

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
February 19, 2026

[Members Present: Christopher Yonke, Beverly Frierson, Terrence Taylor, Bryan Grady, Sena Loyd, Chris Siercks, Charles Durant; Absent: Frederick Johnson, II, Mark Duffy]

Called to order: 6:04 pm

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, are you ready?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'd like to call to order the February 19, 2026 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. Staff, please confirm the following: in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to the news media, persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board located in the county administrative building. Is that correct? For this work session?

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

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

MR. SMITH: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Here.

MR. SMITH: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Here.

MR. SMITH: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Here.

MR. SMITH: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Here.

MR. SMITH: Loyd?

1 MS. LOYD: Present.

2 MR. SMITH: Duffy? Johnson? Frierson?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: On behalf of Ms. Frierson, she'll be here in a few minutes.

4 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

6 MR. SMITH: You have a quorum.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the
8 February 19, 2026 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning
9 Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer our time
10 to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council. Our
11 recommendations are to approve or deny Zoning Map Amendment requests. Per Title
12 VI, Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of Laws* Planning Commission may also prepare and
13 revise plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of unincorporated
14 portions of the County. The County's Land Comprehensive Plan update process is an
15 example of this. Once again, we are a recommending body to County Council and they
16 will conduct their own public hearing and take official votes to approve or deny Map
17 Amendments and Text Amendments on a future date to be published by the County.
18 Council typically holds Zoning Public hearings on the fourth Tuesday of the month.
19 Please check the County's website for updated agendas, dates and times. Please take
20 note of the following guidelines for today's meeting. Please turn off or silence any
21 cellphones. Audience members may come and go quietly as needed. Applicants will be
22 allowed up to two minutes to make comments/statements. Citizens signed up to speak
23 are allowed up to two minutes each. Redundant comments should be minimized.

1 Please only address remarks to the Commission and do not expect the Commission to
2 respond to questions from the speaker in a back and forth style; that is not the purpose
3 of this meeting. Please no audience/speaker exchanges. No audience demonstrations
4 or other disruptions to the meeting are permitted nor are comments from anyone other
5 than the speaker at the podium. Please remember the meeting is being recorded.

6 Please speak into the microphone and give your name and address. Abusive language
7 is inappropriate and will not be tolerated. Please don't voice displeasure or frustration at
8 a recommendation while the Planning Commission is still conducting business. And if
9 you have any questions or concerns you may contact our Richland County Planning
10 Staff down here below. This moves us right along to number 3 on our Agenda, which is
11 Additions and Deletions. Staff, do we have any additions or changes to the Agenda
12 tonight?

13 MR. DELAGE: There are no additions or deletions, Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. The Staff provided, this is number 4, the
15 Commission with copies of the transcript for the Commission's December 2025
16 meeting. Do any Commissioners Members have any concerns or comments about this
17 transcription? Okay seeing none the Chair would like to make a motion to approve the
18 Minutes unless there's an objection. Do I have a second?

19 MR. DURANT: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Thanks. With that
21 motion, can the Staff please take a vote to approve the Minutes from December?

22 MR. SMITH: Grady?

23 MR. GRADY: Aye.

1 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

2 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

3 MR. SMITH: Taylor?

4 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

5 MR. SMITH: Durant?

6 MR. DURANT: Aye.

7 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

8 MS. LOYD: Aye.

9 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

10 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

11 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

13 MR. SMITH: Motion approved.

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

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Moving along to number 5 on the
17 Agenda. The Consent Agenda is an action item that allows the Commission to approve
18 Road Names and Map Amendment requests where the Staff recommends approval, or
19 it's in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, and no one from the public has signed
20 up to speak against the amendment; or no Member of the Commission is in need of
21 further discussion on the request. I see we have one case tonight, 26-001, which is
22 Comprehensive Plan compliant, that would be Case No. 5 tonight. And no one has
23 signed up to speak against it, correct? No head shakes, okay. Commission, any further

1 discussion on Case 5, the number is 26-001? Seeing head shakes, no one, okay. The
2 Chair would like to place that on the Consent Agenda tonight, as well as our road
3 names. So the Chair will make a motion for approval of the Consent Agenda including
4 5.a., Road Names and 5.b.5., Case Number 26-001 MA. Do I have a second?

5 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Siercks. Staff, can you please
7 take a vote for the Consent Agenda tonight?

8 MR. SMITH: Grady?

9 MR. GRADY: Aye.

10 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

11 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

12 MR. SMITH: Taylor?

13 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

14 MR. SMITH: Durant?

15 MR. DURANT: Aye.

16 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

17 MS. LOYD: Aye.

18 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

19 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

20 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

22 MR. SMITH: Motion approved.

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

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. This will get us moving on with our Map
4 Amendment requests tonight. And our first case is 25-044 MA and I'll flip it over to Staff
5 for some information.

6 **CASE NO. 25-044 MA:**

7 MR. SMITH: Alright so the case you have before you, 25-044 MA. The Applicant
8 is Richland County. This location is on Montgomery Road. The tax map numbers are
9 06600-02-17, and it is a portion of. The acreage is 63.07. The zoning, existing zoning is
10 AG or Agricultural, and the proposed zoning is HI or Heavy Industrial. The
11 Comprehensive Plan's recommendation or compliancy is noncompliant. The request
12 does not comply with the objectives and recommendations of the neighborhood low
13 density designation of the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan recommends
14 that areas within this designation serve as a transition between rural and neighborhood
15 medium density areas, and are opportunities for low density traditional neighborhood
16 development and open space developments that preserve open spaces and natural
17 features. However, approval of the Map Amendment would provide a zoning
18 designation that is compatible with the adjacent parcels.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you Staff. I have a question, is, this is a
20 property we've looked at recently before, correct?

21 MR. SMITH: That is correct.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And the difference here would be, it's a different portion?

1 MR. SMITH: I believe my colleague Tommy DeLage will pull up the different
2 zoning map, I believe? Or the different parcel that was being recommended last time we
3 were here.

4 MR. DELAGE: So yes, it's a reduced portion from the previous request and I will
5 pull that up for you now.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff is navigating our County's website where the public
7 can also find old agendas. Commission, any other comments or questions for Staff as
8 Mr. DeLage is hooking us up? Yes, Commissioner Loyd?

9 MS. LOYD: Yeah, I have a question about partial rezoning of the property. Would
10 any other applicant, if they were to make a similar request be allowed to do the same
11 thing or is it just because it's Richland County?

12 MR. SMITH: No, that is correct. You can zone portions of your parcel.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. I believe our next case is also a portion
14 of.

15 MR. SMITH: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, could you do it side by side? Commissioner Loyd has
17 a question, go ahead.

18 MS. LOYD: Was this change of rezoning based on public comment at this last
19 meeting or in consultation, like at a community meeting with the public on this topic?

20 Any insight into that?

21 MR. SMITH: I would have to defer to the Zoning Administrator on that one.

1 MR. DELAGE: So yes, that is correct. In an attempt to basically make it more
2 palatable, the frontage portion along Montgomery Road was removed to kinda reduce
3 some of the potential future road frontage associated with the previous request.

4 MS. LOYD: And that was done just based on the public comment or in
5 consultation and meetings with the public?

6 MR. DELAGE: I don't wanna specifically say one or the other or both or none but
7 that's my understanding, yes.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Commission, any questions or comments, discussion
9 before we open this up for public comment? Okay not seeing any we will move right
10 along. As we get started both podiums are open with microphones. Ms. Frierson, will
11 you go ahead and read the first name?

12 MS. FRIERSON: Okay. The first person is the Applicant, Syndi Castellucio,
13 followed by Heather Lee.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: State your name and address. You'll have two minutes.

