RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
June 5, 2023

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

Called to order: ______

CHAIRMAN YONKE: - Mr. Taylor would be down at the end over there, well, I think we moved in a little bit. Is Staff ready? Okay, I'd like to call the order of the June 5th, 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. PRICE: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Staff, can you please take attendance for today's meeting?

MR. PRICE: Those in attendance for today's meeting, Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS FRIERSON: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Here

MR. PRICE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Here.

MR. PRICE: Metts?

MR. METTS: Here.
MR. PRICE: Durant?
MR. DURANT: Here.
MR. PRICE: Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible]
MR. PRICE: Siercks?
MR. SIERCKS: [Inaudible]
MR. PRICE: Grady?
MR. GRADY: Here.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. Mr. Siercks has his items up here so he should be returning and Mr. Taylor did reach out to me and he said he was going to be unable to come out today but sends his best wishes. I will start with our public announcement. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the June 5th, 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 request. 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 the 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 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
County’s website for updated agendas, dates and times. 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; that is not the purpose of the meeting. Please no audience/speaker exchanges. No audience demonstrations or other 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. This will now move us on to Item number 3., Additions or Deletions to the Agenda. Are there any motions for additions or deletions to the Agenda? Let’s also deal with any motions to amend the Agenda. I notice that we have a couple of page numbers incorrect, Staff. Just minor updates. For number 6., actually, number 5, letter c., that information for the text amendment we’ll speak about is found on page 53 of our packet. It was just flipped cause I, cause for my Chairman’s Report pages 49-51. Commissioners, do you notice any other issues with our packet today? And were there any motions to amend, make changes? Okay, if there are none, we can move onto Item number 4., which is the approval of our Minutes, this is from our last meeting. The Staff
provided Commission with copies of the transcript of the Commission’s May 1st, 2023 meeting. Do any Commissioners have any comments or concerns regarding these transcripts? If there are none, the Chair makes a motion to approve the Minutes unless there’s an objection. Do I have a second?

MR. DENNIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, please take a vote.

MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the motion to approve the May 1st, 2023 Minutes, Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Metts?

MR. METTS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye. Thank you, Staff.

[Approved: Grady, Siercks, Durant, Metts, Dennis, Johnson(?), Yonke; Absent: Taylor, Frierson]
MR. PRICE: Mr. -

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes? Yes, Mr. Price?

MR. PRICE: I'm not sure about the appropriateness of this that the additions and deletions but you will note on each case, on each case it has the Zoning Public Hearing date is for June 27th, 2023.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

MR. PRICE: This is a little unique, kind of a trend I think with County Councilmembers in which all of the Councilmembers that are representatives of each of these cases or districts that have each of these cases, they will, their, their intent is to defer at the June 27th meeting. And so with that being said these cases will not be heard until July 25th, I believe that's the fourth Tuesday, at the, that's when the next Zoning Public Hearing will be.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. I'll just copy that for the public.

Earlier I stated that Council typically holds their Zoning Public Hearings on the fourth Tuesday of the month. You're saying that County Council will typically defer that for this month and then these cases that we hear today will then be heard in July.

MR. PRICE: Yeah, so based on, based on each of these discussions with the Councilmembers that represent these districts that since it was their intent to defer to allow a community meeting or at least some type of town hall to discuss these further, they've asked, decided to go ahead and move these to the July meeting as opposed to posting property and then having to go back out and put deferred on them.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do you have any questions for Staff?

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: What was that date again?

MR. PRICE: July 25th.

MR. DENNIS: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Dennis. With that we will move on to Item number 5., our Consent Agenda. So I’m going to explain the 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 amendments or no Member of the Commission is in need of further discussion on the request. Today we have Commissioner Grady which cases do we have people signed up to speak or Staff recommends disapproval and we need to remove from our Consent Agenda?

MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair, based on, based on those items we will be removing Item 2., Case number 23-014 MA, number 4., Case 23-016 MA, Case 5., 23-017 MA and Case 6., 23-018 MA from the Consent Agenda.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. So we also have a text amendment under letter c. Question of Staff, do we remove that from our Consent Agenda and hear about it?

MR. PRICE: I would suggest we go ahead and remove that.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Also going to remove letter c. We’ll address it, make sure we are correct here, our Consent Agenda. The Chair makes a motion to amend the Consent Agenda, so that cases 5. 2., 4., 5., 6. and letter c. are removed so the motion is
to approve the Consent Agenda with the letter a. Road Names and b.1., case number one and case number 3. Do I have a second?

MR. GRADY: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: With that, Staff can we -

MR. PRICE: Who made the motion?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: The motion is to approve Consent Agenda.

MR. PRICE: Who made the motion?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Chairman Yonke, that’s me. Thank you. Please take the vote whenever you’re ready.

MR. PRICE: All those in favor of the motion to approve the agenda, the Consent Agenda, Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Metts?

MR. METTS: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Frierson?
MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye. Thank you, staff.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: With that Case Number 23-012 as well as case 23-015 have been approved inside of our Consent Agenda and those will be passed down to County Council as recommended approval; not on June 27th meeting but what you said, July 25th.

MR. PRICE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. So moving along inside of Item number 5., our map amendment b.2., Case Number 23-014 MA, Staff, can you please provide the information, thank you.

CASE NO. 23-014 MA:

MR. PRICE: Alright, as stated, the next item is case 23-014 MA. The applicant is David Cook. Location is Hollingshed Road. The Applicant requesting to rezone two parcels which comprise 5.63 acres from rural, RU to residential single-family low density which is RSLD. Upon Staff’s review of the request as compared to, in comparison with the recommendations and guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan we found that it is in compliance with, with the Comprehensive Plan thus, and also, it we also found it to be in character with the existing residential development pattern in that area, along with the zoning designations. So thus, Staff recommends approval.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Ms. Frierson, how are you doing?
MS. FRIERSON: Doing okay.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Will you please read any names that are signed up to speak?

MS. FRIERSON: The first person we have who signed up to speak is the Applicant Mr. David Cook.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Cook, you’re going to have two minutes to speak. Please state your name and address. Thank you.

**TESTIMONY OF DAVID COOK:**

MR. COOK: Good evening, David Cook, 2271 Hollingshed Road. The only reason that the request for rural to residential low density is to add a small detached structure along the side of my property there that’s along the left-hand side of the property. Right now the rural zoning setback requirement is 20’ and we need to go back to five feet for the residential low density and that’s the only reason for it.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anything else you’d like to share?

MR. COOK: I’d appreciate everybody’s consideration with it. I have spoken with all of my neighbors there on contiguous lots, either stopping by my home or text message or calls and I’ve had no opposition of it, everybody is for it. That’d be it.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

MR. COOK: Thank y’all.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

MS. FRIERSON: We have an additional person who’s signed up to speak on the opposing side. Ms. Kim Murphy.

**TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**
MS. MURPHY: Thank you. Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel Lane in Chapin. And I’m not necessarily opposed to this, I just wanted to hear what was being proposed and I had heard that it was to do something that was not developed at a high density. So I do appreciate that. But I was wondering if there’s another opportunity that the developer, the owner could use instead of having the rezoning take place. It kind of sets a precedent to do that and potentially, not that this would happen, but it allows it to be an entrance to the 50 acre parcel behind it that potentially be used to develop and without any examination of the effect on the infrastructure. I just would like for you to consider another zoning opportunity if there is one instead of rezoning. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chair, we do not have additional people wishing to speak.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. This item is now opened up on the floor discussion and for any questions for Staff. Item’s open on the floor also for any motions.

MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: I make a motion to, excuse me, to forward Case 23-014 MA to County Council with a recommendation for approval.

MS. FRIERSON: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, with a motion for approval and the second, can you conduct a vote?

MR. PRICE: Alright, motion is for approval for Case 23-014 MA. Those in favor, Durant?
MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Metts?

MR. METTS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Alright, the motion passes.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Case 23-014 moves on with recommendation of approval. Move right along to number 4., Case number 23-016. Staff, please share the information with us.

CASE NO. 23-016 MA:
MR. PRICE: Alright, again, the next item is case 23-016 MA. The Applicant of record during that time was Raymond Perkins, but the school, the Applicant for this particular the case will be represented by someone else. The location is 2812 Rawlinson Road. The acreage is about 12.09 acres and the Applicant is requesting to rezone from residential single family low density, RSLD, to office and institutional which is OI. Upon Staff’s review and looking at this, does the request meet the objectives and guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan, we found that it does not meet the objectives I guess principally as we like to say, thus Staff recommends disapproval of this request. However, there’s another provision within the Comprehensive Plan for the neighborhood medium density designation where it talks about uses that are integrated to better serve surrounding residential properties through pedestrian access, and some of those are things such as churches, libraries, institutional type uses that people may want to access. But because we don’t know exactly what the request is at this time we just wanted to make sure we put that in there as part of the Staff Report and maybe you’ll find a little more information that will assist you and making your recommendation for this case once you hear from the Applicant.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. Anything else? If not we'll move on to anyone signed up to speak, Ms. Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Under Applicant it just says Richland One. So I don’t have the name of the person.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Hello, sir.

TESTIMONY OF CRAIG WITHERSPOON:
MR. WITHERSPOON: Hi, I’m Craig Witherspoon, Superintendent Richland One. I did sign a sheet over there. Okay. Alright. Again, thank you for all an opportunity to present to you today. This is for an early learning, early childhood learning center on the said property. And what’s being offered there is the same thing that’s offered at any school in the district in terms of a health room, in terms of those types of things, support services that you would find at, at any school that we have. The operations are during the day, which is at any school that we have. We have health screenings at schools, we have sometimes dental screenings, those types of things. And there’s also property, others, there’s a park near there, there’s a, there’s a bookstore that’s on that corner and, and other things as well. And there was a community meeting that was held on March 13th with those surrounding and, and those individuals were in support of the early learning center. And we would just ask the committee’s consideration today.

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

MS. FRIERSON: That’s the only person signed up.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Ms. Frierson. Commissioners, do we have any questions for Staff on this? This will also open up for discussion. Commissioner Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price, I guess my understanding you said there is a lesser intense zoning that would still allow them to move forward with what they intend to do. Was that discussed with the Applicant?

MR. PRICE: No, sir, let me clarify. So the, the Comprehensive, according the Comprehensive Plan within the neighborhood medium density there are different sections as it discusses whether a request would be incompliance with the objectives
and guidelines. So initially when we talk about the land use and character which is found on page 26, it talks about non-residential development may be considered for location along main road corridors and within a contextually appropriate distance from an intersection from a primary arterial. So just based on that language itself, Staff recommended disapproval of this request. However, and I apologize cause it doesn’t look like that section is included on here, but within that same designation of the Comprehensive Plan, it also talks about, I think I have it quoted here where uses that are integrated to better serve surrounding residential properties through pedestrian access and are in character with the institutional or recreational, you know, and in this case they would be in character with the institutional or recreational uses that are adjacent to the property, Staff wanted to make sure we pointed that out because based on hearing what it may be. So again, what we, as a Staff we typically don’t like to talk about what the applicant is requesting itself because of course the zoning designations each allow for a multitude of uses, but in this particular case they are looking to place a school here, an educational facility. So an educational facility will more than likely fall into a use that’s integrated to better serve surrounding residential properties through pedestrian access, very similar to if this is a park or a library or some other type institutional use.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anything else, Commissioner Johnson? Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Staff, would you mind zooming the map out a little bit? I’m pretty familiar with this area. This intersection there, there’s a church across the street. There’s a park across the street and bookstore.

