

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
April 13, 2026

[Members Present: Christopher Yonke, Beverly Frierson, Terrence Taylor, Bryan Grady, Sena Loyd, Chris Siercks, Charles Durant; Absent: Frederick Johnson, II (in at 6:13pm), Mark Duffy (in at 6:45)]

Called to order: 6:04 pm

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'd like to call to order the April 13th, 2026 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. Staff, please confirm the following: in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to the news media, persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board located in the county administrative building. Is that correct?

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Staff. Can you go ahead and take attendance for today's meeting?

MR. DELAGE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

MS. LOYD: Present.

1 MR. DELAGE: Duffy? Johnson? Frierson?

2 MS. FRIERSON: Here.

3 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

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

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the
7 April 13th, 2026 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning
8 Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer our time
9 to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council. Our
10 recommendations are to approve or deny Zoning Map Amendment requests. Per Title VI,
11 Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of Laws* Planning Commission may also prepare and revise
12 plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of unincorporated portions of
13 the County. The County's Comprehensive Plan update over the last year or so is a good
14 example of this. Once again, we are a recommending body to County Council and they
15 will conduct their own public hearings and take official votes to approve or deny Map
16 Amendments and Text Amendments on a future date to be published by the County.
17 Council typically holds Zoning Public hearings on the fourth Tuesday of the month. So
18 please check the County's website for updated agendas, dates and times. Please take
19 note of the following guidelines for today's meeting. Please turn off or silence any
20 cellphones. Audience members may quietly come and go as needed. Applicants are
21 allowed up to two minutes to make comments/statements. Citizens signed up to speak
22 are also allowed two minutes each. Redundant comments should be minimized. Please
23 only address remarks to the Commission and do not expect the Commission to respond

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

11 MR. DELAGE: There are none, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Number 4 on the Agenda is the Approval
13 of the Minutes. The Staff provided the Commission with Minutes from our February 19th,
14 2026 meeting. The Chair would like to make a motion to approve these Minutes as long
15 as I don't hear any concerns from the Commission. Alright, Chair makes a motion to
16 approve the Minutes from February 19, 2026. Do we have a second?

17 MR. DURANT: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Staff, can you please
19 take a vote?

20 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

21 MR. GRADY: Aye.

22 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

23 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

1 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

2 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

3 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

4 MR. DURANT: Aye.

5 MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

6 MS. LOYD: Aye.

7 MR. DELAGE: Duffy? Oh, sorry. Frierson?

8 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

9 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

11 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion passes.

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

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks again, Staff. Okay, look at the notes. I don't have
15 any Road Names. Alright, the next part of the Agenda would be the Consent Agenda. I
16 have a whole description about that one but we're not gonna need to use the Consent
17 Agenda today, we're gonna go ahead and look at every property that's on the Agenda.
18 So that means we can move right along to 5.a., Map Amendments, Case No. 1, 25-046.
19 I'm gonna flip it to Staff for some information.

20 **CASE NO. 25-046 MA:**

21 MR. SMITH: Okay, so the case you have before you today, Case No. 25-046 MA,
22 the Applicant is Katherine Lloyd, the location is 9450 Wilson Boulevard and Wilson
23 Boulevard, 1.07 acres. The existing zoning for each parcel is RT and HM, that's

1 Residential Transition and Homestead. The proposed zoning is Rural Crossroads. The
2 proposed zoning request is compliant with the land use and character and intent of the
3 neighborhood low density designation. The Comprehensive Plan indicates that
4 commercial development should be directed to designated neighborhood activity centers
5 and may be also considered along main road corridors and with contextually appropriate
6 distances from primary arterial intersections. Although the subject property is
7 appropriately situated near a primary arterial roadway, Killian Road, and along a main
8 road corridor, Wilson Boulevard, it is not located within a designated neighborhood activity
9 center. Notwithstanding the existing zoning classifications and established development
10 pattern within the subject property's sphere of influence indicate that the area could
11 accommodate and support the requested zoning designation. However, the RC district is
12 intended to support the rural areas of the county. This district is designed to be located at
13 major intersections so as to prevent the spreading of commercial uses along the major
14 road corridors or into surrounding countryside. The location of the property map
15 amendment is not rural in character and abuts existing commercial zoning, therefore it is
16 not aligned with the intent of the RC zoning district. In addition, the requested Rural
17 Crossroads zoning would allow uses that are more intensive than those supported by the
18 objectives and guidelines for this designation, potentially introducing activities that are not
19 compatible with the existing development pattern. And just wanted to highlight to the
20 Commission as well, when we look at these cases we're not looking, we need to be
21 looking at what, not what fits today but what we want this area to look like in the future;
22 just a side note.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, do we have any questions
2 for Staff? Okay seeing no questions, Ms. Frierson?

3 MS. FRIERSON: We have first the Applicant, Katherine Lloyd.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: As we get started, both podiums are usually open with our
5 microphones. And remember to state your name and address and you'll have two
6 minutes.

7 **TESTIMONY OF KATHERINE LLOYD:**

8 MS. LLOYD: [Inaudible] Okay, there we go. Also with me tonight is Greg Minton
9 with the Spinx Company who will be here as well to answer any questions you all may
10 have. My address is 463 Whispering Oak Circle in Chapin, South Carolina. Thank you for
11 your time and consideration this evening. We are proposing to rezone approximately
12 1.072 acres to RC which will be part of an overall 3.9 acre development. Our request is
13 about consistency and appropriate use. The remaining 2.8 acres already carries RC
14 zoning and we believe this application simply aligns with the remaining parcels to create
15 a cohesive, well-planned development. The Rural Crossroads zoning district is intended
16 to provide small scale commercial uses such as convenience stores and gas stations at
17 key intersections to serve the surrounding community. This is exactly what we intend to
18 do without driving large amounts of new traffic as we consider, as we are considered a
19 pass by use and not a destination. The traffic study has been completed and we will abide
20 by all SCDOT requirements to ensure customer safety if the rezoning is approved. On
21 March 18th, we presented our project to the community at a town hall meeting hosted by
22 Councilwoman Cooper. We provided an overview of our company, the benefits we bring
23 to the community and answered questions from the residents. We felt like the meeting

1 was positive and we appreciate the opportunity from Staff and Councilwoman Cooper to
2 do so. We believe this request aligns with the intent of concentrating commercial activity
3 at intersections supporting existing development patterns and it provides practical service
4 to a growing area while avoiding broader impacts to the surrounding community. We feel
5 that the rezoning request will not be detrimental to the surrounding area and it still
6 supports the intent of the Comprehensive Plan established by Richland County. We are
7 very proud to serve the communities that we operate in and we appreciate those listening
8 in to our request tonight. Thank you all again and we are happy to answer any questions.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you very much.

10 MS. LLOYD: Yeah.

11 MS. FRIERSON: Next we have Greg Minton, followed by Hunter Whitfield.

12 **TESTIMONY OF GREG MINTON:**

13 MR. MINTON: Good evening. My name is Greg Minton, 309 Ellington Creek Lane
14 in Greer, South Carolina. I think Ms. Lloyd presented all the facts behind our proposal
15 tonight. We appreciate the opportunity to present it to you. I'm here to answer any
16 questions should they come up from the Planning Commission tonight. Again, I just want
17 to reiterate that we feel that this is still, won't be detrimental to the surrounding area, will
18 enhance and provide services to the community, and it does fit into the intent of the
19 Comprehensive Plan that was set by Richland County. And we just appreciate your
20 consideration tonight in reviewing this rezoning application for us. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

22 **TESTIMONY OF HUNTER WHITFIELD:**

1 MR. WHITFIELD: Good evening, Hunter Whitfield with Siemen Whiteside. We are
2 the civil engineer on the project and again I think all the facts have been stated but we're
3 here to answer any technical questions, engineering-related questions that may come up.
4 And yeah, thank y'all for letting us be here tonight.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

6 MS. FRIERSON: And the last two people who have signed up, Keith Lomaz and
7 Tammy Fulmer.

8 MR. LOMAZ: We're right here but we don't have anything to add.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay, thank you for coming out tonight. Commission,
10 this is now on the floor for discussion or any questions. My comment as Chair and I may
11 have overlooked this, is that it's compliant with the Comprehensive Plan and the public
12 that came out to speak, they all did sign up, they signed up under the "for" column. So no
13 one said anything to change the mind, so if you have any other questions I wouldn't mind
14 leaning towards the Comp Plan. Commissioner Loyd?

15 MS. LOYD: I just have a comment. My last name is Loyd. I have no relation. I will
16 be voting on this item. Just as a disclosure.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for clarifying. Comments from those on my left
18 over here?

19 MR. DURANT: Just a question, Mr. Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

21 MR. DURANT: Staff, the properties to the immediate north and east of the property
22 at issue here, were those the subject of any recent map amendment requests?

1 MR. DELAGE: So Commissioner Durant, they were recent as in the last couple
2 years but they are a fairly recent rezoning request to Rural Commercial that the Planning
3 Commission and ultimately Council voted to approve.

4 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Any other comments from
6 the Commission? As Chair I rarely like to make the motion but I'll do it. Commissioner
7 Loyd, go ahead.

8 MS. LOYD: If I can – I move to approve to – I –

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You make a motion for approval?

10 MS. LOYD: I make a motion for approval for RC Project 25-046 MA.

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

12 MR. DURANT: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Got a second from Commissioner Durant. Thank you. Staff,
14 with a motion and a second can you please take a vote?

15 MR. DELAGE: Alright, so motion for approval. Grady?

16 MR. GRADY: Aye.

17 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

18 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

19 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

20 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

21 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

22 MR. DURANT: Aye.

23 MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

1 MS. LOYD: Aye.

2 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

3 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

4 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

6 MR. DELAGE: Motion passes.

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

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commission. Thank you, Staff. Thanks for
10 coming out. This will get moved as a recommendation of approval to County Council,
11 and when is their next meeting, Staff?

12 MR. DELAGE: It is April 28th at 7:00pm.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: In these chambers.

14 MR. DELAGE: That's correct.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. Come back to hear more then. Thank you. We'll
16 move on along to our next map amendment, Case, number 2., Case 26-005 MA. Move it
17 to Staff.

18 **CASE NO. 26-005 MA:**

19 MR. SMITH: The case before you, Case No. 26-005 MA. I apologize to the
20 Applicant in advance I'm probably going to butcher this name, Asad Asalim, Incorporated.
21 The location is NX5010 and 5010 Ridgewood Avenue. It's 0.33 acres. Current zoning is
22 Residential Zone 4 and requested zoning is General Commercial. The Comprehensive
23 Plan compliance is non-compliant. The proposed rezoning is not compliant with the

1 objectives of the mixed residential high density designation in the Comprehensive Plan.
2 While there are existing commercial parcels and uses in the immediate area those parcels
3 have frontage along Monticello Road. To the extent possible commercial and office
4 development should be located in activity centers and mixed use corridors. The proposed
5 rezoning is not located in an activity center or in a mixed use corridor. Additionally the
6 proposed rezoning could be viewed as an encroachment into the established residential
7 are and thus is not consistent with the intentions of the Comprehensive Plan objectives
8 for commercial in the urban area.

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

10 MR. DURANT: Yes, Mr. Chair, question for Staff.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright Commissioner Durant, go ahead.

12 MR. DURANT: Staff, do you know what the zoning is in the City of Columbia part
13 that surrounds the property, parcel at issue?

14 MR. DELAGE: So the parcels to the south are zoned one of the residential zoning
15 districts within the city.

16 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Thank you, Staff. Any
18 questions? Alright seeing none, Commissioner Frierson?

19 MS. FRIERSON: We have Omar Shaheed.

20 **TESTIMONY OF OMAR SHAHEED:**

21 MR. SHAHEED: Good evening. My name is Omar Shaheed. I'm at 5119
22 Monticello Road, Columbia, South Carolina. We purchased this piece of property, which
23 is about .33 acres. It was heavily blighted and that area where we are is right next to

1 property that we own. Heavily blighted, snakes, people throwing garbage in the area. We
2 purchased it and we wanted to use it for anything, well not for any businesses or anything
3 but possibly for, if we need it for parking or something of that nature. We're not trying to
4 make a concrete, we just wanna make it so that it won't grow up and it has some, I can't
5 think of what they call it, reeves or reeds or something like that just grows up and it just
6 grows up very heavily. Snakes have been seen in the area. And we wanted to clean it
7 off and make it so if we use it for anything it would just be additional parking, but we don't
8 plan to put a business there or anything of that nature. And we purchased it, if we leave
9 it like it is it's just gonna keep growing up and people just gonna keep dumping trash in
10 the neighborhood. And we have been in that neighborhood for, ever since 1980, and we
11 have been very much received. We talked to our Councilman Livingston about this and
12 he's familiar with the location and us. And we've done nothing in that area but tried to
13 improve. It's a heavily blighted area and it was heavily blighted before we got there in
14 1980. I think it was called a club and someone had been killed I think, two people had
15 been killed and they closed the club down. So we went in there as a religious institution
16 and we have been in that area ever since. So we purchased that strictly, if we use it for
17 anything it'll just be for parking.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Thank you for coming out. Anyone else
19 signed up?

20 MS. FRIERSON: No one else is signed up.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. Commission, any questions for Staff on this now? I
22 have one about the City of Columbia zoning straight east of the property. That wouldn't
23 be residential, correct? That shows as a store.

1 MR. DELAGE: So according to the Assessor's data is the RSF3, but we can always
2 pull up the City's GIS and verify.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other thoughts from the Commission as we wait for
4 Staff? Quiet tonight. Ridgeway address looks like. According to the Google map or the
5 Richland map it looks like there's a store operating there, right sir?

