

**RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**July 10, 2023**

1  
2  
3  
4 *[Members Present: Christopher Yonke, John Metts, Charles Durant, Chris Siercks, Bryan*  
5 *Grady; Absent: Beverly Frierson, Gary Dennis, Terrence Taylor, Frederick Johnson, II]*  
6

7 Called to order: \_\_\_\_\_  
8

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Staff, are you ready? I'd like to call to order the July  
10 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. Staff, please confirm the  
11 following: In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was  
12 sent to the news media, persons requesting notification and posted on the bulletin board  
13 located in the County administration building. Is that correct?

14 MR. PRICE: That is correct.

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

16 MR. PRICE: Alright. Attendance for the July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Planning Commission.

17 Those here, Yonke?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

19 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

20 MS. FRIERSON: [Inaudible]

21 MR. PRICE: Johnson?

22 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

23 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

24 MR. DENNIS: [Inaudible]

25 MR. PRICE: Metts?

26 MR. METTS: Here.

27 MR. PRICE: Durant?

1 MR. DURANT: Here.

2 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

3 MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible]

4 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

5 MR. SIERCKS: Here.

6 MR. PRICE: Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Here.

8 MR. PRICE: We have a quorum.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the  
10 July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning  
11 Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer our time  
12 to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council. Our  
13 recommendations are to approve or deny zoning map amendment requests. Per Title VI  
14 Chapter 29 of the *SC Code of Laws*, Planning Commission may also prepare and revise  
15 plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of unincorporated portions  
16 of the County. The County's Land Development Code rewrite process conducted this  
17 past year is an example of this. Once again we are a recommending body to County  
18 Council and they will conduct their own public hearing and take official votes to approve  
19 or deny map amendments and text amendments on a future date to be published by the  
20 County. Council typically holds zoning public hearings on the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of the month.  
21 Please check the County's website for updated agendas, dates and times. Please take  
22 note of the following guidelines for today's meeting. Please turn off or silence any  
23 cellphones. Audience members may come quietly and go as needed. Applicants are

1 allowed up to two minutes to make statements. Citizens signed up to speak are allowed  
2 up to two minutes each. Redundant comments should be minimized. Please only  
3 address remarks to the Commission and do not expect the Commission to respond to  
4 questions from the speaker in a back and forth style, that's not the purpose of the  
5 meeting. Please no audience/speaker exchanges. No audience demonstrations or other  
6 disruptions to the meeting are permitted nor are comments from anyone other than the  
7 speaker at the podium. Please remember the meeting is being recorded. Please speak  
8 into the microphone and give your name and address. Abusive language is  
9 inappropriate and will not be tolerated. Please don't voice displeasure or frustration at a  
10 recommendation while the Planning Commission is still conducting business. If you  
11 have any questions or concerns you may contact the Richland County Planning  
12 Department Staff. Now we're on Item number 3 now, Additions and Deletions to the  
13 Agenda. Staff?

14 MR. PRICE: Yes. I think the package that you received, it did have a couple of  
15 amendments to it. However, those were sent out to you via email with those changes on  
16 it. Those were also reposted and sent out to the public with the correct version and also  
17 the correct version is online, so I don't think you have to make any changes but we  
18 wanted just to identify the two changes/amendments to the original Staff Report which  
19 was the changing of the date for the approval of Minutes to June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023, and also the  
20 Staff recommendation for Case 23-023 should've been for approval. It was originally  
21 listed for disapproval. But those are the only changes.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. With that we can move on to Item  
23 number 4, the approval of Minutes. Like you just said we have in our packet the Minutes

1 from our June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023 meeting. Do any Commission Members have any comments or  
2 concerns regarding these transcripts?

3 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Mr. Grady.

5 MR. GRADY: I would just like to, prior to approval, have the Minutes amended to  
6 note that I was in fact present at last month's meeting. I was not included at the top of  
7 the Minutes as being present.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Mr. Grady. Staff, can we add his name to the  
9 top?

10 MR. PRICE: That's been noted.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Okay, any other amendments to the Minutes?  
12 Okay, the Chair makes a motion to approve the Minutes with this amendment of adding  
13 Commissioner Grady's name to the top. Do I have a second?

14 MR. DURANT: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you with the second. Staff, can you take a vote?

16 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the approval of the Minutes with the edit of  
17 adding Bryan Grady as being present for the meeting. Those in favor, Grady?

18 MR. GRADY: Aye.

19 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

20 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Durant?

22 MR. DURANT: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Metts?

1 MR. METTS: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE:

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

6 MR. PRICE: Alright, motion is approved.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Now we move on to number 5., which is  
8 our Consent Agenda. I wanna explain the Consent Agenda. It's an action item that  
9 allows this Commission to approve road names and map amendment requests where  
10 one, the Staff recommends approval, two, no one from the public has signed up to  
11 speak against the amendment, or three, no Member on the Commission is in need of  
12 further discussion on the request. So today Mr. Siercks, which cases do we have people  
13 signed up or, we can, let me rephrase that. What can we leave on the Consent Agenda  
14 today?

15 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair, we can leave Case No. 23-020 MA on the Consent  
16 Agenda. Every other application we would need to pull from the Consent Agenda.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. So the Chair makes a  
18 motion to approve the Consent Agenda, so 5.a., the Road Names and Item 5.b.2., Case  
19 No. 23-020 for approval. Do I have a second?

20 MR. METTS: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Got a second from Commissioner Metts. With that can we  
22 take a vote, Staff?

23 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor of the Consent Agenda, Siercks?

1 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Grady?

3 MR. GRADY: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Metts?

7 MR. METTS: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye. Thanks again, Staff.

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

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We will now move on. We are in Item 5 looking at our Map  
13 Amendments, 5.b. We're gonna start with Case number 1 today, Case 23-019. Staff,  
14 please.

15 **CASE NO. 23-019 MA:**

16 MR. PRICE: Okay. The first item is Case 23-019 MA. The Applicant is Keisha  
17 Garrick. The location is 7730 Bluff Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone a little  
18 less than  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an acre, .73, from rural RU to neighborhood commercial which is NC.  
19 You have to kind of take a look at this one but Staff did recommend disapproval of this  
20 request. Primarily just looking at the area in which this request is located it's really in a,  
21 it is identified as being in a rural activity center. It's also part of the nose of activity for  
22 rural crossroads as part of the Lower Richland Strategic Community Master Plan.  
23 Looking at the purpose of the rural commercial versus the purpose of the neighborhood

1 commercial as found in the Land Development Code and also looking at the objectives  
2 as identified within the Comprehensive Plan, one of the things that was taken of note is  
3 that the rural commercial really allows for a little more flexibility as far as the type of  
4 uses allowed, those are both commercial and service type uses versus the NC, this  
5 doesn't get the flexibility and part of that flexibility can be found in the maximum lot  
6 sizes. Within the neighborhood commercial the building footprint cannot exceed 6,000  
7 square feet. You can do 12,000, of course if you do a two story, but the footprint is  
8 6,000 square feet, whereas in the rural commercial it can go up to 20,000 square feet.  
9 So just kind of keeping in line with the purposes of each of these zoning designations  
10 and also looking at the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, Staff recommends  
11 disapproval of this request.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioner Siercks, do we have an  
13 applicant here signed up to speak?

14 MR. SIERCKS: We do. Keisha Garrick.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Please remember to come to the podium and state your  
16 name and address. That's fine. Just state your name and address and then  
17 Commissioner Siercks, please take a note.

18 **TESTIMONY OF ROBERT FREEMAN GARRICK, SR.:**

19 MR. GARRICK: My name is Robert Freeman Garrick, Sr., I'm Keisha's father. I'm  
20 79 years old, I've been in Gaston all of my life. I've been a businessman in Gaston for at  
21 least 40 years. This particular property was a store in the '50s when I was going to  
22 school. Ms. Dawson used to own it. Mr. Green bought it and turned it into another store.  
23 Then it changed from a convenience store, old time grocery store, whatever way you

1 wanna say it. Mr. Burnette whose part owner in Capital Supply on Two Notch Road, he  
2 bought it and turned it into a hardware store. When he retired he let Mr. J.D. Lloyd have  
3 it. He ran it as a hardware store till last year, he had a stroke, he got blind. Mr. Burnette  
4 sold it to me and my daughter. I bought it for my daughter. It's already been a business  
5 for the last 60 or 70 years. I don't see how they can deny it now. And we've just about,  
6 we didn't add nothing on the building, the building is in good shape. We went in and  
7 cleaned it up and done fixed it up for a convenience store. We done paint along the  
8 front of it and everything. And my thing is if you turn this down how can they let Dollar  
9 General come right there in a flooded area and put a store. I been in business just about  
10 all my life in Gaston, at least 40 years. So I don't understand how can you turn it down  
11 and it's been a business all these years, you know? Up until J.D. got out of it I think last  
12 year in May or June of last year. And I gave back more to Gaston than any other  
13 businessman ever been there. Ms. Bernice Scott can tell you that, Ms. Shirlings can tell  
14 you that. I do a lot for the community. That's it. I appreciate y'all time, thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Commissioner Siercks, anyone else signed  
16 up?

17 MR. SIERCKS: Did the Applicant wish to speak?

18 **TESTIMONY OF KEISHA GARRICK:**

19 MS. GARRICK: Hi, my name is Keisha Garrick and my father just spoke pretty  
20 much a lot – we all grew up in the community, we owned a store since I was five that's  
21 down the street and we're just trying to bring more to the community by changing it from  
22 the rural to another store. Cause we do own the other store that's down the street by  
23 Mr. Herbert Sims, y'all had to rezone his also to change it to, from rural to commercial.