MR. JOHNSON: Chairman, can you put the zoning layer on top of that?
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes Staff, can we do that? This area does see a lot of traffic for a residential area. Any other questions for Staff? Commissioners, comments, thoughts? The floor is also open for any motions.

MS. FRIERSON: I have a comment.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Frierson.

MS. FRIERSON: I don’t want to make a motion until after my other Commissioners have an opportunity to express themselves. I was looking at the conclusion and I see where in it does not meet the letter of the law, well not law, the Comprehensive Plan completely, however, the part about the zoning designation being integrated to better serve the surrounding area. In listening to Dr. Witherspoon, a child development center, early childhood development center would definitely be, in my opinion, consistent with that which would improve the surrounding area, and therefore, if I need to make a motion I will make a motion in favor of this, but I definitely know that early childhood is crucial and people have a great need for centers that are safe. And so I would be in favor of this motion being sent to County Council with a recommendation for approval, but again I’ll wait until the other Commissioners had an opportunity to speak if they so desire.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Vice Chair, I agree with your train of thought. My problem is that I just think we still, for the Record, just to need to note that is contrary to the map. And so much relying on the applicant intended use is the basis for this, if there’s any other applicant the, my vote would’ve been denial but because of who the applicant is and who they’re stating it, we’re just going against what we would traditionally do and I just need that to be on the Record.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. My thoughts as a resident of the area, and I asked to zoom the map out, that are other uses right there at that intersection of a park, a church, a few different churches as you zoom out and there’s a lot of traffic in that area. What’s it zoned now? It’s RSLD as it stands. [Inaudible] a single-family home would be more appropriate there than an office or institution.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: I didn’t hear you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes sir, Commissioner Johnson. My feelings are with it being RSLD as it currently stands, I’m not sure if a single-family home would be better suited there or office or institution with that level of traffic and Caughman Road Park is there. They just improved the area with a cross walk. It looks like Staff has pulled up some information? Mr. Price?

MR. PRICE: Well, we just wanted, because it wasn’t included in your packet, we wanted you to see the section of, for the neighborhood medium density designation, just so you can see that language. And it’s, Tommy if you make it larger, under the recommended land uses for secondary land uses that are, that are deemed to be appropriate, and Tommy can you go to that section, I guess the last sentence. This is that section I was referencing. That actually would be the last two sentences are places of worship and it’s again, to go along with what Mr. Johnson is saying again, because as I stated earlier typically we don’t discuss a specific use when, you know, I think y’all have been doing this with us long enough to know we try to stay away from that, we talk about the specific zoning, but again, there are just sometimes, who the applicant is and what they’re proposing that we do kind of look at it a little further.
MR. JOHNSON: Madam Vice Chair, if you want to move your motion forward, you would have a friendly second coming.

MR. DURANT: Question, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

MR. DURANT: Question for Staff, actually. Mr. Price, am I to understand this zoning as it currently exists, I mean, as it’s being proposed, is that or is that not in, in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan?

MR. PRICE: Yes.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Question for probably Staff or the Applicant. Does Richland One already own this parcel?

MR. PRICE: Yes.

MR. DENNIS: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Yes, Commissioner Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: I have a question of the Applicant, too. We heard the term school. Is the intended use an elementary school or just an early childhood center? Could you elaborate, please?

MR. WITHERSPOON: Yes ma’am, this intended use is an early learning center. Birth to four, birth to five. So it would be young people, and, and the majority if we’re talking birth to four, you know, would be brought, dropped off and then services would be provided just like they would at any, any early learning center during that time.

MS. FRIERSON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Just for the public to show the fairness I have a stop watch up here, he only used about a minute the first time, and like 20 seconds there. So we will give everyone their two minutes.

MR. PRICE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: So the Commissioner, the Chair opens this up on the floor for an official motion to be made and then we can look for a second and conduct a vote either way.

MS. FRIERSON: I’d like to make a motion that we as a Planning Commission move Case 23-016 forward to County Council with a recommendation of approval. And in that this is going against Staff we’re supposed to state a reason and is the reason is that in my opinion this particular request is one wherein it does, it would improve the surrounding community.

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

MR. JOHNSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: That’s a second from Commissioner Johnson. Thank you. With that, Staff can you conduct a vote?

MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the motion to approve Case 23-016 which goes against Staff’s recommendation based on the Comprehensive Plan, for the reason that it will improve the surrounding area, those in favor, Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Metts?
MR. METTS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye?

MR. PRICE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Motion passes.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Thank you, Staff. That item moves on as approval to County Council. With that we are moving along to item number 5. inside of item number 5., Case Number 23-017 MA. Staff, can you provide the information?

Thank you.

CASE NO. 23-017 MA:

MR. PRICE: Next item is of course as stated is 23-017 MA. The Applicant is Blake Valentine. The location is, what’s that, we have it as Mount Vernon Church Road, it’s actually near the corner of Mount Vernon Church Road and Broad River. The Applicant is proposing to rezone three parcels, which total 50.78 acres from rural which
is RU to RSE which is single family residential estate. Upon review of the
Comprehensive Plan which designates this area as neighborhood low density it’s been
determined that the request meets the objectives and guidelines of the, of that zoning
designation, excuse me, of that Comprehensive Plan designation and for that reason
Staff recommends approval.

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

MS. FRIERSON: [Inaudible]

MS. FRIERSON: We do, the first person is the Applicant, Blake, looks like
Valentine?

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

TESTIMONY OF BLAKE VALENTINE:

MR. VALENTINE: Sure, Blake Valentine, 322 Justin Rodgers Court, Lexington,
South Carolina. So yeah, Blake Valentine here on behalf of Pulte Homes. We came
across this property from the seller who’s, used to be a farm, they no longer decided to
farm the property so reached out to sell it. So in reviewing it with the current RU zoning
we thought it best to seek the RSE zoning after talking with Staff here. So we think it’s
appropriate in relationship that currently you can do about 70 lots there; with the RSE
zoning, you can achieve about 110, which is all we’re asking for. We have been talking
with Councilmen Branham, he has asked us to do a town hall on this to speak with the
residents of the area which we do plan to do. That’s it for me.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

MR. VALENTINE: Yep.
MS. FRIERSON: We have a number of people who have signed up to speak against. The first person listed is, Kim Murphy.

TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:

MS. MURPHY: Good afternoon, again. Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel Lane. The three tracks of land totaling 51 acres is actually divided by the new frontage road and Mount Vernon Church Road leaving several parcels detached from the main parcel that appear to be undevelopable. So based on what property is left for development after those small parcels are deducted that would lead to a much higher density than the agenda would indicate, especially with the addition of density that could be obtained from setting aside open space or land that could not be developed. Also, the Agenda notes the DOT’s road condition for Broad River Road and indicates that it’s a level C but the Agenda does not indicate the road condition for Mount Vernon Church Road which is, except for a small area, a narrow curvy farm to market road with a railroad crossing that is already overburdened with traffic, with no improvements planned. Also, Spring Hill Master Plan in this area was passed in 2014 which purpose was to protect rural and the environment. One of the reasons for this is that we have Lake Murray on one side and then we have the Broad River Road on the other. So in between is this narrow strip of land, of rural, that is trying to be protected so we can protect the water bodies on either side. Both are used for drinking water. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Next person is Jason Pittman.

TESTIMONY OF JASON PITTMAN:
MR. PITTMAN: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I’m Jason Pittman, I live at 1212 Canterfield Road in Chapin, which is very close to this piece of property. I’m here today to speak in opposition to the request that is being advanced here today. I respectfully disagree with the Staff recommendation that it’s consistent with the use of the area. The plan, the Comprehensive Plan for this area provides for low density. The requested rezoning actually indicates that it’s for use in low density to medium density. So as indicated by the Applicant they are able to put 70 homes in this location. They are able to do residential development which would be consistent with the area. The RU zoning designation importantly has in it a intention and an obligation by the Commission and the County Council to preserve open space and farm land and to protect and encourage the integrity of existing rural areas. Changing a designation that is historically rural and surrounded by all rural property does not protect the integrity of the area as is intended by the rural designation. Importantly, there are no other designations in the zoning code that mandate the protection of areas such as this. I am an owner of one the pieces of farmland close to this tract and so I’m not saying that residential development isn’t appropriate but it can be accomplished under the existing zoning designation and no change is required. There is no compelling reason for the increased density which would not protect this rural area. I would note that there are probably a number of my neighbors and constituents that can’t be here because this is at 3:00 o’clock when most folks are out working, so take into account my comments, please, respectfully and I would ask that you advance this with a recommendation for disapproval. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Real quick, I just want to make known that we had in our packets several requests for this one, information. Mr. Price, do you want to mention that since you put it in our packets?

MR. PRICE: Sure, yes sir. We received some emails in opposition, well, I'm sorry, we received emails in response to the request, and so Staff, because it was directly to the Planning Commission and we compiled those into a couple of, one document about three pages and we included that in your packet. So although it did not come in to speak, their comments regarding this request it had been received by the Planning Commission.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. And again anytime anyone from public would like to send in information we appreciate that. Send it out to the Planning Commission, Staff and they do get it to us. Okay, Commissioner Frierson, please continue.

MS. FRIERSON: The next person is it looks like Brian, gosh, Mosolgo, I'm sorry, Mosolgo. I apologize.

TESTIMONY OF BRIAN MOSOLGO:

MR. MOSOLGO: Yes, I'm Brian Mosolgo. I live at 11447 Broad River Road about, less than half a mile from the proposed zoning change. Other than Broad River Road being a very busy road I don't see adding, you know, 100 houses helping the traffic out there at all. When I pull out of my drive way during rush hour I can't make a left-hand turn, it's impossible, the road is very busy. And other than that I was under the impression that we were in a rural transition zone, so I had receive a letter from Richland County proposing to or suggesting that our property, which is a flag lot, we
don’t have a driveway that’s on Broad River Road, considering rezoning it to RTU which is rural transition and I read the perimeters for that and it sounds like a good idea to go from the urban area, you know, closer to the exit, exit 97 and transition to rural, you know, past the schools and maintain the, the beauty of the area. So I don’t see putting this many houses over there as any kind of a transition, so thank you.

MR. DENNIS: Chair?

MS. FRIERSON: Excuse me, could you spell your last name?

MR. MOSOLGO: M-O-S-O-L-G-O.

MS. FRIERSON: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: And what was being referenced there is the 2021 Land Development Code that is still in progress with the County Council. Ms. Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: The next person is Joann Kerr?

MS. KERR: [Inaudible]

MS. FRIERSON: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: The next person is Melissa Dealy?

TESTIMONY OF MELISSA DEALY:

MS. DEALY: Hi, my name is Melissa Dealy and I live at 2130 Wash Lever Road. We’ve lived there for 18 years, moved from Columbia, from Irmo, the city, to get out into a rural environment. In that 18 years you cannot get on Broad River Road, there are no street lights on Broad River Road or on Kennerly Road or sidewalks for anyone to maintain unless you go all the way back to Irmo area. At 2:00 o’clock in the afternoon the Peake exit all the way to this property is backed up for the two miles that it’s there;
5:00 o’clock rush hour it’s still backed up for the two miles to you even get close to my home. I have to literally take the Kennerly Road route to get home to my house. Again, as this gentleman said earlier you cannot turn either way on Broad River Road now. It’s meant to be rural, most people that live there are there for that reason, to have privacy, comfort in their home and not all this noise with traffic. And the schools can’t handle it, we’ve just built a new school there and our, it’s already overburdened with people. I definitely oppose it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: The next person is John Launt?

