, you're out in suburban part of the county, you've already

1 developed a piece of parcel but you actually want to add on to that project, but you want
2 to add on using the open space code, which we should encourage. But by putting that
3 buffer in you would be disconnecting these two neighborhoods that would otherwise be
4 connected, which we also do promote.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, any other discussion? Do we have a motion?

6 MR. THEUS: Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the Text Amendment as, as
7 written, move it forward.

8 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion to send the Text Amendment forward
10 to Council with a recommendation of approval, and a second. All those in favor say
11 aye. Any opposed?

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

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Comprehensive Plan update.

15 MS. HEGLER: Yes. We have our consultants back in town, our good friends.
16 We've had a round of public stakeholder meetings, or public meetings and then also
17 stakeholder meetings since we last met. So we're gonna briefly update you on the
18 results of those and then spend a little bit of time with you getting your thoughts on
19 guiding principles and as we dig into actually writing the update to the land use element
20 of this plan, getting some thoughts from you before we start that will help guide us. And
21 Leann King is with us from Clarion Associates again, and her partner is with her from
22 *[Inaudible]* Dale, Bride, and I'll let her take over.

1 MS. KING: Afternoon everybody. As Tracy mentioned the last time were here in
2 front of you we were just about to kick off the four days of meetings with the community.
3 And so we'll be giving you an update on, on where that, what we learned from that, as
4 well as meetings with different stakeholder groups and also county, different department
5 officials with the county. We're also gonna tell you a little bit about how we want to
6 change our strategy for public engagement and how we learned about this last round of
7 meetings and have some ideas for how we can kinda boost the numbers that come out
8 to future meetings. And then as Tracy mentioned Greg Dale's gonna guide you through
9 a discussion about some draft guiding principles for the plan that we've developed,
10 based on everything we've learned up to this point and I wanna get your thoughts on
11 that and your feedback, so you can help us in terms of guiding the development of the
12 plan.

13 Okay, so real quick project update. One thing that's important that we learned
14 from this last round of meetings, there was a little bit of confusion about some of the key
15 milestones. We do have four meetings that the public are, were invited to participate in.
16 The first one was the community conversations that we held in April. The second round
17 of meetings are the community choices meetings, and those are coming up in July, the
18 week after July 4th, I think July 7th is that Monday. And then we're gonna present the
19 draft plan to folks in September, I believe it's the second week in September; that's the
20 third. And then the fourth opportunity is when it goes through the formal adoption
21 process and I know there are gonna be multiple meetings there. There was some
22 confusion, some folks thought that you could come to any one of the meetings and it
23 was kinda of the same meeting, but those are very different points in the process and

1 different types of input that we're looking for. So we wanna make sure people
2 understand that distinction. So again, we're here in May. We conducted those
3 community conversations in April, we're still working on the technical analysis, again
4 brought draft guiding principles with you today, and the, the hope is that when we come
5 back a month from now we're actually gonna have some draft goals and strategies for
6 the land use and priority investment elements that will be guided by everything that
7 we've learned up to today, including the input you're gonna provide us today. So that's
8 where we are in terms of that. So public engagement, again, five meetings were held
9 April 7th through 9th. There was one in each of the county's five planning areas, and
10 that's gonna continue for the other rounds of meetings up through the public adoption,
11 we'll have, we have, you know, three rounds of five meetings, we're gonna be holding
12 them at different times and different locations so we can make sure and kinda mix it up
13 and give people opportunities to come to those at the next two rounds. The community
14 conversations had really three main objectives; one was to build awareness for the
15 project. A lot of people don't know what a Comprehensive Plan is, they don't know how
16 or why they should be engaged in the process so we wanted to educate people about
17 that. The second was really to provide them a meaningful opportunity to provide input
18 about the future growth of the county. And we had two specific exercises, you might
19 recall us presenting those to you at the last meeting. And we'll give you the results from
20 those. And then the third was really to kind of bring people together in a conversation
21 format. It's very infrequent that people get to come together and talk about the future of
22 their community and how that might shape up over the next 20 years. So wanted to
23 provide that opportunity for folks. Public outreach, there was a lot that was done in a

1 fairly short period of times. There's a dedicated project website, again, it's got both the
2 city and the county's plan on it and describes both those planning efforts. A thousand
3 project business cards, 5,000 postcards, there were articles, interviews on your radio
4 station, there was a public information video, Facebook, ads, weekly emails to the
5 county. I believe Planning Commission was on that email list as well as neighborhood
6 groups. And there were some presentations to different groups in the community. So
7 there was, you know, a big push to get the word out about these meetings. We had, in
8 total over the five meetings about 115 attendees, so we have some work to do. We
9 want to boost those numbers for the next round of meetings. In terms of where people
10 came from, about 53% were from the unincorporated areas, 23% from Columbia, and
11 16% from other towns. There were a few people that came from outside of Richland
12 County. How long have they lived here? We've got a pretty good distribution of folks;
13 normally you just get the folks that've been here a long time, but we actually got people,
14 you know, almost 30% lived here 0 to 19 years, 36 between 20 and 39, and 35, you
15 know, percent for 40 plus years. Eighty-eight percent work in Richland or retired, and
16 86% are property owners, so mostly folks that live here or retired here and own
17 property. We learned that word of mouth is really the best way to get people to the
18 meeting. Of those that came and filled out the exit questionnaire, 73% said they heard
19 either from email, word of mouth or community presentation, so it was that personal
20 touch that really got them to come to the meeting. About 19% learned about the
21 meeting through the flyer/postcard that was mailed to them through the mail. So that's
22 something that's important and that's very common in most communities we work in,
23 that's really where we have to kind of focus our efforts in the future is that personal

1 touch in getting that word our mouth. In terms of the experience people had, we like to
2 ask them a couple of questions at the end of the meeting, 98% thought that the meeting
3 was the right length, so we could kind of look at that meeting length in the future. About
4 100%, well about, 100% were comfortable in the groups that they worked in, most
5 people felt comfortable that their feedback was accurately reported and they will
6 participate in the future, so. And we're paying attention to those folks that are in that,
7 you know, the 1 and 2% that weren't, and following up on that.

8 So the first question we asked folks at the community conversations was, what
9 should we protect? And it was a mapping exercise, we asked folks to first individually
10 think about places they want to protect within their planning area. And then as a group,
11 they worked in small groups, we asked them to come up with the top five areas that
12 they wanted to protect. And then we've got a report that's in draft form, we can present
13 that final report to you at the next meeting. But we, you know, we've been able to distill
14 from that and look at all the groups and kind of come to some, you know, come to some
15 idea about what folks are most interested – and I'll just kinda, we'll put these up there
16 real quick. So Gills Creek and Broad River protection came up over and over and over
17 and over again, that was a real big one. And what was interesting about it is not just
18 protection of the watershed, not just protection of waterfront area, but people are
19 actually saying, we want more access and we would actually maybe like to see some
20 development near these areas that, you know, could really kind of take advantage of
21 these as a unique community asset. Also waterways, creeks, wetlands, other water
22 resource areas, you know, those were kind of big protection areas people identified.
23 Maintaining your permanently protected lands also were big on the list. Schools, your

1 military installations were on there. Rural landscapes, there's some particular places
2 where people felt the rural aesthetic was really important to protect in the future. And
3 some unique urban places that were more specific to primarily Columbia. And again,
4 we're gonna, in the report we're gonna have maps that show and name what these
5 locations were. The second question that we asked was, how should growth be
6 distributed and where. And we gave them three choices, and these are just kind of
7 conceptually where do you think development should be distributed? Should it be green
8 field, you know, on land that's not developed? Should it be redevelopment, changing up
9 land that it's already development? Or infill, places, vacant lands near undeveloped, or
10 near developed areas? And what we learned was that most people were really focused
11 on the places that they wanted to improve, you know, those blighted areas, areas where
12 reinvestment need to be occurring. There were, you know, a fair number of people that
13 were interested in green field development and they had some particular places where
14 they wanted to see that occur. And then also infill development. The redevelopment
15 focus areas, cause most, most groups, you know, chose redevelopment, and those
16 were the places they mapped during the exercise, they really focused on older
17 commercial corridors and neighborhoods that were really kind of aging and blighted and
18 need some, need some reinvestment. So those were really kind of the big picks on
19 those across the board. And again, we're gonna have final maps to show where each of
20 those areas are in the, in the final report. Again, we met with stakeholder and county
21 department representatives to gather additional input for this process, and this is a list
22 here, I won't read it off to you, of the different groups that we've met with. And that has
23 been folded in, you'll see when we go through our draft guiding principles, a lot of what

1 we learned from these folks really kind of drove what the principles are that we've
2 developed for you and we'll be sharing with you tonight.

3 So again, personal outreach is the most effective. One of the things that we want
4 to do to try to get more folks to come out and be engaged in this process is develop this
5 network in community. Staff have already jumped on this idea, they're basically pulling
6 together a broad array of different folks from the community at a meeting on
7 Wednesday, is that correct? It's on Wednesday, I think it's a lunch meeting, to, to
8 educate them about the process, how they can help get the word out with their
9 networks, their contacts, and really try to make this kind of a grassroots effort, because
10 that's how you're gonna get folks to come to the table, so. And with that, we're gonna
11 switch over – let me stop there. Any questions about the community conversations or
12 any of the public engagement piece? Yes, ma'am?

13 MS. FRIERSON: I notice that you stated that there were five meetings and at the
14 five meetings you had a total of 115 attendees?

15 MS. KING: That's correct.

16 MS. FRIERSON: I recall that at the last meeting I was concerned about
17 additional outreach to the community, and I even gave some suggestions in writing as
18 to sources that might assist in getting the word out.

19 MS. KING: Correct.

20 MS. FRIERSON: Did you all utilize any of those suggestions?

21 MS. KING: I believe, and I don't know if LaToya's in here or not. LaToya may be
22 able to better respond to that. I know that part of this networking committee was, again,
23 trying to broaden that, but.

1 MS. LATOYA: Yes, ma'am, at that April meeting, at that Planning Commission
2 meeting, that was actually the first night that we were doing our kickoff, so there was no
3 way for us to utilize that information for those April meetings. But we do have them, I've
4 also provided them with our PIO director and we will be utilizing those for our July
5 meetings.