1 We actually renting that property out so, from him right now, so we're just trying to  
2 expand the business back again to the community to make it better cause I grew up  
3 there since I was five and I'm 44 now. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

5 MR. SIERCKS: We have one more, it looks like Ann Garner?

6 MS. GARRICK: Garrick, it's my mother. She signed up by mistake.

7 MR. SIERCKS: That's it, we have no one else to speak on this application.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming up to speak and thank you  
9 Commissioner Siercks. This is open to the floor now to the Commission for discussion.  
10 Is there any questions for Staff?

11 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner.

13 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff. Has this property been in a nonconforming use  
14 for the last few years?

15 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I'm sure if it's been operating during any time it would've been  
16 under a nonconforming status, even from, so it would've been, we enacted zoning  
17 around 1978 so if it was operating during that time it would've been nonconforming. But,  
18 I'm sorry I don't have it directly in front of me but the assumption is that this business  
19 has not operated I guess over the last year or so which would've helped to maintain the  
20 nonconformity.

21 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

1 MR. GRADY: Question for Staff on this one. At least on, and you can correct me  
2 if I'm mistaken here, it reads based on the conclusion of the recommendation that the  
3 main objection is that this is, this request is for a neighborhood commercial as opposed  
4 to a rural commercial zoning, is that an accurate assessment?

5 MR. PRICE: I think that's accurate. I think that's pretty accurate, Mr. Grady.

6 MR. GRADY: Okay. And you mentioned there was a difference in the footprint  
7 that would be allowed under the two different zoning types. You'll forgive me I do not  
8 have the entire use table memorized so if you could speak broadly to what types of  
9 structures are allowed under a neighborhood commercial that would not be allowed  
10 under a rural commercial, that would be helpful.

11 MR. PRICE: Yeah, my apologies, I actually meant to have that here. The uses  
12 are very similar. One of the things we found, there are a few uses that I guess based on  
13 the square footage allowance of the rural commercial zoning designation were allowed  
14 within the rural commercial versus being allowed within the neighborhood commercial. I  
15 can just kinda off the, just kinda go through the list I'll just quickly identify a few. So for  
16 example, a automobile towing which doesn't include storage but an automobile towing  
17 business is allowed in the rural commercial versus the neighborhood commercial.  
18 Furniture repair shops and upholstery, hotels and motels, janitorial services, kennels are  
19 all allowed in the rural commercial versus being allowed in the neighborhood  
20 commercial. And I think you can kind of see that a lot of those it's due to the size of  
21 those would be the difference. Minor repair and maintenance for automobiles is allowed.  
22 Repair and maintenance for appliances and electronics, rental centers without outside  
23 storage are all allowed in the rural commercial and not in the neighborhood commercial.

1 Septic tank services are allowed, taxidermists are also allowed just for a few from the  
2 list, but I think you get the gist.

3 MR. GRADY: So if I understand this correctly you're saying that the rural  
4 commercial is actually a broader?

5 MR. PRICE: Yes.

6 MR. GRADY: Okay.

7 MR. PRICE: And again, maybe – I'm sorry, I'll let you finish first.

8 MR. GRADY: No, go ahead.

9 MR. PRICE: I was gonna say, you know, unfortunately I've dealt with Mr. Garrick  
10 I believe and his daughter also a couple of times over the years so I'm aware of their  
11 previous businesses down there. This is just one of those situations, we've run into this  
12 periodically where the size limitations of the size of the lot that they're bringing in before  
13 does not allow them to ask for the appropriate zoning designation. If this was a two acre  
14 tract they would be allowed to ask for a rural commercial. If they were abutting a rural  
15 commercial tract, zoned parcel, they would be able to ask for rural commercial.  
16 Unfortunately there's a sliver that separates them in a rural commercial tract and so  
17 because of the size of the parcel they are unable to ask for the rural commercial. And so  
18 the only eligible commercial zoning designation for them to ask for was the  
19 neighborhood commercial.

20 MR. GRADY: Okay. I guess the follow up I would have to that is, are those sort of  
21 policy decisions that you mentioned, are those simply determined by Staff or are those  
22 statutory in some way?

23 MR. PRICE: That is within our Code.

1 MR. GRADY: Okay. And let me, looking at the map we can see that, I'm not sure  
2 how many feet that is, but it's a fairly narrow piece of property there so it may not be  
3 abutting a rural commercial but, you know, that is so close that it seems kind of a  
4 [inaudible] amount of difference in my opinion. But I think your answers have been  
5 helpful so I'll yield back.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you Staff and Commissioner Grady.

7 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

9 MR. DURANT: I have a question for Staff. So Mr. Price, but for that sliver of land  
10 separating the two properties we were just discussing, this zoning change request in all  
11 likelihood would meet the criteria of the Comprehensive Plan and we would in all  
12 likelihood approve it?

13 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

14 MR. DURANT: That sliver of land, what's it being used for now?

15 MR. PRICE: I'm not sure.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Can you highlight that parcel on the map? Is that the one  
17 we're talking about?

18 MR. PRICE: The street view.

19 MR. GARRICK: Can I answer that question for you?

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Sure, go ahead.

21 MR. GARRICK: Okay, the last -

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down to the podium so we have you on the  
23 microphone. Thank you, sir.

1 MR. GARRICK: The land on both side of this business is not being used for  
2 anything. The only thing on that whole strip from 769 up to the railroad track is Mr. Doc  
3 Sim and Hattie Sim used to own a convenience store on the corner there. We're running  
4 that as a convenience store now. But close to that building I think the Webbers own it on  
5 one side, the Davis on the other side. Used to be a small business but it's no business  
6 or anything in there. And we spent about \$150,000 in this business. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The Chair is open to any motions as well. Or further  
8 discussion.

9 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

11 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion that we send this case, 23-019 MA to  
12 County Council with a recommendation of approval with the rationale being that a  
13 rezoning to a commercial property is consistent with both multiple parcels in the area as  
14 well as the designation as a rural activity center.

15 MR. DURANT: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do I have a second? I have a second from Commissioner  
17 Durant. With that second, Staff can we take a vote?

18 MR. PRICE: Alright, the motion is for approval of Case 23-019 MA. Those in  
19 favor of the motion, kinda follow along Council so your yes would be for approval. Those  
20 in favor, Metts?

21 MR. METTS: Yes.

22 MR. PRICE: Durant?

23 MR. DURANT: Yes.

1 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

2 MR. SIERCKS: Yes.

3 MR. PRICE: Grady?

4 MR. GRADY: Yes.

5 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

7 MR. PRICE: Alright, motion passes.

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

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you Commission, thank you Staff. That will now go  
11 as a recommendation of approval to County Council. Thank you. Again, that's gonna go  
12 to County Council with a recommendation for approval. They'll have their meeting at the  
13 next zoning public hearing. Next we'll move on to our next case which is going to be  
14 item number 3, 5.b.3., Case No. 23-021 MA.

15 **CASE NO. 23-021 MA:**

16 MR. PRICE: Alright, the next item is Case 23-021 MA. The Applicant is Richard  
17 Romero. The location is 7532 Fairfield Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone one  
18 acre from rural which is RU to GC - hopefully you can hear me – to GC which is general  
19 commercial. Again, Staff recommends disapproval of this request. It's within, it falls  
20 within the neighborhood low density designation of the Comprehensive Plan. And I'll just  
21 kind of read from the Staff Report here, the requested Map Amendment would be in  
22 character with the zoning designations of the parcels north and south of the subject site.  
23 Some of those sites are either zoned general commercial or light industrial. However,

1 it's not consistent with the objectives of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan as the subject is  
2 not located within a contextually appropriate distance from the intersection of a primary  
3 arterial or within a neighborhood activity center. Again, in addition the uses permitted by  
4 the requested zoning district do not support the small scale neighborhood commercial  
5 establishments desired by the Comprehensive Plan and again for these reasons Staff  
6 recommends disapproval.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Do we have anyone signed up to speak  
8 for this one?

9 MR. SIERCKS: There's no one signed up to speak on the sign in form. Is there  
10 anyone present?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, the Chair opens this up for discussion with the  
12 Commission. Any questions for Staff? Commissioner Siercks, you would like to speak?

13 MR. SIERCKS: Is there anyone who wished to speak either for or against  
14 application number 23-021 MA, location 7532 Fairfield Road.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks, that'll be the last call  
16 from the public on that one. We'll continue with any questions for Staff or comments  
17 from the Commission. Also any motions.

18 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff, Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

20 MR. DURANT: Staff, in your conclusion you said this property is not located in  
21 [inaudible] intersection of a primary arterial or within a neighborhood activity center.  
22 Would that be the case for the properties directly east and north of this, of the subject  
23 site?

1 MR. PRICE: Those properties do not meet the objectives of the Comprehensive  
2 Plan for this designation either. Those properties just happened to have that zoning. It  
3 was definitely prior to the adoption of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan and probably could  
4 go back and see those parcels probably had that designation for quite a while.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff.

6 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, sir.

8 MR. PRICE: Maybe I'll kinda throw something to the Planning Commission.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead. Thank you.

10 MR. PRICE: So I think you have a couple of choices here. One, if you feel that  
11 you would still like to hear from the Applicant and give them a chance to petition the  
12 Planning Commission for his request, this could be deferred and we will just bring this  
13 back. It won't be coming back till September but it'll give him an opportunity to speak. Or  
14 you could go ahead and just take this up on the basis of what's been presented to you  
15 because, I mean, regardless of what the Applicant is asking for from a use standpoint,  
16 what we're really looking at is a request for a general commercial zoning designation at  
17 this location. So you can make your decision based on that also.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. That is true, we are tasked up here as  
19 Commissioners to look at this without, as if there's no building there and if this is a good  
20 fit for this area. So I'll put on the floor, any motions?

