

**RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**December 8, 2025**

1  
2  
3  
4 *[Members Present: Christopher Yonke, Beverly Frierson, Frederick Johnson, II, Sena*  
5 *Loyd, Charles Durant, Chris Siercks, Bryan Grady Absent: Mark Duffy, Terrence Taylor]*

6  
7 Called to order: 6:00pm

8  
9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'd like to call to order the December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025 Richland  
10 County Planning Commission meeting. Staff, please confirm the following: in  
11 accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent out to  
12 the news media, persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board  
13 located in the county administration building. Is that correct?

14 MR. DELAGE: That's correct, Mr. Chair.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Staff. Can you please take attendance for today's  
16 meeting?

17 MR. SMITH: Grady?

18 MR. GRADY: Here.

19 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

20 MR. SIERCKS: Here.

21 MR. SMITH: Taylor? Durant?

22 MR. DURANT: Here.

23 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

24 MS. LOYD: Present.

25 MR. SMITH: Duffy? Johnson?

26 MR. JOHNSON: Here.

27 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

1 MS. FRIERSON: Here.

2 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

4 MR. SMITH: You have a quorum.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Staff. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the  
6 December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning  
7 Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County, just like you, who  
8 volunteer our time to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council.  
9 Our recommendations are to approve or deny Zoning Map Amendment requests. Per  
10 Title VI, Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of Laws* Planning Commission may also prepare  
11 and revise plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of the  
12 unincorporated portions of the County. We worked on the Land Development Code a  
13 couple years ago and we're updating the Comprehensive Plan this month and going on  
14 next year. So, once again, we are a recommending body to County Council and they  
15 will conduct their own public hearing and take official votes to approve or deny Map  
16 Amendments and Text Amendments on a future date to be published by the County.  
17 Council typically holds Zoning Public hearings on the fourth Tuesday of the month.  
18 Please check the County's website for updated agendas, dates and times. Please take  
19 note of the following guidelines for tonight's meeting. Please turn off or silence any  
20 cellphones. Audience members may quietly come and go as needed. Applicants will be  
21 allowed up to two minutes to make statements. Citizens signed up to speak are also  
22 allowed two minutes each. Redundant comments should be minimized. Please only  
23 address remarks to the Commission and do not expect the Commission to respond to

1 questions from the speakers in a back and forth style; that is not the purpose of this  
2 meeting. Please no audience/speaker exchanges. No audience demonstrations or other  
3 disruptions to the meeting are permitted nor are comments from anyone other than the  
4 speaker at the podium. Please remember the meeting is being recorded. Please speak  
5 into the microphone and give your name and address. Abusive language is  
6 inappropriate and will not be tolerated. Please don't voice displeasure or frustration at a  
7 recommendation while the Planning Commission is still conducting business. If you  
8 have any questions or concerns you can contact Richland County Staff department  
9 down here. Again, I want to reiterate that no decisions are made, we are citizens of  
10 Richland County who are concerned and we volunteer our time, we don't work for the  
11 Staff. I've been volunteering for several years now and I just love helping out my county.  
12 So this is gonna move us to number 3, which is Additions and Deletions to the Agenda.  
13 Staff, are there any additions or deletions?

14 MR. DELAGE: There is an administrative deferral for the last case on file, that's  
15 the Montgomery Road, so that'll be coming before y'all in February. Also want to note  
16 just briefly one of the dates for the posting was off, we had it as the 17<sup>th</sup> but it ended up  
17 being the 18<sup>th</sup>, which is still well ahead of the requirement schedule. And then the re-  
18 postings when we discovered that, there was a motion to change it to December the 8<sup>th</sup>  
19 rather than our traditional first Monday of the month, that's when the re-postings took  
20 place to show the correct date.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm guessing the County apologizes for any confusion  
22 there. For the properties we're gonna speak on those properties tonight, thank you.  
23 Excellent. Do we have the sign up sheet for later on? Can Staff, someone bring it on up

1 here? Thank you. And this will take us to number 4 which is the approval of Minutes  
2 from prior meetings. The Staff provided the Commission with copies of our November  
3 2025 meeting. Do Commissioners have any comments or concerns regarding the  
4 transcripts? Hearing or seeing none the Chair would like to make a motion for approval  
5 of the November Minutes. Do I have a second?

6 MR. DURANT: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Staff can you please  
8 take a vote to approve the Minutes?

9 MR. SMITH: Motion to approve the Minutes. Grady?

10 MR. GRADY: Aye.

11 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

12 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

13 MR. SMITH: Durant?

14 MR. DURANT: Aye.

15 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

16 MS. LOYD: Aye.

17 MR. SMITH: Johnson?

18 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

19 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

20 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

21 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

23 MR. SMITH: Motion passes.

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

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. The next part of our Agenda is number 5 which  
4 is the Consent Agenda. The Consent Agenda is an action item that allows the  
5 Commission to approve Road Names and Map Amendment requests where the Staff  
6 recommends approval, or it's Comprehensive Plan compliant is what we say now, and  
7 no one from the public has signed up to speak against the amendment; also that no  
8 Commission Member needs any further discussion. So I'm looking through the signup  
9 sheet right now. I see Case No. 39, has the Applicant, I'm assuming the Applicant  
10 doesn't wanna talk us out of it – compliant. Okay Commission Members do we have,  
11 would you like to speak or discuss Case No. 25-039, any more detail? Not seeing  
12 anything the Chair would like to make a motion for the Consent Agenda tonight, there's  
13 no road names so just 5.a.2, for a recommendation of approval to County Council. Do I  
14 have a second?

15 MR. GRADY: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Grady. Staff, can you please  
17 take a vote for the Consents Agenda and this Map Amendment? Wait, Commissioner  
18 Johnson, yes?

19 MR. JOHNSON: So someone had signed up [inaudible].

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 25-042?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, we have people signed up against it to talk, yes.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, sorry.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, I have a motion on the floor.

2 MR. SMITH: Motion on the floor is approve the Consent Agenda with Case No.

3 25-039 MA included. Grady?

4 MR. GRADY: Aye.

5 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

6 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

7 MR. SMITH: Durant?

8 MR. DURANT: Aye.

9 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

10 MS. LOYD: Aye.

11 MR. SMITH: Johnson?

12 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

13 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

14 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

15 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

17 MR. SMITH: Motion approved.

18 *[Approved: Grady, Siercks, Durant, Johnson, Loyd, Frierson, Yonke; Absent: Duffy,*  
19 *Taylor]*

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. This now moves us along. We are  
21 at 5.a.1, I'll flip it over to Staff for some information.

22 **CASE NO. 25-032 MA:**

1 MR. SMITH: Okay, so the Map Amendment you have before you, Case  
2 No. 25-032MA, the Applicant is Mark Jeffers, location is on Wilson Boulevard,  
3 Tax Map number R14800-05-39, 88.62 acres, existing zoning is AG, which  
4 Agricultural and the proposed zoning on this case is gonna be R3 or Residential  
5 3. The Comprehensive Plan recommends non-compliant. The proposed rezoning  
6 is not compliant with the objectives of the neighborhood low density designation  
7 which promotes low density traditional neighborhood development. Although this  
8 designation allows for increased densities when balanced by the preservation of  
9 open space and natural features, the requested Map Amendment may be viewed  
10 as establishing a density level that exceeds what is appropriate to support the  
11 intended transition between rural and medium, or neighborhood medium density  
12 areas. Furthermore, while the lot sizes of most residential developments in the  
13 surrounding area are comparable to those permitted under the requested zoning  
14 designation, the overall densities of these existing developments remain  
15 consistent with the low density development pattern for the neighborhood low  
16 density designation.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, do we have any  
18 questions for Staff? Hearing none we'll go to the public opinion part, Ms.  
19 Frierson?

20 MS. FRIERSON: Our first speaker is the Applicant, Mark Jeffers.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And tonight we have both podiums open. And again  
22 remember to start with your name and address. And you have two minutes to

1 speak. So after two minutes I am gonna say, give me your final thought, please,  
2 so we have enough time for everybody. And that's not be being rude, alright? I  
3 just wanna respect our time, thank you.

4 **TESTIMONY OF MARK JEFFERS:**

5 MR. JEFFERS: I'm Mark Jeffers, 1616 Syrup Mill Road, Blythewood. We  
6 had this project started with over 50% of the lots already built and, and sold, but  
7 this close to the Scout plant we were, you know, we're asking that we could get a  
8 higher density zoning just so we don't waste that land that's in the homeowners  
9 association; there's 60 acres in the homeowners association that would never be  
10 able to be developed if we don't get the rezoning and put this density where  
11 we're already developing. So the first part, the, the first section of this we had 88  
12 acres total and we only impacted 29 of that 88 acres with the infrastructure and  
13 the lots that we created. So with, if we get the rezoning and we can get the  
14 additional lots that we request it's gonna be way away from any subdivision, way  
15 away from any public road, it really won't be seen by anybody else except for  
16 within the subdivision. And we're only gonna impact 16 acres of this 60 acres  
17 that's, you know, will be in the homeowners association. So we ask for that  
18 zoning so that, you know, we don't have to go buy another property and create  
19 these lots that we're trying to do, we can create the lots within the subdivision  
20 we're already developing in. It's so close to the Scout plant it's just a, kind of  
21 ashamed to waste that land when we really need – the traffic, you know, driving

1 one mile to the Scout plant to go to work instead of seven miles across town. So  
2 that's why we're asking for the rezoning for a little higher density.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you sir.

4 MR. JEFFERS: Alright.

5 MS. FRIERSON: Next speaker is John S. Boswell.

6 **TESTIMONY OF JOHN BOSWELL:**

7 MR. BOSWELL: Thank you for letting me speak. My name is John Boswell  
8 and I'm the president of the HOA for Stonington community, which joins this  
9 particular property, and I think is a right-of-way or an easement part that's within  
10 —

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Your address, sir, as you get started?

12 MR. BOSWELL: Sorry?

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Can you state your address, too, for the —

14 MR. BOSWELL: Oh, excuse me.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Of course.

16 MR. BOSWELL: My address is 205 Durdon Park Road, Blythewood, SC  
17 29016.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

19 MR. BOSWELL: But, and as the president of the HOA there, we just want  
20 to express our concerns that we do not have multi-family housing in any part of  
21 that because we understand that all of that traffic is going to, now some of it or a  
22 lot of it, will come through the Stonington area. And so we want to just make sure

1 that you're aware that we do not want multi-family housing, it will be single-family  
2 housing and would like for y'all to consider that. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

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

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. Okay Staff, I'll  
7 open with a question then.

8 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

10 MR. SMITH: I'd like to just point out in the designation they're requesting of  
11 R3, that is a single-family designation that would not allow for multi-family. For  
12 the Record.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. You beat me to my question. I was  
14 gonna ask you to point out page 14 and explain, make sure that we're on the  
15 same page. Thank you. Staff, you did hand out one more flyer that came from  
16 the City of Blythewood, was that for this property?

17 MR. SMITH: Not sure.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. Okay Commission, this one is now  
19 on the floor for discussion.

20 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

1 MR. GRADY: Thank you. So in looking at the immediate surroundings of  
2 this parcel, both to the north and the east, are substantial pieces of land that  
3 appear to be residential development that are zoned as a PD. Would you be able  
4 to speak to how the density of the housing in that PD would compare to a  
5 standard residential zone?

6 MR. SMITH: Bear with me, I've got to pull out a document.

7 MR. GRADY: Okay.

8 MR. SMITH: Which residential development were you referring to?

9 MR. GRADY: Well I suppose the most proximate one would be the one  
10 along Roundtree Road adjacent to the parcel?

11 MR. SMITH: So the density for Stonington, the neighboring subdivision just  
12 north of the subject parcel, the overall density for that is a 1.22 lots per acre, with  
13 a total of 202 lots on 165 acres; comparably to the R3 which is a, six units per  
14 acre.

15 MR. GRADY: Okay.

16 MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff?

18 MR. DELAGE: Just to point out because it's, you know a PDD and how it's  
19 set up is a little unique, just wanna note that you can see some of the larger  
20 adjacent tracts which I was recently measuring. Those range from, you know,  
21 just taking two of the numbers, close to a 20,000 square foot lot to some of the  
22 larger ones being closer to 25, however, there are sections that are smaller than

1 that. So I just wanted to point that out that there is a diverse lot size between the  
2 two portions of Stonington.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, looking at our current Land Development Code  
4 it could be comparable to, like R2s and R3s in this area? Roughly speaking, the  
5 area where it looks more compact to the south, is that more like an R3?

6 MR. SMITH: So the most comparable density for the existing subdivision  
7 would be more of a RT or R1, which gives you about 1.33 density or dwelling  
8 units per acre.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Questions, Commissioners?

10 MR. SMITH: And the smaller parcels just for reference would be more  
11 relatable to the R3 and R4.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So comparatively speaking for the character of this  
13 area on the map see LE to LE4, that area, is similar to an R3, which is being  
14 requested in our Map Amendment. Roughly.

15 MR. SMITH: So the denser development to the north would be more  
16 comparable to an R4 development, but because it's a PDD the density varies, or  
17 the amount of lots vary.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Right. Just to paint the picture for the public and for  
19 the Commission, that's what I'm making the comparison for. Thank you. What an  
20 R3 would look like. Okay, Commissioner Johnson?

21 MR. JOHNSON; Mr. Chairman?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

1 MR. JOHNSON: If Staff can address this, if not the Applicant, but  
2 something in the comments and the way it's laid out makes me ask the question,  
3 was this intended as a subsequent phase to the existing development originally?

4 MR. DELAGE: So what was originally approved was a subdivision that was  
5 under the open space provision. So basically that would, you have the initial, I  
6 guess if you wanna say phases of, that are approved under the sketch with  
7 exchange for some of these areas to be open space, to count towards your open  
8 space requirements to be able to do reduction of lot size, reduction of setbacks,  
9 and in some cases bonus density. That was a provision of the old RU prior to the  
10 adoption of the new Code. You can see on the map, you can kinda, let's see if I  
11 can get – there we go, do it that way, so you kinda have those initial phases and  
12 you'll see some of the roads that are out, that are part of that development, but it  
13 has not been further subdivided along that section yet, but these lots have been  
14 further subdivided. So it just really depends on what time the, what phase the  
15 subdivision is in. So, but the rezoning request, I would think of it as phase 2. It's  
16 just to be able to develop some additional areas within the existing subdivision.

17 MR. JOHNSON: So the lots, so part of the parcel has lots that are already  
18 platted and some of it is undeveloped at this point prior to the rezoning request.

19 MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

20 MR. JOHNSON: And the original lots that are plotted originally were done  
21 as a part of the previous subdivision.

22 MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. So then was some of that open space a part of the  
2 negotiation in determining the PUD for the first phase?

3 MR. DELAGE: Well the open space was used as part of the ability to do  
4 the reduction of the lot size, and then also the setbacks. So the open space had  
5 a specific, a set amount of open space that had to be set aside, and then it also  
6 had provisions for additional acres to be set aside to be able to kinda receive  
7 some of those incentives, which again the reduction in lot sizes and then  
8 setbacks.

9 MR. JOHNSON: And that was done at the time that the PUD was created.

10 MR. DELAGE: When the subdivision was submitted for sketch plan review,  
11 it was done at that time, yes.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: All set Commissioner Johnson?

13 MR. JOHNSON: I am.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you. Commissioners, do we have any  
15 motions on this one? Or further discussion? No need to be nervous, a motion can  
16 only go one or the other way.

17 MR. JOHNSON: I don't know if I have a motion, I just have a – and maybe  
18 instead of making it a statement just make it as another question. Then  
19 effectively the rezoning request is to renegotiate the agreement done when the  
20 PUD was put in place. Is that a fair conclusion? Or am I mischaracterizing?

