RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
July 9, 2026

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

Called to order: 6:10pm

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Citizens are here. Thank you for being patient with us. We had a work session before this. We'll get things moving. And there should be a signup sheet at the door. If there wasn't one, Tina, is there a signup sheet? Okay, so if you would like to speak, you can sign up down there. Staff, are you ready? No? You want to stay all night? Okay, I'd like to call to the order the July 9th, 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 Administration building, is that correct?

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

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

MR. DELAGE: Alright. Grady?

MR. GRADY: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

MS. LOYD: Present.

MR. DELAGE:

MR. JOHNSON: Here

MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

MR. DELAGE: We have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Ladies and Gentlemen welcome to the July 9th, 2026 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer our time to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council. Our recommendations are to approve or deny zoning map amendment requests per Title VI, Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of Laws*. Planning Commission may also prepare and revise plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of unincorporated portions of the County. The County's Comprehensive Plan update process is an example of this. Once again we are a recommending body to County Council and they will conduct their own public hearing and take official votes to approve or deny map amendments and text amendments on a future date to be published by the County. Council typically holds Zoning Public Hearings on the fourth Tuesday of the month. Please check the Counties website for updated agendas, dates and times. We have a smaller crowd here in person today. I usually go through something that's longer but we're just going to turn off our cellphones. Audience members can come and go quietly. People who are signed up to speak are going to have

two minutes to speak each, and the purpose of this meeting is not to be back and forth style. So we'll give you your time and, and move things on. Okay, we're going to go ahead and move on to item three on the agenda which is additions or deletions. Staff, are there any tonight?

MR. DELAGE: There are none, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Item number four is the approval of the Minutes. Staff gave us a copy of the June 1st minutes. As Chair, I would like to make a motion to approve the minutes. Do I have a second from Commission, someone?

MR. DURANT: Second?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. Okay, with a second, staff could you please take a vote?

MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion for approval of the minutes? Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

MR. DURANT: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MS. LOYD: Loyd?

MS. LOYD: Though I was not present. I did read and watch video and I vote, aye.

MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion passes.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, the next part of the Agenda is the Consent Agenda and item five we have road names and a couple of map amendments. I believe, it's not on the first page on the Agenda with what the Comprehensive Plan says but as you go through the pages I believe they both come out as non-compliant, if that's correct? We're going to listen to both cases tonight, but the Chair would like to make a motion and we also have a C as well. A text amendment that you guys will, Staff will talk us through. So the Chair would like to approve the Consent Agenda with 5a, just the road names. Do I have a second?

MR. DURANT: Chairman?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes?

MR. DURANT: Can we not include 5c?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: 5C is Text Amendments about some exterior lighting. I would like to hear about that from the Staff. And, yeah, make sure we're are okay with this. Staff?

MR. DELAGE: Sorry, just noticed something else. Sorry, Mr. Smith and I were talking. So for in particular the case, sorry, Case No. 26-017 MA which is your first case,

it has not compliant on the first page but in the conclusion we note that it is compliant so I apologize for that.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Frierson pointed that out, okay.

MR. DELAGE: So, it's up to you whether or not you want to put that on the consent or not.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: We have two cases. Let's just go through it. Alright again, the Chair is going to make a motion for Consent Agenda approval on a Road names. Do I have a second?

MR.GRADY: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is it a question?

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, Commissioner Taylor, Go ahead.

MR. TAYLOR: That correction, was the Applicant made aware of the noncompliant, compliant or?

MR. DELAGE: Not that I know because we just discovered it.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay, I mean but were they told? Or do you know?

MR. DELAGE: In, they made have received one as part of their - no, they didn't it get as part of their mailing but it is available online. So they may or may not be aware of the recommendation.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: It's okay. Thank you Commissioner Taylor. We have the sign up here and someone did sign in as the applicant. So we should hear from them soon and there are people signed up to speak for it too so, we're going to move on. I have a

second from Commissioner Grady as approval for the Consent Agenda of just the road names. So go ahead Staff, please take a vote.

MR. DELAGE: Alright. Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

MS. LOYD: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Motion passes.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. I will now, I'm gonna flip to Staff for information on 5.b.1., Case 26-017.