21 MR. METTS: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.



1 MR. METTS: I think I would like to just defer this and see if the Applicant would  
2 like to come and talk next time just to see what's going on in their mind, what's  
3 happening with this and get a better picture of it.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Metts. So we have a motion for  
5 defer? Do I have a second?

6 MR. DURANT: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second. With the second, Staff can you take a vote?

8 MR. PRICE: Alright, the motion is for deferral of Case 23-021 MA. Those in favor  
9 of that motion, and a yes is agreeing with the deferral, Grady?

10 MR. GRADY: Yes.

11 MR. PRICE: Metts?

12 MR. METTS: Yes.

13 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

14 MR. SIERCKS: Yes.

15 MR. PRICE: Durant?

16 MR. DURANT: Yes.

17 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

19 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion will be deferred. We'll attempt to put this on the  
20 September Planning Commission agenda.

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

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Thank you, Staff, can we move on to the next  
2 item?

3 **CASE NO. 23-022 MA:**

4 MR. PRICE: Alright, the next item is Case 23-022 MA. The Applicant is Jesse  
5 Carter. The location is Broad River Road. The parcel is just a little bit less than 30  
6 acres, it's actually 29.96. The Applicant is requesting to rezone the property from its  
7 existing zoning of light industrial, M1 to a PDD which is planned development district.  
8 Staff recommends approval of this request. As you'll take note within your package part  
9 of creating a PDD is essentially you're almost creating your own zoning designation with  
10 all of your rules and allowances and everything within there and that is actually what's  
11 being reviewed. There are some things that will automatically default to our Land  
12 Development Code if it's not referenced but, you know, one of the things Staff does is  
13 we go and take a look just to make sure. That is why one of the things that you will take  
14 note of, especially starting on page 41, that there is actually an ordinance that's been  
15 drafted. This is typically something we do after County Council has the zoning public  
16 hearing and gives first reading to an item but because again this is a PDD we wanted  
17 you to actually see if this is approved these are the allowances for this development.  
18 Going back, which you can probably see a little bit clearer on page 26 under Exhibit C  
19 are the permitted uses. According to the Applicant they were gonna use the permitted  
20 uses that are currently identified under our neighborhood commercial zoning  
21 designation with the addition of restaurants with limited service with a drive-thru  
22 essentially because drive-thrus are not permitted in the neighborhood commercial. But  
23 again they're kind of creating their own zoning designation here. So it's easier to spell

1 out each one of the uses versus just referencing the neighborhood commercial, we  
2 found that to be very helpful for future Staff that's gonna be enforcing this ordinance. So  
3 if you, you know, again take note on page 41 under the site plan which is identified as  
4 Exhibit A, Staff took what was presented and we basically spelled it out. So they would  
5 be limited to those uses as previously stated from the buildings to the height to the  
6 number of units to square footage, all of those would be limited and also the reservation  
7 of at least 10% of the total area as a parkland or open space. And that is a requirement  
8 of the PDD as found in §26-102(8)(c)(d) and (e).

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Would you mind putting the [inaudible] so we can see?  
10 Thank you. Commissioner Siercks, do we have anyone signed up to speak?

11 MR. SIERCKS: We do. The Applicant, oh I guess not the Applicant, is the  
12 Applicant?

13 MR. CARTER: Yes.

14 MR. SIERCKS: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Come on down to the podium, sir. State your name and  
16 address.

17 **TESTIMONY OF ALEX DEMETERCO:**

18 MR. DEMETERCO: My name is Alex D. Demeterco. My address is 5 Century  
19 Drive, Suite 240, Greenville, South Carolina. Just for clarification, Jesse Carter was the  
20 person that filled out the application, Jesse and I are partners in the development  
21 company. Currently the property is zoned M1 and M1 allows for light manufacturing but  
22 it also allows for retail and warehousing if you look through what the permitted uses are.  
23 We looked to rezone this property about a year ago into GC and after consultation with

1 the Ballentine, I believe it's called Ballentine Community Association, and also with both  
2 Councilman, previous Councilman Malinowski and Councilman Branham, Councilman  
3 Branham suggested the PDD process. One of the reasons is we wanna develop and  
4 are looking to develop and proposing multi-family with a smaller amount of retail. Rather  
5 than being able to do 100% of retail we scaled it back to about 10% with apartments in  
6 the back, which is of course a less intrusive traffic use. And that's based on just straight  
7 acreage of the property. Our development objectives remain the same but one of the  
8 reasons we're looking for a PDD is it allows a little more control, in other words we're  
9 approving the site plan as well as the zoning. So we're saying that we're going to  
10 develop apartments with a small amount of retail, this ensures that process. When you  
11 look at from a square footage standpoint what we're proposing, it is about 93%  
12 apartments and 7% retail, so much lower traffic use. We've done a lot of investigations  
13 from wetlands to soils investigations, reviewed the, worked with DOT – I take it that's  
14 my time, is that correct? Okay. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Sir, you can keep going, as the Applicant I wanted to give  
16 you an extra minute, go ahead.

17 MR. DEMETERCO: Okay. We have worked very closely with DOT and our, have  
18 been collaborating in terms of the improvements that are scheduled or planned for  
19 Broad River Road and our participation in that from a standpoint of it being able to help  
20 improve the traffic situation there, and we don't have specifics at this point other –  
21 because we and DOT just haven't gotten that far other than the agreement that we  
22 would be collaborative in terms of providing lands and dedicating land to be able to  
23 widen the road and DOT talking about putting in a signal which we're supportive of at

1 Bickley Road to help improve that. So those are some of the main things. I just wanted  
2 to address traffic, the conditions on the property. There's a floodway on the property  
3 which we intend to honor, we will not disturb it in any way. That'll be in fact part of the  
4 open space requirements that we'll be providing.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

6 MR. DEMETERCO: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Siercks?

8 MR. SIERCKS: Manuel Merrick?

9 MR. MERRICK: So I'm with the engineering company. I'm just here for technical  
10 questions, but.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you.

12 MR. SIERCKS: Andrew Allen?

13 MR. ALLEN: Same as Mr. Merrick?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

15 MR. SIERCKS: Ms. Kim Murphy?

16 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

17 MS. MURPHY: Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel Lane, Chapin. There are multiple  
18 issues including with documents presented and it should be deferred. The ordinance  
19 incorrectly states the property is to be rezoned general commercial. The traffic count  
20 increased 500 daily trips between 2021 and 2022, and there are no DOT or penny tax  
21 improvements for this road, which is operating at a level D. This is the same proposal as  
22 in 2022 except the density of 264 multi-family units has increased with the addition of  
23 three garage buildings with apartment units above. Because of inconsistencies in

1 Exhibit A and B, Staff's Report and the ordinance, the two exhibits do not appear to be  
2 the same exhibits, A and B, referenced in the ordinance. Exhibit B references in the  
3 ordinances is general development plan, but Exhibit B in the packet is called Statement  
4 of Intent. The layout in Exhibit A, the site plan, does not match the ordinance. The  
5 ordinance states there will be four garage structures plus three garage buildings with  
6 units above, a total of seven garage units. But the site plan only shows a total of four  
7 garage buildings, which look alike, not the seven according to the ordinance. And one of  
8 those four is labeled as 'garage building with units above', typical, as if all four buildings  
9 not three have units above. Staff Report indicates that a maximum of 264 units, Exhibit  
10 A states 264 proposed units. Exhibit B states approximately 264 units, which will be  
11 amongst the 11 three story buildings. But the ordinance states the plan will be limited to  
12 11 buildings plus density in three garage buildings. The ordinance does not specify a  
13 maximum number of units or any number of units, but should. Aside from the excessive  
14 density I request that you defer this until you receive accurate documentation and know  
15 what you are approving. If you feel you must approve it nail down the maximum density  
16 in the ordinance and disallow bonus density. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

18 MR. SIERCKS: Next is Matthew McCommon?

19 **TESTIMONY OF MATTHEW MCCOMMON:**

20 MR. MCCOMMON: Matt McCommon, 44 Aderly Oak Court, Irmo, South  
21 Carolina. We live off of Bickley Road in the neighborhood, Aderly neighborhood. And  
22 my only concern, the statement I'm making is in relation to the traffic right now; Broad  
23 River Road is a two lane road and during the school year I have kids that go to

1 Ballentine and in the morning and even in the afternoon the traffic is just horrendous  
2 there, specifically where Bickley runs into Broad River. So my concern with adding  
3 commercial and residential multi-family dwelling housing, my concern is just the  
4 increase in traffic. You know, now I know the gentleman spoke to working with the  
5 Department of Transportation and coming up with a plan and expanding those roads,  
6 but at the end of the day we don't know when that would happen and so if you move  
7 forward with the development of rechanging the zoning on that you're just gonna  
8 increase traffic which is gonna just continue to make, you know, going through that area  
9 tenuous best or terrible, so that was my only concern. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

11 MR. SIERCKS: Terry Rowell?

12 **TESTIMONY OF TERRY ROWELL:**

13 MS. ROWELL: Terry Rowell, 3635 Kennerly Road. I promise not to waste my  
14 time calling out Acreage Plot System. I'm in agreement that there are too many  
15 discrepancies in this proposal right now to vote one way or the other. I think it should be  
16 deferred until things are, you know, put in place. The other thing I think we're doing is I  
17 was on that road, Bickley Road, last week and there was an accident. It's always  
18 crowded but it literally was backed up from 76 to 176, all the way on one side and part  
19 way back on the other side. I think we're putting the cart before the horse. I think we  
20 need to make the infrastructure improvements before we approve these types of things  
21 in the area. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

1 MR. SIERCKS: We have no one else signed up to speak. Is there anyone who  
2 would like to speak for or against?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we have any questions for Staff? It's open on the floor  
4 for discussion.