TESTIMONY OF JOHN BLUNT:

MR. BLUNT: Good afternoon, thank you for having me. Just wanted to, to piggyback off of Ms. Murphy -

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Please state your name and your address.

MR. BLUNT: Oh, I apologize, sorry.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: No worries, thank you.

MR. BLUNT: Name is John Blunt, 142 Almafini Lane in Chapin. I just wanted to piggyback off them referencing the traffic and Broad River and how bad it is. I’m a resident of the big neighborhood you see there and it is a very huge neighborhood in the pink there at Portrait Hill. Currently there is 491 houses, at that time that the data was ran in February, February 16th, 2021, they were still 130 houses to be completed in there. So the data is roughly skewed when you say you have a 10,600 average daily trips if you will. And it’s a providing a, a level of service of c. You add that to what is now in Portrait Hill, the fact that that was during COVID there is going to be more trips every
single day through there and judging by everybody’s response it’s already backed up
two miles from the Peake exit and all the way to this property. So it’s my
recommendation that you review, have reviewed the data and then pass on a, a
disapproval to the Commission, to the Council. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

MS. FRIERSON: The next person is Terry Rawl.

TESTIMONY OF TERRY RAWL:

MR. RAWL: Good afternoon, my name is Terry Derrick Rawl. I live at 3635
Kennerly Road. Got me, now?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MR. RAWL: My ancestors settled this land. We are the original Dutch Fork line
that have lived here all our lives. As I have grown up, they are taking away my way of
life. I have been to meetings back at the Cate Center a few years back where they
asked me what I wished my land to be and the people surrounding it and we all said
rural. Rural does mean 2.2 houses per acre. Rural does not mean coming in and
stripping all the hardwoods off of a piece of property, leveling the ground. Mother Nature
is taking great care of the run off now. We do not need holding ponds, we do not want to
see houses with one little tiny tree planted with some shrubs along the side. Now, if you
will look at that map and you will follow the parcels around that area, starting on Broad
River Road we do have a part over there with a little piece that will not be developed
where there is a light industrial place that has been there since 1981. I don’t even know
if they had zoning at that time. Following from there you get a parcel of 9.58 acres, 6.07
acres, 6.83 acres, 6.83 acres, 3.52 acres, very small parcel, 3.45 acres, 3.30 acres,
3.17 acres, 8.10 acres, 8.49 acres, 8.50 acres, coming on around, 6.64 acres, 4.82 acres, 4.44 acres. There is a small spot on the corner that I actually sold off of my piece of property going over to my piece of property we have 43.52 acres, my mother, brother own 22.9 acres.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: We need your final thoughts, ma’am. Just so we can keep the time fair.

MS. RAWL: Well, my point is, is that this does not fit in with our area at all. It does not improve our surrounding, it destroys our surroundings. It increases noise population, it increases traffic, it does not fit in with the surrounding area. We like the way we live and we invite you to come to our area and look at it and see how beautiful it is. And if you would go out and look at these areas you have to rezone I think you would agree, this area does not need to be rezoned.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, so much.

MS. RAWL: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: The next person is Jimmy Smith.

MR. PRICE: Excuse me, Mr. Chair, can we pause for a moment?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

MR. PRICE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Shall we continue?

MR. PRICE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down. Please state your name and address.

TESTIMONY OF JIMMY SMITH:
MR. SMITH: My name’s Jimmy Smith. I live at 1181 Joe Metts Road. It’s listed as Little Mountain but we’re in Richland County because of postal service. I’ve lived and worked in this area for 40 between 40 and 47 years. Worked there for 25 years but I’ve lived here in this general area for almost 47 years. There’s been a lot of change. I understand progress makes change but the roads that are out there now which I call in just about daily about repairs needed in these roads, we can’t get the roads repaired like they should be. The infrastructure is just not there for more traffic. I don’t know how familiar y’all are with that area but it has been stated, the number of vehicles that’s out there, the number of houses that’s already out there, we can’t keep up with what we got now. I don’t know how we going to be able to keep up with more homes out there. So it’s my wish and my wife’s wish that we disapprove of any additional homes that are going to be built there or anywhere else in this general area. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

MR. FRIERSON: Next person is Mike Richie.

TESTIMONY OF MIKE RICHIE:

MR. RICHIE: Hey y’all. If I heard right, y’all volunteered for this?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Please state your name and address and go ahead and get started.

MR. RICHIE: Oh, I’m sorry.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

MR. RICHIE: Mike, Mike Richie, 100 Back Acre Road. That’s a dirt road right around the corner from this, from this development. And if I understand y’all volunteered for this? If y’all do we appreciate it. But we’ve been there since the late ’60s on this 30
acre tract of land. And just like Terry over there we seen it all built up around us and we,
we just like our little community, like the way it is, please, please vote no. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out today and we appreciate
everyone coming out today. We know 3:00 o’clock on a Monday is hard to come out.
Thanks. Ms. Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Next person is Lisa Epting.

TESTIMONY OF LISA EPTING:

MS. EPTING: Hello, good afternoon, my name is Lisa Epting. I live 2409 Freshly
Mill Road. And I am not a public speaker so I apologize ahead of time. I am here
because I recommend disapproval. For all of those that have come before me as
they’ve mentioned, my concern is also the safety I don’t know if y’all realize that there is
a school right there across from where this parcel is. I have, when I, I am very
concerned about the safety of me, my neighbors, the student drivers, it is a lot of traffic.
You really need to see it. And like they were talking about it backs, it backs up in the
mornings, in the afternoon and I always tell my husband hey, I’m leaving to go take my
life in my hands to go to the store or wherever I’m going to go. But I’m very concerned
about the traffic and what this is going to add. I would like to keep it rural for that reason.
I really would like us to leave it that way. We, I think everybody understands you’re
always going to have growth but it does need to be responsible growth. We need to
make sure that there’s the infrastructure that we need. Our roads need to be better if
we’re going to add anything to that rural area. I’ve lived here all my life. I started out, I
grew up on Kennerly Road, got married and I moved to Freshly Mill Road so I’ve lived
here all my life and we have seen so many, so much growth. We’ve got the school that
came in, we got Portrait Hill that came in, we got other subdivisions. And people, it is scary to watch people try to come out of their driveways, I mean, you are actually scared for somebody. And the other day we, just yesterday I was pulling, somebody pulled out really fast and my husband said, oh my gosh they about hit us and I said yeah, because they can’t get out because of the traffic. And we really, really do not need any more houses developed until we can do some improvements. If you want growth let’s be responsible, let’s look at our infrastructure, let’s, let’s keep it rural. And so I recommend disapproval. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. You did very well at public speaking, thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Next, Cliff Corley.

TESTIMONY OF CLIFF CORLEY:

MR. CORLEY: Thank you, thank you. My name is Cliff Corley, I’m at 211 Holiday Road, Chapin, South Carolina. And I also appreciate you guys volunteering for this. So my situation is much like everybody else has already said, but one thing that hasn’t been mentioned is there’s a huge contingent of cyclists out here. This is a huge cycling area, out Wash Lever, out towards Little Mountain and stuff. But the thing is I know you’re, you’re going to have growth, I get it but we have a two-lane road and since I built out there in 2008, 2009 excuse me, we’ve added a middle school, a high school, Cate Center, we’ve added all those things. We’ve added Portrait Hill, someone mentioned Portrait Hill and unless we’re going to have another Hard Scrabble Road situation where there’s all kinds of problems with that I think it’s a good example to go back and look at that problem and say hey, perhaps we need to build the infrastructure first before we allow people to come in there, cause I think that project thirty million dollars over or
something I believe, it might be outdated information but I looked it up last time I came
cause there was another parcel that they were trying to approve. Again, I understand it’s
going to have to grow but I think if we do it responsibly and build the roads, build the
infrastructure, I think we’ll have a safer community. And so I would respectfully also
decline and ask that you not approve this and move this forward, do not move this
forward.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Sure, thanks for coming out.

MR. CORLEY: Thank you, thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Eric Caughman.

TESTIMONY OF ERIC CAUGHMAN:

MR. CAUGHMAN: Good afternoon, I’m Eric Caughman and I live in the Portrait
Hill neighborhood at 2328 Harvest Wood Lane. I’ve definitely seen both sides of this
story and I definitely appreciate the people that have pointed to the roads and school
systems that need to be upgraded to allow for this improvement, but I also do
acknowledge that the growth does need to happen. I wouldn’t live in the area if it wasn’t
for this committee and other people vetoing the people in the areas around it to allow for
Portrait Hill. At the same time, I also know that Newberry County is only, what, two miles
away maybe and they’re promoting a lot of residential growth. I drive to Winnsboro
everyday on the back roads and there’s a lot of opportunity for big neighborhoods like
Portrait Hill. So my, my point is anyways that I think that if Richland County doesn’t build
up the roads to support it I’m afraid that Newberry County will do it and we’ll be stuck in
Richland County roads to, to deal with anyway on Broad River. In that area more people
are going towards Columbia for work than, than going up towards Newberry and
Greenville. So I think that's just kind of an opportunity to point out there and I think that the, the County has to do the planning for the growth eventually. Sooner rather than later. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir, thanks for the information.

MS. FRIERSON: Next person is Cheryl, I cannot read the last name, begins with a V? 1220 -

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: And Bridgette Craver.

TESTIMONY OF BRIDGETTE CRAVER:

MS. CRAVER: Hello, how are you?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Hello.

MS. CRAVER: I'm not a public speaker either but I live -

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Start with your name and your address.

MS. CRAVER: Okay, Bridgett Carver at 1024 Bookie Richardson. That is the road that wraps around this neighborhood. It's a dirt road in sections and is privately owned most of it. It's not a county road or anything, it's maintained by the county. So my question is if we put a neighborhood on it what is going to happen to the dirt road. It's a, basically a one lane, people have to pull over to the side to get by. We have a farm with animals and things. I just want to, you know, let that be known. If you look at Wescott Ridge it backs up to our dirt road and that, those houses are very close to it and we've already had a car flip on the road. There are things, it's just not designed for that kind of traffic. So I think you really need to think about, I know all the other roads are backed up but that is definitely one that is backing up, too, that could be an issue. People use it to
cut through to get to the school and it’s just not designed for traffic. So just something else to consider.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, ma’am. If you can’t make a left turn on Broad River Road maybe you’ll find another route. Any more names?

MS. FRIERSON: Jacklyn Page.

TESTIMONY OF JACKLYN PAGE:

MS. PAGE: Hi, my name is Jacklyn Page. I live at 111 Rolling Creek Circle in Irmo. I live in the Rolling Creek neighborhood which is shortly before where this parcel is indicated and the closest street to me that I can turn on is West Shady Grove. It’s an immediate entry onto Broad River which is desirable but impossible to turn on. So as a result when you leave my community I hang a left on West Shady, go up to Julius Richardson and go around, no matter which direction I’m going. It’s just got too much traffic, I mean, I live right off of exit 97 and it can barely handle what it currently has. I think also the expansion that’s gone up further in Chapin has exacerbated the issue, there’s a real delta between exit 97 and the next exit and so a lot of people, if the freeway starts to back up, get off at 97 and take Broad River Road. I just don’t believe that, like the others have said, the infrastructure can handle that. It’s currently two lane, perhaps if it was four it could. I also just don’t think it’s appropriate zoning for the area, I think the rural zoning that it’s currently at is appropriate and I think the amount of houses is just too much. I’m totally not against progress. I have a limited experience in the area, I’ve only been here for two years, but I do think that perhaps if it was one house per half acre or something of that nature it would be different than a medium, I think it’s zoned up for a medium density. I just think that that’s inappropriate for that
area and I don’t believe the roads or the schools can handle that. So I would vote for
disapproval. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Next person’s Patricia, I don’t know how to pronounce that last
name but 106 Cedar View Drive.