6 MS. FRIERSON: Excellent. And one more suggestion. Might you all please
7 prepare, maybe just brief colorful flyers if necessary so that civic organizations and
8 maybe churches that are interested can insert information in bulletins so that more
9 people will know about this process and this procedure?

10 MS. LATOYA: Would that be in addition to these? Are you saying different types
11 of –

12 MS. FRIERSON: It doesn't necessarily have to be in addition, even if you have
13 that – we don't have any of that in our church, and I know that there are other churches
14 that don't have, and there's civic organizations that probably would be pleased to
15 provide input if they received this.

16 MS. LATOYA: That's what we're hoping that that networking committee will help
17 us do and I don't know if you all have gone over what's in your packet as Planning
18 Commissioners as well, but we've provided you all with some postcards and our leaflets
19 in hopes that you will share those with the groups that you are aware of. There's really
20 just no way for us to know of all the different churches or organizations so we're looking
21 for other people to make us aware of those groups and for those groups to contact me
22 or someone in our office for that networking committee. We're gonna give them these
23 leaflets as well so they can forward emails, and so we're utilizing those suggestions but

1 I just don't want to leave it under the impression that I'm gonna go through and look for
2 these different churches or civic groups, cause I'm gonna miss somebody if we do it that
3 way. So we definitely are looking for y'all to help us on that end.

4 MS. JOYNER: Yeah, I would, I would say that the grassroots efforts with this
5 does work the best. And I think our job, too, as Planning Commissioners, is to go to our
6 organizations and our network of people and pass this stuff around cause, I mean, I've
7 sent out a chain email to some people that I knew and I had a couple people come. So
8 –

9 MS. LATOYA: Good, thank you.

10 MS. JOYNER: - I think it does work.

11 MS. HEGLER: And if you need more of these let us know. We can – and if you
12 will let us know places that you see that we should get to, we just can't, we just don't
13 know of that yet, so we're definitely asking for help with that.

14 MS. FRIERSON: And I will provide more information as well. And I appreciate it.
15 My last statement is, the information that you provided, and I apologize, I don't
16 remember your name.

17 MS. KING: Leann.

18 MS. FRIERSON: It was excellent, but might I please have a copy of that which
19 I'm seeing on the screen? Thank you.

20 MS. KING: Okay, so now we're gonna move on to the draft guiding principles.
21 And here we hope we can have a pretty dialogue with you again about where we see
22 the plan heading based on what we've learned today. So the real purpose of these
23 guiding principles; three-fold, we see them as being kind of upfront in the plan and, you

1 know, helping to communicate quickly what the, you know, what the focus of the plan is
2 and really what the, the guidance that the plan's gonna provide to the county over the
3 next 20 years is. It's gonna set the key principles for us to do the work with Staff to
4 develop the plan. And it's also weighted to kind of check products as we get through
5 this. It's kind of a common understanding between us and yourself in terms of how
6 we're gonna go about developing the goals and strategies for the plan. So how were
7 these generated? Well, there were many inputs. You may recall that we met with the
8 Planning Commission. We also met with Council at the beginning of the process, and
9 we learned from you all what you thought were the, kind of the big objectives for this
10 update and what you wanted to accomplish. We also had the public input from the April
11 meetings and the stakeholder meetings and the meeting with the county Staff, as well
12 as some of the technical analysis that we've been doing. So those were the main inputs.
13 And here, listed here in bulleted form are the 10 draft guiding principles, and what we're
14 gonna do is we're gonna go through each of them with you and give you a little
15 snapshot of kind of what we've learned and then what the questions are that we have
16 that we're hoping you can help us kind of answer and make sure we're on target. So
17 Greg Dale's gonna lead this discussion, I'll step back.

18 MR. DALE: Thanks, Leann. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. So the
19 way I would think about this is this is the direction that we think this plan is heading, but
20 before we start off in that direction we'd like to have a conversation with you to see if,
21 number one, you agree, and if not obviously we need to hear that, and number two, if
22 you can help us understand some of the nuances of these issues that we'll be putting
23 on the table. And I'll pull them up one at a time. So we've got 10 different guiding

1 principles. A couple of them, the first couple of them are really about balance and how
2 we achieve the right balance between certain things, which I'll explain. A couple of them
3 have to do with the need for perhaps improved coordination that I'll explain, and then we
4 get into some kind of substantive issues. We hope that we have time to get through all
5 10 of these with you today, but we did order them, not necessarily in priority but maybe
6 it would be accurate to describe them in terms of broadness, in a sense. So if we, if we
7 just get through the first five I think we'll have good guidance and, and hopefully get the
8 sense that these kind of get narrower and maybe a little bit straightforward, more
9 straightforward to think about as we go.

10 Alright, so let's pull the first one up, and that is the balance that's needed
11 between land planning and the protection of property rights. So what we'll do here is
12 you'll see there's two subheadings under these, which will be the same in each one.
13 What are we hearing, what we are hearing, and then what we want to learn from you.
14 So this is probably the most broad principle to deal with, and I will say to you that every
15 county and municipality in the country that have local land use planning and zoning is
16 trying to do this. We put this one first because we have had the sense that we've heard
17 this issue come up, perhaps more frequently than we hear it come up in other
18 communities, and that is as critical importance of, on the one hand providing guidance
19 for future growth, I mean, that is the, the inherent, you know, goal of land use planning
20 and zoning, and that is we're trying to guide future growth in a way that best promotes
21 the public, as lawyers will say, public, health, safety and welfare, but while also
22 protecting private property rights. And, and when you think about land use planning and
23 zoning there is always this tension, and I mean that in a positive way, between on the

1 one hand coming up with policies and regulations that advance the public interest, but
2 at the same time respect the private property rights of the people who own the
3 property and have an expectation that they're gonna be able to use their property in a,
4 in a reasonable way. So the key is to find the right balance. And I will tell you I've
5 worked in communities all over the country and finding that right balance is going to
6 vary from community to community. There is no equation, there is no, there is no
7 mathematic answer that's gonna come out of this question. So what we just wanna
8 understand, first of all is, are we hearing correctly in this county that there seems to be a
9 particular sensitivity to this challenge, this goal in trying to find this right balance
10 between public interest of the land use policies and ultimately your regulations and the
11 private property rights? And should this be a guiding principle for the, for the plan? And
12 if yes, how can the plan best do that? So we're just trying to understand the ins and
13 outs, the nuances of this issue a little bit. So I'd be appreciative if you could share some
14 of your thoughts about this.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes. Yes, very strong opinions about property rights in the
16 county. And an overall need of 50,000' regulations that do protect the safety and
17 wellbeing of the community, but that don't get as specific as what color shutters
18 someone can have on their house.

19 MR. DALE: That's actually a really interesting comment because you've kind of
20 framed up, you know, kinda the parameters there, that the idea of colors and so forth of
21 a house is clearly beyond the pale here, right? No one is going to accept that, but we
22 also have the desire to – so there's a lotta space in-between those two ends, so I'm
23 curious, are we dealing with things related to the kinds of regulations that control the –

1 and let me be clear because when I use the term 'regulations' I am kind of lumping
2 together the obvious idea that if you're going to be updating your land use element of
3 your Comprehensive Plan, the other half of your brain needs to be thinking about what
4 implications that has for your land use regulations. Now, we're not here to write your
5 zoning code, we're not here to update your land use regulations, but I think you all
6 understand they are part and parcel of the same set of issues. So when we talk about
7 land use policies, can you all share a little bit more? What is in-between that, that large
8 realm between, you know, colors of shutters and, and other things? I mean, are we
9 talking about density issues? Are we talking about site plan related issues? Are we
10 talking about the kinds of things that I heard you talking about earlier which have to do
11 with buffers and landscaping? Where, where does the rub come in in this community,
12 and if you can help amplify that a little bit in terms of this property rights balance issue.
13 What are the issues that –

14 MR. BROWN: I think one of the main concerns that I hear about is overcrowding.
15 And, and not properly planning, not just where people, you know, lot size and all of that
16 in neighborhoods, but how people get in and out of subdivisions, road design and so
17 forth so that you don't have congestion; similar to what we are seeing in certain areas of
18 the county right now. Those are issues and those are going to end up being even more
19 so as, as the county continues to develop.

20 MR. DALE: So those are, in your mind those are, those examples of those things
21 that are in that bucket of legitimate public concerns that we need to be trying to, you
22 know, on our scale of the public interest versus the property rights –

23 MR. BROWN: I think so.

1 MR. DALE: - and those are some of the things that are particularly important in
2 that public interest.

3 MR. BROWN: I think so. You can have too many subdivisions in one area and
4 you have narrow roads, two lane roads, main artery roads to the extent that people can't
5 get in and out of those subdivisions.

6 MR. DALE: Right.

7 MR. BROWN: You're planning for schools that then bring children into all of that
8 with buses and all the rest that impact on those neighborhoods, that frustrate people to
9 the extent that they're investment becomes less valuable for having moved into those
10 neighborhoods. And I think you have to look at those quality of life issues in the whole
11 planning process. We don't tend to get into that quite as much, we ask about traffic
12 counts and all of that and what the state highway department does and what have you,
13 but all of that needs to be included in what we are doing, if in fact we're gonna properly
14 plan for this county.

15 MR. TUTTLE: I think we have to be careful. I think our, our county's more diverse
16 than most counties and I think dependent upon where somebody spends most of their
17 time they would have a different view as to whether it should be more densely
18 developed or less densely developed. Certain areas of the county are already kinda set
19 up to be less densely developed on purpose. Other areas need to, you know, need to
20 be densified. You know, one of the, one of the tensions in planning is that you generally
21 don't improve roads for a need ahead of the need. I wish we always did, you know,
22 wouldn't that be great if we had six lane roads wherever we thought the growth was
23 gonna go? But they always, because of funding, etc., they have to wait until it becomes

1 a problem. So sometimes it's hard to, to look at that on its own because I don't think
2 we're ever gonna be in a situation where we're gonna have adequate roads to
3 significant development, because otherwise you would've already had the development
4 there. I think that's one of the precursors. So I just think we're a weird county in the fact
5 that we're so uniquely urban and uniquely rural.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think a lotta times people move into a community and
7 they expect there's to be the last home built.