5 MR. METTS: Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

7 MR. METTS: Question for Staff. Mr. Price, could you speak to the discrepancies  
8 they're referencing? I know y'all were looking back and forth, just trying to figure out  
9 what's going on with it.

10 MR. PRICE: I would actually have to hear all of those again cause it went pretty  
11 fast. But –

12 MS. MURPHY: I'd be happy to. That was only some of them.

13 MR. PRICE: What we can do, we can add the maximum number of units to the  
14 ordinance. You know, that is something that can easily be added, we can cap the  
15 number of units that would be allowed there. I believe they referenced 264 so that's  
16 what, we could definitely add that to the ordinance that would go forward.

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. With that would we be able to do  
18 anything as a Planning Commission to make that amendment to Exhibit B or does that  
19 mean we have to defer and then –

20 MR. PRICE: I mean, that can be a part of your approval to, you know, one of the  
21 things about a PDD you can actually make changes to it or make recommended  
22 changes to what is actually going forth. You know, unlike most of your zoning requests  
23 that come before you, this one you can actually ask a bunch of questions and put, you



1 know, certain restrictions on them if you need to or allowance, so you have an  
2 opportunity to actually kind of craft the zoning for this parcel.

3 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair, question for Staff.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: I'm just wondering, Mr. Price, would it be a worthwhile effort to  
6 take a look at all of the discrepancies that were pointed out earlier and see if that  
7 impacts or effects Staff's decision process at all before we take a vote on this.

8 MR. PRICE: I don't know what the discrepancies, if they truly are discrepancies.  
9 We will be happy to look at this, I mean, if you want to, but again I don't, this is my first  
10 time hearing about any discrepancies. And again, just you know, if they're stated, I  
11 mean, if she would like to come back up here and state those again we'd be more than  
12 happy to hear it, that way we can kinda follow along and see, but they were kind of done  
13 pretty quickly previously.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you Staff. We can, if as Chair I can entertain  
15 that I would then like to let the Applicant then have two more minutes and then we could  
16 discuss. With this being a PDD and you just explained we could, like shape this parcel –

17 MR. PRICE: Exactly.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: - then let's have a couple more minutes to discuss. So Ms.  
19 Murphy, would you come down and we'll give you two more minutes to explain the  
20 discrepancies that you found to Staff.

21 MS. MURPHY: Thank you. For one of the things that I think is important that Mr.  
22 Price mentioned is that you can mold this. And what comes out of here should be a  
23 molded, in molded form. It is too vague for you to do that right now, and part of that has

1 to do with these discrepancies. Like the very first one it says that it's supposed to be  
2 rezoned on the ordinance to general commercial. This is to a PDD, not general  
3 commercial. I'm taking up my time by having you look but I want you to see that's just  
4 one of these discrepancies.

5 MR. PRICE: If you don't mind, I mean, I don't think you're capping her at a  
6 certain time cause we wanna hear from Ms. Murphy. So I see what she's referring to, so  
7 if you look at – there are two headings on the, on page 41 where it does talk about  
8 going from rural, excuse me, so again I apologize but those, if you wanna consider it  
9 just to be typos, we can make that change. Cause what we have before us is M1 going  
10 to PDD.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So section one should read M1 to PDD.

12 MR. PRICE: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Not rural?

14 MR. PRICE: No, so we change that to M1.

15 MS. MURPHY: So this is just one discrepancies but there are others like this that  
16 I think it should be deferred, go back to the Planning Staff and have them clean it up.  
17 Let me talk about a couple other things. Again, this is supposed to be a formal  
18 document that comes out of here. You have that ability and it deserves more scrutiny  
19 because of that. PDD's are different. So if you look at Exhibit A and B in your packets,  
20 Exhibit A does not say that it's part of the ordinance. It's easy to assume that that is the  
21 site plan that is part of the ordinance, that's referenced in the ordinance, but you don't  
22 know that. But the site plan, if this is the exhibit that should be part of the ordinance

1 that's referenced there, it does not match the ordinance. You would need a site plan  
2 that matches the ordinance or the ordinance needs to match the site plan.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Would the Applicant like to help with some of the  
4 discrepancies? Okay, you wanna come on down, maybe take the other podium here?

5 MR. DEMETERCO: Sure. Let me, let me be clear about the number of units, it's  
6 264, let me just start with that. So we can firm that up and have a not to exceed amount.  
7 The second thing, there are no apartments above the garages, let me clarify that as  
8 well. They're garages only. The, the third thing is I'm in agreement, you know, we're  
9 looking for PDD zoning, not GC zoning. We're very specific about the site plan of where  
10 we wanna head. If we need to clean up the ordinance in order to do that I would  
11 recommend that if you're so inclined to be able to approve it with those, subject to that.  
12 I'm trying to think if there was something else that was mentioned, but those were kinda  
13 the main items that I heard come up and hopefully I'm clarifying it.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

15 MS. MURPHY: If you look at Exhibit B in your packet it's called Statement of  
16 Intent. In the ordinance it's called –

17 MR. DEMETERCO: General Development Plan.

18 MS. MURPHY: General Development Plan. So they're two separate documents,  
19 that needs to be cleaned up. But the site plan –

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Did you hear that, Staff?

21 MR. PRICE: We looked at that. Typically within a PDD you give a general  
22 development plan. They may have named it one thing as, from theirs but as a heading  
23 and we reference it as Exhibit B, it's a general development plan for this. It's saying the

1 same thing. It may have a different name but it's the same thing, so typically just every  
2 PDD has a general development plan. They may not have called it that but this is what it  
3 is. And that's what we labeled as Exhibit B and we placed that within the ordinance.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: The ordinance, it looks like there's some amendments we  
5 would make like rural to general commercial, so if you decide to make a motion on this I  
6 can see us as a Planning Commission making edits to the ordinance cause then we're  
7 going to send that to County Council as a recommendation.

8 MR. PRICE: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So we would edit the text General Development Plan to  
10 match to say Statement of Intent. Is that okay?

11 MR. PRICE: Or we could label it as General Development Plan and in  
12 parenthesis we could also reference as they've identified it in their document. You  
13 know, their Statement of Intent, again they're the same thing so if we have General  
14 Development Plan, you know, "Statement of Intent" it'd be the same thing.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I just wanna make sure that what we send to County  
16 Council is clear.

17 MR. PRICE: No, I understand. And I understand what Ms. Murphy's bringing  
18 forth, so we can do that.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioners, questions at this point? This is a little  
20 unorthodox I know, thank you for everyone's patience. Hang on, Ms. Murphy.

21 MR. DURANT: Comment, Mr. Chair.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

1 MR. DURANT: Everything I've heard seems like it can be easily cleaned up by  
2 Staff and I'm not sure I've heard anything to cause us to have to defer this to the next  
3 meeting. I am sensitive to the fact that having attended one County, or at least a  
4 subcommittee of a County Council meeting, they do not want any documents that aren't  
5 final and perfect to look at. So anything we forward to them with a recommendation  
6 obviously would need to be cleaned up as best Staff can determine.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Durant, you're reading my mind.  
8 I was also at that committee meeting. We wanna make sure our document is clean that  
9 we send to County Council as a recommendation. So if we're looking at the ordinance  
10 and making, you know, typo changes let's put that into our motion.

11 MR. PRICE: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Seems like Exhibit B, A and B would go along with it  
13 but the ordinance seems to be the legal text of this. Am I correct, Staff?

14 MR. PRICE: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, any other questions? Okay. Alright, Ms. Murphy –  
16 let's cap this, let's do two more minutes and then cap it.

17 MS. MURPHY: Okay, if these are the exhibits that are going in there they need to  
18 be cleaned up as well. For example, the gentleman said there are no garage buildings  
19 with units above but Exhibit B says it'll be a, multi-family units will be spread across  
20 among 11 primary buildings with a mix of one, two and three bedroom units as well as  
21 three garage buildings with units above. So there are other things in here that need to  
22 be, to match the ordinance need to come out because if it's not said in the ordinance it's  
23 said in the exhibits and you will have to make sure those exhibits are correct. If you look

1 at the site plan, the site plan doesn't show the seven garage buildings, it only shows  
2 four. One of those buildings says, garage unit with, excuse me, let me get it out in front  
3 of me exactly, if you look at your site plan, I don't know if you can see this little tiny  
4 writing here.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, can we zoom in on the site plan so everybody can  
6 see what we're talking about?

7 MS. MURPHY: So on the southeast property line you'll see a note that says,  
8 garage buildings with units above, typical. And you can see the garage building it  
9 references. There are four garage type buildings exactly like that so the assumption is  
10 that they're going to be four garage type buildings with units above. But supposedly  
11 there are a total of seven garage buildings. So the site plan would have to be adjusted  
12 as well.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. The Applicant, sir, can you clarify that?

14 MR. DEMETERCO: I don't know where the seven unit garage units came from.  
15 There are four and we will eliminate any language that shows that there's any  
16 apartments above it. There's 264 units, period. None of them above the garages, or will  
17 not be I should say.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So just to clarify on my end I see item a4, four garage  
19 structures containing no more than 24 garages. Is this a line where we can state  
20 something there that clarifies everything, Staff?

21 MR. PRICE: I was looking for the seven. Yeah, I'm sorry. I apologize I was  
22 looking for the seven units referred to, the seven within, so there are four garage  
23 structures and three garage buildings with units above.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: It looks like it's an addition of the three garage buildings  
2 with units above and four garage structures containing no more than 24 garages. Could  
3 we remove one of those lines? Cause on the site plan garage building with units above,  
4 do we know what TYP stands for, is it typical? Okay, thank you. If you have a keen eye  
5 we can count and we would get seven there? So seven throughout the site plan and  
6 then units inside.

