

**RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**February 2, 2015**

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

*[Members Present: Heather Cairns, David Tuttle, Patrick Palmer, Stephen Gilchrist (in at 1:08pm), Christopher Anderson, Wallace Brown, Sr.; Absent: Beverly Frierson, Stephen Gilchrist, Bill Theus]*

Called to order: 1:05 pm

CHAIRMAN PALMER: We'll call the February meeting of the Richland County Planning Commission to order. Please allow me to read this into the Record. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, as well as posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration building. So our first order of business is election of officers for this next year. Do we have any – we got rid of the treasurer, we just have the secretary, vice-chair and chair, is that right?

MS. HEGLER: Is that correct?

MR. PRICE: The secretary is served by Staff.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: So we just need a chair and vice-chair?

MR. PRICE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd – go ahead, I'm sorry.

MR. BROWN: Excuse me, I'm sorry.

MR. TUTTLE: Go ahead.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the officers currently serving be re-elected.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Which is Gilchrist and –

1 MR. BROWN: Mr. Palmer and Mr. Gilchrist.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. So that's –

3 MR. BROWN: Chair and Vice-Chair.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Chair and Vice-Chair. We got a motion on the table, do  
5 we have a second?

6 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other thoughts on that? I think just based on some of  
8 the attendance in the past and if I were to miss the Vice-Chair would need to step into  
9 the Chairmanship role, perhaps nominate Mr. Tuttle for Vice-Chair this year. If you're  
10 okay that, if you think that's okay.

11 MR. BROWN: That's fine.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So let's just take these one at a time, then.

13 MR. BROWN: Alright.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright?

15 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chair, I'll make a motion that we nominate Pat Palmer as the  
16 Chairman again for next year.

17 MR. BROWN: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say  
19 aye. Any opposed?

20 *[Approved: Cairns, Tuttle, Palmer, Anderson, Brown; Absent for vote: Gilchrist; Absent:*  
21 *Frierson, Theus]*

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And now for Vice-Chair?

23 MR. BROWN: Move that Mr. Tuttle be Vice-Chair.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion?

3 All those in favor say aye.

4 *[Approved: Cairns, Tuttle, Palmer, Anderson, Brown; Absent for vote: Gilchrist; Absent:*  
5 *Frierson, Theus]*

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, so we got those outta the way. Adoption of the  
7 Agenda. Any Agenda amendments?

8 MR. BROWN: Move adoption.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion –

10 MS. HEGLER: The only thing I would point out is that you do have a revised map  
11 in front of you for Case 14-41, it just had incorrect rezoning designations. So HI to GC,  
12 not HI to OI, but I think that's in front of you.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

14 MR. BROWN: Amended, Mr. Chairman.

15 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say  
17 aye.

18 *[Approved: Cairns, Tuttle, Palmer, Anderson, Brown; Absent for vote: Gilchrist; Absent:*  
19 *Frierson, Theus]*

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Road Name approvals?

21 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we send the, we approve the road  
22 names as submitted.

23 MR. BROWN: Second.

1 [No road names provided to insert]

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say  
3 aye.

4 *[Approved: Cairns, Tuttle, Palmer, Anderson, Brown; Absent for vote: Gilchrist; Absent:*  
5 *Frierson, Theus]*

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. First case, Case No. 14-40 MA.

7 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, if we could back up for one minute, I'd like to make  
8 a motion that we approve the Minutes, the December Minutes.

9 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

10 MR. TUTTLE: As submitted.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say  
12 aye.

13 *[Approved: Cairns, Tuttle, Palmer, Anderson, Brown; Absent for vote: Gilchrist; Absent:*  
14 *Frierson, Theus]*

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. First case.