15 **TESTIMONY OF SYNDI CASTELLUCIO:**

16 MS. CASTELLUCIO: So my name is Syndi Castellucio and I'm here tonight on
17 behalf of Richland County Solid Waste and Recycling Division. Our address is 1070
18 Caughman Road North in Columbia, South Carolina 29203. We're requesting to rezone
19 the 63 acres from what it's currently zoned as Agricultural or AZ, or AG, sorry, to Heavy
20 Industrial HI so that the parcel can be incorporated into the County's existing landfill
21 facility boundary. The property was approved for purchase by County Council in 2021
22 for future landfill expansion and was acquired in 2022. Rezoning is a necessary step
23 before the property to be considered for any future operational use including dirt

1 operations, which is what we intend to use the property for at this time, which is a vital
2 operation for the landfill. The landfill directly south and adjacent to this parcel is
3 currently zoned as Heavy Industrial. This request simply aligns the zoning of this
4 property with the existing facility and supports the County's long-term solid waste
5 planning. The original request included the entire parcel of approximately 80 acres,
6 however, after hosting a district town hall and receiving community feedback we did
7 withdraw the application and reduce the request to approximately 63 acres. That
8 creates a 300' setback along the frontage of Montgomery Road which is about 18 acres.
9 It allows us to expand the regulatory buffer area. There will be no public access from
10 Montgomery Road. Access would occur internally by extending the landfill road along
11 the perimeter that will allow us to keeping the operational traffic and dirt operations
12 further away from the residential areas.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

14 MS. CASTELUCCIO: Thank you.

15 MS. FRIERSON: I called out Heather Lee, that was a mistake. The next person
16 is Randy Wolfe.

17 **TESTIMONY OF RANDY WOLFE:**

18 MR. WOLFE: How you doing this evening? My name's Randy Wolfe and you
19 said to give my address?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Start with your name and address, yes please.

21 MR. WOLFE: Randy Wolfe, address is 618 Riverdale Court in Chapin. And
22 definitely concerned about the part about the adverse effects that it would have, the
23 heavy industrial zoning because there's a portion that was read earlier but talking about

1 how the environment and surrounding lands, there's dust, fumes, smoke, odor, noise,
2 vibration, large scale activities, you know, large trucks, that sorta thing. And basically, I
3 know that there's probably a lot of precautions that are, try to take but worry about if the
4 landfill is extended or something like that more issues that it could cause with the Broad
5 River, in particularly. Obviously, I think a lotta people have talked about the heavy traffic
6 up and down Montgomery and, you know, looking at the fact that the 2015 Richland
7 County Comprehensive Plan, that the area is really designated for low density and
8 obviously heavy industrial would be a big change to that. So you know, overall it would
9 be considered potentially noncompliant with that. The current proposal, the differences,
10 you've got that 300' buffer but if you look it goes down to the powerline and then it
11 comes out and meets the road. And so if heavy industrial trucks would be coming up
12 and down the road ultimately it leaves the door open to have access at the bottom of
13 Montgomery Road, and so I think that that is a concern that the buffer doesn't go all the
14 way down Montgomery Road. And so it looks like it goes to the powerline and then
15 comes back out to Montgomery Road and then doesn't extend down, so that portion
16 where it's pointing to the site –

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'll give you a few more seconds to give me your final
18 thoughts.

19 MR. WOLFE: Yeah, that portion where it says site would potentially be an access
20 point in the future for heavy industrial trucks. So –

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

22 MR. WOLFE: - thank you very much, appreciate it.

23 MS. FRIERSON: Next two speakers, Wendell Patton and then Wes McManus.

1 **TESTIMONY OF WENDELL PATTON:**

2 MR. PATTON: Wendell Patton, 213 Montgomery Road, Columbia 29203. The
3 residents of Montgomery Road are in unison, we are 100% against this landfill
4 expansion. There's not one family on that road that is for this amendment. It will ruin the
5 rural atmosphere that we've got that we all moved out here to enjoy. We don't want the
6 landfill and we certainly don't want it addressing Montgomery Road. The area that Mr.
7 Wolfe just pointed out leaves an access to Montgomery Road and we don't want it.
8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. When Commissioner Frierson calls two names
10 you can go ahead and take a podium so we can –

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I rescind, that was the same thing I was coming up with.
12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

14 MS. FRIERSON: And Jeff Coleman and Darlene Simpson.

15 **TESTIMONY OF JEFF COLEMAN:**

16 MR. COLEMAN: Howdy, Jeff Coleman, 205 Montgomery Road 29203. While I do
17 echo Mr. Wolfe's concerns and Wendell Patton's, mine is more of a procedural one from
18 the previous meetings that were the, the previous town hall I felt like was very helpful
19 and Richland County did take the step to try to create a buffer and kinda meet us in the
20 middle there. I do remember the comments from that previous town hall that they
21 couldn't use past those powerlines for their intended purpose for the dirt operations
22 because they didn't want the powerlines to interfere with those operations. So the
23 questions some of us had after the town hall is why not parcel that property, not where

1 they parceled it but at the powerline? Why now, and also again the Montgomery Road
2 frontage, even on the very end of Montgomery Road, if their successors decide to
3 change the intent of Richland County and provide an access then they would be free to
4 do so per the zoning. So I would also recommend coming off of Montgomery Road with
5 that as well, even notwithstanding the powerline comment. And my third comment is
6 almost procedural. I think I also remember that we really have years to figure all this out
7 so we're not having another town hall meeting to talk about this one for a while, you
8 know, a couple weeks now and County Council has pushed this issue back another
9 month, and I would almost like to not have a vote on this tonight and just let us have
10 another town hall and another round, cause we have time. So I don't think it costs us
11 much to go back and forth and kind of everybody come as close to a consensus as we
12 possibly could, given the comments you've had tonight, which I feel like are valid. Thank
13 you.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

15 MS. FRIERSON: Then after Ms. Simple then we have Eddie Wolfe.

16 **TESTIMONY OF DARLENE SIMPSON:**

17 MS. SIMPSON: Hi, Darlene Simpson, 444 Montgomery Road. And I wanted to
18 give you a little history of our road. We are already dealing with the rock quarry; the
19 sound, the noise from it. And now, and then we've had contaminated land that we've
20 had to deal with. And now they're wanting to add more to the landfill which will be the
21 noise, the trucks. And so I think we're all in agreement that we just do not want this on
22 our property. And what I've read that CD waste is generally considered nonhazardous
23 under federal regulations. These materials can still release toxic substance into the air,

1 soil and water, threatening the wellbeing of residents in the proximity of the site. And so
2 I want you to take that in consideration because you're talking about our home, our life.
3 And what will the value of our property become that we've worked hard to retire? And
4 that's a question that I'd like you to ask yourselves. And then the other thing, what about
5 Broad River? That's one of our main water supplies. So you're getting so close to it. So
6 when do we start protecting our properties and our water? Just some questions for you
7 to think about. Thank you very much.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out tonight.

9 **TESTIMONY OF EDDIE WOLFE:**

10 MR. WOLFE: Yes, I'm Eddie Wolfe, 1013 Windwood Road, Columbia, South
11 Carolina and I'm here, of course, to voice my opposition to the rezoning, new rezoning.
12 And by the way I want to mention right of the bat there has been no town hall for this
13 particular zoning here, it was for the original one. There's one scheduled on the 27th I
14 believe it is, which is after the fact, so. But I just wanted first to say that it's obvious that
15 it's noncompliant, all through the information that's online shows that it's noncompliant.
16 But we had talked before about noise, debris and property values decreasing and such
17 as that. But the one thing that was most important to the people here and the people of
18 the community is to not to have access on Montgomery Road because of the traffic and
19 the big trucks and everything. And what's being proposed here absolutely does not
20 guarantee that we won't have that. I've lived very near this my entire life of 77 years.
21 From the powerline that's being talked about here to the end of the road at the gate is
22 actually 96 yards; that is, will be, if this passes, will be zoned as heavy industrial which
23 would allow the County to come in, to come back any time they would want to do that.