7 MR. PRICE: We have four structures.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Four structures.

9 MR. PRICE: Four structures.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Four garage structures containing no more than 24  
11 garages. So six? In each one, right? Thank you. Commissioners, I'm just leading a  
12 discussion here. I'm still, the motion would be one of my colleagues here to for or deny  
13 or defer. But I like to see that we're doing our due diligence here as a Planning  
14 Commission, I appreciate everyone's time today. Let's go ahead and ask Ms. Murphy to  
15 take a seat and our Applicant as well and we'll continue like we normally would on a  
16 Commission. I appreciate everybody, thank you. Staff, final thoughts on clarity?

17 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I was gonna say it's been a while since we've done a PDD of  
18 this sort and typically when we do PDDs they are typically more residential based with  
19 some levels of commercial surrounding those. And I will tell you that most of, the site  
20 plan that is submitted is conceptual. They can't, they don't typically do exact, that's why  
21 we're always very mindful of the exact language that spells it out. So sometimes you  
22 aren't gonna find, like I say whether it be this one or whether it had been a residential  
23 PDD, in which you're gonna find the [inaudible] gonna match exactly. You know, what I

1 would look at is, you know, so there are four items that I've taken note of and we can  
2 make that correction. Again, these are all, you can do this all on page 41 in which we  
3 will make that correction of exactly the district is going from and what it's going to for  
4 both of those sections that that can be clearer. But everything that was advertised and  
5 referenced is for, to go to a PDD. We can also include within the ordinance from the site  
6 development plan the limitation of 264 units. Going to section 2.b. under the General  
7 Development Plan we will also make note that it's also identified as a Statement of  
8 Intent but it still references Exhibit B. And from what I've also seen, so the big one really  
9 is items 3 and 4 which we have because we have in the Statement of Intent it has that  
10 multi-family units will be spread across 11 primary buildings as well as three garage  
11 buildings with units above. So we need to clarify whether there will be units above within  
12 those garage units so we can clarify that within the ordinance and also the number of  
13 garage structures that would be there.

14 MS. MURPHY: Excuse me, the site plan [inaudible].

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners does anyone have a  
16 motion if we went ahead and made these revisions and we found clarity on the number  
17 of garages? This is a PDD so I feel like we're stepping into, like Board of Zoning Appeal  
18 area?

19 MR. PRICE: No, you're –

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: In my four years this is pretty unique.

21 MR. PRICE: Okay, so this – good talking point – so if we, if this land, the Land  
22 Development Code that we have, the truth of it is this could easily be two or three times  
23 larger than what it is, because what we would have is your typical zoning designations,



1 your RSLDs, RSMDs, RM, HDs, GCs and so on. What we also have, I'm just using a  
2 couple for reference, we would also have PDD, Summit; PDD, Lake Carolina; PDD  
3 Lowman Home, so just, you know, a couple off the top of my head, because those are  
4 all designed zoning designations. So what you're doing right now, not that you're going  
5 to the Board of Zoning Appeals, what you're doing is creating a new zoning district and  
6 all of the uses that are in there. And this would be the same kinda conversation we  
7 would have if I came and proposed, let's do a GC2 zoning designation, we listed some  
8 uses and you would make decisions on whether certain uses should be there and also  
9 what the limitations should be, whether it be on square footage or setbacks or any of  
10 those sorts. So that's kind of the conversation we're having right now.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. With that as a Commission we could  
12 make a motion to approve, deny or defer. I'll put that on the floor to my colleagues.

13 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

15 MR. DURANT: I move that project 23-022 MA with the adjustments and  
16 corrections mentioned by Mr. Price earlier be forwarded to County Council for a  
17 recommendation of approval.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we have a second?

19 MR. METTS: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Metts. With that we have a  
21 motion and a second for approval that we will make the amendments.

22 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I want just for clarification – we're looking at this I believe we  
23 would remove item 3 which says three garage buildings with units above unless the

1 Applicant has something regarding that, and the four garage structures containing no  
2 more than 24 garages would seem to match what is on the conceptual plan that was  
3 submitted. And in addition we would need to clarify if there are going to be no units  
4 above then we would have, if they're gonna be no units above then we would then  
5 remove that from the ordinance that's being proposed. And one of the things that you  
6 can – it's been a while since we've really done this, but what we will do is we will get a  
7 cleaner version of what they've identified as Statement of Intent and which we've  
8 identified as Exhibit B to clarify any language that's in here to make sure it matches  
9 what ordinance that you recommend approval going forward to County Council.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, just to paraphrase that, we have a motion of  
11 approval with the amendments and a second. So we would go ahead and we would  
12 approve it with these minutes, but you would then bring the document back to us?

13 MR. PRICE: No, we'll send the document forward with those noted  
14 recommendations to County Council.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So let's take the vote since we have the motion out there  
16 with a second.

17 MR. PRICE: Oh I'm sorry, who seconded?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Metts.

19 MR. PRICE: Okay. Okay. Alright, so we have a motion for the approval of Case  
20 23-022 MA. The request is to rezone the parcel from light industrial to a PDD and within  
21 the PDD there will be a number of edits, primarily on page 41 in which we will clarify the  
22 zoning designation that it's going from and to, we will include language which restricts  
23 the maximum number of units for the development, residential units, we also include

1 the, identify the General Development Plan and we will also reference that it is also  
2 known as the Statement of Intent, and we would remove three garage buildings with  
3 units above and instead just have four garage structures containing no more than 24  
4 garages. Alright, so those in favor of that motion, Metts?

5 MR. METTS: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

11 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Durant?

13 MR. DURANT: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Alright, motion passes.

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

17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you to everyone who came to speak on this case  
18 and the Commissioners. As Mr. Price just stated this will go to County Council with a  
19 recommendation of approval with the, Exhibit A and B and the ordinance clarified.

20 MR. PRICE: Yeah, more than likely instead of going I believe the 25<sup>th</sup> of July is  
21 the scheduled zoning public hearing, this item from my conversation with the  
22 Councilmember will not go in the July ZPH but instead it looks like it won't go until the  
23 September ZPH. The County Councilmember would like to have a kind of community

1 town hall with his constituents to discuss this request. So that will probably occur  
2 between now and the zoning public hearing in September.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Again to paraphrase for the public, stay tuned to the  
4 website for a community meeting that may come up by your Councilman and the zoning  
5 public hearing, ZPH would be end of September.

6 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Okay Mr. Price, ready for the next item?

8 **CASE NO. 23-023 MA:**

9 MR. PRICE: Okay. Next case is, next item is Case 23-023 MA. The Applicant is  
10 Kevin Steelman. The Applicant is requesting to rezone property located at 111 Pine  
11 Wedge Drive which is a little less than 22 acres from M1 which is light industrial to  
12 RSLD which is residential single-family low density. Staff recommends approval of this  
13 request. The proposed, the location of the zoning request falls within the neighborhood  
14 medium density designation of the Comprehensive Plan. These areas are identified as  
15 a transition from neighborhood low density to mixed residential density. The land uses  
16 and the character of the areas within the designation should include medium density  
17 residential neighborhoods and supporting neighborhood scale commercial. The request  
18 would be consistent with the densities and the development standards of the adjacent  
19 developments which falls within the Willow Lakes subdivision, the various phases  
20 they've had there that are both located north and east of the subject parcel. Again,  
21 based on the consistency of the request as it relates to the Comp Plan and also with the  
22 various developments, Staff recommends approval.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioner Siercks, anybody signed  
2 up to speak?

3 MR. SIERCKS: We have the Applicant, Kevin Steelman.

4 **TESTIMONY OF KEVIN STEELMAN:**

5 MR. STEELMAN: Good afternoon.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Afternoon.

7 MR. STEELMAN: Kevin Steelman, 522 Lady Street. This microphone isn't made  
8 for average people. I'm with Land Tech, we're a local residential land developer. We just  
9 completed a development of a phase of Willow Lake adjacent to this property and  
10 during that time the pastor of Willow Lake Church reached out to us to let us know that  
11 they had some residual land or excess land that they weren't going to need and they  
12 didn't think they needed to accommodate growth. And so we worked with them over a  
13 couple of months to identify a portion of the land that they would not need to support  
14 their ministry and leaving them with the land that they do believe they need to support  
15 their ministry. And so we worked with their staff to develop a subdivision of the property  
16 that would allow us to purchase a portion of the property and develop it into a single-  
17 family neighborhood that would be very compatible with the adjacent development and  
18 Willow Lake. And so that's our request and I'm here and happy to answer any  
19 questions.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

21 MR. SIERCKS: Next person, Jeff Benson.

22 **TESTIMONY OF JEFF BENSON:**

1 MR. BENSON: Hi, my name is Jeff Benson. I live at 100 White Oakridge Lake in  
2 Blythewood. I'm the pastor of Willow Lake Church. We have been looking at developing  
3 our land, we were zoned light industrial. Our congregation voted to move to, move it to  
4 residential to fit into the environment that we're already in. We were approached earlier  
5 to build a warehouse on our property, we're already zoned light industrial so would need  
6 no rezoning, but we felt that it might hurt the value of the homes in our subdivision  
7 where we're really trying to minister. And so we felt like the residential would be more  
8 helpful to the values of the homes that are already there and probably be a blessing to  
9 everybody in that subdivision. Sometimes when a warehouse moves in all sorts of other  
10 problems move in with it and so we felt that that would be the best thing. So actually our  
11 whole congregation voted to approve this as well. So we are very excited about that  
12 possibility, so.

13 MR. SIERCKS: Next up, Joe Henry.

14 **TESTIMONY OF JOE HENRY:**

15 MR. HENRY: Good afternoon, gentlemen. My name is Joe Henry, I live at 86  
16 Sunset Maple Court. The reason I'm speaking is because that address is in Willow Lake  
17 subdivision so I won't be redundant and repeat what you've already heard, but, so the  
18 fact that I am at the church as well as in the subdivision I have feet in both parts of this  
19 topic. We do have a number of members of our church who live in the Willow Lake  
20 subdivision, our resident homeowners in the subdivision, they are all in approval of this.  
21 So I just wanted to let you know that our church body, those who live within the  
22 subdivision are pleased with this opportunity. We do feel, you know, I feel very strongly  
23 that because it's, you know, it's a low density proposal, it's consistent with the County

1 Comprehensive Plan, it's consistent with the adjacent developments, it feels like a good  
2 fit. As the pastor said we did have an opportunity to put up a warehouse and we  
3 unanimously felt like that was not a fit. Our church has been in this community for 20  
4 years and we feel very much like part of the community and we wanted it, we wanted  
5 whatever we put forward to be something that fit within the community and was not  
6 something that was not well outside of what was already there. So that was our goal  
7 and I think we've met that, so we would appreciate your consideration and hopefully  
8 your recommendation. Thank you very much.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

10 MR. SIERCKS: Did anyone else signed up to speak?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anyone else out there need to talk on this property? Okay if  
12 not this is opened up to the floor for our Commissioners, discussion? Discussion,  
13 questions for Staff or a motion?

14 MR. DURANT: Question, Mr. Chair.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

16 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff. I've heard the name Willow Lake community  
17 mentioned. Is that the community off to the right and to the left on the map, I mean off to  
18 the right on the map here, all of those subdivisions?

19 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. As you can see most of the area there's, come up in some  
20 form of blue/aqua, whichever detail you wanna get with the colors as part of the Willow  
21 Lake subdivision.

22 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

1 MR. GRADY: I would like to make a motion that we send Case No. 23-023 MA to  
2 County Council with a recommendation for approval.

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

4 [Recording stopped]

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, could you take a vote?

6 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor, Durant?

7 MR. DURANT: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

9 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Grady?

11 MR. GRADY: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Metts?

13 MR. METTS: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

17 *[Approved: Metts, Grady, Yonke, Siercks, Durant; Absent: Frierson, Johnson, Dennis,*

18 *Taylor]*

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. That goes with a recommendation of approval.

20 It's gonna go to County Council. Mr. Price, is this the same situation where our Council  
21 men and women have been wanting to have to go to the next month or maybe the –

22 MR. PRICE: No, sir. I don't believe that this will apply in this particular case. At  
23 least I haven't heard from the –



1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So this could be the July?

2 MR. PRICE: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Gotcha. Later this month, thank you. Okay, if we're ready  
4 the next item please.

5 **CASE NO. 23-024 MA:**

6 MR. PRICE: The next item is Case 23-024 MA. The Applicant is Harry Walsh.  
7 The location is on Kennerly Road. The Applicant is requesting to rezone 3.08 acres  
8 from PDD to PDD, essentially this is an amendment to the previously approved PDD.  
9 Staff recommends approval of this request. This falls within the neighborhood medium  
10 density designation of the Comprehensive Plan. Looking at the objectives of that Plan  
11 including the desired development pattern and the zoning designations that are  
12 identified as being consistent with requests for the neighborhood medium density, this  
13 particular, what's proposed before you would be similar to those, that zoning  
14 designation so for that reason Staff recommends that this be approved. In addition it's  
15 also consistent with the character of the existing residential area from a pattern  
16 standpoint and also from zoning designations. If you take a look at your, within your  
17 package starting on page 63, previously when this PDD was approved this section, a  
18 little more than three acres, was originally designated to allow standalone garages. I  
19 guess it was never developed so what's being proposed is instead to allow nine single-  
20 family lots, looks like the minimize size for the lots would be 12,066. The PDD is pretty  
21 much going to lock them into, you know, to the exhibit that you see on, that's been  
22 labeled Exhibit C which is on page 64. I know it's a conceptual plan but this is pretty

1 much what the layout is gonna have to be like. So again for these reasons Staff  
2 recommended approval of this request.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioner Siercks, who do we have  
4 signed up to speak?

5 MR. SIERCKS: First person signed up to speak is Kim Murphy.

6 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

7 MS. MURPHY: Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel Lane, Chapin. This case should be  
8 deferred because of missing documents, inaccurate and omitted information; the  
9 application is a mess. A major change in density, use and traffic flow of an already  
10 approved PDD such as this case requires the proposal to be submitted as a new PDD  
11 like the Broad River Road PDD you just saw. However, that was not done here. For this  
12 reason it should be deferred. You should also have in your packet the existing PDD  
13 ordinance for the entire 53 acre tract with the original development standards that  
14 applied that you may be removing without knowledge. The documents enclosed in no  
15 way indicate what is in the adopting ordinance. The most significant issue is that per  
16 Code a PDD must front on a paved road. This three acre long narrow strip fronts Miles  
17 Bowman Road. Miles Bowman is a county maintained dirt road, but you wouldn't know  
18 that because nowhere in the Staff's Report is it documented. The Report does note,  
19 however, that there are no sidewalks on Miles Bowman; of course not, it's a dirt road. Is  
20 the developer going to pave the road at his cost or are the taxpayers in Richland County  
21 going to pay for it with the penny tax? If the latter the County will be using taxpayers'  
22 money to facilitate this developer and I believe all taxpayers in Richland County would  
23 be enraged. I could say with certainty the property owners on the road beyond the

1 proposed subdivision do not want it paved. At one time they did until it was discovered  
2 the County would take their land and front yards for road right-of-way. Timing is  
3 interesting here, on July 18<sup>th</sup> the third reading of an ordinance to remove the provision  
4 that allows property owners to object to their road being paved with penny tax. Removal  
5 of this provision will allow the County to pave dirt roads for developers. Please ask  
6 Councilmembers before July 18<sup>th</sup> to vote no. Also, traffic characteristics on the Report  
7 list the road as Hollingshed and the conclusion states that the request is consistent with  
8 the character along Hollingshed. But the road is Kennerly, not Hollingshed. The Report  
9 states that the maximum number of units is nine but this number is not spelled out in the  
10 PDD ordinance. Please defer, thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Ms. Murphy. Commissioner Siercks, who's  
12 next?

13 MR. SIERCKS: The next person signed up to speak is Gayle Hayden.

14 **TESTIMONY OF GAYLE HAYDEN:**

15 MS. HAYDEN: Gentlemen, thank you. Gayle Hayden, I live at 1043 Miles  
16 Bowman Road. I've never been to a Planning Council meeting so, and I just met Kim  
17 Murphy today and I thank her for her advocacy. My brother's a civil engineer, I didn't get  
18 any of those genes so all of these numbers are confusing. We've lived on the property  
19 21 years. We own, I don't know if you can switch to a map to show the bigger area, to  
20 the right there's two five acre plots down Miles Bowman Road, right past the three acre.  
21 Yeah, those two five acre plots are what we own and what we live on. Anyway, we've  
22 always, when we first moved in there in 2001, we were told that that was, that three  
23 acres was owned by Mungo Company, it was a buffer zone to protect the Ascot

1 residents and that one day it might be turned into storage units for the Ascot owners'  
2 boats, RVs, toys, things like that. This is new to us with a new development. We are not  
3 in favor of paving the road, although I consented in 2019 I removed that consent as Ms.  
4 Murphy has indicated. We are concerned, we do not know, and I think one of the  
5 staffers mentioned that when you get a PDD you basically create your own zone. So  
6 this developer, even though he could come in and say, they're going to be nine houses,  
7 it could be, anything could change, everything's subject to change. Anyway, I would not  
8 approve of this, would request that the discrepancies be corrected and we receive more  
9 information on the plans for this building and the ordinances. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for your time.

11 MR. SIERCKS: Next person signed up to speak is Lisa Kinard.

12 MS. HAYDEN: Gentlemen, Ms. Kinard was supposed to be here today. She is  
13 our neighbor down at the end of the dirt road. Her husband had a major heart attack  
14 and died this morning, so she is not here. But she was vehemently opposed to this and  
15 that's what I can say on her behalf.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Our thoughts are with her and her family.

17 MR. SIERCKS: Next person is Michael Bell.

18 **TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL BELL:**

19 MR. BELL: Michael Bell, 212 Treyvern Circle in Ascot on the other side. I just  
20 came primarily for information because I saw the signs and a little confused when it said  
21 changing from the same thing to the same thing, but I called and said it was because of  
22 more density than it had been previously done. I wasn't sure how much property it was,  
23 whether it was the whole, like 500 acres or, you know, what section so I came out of

1 curiosity. But I would, it really wouldn't affect us I don't think very much but I certainly  
2 think I would align myself with the folks on the road. If it's something that they don't  
3 approve of then I certainly would be for that. I do know that because of development up  
4 Kennerly there's gonna be I think I understood about 90 houses, so the traffic situation  
5 probably, you know, will get worse and schools are overflowing in the area, I do know  
6 that, I checked on that. So I'm just throwing myself with the weight of the folks there. But  
7 I do appreciate the process that you go through and allow people to speak their mind.  
8 Thank you very much.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out.

10 MR. SIERCKS: Next person up is Terry Rowell.

11 **TESTIMONY OF TERRY ROWELL:**

12 MS. ROWELL: Terry Rowell, 3635 Kennerly Road, Irmo, South Carolina. I guess  
13 I'm up here speaking because the dirt road is the thing that I'm concerned about  
14 because I also have a dirt road on my property. And I am totally against Council taking  
15 over dirt roads and paving them at will. I think the people, I think it's an overreach of  
16 government and I think the people who live on a dirt road should come together and  
17 decide whether or not their dirt road is paved or not. In addition to that something else  
18 that was brought up that greatly concerns me, as a penny tax person I don't think we  
19 should ever pave a dirt road for a developer. I think a developer should be required to  
20 pave whatever dirt road or any other road that they're gonna be using in their  
21 development. And if that means paving the part down to where the dirt road is and then  
22 leaving the rest of the dirt road dirt, then the people on that end of the road need to  
23 make that decision, not the County. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. This will probably be a topic we take up with  
2 our Comp Plan as we look into that next year. Alright.

3 MR. PRICE: You mean the paving of dirt roads?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Maybe one of those, yeah.

5 MR. PRICE: We can actually have someone from County Staff come in and  
6 speak to you about what it is exactly they'll be doing over the next, we'll try to get  
7 someone in hopefully the next, by the next meeting to come in and speak to you about  
8 this issue, but.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Commissioner Siercks?

10 MR. SIERCKS: We do not have anyone else signed up to speak. Is there anyone  
11 else who would like to speak for or against?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, come on down sir. Just state your name and address  
13 and Commissioner Siercks if you can note it.

14 **TESTIMONY OF HARRY WALSH:**

15 MR. WALSH: I'm Harry Walsh. We had the homeowners association from Ascot  
16 come to my partner and say that they had no use for the property and they would like to  
17 find a buyer. Well, we decided to buy it and thought that this would be a good use for it.  
18 The way it's zoned right now I don't think anybody can tell me what goes on it and how  
19 many units would go on it. I mean, it's standalone garages so you've got three acres,  
20 how many could you put on there? Forty? I don't know. But Ascot Homeowners  
21 Association was in favor of selling this property, they don't have a use for it.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Mr. Walsh, could we get your address?  
23 Yeah, just for the Record, Mr. Walsh? When someone comes down to speak we ask for

1 the name and address. Or give it to Staff if you can. You understand? Staff, help him  
2 out please, just write down his address. Thank you.

3 MR. PRICE: If you could come back and state it for the Record and then we can  
4 put it on the sign in sheet. We can move on.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We can move on? Okay, we're gonna continue. Alright  
6 fellow Commissioners, we're gonna open this up on the floor for discussion as well as  
7 additional questions to Staff.

8 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

10 MR. PRICE: Just to address something. You know, looking at, Staff did take a  
11 look at the previous ordinance for the development of this parcel and the others that  
12 were part of it. I can tell you back when this was done many of the ordinances were very  
13 vague. You know, looking at the previous PDD which we have to try to spell out a lot of  
14 the restrictions for it, you know, this was the ordinance itself, basically just every zone  
15 from rural to PDD and that identified the parcels. Even the, whatever we wanna call it I  
16 guess, general development plan, really didn't say much, just gave percentages, and  
17 one of the things it identified is that 4% of the land, which would be the three acres, was  
18 identified as a common area with attached garages. So that's what we, you know, what  
19 we presented to you was relatively simple, it was more like a typical rezoning request,  
20 however, once we, when we, once this goes to County Council if County Council gives  
21 first reading approval to this request we will craft the ordinance at least for this three  
22 acre tract that is before to set the limitations and the limitations as presented were for  
23 nine parcels and that is the maximum that would be allowed there. That is, unless

1 County Council deems it necessary to increase those numbers, but we will go by what  
2 was presented to us in the Staff Report, excuse me, in the submittal and limit it to nine  
3 units.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. I might've missed this so I just wanna ask  
5 it, page 62, the original map amendment, it shows existing and proposed. Where is this  
6 on the map and are there any discrepancies here or any concerns with this part of it?

7 MR. PRICE: No, sir. This came in during the original PDD. As you can see just  
8 looking at the, what's deemed to be existing they have existing rural, three acres, and  
9 then on the sketch plan I guess that's below it you can see they identify that as common  
10 area. But if you take note of the legend next to it where it says proposed, it has common  
11 area with detached garages. And I think as Mr. Walsh previously stated, yeah there are  
12 no limitations on that so if somebody came and said they wanna put three garages on  
13 there I guess they could and if they wanted to put more. There's nothing from a staffing  
14 standpoint in which we could actually limit them for what could go on that site.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Just to reiterate thus far into it the only change we're  
16 looking at, page 63. The rest of the parcel, the rest of the acres there was not a change  
17 to it.

18 MR. PRICE: No, just this.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

20 MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chairman?

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.



1 MR. DELAGE: So just in an effort to be transparent and have everybody's  
2 address in there, we have the Applicant's address if we wanna go ahead and read that  
3 into the Record.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

5 MR. DELAGE: So it is 852 Sandbar Road, Chapin, South Carolina 29036. And  
6 that was for the Applicant, Mr. Walsh.

7 MR. SIERCKS: Sorry, can you say that again?

8 MR. DELAGE: Sorry, the Applicant's address is 852 Sandbar Road, and that's  
9 Chapin, South Carolina 29036.

10 MR. SIERCKS: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Commissioners, further discussion, questions  
12 or a motion?

13 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

15 MR. GRADY: Alright, we heard a number of people raise the issue of the  
16 potential paving of this road. I wanted to give Staff the opportunity to clarify the situation.  
17 Is the claim that was made accurate, that if this rezoning were approved that it would in  
18 any way require the paving of Miles Bowman Road?

19 MR. PRICE: It does not.

20 MR. GRADY: Okay.

21 MR. PRICE: It just said the road just has to be able to accommodate the  
22 projected traffic needs of the proposed development, and that's something that we will  
23 look at once plans are submitted. And of course, with this being a county road then we'll

1 work with our Public Works Department to make sure any improvements that are  
2 necessary, especially those that can be done on behalf of the developer, excuse me, by  
3 the developer are done.

4 MR. GRADY: Okay. And so on page 64 in our packet we have this document  
5 labeled conceptual plans, the intent is that that would be an exhibit to an ordinance that  
6 would be proposed for Council to consider?

7 MR. PRICE: That is correct.

8 MR. GRADY: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I have a question for Staff. Pull the aerial map up again?  
10 Just in the overall character of the area, if we look at Miles Bowman Road, so this is all  
11 a dirt road, currently very few other residences that use this as their primary in and out?

12 MR. PRICE: It looks like probably about three parcels are developed. We have  
13 three, four, probably about six parcels are developed that would use this section of  
14 Miles Bowman.

15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm gonna get out of the PDD mindset for a minute just so if  
16 it was nine residences to the addition of this, just for the character of what's there,  
17 there's six existing ones that [inaudible], 15? Commissioners thoughts and motions?

18 MR. PRICE: Please take note that Miles Bowman Road actually you will see the,  
19 there's actually a right-of-way for Miles Bowman Road. But once you get to the point  
20 where Mr. DeLage has his pointer that becomes an easement, so any county  
21 maintenance and ownership would stop at that point.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So just for clarity if you traveled east on Miles Bowman  
2 Road and you reached where that parcel line is, county maintenance stops there and  
3 it's the neighbors' responsibility?

4 MR. PRICE: Yeah, for anything going back that far, going east, that's private  
5 property.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Right, private.

7 MR. PRICE: And so the easement that goes, that serves those homes that are  
8 located along that section.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Any other discussion? Commissioners?

10 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

12 MR. SIERCKS: I move that we send Case No. 23-024 MA to County Council with  
13 a recommendation for approval.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we have a second?

15 MR. DURANT: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second from Commissioner Durant. With the motion and a  
17 second, Staff can you take a vote?

18 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a motion for the approval of Case 23-024 MA from  
19 PDD to the amended PDD. Those in favor, which will be a yes, of that motion, Grady?

20 MR. GRADY: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Metts?

22 MR. METTS: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Durant?

1 MR. DURANT: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

3 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

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

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you, public. Thank you,  
10 Commissioners. That goes as a recommendation of approval and County Council will  
11 have the meeting the fourth Tuesday, right?

12 MR. PRICE: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, for the zoning public hearing. Thank you. Okay Staff,  
14 we're gonna move on to our next case.

15 **CASE NO. 23-025 MA:**

16 MR. PRICE: Alright, next item is Case 23-025 MA. The Applicant is Austin Watts.  
17 The Applicant is requesting to rezone 2.6 acres which is comprised of two parcels from  
18 rural which is RU to rural commercial, excuse me, rural commercial, which is RC. This  
19 area is designated as neighborhood low density and the plan recommends commercial  
20 development within a neighborhood activity center and within a contextually appropriate  
21 distance from the intersection of a primary arterial. The subject parcel is not located at a  
22 traffic junction and is not within a contextually appropriate distance of an intersection or  
23 neighborhood activity center which meets the objectives of the Comp Plan. The Plan

1 also discourages strip commercial development or fragmented leapfrog development  
2 patterns along corridors. That's read as the Comp Plan currently identifies the  
3 objectives for neighborhood low density. However, it's for those reasons Staff  
4 recommends disapproval. But I want to point out that, you know, looking at the Comp  
5 Plan that the request may not result in strip commercial or fragmented leapfrog  
6 development due to the approvals of the previous map amendments, and you can see  
7 that under your zoning history. So there've been a number of parcels there that have  
8 been approved, you can see it kinda in the pink, east of the subject site, to  
9 neighborhood commercial that have gone against the Comprehensive Plan. However,  
10 without the updating of the Comprehensive Plan for this area the Staff's  
11 recommendations will continue to be for disapproval. Another thing to point out and this  
12 goes back to the case we just had earlier today, you know, looking at the designation  
13 when we talk about neighborhood low density and the type of uses that fit within there,  
14 they're looking for neighborhood scale commercial development within this. So that's  
15 something that you typically will find more in the NC zoning designation versus the rural  
16 commercial cause I think as we stated during I think your first case that you heard this  
17 evening, afternoon, it's been a long day here, that we feel that the rural commercial is a  
18 little more intensive, also allows for larger scaled type developments that you might  
19 necessarily find, based on a neighborhood commercial type scale uses. I think at the  
20 request of Commissioner Grady I actually kinda read a kinda comparison of the rural  
21 commercial versus the neighborhood commercial so you can see that there are a  
22 number of uses that are a little more impactful found in the rural commercial than  
23 neighborhood commercial designation. So with that being said this is kinda like, you

1 could almost argue opposite of the previous case that you heard in the beginning. I hate  
2 to kinda go back to another case but it's the opposite. In this particular case based on  
3 the designation, location and the previous zoning requests that have taken place, I just  
4 feel that the rural commercial request is not appropriate and so again, for those reasons  
5 we recommend disapproval.