21 MR. DELAGE: I wouldn't say necessarily a renegotiation, I see where  
22 you're going though, but is it a way to basically get a, some additional acreage

1 for development? Yes, through the map amendment process the rezoning of the  
2 entirety of Leatherstone would allow them to develop additional acreage. I don't  
3 wanna get into the development side cause there's so many variables as far as  
4 for, you know, what can and can't be, you know, developed based off of, you  
5 know, those development standards. But I'm sure as everyone can see there are  
6 some constraints on the property to the rear. But it's mainly a way or, the map  
7 amendment is a vehicle or a legislative action to be able to do additional  
8 development within those areas that are currently shown as open space on the  
9 approved Leatherstone.

10 MR. JOHNSON: I understand. But, well let me rephrase my question then,  
11 if this is approved and additional acreage is available for development, the  
12 reduction in lot sizes that are already approved would remain in place.

13 MR. DELAGE: So for the existing lots, yes, those would be considered via  
14 the map amendment process so legal non-conforming.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anything else, Commissioner?

16 MR. JOHNSON: I don't have any further questions.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

18 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we have questions or do we wanna hear from the  
20 Applicant anymore? Or are we ready to make a motion?

21 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

1 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion that we send Case 25-032 to  
2 County Council with a recommendation of approval, with the rationale being that  
3 the R3 zoning designation is comparable to surrounding single-family residential  
4 properties.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. We have a motion  
6 for approval. Do we have a second?

7 MR. DURANT: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And a second from Commissioner Durant. Okay,  
9 with a motion for approval and a second, Staff can you please take a vote?

10 MR. SMITH: Okay, so this motion is for approval of Case No. 25-032 from  
11 AG to R3, Yonke?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

13 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

14 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

15 MR. SMITH: Johnson?

16 MR. JOHNSON: No.

17 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

18 MS. LOYD: Aye.

19 MR. SMITH: Durant?

20 MR. DURANT: Aye.

21 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

22 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

1 MR. SMITH: Grady?

2 MR. GRADY: Aye.

3 MR. SMITH: Motion passes.

4 *[Approved: Yonke, Frierson, Loyd, Durant, Siercks, Grady; Opposed: Johnson:*  
5 *Absent: Taylor, Duffy]*

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner. Thank you, Staff. That's  
7 a recommendation to County Council, they will take this case up on their next  
8 Zoning Public Hearing, I believe, Staff, is that true? Which would be the fourth  
9 Tuesday of the month?

10 MR. DELAGE: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do you have a date on that?

12 MR. DELAGE: It is going to be December the 16<sup>th</sup>.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: December the 16<sup>th</sup> at 6:00pm.

14 MR. DELAGE: It's gonna be at 7:00pm.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Seven pm, alright in these Council chambers.

16 MR. DELAGE: That is the third Tuesday.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The third, third Tuesday.

18 MR. DELAGE: The departure due to the upcoming holidays.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Gotcha, alright so December 16<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm. Thank  
20 you. We'll move on to our next case. Number was a Consent Agenda so we're  
21 gonna keep going to number 3, flip this back over to Staff. And again, public can  
22 come and go quietly if they'd like to. Go ahead, Staff, thanks.

1 **CASE NO. 25-040 MA:**

2 MR. SMITH: Case No. 25-040 MA. The Applicant is Carl Kaiser, location  
3 214 Blythebrook Road and 1509 Fulmer Road. Tax Map Number R12400-02-08  
4 and 09. Acreage is 157.44 acres. Existing zoning is AG and HM, the proposed  
5 zoning is R3. Comprehensive Plan recommends noncompliant. The zoning  
6 history, I just need to point this out, earlier this year Case No. 25-002 and Case  
7 No. 25-003 MA were both AG zoning designations that requested an R3  
8 designation. The Comprehensive Plan recommended non-compliant in both  
9 those cases. The Planning Commission denied the request and County Council  
10 approved those requests for the approval of R3 in the same area. So the  
11 proposed rezoning is not compliant with the objectives for the neighborhood low  
12 density. The designation encourages low density traditional neighborhood  
13 development and open space developments that preserve open spaces and  
14 natural features. The proposed zoning district does not provide for a density that  
15 is supportive of this recommendation. However, the proposed zoning could be  
16 viewed as being in character with the development pattern of the area due to the  
17 approval of recent rezoning cases in the immediate area. I also wanted to point  
18 out the letters I gave at the beginning of the meeting, they would refer to this  
19 case.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, do we have any  
21 questions for Staff on this before we send it over to the public? Okay.

22 Commissioner Frierson?

1 MS. FRIERSON: Our first speaker is Mr. John Rowe.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: - the Applicant. Your name and address, two  
3 minutes.

4 **TESTIMONY OF JOHN ROWE:**

5 MR. ROWE: John Rowe, 405 Western Lane, Irmo, South Carolina. Here to  
6 speak on behalf of the Applicant, Mr. Kaiser and Haven Communities, the  
7 developer. This basically is just as Staff pointed out, it does not fit with what may  
8 have been the plan several years ago, but this property is now surrounded by  
9 subdivisions, housing developments and soon-to-be housing developments. It  
10 seems like you have R3 now to the west and to the south of the property. Those  
11 were also not in the Comprehensive Plan but it has become the characteristic of  
12 the property and the surrounding area. The property has access to water and  
13 sewer, it has capacity for both, it's primed for development. This would be  
14 additional housing for, you know, the people that are moving into the area and  
15 the Scout plant coming. This area is growing and this does fit in with what the  
16 Council's recently approved. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

18 MS. FRIERSON: Next speaker is Steven Warren?

19 **TESTIMONY OF STEVEN WARREN:**

20 MR. WARREN: Good evening. I own the property just –

21 MS. FRIERSON: State your name and address, please.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: State your name and address.

1 MR. WARREN: Steven Warren, 201 Blythebrook Road. I didn't know there  
2 was a 214 Blythebrook Road. Blythebrook Road is supposed to be an entrance  
3 that was put in by the chain gang in 1967, and that was the prison system in  
4 which they operated underneath it then. In order to build the home that I have  
5 now on the property that is family property since the early 1800s, surrounded by  
6 Fulmers and Branhams, all of the Fulmer clan if you will, in the early 1800s, it's  
7 hard for me to understand why Mr. Julius Crocker had Council to approve a  
8 subdivision without roads, which meant my home could be built since it was  
9 landlocked at the time, the property that I have and the adjacent properties.  
10 We're landlocked. And then all the homeowners from the entrance from Fulmer  
11 Road where, had to, signed in on that. So how is it, I'm not sure, I don't know if  
12 anyone could really answer that in here, it was before most of you lived, I've  
13 been there for 45 years. My wife is a Fulmer and there are other Fulmers in the,  
14 in the group here. I have a lot to say as a pastor for heritage and history. It  
15 matters. It matters where we've come from and we need to learn from it. And I  
16 have had opportunity to do mission work and a lot of pastoral and ministerial  
17 work around the world. High density population is good for certain areas than  
18 some areas when there's a lotta concrete around. And there's infrastructure to  
19 support it. But as you grow and, it takes time. I remember Johnny Monroe was on  
20 Council years ago and tried to say, well we need straighten out and make sure  
21 Clemson Road went all the way out to at least, not just the normal, but all the  
22 way to the I20 and to No. 12. And they laughed at him. But as we know now it

1 was needed and it took growth, it took a lot to get that infrastructure approved.

2 And finally they got it all –

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Your final thoughts, sir. Just making sure.

4 MR. ROWE: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay thank you. Thank you for coming out.

6 MS. FRIERSON: Next person is Kathy Warren.

7 **TESTIMONY OF KATHY WARREN:**

8 MS. WARREN: Kathy Warren, 201 Blythebrook Road, Blythewood. I've  
9 recently seen an AllSouth Credit Union commercial and this is what it says,  
10 Neighborhoods Don't Have Shareholders, They Simply Have Neighbors, every  
11 day people not afraid to roll up their sleeves and get dirty, who aren't thinking about  
12 what's in it for them, they look out for each other because that's the right thing to  
13 do. They know that real value isn't measured in dollars and cents. And so the  
14 commercial goes on, you know, as their advertisement, but really citizens deserve  
15 a voice in what's going on and I appreciate your time here today. And if you see  
16 the property, yeah there's subdivisions in one section but there's a whole section  
17 that's not. And so this is adjacent to where we live, to where our home is, and so  
18 as we think about this, we think about the proposal being for the benefit of one  
19 person, for this, for the developer. I don't know, there's a negative impact that could  
20 be had. Most of the subdivisions that are there like Ashley Oaks and on there are  
21 larger lots. I know we've been talking about that with the first set of considerations  
22 here. But when you're talking going from agricultural homestead down to R3, you

1 know, you're looking at higher density, and I don't even know what the proposal  
2 really is for that acreage because that really wasn't made clear other than the  
3 subdivisions that are surrounding that. But if you look at the property there's a  
4 whole section that's not already developed. And so that is where our property is,  
5 our family property. We have cousins. There's already a high density of traffic with  
6 those subdivisions, there's problems getting in and out of driveways in the  
7 mornings and the afternoons. The traffic, people are speeding through there, 45  
8 but people surely don't drive that. My concern is for emergency services trying to  
9 get through there, things like that. We think about the environmental situation  
10 there. There's a lot more we could say I guess but we don't have time, but I  
11 appreciate the little bit of time we've been given to voice our opinion.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And thank you for coming out tonight.

13 MS. FRIERSON: Rich McKendrick. And after Mr. McKendrick then we'll  
14 have Andrea Fripp.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You can come down to the, the podium if you'd like.  
16 Go ahead, sir, thank you.

17 **TESTIMONY OF RICH MCKENDRICK:**

18 MR. MCKENDRICK: Good evening Commissioners. My name is Rich  
19 McKendrick. I live at 495 Holly Berry Circle in Blythewood, South Carolina 29016.  
20 That is in the Ashley Oaks subdivision. I, and for full disclosure I do serve on  
21 Blythewood Town Council but I am here in my personal capacity as a resident. My  
22 home is actually on the map before you. I appreciate every councilman up here

1 willing to serve, I served on Blythewood's Planning Commission. I know it is both  
2 a joy, a sacrifice, but is a task nonetheless. You have better things to be doing,  
3 you have families at home, so I appreciate your service. Yes, Blythewood is  
4 growing, Richland County is growing. I would like to keep my remarks brief, but  
5 our infrastructure in Blythewood simply cannot continue to handle an R3  
6 development of this magnitude on Fulmer Road. The traffic, the schools, the  
7 intersections that are not aligned right now. You know, the old adage is, what come  
8 first, the chicken or the egg? Blythewood brought Scout Motors because we knew  
9 it would bring growth, but in bringing growth I would ask you please to look at smart  
10 growth. I know you're a recommending body but there is smart growth. If this is  
11 gonna be residential let's make it smart residential. Six units per acre and what  
12 that dumps on Fulmer Road which would be the only access onto this property,  
13 very similar to Abney Hills which anybody who passes Abney Hills Subdivision  
14 knows there's one entrance and one exit with well over 400 homes in that  
15 neighborhood. It's too much. So our infrastructure would simply cry right now,  
16 Richland County we need your help on infrastructure leading on to these large  
17 developable tracts of land in and around Blythewood. And my last thought would  
18 be you approved Case No. 1 because it was, the motion was it was comparable.  
19 This is not comparable. So the same logic would not hold true to this 150+ acres.  
20 Again, I thank you for your time and I do trust your leadership, so I thank you very  
21 much.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

**TESTIMONY OF ANDREA FRIPP:**

MS. FRIPP: Good evening.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Name and address.

MS. FRIPP: Good evening, my name is Andrea Fripp and I am a resident of Blythewood. I too serve as a councilwoman for the Town of Blythewood, but I am here in my personal capacity. My address is 11 Bumble Bee Court. I live in the Holly Bluff subdivision and I think that I am probably gonna say, well I won't say but I am supportive of what Rich McKendrick said. I don't wanna repeat, that's one of the things that you asked us not to do. But I just can't help but think about the infrastructure and what a heavy load that is for Blythewood. We already are, you know, busting at the seams and I think that if we just continue to pile on and, you know, people are saying that is what has been approved and this is what is comparable, but at some point we're just not gonna be able to sustain the growth and it's no longer smart growth. And so I'm just asking for some consideration with these developments because it's just, you know, we're at a point where we really can't sustain the impact on the infrastructure. I am supportive of Scout Motors but everybody doesn't have to live in Blythewood and it's just, it's a lot on us and I am just asking you to consider that. And I appreciate and thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out.

MS. FRIERSON: The last two speakers, Carolyn Mitchell and Patricia Hovis.

**TESTIMONY OF CAROLYN MITCHELL:**

1 MS. MITCHELL: Good evening. My name is Carolyn Mitchell and I live at  
2 1465 Fulmer Road in Blythewood and I'm right off of Blythewood Road and I do  
3 know the Fulmers and some of the people that spoke already. And I too am  
4 concerned about the traffic for Fulmer Road actually. My mother gave consent to  
5 let others use Blythewood Road because her property was adjacent to that road,  
6 and when my kids were young and they lived at the house they used to drive and  
7 I had to actually stop them from using Blythewood Road because we had a  
8 business back there with trucks and stuff that came through, and they were  
9 beginner drivers. So I had to build our own driveway which is right next to  
10 Blythebrook Road. So I'm just concerned about the traffic in Blythewood too, and  
11 Blythewood is a beautiful place and I know everybody wants to be a part of  
12 Blythewood, but like the young lady said, not everybody can live in Blythewood.  
13 They came there because it was beautiful. It's not going to stay beautiful if it's  
14 flooded with traffic. And I'm nervous because all of y'all looking at me.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You're doing great.

16 MS. MITCHELL: So. So, and this is my husband here, this is Raymond  
17 Mitchell. So actually I live in two places, I live on Truman and I live on Fulmer Road,  
18 so. That's it.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Appreciate you.

20 **TESTIMONY OF TRISH HOVIS:**

21 MS. HOVIS: Hi. My name is Trish Hovis. I too am a member of Blythewood  
22 Town Council but I am here tonight representing myself as a citizen of Blythewood

1 from 209 Maple Ridge Road. My property does sit on one acre, we're very fortunate  
2 in that way. And those are the homes that I'm accustomed to looking at. Now I  
3 travel Fulmer Road quite frequently. You will see on Fulmer Road teenagers who  
4 if you look at insurance premiums are much higher than they are for a different  
5 generation. They're traveling to Westwood High School and they're traveling to  
6 Blythewood High School on a two lane road, which is notorious for tremendously  
7 bad car accidents. And I do believe that if you've driven on Fulmer Road any time  
8 lately you'll see that teenagers, and I once was and I just thank goodness that I'm  
9 still here, sometimes drive recklessly. And that is a tremendous concern for me  
10 especially when we consider the first responders, the ambulance and the fire  
11 department assets that are available to those that live in Blythewood. My second  
12 comment would be Scout Motors. Anything less is a car, that's their motto. So I  
13 believe if we're using commuting as one of the reasons to support, making our  
14 infrastructure contain a large amount of homes to accommodate those who work  
15 at Scout Motors, I commute to Rock Hill every day so a seven mile commute for  
16 me would be a cakewalk as opposed to a one mile commute. And I believe that if  
17 you work at Scout Motors you very well may be driving a Scout vehicle and you  
18 would miss the opportunity to drive and have that experience. I don't think a  
19 commutation, commutation, that's a prison term, I work in criminal justice, but I  
20 don't believe that that is a valid argument, I think that's a lackluster argument. And  
21 I do appreciate the fact that you're sitting on the Planning Commission and I

1 understand all the different things you have to consider. So thank you for listening  
2 to me.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out. Anyone else,  
4 Commissioner Frierson?