1 One of the things I wanted to mention here is that I think that it's pretty apparent that
2 that is the chosen site for an access point. Today, maybe not today, maybe not next
3 month or next year but it's pretty obvious because the way it was drawn because the
4 line for the setback or the area that they're talking about would be 300 yards, I believe
5 somebody mentioned. We didn't even, this is the first that we've even heard that, so it
6 comes to the powerline which is the Santee Cooper powerline, it moves out to the road
7 and straight down the road and everything inside of that line is gonna be heavy
8 industrial. The thing that makes me to believe that that's the site is that, is the plan was
9 drawn that way purposely, and secondly it's interesting that a couple of years ago
10 directly across from that site the County purchased 7/10ths of an acre of land across
11 Montgomery Road. So I don't know why that would be, other than –

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Give me your final thoughts, sir. I wanna be fair to your
13 neighbors so give me your final thought.

14 MR. WOLFE: Okay. Final thought, I think that connection is, it has to do with the
15 access point there. Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

17 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Wolfe was our last speaker.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you.

19 MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chair, may I be recognized?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff.

21 MR. DELAGE: Since I heard it twice tonight I figured I might wanna just advise
22 the Commission that the town hall meeting is not required by ordinance. Those are
23 called at the pleasure of County Council. Some typically do it on every rezoning case,

1 some do it on more controversial ones. So your recommendation tonight, approval,
2 disapproval, will not negate the fact that the town hall will be held. The item is on the
3 Council's agenda for the 24th so they can choose to take action, approval or
4 disapproval, or they can take action by deferring the request as well. But I just wanted to
5 make that clear because we have received many calls, too, about the town hall meeting
6 being held after the Zoning Public Hearing and also in what the Council District
7 representative has stated. But it is still on the agenda for the 24th, Council will probably
8 take some kind of action, again, approval, disapproval or deferral, and then the town
9 hall meeting will be held on, I don't wanna get the date wrong, I believe it's the 27th?
10 Yes, the 27th at 6:00pm.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. I find that frustrating as well, the process
12 as I understand is that Planning Commission, we are a recommending body to County
13 Council, and then that's when County Council takes official votes. The town halls that
14 they have have seemed to be optional and whenever they can schedule it, so. But that
15 is interesting how the 24th, you said, and the 27th?

16 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, gotcha, okay. Okay I had a map question for Staff,
18 seeing how I'm a map guy. Is this the most accurate GIS parcel line that, is this pretty
19 true? It does still touch Montgomery Road.

20 MR. DELAGE: My understanding is the GIS technician that draws it is based off
21 of the plat that's provided by the applicant, but we can verify that real quickly. But yes, I
22 believe that it is.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Again, I guess this is my, as my day job as a GIS guy, if it
2 is a 300' buffer it would go parallel with Montgomery until it ended, and not come and
3 touch it the way that it does. But that's just me viewing the map making comment.
4 Commission, open for discussion and questions for Staff. Open for a motion as well if
5 you guys are ready. Maybe Commissioner Siercks might have something? Yes
6 Commissioner Siercks.

7 MR. SIERCKS: Just a question for Staff. With the talk, or at least part of the
8 comments focusing on that little sliver that touches Montgomery Road, one question
9 that I had was, doesn't the landfill already have or could already have access to
10 Montgomery Road, given what the current property line is?

11 MR. DELAGE: That is correct. If you see the GIS here, and I'll click on it so it'll
12 show Montgomery Road – it's running a little slow, but you can see the owner's address
13 as Richland County. It does have frontage along this portion of Montgomery Road.

14 MR. SIERCKS: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. Commissioner Durant?

16 MR. DURANT: Yes, question for Staff. Last time this came before us, before the
17 revision for the 300 yard setback, what did we do with it, what was our vote?

18 MR. DELAGE: I like to think I have a pretty good memory, I'd like to put it in front
19 of you so we can make sure. I believe the recommendation was for disapproval, but
20 let's pull it up.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Gonna click on the Government tab as we're going through
22 the website so the public can navigate the new – I'm still getting used to the new

1 website. It's probably been out for about a year now? The agenda, probably the last
2 page would be Council notes?

3 MS. LOYD: It says that we voted 8/1 to deny it.

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

5 MS. LOYD: Well, motion for disapproval.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Thank you. Yes, Commissioner Durant?

7 MR. DURANT: Any reasons for that disapproval?

8 MR. DELAGE: So as Mark was mentioning, consistency with the Comp Plan was
9 the reason for the motion.

10 MR. DURANT: So the only thing that's changed between the last one we looked
11 at and this one is the 300 yard setback?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE? Staff?

13 MR. DELAGE: The parcel size, yes. And the configuration of what is being
14 rezoned. The zoning district is the same as the previous request.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you, Commissioner Durant. More
16 discussion, more questions? Let's go. Commissioner Loyd?

17 MS. LOYD: I'm willing to make a motion.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other discussion? I'm not seeing any. Okay, the Chair
19 will hear a motion.

20 MS. LOYD: I'll motion for disapproval.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. We have a motion for disapproval from
22 Commissioner Loyd. Do we have a second?

23 MR. DURANT: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We got a second from Commissioner Durant. Okay, Staff
2 with a motion and a second let's take a vote for disapproval.

3 MR. SMITH: Alright, this motion is for disapproval of Map Amendment 25-044
4 MA. Grady?

5 MR. GRADY: No.

6 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

7 MR. SIERCKS: No.

8 MR. SMITH: Taylor? Durant?

9 MR. DURANT: Aye.

10 MR. TAYLOR: I didn't get a chance to –

11 MR. SMITH: I thought you were absent, I'm sorry. Durant? Sorry, sorry, Taylor?

12 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

13 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

14 MS. LOYD: Aye.

15 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

16 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

17 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

19 MR. SMITH: Motion passes.

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

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That was 5/2? Yes. That motion passes for disapproval. It's
23 the recommendation going to County Council and as our Staff noted, it is still on the –

1 MR. DELAGE: February 24th.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: April – wait, February 24th zoning meeting that the Council
3 holds. Alright. And then a town hall is said to be scheduled on the 27th.

4 MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Okay for the Commission we're gonna go
6 ahead and move on to our next case. The public is welcome to hang out. We're gonna
7 talk about our Comprehensive Plan updates later tonight.

8 MS. LOYD: Before we move on, Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Or you can also go quietly.

10 MS. LOYD: Chair, before we move on do we want give on the Record a reason
11 for the Council as to why we did it?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is it necessary since we went along with the
13 Comprehensive Plan?

14 MR. DELAGE: Couldn't hurt.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Couldn't hurt? Okay. We should've done that before the
16 motion I believe, Commissioner Loyd, but go ahead, what was your reason?

17 MS. LOYD: Cause it doesn't comply with the Comprehensive Plan and I think
18 that, and I think that more public input is necessary in this situation.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Loyd. Full heartily agree.

20 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

22 MR. SMITH: It would also be nice to have clarity for why some of the
23 Commission voted against as well.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Alright, Staff who were the two that voted against?

2 MR. SMITH: I believe that was Grady and Siercks.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Commission Grady, any comments.

4 MR. GRADY: Sure. So I was the one dissenting vote the last time this came to a,
5 came before us. I think it's, you know, one of the questions that we consider is whether
6 the rezoning is contextually appropriate to the surroundings, and considering that this is
7 a, next to an existing landfill, you know, that certainly strikes me as being a relevant
8 factor. More broadly I find it somewhat bizarre in a weird way that the County is having
9 to come to the County to request a rezoning for land that it already bought four years
10 ago for this purpose. I don't feel like as a Planning Commissioner it's really my job to
11 come back four years after the fact and say, well you shouldn't have done that. So I,
12 you know, while I appreciate the concern that members of the public have I think
13 ultimately we wouldn't be here if there wasn't a need for this. And the question is, you
14 know, it would be either this change or establishing a new landfill somewhere else with
15 probably an even larger number of people who would be upset about that. So I think, I
16 think given that I would say that I, that's essentially why I would approve this request.