6 MR. SHAHEED: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, okay.

8 MR. SMITH: Just for the Commission's information, the reason for the rezoning is
9 because the parcel is under the amount of acreage that you would be able to request
10 anything but because he is adjacent to General Commercial that's the reason why
11 General Commercial was his only option.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: As to what other type of zoning?

13 MR. SMITH: As to any other zonings that would allow the use that he was looking
14 for.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

16 MR. DELAGE: So it looks like, Mr. Chair, what they had on the Assessor's Office
17 as RSF3 is what is also listed on the City of Columbia's GIS as well.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is that a non-conforming use?

19 MR. DELAGE: I would leave the designation to the jurisdiction that has authority,
20 however, from my experience yes, if it's a use that is not permitted in the base zoning
21 district it would be a non-conforming.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Up for discussion for the Commission.

23 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair, just a question.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

2 MR. DURANT: The Applicant indicated that they're applying for this rezoning in
3 order to be able to clean up the property. Can't that be done regardless of what zoning it
4 is?

5 MR. DELAGE: Commissioner Durant, yes they could technically clean up the
6 property that would not require a rezoning. I believe that the, as the Applicant said though
7 that the reason why they're needing or they're trying to potentially in the future do some
8 additional parking. As it is residentially zoned now and not the same site as the place of
9 worship it would need a different zoning designation than it currently has for them to be
10 able to utilize it for parking.

11 MR. DURANT: Understand.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. What are the thoughts on
13 this one, or motions? As I've said before in other meetings motions only go one of two
14 ways. So we could throw some thoughts on that, although County Council is happier to
15 hear our thoughts behind the motions that we're making, especially if anyone's gonna
16 dissent. Commissioner Grady, thank you.

17 MR. GRADY: Yes, Mr. Chair. I have a motion. I would like to move that this item,
18 which is Case 26-005 MA, be forwarded to County Council with a recommendation of
19 approval. The reason being that the General Commercial use is in line with the adjacent
20 property as well as the general character of the roadway corridor.

21 *[Johnson in at 6:30pm]*

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

23 MR. DURANT: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, we have a second from Commissioner Durant. With a
2 motion on the floor with a second, Staff can you please take a vote?

3 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion is for approval. Grady?

4 MR. GRADY: Aye.

5 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

6 MR. SIERCKS: No.

7 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

8 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

9 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

10 MR. DURANT: Aye.

11 MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

12 MS. LOYD: I'm going to say aye to this but I'm gonna give a little bit of an
13 explanation as well. I think that it is disappointing that it is so limiting that this is the only
14 option when there are probably better options for that neighborhood, just because
15 General Commercial is what is adjacent to allow the rezoning.

16 MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Abstain.

18 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

19 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

20 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I agree with Loyd, aye.

22 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion passes.

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

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Siercks, I hate to put you on the spot but
4 County Council gets value for those who disagree.

5 MR. SIERCKS: I think while I certainly can see the rationale for voting for approval,
6 I think what stuck with me and what sticks with me in a lot of these types of cases where
7 there doesn't appear to be, you know, great options and the applicant is kinda stuck with
8 applying under, in this case a General Commercial because there's no other zonings that
9 fit the needs, it's worth remembering that this isn't a rezoning request for this specific
10 intended use but all intended uses, and how we should look at these cases in a long-
11 term, not what is intended in the near term but what could also be placed there under the
12 proposed zoning amendment.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. And I was kind of on the
14 fence for some of those reasons, too. So that goes as a recommendation of approval. It
15 will go to County Council at their next meeting which I should've wrote down, tell me again
16 Staff when is it?

17 MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair, it's April 28th, 7:00pm in Council chambers.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Right here. We'll go ahead and move on to our next case,
19 Case 26-006, flip it right back to Staff. And we welcome Commissioner Johnson

20 **CASE NO. 26-006 MA:**

21 MR. SMITH: The case you have before you, 26-006MA, the Applicant is Jeremy
22 Haladay. The location is 2101 Kennerly Road and it's 3.138 acres. The existing zoning is
23 Homestead, HM. The proposed rezoning is RC which is the Rural Crossroads district.

1 The Comprehensive Plan compliance is non-compliant. The proposed rezoning is not
2 compliant with the objectives of the neighborhood medium density designation in the
3 Comprehensive Plan. Per the Plan nonresidential development within the neighborhood
4 medium density designation may be considered for location along main road corridors
5 and within contextually appropriate distance from an intersection of a primary arterial. The
6 proposed request is not located along a neighborhood corridor within an appropriate
7 distance from an intersection of a primary arterial. Additionally, the Plan states that the
8 commercial uses should be located within neighborhood activity centers and that
9 commercial land uses should not result in strip commercial development or fragmented
10 leapfrog development patterns along corridors. The proposed request does not fall within
11 a neighborhood center. A rezoning such as this could be viewed as a leapfrog
12 development.

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

14 MR. TAYLOR: Question.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor?

16 MR. TAYLOR: Could you repeat the acreage, please?

17 MR. SMITH: The acreage is – sure, the acreage is 3.38 acres.

18 MR. TAYLOR: Okay, I thought you said 1.138.

19 MR. SMITH: I may have.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other questions? Alright seeing, hearing none,
21 Commissioner Frierson?

22 MS. FRIERSON: We have Phillip Bradley and then Jesse Groat.

23 **TESTIMONY OF PHILLIP BRADLEY:**

1 MR. BRADLEY: Good evening Chairman and Members of the Commission. My
2 name is Phillip Bradley. I reside at 518 Lockshire Road, Columbia 29212. I serve as the
3 lead pastor for Decided church and I'm here regarding the request to rezone the Decided
4 Church property from HM to Rural Commercial. I want to begin by saying we are not
5 coming here with a desire to disrupt the community. I've been a part of the community
6 since 1989 so I have a vested interest in this, in the community. But we're here to ask
7 that it be rezoned in such a way that aligns with both the County's vision and the
8 surrounding area. This property has functioned as a place of gathering, ministry and
9 community engagement. What we are requesting does not introduce something entirely
10 foreign to the area but allows for continued and appropriate use of property in a way that
11 is consistent with similar uses already present in this part of the county. From my
12 understanding the commercial rural designation is specifically intended to allow for low
13 intensity, community-oriented uses that serve the surrounding area without introducing
14 the kind of density or impact associated with more intensive commercial zoning. This
15 request does not increase residential density, it does not introduce heavy commercial
16 traffic, and it does not change the fundamental character of the area. Instead it provides
17 flexibility for the property to be used in ways that serve the community, whether that be
18 continued ministry use or other low impact appropriate uses that align with the County's
19 long-term planning goals. We also recognize that zoning decisions are not just about a
20 single property but about the broader health of the community. Our intent it to work with
21 that goal. This rezoning would help ensure that the property remains viable, usable and
22 beneficial rather than restricting it in a way that could limit contributing to the area in the

1 future. We are grateful for your time and consideration and we respectfully ask for your
2 approval of this request. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you so much for coming out.

4 **TESTIMONY OF JESSE GROAT:**

5 MR. GROAT: Good evening. My name's Jesse Groat. I reside at 695 Bluff Point,
6 Columbia, South Carolina 29212. I'm the real estate agent that has the property listed for
7 sale. So over the last several months as we've been trying to sell it we've had many small
8 businesses, also nonprofits, approach us about this facility. Just so y'all know it's a 5,000
9 square foot metal structure with parking on the front and back of the property, so the
10 building appears to be what looks like a commercial building, there's office space in it and
11 everything. So we just hope that the council would consider the rezoning of this property
12 just due to all the potential buyers and clients that keep approaching us for this property.
13 So thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

15 MS. FRIERSON: Next we have Dean S., I'm sorry I cannot make out your last
16 name, of 518 Cockspur Road, and then Kim Murphy.

17 **TESTIMONY OF DEAN SMEDLEY:**

18 MR. SMEDLEY: Good evening, my name is Dean Smedley. I reside at 518
19 Cockspur Road, Irmo, South Carolina 29063. And I don't have much more to add to what
20 was already shared. I think you've heard our heart of what we desire to do. We desire,
21 actually I'm a part of the church, I work that at Decided, and we really just wanna make
22 sure that this property is used for the good of the community. That's really what we wanna
23 do. I think you've heard the heart, our heart in that, our desire for that. And by making this

1 change it'll allow us to open up to other opportunities for people that really desire to use
2 it for the same purposes, so thank you again for your time.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

4 MS. FRIERSON: After Kim Murphy, Clark Thomas.

5 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

6 MS. MURPHY: Hi, Kim Murphy here. I'm kinda switching around just a little bit.
7 There were three items listed on the Agenda, number 6. Land Development Code
8 Updates listed as action.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And what's your address?

10 MS. MURPHY: Okay, 154 Old Laurel Lane.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

12 MS. MURPHY: Chapin. Number 7. Comprehensive Plan action and number 10.b.,
13 Development Review Team Report. There were no sign up sheets to speak but I'm
14 wondering if you're gonna allow the public to speak like you did with the Land
15 Development Code.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We don't do the back and forth style, but –

17 MS. MURPHY: Pardon me?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The purpose of this meeting isn't to have a back and forth,
19 Ms. Murphy. So you have the two minutes uninterrupted and then we'll discuss that as
20 we get to it.

21 MS. MURPHY: Okay, thank you very much.

22 CHIARMAN YONKE: Of course.

23 MS. MURPHY: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I know you walked through all the Land Development Code
2 stuff with us for many years so I appreciate that.

3 MR. MURPHY: Yes, and I appreciate your work, too. I guess this area is the
4 boundary between rural and suburban and rural, pretty rural. It's a good distance from
5 areas that are developed as commercial and if you turn on your zoning layers and zoom
6 out you can see where commercial is. If you were rezoning this to commercial you know
7 anything that's listed as commercial can be constructed there. I don't wanna say that
8 faithful people are not, are going to do what they say they're gonna do or they're not, but
9 it's the general commercial that is the issue. It would be considered leapfrogging and I'm
10 hopeful that you will deny it because it is such a good distance away. HM does allow for
11 commercial development. So they could do some commercial. And I'm not sure if that
12 limits them but it's the GC that is the issue. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Ms. Murphy. I was gonna ask if you could put the
14 zoning layer on.

15 MR. DELAGE: Can I be recognized?

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Huh?

17 MR. DELAGE: Real quick?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff go ahead.

19 MR. DELAGE: The Applicant is applying for Rural Crossroads, so I just wanna
20 make sure everybody's clear what you're voting on, Rural Crossroads.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: HM to RC, yes. Thank you. I was curious to see maybe split
22 screen zoning on, and then also street view. Thanks, Staff, and we have one more person
23 signed up to speak.

1 *[Duffy in at 6:45pm]*

2 MS. FRIERSON: Clark Thomas.

3 **TESTIMONY OF CLARK THOMAS:**

4 MR. THOMAS: Hi, my name's Clark Thomas. I'm at 2165 Kennerly Road.
5 Appreciate the opportunity to speak. I'm here today to respectfully oppose the proposed
6 rezoning from Homestead to Rural Commercial. I'm the adjacent landowner where my
7 family has lived for over 65 years. This 3.4 acres under consideration for rezoning was
8 owned by my family before being sold to the Richland Lodge in 1998. They sold the
9 property to a church in 2013. The property is up for sale again which I assume is the
10 reason for the rezoning so they can allow for more potential buyers. Richland County
11 denied the rezoning request in 2013. I've got the information on that if you need it.
12 Homestead zoning exists to protect low density residential living, preserve rural character
13 and allow families to enjoy quiet open space without the impacts of commercial activity.
14 Changing this designation is not a small adjustment, it's a fundamental shift in how the
15 land can be used. The property is directly across the street from an elementary school
16 and the zoning change would allow for multiple types of retail business including liquor
17 stores. This change would increase change and delivery vehicles which raises concern
18 about safety, congestion and the overall quality for the current, of life for the current
19 residents. There's also the issue of precedent. If this rezoning is approved it opens the
20 door for similar requests nearby. Over time that leads to gradual commercial
21 encroachment into what is supposed to remain a rural residential area. Property owners
22 in homestead areas have made the investments with the expectation that the surrounding
23 land would remain consistent with that zoning. Introducing commercial uses can

1 negatively affect property values and undermine that expectation. Finally, Richland
2 County has already, already has designated areas that are better suited for commercial
3 development; places with the infrastructure, traffic capacity and planning framework to
4 support it. Moving commercial zoning into homestead areas is not necessary and is not
5 consistent for long-term planning. For these reasons I respectfully ask that you deny the
6 rezoning request. Thank you for your time.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for your time, for coming out.

8 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Thomas was the last person who signed up to speak.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Ms. Frierson. Okay Commission, this is on the floor
10 for discussion. Not everybody at once now. Questions as well. Greetings Commissioner
11 Duffy.

12 MR. DUFFY: Greetings.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Mixing things up.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson.

16 MR. JOHNSON: I don't have a lotta discussion topics on this, I mean, I'm, in my
17 mind I have a conclusion [inaudible] recommendation [inaudible – mic cutting out]

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do you wanna elaborate some of your thoughts before it's a
19 conclusion?

20 MR. JOHNSON: I think that, looking at the zoning map that notwithstanding the
21 language that Staff has used there's only in the [inaudible] challenge for me to support.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. I see it as well, you have
2 to zoom the map out even more and I still don't see any commercial in the area. Staff, are
3 you seeing any commercial that we're missing?

4 MR. DELAGE: No, sir, Mr. Chair, there's just a PDD just at this scale, we just
5 wanted to double check.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. Okay, any thoughts, questions,
7 comments? Commissioner Taylor.

8 MR. TAYLOR: So again just for clarification because you're saying you don't see
9 any commercial, it is Rural Crossroads that we're looking at, correct, which would be
10 considered a commercial designation, is that accurate or no?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, would you like to explain?