8 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That after them it won't become any more congested, that
10 this – when I bought it wasn't like that. Well, that happens a lot and, you know, a lotta
11 things that are outside of our control affect us; where the water is, where's the sewer,
12 where the schools are going. Schools don't need our approval to build a school
13 anywhere. A lotta times what we see from the development community is reactive to
14 other outside sources that are pushing the developments in certain directions and they
15 have to go in those areas. I know that a lot of the areas where there is less congestion,
16 developers are waiting to get to those areas because they hear the same concerns of
17 the people, and they want to put developments out in those areas, but there's no water,
18 there's no sewer. So they can't do it, so they have to look at infill tracts along congested
19 roads that area already out there to service the population that wants to be out in that
20 area. Developers don't develop homes, they don't develop lots for people that don't buy
21 them. So if there wasn't a customer base for them to be in those areas then they
22 wouldn't be developing in those areas.

23 MR. DALE: Right.

1 MR. TUTTLE: But it's kind of a juxtaposition if you can imagine because you get
2 in a situation where you think the key is to reduce density, when in fact the solution may
3 be in certain areas to increase density where infrastructure is there and traffic patterns
4 are able to be disbursed, etc. So it just, you know, that's why I'm saying it's difficult
5 cause you, you can't just say we need to reduce density because you may need to do
6 that in some areas but in the CBDs there's probably a tremendous need to densify
7 because every, every bit of infrastructure is there and you really don't effect traffic, etc.,
8 and you might even lessen it. So it's, back to my earlier point, it's just kind of a
9 quandary.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

11 MR. BROWN: What I'm arguing for, and I understand what the both of you are
12 saying, we need more comprehensive planning and I don't think we have that. I think
13 we're planning for neighborhoods and subdivisions but we're not looking at the overall
14 plan and how the, the access to those neighborhoods and subdivisions, the – and I
15 think the Chairman raised a very important point there – having, like water and sewer
16 and all the rest of that out there, the impact that that's gonna have on our rivers and
17 streams and what have you. Making sure it's a comprehensive plan, not simply a spot
18 plan as I would see it; this subdivision as opposed to that subdivision as opposed to that
19 subdivision. But a more overall plan so that you have more balance to it so 20 years, 30
20 years down the road you're not looking back like we're, you know, I'm looking at – I'm
21 from California and someone said, well how did you plan Los Angeles? And a person
22 answered that and said, they tied a stick on a cow's tail and wherever he made a mark
23 they put a street. [Laughter] So they're in a subdivision.

1 MR. DALE: Well, that's actually good transition into the next point. Are there any,
2 is there anything else –

3 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah.

4 MR. DALE: - on the property rights? Yes?

5 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I would just offer that I feel, I mean, I've been sitting here
6 on the Planning Commission for a lotta years and have been through a comp plan once
7 before, and I feel that we as a county get stymied I think by truly doing anything that
8 really functions as a true comprehensive plan because of the adamant determination to
9 maintain property rights to everybody. And that any time we, you know, maybe even get
10 on the cusp of doing something that would truly be a comprehensive county-wide plan,
11 let alone considering the region, which of course is greater than the county, that we get
12 kneecapped because nobody is willing to do anything that would potentially degrade or,
13 or be alleged to have been able to degrade some property right of somebody else. And
14 so I, you know, I would just offer that I find that our success in planning is, is severely
15 impacted downward by the issue of retaining property rights. There isn't a, there isn't a
16 community sense of all in together, it's all, I just need to make sure that my property
17 rights are protected. So.

18 MR. DALE: So in your mind, not putting words in your mouth, that balance may
19 be tipping too far.

20 MS. CAIRNS: Oh, I think it has, always. I hope that, that there can be some
21 movement away from that, because I don't think that we've done a very job of trying. I
22 mean, we've got some great developments in Richland County. The location of some of
23 the developments though help exacerbate some of our problems. You know, so yeah, I

1 mean, we've got absolutely beautiful parts of the county, both the rural and urban and
2 suburban and stuff like that, absolutely. But it's, but the concept of a comprehensive
3 plan that doesn't create just crushing infrastructure problems, both in terms of
4 maintenance and creation.

5 MR. DALE: Well, and we're gonna talk about the infrastructure. That's a, that's a
6 specific one of our guiding principles, so.

7 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I guess one of the things, I don't know where in today's
8 discussion it might be most appropriate, I think it's a little bit outta spot right now, but
9 just last week I became more, or became aware of the ULI Midlands Realty Check. And
10 I'm curious how that work is, is being – will influence us, because I think that, you know,
11 they did a lot of great public input work and –

12 MR. DALE: Right.

13 MS. CAIRNS: - and, you know, I come from a background that the idea that we
14 should be planning regionally is absolute.

15 MR. DALE: Right.

16 MS. CAIRNS: You know, I know that we can only control what we can control.
17 And I know the issue of fee comes without any hesitation, but.

18 MR. DALE: Well, that's very helpful. If I could, if I could move forward because
19 three, three things that we've talked about here, each of which gets dealt with as a
20 separate issue. So on some of those thoughts, let's come back to those if we could,
21 because as you'll start to see these all start to link together. So let me put up this next
22 one. Okay, so Mr. Brown, your comment about the comprehensive nature of these I
23 think comes into play here, because one of the other guiding principles is to define a

1 clear vision for growth framework in Richland County. So what we're hearing, what's
2 behind that and what we're hearing is that the current land use plan is, is very vague.
3 Your categories of future land use in your current plan are very broad categories,
4 especially when you compare it to other, other counties, other communities around the
5 country. And so the new plan should balance the need to provide more clarity about the
6 strategy for future growth and conservation and yet remain flexible to changing
7 conditions. Updating the county zoning ordinance to reflect the new plan is also
8 important. And we just wanted to put that in there because it doesn't, honestly it doesn't
9 make sense in the long run to be only thinking about your land use if you're not also
10 able to think about how you implement that land use plan through the, through the
11 zoning ordinance. So similar question, should this be a guiding principle? If yes, what is
12 the appropriate level of specificity? So your plan now, Tracy, has what, four, three or
13 four broad land use – is it just two? I thought there were a couple of other – yeah, three
14 – three broad land use categories and on the other end of the extreme is something that
15 in some communities looks like your zoning code, 25 levels of categories, which is
16 gonna be too much for you. So the question is, is, whatever we end up with here in
17 terms of what the future best land use pattern and relationships are, the question really
18 becomes, how best do we communicate that to the public in such a way that they – and
19 this is, you know, residents, landowners, developers, everybody in this whole spectrum
20 of people that might use your plan – so that they can look at it and have a little better
21 sense of, what is this county trying to achieve with this plan? What is the vision? What is
22 the future land use pattern that you're talking about here? What does really make
23 sense? But is not at such a high level of specificity that it starts trying to act like a zoning

1 ordinance. And also, and this is the other implication of having very specific land use
2 plans is they tend to be out of date within a couple of years, right? Because
3 circumstances do change. So I think the question we're putting out there, and again this
4 is not an easy answer, but, but the question we're putting out there is, what is that sweet
5 spot between specificity and, and generalities? And, and what is going to be a good fit
6 here to help you start to wrestle with some of these issues? Thoughts on that? Is
7 anybody surprised to hear that people think it is too vague or is that something you all
8 have sensed for a long time? Okay, I see some heads nodding, so.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, yeah, I think what we've heard constantly for a
10 while now is, you know, at least from the people that own the property and are trying to
11 sell the property or trying to do something with their property, trying to figure out what
12 they can do with their property, or even the development community is, give us black
13 and whites, let us evaluate a site. What causes problems is when somebody gets into a
14 project and then three or four months down the road there's something else that
15 changes on it that they hadn't planned on, that's what causes problems. If you can
16 evaluate a site early on and put it through your modeling and know whether or not it'll
17 work or not there's, there's really no hiccup between the community and the, and the
18 development side. Because if that site doesn't work, if it's close you can, you can
19 maybe talk to the community and see if there's a compromise that'll work, but if the
20 numbers are so far out of whack you just move on to the next site and see if you can
21 figure out something to work on it. Nobody wants to work on projects where they have
22 arguments on them.

1 MR. DALE: Right. And I've heard, I've heard the development community, and I
2 use that term very broadly of course, I've heard the development community
3 representative say in effect, we don't mind the regulations, we don't mind the policies,
4 we just want to know what they are going in. What we don't like is surprises.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Here's the hard part with the regulations, and I've heard
6 that same thing. But when you throw major regulation changes down, like for example a
7 sign ordinance where you go from pylon signage to monument signage, in theory over
8 the next 30 years everyone will have monument signs.

9 MR. DALE: Right.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But it makes the playing field so uneven between the
11 current structures that are out there and the ones that need to be built that people will
12 try every single way they can to find out the stuff to make something work that's
13 currently out there as opposed to building new. And then some folks need to have new
14 for their product that's needed in the area and they're completely outmatched through
15 signage, which people don't understand until they come to a community where they
16 don't know anyone and they try to find something and you have monument signage – I
17 used this example when we did the first one probably eight years ago – was that I'll give
18 you \$100 if you can go, and I used this at the time which it isn't around anymore, I said,
19 if you can go into Hilton Head and find me a Blockbuster within 30 minutes, I'll give you
20 \$100 bucks. Now Blockbuster's not around anymore, but probably because of the
21 signage in Hilton Head. [Laughter] But, but to the point we're such a commuter, we're
22 such a commuter community with the state government, with the university, the Fort,
23 everything we've got where people come into the town and they need to find things, I

1 mean, that's just one issue is the signage. So when you take drastic changes like that
2 and you just say, okay all new development, now it needs to have a 5' monument sign
3 that's no more than 4' off the ground, it's just, it just makes the sites uncomparable.

4 MR. DALE: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: When you're looking to develop a site.

6 MR. DALE: Right, I've heard that subscribed, the analogy I've used is that we're
7 a really big ship and really big ships don't turn very fast. Right? And so the implication of
8 that is, is that you have certain regulations, you have certain policies and if those get
9 changed too quickly, too drastically, the question is the fairness to the next person and
10 who all of a sudden has to be the pioneer on the ground sign when everybody else has
11 a pylon sign. But on the other hand I also had a, an old attorney I used to work with, he
12 said, communities have the right to get smarter as they get older, just like people do. So
13 you can change things. I think part of the implication is, is that we can't send too much
14 of a shock to the system. But, but back to this, this basic question of – and again, I'm
15 not asking you necessarily to answer it now, we're just trying to get a little bit of
16 guidance as to what, you know, if we move from three very, very broad categories into
17 something that is more granular, more fine-tuned, does that make sense, first of all. Is,
18 do we agree that what we have right now is not providing the guidance that, that folks
19 need? We do need some better way to communicate this desire. Okay, I see some
20 heads nodding on that.