5 MS. FRIERSON: That was our last speaker on that issue.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. Okay Commissioners, this one's on  
7 the floor for discussion and any questions.

8 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

10 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff. The two parcels that were recently, I  
11 guess recently approved from agriculture to R3 to the west of the parcel at issue  
12 today, what was the basis for those approvals?

13 MR. SMITH: Can you be more specific about that?

14 MR. DURANT: I'm just curious as – I think they were originally zoned AG or  
15 HM and then they were approved to change the zoning to R3, correct?

16 MR. SMITH: Yes, but we, we would have to have to go back and check on  
17 the specifics.

18 MR. DURANT: Okay, meaning that it – if the Planning Commission denied  
19 them originally it means it wasn't consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, so some  
20 basis had to be put forth for the approval, correct?

21 MR. SMITH: That is correct. We would have to go back and check the  
22 records from Council to see what their comments were.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Thank you, Staff.  
2 Staff, can you pull up the map that's on page 29? So the public can see it too. This  
3 would be a current zoning map for the area, correct, with those County Council  
4 changes?

5 MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

7 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

9 MR. GRADY: Question for Staff. This will be a familiar question. So I was  
10 curious if you could pull up the GIS map and give me a bit of a ballpark estimate  
11 of the average lot size on, say Ashley Wood Court? On the screen. There we go.

12 MR. DELAGE: So that lot, just in case you can't see it is approximately an  
13 acre. And the same is true for the second lot.

14 MR. GRADY: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. The neighboring  
16 parcels are an acre and this request would be, what, a third of an acre density?  
17 Staff? I hear the public saying a sixth of an acre. Is that correct?

18 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, that's correct.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you. Commissioner Johnson.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I probably should've asked on the previous  
21 case, but on this case let me ask this question. These are both in the, have we  
22 received any information in terms of the district representatives having any public

1 input sessions? And if so what would the outcome of it, if they were held? Public  
2 hearings.

3 MR. DELAGE: So this, there has not been a meeting scheduled at this time,  
4 however, given the Council district representative's preference for holding town  
5 halls there is a very good chance that she will have a town hall meeting prior to the  
6 zoning public hearing.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Commissioner Grady?

8 MR. GRADY: Yes, thank you. One more question for Staff about the  
9 surrounding area cause I see to the north of the parcel in question we have a large  
10 undeveloped lot in the City of Blythewood, Town of Blythewood rather. Do we have  
11 any indication of how that is zoned or could be developed in the future?

12 MR. DELAGE: According to the map from the Town of Blythewood's website  
13 it's showing that area along Fulmer Road as RU.

14 MR. GRADY: And that is some form of rural.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner, the Town supplied a letter sent, to that  
16 same effect, saying it's RU, rural intended to include areas of agriculture, forestry  
17 animal husbandry with associated facilities, residential uses with a minimum lot  
18 area of one acre. That's according to the town manager.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Yes,  
20 Commissioner Loyd?

21 MS. LOYD: I have a question regarding the traffic count. [Inaudible] about  
22 the traffic. There is mention of a traffic count from SCDOT and it said it was south

1 of the property and I did find the location and it's like south of the Turkey [inaudible]  
2 but it's not up on Fulmer Road. Is there any other counts anywhere closer to the  
3 property or closer to Blythewood Road that we can see?

4 MR. DELAGE: Looks like the next closest one that would be along a  
5 potential travel route is showing up here at Blythewood Road. Of course, that's  
6 gonna pick up traffic, you know, going potentially past Fulmer. And then Lorick  
7 Road down here, this looks like that, without having the benefit of the functional  
8 classification and doing level of service, you know, assuming that, that's a two lane.  
9 So it looks like it is a two lane collector road according to the DOT's functional  
10 class.

11 MS. LOYD: [Inaudible]

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Microphone? Commissioner Loyd, use your  
13 microphone.

14 MS. LOYD: Oh, sorry. I'll repeat myself. It looked like potentially the part of  
15 the parcels that would be connecting onto that road would be a rural minor  
16 collector. I'm just saying this because in the report here it does say that there are  
17 new planned improvements or planned or programmed improvements for this  
18 section of the road, and I think that that is a concern bringing in, at least for me, an  
19 R3 designation.

20 MR. DELAGE: So yes, similar to where the potential future connection would  
21 be to Fulmer where the parcel has frontage, it looks like that section is considered  
22 to be, a portion of it's a major collector but it does turn in to, let's see, it's showing

1 both as major collectors. For some reason that segment is highlighted a different  
2 color but it's still showing up as a major collector when I click on it.

3 MS. LOYD: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Loyd. Thank you, Staff.

5 Further discussion or a motion?

6 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

8 MR. DURANT: I move that Case 25-040 MA be forwarded to County Council  
9 with a recommendation of disapproval as not being consistent with the  
10 Comprehensive Plan, in particular the neighborhood low density designation.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Do we have a  
12 second for disapproval?

13 MS. LOYD: I'll second.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, Commissioner Loyd seconds. Okay, we have a  
15 motion on the floor with a second for disapproval of this Map Amendment. Staff,  
16 can you please take a vote?

17 MR. SMITH: Okay, so the motion on the floor is for the denial of Case No.  
18 25-040, Yonke?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'd like us to mix up the vote, Staff, but aye.

20 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

21 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

22 MR. SMITH: Johnson?

1 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

2 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

3 MS. LOYD: Aye.

4 MR. SMITH: Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Aye.

6 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

7 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

8 MR. SMITH: Grady?

9 MS. GRADY: Aye.

10 MR. SMITH: Motion passes.

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

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Okay so this goes, recommendation  
14 to County Council as disapproval. For those who came out for this one, thank you  
15 for coming out.

16 MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'll take a minute as many people seem to be leaving.  
18 Staff?

19 MR. DELAGE: Just real quick for folks that might be curious about attending  
20 the town hall, Mr. Price did confirm that there's a tentative date for January 7<sup>th</sup> so  
21 more information will be forthcoming from the Clerk of Council's office.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Town hall, January 7<sup>th</sup>, please stay tuned. Thank you.  
2 And I just made that comment before cause I don't like the drive the motions, so  
3 just randomize it if you can. Thank you. I talk enough.

4 MR. SMITH: No problem.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I respect my colleagues.

6 MR. SMITH: I'll do that going forward.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Microphone?

8 MS. LOYD: - service level map?

9 MR. DELAGE: Yes, the, I found that sometimes it's easier just to, instead of  
10 trying to go to the GIS website, just to directly do an SCDOT functional  
11 classification map. They do have a GIS landing page where they'll have more  
12 information as far as for roadway data, roadway conditions and stuff like that, but  
13 I found it's just easier just to Google that SCDOT functional classification rather  
14 than going through the landing page.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Staff, thank you. We're gonna go ahead and  
16 keep moving along. Pass it back to you information on Case 25-041.

17 **CASE NO. 25-041 MA:**

18 MR. SMITH: Okay, so Case No. 25-041 MA. The Applicant is Walt Shealy.  
19 Location is 113 Western Lane. Tax Map number R04100-07-79, 5.99 acres. The  
20 existing zoning is HM or Homestead. The proposed zoning is Rural Crossroads.  
21 The Comprehensive Plan recommends non-compliant. The proposed zoning  
22 request it not compliant with the land use and character of the neighborhood

1 medium density designation. According to the Comprehensive Plan nonresidential  
2 development should be located along main road corridors within a contextually  
3 appropriate distance from a primarily arterial intersection. Furthermore, the  
4 requested Rural Crossroads zoning would allow uses that are more intensive than  
5 those supported by the objectives and guidelines for this designation; potentially  
6 introducing activities that are not compatible with the existing development pattern.  
7 Additionally, the RC District is intended to support the rural areas of the County.  
8 The location of the proposed Map Amendment is not rural in character or  
9 development and therefore it does not align with the intent of the RC zoning district.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, any questions for  
11 Staff? Not hearing any yet. Commissioner Frierson?

12 MS. FRIERSON: We have the Applicant, Mr. Walt Shealy.

13 **TESTIMONY OF WALT SHEALY:**

14 MR. SHEALY: Good evening, my name is Walt Shealy. I live at 12559 Broad  
15 River Road in Little Mountain, South Carolina. The purpose for us tonight for this  
16 piece of property is I own a commercial general contracting business. We are  
17 currently located in Downtown Chapin and we'd be looking to build our new office  
18 on this piece of property. A lot of our work is in the Midlands area, Richland County,  
19 City of Columbia, Lexington, so it would be closer to where we operate as well as  
20 a more central location for our employees. We feel like being Western Lane is a  
21 frontage road to the interstate so that would be a good spot for us to be for a  
22 frontage road. And on the other end of that we feel like it's not a good residential

1 location as it's zoned now because it's on a frontage road with noise. The adjacent  
2 property is a commercial generator repair shop and then on the other end of  
3 Western Lane down the road you have a Redi-Mix Concrete plant and many, many  
4 other businesses so we feel like it would be a good location for us to have our  
5 office. We're not high traffic count, our office is eight employees so very minimal  
6 traffic in and out at the actual office itself. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out. Anyone else,  
8 Commissioner Frierson?

9 MS. FRIERSON: No, that's our last speaker.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay Commissioners, any questions? This is  
11 open on the floor now for discussion as well. Staff, can you put up the zoning layer  
12 on the map? Staff, I think you mentioned in your report we recently spoke about  
13 the parcel across the highway last month?

14 MR. SMITH: That is correct.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We're also at the edge of the county, correct Staff?

16 MR. SMITH: That is correct. The neighboring municipality of Irmo is abutting  
17 these areas of the county.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And there's some development going on, correct?

19 MR. DELAGE: So where the hand is over that parcel, kinda on the  
20 southwestern side of the interstate, the, that parcel is being developed for a school  
21 and is currently under development.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. That's a refresher from last month.  
2 Okay Commissioners, any discussion?

3 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

5 MR. GRADY: Question for Staff. So the parcel immediately north of the one  
6 in question is also zoned as, as Homestead but as noted by the Applicant appears  
7 to have a, a commercial/industrial sort of business. Is that a grandfathered in  
8 nonconforming use or is there some other explanation for why that is on a property  
9 that it wouldn't be zoned for ordinarily?

10 MR. DELAGE: That is correct, yes it is a legal nonconforming use.

11 MR. GRADY: Okay. Just out of curiosity any idea how long that property's  
12 been developed?

13 MR. DELAGE: I'm sorry?

14 MR. GRADY: Any idea how long that property has been developed?

15 MR. DELAGE: That's the 2000 aerial and then there's the '96 aerial and  
16 that's gonna be the last one before 1959, so it would've at least been done under  
17 two previous codes; so one that was adopted in 2005 and then the original zoning  
18 ordinance that was adopted in '77.

19 MR. GRADY: Okay, thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Thank you, Staff.  
21 Further discussion or a motion? You guys know as the Chair I don't like making  
22 motions.

1 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

3 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion that we send Case 25-041 MA  
4 to County Council with a recommendation of approval. The rationale being that  
5 there is an adjacent commercial property and the parcel in question is immediately  
6 adjacent to Interstate 26.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Second, Mr. Chairman.

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

10 MR. JOHNSON: Second, Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Johnson. Okay, approval  
12 and a second, we have a motion for approval with a second. Staff, can you please  
13 take a vote?

14 MR. SMITH: Okay, this motion is for approval for Case No. 25-041 MA from  
15 HM to RC, Grady?

16 MR. GRADY: Aye.

17 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

18 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

19 MR. SMITH: Durant?

20 MR. DURANT: Aye.

21 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

22 MS. LOYD: Aye.

1 MR. SMITH: Johnson?

2 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

3 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

4 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

5 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

7 MR. SMITH: Motion passes.

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

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. That will go to County Council as a  
11 recommendation for approval. And will that also be heard December 16<sup>th</sup> at  
12 7:00pm, Staff?

13 MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you so much. We'll keep moving along. Case  
15 25-042.

16 **CASE NO. 25-042 MA:**

17 MR. SMITH: Okay, so the case before you, 25-042 MA. The Applicant is  
18 Hank Mabry. Location is 1459 Freshly Mill Road. Tax Map number R02800-02-51,  
19 76.71 acres. Current zoning is Agricultural, AG. The proposed zoning is  
20 Homestead, HM. The Comprehensive Plan recommends compliant. The proposed  
21 rezoning is consistent with the objectives of the Rural, large lot designation in the  
22 Comprehensive Plan. The requested Map Amendment does align with the

1 residential agricultural guidelines recommendation for this designation. In addition  
2 the requested zoning designation would be in character with the parcels located  
3 within the immediate area.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, do we have any  
5 questions for Staff? Alright, not seeing or hearing any, Commissioner Frierson,  
6 anyone signed up to speak?

7 MS. FRIERSON: The first person is, looks like Moultrie?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is the Applicant here? Yes, come on down. State your  
9 name and address and we'll write that down so they can record it.

10 **TESTIMONY OF HANK MABRY**

11 MR. MABRY: Thank you Commission. My name's Hank Mabry.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Hank Mabry, there it is.

13 MR. MABRY: I live at 2536 Canterbury Road in Columbia, South Carolina.  
14 Currently, as y'all see this property is zoned AG. We would like a little bit higher  
15 density to go up one notch to Homestead. Right now it's 77, about 77 acres with  
16 one home on the property. As y'all mentioned earlier this area is going through a  
17 transition, we just wanna put a few larger lots other than one home on 76 acres.  
18 We don't plan on putting any public roads in, no public water and sewer,  
19 everything'll be septic and well. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out.

21 MS. FRIERSON: Next two people, Frank Rowe, somebody, Wessinger?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Wessinger, come on down. Name and address?

**TESTIMONY OF FRANK ROWE:**

MR. ROWE: Good evening, my name is Frank Rowe. My address is 125 Water Song Lane in Irmo, just right down the street from the proposed lot. I came out tonight because I was not sure what the proposed plan but hearing that they're gonna be large lots I don't think I have any objection to that. I was, I enjoy the fact that we have wildlife and that we have no light pollution in the area. So if they are as high density or a lot of things coming in that would ruin the light pollution or the low light that we have, and drive off the wildlife; that would, I would not enjoy that as much but I don't think I have any disapproval to large lots of five acres or so. And those are my comments, thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out.

**TESTIMONY OF CHARLIE WESSINGER:**

MS. WESSINGER: Hi, Charlies Wessinger. I actually live at 145 [Inaudible] Outlet Road in Chapin, however, I have friends and family down this road and I'm very familiar with that acreage. Your current AG zoning is one home per three acres approximately, and I believe Homestead is one home per acre and a half. So if the Applicant is truly looking at keeping everything large lots, not putting in any additional roads, I don't see why the zoning would need to change from AG to Homestead. The surrounding area has large lots. There might be a couple in there that are around an acre and a half but those were from families that lived there and they pulled off an acre and a half for their kids and/or cut out for tax purposes. So I would ask you guys to please look at this as a noncompliant move to an acre and

1 a half for density if the plan is actually to keep it as larger lots. I'm also on Lexington  
2 County Council so I appreciate all of you. I know what you go through, I know what,  
3 the decisions you have to make so I appreciate all of you and your time. Thank  
4 you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

6 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, next Jackie Chapman and Brett Chapman.