CASE NO. 26-017 MA:

MR. SMITH: Okay, so the case you have before you today, Case No. 26- 017 MA. The Applicant is Johnny Howell Jr., the location is 200 Gillwood Road. Acreage is 0.62 acres. The existing zoning is HM or homestead. Proposed zoning is RT or residential transition. The Comprehensive Plan is compliant. The conclusion, the proposed rezoning request is consistent with the goals and objectives of the 2015 Richland County Comprehensive Plan and the future land use designation. The requested residential transition zoning district supports the type of residential development envisioned for rural areas and provides an appropriate transition between lower density rural development and more established residential communities. Proposed rezoning is compatible with existing development pattern which includes single family homes, agriculture uses, manufactured housing and undeveloped land, and would allow residential development that is consistent with surrounding land uses while maintaining the rural character of the area. The rural designation encourages single family residential development in rural settings and supports development patterns that preserve open space and natural features. The RT district is consistent with the objectives and does not introduce commercial or higher intensity uses that would be inconsistent with the rural designation.

CHAIRMAN YONIKE: Thank you, staff. Commissioners any questions for Staff? Commissioner Frierson, is anyone signed up to speak?

MS. FRIERSON: Yes, we have the applicant Johnny Howell.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down to the podium. Yeah. Okay, great. We'll begin by stating your name and address, your address and we'll give you two minutes.

TESTIMONY OF MELISSA O'NEAL:

MR O'NEAL: Hi, my name is Melissa O'Neal. The address is 200 Gillwood Road.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead.

MS. MCNEAL: I'm new at this. Do you want me to say something or =

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anything about your property.

MS. MCNEAL: Okay, the purpose, and it's my father, the purpose, his purpose of changing this over is because, as you can see the part, that 6.3 or 0.63 there's a well on it. He's trying to divide that, give that well to his nephew. That's the only reason, and they said they we could do it if it's the same. So it can't be an HM and then a residential.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, great, thank you. Okay, thanks for coming out tonight.

MS. O'NEAL: Thanks.

MS. FREIRSON: Taylor Leaphart.

TESTIMONY OF TAYLOR LEAPHART:

MS. LEAPHART: My name is Taylor Leaphart. I own the property next to the land 210 Gillwood. My only concern was about the trees on the land and if there would be a property placed there to maintain the integrity of the mature trees to preserve the environment and the rural aesthetic that we currently have.

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

MS. FRIERSON: We have no other speakers.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay Commission this is now the floor for discussion or possible motion. Commissioner Grady, go ahead.

MR. GRADY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would say this seems fairly cut and dry so I will make a motion to advance case 26-017 MA to County Council with a recommendation of approval.

MS. FRIERSON: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you Commissioner Grady, Commissioner Frierson with a second. Alright, with that we'll take a vote.

MR. DELAGE: Alright, Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

MS. LOYD: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Motion passes.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Now this goes as a recommendation from Planning Commission to Council as approval. Do you have a date for their meeting on this one?

MR. DELAGE: Yes sir, Mr. Chair, it will be July 21st at 7:00pm back here in County Council chambers.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: July 21st, 7:00pm,right here. Alright, thank you. We're going to move on to our last case of the night. Flip it back to Staff Case two, 26-018.

CASE NO. 26-018 MA:

MR. SMITH: The case you have before you 26-018 MA. The Applicant is Nell Duncan. The location is 115 Jennie Collins Road. It is 6.2 acres. The existing zoning is HM or Homestead. The proposed zoning is RT or Residential Transition. The Comprehensive Plan of compliance is non-compliant. The proposed rezoning request is not consistent with the goals and objectives of the 2015 Richland County Comprehensive Plan or the rural large lot future land use designation. The rural large lot designation is intended to preserve agricultural lands, forests, natural resources and large lot rural residential development. The Comprehensive Plan recommends the residential development in these areas occur on very large individually owned lots or as family sub divisions. Although the proposed rezoning is generally compatible with the existing zonings, surrounding land uses and development pattern, it is not consistent with the development pattern envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan for the rural large lot areas. The requested residential transition RT zoning district would permit a more intensive residential development pattern that is intended for the future land use designation.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thanks again, Staff. Commission. any questions for Staff? Yes, Commissioner Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: The highlighted parcel that you have the cursor over and adjacent to it, there's the parcel with a home on it. The next five parcels after the house, are those not RT zonings, those -

MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

MR. JOHNSON: So the sole distinction, I mean, if you take those five parcels collectively together as RT appear to be roughly the same size as the subject parcel, so we're making the distinction solely based upon, or the recommendation it's made solely based upon the size of the subject parcel.

