

**PC Recommended Changes for the Public Hearing Draft**

Recommended Change	Section Reference	PH Draft Pg Ref	Rationale/Justification	Notes
Remove section 26-1.9(e) Zoning Districts from the text	26-1.9(e)	"1-7"	Transition table would not be applicable as there is no single equivalency for all of the districts in most cases and keeps with the message that is an entirely new code	Transitions will not be wholly accurate and too many would be considered N/A; equivalency tables are currently available but shouldn't be relied upon once the code is adopted.
Make this optional for all application types, including those with a public hearing.	26-2.4(b)(2)2-3	"2-9"	Requiring the pre-application neighborhood meeting for by-right uses would give a false sense of change that may not happen, likewise for things such as map amendments, it would require having information that may not be available or pigeon-holing a request for one use that could occur among many potential ones; it also puts an unfair burden on private citizens to have a meeting with private citizens that has to be "open"; this requirement would also include *all* applicants, not just developers, so any applicant including a potential economic development project would be required to abide by these provisions to host the meeting as written, not to mention the potential cost associated with it.	An alternative would be providing a mailed notice to adjacent and nearby residents regarding new developments as they occur and are approved for by-right uses; or, would be to make it required for those application types but only of a certain size (acreage or units or sqft).
Add language to subsection 2 from subsection 1.b regarding exemption to limit	26-2.4(n)(2)	"2-21"	Includes language for mechanism by which to exempt the application as with a previous denial	
Change minor land development permit review time from 30 days to 17 business days from determination of completeness	26-2.5(e)(3)a.1	"2-33"	More closely aligns codified language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days	
Change major land development permit review time to coincide with that of the sketch plan review of 17 business days of determination of completeness	26-2.5(e)(4)b	"2-35"	More closely aligns codified language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days	
Change determination time frame from 30 days to 17 business days	26-2.5(f)(3)a	"2-38"	More closely aligns codified language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days	
Change decision timeframe from 30 days to 17 business days	26-2.5(f)(4)a	"2-39"	More closely aligns codified language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days	
Change decision timeframe from 30 days to 17 business days	26-2.5(f)(5)b.1(a)	"2-40"	More closely aligns codified language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days	
Change decision timeframe from 30 days to 17 business days	26-2.5(f)(5)c.1(a) and (b)	"2-42"	More closely aligns codified language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days	
Change decision timeframe from 30 days to 17 business days	26-2.5(f)(5)d.1(a) and (b)	"2-43"	More closely aligns codified language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days	
Change decision timeframe from 30 days to 17 business days	26-2.5(f)(5)e.1(a) and (b)	"2-45"	More closely aligns codified language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days	
Change decision timeframe from 30 days to 17 business days and any necessary extension from 45 to 30 days.	26-2.5(l)(3)b.1-2	"2-56"	More closely aligns codified language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days	
Change decision timeframe from 30 days to 17 business days	26-2.5(m)(3)a.1-2	"2-60"	More closely aligns codified language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days	
Add language on timeframe for a decision within 17 business days of determination of completeness	26-2.5(o)(3)a	"2-63"	More closely aligns codified language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days	
Add new subsection (5) to include language about the cluster development and the standards that can be superseded as part of those provisions: includes reduction of 75% of the dimensional standards to lot width and setbacks, where the minimum lot widths shall be no less than 30', front setback no less than 20', side setback no less than 7', and rear setback no less than 15'. Lot width removal for R2-R5 if cluster development provisions	26-3.1(f)	"3-5"; various	includes superseding standards for the various low intensity districts to allow for greater clustering of the sites and the various lots associated with them.	
Add notes about superseding standards for the AG, HM, RT, and R1 districts for the cluster developments and other developments	26-3.2(c)	Various	includes superseding standards for the various low intensity districts to allow for greater clustering of the sites and the various lots associated with them.	
Fix typos of zoning district names on the table	26-3.1(c)	"3-4"		
For zoning district "purpose" rename as "General Description"; minor language changes to descriptions	26-3	various	Generalizes the former purpose statement to a "general description" of how the district will normally function and can be described in terms of development, uses, and intent	