7 **TESTIMONY OF JACKIE CHAPMAN**

8 MS. CHAPMAN: Good evening, I'm Jackie Chapman at 1404 John  
9 Chapman Road in Irmo. I'm gonna piggyback off of Ms. Wessinger and just say  
10 that I also don't understand why we need to change the zoning if we're keeping  
11 this at large lots. I had a complete three page document I wanted to read about all  
12 the reasons not to do this but I just wanna say by looking out here, these are my  
13 neighbors, these are my family, this is a farming, a fishing, a community of people  
14 who have legacies that have been passed down from generation to generation four  
15 our kids and our grandkids. And having this kinda development does not comply  
16 with what we have. Like Charlie said, these smaller acres are families. These are  
17 brothers and sisters and aunts and uncles, it's the same as where I'm on 64 acres  
18 of four homes and those are my family. So I don't see the need for this sort of  
19 development. We can't handle it, our wildlife can't handle it. And I appreciate what  
20 y'all do. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

22 **TESTIMONY OF BRETT CHAPMAN:**

1 MR. CHAPMAN: I'm Brett Chapman, I live at 1408 John Chapman Road and  
2 I'm not gonna repeat a lot of what Jackie said. I just wish he would explain how  
3 many lots and have a more plan about what he's gonna do. And I don't see a need  
4 to reduce it down to Homestead. If he wants bigger lots, most of the acreage  
5 around there is three acres, five acres, you know, we just wanna start something  
6 by putting acre and a half lots in there. As you can see there's a lot more bigger  
7 lots around there and we don't wanna set a precedent to start having more sprawl  
8 in there. And we're full in there, we're like Blythewood, we can't handle anymore  
9 up there in the Ballentine/Irmo/White Rock area. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

11 MS. FRIERSON: The next two speakers, Larry Scott and Cliff Corley.

12 **TESTIMONY OF LARRY SCOTT:**

13 MR. SOCTT: My name is Larry Scott. I live at 1601 Freshly Mill Road which  
14 is directly beside the property. I understand the large lot size and most out there  
15 do have large lots. I'm just not sure that the roads can handle one and a half acre  
16 lots with the amount of homes that they would be putting in there. I'm not exactly  
17 sure, you know, what size homes they are. And again education would've done a  
18 lot for us in this meeting tonight, had we had a little disclosure about what was  
19 going on and what was happening. I'm sorry, that's not your fault, it's nobody fault  
20 but whoever proposed this. Originally the thought was there were gonna bring  
21 sewer down our road, and water, and that was some misinformation also unless  
22 we're unaware of that right now. At that point in time, you know, anything we say

1 tonight is irrelevant. We're not educated enough to know what we're making a  
2 decision on. No, one and a half acre lots, too concentrated in there. There's a pond  
3 in there, I think it's about a seven acre pond. And I'm not exactly sure it's 76 acres.  
4 I'm imagining that's taking into the consideration the pond that's not buildable. Or  
5 we're gonna drain the pond, that was another thing that was mentioned. Again,  
6 this is misinformation and none of us know what exactly is gonna go on on this  
7 property. Three acre lots, more power to you, that's fine. But there's no  
8 infrastructure, there's no roads. If you consider how much area or land mass the  
9 roads or the infrastructure would take up, I'm not so sure you're gonna be able to  
10 get 40 homes on this property. But that's still quite a bit. Thank you for your time.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

12 **TESTIMONY OF CLIFF CORLEY:**

13 MR. CORLEY: Hello, thank y'all for your time tonight. My name's Cliff  
14 Corley. I live at 211 Holiday Road in Chapin, South Carolina. And I, I won't repeat  
15 what he said but I agree with everything he said. Last year I was here and there  
16 was a neighborhood on Mt. Vernon Church Road that was being proposed, it's 110  
17 houses. It's two and a half miles from this property and there's still no infrastructure,  
18 okay? But the reason I'm here tonight is because, you know, if it's one house every  
19 three acres that's fantastic. I came to hear what was proposed. Another thing is is  
20 you don't have a lotta people here from the area. And I think the reason is is  
21 because the meeting must've been changed, I think the meeting was supposed to  
22 be scheduled on the 1<sup>st</sup> of December, maybe, that's what I understand. But when

1 the meeting was changed over at Mt. Vernon Church Road and 176, which is right  
2 across the street, that meeting was very well documented it was changed, it was  
3 a big banner saying the meeting was changed and everybody was here from the  
4 other neighborhoods. But I didn't see that on this meeting. I was only notified that  
5 the meeting had changed when a friend of mine called me. So I would at least ask  
6 you to consider deferring this decision, you know, until, cause next week, is that  
7 right, the County Council meeting is when you're trying to do this, the 16<sup>th</sup>? Yeah,  
8 I would, you know, better advertisement, like the gentleman said, more education,  
9 what's gonna transpire cause we are, I've been over there, I've been out there  
10 since 2009 and we have seen unbelievable growth, middle school, high school,  
11 you know, and it's just, we need change. And another think you're gonna hear from  
12 a couple other guys, we're cyclists, we ride back there, you know, and it's already  
13 getting tight. So thank you for your service, appreciate you.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

15 MS. FRIERSON: Next two, Jim O'Leary and Brian Barnes.

16 **TESTIMONY OF JIM O'LEARY:**

17 MR. O'LEARY: Yes, hi. My name is Jim O'Leary and I live at 40 River Mist  
18 Court, Irmo, South Carolina, about two miles from this property. And I've been a  
19 lifelong resident of the Irmo/Chapin area. And many of us moved into, into Water  
20 Song, the Water Song community which is, which is in the top right corner. And  
21 that was about, about 18 years ago we built, I have about 10 acres. It was a  
22 development that had very little opposition, it did not require any zoning changes,

1 it's a minimum of five acres, and I think it's, we've become very close friends and  
2 family with many of the people in this room. And I think that if this were proposed  
3 in a similar manner it would be received in a very similar way. But I was attracted  
4 to the area for the same reasons that many others have been. If you haven't been  
5 there it's one of the most, I'm biased, one of the most beautiful parts of rural  
6 Richland County. It's got hardwoods, rolling hills, pastures, farms, it's a great area  
7 for cycling, running, hiking, bird watching. Wildlife's abundant. As has been said  
8 there are no street lights and it's in the extreme, it feels like you're out on the  
9 frontier, it's in the extreme northwest corner. And if we're not gonna protect that as  
10 rural, where are we gonna protect? Is there gonna be anyplace left? If we don't  
11 protect this, this is, in my opinion, the most cherished part of the County, it's  
12 absolutely gorgeous. And if we don't protect this where are we gonna protect. And  
13 I just respectfully ask that the councilmembers to consider that. For people who  
14 are looking for a large suburban neighborhood with many houses, how many have  
15 we seen tonight? We've seen countless, there are countless options in Richland  
16 County. If you wanna house in a neighborhood with kids and roads and lights and  
17 all that, and many people want that, this isn't that. This is rural. For those people  
18 who want rural, peace and quiet, this is about one of the remaining, the last few  
19 areas. And if this ques the way that some of the other places have gone I don't  
20 know what we'll have left, but. So you know, the County documents on page 43, it  
21 clearly states the development in this area should preserve the rural and natural  
22 character of the district. And that's all we can really even ask from you, from this

1 committee, just please preserve and rural and natural community and don't  
2 change, don't change the rules. Thank you.

3 **TESTIMONY OF BRIAN BARNES:**

4 MR. BARNES: Hi, my name is Brian Barnes. I live at 155 Water Song Lane,  
5 Irmo 29063. And I respectfully request that you not recommend that this be  
6 approved to County Council. This parcel cannot support 50 houses, which is what  
7 the Staff's language talks about, regardless of what was mentioned that it would  
8 just be a few large lots. If it's approved it would be approved for exactly what's in  
9 this document which would be up to 50 houses. This property has a large pond,  
10 the property has a lengthy steep slope down Freshly Mill Road. This property has  
11 a point at the back that you can see that's gonna be almost undevelopable. And if  
12 the infrastructure, in order to have 50 homes there's gonna have to be a road, and  
13 if any infrastructure is pulled out of this and you consider the pond and the steep  
14 slope and the part that can't be developed, you're probably down to about 38 acres.  
15 And if you take 38 acres and divide it by 50 you're talking about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an acre for  
16 the houses. And as Dr. O'Leary said the houses in Water Song have a limit of no  
17 less than five acres. And the character of the area is large lots, not  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an acre  
18 jammed in there. The, page 44 says that the Richland County Comprehensive Plan  
19 says that in the desired development the Staff's statement describes what can be  
20 there in the first couple of sentences, but in the third sentence it says, master  
21 planned smaller lot subdivisions are not an appropriate development in rural large  
22 lot areas. Fifty houses squeezed onto what is left after the acreage for the slope

1 and pond and the point and the roads are removed would have to be master  
2 planned, so I would ask that you recommend that this not be approved. Thank you  
3 for your time.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

5 MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

7 MR. DELAGE: I would just like to point out, I believe some of y'all remember  
8 when you were on the Planning Commission that part of those recommendations  
9 for adoption that County Council ultimately did was the removal of the cluster  
10 provision. So in the HM district it wouldn't allow them, even though the gross  
11 density for the parcel is a higher amount, they wouldn't be able to reduce the lot  
12 sizes down below that, to that  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an acre.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. And while we're taking a break from  
14 public opinion, can you turn on the environmental layers, wetlands and  
15 topography? Elevation? Not a very flat area like we're hearing from everyone.  
16 Okay, Commissioner Frierson?

17 MS. FRIERSON: The last two speakers, Melinda O'Leary and William  
18 Mireres, Jr.

19 MS. O'LEARY: I'm gonna pass.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. Was anyone else out there maybe  
21 missed their time to sign up to speak that wanted to say anything? If not we'll go  
22 ahead and close our public speaking time for this.

1 MS. FRIERSON: What about Mr. Mireres?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Mireres? Out there? No? Okay. Alright. Okay  
3 Commission, this is on the floor for discussion. And questions for Staff or a motion  
4 if you're eager.

5 MR. DURANT: I have a question for Staff.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

7 MR. DURANT: Staff, the Comprehensive Plan is the guiding light of these  
8 rezoning requests. Does the Commission have the authority to deny a map zoning  
9 request that's consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?

10 MR. SMITH: The Comprehensive Plan is a recommending document, it's  
11 not a regulatory document so it is up for you guys to decide if it fits or not, so you  
12 could go against it if that's your wish.

13 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. How you doing? I  
15 thought I saw you pull your mic close.

16 MR. JOHNSON: I'll reserve my –

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you.

18 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

20 MR. GRADY: Question for Staff, cause I think there's been a lot of back and  
21 forth on the question of what constitutes a large lot. Does the County have an  
22 official definition of what that means?

1 MR. SMITH: Hold on one second, we're gonna do some research.

2 MR. GRADY: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: While Staff is researching I wanna do some Chairman  
4 math. If this was approved, it says on page 43, 50 dwelling units, but if we left it as  
5 it is that would be about 25 dwelling units, correct? Three acres?

6 MR. DELAGE: I was mathing some other math but I'll have to go back.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Twenty-five acres. That's if that land was perfectly flat,  
8 nothing, no pond in the way, beautiful pond.

9 MR. DELAGE: So just real quick and we can get back to the density. One  
10 thing you can note, there is not, there's not a specific definition by zoning ordinance  
11 of what a large lot is. However, it does break down some of the zoning districts, so  
12 you have your special purpose zoning districts that are listed in Table 26-3.2, those  
13 include the open space district, the AG, Agricultural district, and the HM,  
14 Homestead district. And just, the purpose of it is, of the special purpose based  
15 district is to ensure that open areas within the County are preserved and to protect  
16 the rural and agricultural character of lands within the County in accordance with  
17 the Comprehensive Plan. So that's probably about the closest you'll get to an  
18 answer on large lots.

19 MR. SMITH: Just to add to that, when the 2021 and 2024 Land Development  
20 Code was adopted we had adopted a new, we had gotten rid of the old RU and  
21 adopted three new rural designations of AG, HM and RT. However, the AG and  
22 HM more aligned with when you look at the translation table, more aligned with the

1 rural, large lot designation as it were. And the RT aligned more with the rural, or  
2 the RR or Rural Residential and the AG and HM aligned more with the RU.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, discussion or a  
4 motion?

5 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks.

7 MR. SIERCKS: So comment, both for the Commission and for the public.  
8 You know, we are a recommending body and as one of the other Commissioners  
9 stated and has been stated in a bunch of different meetings in the past, our  
10 guidepost is the Comprehensive Plan, it's not the determining factor, but also taken  
11 into consideration with, whether the proposed change would meet with the  
12 character of the surrounding area. Seeing that this proposed amendment does  
13 meet with compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and as far as I can tell is in  
14 keeping with the character of the surrounding zoning, I'd be inclined to support a  
15 motion to refer to County Council with a recommendation of approval. But I hold  
16 off on making any motion until discussion is closed.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. We'll reference  
18 that as a comment, not a motion. Anyone else wanna have a comment like that?  
19 Commissioner Johnson? No? I love calling on you, you say great things. All you  
20 guys say great things.

21 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

1 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff. In the 2005 Land Development Code  
2 agriculture designation [inaudible]. Can you tell me what is the basic difference  
3 between an AG designation and HM designation?

4 MR. DELAGE: So the main difference is in minimum lot width acreage, that  
5 a minimum acreage you would have to subdivide. And then there are certain uses  
6 that are permitted in the AG district more related to what it sounds like agricultural  
7 uses than necessarily the Homestead district.

8 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Commissioner  
10 Siercks?

11 MR. SIERCKS: Just to add to my comments, while I'm certainly sympathetic  
12 to some of the concerns that have been voiced by the residents who have talked  
13 here tonight, we don't look at any proposed amendments, or at least we shouldn't,  
14 in terms of potential future uses. We're looking at the map and basically as a blank  
15 map without regard to what could or may eventually be put on the plat. We look at  
16 whether it's compliant and if it fits with the character of the surrounding area.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. Further  
18 discussion? Commissioner Grady?

19 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

21 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion to send Case 25-042  
22 recommendation to County Council for approval because the requested zoning is

1 in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and is contextually appropriate to  
2 surrounding parcels.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, I'll make a Chair move here. So we have a  
4 motion for approval and before I ask for a second, I've been around long enough  
5 for the Land Development Code and Staff as more of a question, AG was defined  
6 as something that was 35 acres or more, so by default as we went from the 2005  
7 Code to 2021, we did it based off of acreage. So it put it at, like this parcel, at AG  
8 because it's above 35 acres, correct?

9 MR. SMITH: That is correct. All RUs were designated to become either RT,  
10 HM or AG, depending on what their acreages were. So three and under would  
11 become RT, three to 35 would become HM and above 35 would become AG.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So as we look at the Comprehensive Plan and we look  
13 at our packet saying compliant, that's really just the interpretation of, of the  
14 Comprehensive Plan. And we also take into account the Land Development Code  
15 which this one clearly by it's size is AG. So that's my comment. Anything else,  
16 Staff, to follow up on that? No? Okay. So now I'll ask, we have a motion on the  
17 floor, do we have a second?

18 MR. SIERCKS? Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

20 MR. SIERCKS: I second.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Siercks has a second. Alright, we have  
22 a motion on the floor for approval, Staff go ahead and take a vote.

1 MR. SMITH: Okay. Motion on the floor is for approval of Case No. 25-042,  
2 zoning going from AG to HM, location 1459 Freshly Mill Road, Grady?

3 MR. GRADY: Aye.

4 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

5 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

6 MR. SMITH: Durant?

7 MR. DURANT: Aye.

8 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

9 MS. LOYD: Aye.

10 MR. SMITH: Johnson?

11 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

12 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

13 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

14 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Nay.

16 MR. SMITH: Motion passes.

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

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioners. Thank you, Staff. This is  
20 a recommendation to County Council for approval and it will be taken up at the  
21 Zoning Public Hearing on December 16<sup>th</sup>, correct, 7:00pm. That is the concrete  
22 date of that meeting, correct?

1 MR. DELAGE: It is.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff apologizes from the Council Chambers right  
3 here. Thank you. Give the room a minute. Alright Staff, I'm gonna flip this back  
4 over to you for more information for Case 25-043.