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

18 MR. SIERCKS: I think my dissenting vote tonight was based largely on relatively
19 similar grounds to the sentiments that Commissioner Grady stated. Initially I don't think
20 my concerns are so much procedural, I think it's fair that, you know, the County, like any
21 other applicant, should have to get approval for, you know, future zoning uses. But in
22 terms of the compliance with the Comprehensive Plan I certainly can recognize that,
23 you know, the current zoning is what it is and, you know, while this may not meet the

1 objectives of the neighborhood medium density designation, I think that looking in the
2 broader context of the proximity to the current existing landfill and also similarly to what
3 Commissioner Grady said regarding, you know, if not here where and how much and in
4 whose backyard. It's not a decision that I made lightly and it's not one that I don't harbor
5 any concerns about, but one that I ultimately felt was appropriate given the proximity to
6 the existing landfill structure, not so much what the intended uses are but I think those
7 also made sense in terms of what I believe the Director of, is it Solid Waste, I'm sorry I
8 forget her name, but [inaudible].

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. Staff, got the
10 information that you requested? Okay. Clear to move on to the next case?

11 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm gonna flip it right to Staff.

13 **CASE NO. 25-045 MA:**

14 MR. SMITH: Alright, so the case you have before you, 25-045 MA, the Applicant
15 is Heather Leigh, I hope I got that right, location is 11020 Two Notch Road. It's a portion
16 of the two acres. Existing zoning is HM, homestead. The proposed zoning is GC,
17 general commercial. Comprehensive compliance is noncompliant. The proposed zoning
18 is not compliant with the objectives of the neighborhood medium density designation in
19 the Comprehensive Plan. Per the Plan nonresidential development within the
20 neighborhood medium density designation may be considered for location along main
21 road corridors and within contextually appropriate distances from the intersection of a
22 primary arterial. The proposed request is not located along a main road corridor within
23 an appropriate distance from the intersection of a primary arterial. Additionally, the Plan

1 states that commercial uses should be located within neighborhood activity centers and
2 that commercial land uses should not result in strip commercial development and
3 fragmented leapfrog development patterns along corridors. The proposed request does
4 not fall within a neighborhood activity center. A rezoning such as this could be viewed a
5 leapfrog development.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, any questions for Staff at
7 this moment? I remember this property from 2022 last time we looked at it.

8 MR. SMITH: That is correct.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Part of a cemetery.

10 MS. LEIGH: It's a unique neighborhood.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. Commissioner Frierson, go ahead.

12 MS. FRIERSON: We have the Applicant, Heather Leigh.

13 **TESTIMONY OF HEATHER LEIGH:**

14 MS. LEIGH: Good evening. It's good to see everybody again. My name is
15 Heather Leigh, 11020 Two Notch Road, Elgin, South Carolina 29045. I am here again
16 before you with a revised and significantly narrowed request. Several years ago the
17 original request to rezone the entire property was denied due to acreage and the same
18 thing that was read previously. After a discussion I met with Geo, Tommy and members
19 of the Zoning Staff. Through those discussions it was determined that returning with a
20 much smaller request would be more appropriate. In response I am requesting that only
21 two acres be rezoned to allow for a modest office building and a small funeral home to
22 support our growing community. I understand the board's concern regarding general
23 commercial zoning and the range of uses it can allow. However, that concern does not

1 really apply to the practice of this property. Perpetual care cemeteries and funeral
2 homes are governed under Title 41, Chapters 8 and 19 of the *South Carolina Code of*
3 *Laws* and regulated by the South Carolina LLR Board. These laws require licensures,
4 inspections and strict limitations on services. Regardless of zoning this property this
5 property can only be used for licensed death care services. It cannot be converted to
6 housing, restaurant, retail or other commercial activities. Richland and Kershaw
7 Counties are experiencing rapid residential growth with significant housing development
8 within approximately 12 miles of the cemetery. The number of funeral homes in this
9 area has not kept pace with that growth and as a matter of fact approximately two or
10 three years ago one closed, creating a service gap for families who need accessible
11 and local care. Additionally, multiple properties within ½ mile of my entrance of the
12 cemetery are already zoned general commercial. This would include the property
13 directly across from the cemetery, real estate offices and other service-based
14 businesses, and most recently approved zoning change at 308 Vallenga and Two
15 Notch.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'll give you 30 more seconds to wrap it up.

17 MS. LEIGH: Thank you. I respectfully ask the board to approve this request with
18 confidence knowing that the state law permanently restricts this property to licensed
19 cemetery and funeral services. If the board believes a different designation or condition
20 would better reflect that limited and regulated use I welcome the opportunity to work
21 together and develop a solution that solves today's issues and also meets the growing
22 demand of our community. I've also prepared handouts for you that summarize the laws
23 that I mentioned if you would like to have those.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Hand that over to Staff and then they could
2 probably hand that to us. Staff, I have a question. Since this property is so close to
3 Kershaw County, can you show us what's going on on the other side of Two Notch?

4 MR. SMITH: That's exactly what I was bringing up.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I saw you pull something up.

6 MR. SMITH: So what you see here is the Kershaw County's Comprehensive
7 Plan future land use map and that red area that runs down south and to the purple and
8 the gray area, that is where Richland County meets. Tommy, would you scroll down a
9 little bit so we can see the legend? As you can see in the legend that red area is
10 designated priority commercial, so up until the county line they're designating that
11 portion of Two Notch in their jurisdiction as commercial future land uses.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's priority or industrial as well right on the border.

13 MR. SMITH: That's correct.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Just higher uses, right?

15 MR. SMITH: Correct.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Interesting, thank you. Commission, questions for Staff?
17 Comments, discussion. Yes, Commissioner Siercks.

18 MR. SIERCKS: Could we go the GIS for this and zoom out a little bit with the
19 zoning put on? Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, could you highlight the portion of, like maybe with a
21 measure? Just roughly. Two acres, correct? What I see from the map is the Applicant
22 isn't requesting the entire parcel to be bright red GC, just that little portion. Commission,
23 comments?

1 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady?

3 MR. GRADY: Couple questions for Staff. Can you speak to what is, what land
4 uses are on the general commercial and institutional parcels in close proximity to this
5 site?

6 MR. DELAGE: So my understanding is the institutional are still, well at one point
7 they had, one had a manufactured home on it but there's not any
8 commercial/institutional development. Now across the street, I don't know if anybody
9 was on the Commission at the time but they came in to do a zoning change that was
10 not, or basically they weren't able to get what they wanted to get to change it to.
11 However, the GC, and I will go back to – sorry, I'm just getting the case history real
12 quick – so the general commercial across the street was rezoned in 1995, so at least
13 three Comp Plans ago. So I'm not sure what the recommendations were at the time. My
14 understanding was that there was some minor automobile repair going on across the
15 street but I'm not sure if that is still the case.

16 MS. LEIGH: Mr. Steel is still in operation.

17 MR. GRADY: Alright, and second question, I wanted to give Staff the opportunity
18 to essentially, if you have any comment on the representations made by the Applicant
19 regarding state regulation of the site. Was there any fact finding into that or, or other
20 verification of those claims?

21 MR. DELAGE: Not for us, not for the state regulations because that would've
22 been something that would've been put on when the use is established, at least for any
23 kind of new uses. The, and forgive me I can't remember what agency had contacted me

1 originally asking about a zoning status, which kinda may have helped prompt the
2 rezoning request, because that, basically what they're asking for is a – funeral home
3 wasn't covered under the ancillary uses that the existing use was approved for.

4 MR. GRADY: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commission Grady. Commissioner Taylor?

6 MR. TAYLOR: If this – this question is for Staff – if this was previously requested
7 and – I guess the first question is how much was being requested for rezoning in the
8 initial request, do you know? I think my understanding is there was a reduction from the
9 original request.

