

**RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**March 2, 2020**

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

*[Members Present: Jason Branham, Heather Cairns, Mettauier Carlisle, Wallace Brown, Sr., Christopher Yonke, Gary Dennis, Jr.; Absent: Stephen Gilchrist, David Tuttle]*

Called to order: 3:04 pm

VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: - sorry for the slight delay. I would like to call the meeting to order; the March 2<sup>nd</sup> Planning Commission meeting. 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, TV stations, newspapers, and persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board located in the County administration building. So we thank all of you for being here [inaudible] and to not pop the speaker, March 2<sup>nd</sup> Planning Commission meeting. First on our Agenda is our Consent Agenda. I believe that there's two of the Map Amendments that have been pulled from the Consent Agenda; namely Case 2., which is the Two Notch Road and Case 3., which is Greenhill Parish, we will be pulling from the Consent Agenda since there are people here to speak on behalf of those. So I'd like to entertain a motion for the Consent Agenda, leaving on the Rosewood Drive.

MR. BROWN: So moved, Madam Chair.

MR. BRANHAM: Second.

VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So the Consent Agenda has been moved and seconded, so those in favor please raise your hand.

MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Branham, Cairns, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis.

*[Approved: Branham, Cairns, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis; Absent: Tuttle]*

VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: That leaves no one opposed. I'll turn it over to Mr. Price.

1 **CASE NO. 20-008 MA:**

2 MR. PRICE: [Inaudible] Sorry. Yes.

3 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So also pull, just as an administrative, we were not given  
4 the Minutes so we need to make sure that the Record shows we did not approve the  
5 Records [sic] on the Consent Agenda.

6 MR. PRICE: Yes. Okay, the first item, Case 20-008 MA, the Applicant is Michael  
7 Winkler. The location is 11045 Two Notch Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone,  
8 this parcel is located within two counties but the 1.25 acres that's within Richland  
9 County is being proposed to be rezoned from Rural to Neighborhood Commercial.  
10 Staff's recommendation for this request is for disapproval as it's been determined that  
11 the request is not consistent with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan as  
12 this area is identified as being within the neighborhood, medium-density designation  
13 and it should be, and commercial may be considered for location along main road  
14 corridors and within a contextually appropriate distance from the intersection of a  
15 primary arterial. The request is not located along a main road corridor or within an  
16 appropriate distance from the intersection of a primary arterial. So it's for those reasons  
17 and also Staff has identified within your package that approval of this request may be  
18 deemed kind of a leapfrogging development and again, it does not fall within a  
19 neighborhood activity center, for these reasons Staff recommends disapproval.

20 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Thank you, Mr. Price. I do have a question regarding the  
21 two acre minimum.

22 MR. PRICE: Yes.

1 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So, I mean, I understand that if Kershaw County had  
2 zoned theirs commercial or something the lines of neighborhood commercial, so if the  
3 R15, is that why it's being designated as consistent?

4 MR. PRICE: Okay. Glad you asked that question. Part of the Land Development  
5 Code, in order to rezone a request, unless it is being initiated by the County  
6 Administrator, County Council, the Planning Director or the Planning Commission, it  
7 must be at least two acres. There are cases though that if it is contiguous to a certain  
8 type of zoning designation that you can make the request if you don't have it. So for an  
9 example, if you were next to a General Commercial designation you could ask for a  
10 General Commercial designation, even though you don't have the two acres. Or you  
11 could ask for a lesser zone, like a Neighborhood Commercial because you're next to it.  
12 Now within the Code there are some designations that aren't specifically identified as  
13 being residential, commercial or industrial, that's the Rural District and the PDD District.  
14 So in those cases it's up to the Zoning Administrator to have to make a determination if  
15 those are deemed residential, commercial or industrial. So in this case looking at the  
16 surrounding development in the area, even though it's zoned Rural, that was deemed to  
17 be more residential; thus, the Neighborhood Commercial was permitted to go forward.

18 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Okay, I understand that. So any questions of Staff before  
19 we hear from the Applicant?

20 MR. BROWN: Madam Chair, it's my understanding that Kershaw County has  
21 basically rezoned this designation requested, is that correct?