5 **CASE NO. 25-043 MA:**

6 MR. SMITH: Okay. The case you have before you, Case No. 25-043 MA.  
7 The Applicant is John Stephens, location is Koon Store Road and 9301 Wilson  
8 Boulevard. Tax Map number R12100-02-13, and R14600-01-08, 155.55 acres.  
9 The existing zoning for both parcels is agricultural or AG. The requested zoning is  
10 R3, Residential 4. The Comprehensive Plan recommends noncompliant. The  
11 subject parcels for the proposed Map Amendment are located within the  
12 neighborhood low density designation of the Comprehensive Plan. This  
13 designation supports low density traditional neighborhood development and open  
14 space developments that preserve open spaces and natural features. The  
15 proposed rezoning is not compliant with the goals of this designation as it does not  
16 offer a density that aligns with its intent. Although this designation allows for  
17 increased densities when balanced by the preservation of open space and natural  
18 features, the requested Map Amendment may be viewed as establishing level that  
19 exceeds what is appropriate to support the intended transition between rural and  
20 neighborhood medium density future land use areas. A portion of the subject  
21 request is located along a section of Wilson Boulevard that falls within the  
22 neighborhood activity center designation of the Comprehensive Plan. According to

1 the Plan medium density housing is encouraged to support surrounding  
2 neighborhood scale commercial development and institutional uses in the area.  
3 However, there appears to be a conflict between the goals and recommendations  
4 of the neighborhood low density and neighborhood activity center designations,  
5 particularly given their close proximity in the area. In addition, recent denials of  
6 rezoning requests which would have permitted more intense uses in the immediate  
7 area suggests that further evaluation of the appropriateness of the neighborhood  
8 activity center designation along this section of Wilson Boulevard may be  
9 warranted.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, any questions from  
11 Staff? Okay, Commissioner Frierson

12 MS. FRIERSON: First we give an opportunity to the Applicant, John  
13 Stephens?

14 **TESTIMONY OF JOHN STEPHENS:**

15 MR. STEPHENS: Hey, how are y'all? John Stephens, 846 Kilbourne Road,  
16 Columbia, South Carolina. Looking to develop this property for single-family  
17 residential homes. The larger tract, Boykins piece, just to throw this out here early  
18 on so everybody can hear it, we have a legal document in place, contract with him  
19 to preserve 70 acres of this parcel he wanted to remain undeveloped land. So with  
20 that being the case we moved forward with this and secured both these properties  
21 here. It is, we have two accesses, one off of Wilson Boulevard and one off of Koon  
22 Store Road. We have sewer going on the back of the property and there's also

1 water going on both of the major roads that we have there. Across is Crane  
2 Landing which I think Ryan Homes is currently constructing that. It's gonna be  
3 similar lot sizes to that. We're really gonna keep this about three units per acre just  
4 because once we, you know, preserve that land we don't have but so much to work  
5 with after that. That's all I got.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

7 MS. FRIERSON: The next two people, Phillip Busbee and D. Jacqueline, it  
8 looks like Garner or Gaden, Gaston?

9 **TESTIMONY OF PHILLIP BUSBEE:**

10 MR. BUSBEE: Yeah, my name's Phillip Busbee. I live at 330 Koon Store  
11 Road. And my concern is the capacity of traffic that's already on Koon Store Road.  
12 It's become real property since the development, all the new developments up  
13 there. It sits right between Highway 21 and 321, and there's a constant barrage of  
14 traffic, 24/7; semi's, dump trucks, and of course automobiles. I'm even afraid to go  
15 to my mailbox now as it is. And I just don't see how the road can, I don't know if a  
16 traffic study's been done but one needs to be done. I don't see how it can handle  
17 any more traffic, and that's my basis.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Okay, we're gonna try the second  
19 name again, 490 Koon Store Road, is that your address?

20 MS. GASTON: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down. At the podium we'll get your name  
22 and address.

**TESTIMONY OF JACQUELINE GATSON:**

MS. GASTON: Thank you. Hi, my name is Jacqueline Gatson. I do live at 490 Koon Store Road. I hadn't been there no more than three years maybe. I agree, I have not talked with Mr. Busbee but he talked for me, he said the exact same thing that I'm experiencing. I can't go to my mailbox because of the traffic. So I have to wait both ways before the, that I can retrieve my mail. And during the three years that I was there it has been at least three accidents, some was killed, I think two was killed. And they, when they go down the road, I mean, two cars behind, one behind each other, they will go by illegally, and I'm on the curve. And so traffic is 24/7. I'm up here, you know, I hear traffic most all night long. They speed, 35 bikers was speeding on that road. I stood in my yard and just count them; zoom, zoom, zoom by. Ambulance come through there all the time, fire department come through there, dump trucks, 18-wheelers, commercial vehicles, cars, trucks, bikes, you name it we got it all coming through there. How is it that they're gonna put us, subject us to more traffic when we can't hardly handle what we already have. There's a day care there that's coming that is right across the street from that property, and people is just complaining. Mr. Busbee can't go to his mailbox he said, I can't go to my mailbox. So something is definitely wrong. There's a deep curve going around, we have several curves, you know, that once you get off one you're on another. But they're speeding so fast and they're passing each other illegally. So please, I beg you on today, please do not approve this that

1 we may live, older people like us, you know, I'm not that old but we're aging, that  
2 we may –

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, ma'am. I wanna be fair for time. I  
4 understand, thank you.

5 MS. GATSON: Right, we may live comfortably. And I thank you so much for  
6 your time, your service and I appreciate you if you did not approve this tonight,  
7 thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

9 MS. FRIERSON: Kennerly Jones Bast and Jacqueline, looks like Gladden.

10 **TESTIMONY OF KENNERLY JONES BAST:**

11 MS. BAST: Hi, I'm Kennerly Jones Bast. I reside at 341 Koon Store Road. I  
12 also own 7812 Winnsboro Road at 317 Koon Store Road and have familial interest  
13 at 343 Koon Store Road. I'm here speaking for my family tonight. I am also gonna  
14 go with the other residents on my road and say the traffic situation is extremely  
15 dangerous. Pulling out of my driveway at 317 you take your life in your own hands  
16 every time, and it is dangerous to get your mail. I have other concerns though; the  
17 dense residential R4 allows for multiple family housing, trailer parks, that type of  
18 thing. Part of the property on Koon Store Road has two flowing bodies of water,  
19 the Long Branch of Crane Creek and the North Branch of Crane Creek. And a  
20 large segment of that is within the floodplain of those two creeks. The ethics and  
21 the ecological impact of putting multiple homes in that area need to be strongly  
22 considered. We also have issues with infrastructure on our road. Water pressure

1 is so low at our homes we cannot pressure wash to maintain the exterior of our  
2 homes, it's not safe, it will break the pressure washer. There's also a problem with  
3 emergency services. We are served by Region 6 of the Sheriff's Department for  
4 Richland County. They are out manned. Living in the 300 block of Koon Store Road  
5 is like living in the Wild West. We've had driveway shootings, I've had an M80  
6 blown up in one of my ditches. I've had two HVAC systems stolen and a break in  
7 at 317 Koon Store Road. Having the deputies at multiple times, they let me know  
8 that they are too busy on the other side of Blythewood to be policing our road and  
9 that our best hope is to catch the criminals ourselves. I am adamantly opposed to  
10 further development on our street.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, ma'am.

12 **TESTIMONY OF JACQUELINE GLADDEN:**

13 MS. GLADDEN: Good evening. My name is Jacqueline Gladden and I live  
14 at 402 Koon Store Road. I have lived on Koon Store road close to 30 years now  
15 and I can say that the traffic has always been pretty normal until 2015 when the  
16 flood hit. During that time it appears, I don't wanna speculate and I really can't  
17 speculate as to why the traffic increased tremendously, but between, Koon Store  
18 Road is a connector, you have 321 and then you have 21. However, I agree with  
19 my neighbors that the traffic is tremendous, it's horrible. And to compound that  
20 problem would create even more of a horrible situation. At this particular time you  
21 cannot, you cannot go around, and my concern is EMS, my concern is the Sheriff's  
22 patrol coming through there. You cannot go around. You pretty much have to stay

1 straight ahead. So it's very difficult to get on to Koon Store Road and it's very  
2 difficult to get out of Koon Store Road as it is now. So I believe to have units to add  
3 to this is just not a good idea. And after the, I would like to say after the flooding  
4 you would've thought that there would've been some engineering to ease the traffic  
5 off that road through a light or something but nothing has happened on either end.  
6 So my recommendation is that you disapprove this multi-family unit or whatever  
7 that's to be constructed in our community. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

9 MS. FRIERSON: We have no one else who is signed up to speak.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. Staff, can you  
11 address the environmental concerns that was mentioned with wetlands? Like just,  
12 that's what we see on the map. As well as the question about R4. I think someone  
13 talked about manufactured homes. I don't believe that's in R4.

14 MR. DELAGE: So I'll address the use first. So back on page 65 you've got  
15 the Principal Use Table. I'm sorry. Let me get the correct page, I flipped to look at  
16 something else.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Sixty?

18 MR. DELAGE: So just a note we will have it changed, it's showing the AG  
19 district in the packet so they may have, I don't know if someone may have gotten,  
20 you know, information as far as for the uses from there, but the R, the requested  
21 zoning, the R4 district is a single-family zoning district.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's correct, page 60 is AG and then page 61 is R4,  
2 so comparing the two.

3 MR. DELAGE: So, yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, good job, Staff.

5 MR. DELAGE: But the, as far as for the floodplain you can see the red here  
6 is a floodway. The orange is an AE flood zone so that mean that there's potentially  
7 some impacts allowed by Code. And then you have the yellow which is just an  
8 X500 which is just, it's not a regulatory floodplain, it's just to kind of show the risk.  
9 However, it is very difficult to impact the floodway which is this red here. It requires  
10 specific impacts to it and generally those are dealing with, like utilities, roads, you  
11 know, something that you'd have to cross is or need to cross it for a particular  
12 reason, but it doesn't allow for building. Additionally, there's wetlands shown here.  
13 The National Wetland Inventory is notorious for it could or could be correct or it  
14 could be wrong. So a wetlands scientist would actually go out and delineate it.  
15 However, if the wetland are present it is a required buffering by the County  
16 ordinance of 50' and while the County does allow buffer averaging the idea is that  
17 it'll maintain a continuous 50' water quality buffer around any of those identified  
18 wetlands.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Could you turn on the elevation layer just for a minute?  
20 That also answered my question for page 61, R4 was a reminder that it's a single-  
21 family, no multi-family in R4, correct?

22 MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay Commission. Yes, Commissioner Loyd?

2 MS. LOYD: Yeah, I have a question for Staff. This is about traffic again. And  
3 it does show one traffic count but there is another traffic count station, it's station  
4 429 on Koon Store Road. And what I don't know is what the design capacity of that  
5 road is and it's listed as a rural major collector.

6 MR. SMITH: So that level of service would be operating somewhere in a  
7 level of service A because it falls below the .5 math that goes into that. 8600 is the  
8 capacity for that typical road, for a two-lane undivided collector.

9 MS. LOYD: I did just notice though when you pulled that up when they took  
10 that data is when school was out. Just to –

11 MR. SMITH: So traffic counts are only 24 hours, they don't take into account  
12 . . .

13 MS. LOYD: I understand that, I just, I think that based on our public comment  
14 I think that that is potentially a concern.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, are we looking for a count for that day in  
16 February?

17 MR. DELAGE: Yes, I was just curious what the count was during the school  
18 year.

19 MS. LOYD: No follow up questions.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No follow ups? They answered your question? Okay,  
21 thanks. Commissioner Grady?

1 MR. GRADY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. Two questions. One might be a  
2 little weird, one is sort of a soap box of mine. Question for Staff, would it be possible  
3 to recommend a zoning change for one of the two parcels, but not the other?

4 MR. SMITH: That would be not possible.

5 MR. GRADY: Okay. So I guess the main question that I have is about the  
6 discussion of the neighborhood activity center designation which applies to a  
7 portion of the real estate in question. So I, so particularly the last paragraph of the  
8 Conclusion essentially seems to argue that the neighborhood low density  
9 designation of the overall area overrides the neighborhood activity center  
10 designation for this specific spot. And I'm just curious, what is the rationale for that  
11 and what are the tradeoffs that are evaluated when you're considering which one  
12 of those two things should be given greater weight?

13 MR. SMITH: When looking at the two parcels knowing that both fall within  
14 two different designations, the philosophy would follow the more restrictive, in this  
15 case as we do in the Land Development Code, and that would be the rural large  
16 lot.

17 MR. GRADY: Alright, thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Thank you, Staff.  
19 Any other comments? Discussions? Motions, dare I say?

20 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Siercks?

1 MR. SIERCKS: I would like to make a motion. I move at this time that we  
2 forward project number 25-043 MA to County Council with a recommendation of  
3 disapproval.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. We have a motion  
5 for disapproval. Do we have a second?

6 MS. LOYD: I will second.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We got a second from Commissioner Loyd. Okay with  
8 a motion and a second for disapproval, Staff can you please take a vote?

9 MR. SMITH: Okay, the motion on the table is for disapproval for Map  
10 Amendment number 25-043, Grady?

11 MR. GRADY: No.

12 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

13 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

14 MR. SMITH: Durant?

15 MR. DURANT: Aye.

16 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

17 MS. LOYD: Aye.

18 MR. SMITH: Johnson?

19 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

20 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

21 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

22 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

2 MR. SMITH: The motion passes.

3 *[Approved to deny: Siercks, Durant, Loyd, Johnson, Frierson, Yonke; Opposed:*  
4 *Grady; Absent: Taylor, Duffy]*

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, that motion goes to the, disapproval  
6 recommendation to County Council. They will meet December 16<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm in  
7 these Council chambers. Appreciate everyone hanging out this long with us  
8 tonight. That was our last case, we still have other items to discuss.  
9 Commissioners, I think if you need a restroom break, maybe we'll take five? Yeah?  
10 Staff, we're gonna take five for a restroom break.

11 [Break]

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Next on our Agenda, 2025 Land Development Code  
13 updates. We'll flip this over to Mr. Price at the podium.

14 MR. PRICE: No.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No? Okay. Anyone from Staff, go ahead.

16 MR. PRICE: Good evening, Commission. So this is an update on the MU2  
17 corridor mixed use district review that's being proposed. This is an informational  
18 item only and no action is requested from the Commission at this time. At the  
19 September 23<sup>rd</sup> Development and Services Committee meeting a motion was  
20 made to amend the MU2, which is corridor mixed use district, by removing  
21 references to high intensity, multi-family residential and eliminating several uses  
22 from the Permitted Use Table, including multi-family dwellings, passenger

1 terminals, surface transportation, kennels, hotel/motels, vehicle fueling stations  
2 and warehouse distribution facilities. The committee voted to send this back to the  
3 Planning Commission noting that Staff may provide recommendations and that the  
4 Commission may recommend something different to County Council. The purpose  
5 of this update is to allow the Planning Commission to evaluate whether the MU2  
6 district's general description aligns with its current density allowances,  
7 development standards, and permitted uses as some of the permitted uses may be  
8 viewed as being more intense than what the district stated in intent and visions.  
9 For your December meeting Staff has included all MU2 related sections of the  
10 Land Development Code in your package. The focus of the Planning Commission  
11 should be to determine, are density and dimensional standards consistent with the  
12 district's description? Do permitted uses support the corridor's pedestrian oriented  
13 mixed use character? Are additional mixed use development standards needed  
14 for combined residential and non-residential development? It is intended that this  
15 review be placed on the February 2026 Planning Commission Agenda as an action  
16 item. However, if the Planning Commission determines that additional discussion  
17 is needed this review may first proceed through a work session with subsequent  
18 actions to participate anticipated at the February meeting. If you have any  
19 questions.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Mr. Price. So the last part of that is based off of  
21 our discussion here. We may decide that we want to have a work session before  
22 our February meeting?