12 MR. DELAGE: That is correct, yes.

13 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chair?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Duffy.

15 MR. DUFFY: Question for Staff. If this rezoning was to go through would it not
16 significantly increase the burden on traffic in the area, cause now it's a church but if it was
17 to be a liquor store, a gas store? I'm familiar with the location and know where it is at a
18 major kind of intersection of different roads so would not, you know, there not be some
19 safety concerns if it was a, you know, an active commercial space that was used for liquor
20 store, garage, whatever it may be, and does it not set a bad precedent if there's no RC
21 around?

22 MR. DELAGE: So I think I can address portions of the question. Not having an
23 exact end use it'd be difficult to say that, you know, particularly there would be a change

1 in traffic. Obviously places of worship, depending on how they function, there's a number
2 that you can assign to them based off the trip generation manual and so you could
3 potentially identify a use that would have more traffic than what's existing. However, there
4 is, from what we could see from the street view, a curb cut, you know, if there is a
5 significant change of use or any proposal where they would need more entrances SCDOT
6 is the road maintenance authority so they would need to get an encroachment permit
7 from them and at that point they would look at the driveway separations and any other
8 requirements. But they would be the authority that would basically be issuing any safety
9 improvements.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioner Duffy, does that answer?

11 MR. DUFFY: Yes, I think so. And just to reaffirm that there's no other immediate
12 examples of RC on any sites around it, is that correct?

13 MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson had something?

15 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the interest of fairness I
16 know we have another Agenda item further down [inaudible] but I wanna raise the same
17 question I raised last month is, we're making this decision based on the existing
18 Comprehensive Plan, correct?

19 MR. SMITH: Yes, that is correct.

20 MR. JOHNSON: And assuming that the new plan is to be adopted, is successfully
21 adopted, does that change Staff's recommendation [inaudible]?

22 MR. SMITH: Without having an adopted plan it's hard to say. On a draft front of me
23 looking at it today the proposed rezoning would be compliant in the new code or in the

1 new map. And one more thing to point out on this is Kennerly Road is the dividing line on
2 the future land use map that separates the rural designation from the medium density
3 designation. In the new mapping I believe this area changes from that designation to
4 something else, so yes that area does change in a way. But again, this designation of
5 Rural Crossroads is a district that provides rural lands with commercial uses. So just
6 taking into context what the description of the zoning district is, that's something you may
7 wanna take into consideration.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson, does that?

9 MR. JOHNSON: He addressed my question. And again I said in fairness I raised
10 the same issue before and [inaudible]. But we're [inaudible] considering this under the
11 current Comprehensive Plan in terms of what we have before us.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You could look at it for the general character of the area and
13 changes in the neighborhood as time's going on, right? As we were doing the research
14 for the new Comprehensive Plan, let's look at the maps again, how, what's changing in
15 this area? Is it still light residential and rural?

16 MR. SMITH: The extension of the residential element will be extended further to
17 the riverfront. So where the Kennerly Road divider currently is now that side of the road
18 in the current plan is rural where in the new plan that will become a suburban residential.

19 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible] suburban residential?

20 MR. SMITH: That is correct.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Does anyone on the Commission have comments,
22 discussion? Commissioner Grady's doing some research.

1 MR. GRADY: I am, Mr. Chair. I was just following up on the question of how the
2 draft Comprehensive Plan, if approved, would alter this. There appears to be a purple
3 speck, light purple speck on the site of the property in question so I was hoping Staff could
4 clarify what that designation is?

5 MR. SMITH: Without the current map or my GIS in front of me it would be hard for
6 me to answer that question at this time.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And for the public to get better understanding of the picture
8 we're trying to paint, cause we are tied to a 2015 Comprehensive Plan, although the
9 County's been doing some great work over the past year for the 2025 Comprehensive
10 Plan, and now we are in 2026. So it is relevant to look at what this, how this new plan is
11 shaping up. Commissioner Johnson.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Staff, if I could get you just to repeat
13 what the new Comprehensive Plan [inaudible] as currently drafted, or as the current draft,
14 what is that zoning [inaudible]?

15 MR. SMITH: The, in the draft form of the new Comprehensive Plan the land use
16 recommendation for that area would be suburban residential.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: [Inaudible] Commissioner Johnson?

18 MR. JOHNSON: Well I was waiting to see if my colleague Commissioner Grady
19 had a position, but I mean, otherwise I would enter my [inaudible]. In the matter of 26-006
20 MA, I'd enter a motion to [inaudible] recommendation for 2101 Kennerly Road to
21 [inaudible] with a recommendation for disapproval.

22 MR. DUFFY: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, hold on. We have a motion on the floor for
2 disapproval. Do I have a second?

3 MR. DUFFY: I second it.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second, got a second from Commissioner Duffy. Alright,
5 thank you. With a motion and a second, we're gonna go ahead and have Staff take a
6 vote, disapproval.

7 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

9 MR. DURANT: For disapproving a motion do we need a basis for it?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Not if it goes with the County's recommendation, right, for
11 the Comprehensive Plan's recommendation.

12 MR. DELAGE: Correct, however, if you do want to add one, yes you can.

13 MR. JOHNSON: I'm happy to. I mean, I think that it is important –

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead, Commissioner Johnson.

15 MR. JOHNSON: - just in fairness so that both the public and the Applicant
16 understands, that under the current land use plan that the proposal is inconsistent with
17 what is [inaudible]. In taking to account if the draft Comprehensive Plan were adopted
18 today I don't think it, speaking from my vantage point, that it would change the outcome.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, that's gonna be the reasoning. Now Commissioner
20 Duffy, you still second that?

21 MR. DUFFY: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. So we got a motion and a second. Staff needs to take
23 a vote.

1 MR. DELAGE: Alright. Grady?

2 MR. GRADY: Aye.

3 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

4 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

5 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

6 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

7 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

8 MR. DURANT: Aye.

9 MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

10 MS. LOYD: Aye.

11 MR. DELAGE: Duffy?

12 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

13 MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

14 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

15 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

16 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

17 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

19 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion for disapproval passes.

20 *[Approved: Grady, Siercks, Taylor, Durant, Loyd, Frierson, Yonke, Johnson, Duffy]*

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you Staff. Alright Commissioner Johnson
22 would like to make some comments.

1 MR. JOHNSON: First of all I want to thank Staff for being prepared to answer and
2 address that question. Secondly I just think I raise it again because I think last month it
3 would've been a different outcome. I think that if we had looked at what the draft was
4 [inaudible].

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Thank you,
6 Commission. Alright, that was a recommendation of disapproval. It's gonna go to County
7 Council for April 28th, 7:00pm. We're gonna go ahead and keep moving on for tonight.
8 Next case, 26-007. I had to say it. Gotta make fun on a Planning Commission, come on.

9 MR. TAYLOR: Quick question.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor?

11 MR. TAYLOR: Looking at some of these proposals or, and looking at Staff's
12 recommendation I have a question as far as when we're looking at these projects and the
13 zoning classifications, you know, a one or two jump is usually understandable or
14 justifiable, [inaudible] you gotta jump, like seven or eight different zoning classes to get to
15 the desired zoning. My question is, can you explain just a little bit, like special exceptions
16 versus special requirements, does that, is that taken into account whenever the applicant
17 comes forward or are you looking for just a natural fit into whatever the zoning class is or
18 the one that's being requested?

19 MR. DELAGE: So as far as, depending on where they are in the process, so
20 typically for a rezoning we're just looking at, you know, basically most intense use that's
21 allowed by right or potentially by special requirement. Your special requirements are
22 generally additional development standards that are placed on a property. For example,
23 they may have a requirement for your driveway not to be closer than 30' to another

1 residential zoning or use. It could be for, in some cases like with places of worship,
2 depending on the acreage and the intensity of the uses that'll be on the property, if you
3 have a very large parcel you have to be located basically on a road, you can't use an
4 easement to basically service it. So they're basically, it's an administrative function to
5 ensure that there are additional standards placed on those uses to kinda make them fit
6 into areas where they may not otherwise fit based on, you know, some kind of constraint.
7 The special exception is before the Board of Zoning Appeals so the idea behind that is,
8 again you have an additional level of review. Generally for those special exceptions they'll
9 identify, other than the basics, we want to make sure there's not gonna be any kind of
10 effect on pedestrian safety, traffic, noise, smoke, odor glare. In other cases you may again
11 have some additional development requirements as part of that, but then the Board can
12 also place additional conditions on approval. So that's kinda the main difference. But
13 typically when we do have our pre-application meetings if they have an identified use that
14 they want, we will talk about that and make sure that they are given all options of the
15 zoning districts that will permit that either by right or by special requirement or special
16 exception. But then, of course, after that because it is a rezoning we don't really talk about
17 uses it's just whatever's allowed in the district.

18 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, and that's kinda the catch-22 because we're not looking at
19 the uses typically but that's what we hear when they come to the podium. And that's why
20 I was asking the question, so thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. Good topic. Alright Staff,
22 we'll move on to this next Map Amendment.

23 **CASE NO. 26-007 MA:**

1 MR. SMITH: Alright. Case No. 26-007 MA. Location 1284 Kelly Mill Road and S/S
2 Kelly Mill Road. The acreage is 7.5 acres. Existing zoning is HM, Homestead. The
3 proposed zoning is MU2, Mixed Use Corridor. The Comprehensive Plan compliance is
4 non-compliant. The proposed rezoning is not compliant with the objectives of the
5 neighborhood medium density designation in the Comprehensive Plan. Per the plan non-
6 residential development within the neighborhood medium density designation may be
7 considered for the location along main road corridors and within contextually appropriate
8 distances from the intersection of a primary arterial. The proposed request is not located
9 along a main road corridor or within an appropriate distance from the intersection of a
10 primary arterial. Additionally, the plan states that commercial uses should be located
11 within a neighborhood activity center and that such uses should not result in strip
12 commercial development or fragmented leapfrog development patterns along corridors.
13 The proposed request is not situated within a designated neighborhood center,
14 neighborhood activity center, I apologize, and is noncontiguous to existing commercial
15 development. Because it effectively bypasses adjacent undeveloped land the request
16 could not be reasonably characterized as promoting leapfrog development patterns which
17 is inconsistent with the intent of the Plan.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commission, any questions? Okay, seeing
19 none. Commissioner Frierson, who's signed up to speak?

20 MS. FRIERSON: We have Mr. Elias Diss and then Levetta Williams.

21 *[Loyd out at 7:00pm]*

22 **TESTIMONY OF ELIAS DIB:**

23 MR. DIB: Good afternoon, or good evening. I'm James Bond because 007.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Nice.

2 MR. DIB: My name's Elias Dib. I'm at 240 Brookspring Road, Columbia. I bought
3 the property about 20 years ago. This is the time right now because this area is
4 expanding, it's growing. That is in Blythewood where houses are being built north, south,
5 east and west, you can subdivisions everywhere. I'm planning to develop it as an anchor
6 grocery store. Reason for that is to serve the community, if they want milk, eggs, they
7 don't have to drive 10 miles or four miles or whatever it is. It's very close by. If you want
8 medicine, if you want something else it's very close by. The need for that in the proximity
9 area is so tremendous. You might find one person or two persons who might object to the
10 progress in Blythewood, but you should not stop the progress, we should not stop the
11 move forward. It might be sentimental for them, might be been there for a long time,
12 maybe because their parents, but progress needs to be continued for, as best for the
13 community as a whole; not just for 1% but to the 99% who wanna achieve a better life
14 and do not have to go through, to down to Blythewood several miles down the road with
15 the traffic to get their eggs or milk. I would like for you guys to approve it. I would like for
16 you guys to say aye, all of you. And let's hope for the best. Thank you for your time.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

18 MR. DIB: I'm here to answer any questions for you.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

20 MS. FRIERSON: Levetta Williams.

21 **TESTIMONY OF LEVETTA WILLIAMS:**

22 MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening, honorable Chairman and your distinguished
23 members. My name is Levetta Lyles Williams and I reside at 5410 Hardscrabble Road,

1 Blythewood, South Carolina 29016. Home is where the heart is and quite literally this is
2 my home. I was born in my grandparent's home at what is now 5425 Hardscrabble Road,
3 just yards from the property being discussed this evening. Long before it was named such
4 and long before it was paved, just an unpaved red dirt road, the home of my grandfather
5 and my grandmother, Nick and Janie Young, land was farmed by them and their 11
6 children. I'm very proud to say that my grandparents were pillars of the community of what
7 is now a vibrant community. Just a little up the road where Hardscrabble intersects with
8 Rimer Pond Road my grandfather gave the lumber from their home to construct the
9 Roundtop Baptist Church, and you all are familiar with Roundtop Baptist Church,
10 Roundtop Church Road and Roundtop Elementary School. Started from my grandfather.
11 I'm saying all this to say that family roots run deep. Having names change diminishes and
12 takes away from all the families who have worked hard, sacrificed much life and limb. It's
13 shameful and disrespectful. It erases our community's history and our heritage. This is all
14 in the name of progress. I am not against progress, change or advancement, but we must
15 be more thoughtful and more plan-ful as we do so, not to take away from what attracted
16 people to Blythewood in the first place. This affects me personally because my property
17 is adjoined to the parcel of land being considered tonight. My first cousin is here with me,
18 Zelma Ruff Gibbs, another of Nick and Janie's grandchildren.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: If you could please give me your final thought, I've give you
20 an extra 30 seconds.

21 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: To be fair to everybody.

23 MS. WILLIAMS: Is here –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

2 MS. WILLIAMS: - with me tonight because her name, her home is located on Ruff
3 Road, which is named after her parents. Respectfully I am making my appeal here tonight
4 that there be no name changes and no rezoning from residential. Thank you so much for
5 your consideration and if I can answer any questions I'll be certainly happy to.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you so much.