### PC Recommended Changes for the Public Hearing Draft

RT lot width = 120'	26-3.3(c)	"3-16"	adds lot width	
R1 changes - 1.5 density; 90' lot width; 35' front; 10' side; 30' rear	26-3.3(d)	"3-18"	Provides a slight increase to density to address goals and objectives related to the Comp Plan, while still providing character and context appropriate zoning	
R2 changes - 4 density; 20' minimum; 30' front, 5' side; 20' rear	26-3.3(e)	"3-20"	Provides a slight increase to density to address goals and objectives related to the Comp Plan, while still providing character and context appropriate zoning	
R3 changes - 7 density; 20' min width; 20' front, 20 rear; 5' side	26-3.3(f)	"3-22"	Provides a slight increase to density to address goals and objectives related to the Comp Plan, while still providing character and context appropriate zoning	
R4 changes - 10 density; 20' width min; 20' front, 15 rear, 5' side	26-3.3(g)	"3-24"	Provides a slight increase to density to address goals and objectives related to the Comp Plan, while still providing character and context appropriate zoning	
R5 changes - 15 density; 20' width min; 20' front; 10 rear 5' side	26-3.3(h)	"3-26"	Provides a slight increase to density to address goals and objectives related to the Comp Plan, while still providing character and context appropriate zoning	
R6 changes - 20 density; 50' width min; 20' front; 10 rear	26-3.3(i)	"3-28"	Provides a slight increase to density to address goals and objectives related to the Comp Plan, while still providing character and context appropriate zoning	
Section references are incorrect throughout MI-O; Sec. 26-3.214(g) doesn't exist; the correct reference should be 26-3.7(g)...	26-3.7(g)	Various	Corrects references within the document	Is also a scrivener error
Review time notice should be amended to include language for once an application is determined complete and the review process is starting notice should be provided for comment - "Once an application is determined to be complete for any...submission and invite comments with regard..."	26-3.7(g)(6)b.2	"3-107	Provides for notice at the beginning of the submittal process versus at the end where an application's approval could be quicker than what the timeframe would stipulate for providing the notice and request for comments	Flips the language around
Agriculture research facility as P in RC	26-4.2(b)	"4-4	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Farm distribution hub as P in RC	26-4.2(b)	"4-4	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Farm Winery as SR in HM	26-4.2(b)	"4-4	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Rural retreat as SR in HM	26-4.2(b)	"4-4	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Veterinary services (livestock) as P in RC	26-4.2(b)	"4-5	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Dwelling, Four Family as P in R2 and R3	26-4.2(b)	"4-5	Widens the usage for housing type and choice throughout the County; provide for more inclusive zoning code	
Dwelling, Single-family detached as blank in R5 and R6	26-4.2(b)	"4-5	Limits single-family housing type to appropriate districts only	
Dwelling, Three-family as P in R2 and R3	26-4.2(b)	"4-5	Widens the usage for housing type and choice throughout the County; provide for more inclusive zoning code	
Dwelling, Two-family as SR in R2 and R3	26-4.2(b)	"4-5	Widens the usage for housing type and choice throughout the County; provide for more inclusive zoning code	
Membership Organization Facility as SE in HM	26-4.2(b)	"4-6	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Rooming or boarding house as SR in RT	26-4.2(b)	"4-6	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Hospital as P in MU3	26-4.2(b)	"4-6	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Library as SR in HM	26-4.2(b)	"4-6	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Public Recreation facility as SR in HM	26-4.2(b)	"4-6	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Public safety facility as P in HM	26-4.2(b)	"4-6	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Zoo as SR in AG	26-4.2(b)	"4-7	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	Need to clarify petting zoo as this or agritourism use, also "safari"
Transit stop as SR in HM	26-4.2(b)	"4-7	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Fleet terminal as P in RC	26-4.2(b)	"4-7	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Utility, minor as SR in HM	26-4.2(b)	"4-8	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Veterinary hospital or clinic as SR in INS	26-4.2(b)	"4-8	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Non-depository personal credit institution as SR in MU2, MU3, GC, EMP, INS, and LI	26-4.2(b)	"4-9	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	Review standards
Restaurant, Drive through as SR in MU2	26-4.2(b)	"4-10	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	Need to include new standards for the SR
Add Paintball and Airsoft as a sub-use to Commercial Recreation and include as SR within current districts for Commercial Recreation Indoor and all districts for Commercial Recreation Outdoor	26-4.2(b)	"4-10	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	Need to include new standards for the sub-type
Marina as P in RC	26-4.2(b)	"4-10	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Shooting Range Indoor as P in RC	26-4.2(b)	"4-10	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Pawnshop as P in RC, MU1	26-4.2(b)	"4-11	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	
Timber and Timber products wholesale sales as SR in AG	26-4.2(b)	"4-13	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	Need to include new standards for use in AG
Manufacturing, assembly, and fabrication, Light as SR in AG for Game Processing	26-4.2(b)	"4-13	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	Need to include new standards for sub-type of uses for AG