1 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

3 MR. PRICE: You know, as previously stated we just, what was included in  
4 your package are, is basically the section regarding the MU2, primarily the general  
5 description and the development standards for this particular zoning designation,  
6 and also the matrix of permitted uses for each zoning designation. And you'll notice  
7 that's highlighted in the yellow and hopefully that's easy to follow for all of the  
8 permitted uses in the MU2 district.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Price, you would like us to look at this as is and  
10 make reference or make reference from specifically certain items to remove?

11 MR. PRICE: We'd just like for you to actually look at the MU2 district as a  
12 whole, you know, look at, especially if you focus on the general description for what  
13 the MU2 designation is intended to be and you look at the densities. You can look  
14 at the development standards for it, you can also look at, again, the allowed uses,  
15 you know, that should be some of your primary focus and determine if those are  
16 actually meeting the, you know, meeting the intentions of that district, you know,  
17 what is envisioned. Cause I think over the years, some of y'all have been here a  
18 little longer, there have been times, especially prior to our current Land  
19 Development where the, we didn't call it general description, what did we call it,  
20 Tommy? The purpose statement, that was it, for each district, you know, you can  
21 look at that and say maybe that didn't quite align with, you know, the uses and  
22 standards for each of those zoning designations. And so this may be the start but,

1 this will be the start but we'll probably look at a number of the other zoning  
2 designations also and kinda go through this same exercise. But this one, because  
3 it was initiated by Council, is one of the main reasons why we started with MU2.  
4 But again from a staffing standpoint we will be looking at some of the other zoning  
5 designations and especially some of the uses and standards for those and bring  
6 this before you, you know, for your evaluation.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. Commissioners, questions for  
8 Mr. Price on this issue?

9 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady?

11 MR. GRADY: Would it be appropriate for us to have a map or a series of  
12 maps that show the current locations where this district is zoned? Would it be  
13 appropriate to look at it through that prism or should it be seen in a vacuum  
14 essentially?

15 MR. PRICE: Along with the adoption of the current Land Development Code  
16 and the maps, one of the things we did was we applied the equivalency zoning for  
17 a number of the, I think some of y'all were on, on the Commission during that time.  
18 The MU2 did not have an equivalency designation. Am I correct? Yes, yes. So as  
19 I say that providing a map to you, you will probably see maybe one, two parcels at  
20 the most in the County. And I think there's been one recently that you approved, I  
21 believe it's off the Dutch Fork Road near the church during that time. I apologize, I  
22 can't give you the specifics of it and I think Mr. DeLage, who is a map wizard, will

1 actually pull that up at this time. So, but that was one of the few that we can  
2 remember, so. But if you would still like for us to provide it to you we can. And I  
3 think it's important that when we look at some of the zoning designations,  
4 especially those who have not, those that have not been used previously, since  
5 we've adopted the Code, I think it's kind of important we just take a good look at  
6 those now. And to kind of give you an example, one of the things that we're kinda  
7 looking at, this is a zoning designation we will be bringing before you, the MU3  
8 designation. We've had a couple of applications for MU3 come in but really that  
9 was more for the parking, essentially variance that that district allows. We have to  
10 really look at that to determine, you know, the appropriate locations for that  
11 particular zoning designation and is that something that will be appropriate in the  
12 unincorporated area of Richland County. I think as Staff we've kind of looked at  
13 that one as more of kind of an urban type zoning designation. But again, you know,  
14 those are the type things we'll be looking at with the Planning Commission going  
15 forward.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioner Johnson?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Price, just three global comments prior  
18 to us having a potential work session. One is if we're going to look at the MU, mixed  
19 use corridor, we're pulling MU2 out as opposed to just looking at the cluster of  
20 mixed use zoning collectively. I mean, to me it just would make sense intuitively to  
21 look at them as a cluster since we've broken into three categories, so that's just an  
22 editorial comment. For me just a common sense perspective of the layman's

1 perception of a mixed use zoning, the first and the last categories; the agricultural  
2 and the industrial, to me just inherently, even though there're only a couple items  
3 in those areas, would not be what I would normally associate with a mixed use.  
4 And then thirdly, I heard your comments but it would help me at some point down  
5 the road really understand the genesis of this specific call out from looking at this,  
6 although I heard you also say there's some other segments we're going to look at  
7 individually, but have a little bit better understanding of what the origin of the  
8 request was would be helpful to help the lens of how to look at it. But those are my  
9 three comments, please sir.

10 MR. PRICE: Okay. So as stated this originally originated with County  
11 Council. Are you're looking at more of the specifics of why they pulled out certain  
12 uses or identified certain uses?

13 MR. JOHNSON: In other words, yes I'm trying to understand what the issue,  
14 I understand it came from County Council, the directive, but I don't understand  
15 what was on their mind, what the issue, what brought this to the top as something  
16 specifically for us to look at? I don't have the context.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I agree with Commissioner Johnson.

18 MR. PRICE: There's been some discussion about the application of the  
19 MU2, you know, to a particular area of the County. I think it's come out more along  
20 the Ballentine area. So there's been a decision, should that occur as an overlay or  
21 as a master planned area or could it be even done through a proactive zoning of  
22 the MU2 designation. However, prior to doing that, because that was something

1 more of a specific area that we've been looking at, it's determined let's have a  
2 further look at the MU2 to determine if it is the decision to go forward with  
3 potentially proactive rezoning an area that all of the uses and standards would be  
4 appropriate, you know, in applying it to an area.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Is the concern the multi-family provisions?

6 MR. PRICE: That was one that was identified.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Okay, that helps narrow it down a little bit.

8 MR. PRICE: Yeah, so one of the things that we didn't include, and I guess  
9 I'll go ahead and take the blame for it, while Council did identify certain uses, we  
10 didn't, that wasn't included in your matrix. I kind of wanted you to have a clean  
11 version going forward, you know, for you to look at. But when we bring this back  
12 before you, whether it be at a work session or at your next Planning Commission,  
13 we will identify both uses and some potential amendments, both by what, that were  
14 recommended by Council but also by Staff.

15 MS. LOYD: That would be helpful cause what I'm looking at it just, to me it  
16 looks very similar, the MU 2 looks very similar to the MU1.

17 MR. PRICE: Okay.

18 MS. LOYD: There's only, like two uses that are different that aren't allowed  
19 in the MU2.

20 MR. PRICE: Right. And so, so again thank you Commissioner Loyd. So  
21 going along with that, and I believe, was it Commissioner Grady or Johnson, we  
22 can include other mixed use districts if you would like for comparison. But again

1 for this particular case we would be focusing on the MU2. But we can include those,  
2 again show you the uses that are allowed in each one of the zoning designations  
3 and also maybe some of the standards for comparison.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. So what would our next step  
5 be?

6 MR. PRICE: I think the next step is to determine, I think as a Commission,  
7 is would you like to have a work session sometime, of course in January, not in  
8 December. But if you would like to have a work session we can kinda come up  
9 with a date, and if you wouldn't mind before you decide to take a vote on that, I  
10 kind of would like to let Director Williams do her presentation on the  
11 Comprehensive Plan because that may also call for a work session and it might  
12 be a time for us to go ahead and include both of these reviews at a work session  
13 versus trying to have multiple work sessions prior to the February Planning  
14 Commission meeting.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. Ms. Williams? We'll go right into  
16 Item No. 7. Item 7 which is our Comprehensive Plan. It says action, so Staff are  
17 you requesting any kind of motion? And explain why the Agenda says action.

18 MS. WILLIAMS: So – the vote on the work session, not necessarily that you  
19 review or recommend the Comp Plan today.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, just for clarity.

21 MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah, just to clarify that. So real quick I just wanna let you  
22 know what I'm gonna talk about because we did get the draft public review copy

1 of the Comprehensive Plan this morning at 7:52am. So we did not have a chance  
2 to print hard copies for you today but it is available on the, our reimagine Richland  
3 website. So, also I would need to know today who would like a hard copy so we'll  
4 get those printed and we'll get a hard copy to you, or if you prefer digital, some  
5 people do, then you can also review the public draft digitally. So for citizens who  
6 are here or those who may be, you know, watching at home and are not familiar  
7 with what the Comprehensive Plan is, it guides everything that Planning  
8 Commission kinda worked on here tonight. It's a decision making tool for County  
9 Council, Planning Commission and Staff regarding land use, infrastructure  
10 investments and also other types of community investments. It outlines the  
11 community vision and priorities for the future. It provides a framework for  
12 coordinated public and private investment, and provides policy strategies for  
13 achieving them. So although it's a nonregulatory document it does have  
14 recommendations of other regulatory areas that you could take into consideration;  
15 policies, procedures, but the most regulatory component of that would be the way  
16 we implement it is through the zoning map, which tries to follow the land use map.  
17 And so as Planning Commission the reason why we're here is because Planning  
18 Commission is charged by the State Planning Enabling Act to prepare, evaluate  
19 and update the Comprehensive Plan and we're at that 10 year update for the  
20 Comprehensive Plan. So we've gone through those three phases, it started a little,  
21 about more than a year ago, I think about August/September of last year when we  
22 started this process where we had the discovery phase, where we got the values

1 and guiding principles for the Comprehensive Plan, the development phase where  
2 we reviewed various land use scenarios and asked the public to give feedback and  
3 vote upon those land use scenarios. And then the third phase was direction which  
4 were the draft recommendations and refinement of that plan. We did have lots of  
5 community engagement, some of you Members of the Commission came out to  
6 some of the various public forums or town hall meetings. There was a separate  
7 advisory community that was created for the Comprehensive Plan, stakeholders  
8 meetings, we met with different agencies separately, surveys and the project  
9 website. So we tried to get as much community feedback as possible regarding  
10 the Comprehensive Plan. To give you a quick snapshot of what we've determined,  
11 which is also in the Comprehensive Plan, is that our population is expected to  
12 reach for 450,000 by the year 2040. Residential uses account for more than ¼ of  
13 the County land area. That our county median home value is lower than the state  
14 overall but more than half of renters and 22% of homeowners are caused burdens,  
15 so housing is an issue here in Richland County as it is many places around the  
16 state and the country. Also our employment is steady in Richland County, however,  
17 20% of households earn less than \$25,000. The County is experiencing a lot of  
18 retail leakage, estimated about \$418M annually flows out of Richland County into  
19 neighboring areas, meaning someone drives somewhere else to make these  
20 purchases. So that's an opportunity for retail/commercial development.  
21 Underdeveloped land represents lots of [inaudible] and opportunities, places  
22 where you may have abandoned buildings, abandoned, fading out kinda

1 commercial areas; that's what we're calling underdeveloped. So that's a prime  
2 opportunity to kind of redevelop the County without having to go into more  
3 greenspace. And we do have vast cultural and natural resources, something you  
4 hear almost monthly when people come to speak either for or against a zoning  
5 recommendation. So what we received today and what you all will be getting hard  
6 copy and also link to is the draft Comprehensive Plan that we would like for you all  
7 to potentially have a work session on in January so that if you feel comfortable you  
8 can make a recommendation in February to County Council. It's broken down,  
9 these are the different chapters where we have the introduction. The Richland  
10 County Today is the one that gives you a little bit more of our existing conditions,  
11 a more deep dive into some of those statistics I have you earlier. The next chapter,  
12 the Guiding Principles, that gives you the foundation, the values that came out of  
13 the first round of public comment that we received. The part that really affects you  
14 all as Planning Commission is that Richland Reimagined area. That's our draft  
15 future land use map, that articulates the vision. So that is what a lot of the upcoming  
16 rezone requests will be referred back to, that will be your new future land use map.  
17 So we really ask you all to hone in on that to see if you have any questions,  
18 comments, concerns that we can take into the final draft of this Comprehensive  
19 Plan. Realizing the Vision, this will be very key for County Council. They're having  
20 a strategic forum work session in January where they will want to see how the  
21 Comprehensive Plan aligns with the County's strategic plan. They'll be doing a  
22 deep dive into what the policy recommendations will mean for them district by

1 district. That's another reason why we recommend a work session with Planning  
2 Commission because Council will be doing something similar in January. But we  
3 will be making Council aware that you all have not made a recommendation yet.  
4 So what they're looking at is the draft and could change based off your discussions  
5 in February. And then finally the Priority Investment which will identify ways to fund  
6 or support some of the initiatives in the Comprehensive Plan. So this is just a  
7 reminder of what the different guiding principles that came out of the  
8 Comprehensive Plan and what the future land use map, this is the draft of the  
9 future land use map, what will be guiding future decisions, compliance,  
10 noncompliance, recommendations from Staff. This future land use map, if you  
11 remember the scenario planning from phase 2, we had A, B, and C; A stay the  
12 course, B a more compact, constricting growth in Richland County around  
13 infrastructure and the municipalities, and then C was a conservation type of land  
14 use scenario. And what came out of those discussions was that most of the people  
15 who looked at it, they liked a mixture of B and C. So that is what this map is, it's  
16 kind of a marriage of scenario B and C where you see a little bit more compact  
17 development, you see a lotta mixed use and transit support development, you see  
18 a lotta infill and redevelopment prioritized. We also talk about protections of open  
19 space, agricultural land, conservation was a big component that came out of those  
20 discussions, and also looking at how we can have resilient infrastructure and flood  
21 mitigation which is another thing that you all hear quite often with people worried  
22 about flooding or infrastructure when it comes to new development and rezone

1 requests that come before you. So when you look at the map just take into  
2 consideration that it is kind of like that marriage between scenarios B and C. This  
3 also has the identification of seven priority investment areas, so that's another area  
4 where you may want to look at. Those may be areas for future proactive rezone  
5 requests or other specific investment by the County to encourage development  
6 within those areas. And so that is a section that's part of that realizing the vision  
7 so you may have questions about that, thoughts about that as you go through that  
8 so this will also be identified on the land use map. So right now where you may  
9 have a property that'll come in for a rezone request we'll talk about what the land  
10 use map says but we'll also identify if that's also a part of a priority investment area  
11 in the future rezone request. So what's next? Again, if you would like to have, we  
12 would like to have a January work session where we combine the MU2 discussion  
13 with the deep dive in the Comp Plan, but Planning Commission must adopt a  
14 resolution recommending the plan to County Council. So if you don't wanna  
15 recommend it in February you have to do it at some point. We cannot adopt it as  
16 a County until Planning Commission feels comfortable and makes that  
17 recommendation via resolution. So we'll have a draft resolution for you all to take  
18 under consideration. That's another reason why we recommend the work session,  
19 just, we don't wanna just throw that in front of you in February and we don't know  
20 how long the January meeting may be with other cases. The resolution has to be  
21 recorded in your official Minutes and then you send a copy of the recommended  
22 plan to County Council, and the governing body must hold a public hearing and

1 give a 30 day notice for that so citizens will have the opportunity to come during  
2 your meeting, but County Council will also have a public hearing where citizens  
3 can also come and have their say about the draft Comprehensive Plan. And then  
4 Council must also adopt the final plan via ordinance. So before I wrap up are there  
5 any questions?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes Commission, I'll open it up to you guys for  
7 questions. Commissioner Siercks?

8 MR. SIERCKS: Quick question. When we, whenever we are able to forward  
9 the proposed plan to County Council, or let's say take it or leave it once it gets to  
10 County Council, or will they be able to amend once it gets to their, once they get  
11 it?

12 MS. WILLIAMS: They also have the option to amend. So you will make your  
13 recommendation for it but if for some reason Council wasn't happy with a policy  
14 recommendation or wanted to add new policy recommendations or had concerns  
15 about the land use map they can always make edits up until third and final reading.