MR. DELAGE: So, yes, per the Comp Plan. For the proposed uses, sorry I'm forgetting verbiage, proposed uses of similar character I believe so it's list certain lot sizes, and it just so happens that in this case, in this particular area it's recommending a larger lot size than the RT which is the one acre minimum lot size. Correct.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson, does that answer your question?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, it answered my question, but it seems arbitrary. I mean, because what's adjacent to it effectively and what's across the street from it is consistent with the request.

MR. DELAGE: Right and I think Staff as part of the discussion, or excuse me as part of the conclusion, had mentioned that as another I guess angle to look at it though is that it's compatible with the existing zoning, surrounding land uses and development pattern but that it doesn't necessarily meet the development pattern envisioned by that Comp Plan recommendation. If that makes sense.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, can we hear from the Applicant? Yes. Commissioner Frierson.

MS. FRIERSON: Shanel Dunkin.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Please state your name and your address. Thank you.

TESTIMONY SHANEL DUNKIN:

MS. DUNKIN: Hi, I'm Shanel Dunkin. I'm the owner of 115 Jennie Collins Road in Eastover, South Carolina. We initially purchased the property, the County listed it's lot, the legal description was lot 1, 2, 3 and 4 so we, it was an assumption that it was already four lots, and it's still on there, I have a printout. But also like, someone stated the lots across from there and beside is already RT. We had plats drawn up and brought them up to the County and he said they would fit the RT zoning but not the HM. So, but our, we solely want to keep it residential. I'm from Gadsden, South Carolina. I'm from there, not wanting to turn it into anything crazy, want to preserve the land. We, me and Kevin Burges, that's my significant other, we just want to land and split it. We do have three, well four children amongst us so that's our plan.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Thanks for coming out tonight.

MS. FRIERSON: We do not have anyone else who is signed up to speak.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, Commission this is on the floor for discussion or a motion. Commissioner Loyd?

MS. LOYD: I would like to ask the dreaded question that you probably can't answer but I'm going to ask it anyway. What would it be under the new Comprehensive Plan?

MR. SMITH: I don't have that in front of me right now so I wouldn't be able to answer that accurately.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

MR. GRADY: I have a question you may find annoying. So when we say the future, future land use designation is rural large lot, how large does a lot have to be, to be considered large?

MR. SMITH: So, the way that we had set up the original Comp Plan it had zoning designations of similar character and those similar characters for the designation for rural large lot were, the designations that we really didn't use which were the RR, the rural residential, and I think we might have only had one or two in the County, and the other one, rural large lot honestly in our minds as Staff would be, you know, the three acres or more. And the way that the Code was set up, the way that the Code was set up the RT was three acres or less and then HM was three to 35, and then 35 or more was AG so in our head and I, I guess I can only speak for myself, being that far out and being in the rural large lot we would think anything out there would have to be at least HM or AG.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Again, motion, discussion?

MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

MR. GRADY: So based in similar, similar thoughts to, to my colleague to my right I would like to advance this case, make a motion to advance Case 26-018 MA to County Council with a recommendation for approval. The rationale for that being that an RT designation is consistent with the development pattern and zoning of the immediate surrounding area.

MS. LOYD: I will second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Two seconds. For a motion from Commissioner Grady and second Loyd. Thank you. With a motion to second, Staff please take a vote for approval.

MR. DELAGE: Alright, Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Seircks?

MR. SEIRCKS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

MS. LOYD: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm very protective of this side of town and I still say aye.

MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion passes.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Just to comment, sometimes there are what I, it feels like unintended consequences and I think that that's, this is an example where it's the right thing because it's the unintended consequences of based upon the property surrounding it.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, are we outside of the grace period? When we switched over the old Code to the new Code? Because we took a large swath of the County that was rural and made it RT, HM or AG.

MR. DELAGE: So, yes. We're outside of that so unfortunately the fees are not waved -

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright.

MR. DELAGE: - for these rezonings.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: It has been a couple of years, I understand. Thank you. This goes to recommendation as approval for County Council. Now we know their next meeting. This one will probably be taken up as well. July 21st.

MR. DELAGE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, 7:00pm. This same location here. Thank you. Alright we're still in five but we're going to go to c. because I had questions about this one so I'm going to flip it to Staff to give us more information.

