RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
April 3, 2023

[Members Present: Christopher Yonke, Gary Dennis, John Metts, Charles Durant, Terrence Taylor, Chris Siercks, Bryan Grady; Absent: Beverly Frierson, Frederick Johnson, II]

Called to order: ______

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Ready?

MR. DELAGE: Yes sir, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I’d like to call to order the April 3rd, 2023 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. Staff, please confirm the following: In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to the news media, persons requesting notification and posted on the bulletin board located in the County administration building. Is that correct?

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Staff, can you please take attendance for today’s meeting?

MR. DELAGE: Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Mr. Metts?

MR. METTS: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Here.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.
Mr. Delage: Dennis?
Mr. Dennis: Here.
Mr. Delage: Siercks?
Mr. Siercks: Here.
Mr. Delage: Durant?
Mr. Durant: Here.

Chairman Yonke: Thank you, Staff. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the April 3rd, 2023 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 Land Development Code rewrite process conducted last year 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 4th Tuesday of the month. Please check the County’s website for updated agendas, times and dates. Please take note of the following guidelines for today’s meeting. Please turn off or silence any cellphones. Audience members may quietly come and go as needed. Applicants are allowed up to two minutes to make statements. Citizens signed up to speak are allowed up to two minutes each. Redundant comments should be minimized. Please only address
remarks to the Commission and do not expect the Commission to respond to questions
from the speaker in a back and forth style, this is not the purpose of the meeting. Please
no audience/speaker exchanges. No audience demonstrations or disruptions to the
meeting are permitted nor are comments from anyone other than the speaker at the
podium. Please remember the meeting is being recorded. Please speak into the
microphone and give your name and address. Abusive language is inappropriate and
will not be tolerated. Please don’t voice displeasure or frustration at a recommendation
while the Planning Commission is still conducting business. If you have any questions
or concerns you may contact the Richland County Planning Department Staff. Thank
you. We’re gonna move on to number 3 now, Additions or Deletions to the Agenda, we
are also gonna deal with any motions to amend the Agenda?

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Yes, sir. I have a change to the Agenda. I don’t, the approval of
Minutes 4.b. February 6, 2023 was not in our packet so we would need to remove those
Minutes cause we can’t vote on something we didn’t have.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Dennis. Staff, can you confirm?

MR. DELAGE: That is correct. We put that as a placeholder with hopes that it
would be in in time, but we actually did receive them this weekend but we weren’t able
to get them out to you since it was Sunday, so it’ll be on next month’s agenda.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, I am marking off 4.b. Any other motions to change
the Agenda? Commissioners? Alright, thank you. We’ll move on to number 5. then,
which is our Consent Agenda.
MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Mr. Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Yeah, I made a motion so it would have to be seconded to approve the Agenda change and then you would have to vote.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you Commissioner Dennis. Okay, the motion by Commissioner Dennis was to update the Agenda to remove Item 4.b. May I, does the Chair have a second?

[Recording interference]

CHAIRMAN YONKE: We'll pause till we fix our feedback. Thanks. Alright, we’re gonna rewind. Let’s do this, Commissioner Dennis what was your motion?

MR. DENNIS: Yes, I make a motion to remove Item 4.b. from our Agenda, the February 6, 2023 Minutes.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do I have a second?

MR. DURANT: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second, alright. I have a second from Mr. Durant. Can you conduct a vote Staff, please?

MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Metts?

MR. METTS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

[Approved: Taylor, Metts, Grady, Yonke, Dennis, Siercks, Durant; Absent: Frierson, Johnson]

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Now we will move on to number 5, our Consent Agenda. The Consent Agenda is an action item that allows the Commission to approve Road Names and Map Amendment requests where the Staff recommends approval, no one from the public has signed up to speak against the amendment or no Member of the Commission is in need of further discussion. Today I’m gonna ask Commissioner Dennis which cases do we have people signed up to speak and we need to remove from the Agenda?

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Yes, the Consent Agenda we would remove the Road Names, 5.a. because I did not see any in the packet. And we would also remove Case or pull Case 23-008 MA and 23-009 MA for discussion as they are recommended for disapproval from Staff.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Dennis, I do see one Road Name. Page one.
MR. DENNIS: Alright, so somehow those stuck together. So let me amend that Agenda, or let me amend that motion. Move to pass the Road Names on to County Council for approval and pull Case No. 23-008 MA and 23-009 MA for discussion.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do I have a second?

MR. SIERCKS: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Second came from Commissioner Siercks, thanks.

MR. DELAGE: Alright, so just as a reminder the Road Names are approved by Planning Commission, this is the final decision making body, just FYI. Our coordinator wanted us to [inaudible].