10 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, originally it was the parcel in its entirety, but has since
11 now been reduced down to the ordinance minimum in order to request the general
12 commercial, which is two acres.

13 MR. TAYLOR: Entirety is the 31, is that the 31 acres or?

14 MR. DELAGE: That's correct.

15 MR. TAYLOR: I guess part two so we'll understand the process, so if the
16 Applicant sought insights from Staff and the recommendation or I guess the conclusion
17 that you all came to was to reduce the amount being requested, was it not reduced to
18 an amount that would've been approved or was that suggestion? I just wanna make
19 sure I'm kinda understanding the back and forth in the process.

20 MR. DELAGE: So one of the roles as Staff is to determine the eligibility for an
21 applicant to make a map amendment request. There's some provisions that are outlined
22 in the Code that talk about, you know, if you're adjacent, you share a contiguous
23 boundary of 15', you can be less than two acres and request a rezone to that adjacent

1 parcel's zoning district. In this case because the portion of was not abutting the
2 minimum that was able to make that request basically applicable was the two acres. I
3 think also though some of the discussion was that although there were state
4 requirements that would limit its ability to be converted to another use under the general
5 commercial district, still by right, by zoning if, you know, it allows a multitude of uses,
6 and that 31.86 acres was looked on less favorably because of the acreage, not because
7 of the proposed use, so that by going to the minimum that would make it potentially
8 more palatable to folks, and then County Council as well, but also still be able to
9 achieve the proposed use that the Applicant was looking at establishing there.

10 MR. TAYLOR: So even in this discourse and going over the, some of the
11 proposed changes that could take place, that's no guarantee that it will be compliant if
12 the new request kinda meets some of those criteria, is that correct?

13 MR. DELAGE: From a Comp Plan standpoint, correct.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. Commissioner Loyd?

15 MS. LOYD: I'm just curious for this item, but also potentially for future items, if the
16 zoning was to the right on the map, even though the road is in-between, would that be
17 considered [inaudible]?

18 MR. DELAGE: In this case it would be considered adjacent to. Unlike parcel
19 lines, zoning district lines run to the road center line. They're only presumed broken
20 when you have something like a railroad right-of-way, a water body or an interstate.

21 MS. LOYD: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Loyd. Further discussion,
23 Commissioners? If not, a motion? It can go one of two ways so either one.

1 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady?

3 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion at your suggestion. I would like to
4 make a motion that we forward Case 25-045 MA to County Council with a
5 recommendation of approval, and the rationale for that being that a, there is existing
6 commercial activity in the area and given that there is state law governing this parcel, I
7 believe that the use is contextually appropriate.

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

9 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We got a second from Commissioner Siercks. Okay Staff,
11 with a motion and a second and a reason, can you please take a vote?

12 MR. SMITH: This vote is for approval of Map Amendment Case 25-045 from HM
13 to GC. Grady?

14 MR. GRADY: Aye.

15 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

16 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

17 MR. SMITH: Taylor?

18 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

19 MR. SMITH: Durant?

20 MR. DURANT: Aye.

21 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

22 MS. LOYD: Aye.

23 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

1 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

2 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

4 MR. SMITH: Motion passes.

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

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commission. Thank you, Staff. This goes as a
8 recommendation for approval to County Council.

9 MS. LEIGH: Thank you all, I really appreciate it.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks. And their next meeting will be the 27th, correct?
11 24th.

12 MR. DELAGE: The 27th is open to the public though, so come if you'd like.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

14 MS. LEIGH: So we still have to come back for the next reading, is that correct?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: To the County Council meeting on the 24th.

16 MS. LEIGH: 24th, got it.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, thank you. Alright Staff, go ahead and move us right
18 along.

19 **CASE NO. 26-002 MA:**

20 MR. SMITH: Okay, next case is 26-002 MA. The Applicant is Brad Shell.
21 Location is 10141 Wilson Boulevard. Acreage is 19.83 acres. Existing zoning is HM,
22 homestead. And the proposed zoning is EMP or employment. The Comprehensive Plan
23 compliance, noncompliant. The proposed rezoning is not compliant with the objectives

1 of neighborhood low density designation in the Comprehensive Plan. Although the
2 proposed Map Amendment would allow for retail and commercial uses along a primary
3 road, the subject site is not within a priority investment area and is not within a
4 contextually appropriate distance from an intersection as prescribed by the
5 Comprehensive Plan. While the parcel falls within the neighborhood low density
6 designation on the future land use map, the approval of the recent rezoning of the
7 parcel north of the subject site to general commercial occurs within the sphere of
8 influence of the parcel in question. Therefore, viewing the subject parcel as within the
9 adjacent economic development corridor may be contextually appropriate rather than
10 neighborhood low density.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, do we have any questions
12 for Staff?

13 MR. TAYLOR: Question.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Taylor.

15 MR. TAYLOR: I may have overlooked it or missed it. On page 42 of the zoning
16 classifications, help me with the EMP, what is that? I notice on page 45, 44 and 45
17 shows the comparison of the two, but I just don't see it on 42.

18 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I believe that there was a typo and the zoning classification,
19 the INS is supposed to be EMP on there.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioner Taylor. Commissioner
21 Frierson?

22 MS. FRIERSON: We have the Applicant, Brad Shell.

23 **TESTIMONY OF BRAD SHELL:**

1 MR. SHELL: Good evening. Brad Shell, 739 Hampton Hill Road, Columbia,
2 South Carolina 29209. Here on behalf of the Applicant, I am also the Applicant, so. This
3 is a 19 acres on the intersection of Turkey Farm Road and Wilson Boulevard. We are
4 requesting obviously as you've heard a zoning change map amendment from
5 homestead to EMP. The, we met with Staff prior to Christmas to discuss this project
6 and, you know, through our conversations with them we decided, I guess collectively felt
7 that EMP would be appropriate for what we were trying to accomplish here. You know,
8 the primary reason being as I think we discussed a little bit earlier tonight in some other
9 cases the general commercial designation allows a really wide range of uses and quite
10 frankly some that we don't need. The, what we're trying to do here, just for the
11 Commission's I guess information, it's gonna be a mix of retail, restaurant, service type
12 businesses. You know, obviously a lot of change is happening in the area, this is, you
13 know, simply taking advantage of that. The property directly to the north is general
14 commercial. You know, so we believe this would obviously be contextually appropriate,
15 given that as Staff mentioned. The other thing I would say too is that, you know, also
16 had a town hall with Councilwoman Cooper on this on, I think it was January 7th and,
17 you know, met, answered a few questions for the community about the project and, you
18 know, one of the takeaways I think from that was, you know, a lot of people if they need
19 services, if they need to go get something to eat, if they need to go to the dentist, to the
20 doctors, things of that nature, they'll either drive all the way up to Blythewood Road or
21 they'll cut across to Killian. And this is a way sort of to serve the people that's kinda in
22 the local community. And I'm happy to answer any other questions but, you know, I
23 guess the last thing I would say is I know that Council and Planning Commission are

1 considered a new Comprehensive Plan and my understanding is that once that new
2 Comprehensive Plan, if it is approved in its current form, that would make this a
3 compliant use within the new Comprehensive Plan. So, happy to answer any questions
4 you may have.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Thank you for coming out. You should stick
6 around till the end of the meeting cause we're gonna discuss that Comp Plan.

7 MR. SHELL: I thought about it.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks. Anyone else signed up to speak, Commissioner
9 Frierson? No? That's it. Okay. Alright Commission, questions, comments, motion? You
10 know the drill.

11 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

13 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff. The last comment the Applicant made, Staff,
14 that if the new Comprehensive Plan were in place now this rezoning request would be
15 approved, what's your thoughts on that?