**PC Recommended Changes for the Public Hearing Draft**

Manufacturing, assembly, and fabrication, General as SR in AG, RC, for Game Processing	26-4.2(b)	"4-13	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	Need to include new standards for sub-type of uses for AG
Manufacturing, assembly, and fabrication, Intensive as SR in LI, EMP, RC, and AG for Game Processing	26-4.2(b)	"4-13	Addresses use permissions as appropriate	Need to include new standards for sub-type of uses for LI
Children's Residential Care Home should apply for HM	26-4.2(d)(2)b.1	"4-23	Addresses use standards as appropriate	
Group Home, Large should apply for HM for (a) and (b)	26-4.2(d)(2)b.4.a-b	"4-24	Addresses use standards as appropriate	
Membership Organization Facility standards should apply for HM	26-4.2(d)(3)a.5	"4-25	Addresses use standards as appropriate	
HM should apply for arboretum or botanical garden	26-4.2(d)(3)d.1	"4-28	Addresses use standards as appropriate	
HM should apply for communication tower	26-4.2(d)(3)f.1	"4-30	Addresses use standards as appropriate	
Kennel should apply for HM for the min two ac lot	26-4.2(d)(4)a.1.f	"4-34	Addresses use standards as appropriate	
HM for golf course standards	26-4.2(d)(4)a.4.b	"4-40	Addresses use standards as appropriate	
HM standards should apply for Farmer's Market	26-4.2(d)(4)e.3	"4-46	Addresses use standards as appropriate	
HM standards for Borrow Pit	26-4.2(d)(5)a.1	"4-49	Addresses use standards as appropriate	
Table 26-5.1(c)(3)b: Connectivity Index should include HM as No Minimum as with AG; RT and R1 should be 1.3	26-5.1(c)(3)b.1	"5-9	Addresses missing information for zoning district and reduces index score as appropriate	
Table 26-5.1(c)(3): Required Development Access Points the first threshold should be 100 units; second threshold should be between 100 and 200; third threshold would be over 200 units is as determined by Fire Marshall, County Engineer, and/or SCDOT	26-5.1(c)(2)c.1	"5-6	Simplifies thresholds and determination criteria based upon feedback.	
Grassed planting strip between sidewalk and roadway shall be 1.5' instead of 3	26-5.1(c)(5)c.2	"5-13	Reduces the amount of space required for planting strip as appropriate	
Need to add language for TIAs related to exemptions for SCDOT roadways similar to the sidewalk section on pg. 5-12; subsection c "...trips on County maintained roads"; subsection d "...only, on County maintained roads."	26-5.1(e)(2)	"5-15	Clarifies language related to TIA applicability for County maintained roads and notes exemptions for state roads as required or determined by SCDOT	
Move R2 to the category with R3, R4, R5, and R6 at 25% for residential uses	26-5.4(c)	"5-79	Moves R2 into more appropriate minimum requirement for the type of development allowed and character type	
"...wildlife habitation, as identified as part of the NRI for endangered or threatened species, and woodland areas as identified under Natural features as part of Table 26-5.4(d)."	26-5.4(e)(4)b.1	"5-85	Clarifies language for "wildlife habitation" and "woodland areas"	
The subsection listed as (C) should actually be subsection (b)(2) and subsection (c) should start as "Cluster Development Standards"; also need to include under applicability, that any other development type may use this as an option for a removal of the lot width requirement	26-5.5(b) and (c)	"5-92	Clarifies textual error for applicability and notes the optional use of the provisions for other developments	
remove language under exemptions for "...or a right-of-way greater than 75 feet"	26-5.7(b)(2)a	"5-100	Removes exemption language to only apply for roads with 4 or more lanes only and not a certain ROW width.	
increase in density from 5% to 20% in R2-R6 and the MU1-GC districts and 30% in the AG, HM, RT, and R1 districts; include edits for table 26-5.13(d)	26-5.13(c)(1)b	"5-161	Provides an appropriate level of the incentives for the various districts as appropriate for the requirements necessary to achieve it	Brings more adequate bang for buck
Conservation Set Asides - at least 5% to 25% as A; change 50-75% to AB; AAB to ABB	26-5.13(e)	"5-164	Modifies thresholds as appropriate and clarifies feature schedule type as appropriate for the incentive	
Vegetation - change from 65% to 50% and from AA to AB	26-5.13(e)	"5-164	Modifies thresholds as appropriate and clarifies feature schedule type as appropriate for the incentive	
Resiliency to Natural Hazards - A to B for "Equip..."	26-5.13(e)	"5-165	Modifies feature schedule type as appropriate	
Changes to the MI-O based upon discussion w/ McEntire related to potential noise contours and terminology	26-3.7(g)	"3-100	Modifies standards and elements in relation to changes operational elements related to McEntire and the other military installations	Will be receiving any specific changes; primarily will apply to the mapping of the overlay, but change in contours may have bearing on the text itself
Changes to the FP-O to address errors and missing info related to CRS and NFIP compliance that were not included in draft	26-3.7(d)	"3-81	Corrects textual errors and missing standards from the current code for continued compliance with the CRS and NFIP	
Need to include authority to approve road names	26-2.3(b)(1)b.	"2-4	Missing info on approval of street names	
"Posted sign notice"	26-2.4(g)(2)	"2-16	Clarifies language	