21 MR. THEUS: I would like to see some examples, your more granular – is that, a
22 lot of these questions are so hairy, I mean, such as the property rights deal.

23 MR. DALE: Right.

1 MR. THEUS: I mean, by working through some examples you might be able to
2 get some more consensus and discussion out of it.

3 MR. DALE: No, that's a very good idea. I think that would be a good idea to put
4 some specific examples out there. In fact, we're, we're actually meeting at Staff level
5 tomorrow with a, with a big map just to start to think through some of these questions.
6 So Tracy, after coming out of that meeting I think it might make a lot of sense to say,
7 hey here's, based on what we talked about here's three or four examples of
8 communities and how they've, how they've done this. I think that would be helpful.

9 MR. TUTTLE: And, you know, to use what you said earlier, if, if 28's on the high
10 end and three's on the low end, my perception would be six or seven might be – not
11 understanding the specifics – might be comfortable as clearly not 22.

12 MR. THEUS: I don't know how you can get 28.

13 MR. DALE: Right. Well, I use that just as an example cause you probably got
14 about that many zoning districts.

15 MR. THEUS: Yeah.

16 MR. DALE: So if you think about the zoning – think about it this way, the, you
17 know, you've got the zoning map and the zoning text, which is the law, right? What we
18 need to find is what is the policy that allows you to engage in that zoning? So there is
19 land use map and land use policy. So the analogy is, the land use map is the longer
20 range, broad visionary version of what the zoning map ends up communicating in the
21 law. So that's why I use that example is, is the zoning map is going to be the most
22 specific. You have four or five single family zoning categories. You have three multi-
23 family zoning categories. You have three commercial categories, three industrial

1 categories. You know, you probably don't need that many for land use, but the land use
2 needs to inform that zoning, so there has to be some relationship between the two, if
3 that makes sense. Okay, well let's move on and I think this gets back to the question
4 that I think you were just asking. So this principle, foster the Midlands regional growth
5 vision in Richland County, we're putting this out there because we seem to be hearing
6 from people that some of the things that came out of that ULI reality check process,
7 which was obviously for the whole region, seems to be resonating with, with people
8 here; particularly this idea of what's - it's a real planning geek term – this multi-nodal. So
9 when you look at what ULI reality check did, you know, they engaged a whole lotta
10 people in these workshops and they come up with, I think it was four different kinda
11 future land use patterns. One was the kinda disbursed pattern, which is, let's just,
12 whatever growth we're gonna have let's just kinda disburse it around, around the region.
13 The second one was the corridor pattern, which is, let's try to direct growth in these
14 different corridors. The third one is really more the opposite of the disbursed, which is a
15 compact urban, we want, you know, as much as possible we want growth to stay in and
16 around the existing urban area. And then the fourth one was this thing called multi-
17 centered. And if this is not, if this is all news to you then we probably need to make
18 arrangements to get you some background so you can see this. But what the multi-
19 center is, is honestly when you look at it and you look at it closely it's kind of in-between
20 the disbursed and the compact urban. Basically what it's saying is, we want as much of
21 our growth as possible to occur in and around the existing growth areas, in and around
22 existing municipalities and/or in and around where existing infrastructure exists. That's
23 what we would like to try to direct growth to, primarily in those well-defined cluster kinda

1 areas, as opposed to, I hesitate to use the word 'sprawl' because it's so loaded to a lotta
2 people, but I think that disbursed pattern was essentially a sprawl pattern which was
3 one of the models they put out there.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Isn't that what occurs naturally, though, in the market? I
5 mean, when a retailer looks to come to the market, they don't want to build a Bi-Lo
6 grocery store out in the middle of, you know, the woods somewhere. They go to where
7 those nodes are currently at.

8 MR. DALE: I think that's probably true more for commercial than it is for
9 residential. I think that's probably right, I think residential –

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think residential is driven by water and sewer.

11 MR. DALE: What's that?

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Residential's driven by water and sewer.

13 MR. DALE: Right, and certainly one of our other policies, I think the next one is
14 dealing with exactly that issue.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Pools have gotta water too.

16 MR. THEUS: Schools, water and sewer.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, yeah.

18 MR. DALE: But schools are also, and that's a good example and I'm not trying to
19 pick on schools, but schools are also a, you know, a good example of where often the
20 choices that are made as to where a school property is, is driven, certainly by sewer
21 and water, but it's also driven by land cost and land availability. And one of the things
22 we have seen in other parts of the country is, you know, the plan may direct growth this
23 way and the school is, is built somewhere else and that changes. So that, that next

1 principle we're gonna talk about, which is infrastructure, is in fact one of those. And Mr.
2 Chairman, if you're saying that's kind of consistent with the market anyway, then, you
3 know, it may be that that's, you know, that's, that's – what we're saying is that, that one
4 of the values of this plan, one of the policies of this plan would be to reflect that.

5 MS. CAIRNS: I'm just – a couple of thoughts. One is, having seen a presentation
6 about the reality check, although not having participated, is it was my take that, like
7 basically the identified nodes weren't to be determined, that basically we were, that the
8 – what the ULI ended up with was that we should use our existing already dense areas
9 and –

10 MR. DALE: Right.

11 MS. CAIRNS: - work around them, not create more nodes.

12 MR. DALE: That's correct.

13 MS. CAIRNS: You know, but that it, you know, should the, the nodes in essence
14 they already exist.

15 MR. DALE: Right, the existing, the existing communities, the existing
16 concentration [inaudible] those that are there.

17 MS. CAIRNS: You know, I was just thinking, though, about the, the tension I think
18 that just exists, naturally, in our whatever is that, I think if you took what, how Richland
19 County has grown the last 20 years and polled us Commission Members you would get
20 vastly different answers as to whether it's been done well or not. You know, so I mean,
21 we even just start from, you know, has, you know, has the growth that we've done and
22 the patterns that we've used, are they good? I don't think we'd even agree on that,

1 whether they are or not. You know, so it's sort of, you know, so, do you wanna, you
2 know – I just think that's sort of an interesting even start point.

3 MR. DALE: Well, I guess what I take from that, and again, I'm, I do this – I'm not
4 trying to put words in your mouth, I wanna make sure I'm hearing correctly – I guess
5 what I take from that is the sense that we might all agree on these principles but have
6 very different images as to what they actually mean.

7 MS. CAIRNS: Oh, well that's a given.

8 MR. DALE: Okay, well –

9 MS. CAIRNS: I think we all see that one. Yeah, I think in whatever the issues are,
10 when you go from principles to application of fact, that's typically where your divergence
11 is occurring.

12 MR. DALE: Fair enough. And that's why we have to start somewhere. And so we
13 start with these principles and then we see if we can try to, you know, make them more
14 specific as they need to be and see if we can get some sense of, of concurrence and
15 consensus on it.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think before I would agree with that I'd need to see what
17 the ULI reality check says, cause I've never seen it.

18 MR. DALE: Okay.

19 MR. TUTTLE: Google ulirealitycheck.com. And you can review it.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I'm not doing it now.

21 MS. CAIRNS: Well, one of the, I mean, the talk that I heard last week was
22 actually the, the, one of the things that came out of the ULI reality check for the
23 Midlands was that they have a speaker's panel now that's going out trying to educate

1 the public in the region about what came out of that and what the next steps are for that.
2 So, I mean, I don't know if we, you know, I mean, I think that we could ask them to
3 come present to us what that was. And I think that might be really helpful.

4 MS. JOYNER: I, I would like that because I don't, I was involved with the ULI
5 Midlands reality check and I don't feel like there's a connection there with them and us.

6 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, that's one way to put it.

7 MS. JOYNER: Yeah. So I feel like it would be good for them to come present to
8 us about, you know, what they're doing now, after they gathered all that data.

9 MR. DALE: And I see Tracy writing this down, obviously. We, you know, we have
10 material that we can send you. I mean, we didn't do it but, you know, there are
11 PowerPoint presentations and I think there's some, even some videos on YouTube. But
12 I think if you wanted to devote some time on your Agenda to having that discussion so
13 you can talk to them and ask questions that would be an excellent way to understand
14 this point.

15 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, I think they definitely would.

16 MR. DALE: Okay. Alright, well let's move on. Cause this was, this was suggested
17 earlier as well and that is the importance of coordinating land use planning and
18 infrastructure. So what we're hearing, infrastructure drives growth, making sure the plan
19 is aligned with future infrastructure plan is essential for the success of the plan,
20 coordinating with multiple utility entities operating in Richland County is important. So I
21 think we heard this, this is an important guiding principle and the question is, how do we
22 best do that? So I think we all know what we're talking about, you know, the old
23 planning saying, growth follows the pipe, the decisions that are made about utilities,

1 sewer and water in particular, but you could also put road infrastructure in there
2 certainly and you can put, you know, school facilities in there. But that this coordination,
3 I have the sense from, you know, my limited knowledge of the situation that this issue,
4 this relationship between land use planning and infrastructure is probably, is one of the
5 most important things to get right here. Is that agreed?

6 MR. THEUS: Yes, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yep.

8 MR. DALE: This issue of the timing is important also because we didn't really
9 write that in here, but having had that discussion I wonder if maybe we need to expand
10 this a little bit. Because one of the things I heard you all suggest is ideally infrastructure
11 before or at the time of development, not after the fact. Not – trying to be more proactive
12 with the infrastructure planning and land use planning and less reactive in terms of
13 trying to provide the infrastructure to catch up to the growth, is that an accurate sense?

14 MR. THEUS: Sure, but that's a budgetary issue.

15 MR. DALE: Right.

16 MR. BROWN: It is, but it is –

17 MR. THEUS: The roads don't get built until there's such an upswell of –

18 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

19 MR. THEUS: - people raising cane that the roads get built. That's how everything
20 gets done.

21 MR. DALE: Yeah.

22 MR. THEUS: You know, we'd love to see it in Utopia, it would be, like Pat said,
23 be built out in front of us.

1 MR. TUTTLE: The problems that we have in Richland County is that you, other
2 than in small segments the county doesn't control the water and sewer.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

4 MR. TUTTLE: You know, so we're having to get a third party, whether it be the
5 city or private entities to, to go along with this vision. They may have a very different
6 view, and that's, you know, I applaud that the city's going through the process at the
7 same times cause that'll be key but, you know, that's one of the tough things. I think the
8 county is starting to delve into getting in the sewer business in southeast Columbia, but
9 you know, other than that, we don't have any control over, over those things.