16 MR. SMITH: Speaking to what the proposed Comprehensive Plan would entail,
17 the applicable, or I should say the place type that is proposed for that area is a
18 neighborhood center that would allow for a bunch of different zonings; MU1, MU2, MU3,
19 R5, R6, GC, but also in the proximity of that you have – and I'm sorry I can't see this
20 map cause it's so small – but since it's parcel based it's hard to distinguish at this scale
21 that I have in my hand exactly what all designations would be included in that area.

22 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Comments, concerns,
2 motions? The rest of this parcel is surrounded by PD, is that correct?

3 MR. SMITH: That is correct.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Looking at page 42. Okay. Are these separate PDs?

5 MR. DELAGE: They are; one is the Turkey Farm Road PDD and then across
6 from it is the Blythewood Crossing PDD.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And just south of it?

8 MR. DELAGE: So that is the Hawkins Creek, yes, PDD.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Commission?

10 MR. DURANT: Question, Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

12 MR. DURANT: Staff, what is the differences between a PD and EMP?

13 MR. DELAGE: The PDD districts in this case are planned development districts
14 were created with a mix of uses. So you've got the one here to the north, we've got
15 some institutional, some commercial, along with some residential to the west of those.
16 The Blythewood Crossing, so you have some single-family, some multi-family and then
17 some commercial and potential mixed use according to the general development plan to
18 the north. The PDDs get to set their uses and their district standards at the time of
19 adoption via the map amendment process versus the EMP is a district that has been
20 identified with certain allowed uses; that is basically done via the map amendment
21 process to establish it but does not set any uses at the time of the map amendment
22 process, it's just what's approved in the table of permitted uses.

23 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Can you zoom the map out so we can see Scout? That far.
2 Highway speaking it's one exit up the road. We can hang out all night or we could do a
3 motion.

4 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady?

6 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

8 MR. GRADY: I would like to send Case 26-002 MA to County Council with a
9 recommendation for approval. The rationale being that the opposite side of the road as
10 well as the immediate north of the parcel in question are both zoned for economic
11 development center corridor on the future land use map and that given the adjacent
12 general commercial property, an EMP zoning would be contextually appropriate for the
13 area.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. We have a motion for
15 approval, do we have a second?

16 MR. DURANT: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Okay, we've got a
18 motion and a second and a reason, so Staff go ahead and take a vote.

19 MR. SMITH: Alright, this motion is for approval for Map Amendment 26-002 from
20 HM to EMP. Grady?

21 MR. GRADY: Aye.

22 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

23 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

1 MR. SMITH: Taylor?

2 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

3 MR. SMITH: Durant?

4 MR. DURANT: Aye.

5 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

6 MS. LOYD: Aye.

7 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

8 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

9 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

11 MR. SMITH: Motion approved.

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

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commission. Thank you, Staff.

15 Recommendation of approval will be at the next meeting which is the 24th. Tuesday,
16 same place here.

17 MR. DELAGE: The 24th at 7:00pm

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 7:00pm. Yes. Okay, looking at our Agenda that concludes
19 number 5. We're now gonna move on to number 6, is the Land Development Code
20 updates. Is Mr. Price presenting?

21 MR. DELAGE: That is correct, Mr. Chair.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Why don't we take a brief three minutes and give him a
23 chance to come on down and fire up his slides. Mr. Price, ready whenever you are.

1 MR. PRICE: Okay. So we, I know we did have a work session previously on this
2 item so what I did was I kinda changed one thing around on this and hopefully this will
3 allow us to kinda encapsulate what took place at the work session yet at the same time
4 shorten what was originally presented to you. So we're here to look at the MU2 zoning
5 designation or the corridor mixed use district. At the September 23, 2025 D&S
6 Committee, which is the Development & Services Committee of County Council, a
7 motion was made to amend the MU2 district. The intent of this motion was to provide an
8 evaluation of the MU2 to determine if the current density, dimensional standards and
9 permitted uses for the district align with the intent of the district's general description. As
10 part of the motion Council identified the following uses that they deemed to not be
11 appropriate for this district and to be deleted. Those included the multi-family dwellings,
12 passenger terminals, surface transportation, kennels, hotels/motels, vehicle fueling
13 stations, and warehouse distribution facilities. The Committee sent this motion to the
14 Planning Commission noting Staff may provide recommendations but with the
15 understanding that the Commission may recommend differently to County Council.
16 Being that the Committee also allowed Staff to make recommendations, we wanna start
17 off with the recommendations before we get really into the meat of the MU2 district.
18 Upon Staff's evaluation it's determined that the MU2 district has a number of uses that
19 are extremely similar to the MU1 and MU3 districts also. And in some ways also a little
20 bit of the GC which is the general commercial district. So based on that we came up
21 with three potential options for the Planning Commission; to take action based on the
22 motion presented by the D&S Committee, which means we will just evaluate the MU2
23 district solely on its own, we could evaluate the MU1 and MU3 district along with the

1 MU2, I think that would kinda give more of thorough representation of what those
2 districts encapsulate and if additional changes should be made to those districts, and
3 the third option was to include the GC district along with an evaluation of the MU1, MU2
4 and MU3 districts. I can go through with the corridor mixed use district, kinda give you a
5 little rundown over it. It is a district that provides for walkable mixed use development
6 along main road corridors. It allows a mix of retail sales, personal and business
7 services, recreation, entertainment, office, high intensity multi-family residential and
8 institutional land uses. You know, multi-story mixed use and pedestrian friendly type
9 development oriented toward the major road corridors provides enhanced visual
10 character along the corridors and is well integrated in terms of access and circulation,
11 complimentary uses and compatible design. As we go through some of the focus for the
12 Planning Commission for this would be to determine whether the density and
13 dimensional standards are consistent with the district's description, do permitted uses
14 support the corridor's pedestrian-oriented mixed use character, and are additional
15 mixed use development standards needed for integrated residential development. So if
16 you would like I can run through the individual development standards for both the multi-
17 family, commercial/industrial uses for this district, but I would state that that may be
18 appropriate if the Planning Commission desires to just look at the MU2 district. If the
19 Planning Commission desires to look at other districts along with the MU2, then we may
20 not need to go through this particular, you know, go through all of the different
21 standards for the MU2 and we will come back to the Planning Commission with Staff,
22 with really kind of a matrix of the districts, their uses, their development standards, and

1 in addition to that we would come back with recommendations from Staff for you to take
2 into consideration.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Staff. We did have a work session prior to this
4 where you went full through your presentation. And would you go back to your last slide
5 that has the options or I believe it's the second one now? And some of the discussion
6 seemed to land on the box to the right where we would evaluate all of the districts and
7 would also include RC in that.

8 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We are considering looking at commercial as a whole, so
10 any Commission Members that weren't able to be at the work session, we can take a
11 minute for comment, discussion here. This is an opportunity given to us from Council to
12 be able to evaluate not just MU2 but all of our commercial districts and see if the uses fit
13 appropriately.

14 MR. PRICE: Yes, just to – if you don't mind – just kind of show you something,
15 and I apologize I did not have this available at the work session, but these are the
16 common permitted uses for the MU1, MU2, MU3 and GC districts. And again, P is
17 permitted outright, SR is permitted essentially outright subject to development
18 standards, and the SE, special exception, is permitted provided that the Board of Zoning
19 Appeals after its review of the request finds that it's in compliance with the additional
20 criteria standards for that use and then give approval to that. So as you can see here
21 there are a lot of uses with these districts. And again I'll be more than happy to send this
22 out if I have not sent this out to you. Here's another view in which we just put what was
23 placed here as the uses that are just exclusive for that district, and as you can see in

1 the MU1 that is the only district that allows for a children's residential home. There are
2 no uses, no additional uses in the MU1. There are no uses in the MU2 or MU3 that are
3 just exclusive to that district, however, you can see that there are a few within the GC
4 versus the other districts. And taking out the GC, this is just the MU1, MU2 and MU3;
5 again, these are the exclusive uses for these districts. Again, if you take note of the
6 MU2 which was the original I guess task that was requested of Council, excuse me, of
7 the D&S Committee, you notice that the MU2 has, there's no exclusive uses within that
8 district from the MU1 and MU3, which is, again, one of the reasons why Staff would
9 recommend us kind of evaluating multiple commercial designations as opposed to just
10 one.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Loyd, did you have a comment, question?