22 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: No, what Mr. Price was offering was that, I mean, this  
23 qualifies even though it's not a full two acres because Neighborhood Commercial as a

1 zoning classification is one that can be deemed compatible with residential use. And so  
2 while the surrounding area is zoned Rural, it's in residential use so that's why this one  
3 doesn't fail on its initial, just attempt to rezone. But within that the County is still saying,  
4 the Staff is still recommending disapproval because it's not an area that we've identified  
5 to go commercial. So it's sort of an interesting nuance but it has, basically this lane on  
6 the County border had nothing to do with the fact that it was allowed to come forward.

7 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

8 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So Mr. Winkler, are you, Michael Winkler? Can you  
9 please come forward to the microphone and state your name and address for the  
10 Record? You have two minutes.

11 **TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WINKLER:**

12 MR. WINKLER: My name's Michael Winkler and I live at 2421 D Charlie Horse  
13 Circle in Elgin, South Carolina 29045.

14 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So in terms of offering to us the reason for the rezoning,  
15 why you feel it's appropriate for the community.

16 MR. WINKLER: This was built back in the '40s and it was a business for quite a  
17 while. We're trying to get this rezoned so that way we can keep the building as is and  
18 not be torn down or anything, because we've seen too much history being torn down in  
19 the Elgin area and we would like to have it rezoned into commercial so we can renovate  
20 it and keep the history of it still there as we put our business into it. We're also looking at  
21 giving back to the community, I'm not sure if you're familiar with Camp Cole that's being  
22 built on Garners Ferry, as we progress in our business we are gonna be giving back up  
23 to 20% back from our profits to that community. We've actually been helping with Elgin

1 Lights for the last 13 years. It's a new type of business, it's a liquidation retail store so  
2 you don't have to go to Walmart, you don't have to go to Target and purchase anything,  
3 you can actually come here and get stuff that they aren't able to sell and we sell stuff up  
4 to 75% off of online retailers, including Ebay and Amazon. We originally were in Elgin  
5 and we did very well, but we needed a different location to be able to put this, and we  
6 have other ideas to bring to this area.

7 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Are you gonna be able to bring up, like street view?

8 Okay. I mean, one of the things that we sometimes – so basically what you've offered I  
9 think is that this is, and the Staff alluded to this as well, that it's a non-conforming  
10 building that's zoned Rural, it's got a building on it that's not – correct, Mr. Price?

11 MR. PRICE: Yes, I know we go through this terminology a lot, if it was non-  
12 conforming then there's a chance he would've been able to reestablish it. So the non-  
13 conforming status for, you know, the use is –

14 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Also it's grandfathered, right?

15 MR. PRICE: The structure itself, there's the location because it is encroaching  
16 into the setbacks, that would be deemed grandfathered, non-conforming. But as far as  
17 any use for it, there's no grandfathering status or non-conforming status applied to this  
18 due to the time of vacancy of the structure.

19 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: And sometimes I think what, I mean, as Mr. Price has  
20 offered, that we do have this strange grandfathering system but this one is not eligible  
21 for that in terms of the use. Sometimes I know that we sometimes look at just sort of the  
22 condition of the structure and whether it's in need of massive renovations or not,  
23 because I mean, in terms of, you know, you offered, well the building, well you know, for

1 it to be residential the building would have to be torn down. Well, sometimes we see  
2 buildings that it might be a bad thing that they're torn down. But I understand what  
3 you're saying about the historic, that this one's been there a long time.

4 MR. WINKLER: Right. We've looked at the renovations for it, we know there is  
5 some issues and we've actually already been working on that with other contractors to  
6 get quotes and everything to get it fixed. I know the roof needs to be replaced, which  
7 we're on the works of that; the foundation needs to be fixed, which is not too bad of an  
8 issue because of the way it is, it's more of the corner, but it has in the back rain that has  
9 been coming down on the foundation so it's kinda washing it. And we're putting gutters  
10 up to get that fixed.

11 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Does anyone on the Commission have any questions for  
12 the Applicant? Thank you, there's no further questions.

13 MR. WINKLER: Alright, thank you.

14 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Any discussion from the Commission Members?

15 MR. BRANHAM: I'll say that I think it does merit some consideration by virtue of  
16 the parcels that are nearby, [inaudible] General Commercial. Just my general sense of  
17 that drive through that area and then just across the County line in Kershaw County, I  
18 think just right around that bend is a furniture store that's pretty prominent, pretty  
19 sizeable, Newman Furniture of Elgin. [Inaudible] certainly not nicely clustered as much  
20 as we might like it to be as planners [inaudible] substantial size of the building  
21 [inaudible].