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you so much.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Anyone else signed up?

9 MS. FRIERSON: No, she was the last person to sign up.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Okay Commission, this is now on the floor for
11 discussion or questions.

12 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Commissioner Johnson, can you ask that in your
14 microphone?

15 MR. JOHNSON: Staff, is it appropriate just to give contextual reference to the
16 properties that [inaudible]?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Frierson?

18 MS. FRIERSON: Yes, under Discussion on page 34, I think there's a mistake.
19 Under public services in that second sentence it says Lake Carolina Elementary School
20 54 miles east of the subject parcel. That's probably supposed to be 5.4 but I know it's not
21 54 miles. Just wanted to bring that – see right here?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. No punctuation there. Good eye, Ms. Frierson,
23 Commissioner Frierson. Okay Commission, let's have a discussion.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Before we go to discussion may I ask a quick question?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson.

3 MR. JOHNSON: The location map has a pink color that's not referenced on the
4 zoning map.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Council map districts. This one's on the edge of a few County
6 Council districts. I can answer that.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks. Okay. One, two, three, discuss. Staff, could you put
9 the zoning layer on? I know what that color is but I wanna ask it out loud, to the southeast,
10 what is that, what does that mean? Does that mean it's a PDD? All of that, that residential
11 there.

12 MR. DELAGE: Yes, it is part of Lake Carolina.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Can we discuss, heartburn for me, primary
14 arterial and roads? With the expansion of Hardscrabble Road over the last two decades,
15 it seems like that's how long it took, right?

16 MR. SMITH: Sure, why not. So the bigger difference is where these primary
17 arterials versus secondary or collectors is gonna be up to SCDOT classification systems
18 and it's gonna be the amount of traffic that is accumulating and how they classify it. I will
19 say that the Hardscrabble construction ended at that intersection so at one time it was a
20 two-lane, it became a five-lane, but at the intersection it goes from five lanes to two lanes
21 at the intersection going north. As far as primary and secondary, I believe that Tommy's
22 gonna bring up, Mr. DeLage is gonna bring up the road classification system.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: In our Report, as you're pulling that up, page 35, almost
2 25,000 cars a day.

3 MR. DELAGE: Yes, so it appears that the, at the intersection Hardscrabble goes
4 from that urban minor arterial to, it looks like the green which is the urban major collector.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: But the residents in this area that are there now see this as
6 more of a busier intersection? Staff what's the use just southeast of the intersection? Yes.

7 MR. SMITH: That would non-conforming residential use with multiple structures on
8 it.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, spin around the street view a little bit. This is just from
10 October. That looks pretty residential. Thanks, Staff. What are your thoughts,
11 Commission? Commissioner Grady?

12 MR. GRADY: Yes. Thank you for bringing up the primary arterial question because
13 I was going to. This has been something that I've brought up on a number of different
14 occasions because it does seem that SCDOT does not necessarily take into account
15 upgrades or traffic flow changes when making these designations. You know, when I think
16 about where there should, you know, where we should permit commercial development
17 in a primarily residential area this strikes me as the sort of site that would apply; whereas
18 the intersection of two roads that are crucial for traffic flow in the area, there's already
19 substantial residential development in the area. There's both sort of the sting for rural
20 development, then you also see there's also more traditional small lot suburban
21 subdivision type development as well. So while I, you know, appreciate the, the precision
22 with which Staff makes their recommendation and notes that it is not a primary arterial as

1 designated by SCDOT, I would, and I will let discussion proceed, but I would be inclined
2 to think that this would be [inaudible].

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Commissioner Johnson.

4 MR. JOHNSON: To Commissioner Grady's point when you read the definition of
5 the zoning district on the bottom of 33, [inaudible] right spot and location for that mixed
6 use [inaudible]. For the same reasons Commissioner Grady outlined that tends to be my
7 initial gut [inaudible] if there was a spot for a mixed use development that intersection is
8 what makes sense. [Inaudible] –

9 MS. MURPHY: Microphone, please? You're breaking up. Sorry.

10 MR. JOHNSON: To start from the beginning I was saying that the zoning district
11 summary for M2, MU2 it's in my mind corner in this intersection which is the essence of
12 what Commission Grady was saying. And I was just saying that I'm, I arrive to the same
13 point. I was going to [inaudible] residents make a compelling case in terms of the desire
14 to retain the current fabric and feel. But if this were an inline site I might be inclined to
15 oppose it but being on a corner and being on the corner of those two main roads, it's hard
16 to not justify [inaudible] supporting that change.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Commissioner Sierks?

18 MR. SIERCKS: Yes, Mr. Chair, if I could ask the Staff to zoom out a little bit on the
19 map.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: When we look at the 2015 Comp Plan we use the
21 neighborhood activity center terminology, right Staff?

22 MR. SMITH: That is correct.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. If we were back in our time machine to 2014 and we
2 were coming up with the terminology, what would define that or what's the birth of one?
3 We've got two busy roads here, residents around the outside, like the different
4 subdivisions.

5 MR. SMITH: A multitude of factors come into range. Normally when we look at
6 these neighborhood centers a lotta things are taken into consideration between traffic,
7 economics, housing, you know, the want or the need from the community, from the
8 government, from you know, constituents. We take all those factors into consideration
9 when we identify these activity centers. And not saying that when we do the
10 Comprehensive Plan update in five years from our new one we might see some areas
11 that we view now not as activity centers that we may see as activity centers in five years.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You said the want and need, I see on the map as
13 Commissioner Siercks asked to zoom it out, there's a want to be there. There's a lot of
14 residences here.

15 MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chair.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Staff.

17 MR. DELAGE: So just to provide some additional information, this section of Lake
18 Carolina has that, that's almost green with my hand, allows for commercial uses as part
19 of the PDD. I believe up here to north is multi-family as well. So just throwing that out
20 there as information if it may help with your discussion.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is there a natural boundary in the 2015 Comp Plan that
22 shows Kelly Mill Road as a barrier? No, it's in the middle of the same color yellow. Okay.
23 Okay Commission, further discussion or a motion?

1 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant?

3 MR. DURANT: Just a, one question of Mr., my colleague Commissioner Johnson
4 brought up the last couple of times was would there be any difference here if we were
5 under the Comprehensive Plan in the Staff's view?

6 MR. SMITH: Again from a face value this area from, the difference between what
7 we're proposing today in our current Comp Plan to what we're proposing in the new Comp
8 Plan, currently in the 2015 Plan it's recommended I believe medium density. In the new
9 Plan this area is actually less dense and lower density, and the dividing line is Rimer Pond
10 Road going north. Rimer Pond Road going north which is the subject perpendicular road
11 that, or Kelly Mill is Rimer Pond. Rimer Pond turns into Kelly Mill at that intersection. So
12 the dividing line is the Kelly Mill/Rimer Pond Road.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Divides between what and what?

14 MR. SMITH: Divides suburban from low density.

15 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Siercks.

17 MR. SIERCKS: Looking at this request, I think what stands out is what has stood
18 out in a couple of the proposed zoning requests tonight which is to me this just seems
19 like a, a leapfrog development pattern. And with regard to, while I can certainly understand
20 the, the questions surrounding what the Comp Plan might be once it's, or the updated
21 Land Development Code might be once it's finished, we can talk about hypotheticals and
22 what could be and what might be; that's a discussion for when and if the Land
23 Development Code is implemented as it's currently been drafted. That could change.

1 What we have before us is a request within the guidelines or at least how we should be
2 looking at this is, does it fit within the guidelines of the Land Development Code and the
3 Comprehensive Plan as it's currently written? If that changes with future land
4 development codes or future comp plans then the applicants are free to reapply at that
5 time if it meets with those changes. But to me where I come down on this one is it's not
6 currently within a neighborhood activity center and it seems like the, some of the
7 discussion is trying to make it work when it currently does not.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. More comments?
9 Commissioner Frierson?

10 MS. FRIERSON: Yes, I agree with my colleague. I'm familiar with that area, too,
11 and reading the conclusion that Staff provided I think those points are quite on point and
12 I think that we must work with the provisions that we have currently. And as I said I'm
13 familiar with that area and it definitely would be a leapfrog zoning change if we did not go
14 along with what Staff recommended in this instance.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. Any further thoughts on
16 this side of the table? On that side? Okay, who's brave to make a motion?

17 MS. FRIERSON: I will.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, Commissioner Frierson.

19 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chairperson, I move that we send Map Amendment 26-007
20 to County Council with a recommendation of non-compliance and we don't have to state
21 a reason because it goes along with Staff, but if we had to it would be because it is not
22 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, it's not located along a main road corridor or nor

1 is it at an intersection of primary arterial, nor is it designated as a neighborhood activity
2 center, so.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. Do we have a second
4 for disapproval, non-compliant?

5 MR. SIERCKS: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Siercks. Okay Staff, with a
7 motion and a second go ahead and take a vote, please.

8 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

9 MR. GRADY: No.

10 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

11 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

12 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

13 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

14 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

15 MR. DURANT: Aye.

16 MR. DELAGE: Duffy?

17 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

18 MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

19 MR. JOHNSON: No.

20 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

21 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

22 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

1 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion passes.

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

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. I appreciate the discussion. I don't come in here
5 with my decision already made so hearing from you helps me, thanks. This goes as
6 disapproval. Staff, would County Council like to hear from dissenting votes on this? That's
7 been valuable we've been told.

8 MR. DELAGE: If y'all would like to have some additional discussion on the
9 dissenting votes then that is always helpful.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Those that voted no, Commissioner Johnson, go ahead?

11 MR. JOHNSON: This is a tough case. Again, as I said the location tends to fit the
12 [inaudible] zoning location and as Staff pointed out, while it's under a PUD there is
13 provision for commercial down the street. And so one of the key [inaudible] some of our
14 Commission Members were leaning on is the definition of what that road is [inaudible] the
15 actual growth, what's happening in that corridor presents that challenge of, and it's the
16 perfect example of the challenge and the balance between rural versus undeveloped. It
17 is, it may not be fully developed but [inaudible] certainly enough [inaudible].

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Was it Commissioner
19 Grady?

20 MR. GRADY: Yeah, Mr. Chair. So I think articulated my rationale during the
21 discussion to a great extent, but I think what it fundamentally comes down to is it's a road
22 with 25,000 daily traffic, Hardscrabble Road, in this stretch as reported by our briefing
23 packet. So given that, while it may not fit the SCDOT definition of a primary arterial it's

1 clearly the primary road in the immediate vicinity. There's substantial residential
2 development and not allowing, you know, small scale commercial activity would
3 essentially require people in the area to drive long distances to other portions of the
4 county which would amplify traffic congestion, which I know is certainly a concern in this
5 area. So I would say that it, it seems that this would be the most appropriate site for such
6 a development, even if it does not necessarily fit the exact letter of what is stated.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. And I'll explain that my
8 vote was swayed by some more information from the Staff with that PDD down the road
9 that there is some potential for mixed use already assigned to the area that hasn't been
10 developed yet. So thank you. This will go to County Council on April 28th at 7:00pm. We
11 can move along to our last case. Which is Case 26-008.

12 **CASE NO. 26-008 MA:**

13 MR. SMITH: The case you have before you is 26-008 MA. The Applicant is Julius
14 Murray, Jr. The location is 1879 Chain Gang Road. It's 9.68 acres. The existing zoning is
15 HM, Homestead. The proposed zoning is residential transition. Comprehensive Plan
16 compliance is non-compliant. The proposed rezoning is not compliant with the goals and
17 objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed rezoning of the subject parcel to
18 residential transition is not consistent with the desired development of the rural large lot
19 future land use designation. Residential development should occur on very large
20 individual owned lots or as family subdivisions. However, approval of the requested Map
21 Amendment would be in character with the current zoning, land uses and development
22 pattern within the area.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thanks Staff. Commission, any questions for Staff?
2 Okay not seeing any, Commissioner Frierson?

3 MS. FRIERSON: First we have the Applicant, Julius Murray.

4 **TESTIMONY OF JULIUS MURRAY:**

5 MR. MURRAY: Good evening Commissioners. I'm Julius Murray, Jr. I reside at
6 1069 Old Bluff Road, Hopkins, South Carolina. And I come before you today to ask you
7 please rezone this property. This property was sold to these people before 2019. I've
8 owned it probably since 1985. My father took care of everything and if you pay attention
9 there's actually a mobile home on one, on tract B that's been there for maybe 15 years.
10 And what has happened is the property was sold for taxes so when I redeemed it or when
11 I bought it back the land that was already cut off was included back into the new map. So
12 I can't get these people a deed for their property based on the new regs of 2023. And all
13 I'm asking is to rezone so I can issue them a deed. And that's it.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thanks for coming out.

15 MR. MURRAY: Thank you.

16 MS. FRIERSON: We have Marya Johnson and then Richard Johnson.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible]

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

19 **TESTIMONY OF RICHARD JOHNSON:**

20 MR. JOHNSON: My name's Richard Johnson. I reside at 330 House Road. I'm
21 also commissioned with the South Carolina Rural Water Association and I'm also licensed
22 with the Wastewater Development also with Richland County. And I'm just here just
23 because I look at the property, one of the properties and I'm just here to state that I check

1 the well cause I'm licensed for the well and I'm also licensed with the septic tank and as
2 of right now it is in working order Thank you very much for your time.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

4 MS. FRIERSON: Excuse me, Mr. Johnson, you said 330 House Road. What city?

5 MR. JOHNSON: Eastover, South Carolina.

6 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else signed up to speak.