12 MS. LOYD: Well as somebody who was not here at the work session I do fully
13 agree. When I was reviewing this prior to the meeting I had a very hard time answering
14 any of those three questions that were proposed to us without referencing other areas
15 and being a little bit confused as to what I was looking at in that process. So I think
16 looking at all of those areas would be helpful.

17 MR. PRICE: You missed a great work session.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Anyone to my left?

19 MR. SIERCKS: Yeah, Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Siercks?

21 MR. SIERCKS: I think I had the, the same or similar feeling, you know, taking a
22 look at this, and plus just generally speaking I think it's worth taking a more
23 comprehensive look, given the opportunity that we're already, that we already have, in

1 reviewing the MU2, I think it just makes sense to review everything and if there are any
2 changes that need to be made make them all at once so that we don't have to come
3 back piecemeal later on.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. And Staff, we don't
5 wanna kick this can down the road too much so we're gonna come back to it each
6 month as we work on this.

7 MR. PRICE: Again, I think, I think it's bit of an undertaking as I expressed at the
8 work session. This is something Staff's been kind of talking about for a while. And I think
9 that as we go through our discussions over the years when we're talking about the
10 individual requests that come in and do we look at the zoning designations, how they
11 align with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and the designations of the
12 plan. We've talked about these before. I believe this is something that, well my
13 recommendation would be, is that we'll start working on this now. But we'll be able to
14 send some things to you time in March and again, if you would like to we can have a
15 work session prior to the April Planning Commission meeting to, you know, talk through
16 and work through some of the, well I don't wanna say work through, but to kind of talk
17 through some of the findings of Staff for the particular district and we can still place this
18 on for potential action at the April Planning Commission.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Too bad you can't have something ready for our March 2nd.
20 I know it's only 10 days away.

21 MR. PRICE: Mr. DeLage told me no.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No, I appreciate the hard work you're doing on this one,
23 Staff, thank you. Any other comments, concerns, Commission?

1 MR. PRICE: So –

2 MS. LOYD: I have one thing really quickly.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, Commissioner Loyd, go ahead.

4 MS. LOYD: Obviously I'm getting a little ahead of myself in saying this but if we
5 were to say eliminate the MU2, please let's not have an MU1 and an MU3. People are
6 gonna be so confused where MU2 went.

7 MR. PRICE: Yeah, and not to get ahead but we do have a number of ideas
8 regarding the MU3 zoning designation also. So I think there's some things that we'll be
9 prepared to present to you.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you Staff, Commissioner Loyd. And we can
11 move on to the next part.

12 MR. PRICE: Actually you would need to take a motion as to what, and take a
13 vote as to what actually you'll be taking.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. Yes. Okay, as the Chair I'd like to direct Staff to
15 conduct some work and research on all of the commercial districts, RC, MU1, MU2,
16 MU3 and GC, and look at the uses, the table, bring something back to us for, by the
17 April meeting. Does the Chair have a second on this request?

18 MR. DURANT: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Is that sufficient?

20 MR. PRICE: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Staff, please take a vote.

22 MR. SMITH: Alright, this vote is for, to bring this information back to Staff for
23 more investigation for the zoning districts RC, MU1, MU2, MU3 and GC. Grady?

1 MR. GRADY: Aye.

2 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

3 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

4 MR. SMITH: Taylor?

5 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

6 MR. SMITH: Durant?

7 MR. DURANT? Aye.

8 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

9 MS. LOYD: Aye.

10 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

11 MS. LOYD: Aye.

12 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

14 MR. SMITH: Motion approved.

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

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff.

18 MR. PRICE: [Inaudible] I'm sorry, does that include a potential work session for
19 the April, excuse me, yeah April Planning Commission? And we can send something
20 out to you regarding that.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Send some potential dates out to us and Commission,
22 reply back all to an email so we can try to get availability.

23 MR. PRICE: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And get a quorum for a work session. Thank you. If I
2 remember our April regular meeting is towards the middle of the month due to holidays?
3 I think it's the 13th.

4 MR. DELAGE: I believe you're correct, because of Good Friday and Easter.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Our calendar's pretty hard coded now but do we bump it up
6 to – are we allowed to have a late March date that's still an April meeting? With these –
7 we're looking at February 19th today as our February meeting and we're gonna have
8 another Planning Commission in, like 10 days. So then we're gonna go about a month
9 and a half until our next one. So I'm just trying to think ahead to break this up every four
10 weeks. Is this something we can discuss as an Other Item later in this meeting?

11 MR. DELAGE: I'm sorry, which meeting?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Would we, moving April's meeting up some so we can
13 continue to serve the County at regular periods of time, or do we just leave it at April
14 13th?

15 MR. DELAGE: Yeah, you've – we had this actually come up with the Board of
16 Zoning Appeals, so you've adopted the calendar so you're unable to change that
17 calendar mid-year since it was adopted and published. The only thing that you could do
18 is have a special called meeting but I would – yeah, you'd still have to have the mid-
19 April meeting.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, we'll leave the calendar as is but this gives us a
21 good time period for a work session then somewhere in-between, maybe late March for
22 a work session on this. Thank you. Okay Staff, go on to the next item which is number
23 7, Comprehensive Plan.

1 MR. SMITH: Okay, so Comprehensive Plan, these will be Staff recommended
2 changes to the Comprehensive Plan. We can go into detail on the items if you'd like.
3 We discussed a lot of this during the work session earlier. So the Staff
4 recommendations as they are today that we're putting forth to you guys is number one,
5 with the future land use map Staff is recommending a change from the parcel-based
6 future land use map to a broad paint stroke-based future land use map. The reasoning
7 is this gives Staff and Planning Commission more flexibility and guidance with rezoning
8 cases. Number two is place types, Staff and Planning Commission, it gives more
9 flexibility in rezoning cases, again. The recommendation is to incorporate additional
10 guidance into the land use types, land uses, development patterns, transportation, etc.
11 Third one is adjusting the future land use map boundaries to reflect community input
12 and better represent where development may feasibly occur. We received public input
13 for some areas in the county that we've been making adjustments to, and up until just
14 recently we've received additional input to adjust those boundaries once again. And
15 then number four is to eliminate the place type/zoning alignment table. We feel that
16 aligning the zoning with the place type kind of paints us in a corner as far as zoning
17 goes, as you've seen with MU2 how it's potentially going to evolve and potentially may
18 fit in some other places and may not because of the changes that are to be made in the
19 future. And just to give you a rough run down of what these things kind of look like. So
20 on parcel-based is what we currently have for our, or what we have in the 2025 plan.
21 What we're recommending is going back to something that we currently have with 2015.
22 The pros and cons, with the parcel-based, stronger parcel level guidance, clearer
23 signals to the landowners and developers, easier to link zoning map updates, useful

1 where suburban and urban patterns dominate. However, the cons, it's very data and
2 labor intensive, less flexibility, the lifespan of the Comp Plan, it's harder to express the
3 big picture structure and parcel boundaries versus market drive realities can be an
4 issue. With the broad paint stroke, it gives you the flexibility across large areas, it gives
5 you clear guidance for rezonings and capital projects, it's better at capturing rural versus
6 growth structure, it supports a character area framework. However, there are cons for
7 this one as well. It can be vague at the parcel or subdivision scale, interpretation can
8 drift over time; Council changes, Commission changes, Staff changes so the
9 interpretations can and will change over time. Other cons, extra translations back to
10 zoning, we do this right now so for us that's not a big con but it is a con. And then
11 potential frustration in edge area. When we talk about edge areas we think about these
12 priority investment areas or activity centers where, that we saw tonight, where the
13 parcel fell right outside the economic corridor and you know, does it fit in there, does it
14 go inside that line? Those are kind of discussion points and, you know, those could
15 create frustration with some people. So what we're proposing is something more of like
16 a hybrid if you will. So think of it if you put the broad paint strokes and the larger swaths
17 of the area, the rural parts, the parts that we know that won't be seeing a lotta change
18 because they're not along these main road corridors and they're not near these activity
19 centers or priority investment areas. However, if they are in the latter they would have
20 more defining edges or more colorization if you will in these areas that would give better
21 guidance for those priority investment areas and activity centers. So as you go into
22 those other areas you get more guidance, but the other part of that is we don't want, we
23 wanna put it to a bubble scale in a way so that we're not singling out individual parcels

1 so people won't potentially get upset that, your parcel's red or my parcel's purple and
2 you can't be red because you were purple, or whatever the case may be. So that's the
3 first justification for that. The other justification for this is we use the Comprehensive
4 Plan and a very recommended language, we don't refer to the zoning directly. We refer
5 to what the use is and how contextually appropriate the use is, whether it's along a
6 primary arterial road, whether it's a primary use or secondary use, what the land use
7 design or development patterns could be in the area, and whether or not that zoning
8 they're requesting fits that description and these qualities. And those are the things that
9 you see in our Staff Reports that we put in those conclusions, and we take that
10 information from the policy guidance from the land use design. But in the 2026 plan we
11 don't necessarily have that guidance and the way that's seen on the right hand side on
12 the 2025 plan, that's all the guidance we have for the land uses at the moment. So what
13 we're proposing is going to something that gives us the policy guidance, something that
14 gives us, you know, transportation or street patterns, connectivity and different
15 parameters that give us the justification or lack thereof for rezoning cases, and gives us
16 that, I keep saying flexibility, but it does, that flexibility in rezoning so that we can use
17 the Comprehensive Plan as it was intended which is a recommendation, not to be such
18 a hard line on, you know, this is one to one, you know, this has to be this because it's
19 that. And so the other part about that is eliminating the place type and zoning alignment.
20 While this looks good on face value, again this kind of paints us in a corner by saying,
21 you know, if you lie within that neighborhood center and my parcel is that neighborhood
22 center, I can only ask for MU1, MU2, MU3, R5, R6, and GC, that's it. And so there's no
23 contextual information that would allow me to ask for anything else because that's the

1 hard line in this table, that's why we're asking or requesting that to be removed. And
2 then the other part about that is these requests, these recommendations, is adjusting
3 the future land use map in some of the areas of the County, particularly in the north to
4 shift some of the boundaries that better reflect what the public has been adamant and
5 vocal about. And we see this as not having a huge detriment on the Comprehensive, or
6 on the future land use map, and I'll share with you what that could look like. This is
7 potentially what that could look like and the only difference in these two maps is you see
8 the green area next to the flood plain right here has shifted over to Cardinal Road and
9 down to Campground Road. And we don't, we see this as giving them more protection
10 as they would like, but also acknowledging that this won't deteriorate or this won't
11 disable any development patterns that we had planned already. And so with that, I think
12 that was all of them for that. And so these are the recommendations that we have and
13 I'll take any questions or comments at this point.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, any questions? I'm gonna say this back in
15 my own words. So the four recommendations would be more of a bubble map style or
16 kinda like the 2015 FLUM of a broad paintbrush. As the draft sits in front of us now it's
17 parcel based. We would eliminate the table that's on page 77 where the place type and
18 zoning alignment, right?

19 MR. SMITH: That's correct.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm calling it detailed place types, that's the place types,
21 those graphs, charts that you have in the Comprehensive Plan. Yes, exactly, on the
22 slide, have more information, better explanation, correct?

23 MR. SMITH: That's correct.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And then the big part here would be to adjust the FLUM,
2 future land use map, where you'd wanna shift some boundaries and I feel like the
3 Commission would need a final map before we could take an action on this.
4 Commission, based off of what I said, questions, comments? Anyone else think we
5 would need a final map before we send it to County Council? Can anyone talk instead
6 of a head nod?

7 MS. LOYD: I think that's fair. This is Commissioner Loyd.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Loyd, thank you.

9 MS. FRIERSON: I think that makes a great deal of sense.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. I don't wanna be the only bad guy asking the
11 Staff to work harder on this or extend the process. My initial thought coming into the
12 meetings before we had an agenda was I would say, Commission, we were presented
13 with a pretty solid 2025 Comp Plan, what's gonna hold us up from sending this over as
14 a recommendation for approval? And I had my experience with the Land Development
15 Code and how long that took, so I don't wanna kick the can or have this take longer but
16 this seems like some good recommendations from the Staff that just might take some
17 time to complete. Commission, any thoughts?

18 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, Staff?

20 MR. SMITH: I just wanted to add real quick just for clarification, just because
21 we're moving from, just we're recommending a paint stroke based or broad paint stroke
22 based FLUM doesn't mean that the designations that we had recommended in the

1 parcel based go away necessarily, they just get encompassed by the new paint stroke.
2 So those recommendations will remain within the guidance.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, with all the public input we've had it would remain the
4 same, correct?

5 MR. SMITH: That's correct.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Absolutely. Gotcha. Okay so what kind of guidance does
7 Staff need from us tonight?

8 MR. SMITH: The guidance we would like from you tonight is a recommendation
9 to move forward with the making of the broad paint stroke based future land use map so
10 that we do have something that we can tell our consultants and that we can also tell
11 them to move forward with the place type descriptions. Those are the two biggest things
12 right now.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, do we see any problems with requesting all
14 four of these? No? Commissioner Taylor seems to agree?

15 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, I was all for the Staff recommendations.

16 MR. DURANT: I agree.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, Commissioner Durant, great. The Chair would like
18 to make a motion to move forward with all four of the Staff recommendations including
19 one, the future land use map moving from a parcel based to a broad paint stroke, two
20 the place types moving forward with the consultant to build those graphics, three the
21 future land use map, adjusting the boundaries to help give us a complete map and a
22 complete package before we make any recommendations to Council, and to go ahead
23 and remove the alignment table. Does the Chair have a second?

1 MR. GRADY: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second, Grady got there first. Got a second from
3 Commissioner Grady. Staff, did you get the notes and can you go ahead and take a
4 vote?

5 MR. SMITH: I did. So I have approval for moving forward with development and
6 to bring back to Planning Commission before moving forward to County Council the
7 change from parcel based to broad paint stroke based future land use map, adjusting
8 the future land use boundaries, additional guidance for the place types, and the
9 elimination of the alignment table. Grady?

10 MR. GRADY: Aye.

11 MR. SMITH: Siercks?

12 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

13 MR. SMITH: Taylor?

14 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

15 MR. SMITH: Durant?

16 MR. DURANT: Aye.

17 MR. SMITH: Loyd?

18 MS. LOYD: Aye.

19 MR. SMITH: Frierson?

20 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

21 MR. SMITH: Yonke?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

23 MR. SMITH: Motion approved.

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

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you for your continued work on
4 [inaudible]. I believe we can move forward to number eight on the Agenda tonight,
5 Chairman's Report. Thank you Staff for all of your hard work. Thank you Commission
6 for all your hard work and time. It's a very lengthy back to back meetings tonight. Thank
7 you. Number nine, Planning Director's Report, Ms. Williams? Nothing? Okay. Alright.
8 Number 10, the one we're looking for, Adjournment tonight. The Chair would like to
9 make a motion for adjournment, do I have a second?

10 MR. DURANT: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Staff, please take a
12 vote with a show of hands. That's how we do it. Unanimous?

13 MR. SMITH: Unanimous.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you so much. Good night, we are adjourned.
15

16 *[Meeting Adjourned 8:00pm]*