22 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: And I'd also like to offer that, I mean, to me Neighborhood  
23 Commercial, while the Comp Plan looks for nodes it is one of these land uses that I

1 think in some ways could be just sort of dropped in to otherwise residential type areas.  
2 And given the fact that it is an old structure and still fundamentally sound as offered by  
3 the Applicant, it's, you know, it's been commercial since it is [inaudible]. Any other  
4 discussion from the Commission?

5 MR. BRANHAM: I'd like to make a motion that we send this case, which is 20-  
6 008 MA, to County Council with a recommendation of approval.

7 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: You have to offer the rationale for going against Staff  
8 recommendation, sorry about that.

9 MR. BRANHAM: I would look to, as the ordinance is written I think there's some  
10 persuasiveness to the existing structure, the history of the usage, maybe that relates to  
11 the need and the justification for the change. [Inaudible] proximity to other parcels that  
12 have a similar zoning designation being commercial in nature.

13 MR. YONKE: Second.

14 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: We have a motion on the floor and a second. All those in  
15 favor of the motion please raise your right hand.

16 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Branham, Cairns, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis.  
17 *[Approved: Branham, Cairns, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis; Absent: Gilchrist, Tuttle]*

18 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: No one opposed. So for the Applicant, there will be a  
19 public hearing on this in front of County Council in these same chambers on March 24<sup>th</sup>  
20 at 6:00pm, correct, 7:00pm. I would've been early last month. Next Map Amendment?

21 **CASE NO. 20-009 MA:**

22 MR. PRICE: The next item is Case 20-009 MA. The Applicant is Bill Dixon. The  
23 location is within the Greenhill Parish development along Greenhill Parish Parkway. The

1 Applicant is requesting to rezone 13.37 acres from PDD to PDD. A quick explanation,  
2 you know, we use the term PDD to amend the PDD, but really because it's its own  
3 zoning designation any time you make any changes to something it's almost like you're  
4 doing a new zoning, really determination for that area and it would follow the additional  
5 changes. So we could've used the term, I know I'm speaking to more to the newer  
6 Members, but at one time we would just term this PDD to amended PDD, but it's really  
7 you're just, you're actually still changing the entire PDD as we look at this. So it's just a  
8 terminology, just like you would never see a GC to GC, of course, you know, but in this  
9 particular case because PDDs are, they're designed as their own zoning designations,  
10 you know, if the use is allowed within there we follow the development standards, it's  
11 just their own zoning within the Richland County Land Development Code. So in this  
12 case they're coming in to make an amendment to it, so we just look at it as a PDD to  
13 another PDD. Okay, sorry. For this particular request Staff recommends approval. It has  
14 been determined that the request would be consistent with the recommendations of the  
15 Comprehensive Plan within the neighborhood medium-density future land use  
16 designation the plan recommends a desired development pattern where the primary use  
17 within this area is medium-density residential neighborhoods designed to provide a mix  
18 of residential uses and densities within neighborhoods. And upon the review of what is  
19 requested Staff finds this to be in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Yes, sir?

20 MR. BRANHAM: Madam Chair, can I ask a question of Staff?

21 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Yes, sir.

22 MR. BRANHAM: Would you be able to put the general development plan up on  
23 the screen?

1 MR. PRICE: It's the same one that's in your package.

2 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Actually Mr. Brown had the –

3 MR. PRICE: I don't know if we have that one.

4 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: It would be helpful if, I mean, I know these PDD to PDDs  
5 can be a little bit boggling, but you know, something that shows it.

6 MR. BRANHAM: Madam Chair, the Application –

7 MR. PRICE: If you would like we can get you a copy of it. If you'd at least like to  
8 have a copy of the –

9 MR. BRANHAM: Well because the application has a little graphic chart that  
10 references the different parcels it was helpful [inaudible].

11 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: I actually have one question for Staff if you can – in terms  
12 of the RG-2 and the PDD, what type of use was allowed in RG-2? And I would imagine  
13 that C-3 was some level of commercial.