MR. PRICE: Chair? Mr. Chair, Planning Commission Members, you know, one of the things that we discussed I think once we adopted the Land Development Code some years ago, some of you were on board, was that, with the understanding that we will have to make amendments as we go along. There are going to be things that we either

unintentional or things that we just missed during the adoption of the Code and there are new things that occur that will require some changes. And for this particular one, one of the things that was noted that our Code really didn't take into consideration certain type lighting that you see around, not necessarily the specific uses but a lot of the neon lighting that you see, they'll put around windows, the flashing late at night, lot of colors. And so with this ordinance, excuse me, the proposed ordinance that you have before you is to address those and to put certain regulations in place that will prohibit these type, this type of lighting throughout the county.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, I see the text on page 25 in our packet.

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. The red text that's additional?

MR. PRICE: Yes. sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

MR. PRICE: So this, this is thinking, that is a, so the, the, the text that you see in red will be the proposed text that will be inserted into the section of prohibited exterior lighting of our Richland County Land Development Code.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: So it does exist in a Code and we have letters A through D, that exist as of now, correct?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. Okay, Commission, do you have any questions, comments, concerns about this?

MR. DURANT: Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant?

MR. DURANT: Is this the lighting that's described the type used for holiday decorations?

MR. PRICE: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good question though.

MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: That was my first question until, yeah I got to the end. But the, the carve out where it says does not prohibit the use of colored lighting and signage, illuminated service station, canopies, or temporary holidays displays. I don't know if we want to get, you know, if we want to get any more detailed but I know that one thing that immediately came to my mind because it happens in some of the neighborhoods that I drive thru is that temporary holiday displays seem to be kept up well beyond the holiday period. And so I don't know if that's worth including in or how that would be included in but just the first thought that came to my mind, I don't know if Mr. Price has -

MR. PRICE: So, I guess I have an actual question. So, is it that there's lighting still out, you know, for the holidays, the decorations, or that they're actually have the lights on?

MR. SIERCKS: It's on, like, I mean, you know, some people keep their Christmas lights up through April, April and, you know, not saying one way or the other how I feel about that though I do have feelings but, you know, if there, if it's, say that it doesn't apply to temporary holiday displays that's fine, I just didn't know if there was any intended meaning in terms of if it's those type of lights, it doesn't apply to that or it doesn't apply to it if it's only there temporarily.

MR. PRICE: It wouldn't apply to those, those lights typically aren't, as described neon tubing or lights or those having periods of exposed neon tubing. Which you'll find on F but that -

MR. SEIRCKS: Yeah, the, the one thing that I, well a couple of things that I did see where it could necessarily apply, things containing rotating lights, beacons, for instance and then under G used to outline or accent architectural elements of the structure, you know, lights that are hung along the, the edges of the, the roof

[Inaudible]

MR. SIERCKS: Window openings and doorways were a few that came to mind that could apply to that temporary holiday displays.

MR. PRICE: I'm gonna go out and give you my opinion but then I'm gonna let the zoning administrator weigh in on this. 5-105. That this particular section of the code under section 26-5.10 is for exterior lighting and it applies to new development in the county and also any extension, enlargement of reconstruction of buildings, of a building or structure but only regarding the extended, enlarged or restructure portions of the building or structure. This typically is more of your commercial, industrial and not necessarily residential. And in those cases that you may be referring to, if it's determined that those lights are kind of a nuisance and effect potential vehicular traffic or shining on someone's home, that would be a different matter. But for this particular section is more for commercial and industrial type uses.

MR. SIERCKS: Alright, I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good discussion though, thanks. Commissioners any other.

MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

MR. GRADY: Few questions I think for Staff. First one, was there any particular event that led to the decision to propose this, this ordinance.

MR. PRICE: I will say no sir. This is just something that you kind of see, you start to take notice of, you know, during your travels to look at.

MR. GRADY: Okay. So, so I mean, where my heads at is I, I obviously understand that if, if you're, you know, I don't want a situation where people are shining spot lights into people's houses, like, I understand that light pollution is a thing. I guess my concern is this, this seemed, you know, unlike the first four items which seem very clear for, for purposes of public safety that they need to be there, I guess I'm just looking at this and like what is this solving? What do we think we're, we're accomplishing with this. And then I would also say that the types of buildings, the types of stores that would potentially have lighting of this sort are typically more youth oriented may well be, well let's just say stores that other people might not like. And so I guess I'm just asking the question is, is, is, so first off I'm worried about the potential for, for inconsistent enforcement and I think that's been raised by, by other Members of the Commission. And then I suppose it's just saying like if you're in a very commercial area like Two Notch Road for example I don't see the harm in lighting of this nature. That's just me so I don't know if that, I'll leave it to the other members of the Commission to opine but I don't, this, this feels a bit like something that's trying to fix a problem that doesn't necessarily exist.

MR. PRICE: I think to kind of answer your question it's actually in the, look at the heading of this, of the ordinance. The intent is to reduce visual clutter, minimize light pollution and preserve the aesthetic character and visual quality of the community. Not,

you know, everything is just going to be a direct impact such as some of the uses that you may see, you know, someone shining a spot light, yes clearly you want to address that or imitating official highway or traffic light. But in some of these cases is drive down some of these roads, especially if you're talking about any of the roads, it could be Two Notch Road or any, like especially if you get into the evening night that actually does provide more of a visual clutter when you see in these areas cause these are the only things out, it's dark and there are more noticeable and more intense as you drive by these areas. So there are things we are going to propose that actually really, again to minimize pollution and to also protect the aesthetic character or areas also.

MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant?

MR. DURANT: Mr. Price, is the lighting that you're trying to prohibit with this amendment, is it in wide use within the county at present?

MR. PRICE: It is, it is starting to become kind of prevalent use in the county.

MR. DURANT: So if this passes those folks that have the lighting up will have to take it down?

MR. PRICE: No, if they have passed they may be grandfathered in at this time. So this would occur, this would, this would be for new businesses and uses that are coming in.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Dare I ask for an example on the map?

MR. PRICE: I don't know if we're going to, we can -

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I have a location.

MS. LOYD: I can probably give you an example.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Hazelwood and Garners Ferry Road. Are we saying that these businesses cannot have that this type of lighting anymore?

MR. PRICE: No, we're not saying they can't have them anymore. Again if you've already established this and you have these lights, you'll essentially will be grandfathered in. These would be for newer businesses coming in. Yeah, I think, you know, I think Mr. DeLage may be able to pull one up. I think one of the issues to really kind of give you the full effect is most of the street views that we see are taken in the daytime. I think as we start to get more -

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I just had this pulled up on my phone, so you can see it. It's behind Bojangles.

MR. PRICE: Oh, okay.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: On both sides of the street.

MR. PRICE: On Hallwood?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: On Hazelwood.

MR. PRICE: Hazelwood, Hazelwood.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is this the type of signage or lighting is, is my question? There's a green, open, then the one next door, that purple, purple, red, so at night they're bright.

MR. PRICE: Yeah, across the street.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Colorful.

MR. PRICE: Go across the street Tommy. On the very end. I think that's one. That's an example. If I'm correct. Yeah, you, it's kind of hard to see that now but if you, I think if you go by there at night time you will see what we're trying to prevent.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is it a safety hazard?

MR. PRICE: Again, it's not necessarily a safety hazard. It could be distracting in some ways but the, again, the intent is to reduce visual clutter and minimize light pollution and preserve the aesthetic character of the area.

MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: But, to be clear this only applies to exterior lighting? So it wouldn't apply to those open signs.

MR. PRICE: No.

MR. SIERCKS: Things like that.

MR. PRICE: Yeah, I think that the language actually does not prohibit where otherwise permissible, the use of neon tubing or lights on signage including but not limited to for example, window mounted open signs. So that, the sign that you referred to with the open that would not be in violation. It would be where you overlay the neon tubing around the frame of the window, around the frame of the exterior of the building this would, this would apply to.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm looking at page 26 on the top. Window openings and doorways including lightening in the interior of the windows. That's a light that was on the interior of the window.

MR. PRICE: Which one are you looking at, sir?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Example I just pulled and the one that Mr. DeLage just pointing out too.

MR. PRICE: Page 26, which one?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Twenty-six of the, the ordinance. G. Colored lighting used to outline or accent the architectural elements of a structure including but not limited to building corners, roof edges and eve lines, parapets, window openings and doorways including lighting on the interior of the windows or doorways that is visible from the exterior.

MR. PRICE: The effect of, if you, the tubing that you may put on the exterior of a window, whether it be on the inside or the outside is the same.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: So that type of lighting would be prohibited.

MR. PRICE: Yes. You can take a look, I think Mr. DeLage has a few pulled up. Especially the one on the right window, Wings, Pizza, that type of lightning.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I personally feel it adds character to the business. I don't see how that's harmful. If we're talking just strobe lights that are dangerous upon the roadway that part of this I would agree more with it. That's just my opinion.

MS. LOYD: I mean I don't know, I have an idea of what businesses there's an attempt to limit and there's some lawyers here, but I would maybe make the argument, argument that they could make the argument that if you're allowing some to be grandfathered and then you're not allowing future ones to express their business in that way, I mean, I don't know what the sign code might say for us either but like, if we're limiting some of that use, I don't know, I don't like it, I guess is where I'm going with this. I just feel like it puts Richland County potentially at risk with some of what we're trying to limit.

MR. PRICE: Well, I think Commissioner Loyd, I think anytime that, anytime we make amendments to our Code, whether we adopt a new code, there's always going to

be some that we essentially we create non conformities for. I think part of the, some of the discussions that we've, you know, we've had for, for parcels in, in the county, for example in the rural area just using from a land use in rural area, the minimum lot size used to be 33,000 square feet and so there are a number of parcels that are 33,000, but the adoption of the Land Development Code those parcels became RT and they're nonconforming, like I said. So whenever there's any adoption of a code of an ordinance there's a likelihood that there will be creating some level of non-conformity.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

MR. DURANT: Just wondering has the County Attorney's office weighing on this, is there a free speech issue?

MR. PRICE: Yes, this something they have looked, they've looked at this, correct? This is something that they will look at, when this gets to them also.

MR. DURANT: Second question is, has there been a lot of complaints about this type of lightning in the county.

MR. PRICE: We've gotten some. But again, you know, one of the things that we we're trying to do, and I think even if we go back to some of the things we looked at with the, with our Code, that we had at the work session, we're trying to be a little more proactive then reactivate because there could be a time where you just okay, well nobody's complaining so that doesn't necessarily make it good so there are some times that when you see something and you start saying this could be a problem that we need to, to address.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commission, just a thought, would we want to consider a motion of deferral until we hear from legal?

MR. PRICE: Again, this is gonna be taking up by legal at the, you're just making a recommendation but this will be, legal will have reviewed this when it gets to Council.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I personally don't feel good about it, I think I would vote for disapproval.

MS. LOYD: I mean, I think I could maybe make a motion that we, that I could include E but not F and G. I mean, I don't think we should have strobe lights on buildings.

MR. GRADY: If that's a motion I will second that.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, first I'll ask it with staff. Can we look at this and make changes to the text and then make that be our recommendation?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Anytime, any, any, when any text comes before you, you can make recommendations on that particular text and we'll keep the original text but include the recommendations of the Planning Commission.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, the Chair is going to ask for a motion.

MR. JOHNSON: The Chair has a motion on the floor.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: But I want it just said appropriately, so go ahead, I'm going to give it to Commissioner Loyd.

MS. LOYD: I'm going to attempt to try.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

MS. LOYD: I move to forward this resolution, no, this text amendment to County Council with the following amendment that the amendment be amended to include 1E only.

MR. GRADY: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

MR. PRICE: Could you rephrase that? State that again, I want to make sure I heard it.

MR. JOHNSON: The motion is excluding sub section F and G.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Want me to say it? Okay the Chair will make a motion.

MS. LOYD: Go for it.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: For approval of 1E but striking out F and G.

MR. GRADY: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we have a second?

MR. GRADY: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Grady. Okay.

MR. PRICE: And I would just, just as this would be for a map amendment if you could state your rationale behind removing those two items.

MS. LOYD: I could say the most simplest term would be F and G don't seem like they are necessary for safety measures.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I agree with that in my motion and do we still, do you still second that Commissioner Grady?

MR. GRADY: I do.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

MR. DURANT: How many motions are on the floor?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: It's one motion, just trying to have it properly stated and trying to follow *Robert's Rules* so everyone feels okay about it. The final motion was that it's a recommendation of approval to add E, 1E with the striking of F and G, and the

reasoning behind it, F and G didn't seem necessary for safety. And then Commissioner Grady, if I said that right, seconded that motion. So that is the motion that Staff is going to give us a vote.

MR. DELAGE: Alright.

MR. SIERCKS: Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Go ahead and comment.

MR. SIERCKS: There's a motion on the floor but just room for discussion on it.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I think after the second we do take the vote.

MR. SIERCKS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

MR. DELAGE: Alright, Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Seircks?

MR. SIERCKS: No.

MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: No.

MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

MS. LOYD: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: No.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye. It's my motion. But we do like to hear from the negative, the dissent, and that goes over to County Council as well. So now I'll give Commissioner Siercks, go ahead.

MR. SIERCKS: On sub section F it, just wanted to point out that it specifies that this sub section does not prohibit the type of open signage in the light or in the windows that was being discussed.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I was commenting on G that, the, page 26 talks about the inside of the windows and the examples that Mr. DeLage has pulled up too with the [inaudible]

MR. SIERCKS: Right, I'm just referring to specifically cutting F and G if, if F doesn't prohibit that type of signage, I don't [inaudible] cut F. I think I'd be more open to the motion if it were to cut G.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant, do you have a comment?

MR. DURANT: Just that I accept the, the reasoning behind the ordinance to reduce light pollution and promote safety.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Commissioner Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: I go along with what Commissioner Durant just said.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: The motion for approval did pass, correct?

MR. DELAGE: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Were there any other dissenting votes or comments that wanted to be added to this as we give it to Council?

MR. DURANT: Chair, just to be clear.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant, go ahead.

MR. DURANT: Your last question to staff was the motion passed, correct?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. The motion for approval while striking F and G passed.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Clearly get this to County Council for us, okay? Thank you. Okay. I think we're done with C. I'd like to give everyone an opportunity to speak. Any other opposing comments on that? Otherwise we'll move on to number six Land Development Code updates. Staff?

MR. PRICE: Yes. We did hold a work session to discuss the proposed amendments to the purpose descriptions for each one of the nonresidential districts. So in this case it would include rural commercial, MU1, MU2, MU3, GC, employment and INC which is institutional. Got them all. I believe during that meeting what was presented was, were some of the responses that were received from the Planning Commission and also from Staff and using those to kind of create what the, an updated purpose statement would be for, excuse me, a purpose description would be for each one of those districts. I believe during the meeting it was determined that it may be beneficial, would be helpful to all of the Planning Commission Members to also include a land use table which would go along with the purpose, the updated purpose descriptions so we would then bring that back to you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: You need any, anything from Planning Commission on that?

MR. PRICE: You know, again if, at any point, you know, during, as we go forward that y'all have any other thoughts on the districts, any thoughts on the language that you

have we would just ask that you please send that in to us as, as a Staff and so we can either try to incorporate that or at least have it listed when we bring this back to you. Looks like that won't be back until September. However, we will try our best to get this to you as early as we can; either sometime late July or early August for you so that you have plenty of time to go, plenty of time to go over this.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do you need any motion from us since it's an action item?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: Question, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price, when you, when you add the additional descriptions supporting the table of uses to support the, the description for each of these areas, even if we act on that, I'm lead to believe from one of the comments in the work session that there still might be another subsequent action that would be required after that because I think you referenced addressing this in three parts, if I'm correct? So if, if, if you bootstrap the table of uses with the narrative, that would be steps one and two and then there still would be a step three, is that correct?

MR. PRICE: That is correct and that will be when we would look at whether there should be either the development standards within the district or, for uses, or for individual uses for some of the districts which would, which would go along with special exceptions or special requirements.

MR. JOHNSON: From Staff's standpoint are we, are there time constraints associated with this?

MR. PRICE: I believe what was stated is that I think, we could push to try and get this done by the end of the year but I think when we're looking at the number of districts and the uses we anticipate at least early 2027. However, if the Planning Commission really, you know, we can push for this to be completed by the end of the year but that, that may require some additional work sessions or at least longer Planning Commission meetings to discuss. Again, we're going through individual uses for each one of these seven districts and along with creating any additional requirements or criteria for uses in addition to the development standards.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Price.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, thank you. Okay, okay the Chair's looking for a motion then from the Commission on this. We direct Staff to update the proposed descriptions and the use table?

MR. PRICE: Yeah, I think the motion maybe you direct Staff to bring back a land use, proposed land use table for each one of the, the nonresidential zoning designations that will coincide with the proposed description updates.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone have a way to word eloquently?

MR. PRICE: Could just -

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, the Chair makes a motion to direct Staff to put together a proposed land use table, yeah, the land use tables and update the descriptions to coincide and these are all the commercial districts. Alright, do I have a second?

MR. DURANT: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second, from Commissioner Durant. Staff, please take a vote.

MR. DELAGE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Seircks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Loyd?

MS. LOYD: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Motion passes.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay so now we go to 7 in the Agenda but Mr. Price can stay close because the Chairman's Report. My Chairman's Report is going to thank everyone for all your time and energy for Commission each month. But what about also a possible training or Planning Commission retreat? We could use some of that time for

either this or in the past you've has speakers come educate us. We are going to be having some new members soon, so later in the year could be beneficial.

MR. PRICE: We could definitely look into that. Again, from a staffing standpoint over the years, I think last year we were able to use the Comprehensive Plan because that was something major but prior to that we would take certain ideas, we would look at some of the discussions that we've had over the year with the Planning Commission and just take some of those ideas, and from there we would determine, okay, let's say invite a couple of speakers in to address those. We do, we also ask the Planning Commission Members if there's any specific topics that you like covered, that you would provide those to Staff and so we can actually look into those or if not it kind of leaves it up to Staff to have to come up with, you know, basically the full format and all of the speakers for the, for the event.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MR. PRICE: And so more than likely, I'm not sure if we'll be able to get anything, we're looking at August, potentially September.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: November, October, whatever.

MR. PRICE: Yeah, we can get a time.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Works.

MR. PRICE: I think y'all have enjoyed those over the years, those who have attended those previously. So, but if you do have any particular, specific topics that you would like covered, or you would like to see certain presentations please let us know.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah, I'd like to give County Council's rules and appointments committee a chance to make their decisions for newer members and with

that, if this is Commissioners Sierck's last month with us. Thank you for your time and efforts. Appreciate it. And that's it for the Chairman's Report. Our Planning Director's Report, number 8.

MR. PRICE: I believe you have that as the report of Council from their June 21st Zoning Public Hearing.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: 23rd. June 23rd. It's in the back of our packet. Yep. Thank you.

MR. PRICE: 23rd, can't see, yeah.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, if there's nothing else. The last thing on the Agenda -

MR. PRICE: I would like to bring up something, I'm not sure if this is the appropriate time or not but why not.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. So I think this has occurred a few times and very similar to the lighting ordinance. Sometimes we see things and we need to go ahead and address it while we can. There have been a few times where y'all have made a motion and then you get a second and then y'all go ahead and do the vote. That kind of kills it because you've already voted. But those who may have questions or may, may not necessarily feel that they are going along with what the motion was don't have an opportunity for discussion or debate and I think that happened just now on the lightning ordinance. And so I think, think part of, and we can, we can look into this, but I believe normally once the motion is made and there's second, there's a point for discussion at that point prior to taking the vote. And we can kind of look at the Council's Rule on this

and how, on how they, I do know that once a motions made there is, there's a point for discussion, we can look at it.

MR. DURANT: *Robert's Rules of Order* allows that after you make the motion and second and say -

MR. PRICE: Correct. And so again, I think that's kind of important, we kind of look at that because what it does is, you really just kind of cut it off for those who may actually have some questions regarding the motion that was made.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: What happens to the motion and the second after that discussion? Do we still take the vote after that discussion?

MR. PRICE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Okay.

MR. PRICE: I'm sorry, do you mind repeating that, Mr. Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: It would be a call the question, under *Robert's Rules of Order* basically saying we've had our discussion, now it's time to vote.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Comments on that?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the comments made by Mr. Price I was going to ask for a moment and substantively say something substantially similar, so I just wanted to say that.

MR. PRICE: And again, these are things that we, this has occurred before, not saying anything is wrong with it, but this has occurred a couple of times and that, you know, I think it's something we should probably address because, make sure we have a full voice as to what the motion is, especially for, again, one of the things we try to do is report to Council what the discussion was, especially for those who may go against the

actual motion and so that gives them an opportunity to speak because and they also could be, I think, we've actually had a couple of cases, I'm not actually recalling any in particular but we've had a couple of cases that I believe that some of the conversation that was had after the vote was taken may have actually swayed some of the members.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I will try and do a better job of pausing before we take that vote cause I absolutely want to hear from everyone. Commissioner Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: We do, I guess more than a pause, if the question is asked the way Commissioner Durant just stated I think that will give itself enough room to have done or said what needs to be done or said. So no pause but the actual wording.

MR. PRICE: Yeah, I -

MR. TAYLOR: That Commissioner Durant laid it. If we'll do that after every second then I think we'll be covered.

MR. PRICE: Correct. And I think as Council does and I guess *Robert's Rules*, you know, after the second the Chair will, you know, ask for discussion.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Absolutely. [Inaudible] discussion moving forward. I am very grateful for the amount of participation that this groups has. When I first joined I was very quiet and there was just a couple of people that would speak, so I love that everyone participates. Or I will call on you, alright. Are we ready for number 9? Commission last discussion? Okay, alright 9 is for adjournment. The Chair ask for a motion for adjournment.

MR. TAYLOR: So moved.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: So moved, okay, second rule of hands, let me see your hands, alright.

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

MR. DELAGE: Motion passes.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Unanimous, we are adjourned, thank you.

[Meeting Adjourned at 7:10pm]