16 MR. DURANT: Question, Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

18 MR. DURANT: Yes, the next to the last bullet says the governing body must  
19 hold a public hearing, 30 day notice, that governing body is the Council?

20 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. That is correct. County Council will have to also hold  
21 a public hearing but they just have to give 30 day notice before that hearing. So

1 just if you make the recommendation in February we have to at least notice it for  
2 30 days before they have their public hearing. And that's from the Enabling Act.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any questions from this side? Commissioner  
4 Johnson?

5 MR. JOHNSON: I'm sorry, do you mind going back to your Agenda page for  
6 a second, please? I'm sorry, Components of the Plan, the, I said Agenda but  
7 contents.

8 MS. WILLIAMS: The next slide, slide 3, that one? Or the Table of Contents  
9 for the actual plan.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay, I gotchu. And that is down here.

12 MR. JOHNSON: I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, how I wanna articulate this if I  
13 can say this, but I mean, certainly we're focused, we tend to be focused on the  
14 map and the definitions of the very zoning items. But when we look at these, the  
15 Richland Reimagined articulating a vision and the future land use map, my  
16 question as best as I can phrase this is, to what extent are we also, is the plan  
17 changing the definitions as set forth in, for example like where it says, activity  
18 center is defined as . . . and is designed to encourage, those pieces, those are the  
19 paragraphs that tend to carry Staff's recommendations as far as compliance. But  
20 that is separate from the map.

21 MS. WILLIAMS: So those will be changing or be updated in the updated  
22 Comprehensive Plan and those will be outlined in that, that same chapter, Richland

1 Reimagined. It's not that you, we don't want your comments on the other chapters,  
2 we definitely want you to look at the entire document, but it will be some new  
3 phrases, some new terms that will be in the updated plan versus the ones you've  
4 been familiar with. So it may not be a, it's, so in a neighborhood activity center it  
5 may say it's in a mixed use activity center, so that will be something that might be  
6 different in the updated Comprehensive Plan versus the current one that you've  
7 been looking at. And that's all explained in that Richland Reimagined section.

8 MR. JOHNSON: And at the risk of sounding obnoxious, for those sections,  
9 those provisions, would we be able to see, like this neighborhood activity center  
10 currently reads this way, in this proposal it's now reading that way. Are you gonna  
11 be able to, are we gonna have to have two separate documents in front of us to –

12 MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah, that would be the deep dive kind of in the work  
13 session because the updated Comprehensive Plan, although it looks at the current  
14 plan and it takes some items from that, with the land use scenario and the scenario  
15 planning and the feedback, it is gonna be a new different document than what we  
16 have right now. So there may be some comparisons, for instance the land use  
17 types are now called place types and they don't exactly match eye to eye to the  
18 current land use types because it is based off of new information, new definitions.  
19 So we would wanna, in a work session, make you all feel a little bit more  
20 comfortable, what does that mean, because it will be thinking about those rezone  
21 requests a little bit differently because of those phrases.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Commissioner Loyd?

1 MS. LOYD: [Inaudible] mention like you want a printed draft or a digital draft.  
2 I have a rather strange request, but is it possible to get, like access to the arc GIS  
3 draft of the map versus just having to look at it in a small paper map format?

4 MS. WILLIAMS: I'll check with our – I know we have a copy of the arc GIS  
5 files for that so we can, we can talk to you to see how we make that available.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Oh, I second that request. Let me bust out my RGS  
7 Pro, let's go.

8 MR. SMITH: So just to give clarity on that the new, or the new future land  
9 use map, we changed it due to the fact that we had some confrontation and some  
10 confliction in previous cases over the years, we used a broad stroke in our painting  
11 of the future land use map in the one that we use today. The new one is parcel  
12 based so we will need an actual GIS database to hone in on these different parcels  
13 regardless. So it's gonna be access, you're gonna be able to access it through our  
14 GIS online portal, it's part of the whole package that we're putting together for this  
15 whole Comp Plan. But I will say that even on the PDF maps that are provided, the  
16 level of detail that you can zoom in is still very accurate down to the parcel even  
17 on the PDFs.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anything else, Commissioner Loyd?

19 MS. LOYD: I was just gonna say I have Google Earth so [inaudible] but it  
20 still would work.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. So you want the KMLs then. Okay, if that's  
2 something – okay. Any other questions before I geek out cause I got stuff.  
3 Commissioner Johnson?

4 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a question I just wanted to say  
5 please include me on a paper copy.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You wanna show of hands for paper copy?

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Sure, that would be great.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, show hands for paper copy.

9 MS. WILLIAMS: Almost everybody except for Loyd? Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And we'll give Commissioner Taylor one.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Oh yes, thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So everyone got their questions? Alright. Now I've  
13 been to the point where I've been around here too long, so I get nervous. Land  
14 Development Code. That was not a one month, button push from the Planning  
15 Commission. That was a deep dive. And the public might not even, it was difficult  
16 for them to participate and notice, but we were having Zoom calls during covid and  
17 we were tearing this thing apart in looking at it and deep diving. So about how  
18 many pages is this versus the Land Development Code which is like 456?

19 MS. WILLIAMS: About 125.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: About 125, okay. Is there something like an  
21 equivalency table from 2015 to 2025?

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Right. So the closest we got is with the place types which  
2 is in the land use map. It talks about what of the current zoning in your Land  
3 Development Code could potentially fit in those place types. So it kinda gives you  
4 an idea if we have mixed residential, yeah I'm drawing a blank of some of the place  
5 types – mixed residential then MU1, MU2, MU3 and R4 of your current zoning  
6 would potentially be appropriate zonings for that mixed use land type. So it does  
7 give you that, but it doesn't necessarily, like compare 2015 place types to 2025  
8 place types. It doesn't do that.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I don't wanna kill the environment but could we get  
10 had copies of 2015? Cause when I do my homework, apples to apples, I wanna  
11 look at the old and I wanna look at the new. Does that not make sense? Mr. Price  
12 is giving me a weird face. If anyone's missing it. Okay. Okay, again I've been  
13 around for a long time, I've probably misplaced mine. Can I get another copy?  
14 Thank you.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: We can get another copy.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, alright. I feel like one of my jobs as Chair is to  
17 ask the dumb questions in case someone else is not asking it. Yes Commissioner  
18 Loyd?

19 MS. LOYD: I would like to clarify, I would like a hard copy when it's finalized  
20 but I do not want a hard copy draft.

21 MS. WILLIAMS: Understood. Oh we'll, well once it's finalized we'll definitely  
22 also get you a copy of the finalized as well for everybody.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm happy that we're looking at this slide. Is there a  
2 way that we break up or review this by the sections? I know you said Richland  
3 Reimagine is our main component, but how can we break up this endeavor of  
4 thoroughly reviewing this document? It's a very important document, I don't feel  
5 like one meeting we're gonna get this accomplished.

6 MS. WILLIAMS: So introduction, I mean, there's not really a lot for you all to  
7 review on that. Richland Today is like the existing conditions, so that is the  
8 snapshot of what Richland County looks like today, those statistics associated with  
9 housing, cultural resources, transportation. So you may look at that but it might not  
10 be as much to change because it's statistical data about what the County looks  
11 like right now. And the Guiding Principles, if you, I would say if you really wanna  
12 have a deep dive it would be the Guiding Principles, Richland Reimagined and  
13 Realizing the Vision. The Priority Investment section is more for Council. We have  
14 to put it in part of the Enabling Act that we look at how we can potentially fund. It  
15 talks about funding sources, it's not really much that I think that the Planning  
16 Commission would recommend unless you know of a new funding source that we  
17 haven't thought of to add in there. But I, I do think that the, if we have a work  
18 session and we hone in on that chapters 3, 4, 5, those would be the ones. But  
19 even with the Realizing the Vision, those are policy and program  
20 recommendations; you may have some but that's gonna be the ones that Council  
21 will have to deep dive in as well.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. The analogy in my head right now is  
2 getting a speeding ticket. You're racing to get somewhere fast, you get pulled over,  
3 it takes a lot longer and you gotta pay a big fine. We did the whole Land  
4 Development Code thing, we did it to the best of our ability during unprecedented  
5 times, right? How can we do this right if we don't get a recommendation by  
6 February but let's say we have March to April, give us the first quarter so we as  
7 Planning Commission can actually do the deep dive for County Council?  
8 Realistically speaking before we just put, press the happy button and then the  
9 public is upset and we gotta put it on the shelf and take it down off the shelf again;  
10 sorry, I've just been around.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: I know, and again as work sessions, again the Land  
12 Development Code is regulatory, this is not regulatory so it, it doesn't have the  
13 same effect on parcels as the Land Development Code does. So just take that into  
14 consideration that it is a vision of the future and a recommendation to Council of  
15 what they could do. So it has a little less heat. I get the public will still wanna talk  
16 on it, but it doesn't have that direct effect on parcels as the Land Development  
17 Code did. But if we have a work session in January and you don't feel comfortable  
18 in February, this is not me trying to say you must make a recommendation in  
19 February, we can have additional work sessions until you feel comfortable. It's just  
20 that the public will speak at your meeting and then the public hearings that happen,  
21 unless Council chooses to have additional town hall meetings on their own.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: It's a very important document, cause tonight, page  
2 43, Case No. 5 or whatever it was, the Comprehensive Plan said it's compliant.  
3 We refer to our Comprehensive Plan for every map amendment. I don't wanna  
4 rush this. So I, I agree we need a first work session and, to get this document in  
5 front of us and to have a good conversation together. What do you, do you want  
6 me to throw dates out that we get on the calendar? What do we do?

7 MS. WILLIAMS: We originally talked about January 22<sup>nd</sup> as a potential work  
8 session date, which would be after the Council's strategic planning forum where  
9 they'll do a little bit of their deep dive, so we can give you feedback from how that  
10 went, if you're interested in that as part of your work session.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And, and all those studies that everyone asks before  
12 we have a map amendment, I know you guys did so much heavy lifting on this so  
13 again much gratitude, thank you Staff for putting this document together and  
14 working with the consultant, everything. They usually ask for the studies; did you  
15 do an environmental study, did you do the traffic study, the schools, all of that, is  
16 this where all of this stuff gets put together?

17 MS. WILLIAMS: That's where the Richland Today, looking at – not just our  
18 conditions but we look at the Comprehensive Plans of the municipalities in  
19 Richland County, the Comprehensive Plans of those surrounding us, because we  
20 don't wanna make our growth decisions without taking into consideration how the  
21 other areas are planning to grow. The studies are looking at, again those statistics  
22 that I talked about. Some of the recommendations are based on what does our

1 population projection look like, what, how much land is still available, what  
2 resources do we have that we need to protect? All of that is taken into  
3 consideration and was presented as part of those multiple public forums that we  
4 had over the past year where we took this same information and put it in front of  
5 the public to get their feedback and make sure we got it right. And the land use  
6 map that you're seeing is actually been revised, I think it may have been mentioned  
7 earlier, it's been revised based off of feedback in phase 3 so we've shown this to  
8 the public in phase 3 and this has been actually revised based off of that public  
9 feedback to try to take that into consideration even before it comes to you all.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: On this end I'm hearing we got a lotta public input  
11 already, which is so good versus the Land Development Code. Okay. Comments,  
12 questions? Sorry if I'm being dramatic. Okay. Alright January 22<sup>nd</sup>, do we have a  
13 time that you wanna suggest?

14 MS. WILLIAMS: I currently don't have a time but we could do it similar to –  
15 we did a work session through all of phase II and that was during the, I believe we  
16 started at like 9:00, 10:00, we could do something similar, start in the morning and  
17 go half a day. Split it between the MU2 discussion and the Comp Plan discussion.  
18 We just have to finalize the agenda to nail down the time. Or if you prefer a different  
19 time we're open to suggestions.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'll open it on the floor for discussion, morning or  
21 afternoon on a work day, to the Commission.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: How much time – I can't control your discussion cause  
2 we're talking about doing two things. We wanna give you time because again if we  
3 wait, if we don't have a work session and we want until February it's having these  
4 discussions after cases and we don't know how many cases you'll get. So I do  
5 realize it's asking for extra time but it's to give you that time to discuss the MU2  
6 designation, looking at those recommendations, and the time to kinda discuss  
7 some of those recommendations in the Comp Plan. So it could potentially go, I say  
8 half a day, four hours?

9 MR. DURANT: My question was geared to [inaudible].

10 MS. WILLIAMS: If we started at 1:00? If we did afternoon I would  
11 recommend maybe starting at, like 1:00 or 2:00, just to give you a little bit more  
12 time and not going too late. But I leave that, again, to the Commissioners at your  
13 discretion.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Loyd?

15 MS. LOYD: I just have a recommendation to add I guess. I would  
16 recommend we do the MU2 first and then, and maybe like budget that for a certain  
17 amount of time we think might happen, and then utilize the rest of our time for what  
18 we know is gonna take the longest [inaudible].

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I agree with that. I think I lean towards the morning if  
20 we can make it happen so we have a clear head.

21 MR. JOHNSON: I agree.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson agrees. Coffee and snacks  
2 provided? Potentially lunch?

3 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

5 MS. WILLIAMS: Similar to what we did when we had the phase II work  
6 session with the Commission. We tried to, we realize it's a lot, it's a long day so  
7 we would try to have snacks as well.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

9 MR. DURANT: What are we talking about morning, 8:00, 9:00, 10:00?  
10 Please don't –

11 CHIARMAN YONKE: I think you said 9:00.

12 MS. WILLIAMS: I would not say 7:00, I would recommend a 9:00 start time.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And the location, would it be –

14 MS. WILLIAMS: We don't have a location yet. We didn't reserve a place, we  
15 wanted to first get through this meeting and make sure it's good and then look at  
16 locations.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, I guess I'll make a motion and we vote on it?  
18 Work session, I'll make a motion for a work session for 9:00am on January 22<sup>nd</sup>.  
19 Do we have a second on that motion and then we'll take a vote?

20 MR. DURANT: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Okay Staff, can  
22 you take a vote?

1 MR. SMITH: Motion on the floor is 9:00am January 22<sup>nd</sup>, no location yet,  
2 Grady?

3 MR. GRADY: Aye.

4 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

5 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

6 MR. SMITH: Durant?

7 MR. DURANT: Aye.

8 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

9 MS. LOYD: Aye.

10 MR. SMITH: Johnson?

11 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

12 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

13 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

14 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

16 MR. SMITH: Motion passes.

17 *[Approved: Grady, Siercks, Durant, Loyd, Johnson, Frierson, Yonke; Absent:*  
18 *Taylor, Duffy]*

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay passes for a meeting, work session 9:00 am,  
20 January 22<sup>nd</sup>. Alright, Commissioner Johnson, your question?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, how does this work session correspond to  
22 9.a.?

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay, I'll roll right into that. So if you're, unless there are  
2 any more questions regarding the Comprehensive Plan? If not –

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This is good for now, thank you. Good presentation,  
4 thank you for the information, thank you for taking my questions.

5 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Thank you all for indulging us in the work  
6 session. So the, our Planning Commission Mr. Tucker sent an email out about  
7 Planning Commission training. Going into the new year we just wanna have the, if  
8 you've gone through the six hours, for those who are required to go through the  
9 six hours, please send us a copy of that certificate because we need to make sure  
10 we get that recorded with the Clerk of Council. And then the required three hours  
11 every year, we need that information as well to make sure we get that information  
12 recorded with the Clerk. Usually we give you the three hours through the work  
13 sessions we do in the summertime, but now we just wanna make sure that we  
14 have the certifications, we have it that we record it with the Clerk so that we're all  
15 good and clear with the State Enabling Act. And for those who are exempt from  
16 the certification if we could just get that confirmed so that we can have that also on  
17 Record. That's just one of the things that we wanted to make clear to Planning  
18 Commission, that we wanna, I think it kinda dropped off a little bit during the  
19 pandemic but now we wanna make sure the files are up to date.