8 MS. FRIERSON: No, Mr. Johnson is the last person.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Okay Commission, this is on the floor for
10 discussion. For the RT. Staff, could you put the zoning layer on? Thanks. Commissioner
11 Grady.

12 MR. GRADY: So I think this was one of the odd sorts of things that came out of the
13 Land Development Code update where we essentially separated the rural designation
14 into multiple components based on the size of the lot. So essentially it seems like this got
15 labeled as a homestead, whereas surrounding properties were labeled as RT. Certainly I
16 know it said it was a large lot rural future land use. I certainly think an acre is a fairly large
17 lot in my person opinion. So I would certainly be inclined to go along with the Applicant's
18 request.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Any other thoughts,
20 comments on this one?

21 MR. DURANT: Question, Mr. Chair.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant.

1 MR. DURANT: For Staff. The surrounding parcels are on the west/east [inaudible]
2 Are they the result of any recent zoning amendments?

3 MR. DELAGE: There has been no recent map amendment applications but,
4 however as part of that March 1st, 2024 what would've been rural was broken up into the
5 RT, AG and HM. So as you can kinda see the adjacent parcel based on acreage went to
6 the RT district. Since this was a larger tract it ended up going to the HM zoning
7 designation.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Thanks, Staff. Hearing
9 much discussion, does anyone have a motion?

10 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady.

12 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion. I will move that we advance Case 26-
13 008 MA to County Council with a recommendation of approval, the rationale being that
14 an RT zoning designation is in keeping with the surrounding land uses adjacent to the
15 subject property.

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

17 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

18 MR. DURANT: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm gonna give it to Taylor. Alright, second Taylor. Okay with
20 a motion and a second, Staff please take a vote.

21 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion is for approval, Grady.

22 MR. GRADY: Aye.

23 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

1 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

2 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

3 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

4 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Aye.

6 MR. DELAGE: Loyd? Oh, sorry. Duffy?

7 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

8 MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

9 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

10 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

11 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

12 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

14 MR. DELAGE: Motion passes.

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

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commission. Thank you, Staff.
18 Recommendation of approval goes to the April 28th, 7:00pm County Council meeting. So
19 that's the end of the Map Amendments. Takes us to 6., Land Development Code Updates.
20 I'm gonna flip that over to Staff. Mr. Price, hiding in the corner.

21 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

23 MR. TAYLOR: Before we move, can I ask one quick question?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. Commissioner Taylor.

2 MR. TAYLOR: It's kinda in line with some of the concerns we had recently with
3 these Map Amendments and these RC projects. How often does the SCDOT update their
4 road classifications?

5 MR. DELAGE: That's a good question. I would assume that it would be as, if there's
6 any change in capacity. I do not know if there's a regular, like interval scheduled update.
7 I will say that Staff has noticed that there has been changes to some of the classifications
8 within the last year on the website, whereas it used to just kinda be minor, major, arterial,
9 local, interstate. They've kind of broken those down into urban and suburban
10 designations. But for the most part the longstanding designations that we reference in our
11 Code, that has been around since, at least in that format since I started doing some zoning
12 and transportation planning in 2012. But, so it stuck around for a while before they kinda
13 changed and it looks like they're breaking them up further. But as far as ADTs, which is
14 your average daily traffic, those are generally, those traffic counts are updated yearly.

15 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. Thank you, Staff. Go
17 ahead, Staff, number 6 on the Agenda tonight.

18 MR. PRICE: Okay. Guess who's back. So what we have before you, it does state
19 that this is an action item and we put that there, again, so if there's any decision made by
20 Planning Commission we'll be following the legal guidelines for any items on the Agenda,
21 for any changes. If you notice, if you take note on page 52, 51 kind of explains where we
22 are and then I believe it was at the February 19th Planning Commission meeting when it
23 was brought before you, Council's motion for Staff to, or the Planning Commission to do

1 a review of the MU2 zoning designation, it was decided that we should look at a number
2 of the other non-residential districts, kind of to do a comparison of those districts, I think
3 it'd be, it kind of made sense. For one it made it easier so we could see exactly what we
4 were gonna be doing going forward. What was provided to you today in your package
5 were the general descriptions for each of those non-residential districts which were the
6 INS, institutional, the rural crossroads, RC, the MU1, the MU2, the MU3 and the GC
7 zoning designations. Those were provided to you along with kind of a matrix of each of
8 the uses that are allowed in each one of these districts. We tried to kind of color code that
9 so it would be a little easier for you as you kind of flip the pages to go along with it. We
10 can take, we can go into further discussion on this at this time and talk about, you know,
11 go through each one of these zoning districts. However, kind of from a discussion with
12 the other Staff, I think it may be recommended that we go forward with the approval of
13 the Comprehensive Plan first. Once we have those designations in place, cause I think
14 y'all kinda went back and forth a little bit looking at what the Comprehensive Plan calls
15 for, not just our current Comprehensive Plan but the potential future Comprehensive Plan.
16 But let's give approval to that and once that's gone forward we'll know what those
17 designations call for and it may be more appropriate to then look at the general description
18 for our current zoning designations. And this also may require some, an eventual work
19 session or two with the Planning Commission to further discuss these. But again, that
20 was just a, kind of a recommendation and we'll be ready to pursue according to the
21 decision of the Planning Commission.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks, Staff. Thanks, Mr. Price. Commission, what are your
2 thoughts on this? I have a question for Staff. This being an action item, do we have time
3 for public input or is there a signup sheet for it?

4 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry, we should've actually provided a sign up sheet because it
5 is an action item at this time.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Can I ask by show of hands, anyone in the crowd wanted to
7 speak on this? We'll give you two minutes. Just give me a show of hands, Ms. Murphy.
8 Thank you.

9 MS. MURPHY: I don't need to speak on it if this is being postponed but if –

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We don't know that yet. Okay, Ms. Murphy come on down
11 and take your two minutes. State your name and address, come on.

12 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

13 MS. MURPHY: Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel Lane, Chapin, South Carolina. I did
14 see a list of the zoning classifications but there were no recommendations from Staff on
15 what the proposed changes might be. And I know you kinda take their lead and run with
16 it, so if this was going to be a vote tonight I was hoping that you would postpone it until
17 we could hear what the recommendations were going to be. Now it looks like it's going to
18 be postponed pending your vote.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

20 MS. MURPHY: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else wanted to speak since we missed a signup
22 sheet, I'll allow it. Not on this one? Okay. Thank you. Alright back to Commission. Do we

1 wanna give Staff more time to work on this, do we wanna have back and forth with Staff?
2 How do we wanna proceed?

3 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry – and again, I think it'd be a little easier to work on this if we
4 know exactly what it is we're kinda comparing this to, so again with the adoption or with
5 your recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan going forward to Council, we'll be able
6 to look more at those designations and compare it to our current general description of
7 our current zoning designations also, and the uses to try to come forward with a couple
8 of ideas for you. But I think in this particular case it will be great to have this as kind of a
9 collaborate effort between the Planning Commission and Staff.

10 MR. DUFFY: I've got a question for Mr. Price.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Duffy.

12 MR. DUFFY: If we, as per your recommendation, if we were to vote on this motion
13 would that not impede our ability then to make any additional changes to the
14 Comprehensive Plan once we, just say the group was to vote in favor tonight, I'm just
15 curious, if you could just clarify that point.

16 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry, could you repeat –

17 MR. DUFFY: If this motion is voted on tonight and folks are for it, thereafter can
18 additional changes be made to the Comp Plan or kind of are we washed our hands of it?

19 MR. PRICE: Well this is a little separate from the Comprehensive Plan.

20 MR. DUFFY: Okay.

21 MR. PRICE: This is separate. This is actually within the current Land Development
22 Code.

23 MR. DUFFY: LDC. Okay, perfect.

1 MR. PRICE: And again, you know, these are things that we're taking up, and I think
2 you kind of, you, I hate to talk about a particular case but I think you saw that on a couple
3 of your cases today, just how some of these designations are described where they're
4 recommended to be located. And I think the idea is to try to tailor this to fit more with what
5 our current Comprehensive Plan, those designations call for.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

7 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant?

9 MR. DURANT: I'm just a little confused. I may be slow but what exactly are we
10 being asked to do today?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I think we're being asked to defer this.

12 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. So that we can focus on the Comprehensive Plan.

14 MR. PRICE: That is correct. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, the Chair makes a motion for deferral. Do I have a
16 second?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I got a second from Commissioner Johnson. Okay Staff, with
19 a motion and a second can you take a vote on number 6., Land Development Code
20 Updates?

21 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion is to defer. Is that to the next available meeting or?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Can I go ahead and say till June? Or skip May?

23 MR. DELAGE: So motion is to –

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do I need a second on that? Motion is to defer until our June
2 meeting.

3 MR. JOHNSON: I'll accept the amendment.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, second from Commissioner Johnson. Thank you.
5 Procedures, guys. Thank you.

6 MR. DELAGE: Okay, Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Aye.

8 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

9 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

10 MR. DELAGE: Oh, I'm sorry. Taylor?

11 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

12 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

13 MR. DURANT: Aye.

14 MR. DELAGE: Loyd? Sorry. Duffy?

15 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

16 MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

18 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

19 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

20 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

22 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion passes for deferral till June.

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

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I would not discount the thought of, like a work session for
4 this one. But yes, let's focus on the Comprehensive Plan right now.

5 MR. PRICE: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. So that puts us at number tonight which is
7 the Comprehensive Plan, which is an action item. So I would also like to give the public
8 some time to speak on this but we'll have Staff introduce it first. By show of hands from
9 the public since we didn't have a signup sheet are there people here that wanted to talk?
10 Okay, Ms. Murphy, gotcha. Typically we'll have Staff present to us so we can all get the
11 information and then we'll take public input.

12 MS. SMITH: Hello again. Okay, so last time we were here we went over a bunch
13 of different changes. The ones in highlight yellow are the ones that we pushed through.
14 The ones that are crossed out are the ones that either we did not need to initiate or we
15 did not get further guidance and they will have to be tabled for a later date. The bigger of
16 the two was the changing of the future land use map from a parcel-based to a broad
17 stroke, broad paint stroke based map. And then the expansion upon the Staff Report or
18 the future land use designations for more details. So this is what the map looked like
19 before we changed it from a parcel-based. This is the parcel-based as it stood, and this
20 is what the broad paint brush looks like now.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Flip it back and forth a couple times.

22 MR. SMITH: Yeah, and we'll get to more in-depth on these as well.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

1 MR. SMITH: One of the first – we're gonna do these in order – so the first one was
2 the Cedar Creek area that we had identified, making some adjustments to the low density
3 and the countryside elements. This is what we had proposed, what the current was and
4 what the proposal was. This is how it actually came out. You can see what the current
5 was and what it got changed to. As you can see individual parcels were not singled out
6 and the white borders around the designations that actually help with some of the
7 ambiguity, some of the gray areas that we might come into contact with when we do these
8 map amendments. This allows us a little bit of flexibility to see how that area is developing,
9 is it going towards the countryside or is it going towards whatever it may be next to?
10 Again, this is, the second point that we had, the parcel-based to broad paint. The pros
11 and cons that we identified. I don't know if you guys want me to go back through these?
12 Basically it just gives us, it's better at capturing the rural versus growth structures as far
13 as the character area framework, flexibility across large areas, clear guidance when
14 rezoning to capital projects. Those are some of the reasons that we identified. So this is
15 the far out scale that you can see how they changed in that respect of the hard lines of
16 the parcel-based map to the broad paint. But if y'all would like to ask questions at this
17 point with this section y'all can cause I know, I'm pretty sure Yonke had some questions.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I just wanted to look at the map publicly in detail.

19 MR. SMITH: Okay. Yep, and we can come back to that when we go through it all.
20 So this was a small detail that needed to be changed, the Hardscrabble, Farrow Road
21 [inaudible] corridor. So we had proposed getting rid of the Hardscrabble portion of it and
22 make it – sorry that should've been the other way around, I apologize. So it changed from
23 US 21 - is that right? Yep, it changed from Hardscrabble Road, Farrow Road innovation

1 center to US 21 Farrow Road. So we got rid of the Hardscrabble which is a, just a
2 oversight that we just had to identify the area appropriately. Next big item was the place
3 type details. In the 2015 plan we have a lotta guidance that we use not only in our Staff
4 Reports but as we look at these areas and what their intended purposes are. In the 2025
5 plan the guidance that we got in the original draft was sparse, it was singled out to single
6 paragraphs. So we felt that we needed to expand upon those designations. This is what
7 it looks like, one of the pages looks like now where we get more guidance, policy
8 guidance, typical uses, you know, transportation, street types, connectivity, things of that
9 nature. So all of those different designations now have this expansion of land use types.
10 The other thing that was point out to us was the donut hole designations or the donut hole
11 future land use items. And those are something that we're continuing to identify and look
12 into cause we know that there's still some things that we've seen tonight was an oversight
13 that we'll take care of our side when we get back with our consultants. So this was taken
14 care of and you can see how the map changed from there to there. I can show you what
15 it looked like, what it looks like now. We had gotten rid of the direct alignment table. We
16 felt like this was a little too hard lined and didn't give us the flexibility that we needed,
17 especially in areas that do develop in a way that we need them to or we wanted areas to
18 have some contextual flexibility if we saw that, you know, an RC might fit somewhere
19 where it normally wouldn't because of the current development patterns. And so again
20 these are the changes that were made and I'll take any questions at this time.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Let's line him up with a bunch of questions. He's been sitting
22 there all night, he's been excited about this part.

23 MR. SMITH: So excited.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I would like us all to be able to surround this new Comp Plan
2 and say yes that, you know, we like it, so if we don't feel that way, what's holding us back?
3 Is there any more work we need to ask Staff to do?