10 MR. BROWN: But I think that it's important to put it on the table and to push it
11 because if we don't put it on the table, we don't push it, the city's gonna remain reactive
12 with all the issues that they may have. Our state, the way that we're so interconnected
13 between our state government, our county government and our municipalities, they all
14 three have to be involved in this. And at some point they're gonna have to come
15 together and agree on a plan, and we know that – we're talking about expensive
16 projects and we're also talking about reaction, there's no question about that. But at
17 some point we're gonna have, somebody's gonna have to push being proactive, cause
18 if we don't push that we're never gonna get there and then we're gonna end up with the
19 same mess that they have in other great municipal areas.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. We don't even control a lot of the roads. Curb cuts.

21 MR. BROWN: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: You know, I'm thinking about a specific example of a
23 neighborhood where I know specifically we approved shared driveways for, for homes

1 that were on a, a main, not a main road but a large state road. You drive back down
2 there four months later, but everybody's got their own cut. And I say, how did this
3 happen? It's not a county road, it's a state road.

4 MR. DALE: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So everything looks good on paper, but when you don't
6 control the roads, you don't control the water, you don't control the sewer, you don't
7 control the schools, all we control is zoning. And the development regulations that are
8 on those parcels that are county and that aren't city, that are not Forest Acres, it's not
9 Fort Jackson, you know, so we, we seem like we have a big stick but we don't.

10 MR. DALE: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And we're expected to have a big stick but we don't.

12 MR. DALE: Right. I understand. Okay.

13 MR. THEUS: Other than to think consequently, true planning is difficult to effect.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, when, when, you know, when you're trying to do,
15 when we're trying to do it for the county and then the city does their own thing, Forest
16 Acres does their own thing, Fort Jackson can do what they wanna do, I mean, any
17 outlying area and all these other parties can do what they wanna do, and nobody talks
18 to each other and honestly, they don't care what each other does, Richland County's
19 gonna do what they wanna do, City of Columbia's gonna do what they wanna do.

20 MR. THEUS: The city gets a site and runs a 4' water line out -

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

22 MR. THEUS: - across the northern part of the county cause they think Google's
23 coming or whatever.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

2 MR. DALE: Not to make this sound like it's simple, but I do wanna put this next
3 one up because that's, that's the other, the next principle that we think is so important is
4 this coordination with the other jurisdictions; obviously Columbia being the largest one.
5 And as you are aware we are working with Columbia and the Staff here is coordinating
6 with their Staff to try to make these two plans better coordinated with each other. But,
7 you know, what we are hearing is about these edge areas. And, and let me, let me just
8 explore this a little bit because I wanna make sure we're on the same page here and
9 make sure we understand. So the county has land use planning jurisdiction throughout
10 the county, including in the municipalities. Well, they don't have zoning jurisdiction but
11 your current plan covers those municipalities. Tracy, that's right, isn't it?

12 MS. HEGLER: Yes.

13 MR. THEUS: What do you mean by that?

14 MS. HEGLER: We [inaudible] land use effort, but we don't control the zoning.

15 MR. DALE: Right, that's the point, you have colors on the map, your county plan
16 shows colors on the map within the municipalities, right, but you don't have zoning
17 jurisdiction over it. And where I'm headed with this is probably where you are, and that
18 is since the municipalities have that zoning jurisdiction, the presumption is they're going
19 to engage in the land use planning in their communities, right? That's their
20 responsibility. Where I'm headed with all of this is what happens outside their
21 boundaries, around the edges? That that's where the coordination is particularly
22 important is in those, those kind of transition areas between the municipalities and the
23 unincorporated – the rest of the unincorporated areas. So, so the question again is, is,

1 should this be a guiding principle and, and do you support incorporating the existing
2 plans of communities into the county plan in shaping the county's edge areas in a way
3 that supports the plans of the existing communities? That's kind of a mouthful but I think
4 you get the idea that the presumption is that the communities, the municipalities are
5 gonna, are responsible for the land use planning within their municipalities since they
6 have the zoning controls, but these edge areas are important in terms of coordinating as
7 well. Do you agree with that? And what are the nuances of, of that?

8 MR. THEUS: Well, we've had a couple, we've had a couple of towns kinda get off
9 the ranch on us with some of their land use plans, so if I were an adjacent property
10 owner –

11 MR. DALE: Right.

12 MR. THEUS: - I would be concerned.

13 MR. DALE: In the, in unincorporated county.

14 MR. THEUS: Right.

15 MR. DALE: Right.

16 MR. THEUS: I mean, I don't know where Blythewood is right now, for example,
17 but they've been, they've done some, in my opinion they had some pretty crazy stuff
18 going on there for a while. If I owned a piece of land adjacent to Blythewood that would
19 worry me.

20 MR. DALE: Right. So, and I guess that gets at the question that we're trying to
21 understand here. What responsibility does this plan, through you as the Planning
22 Commission looking at a plan, have for that kind of situation?

1 MR. TUTTLE: Well, it's real interesting because to go backwards, you know, they
2 have roads, infrastructure, water, sewer, you know, greatly underutilized intersection,
3 etc., but they don't want density whatsoever. So the city has water there and
4 everybody's made plans for that to be a growth node, but because we don't control the
5 city limits of Blythewood it won't be. And I'm not commenting whether that's good or
6 bad, but that just shows you that you can have a good perspective and try to do what's
7 right, but then if you don't control the whole thing you just lose out.

8 MR. DALE: Okay. And are you talking about the edges around all the
9 municipalities?

10 MR. THEUS: But you don't know who's gonna take over a municipality two or
11 three years from now, how their plans may change over time. Then you're subject to
12 their plan in effect.

13 MR. TUTTLE: That's probably the most glaring –

14 MR. THEUS: Yeah.

15 MR. TUTTLE: - current example I would think.

16 MR. DALE: So I'm curious, your reaction when I – Mr. Chairman, as you were
17 leaving the room I said the, my understanding is the county plan technically covers the
18 municipalities. I mean, there are, you know, they are colored on the map as if you are
19 planning for them, and yet those municipalities have their own plans and they have the
20 zoning jurisdiction. So I guess the question I'm trying to get a sense of, is what
21 responsibility do we, do you feel like we have within those municipalities and then the
22 edges around those municipalities? That's where I'm trying to get a, a sense of –

1 MS. CAIRNS: Well, I mean, it was, it's always been my understanding that we
2 don't have any, you know, and that basically a lot of the property owners will
3 sometimes, you know, the ones that are right on borders can sort of play the two, like
4 City of Columbia and Richland County, off each other.

5 MR. DALE: Right.

6 MS. CAIRNS: And sometimes annex in to grab at an ordinance that Columbia
7 allows that Richland County doesn't so there's some gamesmanship cause of our
8 annexation laws.

9 MR. DALE: Yeah, we call that jurisdiction shopping.

10 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. But, I mean, I, you know, our annexation laws are, have
11 created chaos if you ask me.

12 MR. DALE: Right.

13 MS. CAIRNS: And through the piecemeal annexation that's gone on.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think you'd have to, of course, talk to the
15 Councilmembers who's County Council District is completely engulfed by the City of
16 Columbia and ask their opinion of that. But I would think it would may be a good idea for
17 us to take those areas out of our planning map so the general public will see that while
18 we have a plan for this area – you know, they take a look at this and they say, oh this all
19 looks great. Well, really step back and take a look at what we have the ability to control
20 here. And I think while the City is in Richland County if our plan plays no role into their
21 thinking they, they are an independent body that does their own work, it'll greatly cut
22 down on what we have to do. And if it's not being used – it'll give the citizens of

1 unincorporated Richland County a better idea of what we can and can't do as opposed
2 to thinking that we control the whole county when we don't.

3 MR. DALE: Yeah. And I understand, I understand that. I will just share with you
4 based on, on experiences we've had in other parts of the country, the other side of that
5 coin that we will hear people say is that that puts us in a position where we're kinda
6 planning in a vacuum without really understanding what that context is there, so.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: If, if there were some cooperation between these bodies
8 in Richland County, historically, I would understand where you're coming from.

9 MR. DALE: Right.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But acting like you're not in a vacuum doesn't not put you
11 in a vacuum.

12 MR. DALE: Yeah. I understand.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We are in a vacuum. We need to plan like we're in a
14 vacuum. We, we don't get any cooperation or conversation back and forth between the
15 two, and if we do – I remember when we first had that development that Cliff was doing
16 out there in Blythewood where for some reason all of a sudden Blythewood wants to
17 come to the table and say, let's talk about what goes on between our borders and that
18 kinda stuff. Because there was a project they didn't like that was right next door to them.

19 MR. DALE: Right.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So, but that's the only time that it occurs and that's the
21 only, so –

22 MR. TUTTLE: Well, and ultimately, I mean, if the city's controlling the majority of
23 the water and sewer, they're gonna really control where the growth goes in the county.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: They're gonna tell us where it goes anyhow.

2 MR. TUTTLE: Even if they're not involved anyway. I mean.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We can give them our wish list of what we, we would like
4 to see. I mean, it's the same thing with the annexation plan that sometimes, you know,
5 there's been floated, let's send down an annexation plan to the City of Columbia that
6 says, hey let's fill in these Swiss cheese holes that we've got. The city has no desire to
7 take some of that stuff, so they don't. They don't have to.

8 MR. DALE: Right. Tracy, you were gonna –

9 MS. HEGLER: Well, no, I mean, I guess what I'm kinda hoping that this is a point
10 at which we can move forward with something different, that this is an opportunity to
11 coordinate. And do more than just put in our plan, identify that they have one, let's
12 actually maybe build in – the option is we could build in, we could do what you've
13 suggested Mr. Palmer, which is just to take it out all together and make it like a, a gray
14 hole. But we could also maybe build in their plans and attempt to merge, especially
15 around the edges, so there's some meaningful collaboration. But, I mean, I think that we
16 have an opportunity to get ahead of what the city does wanna do and be a part of it and
17 incorporate it into our plans. And we're doing that by way of actually working on them
18 together. But even with the other municipalities they are, they are engaged in what
19 we're doing right now. They know we're doing this, we're having, you know,
20 conversations. So would it be your desire to actually fold their plans in more so than just
21 reference them or block them out all together, and then make sure that we make sense
22 at the edges? I mean, it's just a, I think it's an opportunity, or, or not. And we may get

1 into that and realize that you're right, the history is still so deep and so embedded that
2 we'll never get beyond that, but.

