

**RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**February 3, 2025**

*[Members Present: Christopher Yonke, Beverly Frierson (in at 6:18pm), Terrence Taylor, John Metts, Charles Durant, Brian Grady, Mark Duffy, Chris Siercks; Absent: Frederick Johnson, II]*

Called to order: 6:03pm

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, are you ready?

MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks. I'd like to call to order the February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2025 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 administration building. Is that correct?

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

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

MR. DELAGE: Alright, Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Metts?

MR. METTS: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

1 MR. DELAGE: Duffy?

2 MR. DUFFY: Here.

3 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

4 MR. SIERCKS: Here.

5 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

6 MR. DURANT: Here.

7 MR. DELAGE: Alright, we have a quorum.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2025  
9 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning Commissioners we are  
10 concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer our time to thoroughly review  
11 and make recommendations to County Council. Our recommendations are to approve  
12 or deny Zoning Map Amendment requests. Per Title VI, Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of*  
13 *Laws* Planning Commission may also prepare and revise plans and programs for the  
14 development or redevelopment of unincorporated portions of the County. Once again,  
15 we are a recommending body to County Council and they will conduct their own public  
16 hearing and take official votes to approve or deny map amendments and text  
17 amendments on a future date to be published by the County. Council typically holds  
18 Zoning Public Hearings on the fourth Tuesday of the month. Please check the County's  
19 website for updated agendas, dates and times. Please take note of the following  
20 guidelines for today's meeting. Please turn off or silence any cellphones. Audience  
21 members may quietly come and go as needed. Applicants are allowed up to two  
22 minutes to make comments. Citizens signed up to speak are also allowed two minutes  
23 each. Redundant comments should be minimized. Please only address remarks to the

1 Commission and do not expect the Commission to respond to questions from the  
2 speaker in a back and forth style, that's not the purpose of this meeting. Please no  
3 audience/speaker exchanges. No audience demonstrations or other disruptions to the  
4 meeting are permitted nor are comments from anyone other than the speaker at the  
5 podium. Please remember the meeting is being recorded. Please speak into the  
6 microphone and give your name and address. Abusive language is inappropriate and  
7 will not be tolerated. Please don't voice displeasure or frustration at a recommendation  
8 while the Planning Commission is still conducting business. If you have any questions  
9 or concerns you may contact the Richland County Planning Staff down below here. This  
10 moves us number 3 on our Agenda, Additions and Deletions. Are there any motions,  
11 Commissioners, for additions or deletions from the Agenda? Staff, are there any  
12 changes to the Agenda?

13 MR. DELAGE: Yes, Mr. Chair. We just wanna make note of, on page 24 of your  
14 packet there is a locator map. The information is correct on it, it's just a duplicate of  
15 another map so we'll make those changes prior to it going to the Zoning Public Hearing.  
16 Also, on, as part of the updated Agenda that was emailed out early this morning, it was  
17 left off but we wanted to note that one of the tax map numbers on, under the first case,  
18 actually specifically the last one that's 01-43, it originally came out probably in your  
19 printed packets as 21-43, so just wanted to make that noted. It has been corrected in  
20 the updated Agenda. Also Staff would like to administratively defer the Administrative  
21 Review to the February [sic] PC meeting.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: March PC?

23 MR. DELAGE: I'm sorry, March, yes.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Gotcha. With that do we need to make a motion to approve  
2 the updated Agenda?

3 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, the Chair makes a motion to approve the updated  
5 Agenda with the revisions that Staff just identified from the updated Agenda that came  
6 out early morning, as well as removing Item 5, it would be c., the Administrative Review.  
7 Do I have a second?

8 MR. DURANT: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second, thank you, Commissioner Durant. With a motion  
10 and a second, Staff please take a vote to approve the Agenda.

11 MR. DELAGE: Alright, Durant?

12 MR. DURANT: Aye.

13 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

14 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

15 MR. DELAGE: Duffy?

16 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

17 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

19 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

20 MR. GRADY: Aye.

21 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

22 MR. METTS: Aye.

23 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

1 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

2 MR. DELAGE: Alright, that's unanimous.

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

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. That takes us to number 4., the Approval  
6 of Minutes from prior meetings. The Staff provided the Commission with copies of the  
7 transcript of the Commission's December 2024 meeting. Do any Commission Members  
8 have any comments or concerns regarding these transcripts? Hearing and seeing none,  
9 the Chair makes a motion to approve the Minutes unless there's an objection. Do I have  
10 a second?

11 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second, thank you, Commissioner Taylor. With that, Staff  
13 can you please take a vote to approve the Minutes?

14 MR. DELAGE: Alright, Taylor?

15 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

16 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

17 MR. METTS: Aye.

18 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

19 MR. GRADY: Aye.

20 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

22 MR. DELAGE: Duffy?

23 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

1 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

2 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

3 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

4 MR. DURANT: Aye.

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

7 MR. DELAGE: Alright, the vote is unanimous in favor.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. That takes us to number 5. on our  
9 Agenda today, the Consent Agenda. I always like to explain it. The Consent Agenda is  
10 an action item that allows the Commission to approve Road Names and Map  
11 Amendment requests where the Staff recommends approval and no one from the public  
12 has signed up to speak against the amendment or no Member of the Commission is in  
13 need of further discussion on the request. Mr. Grady, do we have any cases on our  
14 Agenda today where the Staff recommends approval and no one is signed up to speak  
15 against it?

16 MR. GRADY: We do have one such case, it is Case 24-057 MA, which is Item  
17 5.b.4. on the Agenda. That is, there's a recommendation, statement of the amendment  
18 being in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and there are no people signed up to  
19 speak against the amendment.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. The Chair makes a  
21 motion to approve the Consent Agenda with the Road Names and Case Number 24-  
22 057 MA. Do I have a second?

23 MR. METTS: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Second from Commissioner Metts for the  
2 Consent Agenda. Staff, can you please take a vote?

3 MR. DELAGE: Alright, Durant?

4 MR. DURANT: Aye.

5 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

6 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

7 MR. DELAGE: Duffy?

8 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

9 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

11 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

12 MR. GRADY: Aye.

13 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

14 MR. METTS: Aye.

15 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

16 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

17 MR. DELAGE: Alright, vote is unanimous.

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

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. This gets us rolling in part 5.b., the Map  
21 Amendments. Case Number 1, take it away, Staff, provide some information.

22 **CASE NO. 24-051 MA:**

1 MR. DELAGE: Alright, today's first case is Case Number 24-051 MA. The  
2 Applicant is Curtis Thomas. The parcel's location is Starling Goodson Road, it consists  
3 of three parcels with, totaling 5.94 acres. The existing zoning is R3, the Applicant is  
4 requesting the RT District and, let's see, based on the Comprehensive Plan the  
5 proposed rezoning is consistent objectives for the Comprehensive Plan as the  
6 requested zoning does align with the objectives for the residential, or does not align with  
7 the objectives for the residential development with the neighborhood medium density  
8 future land use designation. According to the Comprehensive Plan the neighborhood  
9 medium density district is intended to support medium density residential  
10 neighborhoods and neighborhood scale commercial development designed in a  
11 traditional neighborhood format. These areas serve as a transition between the  
12 neighborhood low density and the more intense mixed residential high density urban  
13 environments. The Plan also emphasizes the creation of medium density residential  
14 neighborhoods designed to provide a mix of residential uses and densities. The RT  
15 District does not align with the intended uses and development standards of the  
16 neighborhood medium density designation which prioritizes higher densities and smaller  
17 lot sizes. Additionally, the proposed rezoning conflicts within the Lower Richland  
18 Strategic Community Masterplan which calls for higher densities and more intensive  
19 uses than those permitted under the requested designation. And just a quick note, I'm  
20 sure everybody's seen the Staff Reports have changed. It looks a little bit different that  
21 there's not Staff recommendation because ultimately Staff was not making  
22 recommendations, we were just acknowledging whether it was consistent or  
23 inconsistent with the Comp Plan recommendations. So that's why some of that

1 language is a little bit different. You'll kinda see in some of the conclusions we went  
2 back and forth between using inconsistent and in compliance, but we will be more  
3 consistent in the future with using whether it's consistent or inconsistent with the Plan  
4 moving forward.

5 *[Frierson in at 6:18pm]*

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff, appreciate it. I approve the update.  
7 Commissioners, do we have any questions for Staff on this case? Hearing none, do we  
8 have someone signed up to speak, Commissioner Grady?

9 MR. GRADY: Yes, Mr. Chair. We have the Applicant, Phil Bradley.

10 MR. THOMAS: I was the Applicant that signed up for it. Curtis Thomas.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down. You have two minutes. Give us your name  
12 and address.

13 **TESTIMONY OF CURTIS THOMAS:**

14 MR. THOMAS: My name is Curtis Thomas, address is 2801 Compass Court, Ft.  
15 Libby, North Carolina 28307. As stated I was the Applicant that applied for it. Just  
16 looking a zoning that can accommodate pretty much something else that's more  
17 affordable in that area, more like a manufactured home if possible. I did some research  
18 last year and found out that it wasn't zoned for that at the current time. Due to timing  
19 and also financial restraints it's just that a mobile home, well a manufactured home  
20 would be more affordable for myself. So I'm going through the process to request to  
21 rezone it to accommodate that.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else signed up to speak for this one?

23 MR. GRADY: Yes, we have Kim Murphy.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

2 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

3 MS. MURPHY: Good evening, happy New Year. Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel  
4 Lane, Chapin, South Carolina. I'm really not here to speak for or against this particular  
5 rezoning, but I thought it might be a good opportunity to maybe offer some suggestions  
6 on the Staff Report. Under Parcel Area Characteristics to maybe better or more fully  
7 describe the development in the immediate area. And then the chart that is under  
8 District, Zoning District Summary, it was explained to me at the last meeting that the  
9 properties listed are not properties that are contiguous to the subject parcel. The, I think  
10 the zoning that is listed for those parcels – let me back up – the parcels on this chart I  
11 think should be the parcels that are contiguous to the subject parcel so that you know  
12 what the direct impact is going to be. And then the third item related to an item on that  
13 I'm really to speak against is that I, I noticed there were multiple errors in the Agenda  
14 packet. And I can't say whether the other cases have multiple errors but one of the big  
15 ones is related to the Principal Use Table that's given to you that shows what the  
16 current zoning will permit and what the proposed zoning will permit. There are multiple  
17 errors in the case I'm here to speak about so again, I don't know if you're relying on  
18 that, it may not be accurate in the other cases. Thank you.

19 MR. GRADY: Alright, David Houston Sr.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And I believe both podiums are open with the mic, so come  
21 down to either one and state your name and address.

22 **TESTIMONY OF DAVID HOUSTON SR.:**

1 MR. HOUSTON SR.: Good evening. My name is David Houston Sr. I live at 1839  
2 Lower Richland Boulevard, in junction to Starling Goodson Road. And my concern was  
3 well, we saw the sign out there for the property to be rezoned. I'm the administrator of  
4 the majority of the property on Starling Goodson Road and I had no concerns or no  
5 commitment from nobody trying to rezone the property. So that's why I'm here tonight  
6 because of that. I have not been communicated with. And like I say I'm the administrator  
7 of the majority of the property on Starling Goodson Road.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Staff, do you have a comment for that? Did  
9 the Applicant request the change? Do we have the proper people we're speaking to?

10 MR. DELAGE: So as part of that if an applicant is not the property owner or is not  
11 the head of whatever company that it may be listed under, we ask them to submit the  
12 Owner Authorization forms as part of the map amendment. So you know, if there is a  
13 property owner that said that they, you know, did not give their authorization we would  
14 need to look into that because that is part of the requirements up front to submit for the  
15 map amendment application.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So are you saying you're the owner of this property?

17 MR. HOUSTON SR.: Beg your pardon?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Are you saying that you're the owner of this property?

19 MR. HOUSTON SR.: Not all of it, the majority on Lower Richland/Starling  
20 Goodson Road, I'm the owner of the majority of it.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, how do we move forward with that?

22 MR. DELAGE: So if the individual that's commenting is not the owner of the  
23 subject parcels for the Map Amendment there is, other than maybe them voicing their

1 opposition for it, there's not a requirement basically to, other than to notify them as an  
2 adjacent property owner that a map amendment request is before Planning Commission  
3 and County Council.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Well, I've been sitting up here since 2019 and this is the  
5 first time where it seems like, so you don't have to be the owner of the land to request a  
6 map amendment?

7 MR. DELAGE: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. But you do have to have permission  
8 from the owner of the parcels that are a part of the subject request.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. So we can continue to hear this case.

10 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay. Well I paused your time so you have another  
12 minute and a half, sir, if you wanna continue to speak.

13 MR. HOUSTON SR.: Yes, well with that being said I appreciate it. But again, like  
14 I said it's a family-owned section over there on Starling Goodson Road and it's, the land  
15 has been divided into certain sections, different sections and not a whole lotta acreage.  
16 And understanding where that zoning gonna be taking place it, there are three parcels  
17 in there, not one, there's three in there that's gonna take the place of one. And the  
18 majority of people that own the property have disagreed and disapprove of it. So that's  
19 the only thing I'm saying, and I'm speaking on behalf of some of the property, like I said,  
20 that I own or is administrator over. And the main thing I'm saying, I'm disapproving of it.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

22 MR. HOUSTON SR.: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady, anyone else signed up to speak?

1 MR. GRADY: Yes, we have a second David Houston.

2 **TESTIMONY OF DAVID HOUSTON, JR.:**

3 MR. HOUSTON, JR: Hello, my name's David Houston, Jr. Address 2 Twin  
4 Osprey Lane, Hopkins, South Carolina. I'm just, I was just looking at this right here. Can  
5 you explain to me what is the difference between the R3 and the RT? We're going from  
6 an R3 to an RT.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'll defer that to Staff, but I think finish any other comments  
8 you might have and then we'll have Staff explain it. Cause usually we give the public  
9 two minutes to speak your opinion on it and then we'll, the Commission –

10 MR. HOUSTON, JR.: I would like to know what the requirements are, what kinda  
11 homes can you put on there. Right here it says going, come from RT to R3, so it's  
12 showing 5.94 acres, so up under Curtis Thomas 5.94 acres. So what type of homes can  
13 be put on this property? What type of homes can be built on this property?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright sir, we always look at the zoning as if it's a blank  
15 canvas and if it fits to the Comp Plan of the area, and we can't ever tie anyone to what  
16 they say they're going to build because that can always fall through. So we always try to  
17 be good stewards of the County and of the land itself. Mr. DeLage, Staff, is there any  
18 other property description information that we can give at this moment?

19 MR. DELAGE: So none other than just to kinda compare the zoning districts.  
20 What it's currently zoned, the R3 District allows for a smaller lot and a higher density  
21 than what the RT District does. The current R3 District allows for stick-built homes,  
22 single-family detached. It allows for modular but not manufactured homes. Versus the  
23 big difference in what's allowed is that the RT District will allow manufactured homes,

1 modular homes and then single-family detached structures, so that's kinda the high  
2 level big differences. And then the RT District also has higher density and dimensional  
3 standards, so meaning that it allows less dwelling units per acre than an R3 and has a  
4 greater setback.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. DeLage. In general I see RT as a lower  
6 dense zone than R3; they count up R1, 2, 3 and higher density. Any final comments,  
7 sir?

8 MR. HOUSTON, JR.: So what about mobile homes?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Manufactured homes were treated differently in the new  
10 Code. They are left in, Mr. DeLage, I'll defer to you, RT as well as R5?

11 MR. DELAGE: So the manufactured homes are permitted in the, just to make  
12 sure since we've done some text amendments over the years with the new Code, so it  
13 looks like by special requirements in the AG, HM, RT and R1 District. And most of those  
14 requirements are dealing with the set up with underpinning and things of that nature.  
15 But it is not allowed in the R3 District, what the parcels are currently zoned.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Again, thank you Staff. Okay sir, as I stated my guidelines  
17 at the beginning of the meeting, this is not a back and forth style, I want to give enough  
18 time for everybody to speak so I'm gonna give you 30 more seconds to wrap up your  
19 thoughts and I'm gonna pass it on to the next speaker. Thank you.

20 MR. HOUSTON, JR.: Okay, well I just wanted to get a clear understanding of the  
21 difference between the R3 and the RT. I just wanna know exactly what type of homes  
22 can be put on the R3 and the RT. So he's saying mobile homes can, if you decide to go  
23 the RT then you can put mobile homes on there.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Sounds like based off of Staff's description –

2 MR. HOUSTON, JR.: How many per acre? How many homes per acre?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We'll answer that question but then we're gonna defer to  
4 the next speaker, okay sir?

5 MR. HOUSTON, JR.: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. Go ahead, Mr. DeLage.

7 MR. DELAGE: So it is one principal dwelling unit per lot regardless of lot size,  
8 however, if you're looking at the RT District the density is one dwelling unit per acre.

9 MR. HOUSTON, JR.: Okay, thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. I do appreciate you coming out tonight.  
11 Commissioner Grady, anyone else signed up to speak?

12 MR. GRADY: We do not have any more speakers for this case.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Staff, since we are able to approve or deny map  
14 amendment with someone coming in that's not quite the owner, I'm just reviewing it.  
15 This is now open on the floor then for discussion, Commissioners, and any further  
16 questions for Staff.

17 MR. TAYLOR: I do have a question.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor.

19 MR. TAYLOR: Just out of curiosity, some of your concern as well, if we have a  
20 case before us can we assume that the applicant has gotten all of the necessary  
21 approvals to come forth and request a map amendment? Or a rezoning? Excuse me.

22 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir. That's correct. You know, there's always, there could be  
23 that outlier where maybe something hasn't caught up with the Assessor's information.

1 Typically what we do is as part of that, the statements are, basically there's a section in  
2 there that the applicant is submitting to the best of their knowledge the most truthful and  
3 accurate information, and as part of that is those Owner Authorization forms. We  
4 compare those with the Assessor's Office information so again it could be an occasion  
5 where something has changed, but typically they would need to show that they are the  
6 property owner or if they were part of an estate or a manager, you know, something like  
7 that that they had the authority to basically have a say in the map amendment as part of  
8 that. Then at that point, you know, we would consider, you know, pulling it cause they  
9 wouldn't have had the appropriate authority. But at least at this time Staff didn't see  
10 anything that was out of order, but we can always make sure that we take a look at it  
11 prior to going to the ZPH meeting later on February as well.

12 MR. TAYLOR: My understanding is that Curtis Thomas is the owner of these  
13 three parcels, and –

14 MR. DELAGE: So – sorry.

15 MR. TAYLOR: Go ahead.

16 MR. DELAGE: So the, and Mr. Smith may be clicking on it, so this particular  
17 RVBM Properties, LLC, there's an Owner Authorization based off of that as Mr. Curtis,  
18 and the adjacent properties there is a signature on that as well from what looks like the  
19 Thomas Willie, and I don't wanna go off the top of my head, so Shirley Thomas, widow  
20 of Willie G. Thomas is what is officially in the Record.

21 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. Any other questions for  
23 Staff or discussion? Open on the floor for motions as well. Staff, would you mind turning

1 on the zoning layer on the map? So one can see [inaudible] if there was a change here  
2 it would be inconsistent with the properties surrounding it. Staff, is this a pretty historic  
3 zoning though, as well in this area? Usually we've seen 1977, it's been like this.

4 MR. DELAGE: So it looks like the original zoning in '77 when zoning was  
5 assigned in the County it was RS2 which is a similar zoning district to the RS-MD, and  
6 then of course with the adoption of the 2021 Plan becoming effective in March of this  
7 year it was, or basically it translated to the R3 District.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff.

9 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

11 MR. SIERCKS: I'd like to make a motion. At this time I move that we forward  
12 proposed Map Amendment 24-051 to County Council with a recommendation of  
13 disapproval.

14 MR. GRADY: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks and we have a second  
16 from Commissioner Grady. Okay, with a motion and a second we'll take that up for a  
17 vote.

18 MR. DELAGE: Alright, the motion is for disapproval. Frierson?

19 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

20 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

21 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

22 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

23 MR. METTS: Aye.

1 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

2 MR. GRADY: Aye.

3 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

5 MR. DELAGE: Duffy?

6 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

7 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

8 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

9 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

10 MR. DURANT: Aye.

11 *[Approved to deny: Frierson, Taylor, Metts, Grady, Yonke, Duffy, Siercks, Durant;*

12 *Absent: Johnson]*

13 MR. DELAGE: Alright, the vote is unanimous in favor of disapproval.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. That goes as our recommendation to  
15 County Council and they will have their meeting on, do we have a date set for that one,  
16 Mr. DeLage?

17 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, it's the 25<sup>th</sup> of February at 7:00pm back  
18 here in County Council chambers.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 25<sup>th</sup> of February, 7:00pm, same location. Thank you. We'll  
20 move on to our next case now which is 5.b.2., Case Number 24-054 MA. I'll hand it  
21 back over to Staff.

22 **CASE NO. 24-054 MA:**

23 MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chairman, if I may? I apologize –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

2 MR. DELAGE: - I forgot to mention this earlier with our Road Names approval.  
3 So our long-time serving E911 Coordinator is here with us tonight. Unfortunately, it is  
4 her last meeting with Planning Commission. She is retiring for the second time. So I just  
5 wanted to mention and recognize Ms. Alfreda Tindal. She's been with the County for 44  
6 ½ years and 32 years of that has been serving with the Planning Commission, so just  
7 wanted to take a moment to recognize her while she's here.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You deserve a round of applause, 44 years, wow!  
9 [Applause] Thank you. Did you have anything you wanted to say? You're awesome!  
10 Come on up.

11 MS. TINDAL: Thank you, Chairperson. I'm Alfreda Tindal at 204 Stonegate Drive,  
12 Columbia, South Carolina 29223. I just wanted to thank you all so much for your time.  
13 And I really enjoyed working with the Planning Commission. Of course like he said I've  
14 been here since, for 44 ½ years, since June 6<sup>th</sup>, 1980. And I pray that my work here was  
15 good servitude to the citizens of Richland County by ensuring that their road names and  
16 addresses are in compliance with 911. And it's been a pleasure working with each of  
17 you. Thank you so much.

18 [Applause]

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: It's been a pleasure working with you. Thank you for  
20 bringing that to attention, that's great. Back to you, Mr. DeLage.

21 MR. DELAGE: Alright, so our second case of the evening is Case Number 24-  
22 054 MA. The Applicant is Brian Harbison. The location is 209 Summerhaven Drive. The,  
23 it is a 1 acre parcel. The existing zoning is RT. The proposed zoning is the R2 District.

1 And just to mention here there, the reason why it is eligible to apply because it's under  
2 2 acres is because it's adjacent to another existing zoning district of similar character,  
3 so. It is in the neighborhood low density future land use category. Because of that the  
4 proposed rezoning is inconsistent with the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan as its  
5 development standards do not align with the recommended land uses and desired  
6 development patterns outlined in the 2015 Plan. Specifically, the requested zoning  
7 district permits a zoning density that is contrary to the recommended lower density of  
8 neighborhood low density designation. However, the rezoning request aligns with the  
9 existing residential development pattern and zoning districts to the south of the site.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, any questions for Staff?

11 Okay. Commissioner Grady?

12 MR. GRADY: Yes, we have the Applicant signed up to speak, Brian Harbison.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down.

14 **TESTIMONY OF BRIAN HARBISON:**

15 MR. HARBISON: Hey, good evening. Brian Harbison, 209 Summerhaven Drive,  
16 Chapin, South Carolina. We have applied to rezone this from RT to R2 specifically just  
17 to, it's, as you can tell on the map, it's a very narrow lot. We're trying to cut the setbacks  
18 down by 10'. We met with Councilman Branham out there and he kinda gave his  
19 blessing somewhat. Got all of my surrounding neighbors to sign a form saying they  
20 have no objection, and we actually put a deed restriction in saying that we will not  
21 subdivide the land as well so we're not increasing density at all. So that's basically it.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks for coming out tonight.

23 MR. HARBISON: Thank you.

1 MR. GRADY: And we also have Kim Murphy.

2 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

3 MS. MURPHY: Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel Lane, Chapin, South Carolina. And  
4 based on what the Applicant said that would be something I would support, but  
5 according to your Agenda it shows that mobile, excuse me, multi-family units are  
6 allowed and I'm not quite sure what the issue is with this – I know Staff is busy and  
7 there were a lotta items – four family dwelling says is permitted. It says three family  
8 dwelling is permitted. It says manufactured home is a special requirement, it is not. It  
9 also says antennas are permitted. So based on the zoning district chart you have, that  
10 was my concern and if this chart is erroneous in the other cases, you need to maybe  
11 just be cautious. And in this particular item, Agenda Item, this case, Staff already  
12 mentioned that one of the maps was incorrect. Also there's a typo, it says, maximum  
13 density standard no more than 12 units per acre. I don't know if someone cut and  
14 pasted, there is the number 3 there, but again the biggest concern is having the current  
15 zoning designations correct in your chart as well as the proposed, and actually the  
16 current zoning misses one of the classifications. Thank you very much.

17 MR. GRADY: We don't have any other speakers for this case.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, this is on the floor for discussion and  
19 questions for Staff. Any comments from Staff?

20 MR. DELAGE: Just one real quick, Mr. Chairman. So it appears that some of the  
21 charts that are just there as information contain some of the old designations prior to the  
22 text amendments for some of those uses that are being referred to by the previous  
23 speaker. So we will correct that, it does have the, some of the uses that are in there

1 such as the two family, three family and four family, however, your motion today will not  
2 be to approve uses that are not permitted in the district as they are not listed in the  
3 adopted permitted Table of Uses. So I just want to mention that.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Back to the Commission. Discussion and  
5 motions as well.

6 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

8 MR. DURANT: I move that we forward Map Amendment 24-054 MA to County  
9 Council with a recommendation of approval based on the fact that the request aligns  
10 with existing residential development patterns and zoning districts to the south of the  
11 site.

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

13 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's a second from Commission Siercks.

15 MR. SIERCKS: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. With that we have a motion and a second so Staff  
17 can take vote for a recommendation of approval.

18 MR. DELAGE: Alright, Mr. Durant?

19 MR. DURANT: Aye.

20 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

21 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

22 MR. DELAGE: Duffy?

23 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

1 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

3 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

4 MR. GRADY: Aye.

5 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

6 MR. METTS: Aye.

7 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

8 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

9 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

10 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

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

13 MR. DELAG: Alright, the vote is unanimous in favor.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. That's a recommendation of approval,  
15 may I assume February 25<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm?

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

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. That's when County Council will hear this case.

18 Thank you. We can move on to the next case. 5.b.3. Case Number 24-056 MA. Put it  
19 back to Staff.

20 **CASE NO. 24-056 MA:**

21 MR. DELAGE: Alright, our next case is, the Applicant is Phillip Bradley. The  
22 location is 737 Ross Road. It is two parcels totaling 3.59 acres. The existing zoning is  
23 RT. The proposed zoning is R5. The Comprehensive Plan recommendation on the

1 future land use map is the neighborhood medium density. The proposed zoning is  
2 inconsistent with the objectives of the neighborhood medium density designation in the  
3 Comp Plan. The requested Map Amendment does not align with the residential  
4 guidelines and recommendations for this designation. According to the Plan multi-family  
5 housing is recommended near activity centers and within priority investment areas  
6 where there is access to roadways with adequate capacity and multi-modal  
7 transportation options. The proposed rezoning does not meet these location criteria.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, any questions for Staff?  
9 Commissioner Grady, anyone signed up to speak?

10 MR. GRADY: Yes. This time the Applicant Phil Bradley is signed up to speak.

11 **TESTIMONY OF PHIL BRADLEY:**

12 MR. BRADLEY: Good evening. My name is Phil Bradley, Woodhaven  
13 Communities. We are requesting a rezoning from RT to R5.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What was your address, sir?

15 MR. BRADLEY: 405 Western Lane.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you.

17 MR. BRADLEY: The parcel that is behind these three is, has been rezoned to R5  
18 about four months ago, so these three parcels are contiguous to that zoning. And we  
19 have a townhome project that we are currently in design that's going on the parcel  
20 behind these three pieces, so we were wanting to rezone so that we could roll  
21 townhomes in through those three pieces of property as well. For some reason, I don't  
22 know why it's not showing the rezoning that was approved, but the parcel, I've got the  
23 drawing right here if y'all would like to see it.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, anything else you wanna tell us?

2 MR. BRADLEY: Any questions? No, that's it.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Anyone else signed up to speak?

4 MR. GRADY: No.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Staff, are we looking at the most up to date  
6 information? Is there something that needs to be updated here?

7 MR. DELAGE: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

9 MR. DELAGE: So sometimes it takes some time between the third reading and  
10 the Minutes being approved and the Assessor's database being updated. However, we  
11 can reach out to them and let them know, sometimes they want for an email from us,  
12 you know, to basically do it. But I want to also note that it is listed in the existing zoning  
13 and use chart in the Staff Report as R5, so.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, in the Consent Agenda we approved 747 Ross Road,  
15 is that right next to this property?

16 MR. DELAGE: It is. If you look at it it's kinda to the south and then the east of  
17 these parcels. And it was based off of the requested zoning district aligning with the  
18 recommendations for zoning districts of similar character for that future land use.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So this one is across the street.

20 MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Okay, questions for Staff, Commission?

22 MR. TAYLOR: Question.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor?

1 MR. TAYLOR: Could you, did you follow the Applicant's statement that there  
2 were other parcels – do you know which parcels he's talking about when he says  
3 there's parcels behind it that were approved for R5?

4 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, Mr. Taylor. On the screen the highlighted parcel that's on  
5 there, where the hand is now, that was part of a previous rezoning request to the R5  
6 District.

7 MR. TAYLOR: And relative to what's highlighted where are the subject –

8 MR. DELAGE: Correct, and then, yes down there where Mr. Smith is showing is  
9 the subject, one of the subject parcels of this request. So it is actually contiguous to the  
10 previous request.

11 MR. TAYLOR: And access to the parcel behind it is also off Ross Road or?

12 MR. DELAGE: So without looking at the plans it does have frontage, or the vast  
13 majority of the frontage is on Ross Road. It also does have some frontage on Rabon  
14 Road for the previous request. However, for the current request Ross Road will be the  
15 road frontage.

16 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Can I just clarify the small parcel to the right of the one  
18 highlighted, that's 747? Okay. Thank you. Okay Commission, discussion or motions.

19 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

21 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion to send Case 24-056 MA to County  
22 Council with a recommendation of approval. The rationale being that the R5 zoning  
23 designation is consistent with land use designations in surrounding parcels.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Do I have a second?

2 MR. METTS: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commission Metts. Okay, with a motion and a  
4 second, Staff can you please take a vote? This would be for approval.

5 MR. DELAGE: Alright, so motion for approval, Frierson?

6 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

7 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

8 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

9 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

10 MR. METTS: Aye.

11 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

12 MR. GRADY: Aye.

13 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

15 MR. DELAGE: Duffy?

16 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

17 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

18 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

19 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

20 MR. DURANT: Aye.

21 *[Approved: Frierson, Taylor, Metts, Grady, Yonke, Duffy, Siercks, Durant; Absent:*

22 *Johnson]*

23 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion is unanimous for approval.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commission. Thank you, Staff. Once again,  
2 February 25<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm. That should be when this case is heard by County Council.

3 MR. DELAGE: And Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

5 MR. DELAGE: Just, the town hall meeting for this case as well as the 747 Ross  
6 Road will take place on February 13<sup>th</sup>, at 6:00pm, and that's gonna be at Killian Park in  
7 Blythewood, so I just want to mention that for both those cases.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: February 13<sup>th</sup>, 6:00pm, Killian Park, correct?

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

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you. I'm gonna give us a second as I see  
11 people stepping out. For those leaving, have a good night, thanks for coming out.  
12 Moving along we are now at Case 5., which is Case Number 24-058 MA. Back to Staff.

13 **CASE NO. 24-058 MA:**

14 MR. DELAGE: Alright, so this is Case Number 24-058 MA. The Applicant is Fil  
15 Mabry, and I apologize if I mispronounce any names tonight. The location is 812  
16 Sandfield Road. The parcel number is R17800-01-13. The acreage is 64.84 acres. The  
17 existing zoning is AG. The requested zoning is the HM District, our Homestead District.  
18 Looking at the Comprehensive Plan recommendation for this area, this is neighborhood  
19 low density, the proposed rezoning is inconsistent with the objectives of the  
20 neighborhood low density designation which recommends low density housing  
21 developments in these areas. The requested zoning does not align with the density  
22 recommendations for this designation. Additionally, the policy guidelines state that new  
23 residential development should be served by adequately supplied public water and

1 sanitary sewer service, however, records indicate the area is not currently served by  
2 public utilities.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, any questions for Staff?  
4 Hearing none, Commissioner Grady, anyone signed up to speak?

5 MR. GRADY: Yes. We have the Applicant, Fil Mabry?

6 **TESTIMONY OF FIL MABRY:**

7 MR. MABRY: Good evening. I'm Fil Mabry, 4005 Devereaux Road. As you can  
8 see we're requesting a zoning from AG to HM. And I first, can you zoom in on that  
9 parcel for me? I wanna note a change. In the packet you've got another parcel included  
10 that is not, will not be in this rezoning request. Can you click on that parcel south? A  
11 little bit to your left. A couple more. One more. Next one. Next one. That right there, that  
12 was included in the packet that I've got, I'm not sure if you all are seeing the same thing,  
13 but that is not included in this request. That dark green area to the north is the 64 acres  
14 that we're requesting to rezone to HM. To my knowledge HM is low density, acre and a  
15 half lots, that's kinda what we're looking at here. And it looks, if you follow the 2015  
16 Comprehensive Plan I'm seeing a suggestion of, let's see, what was it, neighborhood  
17 low density. I'm not sure if y'all can answer what zoning that is from what I looked at, it  
18 looked like an R2. So I'm actually, I'm actually proposing a lesser density zoning than  
19 what the Comprehensive Plan is suggesting. And that's about it. Any questions for me?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No, sir. Thanks for coming out tonight.

21 MR. TAYLOR: I actually do have a question.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Go ahead, Commissioner Taylor.

23 MR. TAYLOR: The part you told us to subtract from the subject parcel –

1 MR. MABRY: Correct.

2 MR. TAYLOR: Does it have a separate tax map ID?

3 MR. MABRY: That has a separate tax map number, yes, sir.

4 MR. TAYLOR: So, okay so –

5 MR. MABRY: I'm not sure why it was, it was all one parcel at one time and it has  
6 been split off, but that long narrow piece that connects to Langford Road is a completely  
7 different tax map number.

8 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

9 MR. MABRY: Yes, sir. Another – do I have any more time?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

11 MR. MABRY: Also most of the adjacent parcels, not 100%, are zoned HM that  
12 are adjacent to me, so that's kind of another, another reason we'd like to rezone to HM  
13 from AG.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Commissioner Grady?

15 MR. GRADY: Yes, next person signed up to speak is David Brunson?

16 **TESTIMONY OF DAVID BRUNSON:**

17 MR. BRUNSON: Hello, good evening. David Brunson, 196 North Melton Road,  
18 Blythewood, South Carolina. I live less, right at a mile from the property the gentleman's  
19 referring to and I'll be super brief but a couple things I wanted to ask y'all to respectfully  
20 consider before you make recommendation to the Council is things like the  
21 infrastructure out there already, Scout's taxing Blythewood pretty hard as far as the  
22 infrastructure goes. And I know the Council's got a lotta things in the works and things  
23 are coming, but I don't think we're quite ready for this. Things like roads and our

1 schools, my children attend Richland Two schools and they're already in portables and  
2 they can't build the thing fast enough to accommodate our children. And also traffic,  
3 even on this low small two-lane road is already terrible and very dangerous and if you  
4 add more to it I just think we're asking for trouble. And I think I understand what the  
5 gentleman said as to why he's also asking it to be HM, but if I heard the zoning council  
6 staff also speak, this is inconsistent. I keep, with the zoning master plan or whatever  
7 that thing was in 2015, so I respectfully ask y'all to not send this to the Council with  
8 approval. And thank y'all for your time very much.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

10 MR. GRADY: Next person up to speak, Nicky Ward.

11 **TESTIMONY OF NICKY WARD:**

12 MS. WARD: Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to speak for this  
13 property. First I'd like to say that I've lived in Blythewood my entire life.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Let's start with your name and address.

15 MS. WARD: Oh, I'm so sorry, I should do that. I'm so sorry. My name is Nicky  
16 Robertson Ward. My property address is 148 North Melton Road in Blythewood 29016.  
17 Okay. So back to what I was saying, I've lived in Blythewood my entire life and it's  
18 where I grew up, it's now where I'm raising our children. Our town is beautiful and  
19 special but it is no longer the small community that I've grown to love and appreciate.  
20 Slowly business is taking over priority of the people. Scout Motors is inevitable, it's  
21 there, it's growing, we see it, but turning our entire town into a place where a company  
22 whose future is not promised is foolish. For those who like myself have been in  
23 Blythewood our entire lives we remember Mack Truck and the utter failure that it was to

1 our community with Winnsboro right down the road from us. We don't need any more  
2 neighborhoods. We don't have the roads as Mr. David was saying, we don't have the  
3 infrastructure to support it. We're already taxed with traffic. If you've ever been to  
4 Blythewood you know exit 24 and 27 should take you five minutes and on any given day  
5 from 24 to 27 is 20 to 45 minutes to get home, which is ridiculous. And Scout is not  
6 even here yet. I just ask the council to respectfully consider the property that is zoned  
7 from us to not have any more neighborhoods out our way. There's neighborhoods  
8 popping up everywhere else and we don't, we request to not have any more near our  
9 home. We need our land because it's when or if Scout fails Blythewood will still be here  
10 and I pray that we still have some of what makes it so special left. Thank you for your  
11 time and your consideration.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

13 MR. GRADY: Last person signed up to speak on this case is Mike Messinger.

14 **TESTIMONY OF MIKE MENSINGER:**

15 MR. MENSINGER: Mike Messinger, 2090 Deerwood Farm Trail, Blythewood.  
16 We as well, my family at least the in-laws have lived in the area for 50 years and I'd  
17 have to agree with the last speaker in regards to the traffic and the thoughts about traffic  
18 and, you know, what's going on in that area. When DOT came before the Blythewood  
19 Planning Commission they talked about not planning for future, you know, problems. I  
20 think that's, you know, rather shortsighted. The roads there now are already starting to  
21 deteriorate and full of potholes and everything else, you know, from the excessive traffic  
22 coming through there. Having said that, you know, the zoning on this property and the  
23 fact that a large portion of it is wetlands and cannot be developed, it's probably not a

1 huge impact on the area but I just want you to, moving forward, continue to take into  
2 account the fact that as more and more of these subdivisions get placed in Blythewood  
3 down Sandfield Road, all that traffic's gotta go through that Langford, Highway 21,  
4 Blythewood Road area which has already become, you know, excessive as she's  
5 already mentioned. So just wanted to make that comment.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

7 MR. GRADY: That is everyone I have signed up to speak on this case.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Okay Commission, this  
9 is open on the floor for discussion. We're back to questions for Staff as well.

10 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

12 MR. GRADY: Yes, question for Staff cause I think there may be some confusion  
13 on this point by myself or speakers. Could someone explain why an HM designation is  
14 not consistent with a neighborhood low density land use category?

15 MR. SMITH: Sure. So I will try to explain it to the best of my ability. The 2015  
16 Comprehensive Plan was adopted with the old zoning code and with those zoning  
17 designations you also had, you know, those future land uses. Now that we've adopted a  
18 new Land Development Code this future land use map has to use a, kind of a  
19 translation of what was once rural has now become RT, AG, and HM. So when we talk  
20 about low density in one term designations that were in those designations were RSE  
21 and RR and RU, but since we've transitioned that RU into three other designations  
22 hypothetically translatable, the way we looked at it was RT would be the one that would  
23 be closest to the low density, but as far as HM and AG were to be referred to as, we

1 consider that more of a rural or rural large lot, and that's why we say that it was not  
2 compliant because in the future land use map it actually wants a higher density of, more  
3 of like an RT or an R1.

4 MR. GRADY: Okay, thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Thank you, Staff. Any  
6 motions, questions?

7 MR. TAYLOR: Question.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor.

9 MR. TAYLOR: With the correction that was made as far as the portion that's not  
10 supposed to be included with the subject property, does that change the proposed or  
11 the acreage?

12 MR. MABRY: No, it does not.

13 MR. TAYLOR: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, back here. Can you back that up, Staff? Yes.

15 MR. DELAGE: That's correct. What I am guessing on but we need to double  
16 check is probably at some point the GIS text zoning layer has not caught up with the  
17 subdivision so it's still showing the, what was formerly part of that. But Staff's made a  
18 note and we'll make sure to correct that before the Zoning Public Hearing.

19 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm a GIS guy by day, so I [inaudible]. Commission,  
21 discussion or a motion?

22 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead, Commissioner Durant.

1 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

3 MR. DURANT: What is the difference in the density requirements for the AG and  
4 HM?

5 MR. DELAGE: So the HM is .66 dwelling units per acre versus the AG is .33  
6 dwelling units per acre.

7 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

8 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

10 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion on Case 24-058 MA to forward this  
11 with a recommendation of approval; the reason being that a HM zoning designation is  
12 consistent with the surrounding land use.

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

14 MR. DURANT: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. With a motion and a  
16 second, Staff we'll ask for a vote. This would be for approval.

17 MR. DELAGE: Alright, Frierson?

18 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

19 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

20 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

21 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

22 MR. METTS: Aye.

23 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

1 MR. GRADY: Aye.

2 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

4 MR. DELAGE: Duffy?

5 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

6 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

7 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

8 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

9 MR. DURANT: Aye.

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

12 MR. DELAGE: Alright, vote is unanimous in favor of approval.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you, Commission. Again, February  
14 25<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm, correct Staff?

15 MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's when County Council will hear this case.

17 *[Duffy out at 7:11pm]*

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you everyone who came out tonight for this case.  
19 I'm gonna give them a minute to walk out. Okay moving along, almost halfway through  
20 ladies and gentlemen. We've got lots of cases today. Case Number 6, which is Case  
21 24-059.

22 **CASE NO. 24-059 MA:**

1 MR. DELAGE: Yes, so our next case, the Applicant is Joanne Williams. The  
2 parcel is located at 3931 Baldwin Road, TMS #R14103-03-10. The acreage is 2.43  
3 acres. The current zoning is the R6 District, the proposed zoning is the R2 District. The  
4 Comp Plan recommendation for this particular area on the future land use map is the  
5 mixed residential high density. The proposed rezoning is inconsistent with the  
6 objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. Mixed residential high density  
7 designation encourages zoning designations which provide for a full range of uses  
8 supportive of neighborhood, community and regional commercial and employment  
9 needs which includes higher density single-family and multi-family developments. The  
10 proposed residential district does not provide for a density that's supportive of the  
11 recommendations of this designation, nor will the proposed district be in character with  
12 the land uses of the surrounding area.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Questions for Staff, Commission? None  
14 yet? Okay. Commissioner Grady, anyone signed up to speak?

15 MR. GRADY: We have the Applicant, Joanne Williams.

16 **TESTIMONY OF JOANNE WILLIAMS:**

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Joanne Williams, 3931 Baldwin Road is the property. I want to  
18 build a single-family residence and the reason why I think it's better not to be multi-  
19 family and rather to this designation is that the lot narrows to a point and half of the  
20 property, half of the lot is wooded, heavily wooded and there's a steep slope. So the  
21 only portion of the property right at the front is, would only really allow a single-family or  
22 possibly up, you know, this zoning could have another one or two houses. But it's  
23 definitely a very narrow lot.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, ma'am.

2 MR. GRADY: Alright, and the only other person we have is Larry Pile.

3 **TESTIMONY OF LARRY PILE:**

4 MR. PILE: I have a hard time walking.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, sir. Do you think you could project from there?

6 MR. PILE: Yes. That would be better cause I just had hip replacement.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

8 MR. PILE: I don't walk well.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, will that be okay for this time?

10 MS. BIRCH: We'll try.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

12 MR. PILE: Thank you very much, I appreciate it.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Give us your name and address as loud as you can and  
14 two minutes.

15 MR. PILE: My name is Larry Pile. And I live at #2 Bee Haven Road in Columbia,  
16 South Carolina. And I own approximately 30 acres adjoining the property that Mrs.  
17 Williams is requesting be rezoned. I own all, all the portion on the high side of her. Her  
18 property is in the flood zone and it has been in the flood zone for, since 1930. And in  
19 order for her to build on it she has to bring dirt in to fill the springs that are on the  
20 property. And I have a, I have a topo map that I had done when I was trying to buy that  
21 piece of property. I have a topo that shows the springs on the property and I was unable  
22 to buy the property because the property did not have a clear deed. I could not get a  
23 clear deed when I did a property check with the law firm. But somehow Mrs. Williams

1 was able to convince the widow of the person that owned it, she was able to get a deed  
2 to it. I was never able to get a deed to it and I had been offered the property myself. But  
3 Richland County Administration, or Richland County Engineer told me even if I bought it  
4 I couldn't build on it because of the springs that were on the property. If they were  
5 covered up the springs would more than likely come out downhill from that piece of  
6 property and it would not be a safe thing. So in 1990 –

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Your final thought on that, sir?

8 MR. PILE: Pardon?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: To keep you to your time I'll give you 30 more seconds.

10 MR. PILE: Okay, In 1990 I allowed Richland County to tear down the courthouse  
11 here and dump it on my property because I have a license to have it dumped there and  
12 I had to build a retaining wall to keep that debris from moving over onto the lowlands  
13 and she has completely eliminated the safety of the embankment that I had to build by  
14 order of Richland County. She has removed the vegetation and the dirt from that  
15 property to help fill those springs in on her property and we are currently, we have  
16 currently filed a suit against her to restore the stability of the embankment and that is  
17 coming up in court soon, so I –

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

19 MR. PILE: - I cannot tell you when.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Thank you, sir. We'll take that in consideration.

21 MR. GRADY: We have no further people signed up to speak on this case.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. I do know that Staff turned on the topo  
23 lines as well as the flood plain, and I mentioned before by day I'm a map guy so when

1 those lines are close together that shows a change of elevation. Okay, questions for  
2 Staff? Comments? Open on the floor for discussion.

3 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks.

5 MR. SIERCKS: I have a motion.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

7 MR. SIERCKS: At this time I'd move that we forward the proposed Map  
8 Amendment 24-059 MA to County Council with a recommendation of disapproval.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. So a motion for  
10 disapproval. Do I have a second?

11 MR. GRADY: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Grady. Okay with that, Staff  
13 this would be a motion for disapproval. Can you please take a vote?

14 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

15 MR. DURANT: Aye.

16 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

17 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

18 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

20 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

21 MR. GRADY: Aye.

22 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

23 MR. METTS: Aye.

1 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

2 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

3 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

4 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

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

7 MR. DELAGE: It is unanimous. And just for the Record, Mr. Duffy left the room,  
8 so.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. But we still have a quorum.

10 MR. DELAGE: Correct.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, so that goes as  
12 disapproval. That case will be taken up February 25<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm, Council chambers.  
13 Thank you for those who came out tonight for that one. We're gonna keep moving  
14 along. Case number 7., Case 24-060 MA.

15 **CASE NO. 24-060 MA:**

16 MR. DELAGE: Okay, so the Applicant for Case Number 24-060 is Marco  
17 Sarabia, and I apologize again if I butcher any names. The location is 711 Bluebird  
18 Lane and also 1039 Bluebird Drive, two parcels is part of the request; one for 104-04-38  
19 and also 39. The combined acreage is 1.02 acres, currently zoned R6, requesting  
20 zoning is R2. And just a note these two parcels are just north of the previous case. So  
21 the Comp Plan recommendation is the same, mixed residential high density. The  
22 proposed rezoning is inconsistent with the objectives outlined in the Comprehensive  
23 Plan. Mixed residential high density designation encourages zoning designations which

1 provide for a full range of uses supportive of neighborhood, community, regional,  
2 commercial and employment needs which includes higher density single-family and  
3 multi-family developments. The proposed residential district does not provide for a  
4 density that is supportive of the recommendations of this designation, nor will the  
5 proposed district be in character with the land uses of the immediate area along  
6 Bluebird Lane.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, any questions for Staff?  
8 Okay hearing none, Commissioner Grady, who's signed up to speak?

9 MR. GRADY: First is the Applicant, Marco Sarabia?

10 **TESTIMONY OF MARCO SARABIA:**

11 MR. SARABIA: Good afternoon. I a little nervous, this is my first time speak to  
12 the people. Okay –

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out and what's your name and  
14 address?

15 MR. SARABIA: Okay, my name is Marco Sarabia. I living on 2928 Alpine Road  
16 and my request is change the zoning to R2. When I buy these two property, me and my  
17 wife, we have a dream to build a house, so we don't know that was an R6 so I don't  
18 know what that mean, R6 before. And when we decide to start doing all the application,  
19 to come for the permit they say we can't build it because it's on, it's not zoning. So that's  
20 why I come in here to ask for change for R2 and trying to build a house for me and my  
21 wife. That's it.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

23 MR. GRADY: And once again Larry Pile. He is not there anymore.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: He took off? Okay. Anyone else signed up?

2 MR. GRADY: No, that's it.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Thank you, sir. Commission, questions for Staff,  
4 open for discussion. And motions. Staff, this is up the road a little bit.

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

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, thanks. So at the time with the old Code this was a  
7 swath of denser mixed use, is that correct?

8 MR. DELAGE: Well the, looking at the parcel, it's kind of on the western portion  
9 of Bluebird Lane, those were zoned residential multi-family high density district, and  
10 then of course east of there was some light industrial parcels. So, but with the adopted  
11 zoning change that became effective in March of this year, or excuse me we're in 2025,  
12 March of 2024, the R5 and R6 districts do not permit single-family detached structures  
13 in them.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Any discussion or motions? Also in our  
15 packet these two, the one your hand is over is part of what we're considering, but the  
16 one just south is not, correct, that's separate?

17 MR. DELAGE: Both the parcel that is highlighted and then the one the hand is on  
18 is part of this request, so. [Inaudible]

19 MR. SIERCKS: If there's no other questions I'll make a motion.

20 MR. TAYLOR: I do have a question I guess.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Taylor, go ahead.

22 MR. TAYLOR: So the, the highlighted parcel, the yellow highlight I guess, is that  
23 a, I mean, it looks like a single-family dwelling on it now, is that correct? Can you tell?

1 MR. DELAGE: We're just checking what the Assessor's database has it as. And  
2 we'd have to do a little bit more digging into what, why it's not showing the dwelling  
3 data. That could be for a number of different reasons, it could be that it's, given its age  
4 or its potential, you know, is it habitable, you know, those, some of those factors could  
5 play into that.

6 MR. TAYLOR: How about the one right below it?

7 MR. DELAGE: So I believe the one below it is, there are a number of  
8 nonconforming uses in the area, so essentially stuff that's been established prior to the  
9 most current Code, and in this case established before we had zoning. So, given that  
10 the year on that construction was 1948.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioner Siercks?

12 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair, at this time I'd move that we forward the proposed  
13 Map Amendment 24-060 MA to County Council with a recommendation of disapproval.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. We've got a motion for disapproval. Do I have a  
15 second?

16 MR. DURANT: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I have a second from Commissioner Durant. Okay, with a  
18 motion and a second, Staff can you please take a vote?

19 MR. DELAGE: Okay, the motion –

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: For disapproval.

21 MR. DELAGE: Thank you. Frierson?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I can't, sir.

1 MR. SARABIA: Yeah, I just wanna say this not a house, this is my – we're up  
2 [inaudible] there's nobody living over there so it's like, it's my [inaudible] and my tools  
3 from work. It's not a house, it's a small shed over there.

4 MR. TAYLOR: Okay, thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That answered your question?

6 MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Alright.

8 MR. DELAGE: And I apologize, Taylor, did – did we get a vote from you? I'm  
9 sorry. I lost track.

10 MR. TAYLOR: Not yet.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I don't think you started the vote yet.

12 MS. FRIERSON: He hadn't started, he -

13 MR. DELAGE: Oh, okay.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, start from the beginning again.

15 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

16 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

17 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

18 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

19 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

20 MR. METTS: Aye.

21 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

22 MR. GRADY: Aye.

23 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

2 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

3 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

4 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Aye.

6 *[Approved to deny: Frierson, Taylor, Metts, Grady, Yonke, Siercks, Durant; Absent:*  
7 *Johnson, Duffy]*

8 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion is approved, unanimous.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you, Staff. That goes as a recommendation of  
10 disapproval for County Council and they will hear this case February 25<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm.

11 Thank you for coming out for that case. We're gonna keep on moving, Case 8. tonight  
12 which is Case 24-061 MA. Give it to Staff.

13 **CASE NO. 24-061 MA:**

14 MR. DELAGE: Alright, the Applicant is Brad Shell. The location is 10205 Wilson  
15 Boulevard. The parcel number is, there's two of them, it's 14900-01-04 and 17. The  
16 existing zoning district is the HM and RT District and the proposed zoning is the General  
17 Commercial District. The parcels are located within the Economic Development Center  
18 Corridor and are also located within the Priority Investment Area 7, which is designated  
19 around the I77/Wilson Boulevard interchange. The proposed Map Amendment is  
20 consistent with the 2015 Comprehensive Plan. The subject property or the subject site  
21 within, is within the Economic Development Center Corridor designation which supports  
22 zoning districts that allow complimentary retail and commercial uses along a primary  
23 road corridor near employment centers. The requested zoning district provides for uses

1 that support the Economic Development Center/Corridor designation and  
2 recommendations. Additionally, the subject site meets the location criteria for this  
3 designation. And just as one note, this may look familiar. There was a case previously  
4 last year just south of the parcel, so if it looks familiar that's the reason why.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So it was a different parcel.

6 MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Thank you, Staff. Commission, do we have any  
8 questions for Staff? Okay, hearing none, Commissioner Grady, I see we have a list of  
9 people signed up to speak.

10 MR. GRADY: We do. First I'll just ask is the Applicant Brad Shell here? And do  
11 you wish to speak, sir?

12 MR. SHELL: Sure.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down.

14 **TESTIMONY OF BRAD SHELL:**

15 MR. SHELL: Thank you. Brad Shell, 739 Hampton Hill Road, Columbia, South  
16 Carolina. I don't have too much to say on this. Fairly straightforward, it's 14 acres,  
17 seeking General Commercial rezoning. I would note that the intent here is not  
18 residential, it's a commercial development and, you know, we think that it's appropriate  
19 for the area as it is, on the north there's a storage facility right across the road on Wilson  
20 Boulevard, there's a 7-11 and other retail being proposed. But with that said, you know,  
21 happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

23 MR. GRADY: Alright next up, Jeanette Robinson?

1 **TESTIMONY OF JANET ROBINSON:**

2 MS. ROBINSON: Janet Robinson, 1170 Halls Pond Road, Blythewood. I don't  
3 know where Alfreda Tindal went but I was gonna thank her for helping me name my  
4 road 32 years ago. Well done, Alfreda, enjoy your retirement. So my concern about this  
5 is once again my property is at the end of this watershed. This water, the water from this  
6 particular property is gonna hit Hawkins Branch watershed. Every time development is  
7 approved on this watershed my property is getting hammered. August 3<sup>rd</sup> I sat in my car  
8 4 ½ hours because my dam was under water and that is the only access to my home.  
9 And I have begged this County to either buy my property or to stop the nonsense. If  
10 they can put in detention ponds that don't drain out in 48 hours, because you gotta  
11 remember all this residential sitting on this watershed and now all this commercial sitting  
12 on this watershed, a rain event happens, detention ponds set up to drain in 48 hours. If  
13 you've got 10 parcels, regardless of what it is, draining in 48 hours it hits my pond in 48  
14 hours. We are being severely damaged. This also drains through a conservation  
15 easement and I would beg you, I implore you to look at Palmetto Federal Conservation,  
16 I might be saying that wrong, owns several acres right above my property and it was  
17 sent there to preserve this conservation easement. So anything that drains to this, this  
18 watershed impacts that conservation. A conservation is put there to preserve. We are  
19 not doing a good job as a county preserving. My other concern about this is, yes it is in  
20 a business corridor but when you head back down Wilson Boulevard toward Columbia,  
21 it goes from four lanes to two lanes almost to I20. Two lanes. And our infrastructure, we  
22 don't have it and I don't know when the County's gonna slow its roll and, you know, start  
23 looking at infrastructure instead of keep rubberstamping everything. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

2 MR. GRADY: Next up, Greg Mancini.

3 **TESTIMONY OF GREG MANCINI:**

4 MR. MANCINI: Hi. Greg Mancini, 181 Turkey Farm Road, Blythewood. And I  
5 concur with her. Just because there's already businesses there I don't think that's a  
6 legitimate reason to keep putting more. We're already congested enough there as it is,  
7 not quite as bad as Blythewood Road is yet, but we're getting there. And for all the  
8 same reasons I don't want an apartment complex going up right next to my property as  
9 well as I stated the last time I was here. So there you go. Appreciate it.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks for coming out again.

11 MR. GRADY: Alright next up, F. R. Dozier?

12 **TESTIMONY OF F. R. DOZIER:**

13 MS. DOZIER: R. Dozier, right here. Good evening everyone. I'm F. R. Dozier at  
14 540 Holland Road in Blythewood. We were here in December concerning commercial  
15 property for apartments and we're back here again. We have commercial enough. We  
16 have the 7-11, which has a gas station which no one seems to talk about. The Exxon is  
17 a gas station and it sells food. And you're close to Turkey Farm Road. On that part of  
18 Wilson where I think you're trying to build because there's so much being thrown out  
19 about Wilson Boulevard, we do know that this County is not, does not have any plans to  
20 do any expansion for Wilson Boulevard, which the gentleman last month when he came  
21 to talk about the property on Turkey Farm and Wilson, that there's five lanes. I'm not an  
22 engineer and it doesn't take a rocket scientist to see we're technically one lane that has  
23 a lot of turning lanes, it's not truly two lanes. It's already congested and bad enough.

1 Talk about the water behind the complex I live in and behind my home there is wetlands  
2 as well, and to put more on us in, in that area, it just makes no sense. And someone  
3 has to go out and look at the roadway to see that Wilson really is not five lanes as was  
4 described before, it's hardly even two lanes. Portions of it are two lanes for a bit, but  
5 mainly they're turn off lanes, either right into the apartment complex, the apartment  
6 complex I live and to the 7-11, and into, on the left side you turn onto Turkey Farm  
7 Road, right at the corner of Turkey Farm and Wilson is a daycare so I don't know which  
8 side of the daycare or behind the daycare that they're planning on building because it  
9 would not be Wilson Boulevard. So we're confused. And you're throwing everything at  
10 us and you don't, the maps say something but they don't say enough. To me it's not just  
11 the map, you need to go look at what's there, you have to see what's there. It's not what  
12 that map says cause the map doesn't show the true story of what's happening there on  
13 Wilson Boulevard, but it is definitely not five lanes. We don't need any more  
14 commercial. The 7-11 with the gas station and the Exxon gas station, that's commercial  
15 enough. Trying to get in and out of our homes when you come down Wilson Boulevard  
16 —

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Your final thoughts. I don't wanna cut you off, I want to give  
18 everyone enough time.

19 MS. DOZIER: - yes, going south it's two lanes but you have to move over to your  
20 left because it runs out. So it's, like I said it's not even two full lanes on any part of  
21 Wilson Boulevard. We do not need any more commercial builds. Thank you so much.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks for coming out.

23 MR. GRADY: Next speaker, Roberta Young?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Ms. Roberta Young? No? Okay, next.

2 MR. GRADY: Next, Caroline Legrand.

3 **TESTIMONY OF CAROLINE LEGRAND:**

4 MS. LEGRAND: My name's Caroline Legrand and I live on Turkey Farm Road  
5 and as everyone else said it's, there is a 7-11, there's a community store there, there's  
6 also the storage unit. And this property runs between Community Road and Turkey  
7 Farm Road and as it is with all the school traffic we have in the mornings and  
8 afternoons on Turkey Farm Road we don't know where the entrance is gonna be. If they  
9 tried the entrance on Turkey Farm Road it's more congested. And as everybody else  
10 has said it goes from a four lane to a two lane right away when you're going south on  
11 Wilson Boulevard. I don't think it's a good idea to have more commercial stuff there.  
12 There's enough commercial stuff already. And, I have to read my notes here, I have to  
13 put my eyeballs on. The school is right behind this property so we already have all that  
14 school traffic coming down and leaving, so if you have commercial property there how  
15 are they gonna get there, turn on Turkey Farm during the school traffic? And that's even  
16 more congested, so I just don't think it's a great idea, it's not four lane that far down  
17 south, so if the state or whatever wants to add four lanes on down to I20 that would be  
18 different, but when you go south on 21 I would say approximately 300, 400' past where  
19 Turkey Farm is it squashes in two lanes and that's bad for traffic already in the mornings  
20 so I don't think it's a great idea. I'm done.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, ma'am.

22 MS. LEGRAND: Any questions?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I appreciate you coming out.

1 MR. GRADY: Next up is David Hickey? Okay. Last person signed up is Markita  
2 Hartley?

3 **TESTIMONY OF MARKITA HARLEY:**

4 MS. HARLEY: Good evening council. Markita Harley, 189 Wading Bird Loop in  
5 Blythewood, and we are off of Turkey Farm Road. And I echo the sentiments of the  
6 residents that have already spoken but in addition to that just a few things. We're talking  
7 about a four lane, it's truly a two lane which one of them is a turning lane as the lady  
8 said already. We have a 7-11 with a store, gas station. We have a, we have the Exxon  
9 store gas station. QT with a gas station and a store. All within a mile of Westwood High  
10 School, all of which that area is congested, all of which it starts to flood, all of which the  
11 water backs up for us even in this new community that we thought the builders took  
12 care of initially. But this whole area lacks the necessary infrastructure to support  
13 additional residential, businesses or anything else. We are truly overwhelmed in that  
14 area as we speak. The water has broken down our roads, our sewer system, there's so  
15 many different things that come into play when people want to build and you think about  
16 the environment and the people who currently live there and pay taxes there, it just  
17 doesn't make sense for us. And just overall we have Scout on Community Road, you  
18 have your warehouse, you have storage, and like I said the gas stations; to put another  
19 piece of business, another business, where are they gonna go, what time of the day are  
20 they gonna go, where is the water gonna come from, who's gonna support the traffic,  
21 what happens in an emergency. I have family that works for this county and I hate to  
22 see emergencies happen when we don't have enough people to come to the area. Just  
23 in general in conclusion, development decisions regarding these properties should

1 reflect the needs and desires of the current residents and I'm one of them and so are so  
2 many of the people who spoke today. With a focus on sustainability and the wellbeing of  
3 the community to, hopefully this council will take into consideration and collaborate with  
4 community members and developers to figure out a better result to that situation in that  
5 area. We don't want to be overwhelmed, we don't want to be unsafe in our  
6 neighborhood and if you lived in that area I would think you'd think twice before saying  
7 yes. Hopefully, that's not what you do. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Thank you for coming out.

9 MR. GRADY: Alright, that's everyone we have signed up on this case.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. Okay Commission, this is open on the  
11 floor for discussion and for questions of Staff. I would ask Staff to turn on the wetlands  
12 layer cause we've heard that discussed a lot. I do remember this area, it was last month  
13 in a December meeting and last fall as well. Staff, these are wetlands layers, am I  
14 correct?

15 MR. DELAGE: Well the wetlands layers are from the NWI, the National Wetland  
16 Inventory, so it comes with a little bit of, you know, they're notorious for, you know, their  
17 best guess, so. However, if there is any wetlands onsite they will need to be delineated  
18 as part of the development approval which comes after any kind of necessary zoning  
19 perfection. So, but again if they are onsite then they'll be doing it and dealt with at the  
20 time of development.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] two foot contours. Thank you. Just this area  
22 [inaudible] public lots of [inaudible] drainage. Commission, thoughts, motions?

23 MR. DURANT: Question, Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

2 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff. Where is the next general commercial area  
3 [inaudible]?

4 MR. DELAGE: So looking at the map the, looks like the next closest GC is  
5 actually gonna be across the interchange. However, it should be noted that while it is  
6 not general commercial the PDD that is to the east does designate some commercial  
7 uses which is how the convenient store or gas station was able to locate across the  
8 street from this site.

9 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

10 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

12 MR. GRADY: I suppose I would like to offer the opportunity to Staff if they care to  
13 take it to respond to the comments that we've heard this evening that there is a,  
14 potentially a risk of flooding from development in this particular corridor; if that is a, you  
15 know, whether that is, whether you consider that to be an accurate assessment or not.

16 MR. DELAGE: I can only speak in one particular area that I know that has been  
17 impacted in the past, specifically I'm speaking about past impacts, I'm not disputing any  
18 current or future impacts, but with the property that was mentioned by one of the  
19 speakers near Hollis Pond Road, there have been some residential developments  
20 around it that had some offsite impacts to that property. The other properties I'm not  
21 aware. Typically, so the way that the County kinda functions is if it's under development  
22 it falls under engineering/new development if there are any potential concerns from  
23 storm water, you know, run off or non-functioning silt fences or something going on with

1 the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Once it's developed out, so in any kind of  
2 instance where you have a subdivision that's been turned over to the County for  
3 maintenance then that goes to the Storm Water Division cause at that point the  
4 engineer, you know, conveyances should be there to handle the storm water. But if  
5 there's not then they would be the ones to handle it, so. But when it comes to, kinda  
6 circling back to that new development, as part of the review for any new development  
7 we're looking to make sure that they meet the Code requirements, the minimums, but  
8 that they meet the requirements, that they're handling their storm water. So at the time  
9 of actual approval the post-construction run off cannot exceed the pre-construction run  
10 off. There's certain thresholds and designations that are, you know, I don't administer  
11 that section so I don't know them off the top of my head, but they should be met at the  
12 time of development approval because part of that site plan or subdivision approval is  
13 also gonna be engineering's approval and review of those storm water retention or  
14 detention ponds.

15 MR. GRADY: That is clarifying, thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Any further discussion, Commission?  
17 Eye contact, Commissioner Taylor, how you doing?

18 MR. TAYLOR: Not too good. Honestly, and I understand the residents'  
19 concerns, but you know, what I'm thinking about is whether even we know or if Staff  
20 knows the processes and procedures. Again, we have one small piece in front of is,  
21 although there is a lot of surrounding impacts, you know, floods and watersheds and all  
22 these other things. So if approved the question becomes, you know, I don't think zoning  
23 is the reason everything gets through, I mean, it's just one step in the process, my

1 question is, what step in the process are all the other concerns addressed? I mean,  
2 cause let's say it is, it does meet the criteria and it can be zoned what's being  
3 requested, but if there are all these other concerns, when do these concerns get  
4 addressed? You know, like I said we have a pretty small piece of the pie, a small job in  
5 front of us, and though I understand all the concerns, you know, it still meets the criteria  
6 that we have in front of us. And reluctantly I would, you know, say it's compliant but my  
7 question is, that part is compliant but it sounds like the other pieces are not. So the  
8 noncompliant pieces, when are those addressed, if Staff knows?

9 MR. DELAGE: Yes, so during the site plan review if it's a commercial use or at  
10 the subdivision review if it's like a single-family residential, but in this case being the GC  
11 it'd probably fall under that commercial. At that point in time as part of any approval, y'all  
12 are right, y'all are, as Planning Commission and County Council are that initial step into  
13 getting a property zoned for a district that allows certain uses, once zoning is perfected  
14 then they would administratively submit any site plans which would be basically their full  
15 civil set where they're, you know, showing the storm water or they're showing  
16 landscaping, they're showing setbacks, parking, any kind of required buffering. At that  
17 point then the storm water would be handled. If there are wetlands onsite then we do  
18 have a requirement for a water quality buffer so that would also be included if there are  
19 wetlands onsite as part of that process so that kinda comes ahead. And it doesn't ever  
20 really stop but that's the point to where the project is being designed to minimize those  
21 impacts. But there's always the potential for if they, you know, were to cause an impact  
22 in the future we have a department that would handle that response or request.

23 MR. TAYLOR: When does the residents' voice stop so to speak?

1 MR. DELAGE: Once the zoning is perfected, it doesn't necessarily stop, there's  
2 just not a mechanism for Zoning Public Hearing or for a public meeting like we're having  
3 tonight. However, that does not prevent them from calling in a service request or  
4 contacting their council district representative if they have questions or concerns about  
5 a development.

6 MR. TAYLOR: I just wanted that on the Record cause again, I think their voice  
7 should be able to be heard further down the line. You know, we catch the brunt of it  
8 here in these meetings and we're happy to hear them, but again when we vote  
9 according to what's in front of us it seems like they're not being heard but I think their  
10 voice needs to be heard even further down the line, if possible. So I don't know who I  
11 would need to propose that to, but I just think if their voice is important, and I believe it  
12 is, I think it should be heard further in the process than just right here.

13 MS. FRIERSON: I have a question for Staff.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Frierson.

15 MS. FRIERSON: I remember a dam that did not hold that was located, I know it  
16 was right off of Wilson Boulevard, and I don't know if you can show it on the map, but I  
17 wanted to see how close it is to Turkey Farm Road [inaudible]. And it's the area, you  
18 know, when I heard the people talking about the lanes not really being quite five lanes  
19 and the turning lanes and so forth, the dam which I'm referring to is right off of Wilson  
20 Boulevard and the County took a considerable length of time to repair it. Do you know  
21 what I'm talking about? I don't really remember the name -

22 MR. DELAGE: Yeah, I would have to go through and look. There was enough  
23 dam failures that I would just need to put eyes on it.

1 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, let me give you a better description. When you're going  
2 down at the very end of Hardscrabble Road and then you face that right turn and  
3 continue down Wilson Boulevard and there is a, some type of commercial building, I  
4 think it's where they work on cars, and for a long time the road was closed up to that  
5 point. And there's residential area near it and I was just hoping you all could pull it up  
6 and I wanted to see how close it is to this Turkey Farm area and these wetlands and the  
7 flood zone, because I think it does have an impact. And I, like Mr. Taylor, am very  
8 bothered by the fact that yes we do see certain things that seem to be compliant but if  
9 we are aware that there really is in essence flooding that we've already seen devastate  
10 for a while it just doesn't seem sensible to approve something that we know in the past  
11 has caused a major flooding area.

12 MR. DELAGE: So I believe I have it up here, so this is the Lake Elizabeth –

13 MS. FRIERSON: That's it.

14 MR. DELAGE: - and that's where the, the dam blew out, made the road  
15 impassable and then it took them doing some work to, and they did not restore the dam,  
16 they just made it free-flowing. And that's a DOT road and project.

17 MS. FRIERSON: And how far is that to the area we're talking about tonight?

18 MR. DELAGE: So yeah, approximately –

19 AUDIENCE: [Inaudible]

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Let's let the Staff speak. I appreciate everyone coming out  
21 tonight.

22 MR. METTS: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Metts?

1 MR. METTS: Yeah, I understand how, I guess, you know, how difficult this is for  
2 this area, everybody's concern for it, I'm just looking at what we have in front of us as  
3 well. Like Commissioner Taylor was saying based off of what this is saying this is  
4 compliant in that the voices here that these people want to have heard should go say  
5 this to Councilmembers, I think, because what we have here is, seems to be what we  
6 should be doing given what the Comprehensive Plan says, it fits. And I get what  
7 everybody is saying, like I don't, I wouldn't want that either, but we're not in a position to  
8 do anything about that. So I think doing what we can in voting for this, you know, cause  
9 I think that it fits, and then going and telling their Councilmembers in the meeting is  
10 more effective than telling us.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Metts. Staff, do you know if a  
12 Councilmember was gonna have a meeting for this one? Those are new optional  
13 meetings that they've been holding over the last couple of years; the process goes,  
14 historically, Planning Commission, we make a recommendation and this comes after – it  
15 used to come out as a Staff recommendation, but really it's does it match the Comp  
16 Plan or not, so that when your County Councilmember is looking at their information  
17 they'll see that whatever's being proposed either matches the Comprehensive Plan, it's  
18 either been recommended approved or disapproved by Planning Commission, and then  
19 it's on them to make the actual final decision. So Staff, do you know if Councilmember  
20 Pugh is going to have a meeting for this one?

21 MR. DELAGE: No, sir, Mr. Chairman, not yet. We had contacted the Clerk of  
22 Council to double check but wasn't able to receive, you know, either a confirmation that,  
23 cause it's not posted on the website, that they will or won't have one. So you know, but

1 there's always the possibility that one will be held either prior to or after the Zoning  
2 Public Hearing. It just depends on the Councilmember's desire, so. Also really quickly I  
3 just wanna mention, I did the calculation for the distance between the parcel and the  
4 Lake Elizabeth. As the crow flies it would be 3.63 miles.

5 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good discussion, Commission. Do we have this wrapped  
7 up as a motion? Any brave souls? It's either way it can go and then we take a vote.

8 MR. METTS: Chair? Yeah, I'd like to make a motion to send –

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Metts, go ahead.

10 MR. METTS: - I would like to make a motion to send 24-061 forward with  
11 approval.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We've got a motion for approval. Do I have a second?

13 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I have a second from Commissioner Siercks. Okay, with a  
15 motion and a second for approval, Staff please take a vote.

16 MR. DELAGE: Alright, Durant?

17 MR. DURANT: Nay.

18 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

19 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

20 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: It fits the plan. Aye.

22 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

23 MR. GRADY: Aye.

1 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

2 MR. METTS: Aye.

3 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

4 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

5 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

6 MS. FRIERSON: Nay.

7 *[Approved: Siercks, Yonke, Grady, Metts, Taylor; Opposed: Durant, Frierson; Absent:*  
8 *Johnson, Duffy]*

9 MR. DELAGE: Alright, it is 5/2 for approval.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for  
11 coming out for this one. This is a recommendation, a split vote of approval to County  
12 Council. So again, they will have a Zoning Public Hearing where your voice can be  
13 heard once again. So thank you for coming out tonight.

14 AUDIENCE: [Inaudible]

15 MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chair?

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

17 MR. DELAGE: You want me to answer that – I heard someone in the audience  
18 was asking about the Zoning Public Hearing date, it's –

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, sorry. February 25<sup>th</sup>, correct?

20 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 7:00pm, Council chambers, same location as we are right  
22 now. Alright for everyone else it's bedtime so we'll keep on moving. We are looking at

1 Case number 9., right? Okay yes, Case 9., on our Agenda which is Case 25-001. Back  
2 to Staff. And please exit quietly as you go, thank you.

3 **CASE NO. 25-001 MA:**

4 MR. DELAGE: So the Applicant for Case 25-001 MA is Donald E. Lovett. The  
5 location of the properties, this is multiple parcels, is along North Brickyard Road and  
6 Hardscrabble Road. There are a number of parcels associated with it; 17300-06-10  
7 which is a portion of, R20100-05-01, 02, 04, 05 and 08. The parcels total 11.72 acres.  
8 They are currently zoned R2 District and the proposed rezoning is for the General  
9 Commercial District. The parcels fall under the neighborhood medium density future  
10 land use map recommendation. The requests is inconsistent with the recommendations  
11 of the Comprehensive Plan for the neighborhood medium density designation.  
12 According to the designation non-residential development should be located along  
13 roads classified as main road corridors. Hardscrabble Road, however, is designated as  
14 an undivided minor arterial. Additionally, the parcels do not meet the objective of being  
15 within a contextually appropriate distance from the intersection of a primary arterial. The  
16 requested zoning district is also inconsistent with the surrounding development pattern  
17 and existing zoning districts in the immediate area.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, any questions for Staff?  
19 Hearing none, Commissioner Grady, who's signed up to speak?

20 MR. GRADY: Yes, it looks like several people working together so I will try to  
21 follow the order in which they wish to speak. So first is Tobias Ward.

22 **TESTIMONY OF TOBIAS WARD:**

1 MR. WARD: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, I  
2 am Tobias Ward, most people know me as Toby Ward. I'm attorney in Columbia, South  
3 Carolina, 40 years of practice.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Throw your address in there, too, and if you can speak with  
5 the mic I think that helps the Staff.

6 MR. WARD: I'm getting to that part.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

8 MR. WARD: Just wanted you to know who I am.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Appreciate you.

10 MR. WARD: And I have lived in Richland County for all of those 40 years and I  
11 currently live at 3012 Glenwood Place which is in the City of Columbia, and my law  
12 office is in Five Points in the City of Columbia. I have the pleasure to be here tonight to  
13 represent the Lovett family. For those of you who don't know the Lovett family, they've  
14 been in the Killian area and the northeast area for a long time and they've only been  
15 associated with quality development projects, and that's the case with this property. And  
16 they did not come before you with this proposal until they were able to secure public  
17 water, public sewer, natural gas and phase 3 electric power, all of which would support  
18 this project. As I said the family has supported development in this area for a long time  
19 because they used to have a farm, Killian Farm, that went from Hardscrabble Road to  
20 Clemson Road, and of course, we all know what has happened in that area, farming no  
21 longer takes place there and homes have been developed in a lot of the area. Examples  
22 of their developments are Killian Elementary School, the Sandhills Community Church,  
23 the Walgreens and the Killian Green subdivision. Now with that introduction let me talk

1 about the Comprehensive Plan. We all know that it was, it's the 2015 Comprehensive  
2 Plan and it's 2025. But the Comprehensive Plan does say that non-residential  
3 development may be considered for location along the main road corridor. And we all  
4 know that at long last Hardscrabble Road has been improved and that's why we come  
5 before you today with this project. The Comprehensive Plan also says non-residential  
6 uses should be designed to be easily accessible to surrounding neighborhoods via  
7 multiple transportation modes. And if Staff would pull out the map you will see that this  
8 property is actually immediately in the area of nine subdivisions; that is State Park  
9 acres, Brookstone, Rice Creek, Mill Bank, Homestead, Clear Springs, Flora Springs  
10 Park, Spring Valley and Spring Valley Extension. All of those are surrounding  
11 neighborhoods. I know I'm past my time –

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, I'm gonna give you 30 seconds to give your final  
13 thoughts.

14 MR. WARD: Your gracious, thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I appreciate you.

16 MR. WARD: Traffic will not be drawn to this parcel from areas outside of the  
17 community because this will serve those areas in the community, those neighborhoods.  
18 Hardscrabble is four lane, North Brickyard has two lanes with two turning lanes. In  
19 conclusion, the proposed rezoning should be recommended to Council because it is on  
20 a four lane with sidewalks, that's Hardscrabble, surrounded by nine subdivisions. It's  
21 easily accessible by the two roads and the sidewalk on Hardscrabble. It'll reduce the  
22 number of vehicles from the nine neighborhoods needing to go further to shop and will  
23 not draw traffic from other areas of the county. Did I do it?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That was a good wrap up, thank you.

2 MR. WARD: Alright.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: A minute over, but thank you.

4 MR. WARD: Alright.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out.

6 MR. WARD: Thank you very much.

7 MR. GRADY: Alright, next on the list is Terry Taylor?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Oh, Commissioner Taylor?

9 MR. GRADY: I was gonna ask but no, apparently not.

10 **TESTIMONY OF TERRY TAYLOR:**

11 MR. TAYLOR: Good evening, Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Terry  
12 Taylor, address is 300 Colonial Center Parkway, Suite 150, Roswell, Georgia. And I am  
13 the developer, my company is Mirabeland Investments. And give you a little bit of idea  
14 about our background, I've been either in the engineering or the development of our real  
15 estate business since 1980. Mirabeland's been around since 2005, but been in the  
16 development business since 1995. We've developed projects all over the southeast.  
17 Our niche where we probably specialize in is neighborhood retail projects and those that  
18 serve the area immediately surrounding our project is what we key on. We provide  
19 necessity retail we call it. Many times they're grocery anchored, sometimes they're not,  
20 but they do provide a service and goods for the immediately surrounding  
21 neighborhoods. We develop first class projects and have developed neighborhood  
22 centers and country clubs and golf course communities and we specialize in that first  
23 class niche. We're interested in developing this project as neighborhood retail and it

1 may or may not be grocery anchored. I don't wanna go back over everything that Toby  
2 talked about, one thing in the packet that I wanna clarify is there is frontage on  
3 Hardscrabble as well as North Brickyard and –

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Sum it in 30 seconds or so?

5 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, I'll sum it up. And the other thing is that the traffic on  
6 Hardscrabble last count was almost 20,000 cars. Any questions? Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

8 MR. GRADY: Alright, next we have Jeff Filpot?

9 **TESTIMONY OF JEFF FILPOT:**

10 MR. FILPOT: Hey, my name is Jeff Filpot and I live at 49 Northlake Road,  
11 Columbia, South Carolina. I am the pastor of Sandhills Community Church immediately  
12 adjacent to the property and I had heard that they were planning to develop it. I am  
13 very excited about that as the northeast area is growing, now with Hardscrabble being a  
14 five lane road essentially, I don't know what you do with the suicide lane, but I think the  
15 development will be great for the community, and particularly great for our church, so if  
16 some of those things develop right next to us it will certainly aid the convenience for our  
17 church and its members. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks for coming out.

19 MR. GRADY: Alright, next we have Timothy Wingard?

20 **TESTIMONY OF TEIMOTHY WINGARD:**

21 MR. WINGARD: Tim Wingard, 1208 North Brickyard Road. This property is right  
22 across the road in front of me. I see no reason why it shouldn't be approved. It'd be a  
23 good asset to the community. You can have the rest of my time, thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

2 MR. GRADY: Alright, next is the Applicant, Donald Lovett.

3 **TESTIMONY OF DONALD LOVETT:**

4 MR. LOVETT: My name is Don Lovett, I live at 7550 Irmo Drive in Columbia,  
5 South Carolina. I grew up on my Lovett family's approximately 200 acre farm in Killian,  
6 South Carolina. The farm extended from Hardscrabble Road to Clemson Road. There  
7 were nine children in my family. My father, mother and seven of my brothers and sisters  
8 are all deceased. Only my sister Jackie Lovett Henson and I are still alive. My sister  
9 Jackie currently lives in a nursing facility. Jackie's house on Hardscrabble Road is  
10 vacant. There are only two houses on this 11.72 acres. The two houses belong to my  
11 sisters Jackie and Gwen. My deceased sister Gwen's home and her two, lives on her  
12 two acres on North Brickyard Road is currently rented month to month for a children's  
13 daycare facility. The additional 7.72 acres is vacant land which is controlled by my  
14 signature. We want to sell this combined 11.72 acres to Mirabeland Investments for a  
15 grocery store which will serve as an anchor for other small retail establishments on this  
16 property. My sister Gwen's two children, Jennifer and Troy, as well as my sister Jackie's  
17 two children, Byron and Kevin, are all in agreement with this rezoning request. On  
18 behalf of my family I request that the Richland County Planning Commission approve  
19 general commercial zoning for this combined 11.72 acres. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

21 MR. GRADY: It does look like there's one more name but I cannot make it out, so  
22 if anyone else would like to speak on this case please feel free to come down.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I think that was everyone.

1 MR. GRADY: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

3 MR. GRADY: That's all I've got then.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, again, everyone whose come out to speak  
5 tonight and will speak soon. Commission, this is up on the floor for discussion.

6 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

8 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff. Can you show me on the map where the next  
9 closest general commercial area is? Thank you.

10 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

12 MR. GRADY: Question for Staff, and I feel like we have trod this ground a few  
13 times, but for the Record and for the awareness of the public would it be possible to  
14 explain the difference between a primary arterial and a minor arterial and whether the  
15 upgrades to Hardscrabble Road could alter that designation in any way?

16 MR. DELAGE: Alright, just give me one moment to pull up my handy dandy  
17 Land Development Code and I will read directly from it. So, so a minor arterial is a  
18 SCDOT designated roadway as depicted on the Functional Classification Map for the  
19 Columbia urbanized area that carries a mix of local and thru traffic in which links  
20 collector roads and sometimes local streets with principal arterials. A principal arterial  
21 road is an SCDOT roadway as depicted in its Functional Classification Map for the  
22 Columbia urbanized area that is primarily intended to provide traffic service between  
23 urban areas. I think for the purposes of the Comp Plan and those designations the

1 roads were used as part of that. We, in our previous Code, the 2005 Code that this  
2 Comp Plan was adopted under, it had the different road types defined in it as well, so I  
3 believe that was rolled in with the 2015 Comp Plan. Hardscrabble Road is currently  
4 classified as, sorry I just wanna look it up to make sure I'm correctly – the, so actually if  
5 we can pull it up on the DOT website we can see what it is. So the, but my  
6 understanding from previous cases is that those roadway designations, while the  
7 increase in lanes may provide for additional level of service, so it may bring it up into  
8 basically, you know, for instance if it was an F, by adding the lanes it could, you know,  
9 make it a C, make it function at capacity. But it doesn't always necessarily change the  
10 road type and how it functions. That was what was explained to Staff in a previous  
11 inquiry but, you know, of course things could change, but that was the latest and  
12 greatest that we received when we asked for guidance regarding that.

13 MR. GRADY: Okay, thank you.

14 MR. DELAGE: And then Mr. Smith's gonna double check on the road type just to  
15 make sure and see if they've updated it as well.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Looks like SCDOT makes you dig for it.

17 MR. DELAGE: Yes, and I think this computer's lucky cause it starts in the center  
18 of the state, mine always starts in Camden for some reason on my desk top. So it looks  
19 like this is a minor arterial.

20 MR. GRADY: Just out of curiosity do we know how SCDOT defines these? Is  
21 there a certain traffic count or other data that goes into these categorizations?

22 MR. DELAGE: That is a good question. So my understanding is the definitions  
23 and basically what DOT has for, like their driveway separations, so basically what the

1 speed limit is supposed to be between different driveways, most, that information is  
2 from what, their language. Beyond that I would kinda refer back to the definition of how  
3 the road is kinda functioning, it's service is either to, you know, provide a linkage  
4 between local and collector to, you know, arterials or in cases where you have the  
5 minors that basically are supposed to connect the major arterials, but beyond that I  
6 wouldn't be able to speak if there's any other data that they use to classify them.

7 MR. TAYLOR: Question.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Taylor?

9 MR. TAYLOR: Based on the map you just brought up and to piggyback on  
10 Commissioner Durant's question, the next closest general commercial appeared to be  
11 on, was it Sloan and Hardscrabble? Yeah. Aren't those the same, it may be, who knows  
12 how old it is, but -

13 MR. DELAGE: So that is if you are traveling up Hardscrabble Road south to  
14 north, most people, that's where the big tower is, however, I will mention that the parcel  
15 to the north of that, I am unsure of the new designation under the Code, but that  
16 received an approval for a change in zoning from a residential to a commercial, I wanna  
17 say within the last 15 years but after 17 years here it's starting to run together a little bit.  
18 But that was rezoned by Planning Commission and County Council.

19 MR. TAYLOR: And it is the same road types as the request for tonight, correct?

20 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, that is correct.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, further thoughts or a possible motion?

22 MR. DURANT: One more thought, Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

1 MR. DURANT: For Staff. In your Conclusion you say that neighborhood medium  
2 density designation, that's where non-residential development should be located along  
3 roads classified as main road corridors. Is that a hard and fast rule or are there  
4 instances around the County where minor arterials have general commercial zoning on  
5 it?

6 MR. DELAGE: So there are other places where, I would say there are even  
7 recent map amendments, where general commercial exists and have made  
8 recommendations for approval. I believe, if it's not last month it might be November, we  
9 had a similar, well I don't wanna say similar, sorry, we had a road type that was a minor,  
10 Dutch Fork Road if I'm not mistaken along a section of Ballentine, I'm sorry, I'm just  
11 conferring with Mr. Smith to make sure I'm recalling correctly, that was more of a recent  
12 case. But there are other locations that are minor arterials around the County that do  
13 have commercial zoning designations.

14 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Staff. Alright, other discussion or a motion?

16 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

18 MR. GRADY: I would like to advance Case 25-001 MA to County Council with a  
19 recommendation of approval. The rationale being that while Hardscrabble Road does  
20 not meet the SCDOT definition of a primary arterial it represents a major road with  
21 substantial traffic and therefore general commercial designation would be an  
22 appropriate land use in this area.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Do I have a second?

1 MR. METTS: Second.

2 MR. DURANT: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, I heard Metts first so second from Commissioner  
4 Metts. Okay, with a vote [sic] and a second, Staff you can take a vote and it's for  
5 approval.

6 MR. DELAGE: Alright. Frierson?

7 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

8 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

9 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

10 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

11 MR. METTS: Aye.

12 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

13 MR. GRADY: Aye.

14 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

16 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

17 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

18 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

19 MR. DURANT: Aye.

20 *[Approved: Frierson, Taylor, Metts, Grady, Yonke, Siercks, Durant; Absent: Duffy,*  
21 *Johnson]*

22 MR. DELAGE: Alright, the vote is unanimous for approval.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. I'll repeat it again, February 25<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm  
2 County Council will meet in these chambers and discuss this property. And we gave it a  
3 recommendation of approval.

4 MR. DELAGE: And Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

6 MR. DELAGE: So also wanna mention too that this particular case will also be up  
7 for a town hall meeting on February 13<sup>th</sup> at 6:00pm –

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: As people are walking out right now, remember February  
9 13<sup>th</sup> town hall meeting with your Councilman.

10 MR. DELAGE: And that'll be at Killian Park.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Killian Park. Thank you.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Safe travels. Alright. We're on the next page.  
14 Thank you for everyone still here hanging in. Case Number 10. Case 25-002.

15 **CASE NO. 25-002 MA:**

16 MR. DELAGE: My apologies for jumping the gun, Mr. Chair. Yes, so Brandon  
17 Pridemore is the Applicant. The location is 800 Mountain Valley Road. The parcel is  
18 R12400-02-22. The acreage is 198.84 acres. Existing zoning is AG. The proposed  
19 zoning is R3. The Comprehensive Plan designation on the future land use map is the  
20 neighborhood low density. The proposed rezoning is inconsistent with the objectives for  
21 the neighborhood low density designation that encourages low density traditional  
22 neighborhood development and open space developments that preserve open spaces

1 and natural features. The proposed zoning district does not provide for a density that is  
2 supportive of this recommendation.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, questions for Staff.

4 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

6 MR. GRADY: So since this parcel is adjacent to the Town of Blythewood I'm just  
7 curious, I see it in the write up that that is designated as an R12 under Blythewood's  
8 zoning statute. So is there anything you can tell us about what that means, what that  
9 entails, what that would correspond to in the County's rubric?

10 MR. DELAGE: Yes, so I will pull that up very quickly. But the, I can tell you that  
11 residential district and we'll double check on what it'll most align to here briefly.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And Commission, as Staff's looking this up just note that  
13 this case and the next one we're looking at are kind of sister parcels. We are tasked  
14 with looking at these individually, but just keep it in mind. Maybe for time's sake can we  
15 go through our names, hear from the public and give Staff time to pull up the zoning?

16 MR. GRADY: Sure.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, and circle back to that. Okay.

18 MR. GRADY: Alright, so first person signed up to speak is the Applicant, Brandon  
19 Pridemore.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down.

21 **TESTIMONY OF BRANDON PRIDEMORE:**

22 MR. PRIDEMORE: Good evening. I know it's been a long night. I'm Brandon  
23 Pridemore, 1186 Stonecrest Boulevard, Tega Cay, South Carolina. I am a development

1 and civil engineering consultant here on behalf of the property owners and the  
2 developer. Just wanted to say the site currently as we look at the Comp Plan is not in  
3 conformance but we also look at the bigger picture of what's happened in that area with  
4 Scout being there. We are on the west side of the interstate and back behind the Scout  
5 as the crow flies we're within a third, half a mile of that site, so we just felt like this was a  
6 good opportunity supplement probably the housing needs that are gonna be coming  
7 with the Scout industry. As we look at it, as we talk about growth patterns and maybe  
8 the comparison to Blythewood, Blythewood basically allows about two units an acre and  
9 while the R3 zoning district has a stated density of six units per acre, just because of  
10 geometry, topography, environmental concerns, all that, we'll be nowhere close to that.  
11 As a matter of fact our projection is that we're gonna land somewhere right around 1.8  
12 units per acre so it's gonna be relatively low density given the location. I think the  
13 development pattern and housing that you're gonna see is gonna be complimentary to  
14 what's there. What we'd like to do and why we wanted to stay in the County is the  
15 County ordinances would provide us a little bit more flexibility than what Blythewood  
16 would do and we'd like to be able to offer, given the size of these two parcels, and to  
17 Chairman Yonke's point that these two projects are connected, this one and the next  
18 one, I'm only gonna speak once on it unless you have any questions for me, is that  
19 given the size of the parcels we'd like to be able to be flexible and offer different price  
20 points but be very, I guess, cognizant of what the market looks like for that area. So the  
21 other thing we wanna look at is, you know, besides the Scout is we do have water  
22 available, it runs right through the property, a big 48" water line with the City of  
23 Columbia, we verified that. Sewer is readily accessible nearby. And as we look at the

1 traffic for the area I know, you know, a lotta roads in South Carolina are not perfect by  
2 any means but this is well positioned that we have direct access to Highway 321,  
3 Highway 21 and the interstate. We've got three intersections that are all within five, 10  
4 minutes of that location. But I'm here to answer any questions you might have and  
5 thank you for your time.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And I'll give you the bonus 30 seconds since you say you  
7 don't wanna talk for the next one.

8 MR. PRIDEMORE: Well, what we'd say is that, you know, one of the other  
9 things, too, we're looking to build a community out of this, not just housing *per se*, so  
10 this plan that we, the concept that we have is gonna be, you know, a lot of open space,  
11 a lot of interspersed amenities, central amenities, so we wanna create a destination  
12 place for people to enjoy. And we just felt like, again given what it is, you know, it also  
13 provides a good tax base I believe for the County. It's gonna be developed at some  
14 point for residential more than likely but at this point it seems beneficial for the County to  
15 be able to benefit from it as well.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

17 MR. PRIDEMORE: Thank you.

18 MR. GRADY: Alright, the next person signed up to speak is Mark Johnston.

19 **TESTIMONY OF MARK JOHNSTON:**

20 MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Mark  
21 Johnston, I live at 419 Mount Valley Road. And as Mr. Pridemore mentioned there is a  
22 lot of development and expansion going on because of Scout and those of us, a bunch  
23 of us that live along, in that area don't want that, additional neighborhoods, additional

1 traffic. The two parcels in question are fed by a dirt road currently and most of the, most  
2 of the land around there with the exception of one large development, housing  
3 development next door, is low density houses, so homes that have, you know, three to  
4 five acres on them. And the existing R3 designation, did the math according to y'all's  
5 agenda, would allow up to 1,800 homes on there. And with all due respect to Mr.  
6 Pridemore, they don't have any, any desire to do that, you know, I'm just really, really  
7 concerned about the continuing sprawl, you know, whether it's Scout or anything else.  
8 Those that, again those of us that live there are there for a reason, we enjoy the woods,  
9 the animals, the, everything that the rural area gives you, and the, the existing  
10 designation I think was very appropriate and I hope that the Planning Commission will  
11 keep that designation. And since they are joined with the other parcel my comments are  
12 the same for the other parcel as well. So I do thank y'all for your time.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

14 MR. GRADY: Alright, next we have Pam Johnston.

15 MR. JOHNSTON: That is my wife and she had to leave. So our comments were  
16 the same, so.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

18 MR. GRADY: Okay. And we also have Janet Robinson.

19 **TESTIMONY OF JANET ROBINSON:**

20 MS. ROBINSON: Janet Robinson, 1170 Halls Pond Road. My concern is density.  
21 My concern is infrastructure again, because Swygert, I mean, Mount Valley Road will  
22 dump out onto Swygert Road which if you go one way on Swygert you go to 321, if you  
23 go another way on Swygert you go to Fulmer Road. Fulmer Road then can either take

1 you into Blythewood to Blythewood Road, Turkey Farm Road, which is gonna be further  
2 impacted, keep that in mind, or Wilson Boulevard. Every single one of these outlets are  
3 two lane roads, so it is nice to hear that there may be less than two homes per acre, but  
4 in reality we all know that once it's rezoned you can't go back. And so what if the  
5 topography allows for six houses per acre and we're looking at 1,800 homes and the  
6 cars, the children, the schools. Currently this County does not have impact fees on  
7 developers and that's another thing that I really hope that we look at because we the  
8 taxpayers that have supported this community for decades are bearing the brunt of  
9 them walking away with fat pockets and we're dealing with every other issue that comes  
10 to town. So for me it's a big fat no. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

12 MR. GRADY: Alright, that is everyone we have signed up to speak on both this  
13 case and the next case.

14 MR. DELAGE: Yes, Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Back to Staff. Yes, thank you.

16 MR. DELAGE: Just to go back to the previous question about the R12 District,  
17 we were able to look up the Town of Blythewood zoning ordinance, so the R12 District  
18 in the allowed dwelling units per acre is more similar to our current R2 District. So just  
19 wanted to mention that, that we were able to look that information up. And the R2 is the  
20 most similar zoning district to the Town of Blythewood's adjacent single-family zoning.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Let's look at that map again. Some  
22 comments, I just wanted to repeat, the dirt road or this might even be landlocked? Is  
23 that true, Staff?

1 MR. DELAGE: So Mount Valley Road currently is the main driveway for 911  
2 purposes, so if – regardless of the zoning if they intended to subdivide the property they  
3 would need to secure either direct access to a public road or right-of-way or in certain  
4 cases they would have to do heir property which is basically if, exactly what it sounds  
5 like, you'd be heiring your property or giving it away to a designated individual. So if you  
6 were to rezone it as part of that, their development requirements, they would have to  
7 provide access, depending on the number of lots they may have to provide multiple  
8 accesses, so. But as it currently is Mount Valley is just a main driveway for E911  
9 purposes. At least along the portion of the property.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is that Scout Motors when you had Google Maps open a  
11 second ago? Or here, too?

12 MR. DELAGE: That's correct, yes.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I notice these parcels actually did touch wetlands. Highlight  
14 the parcel again? Commission, discussion, questions, motions? I'm sorry if I'm hogging  
15 the floor.

16 MR. DURANT: Question, Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

18 MR. DURANT: When we get to the point of a motion do we handle both of these  
19 Map Amendments at once or each separately?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: They have separate case numbers so I believe we have to  
21 vote for them separately. Yeah. Staff, would it be okay to take them back to back? Is  
22 there any more information in the packet for Case No., what is it 10?

23 MR. DELAGE: Yes, so –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 11?

2 MR. DELAGE: - my suggestion would be, you know, typically make a motion on  
3 this one and then you can basically, you know, we'll go through a quick little, you know,  
4 hey this is similar introductory to what the case is, tax map number reference, that stuff,  
5 and then at that point you could open the floor to comment and if there's no comments  
6 because everyone's basically said that they're not, you know, go ahead and then make  
7 a motion. That way it's still a clear kind of separate motion and second and actual vote  
8 on each item.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And please highlight that one that we're looking at now.  
10 Thank you. Commission, any motions or discussion?

11 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

13 MR. DURANT: I move that we forward Map Amendment project 25-002 MA to  
14 County Council with a recommendation of disapproval as it doesn't meet, or it's not  
15 compliant with the 2015 Comprehensive Plan objectives for the neighborhood low  
16 density designation which encourages low density [inaudible].

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Do we have a second?

18 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Got a second from Commissioner Siercks. Okay, with a  
20 motion on the floor, this would be for disapproval, a motion and a second for  
21 disapproval. Staff, please take a vote.

22 MR. DELAGE: Alright, Frierson?

23 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

1 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

2 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

3 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

4 MR. METTS: Aye.

5 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

6 MR. GRADY: No.

7 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

9 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

10 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

11 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

12 MR. DURANT: Aye.

13 *[Approved to deny: Frierson, Taylor, Metts, Yonke, Siercks, Durant; Opposed: Grady;*

14 *Absent: Duffy, Johnson]*

15 MR. DELAGE: Alright, so it's a 6/1 approval.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: For disapproval.

17 MR. DELAGE: Or for disapproval, I'm sorry.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, recommendation of disapproval.

19 MR. DELAGE: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Okay. And I would say February 25<sup>th</sup>,  
21 7:00pm, Council chambers. Thank you for coming out. And then we would go to the  
22 next case.

23 MR. DELAGE: And Mr. Chair?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, sir.

2 MR. DELAGE: So also same is true of the next case that is located at 700 Mount  
3 value. Both the previous and the current case, so 800 Mount Valley Road and 700  
4 Mount Valley Road will be, there'll be a town hall, Doku Manor at 6:00pm on February  
5 the 6<sup>th</sup>.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Doku Manor, February 6<sup>th</sup> at what time?

7 MR. DELAGE: At 6:00pm.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: 6:00pm. The 6<sup>th</sup> at 6:00, alright, make sure everybody got  
9 it. Okay, thank you. So we will now go to Case, and we're 11. on our Agenda, which is  
10 Case 25-003.

11 **CASE NO. 25-003 MA**

12 MR. DELAGE: Yes. So the Applicant is Brandon Pridemore. The parcel location  
13 is 700 Mount Valley Road. The parcel is zoned AG and the request is to the R3 District.  
14 It is a 111.41 acres and tax map number R12400-02-23. Similar to the last case it is in  
15 the neighborhood low density district. The proposed rezoning is not compliant with the  
16 objectives for the neighborhood low density. This designation encourages low density  
17 traditional development and open space developments that preserve the open space  
18 and natural features. The proposed rezoning district does not provide for a density that's  
19 supportive of this recommendation.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Any questions for Staff on this one?

21 Hearing none, any new people signed up to speak for this one?

22 MR. GRADY: No, same as the last case.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Same comments? Okay. Anyone who signed up to speak  
2 need to speak again on this one, for fairness since you did sign up twice? No? Okay. I  
3 followed the order, thank you. So we would've heard from everybody and then I  
4 would've said discussion, is there any further discussion? No? Is there a motion?

5 MR. DURANT: Yes, Mr. Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

7 MR. DURANT: I move that we forward Map Amendment 25-003 MA to County  
8 Council with a recommendation of disapproval based on the fact that it's not compliant  
9 with the objectives of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan regarding [inaudible] designation  
10 which encourages low density traditionally [inaudible].

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

12 MS. FRIERSON: I second.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We got a second from Ms. Frierson. Hello down there.  
14 Alright. With a motion and a second, this is for disapproval, please take a vote Staff.

15 MR. DELAGE: Alright, Durant?

16 MR. DURANT: Aye.

17 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

18 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

19 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

21 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

22 MR. GRADY: No.

23 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

1 MR. METTS: Aye.

2 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

3 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

4 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

5 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

6 *[Approved to Deny: Durant, Siercks, Yonke, Metts, Taylor, Frierson; Opposed: Grady;*

7 *Absent: Duffy, Johnson]*

8 MR. DELAGE: So that's a 6/1 approval for the recommendation of disapproval.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So both these properties, again, are gonna come up for  
10 Zoning Public Hearing with County Council on February 25<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm, and this is  
11 gonna have that town hall meeting at the Doku Manor?

12 MR. DELAGE: That's correct.

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

14 MR. DELAGE: That's correct.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This coffee's keeping me going. Alright.

16 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor.

18 MR. TAYLOR: I thought I heard something, when this one was being read I  
19 thought the acreage was read as 112 or 111?

20 MR. DELAGE: It was 111.41 acres.

21 MR. TAYLOR: Okay, I think it has 64.[inaudible].

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What page are we looking at, Commissioner Taylor?

23 MR. TAYLOR: 111, page 111.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is this one of the revisions that we made for the Agenda?

2 MR. DELAGE: Let me double check.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Check on the acreage.

4 MR. DELAGE: I would need to go back to double check the email to see if that  
5 was one of the -

6 MR. TAYLOR: I apologize, I didn't print the correction so it may be corrected, but.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: When we checked it against the GIS did it show 111  
8 acres?

9 MR. TAYLOR: This was the packet that was delivered [inaudible].

10 MR. DELAGE: So according to the application it's 111.41, so we'll make a note to  
11 change that.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. It matches GIS.

13 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sorry. That is correct.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This is a public website by the way that I use. If you like  
15 maps then have fun, richlandmaps.com. Okay, we're gonna move on to Case Number  
16 12., home stretch everyone, thanks for hanging in. Case 25-004 MA. Back to Staff

17 **CASE NO. 25-004 MA:**

18 MR. DELAGE: Alright, the Applicant for this case is Carol Crooks. The requested,  
19 or the current zoning is AG and the parcel is 10.55 acres. The requested zoning is HM.  
20 It's located at 624 Langford Road. Tax map number R20600-01-04 and it is a portion of  
21 the property that is being requested to rezone. The Comprehensive Plan designates this  
22 as neighborhood medium density on the future land use map. The proposed rezoning is  
23 inconsistent with the objective for the neighborhood low density which recommends low

1 density housing developments within these areas. The proposed request does not meet  
2 the density recommendations of the neighborhood low density designation.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, any questions for Staff?

4 MR. DURANT: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

6 MR. DURANT: Staff, just a quick question. The parcel that we're looking at is the  
7 same as the adjacent parcel [inaudible].

8 MR. DELAGE: Yes, so looking at it there is surrounding it some AG parcels in the  
9 immediate area and then there is also HM. Just quickly wanna note to kinda similar to  
10 the case on Sandfield, we're fairly close. The Langford Road acts as a dividing line  
11 between future land use classifications, kinda similar to, or like the Sandfield Road –  
12 sorry, it's been a long night – you know, kinda falls under that density recommendation.  
13 And based off of the proposed HM District it wouldn't meet the request, or excuse me,  
14 the proposal for higher density that's called in the Comp Plan. So I just wanted to point  
15 that out.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, the shapes differ from our map on page 126 from the  
17 GIS.

18 MR. DELAGE: Yes, so the portion of that is being rezoned is that southern  
19 parcel. It is part of a larger tract but the parcel to the north is not part of the request. But  
20 it is currently one parcel.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Also not the part that touches Wade Kelly Road? According  
22 to the map on the left of the screen?

1 MR. DELAGE: Yes, that is correct. Sorry, my mic was not on, sorry. Yes, that's  
2 correct.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other questions for Staff, Commission?

4 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

6 MR. SIERCKS: Question for Staff. Could you point out on the map that's  
7 currently up which parcels in the immediate surrounding area are currently zoned as  
8 HM, just cause some of the colors are kinda running together on my map or are a little  
9 had to differentiate?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I would have the same question. Thank you, Commissioner  
11 Siercks.

12 MR. DELAGE: And Mr. Smith is clicking on some of the parcels to kind of show  
13 the different zoning designations now. So it looks like to the north you're looking at HM  
14 and then there's some kinda south, or where his marker is it's showing the RT District.  
15 And then that parcel that was just highlighted to the, kinda north, northeast is HM as  
16 well. And looks like the parcel that kinda completes the block is also zoned HM to the  
17 south.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, do we know which map is slightly more current when  
19 we look at these? Cause the one in our packet seems to have different colors than the  
20 one on the map, the Richland map. Unless I'm looking at it wrong.

21 MR. TAYLOR: Actually the one on the left of the screen seems to have different  
22 too, [inaudible]. Maybe it's me but that looks, it [inaudible].

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, that's what I'm seeing.

1 MR. DELAGE: Yeah, we can, we can go back and double check it. If, I don't  
2 have access to our Planning drive where I can pull up our scanned zoning maps but  
3 based on – I'd have to double check the acreage – but depending on what the acreage  
4 is, and it could, maybe it could be the color on here too, just in how it's showing up, but  
5 it's hard to say. I can say I have trouble sometimes, you know, looking at the different  
6 similar shades of green when it comes to the AG, HM and then the RT districts.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So basically in this triangle of road we're looking at what is  
8 AG and they wanna go to HM and everything else around it is already HM, am I right,  
9 inside of the triangle of road?

10 MR. DELAGE: So it looks like – can you click on the parcel to the east that's the  
11 point, cause that looks like that's an RT, yeah. So based on the acreage, yeah that'd be  
12 an RT District, and then you said the parcel that kinda creates the remainder of the  
13 block so the one to the south just below where the cursor is? Yes, so that would be the  
14 HM District, so the, the requested zoning would be consistent with that.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, any other questions or comments before  
16 we go to the public? Alright hearing none and wanting to keep us moving,  
17 Commissioner Grady go ahead.

18 MR. GRADY: First person signed up to speak is the Applicant, Carol Crooks.

19 **TESTIMONY OF CAROL CROOKS:**

20 MS. CROOKS: Hi. I'm Carol Crooks and I live at 651 Langford Road in  
21 Blythewood. I live directly across the street from that triangle. The home that's HM right  
22 above it, that's me. I have owned this property since I was 18 years old and it was  
23 always my intention, I've never sold an inch of any of it, to use it for retirement. And I

1 was kinda blindsided by the AG zoning, I didn't really see it coming, this was RU before.  
2 And I just, the only thing I wanna sell is the 10.55 acres. I've actually already sold,  
3 cause the maps are a little different because where it says site on the one to the left, I  
4 sold 1.33 acres, of course I had it surveyed out before this happened to me. All I'm  
5 looking to do is divide the 10 ½ acres I've got left into three, 2 acre parcels and one  
6 larger parcel which would be directly across the street from my house which I would not  
7 sell. And I live across the street from it, I want it to look nice. I put restrictions on the  
8 1.33 acres for minimum square footage, I'd do the same for the other three parcels. I  
9 don't even wanna sell them all at once, I just wanna sell them one at a time as I need  
10 funding to do repairs to my house or whatever I need money for. I'm not a developer,  
11 I'm just somebody that got kind of in a strange situation with this whole AG because my  
12 two parcels were tied together for tax purposes and they ended up there are 34.25  
13 acres together and I think the trigger for AG was 34. So that's the situation I'm in. I'm  
14 just asking for it to go to what is consistent with what's around it, as you guys have  
15 already noticed yourselves without me even having to point it out, so. I think that's pretty  
16 much, sums up what I have to say. So thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Perfect timing. Thank you.

18 MR. GRADY: Alright, next up we have Lance Hayman.

19 **TESTIMONY OF LANCE HAYMAN:**

20 MR. HAYMAN: How y'all doing? I'm actually here, I didn't know what was going  
21 on. Me and my wife actually, well excuse me, I'm Lance Hayman, 182 Lambert Lane,  
22 Blythewood.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

1 MR. HAYMAN: Me and my wife were actually the family couple that bought the  
2 acreage from Ms. Crooks. So we just saw the sign, didn't know what was going on,  
3 figured we needed to be here to find out what was going on. So that's why I'm here. So,  
4 that's it.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Would you say you're in favor or against?

6 MR. HAYMAN: In favor. In favor. Of course, in favor.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Very good. Thank you.

8 MR. GRADY: Alright, we also have April Hayman.

9 MR. HAYMAN: That was my wife, she's already gone.

10 MR. GRADY: She's gone, okay.

11 MR. HAYMAN: Yes.

12 MR. GRADY: Next we have T.J. and Kim Lancaster?

13 **TESTIMONY OF T.J. LANCASTER:**

14 MR. LANCASTER: I'm T. J. Lancaster, I live at 641 Langford Road, Blythewood,  
15 South Carolina. Carol's my neighbor, I live directly across the street from the property in  
16 question and I'm in favor of her being able to get this proposed zoning change. That's it.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

18 MR. GRADY: Last person we have signed up, Toby Wood or Ward?

19 **TESTIMONY OF TOBY WARD:**

20 MR. WARD: I won't give you a long old lawyer introduction. There are two  
21 contiguous parcels in the triangle –

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We need a name and address again.

1 MR. WARD: I am Toby Ward, 3012 Glenwood Place. Two contiguous parcels in  
2 the triangle, one's HM, one's RT. We now know that the piece, the 1.33 where it says  
3 site I believe is HM, too, or HM also. Four of the surrounding parcels are HM. Eleven of  
4 the surrounding parcels are RT. The zoning classification sought, that is HM, is actually  
5 less dense than the predominate RT zoning in the area. And less density, bigger lots is  
6 what everybody wants in this area. The site has public road frontage as you can see on  
7 both Langford Road and Roundtop Church Road, so it's got good access. Blythewood  
8 Fire Station and Langford Road Elementary are nearby so those services are readily  
9 available. The proposed rezoning should be recommended to Council because it is,  
10 actually HM is very low density as opposed to what is suggested which is low density or  
11 low intensity. So you know, we're seeking a down zoning. It's consistent with and less  
12 dense than what is recommended by the Comprehensive Plan, road and services are  
13 available, it's very low intensity, it won't generate significant traffic. I think seven units is  
14 what Staff said would be the max. So we would ask you to send this forward to County  
15 Council with a recommendation in favor of the rezoning. Thank you very much.

16 MR. GRADY: Alright, that's all we have to speak on this case.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Commission, open on the floor for discussion or  
18 motions. Questions for Staff as well. Staff, the threshold for AG to HM, correct me if I'm  
19 wrong, wasn't it 35 acres?

20 MR. DELAGE: That's correct.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. What's the acreage on this property?

22 MR. DELAGE: It is 34.42.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Somehow it became AG. Maybe it rounded up?

1 MR. DELAGE: That is a potential. Also some of the, I'll have to go back and look  
2 at the exact provisions cause it is close enough, but I just received some information;  
3 one action that Planning Commission could take because of the fact that we wanna  
4 verify the acreage to see if it is incorrectly listed, you could always defer the case to  
5 next month and we could always confirm that it is an error that somehow either it  
6 rounded up, you know, by accident, so that's an option. It is really up to y'all but I would  
7 offer that, that would give Staff time to verify to go back to look at the language that was  
8 proposed for the remapping, that criteria, and also just to verify that if there was an  
9 acreage error that it's not already zoned something else.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Will that provide any benefit for the Applicant?

11 MR. DELAGE: Regardless of, you know, the outcome, you know, it still allows  
12 them the opportunity to come forth, you know, under, and request that zoning district if  
13 it's deferred. There's the provision where it was a free rezoning if, you know, you're AG  
14 going to RT, HM, with it and that is from March 1 to last one year. This is already in the  
15 pipeline so that would not effect that in any kind of way, shape or form. Best case  
16 scenario the, you know, we come to find out it was a mistake and it's actually zoned  
17 something else based on the acreage, which would potentially be HM cause that would  
18 be the next step down, so that would mean that it would make the rezoning not  
19 necessary if that's the case.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Which path is easier for the Applicant?

21 MR. DELAGE: I guess it just depends on how much of a, you know, hurry they're  
22 in. The easiest thing is is that Staff should be able to verify the acreage pretty quickly,  
23 you know, that being a couple of days. I don't wanna promise anything just in case

1 there's something really weird with the acreage and we have to do a lotta digging with  
2 the Register of Deeds and stuff like that, but, or the Assessor's Office, but you know,  
3 that could be found out fairly quickly. You know, if they get deferred a month, you know,  
4 it's basically turning a three month process into a four month process, but it wouldn't  
5 necessarily, again, prevent them from continuing on with the map amendment if they're  
6 deferred.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. I usually don't do this to my Commission  
8 but I would just make a motion of approval. I know it goes against the Comp Plan but if  
9 the acreage, being that close and hearing from the direct neighbors the Chair would  
10 make a motion for approval. Do I have a second?

11 MR. DURANT: Second.

12 MR. METTS: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, I got a second from – I heard you even though I  
14 saw you so I'll just give it to Durant, Commissioner Durant. And let's just take a vote. It's  
15 not hasty, I actually feel this way about this property, so go ahead Staff, this would be a  
16 recommendation of approval.

17 MR. DELAGE: Alright, Frierson?

18 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

19 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

20 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

21 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

22 MR. METTS: Aye.

23 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

1 MR. GRADY: Aye.

2 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

4 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

5 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

6 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

7 MR. DURANT: Aye.

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

10 MR. DELAGE: Alright, it is unanimous for approval.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Maybe make a note for County Council of the acreage.

12 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

14 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor?

16 MR. TAYLOR: I just wanna make sure I understood what was being said about  
17 the deferral. If it was determined that it was erroneously classified or, is that what we  
18 were trying to determine, that based on acreage it could've been possibly erroneously  
19 classified?

20 MR. DELAGE: That's correct. So just to kinda add on to that, so if Staff, let's just  
21 say this week goes on and finds out that there was some kinda error that would change  
22 the zoning classification, we would just not include it on the Zoning Public Hearing and

1 inform the Applicant. But I don't think necessarily you did wrong by making a motion, or  
2 taking action on it because Staff will still look into it before the Zoning Public Hearing.

3 MR. TAYLOR: But I guess my question is if the Applicant didn't have to apply,  
4 was there a fee for her to apply?

5 MR. DELAGE: No, sir. So if it was submitted within that year timeframe from  
6 March 1 of 2024 to March 1 of 2025, it's a free rezoning if you are an AG, HM or RT and  
7 you're requesting one of those other districts, so.

8 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, in regards to that did everyone get in that you've  
10 heard from with March 1 being our next meeting? Or does that mean this period has  
11 come to a close?

12 MR. DELAGE: So it will for the free rezonings, however, that would not mean that  
13 County Council could not, you know, potentially vote to extend that or reinstate that at  
14 some point in the future. So I am getting an update from the Deputy Director that it,  
15 based off of the fact that the zoning maps are officially adopted even if it was, you know,  
16 in error based on the acreage that they would still need to go through the full process of  
17 going through the rezoning. So, my apologies for the confusion.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] made our, our motion today so.

19 MR. DELAGE: Correct, so they have not delayed it.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

21 MR. WARD: Mr. Chair, if I may be heard on one point?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thirty seconds, go ahead.

23 MR. WARD: Oh, it'll be quicker than that.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead.

2 MR. WARD: It's my understanding under the state ordinance, state law, that if  
3 you had deferred it it would go forward as recommended approval because you don't  
4 have the authority to hold things back on a deferral. So I think you did the right thing,  
5 thank you very much.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

7 MR. WARD: [Inaudible] 30 seconds.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, you did great. Okay, Case Number 13., who's been  
9 holding out waiting for us? Wave? Ready for 13?

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, I am.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you for your patience, sir. Alright, we are  
12 gonna get rolling on this one so it's Case 25-005. Going to Staff.

13 **CASE NO. 25-005 MA:**

14 MR. DELAGE: So the Applicant is Michael Schroeder. The parcel is located at  
15 520 Todd Branch Drive. Tax map number R17115-01-18. It is 3.8 acres. The existing  
16 zoning is R3. The proposed zoning is the R4 District. It is located in the neighborhood  
17 medium density future land use map designation area. The proposed rezoning is  
18 inconsistent with the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. According to the Plan the  
19 primary use for this area is medium density residential neighborhoods designed to  
20 provide a mix of residential uses and densities within the neighborhoods. The requested  
21 zoning designation does not align with the existing zoning districts in the immediate  
22 area.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, questions for Staff?

2 Hearing none. Commissioner Grady.

3 MR. GRADY: Alright, so the only person signed up to speak is the Applicant,  
4 Michael Schroeder.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down.

6 **TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL SCHROEDER:**

7 MR. SCHROEDER: I was all nervous about public speaking again after so many  
8 years. I'm Michael Schroeder, 832 Drawdebil Road, Gilbert, South Carolina, way out in  
9 the middle of nowhere. My family has owned this particular piece of property since  
10 1971. When we purchased it it was zoned light industrial. And if you have the picture of  
11 the actual property you'll see a bunch of crap up there, that was the nicest euphemism I  
12 could give you for it right this moment. We've used it for various businesses over the  
13 years. At this point in time it doesn't make sense to continue running a business out of  
14 there as I'm out in Gilbert at this point in time. So we'd like to turn it into a single-family  
15 subdivision, single-family home, detached single-family home subdivision consistent  
16 with the rest of the neighborhood. The rest of the neighborhood is zoned R4. The two  
17 issues that we had are a, it runs into that flood plain although over the 40 or 50 years  
18 that we've owned it we've raised the property up by about 4', so we have to cross T's  
19 and dot I's on that, and also there is an unofficial easement on the far right hand side  
20 where it's, on the far right hand side is probably the easiest way to say it, right, yeah  
21 right next to that particular house, there's an unofficial easement down there that the R4  
22 designation will give us the ability to put three, possibly four, two-bedroom, two  
23 bathroom houses there that are not attached but relatively close together. And then the

1 parking lot for those three, possibly four houses can actually continue to be the  
2 easement back to Little Jackson Creek down there to give whoever manages Little  
3 Jackson Creek sewer system down there access. Everything we're trying to do is  
4 consistent with what the neighborhood is and we are the only, if you drive into that  
5 neighborhood you come down all the way into where we're at, we're the only business  
6 and vacant property in the entire area.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, sir. Thank you and thank you especially for your  
8 patience tonight. There's no one else signed up to speak.

9 MR. GRADY: That's correct.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, this is on the floor for discussion and  
11 questions for Staff.

12 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

14 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion to send Case 25-005 MA to County  
15 Council with a recommendation of approval. And the rationale for that being that the R4  
16 zoning designation is consistent with neighboring land uses.

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

18 MR. DURANT: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We got a second from Commissioner Durant. With that,  
20 Staff we're gonna take a vote for approval. Take it away.

21 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

22 MR. DURANT: Aye.

23 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

1 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

2 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

4 MR. DELAGE: Grady?'

5 MR. GRADY: Aye.

6 MR. DELAGE: Metts?

7 MR. METTS: Aye.

8 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

9 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

10 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

11 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

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

14 MR. DELAGE: Alright, the vote is unanimous for approval.

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

16 Recommendation of approval. February 25<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm. Who knew case 13 was gonna be  
17 so easy, could've moved it but we do take them as they come in to the Staff, so thank  
18 you again for your patience. Okay, so we can move along in our meeting now, this  
19 closes out b., well c. if it was corrected in the Agenda as it should be, Administrative  
20 Review, that was deferred or pulled out.

21 MR. DELAGE: That's correct.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This month. So that takes us to 6. Chairman's Report.  
23 Right?

1 MR. DELAGE: That's correct.

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Right? Okay. Oh, that's me. I'm honored to be your Chair  
3 again this year, thank you everyone. Thank you for your time you spend every month  
4 visiting properties and doing research. Again, you know, we're volunteers so thank you  
5 for your time away from your families late at night on a Monday and throughout the  
6 weeks that you spend to do your service to the County, so thank you. That's all the  
7 Chairman has today. We move on to 7., which is the Planning Director's Report. Mr.  
8 DeLage?

9 MR. DELAGE: So there are two items underneath here. The first item is just the  
10 Report of Council on their actions taken on the map amendments that y'all made  
11 recommendations on. And then the second part is the Comprehensive Plan update  
12 which Mr. Smith will be providing.

13 MR. SMITH: Sure, so the Comprehensive Plan, we've been doing a series of  
14 public engagements, last one being last week in the Ballentine area during a rezoning  
15 map amendment request town hall. We plan to have more public engagements coming  
16 up. We've collected a lotta data, we're supposed to have a team meeting this Thursday  
17 about those findings, potentially, and what those results may have produced. But at this  
18 time we don't have any specific days for any other public engagement, we should have  
19 more information for everyone by the next meeting. So we are ending our phase 1 part  
20 of the process, however, the surveys will remain open for additional comments and data  
21 to be acquired, but for the reasons of keeping things on track we have to start using the  
22 data that we've acquired throughout these other public engagements that we've done  
23 during phase 1. If you have any questions I'll be happy to answer them.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, questions? Thank you for your hard work on  
2 this. We look forward to helping out. Anything else from the Planning Director's Report?

3 MR. DELAGE: No, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Number 8., Other Items. Any other items to discuss?

5 MR. DELAGE: No, Mr. Chair, there are no other items for discussion.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, any other items to discuss? No? Except for  
7 number 9., which is Adjournment.

8 MR. DURANT: We don't have to discuss that.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We will take a vote for adjournment by a show of hands.

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

12 MR. DELAGE: Alright, it is a unanimous approval for adjournment.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank, you Staff. Thank you, Commission.  
14

15 *[Meeting Adjourned at 9:30pm]*