4 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

6 MR. GRADY: So I definitely still have some concerns and I articulated this to some
7 degree in February. And while there was a public meeting the public was not there so I
8 will restate some of my concerns here. So when I look at the, the text of the plan there's
9 a lot of discussion about environmentally sustainable development, about facilitating
10 development that is compatible with non-car ways of getting around that is, you know, a
11 particular emphasis on mixed use development, a particular emphasis on a more, I guess
12 you could say for development going [inaudible]. And the concern that I have is that all
13 of that is said in the text but when it comes down to what are the changes in the future
14 land use map from the 2015 edition to this version that is in front of us to consider, it
15 seems like the main change is that it would essentially facilitate more of the kinds of land
16 use that we have heard so many concerns about in this chamber since I've been the
17 Commission since 2020; and that is people are upset about their rural areas being
18 consumed by, by sprawl style development for lack of a better term. They're upset about
19 traffic congestion. And they're upset about sort of this, this general sense of sameness I
20 guess you could say. And I feel like this proposed future land use map essentially doubles
21 down on the strategy that we've seen in the past 10 years. And I think that facilitating a
22 more of the same when we've already seen from the public that there is substantial
23 concern about the pattern of development that this county has pursued in recent years,

1 and you know, and our role as, as people who have an expertise in, in community
2 planning, I think that there's an obligation for us to think about some of these broader
3 trends. You know, one thing I would note is that when you look at development in Richland
4 County, in South Carolina as a whole, we have built an extremely high number of single-
5 family homes per capita. We have met the demand in large measure for people who want
6 to live in a single-family home. Richland County, however, has a lot of renters, it has a lot
7 of people who, whether they're affiliated with the University or Fort Jackson or their
8 institutional facilities, we have not created development in a manner that fully
9 accommodates the growth that we've seen in that population as well. So I think I definitely
10 have concerns about sort of the continued premise of single-family development and of
11 the, sort of the thesis that this bakes in that we've seen the northeast part of the county
12 which has more or less developed to largely single-family development and there have
13 been obviously lots of fights that we've seen on that front. I feel like this essentially takes
14 the north central part of the county and says, well we're gonna have more of that. And
15 that concerns me. So that's sorta where my heads at of, of this mismatch between the
16 map and the priorities that were articulated in the text of the plan and, you know, knowing
17 how we evaluate zoning map amendment requests, you know, we're looking at the future
18 land use map, that is often the primary mechanism and I feel like if there's a conflict
19 between the map and the text, in the future our successors on the Planning Commission
20 will, will gravitate toward the map and that I think would be a decision for the worst. So
21 that's in broad strokes my concern with the document as it's been prepared.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Good points. Staff,
23 thoughts?

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, Thank you. I'm Synithia Williams, Director of Community
2 Planning and Development. One thing I'd like to point out with the maps, so in phase 2 of
3 public comment is when we went out to the public with different land use scenarios and
4 we asked the public to kinda give us their feedback on how they wanted to see the county
5 grow over the next 10 to 15 years. Scenario A was just growing as is, keeping what we
6 had in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan. Scenario B was looking at more compact
7 development, encouraging more growth towards the municipal boundaries. Towards
8 those city centers and where we already had infrastructure. And Scenario B [sic] was a
9 more conservation type approach where we conserve a lot more land area and sensitive
10 space. And so based off the surveys and the feedback from that phase 2 of public
11 comment, this is the map that came out, that we heard from the public. And it's kinda a
12 mixture of Scenario B and C where you have, you do see the residential because we are
13 growing, we know more people are coming. But that residential growth and that mixed
14 use growth and commercial growth is concentrated where we currently have
15 infrastructure, closer to the city centers, municipal boundaries, so that we're not sprawling
16 out. If you look at the outer edges of the county on this map you see there's still a lot of
17 that agricultural, open space, countryside. And we even took citizen feedback to add
18 additional countryside area based off that citizen feedback. As far as the text, the map is
19 just visualization, it's a guiding document of how we wanna see growth but the text also
20 is guiding Council policy decisions outside of just the Land Development Code. And our
21 County Council had a work session on this during that strategic session to see what some
22 of the recommendations are in the text and to get their feedback. And County Council is
23 very willing to make sure that the Comprehensive Plan aligns with their strategic goals,

1 and looking at implementation of other areas of the Comprehensive Plan, not just making
2 it we're only looking at the Comp Plan when a zoning request comes through; what other
3 policy decisions do we need to take into consideration, what other ordinances does the
4 county need to put into place, making sure the different departments are working together.
5 We're in Planning and Development but we don't control penny tax and transportation.
6 So how can we make sure that what the penny tax and the Transportation does is in
7 alliance with the recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan? And currently we have
8 Council support to make sure that we get the rest of the departments to also look at the
9 Comprehensive Plan and make sure their plans are in alignment. So while I do
10 understand the concerns County Council is realizing that this is not just a document for
11 when we have rezone requests, that we have to look at it holistically across all county
12 departments.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

14 MR. DUFFY: Can I ask a question just off of –

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Duffy.

16 MR. DUFFY: - just on what Commissioner Grady said and mentioned there. He
17 made some important points on the feedback we've had from public and, you know,
18 doubling down on some of the mistakes of the past. And I'm just curious, and you know,
19 we've had a lot public input, has there been developer input and builder input into the
20 Comprehensive Plan, and how much have their weighed in on the process?

21 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. So we had seven stakeholder meetings and one of those
22 stakeholders did include realtors and developers as well. So just to touch on the different
23 public, we had an advisory committee that was created by County Council, the met four

1 times on all the different recommendations before each public phase went out for the
2 public input. Seven stakeholders, 18 public meetings, multiple town halls by County
3 Council Members, along with the surveys and the project website where we got feedback
4 from the public, along with the separate workshops we had with Planning Commission
5 and County Council. So we did try to reach out to as many different stakeholders and as
6 many different parts of the community. We were around the county over the past year
7 trying to get as much feedback and in all three phases of this Comp Plan update.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, thank you Staff for that front, like learning from the LDC
9 just getting out there with the public. Any other comments? I do wanna open it up to public
10 input. Ms. Murphy. Was there anyone else? Wanted to sign up to speak? Okay Ms.
11 Murphy, gotcha. You have your two minutes.

12 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

13 MS. MURPHY: Thank you. Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel Lane, Chapin, South
14 Carolina. And Mr. Grady, thank you so much for your comments. All that was in the
15 Agenda was a resolution to approve the packet, or approve the map. There was no map
16 in there. We don't know what you were going to approve. It does say action. And I'm
17 wondering if you might be able to tell me when this meeting was, there was a presentation
18 that Mr. Smith had up on the screen. If I can get a copy of that, that would be helpful. And
19 I'm sorry I missed the February meeting. Our recommendations don't, aren't on the plan.
20 Mr. Smith sent us the map on the 8th and I had an opportunity just to review the map, not
21 the text of it. What would be very helpful is to see the current map and the proposed map
22 side by side so we can see the changes more readily. But again our recommendations
23 don't seem to be included, which is to preserve more of the agriculture area and especially

1 around the creeks and other waterways and not just have a setback but provide areas to,
2 that would limit development around there. And it would be helpful showing, I think
3 information that was sent out in the email on the 8th was not a redline document, it would
4 be helpful to see the redline document as well if that's available. And I'm sure I'll have
5 some other comments once I can see more information but I sure do appreciate your hard
6 work on this, thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Come on down. I'm making my own sign up
8 sheet to give to Staff. State your name slowly and address so I can write it.

9 **TESTIMONY OF KATHY YOUNG:**

10 MS. YOUNG: Okay. Kathy –

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

12 MS. YOUNG: Young.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: An easy one, I like it.

14 MS. YOUNG: Easy. 1629 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, South Carolina. Okay.
15 I wanna thank all of you and especially the Planning Staff for all of the work that has gone
16 in to this plan. It's a pretty amazing iterative process that we have a lot of people from
17 our community take place, or take part in every single step of it. And we always felt like
18 we were heard and that something was done based on what we said. Was it always
19 exactly what we wanted? Not quite, but it was, we heard and there was something that
20 was done. The way I view this is this is the first step in a process that will take the next
21 10 years before we do this process again. It's up to you guys and really up to County
22 Council to do the sorts of things that Commissioner Grady is talking about, which is taking
23 this bare bones and continuing to iterate it and change it as is needed over time. Again,

1 this is really a thanks to all of you for what you've done for the county and I happen to
2 think that it's going in a really good direction, so I appreciate it. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you so much. Anyone else wanna speak on this?
4 Okay. Then I'll close the public input part for this. Okay. Staff, do you have some
5 information about the Comprehensive Plan where the public can go get more information
6 online?

7 MR. SMITH: I do.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright.

9 MR. SMITH: So we have been working, as Staff we have been working with our IT
10 and public engagement. We just launched our Engage Richland platform on Friday. We're
11 just now putting this out today to the public. It's a way for the public to get engaged with
12 the Comp Plan, not just today, not just this year, but for future endeavors, future
13 participation. You can view the site at engagerichlandcountysc.gov, that'll take you where
14 you can view the project, the documents associated with it. If you would like to leave
15 comments and participate you'll have to register with an email of course, but you can view
16 it without putting your email in. It is, right now it is very bare bones, mostly because we
17 have not adopted anything yet so I didn't want to put too much out there but there is the
18 draft map that you've seen tonight, the updated draft for the Comprehensive Plan and the
19 appendix associated with the plan, those are the documents that are associated with it
20 right now.

21 MS. WILLIAMS: And Mr. Chair, if I can jump in. This is the county's attempt to
22 move the information from the previous Re-imagine Richland website that we had that
23 was hosted by our consultant, and on that website we did have all of the different iterations

1 of the draft, all the information shown during the public comment sessions, the changes
2 from the map by the time it came to Planning Commission, we outlined that, and that
3 information was also emailed out to people who attended those different public meetings
4 that we had, and the stakeholders as well so they would know that it's on the website and
5 they could go and look at it and give us feedback. So even though we have the
6 engagerichland, I don't want you to think it just started today; we're just moving it from
7 our consultant hosted site to a county hosted site.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good information. Any other questions, comments?

9 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair, just one question for Commission Grady.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant.

11 MR. DURANT: Do I have the right impression that you think that there's too much
12 single-family development going on in the county?

13 MR. GRADY: So I would say that I am not necessarily suggesting that there is too
14 much single-family development, but what I am suggesting is that what I take into account,
15 honestly my expertise from my previous day job as a housing researcher, and I think
16 about the goals that are articulated, specifically on pages 50 and 51 of the draft
17 Comprehensive Plan that I have, when I look at these, this language which I think is, is
18 exactly on point and very thoughtful, you know, when it says here, you know, there's,
19 there's focusing investment in key locations, embracing diverse housing options and
20 reducing pressure on rural and undeveloped lands, the main tension I see is that the map
21 does not seem to reflect that sort of language. It seems that it is, you know, I'm looking
22 particularly at the S4 area on the draft map, which is essentially as I said the north central
23 portion of the county, which is more or less with very few exceptions covered with a single

1 use residential land use. Now it is in many case mixed densities so there is the potential
2 for townhomes and other types of construction, but it fundamentally continues the land
3 use pattern which is the more you have people on residential properties without nearby
4 amenities that they can access in a way that does not involve going out on a main road
5 and driving several miles to those retail or amenity parcels, you know, I think that we're
6 not really giving this the attention that it deserves. The ambition articulated in those goals
7 does not appear to match what comes out in the map, which overwhelmingly is a
8 continuation of the same sort of land use patterns that we've seen in recent years. And
9 so when I think about, you know, in there's equitable access and connectivity,
10 transportation networks that reduce barriers, promote inclusivity and support a dynamic
11 interconnected economy, you know, if you basically say, you have to have a car to live
12 here that's essentially the government putting a tax on you. That is a situation where we
13 are saying you can only live here if you have enough money to buy a car and gasoline
14 and insurance and the other expenses that are a function of it. So I feel like there's a need
15 to not only increase the volume of multi-family development but also to rethink the general
16 land use pattern, because if we want to do the things that are articulated in this draft plan
17 there really does have to be a, a different way of thinking about how we organize our
18 development patterns and I'm just not seeing that level of thought put into it. And I think
19 that's not necessarily a, that's not an indictment on anybody who was involved in this
20 plan, neither county staff or others, I'm just seeing a disconnect here that I feel like
21 certainly needs to be underlines. And so I think that part of it is just the need for a larger
22 amount of multi-family, a larger amount of walkable communities, a larger amount of
23 those sorts of things, and certainly that's not everybody. Some people want a big house

1 on a big lot and Godspeed. I just think we need to serve all of the different types of
2 population that we have in our county which is obviously a very diverse wide gamut.

3 MR. DURANT: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. We need this kind of discussion for every map
5 amendment, this is great. I love it. Cause we are again, I stated this in the beginning, we
6 are volunteers with our time. I enjoy being up here. Staff, go ahead.

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chair, and to that point, that's a very good point,
8 Commissioner Grady. I'd like to also point out S4 is one of those, so we have the priority
9 investment areas which are all the P circles on there, and those are areas identified by
10 the Comprehensive Plan where we may have to do separate studies, plans, to figure out
11 how can we redevelop those areas, revitalize those areas, encourage development. S4
12 is one of the secondary growth areas. It's one of the areas where we know growth is
13 coming but we need to kind of rethink what that growth looks like as it comes to those
14 areas. And so that S4 is one, if you can scroll down to the legend, you see with S4 it talks
15 about this is an area that we need to target for walkable neighborhoods and centers. So
16 this may be changes to the county's subdivision regulations, maybe other changes to the
17 county's Land Development Code so that we can see that encouraged. So I understand
18 what you're saying, the map may not show it specifically but by identifying this area as a
19 secondary growth area we wanna rethink how that area grows so it doesn't grow just like
20 all of the other subdivisions in the county. That's gonna be unfortunately how you look at
21 it a little bit of work for the Planning Commission as we present ideas to you all of what
22 we may need to do to change subdivision regulations, and again back to County Council,

1 what other policy or decisions they may need to take into consideration to kinda change
2 how this area grows going forward.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, what do you need from us tonight on this?