3 MR. DALE: But, you know, while you're thinking about that answer, let me just
4 throw out that this is not a hopeless situation in that other communities in the country
5 have dealt with – there are tools out there, there are things like agreeing to notify each
6 other if you're building something of a certain magnitude within a certain distance of the
7 border. There are communities, including in South Carolina, where a county and a city,
8 two cities actually, two municipalities, actually entered into a written Memorandum of
9 Agreement as to how they're going to handle some of these cross border issues. So,
10 you know, it's not outside the realm of possibility to think about, hey if we could, if we
11 could do a better coordination on these three or four things, is to develop policies, you
12 know, this is the opportune time while both communities are working on the same thing.
13 There may be, you know, the city's perspective on that would be, gee if we could only
14 do this with the county, you know, so there are, I just would put out there I wouldn't right
15 off this idea that we can't ever do anything about this cooperation. There are tools, there
16 are policies, there are things that communities have agreed to as being in both of their
17 best interests to, to explore.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, ma'am?

19 MS. FRIERSON: Being very, very new to the Commission, I like what you said
20 and I hear what you're saying in terms of what has been the reality and what has
21 happened in the past. But I would like for us to move it the direction that you just
22 mentioned and you just mentioned in terms of, let's look at this as an opportunity
23 whereby we might be cooperative. And instead of just saying it with our mouths, maybe

1 we can plan some type of forum, luncheon, dinner, something whereby we can get
2 some of these issues on the table about what has happened in the past and see if there
3 is a willingness to move forward where we are intentionally more cooperative in terms of
4 what we can do. And you mentioned some tools and resources that other areas or
5 entities have used. I'd like to, not necessarily at this meeting, have as resources some
6 of those tools, and more training so that we can help come together.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: My personal opinion is you need to get the
8 Councilmembers in that discussion. We, we don't make the policy.

9 MR. DALE: Right.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: If, if they want Planning Commissions to cooperate
11 together they can certainly go down that path, but as for now we don't, you know, just
12 because – even if our Planning Commission and the City of Columbia, if we all sat
13 around and we came up with the same exact plan, that doesn't mean that's what
14 Council's gonna approve or would approve or would even care to approve.

15 MR. DALE: No, I understand that. Ideally what you would have is the City Council
16 saying the same thing to their Planning Commissioners.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's right.

18 MR. DALE: Right.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Y'all work with each other.

20 MR. DALE: I, I agree with you that if this is a, a change in policy that that's
21 something that is ultimately gonna have to be reflected in the legislative boards.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

1 MR. DALE: Ideas about that, okay. Okay. Well, let's keep moving. Mr. Chairman,
2 in terms of time are we doing okay here?

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: How much more do you think you have?

4 MR. DALE: What number are we on? I think we're about halfway through, and I
5 think the next five are not gonna be as challenging.

6 MS. HEGLER: We loaded them heavy on the front end.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Is everybody good till about 3:00?

8 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Alright.

10 MR. DALE: Okay, so the next one is Promote Investment in Existing
11 Communities and Take Advantage of Redevelopment Opportunities. I hear a lot that
12 there are many areas that are experiencing dis-investment and are in need of
13 redevelopment and revitalization. Doesn't mean no more new green field development,
14 but that redevelopment should be a focus. Again, agree, disagree? How should this
15 plan address redevelopment? So you have growth occurring in green field areas but
16 you also have dis-investment occurring in other areas. Not suggesting this is an easy
17 economic issue to solve, but just as a policy is there agreement that we'd like to try to
18 do this?

19 MS. JOYNER: I just have a question, kind of going back to what we talked about
20 at the beginning. How are we laying out the plan? Like how is it gonna be organized?

21 MR. DALE: You mean what is the, the, literally the graphic representation of it?

22 MS. JOYNER: Yes.

23 MR. DALE: What it'll look like? That, that is the, that was the second question.

1 MS. JOYNER: Okay.

2 MR. DALE: And the short answer is, we don't know, we're gonna start that
3 discussion with Staff in the morning, literally drawing lines on a map. We've got some
4 ideas that would, that would, that we'd like to share, but I think that's what we need to
5 come back with you with is a proposal that, you know, let's not get into details but you
6 have a map that's gonna look like these, these are the categories that it's gonna have.
7 That would be, I think, a future discussion.

8 MS. HEGLER: But it is literally a map, it's a future land use map.

9 MS. JOYNER: So it's gonna be categorized by land use, the whole
10 Comprehensive Plan will.

11 MS. HEGLER: Just, we're only updating the future land use element of the
12 Comprehensive Plan.

13 MS. JOYNER: Okay, okay. Okay.

14 MR. DALE: But the question is how you define that land use.

15 MS. JOYNER: Right.

16 MR. DALE: So what we see are a lotta communities trying to get away from the
17 traditional three kinds of single-family, four kinds of multi-family, and –

18 MS. JOYNER: Okay.

19 MR. DALE: - describe things differently.

20 MS. JOYNER: Okay.

21 MR. DALE: Okay?

22 MR. TUTTLE: So for instance, we've had this discussion at the roundtables
23 before, what are the quivers that the county has to, to incentive redevelopment? I mean,

1 that sounds great as a, as a big idea, but what would those things be; an expedited
2 review, a –

3 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, it's a number of things, but of course that, that would have
4 to translate in the Land Development Code. But we could certainly now through the map
5 and through some goals and priorities that this is what we want to do, and then suggest,
6 make suggestions for it.

7 MR. TUTTLE: I just remember back when we were –

8 MS. HEGLER: Yeah.

9 MR. TUTTLE: - talking about some of the things, we, we thought the arsenal was
10 this big and we found out that it was really much smaller. And I think that would have a
11 bearing on whether I thought this was a good idea or not.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

13 MR. TUTTLE: It depends on what the incentives are.

14 MR. DALE: Well, the one thing, you know, there's a lot of ways that communities
15 have tried to deal with this. The, probably the first thing you hear most often is, is get out
16 of the way. In other words stop making what you might consider to be quality infill
17 redevelopment illegal. Mr. Chairman, you were talking earlier and I think in the previous
18 meeting about the desire, the changing demographics towards smaller lots.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

20 MR. DALE: And in a lotta cases what you see in communities is you go in and
21 you do the policy stuff through the planning and you realize, hey there are certain areas
22 where developers might want to invest in higher density, mixed use patterns in this
23 area, but you can't do it. It's not zoned for that, it's not permitted. So in a lotta ways it's

1 removing barriers to, to this. A lotta communities unintentionally are preventing the very
2 thing happening that they wanna have happen in some of these areas.

3 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I think one of the, just enormous elements that's very
4 difficult to work with but can't be ignored is Bull Street. And I mean, if the City of
5 Columbia gets Bull Street moving, when we look at the amount of growth that's gonna
6 occur in Richland County, a lot of it could be absorbed just in Bull Street. You know, so
7 that's –

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's if people wanna live in a downtown environment
9 though.

10 MR. DALE: Right.

11 MS. CAIRNS: The, the statistics and information are showing that the younger
12 population wants to live in the urban areas in downtown. So, I mean, we've got, I mean,
13 that's just, I mean, I don't know what we do about it because it's this, I mean, I loved it
14 when he put the graphic up and showed that Bull Street's as big as all of the Peninsula
15 of Charleston.

16 MR. DALE: Yeah.

17 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, that's an enormous tract of land.

18 MR. DALE: Right.

19 MS. CAIRNS: That may go into all kinds of development that would absorb a lot
20 of the future growth that needs to occur.

21 MR. DALE: Well, that's an interesting question. And honestly –

22 MR. TUTTLE: Somebody's gonna have to pay for it, that's all.

1 MR. DALE: - as a professional planner I have to tell you that right now with all the
2 – for a lotta reasons we're talking about, like the aging baby boomers, changing in
3 demographics, changing in tastes, you know, our children's generation the millennials –
4 I think those kinds of things are harder to predict now than they've ever been. I'm not
5 convinced that that is going to absorb growth that otherwise would've gone into a green
6 field suburban category. I'm not so sure that that's not creating new demand that
7 doesn't necessarily exist on the forecast, so. I understand what you're saying. And the
8 magnitude of it is such that you could theoretically probably have enough land to
9 support, you know, 20 years' worth of forecasted growth or something. But, I guess my
10 point is, I wouldn't let that prevent you from still doing what you think is best for some of
11 these other areas that need reinvestment.

12 MR. THEUS: Yeah, I suppose that, the way I feel about it is I'm all for
13 redevelopment but it's a, not to the exclusion of green field development.

14 MS. JOYNER: Um-hum (affirmative).

15 MR. THEUS: It's very, very difficult. Even with people working with you. You got
16 multiple property owners usually, you run into easement issues, use issues, covenants.
17 And then you got, then when you, then you got it all T'd up and you go to rezone it, say
18 it's retail and you wanna rezone it to high density residential, then all of a sudden the
19 neighbors show up at a Council meeting and don't want it for whatever reason cause
20 they just don't like change and you don't, and the Council doesn't have the political will
21 to change the zoning.

22 MR. DALE: Right.

1 MR. THEUS: So to have it as a primary tool for supply for future growth is, I think,
2 a little ambitious.

3 MR. DALE: Well, okay. And let me, and that's actually not what we were
4 suggesting, so that's a good refinement, let me make sure that we're on the same page.
5 So the idea of wanting to encourage redevelopment opportunities, reinvestment areas
6 and those areas that've been achieving dis-investment, what we're not saying is to
7 artificially constrain the green field market to try to force them into there.

8 MR. THEUS: Yeah.

9 MR. DALE: Right? What we're really more talking about are things that might
10 incentive it or remove the barriers from it happening.