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Ah, thank you. Okay.

MR. DELAGE: Alright, so for the vote, Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Metts?

MR. METTS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.
MR. DELAGE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

[Approved: Taylor, Metts, Grady, Yonke, Dennis, Siercks, Durant; Absent: Frierson, Johnson]

MR. DELAGE: Okay, motion approved.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. We are going to move on now to Item number 5.b.1., Map Amendment Case No. 23-008MA. Commissioner Dennis, do we have someone signed up to speak? Or let’s hear from Staff first. Thank you.

CASE NO. 23-008MA:

MR. DELAGE: Yes sir, Mr. Chairman. So of course we have Case 23-008MA. The request is for a Map Amendment change from the residential single-family low density district to the neighborhood commercial district. The site is approximately .39 acres, it’s located at 8033 Caughman Road. Again the TMS # R19116-11-02. So the parcel is located in the neighborhood medium density district which recommends that the commercial development be located along main road corridors within a contextually appropriate distance from the intersection of a primary arterial. Staff felt that in review of this that the subject parcel was not located along a main road corridor or within a suitable distance of a traffic junction and for those reasons Staff recommended disapproval.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. A question about something you said. You said it’s located in the medium residential district?

MR. DELAGE: That’s correct, so the neighborhood medium density future land use.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, that’s for the future land use, thank you.

Commissioners, any questions for Staff? If there are none, Commissioner Dennis do we have anyone signed up to speak?

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chairman, we have zero participants signed up to speak for Case No. 23-008 MA.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Was there anyone in the audience that may have forgotten to sign up and would like to speak on this? No? Yes, sir? If you’d like to come up to the podium, give your name and address we’ll get you up there. Thank you. You have two minutes to speak.

MR. GWYN: For 23-008, is that correct?

MR. DENNIS: Yes, sir.

MR. GWYN: Okay. Yeah, I did sign up, I don’t know if you got the signup sheet or not but I did sign up on that.

TESTIMONY OF MARK GWYN:

MR. GWYN: I’m Mark Gwyn. My property is 9467 and 9469 Caughman Road.

MR. DENNIS: Copy. Yes, sir. You signed up, you just signed up on the wrong one. You’re good.

MR. GWYN: Okay. Well, as I said I’m Mark Gwyn and my property is 9467 and 9469 on Caughman Road. I’m an adjacent property owner and I’ll be brief on this. It’s my understanding that this change of zoning to neighborhood commercial allows for businesses such as bars or convenience stores, which could very likely decrease property values of not only my property but adjacent property owners. So if so this increase in value to the property for which the zoning request is being made would be at
the expense of my property and other nearby property landowners if that’s the case. So I would request the zoning change be denied for this reason. I’m sure you’ve already considered the congested traffic issues in the area for this property. I’m not an authority on that but it’s quite congested there. But there are also problems with excessive noise much of the time and having a business that allows a lotta in and out traffic will only worsen this situation and be very detrimental to the residential community in my opinion. I’m not against anybody doing what they can with their property; it just, it’s gonna be at the expense of my property I feel and, you know, adjacent property owners can voice their opinion on that. But the noise, the traffic, the in and out traffic in a residential area, this does not fit well in my opinion for that property. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. The Chair now opens this up for discussion with the Commissioners. Discussion or I would invite any motions.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Yes sir, I have a motion to send Case No. 23-008MA to County Council with a recommendation of disapproval.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do I have a second to the motion?

MR. DURANT: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second, Commissioner Durant. We have a motion on the floor with a second. Staff would you mind taking a vote?

MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: I’ll abstain.

MR. DELAGE: Metts?
MR. METTS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

[Approved: Metts, Grady, Yonke, Dennis, Siercks, Durant; Abstained: Taylor; Absent: Frierson, Johnson]

MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion approved.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: If I may. Just so there’s no conflict of interest I did have a direct access to this particular property which is why I abstained from voting. And I did look into it while it was for sale, too. And normally that wouldn’t necessarily disqualify me but because I did have an actual interest in this particular one that is why I abstained from voting.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. And we are a recommending body to County Council. They will have their vote at their zoning public hearing which is
usually the fourth Tuesday of the month. We will move on to Item No. 5.b., our next Map Amendment case, number 23-009MA.

CASE NO. 23-009MA:

MR. DELAGE: Alright, so the Applicant for this case is currently zoned RU, rural district, and requesting the general commercial district. The site is three acres and a portion of the property. It is located at Garners Ferry Road, actually west of the SERN, which is the master plan, the neighborhood master plan for the Lower Richland Boulevard intersection. It is located within the Lower Richland Neighborhood Master Plan which is the overall larger plan for the Lower Richland area. In this particular case the property is located in the neighborhood medium density future land use category which as similar to the previous case recommends that commercial along major road corridors within a contextually appropriate distance from the intersection and Staff in their review principally recommends disapproval. While the subject site is located along a main road corridor it is not within a contextually appropriate distance from the intersection of a primary arterial. However, although the request is not located at a traffic junction the site is adjacent to existing commercial uses that are located in an area where other commercial uses have been established. As the intent of the GC district is to orient primarily to major traffic arteries or areas of commercial usage, the request could be deemed to be in character with the developing commercial nature of the area. And for those reasons Staff recommends disapproval of the request.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Any questions for Staff from the Commission?

MR. DURANT: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

MR. DURANT: Question for Staff. The adjacent properties, particularly the ones across Garners Ferry Road from the property at issue appear to be general commercial. Does Staff know whether those were originally rural and at some point changed to general commercial or were they always general commercial?

MR. DELAGE: So under the zoning history for the general area it appears that the commercial site which is in particular if you look over at my mouse, it’s hovering over, was rezoned back in 2014, let’s see, and also – oh I apologize, I believe that one was in 2014. Sorry, I’m just running through the case numbers. I apologize, I swapped them around. So 14 and for this parcel here which is showing up as the Google spot and then the other one was in 2002. So within the last, you know, 23 years roughly.

MR. DURANT: In the last 23 years they were rezoned from –

MR. DELAGE: Rezoned.

MR. DURANT: Thank you.

MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any further questions, Mr. Durant?

MR. DURANT: Yeah I do, Mr. Chair, one other question.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

MR. DURANT: And I guess this is for Staff. Is there the tendency here that there’s a trend of moving these rural lots towards general commercial seeing how there’s several general commercials nearby and this one is trying to become general commercial also? Is there a trend that was going on or it just happened that way?
MR. DELAGE: I would think given based on the request in this general area there has been the desire and in some cases needs for certain properties to be rezoned from rural to general commercial; whether it be by the fact that there was already an adjacent commercial zoning district next to the site, particularly in case with the property that’s kinda located east of this portion of yet an existing commercial use, next to it was needed for additional parking and it kinda made sense that you’ve already got commercial beside it, commercial across the street. So in that case kind of looking at it not necessarily as an infill but as a natural kind of progression of that commercial. Given if this were ideally in a perfect planning world and you were able to start from scratch and move out you would kinda be centric and kinda go out without necessarily leapfrogging a little bit, but as you can kinda see even west of here there’s a good bit of general commercial. So there is some logic being that it’s a major highway that there would be some commercial kind of trailing down, especially from major intersections.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you, Commissioner Durant. Commissioner Dennis, do we have anyone signed up to speak?

MR. DENNIS: Yes, we do. It looks like a Hank Mabury?

TESTIMONY OF HANK MABURY:

MR. MABURY: Good afternoon. My name’s Hank Mabury. I’m the agent for the owner of the property. Basically what we have here is a 25 acre tract that’s zoned rural and the owner is agreeable to rezone three acres of the property up front. In just a minute you’re gonna hear from Mr. Lee Bell who is actually the Applicant and Mr. Bell’s gonna tell you a little bit about what he plans to do or would like to do and why he needs a general commercial zoning. I’ve read and I listened to what Staff said and I appreciate
the traffic concern about this. To me it didn’t sound like it was a strong disagreement on what we’re trying to do. And there are a number of general commercial uses in this area already, across the street, you know, within a rock’s throw of this property, and I can think of a number of things other than what Mr. Bell plans to do on this property if the, you know, the new owner decided he needed to go from, like a rural zoning to something else to put on 25 acres of land. There’s a tremendous amount of housing going on as y’all know. Garners Ferry Road is getting more and more traffic, but physically there’s no way to move this tract of land up to Lower Richland Boulevard where we’re trying to get the commercial uses to concentrate. Unfortunately this is something that’s happened over time the way we’ve had this leapfrogging. But I think the general commercial should be strongly considered for this property and all we’re talking about is three acres of a 25 acre block. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

MR. MABURY: Oh, one other thing. Is Ms. Jones here? Ms. Jones, she is the adjoining property owner and we tried to contact her and to see if she had any objections. We tried to explain what we were doing and we never heard anything from her.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Commissioner Dennis, next?

MR. DENNIS: Michael Bell.

TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL BELL:

MR. BELL: Hey, good afternoon. So I’m Michael Bell. I own a landscaping company here in Richland County. And I’ve lived here, probably about two miles from this property –
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Please state your address for the Record, sir.

MR. BELL: Oh, I’m sorry.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: That’s okay. Thank you.

MR. BELL: 541 Old Congaree Run in Eastover. My plan is to have a retail nursery here on this property. I went to church with the previous owners of this property and now their daughter owns it. I think that it is a good use for the land, predominately because there’s a flood zone that comes through the back portion of the property. I don’t think it would be useful for anything else other than just maybe hunting or something like that. The portion that we’re talking about it just basically drawing a straight line off of that corner that is the first three acres that you get to along the roadside. I think it’s a great opportunity for the area, something that we don’t have on this side of town like a Reese’s Plants or a Woodley’s Garden Center, and I’m trying to use my expertise to improve our community.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. You can have a seat. Staff I would like, with the map, if we could pull up the wetlands layer. Thank you. And the Chair now opens this up for discussion.

MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Mr. Grady.

MR. GRADY: So a question for Staff. Because we see this phrase pop up a lot because it’s cited in the Comprehensive Plan, I was wondering if there was any context that could be provided. So I think we’ve had the discussion, on my previous stint on the Planning Commission about the definition of a primary arterial and how that is classified,
how, in the opinion of Staff, how would you define the phrase ‘contextually appropriate
distance’?

MR. DELAGE: So I think in most cases what we would look at as contextually
appropriate, it kinda sounds like what it is, depending on the location, how it functions,
you know, the intersection of Garners Ferry and Lower Richland Boulevard is a little bit
different than say Hardscrabble Road and Clemson Road. So in these cases we’re
looking at existing zoning districts, existing uses, kind of, you know, whether that be
immediately adjacent to the site or kind of as a, if you kinda zoom out a little bit, the
development pattern and character. So that’s kinda how we kinda come up with what
we feel is contextually appropriate. I know it sounds pretty, or could be subjective but
we typically try to look at the area and each individual case and try to make a decision
based off of those factors.

MR. GRADY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you, Mr. Grady.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: Question for Staff. In your conclusion, and I could be reading it
wrong, but seems like the only real objection comes in that first paragraph while the
second paragraph seems to support that it could go to this, is that correct? Am I reading
that correctly?

MR. DELAGE: Yes sir, that’s correct.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. Commissioner Siercks.

MR. SIERCKS: So kind of on a similar note I see in the second paragraph where it says it’s adjacent to existing commercial uses and located in an area where other commercial uses have been established. But under the zoning district summary it says that the GC district is intended primarily to be oriented to major traffic arteries, which we already talked about, or extensive areas of predominately commercial usage. Is there any, you know, special meaning to the, you know, particular phrase extensive areas and predominately commercial uses? I mean, is that kind of dealer’s choice in terms of what we’re looking at or, you know, are those subjective phrases I guess is the question that I’m asking?

MR. DELAGE: Yes sir, so that terminology and those phrases came from the Purpose Statement which is included with every zoning district. So when you look up the general commercial district in our Code they’ll have the general purpose statement kind of saying what intended locations for those zoning districts are. And we include those as kind of, I don’t wanna say necessarily a definition, but kinda the intent behind them, and then we further kinda back that up with the Comprehensive Plan and that’s recommendations, so it can often be a little bit of a blend when it comes to the Staff decision. But that’s where that language came from, and it is a little bit, you know, kind of subjective in its intent as far as for the Purpose Statement.

MR. SIERCKS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other comments, concerns, Commissioners? I also invite any motions.

MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

MR. DURANT: I move that the zoning request for project 23-009MA be approved based primarily on the language in Staff’s second paragraph in its inclusion that it, the property is adjacent to existing commercial uses and is located in an area where other commercial uses have been established.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. We have a motion on the floor for approval. Do we have a second?

MR. METTS: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: We have a second from Commissioner Metts. With that, Staff can you take a vote?

MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir. Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Metts?

MR. METTS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Durant?
MR. DURANT: Aye.

[Approved: Taylor, Metts, Grady, Yonke, Dennis, Siercks, Durant; Absent: Frierson, Johnson]

MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion approved.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Again, we are a recommending body to County Council. Our recommendation will go forward to them and they will have their vote at their next zoning public meeting.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Mr. Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Yeah, I wanted to go back and look at something. I think when I made my motion for Item 4. Approval of Minutes, I think I just did it to remove the February 6th Minutes, I don’t think I did it to actually also approve the Minutes for November 7, 2022. And I, for the life of – did I make it to approve those Minutes? Okay, so yeah, we need to take a vote on that. I think we started running a little –

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Our apologies, yes.