4 MS. WILLIAMS: So you have, one option is to, you know, we went through the
5 changes that you all approved back in February, we presented some ideas, updates to
6 the map. At that February meeting the Commission asked us to go back and make those
7 actual changes to the document so you can see them, which we've done. So you have
8 that in front of you now. If you feel like you need, wanna look at it, take some more time
9 to review it and then take it up for a vote at your May meeting you have that option. If you
10 feel comfortable tonight you also have the option to recommend the Comprehensive Plan
11 to County Council. But I do point out whether you do that today or you postpone it to May,
12 you have to do it by adopting that resolution. It requires by state code that you have to
13 adopt a resolution recommending the Comprehensive Plan to County Council.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: And that's page 58 of our –

15 MS. WILLIAMS: Correct, yes, sir.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Commissioner Johnson, did you have
17 something? No? Okay. I would like to make sure we have public input on the Agenda for
18 next month if we decide to defer. And then this would give us and the public more time to
19 engage, engagerichlandcountysc.gov. And then we'll be able to look at the first draft. Is
20 that on there as well? So you can compare the old map?

21 MR. SMITH: No, the first draft is located on our main web page at the
22 Comprehensive Plan, or Comprehensive Planning on the Richland County website. This

1 website was developed specifically for the separation of the two so you can still access
2 the 2015 from our main website, but they're not gonna be handled the same.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

4 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, question. Well let me make a statement, then a
5 question. I am always a proponent and wanna make sure that we maximize participation.
6 From a consensus standpoint is the majority of the Commission still at unreadiness?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's a good question. Can we go around?

8 MR. DURANT: Unreadiness about what?

9 MR. JOHNSON: To move forward with the resolution in our packet.

10 MR. DURANT: Well I thought we were gonna give the public a chance to take a
11 look at that resolution and have [inaudible].

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Commissioner Duffy?

13 MR. DUFFY: Yeah, can I ask just a question of the Staff for clarification? If we
14 delay or postpone this decision until next, until May, does the county incur, you know,
15 additional charges from consultants? Just to be good stewards of the taxpayer's money,
16 or is it a flat fee, are you getting, you know, the longer we delay taking action are we
17 getting, is the county getting billed thousands of dollars extra per month is my question?

18 MS. WILLIAMS: So we have extended the contract. If we go past July 1, that's
19 when the contract ends, that's when we could possibly see additional monetary
20 associated with it. If the Commission pushes it to May and makes a recommendation in
21 May, there is still the opportunity for County Council to adopt their ordinance, which is
22 three readings and another public hearing when they do that process and hopefully get it
23 adopted before July 1.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm gonna borrow Commissioner Johnson's word,
2 unreadiness. So just from the Commission if we could go around, do we have hesitation
3 or unreadiness. Commissioner Grady spoke, you do have some unreadiness, is there
4 some more changes you would like to see? Are there I mean?

5 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair, I would say, I would say yes. I would say that I, like I said
6 I think I'm in a position where I, I believe in the good intentions of everyone involved. I
7 just, I, I see situation where essentially inertia gets in the way of implementing the
8 recommendations as articulated. And I, you know, when I look at the map and I see that
9 so much of the county is designated as exclusively a residential area, which necessitates,
10 without radical changes in infrastructure, necessitates long distance travel by car and,
11 you know, essentially does not meaningfully implement the recommendations as
12 articulated, I would say that I have, I have concerns and just as we are articulate our
13 dissent in a map amendment case on the Record, I'm more than happy to provide County
14 Council or Staff or anyone else who is interested with a more cogent, less rambling
15 version of what I've articulated here. But year, I would say that I, there are some missing
16 pieces here.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Ms. Frierson, looks like you wanted to say something? Thank
18 you, Commissioner Grady.

19 MS. FRIERSON: I too am unready mainly based on the wording of that third
20 section of the resolution. You know, it says, you know, we've looked at the
21 Comprehensive Plan including the text, maps, tables, figures and the public comment,
22 and we've done some of that but in my opinion we have not done all of that yet. And
23 therefore I'd be uncomfortable with moving forward at this time.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. Commissioner Taylor?
2 I think I'm hitting everybody. Get ready.

3 MR. TAYLOR: This is a massive amount of information to process and we've been
4 processing it for quite a while. I understand the concerns but after a while it gets kinda
5 blurry as to, like even the back and forth on tonight, I understand Commissioner Grady's
6 concerns and what he articulated, but Ms. Williams' response almost seems to say, and
7 I know it wasn't a back and forth or necessarily a rebuttal, but that the interpretation of
8 that particular section could've been a little bit off, right, or could lead itself to more
9 interpretation. Personally I'm more apt to, you know, adopt it and push it forward. Pretty
10 soon you can get into that paralysis of analysis and again just having been here to long,
11 some of it you just gotta move with it and, kinda like we're doing with everything else, you
12 know, we make these corrections along the way, and certainly I don't think anyone's intent
13 is to go forward with an incomplete document or a document that does not accomplish
14 the goals that are set forth. But inevitably not everyone's gonna be pleased with what,
15 with the outcomes, you know, every i can't be dotted and every t can't be crossed, it's
16 just, it's too massive. I mean, you can try but like I said I'd be more apt – I'm not, I have
17 no problem with public input, you know, at our next meeting, but I'm not as apt to hold
18 back and not push it forward to County Council.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. And a quick question for
20 Staff as I continue to go down, can you remind me how many public meetings you did
21 have? Cause that is different – I still play the tape of the LDC in my head and how little –
22 we did try – we had to come later on and have the public input here, but you got out in
23 front of this.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: That is correct. I, I don't have the number of town hall meetings,
2 it depends on Council Members, but we had four advisory committee meetings, seven
3 stakeholder meetings, 18 public meetings that we held specifically just on the Comp Plan,
4 the town hall meetings we were invited to, the surveys, the project website, and then as
5 – I didn't include, as you heard from one of the citizens tonight, sometimes we went
6 straight to neighborhood groups if they called us to come out and talk to them as well.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Well, we had news coverage for this.

8 MS. WILLIAMS: There was news coverage throughout the process last year and
9 if you were excited about watching County Council meetings there were updates to
10 County Council on the process during the Administrator's Report several times last year
11 as well.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright Commissioner Johnson? I'm going down this way?

13 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I mean, like Commissioner Taylor I'm ready to
14 move it forward I just want to [inaudible] the pulse of my colleagues. But having said that
15 [inaudible] step with Grady in terms of [inaudible] but the distinction between the projected
16 numbers of growth versus where we've made provision for it. That's not gonna change
17 [inaudible]. So for that reason I think we need to move forward so that we can continue
18 to [inaudible].

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Commissioner Siercks?

20 MR. SIERCKS: I think generally I'd be ready to move forward. I have a couple
21 questions and more points of clarifications that I think if answered would probably get me
22 even closer to being ready to move forward, the first of which is more of a point of
23 clarification both for myself and the public to the extent that it's needed. Because it was

1 at some point referenced that, you know, on this map, and I may be, I may have misheard
2 or misunderstood, but I believe I heard that, you know, something to the effect of large
3 swaths of the county are being zoned under this map as residential, but if I'm
4 understanding this map as I'm currently seeing it, it's not necessarily what's zoned but
5 there are, the colors denote more of what we would typically see on the future land use
6 and priority investment areas that this isn't zoning, this is, you know, akin to, not all of
7 them, but activity center or, you know, municipality as it's laid out on the maps. Is that,
8 am I correct in that?

9 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir, that is correct.

10 MR. SIERCKS: Alright. The second question that I had, and this gets more to the
11 – I forget, the name that it was given, I think bubble or the, the flexible zoning areas. How
12 does that I guess match with what we're seeing on the map when it comes to
13 municipalities? Because the, you know, municipal boundaries are not flexible, and does
14 that, does the map, I mean, cause it looks like what's on the map as denoted is, you know,
15 city or town limits are considered more with these flexible guidelines. How does that work
16 with the flexible spaces as they're currently shown?

17 MS. WILLIAMS: So kind of to go back to your previous question, the first map
18 because it was parcel-based it could look more like a zoning map because it was those
19 hard lines based off of the parcels. So by going with the more flexible bubble map it
20 doesn't give you those parcels but what happens here is that with the municipal
21 boundaries it still colors in the areas that are part of the municipal boundaries, it just gives
22 us the flexibility where we abut a municipality. So for instance as part of this update we
23 did look at other comprehensive plans, what growth patterns they were trying to

1 encourage in their area to try to match our growth pattern to what their comp plans say,
2 but by having this more flexible kind of bubble map it gives us that flexibility as, if the
3 municipality boundaries change in the future or if their comp plans get updated and they
4 change, it gives us a little bit more flexibility to look at that. So it still recognizes that these
5 are municipal boundaries, they don't change, but because it's not gonna be that hard line
6 parcel-based it just gives us a little more flexibility from what, where we border those
7 municipalities. Does that answer the question?

8 MR. SIERCKS: Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

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

10 MR. DURANT: Well I'm sensitive to the idea of kicking the can down the road in
11 pursuit of perfection, but I guess I would have a question for Staff. Are you at a point
12 where you're ready, you can say comfortably that it's time to push this plan to County
13 Council? Recognizing that it's the Planning Commission that's making the
14 recommendation, but obviously we're standing on your shoulders.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: [Inaudible] Jenson would like to answer that question.

16 MR. JENSON: So Mr. Chair, may I be recognized?

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

18 MR. JENSON: Thank you, sir. First of all I wanna say thank you. This is, you have
19 a list of duties and functions that are substantial, and taking this on it just adds to that. So
20 I say thank you. This is the, I forgot, lost count, sixth or seventh comprehensive plan
21 revision that I have shepherded in my career, either as a staff member or as an executive
22 leader for it. And their always difficult, it doesn't matter. And at the end of the day I hear
23 the exact same comments that I've heard here that some folks are, you know, Bruce Lee

1 is [inaudible] quoted as saying, perfection is the enemy of good or the enemy of done.
2 That's actually a much older saying but it's true that at some point you have to kinda just
3 say, we did our best and we're ready to move on. And I'm not here to tell you that that is
4 tonight or it is not. But what I am here to ask is, if it is not tonight please give us very
5 direct, succinct, clear instructions what you need to get to that point so that we can come
6 back in a month and we can bring you, deliver all the information that you require so that
7 we can move forward in a month. So that is all I wanted to share. Mr. Price asked if I'd
8 share one other comment which is simply that please remember that this is not zoning,
9 everything in here is a recommendation. The rubber hits the road when the Planning
10 Commission and the City [sic] Council consider a zoning request. And yes, this absolutely
11 obviously influences those decisions, that's its purpose. Its purpose is to say, you know
12 what, when this comes up in the future this is how we intend to act. But it doesn't mean
13 thou shalt act because there are other factors; there's timing. We look at the map up there
14 and we see a whole bunch of yellow and we say, tomorrow it's all gonna become that,
15 and the answer is, no it's not because there are always other factors that we have to take
16 into account when we rezone something. So that's all I wanted to share, thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Commissioner Duffy, go ahead.

18 MR. DUFFY: Yeah, I mean, you know, this is some helpful guidance from the, from
19 Staff and the rest of the Commissioners. You know, obviously I'm mindful of there's been
20 four advisory meetings, and like 18 public meetings and a lotta surveys and news
21 coverage around this. I suppose if we were not to move forward on it tonight just based
22 upon the points that were made there, what changes specifically would we wanna
23 request? Like I think we need to be not abstract and be kinda, oh yeah we'd like this or

1 that, we need to be like, we need this added on page, you know, what's the specific ask
2 of the Staff at this point? So in principle, you know, I'm not opposed to moving forward
3 with it tonight but I just wanna make sure that if there's dissent or folks on the Commission
4 feel it's not quite there, like what specifically do we want turned around or improved in the
5 next month, and if we don't vote tonight can we do it in May and just, you know, as
6 Commissioner Taylor was saying, just kind of – we've been doing this for a while so, and
7 we've got a lotta public input so if we can just make a decision that would be great. But
8 yes, but more to the group what, what is missing specifically, not in abstract terms, in line
9 by line items if there's any other major edits from other Commissioners?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Duffy. Yes, let's ask that question.
11 Is there anything specifically we can ask the Staff for?

12 MR. GRADY: That is directed at me.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady and Commissioner Frierson. I want
14 everyone to feel confident about this.

15 MR. GRADY: Yeah. So, so based on what I've heard it sounds as though a
16 majority of the Commission is, is in favor of moving forward. And, and it is not my goal to
17 just throwing a spanner in the works for the sake of throwing a spanner in the works. To
18 answer Commissioner Duffy's question, I think that, I think that the, the way to reconcile
19 that concerns that I have would be to, in this future land use map, have a – well first off
20 have a larger share of areas that are mixed use development, because if we're talking
21 about having a, if we're talking about those broad policy objectives that are articulated in
22 the Comprehensive Plan I think that there is a need to codify not just in aspiration but in
23 a physical plan, that we are wanting to do something different, that we are wanting to

1 develop in a way that is more sort of pre-World War II in its spatial dimensions and, and
2 reflects these desires to facilitate equitable transportation access that takes into account
3 the desire to have people be in closer proximity to amenities to reduce traffic congestion,
4 to reduce pressure on currently undeveloped or sparsely developed areas on the, further
5 out in the county. So I would say that I would want to see a greater number of, of, a
6 greater amount of land that is designated as an activity center or one sort or another and
7 less land that is designated solely for, for residential use. And I realize that as, as Ms.
8 Williams and others articulated, this is not saying that literally every single building in that
9 area has to be residential, but you know, when you look at it on a map it says residential
10 the default assumption is that that is the, the primary land use that is there. So, so
11 speaking for myself in terms of this question of how do you reconcile the text with the
12 map, those are, are broadly speaking the sorts of changes that I would be interested in,
13 in articulating. As I said if the majority of the Commission wants to move forward then
14 we'll move forward.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. To piggyback off that, we
16 had our case earlier, that was Kelly Mill and, is it Hardscrabble – can we zoom into that
17 part of the map? Cause that was talking mixed use. In that area, gotcha. Commissioner
18 Grady, you talking about being proactive in looking into other areas that could be mixed
19 use, like that one for instance? Or others?