16 **CASE NO. 14-40 MA:**

17 MR. LEGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first application is project number  
18 14-40 MA. The Applicant is Mr. Carl Parrott. The property's located at 908 North  
19 Brickyard Road, in the stretch of Brickyard Road which is primarily residential in nature.  
20 The site is approximately 3.5 acres in size, currently zoned RS-LD, which is Residential  
21 Single-family Low Density, and Mr. Parrott is asking for the OI, Office and Institutional  
22 District. The site is currently occupied by the church and a residential structure where  
23 the original zoning from 1977 was RS-1, a residential district. In 2005 that was changed

1 to the RS-LD District. The Special Exception to allow the church was approved in 2010,  
2 consequently it remains that. In the vicinity in all directions we have properties zoned  
3 RS-LD, single-family low density district, and we have residential structures on all  
4 properties in, in all directions. To the east and west further down North Brickyard Road  
5 we do have residential subdivisions. The property basically has little slope, some  
6 residential vegetation, and again has a church and single-family structure located on it.  
7 The Comprehensive Plan recommends suburban in this vicinity where it describes  
8 commercial and office uses should be located at traffic junctions or where intersections  
9 are located and should not encroach on residential development. The Staff felt like this  
10 was really not a traffic junction as it isn't, it is not really located near any other  
11 commercial or office uses and really would encroach on other residential development  
12 nearby. Based on the fact that the property is surrounded by residential development in  
13 single-family stand alone or nearby subdivisions and the fact that really North Brickyard  
14 is more of a residential street as opposed to a commercially designed street, based on  
15 our Comprehensive Plan recommendation, the Staff recommended disapproval of this  
16 application at this time.

17 *[Mr. Gilchrist in at 1:08pm]*

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Carl Parrott? Do you have  
19 anything you'd like to – is Mr. Parrott here? Okay. We have one signed up to speak.  
20 Rex Sprolls. Yes, sir, if you would come down and take the podium for us, and give us  
21 your name and address. And if you can limit your comments to two minutes we'd  
22 appreciate it.

23 **TESTIMONY OF REX SPROLLS:**

1 MR. SPROLLS: Yes, my name is Rex Sprolls. I live on the adjacent property  
2 from the church. I've lived there for about 30 years. We have a nice quiet residential  
3 neighborhood and I'd like to see it remain that way. I don't feel that it's right to let this  
4 small church move in and change our residential area into a business area. So I guess  
5 that's about all I got to say. I'd like to see it remain the way it is.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. That's all we've got signed up. Do we have  
7 any motions?

8 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion that we take the Staff's  
9 recommendation for Case No. 14-40 MA and move this ahead with disapproval.

10 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion?  
12 All those in favor say aye.

13 *[Approved: Cairns, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Absent: Frierson, Theus]*

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: None opposed. Next case, Case No. 14-41 MA.

15 **CASE NO. 14-41 MA:**

16 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. The Applicant for Case No. 41 is PGM  
17 Retail. The property's located on Mill Field Road between North Brickyard and  
18 Sparkleberry Lane Extension. It's almost 20 acres in size and currently zoned HI, Heavy  
19 Industrial District, and the Applicant's requesting a General Commercial District. M-2  
20 was the original zoning in 1977, it was heavy industrial. That was changed to HI in 2005  
21 with the update of the Code. In the vicinity, to the north we have property zoned RS-MD,  
22 which is Residential, Single-family, Medium Density and is a residential subdivision fully  
23 developed. To the south we have Two Notch Road which is, on the south side of Two

1 Notch Road, fully developed as well with restaurants, shopping centers and retail uses.  
2 To the east we have property zoned HI and GC, where we have office use and storage  
3 warehouses. And to the west we have property zoned Heavy Industrial, which is either  
4 warehouses or concrete [inaudible]. The property is currently vacant and undeveloped,  
5 has a little slope, and partially wooded as you can see on the slide. We contacted our  
6 Economic Development Director who felt that the General Commercial District would be  
7 more suitable for this location than the Heavy Industrial District, and as a result  
8 supported the request basically. Our Comprehensive Plan recommends priority  
9 investment for this site where commercial and office should be located along arterials  
10 and near traffic junctions, and located near other commercial type uses. In our analysis  
11 the Staff found that this site was located near other commercial uses, non-residential  
12 uses [inaudible]. Based on the Comprehensive Plan recommendation and the types of  
13 uses that are located in the vicinity, the Staff felt that the General Commercial District  
14 was appropriate at this time and recommended approval.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Ed Burgess?

16 **TESTIMONY OF ED BURGESS:**

17 MR. BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, Council, my name is Ed Burgess, 140 Lincoln  
18 Street, Columbia. I stand in support of the rezoning request as a commercial property  
19 rather than heavy industrial. There isn't really any heavy industrial present in that, those  
20 particular blocks of Two Notch.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Paul Spencer?

22 **TESTIMONY OF PAUL SPENCER:**

1 MR. SPENCER: Paul Spencer, 109 South Branch Road, Columbia, South  
2 Carolina. Thank you for your time. It's hard pressed objection [inaudible] don't know  
3 what it's gonna be building, but the storm water runoff of that particular property goes  
4 two places; either onto private property into the lake or into Little Jackson Creek  
5 watershed. Last month the county spent thousands of dollars to remove silt from  
6 commercial runoff at this location. Last, in December the county spent \$300,000 for a  
7 study on how to repair damage to private property along Little Jackson Creek caused by  
8 commercial runoff. We know it's caused by commercial runoff because a couple years  
9 ago they spent a couple hundred thousand dollars doing a study, and the cost of  
10 repairing that damage is unknown at this time. Commercial property by itself and the  
11 individual commercial property doesn't much problem, but there's so much of it now  
12 we're not able to control the storm water runoff in that area. It causes damage to private  
13 property and damage to the waterway. It seems that heavy industry, for whatever  
14 reason, tends to have a better control of their storm water runoff with retention, and  
15 commercial property along that area's just flat asphalt that's causing the problem now. I  
16 don't know where the breakdown is but it's costing the county thousands of dollars to fix  
17 problems that doesn't seem to come up in the zoning and the approval of those areas  
18 for commercial to have some sort of storm water retention plan. So we're, as a resident  
19 and a representative of several people in that area, we would request that it not be  
20 zoned commercial. And we don't understand the recommendation of the county.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Thank you. Mike Sanders?

22 **TESTIMONY OF MIKE SANDERS:**

1 MR. SANDERS: Hi, I'm Mike Sanders, PMG Retail, office is at 111 West 57<sup>th</sup>  
2 Street, New York. Here really just to answer any questions and I understand the last  
3 gentleman's comments, and any development that we plan for the site would have  
4 retention. So I think we could help solve that problem with our development.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Howard Miller? Okay. That's all we've got signed  
6 up to speak on the issue. Any thoughts?

7 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I make a recommendation we send Case 14-41 MA  
8 forward to Council with a recommendation of approval.

9 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion?  
11 All those –

12 MR. BROWN: I have one question.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir.

14 MR. BROWN: What the gentleman said with respect to the runoff and the  
15 county's expense in that, what would be the difference between the two zonings? Cost?  
16 Do we have any idea?

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well Mr. Brown, I think what happened there is over the  
18 years, and I know what the gentleman's talking about, I have intimate knowledge of land  
19 along Little Jackson Creek and Jackson Creek, and what's occurred there is over the  
20 years from back in the '70s and '80s, really prior to us having the stringent Storm Water  
21 Protection Act that we've got now, we just passed not that long ago, Storm Water  
22 Protection Plan, there was a lot of misuse by development, runoff, not detaining stuff on  
23 site, and then releasing it back into the storm water system before cleaning it or

1 anything else. We do now have those mechanisms in place that once that area's  
2 cleaned up and, and the silt is taken out it theoretically should not get back in there with  
3 our new Storm Water Management Plan that we have. And those, those storm water  
4 requirements are gonna be the same for Heavy Industrial as well as General  
5 Commercial where they have to, they can't release the water back out into the storm  
6 water system at any rate higher than what it was post-development than it was pre-  
7 development. So those rules are the same for both, and unfortunately in past years we  
8 didn't have a lotta stuff in place to, to stop all that. You'll see a lot of sites that are  
9 already on, that are already built where the water just goes off the parking lot into the  
10 street and is handled however, sites that don't have any detention. New developed sites  
11 have to retain that water on site and release it into the storm water system properly. So  
12 it, what they're cleaning up now was from mistakes in the past, which should not occur  
13 anymore because of the new Storm Water Management Plan.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other questions? We have a motion to send Case  
16 No. 14-41 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval. All those in favor  
17 say aye. Any opposed?

18 *[Approved: Cairns, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Absent: Frierson, Theus]*

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. And we are, just so that you guys know that were  
20 in here for the, these two cases, we're a recommending Body to County Council.  
21 Council will meet back in these same Chambers on the 24<sup>th</sup> of this month at 7:00, so if  
22 you have an interest in the case, they have final say on it, we just recommend to them  
23 what they should do. Thanks. Comprehensive Plan update?

1 MS. HEGLER: Yes. Chairman, just wanted to let the Commission know that  
2 County Council gave the Comp Plan first reading approval at the Zoning Public Hearing  
3 in December. There were a couple questions, couple comments and concerns that Staff  
4 was instructed to work out with those Councilpersons and, and we haven't done that  
5 yet, but expect second and third reading in a couple weeks. It's moving forward.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Anything else for this?

7 MS. HEGLER: We have reports in there for your information.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. What can we expect this year coming up?

9 [Laughter]

10 MS. HEGLER: All good stuff.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sounds good.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Well Pat, I do have a question. What is Staff's long-term goal  
13 relative to once the Comp Plan's approved, trying to adopt the Code to more readily  
14 align with the new Comp Plan?

15 MS. HEGLER: Very pertinent question. We, Council had their retreat last week  
16 and that was a question I put forward; would they be interested in updating the Land  
17 Development Code so that it was consistent with the Comp Plan. And at the retreat the  
18 answer was yes. Of course, they actually act on that at their next Council meeting. But I  
19 did request that we do make sure that the Code is compliant with the Comp Plan.

20 MR. TUTTLE: In your best guess once you had approval and obviously you have  
21 to solicit because, for some consulting help, etc., etc., is that a, is that a year process,  
22 year and a half?

1 MS. HEGLER: I think it's probably a year and a half to two years. And it's my  
2 sense at the moment that we start with a blank slate instead of attempting to retrofit or,  
3 you know, make changes to our existing, very lengthy Code. My goal would be that we  
4 have a much smaller code, more illustrative, easier to read. But that would probably be  
5 easier to do by starting from scratch. I, I envision two years.

6 MR. TUTTLE: Thank you.

7 MS. CAIRNS: Do you envision doing it in sections or in total?

8 MS. HEGLER: I don't know yet, but probably in total. I know you have experience  
9 with it, I mean, you did it last time, you did it chapter by chapter, is that –

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

11 MS. HEGLER: - correct? Would you want to do something like that with a  
12 consultant again or what would be your –

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, we, we got the whole document from the consultant  
14 and then we had two, three months for us to take a look at it, read through it. And then  
15 we had meeting where we took the whole document, the document as a whole so you  
16 could see how it would relate to each other and intertwine with each other, the different  
17 chapters and sections and stuff. And we went through it page by page in work sessions,  
18 and took items that were on each page and if a Planning Commission Member had a  
19 problem with it or an issue we'd talk it out and vote on individual items. You know,  
20 sometimes they were unanimous, sometimes they weren't but, you know, whether this  
21 should be in there or that should be in there and how this related to that. So we took it  
22 as a whole. But we did work through it page by page really.

1 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, and that, see I mean, you did something somewhat similar  
2 with the Comp Plan. But we could, we could start at that, in that way if that's the way  
3 you would prefer.

4 MR. TUTTLE: Lexington County's going through theirs now a chapter at a time.

5 MS. HEGLER: It'll be, I think it'll be FY '16 before we do initiate, before we  
6 procure a consultant, so that would be something I would ask them to work out with you,  
7 how you prefer to proceed.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: One thing I'd ask, too, if, if you could at some point in the  
9 near future just give us an update on where the 10 Master Plans –

10 MS. HEGLER: Sure.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - are coming, how they're doing, how far along they are  
12 and kinda what's, what's going on with them. It seems like Decker Boulevard's starting  
13 to get some momentum.

14 MS. HEGLER: Yeah.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So –

16 MS. HEGLER: We could do a presentation in March, would you like that?

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure. April? Don't wanna load you up too much in March.

18 MS. HEGLER: Okay. We'll look at the upcoming calendars and -

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. I'd also like to point out that my daughter is in the  
20 audience today. Today's shadow day, so there's Hannah back there typing away on her  
21 computer.

22 [Applause]

1 MR. TUTTLE: I'd just be curious as to whether Hannah is as disappointed as the  
2 rest of us are that you didn't deem it appropriate to wear a tie today with your daughter  
3 in the audience.

4 [Laughter]

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It was just, it was too rainy and windy, I didn't have a nice  
6 over coat to put on, so I just put on, you know. Anything else? Can I have a motion to  
7 adjourn?

8 MR. BROWN: So moved.

9 MR. GILCHRIST: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor say aye.

11 *[Approved: Cairns, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Absent: Frierson, Theus]*

12

13

[END OF RECORDING]