MR. DENNIS: - quick.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Dennis. So looking at the Agenda, Item number 4., Approval of Minutes, we need a motion to approve or deny our November 7th, 2022 Minutes. Before I ask for that motion, Commissioners do we have any questions or discussion on these Minutes? This was a thick packet, a long meeting.

MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.
MR. DURANT: Just a comment, a reminder that the Staff and the Commission has noted that Commissioners did not have to be present at the meeting in order to approve the Minutes.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Commissioner Grady’s back with us and that means you can also vote on these. Alright, Staff looks for a motion on the November 7th, 2022 Minutes.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Yes sir, I would like to approve the Minutes for November 7, 2022.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we have a second?

MR. TAYLOR: Second.

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

MR. DELAGE: Yes sir, Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.
MR. DELAGE: Metts?

MR. METTS: Aye.

MR. DELAGE: Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

[Approved: Durant, Siercks, Dennis, Yonke, Grady, Metts, Taylor; Absent: Frierson, Johnson]

MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion approved.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you everyone. Thanks for helping me out on that.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: I should've made that motion in with my other one but I just, I was thinking we was gonna do it separately but I just wanted to make sure those Minutes were crucial for the public to see what we've done for the LDC so I wanted to make sure those were approved.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay if I'm correct this moves us on to Item no. 6. on the Agenda, which is the Chairman's Report. All I have this time is to say thank you Commissioners for your time every month and your time you take to research each Map Amendment. Thank you for everyone with the Land Development Code rewrite last year. I wanna welcome back Commissioner Grady, welcome back, sir, we're happy to have you.

MR. GRADY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: We have several, we more Richland Planning Staff is hosting several open house meetings for the Land Development Code rewrite. This was
published on the website under the News tab. Everyone’s encouraged to attend one if possible. It helps out the public in educating on the Code and moving forward with the County Council beginning to conduct their readings. I’ve been invited to speak for County Council, in front of County Council tomorrow night on behalf of the Commission on the work that we did. I can encourage anyone interested to attend that meeting or listen in, 6:00pm tomorrow. That’s all I have for the Chairman’s Report. Now we’ll move forward to number 7., the Planning Director’s Report. Mr. DeLage as you’re standing in today?

Mr. DeLage: Yes. Nothing new to report. The only thing I was gonna mention was the meeting tonight at the Eastover Library, so it’s from 6:00 to 7:30, it’s gonna be a similar format for other meetings. I know that we have two scheduled in the upcoming week with more to follow so just as a reminder just to keep an eye out, and we’ll be going all around to different districts throughout the County, so.

Chairman Yonke: Thank you, Mr. DeLage. Number 8. on the Agenda is Other Items for Discussion. Anyone have any other items for discussion?

Mr. Durant: Mr. Chair, I do have a question.

Chairman Yonke: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

Mr. Durant: I think it was either at the last meeting or the one before but was there anything left over for us to do or discuss regarding short-term rentals?

Chairman Yonke: Staff? Any knowledge on that?

Mr. DeLage: So just a little bit, not a whole lot really to report. I know that we’d had some discussions about coming back at a later meeting date. I think there’s some, you know, potential for that to come back up at a regularly scheduled meeting in the
future. Also I think that we’re also watching closely the recommendations for the Land Development Code as that does contain language that would address it in some form for the 2021 Code. So potentially maybe, you know, once we kinda get a little bit firmer date or potential for adoption of the maps that could kinda help dictate when we bring that back and what kind of language. But certainly there’s nothing that, there’s no reason why we couldn’t bring back language at the next or at a sooner date as far as for the short-term rentals cause there’s some great interest in it.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, thank you sir.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: For short-term rentals have we looked at anything with the City of Columbia with that to partner with them? Cause I know they’re not doing zoning, they’re doing ordinance.

MR. DELAGE: That’s correct. Yes, actually our Business Service Center, I wish he was here cause I would, he actually asked me about it before coming in, they’re looking into it. He’s kind of the, the gentleman Zach Cavanaugh, is working with the City as far as we’re looking into kinda how they’re doing it. So we are considering that. They are doing it a little bit differently though by, just like you said they’re not necessarily, at this time the ordinance is not through the zoning code it’s through another area so that is something to consider moving forward as a potential option, either in combination with zoning ordinance or potentially in a standalone.

MR. DENNIS: Copy. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Unless there’s anything else up for discussion the Chair would look for number 9., a motion for adjournment.

MR. DURANT: So moved.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: So moved. Do I have a second?

?: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you, sir. Thank you everyone, we’ll see you next month. Oh we need to vote? With your hands. The vote’s unanimous.

[Meeting adjourned]