20 MR. DURANT: How do you update those files with the exemptions? Is there  
21 a form to fill out?

1 MS. WILLIAMS: We can resend out, I know if you're a lawyer or AICP there's  
2 certain things where you don't necessarily have to have the training, the same  
3 training requirements. But we can send that out to the whole Commission, and  
4 then if you could just let us know, we'd just like you to verify it with us for those  
5 who are not, and for those who have done the six hours give us a copy of that  
6 certificate to make sure we have it and for those three hours or any additional  
7 trainings you may take outside of what we do, that we get copies of that  
8 confirmation so we can record it with our Clerk.

9 MS. LOYD: Is that based on [inaudible] or calendar year?

10 MS. WILLIAMS: It's within, the first year of appointment you have to do the  
11 six hours, and then every calendar year you have to do three. But that's, that's  
12 what that Planning Commission training bullet point was about. And then Report  
13 of Council I believe that's in your packet. And that is all of mine unless there are  
14 additional questions.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any questions, Commission? Commissioner Grady?

16 MR. GRADY: No, I think I dropped the ball on this but if somebody could  
17 resend a copy of the exemption paperwork I'll get that taken care of.

18 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, we'll get that sent out to the whole Commission. And  
19 again we'll, if you want I can send a presentation. We'll send you the link, it is on  
20 the website as of this afternoon, of the Comp Plan, and we'll, when the hard copies  
21 are printed we will get them distributed to everyone. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you so much. That knocks out 7 and  
2 9m, 8 is Chairman's Report. Again, just thank you for your time everyone,  
3 especially tonight, we're looking at 9:00, we're not done yet. I do really enjoy  
4 serving as your Chair so thank you. Thank you for putting up with me. Now we  
5 can move on to number 10, and I'll flip this over to Staff.

6 MR. DELAGE: Just briefly, just to kinda go over, so the Election of Officers  
7 is for the Chair and then for the Vice-Chair. It is also for the Secretary, however,  
8 Staff typically functions as the Secretary to the Planning Commission. So I'll just  
9 throw that out there, not that you couldn't fire us and put someone else in, but other  
10 than that we're looking for, like I said a motion to basically get the Chair, Vice-Chair  
11 and then Secretary. And they will be separate motions.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair? Question.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. Commissioner Johnson.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Do the incumbents desire to stay where they are?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I do desire. As long as you guys see me as serving  
16 you successfully.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Madam Vice-Chair?

18 MS. FRIERSON: I do also.

19 MR. JOHNSON: I move, if I may, Mr. Chairman? A motion to have our  
20 Chairman for 2025 and Vice-Chair for 2025 continue to Chair for 2026, please sir?  
21 If someone could second that?

22 MR. DURANT: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do I need to say anything?

2 MR. JOHNSON: I know you asked for two separate motions but –

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, there's a motion on the floor to reappoint me,  
4 Christopher Yonke, as Chair and Commissioner Frierson as Vice-Chair. We got a  
5 second from Commissioner Durant. So then we would say Staff, can you please  
6 take vote? And Secretary we're gonna continue with Staff.

7 MR. DELAGE: Unfortunately Mr. Chair, they need to be separated out and  
8 voted on individually.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

10 MR. JOHNSON: I will remove Madam Vice-Chair from the, my initial motion  
11 and just move for the Chairman at the moment.

12 MS. LOYD: I'll second.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Thank you. We have a motion to reappoint me,  
14 Christopher Yonke, as Chair, that's Commissioner Johnson. Then we have a  
15 second from Commissioner Loyd for the same. So we will now take a vote. Go  
16 ahead, Staff.

17 MR. DELAGE: Alright, Johnson?

18 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

19 MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

20 MS. LOYD: Aye.

21 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

22 MR. GRADY: Aye.

1 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

2 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

3 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

4 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

5 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

6 MR. DURANT: Aye.

7 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: How funny would it be if I said no? Aye. Thank you.

9 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion passes.

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

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, so we're gonna take another motion now for  
13 Vice-Chair. I'll nominate Commissioner Frierson as a motion. So do we have a  
14 second?

15 MR. DURANT: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Staff can take a  
17 vote.

18 MR. DELAGE: Alright, that is a motion to elect Beverly Frierson as Vice-  
19 Chair, Johnson?

20 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

21 MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

22 MS. LOYD: Aye.

1 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

2 MR. GRADY: Aye.

3 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

4 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

5 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

6 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

7 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

8 MR. DURANT: Aye.

9 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

11 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion passes.

12 *[Approved: Johnson, Loyd, Grady, Frierson, Siercks, Durant, Yonke; Absent:*  
13 *Taylor, Duffy]*

14 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we need to do one for Secretary?

16 MR. DELAGE: Unfortunately, yes.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. The Chair makes a motion for Staff to be  
18 Secretary. Do we have a second?

19 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Siercks. Staff, please  
21 take a vote.

22 MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

1 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

2 MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

3 MS. LOYD: Aye.

4 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

5 MR. GRADY: Aye.

6 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

7 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

8 MR. SIERCKS? Aye.

9 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

10 MR. DURANT: Aye.

11 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

13 MR. DELAGE: Motion passes for Staff to be Secretary.

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

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commission, I appreciate it. This take us  
17 to Item number 11 which is adjournment. No, it's not. We're not there yet. Adoption  
18 of the calendar, okay. My apologies. Okay, yes. A note about this too is due to the  
19 Public Information Act, once we approve this we speak now and then forever hold  
20 our peace. We saw that for this December meeting, there being a little bit of  
21 confusion. So I wanna look at page 72 in our Agenda.

22 MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chair?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff.

2 MR. DELAGE: Sorry. I just wanna make note that on page 72 of your  
3 Agenda it is showing the 2026 calendar. The, you're not adopting the Zoning Public  
4 Hearing schedule, it is just shown for comparison to when the dates are for your  
5 meetings. So I just wanted to point that out and put that on the Record.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I also would like discussion on this. We read the  
7 column as it goes down, Planning Commission customarily meets on the first  
8 Monday of the month at 6:00pm. And throughout our meetings we also say that  
9 the County Council, based off of our recommendation, will have a zoning meeting  
10 that is at 7:00pm. So the, and that's what you're looking at right here. So the public  
11 does have an opportunity to come to an evening meeting if we wanted to discuss  
12 the idea of having an afternoon meeting like we did historically. I learned  
13 historically Planning Commission at one point met at 1:00pm and I know when I  
14 started it was at 3:00pm. And right now we are looking at 9:05 pm. And I know our  
15 Staff has been here since the beginning of business day. So I am open to having  
16 discussion.

17 MR. DURANT: I have a question.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

19 MR. DURANT: Does the Staff, do you recall whether there was an increase  
20 in attendance from the public once we moved to 6:00pm over the 3:00pm time  
21 slot?

1 MR. DELAGE: So in order to verify that we would need to look at the past  
2 sign in sheets and compare them to when the meeting was moved. So  
3 unfortunately I don't have a number for you right now to say whether or not it  
4 resulted in an increase or if it was the same or, you know, a decrease.

5 MR. SMITH: It's also kind of hard to look at the numbers on different cases  
6 because every case is different. So you could have an influx on one case and  
7 someone on the other ones, some of them not have an influx at all. So it's a case  
8 by case scenario as well so those numbers wouldn't truly reflect what the numbers  
9 were.

10 MR. DURANT: I only ask because the purpose of moving it to 6:00pm was  
11 to allow the public more access to the meetings, so I was just curious whether that  
12 purpose is served. I understand you don't have an answer to that now.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] 1:00pm be an option, like middle of the day  
14 [inaudible]? Commissioner Loyd?

15 MS. LOYD: I have a question. So, like today we received a letter from the  
16 Town of Blythewood on an item. Do we receive public comment, like written public  
17 comment from members of the public who cannot attend a meeting?

18 MR. DELAGE: So at the Planning Commission at richlandcountysc.gov, we  
19 receive comments via there and when I do we do forward them to Planning  
20 Commission. So they're, it's not like covid when we would read them verbatim up  
21 to two minutes when we weren't able to be open to the public, but we will pass that  
22 information on when we get that.

1 MS. LOYD: But we don't see it but they do, but the County Council sees  
2 them, or we do see them?

3 MR. DELAGE: No, you'll see those. Similar to the letter that was sent in,  
4 anything that comes in there that's a specific comment for a case we forwarded as  
5 information or we'll provide it if it's an official letter, like from the town or the city.

6 MS. LOYD: Well, I would say I'd be open to 1:00 if we were maybe better at  
7 advertising that that option was available for members of the public if they couldn't  
8 attend a meeting.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Loyd. I remember there  
10 being times where my packet had extra documents in there as they were letters  
11 that came in or maybe emails you had time to print out that was a part of our  
12 packet.

13 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff.

15 MR. SMITH: We can confidently say that we have not received any  
16 complaints about the meetings being held at 6:00pm, as opposed to the latter. If  
17 that helps.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I wanna hear from everybody on this. Commissioner  
19 Johnson?

20 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible] certainly the 3:00 timeframe I personally  
21 preferred. It was a little bit easier to those occasional three hour meetings. But I'm,  
22 but I also do appreciate that it does make it easier for those that are working to

1 attend the 6:00 session. So [inaudible] our service. If there's a desire to move to  
2 3:00 I would support that, but I also recognize. It's certainly easier to park at 6:00.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm taking an unofficial poll. Commissioner Loyd, you  
4 mentioned 1:00 would be something you would be okay with?

5 MS. LOYD: Or 3:00, I don't really have a preference just as long as the public  
6 really does have full access.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady?

8 MR. GRADY: So for those of you who may have been here at the time I was  
9 the person who first broached this topic. Certainly I do think there is value in having  
10 as many varieties of public input as is practical. I am somebody who has a lack of  
11 flexibility, I have an 8:30 to 5:00 job so if I was going to take an afternoon and be  
12 here that would be vacation time. But I'm certainly open to moving it back into late  
13 afternoon if we feel like that's necessary. I would lean against a 1:00 but – I, yeah,  
14 anecdotally obviously we haven't counted everybody; it certainly seems like we get  
15 both a larger number and a better cross section of people when we have a later  
16 meeting, but obviously I will defer to judgment of the group.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Ms. Frierson, what do you think?

18 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, I do recall that you were the gentleman that first  
19 mentioned that we should meet at 6:00, but no, no, what I was gonna say is I am  
20 very much in favor of it remaining at 6:00 because I definitely see that there is a  
21 cross section. And even if people take off and come at lunchtime, some people  
22 don't have the flexibility to stay for a long time so we may be inconvenienced

1 somewhat sometimes, but for the benefit of the County and diversity I would like  
2 to keep it at 6:00.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. Okay, I'll have an  
4 added anecdote. Like whereas you discussed earlier about work sessions, maybe  
5 there's a little bit of fatigue at 9:00 for, to dive deeper into the Comprehensive Plan  
6 but we need to. So we either need to schedule more meetings so we can have  
7 these work sessions and serve our County, or maybe start a little bit earlier so we  
8 have more time to fully digest and tackle projects. Commissioner Siercks?

9 MR. SIERCKS: I'd echo the sentiments voiced by Commissioner Grady and  
10 Commissioner Frierson. Count me as staunchly opposed to moving it from the  
11 6:00pm time slot for the reasons that they stated.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

13 MR. DURANT: I'm not sure asking me at 9:00 whether 6:00 is okay. But I'll  
14 answer the question anyway. I'm retired so I can make any hour you say so I feel,  
15 I wouldn't feel right trying to restrict the flexibility of others. So 6:00 works for me,  
16 actually it gives me time to take care of a lotta things at home before coming to the  
17 meeting; whereas 3:00 would be a little more difficult. So.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you everyone.

19 MR. DURANT: If we're still sitting here at 10:00 I might ask for a recount.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I remember when we talked about this last time we,  
21 we, I don't know, we were avoiding 4:00 and 5:00 as options, what, because of  
22 traffic?

1 MR. JOHNSON: I was gonna say, I mean, is there, what was the rationale  
2 of skipping 5:00, cause I mean, that still gives folks off work to, a change to get  
3 here, but on the – I mean, not that we've had that many late meetings but it does  
4 make it a little bit easier when we have these long sessions.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What are your thoughts on 5:00?

6 MS. LOYD: The same feeling, 5:00 or 5:30 I think is also, like viable, would  
7 give us an extra half hour, it would only be 8:45.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, Staff, I'm trying. I just wanna have a  
9 good conversation cause we're gonna lock this in.

10 MS. LOYD: I, I do wanna add, so I have served on a Planning Commission  
11 before and I'm just gonna add this. So we would start our Planning Commission at  
12 5:00 and when we had work sessions we would start our work sessions at 3:00 or  
13 4:00, depending on the length or whatever we were talking about for the work  
14 session. Work sessions were not at the beginning of every single meeting but we  
15 did, that's kind of how we did them and it worked pretty well. I have as much  
16 flexibility with my job now as I did then and sometimes I would have to take time  
17 off depending on, you know, if I had meetings that I was like, oops scheduled that,  
18 need to take some PTO for that. But it, it seemed to work for us so I just wanted to  
19 throw that out as also an idea that sometimes we don't necessarily, especially if  
20 we're doing more work sessions into the future, that we don't necessarily have to  
21 have them on separate days and extended long periods of time, we might be able  
22 to stack them on with our Commission meeting that way.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Commission. Do we wanna look at 5:00 as an  
2 option or do we wanna go ahead and stick with 6:00? Just as a discussion?

3 MR. DURANT: If I go –

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: I'm sorry. If our goal is to provide the public more time to get  
6 here then we should probably stick with 6:00.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for the discussion. Seems like we're  
8 leaning towards 6:00 in my little notes. Okay. So we're gonna approve this  
9 calendar one time so that the top block, that we will continue to customarily meet  
10 on the first Monday at 6:00, and then we look at these dates. Staff, can you  
11 highlight the dates that are different from the first Monday, just so we all have a  
12 chance?

13 MR. DELAGE: So the July 9<sup>th</sup> because of the, of course 4<sup>th</sup> of July. April  
14 13<sup>th</sup>, so that's changed I believe due to the Easter holiday. September 14<sup>th</sup> due to  
15 Labor Day. And, let me just check.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What is August 3<sup>rd</sup> on there for? Potential retreat?

17 MR. DELAGE: That's correct, or if any business needs to take place in  
18 August. So yeah, the main ones are September, July, and then April that are  
19 different from the first Monday of the month.

20 MS. LOYD: And can I ask a question real quick about July? July 9<sup>th</sup> is a  
21 Thursday, is that intended?

22 MR. DELAGE: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Summers get difficult with scheduling and usually if  
2 we have a Thursday it's usually in there. Any other comments, concerns,  
3 Commission on these calendar dates? Thank you for the [inaudible] discussion on  
4 the calendar. The Chair will make a motion to approve the calendar as is, as shown  
5 on page 72. Do we have a second?

6 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Siercks. Staff, can you  
8 please take a vote?

9 MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

10 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

11 MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

12 MS. LOYD: Aye.

13 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

14 MR. GRADY: Aye.

15 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

16 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

17 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

18 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

19 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

20 MR. DURANT: Aye.

21 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I don't have to say aye, but okay aye.

1 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion passes.

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

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, can we move on to number 11 now?

5 MR. DELAGE: Absolutely.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff? Okay. Item 11 is Adjournment. The Chair is  
7 gonna ask for a vote of show of hands. The Chair sees all the hands.

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

10 MR. DELAGE: Motion approved, we're adjourned.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, Staff approved, we're adjourned. Thank you  
12 everyone. Happy New Year.

13

14

*[Meeting Adjourned at 9:30pm]*