TESTIMONY OF PATRICIA STAGURA:

MS. STAGURA: Hey, I’m Patricia Stagura. I live at 106, that’s also in the Rolling
Creek subdivision. And I just wanted to mention once the interchange is done when
they get off of 26 they’re gonna be coming up West Shady Grove dumping straight to
Broad River. So that is gonna be even more part of the exit and then you’re right at
Broad River. And what are we gonna do, maybe put a light, but still it’s always backed
up. Somebody mentioned that the gridlock at the rush hour, well I’m a teacher, it starts
at 6:00 am and it is gridlock until 8:00pm at least. It’s very congested and with all of
those schools, like somebody else mentioned, high schools, student drivers, fender
benders, two-lane road, it, it’s unbearable as it is now. So I would ask that you would
disapprove this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Next person is Allison, I don’t know how to pronounce your last
name but 1824 Freshley Mill Road.

TESTIMONY OF ALLISON MATEMAN:

MS. MATEMAN: Allison Mateman, 1824 Freshly Mill Road. I’m speaking for
myself today but I would also like to note that in speaking with my neighbors the
overwhelming sentiment is that we don’t want overdevelopment in this area. I’m against
this zoning change and as others have mentioned against the addition of vehicle traffic on the infrastructure that wasn’t built to support it. There are no lights on Broad River and on Mt. Vernon Church Road. There are no outside turn lanes at that intersection either. Also note that a recent bridge, a recent bridge replacement did not expand the north/south lanes to two lanes so that would add to traffic being backed up even more. More so than a logistical perspective other people have mentioned that the quality and safety for the pursuit of happiness of the neighbors and for the folks that enjoy that area for cycling and other hobbies would severely be degraded by the zoning change. I would vote for the Commission to disapprove this zoning change. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: The next person, Chris, I’m not sure, but 178 –

TESTIMONY OF CHRIS COLBY:

MR. COLBY: Hi, Chris Colby, 178 Almafini Lane, Chapin. Thank you for your time, appreciate your efforts being on this Commission. I have an interesting perspective, I’m an architect so most of my livelihood is based on development and building. I’ve built subdivisions, I’ve built single-family homes, I’ve built mainly schools throughout my career, so I’m not anti-development. However, I’m not in support of this project. I believe the 110 units is an increase in density that it lies outside of the character of the neighborhood. This project could be built by-right if it, you know, stuck to the original zoning which would be 70 units. I also think that this Commission has to consider protecting cultural resources. This area and this property in particular is much of a view shed and I think when you’re looking at developing a property of this
magnitude you have to consider protecting cultural resources as stated in the overall Comprehensive Plan, to protect the area as well as the growth of the area, which obviously is desirable because this is a great area, that’s why we all live here. I won’t continue to beat on all of the other things that have been mentioned including traffic and other infrastructure needs which we all know do need an upgrade, but I think it is important to note that there are three schools directly across the street from this property, two of which are at a high school level. So consideration for turning lanes, bus traffic, student traffic is not a typical traffic pattern. Most of my work, as I mentioned before, is designing schools and those types of traffic patterns and density of traffic is completely different than what most of us are used to. The Cate Center on a regular basis experiences while school is in session usually on a weekly basis accidents at the ingress and egress of that property which is directly across from the proposed development here. So thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Thanks for coming out.
MS. FRIERSON: And the last person signed up to speak is Eddie Weathersby or Weatherby.
TESTIMONY OF EDDIE WEATHERSBY:
MR. WEATHERSBY: Hey, I’m Eddie Weathersby. I live at 1016 Bookie Richardson Road right next to Bridgette Craver that already spoke. And as she pointed out Bookie Richardson is a privately owned road and if you’ll notice one end of the property goes through Westcott Ridge’s property and when they built Westcott Ridge they promised us they were not gonna put an entrance on to Bookie Richardson Road and they did it anyway. And if you’ll notice the other end of the property goes through
the proposed property we’re talking about, and I know they’re gonna put another entrance there. And if they don’t since they built Westcott Ridge and the high school, traffic has gone from, we used to have about four cars a day on my road when I moved there in 1990, to we have probably 10 or 15 an hour during rush hour, morning and afternoon. And I think we’re naïve to think this is gonna be a cotton field the rest of our lives like we’d all like to see it. When I bought my property I knew Westcott Ridge would be a neighborhood one day, and this is gonna be a neighborhood or something worse if we don’t – and it's gonna be a gas station or an apartment complex or a neighborhood. In my opinion the neighborhood’s the best thing. But my concern is what they’re gonna do about our road, it’s private, there’s potholes in it constantly, people coming up and down the road speeding and it’s a little narrow road. And I’d like to talk to the developer and the County about how we can limit traffic on the road or do something to restrict it. But that’s my concern. Thank y’all.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out.

MS. FRIERSON: That was the last person on the list.

MR. PRICE: Excuse me, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

MR. PRICE: I believe we have one other person that came in.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I was just gonna announce that, if anyone came in late and wanted to speak just, ma’am, come on down, state your name and address and Ms. Frierson can you add it to this list?

TESTIMONY OF JAMIE TIMMERMAN:
MS. TIMMERMAN: Hey, y’all. My name is Jamie Timmerman and I live at 442 Hollow Cove Road which is in Westcott Ridge that he just referred to. It is the first neighborhood off of the Peake exit, off of Broad River Road on the right, so across from the Rolling Creek neighborhood. It has 580 homes and I will say as a person who has to turn out onto Broad River Road to the right to go towards town, even, there’s like a death curve that it actually really needs a light cause there’s accidents there all the time. The speed limit is 45 miles an hour, people fly up and down that road when you can because otherwise it’s typically backed up. But I’m just here to voice, just reiterate what everybody else stated, that Broad River Road is two lanes and until it gets widened or until we can do something with the roadway there is no way that it can support 70 up to 110 more, you know, cars times two, times whatever it is that will be making that trek, so. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Excuse me, would you repeat your last name and the address just for the Record?

MS. TIMMERMAN: Yes, last name is Timmerman, T like Tom, I-M-M-E-R-M-A-N. And my address is 442 Hollow Cove Road.

MS. FRIERSON: What city?

MS. TIMMERMAN: Richland, Chapin.

MS. FRIERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks again everyone who’s come out to speak today. Anyone else miss the signup sheet? Okay, come on down. Just like everyone else, state your name and address, please.
TESTIMONY OF SCARLETT LUTZ:

MS. LUTZ: Hey, how are y’all? My name is Scarlett Lutz and I live at 228 Goodlett Lane, Chapin. My road is actually right there at the bottom of that screen and I just wanna second what everyone else has already said. The infrastructure can't handle something of this magnitude. We know that change is coming whether we like it or not, however, the homework on this has not been very good. I also wanna note in the paperwork that was given it says that there is sidewalks, there are no sidewalks. There’s, I mean, we have bicyclists, there’s people walking, I like to run and the traffic at this point with the, all of the road construction on the interstate it has only gotten even worse if there’s an accident or something. Everyone gets off at the Peake exit, Broad River Road and it’s a nightmare pretty much all day long, not just rush hour. So I would like for y’all to disapprove this. Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Excuse me, Ms. Lutz, would you give the address again? You said 228 what?

MS. LUTZ: Goodlett, G-O-D-L-T Lane. It’s right there on Mt. Vernon Church Road.

MS. FRIERSON: Thank you.

MS. LUTZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Okay, last call for comments. Okay, I see a hand back there. Alright, and then state your name and slowly your address.

TESTIMONY OF KONNI SMITH:

MS. SMITH: Konni Smith, K-O-N-I, 1721 Wash Lever Road, Little Mountain. I work in that area and my vocabulary for traffic has gotten bigger because the traffic has
gotten bigger. And when I get off of work I can’t even get home within an hour and a half and I work in that area. The other thing that I understand is the Fire Department is further away than what is indicated. And like everybody else has spoken about the sidewalks, huh-uh (negative), you have to stop for the bicycles so they can get by. If another development like Portrait Hill or anything else like that comes in out there, South Carolina will be a gridlocked state. It's gonna be worse than awful. But that’s my sentiments and I appreciate your time. Thank you all.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, we appreciate your –

MS. FRIERSON: Ms. Konni, what’s that last name again please?

MS. SMITH: Smith.

MS. FRIERSON: That's what I thought you said, okay just wanted to make sure.

MS. SMITH: Yes, ma’am.

MS. FRIERSON: Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Back row, come on down.

TESTIMONY OF CYNTHIA SHEPHERD:

MS. SHEPHERD: Thank y’all for letting me speak. I just wanted to say I’m Cynthia Shepherd, I live at 200 Back Acres Road in Chapin. And I have a slightly different perspective on this. It is the traffic obviously because the traffic just doesn’t flow on Broad River Road. We’ve had two major projects, the Mt. Vernon Church bridge replacement, plus the roads being sort of reconfigured, and then the old Hilton bridge project that has taken place over the last year and a half or so. And so for myself and Mr. Ritchie who spoke before me, there were environmental impacts too because when
they built the school Mr. Mike's pond filled up with mud and it's happened again and again and again. He didn't speak about that today but I'm gonna speak about that for him because it does affect everything around us, it isn't just the traffic. We have people that have horses. My neighbors, we live on a dirt road, it is a single lane dirt road. When the old Hilton bridge project was going on we had semi-trucks going up our road, speeding people, people throwing out their trash. I've lived there for 13 years, my husband served this country for 26, we spent two years finding a place to live. I love Chapin and I love my community so this is very passionate for me. I hope all of you will take a drive out there and take a look because it's not the same place anymore. You know, people move out there because we wanna raise our children in a place that is quiet, to have your people know people so that you get to have your children grow up with people. I know everybody wants that and we know that growth is coming and we understand that, but there is something called graceful growth and that's what we're asking for; to consider, drive out there and take a look at it and ask yourself this question, why would you add 110 homes when the current zoning will suit any builder that wants to build 60 to 70 homes on that property, which will still be quite a lot. And right now across the street from that you have a horse property that has gone into play. Alright, so I know I'm running out of time. I wanna thank y'all for your time. I know that you're volunteering and I appreciate all of you, but I hope that you'll come out and take a drive out there at when school is ending or school is starting because I think you'll see the impact. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks a lot. Okay, I think we’ve covered the room. I would like to open the floor up to the Commissioners now for discussion or any questions for Staff.

MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks.

MR. SIERCKS: Question first for Staff. Can we zoom the map out a little bit?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, could we take a look at the environmental layers?

This is helpful, I’m a lover of maps. That’s what I do for my day job so it’s definitely – thank you, Staff. Comments, Commissioners, questions?

MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

MR. DURANT: Comment. I’m struck by the apparent condition of the roads surrounding this property and I haven’t been out there myself but, I do fully admit that, but everybody has commented on that and it doesn’t appear to be any, or at least no discussion today about whether there’s any plan to improve it. And I’m also struck by the fact that this parcel is currently zoned rural, RU, and everything to its north, east, west and south is the same thing, so it’s pretty consistent. So going forward with this change would seem to make this property an aberration in that area and it just seems like it would just stick out from what it already is, and as it sits now it’s consistent with everything around. Just a comment.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant. I have a question for Staff. We heard along the way that with the remaining rural that it could have 50 to 70
homes. Mr. Price, is that math correct? Unless Mr. Dennis, Commissioner Dennis, I see a head nodding.