14 MR. PRICE: What we found over the years when it came to the PDDs is that it  
15 was the intent of the developer, you know, through the development plan, the general  
16 development plan, to identify what uses they were going to have within, you know, each  
17 designation within their PDD. Seems like there were kind of like a little shortcut to a  
18 degree that many of them would take and so rather than saying in some areas, say this  
19 will be a multi-family designation and giving it their own name, again, remember they're  
20 kind of creating their own zoning within this area. They'll say, we'll just make RG-2,  
21 which, or RG-1, which under our old Land Development Code was multi-family with a  
22 certain density. But it is because of the overall intent and what was identified within the  
23 general development plan that we know even though within, if I were to go to our old

1 zoning designation zoning code and look up the RG-2, I believe that's the one you're  
2 referring to, look at that designation, it allowed for multi-family, it's allowed for single-  
3 family, but for a multitude of uses. But all of those uses would not be included because  
4 the point of it, well they didn't rezone it to a zoning designation within, that was within  
5 our Code, they just happened to name it similar to what we had. But the intent of it was  
6 specifically for a certain use, so you see the RG, that was for multi-family; if you see a  
7 General Commercial, it was for commercial; if you see something that's zoned OI or C-1  
8 during that time, it was for institutional type uses.

9 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So just in terms of sort of general concept, it appears that  
10 – so the 55.2 acres of RSHD that are referenced in our chart, are those 52.5 acres  
11 currently undeveloped?

12 MR. CROOKS: Ms. Cairns, most of that looks like it's currently being developed  
13 so that would be this subdivision section here. So a lot of that is currently in the process  
14 of being developed.

15 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Okay, so the 13.5 acres that's going from RG-2 to RS-HD  
16 –

17 MR. CROOKS: Yes, ma'am, is gonna be this parcel highlighted here.

18 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So it appears that the RG-2 would've allowed up to 16  
19 dwelling units per acre and that RS-HD is, like a little over four units per acre?

20 MR. PRICE: Well again, the Applicant has to establish what his density will be,  
21 his or her density will be proposed, and it's up to, you know, during our review we can  
22 determine if that's an appropriate density for that area. So, but typically the RS-HD,  
23 which is why kind of, I don't like those, the acronyms they use for these, you know,

1 within their PDD because it can be a bit confusing, but the RS-HD actually allows for 8.7  
2 units per acre. But the Applicant can identify and he will be held to what he proposes  
3 within his PDD amendment.

4 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: I mean, it's just, it's – so, I mean, what I'm just trying to  
5 get a feel for is, are we increasing or decreasing the density of the 13.5 acres or so  
6 going from RG-2 to RS-HD?

7 MR. PRICE: You are not increasing it.

8 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: But it simply allows, okay. So then the C-3 is being in  
9 essence completely eliminated so is it accurate that basically all of the commercial =  
10 there'll be no more commercial out in the Greenhill Parish if we approve this?

11 MR. PRICE: That is correct. What, you know, PDDs have mixed use so their  
12 mixed use would be primarily residential with components of single-family and multi-  
13 family, and institutional uses, which would include schools and places of worship.

14 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: And then designated buffer.

15 MR. PRICE: Yes. The buffers will, you know, remain. They kind of serve truly as  
16 a buffer between the two different developments.

17 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So in the paragraph above our chart it offers that – you  
18 said the residential yield would go from 1098 to 1141, so that's an additional about,  
19 what, 43 units, that's for the entire 330 acres, correct? So a lotta those are already  
20 existing or in development.

21 MR. PRICE: Yes.

22 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Okay. Any more questions before we hear from the  
23 Applicant?

1 MR. BRANHAM: I will be interested to hear, if anyone is able to help us  
2 determine where the additional 9.63 acres [inaudible].

3 MR. PRICE: Thank you for – Mr. Crooks will answer that question for you.

4 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Branham, as much as we can tell, from what we can tell it  
5 seems to be just part of general development, so loss from that. And then there's been  
6 other PDD amendments that have happened previously where we expect that loss to  
7 have occurred cause it seems like there's around eight or so acres that was involved  
8 with other PDD amendments to either PDD to something else or another traditional  
9 zoning district. And that's where we expect that loss of acreage to be.

10 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Put it in your back pocket and take it home or anything.  
11 No? Okay.

12 MR. CROOKS: I don't think so.

13 MR. BRANHAM: [Inaudible] I'm looking forward to hearing from the Applicant and  
14 [inaudible].

15 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Okay, so Mr. Dixon? Are you here to – come on down  
16 and please state your name and address for the Record. And as I've offered there's a  
17 two minute presentation time.