11 MR. THEUS: That's good.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And that's, I know a prime example of an infill multi-family
13 project that was T'd up and was, came before Council, some of the Council
14 subcommittees to try to get some economic incentives to incentivize these folks to come
15 into an infill project where there is more competition, instead of going further out, getting
16 a new project out and there's less competition. Well, there's more competition yes, but
17 the infrastructure's in there and I was told at the time, we don't give tax incentives
18 unless it's job creation. So these folks went further out, because I was trying everything
19 I could to figure out a way to, to use some of the infill property and all things being
20 equal, if the development standards are the same for this piece and for this piece, it's
21 gonna cost you more to figure out how to get that proverbial square peg in a round hole
22 here, as opposed to going out and getting exactly what you want over here.

1 MR. DALE: Right. No, I understand. And that's the thing about infill is there is
2 this, this idea that because the infrastructure's there it's easier to do. But there are lots
3 of other reasons why it's not easier to do, not the least of which is, is the, you know, the
4 old saying in planning, the only thing worse than sprawl is density, right? And that is,
5 you start putting density in an area that's already dense and you're still gonna have
6 people who aren't happy with it.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

8 MR. DALE: So it's, they're not necessarily easy nuts to crack. Okay, let's keep
9 going here. Designate Areas of Highest Priority for Environmental Conservation and
10 Agricultural, and this is one, again, where there's a real, there's a real nuance here that
11 I wanna make sure we're getting right. So what we're hearing, environmentally sensitive
12 areas, particularly things like the Broad River and Gills Creek, are important places and
13 watersheds to protect. It also appears that there's interest in finding ways to provide
14 greater access to those areas and to utilize them as community amenities. So certainly
15 we're hearing a lot about conservation of environmentally sensitive areas as listed
16 there. What we also hear in the same, in the same breath, the concern about
17 agricultural. And this is where I wanna make sure that we have your sense because
18 what we're not hearing, Leann, Tracy, tell me if I get this right, what we're not hearing is
19 a strong protect agricultural areas through regulations, right? What we're hearing is,
20 more having to do with policies that are designed to allow the agricultural areas to
21 operate. In other words, what we often see in communities is this problem where people
22 want to buy into an agricultural area because they like the rural environment and then
23 they understand what really happens on a farm and they're not happy with the impacts,

1 the smells, the noise, the, you know, those sorts of things. And you've got traffic
2 clogging up roads so the farmers can't use them. So the issue is more whether we can
3 find ways to help our policies be more friendly for farming operation, not that we've
4 sensed any interest in going out and saying, let's try to ratchet up our minimum lot size,
5 let's try to really clamp down on, on development in rural areas so that farms aren't lost.
6 That's not where this, the direction that we're hearing this go. Did I describe that right,
7 Tracy?

8 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, I mean, I think what we've heard a lot of is that balance that
9 we talked about on the first issue.

10 MR. DALE: Right.

11 MS. HEGLER: Is that folks in Richland County want to preserve a lot of that rural
12 character that they have. They know they like it, but they also don't want to penalize
13 somebody for having that. So they wanna still allow that person that rights that they
14 think that they have and should have to develop it, but they still – we need to find some
15 mechanism that balances both of those because we hear time and time again, we just
16 went through this with the Lower Richland Master Plan which is where most of this
17 occurs, I mean, it is, it is resoundingly an issue we hear that we want to protect the rural
18 character of Richland County. Nobody wants to lose that half of the statement. But that
19 we haven't yet figured out how to do that. But they should be penalized for having
20 farms, we shouldn't take away their rights, but that we should come up with something,
21 some other way to I guess incentive keeping it rural.

22 MR. DALE: Right.

1 MS. HEGLER: That, people don't say it in that many words, but that's their, that's
2 their conflict is that they know they don't wanna tell farmer, you know, A that he
3 shouldn't be able to do what he wants to do with his land, but they still really don't
4 wanna see that farm go away.

5 MR. DALE: And we, honestly we've seen that in farmers. You know, I've had
6 farmers say, I get the conflict, I am conflicted and I don't want to lose my farm, I don't
7 want to be surrounded by subdivisions. But my children don't wanna farm and when I'm
8 finished farming I need to be able to sell my property to somebody who can, that, you
9 know, we've all heard, my, my land is my 401K, that's reality. So.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: This statement is something though, bringing it back to
11 this statement, environmentally sensitive areas, particularly the Broad and Gills Creek
12 are important places with watersheds to protect, are we assuming that there are not
13 currently adequate protective measures in place to protect those? That we need to do
14 more to protect those? Is that the assumption of that?

15 MR. DALE: That's a really good question. Tracy, what's your sense of, of that
16 from those public meetings?

17 MS. HEGLER: I would say that it was, it was that they wanted to continue to
18 protect them. I mean, if we feel like that protection's in place then they would be, I think
19 citizens would be happy with that.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think a lot more of that statement is the second half. I
21 think people are frustrated with the lack of access to our natural rivers that we have in
22 the area. You take a look at Greenville and how they've been able to utilize theirs –

23 MR. DALE: Right.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - and what an amenity it's been to the community. And for
2 us it's almost like, oop, let's keep people, you know, 300' away from these things
3 because they can't use them properly or something, you know?

4 MR. DALE: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's, that's my understanding of it is that, you know, I
6 mean, just like the pad down there with the zoo, and understandably, I mean, it's the
7 zoo's property, but they've taken an access point away from a lot of people that would
8 use the, the river. And so –

9 MR. THEUS: Yeah, but at the same time the River Alliance, part of this bond deal
10 is another \$10m running down by the zoo, so it's –

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It is.

12 MR. THEUS: - it's coming.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's coming, it's coming but what I'm saying is –

14 MR. THEUS: What was down there was - we own a piece of property down
15 there.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It was –

17 MR. THEUS: It was utter bedlam and anarchy and –

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. Right.

19 MR. THEUS: - and I mean, it had to go.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And that's what I was saying, I mean, they can do with it
21 what they –

22 MR. THEUS: Yeah.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - what they will, and what they did was probably the right
2 thing. But I think getting people access to those things, you know, the river walk is
3 fantastic.

4 MR. DALE: So you think that, that second part is probably more of an issue than
5 the first, and again, I'm just, you know, I'm tracking what you're saying, because you're
6 thinking the protections we have in place maybe people just don't understand. In other
7 words it's, you often hear, you often hear the public say, we wanna protect
8 environmentally sensitive areas, and you might often be able to say, we, we are.

9 MS. HEGLER: They certainly couldn't speak to that. They didn't, I mean, they
10 didn't speak to the fact –

11 MR. DALE: They didn't know.

12 MS. HEGLER: - there was no, it wasn't a quantitative –

13 MR. DALE: Right, it wasn't like –

14 MS. HEGLER: - conversation.

15 MR. DALE: - we know the existing regulations and we think they're not adequate,
16 that's not –

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think if you take a look at the existing regulations, and
18 anyone who's ever tried to do anything to a piece of property that has a wetland or a
19 creek or a stream or anything on it, knows the amount of regulation that's involved in
20 doing anything on that property.

21 MR. DALE: Is that, is that county regulation or is that mainly other, like state or
22 federal regulation?

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: DHEC, Army Corps.

1 MR. THEUS: It comes from the EPA through DHEC to –

2 MR. DALE: Right, right.

3 MR. THEUS: It's the Clean Water Act.

4 MR. DALE: You don't have local regulations that exceed those, you're just talking
5 about the ones that are already –

6 MS. HEGLER: [Inaudible]

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have the Storm Water -

8 MR. TUTTLE: Yes, they do exceed.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - yeah, the Storm Management Plan that we passed not
10 long ago.

11 MR. BROWN: In all of the, in all of what is being addressed, how is landfill and
12 wastewater being addressed?

13 MS. HEGLER: I mean, those also have stiff regulations. I mean, they could be
14 something we, we talk about. I mean, what we're putting, presenting to you are just
15 some guiding principles that you can adapt or –

16 MR. BROWN: I understand that, but –

17 MS. HEGLER: - change.

18 MR. BROWN: - within all of that, how are those two issues being addressed?

19 MR. DALE: You mean –

20 MR. BROWN: Or how are they being included?

21 MS. HEGLER: Well, I mean, in the sense that there's a desire to maintain, you
22 know, the water quality. I think that's what this all says, and this is what we heard is that
23 there is a desire to maintain water quality, there's a desire to protect these places, if

1 they already are – certainly not to lessen any of them. I mean, I think that's the
2 takeaway, it's not to lessen any of what we're doing.

3 MR. BROWN: What have we learned from, in this, what are we learning from the
4 experience of, of Duke, what's happening in North Carolina, for example? And with the
5 problem we have with the landfill situation that's in Lower Richland?

6 MS. CAIRNS: Are you talking about ash pits?

7 MS. HEGLER: I don't – yeah.

8 MR. BROWN: Huh?

9 MS. CAIRNS: Are you talking about the ash pits?

10 MR. BROWN: Yes, all of that, as well as the, the situation that we have in Lower
11 Richland right now over where we have the landfill off of, what is that, it's not Percival –

12 MR. TUTTLE: Screaming Eagle?

13 MR. BROWN: - Screaming Eagle, right. Back over in that area, what are we, how
14 are we going to address all of that. All one has to do is drive down 20 at a certain time
15 of the day and you'll understand that it's there. Okay, and with all those subdivisions
16 that are, are affected by, whether it's in Northeast Columbia and what have you. And
17 then the wastewater issue and the spillage and all the rest of that, SCE&G as opposed
18 to Duke up in North Carolina?

19 MS. HEGLER: Well, I don't know that we've learned anything, but I think that
20 comes back to infrastructure and making sure that we have adequate, which –

21 MR. BROWN: But are we going to address those issues within what we're trying
22 to design?

1 MR. DALE: We're, I'm honestly not familiar with the landfill issue, so we're gonna
2 have to learn more about that and, and –

3 MR. BROWN: Well, I think that's something that you definitely need to take a
4 look at cause that can spoil all of what you're talking about.

5 MR. DALE: We'll have to learn more about that.

6 MR. BROWN: Broad River, Wateree, and all the rest of them.

7 MR. DALE: Okay, we, I know we're getting close to the end here. I think the, the
8 next two are relatively straightforward and that is, support the military installations, you
9 know, we're all familiar with the, the military presence here. That important part for
10 national security and local economy, so this idea of, of incorporating the plans of those
11 installations into the county plan, again it's not unlike what we just talked about with the
12 municipalities in a sense. And that is what we're interested in making sure that the land
13 use policies around the edges of those installations don't interfere with our ability to
14 engage in their mission is what we're talking about. Any comments?