     MR. DENNIS: My math came up to 67.02 homes based off 43,560 square feet per acre, and with that many acres you get – then by the time you do all the math, yeah that’s about it.

     CHAIRMAN YONKE: This is my math guy. Thank you, Commissioner Dennis.

     But Mr. Price, yes?

     MR. PRICE: The rural zoning designation allows 66.

     MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chairman?

     CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks.

     MR. SIERCKS: Couple questions for Staff.

     MR. PRICE: Excuse me, 67.


     MR. SIERCKS: First question, it was something that was brought up at one point, the, it was three non-contiguous portions of the [inaudible] to be rezoned that are substantially smaller than the other contiguous lots. Does that affect the number of potential dwelling units, and if so, how?

     MR. PRICE: Just a moment, please. Are you referring to the smaller piece?

     MR. SIERCKS: Yeah. Yeah, the three smaller pieces; one looks almost directly to the south and two very smaller pieces to the southwest.

     MR. PRICE: So typically when something like this comes in, probably from a historical standpoint it looks like this may have all been one parcel at one time. However, with, you know, the creation of roads that go between there, those roads were
created or at least some type of ingress/egress between the parcels, but the parcels
were never actually separated so technically they are considered one parcel and it
would count towards the development of the site.

MR. SIERCKS: Alright, thank you. I’ve got one more.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Continue please.

MR. SIERCKS: Another question for Staff. With the proposed rezoning being
RSE, how does this meet the standards of the Comprehensive Plan when the rest of the
area is almost entirely rural except for one neighborhood to the northwest and another
to the southeast? Is it because that RSE is supposed to act as like a buffer zone or a
transition area between lower density and medium density?

MR. PRICE: Let me make sure, I’m gonna answer your question the best I think I
heard. If I’m not correct please tell me. So again, this area is designated as
neighborhood low density and within the Comprehensive Plan for neighborhood low
density it gives you a number of guidelines and objectives for this particular designation.
So you’ll, if you’ll note on page 34, and Mr. DeLage has brought up a little bit more
information, you know, we identify land use, we identify the desired development
pattern, recommended land uses and so on, but one of the things that most of the
Comprehensive Plan designations also include, and Tommy if you will go all the way
down, it also includes existing zoning districts of similar character. And so we look at
that also when we’re I guess, again I’m a little skittish when I say Staff’s
recommendation, but what Staff has found is that the zoning designations as identified
within the Comprehensive Plan for neighborhood low density, identifies either the
current zoning which is rural, the proposed zoning which is RSE and also another
zoning designation which is RR is all appropriate zoning designations to meet the objectives of this particular designation. And again, you know, if you wanna go further out on this, you know, looking at, if you look at the Comprehensive Plan an area like let’s say Portrait Hill is not in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. However, and I think you can make the argument that the parcels east of this subject site going all the way down, going down toward Old Tamah, I think if you can go down that far, and Shady Grove Road are also, none of those designations are in compliance either. Zoom out a little bit more, Tommy. So under our current Comprehensive Plan of 2015 and I think most of these developments took place prior to 2015, but none of these developments that are currently out there are in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan’s recommendations for that area. This particular request would be, which is kinda ironic.

MR. SIERCKS: Thank you.

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price.

MR. JOHNSON: Guys, can you go back to the supplemental page that was on beforehand and scroll down back where the [inaudible].

CHAIRMAN YONKE: This is Commissioner Johnson’s question.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. A little bit further please. Thank you. Item number 10 just jumped out at me in terms of wetlands, flood plains, because several respondents raised that issue. And the topography of that also being a concern out there.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson. Was it Commissioner Durant, did you have something?
MR. DURANT: Oh yes, I had a question.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

MR. DURANT: I had a question for Staff.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, go ahead.

MR. DURANT: Mr. Price, in the Staff’s conclusion it says the proposed rezoning meets the objectives and desired development pattern of the Comprehensive Plan for the neighborhood low density future land use designation. I was just curious, are there any other parcels in this area where the proposed rezoning is take place that also meet the desired development of the Comprehensive Plan? And I guess I’m not understanding what that desired pattern is.

MR. PRICE: Okay, so again a lot of words on those pages that Mr. DeLage has when we talk about the land use design, desired development pattern and such. But Tommy if you would go back to the actual aerial and put on the zoning layer. So as you can see all the green that you see, all of those are zoned rural and so those actually are in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan as we initially would look at those. So all of those are. It’s the ones that are not, again based on our current Comprehensive Plan, which you see, okay I’m bad with my colors, but hot pink, whatever, and the purple and also the yellowish color, I think that’s Portrait Hill a little further up, all of those fall within the neighborhood low density designation but none of them have a zoning designation that is recommended for neighborhood low density.

MR. DURANT: I guess I’m just not seeing any difference between the parcel at issue in this map amendment request and the surrounding properties. They all are rural,
they all look the same, but for whatever reason this one has been singled out and it’s to be changed.

MR. PRICE: Right, because with – the Comprehensive Plan, I mean, I think within any of the – and I’m speaking specifically for residential now – with any of our neighborhood designations for the Comprehensive Plan whether it be medium density or low density, there are a variety of zoning designations that will actually fit within that designation. So an example, if this was neighborhood medium density everything from RSLD, MD, HD would fit within that designation. Within the low density, which is what this particular request is located within, it actually allows for, I guess you could say suggests that the rural RSE which is the request and RR are zoning designations that would actually help meet the requirements and guidelines for this designation.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Stating Commissioner Durant’s concern or question a little bit differently, my core issue with this looking at it while you do recognize that RSE is one of the similar characteristics, but when I look at this map and I look at everything around that being RU and how many times that I’ve made [inaudible] the fact that something immediately in the area matches what’s being asked, and that’s not the case here. And so, and part of the rationale saying it’s low density, well there is an existing low densities of right that we’ve said, they can put 70 units with the current zoning and achieve a low to medium density, that we’re increasing it when the surrounding area there’s not a single parcel in the immediate area that is comparable.
MR. PRICE: Correct. And I think one of the things to look at and I think I may have this discussion with some of you previously, but what you're looking at when Mr. DeLage pulls up the map showing the northwest planning area – do you have that Tommy? One of the things that you will notice is that is actually, we call it the FLUM, otherwise the Future Land Use Map. So one of the things – the question is does the proposed use match, the question really is does the proposed use fit the future land use that's recommended for this area, not today but going forward. So yeah, sometimes you are going to have some requests that don't fit what's currently out there. But the question is does that request as recommended by the Comprehensive Plan fit how it should look in the future.

MR. JOHNSON: To your point Mr. Price – I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, may I?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, go ahead.

MR. JOHNSON: As a follow up question, at some point tonight we're gonna discuss the text amendments and the map, do any of our recommendations in that chart impact this parcel if this action was not taken?

MR. PRICE: As far as the text amendment no, sir.

MR. JOHNSON: The chart of recommended –

MR. PRICE: You're talking about the ledger?

MR. JOHNSON: Will the new zoning code, if approved based upon our recommended chart, would that have an impact on what this would be zoned? Since we're talking about the future land use.

MR. PRICE: Based on the recommendations that were sent forward by the Planning Commission, this could, yes, sir. Really it's just a matter of when, you know,
let’s say County Council does decide to enact the map, so right now we’re looking at a
couple of large tracts that may fall in I believe either, probably under the AG zoning
designation if nothing happens with this parcel. If this is rezoned to RSE even with going
forward, it may still fall under AG but it’s just a matter of when the development comes
in, the parcels are subdivided, because during that time there’s the reduction of the lot
sizes would make it fall under a different zoning designation, maybe even, well maybe
R1 I believe would be the more appropriate zoning designation.

MR. JOHNSON: I may not have phrased my question very well, but I think some
of the Commissioners understand where I’m going is that if we don’t take action on this
and the recommendations that have been approved move forward and are approved by
County Council, where would this parcel land under the new Code?

MR. PRICE: AG. It will fall under the AG zoning designation.

MR. JOHNSON: Which would provide for how many units?

MR. PRICE: Okay –

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Dennis, do you have that?

MR. DENNIS: No, because that’s, I don’t have those formulas in front of me for
that one cause I only got the other Code, I don’t have the new Code in front of me.

MR. PRICE: Yeah, I’m afraid to say without looking it up, so.

MR. DENNIS: You said AG, right?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: As the team is looking, I’ll give you guys an update. The
2021 LDC has been on the shelf and is now in the hands of County Council. I had the
opportunity to speak to them last month. But we are still working off of our 2005 Code
until authorized.
MR. PRICE: We’re looking for the AG or the R1? I’m sorry. I believe that would be the three units per acre.

MR. DENNIS: I think it’s gonna be right at 23 units if I’m doing math right. Yeah, something like that. I’m doing the math in my head, so.

MR. JOHNSON: If I’m reading this correctly on the chart, [inaudible] amend the AG’s zoning standards gross average lot size, 130,680 square feet, three acres, minimum lot size 98,000 square feet.

MR. DENNIS: Ninety-eight thousand square feet, you divide that by that 2. – yeah, so you’re looking at around 22 units going forward if we don’t do anything.

MR. JOHNSON: Going forward. So if we take no action the future development code would produce a lower number of units than what’s being requested, and what’s of right right now.

MR. DENNIS: Correct. Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Yeah, you know, I look at this case and I, and I have to look at the 2005 Code, unfortunately I really can’t use the new code coming forward because it’s not in front of me as far as adopted with the maps ready to go, so I literally have to use the 2005 Code. So when I look at it, as much as the surrounding area is rural, but when I go to the Comprehensive Plan the Comprehensive Plan does call for medium, or calls for low density neighborhood on the north side of 26 and then directly on the south side of 26 it actually goes to neighborhood medium density for the future land use. While I hear everybody out there and I side with them in my heart, I have to go by what’s in front of me on the Code, and when I see this, you know, one of the good things that was
mentioned to us at the front was that no matter how we vote this is gonna be deferred so that there can be community meetings forward and talking with the developers and talking with the councilmen out there. But as where I sit as a quasi-judicial, basically sitting like a judge up here, I have to go by the rule of law and sometimes the rule of law to me doesn’t make sense in my heart but I gotta follow it. To me it looks, I’m starting to agree with the Staff’s recommendation on this but I don’t agree in my heart with it, if that makes any sense.

MR. JOHNSON: Can I just, clarification point.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: My reference to the future code was not to try to make a decision based on what’s coming, it’s simply that Staff said that part of the rationale was based on the future use, but the future use is a less dense use. So if I’m gonna look at the future use it’s a lower, it’s a higher lot size area than what’s entitled now. So yes, the current Code makes provision for that but the reason that Staff said that they were voting, that they recommended yes was based upon the future use, and the chart that this Board has brought to send forth to County Council recommends a lower density.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: I understand that but I think if we look at it the Comprehensive Plan would also be R1 residential so that, I mean, you could go up to R1 which would be higher than the AG because, I mean, they could break those parcels apart. So I mean, ultimately I think the numbers are gonna be the same on here versus the future.
MR. PRICE: I wanna also point out that we are also charged with updating our Comprehensive Plan which is something that hopefully have the same body of Planning Commissioner Members for next year, but that’s something that we’ll be working on toward the end of this year hopefully as a start, but definitely through next year and going into early ’25 to update our Comprehensive Plan and so we will be looking at these type of areas again, also looking at the new Land Development Code also.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. At this point I’ll open the floor for any official motions on this.

MR. PRICE: May I say one thing?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

MR. PRICE: Because I know sometimes after your vote everybody starts to scatter, but as I stated earlier all of the cases will be deferred from the June 27th meeting to the July 25th meeting, but for this particular – that’s to allow the Councilmembers for each of their respective districts to have town halls on certain cases. For this particular case Councilman Branham who represents this particular area, District 1, will have a meeting on June the 21st at 6:00pm at the Ballentine, is it Civic Association to hear from the community.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: June 21st, 6:00pm.

MR. PRICE: The 21st at 6:00pm.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: June 21st?

MR. PRICE: June 21st at 6:00pm at the Ballentine Civic Association, I’m sorry, is it the Ballentine Civic Association, am I saying that correctly? Yes, at the Ballentine Civic Association.
MS. FRIERSON: Question.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Frierson.

MS. FRIERSON: But I don’t know whether it should be directed to Staff or to the Chair. My concern is that in that Mr. Price just mentioned there’s going to be a meeting on the 21st and we also know that we’re working right now with the plan from 2005 and it’s got to be, you know, changed, amended, adopted or whatever, it seems to me that this matter ought to be deferred until after we have had the town meetings. I mean, I may be wrong, cause it just doesn’t make logical sense to me that we may take an action today which will be perhaps thrown out when County Council officially does what it’s supposed to do. Am I making sense?

MR. PRICE: No, I think what you have before you today is, of course, is the request from the Applicant and your charge as a Planning Commission is to hear the case, hear from citizens, and to make a recommendation going forward. The town hall is for that Councilmember to hear from the constituents for Council’s decision, mostly led by that Councilmember that represents that district. So the appropriate thing is for you as a Planning Commission to go ahead and do your normal, take your normal course of action of making a recommendation today and then the Councilmen will actually take that into consideration I’m sure when they have their official zoning public hearing meeting. But in-between he does want to have another avenue to hear from his constituents.

MS. FRIERSON: One more question. If we take an action today, especially since we know there’s still the text part has to be approved and all of that, what effect does whatever we do today have on the Applicant when we’re working with – I know legally
we’re looking at something that was done in 2005 – how does that impact the Applicant and really the residents for us to make a decision today when things are gonna change probably real soon?

MR. PRICE: Right now that’s – we don’t know. We don’t know what that change may be. We don’t know when that change may occur. So we are all operating, including Council, under the 2005 Land Development Code.

MS. FRIERSON: If it is changed does it mean that the Applicant has to come back and reapply? You know, I just don’t know how it works.

MR. PRICE: If, okay if any applicant gets a rezoning request and they submit their plans prior to any changes by Richland County, then those plans are considered in the pipeline and they’re allowed to proceed as is regardless of any future changes to the zoning designation.

MS. FRIERSON: Thank you, Mr. Price.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Price. We are stuck in this in-between right now where we still are using the 2005 Code and at the community members I’d say reach out to your County Councilmen to look at the Richland County’s planning website. We’ve created this document, a ledger that is now in the hands of the Development Services Committee, so to look at the new Code they need to move forward with that. Here we are right now looking at this property with the 2005 Code. The Chair looks for any motions.

MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair before you ask for motions -

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, sir.

MR. DURANT: Just I need confirmation on something.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant.

MR. DURANT: Under the current 2005 Land Development Code did I understand this area would be zoned AG?

MR. PRICE: You know, looking at this, so there are three parcels that you have before you, so I wanna make sure, I think you were bringing that up for clarification, based on what was recommended by the Planning Commission, anything between three and I think 30 acres, is it 30 or 35?

MR. DENNIS: Thirty-five.

MR. PRICE: Thirty-five acres, would fall under the, I'm sorry, so for correction it would fall under HM zoning designation, not AG, it would be HM. So all three of these parcels would become HM if nothing else is done and County Council adopts the recommended map that was sent forth by the Planning Commission.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Price, acreage is 50 acres.

MR. PRICE: Total.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Total. So the large one, is that –

MR. PRICE: The large one is 32 acres, so again it falls under, between that three and 35.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Okay Commissioners, any other questions before I ask for a motion? Okay. So we can be here all night if you like [inaudible] Commissioner Johnson? No? Okay. Alright, the Chair is looking for a motion then.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.
MR. DENNIS: I have a motion. I would like to send Case No. 23-017 MA to County Council for approval.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, do we have a second?

?: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright Mr. Price, we have a motion for approval and a second, so can you please conduct a vote?

MR. PRICE: So the motion is for approval of Case 23-017 MA. Those in favor of the motion, Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Nay.

MR. PRICE: Metts?

MR. METTS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: No.

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: No.

MR. PRICE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: No. The motion fails.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: So in this case do we look for another motion?

MR. PRICE: Yeah, so over the, what we have done previously we’ve gone on and taken another vote and any tie will go forward to the County Council as a no recommendation.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: If I’m not mistaken you can all for a reconsideration of that vote. And if it ties again then it goes as in a disapproval.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Are we allowed any discussion? Mr. Price, does this take us back to discussion and then vote?

MR. DENNIS: I don’t have our Rules and Procedures in front of us for tie votes. If we could look that up.

MR. PRICE: We’re pulling that now.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I appreciate your insight, Commissioner Dennis, with the rule book and the math. And I appreciate everyone’s patience tonight.

MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes?

MR. DURANT: I have a copy of our Rules.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Durant, thank you.

MR. DURANT: Section 4, or Section 5 Voting, part d says, a tie vote for motions regarding recommendations to the County Council is a no recommendation vote. A tie
vote for motions regarding action where in the Commission has final authority is a failed vote. In the latter circumstance the matter will be rescheduled for the next available Commission meeting.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: If I heard that correctly that’s a no.

MR. PRICE: So as is stated by Mr. Durant, so in this particular case this is not, you do not have the final determination on this matter. If this was an administrative appeal *per se* for the Planning Commission then that would be a failed vote. But for this particular one because it is a tie it will go forward as a no recommendation.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. So in summary everyone, this is gonna move on to County Council as denied. It sounds like Chairman Branham is gonna have a public meeting at some point next month, so this would then be in front of the zoning committee in July. Thank you everyone for coming out. Everyone is free to stick around.

MR. PRICE: For clarification, a tie vote for motions regarding recommendations to the County Council is a no recommendation vote. So it’s not going forward as a recommendation for denial or approval, we have no recommendation based on your tie.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. My apologies. That’s a no vote.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Just everybody before you leave out, Councilmember Branham does have that meeting on June 21st correctly town hall on this. Definitely please ask your questions at that and let it be known where you stand. Thank you.
MR. PRICE: Any anyone who may not – and I’m sure y’all will all make the 6:00 meeting, anybody who can’t get there or you wanna get comments in in advance, if you would still those to the Planning Commission’s email address we will make sure we get those to Councilman Branham prior to his meeting on the 21st.

MS. FRIERSON: Where will that meeting be held?

MR. PRICE: At the Ballentine Civic Association.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I’m gonna go ahead and pause the meeting for a couple of minutes. Thank you public for coming out.

[Meeting paused]

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, we’re gonna continue our meeting. If the public can continue their separate discussions outside of the Council chambers you’re welcome to go on that side of the door there. We’re gonna continue, we have another case. Alright.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: I’m going to step outside, I just wanted the public to know I gotta step outside because I’m supposed to be in another commission meeting so I’m gonna go give them a quick phone call and let them know that I’m gonna be late and then I’ll come right back.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Mr. Price, we’re gonna move on to Item number 5.b. number 6., Case number 23-018 MA.

**CASE NO. 23-018 MA:**

MR. PRICE: Okay. Again Item 23-018 MA, the Applicant is Mark Meadows. The location is at 239 Killian Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 2.37 acres from
rural which is RU to general commercial which is GC. So this particular parcel falls within the economic development center corridor future land use designation and as such Staff’s recommendation that that particular designation does support the general commercial request. So thus Staff’s recommendation was for approval. However, please take note that the paragraph under the conclusion states, however, while the two parcels directly south of the subject site are zoned general commercial under Case 19-020 MA, the subject site for the proposed map amendment can be viewed as an encroachment which would allow for incompatible land uses with existing adjacent residential uses nearby. In addition the subject parcel does not have frontage or direct access to a major road, which would be Killian Road in this particular case. But that’s not, again just, that’s not to say that if this was approved it couldn’t be combined or developed in association with the other parcels that are zoned general commercial.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price, just for clarity then. Does the owner own the parcel that touches, the same owner?

MR. PRICE: It doesn’t, they’re made up of different names so I’ll let the Applicant state any relationship he may have with those parcels.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay thank you, Mr. Price. Any other information?

MR. PRICE: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: No? Okay. Ms. Frierson, could you please let us know who signed up to speak?

MS. FRIERSON: First person is the Applicant, Mr. Mark Meadows.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down. Please remember to state your name and address.
MR. MEADOWS: My name is Mark Meadows. I live at 239 Killian Road. I own the property located at 239 Killian Road. I have lived in this area approximately 50 years. I purchased this property about 15 years ago, at that time it was on a 16 acre lake, the lake is no longer there anymore. The dam burst about seven years ago. The owner of the property are not gonna rebuild the lake so the lake has now grown up. There’s no view from any of the other houses on the lake to my property except for one piece of rental property that’s adjacent to mine. As Mr. Price said, the two pieces of property beside me are already zoned general commercial and if you’ll look I have access off of Killian Road. My main driveway is on the property, I have a prescriptive easement to Killian Road, that is my main access to that piece of property. The road that it shows going behind the piece of property was cut off approximately 60 years ago, it’s fenced off. There’s no vehicle access from Lucas Road coming into the back side of my property, that’s all fenced off and I own the old roadbed at this time. Last year’s Land Development Code rewrite it was recommended that it be, these two pieces of property be rezoned general commercial. That’s about it, I appreciate it if you would vote to zone it general commercial. The lake is gone, I’ve lost property value and if they develop commercially behind me as far as a residential piece of property I lose value again. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Thanks for coming out.

MS. FRIERSON: Next person is Shawn McLaughlin.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Is Shawn still here?
MS. FRIERSON: At 3016 [inaudible]. Okay. Patrick at 140 Governor Road.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I defer to one of my neighbors.

MS. FRIERSON: David or, okay David Strother.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down, sir.

TESTIMONY OF DAVID STROTHER:

MR. STROTHER: David Strother, 226 Davis Smith Road. I’m actually down Killian Loop back behind this area. So there really is no access to this property from Killian Road. That’s the big objective, we have to access this property, if he sells this property it’ll be accessed off of Lib Lucas which passes five properties that have homes on them. Two of those properties are already bought, being remodeled and either sold or rented. People live in these places so encroachment’s huge for this area. That’s just on Lib Lucas. Then if you go to Governor’s Pond side there’s I think 14 homes in that area that have people either living or renting those homes. So encroachment’s a big deal for this piece of property. We’ve had a lot of folks wanna develop this area for some odd reason, I don’t know why, because less than a mile down the road behind the Kroger off of Killian Road there sits 100 acres undeveloped. There’s nothing there, but they wanna dump general commercial in this area; water diversion, road maintenance and issues, pollution, etc., not including the encroachment. Flooding, that’s another big one here, upstream development we have been fighting flooding area, hence why that dam busted. It still floods Governor’s Pond Road which lines up right with the property we’re talking about. So what we’re saying here is, look we understand Killian Road be developed, we’re not arguing Killian Road. This is not Killian Road, it’s a driveway off of
Killian Road, it pushes it back around everybody else’s houses. So encroachment for us
is a huge deal. Thank you guys, appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

MS. FRIERSON: The next person, looks like, I’m not sure if it’s Larry but 216
Davis Smith Road.

TESTIMONY OF LARRY LOWMAN:

MR. LOWMAN: My name is Larry Lowman at 216 Davis Smith Road. I live just
down the street from Mark and just about see his house from my house. And I’m gonna
hit it from a little bit different angle. My family bought this land back in the ‘60s. I
remember when 77 was built, Highway 77 and when Clemson Road was a dirt road so
I’ve been there a long time. And when I got out of the service my dad had purchased
some land in here and I built me a house, raised my kids there, now I got grand
youngins next door to me, and so I’m hitting it a little bit from the rural side. Every time
something happens it goes a little bit less rural and that’s the purpose that I built out
here where I did and, you know, to live with my family and live a quiet life after I got out
of the service. I understand economic growth but seems like every time we turn around
there’s an encroachment, a little bit more here, little more there, little bit more there.
Last year we had someone come in and do something similar to this and you guys turns
it down and I don’t know whether it was a technicality or whatever but it got turned
down. But one of the main problems from an environmental aspect is the water issue
that David brought up just a few minutes ago. That’s why the dam is gone, that’s why
the roads flood. Governor’s Pond Road I’ve seen it so you can’t get across it, I’ve seen
Killian Loop so you can’t get across it. When the dam burst out it knocked out Killian
Road, knocked it completely out, when on down to Lake Elizabeth and then Lake Elizabeth’s dam is gone, which the dam happened to be Highway 21, Wilson Boulevard, and they couldn’t rebuild it either, and that’s all because of these little places where it’s a little bit here, little bit there, little bit there. I don’t know what this land might intend on being one day but we just can’t have any more water coming in our little hole that we’re in down there. It’s just, you know, I understand economic development and I understand - we Walmart and the hotels and the car dealerships and Lowe’s and all of them are right there and dumping all that water right in our little area down there. My next door neighbor, bless his heart, he died a couple months ago, ambulance came to his house three times before he died and if the poor road had been, had water over the top of it he wouldn’t have made it, you wouldn’t be able to get a fire truck down there. I’ve covered, take people back and forth in my backhoe going across the water so they could get back and forth going to wherever they had to go. So that’s the aspect that I really hate about it is the environmental thing plus I’m losing my rural area.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Final thoughts.

MR. LOWMAN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I really appreciate you coming out, thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Last person Patrick, I’m not sure if it’s Money, but 140 Governor Road.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT PATRICK MOONEY:

MR. MOONEY: My name is Robert Patrick Mooney. I live at 140 Governor Pond Road which is on the map a little further back, I’m like the last lot on Governor Pond at the very end on the right. And just wanna reiterate what the rest of my neighbors are
saying, you know, this being commercial back there doesn’t make a whole lotta sense. I know there’s commercial properties towards the front and if they put something there, that’s fine, you know, that’s not really, you know, the water issue is a huge issue. I mean, we could not get across through our road when the dam burst. I’ve never seen that much water in my life, I have videos of it on my phone of it coming across the road and being as high as this man’s Hoover building. The Everly’s right there on that corner right, on the other side of the corner, their house was, not their house but their Hoover building was completely covered in water, it was just unbelievable. It looked like something out of the Walking Dead. But anyway, just I wanna just vote my vote here saying that I’d like that not to be approved. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Do we have anyone else who didn’t – come on down and state your name and address slowly for us and we’ll add you to the list.

TESTIMONY OF GINA DOW:

MS. DOW: I am Gina Dow and I have property at 1107 Killian Loop, but I also own 108 Lib Lucas as well. And as the other residents have said we are in a very rural, very small community, dirt roads that are not being maintained properly already, Lib Lucas is one of them, secondary power sources, I can’t even get them to trim the trees because it’s all ran secondary power. You know, and I have now bought a secondary piece of property there to hopefully one day put one of my kids, so it’s a big family environment there. We were here just about a year and a half or two years ago and we spoke very strongly. At that time Mr. Meadows was on the same side as us against commercial development that was trying to come at the top of Killian Loop and down Lib Lucas Road and all of that we fought that together. And now at this point we, somehow
we’ve ended up on opposite ends of the spectrum, but you know, like I said we were all
in agreement [sic], we came here together against a commercial developer and that was
denied for the same reason of encroachment. Also too, keeping in mind that when
you’re leaving the Killian Road Walmart and hitting Killian Loop to your right that road at
Killian Loop becomes a one lane road, very dangerous one lane road that I take a right
turn on all the time. So single lane road down Killian Road, nothing but residences all
the way down towards Highway 21.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, can you zoom the map out? Thank you.
MS. FRIERSON: Excuse me, would you spell your last name for us again?
MS. DOW: D as in David – O-W.
MS. FRIERSON: And first name?
MS. DOW: Gena, G-E-N-A.
MS. FRIERSON: Thank you.
MS. DOW: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, was there anyone else out there that missed the
signup sheet and wanted to speak? Okay. Now I’ll open this up to the floor for my fellow
Commissioners for discussion. Commissioner Dennis, I see you thinking. Do you have
thoughts?
MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.
MR. DENNIS: Yeah, you know, I look at this and when we look at our northeast
planning for the future this is directly inside a priority investment area and priority
investment areas are a headache for me because at one, we can either send this to a
Councilmember as 100% supporting it and then they’ll go around and say, no let’s put houses there, or we’ll send it and say let’s put houses and they’ll go, no let’s do commercial. So going through, because the parcel next, directly to the right’s GC, the parcel underneath it’s GC, and I, internet’s slow here so I couldn’t pull it up. Tommy, that parcel right there on Governor Pond Road, yeah, so that’s still RU, okay. An investment area, I mean, for me it seems, I seem to agree with the Staff’s recommendation on this because of, you know, I mean, straight up what they said, I mean, it’s economic development center corridor future land use. I mean, it’s right there, right off 77. I mean, if you’re within basically three miles on either side of an interstate it’s hard, it’s gonna be hard. So I mean, that’s just kinda, just letting everybody know my kinda thoughts about it.

MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

MR. DURANT: I’ve got a question for Staff. Mr. Price, the bottom two parcels beneath the proposed rezoning, were those rezoned from rural to GC at some point in the past?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, they were. I think it’s stated within your package, there were two rezoning requests; one was in, both of them were in 2019 and one was 2020, and the other one was, I mean, excuse me, one was 19-020 and the other one was 19-044, so those were rezoned in the last four years I guess.

MR. DURANT: Second question. Residents, several of them mentioned issues with flooding of that area. Does, that has no impact on the zoning, correct?

MR. PRICE: No, sir.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. DeLage, can we turn on the environmental layers just to look at it? I’m sure this data may have changed since the floods of 2015. I have my own comment looking at the map on page 47 which is our future land use map. There’s been other Commission meetings where we’ve looked at this as like a broad paintbrush and I know we’ve been told to kinda leave that phrase alone, but it’s a future land use, and some of my training, some of these designated areas weren’t, it doesn’t go by parcels particularly, you know, it’s still a broad line. So being familiar with the area west of 77 there does remain a little bit more rural in character than east of 77. Just my thoughts as someone who loves maps as I mentioned earlier. Thoughts? Questions? Comments? Yes, Commissioner Siercks.

MR. SIERCKS: Question for Staff. With the proposed zoning as general commercial, it says it’s characterized primarily by retail office and service establishments oriented primarily to major traffic arteries. And I don’t have it in front of me but is there a point at which a road that is categorized as a major traffic artery stops becoming, or at some point is not a major traffic artery, if that makes sense? Does it go down to two lanes and then it’s not a major traffic artery?

MR. PRICE: Right. That particular one –

MR. DELAGE: So it could be depending on the functional classification for SCDOT and we’ll go ahead and pull that up now if that’d be beneficial. Sometimes a narrowing of lanes from say five or four in this case to two may not necessarily lower the class but it may have an impact on the kind of road it was, so how it operates. And it looks like this is being shown as a minor arterial road. Whereas where it is a four-lane
divided on Killian Road, that is a principal arterial, so the functional class does change once you cross over.

MR. SIERCKS: That’s kinda why I was asking.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you Staff for pulling that up. That’s thoughtful. Any more comments from my peers? Concerns? Anybody for a motion? The floor is open for a motion.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: I have a motion. I’d like to make a motion for Case No. 23-018 MA go to County Council – hold on, go to County Council for approval.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: We have a motion for approval. Do I have a second? Is that from Commissioner Metts?

MR. METTS: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. I have a motion for approval and a second. Staff, can you please conduct a vote?

MR. PRICE: Okay. The motion was for the approval of Case 23-018 MA. Those in favor, Metts?

MR. METTS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Durant?
MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. PRICE: The motion passes.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: This Commission just made a recommendation for approval. It’s gonna go to County Council’s next zoning meeting after June, in July.

Thank you.

MR. PRICE: In July. And as previously stated I don’t have a date but I do know that Councilwoman Barron who represents this area will be having a community meeting to discuss this with the residents.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Okay, we’re gonna move on to a new topic but still in Item number 5., 5.c., we have a text amendment of the 2005 Code in front of us. So Staff, please guide us along this path.

MR. PRICE: I’ll try to simplify it but of course I’m sure y’all will have questions for Staff.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: And it’s on page 53.

MR. PRICE: Yes, page 53.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Of our packet.

MR. PRICE: Yes. So in a nutshell one of the things we really have tried to do is avoid having too many text amendments going for the 2005 version, especially as I think we’re getting closer and closer to the adoption of the 2021 Land Development Code. However, every so often something will come up that we feel is kinda more pressing. Within our industrial zoning designation, so we have, in our current Code we have the M1 which is light industrial, we have the LI which is light industrial and we have the HI. The only one of those designations that has certain restrictions on square footage is the LI. Again the M1 has no limitations nor does the HI. So you know, from working with our Economic Development Department and also with discussions with those looking at parcels for industrial use, what we ended up having is sometimes rezoning requests that need to go from LI to HI, mostly for square footage because you can’t get a Variance for that, the Board of Zoning Appeals cannot vary from the criteria that’s established for a Special Exception as it relates to the square footage so they wouldn’t be able to vary from that. So they end up asking for a rezoning to HI essentially as a way to get that Variance to eliminate the square footage limitations. And so just kind of looking at this and looking at the other zoning designations, we felt it might be appropriate to just remove those square footage limitations within the LI zoning designation, yet we will still have the special requirements that were found under the Special Exceptions, that criteria will still be imposed as a special requirement for any of those uses.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. I’m gonna open this up for questions to Staff. Let’s try to unpack this and understand it as a Commission. Does everybody have a complete understanding? Is there any –

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Yeah, I mean, I understand it. I didn’t, I don’t have any questions.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Metts, do you have any questions?

MR. METTS: Right now no, I do not.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. With that I’ll also open the floor up to a motion then to update this text.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Yes, I have a motion to support the text amendment change on Chapter 26 of the Land Development, Article V, Zoning Districts, §26-141, Table of Permitted Uses as presented to us on page 53 through 56 of our packet here.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Dennis, that’s a motion to approve.

MR. DENNIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. We have a motion for approval. Do we have a second?

MR. GRADY: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, we have a second from Commissioner Grady. Staff, can you please conduct a vote?
MR. PRICE: Yes. Those in favor of the motion for approval of the text amendment as presented on page 53, Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Metts?

MR. METTS: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Motion passes.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. I believe that will also go on to the zoning committee of the County Council.

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Continues with the process. Alright, thank you. Alright, with that we have moved on from Item number 5. to Item number 6., which is the Chairman’s Report, my report. Alright, I wanna begin by saying thanks again to my fellow Commissioners for all their time and effort they invest each month in this Commission. Commissioners, please check your emails for a message sent May 16th, '23 from Mr. Price, I believe there’s a more recent one now, regarding mandatory training for Commissioners. This is training we can do online at our own pace. Please reply to Mr. Price to set up your accounts on the provided website and just sync a communication with Mr. Price cause he can help guide you along the way.

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Not to interrupt your Chairman’s Report, but –

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

MR. PRICE: - I would like to say, I’d like to thank every Member of the Planning Commission. I believe we are eight of nine that are, have completed the requirements in one way or the other.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright then, I wanna say thank you to my fellow Commissioners for completing this requirement. Alright. And if you’re that one who hasn’t done it yet Mr. Price will track you down, right?

MR. PRICE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner –
MR. DENNIS: Something for Mr. Price. I did contact customer support or whatever that, them people are on the other end. They are going to email me a certificate so that I can actually send you something, so yeah.

MR. PRICE: Yeah, thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, continuing my report, thank you Commissioners for coming out to County Council’s Development and Services Committee meeting last month. In our packets for review, just like our Minutes, we have our ledger of recommendations we sent to County Council last November. There were a few minor edits that needed to be made due to the Staff’s technical issues but as you can see now they’ve all been corrected and the ledger now matches verbatim our approved recommendations. Thank you, Staff, for your hours spent reviewing our meeting Minutes and YouTube recordings as you can go ahead and look at pages 49 and 51. So 51 with the redline markings are the minor text updates we needed. Commissioner Dennis, do you wanna speak on those three lines that came out? I believe those were yours that were supposed to come out in the first place if I’m correct.

MR. DENNIS: Yeah, we was at that last meeting and they wanted us to look at this. There was, and I spoke to Councilman Pugh and Councilwoman Barron, and they were talking about, hey we need to really look at this and make sure it’s right. So I told them, I said, well it’s not right and mainly because there was three in there that was passed on to them that we actually voted on at the end to take off because of some other changes that we’d done prior to those. And then to say a few other words on it, there’s a few in here that it might not be verbatim but the numbers and all that are there, and I will say this, after looking at it a few, a little bit more I didn’t see anything that
came up that would be wrong for the intent based just upon our recommendations going forward. I’m not sure where County Council sits with this, what they’re gonna do, but I imagine whatever they do they’re gonna, whatever they vote on will send it back to us to make sure that that intent was there just for us to look at it. I think that’s what I got from them.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner Dennis. And so Staff, as Chair I am very pleased that we can send this corrected ledger to the Council’s Development and Services Committee so they can now begin their review. We know this is corrected, we are happy with it, this is what we pushed from November. That’s all I have to say about that. So we have, another part of my Chairman’s Report, this is fun part, we would like to begin planning for an off-site orientation and training session this summer. Commissioners, please email Mr. Price some topics or some County departments that you’d like to hear from or learn more about. In my going on four years on the Commission I’ve been blessed to attend two of these sessions which I found were truly valuable for all the attendees there. It is a public meeting so the public is welcome to come out. Personally I found the insights gained there directly add to my abilities that are used here on the Commission. So to get this going we’re looking for possible Thursdays or Fridays that you would have for this training, and I know summers can be difficult and time to schedule, I’ve got five kids, it’s crazy, but please email Mr. Price your availability, again for a Thursday or a Friday, starting this month in June through August, and hopefully we can find a mutual time that works for the Commission. This again is an off-site training. In the past we’ve had different speakers come. I found it to be valuable and some of our newer Members were able to attend last
year. I remember this is where we met for the first time, so that’s great. This goes right in to our Planning Director’s Report, so Mr. Price I will give you the floor.

MR. PRICE: As you can see on page 57, I think that’s correct, it has the Report of Council on there. I believe that one was from the May 23rd Zoning Public hearing so you get to see the results of the Council meeting. Jumping down to 7.b., to continue with what the Chair spoke about with the PC orientation and training, we thought that those have been pretty valuable for not only the Commission but also for Staff. So we were looking at a couple of dates, and again we’re not necessarily, this is not a deadline that you have to have this in or something, this is something that we are providing to the Planning Commission so your attendance is what we’re really shooting for. Ideally for us right now we were hoping to have one initially at the end of this month, I know that’s short notice but we were looking at either the 29th or the 30th, which would be a Thursday or a Friday. And we can put that together, we’re probably looking at the same place we had the last one over at Clemson Research office. If those dates work for you please let me know as soon as you can if this works, that’s the 29th or the 30th of June.

MR. JOHNSON: Both days?

MR. PRICE: Either one of those days. And so we’re just, you know, ideally the Thursday would be great but, you know, again we want to try to accommodate your schedules. If we cannot do it in June don’t worry we can always find another day some time hopefully in July or August.

MS. FRIERSON: The dates don’t work, I’ll let you know that now, too.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes –

MR. PRICE: If you can tell us now then that would be wonderful.
MR. DURANT: The 29th doesn’t work.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, let’s go down the line, we’ll start with Commissioner Durant if he wants to say.

MR. DURANT: June 29th is not good for me.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MR. SIERCKS: What times were, any times in particular we were looking at?

MR. PRICE: I think the last time we started, was it 10:00? I think at 10:00, yes about 10:00.

MR. SIERCKS: Well as it currently stands I could do the 29th but I probably couldn’t do anything before early afternoon on the 30th.

MR. DENNIS: I’m outta town, however, I’m coming back on the 29th so if Delta gets me here at the proposed 7:00 arrival time at Charlotte Airport I could be here. If they do not I probably wouldn’t be here on the 29th. But I am in town on the, from 10:00 am on the 29th and the 30th.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: The 29th actually looks better for me than the 30th. Yeah, I was planning to go out of town on Friday, the 30th.

MS. FRIERSON: I apologize, Mr. Price, neither date works for me. I’m the new president of the South Carolina Education Association Retired and I’ll be in Orlando attending a national conference.

MR. PRICE: You picked Orlando over us.

MS. FRIERSON: Do what?

MR. PRICE: You picked Orlando over us, okay.
MS. FRIERSON: They told me I had to go there. I have to be there through July the 6th.

MR. DENNIS: I will high five you, I will be leaving when you’re getting there.

MR. GRADY: I will be out of town both days that are proposed there.

MR. METTS: The 29th is fine.

MR. JOHNSON: Most likely going into the 4th of July I’ll be Johnson family vacation road trip.

MR. PRICE: Yeah, I believe just from what I’m hearing from you, and again I apologize it’s a little short notice, I know we’ve been talking about this for a while, we may just go ahead and move this because I think it’s just better the more that we can have in attendance I think it works out better. So I don’t wanna do it, it would be my preference not to do it with just a few, and even with, you know, looking at Mr. Dennis’ situation where he hopes to be there, so we would like to – I think we will just pick another date and time. But again, I would still request that you can, especially in the next week or two, if you have particular topics that you have in mind that you would like for us to cover we would be more than happy to look into that to, you know, try to get the appropriate speakers or information to you. Like I said we’ve, I think over the last, the last two meetings we’ve had we’ve covered a number of topics and so I think those are mostly done through Staff, but you know, again we will take any input we can from any of the Planning Commission Members and also we’ll see as a Staff what we can put together also for you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Price, not to get hung up on dates but I fear if we don’t look at this it’ll get hard to get on our schedule. If I threw out the dates of July 20th or
21st, can we look at that with the group? I’m afraid if we kick the can to next month then it’ll be busy.

MR. PRICE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thursday, July 20th or Friday the 21st, would you guys pull up your calendars again? No one’s on the spot but if we know it’s helpful.

MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible] Friday the 21st.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson’s good for the 21st. We’ll start from the right and come down.

MR. METTS: Yeah, that works for me, too.

MR. GRADY: June 21st, [inaudible].

MR. PRICE: What time are we looking at?

MR. GRADY: Yeah, I think I can make any time those days work but I have some things I’d have to move around before, say 10:30 on both days.

MR. PRICE: Okay, I think we, we can work around that.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Ms. Frierson, do you know yet? It’s okay if you don’t.

MS. FRIERSON: I do – this time I’ll be in Cozumel.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good for you.

MS. FRIERSON: I’m serious. Serious. Y’all are welcome to come with me.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: I would love to. Mr. Price, I’m available that day, that’s why I threw it out there. Either day. Mr. Dennis, do you know yet?

MR. DENNIS: I’m in St. Maarten.

MR. PRICE: Hold on, let me make a note.

MR. SIERCKS: I’ll be in Tahiti.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Are you serious?

MR. SIERCKS: No. No, as it currently stands either of those dates work for me. But my preference would be for Friday if possible.

MR. DURANT: Either day works for me.

MR. PRICE: We can, we'll look into that. We just needed to make sure that date’s available. If not, we will have to get something out to you. Thank you. And that’s it for Planning Director’s Report.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, Item number 8., Other Items for Discussion. We do have one. Ms. Frierson made it known to me, she stepped in after we approved the Minutes. The very top of the Minutes it shows, for May 1st, 2023, it does not have Ms. Frierson’s name on the top, so Mr. Price, how do we do this?

MR. PRICE: You take another vote with that correction. We will get that to our transcriber to get that corrected and then we will post this on the web page.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, as Chair then I make a motion to vote to update our May 1st, 2023 Minutes to add Commissioner Frierson’s name to the Members Present as shown, line 19 where she says “here”. Do I have a second?

MR. DENNIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. Please conduct a vote.

MR. PRICE: Those in favor, Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Johnson?
MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Metts?

MR. METTS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Alright.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we have any other items for discussion? Yes, Commissioner Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Can I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: There’s a social media expression when they say “asking for a friend”, as it relates to your report on the required online documentation, what’s the cutoff date to [inaudible]?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Price, do you have answer?

MR. PRICE: For orientation?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Orientation, what’s our cutoff date for that?
MR. PRICE: Actually for, again for most of the Members if you would, according to – you’re exempt from meeting those requirements if you are an attorney or if you have an advanced degree in planning. So I know those two, so that actually, so I think four of you, five, sorry, so there’s six of the Members.

MR. DURANT: An attorney or an attorney admitted in South Carolina?

MR. PRICE: It says an attorney.

MR. DURANT: Okay.

MR. PRICE: It didn’t say, just attorney.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other items for discussion?

MR. PRICE: Yeah, I think the only thing I would just, I would wanna point out, just real quickly I know one of the things that came up during our, during one of our cases when we were looking at the economic development designation, you know, I wanna make sure I kinda wanna point this out cause you’re correct, one of the things you stated, we’ve had this discussion a lot. Everything’s broadly painted, ideally for some of these corridors we would’ve done more of an oval so it goes along the main roads, but that’s just not how that was done. So no, it is something that I think as you stated you should look at that that’s the intent, we kind of identified this area but that’s, but it’s broadly identified but the Planning Commission should look a little deeper into whether the appropriateness of that designation as it relates to specific parcels.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Price. Any final thoughts, words from the Commission? That is gonna be number 9., the Chair would like to make a motion for adjournment, do I have a second?

MR. DENNIS: Second.
CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, Mr. Price, please take a roll of show of hands, is that okay?

MR. PRICE: Those in favor of adjournment, Yonke?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Metts?

MR. METTS: [Inaudible]

MR. PRICE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Aye.

MR. PRICE: Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

MR. PRICE: And Grady?

MR. GRADY: Aye.

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

CHAIRMAN YONKE: We are dismissed, thank you everyone.

[Meeting Adjourned]