20 MR. GRADY: You know, I hesitate to draw a direct connection between the
21 Comprehensive Plan and the case that we reviewed, but certainly that was an example
22 of an area where, you know, as I was looking at the map I was looking at the subdivisions
23 around it, I was looking at the parcel in question, and I could see where if you added some

1 sidewalks and some other infrastructure it could materialize into the sort of area that the,
2 the Comprehensive Plan indicates that there is an interest in developing more of. But I
3 think as we heard there was sort of concern, you know, is this leapfrog development as
4 well. I think at some point if you're going to develop in a conscientious way sometimes
5 you do have to build something beyond the edge of the, the current developed area to
6 ensure that it materializes into the sort of community that reflects the values that are
7 articulated by this plan and by extension our elected officials and the public.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Commissioner Frierson?

9 MS. FRIERSON: Are we supposed to consider the Land Development Code and
10 the Comprehensive Plan as two separate entities?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Tonight on our Agenda?

12 MS. FRIERSON: No, this is what I mean. You know, like tonight when we got to
13 Item 6., Mr. Price, you know, started the presentation and we agreed to defer it till June.
14 And now we're looking at whether or not we're going to move forward with a resolution
15 for adoption or moving forward with the Comprehensive Plan. What I'm trying to figure
16 out, are we supposed to be considering the Land Development Code as part of the
17 Comprehensive Plan?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We just said we're gonna look at those separately. We
19 wanted to work on the Comprehensive Plan and get that finalized for Council and then go
20 back – Mr. Price had reasoning. Staff, can you elaborate? Yes?

21 MS. FRIERSON: See, this is what I mean. When we finish it is the Land
22 Development Code a part of the Comprehensive Plan?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I believe they work hand in hand as they have always.

1 MS. FRIERSON: Okay. Well see that's what I mean by it's not that I'm opposed to,
2 you know, saying let's move on down the road, but how can we in good conscience do
3 that when we really haven't done all the work that we're supposed to be doing with the
4 things that we said we're doing? If we're gonna defer part of it till June, how can we say
5 now in, what's this, April that let's just go on down the road and say we've adopted this
6 as where we wanna go? We haven't even heard it all yet. You see what I mean?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I understand it as the difference, one of the changes they
8 made here for the map that it's now they're looking at it parcel-based or broad paint brush
9 based. If we're gonna look at this parcel-based then I absolutely agree with you. Looking
10 at number 6 on the Agenda, the Land Development Code, understanding our commercial
11 zones better, getting that lined up, that's spot on. But since the map we just, we moved it
12 to more of the bubble based giving us more flexibility, or giving future Planning
13 Commissions the flexibility to look at it, it makes me a little bit more ready to move forward
14 as well.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chair?

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, go ahead Staff.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Can I also touch on that, too? So the Comprehensive Plan is a
18 non-regulatory guidance document. So it is just a guide, it is a visualization of how we
19 want the county to grow. So there's no regulatory ties to what is in this. The way the
20 Comprehensive Plan is implemented is through regulation, and part of that is the Land
21 Development Code. So typically you see an entity will update their comp plan and then
22 they'll revise their land development code based off of what we've put into the
23 comprehensive plan. So that's one of the reasons why before we update zoning

1 classifications, how do we want the county to grow? Do we agree with this guidance
2 document of what a mixed use activity center should look like, of what a suburban
3 residential area should look like? If we agree on that in the guidance document then we
4 do that through regulation by updating those zoning designations in the Land
5 Development Code. So that is the reason why Deputy Director Price made the
6 recommendation of, before we start making zoning changes let's make sure our guiding
7 document is what we all agree upon. And so if you look at, so for instance if we wanna
8 add additional mixed use activity centers to the map, one of the things that we talked
9 about in February was giving more definition of what a mixed use activity center should
10 look like, not just for now but when we go to a five year update or we see, you know,
11 another thing happens in the county and it changes and we realize this corridor should
12 be a mixed use activity center, we may have to update the future land use map. But this
13 is kind of like that additional policy guidance of where do mixed use activity centers belong
14 in the county and what should we take into consideration if a rezoning request potentially
15 comes up in an area that may or may not be a mixed use activity center; does it also meet
16 these additional policy guidance, the typical uses and buildings we would wanna see,
17 what transportation network is around there. So that's the other reason why back in
18 February we talked about, we need more details on what these land uses would look like
19 and how we would determine if an area of the map, if the land use needs to change going
20 forward. Does that help, Commissioner Frierson?

21 MS. FRIERSON: I understand. It seems like the big, big picture is the
22 Comprehensive Plan and then we can go back and refine it by fine tuning the Land
23 Development.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: That's exactly right, yes, ma'am.

2 MS. FRIERSON: But see for me my problem is the wording, it's saying that we've
3 looked at all of this already and we really haven't. And I understand people say at some
4 point you have to move forward, but it just doesn't make sense to me when we're saying
5 we're going to look at it in more detail, this land development part, which is gonna be a
6 portion of it, I think that we really should do that first. That's just how I look at it.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. Any more thoughts?

8 MR. DUFFY: Yeah, just to add. My understanding, and please correct me if I'm
9 wrong, Chair, is that Councilman Branham was very involved in the rewriting of the LDC
10 a few years ago or can you just maybe tell us that or you all did make, you revised the
11 Land Development Code in the last number of years, is that not correct?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: As a Planning Commission we did with the help of Mr.
13 Jenson. We had it approved. We were working on a lot of this during covid and we had
14 to take it – what was the analogy you always said, take it off the shelf or put it on the shelf,
15 something like that. And then we did, we, we reworked everything. And I'll let him
16 elaborate, go ahead.

17 MR. JENSON: It'll take me longer to get to the podium than it will to share this.
18 Very simply, it took us seven years to adopt the last Land Development Code revision.
19 We started immediately following adoption of the Comprehensive Plan update in 2015 or
20 '14. It just took that long. So the reality is, yeah we're gonna have to start updating the
21 Land Development Code again in three months after Council adopts this Comp Plan. It
22 just, that's just, that's how it works.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Okay, so Commission unless we're gonna ask
2 for anything specific from Staff I think it'd be fair for us to make a motion and vote. Is that
3 concerning to anybody? Okay. I'm gonna do it. The Chair makes a motion to approve the
4 resolution, page 58 of our packet. Before I finish that, Commissioner Frierson, is there
5 any terminology we would like to strike out?

6 MS. FRIERSON: No, it's just that I don't think we're being true to what we're saying
7 that we've looked at, you know, the maps and so forth cause we haven't finished, that's
8 all. So. It won't be a unanimous vote but, you know, I'm bold enough to stick to my guns.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Frierson, I agree with you. As of February
10 when Staff came to us and said, we had a couple areas of the map we needed to update,
11 I was like, no I don't wanna send an unfinished document to County Council. We needed
12 to continue to look at this until we [inaudible] about it. I feel like we asked to see specific
13 changes, you made those changes. I understand, as far as I understand them I agree
14 with them. I, that's why I'm ready to go ahead, I'm gonna finish it. The Chair makes a
15 motion to approve the resolution on page 58 of our packet as it's written. Do I have a
16 second?

17 MR. DURANT: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Got a second from Commissioner Durant. Alright, this is for
19 the Comprehensive Plan, resolution on page 58. We have a motion for approval,
20 acceptance, and a second. So Staff, go ahead and take a vote.

21 MR. DELAGE: Grady?

22 MR. GRADY: No.

23 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

1 MS. SIERCKS: Aye.

2 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

3 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

4 MR. DELAGE: Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Aye.

6 MR. DELAGE: Duffy?

7 MR. DUFFY: Aye.

8 MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

9 MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

10 MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

11 MS. FRIERSON: Nay.

12 MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

14 MR. DELAGE: Motion passes.

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

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, we just accepted the resolution of the Comprehensive
18 Plan and moved it over to County Council for their next meeting. And Staff, could you
19 explain their schedule?

20 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, because the way Council's scheduling has worked out this
21 won't appear until their meeting in May, I have to look at the calendar, cause they meet
22 tomorrow and obviously it won't be on tomorrow's agenda, and then they meet the week
23 after for their compressed schedule. So their first meeting of May is when first reading will

1 happen. And then we'll work with them to have, their clerk will schedule the three readings
2 and a public hearing related to that. I don't have it right in front of me but a schedule of
3 proposed timeline will be presented to them tomorrow based off of the Planning
4 Commission approved the Comprehensive Plan going forward in May.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, we got a couple here, Commissioner Johnson, you
6 had your hand up? You're gonna defer?

7 MR. JOHNSON: I'll defer.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Commissioner Durant?

9 MR. DURANT: We need to sign this, correct?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, is that true?

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, in order for me to submit it for the May Agenda.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

13 MS. WILLIAMS: And we can get it –

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do you have a nice clean one for me tonight to sign?

15 MS. WILLIAMS: - we can get one together for you tonight to sign.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Alright, thank you.

17 MR. DUFFY: Chair?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Duffy.

19 MR. DUFFY: I was just gonna add I think this gives the Council, who are obviously
20 elected, more time to make this, you know, to work through this process before the
21 contract needs to be extended or additional monies of taxpayer funds need to be used
22 past July 1. So I think from that standpoint as well it makes, from the economic standpoint
23 it's prudent that we're moving forward based upon information presented to us tonight.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Duffy. And Commissioner Johnson,
2 right?

3 MR. DUFFY: Yes, sir.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Staff, I don't throw a rock [inaudible] a
5 question, as we go through our meetings and you have the planning maps pulled up and
6 we're looking [inaudible] properties on those maps, it's difficult for me sometimes looking
7 for a specific property or parcel to see exactly where it falls. And I know y'all highlight
8 where it is. When we looked at those maps [inaudible] the same issue, so my question is,
9 once this is finally adopted [inaudible] will this be searchable? Can we, can those
10 [inaudible] the planning maps and those bubble maps be implemented in a way, I know
11 we have some GIS folks here as well, but that we can actually search [inaudible]
12 specificity by address or parcel number to see exactly where we [inaudible]?

13 MR. SMITH: Yeah, so that was part of the process as we were going to add a
14 layer to our GIS that would put an overlay of the Comprehensive Plan map.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. I've been wanting that for years. The old FLUM
17 map, thank you, of the GIS [inaudible].

18 MR. JOHNSON: If I was in a community meeting I'd say that'd be a good place for
19 a hand clap.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other comments on this side? Could you, Staff, take
21 some of the notes from this meeting and make sure County Council gets the approval
22 and the dissenting and kind of where we're at?

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, I'll be updating the Council briefing document and you won't
2 approve the Minutes before they have that first meeting but I will summarize based off of
3 the discussion tonight what was discussed here and put it in an update for County Council
4 for their first reading. And then they should be able to have your meetings by the time
5 they get to their second reading, or meeting Minutes that are approved by the second
6 meeting.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Big thank you, Commission and Staff on this one. Can
8 we go ahead and move on to number 8 on our Agenda. Gonna do that. That's Chairman's
9 Report. And I just did it, thank you because you're awesome. Appreciate your time tonight
10 and every month that we get together. So moving on we can go on to number 9., that's
11 Planning Director's Report.

12 MS. WILLIAMS: You have in your packet the results of the March 24th Zoning
13 Public Hearing, that's for your information. And then also you have for your information
14 as well the Development Review Team Report. It's something that was previously in
15 Planning Commission packets but now we just decided we would like to also give you
16 that information on where we are as far as new development in the county. The goal is to
17 try to get this report to you for information either quarterly or twice a year. But that way
18 you can see where different things are in development because you do hear a lot about
19 the development happening in the county and this is just to give you some information on
20 what's been, where things are in the process.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: What are our roles with this list? Is there anything we can do
22 if we see anything concerning?

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Well, these projects do not require approval by Planning
2 Commission or County Council, it's just again for your information of what developments
3 are coming in.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The public heard that, Planning Commission cannot do
5 anything about these subdivisions, they've already been approved. Okay. Gotcha. Is that
6 for the Planning Director's Report?

7 MS. WILLIAMS: That concludes my report, sorry. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, and then we can go to number 10 which is
9 Adjournment and I see Ms. Murphy out there already raising her hand for adjournment,
10 that's usually how we do it. We'll talk after the meeting.

11 MS. MURPHY: [Inaudible]

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's the Development Review Team Report that we were
13 just discussing. Yes. That's what Ms. Williams just showed us.

14 MS. MURPHY: [Inaudible]

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: No, that's not on there as an action and we're not gonna do
16 the back and forth style, we're gonna stick to procedural Ms. Murphy, please. Thank you.
17 Alright 10., Adjournment. I'm gonna do this by way of hands. Alright.

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

20 MR. DELAGE: It is unanimous.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's a unanimous. Thank you so much, we are adjourned.

22
23 *[Meeting adjourned at 9:00pm]*