15 MR. THEUS: What is McCrady?

16 MS. HEGLER: It's a little piece of the corner of Fort Jackson that is –

17 MR. TUTTLE: It would be the end of Leesville [sic]. Leesburg, I mean, Leesburg
18 and –

19 MR. THEUS: That's I wouldn't know it.

20 MR. TUTTLE: - whatever it runs in – 601 or whatever.

21 MR. BROWN: 601.

22 MS. HEGLER: It's its own installation, has a separate mission but it actually just
23 shares space with Fort Jackson.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: This is a question I have and it's not putting out a
2 statement or really opening for discussion, this is just as far as a thought process, but a
3 lot of times these military installations house their maneuvers inside of a certain
4 boundary but yet step beyond their boundaries to grab other areas that they don't know
5 as if it were part of the installation. In other words, these flight areas where the planes
6 come in, where they don't, and we need to have this area or else we're gonna move the
7 installation further out. You know, as a private sector we have to contain within our
8 borders everything that we need. So if, if there's extra area or land that they want to
9 restrict further out, conceptually in my mind it should be part of the installation, but that's
10 not to stir up a whole new hornet's nest and I understand all that, but conceptually I, I
11 mean, that's just –

12 MR. TUTTLE: Well, but it goes further than that because I've heard that in
13 general at different points in time talk about noise.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Correct.

15 MR. TUTTLE: Okay? From the live ordinances and so forth. And the closer
16 development is the more complaints they get, so if their footprint is X, they can really
17 only use the inner 1/3 of that –

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

19 MR. TUTTLE: - as relates to those things. And they're kinda landlocked in ways, I
20 mean, they can't absorb more land where it's already developed –

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

22 MR. TUTTLE: - so I think we do have to be sensitive.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We do. We do.

1 MR. THEUS: I think you said that we want to stay at peace with them because if
2 they –

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Absolutely.

4 MR. THEUS: - leave us, then we don't have to worry about growth anymore.

5 MS. CAIRNS: I just have to laugh cause I, I agree with Pat. [Laughter] I mean,
6 I've always, I mean –

7 MR. TUTTLE: Tell me that that was on –

8 MS. CAIRNS: - I've sat here and had them come, you know, that they say, here's
9 our boundary –

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I'd like to retract my former statement. [Laughter]

11 MS. CAIRNS: - but you know what? But you know, I mean, it is, it's always weird
12 the way that boards are like, okay here's our line, but you know what, don't do this
13 within this close and don't do this within that close. And it's always like, well didn't – but
14 yeah, you have to listen to them or they just say, forget it we're outta here. It's weird.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

16 MR. DALE: Well, that's also not unlike airport planning or planning around
17 airports. Airports out, you know, they often, communities will often have regulations or
18 policies outside the fence so the impact of airports in general often exceeds those.

19 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, but I mean, it is, it is just weird when they come in and say,
20 don't do this in this area that's all privately owned, that we don't own, but you guys gotta
21 control all this cause otherwise we pull out. Yeah, and I mean, there's – I'm from
22 Cleveland and there's an entire set of houses that was removed because of the airport.
23 So, I mean, it's interesting cause they've moved the car rental terminal is now off site

1 from the airport terminal, and so you take a shuttle and you drive down this road and
2 there's roads and roads and trees and roads and it's all grass, used to be houses. And
3 they had to remove all the houses so, to appease the airport. It was amazing.

4 MR. TUTTLE: We currently do have a mechanism whereby they are notified of
5 anything within a certain proximity, don't we?

6 MS. HEGLER: We do. We notify them. And if you recall you had a presentation
7 some time ago, there's a Joint Land Use Study. And it does the things that Ms. Cairns
8 suggested. I mean, it proposes a graded down level of restriction on growth, depending
9 on their most crucial, critical mission requirements. Clearly I think it's everybody's intent
10 to try and find that sweet spot that keeps them there and keeps the mission critical
11 without offending the development that may or may not come into there. And they learn
12 over time what that spot is.

13 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah.

14 MS. HEGLER: So it's a, we do have, we do have proposed language that I
15 haven't presented to you yet, I think it's probably a good thing to think about it in terms
16 of the Comprehensive Plan which is why I've held it. But there are proposed zoning
17 changes based on the Joint Land Use Study that would protect the mission and
18 conceivable make the development happy as well, or prevent them from getting stuck in
19 a situation that would be obnoxious to themselves as well, so. But you have not seen
20 that, that zoning language, but you did get a presentation from the –

21 MS. CAIRNS: So we can't handle it?

22 MS. HEGLER: [Laughter] No. I was timing it with, I think, the Comprehensive
23 Plan update to kinda understand this guidance to see if this is something that we're –

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We're on a need to know basis.

2 MS. HEGLER: Well, you did see it, it was in the study. But we didn't, we haven't
3 proposed it to you as a text amendment is what I mean. You have seen it, it's just not –

4 MS. CAIRNS: I just think we should –

5 MS. HEGLER: - part of a text amendment.

6 MS. CAIRNS: - [inaudible] other the other side of Broad River so that we can be
7 like Greenville and control both sides of the river. What do you think? It is so frustrating
8 to have jurisdictional lines run right down the river.

9 MS. HEGLER: Down river?

10 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, you know that. It's just absolutely kneecapping.

11 MR. DALE: Frustrating?

12 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, but I mean –

13 MR. DALE: The next one, again, I think is pretty straightforward and it's really just
14 saying, well let's not lose sight as we're talking about all this balance, that there does
15 need to be a strong economic component to any community. And that supporting
16 economic development is in fact a prime theme here in these guiding principles. Any
17 comments about that? And then the final one I would put up is, is Improved Quality of
18 Life, and I think this one's important to think about. It feels kinda like a throw away kinda
19 thing, well of course it's about quality of life, but I think this is an important one to think
20 about because one of the things that we're hearing in more and more communities is
21 the importance of intangibles in terms of community quality of life. In other words, you
22 can get land use right, you can have the right densities, you can have the right land
23 uses in the right places, but some of the other things that relate to the less quantitative

1 kinds of things like amenities, like greenways and bikeways, like the quality of
2 development, like the range of housing choices that area available. It's just the idea that
3 when all is said and done there is a certain level of community building and place
4 making and intangibles in here that at least we're hearing people say that quality of life,
5 and you know, you hear this in a lotta different ways, quality of life and livability kinds of
6 things are important to people. You know, they're not gonna, these kinds of things aren't
7 gonna drive it but there are a subtly or a nuance that we need to make sure we, we get
8 right here as well. I didn't say that very well at the end, but I think you get the idea what
9 I'm, what I'm talking about here. That there are some intangibles that are important in
10 this process as well. Agreed? So that's, that's kind of our mission. Speaking of military,
11 this is kind of our mission and these are the things that are gonna be in our mind as we
12 go forward. And we realize some of these are almost not answerable, it's kinda like
13 hopefully we know when we see it that we get it right or we didn't get it right. But these
14 are the things that are guiding us in our thinking. So I say it that way because if there
15 are other things that we haven't talked about here in our compass, if you will, our
16 compass as we go forward with this process, we'd really like to hear them. Anything we
17 missed? Any critical principle that you think, you know, needs to be put in the mix?
18 Well, 10 is a nice round number, isn't it? Okay with that, Leann do you wanna do the
19 real quick, 30 second next steps just so they know?

20 MS. KING: And again, we've all, we've been talking about how this schedule's
21 really aggressive so we're trying to kind of stay, you know, in front of you and give you
22 this stuff piecemeal because we are trying to move forward with the adoption by the end
23 of the year. So on June 2nd we'll be back in front of you taking what we heard today, the

1 work that we're gonna do with Staff tomorrow, and we'll have a draft policy framework
2 and, you know, starts of a map to share with you. And I think probably then you'll have a
3 lot more comments cause you'll have something concrete in front of you to take a look
4 at and respond to, so that's the goal that we can do that. And then we'll take that, revise
5 it and then come, take that out for review at the July 7-9 community choices meetings.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thanks.

7 MR. THEUS: Thank you.

8 MS. JOYNER: Thank you.

9 MS. JOYNER: Yes. And just, oh I think we showed here, yeah you may recall
10 there was a map earlier in the presentation that showed the locations. So again we're
11 gonna meeting in all five planning areas, in a different location, actually a little further
12 out than where we met for the original meetings. So just wanted to make sure you got
13 that.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So the areas on there that are grayed out are the areas
15 that we don't have control over?

16 MS. KING: That is correct.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think that would be profound to put that in the plan.

18 MS. CAIRNS: I think it'd be nice to be able to, you know, toggle it in and out.

19 MS. KING: Just have a, a –

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

21 MS. KING: - really have a jurisdictional map that shows where the county clearly
22 does and does not have jurisdiction.

23 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

1 MS. KING: That's a very easy map to –

2 MS. HEGLER: I thought you were saying it'd be profound to incorporate all of
3 their land uses into ours.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, no, no, to show that –

5 MS. HEGLER: It would be [laughter].

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - it would be, but to show that this is, this is what the
7 county's land use plan is for the things that we control. So. Okay, anything else? Thank
8 you very much. Nice job.

9 MS. KING: Thanks.

10 MR. DALE: Thank you.

11 MS. HEGLER: Just a couple quick announcements. You do have a packet in
12 front of you that includes marketing and advertising for the next round of meetings in
13 July. Spread it out, tell us if you want us to send you more or take more. [Inaudible] to
14 anybody, if you can pick up any groups that would like to, you know, we'll talk to them
15 about what we're doing. We kinda have a roadshow going so we're happy to do that,
16 but –

17 MS. FRIERSON: Just notify you?

18 MS. HEGLER: - you know, just definitely let us know. That'd be great. Also I think
19 Suzie passed this out just so I can draw attention to it we just got this morning. I know
20 this is about an orientation you may be interested in. Did you give this to everybody?

21 MS. HAYNES: I gave it to the people who need orientation.

22 MS. HEGLER: So if you got one then you're – Suzie was slapping your hand
23 [laughter].

1 [Inaudible discussion]

2 MS. HEGLER: But that's all I have.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

4 MR. THEUS: So moved.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we have a second?

6 MR. BROWN: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All in favor say aye?

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

10

11

[Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm]