

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

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

Called to order: 6:09pm

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, are you ready?

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks. I'd like to call to order the March 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: Thank you. Staff, can you please take attendance for today's meeting?

MR. DELAGE: Alright, Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Duffy? Metts? Durant? Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

1 MR. SIERCKS: Here.

2 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

3 MR. GRADY: Here.

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

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Staff. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the  
6 March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2025 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning  
7 Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer our time  
8 to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council. Our  
9 recommendations are to approve or deny Zoning Map Amendment requests. Per Title  
10 VI, Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of Laws* Planning Commission may also prepare and  
11 revise plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of unincorporated  
12 portions of the County. Once again, we are a recommending body to County Council  
13 and they will conduct their own public hearing and take official votes to approve or deny  
14 map amendments and text amendments on a future date to be published by the County.  
15 Council typically holds Zoning Public Hearings on the fourth Tuesday of the month.  
16 Please check the County's website for updated agendas, dates and times. And please  
17 take note of the following guidelines for today's meeting. Please turn off or silence any  
18 cellphones. Audience members may quietly come and go as needed. Applicants are  
19 allowed up to two minutes to make comments. Citizens signed up to speak are also  
20 allowed two minutes each. Redundant comments should be minimized. Please only  
21 address remarks to the Commission and do not expect the Commission to respond to  
22 questions from the speaker in a back and forth style, that's not the purpose of the  
23 meeting. Please no audience/speaker exchanges. No audience demonstrations or other

1 disruptions to the meeting are permitted nor are comments from anyone other than the  
2 speaker at the podium. Please remember the meeting is being recorded. Please speak  
3 into the microphone and give your name and address. Abusive language is  
4 inappropriate and will not be tolerated. Please don't voice displeasure or frustration at  
5 the recommendation while the Planning Commission is still conducting business. If you  
6 have any questions or concerns you may contact the Richland County Planning Staff  
7 down below here. This'll moves us number 3 on our Agenda, which is Additions or  
8 Deletions. Are there any motions, Commissioners, for additions or deletions to the  
9 Agenda? Staff, are there any changes to the Agenda?

10 MR. PRICE: There will be a couple of edits throughout the Agenda but I think we  
11 can actually wait until we get to the individual cases for those.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay, we can move on then to Item 4. on the  
13 Agenda which is the Approval of Minutes. As we've been reviewing these we see this is  
14 the first half, it happened to stop at page 100. So can we go ahead and approve partial  
15 Minutes, Staff, what do we do with this? Or should we hold off till next month?

16 MR. PRICE: Go ahead and repeat that?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We noticed in our Minutes that it stopped at page 100, not  
18 at the end of the meeting. There would be more Minutes to follow.

19 MR. PRICE: Okay, sorry about that. That can probably just wait until next month.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Thank you, Staff. Okay, we'll move on to Item 5.  
21 then, which is our Consent Agenda. Typically I would take time to explain the Consent  
22 Agenda. We have people signed up to speak for every property tonight so we're only  
23 gonna use the Consent Agenda for Road Names. This allows us to quickly make a

1 motion and pass the Road Names. If I have a second the Chair would like to make a  
2 motion to pass along the Consent Agenda with just the Road Names on there. Yes,  
3 Commissioner Johnson?

4 MR. JOHNSON: On number 5, someone's in opposition or just for for number 5?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: There are many for number 5 in opposition, so even though  
6 the recommendation is compliant, yes, so that's why we need to pull it. Thank you. So  
7 we'll be talking about every case tonight. Okay, there's a motion on the floor to pass the  
8 Consent Agenda. Do we have a second?

9 MR. GRADY: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Grady. Staff, can you please  
11 take a vote?

12 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the Consent Agenda, Siercks?

13 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

15 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Grady?

19 MR. GRADY: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

21 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

23 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: The motion passes.

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

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you, Staff. We'll now get rolling to Item 5.b.,  
5 our Map Amendments for today. Case number one, I'll pass it over to Staff.

6 **CASE 25-006 MA:**

7 MR. PRICE: Okay. I think one of the things I'll start before I actually get into the  
8 case, I just wanna make sure we pointed out something that you may have noticed in  
9 this particular Agenda; that we don't reference Staff recommendations on these  
10 anymore. We've actually just, as you can see, re-identified this as just whether the  
11 request is in compliance or not complaint with the Comprehensive Plan. I think that  
12 kinda gives some clarity cause I think that at some point people were thinking that Staff  
13 was actually sitting down debating on whether a case should be approved, when  
14 everything that we base it on is really based on the Comprehensive Plan. And it's more  
15 of just a reminder to Planning Commission and also to County Council that this is what  
16 was adopted back in 2015 for these particular areas of the requests and we're just,  
17 again just a reminder of what the Comprehensive Plan, the future land use called for for  
18 that development of that area. And we just wanted to make sure that was understood  
19 that this isn't Staff, but it's just a reminder of what the Comprehensive Plan  
20 recommends.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price.

22 MR. PRICE: Okay. First case is Case 25-006 MA. The Applicant is Denise M.  
23 Canarella. The location is 1620 Dutch Fork Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone

1 1.65 acres from Residential Transition, RT, to General Commercial, GC. The request  
2 has been determined to be not compliant with the recommendations of the  
3 Comprehensive Plan. So just kinda going to the conclusion which is on page 5, that the  
4 proposed zoning again does not comply with the objectives of the neighborhood  
5 medium density designation in the Comprehensive Plan. The requested Map  
6 Amendment does not align with the non-residential guidelines and recommendations for  
7 this designation. The proposed zoning designation would encourage uses that are  
8 inconsistent with the Plan's recommendations. In addition although the subject site is  
9 located along a main road corridor it is not situated within a contextually appropriate  
10 distance from the intersection of a primary arterial as recommended by the Plan. I  
11 wanted to note that the majority of the parcels north of Dutch Fork Road are either  
12 zoned General Commercial or contain nonconforming commercial uses on parcels not  
13 designated for those uses. Approval of the requested zoning would create a designation  
14 compatible with adjacent zoning and allow uses consistent with those established on  
15 surrounding parcels.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, do we have any  
17 questions for Staff?

18 MR. TAYLOR: Question.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, Commissioner Taylor?

20 MR. TAYLOR: Just curious, when I was looking at the packet the, the tables are  
21 no longer in there, is that deliberate

22 MR. PRICE: Yeah, that was just, I'm sorry, that was a little oversight on our part.

1 MR. TAYLOR: Oh, okay. That's fine, just, I didn't know if we were changing that  
2 style cause -

3 MR. PRICE: No, that wasn't the intent. I will tell you that we were, at least I can  
4 speak from Staff, we got a little excited because we could actually print these and staple  
5 them. Our printer, once we go over 100 pages it doesn't and I couldn't figure it out until  
6 later after they had been delivered that I spoke to Chairman Yonke and I realized that's  
7 why it was so thin. But I apologize, but those will be a part of your package going  
8 forward.

9 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I think that's what might've happened with our Minutes as  
11 well.

12 MR. PRICE: I, I believe so, yes.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: With that I'm gonna go to Commissioner Frierson?

14 MS. FRIERSON: We have one person who is signed up to speak, the Applicant  
15 Denise Canarella.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down to the podium, please. Thanks.

17 **TESTIMONY OF DENISE CANARELLA:**

18 MS. CANARELLA: Thank you for looking at my case, and I wanna thank Jason  
19 Branham and the Richland County Planning Commission.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead and start with your name and address. And then  
21 you'll have two minutes. Go ahead.

22 MS. CANARELLA: Denise M. Canarella and my mailing address is PO Box 232,  
23 Irmo 29063. And this property in question is at 1620 Dutch Fork Road. And the reason

1 I'm asking for this rezone is to improve my property in order to develop it in the future. I  
2 believe it meets the necessary criteria to do so and hopefully it will fit in with the  
3 County's vision for this area. It will make it compatible with adjacent zoning and  
4 consistent with the current surrounding parcels and this is why I request it zoned  
5 General Commercial in order to move forward with developing my property. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Anyone else signed up to speak?

7 MS. FRIERSON: We have no other people signed up.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Commissioner Frierson. This is now open on the  
9 floor for discussion, Commission. And again, any questions for Staff. I have a question  
10 for Staff. These are rollover RTs I'm guessing from the old LDC?

11 MR. PRICE: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: As you look at the map it looks like that's what's going on in  
13 this area. Maybe we would be concerned about leapfrogging here? We do see General  
14 Commercial to the east.

15 MR. PRICE: There is General Commercial to the east and as stated previously  
16 there's a lot of non-conforming uses in the particular area, particularly those as  
17 everybody's looking kinda that green color but which is for Residential Transition that  
18 was formerly zoned Rural. As stated again these uses are nonconforming just basically  
19 because of the use that's on the property does not, is not allowed by that current zoning  
20 of it.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So the use does not conform to the RT?

22 MR. PRICE: Yes. So all, basically everything you see in the green in that general  
23 area of the request is not allowed under the RT.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We're missing some of the uses in our packet this week.

2 Would it be allowed in the GC?

3 MR. PRICE: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Thanks, Staff. Thoughts from the Commission?

5 Commissioner Grady?

6 MR. GRADY: Thank you. Hearing no other discussion I'd like to make a motion  
7 that we advance Case 25-006 MA to County Council with a recommendation of  
8 approval. The rationale being that the parcel in question is adjacent to other General  
9 Commercial properties and the change would change a nonconforming use to a  
10 conforming use.

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

13 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Got a second from Commissioner Taylor. Okay, with a  
15 motion and a second for approval, Staff can you please take a vote?

16 MR. PRICE: Those in favor of the motion for approval of Case 25-006 MA,  
17 Grady?

18 MR. GRADY: Aye.

19 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

20 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

22 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

1 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

3 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

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

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commission. Thank you, Staff. This goes to,  
10 recommendation to the County Council for approval, they will hear this at their next  
11 Zoning Public Hearing. Staff, what's the date on that one?

12 MR. PRICE: March the 25<sup>th</sup>.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: March 25<sup>th</sup>, that's usually a 7:00 meeting?

14 MR. PRICE: It is 7:00, yes.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: In these same, Council chambers. Thank you. We'll move  
16 on to our next case then. Case number two.

17 **CASE 25-007 MA:**

18 MR. PRICE: Okay, so the next item is Case 25-007 MA. The Applicant is Susan  
19 Clements. The location is 1531 Wash Lever Road. The Applicant is requesting to  
20 rezone 3 acres from Homestead designation which is HM, to Residential Transition, RT.  
21 It's been determined that the request is not compliant with the recommendations and  
22 objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed rezoning is not complaint with the  
23 rural large lot designation of the Comprehensive Plan and according to the Plan smaller

1 lot subdivisions are not an appropriate development type. The requested zoning allows  
2 from a minimum lot size that does not support the recommended or desired land uses  
3 for this designation. Additionally, the proposed Map Amendment is inconsistent with the  
4 residential agricultural guidelines and recommendations for this area. While the  
5 requested Map Amendment does not comply with the rural large lot designation  
6 recommendations, its approval would permit lot sizes and uses that are consistent with  
7 the character of the surrounding parcels.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, any questions for Staff?  
9 Hearing none, Ms. Frierson?

10 MS. FRIERSON: We have one person, the Applicant, Susan Clements.

11 **TESTIMONY OF SUSAN CLEMENTS:**

12 MS. CLEMENTS: Good evening. My name is Susan Clements and I'm at 1531  
13 Wash Lever Road, Little Mountain, South Carolina. And I'm here today to respectfully  
14 request an amendment to the zoning ordinance of my property with the goal of reverting  
15 that zoning designation from HM to RT. This request is deeply personal to me and my  
16 family. We've lived at this property for 20+ years and have always cherished the  
17 community and the surrounding area. Our goal, my husband and I, is to be able to  
18 provide a piece of our land to my son and his young family for them to build their home  
19 and live next to us. We hope to keep our family close and support one another. The  
20 land we are requesting to carve out is approximately 1 ½ acres, it is currently zoned HM  
21 and as I understand it from our survey request, the recent zoning that took effect last  
22 March now requires us to have the 1.52. And with our current property, our entire  
23 property only being 3 acres, that doesn't leave enough for us to split it evenly. So we

1 believe that reverting back to the RT would be more appropriate and in harmony with  
2 the surrounding properties which are primarily residential. Allowing this zoning change  
3 would not only facilitate the construction of a home for our son and his family, but it  
4 would also maintain the area's residential character and contribute to the community's  
5 overall wellbeing. In conclusion I just kindly ask the Commission to approve the zoning  
6 amendment for my property to allow us to break off this and gift it to my son. The  
7 request is in line with the overall character of the area and would have a positive impact  
8 on both our family and the community. Thank you very much for your time.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out tonight. Ms. Frierson, is there  
10 anyone else signed up to speak?

11 MS. FRIERSON: No, she's the only person.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Excellent, thank you. Okay Commission, this is now open  
13 on the floor for discussion.

14 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

16 MR. GRADY: Question for Staff on this. So the, I just want to make sure I have  
17 this right, so the future land use map designates this area as rural large lot, correct?

18 MR. PRICE: That is correct.

19 MR. GRADY: So the maximum allowable density in an RT is 1 unit per acre?

20 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

21 MR. GRADY: Perhaps I have not lived in a representative sample of places but  
22 an acre seems like a large lot to me. What is the minimum lot size required to count as  
23 large?

1 MR. PRICE: That's a good question. So I think one of the issues that, you know,  
2 again this is Staff and we look at these things, each request that comes in, is that we're  
3 still trying to, you know, prepare a Staff Report and determine compliance upon a  
4 Comprehensive Plan that was done in 2015. In the meantime we've adopted new a  
5 Land Development Code with new zoning designations, so this, a lotta times there's not  
6 a true mix or match for what is an appropriate zoning designation in these areas now.  
7 One of the things that we looked at when looking at what is a rural large lot is we look  
8 at, look at some of the recommendations for uses in those areas and so that kind of  
9 helps us determine what is large lots. And when you're talking about – when you're  
10 talking about a lot of agricultural uses, farms, you know, forests, those type uses, those  
11 are typically what you find on large tracts of land, not an acre, maybe not even an acre  
12 and a half, and to be honest with you it may not even be in a 3 acre tract which actually  
13 is our largest minimum in the AG. So just looking at those uses that's what we  
14 determine that the, in the rural large lot designation that you would need larger tracts  
15 that would support those particular type of uses. We're talking about, you know, again,  
16 agricultural, conservation, those type uses.

17 MR. GRADY: Alright, thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commission Grady, Staff. Other discussion or  
19 possible motions?

20 MR. JOHNSON: Question, Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price, in the previous case the, what appeared to be the  
23 trend in those areas that were trending toward General Commercial supported the

1 adjacent, [inaudible] make that change. In this case it seems like the predominance is  
2 the other way around in that the majority are HM. The ones, those parcels to the north  
3 and east that are RT, are those recent changes?

4 MR. PRICE: No, sir. A lot of these parcels we haven't, I don't think we've had any  
5 really, excuse me, any map amendment request for this particular area.

6 MR. JOHNSON: But then I would assume that based on the size of those parcels  
7 that's just a reflection of the transition in the adoption of the new Code on those  
8 equivalency tables and that's the reason?

9 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Now again, you know, just again for those who may not be  
10 familiar with it, you know, when we did the transition it was anything, any parcel that  
11 was 35 acres or larger became AG, less than 35 but at least 3 acres became HM, and  
12 the, you know, the less, any parcel that was less than 3 acres became RT, it was the  
13 RT designation so that's how these parcels came to be, the mixture you see of some  
14 AG and RT in this area.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anything else, Commissioner Johnson?

16 MR. JOHNSON: No, sir. He answered it.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Excellent. I notice in that explanation this one is definitely  
18 on the cusp, it's at the minimum there at 3, so it could've fell into either RT or HM. What  
19 does the GIS say when you click on the parcel? Three acres, 3 acres. Thank you.

20 MR. PRICE: Yeah, and I – I'll save that for another time, sorry.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay Commission, further discussion or motions?

22 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

1 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion that we advance Case 26-007 MA to  
2 County Council with a recommendation of approval. The rationale being that the RT  
3 designation is in keeping with the surrounding land uses in the area.

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

5 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second –

8 MR. JOHNSON: I do think it is important to put on the Record that the primary  
9 reason that it is not, does not already have that existing zoning is because of the size of  
10 that parcel.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, so could Commissioner Grady add that to his  
12 explanation since it's going against the Comp Plan?

13 MR. GRADY: Yes. So do I need to say the whole thing again?

14 MR. PRICE: If you don't mind.

15 MR. GRADY: Okay. I would like to move Case 25-007 MA to County Council with  
16 a recommendation for approval. The rationale being that the RT zoning designation is in  
17 keeping with surrounding land uses and that the parcel in question being 3 acres was  
18 essentially on the line between these two zoning categories during the last Land  
19 Development Code update.

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

21 MR. JOHNSON: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Johnson. Staff, with a second  
23 on this motion for approval can you please take a vote?

1 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the motion for approval of Case 25-007  
2 MA, Grady?

3 MR. GRADY: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

5 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

7 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

9 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

11 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

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

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commission. Thank you, Staff. This goes as a  
18 recommendation of approval. This will also be taken up at the March 25<sup>th</sup> County  
19 Council meeting, right Staff?

20 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Seven pm, Council chambers here. Thanks for coming out  
22 tonight for that. Okay, number 3. is deferred in our Agenda so we'll move on to Case  
23 number 4. And I'll flip it to Staff, go ahead.

1 **CASE NO. 25-009 MA:**

2 MR. PRICE: So the next item is Case 25-009 MA. The Applicant is Luella Martin  
3 Bolton. The property is located off of McCords Ferry Road. The Applicant is requesting  
4 to rezone 3 acres from Heavy Industrial, which is HI, to Residential Transition, which is  
5 RT. According to the Comprehensive Plan this requested zoning designation would be  
6 noncompliant with the recommendations of Comprehensive Plan as it does not align  
7 with the residential development goals of the conservation future land use designation.  
8 This designation along with the Cowasee Conservation Corridor of the Lower Richland  
9 Master Plan pushes for nonresidential uses and developments that protect and support  
10 the environmentally sensitive areas. The conservation designation discourages the  
11 subdivision of land for commercial and residential development. Furthermore, the  
12 proposed zoning designation would allow for development of lot sizes that conflict with  
13 the goals of both the conservation designation and the Cowasee, hopefully I'm saying  
14 that correctly, Conservation Corridor. It is important to note that the current Heavy  
15 Industrial zoning does not align with the development goals of the Comprehensive Plan  
16 or the Lower Richland Master Plan either. The majority of the area east of McCords  
17 Ferry is primarily zoned HI with some scattered residential uses and zoning. Approving  
18 the requested Map Amendment, even when considering the prior rezoning of  
19 neighboring properties, would not result in an immediate or significant shift in the area's  
20 overall zoning pattern or character. The predominant Heavy Industrial and  
21 nonresidential zoning and nonresidential development of the surrounding parcels will  
22 largely remain unchanged at this time.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. [Inaudible] questions for Staff,  
2 Commission? Commissioner Johnson, you're thinking about it.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Well, I don't think it changes the outcome of whatever our vote  
4 is but a legal matter, do we need to amend the Agenda [inaudible] Luella Martin Bolton  
5 [inaudible]?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, so we notice an error in our Agenda. So for the, with  
7 the case – no, Luella Martin Bolton and then Luella Martin Bolton – it's on both pages.  
8 What are we missing? Is this from the Agenda that's here in the room?

9 MR. PRICE: Oh, I'm sorry.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

11 MR. PRICE: I apologize. So you may have, I think you picked up one of the ones  
12 we had out there and we had to make some corrections on that, so I apologize for that.  
13 But she has, her name has been included on both the Agenda page and throughout the  
14 report.

15 MR. JOHNSON: I apologize.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Your attention to detail is great. Any other, any questions,  
17 comments? Alright, we'll go to Ms. Frierson then.

18 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, we have the Applicant, Mrs. Luella M. Bolton.

19 **TESTIMONY OF LUELLE M. BOLTON:**

20 MS. BOLTON: Oh, you ready for me?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, ma'am. Please start with your name and address.

22 MS. BOLTON: Yes, my name is Luella Martin Bolton and I have 3 acres of  
23 property joining International Paper. And I would like for my property to be split up into

1 three acres, I have children and grandchildren that I would like to, for them to build or  
2 put a trailer on or something like that. Now if you all don't approve it, I pay taxes on this  
3 property and I don't farm it so I wanna know, so you all are disapproving this? I, I'm not  
4 understanding.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No decision has been made yet, ma'am, it's just, it's  
6 according to Staff's review of the Comprehensive Plan it's not compliant. But that's what  
7 we're here to discuss today, to hear from you and to discuss. So yes, you still have  
8 another minute and a half if you wanna share about your property.

9 MS. BOLTON: I, I've already said I think what I had to say, that I would like for  
10 my property to be residential and that's about it.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Back to Staff, do we need the exact address?  
12 Did you get that from her?

13 MS. BOLTON: It's off McCords Ferry Road. I don't know what the address is.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Does that work? Okay, thank you. Okay Ms. Frierson,  
15 anyone else signed up to speak?

16 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

18 MR. PRICE: If I'm correctly hearing, so this particular parcel doesn't have an  
19 address at this time yet. It's just, it's east/south of McCords Ferry Road.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

21 MR. PRICE: But I believe when the applicants come before you you're asking  
22 them to give their name and their actual address where they live at the time or maybe

1 even a business address, not necessarily the address of the site if that's now where  
2 they currently reside.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. Okay, I'll specify, what is your address, like your  
4 mailing address?

5 MS. BOLTON: My mailing address is PO Box 349, Hopkins, South Carolina  
6 29061.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you so much.

8 MS. BOLTON: Is that it?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That is it, yes.

10 MS. BOLTON: May I ask one more, do I have a little bit more time? So if this  
11 don't get approved what do I do next?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead, Staff.

13 MR. PRICE: If it doesn't get – we'll be happy to talk to her about the next steps  
14 after this particular meeting.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

16 MR. PRICE: And I think maybe you can explain to her that, what you as a body,  
17 what you are doing as far as making a recommendation.

18 MS. BOLTON: And I'm also landlocked, too.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I see that. We'll move on to our next speaker.

20 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, the next person is Erin Capers.

21 **TESTIMONY OF ERVIN CAPERS:**

22 MR. CAPERS: Good evening. I am Ervin Capers and I request that you approve  
23 the request to rezone.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What's your address?

2 MR. CAPERS: Oh, Ervin Capers, 203 Gayfield Road, Eastover which is adjacent  
3 to the property that's in question now.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

5 MR. CAPERS: The reason I request that you approve it is because I own 203,  
6 200, 217 and 213 and plus an additional 9 acres which is all in that same area right  
7 there. I had 213 and 203 rezoned a year, a little over a year ago to residential to be able  
8 to allow me to be able to build me a home and put up a shop. So by approving hers  
9 that's just gonna enhance my agenda to get my other 10 acres that I have approved for  
10 residential cause I have four boys, 12 grands, so I wanna be able to split that up cause  
11 they've all expressed interest in building their home down there. So if hers gets  
12 approved that's residential, then hopefully that would enhance my ability to get the rest  
13 of my land approved, for instance, cause my land actually attaches to her land. Thank  
14 you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. And I take note, I do remember talking  
16 about this area in the past.

17 MR. CAPERS: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. Okay. Anyone else signed up to speak?

19 MS. FRIERSON: No, that's it.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay Commission, this is open on the floor for  
21 discussion and questions, again to Staff. I, again I'm a map guy by day and looking at  
22 the map this is an interesting area in the County. You look at the map on page 24 it is  
23 just a sea of purple, and then when you look at that conclusion from the Staff Report, it

1 almost contradicts, at least in my head. So the Heavy Industrial in this area, Staff, is not  
2 part of the Comp Plan, or it is? What do we wanna do with this southern tip of our  
3 County?

4 MR. PRICE: I think that would be determined as we go through the  
5 Comprehensive Plan update.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The 2025 Comp Plan update?

7 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So while it says noncompliant to the 2015, this is still a  
9 good chance to have discussion here.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, if Staff –

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson.

12 MR. JOHNSON: - could go back in, zoom back in again, please on that map?  
13 What we have in our package on page 24 versus what is shown on the screen, which is  
14 governing?

15 MR. PRICE: What you see on page 24. We took note that Mr. Capers' property  
16 that he just spoke about was coming up as Heavy Industrial, but that is actually  
17 incorrect, his property has, was rezoned previously I believe to RT. Yes, sir, so again  
18 what you see on page 24 of your package is the correct map for that area.

19 MR. JOHNSON: And then the parcel in-between what the gentleman that spoke  
20 and the subject parcel, is that under common ownership between one of them?

21 MR. PRICE: It's shown as being owned by the Estate of Martin Rubin. So it's not.  
22 So you know, I'll kinda chime in a little bit here, Tommy if you'd zone back out. You  
23 know, one of the things that we always talk about, and I was expecting the Chair to

1 actually take this lead, but you know, applying the designations of the Comprehensive  
2 Plan, you know, to our future land use maps, it's kinda broadly painted in those areas.  
3 And so you know, they don't go parcel by parcel or, you know, to be very specific as to  
4 what the use is occurring. And as you can see everything along that section off of  
5 McCords Ferry, I guess east of McCords Ferry by the Wateree River, a lot of industrial  
6 uses. And so I'm sure during that time when, you know, application of the designations  
7 that may, excuse me, during the rezonings back in '78 cause I'm pretty sure that's  
8 probably when all of this occurred, that Heavy Industrial was the appropriate use to  
9 place on that, in this area. However, during the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan,  
10 the current Comprehensive Plan back in '15, this area fell under a designation that does  
11 not support the Heavy Industrial uses. So this is a, this is one of those times where it  
12 gives us a chance to go back and revisit and look, and make a determination as to  
13 actually what is the most appropriate designation for this area. And this is probably  
14 something that the Planning Commission, and we'll probably bring back before you as  
15 we go back and examine areas and apply new future designations under our  
16 Comprehensive Plan update, or Comprehensive Plan 2025 update.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Can you zoom out even more? Thank  
18 you. I was looking for that recent solar farm development.

19 MR. PRICE: Right there.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Um-hum (affirmative). You can zoom back in. Commission,  
21 questions, motion?

22 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady.

1 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion to advance Case 25-009 MA to  
2 County Council with a recommendation for approval. The rationale being that there are  
3 residential uses in the vicinity of the parcel in question and that an RT designation is  
4 certainly more in keeping with conservation than Heavy Industrial.

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

6 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Taylor. Okay with a motion  
8 and a second for approval, Staff please take a vote.

9 MR. PRICE: Sorry about that. We have a motion for the approval of Case 25-009  
10 MA. Those in favor, Grady?

11 MR. GRADY: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

13 MR. SIERCKS: Nay.

14 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

15 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

19 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

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

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you Staff and Commission. That's for approval and  
4 will this one also be taken up at the March 25<sup>th</sup> County Council meeting, Staff?

5 MR. PRICE: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, 7:00. For those who came out for this one, thank  
7 you so much. We can now move on to Case number 5. for tonight and I'll flip it back to  
8 Staff.

9 **CASE NO. 25-010 MA:**

10 MR. PRICE: Our next item is Case 24-017 MA. The Applicant – I'm sorry, as I  
11 stated earlier there would be a couple of corrections needed so in your package on  
12 page 27 it states that it's case 24-017 MA. It's actually 25-010. Okay, the Applicant is  
13 Jared Munneke, hopefully I'm saying that correct. The location is 1401 Shop Road. The  
14 Applicant is requesting to rezone 22.35 acres from Heavy Industrial, HI, to Residential  
15 6, R6. The requested zoning designation would be in compliance with the  
16 recommendations and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan as it supports residential  
17 development within the mixed residential high density future land use designation. This  
18 designation encourages a mix of residential uses and supportive services. And while  
19 this location of the subject parcel does not fully conform to the Plan's preferred  
20 development pattern, which calls for high density residential uses near or within activity  
21 centers, approval of this Map Amendment would allow for uses that are consistent with  
22 existing multi-family developments along this section of Shop Road. It's important to  
23 note that the current Heavy Industrial zoning does not align with the development goals

1 of the mixed residential high density designation. Industrial uses that are permitted in  
2 the HI zoning district where significant community impacts meaning noise, exhaust  
3 odor, heavy truck traffic are discouraged.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, any questions for Staff?  
5 Just a fun fact, this is the old newspaper.

6 MR. PRICE: The old *State Newspaper*, yes, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you. I'll flip over to Commissioner Frierson.

8 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, I'm not sure about the pronunciation of the last name but  
9 Jared, is it Munneke?

10 **TESTIMONY OF JARED MUNNEKE:**

11 MR. MUNNEKE: Thank you, Commissioners. As noted I am Jared Munneke. I  
12 represent Landmark Properties as a leading developer of housing across the country.  
13 We are at 3060 Peachtree Road NW, Atlanta, Georgia 30305. As noted we're  
14 requesting a downzone from the HI zoning to our R6. You know, there's really a few key  
15 reasons for that; it is in compliance with the future land use Comprehensive Plan here.  
16 Beyond the Comprehensive Plan we also feel that this is gonna serve as a great  
17 accessory use to the stadium project investment that USC's making in this area as well.  
18 They have great ambitions of making this more of an entertainment and housing  
19 focused district rather than the current industrial district that it somewhat is. And this  
20 also aligns with some of the current housing focused developments that have already  
21 been in place on Shop Road and surrounding areas. So we feel that the rezone is  
22 appropriate for that reason. Additionally, this parcel is, everyone in this room probably  
23 knows has sat vacant for several years. The impression we get is that it's simply too

1 large for an industrial use and that a residential use is a more appropriate space, is a  
2 more appropriate use of the acreage here for residential uses compared to the industrial  
3 use. And the current owner of the site has been marketing it as a residential  
4 development because they've had a lack of success marketing it for industrial re-use.  
5 Finally, you know, we've had the chance to talk with a few of our adjacent property  
6 owners. We've had a chance to attend a town hall meeting hosted by Councilwoman  
7 English and, you know, we were pleased to hear that folks were generally ambivalent or  
8 in favor of the project. We do understand that there's some folks here tonight who'd like  
9 to talk about making sure that Shop Road gets the much needed facelift it deserves and  
10 we hope that our development would bring light to those issues as well. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

12 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, next we have Layton Lord.

13 **TESTIMONY OF LAYTON LORD:**

14 MR. LORD: Thank you. Layton Lord, I'm counsel for the developer, Landmark  
15 Properties. I live at 2416 Terrace Way, Columbia, South Carolina. This property as  
16 Jared just mentioned doesn't work for HI, it's not consistent with the area. It's too big for  
17 the types of small shops that Shop Road has been known for and it's too small for a  
18 large industrial tract that Mr. Price said would probably be inappropriate for the area. So  
19 we think it's very consistent with the trend. Housing has continued to grow around the  
20 stadium. There's The Gates, there's The Row, and now this property; it's the perfect  
21 size for high density housing which is consistent with the Comprehensive use. We have  
22 talked to several of the neighbors who are not in the residential world; one of them Hood  
23 Construction, the other Doc's Barbeque, and they said they would welcome this use.

1 They see this use coming to their neighborhood. And their main concern is they don't  
2 want this property to be vacant forever. And it's a tough property, it's got environmental  
3 issues that Landmark's gonna take care of and we think it's perfect for this, for this  
4 project. So we think it's gonna enhance the area, not be a detriment to the area at all.  
5 And I wanna re-emphasize that those who would like Shop Road to be improved, we're  
6 on their side, we'd like it to be improved, too. And that would only enhance everything  
7 that's going on in that area. So that's it. We're here for any questions that you have.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you so much. Commissioner Frierson?

9 MS. FRIERSON: Okay next we have Jennifer Boone Donnelly.

10 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff?

12 MR. PRICE: While she's coming to the podium, we just ask that you note on  
13 page 29 of your Agenda that there is a planned road widening project improvement for  
14 this section of Shop Road through DOT, but there is no anticipated completion date.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So the Richland Penny Program?

16 MR. PRICE: Correct.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. Hi. Please state your name and address.

18 **TESTIMONY OF JENNIFER BOONE:**

19 MS. DONNELLY: Hi. My name is Jennifer Boone and I'm the president of R.R.  
20 Donnelly at 1210 Key Road, Columbia, South Carolina 29201. I'm not necessarily here  
21 to dispute the zoning change from high industrial to residential. My concern is to go on  
22 Record about easement concerns that I have. RRD is adjacent to the property, to the  
23 west and actually to the north also. It wraps around our facility. When the facility was

1 built in 1981 we were actually owned by *The State Newspaper* and called State Printing,  
2 and that road, there's a dual lane road that splits between our property and the 1401  
3 property. And it was established to accommodate the industrial access needed for both  
4 facilities, so when we were sold by *The State Newspaper* in 1986, we were given  
5 easement rights to that two-lane road and the service road that's behind the building. So  
6 for us our concern is that that is not a public road and it's technically on that piece of  
7 property and we just wanna make sure that that road is able to stay there because it is  
8 actually the only access to the east side of our facility. So if part of the development  
9 plans was to take that road out between Shop Road and Bluff Road we would lose  
10 access to our shipping docks.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Staff, can you comment on that? Where do  
12 easements come in when we look at map amendments?

13 MR. PRICE: They shouldn't come in this particular case. What we're looking at  
14 now is the appropriateness of that zoning designation in that particular area. During any  
15 plan submittal that may come in between County Staff review along with any reviews  
16 that may be done by the Department of Transportation, it will be determined the  
17 appropriateness of access points. And also if not then, this also sounds like this one  
18 may be something to be worked out between the owners of the property that's before  
19 you today and the adjacent property that was just referenced just now. But as far as  
20 what you have before you today that's not something that Planning Commission will be  
21 taking up.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So as far as we are concerned with the zoning if a parcel  
2 anywhere is changed that does not affect the easement. Is that something that's taken  
3 up between the landowners?

4 MR. PRICE: Yes. Again, we don't have the easement language before us so  
5 something that we normally take up regarding this – again, those things may come  
6 about during site plan submittal.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, any questions for Staff on this? No? Okay.  
8 We'll move on to the next speaker. Thank you.

9 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, the next person is Gene Washington.

10 **TESTIMONY OF GENE WASHINGTON:**

11 MR. WASHINGTON: Good evening. I'm Gene Washington, 1219 Old Bluff Road.  
12 My property's on the front side of the National Park. But this is in reference to the Shop  
13 Road location. I think that's one of the, one of the greatest historical buildings we  
14 probably have in the area. I think it should be, you know, stay with the zoning that it has.  
15 I'm into organic farming, biofield research where I design a model for the 22,000  
16 students in Richland County, so you know, I'm for like redevelopment. And keeping it  
17 zoned as is for an incubator and as far as bringing tourism and agriculture back to the  
18 City. I worked on the board, I was on the board [inaudible] Board when the Palmetto  
19 Institute came on some years ago and it was agriculture and tourism. So this would be a  
20 great example for South Carolina to be like the leading force and to bring in not just the  
21 building back but the students, the community that, where you're training the kids in my  
22 opinion to be like small pharmacists, if you please. And this is, you know, what I'm  
23 speaking of is how we share information, you know, we're not sharing information on

1 the frequency that our kids are in place right now. So you know, we're talking about  
2 development and incubator for the kids. I just took a bus load of kids to the University of  
3 Georgia agriculture health and science class. I called the president up and asked them  
4 to host my program, so we did that, it was very successful so as far as, like setting up  
5 labs it's what we need and it would be a great location for that. And shortly even more  
6 so –

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Give me your final thoughts, sir. I'm sorry, that's your time.

8 MR. WASHINGTON: No problem. I would say, like as far as being a visionary,  
9 being able to work with the planning board, if the pandemic or another situation, health  
10 situation comes like that then we're gonna need, like a hospital or something related to  
11 that to be able to offset what's coming if the planning board is not entertaining anything.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good idea, sir, thank you.

13 MR. WASHINGTON: Yes, sir.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright.

15 MS. FRIERSON: Next we have Bill Yarborough.

16 **TESTIMONY OF BILL YARBOROUGH:**

17 MR. YARBOROUGH: Good evening. My name is Bill Yarborough, I live at 1085  
18 Shop Road, The Gates at Williams Brice. And I wanna make sure everybody  
19 understands my position as I welcome this development. I think it's good, I think it's  
20 good neighbors. I think to get rid of a vacant building and have it full of lively, you know,  
21 young folks is a good thing. We've had that same experience with the other student  
22 housing, it was just, they've been good neighbors. I also had the occasion to be the  
23 HOA president of The Gates at Williams Brice when the other student housing was built

1 a couple of, five or six years ago. And our concern when that one was built was Shop  
2 Road, it's basically a two-lane road, no sidewalks, minimal lighting and you're dumping  
3 hundreds of, you know, kids on this road. So I was told at that time that Shop Road  
4 would be enhanced to five lanes, sidewalks on both sides and appropriate lighting, and  
5 the infusion of an efficient storm water system cause we have none now. And I was told  
6 that that was gonna happen when the other student housing was completed, you know,  
7 five or six years ago. Of course it has not. So you know, my concern and my personal  
8 desire is, you know, we welcome these people but let's don't put their young people on  
9 this two-lane road with no sidewalks as well. And somebody mentioned, this has been a  
10 Richland County Penny Tax Project for 10 years, I mean, it was on the very first list.  
11 And I think there was a list of priorities that came out the very first time and this section  
12 of Shop Road at that time was number 3 on the list. So you know, we just implore  
13 everybody, you know, to make this a priority and that's the end of my comments. Thank  
14 you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

16 MS. FRIERSON: Next we have T. Ward, I'm sorry I can't make out your first  
17 name.

18 **TESTIMONY OF TOBY WARD:**

19 MR. WARD: Good evening. I'm Toby Ward, 3012 Glenwood Place, and that  
20 writing is often a common complaint I hear. I apologize for that. I think you'll hear from  
21 the other speakers, too, that no one's opposed to this project. What they are concerned  
22 about and would like to enlist your support on is sending this recommendation forward  
23 for approval with a notation that all deliberates be applied to the, to the commencement

1 and completion of the Shop Road improvements. Right now Shop Road's just a minor  
2 arterial, two lanes with a turn lane as was mentioned, no sidewalk, no drainage, no  
3 lighting. Got a lotta kids there with The Row which I think is 500 beds, The Gates which  
4 is over 150 units, and this project which as the Staff pointed out could be as much as  
5 400 dwelling units. The, the traffic study that was done for The Row in 2017 mentioned  
6 in that study eight times, eight times that Shop Road was gonna be improved. That was  
7 2017, now it's 2025. Shop Road isn't improved. You might be interested to know that  
8 56% of pedestrians struck by vehicles in South Carolina are struck while walking,  
9 playing or riding. And that's what's gonna happen on Shop Road, so the people that I'm  
10 here on behalf of, we welcome this development to the neighborhood but we need the  
11 Planning Commission to suggest in the strongest possible terms to Council to please  
12 move forward with the Shop Road improvements. Thank you very much.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

14 MS. FRIERSON: The last person is Ken Spires.

15 **TESTIMONY OF KEN SPIRES:**

16 MR. SPIRES: Thank you. Ken Spires, 1085 Shop Road. I am presently president  
17 of our HOA at The Gates at Williams Brice and just like these other people before me,  
18 we're not opposed to the project but we've got a disaster in the making there. If you go  
19 on any day you can watch the young people walking, jogging, whatever it may be on  
20 Shop Road, no sidewalks, very hazardous conditions, the road itself has been  
21 deteriorating for some time. Even in your, the planning report, the summary, we've got,  
22 you know, a comment, 'The district is intended to provide good access and connectivity  
23 for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians. They obviously are thinking about it. And then in

1 the characteristics, there are no sidewalks along the section of Shop Road, Key Road or  
2 Northway Road. And then as previous speaker, if you look at the ADTs in the average  
3 of 2023 it was 11,400 with a capacity of a little bit over 14,000, which after this next  
4 project is built then obviously the capacity's gonna be, you know, approaching there or  
5 over so that is something else to consider. And again, there's a planned road widening  
6 project/improvement to this section of Shop Road through the South Carolina DOT with  
7 no anticipated completion date. So obviously you can see the common thing, the  
8 concern that we have, even from our standpoint as owners at The Gates, even entry  
9 onto Shop Road is getting tougher and tougher each day. But my concern, and  
10 especially seven days outta the year at football games, it truly, truly is a disaster waiting  
11 to happen. So with your recommendation going forward we would appreciate any help  
12 you can give us there.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

14 MR. SPIRES: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else, Ms. Frierson?

16 MS. FRIERSON: No, that's it.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, can you speak on the relationship of what we do here  
18 and DOT and Shop Road once again? I too, you know, I used to keep up with the old  
19 Richland Penny website until it went away. I know it was, what, 2012 the County  
20 approved that and I've been looking forward to Shop Road. But Staff could you share  
21 with the group what's going on there?

22 MR. PRICE: Yes, it is still on the web page. If you to Richland County  
23 Transportation, that is their page, and you can also, you can also see the projects that

1 they have planned for particular areas of the County. So according to the page they're  
2 looking to do improvements to widen Shop Road from, and Tommy if you can kinda  
3 show this, if you can use the measuring tool I guess that would help out, from George,  
4 near the George Rogers intersection on Shop Road and this will go all the way down to,  
5 I believe it's Bonnie Drive? Okay, well –

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: It's where it's four lanes?

7 MR. PRICE: It's going down that way. It'll be, yes, two lanes on each side and I  
8 believe it's stated a 13' median, of course, in the middle. No particular, no dates were  
9 established, dates of initiation or completion or projected completions. But it does seem  
10 like there is a, proposed improvements to this particular area of Shop Road.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Are there County meetings that the residents can  
12 participate in?

13 MR. PRICE: Yes. Yes, and you can also, and all of that information is on the web  
14 page as to when they have these meetings. And also residents can also call the  
15 Transportation Department to get additional information. I'm not sure if Ms. English, I  
16 believe she had a couple of meetings recently in her particular area in which she asked  
17 the director for the Transportation to come out and speak on some of the projects that  
18 were taking place, particularly down in that area. And also essentially how the Penny  
19 works, as they identify projects and what they will do. That may be something that, I'm  
20 not sure if she may do more of that and maybe some of the other Councilmembers may  
21 also kind of tag on and have more of those type meetings where not only  
22 Transportation, the Comprehensive Plan was discussed with the community just to

1 really kinda talk to them about the improvements in that area and also how we're  
2 projecting future development and growth.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Are there County Council committee meetings for the  
4 Richland Penny that are public or is that not?

5 MR. PRICE: They are, there are. We would have to, I would need to pull it up  
6 when they meet, usually the fourth, Ms. Williams is looking for that information right  
7 now.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do they take public participation in those meetings or?

9 MR. PRICE: Normally those meetings, no. Usually it's just for the meeting.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That would be the appropriate time to help with, move  
11 these projects along as someone who's looking forward to Shop Road improvements.

12 MR. PRICE: Right. Well I mean, you know, you could always reach out to your  
13 Council representative or to Councilmembers. Also each of the committees is  
14 composed of a chair and vice-chair and members of Council so you can reach out to  
15 them also to express, you know, whether it be your concerns or your wants for  
16 improvements in areas.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So a starting point for any concerned citizen would be the  
18 Richland County website under County Council.

19 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Well, they can go to Richland County Transportation to get  
20 as much information as they can. And I believe they have contact information also on  
21 that web page.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That took a lotta time. Commission, thoughts on the road  
23 component of this? Alright, this is open on the floor for discussion of the zoning.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson?

3 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, just referring back to your opening comments  
4 that you make at the beginning of each meeting as it relates to this body being a  
5 recommending body to Council, as it relates to the map amendments presented to us,  
6 that those matters, while we're concerned and sensitive, are outside the scope of what  
7 we can do. Those are beyond the scope of our recommendations.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. [Inaudible] say that on the mic, Commissioner Taylor?  
9 No, you're good.

10 MR. TAYLOR: Not really. Again, very similar to what Commissioner Johnson was  
11 saying, I don't even know if anything coming from us holds any extra weight that could,  
12 you know, I think what you are trying to allude to is the proper venues to go to to  
13 express those concerns. I don't know if, whether it's written or calling in or whatever you  
14 have to do or we have to do, cause again I think it's a concern of us as well to make  
15 sure DOT and the County Council addresses some of the concerns that are coming up  
16 with these new developments, up to and including even some of the, I understood the  
17 concern about the easements or whatever when some of these projects come in, but it's  
18 outside of our purview and [inaudible] recommendation.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. Okay Commission, let's  
20 get this open on the floor to discuss the zoning of it going from HI to R6, discussion or  
21 motions.

22 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks? How's it going down there?

1 MR. SIERCKS: Good. Just to be clear before I make any motion, this is project  
2 number 25-010 MA, correct?

3 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

4 MR. SIERCKS: Alright. I would move that we forward project number 25-010 to  
5 County Council with a recommendation of approval.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do I have a second?

7 MR. JOHNSON: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Johnson. Gotcha. We don't  
9 need a statement cause it's going with Staff's –

10 MR. PRICE: So typically whenever you go with Staff's, okay excuse me –

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Sorry, Comp Plan.

12 MR. PRICE: Typically before we go with you're in agreement with the  
13 Comprehensive Plan, so it's not Staff, Comprehensive Plan, you typically don't  
14 necessarily make any additional comments. But I guess, you know, just based on some  
15 of the conversation that you're having right now that doesn't mean that you can't make  
16 any comments. And I know Mr. Taylor expressed, you know, that concern, you know,  
17 whether it will fall on deaf ears, if I'm saying that correctly or not, but I still think it's  
18 important, again as the Planning Commission, as you, you know, you may come across  
19 some projects that you may wanna add some additional comments, just if nothing else it  
20 gets it on the Record, of some things that you may see and recommend to County  
21 Council.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So I guess as Chair I would say we're moving forward, we  
2 have a motion for approval and a second, and a little asterisk there is that we recognize  
3 Shop Road as a concern and that needs to be a priority for the Council to discuss.

4 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

6 MR. SIERCKS: To that end if there's any other comments that would need to be  
7 made to that or any other subject I can move to table the motion while those  
8 annotations are made.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, any other comments we wanna state to this  
10 one?

11 MR. TAYLOR: What was your annotation?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: To make sure that's focus, that there's concern about Shop  
13 Road and its priority on that list.

14 MR. TAYLOR: Because of the widening?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

16 MR. TAYLOR: Of Shop Road?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Um-hum (affirmative). As far as I understand, it being a  
18 Richland Penny Project, County Council may have some weight in that with their  
19 committees that they partake in.

20 MR. PRICE: Yes. And maybe I'll kinda offer this for what you're saying, that  
21 something along the lines of, with this approval you recommend that County Council  
22 look at making Shop Road a priority because with the introduction of the potential

1 number of students from this development along with what's currently there, that you  
2 feel that this should be a priority for improvements.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Siercks, you got that? Yeah, go ahead,  
4 restate.

5 MR. SIERCKS: Sorry, you wanna restate that? I'll –

6 MR. PRICE: If you just wanna take that as your motion -

7 MR. SIERCKS: Yeah, I'll adopt -

8 MR. PRICE: - we'll be able to –

9 MR. SIERCKS: - that language into my motion.

10 MR. PRICE: - we'll be able to add on to it.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright Commissioner Johnson, you still second?

12 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. With a motion and a second on the floor, Staff can  
14 you please take a vote? This would be for approval.

15 MR. PRICE: Okay. Alright, those in favor of the motion for approval of Case 25-  
16 010 MA, Grady?

17 MR. GRADY: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

19 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

21 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

23 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

2 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

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

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commission. Thank you, Staff. Again, this will  
9 be taken up March 25<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm, County Council chambers where you may have the  
10 opportunity to speak again and highlight your concerns with Shop Road. So please  
11 participate in your local government, it's great. Thank you. We can pause for a minute  
12 as many are trying to exit.

13 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, I think one of the things –

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff.

15 MR. PRICE: - you know, we may look or get with Director Williams on this, is that  
16 I think looking at next month's agenda if there's, you know, a few cases and we don't  
17 have any other items that we really need to take up that's gonna be a little time  
18 consuming, maybe we could invite our Director of Transportation to come in and just  
19 speak to you, you know, as a body, kinda give an overview that's similar to what's been,  
20 they've been doing out in the communities. Again, we can just look into that.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I think that's a great idea. Thank you, Mr. Price.

22 MR. PRICE: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'll flip it right back to you for number 6.

1 **CASE NO. 25-011 MA:**

2 MR. PRICE: Alright, our next item, our next item is Case 25-011. The Applicant is  
3 Mark James. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 5.93 acres from Agricultural district,  
4 AG, to Rural Crossroads district. The Comprehensive Plan identifies this as not being,  
5 as not being compliant with the objectives of the Plan for this area. One thing I wanna  
6 point out, it is a little error on page 37 of your package under the conclusion where,  
7 under the last sentence of the first paragraph where it states, the property lies one mile  
8 west of a rural activity center and is not contextually appropriate for the requested  
9 rezoning of General Commercial, that should actually be Rural Crossroads versus  
10 General Commercial. Alright, and I'll continue. Again, as stated the proposed rezoning  
11 is not compliant with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. The desired  
12 development pattern encourages commercial development to be located within rural  
13 activity centers. And as just previously stated the property lies one mile west of a rural  
14 activity center and is not contextually appropriate for the requested zoning of Rural  
15 Crossroads. In addition to the Comprehensive Plan the Lower Richland Community  
16 Strategic Master Plan does not support the type of developments associated with the  
17 requested zoning designation within the identified agricultural area. According to the  
18 Lower Richland Master Plan development within the agricultural areas should protect  
19 prime or farm lands, soils and soils of statewide importance, preserve existing  
20 farmlands for active agricultural use, promote farming as a viable occupation and a way  
21 of life for current and future generations, and expand the market for locally grown,  
22 locally produced goods. Approval of the requested map amendment will provide for an

1 intensity of uses and development that could be deemed to be incompatible and out of  
2 character with the current zoning, land uses and development patterns within the area.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Any questions for Staff? Commissioner  
4 Taylor?

5 MR. TAYLOR: Do we know how much, sorry, area the Lower Richland Plan  
6 covers?

7 MR. PRICE: I believe [inaudible]. I have Mark behind me, I'm sure he will correct  
8 me if I'm wrong in this, but looking back at the application of a master plan to an area  
9 that large did have Staff go back and revisit that. And so the criteria has changed to be  
10 more focused on the applications of master plans versus applying it to an area as large  
11 as what was previously shown to you. One of the biggest issues that we have seen, and  
12 I'm sure y'all may have observed this during previous map amendments for anything in  
13 the Lower Richland area, is a lot of times that the Lower Richland Master Plan is going  
14 to actually be, it's not gonna be complaint or not going to agree with the future land use  
15 map for that area. So there's a conflict sometimes with that, having a master plan that  
16 large.

17 MR. TAYLOR: Is it like a, did I read it right, was it like 195,000 acres, or what was  
18 it? I didn't, I saw you hover over it but I wasn't sure if that acreage was on there.

19 MR. PRICE: 195,645 acres.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's everything, yep.

21 MR. TAYLOR: You're right, that's everything.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, can you zoom the map out a little bit? Just the  
2 surrounding area [inaudible]. Does this fall within the military overlay that's included in  
3 the new Land Development Code?

4 MR. DELAGE: It would fall under some of the notification requirements, you  
5 know, as far for, with disclosure that, you know, that's in basically an area where there's  
6 military activity. But it doesn't fall under any use exclusions.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other questions for Staff?

8 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

10 MR. GRADY: So I'm looking at the map here, so question for Staff. The land, it  
11 looks like the land immediately west of the site is designated as a Planned  
12 Development. Do we have any idea what uses are allowed in that particular Planned  
13 Development zone?

14 MR. PRICE: We can do a little more research as to the specifics of it, but usually  
15 when you look, when we see a parcel that's zoned PD and it's out in an area like this  
16 and there's no residential development, that at one time you could apply for a zoning  
17 designation for Planned Development which was different than a Planned Unit  
18 Development. The Planned Development was more site specific as to what it was, and  
19 so the applicant would identify exactly what it was they were gonna do, all of the specific  
20 parameters of the property and how it would be used. So usually it was a single use that  
21 was zoned PD and if there was gonna be any other use introduced a lotta times they  
22 had to go back through the full rezoning process. So this looks like it's a parcel zoned  
23 Planned Development and is, it's really nonconforming mainly because it's a single use.

1 In order to do a true Planned Development you have to have a mixed use on the  
2 property. So it's just kind of a hold over which probably goes back into maybe early  
3 2000s, maybe late 1990s when this was introduced.

4 MR. GRADY: Alright, thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Commission, unless there's any other questions we'll  
6 move on to Ms. Frierson.

7 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, the first person is the Applicant, Mark James.

8 **TESTIMONY OF MARK JAMES:**

9 MR. JAMES: Good evening. My name is Mark James at 3101 Devine Street  
10 here in Columbia. I'm not the actual applicant, I'm an agent for the Applicant, the owner  
11 of the property. And I am actually, with your permission, would like to turn over the time  
12 here for the Applicant to Greg Gouzier with Coastal Development Properties. I think he's  
13 got, he's the one who's gonna have the most information that you're gonna be  
14 interested in. But I'll be here if there's any questions at all that would come up, I'm  
15 happy to do that. The owner of the property is fully supportive of this rezoning effort,  
16 obviously, and is optimistic this is gonna be something, a quality development that he  
17 would be supportive of. So with that I'd like to, with your permission turn it over to Greg  
18 Gouzier with Coastal Development Partners.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I think he's signed up to speak.

20 MS. FRIERSON: He did, Greg Gouzier.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. He will get his full two minutes as well. If you can  
22 state your name and address, thank you.

23 **TESTIMONY OF GREG GOUZIER:**

1 MR. GOUZIER: My name's Greg Gouzier, 101 North Pine Street in Spartanburg,  
2 South Carolina. With your permission I'd love to give you a handout.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We're supposed to look at the land as it is.

4 MR. GOUZIER: There's a correction on the exhibit that's in your packet that I'd  
5 like to give you. I'm the owner of Coastal Development Partners. We're the preferred  
6 developer for about 50% of the State of South Carolina for Dollar General. We're  
7 excited to bring this parcel to Richland County because we've identified this area as  
8 having significant need for general retail and groceries in this area. Certainly the terms  
9 that you hear a lotta times is a food desert, there are very few services in this area of  
10 your County. The closest Food Lion, for example, is about 10 miles away, taking a drive  
11 of about 12 to 15 minutes. The thing that I want to make sure that's clear, I think it's on  
12 page 3 of my handout there is that on the exhibits that are in your hand, you're being  
13 shown a parcel that's about 100 acres and of course we're not asking for rezoning  
14 anywhere near that. We're rezoning about five acres which doesn't go much further  
15 back than the clump of trees that are, front Garners Ferry Road. And so this, the highest  
16 and best use for this land would be Neighborhood Commercial or Rural Commercial to  
17 serve the residential community around it. We have looked at the node that's close to  
18 this, I think they said it was a mile away. And certainly during a Comprehensive Plan  
19 you can look at an intersection and go, boy grocery outta go right there. Well, when you  
20 really get down on the ground and start talking to landowners and looking at sizes of  
21 parcels and people that are willing to sell their property or not willing to sell their  
22 property, sometimes that's possible and sometimes it's not possible. And we feel that  
23 this site really is within harmony of the area, it brings some services to the area so that

1 people don't have to drive as far. It will be a DG Market store which is a newer concept  
2 for Dollar General that increases the fresh produce, the grocery, as well as fresh meat  
3 in the store. And that is already approved by Dollar General, we have, we are coming if  
4 this is approved.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You have 30 more seconds since you're past your time.

6 MR. JAMES: I understand. And so, you know, with a, with a road that has 16,000  
7 cars per day in front of it it's, it's not desirable for residential development, you know, an  
8 acre lot house up against the road like that. Certainly the rest of it might be residential in  
9 the future or would remain farmland, but this that's right up against a busy road like that,  
10 we would not be adding any accesses to Garners Ferry Road and we'd ask for your  
11 support. I'm available for any questions.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

13 MR. JAMES: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Ms. Frierson?

15 MS. FRIERSON: Next we have Lynn Renke?

16 **TESTIMONY OF LYNN RENKE:**

17 MS. RENKE: Good evening. My name's Lynn Renke and I live at 1130 Chain  
18 Gang Road which abuts the property in question on the back side. The rural residential  
19 area, there are homes that are up on Garners Ferry Road existing now. There are  
20 homes across on 378. I have a petition that I've gone around and I've canvased the  
21 neighborhood, I've canvased Chain Gang Road, which would probably be the easement  
22 to that, the access to that site, and we are opposed to any type commercial building on  
23 that site, particularly now that he, we found out, I just found out that it's a Dollar

1 General. We have a Dollar General in the Town of Eastover four miles down the road.  
2 According to the Comprehensive Plan you guys have developed an area for rural  
3 activity for commercial sites which is 601, which gets easement to off-ramps, on-ramps,  
4 you know, to take the traffic off of 378, which is a highly traveled road between Sumter  
5 and Columbia, and commuters come every day. And the congestion coming out the  
6 road from Chain Gang or Antioch onto 378 is dangerous. We have school buses that  
7 come through with children, we have the City bus that comes through Chain Gang  
8 Road. It's just not conducive for our area. We like the agricultural land, we like the rural  
9 residential large lots. If you look and you expand you'll see most of that. If you come  
10 down Chain Gang we're, it's all residential, there's nothing commercial on residential;  
11 the only site that's there that is public is the Public Works station for Richland County.  
12 Everything else on Chain Gang Road is residential. If you look at Antioch Road,  
13 everything there is residential except they have places, they have a, a few places of  
14 worship on Antioch, they have a church. On Southland which runs off of Antioch they  
15 have a place of worship. And across the road from this site is a place of worship as well.  
16 So we do not support any commercial establishments of any type within this area. And I  
17 thank you for your time.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out tonight.

19 MS. FRIERSON: Next is Elaine Rump.

20 **TESTIMONY OF ELAINE RUMP:**

21 MS. RUMP: Good evening. Thank you for pronouncing my name correctly. My  
22 name is Elaine Rump, I live at 11 John Fleming Court in Eastover. I am also opposed to  
23 this. I think the country is the country for a reason, it's a rural area, you're trying to get

1 away from all the hustle and bustle. So I would like for it to stay just as it is. So we are  
2 opposed to them coming in with commercial. I don't think it would be conducive to what  
3 we're, what the environment is, what it has now, so. That's it.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Thank you.

5 MS. FRIERSON: Tatanesia Favor?

6 **TESTIMONY OF TATANESIA FAVOR:**

7 MS. FAVOR: Thank you for allowing me to speak today. My name is Tatanesia  
8 Favor. I'm at 1074 Chain Gang Road in Eastover. I wish I were more prepared for this  
9 meeting, I just found out about it and I'm also getting off of a long shift from work, so  
10 hopefully you can understand what I'm about to say. I do not think that adding a Dollar  
11 General is helpful to our community. It was important for me to be here today on behalf  
12 of myself, my family and others in the community. I usually like to speak with numbers, I  
13 like to have facts and statistics. I wasn't prepared for that today so I'm gonna have to tell  
14 you about my real life experience. I'm an emergency medicine physician, I've been  
15 practicing for over 16 years. I specialize in rural communities. Dollar Generals tend to  
16 be places that attract the criminal element. I'm the one that takes care of the gunshot  
17 wounds. I'm the one that takes care of the assaults, robberies, things like that. Oh, by  
18 the way I also work at a detention center as well so if they're not hurt I see them at the  
19 jail, okay. Dollar Generals do have their benefits but we already have one four miles  
20 down the road, we don't need another Dollar General. In addition, just not only am I a  
21 physician in the area but on my time off I'm a beekeeper. I have a farm that is about two  
22 miles away from this site that you're talking about building. I'm concerned about the  
23 environmental impact on my bees. In this rural agricultural area we have cotton, corn,

1 bees, or beans, the bees that I harvest, they're gonna be, they're important for the  
2 pollination for food, crops. I just don't think that this is a good idea for the Dollar General  
3 and I hope that you vote to oppose it today.

4 MS. FRIERSON: Amanda Stansel?

5 **TESTIMONY OF AMANDA STANSEL:**

6 MS. STANSEL: My name is Amanda Stansel. I'm at 341 Tillinghast Road,  
7 Eastover. And I just echo everything everybody else has said, this is – I travel every day  
8 into Columbia so if I need a grocery store I stop at the Food Lion on my way home. If I  
9 forgot something I can go to the Dollar General a few miles down the road. I, I don't  
10 think that we need another commercial business. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. [Inaudible] do it like this. Anyone else signed up  
12 to speak for this property? Come on down, sir.

13 MS. FRIERSON: You need to work on your handwriting.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: State your name and your address.

15 **TESTIMONY OF JAMES FAVOR:**

16 MR. FAVOR: All through elementary school, all through college, nobody could  
17 ever read my handwriting but when I speak you'll understand. Good afternoon  
18 everybody. I'm the Mayor from the Town of Eastover and I would just like to offer –

19 MS. FRIERSON: We need your name, please.

20 MR. FAVOR: Yeah, James Favor. I live at 525 Main Street in Eastover, down the  
21 center of the town in Eastover. I'd just like to offer to the gentleman from Spartanburg,  
22 come on to Eastover. Explain the Dollar General that you have in Eastover. You have  
23 space, if not space there's other space there that we can provide for you. We'd love for

1 you to come downtown Eastover and expand because I'm in the business now of  
2 looking for a grocery store that would provide some of these things that you talked  
3 about, additional food, additional meat. Everything that you talked about we could, we  
4 could actually help you with that downtown. I could probably figure out some people  
5 who got some property who would love to offer you something downtown. So I would  
6 love for you to do that. I don't think, and I'm a businessman, so I really, I hate to speak  
7 against any development, but I don't think this is probably one that would be, would add  
8 any benefits to the community. In particular, the people who live in the adjacent  
9 community right around it. I think the other problem you'd have to deal with is the  
10 infrastructure, the highway and getting in and out of the highway and that, that area now  
11 is really getting very busy, very, very busy. And so I don't think this would probably be, I  
12 wouldn't say it would be adding an asset in the fact that you have a Dollar General right  
13 downtown. And that we're available to help expand and provide services for the one that  
14 you already have. You have water, sewer, I think you'd be spending, putting a lotta  
15 money in the ground that you probably wouldn't need to place if you decide to come to  
16 Eastover. So thank you very much and we would hope that you take a had look at this.  
17 Again, I hate to speak against growing businesses but this is one that I think that would  
18 not have, that would be a detriment as opposed to something that would provide any  
19 advantages for us. So I hope you take that into consideration and vote against it. Thank  
20 you.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

22 MS. FRIERSON: He was the last speaker.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Anyone miss the signup sheet for this and hung out  
2 this late with us and wanted to speak? No? Okay. I'll hand this back over then to the  
3 Commission for discussion or questions back to the Staff.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commission Johnson.

6 MR. JOHNSON: I just think that for the public's reference, I think it is important  
7 just for us to note that as Planning Commission we have to look at the underlying use of  
8 what we're approving from the zoning standpoint, not based on the individual applicant's  
9 proposed use and what they plan to do because once it's rezoned anything within that  
10 zoning is then eligible.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. That does need to be  
12 echoed sometimes. Comments, Commission, or a motion too?

13 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

15 MR. SIERCKS: I do have a motion but I'll also hold off until anyone's had,  
16 anyone who does have additional comments would like to make them.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any additional comments? Mr. Siercks is asking for – no?  
18 Let's hear your motion.

19 MR. SIERCKS: At this time I'd move that we forward Case number 25-011 MA  
20 to County Council with a recommendation of disapproval.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is there a second? Commissioner Johnson with a second.  
2 Okay. Staff, we've got a motion on the floor for disapproval. Can you please take a  
3 vote?

4 MR. PRICE: Again, we have a motion for disapproval for Case 25-011. Those in  
5 favor of the motion of disapproval, Grady?

6 MR. GRADUY: Aye.

7 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

8 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

9 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

10 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

11 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

12 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

13 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

14 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

17 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

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

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff and thank you, Commission.

21 MR. PRICE: Yes. Mr. Yonke, I would also like to point out that normally you get  
22 to this, but this case will be forwarded to County Council for their, at their, for the Zoning  
23 Public Hearing and be held on the 25<sup>th</sup> of March, 7:00pm. However, well also

1 Councilwoman Newton who represents this area of the County will be having a town  
2 hall meeting for any cases in her area which would include this one, on the 13<sup>th</sup> of  
3 March at 6:00pm at the Garners Ferry Adult Activity Center. You know, that town hall  
4 actually gives the applicant and the community a chance to engage in some discussion,  
5 it's not necessarily, you know, for them to make a decision on whether they want it or  
6 not. But it does give them an opportunity to get additional information that we may not  
7 be able to offer or this may not be the arena to actually offer that type of discussion.

8 MR. TAYLOR: Can you give the town hall date and time again, please?

9 MR. PRICE: Yeah, again it's gonna March the 13<sup>th</sup> at 6:00pm at the Garners  
10 Ferry Adult Activity Center.

11 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. That's our last Map Amendment case for  
13 tonight. We do still have more work on our Agenda. People are welcome to stay or take  
14 off if they'd like. These meetings get late, we understand. We'll give Staff a minute to  
15 get ready for the next one which will be our Overlay District discussion. Staff, are you  
16 ready to continue on?

17 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: Yes, we are good to continue.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We still have one concerned citizen in the back there. You  
19 gonna stay till the end with us? Alright.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price, are you on your way to go get pizza?

21 MR. PRICE: No. I'm eager to get out.

22 MS. WILLIAMS: Alright, good afternoon, Members of the Commission. We're  
23 here today to talk about the next steps in the adoption of the Neighborhood Character

1 Overlay District for the Olympia area. We've conducted at least two public meetings in  
2 the Olympia area; one with the Olympia Association, and then we held another public  
3 meeting to present the architectural guidelines that are in the overlay district. And we've  
4 gotten feedback from those residents, most of the feedback would relate to the actual  
5 implementation and how we would implement it procedurally, but not a lot of negative  
6 feedback regarding the actual architectural standards. And so before we have you to  
7 deliberate it and potentially make a motion to move this on to County Council for review  
8 we'd like to just go through the information we've presented to the residents at those  
9 public hearings. And I'll turn it over now to Mark Ridlehoover.

10 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: Okay, thank you Director Williams. My name is Mark  
11 Ridlehoover, Comprehensive Planner. So this is a presentation that we gave in a public  
12 meeting to, in the Olympia neighborhood back at the end of January with very minor  
13 changes to this presentation for you all. So for the purpose of the overlay, we are  
14 wanting to enact it in order to preserve and protect the architectural style and  
15 characteristic of the historic millhouses and other historic structures in the Olympia  
16 neighborhood, as well as encourage any change in the neighborhood, whether through  
17 new builds, renovations or demolitions; that they reflect and contribute to the  
18 architectural character of the historic neighborhood. And Planning Commission is,  
19 we've gone over this before with, when we initially brought the overlay to you last year,  
20 but as far as how the overlay is applicable and how are we allowed to enact one in our,  
21 in the Land Development Code, it allows us to enact a neighborhood character overlay  
22 as long as it meets certain requirements; one of those being that there is a master plan  
23 for the area, that being the Capitol City Mill District Area Corridor Plan as well as the

1 neighborhood having a distinctive and cohesive character through type of construction,  
2 building materials, lot layouts, setbacks and historic districts. So the Olympia  
3 neighborhood meets these requirements. The area that you're looking at and that you'll  
4 be voting on for the map amendment consists of the area included in the master plan.  
5 That master plan was done as a joint plan with the City of Columbia, so the areas that  
6 we will, that will be in our jurisdiction are the unincorporated areas from that master  
7 plan. And also this being an overlay the underlying zoning will still exist and will dictate  
8 any, anything that the overlay does not, does not cover or any parcels that it is not  
9 applicable to. The underlying zoning will still exist and dictate the uses for those areas.  
10 The, the Olympia Character Overlay based on how the, it was historically built, there are  
11 two separate categories that will, that will judge applicability for and different standards  
12 just based on, like I said, how the neighborhood was developed. So we have split  
13 Olympia into what we call Old Hill and New Hill. This is an example of the housing types  
14 that can be found in the neighborhood and we identify the historic houses based on the,  
15 if they were built as one of these housing types as well as if they were built within the  
16 period of significance, that being within the Old Hill district being built between 1900 to  
17 1903 or 1914 to 1915, and then the New Hill houses being built in the 1940s. So what  
18 are we regulating with the overlay? We are, we'll be dictating the renovations to any  
19 historic structures, preserve the historic architectural character of Olympia, and  
20 throughout this presentation I've just included some examples from the draft overlay as  
21 well to reflect the different things that the overlay can regulate, so things like materials  
22 for the walls, the roof, things like that, any exterior façade type materials. The overlay  
23 will also require that new builds conform to or emulate the historical architectural

1 characteristics of Olympia. So we have various standards within the overlay language  
2 that dictate how new builds will look in the area as well as providing language for any  
3 kind of contemporary design or style. However, the judgments for those types of  
4 situations will be, will be decided on by an architectural review board that will also, that  
5 we will also be developing alongside implementation of the overlay. We are also putting  
6 together a framework for demolition. This is one of the sections that's different from,  
7 from what was seen in the public meeting. We developed, we further developed our  
8 criteria for demolition based on advice from the City of Columbia who also has an  
9 historic district adjacent to this. So we've updated our criteria for what it, what our  
10 architectural review board will consider for any demolition of historic structures, with the  
11 intent of doing our best to prevent any demolition if there are mitigating circumstances  
12 that we can preserve in a historic structure. The overlay also can dictate where the  
13 structures and accessory lots go on the plot, plot of land. So we have setbacks  
14 standards for the, within the overlay as well as dictating where any accessory buildings  
15 like a garage can go on the, on the plot of land as a way to preserve the historic façade  
16 within the neighborhood. We also regulate parking and driveways on the lot. And this is  
17 just a list of all the different aspects that we currently will be regulating with the overlay  
18 and anything that isn't covered here, like I said, will go back to the underlying zoning. So  
19 things like density, lot size, lot width, ADUs, impervious surfaces, use, drainage, off  
20 street parking requirements, those will all fall to the underlying zoning. So some of the  
21 things that the overlay will not be addressing, and these are points of interest for the  
22 Olympia neighborhood that we included in this presentation to address specific  
23 questions. Any non-historic structures, we're not preventing renovation or demolition of

1 those, we're only putting regulations for renovation and demolition on the historic  
2 buildings. Like I said, the density is, falls back to the zoning, the underlying zoning. Any  
3 interior designs of the buildings will not, we'll not be dictating; this being an architectural  
4 overlay where our primary focus is on the façade of the buildings, so interior is not  
5 dictated by this overlay. We're not doing anything with the medians in the roads or  
6 regulating on street parking, and we do not have, this overlay does not provide any  
7 program or incentive for owner occupation. And this is the, just the tentative timeline  
8 that we gave to the neighborhoods for best case scenario for us to be able to pass this  
9 overlay, so we are currently in the Planning Commission phase before we move on to  
10 County Council. And that is the presentation that we gave to the Olympia community.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: So once again I'll just point out that you have in your packet the  
12 wording that you originally received, I believe last year before I came on board, related  
13 to the specific architectural standards. That has not changed, except as Mr. Ridlehoover  
14 pointed out, we got a little bit more specific on the demolition requirements because that  
15 was a question that came out during the public hearings was how would we look at  
16 something as far as demolition; would we try to prevent someone from being able to  
17 repair their homes or would we look at how expensive it may be to demolish versus  
18 renovate the homes. And so we wanted to be a little bit more specific of what that would  
19 look like before it would to the Development Review Board. And so unless there's any  
20 additional feedback or research you would like for us to do then we would request that  
21 you make a recommendation that we move this on to County Council for their review  
22 and consideration.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff, for the presentation and all the hard work  
2 that's going into this. Commission, questions, comments?

3 MR. TAYLOR: Question.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, Commissioner Taylor?

5 MR. TAYLOR: Just, and I've been, and maybe it's been answered, so this is only  
6 for the façade you said, right, it's nothing interior or anything like that. So –

7 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: That's correct. Yes, sir.

8 MR. TAYLOR: Okay. And there is no, I've never been clear on, so what if it's  
9 violated, are there penalties or, you know, how is it gonna be enforced? What does that  
10 look like? I might be unclear on the process but I'm just not sure, you know, how we'll  
11 protect the integrity of this.

12 MS. WILLIAMS: That was a question that also came up during the public  
13 meeting. For instance, a concern in the Olympia community is if someone wants to  
14 renovate a property and then they are not as forthcoming with what their renovation is  
15 going to be, and that's part of when I said a lot of the comments we received back came  
16 back to our internal implementation procedures. So it would be a joint enforcement  
17 between the county zoning office if it's a violation of a zoning requirements, or also  
18 maybe our Building Department if it's a violation to building standards. So we would be  
19 working with various departments, depending on what the potential violation may be.

20 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

21 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

1 MR. SIERCKS: Quick question, and I apologize if it's already been addressed or  
2 been answered, but specifically with regard to the, the architectural review boards, it  
3 was, I mean, I saw the slide quickly but it, you know, it said that the, these review  
4 boards would basically make sure that whatever changes were being made were in line  
5 with the historical designs and architectural designs. Is there gonna be a specific set of  
6 criteria that the architectural review board is gonna have to go by or is it just gonna be  
7 a, kind of a purely subjective, yeah that looks right or no it doesn't based on the board's  
8 opinion at just looking at the pictures?

9 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: Sure, so the, the board's task will be basically interpreting  
10 what we have for the, or the language of the overlay. And the things that are more  
11 subjective, like whether a contemporary design or style is appropriate with the rest of  
12 the neighborhood. That'll fall more towards how we wanna design the, how the, the  
13 makeup of the board where they have experience or expertise in preservation or  
14 architecture, things like that. So we're currently in the process of developing how the  
15 board will be built and the bylaws dictating it, but that's one of the things we're ensuring  
16 is that they have the appropriate experience to make those calls.

17 MR. SIERCKS: Thank you.

18 MS. WILLIAMS: And if I may jump in real quick, we're also working to create a  
19 style guide based off of those Olympia guidelines so that we have a good style guide  
20 that anyone who wants to do work in the Olympia area can have something that just  
21 kind of visually expresses what's also in the overlay.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

1 MR. JOHNSON: Question. Will the deferment to this body be tiered such, for  
2 expediting things as opposed to at Staff level for some of this by the roof materials  
3 [inaudible] Staff level versus [inaudible] for a full review.

4 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: Yes, so we will be establishing criteria based, for what  
5 constitutes Staff level versus what goes before a review board. Most minor things and,  
6 we would be able to handle Staff level versus any changes or any new builds, things  
7 like that we will, we'll be deferring to a board. But any minor repairs, renovations using  
8 the same materials that were already present in the building, those are the types of  
9 things that we'd be looking at as being Staff level. And a lot of that will be reflective of  
10 how the, how the City handles theirs for the adjacent neighborhood to, to Olympia.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: If their roof is leading they can repair it and not have to wait  
12 for the next month?

13 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: That's correct, yes.

14 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady?

16 MR. GRADY: Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. So I will say this is a topic that is, is close  
17 to my heart as I happen to live in a historic district albeit in the City of Columbia as  
18 opposed to the County. I think I've expressed this in a previous meeting, the concern  
19 that I have is that, you know, the specificity of these requirements may be burdensome,  
20 particularly for any homeowners who are low to moderate income. So in particular for  
21 example the windows requirements. So essentially, as far as I understand the goal here  
22 is to ensure that the neighborhood appears from the outside, you know, someone is

1 walking or driving down a street it appears as, very similar to the original construction.

2 Would that be a fair statement?

3 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: Correct.

4 MR. GRADY: Okay. So for example, requiring the replacement of windows with  
5 similar materials, I don't think I've ever been able to tell the materials of a window from  
6 the street in terms of that, so I, I, you know, I think I would just encourage Staff to not be  
7 too specific in its pronouncements and perhaps, and perhaps this'll come out in the  
8 architectural board once that, you know, is devised and the composition and bylaws and  
9 things of that sort. But I just, I have concern that, you know, when you look at the areas  
10 in Columbia and other cities that are under a historic district designation, you know, they  
11 tend to be the ones that are rapidly pushing out the current residents and are being  
12 replaced by wealthier residents who are able to pour the money necessary into the  
13 home for, you know, to meet these criteria. So I know that was sort of a rant rather than  
14 a question or a comment, but I would just encourage emphasis on that point and I would  
15 say to interpret the guidelines in a way that provides a little bit of latitude. One other  
16 question, you mentioned that this only applies to the homes that were built in those  
17 particular time periods. Is that going to be, well let me ask, so this, this draft, if it ends up  
18 being approved by County Council, this will be added to the Land Development Code?

19 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: Correct.

20 MR. GRADY: Will there be explicit language in there that says what you said  
21 about only applying to buildings that were built in the relevant historically significant time  
22 periods since that's not written in the, in the statute or the ordinance or the addendum if

1 you will. So I would wanna make sure that that is clear, that it only applies to those  
2 buildings within the district and not every building in the district.

3 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: Yes, sir. So in the current draft we have in §1A we, we  
4 mention that the applicability of the standards as determined by the architectural type  
5 and date of construction, if we should make it more clear then we'd be happy to do it to  
6 more explicitly state that the period of significance is these specific years, depending on  
7 which district, whether Old Hill or New Hill. We'd be happy to more explicitly state that in  
8 the statute.

9 MR. GRADY: Yeah. And I would assume that the County in its records would  
10 have a list of the homes that we're talking about?

11 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: Right. So they will be, we'd likely have them flagged based  
12 on the build year and where in the, whether it's in Old Hill or New Hill. That would be,  
13 that would be how we would come up with that, whether it's applicable or not.

14 MR. GRADY: Yeah, so I would just encourage, you know, as much transparency  
15 as possible making sure that, you know, lists of properties or maps or other resources  
16 are available that indicate what's designated and also that individuals who are  
17 purchasing a home that is subject to these requirements, that they know that when  
18 they're buying it. I think that would make, that'll make enforcement easier on the back  
19 end and it'll make sure that the homebuyer is aware of the historic designation. So I  
20 think I've said my peace.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady.

22 MR. GRADY: And thank you.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

2 MR. JOHNSON: I can follow my Commissioner's, he opened the door so let me  
3 just walk on through it. But, cause you touched on something that's a little bit near and  
4 dear to my heart, part of what I think I heard was the details will follow, at least like in  
5 relation to things [inaudible] problematic or concerning piece. Like for example  
6 [inaudible] if it's a two over two window in some jurisdictions in historic differences, if the  
7 mullions are on the inside of the glass or on the outside matters. And that to me from a,  
8 from, especially depending on the income of the occupant, can be an expensive  
9 differential from that standpoint. So I think that is something from there. The other is in  
10 order to maintain efficiency and not have the ability to substitute materials that still look  
11 it, there's also the issue of the energy efficiency and what that means in terms of the  
12 actual operating costs of those homes. So while I don't wanna sound as if I'm not  
13 supportive of what we're doing, I'm supportive of what we're doing, but I also think that it  
14 would be great to have the devil in the details to know exactly what we're being asked to  
15 sign on to as it relates to [inaudible] real world implications from a budgetary standpoint  
16 of that.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson.

18 MS. WILLIAMS: And if I may, again you know, we're coming to you now to let  
19 you know where we've been and see if you're ready for us to move this forward to  
20 County Council. But if you would like for us to flesh out some more of those details  
21 before you do that you have that ability to do that as well. But we we're hearing what  
22 you're saying, it's similar to what we heard during the public meetings as well.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I was gonna ask, what's some more of the feedback from  
2 the residents? I heard the part that you had about demolition, was it generally positive,  
3 concerning?

4 MS. WILLIAMS: I received text messages from a specific resident every time  
5 something is torn down saying that we are not moving fast enough. But that's just one  
6 specific resident. But when we talked about it some of the same things came out, it was  
7 just, you know, will it belabor the process if they're changing the windows out in their  
8 home and how do we determine if it's a Staff level review versus something that has to  
9 go to the review board. And we wanna make the smaller renovations something that we  
10 can do on the Staff level. So that was what we heard. And then some feedback  
11 regarding if it's a non-historic structure, if it was a house built, just say 1970, that yes  
12 you can demolish that house without having to go through any review process, but  
13 anything you build back would still have to meet architectural guidelines. So the  
14 residents seemed comfortable with that knowing that even if you tear down something  
15 not historical, whatever you put back has to kind of fit in and meet that same  
16 architectural standard.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Taylor?

18 MR. TAYLOR: And based on that feedback were there any, were there any  
19 follow ups that you all had for them on the, I guess the town hall meetings or the  
20 meetings with the public? Also could you bring up the timeline again, please?

21 MS. WILLIAMS: The answer is yes, after the last public meeting that we had we  
22 received a list of comments back from a representative of the Olympia Mill Association.  
23 A lot of those comments we responded, they were very specific to the historical type of

1 some of the houses saying maybe this house was changed a little bit over time and  
2 does it meet out, does it necessarily need to be on the list. And we responded whether  
3 we thought that it specifically still met the architectural intent, so whether we were  
4 gonna leave that. So we did respond to those questions that we received back from,  
5 after that public meeting. Those were the only lists of questions that we have received.

6 MR. TAYLOR: So it doesn't require you to do anything to the document based  
7 on, you followed up the comments but there was nothing that needed to be added or  
8 deleted from the document?

9 MS. WILLIAMS: Correct. The actual architectural standards have been pretty  
10 well received. It's the how we handle stuff in house, accepting the applications, the  
11 review process, the makeup of the board, what is administrative review versus what is a  
12 board review, those are the details that they brought up and wanted us to take in  
13 consideration, similar to what you all are doing.

14 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The room is pretty quiet tonight now. These residents, are  
16 they aware that we're discussing this? I know I read the thing at the beginning of each  
17 meeting, but are there members of this, if there's a homeowners association group that  
18 would wanna come and speak?

19 MS. WILLIAMS: We did make them aware but I'm sure that if they had the  
20 opportunity to come again they would be willing to come and speak as well.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This is gonna go into the Land Development Code so this  
22 makes me think how we went through the map amendments and text amendments a  
23 couple of years ago. So do we look at this pretty much word for word, this is what's

1 gonna go into the LDC? Correct? Alright, so if we're concerned about a statement about  
2 windows this is where we can, like scratch it out and write it the way we wanna write it?  
3 And I'm also concerned in our packet, we just have the one map that shows the overlay  
4 area, but there is a distinction between Old Hill and New Hill. And so just, again I just  
5 have my Land Development Code hat on where we had to have the map be a part of it  
6 as well, it helps dictate the architectural design, correct?

7 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: That's correct.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. I would like to present, like a clean package to  
9 County Council. Like if we were to approve this today then it's verbatim that we sign off  
10 on this, right? If not, then we would also need to be able to give something tangible to  
11 Staff to work on so that we're not just kicking the can down the road, right?

12 MS. WILLIAMS: Right.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is this a work session type of thing, Commission, where we  
14 would wanna sit instead of two and a half hours into our meeting, and go through the  
15 line by line for this since we're dictating how this neighborhood is going to manage  
16 itself? What do you think? Did you guys hear me at the end, should we have a work  
17 session on this? Do we need to go line by line? Do we overall agree? What do you  
18 think?

19 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

21 MR. GRADY: Given that I certainly would not feel – I would just say I would not  
22 feel comfortable rewriting, rewriting a very specific, you know, draft document here that  
23 has technical architectural terms that I have literally never heard of before we started

1 discussing this matter. What I would suggest, and I can make this in the form of a  
2 motion should people want me to do that, would be that we, we approve the current text  
3 but that we make a, we provide a comment to County Council indicating the concerns  
4 that myself and my colleague have articulated, and that is essentially something to the  
5 effect of while the broad objectives of this, yeah we approve of them, there should be  
6 care taken to make sure that the final language only reflects that core intent of  
7 preserving the façades, the appearance of the façades and, and not have quite as much  
8 specificity on exact mechanisms for implementation.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Question, before you make that as a motion let me [inaudible] I  
11 agree with, well I agree with all of Commissioner Grady's statement but his preamble in  
12 terms of not wanting to actually try to redraft something that Staff has spent substantial  
13 amount of time, but let me just ask a question and I think this will help form my opinion.  
14 Page 48 under Windows, by way of example, under matching the original, the second  
15 line down says, size configuration, finish and details as the original windows. In Staff's  
16 opinion does that mean that a wood single pane glass window would have to be  
17 replaced with another wood single pane glass window as opposed to a vinyl clad  
18 window that has the same look as that original window?

19 MR. RIDLEHOOVER: So when it comes to those types of details, our original  
20 intent and the way we've been interpreting it is that the look itself is what matters the  
21 most. I know one of the details we had when we were initially developing these was that  
22 obviously the original windows were not as energy efficient and to replace them with  
23 such would, could be to the detriment of the homeowner, and that replacing them with

1 the more energy efficient option that has the same general look to the façade would be  
2 something that is acceptable. And so that's kind of how we've been, we've interpreted  
3 as far as that goes. And an additional example being that many of the homes were built  
4 with asbestos board siding. Clearly we're not advising homeowners to rebuild their  
5 house with asbestos. But the overall look that those boards had can be replaced with  
6 synthetic materials and that's the intent that we're looking at, and that if a replacement  
7 material still emulates the original architectural style then that's something that they  
8 would be able to do.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Commission, thoughts, comments?

10 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

12 MR. GRADY: In response to the scenario that was put forward I will say that in  
13 terms of how it was implemented in the City of Columbia, that is precisely what I was  
14 told. There was not an allowance to rebuild the window with a more energy efficient  
15 mechanism so we had to, we had to procure a specialist to repair the window as it was  
16 and it's drafty, very drafty. So that's, you know, I hate to be the person who's like  
17 personalizing everything, but I would definitely say that there's, there is concern there  
18 and I do think that, in particular that window language but I'm sure there's other  
19 language in here that is similar in nature where I am sure it is very well intentioned, I just  
20 have concerns that it would prevent homeowners from properly maintaining their  
21 properties.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner Grady, to your point, you mentioned the City of  
23 Columbia. The City of Charleston, take that up a couple more notches.

1 MR. GRADY: Oh yeah.

2 MR. JOHNSON: That becomes a big fight and [inaudible] part of that challenge is  
3 when you get to the qualifications of the members of the review board, the subjective  
4 nature that kicks in without some real specifics and guidelines can really go in an  
5 unintended direction very fast. [Inaudible] point out is really what I'm concerned about is  
6 that, you know, what you've said, just getting what you've said integrated into the text in  
7 some form or fashion that it's a little bit clearer in terms of the intent that truly the actual  
8 matching the exact original but the intent that looks and has the same aesthetic look  
9 [inaudible] take into account some type of enhanced technology or enhanced material  
10 that can make the cost of living or the installation of it so onerous [inaudible].

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson.

12 MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chair, also if you could –

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

14 MS. WILLIAMS: - recognize ACA Jenson, he can give some insight as well.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come up on, Mr. Jenson, how you doin'? It's been a few  
16 months.

17 MR. JENSON: It has been a long meeting, I'll tell you what. Holy cow. It reminds  
18 me of the old days. So thank you Mr. Chair, if I may be recognized. Thank you, sir. So if  
19 the Commission has any qualms, heartburn, reservations about what they're looking at  
20 tonight I highly recommend that you continue this or table it till your next meeting so you  
21 can come with very clear recommendations to the Council on what you want, because if  
22 you pass it on this is your one bite at the apple. So if you're feeling reluctant in any way,  
23 reticent, then just table it and take it up in a month. I mean, yes that sets us back but it's

1 not the end of the world and it's better to get it right than to half bake it in my opinion. So  
2 that's just my advice to you.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Jenson. This is our first overlay, correct?  
4 So we're trying to get this right cause we would do this in other places across the  
5 County?

6 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. And to, to reiterate what ACA Jenson said and what I  
7 mentioned earlier is that if you would like for us to do more massaging to the language  
8 we can do that and bring it back. And it doesn't necessarily have to be a work session  
9 unless you all want a work session, but we can go back and incorporate your comments  
10 and then bring an updated draft to you for review.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What would you need from us?

12 MS. WILLIAMS: The comments that I have tonight relate to making sure we  
13 make it very clear to the intent of the ordinance and if there's very specific language that  
14 could be interpreted as you have to put back exactly what was there before, i.e., certain  
15 windows or asbestos planks, that we clarify that that is not the intent of the ordinance.  
16 And then also two maps, one for Old Hill and New Hill, that is very clear, instead of one  
17 map that includes them both together. Those are the two that I heard, but if there are  
18 additional comments you can say now or you can also email those comments to us and  
19 we can get that included before the next meeting as well.

20 MR. JOHNSON: One last comment, Mr. Chairman.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No, this is great, I was actually gonna think about going to  
22 each Commissioner and give your comments so we can pass it over to the Director and  
23 that's what they can work on. And if you don't have any comments you can say no

1 comments. But let's go down the row. Commissioner Johnson. Everyone else think  
2 about your comments in the meantime, okay?

3 MS. WILLIAMS: So just talking to Deputy Director Price, I mean, if you wanna  
4 send comments to us within the next two weeks that'll give us time to incorporate it and  
5 make any other changes before the next Planning Commission meeting.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Any top of the mind comments go ahead.  
7 Commissioner Johnson?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Appreciate that, that's helpful. And just from, I just wanna be  
9 real clear from – I'm not anti, I'm not against, and I applaud and support the work that  
10 you've done. You've done the, the big issue of making sure that we have public input  
11 and the process. I will say what hit me with heartburn was when the Chair pointed out  
12 that this is not language as a master plan that is generic in nature, but as incorporated  
13 as a part of the Land Development Code that once we get our one bit at the apple as  
14 Mr. Jenson says and Council takes action on it, then that becomes part of that Land  
15 Development Code and has a lot more rigidity to it at that point. And so it just makes  
16 [inaudible] with a different set of eyes as opposed to a neighborhood master plan where  
17 there's a little [inaudible]. [Inaudible]

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Commissioner Taylor?  
19 Any top of the mind comments?

20 MR. TAYLOR: Yes, my only comment or question based on what was said, so  
21 what is our deadline to submit emails to you? You said a couple of weeks, right? Let's  
22 get a date, a deadline.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: If you could get comments back to us by St. Patrick's Day,  
2 Monday, March 17<sup>th</sup>. That gives all of this week and all of next week for you to review  
3 the information in the packet, submit other comments. So feel free to email it to us, call  
4 us or if anyone needs to schedule a separate meeting just let us know.

5 MR. TAYLOR: And the way we're doing it currently is sufficient, right? So even if  
6 it's a broad statement like has been given as far as windows or whatever else we might  
7 come across and talking about I guess the intent, and you all will massage the  
8 language, right?

9 MS. WILLIAMS: Correct. One of the things that I like to do, similar to what I did  
10 with the email I received from the resident is that at the next presentation to you all bring  
11 up the comments that we received and how we address those comments, either in the  
12 document or if we, for instance, chose to keep something the same, the reason why we  
13 would've kept it the same. That's usually how I try to approach these.

14 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'll continue going through the row or we'll just go with the  
16 emails. Go with the emails? Okay, alright.

17 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks? See, it would've worked.

19 MR. SIERCKS: One last thing, because it was something that I think was kind of  
20 alluded to and I think that we've seen in previous iterations but one thing that I think I'd  
21 like to see just depending on how many there are and where it all goes is a, like a track  
22 changes view of any changes that are made so that you can see, or so that we can see

1 additions and deletions and have specifics when we talk about why those changes were  
2 made.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. Anything else on this  
4 matter Commission? Commissioner Frierson?

5 MS. FRIERSON: I was just gonna ask what email are we to use specifically,  
6 email address?

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Right, you can, our email addresses aren't on there. They're  
8 usually our last name and our first name at richlandcountysc.gov. Or the easy email  
9 address is nip@richlandcountysc.gov.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks again Staff for all your dedicated had work on this  
11 one. And we're just trying to give this the time I believe to get this right, so thank you.  
12 Does this move us along on our Agenda? Anything else on this topic of the overlay?  
13 Thank you. This will take us to Item No. 7, which is an Administrative Review. Are we  
14 still looking at this tonight? Mr. Price?

15 MS. WILLIAMS: Sorry Mr. Chair, because this was an action item we will need  
16 an actual motion to defer. So if you could at least do that.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, the Chair makes a motion to defer Item No. 6.,  
18 Overlay District action tonight. Do we have a second?

19 MR. GRADY: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Got a second from Commissioner Grady. Staff, please take  
21 a vote for deferment.

22 MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah, can you make that motion include both, the map and text  
23 amendment? Make a motion to defer items –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, the Chair makes a motion to defer number 6a.  
2 Olympia Neighborhood Character Overlay – Text Amendment and 6b., Olympia  
3 Neighborhood Character Overlay – Map Amendment. Do I have a second?

4 MR. GRADY: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: A second from Commissioner Grady. Staff, please take a  
6 vote.

7 MR. PRICE: We have a motion for the deferral of Item 6a. and b., which is the  
8 Olympia Neighborhood Character Overlay Text Amendment and the Olympia  
9 Neighborhood Character Overlay Map Amendment. Those in favor of the motion,  
10 Grady?

11 MR. GRADY: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

13 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

15 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

19 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Motion passes.

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

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. We'll go ahead to Item No. 7 on the  
4 Agenda.

5 **CASE AR-24-001:**

6 MR. PRICE: So the next item before you is Item 7a., which is an Administrative  
7 Review. This came before you, I think we started this last year some time, and there've  
8 been a number of deferrals either directly before you or they have been done by Staff.  
9 As stated the, you know, kind of going over this the appeal is that the Applicant is  
10 appealing the provision of §26-181(b)(3)b. of the 2005 Richland County Land  
11 Development Code which establishes the provisions for the extension of roads and  
12 right-of-way to the boundary of adjoining property. Again this, it was Staff's contention  
13 that per that provision that if you're abutting, and let me make sure I get this right, if it  
14 does provide for a logical connectivity, and in this case it was because there was a part  
15 of a golf course between the subject property that's being developed and a parcel north  
16 of that that Mr. John Bakhaus owned that there was, that requirements of connectivity  
17 were not necessary. I think Mr. Bakhaus has come in and made a number of points as  
18 to why he felt it should've been required. I know we've had previous deferrals for, to  
19 bring in items such as I think a plat was required or some other recorded documentation  
20 which is, we have yet to receive. A call was made to Mr. Bakhaus about today's meeting  
21 by Staff. He wasn't available, at least we weren't able to speak to him directly but we left  
22 a message regarding today's meeting. So he's not really here at this point. I'm not sure  
23 what direction, you know, the Planning Commissions wants to do, if you want to defer

1 this again or take any, some type of action regarding his appeal. Again, we've kind of  
2 gone in different directions on this. You know, again I'll go back to the point of that  
3 provision of the Code where it talks about access to undeveloped property. And that's  
4 what Staff based their determination on. I believe during previous testimony from the  
5 appellant that he stated, and there were a lot of issues that came about, and I'm not  
6 sure – and again he's not here to really discuss this, but I can just tell you that I'm not  
7 sure if any of them really related specifically to this section. I think they were decisions  
8 the property owner made, a lot of other things that have come up versus actually  
9 looking directly at what you had before you.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Question for Staff. This, we act as a judiciary body, right?

11 MR. PRICE: Yes. Correct.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The County is the plaintiff, or is Mr. Bakhaus the plaintiff  
13 and the County's the defendant?

14 MR. PRICE: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: However we look at this?

16 MR. PRICE: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, so I guess I'm deferring to my Commission here,  
18 any lawyers on Staff not asking for actual legal counsel here but he's not here, we  
19 requested him to give us information. Staff is here but they are actually a party in this.  
20 So do we just have to defer cause he's not here or can we go ahead and finally make a  
21 motion, judgment on this? Because what we've asked for him to provide has not been  
22 provided yet. Just as a – Commissioner Siercks, what do you think?

1 MR. SIERCKS: Well in my line of work if Mr. Bakhaus were considered the  
2 plaintiff and, you know, I mean, it's not quite an apples to apples comparison but if he's  
3 been asked by the other party to provide information that would be helpful in moving this  
4 case forward and he's been provided notice of this hearing and he's not here, this would  
5 be a ground for a dismissal of the case for failure to prosecute. It's not an apples to  
6 apples comparison but given the *quasi-judicial* nature of the proceeding that's the lens  
7 through [inaudible].

8 MR. PRICE: Excuse me, Mr., Chairman Yonke?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. Yes, Staff.

10 MR. PRICE: Just for clarity. It's something that Commissioner Siercks just stated,  
11 Staff did not ask for additional information. The applicant offered, or excuse me, the, Mr.  
12 Bakhaus offered a document and it's the Planning Commission –

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Let's refer to him as the plaintiff.

14 MR. PRICE: Yeah, the plaintiff. The plaintiff offered a document that he thought  
15 would be helpful, and thus the Planning Commission deferred to allow that document to  
16 come in. But it was never requested by Staff. I just wanted to put that on Record.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, comments, concerns from the Commission? Do we  
18 feel comfortable making a motion on this or a judgment tonight or? Commissioner  
19 Johnson?

20 MR. JOHNSON: Individually, I mean, I think [inaudible] the applicant's shown up  
21 a couple different times and as Mr. Price has said at least in my mind twice has said  
22 that he was going to produce a plat which he later said it no longer available. In his mind  
23 [inaudible] of what would move forward. I mean, I think from that standpoint we've

1 fulfilled our fiduciary duty in terms of having a hearing present, I mean, we've [inaudible]  
2 procedural process for that. I mean, if the body wants to take a motion or consider a  
3 motion, I mean, I can lay out some thoughts of a proposed action.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I would like to hear. Commission, do we wanna hear  
5 Commissioner Johnson's possible motion? Yes? I can see head nods, okay.  
6 Commissioner Johnson, the floor is yours.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Staff has outlined that upon receiving an application the  
8 Planning Commission can either reverse or affirm the decision coming from Staff, and  
9 the decision needs to be supported by findings of fact and conclusions of law that  
10 support our decision and we need to pass that on to the applicant. In the previous  
11 hearings it's my understanding that the applicant is saying that Link Side Village  
12 Development is required to provide a connectivity to the 80 acre tract. Staff's position it  
13 is not required because of the incompatible characteristics present and then the  
14 presence of the golf course is then considered as a developed parcel exempting it from  
15 the connectivity requirement. The second item, the applicant's arguing that they were  
16 being landlocked. The applicant actually had the opportunity to cure before they made  
17 the transfer in 2008 of the parcel that now is a part of an HOA and then in 2012, 2012  
18 when they split the 100 acre parcel off. Now the presence of the easement that is  
19 claimed to be made is supposed to be recorded in a plat that he's on more than one  
20 occasion said that he was going to produce and has not been produced. The subject  
21 parcel and the golf course are both under common ownership and in the previous  
22 hearing we got into the discussion about the separation between those two parcels  
23 being there. The original plan, site plan approved for Fairways Development shows,

1 Staff is saying that it was produced March 9<sup>th</sup> of '22, December of '22 and then June of  
2 '23. That's notice to the owner. So he's had three different opportunities to say  
3 something. He's had, they've transferred the property, transfers affecting the property  
4 twice, and they're saying their legal counsel made mistakes as relates to the plat. All of  
5 that is beyond our control or Staff's control, but the golf course still presents developed  
6 property that provides access to the tract. So for those facts I think it at least gives a  
7 credible reason to support Staff's position and based on those facts, those [inaudible]  
8 affirming Staff's findings. [Inaudible]

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is that succinct enough to be a motion? Or shall we have  
10 him, Commissioner Johnson paraphrase?

11 MR. PRICE: I think that's fine.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, so yeah, I would ask the Commission for a second.

13 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: A second from Commissioner Taylor for us to favor with  
15 the Staff on this issue.

16 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady? Comments, but there is a  
18 motion on the floor so go ahead.

19 MR. GRADY: Yes. So I, I would like to comment before a vote is taken here, so I  
20 am, I definitely have concerns as I expressed in the previous discussion on this. And  
21 ultimately what I find is, is the broad intent as expressed in the first sentence of the  
22 section of statute that we're concerned with, "Where it is deemed necessary to the  
23 development of a logical road pattern and transportation network, roads and right-of-

1 ways shall be extended to the boundary of the adjoining property.” The idea here is a  
2 logical road pattern and it seems quite clear from the, the shape of the golf course and  
3 the parcels in question that it is an extremely logical requirement to, to place a, to place  
4 a road that’s compatible with future extension into the parcel in question. I find that it is  
5 a, it is a minimal requirement to ensure that if there is future, if documents are found, if  
6 there’s some evidence produced that makes it such that a road can in fact be built  
7 through this slice of the golf course property I will say it’s a golf cart, it’s not like we’re,  
8 you know, proposing to run a freeway through the middle of a fairway, but I would say  
9 that it’s a situation where accepting his appeal does not produce any, it obviates the  
10 possibility of injury whereas simply foreclosing all possibility of development in this  
11 particular piece of real estate is, it means you can’t ever go back. So I would say that  
12 the idea here is to make sure that things are connected in a logical manner and I would  
13 submit that requiring the extension of the roadway would facilitate as such. So those are  
14 my thoughts.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Okay, we have the  
16 motion and the second to favor what Staff, so I believe we still need to take a vote on  
17 that. Alright, Staff.

18 MR. PRICE: Alright.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Hold on. Commissioner Johnson?

20 MR. JOHNSON: Again –

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This is a unique case so I’m not specifically keeping to  
22 *Robert’s Rules* as we usually go with, but go ahead.

1 MR. JOHNSON: My colleague makes a very good point, which is what makes  
2 this a very challenging and difficult case, because the other side of your point is, though,  
3 is based on the existing approvals that have been issued what jeopardy is that to those  
4 approvals and to that owner? So kind of, we've rung the bell, now how do we un-ring it  
5 when there's approved plans to another owner. And so the remedy becomes the  
6 question, what is the appropriate remedy and part of the reason, distinction between my  
7 position and my colleague's position is who is best positioned to, to correct that? And so  
8 that's part of the challenge that makes it challenging, and if you remember the last time  
9 that we actually attempted to make a vote and then ended up deferring it, well I  
10 shouldn't say the last one, one of the times was just that, was that they're both very  
11 plausible outcomes and we split two, two to three, I forget, whatever the – but right in  
12 the middle with both plausible outcomes, so I mean, I think that we have to make certain  
13 whatever course of logic that we pursue and that we approve that we've gotten the  
14 feedback among those of us, you know, across the board. I mean, you've heard two  
15 positions and they're both credible positions [inaudible] welcome [inaudible].

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I agree with Commissioner Johnson. Further comments?  
17 The motion's still on the floor. Okay. And you can only go two ways with it, so that vote,  
18 you can still vote yes or no for it, but. Commissioner Siercks, any thoughts?

19 MR. SIERCKS: No.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No? Commissioner Frierson?

21 MS. FRIERSON: No.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Commissioner Taylor, we heard from Commissioner  
23 Grady.

1 MR. TAYLOR: I'm good. [Inaudible]

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay, that's what I'm trying to do. Okay Staff, let's,  
3 the motion of favoring with Staff on this which would be the defendant is the motion and  
4 it was originally seconded by Commissioner Taylor. Alright, and put into motion by  
5 Commissioner Johnson. Please take the vote.

6 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the motion, Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: No.

8 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

9 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Mr. Taylor?

11 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

13 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

15 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

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

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Chair's comments here we gave this case  
22 plenty of time and many months, and we did ask a specific request. That's what I was  
23 looking for since the first night. Like I could've made a motion, yeah. So thank you

1 everyone for your time, Staff and Commission on this. We're not done, there are 7. we  
2 end but usually number 8. which is other items. Commission, Staff, any other items?  
3 Hearing none. Moving on, number 9. would usually be, like the Chairman's Report. I  
4 think everyone's doing great. Thank you for your time, dedication, especially these extra  
5 plans, the overlays, the whole team. I don't wanna lay anything else on there but I do  
6 like to ask about a retreat usually cause I always gain so much from attending those. It's  
7 usually something in August timeframe so if that's possible and if it pairs well with our  
8 Comp Plan work that would be great.

9 MR. PRICE: I think there are a number of items that have come up over the past  
10 year that I think that we can kind of cater a retreat towards, just target it towards. We  
11 can, we'll look to, for that August retreat.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Okay, I would then go to number 10., which  
13 is usually the Planning Director Report. You guys gave us an extra copy.

14 MR. PRICE: Essentially normally we present you with the actions of Council from  
15 the Zoning Public Hearing that was held the previous month.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anything else from the Staff?

17 MR. PRICE: No.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This is when we go to the magical time of number 11.,  
19 which is adjournment and we will take a vote for adjournment with a show of hands.  
20 Hands are unanimous.

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

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff sees that, recognizes it. We are adjourned. Thank you  
2 everyone.

3

4

*[Meeting Adjourned: 9:00pm]*