18 **TESTIMONY OF BILL DIXON:**

19 MR. DIXON: Good afternoon, I'm Bill Dixon with Mungo Homes at 441 Western  
20 Lane. Essentially we are buying this tract of land, it's adjacent to an existing  
21 neighborhood that we're developing, Catawba Hill in Pontiac, and so we're gonna just  
22 expand the current neighborhood into that area. And the density is approximately four  
23 per acre in our existing neighborhood so I expect it to be in that range in the new area.

1 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So is that the neighborhood to the west of where the  
2 finger is?

3 MR. DIXON: Correct. Correct, with the circle coming in that you see is partially  
4 developed. And it's actually much further along than this aerial indicates. So anyway,  
5 currently it's zoned for apartments, multi-family, and so we'll be reducing the density by  
6 about a factor of four from 16 to about four per acre.

7 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Dixon, so the Catawba development, is that under the  
8 umbrella of the larger Greenhill Parish PDD or is that its own PDD?

9 MR. DIXON: It is part of the Greenhill PDD. When we purchased that property  
10 the majority of it was commercial and we had to rezone it to single-family residential as  
11 well.

12 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Any other questions for the Applicant? Okay, thank you.  
13 We do have Michael Frisina? Please come forward and state your name and address  
14 for the Record.

15 **TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL FRISINA:**

16 MR. FRISINA: Yes. I'm Michael Frisina, I'm at 101 Stillwild Lane, Elgin, South  
17 Carolina. I'm a resident and the Vice-President of the HOA for the Greenhill Parish  
18 Homeowners' Association. I've been a resident there for 15 years. During that time  
19 we've seen the traffic and density buildup of the area with the additional of the  
20 elementary school, the apartment complexes and the Catawba Hills development that  
21 the Mungo representative just alluded to. The traffic circle that he mentioned is not an  
22 open traffic circle, the 200 some home sites that you see on the southeast side of  
23 Greenhill Parish Parkway contiguous to that traffic circle is the only entrance and egress

1 for emergency vehicles and for the residents to leave this subdivision and get to either  
2 Old National Highway to the northeast or Spears Creek Church to the southwest. I  
3 watched my commute increase by over 20 minutes with traffic buildup in the morning  
4 between 6:30 and 8:00, and the density of traffic coming off of I-20 up Spears Creek in  
5 the evening from 4:30 to 6:00 with nearly a half to sometimes three quarters of a mile  
6 density of traffic between the stop light at Two Notch at Pontiac with Spears Creek and  
7 going the opposite direction, the stop light at the entrance to Woodcreek Farms and  
8 Spears Creek Church. So it goes opposite directions but it's massive traffic buildup.  
9 There was an agreement that the developer made with the former developer of  
10 Greenhill Parish, Deas Manning, that when they developed Catawba Hills they would  
11 not create an entrance or egress out of Catawba Hills to Greenhill Parish Parkway; that  
12 that traffic circle would remain intact as the only entrance/exit for Greenhill Parish.  
13 There's a retention pond that's currently contiguous on the opposite side. We're looking  
14 for the Council because of the contiguous parcels and the same developer, to uphold  
15 that same agreement that in the development of this parcel they would not be given  
16 access to – sorry. What we're hoping for is that the County and the Council with  
17 previous Council representative, would preclude the development of that parcel from  
18 gaining egress and exit and entrance off of the Parkway. The traffic for the school is  
19 problematic at the traffic circle, we also have continued pothole issues at that traffic  
20 circle. There are two yield signs on the contiguous Parkway dynamic with the stop sign  
21 coming out of the development. People don't pay attention to the yield sign, you  
22 basically are playing a Russian roulette moving from the stop sign into the traffic circle  
23 and hoping you don't get his from people ignoring the two yield signs on the opposite

1 side of the traffic circle. Beginning of February a crossing guard at the school was hit by  
2 a hit-and-run driver with some density of traffic. So basically what we're saying is as  
3 Greenhill Parish homeowners with only one entrance/exit access out of our area and  
4 with no hope of getting another one, we need to maintain the density of traffic and  
5 access out to Spears Creek Church on behalf of our sub development and limit the  
6 developer from creating any entrance/egress/access out to Greenhill Parish, which was  
7 a restriction under the development of their previous development of Catawba Hills.

8 Thank you.

9 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Thank you. Questions for the Applicant?

10 MR. DENNIS: Do we happen to know if Greenhill Parish Parkway is a County  
11 road or is that part of the HOA?

12 MR. FRISINA: It's County. Public Road. Two Notch Road I believe is state so it's  
13 maintained at a heavier dynamic of pavement than the Parkway.

14 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So just to sorta offer, I mean, what we have is a parcel of  
15 land that's currently zoned for a higher density of residential use. The Applicant is  
16 asking to change the density down. It's my understanding based on what – is that  
17 consistent, Mr. Price?

18 MR. PRICE: Yes.

19 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: In terms of issues with access and traffic, I mean, it  
20 appears that Greenhill Parish is its only access. So certainly whatever goes on there  
21 appears that it's gonna use that access, but that's sort of not within our decision making.  
22 We literally just look at the land, what it's currently zoned for, what the Applicant is

1 requesting and whether it's consistent and beneficial to have it developed under the  
2 new concept.

3 MR. FRISINA: Well somehow the developer was limited from gaining access out  
4 to Spears Creek Church –

5 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Oh, I understand that. I actually have been serving here  
6 long enough to remember the previous map amendments for Greenhill Parish and when  
7 Mr. Manning still owned it all. So you know, but I mean, just in terms of this parcel it  
8 appears to not have access to any other road. Like I said that's not even, we look at  
9 road networks and capacity in a very generalized concept, but what we have is a higher  
10 density parcel that's being recommended to be a lower level of density but still  
11 residential use. So we're not even having a fundamental change in use, just a change in  
12 the development [inaudible].

13 MR. FRISINA: I would appeal that there was precedent from their previous  
14 development in that –

15 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: I understand but that's, but when developers make  
16 agreements with Council and with neighborhoods and stuff like that, they can do that  
17 outside of us, we can't force, I mean, it's the concept of agreement, we can't force an  
18 agreement. You know, we as the Planning Commission have before us whether or not  
19 we're gonna recommend on to Council or not whether this should get rezoned based on  
20 the request of the Applicant. So I'm not telling you that things aren't possible but we  
21 can't [inaudible] do that.

22 MR. FRISINA: Okay, understand. We just wanted to be on Record that we have  
23 concern on the safety issue regarding increasing traffic. Thank you.

1 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So any discussion from the Planning Commission?

2 MR. BRANHAM: I think as has been noted this property is currently zoned to  
3 have up to 216 units, residential units developed on it, and the new designation would  
4 take it to somewhere around 50. So yeah, a quarter less density [inaudible]. I'm happy  
5 to make a motion unless there's further discussion. I make a motion [inaudible] to send  
6 this case, 20-009 MA, to Council with a recommendation of approval.

7 MR. DENNIS: Second.

8 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: We have a motion on the floor and a second. All those in  
9 favor please raise your right hand.

10 MR. PRICE: Those in favor: Branham, Cairns, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis.  
11 *[Approved: Branham, Cairns, Carlisle, Brown, Yonke, Dennis; Absent: Gilchrist, Tuttle]*

12 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: And as offered there'll be a County Council public hearing  
13 on this on March 24<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm in this chamber. Do we have any other business?

14 MR. PRICE: At this time, no, ma'am.

15 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: I do not have a Chairman's Report. Is that it?

16 MR. CROOKS: Ms. Cairns, I just have one announcement for y'all. We  
17 mentioned it at the last Commission meeting as well, but we're looking to have the Land  
18 Development Code rewrite meetings come the end of March, so we're actually finalizing  
19 that schedule now with the consultant. So we'll have, hopefully have the draft out soon  
20 but then we'll also be notifying y'all of particular meeting dates; one for the public  
21 meetings but then also having a particular work session with you all as we did  
22 previously. So be on the lookout for that. Those days would be March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 24<sup>th</sup> or 25<sup>th</sup>.  
23 So thank you.

1 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Thank you so much. So if there's nothing else?

2 MR. PRICE: We'll try to follow up with you soon with an email reminder so that  
3 you can kind of start looking at your dates, you know, at least in advance of the  
4 meeting. But that is it.

5 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: So there being no other business do we have a motion on  
6 the floor?

7 MR. BROWN: So moved to adjourn.

8 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Second?

9 MR. CARLISLE: Second.

10 VICE-CHAIR CAIRNS: Alright, so we are adjourned.

11

12

*[Meeting adjourned at 3:45pm]*