6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Do we have any questions before we ask  
7 people to speak trying to understand this? I understand it as a smaller parcel but could  
8 have more uses. That's the opposite of what we looked at with our first case?

9 MR. PRICE: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thanks. Okay, Commissioner Siercks, who is signed  
11 up to speak?

12 MR. SIERCKS: The person listed as the Applicant on the form is John Kelly  
13 Ashley?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Please remember to state your name and address, thank  
15 you.

16 **TESTIMONY OF JOHN KELLY ASHLEY:**

17 MR. ASHLEY: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. My name is John Kelly Ashley. I'm  
18 with Kenley Horn & Associates, engineering consulting firm. We're located 200 South  
19 Tryon, Charlotte, North Carolina. Thank you for the Planning Commission and Planning  
20 Staff for the time allocated to this Map Amendment. As Planning Staff has stated the  
21 objective would be to combine the two parcels in question and to zone from residential,  
22 or from rural to rural commercial. The combined parcel would be 2.6 acres. The main  
23 point of the Applicant would be that the Council has previously kind of established a

1 precedent and the history for map amendments in this area as you can see in the yellow  
2 that shown on the screen from rural to commercial. Right across Three Dog Road is a  
3 general commercial zoning which would be an even more, would allow for even more  
4 general uses than the rural commercial zoning that we're applying for. And that is in the  
5 five stated cases in Staff Report to being in the, that's listed under the heading of zoning  
6 history for the general area. Two of those were previously zoned rural and now are  
7 zoned general commercial and the other three were previously zoned as rural and now  
8 rezoned to neighborhood commercial. As far as the overall site, it's bounded by three,  
9 or excuse me, four different uses; one in Staff Report is general commercial as  
10 previously mentioned across Three Dog Road, to the east is neighborhood commercial  
11 and to the north is railroad right-of-way.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You have 30 seconds to wrap up if you have any other final  
13 thoughts since you're our applicant.

14 MR. ASHLEY: That basically concludes the point that I was gonna make, thank  
15 you.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Okay Commissioner Siercks, anyone else  
17 signed up to speak?

18 MR. SIERCKS: Yes. The next person who signed up to speak is Kim Murphy.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Kim Murphy, come on down. We're gonna need your  
20 address again.

21 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

22 MS. MURPHY: Thank you. Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel Lane. I am just trying to  
23 make sure you have the right information and I know Staff is very busy, they've got a lot

1 going on but I think it's important that you have the right information. In this case I  
2 support Staff's recommendation to disapprove, not only do I agree with their rationale  
3 but the traffic is horrendous on Highway 76 which is operating a level of service D. Lake  
4 Murray Elementary is a couple blocks away at this intersection on Three Dog Road but  
5 until there are adequate road improvements causing more traffic congestion with curb  
6 cuts right at this intersection will create a more dangerous situation. Just because there  
7 are past rezonings that took place and were approved that are similar to what the  
8 developer wants doesn't mean it's okay to use that as the sole reason. Interstate 26  
9 improvements when complete will ease traffic on Highway 76 but not cure it. The  
10 additional traffic will be put on Highway 76 from the numerous subdivisions in Lexington  
11 County just up 76 to the north in Chapin that are either under construction or that made  
12 it into the pipeline before Lexington County Council downzoned large tracts of land and  
13 added the Lake Murray overlay on the Lexington County portion of the lake. But the, this  
14 will only compound the traffic issues that we have here. Please consider the Staff's  
15 recommendation.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

17 MR. SIERCKS: And the next person signed up to speak is Terry Rowell.

18 MS. ROWELL: I'm sorry, I must've put my name on the wrong thing.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, no worries.

20 MS. ROWELL: I'm good.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

22 MR. SIERCKS: Okay, we have no one else signed up to speak on Case No. 23-  
23 025 MA.



1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. Commissioners, this is  
2 now open on the floor for discussion or questions of Staff. Also up for any motions.

3 MR. METTS: Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Metts.

5 MR. METTS: I've got a question for Staff. Mr. Price, when you have the parcel  
6 that is to the west of this general commercial and you're going across the street and you  
7 have neighborhood commercial around it and in-between is this, is that leapfrogging  
8 from going across the street right there? [Inaudible] general commercial to the west, on  
9 that south or is that, yeah the southwest corner?

10 MR. PRICE: I think, I don't know if you would necessarily call it leapfrogging  
11 now, especially when you look at the other tracts of land that have been rezoned in that  
12 area. Again, during the, you know, if you go back to the previous Staff Reports for those  
13 other parcels basically it's very similar language, we consider it to be leapfrogging but  
14 again, because the Comprehensive Plan has not been changed and we basically go by  
15 what the Comprehensive Plan states for that area, the main reason, well one of the  
16 main reasons for a recommendation for disapproval; that parcel on the western portion  
17 of it that's zoned general commercial, I believe the records show that was done in '06,  
18 so of course, that would have been done prior to the adoption of the 2015  
19 Comprehensive Plan. So I'm not sure exactly what the Comprehensive Plan that was in  
20 place during that time would've, you know, would've recommended for that location.  
21 Also might've been a different approach to rezonings back in '06.

22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Does that answer your question?

23 MR. METTS: Yes. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So what I see from the map and our packet is as  
2 undeveloped GC sitting right there. So it could be developed and no one would have to  
3 come before us.

4 MR. PRICE: That is correct.

5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. I'm up for further discussion or any motions.

6 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant?

8 MR. DURANT: I move that we forward project 23-025 MA to County Council for a  
9 recommendation of disapproval.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Do we have a second?

11 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

13 MR. SIERCKS: I second that motion.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Second from Commissioner Siercks. With that,  
15 Staff go ahead and take a vote?

16 MR. PRICE: Alright, we have a recommendation of disapproval for Case 23-025  
17 MA. So a yes vote would be for the disapproval. Those in favor, Durant?

18 MR. DURANT: Yes.

19 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

20 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Grady?

22 MR. GRADY: No.

23 MR. PRICE: Metts?

1 MR. METTS: No.

2 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm gonna go yes.

4 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes. This will be forwarded to County Council  
5 with a recommendation of disapproval.

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

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'd like to share my feelings as Chair since it kinda fell on  
9 me there. Can you pull the map again? I looked at the zoning history and I started  
10 hearing 2019, so I remember the 2019 rezoning of that but it appeared like it was in the  
11 back, like to the parcels that were already changed. I don't know if I was here in 2018 if I  
12 would've had that same thought process. So. Thank you. Again, this is just gonna be a  
13 recommendation that goes to County Council. They're gonna have their meeting on the  
14 fourth Tuesday so come on out later this month. Staff, can we go ahead and go to our  
15 last case I believe?

16 **CASE NO. 23-026 MA:**

17 MR. PRICE: Last item is Case 23-026 MA. The Applicant is Tony Lawton. The  
18 Applicant is requesting to rezone 1.14 acres along, at 113 Sease Road from rural, RU to  
19 general commercial, GC. This, I'm sorry we don't have it in our zoning history, but this  
20 parcel did appear before the Planning Commission previously. So it did appear before  
21 you previously and it was disapproved at the County Council level. So again, principally  
22 Staff recommends disapproval of this Map Amendment as it would not be consistent  
23 with the general objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan for a neighborhood

1 medium density designation. However, the proposed zoning would be in character with  
2 the adjacently zoned GC district parcels. So I did wanna make sure I point something  
3 out to you, so I'll wait till Mr. DeLage gets this up. So if you take a look on, if your look in  
4 your booklet while he's pulling this up, but on page 78 you'll take note that there's some,  
5 there are three parcels and they're more of a purple which essentially those actually  
6 should be red. But they both stand for general commercial, somewhere in our mapping  
7 system it was still designated as C3 which actually became GC, so when this was being  
8 compiled it just came up under the color purple but they both are, the red and the purple  
9 both stand for general commercial designations.

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Price, you said in the zoning history the Planning  
11 Commission voted this down in the past? Was it for this same designation?

12 MR. PRICE: No, I didn't say it was the Planning Commission, it was County  
13 Council.

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: County Council voted it down?

15 MR. PRICE: But I don't have that history, I apologize.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Was it rural to general commercial?

17 MR. PRICE: Yes, same request. You have to wait a year to come back in.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So this was a year ago so not too far.

19 MR. PRICE: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Siercks, anyone signed  
21 up to speak?

22 MR. SIERCKS: The Applicant is here, Tony Lawton.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay.

1 **TESTIMONY OF TONY LAWTON:**

2 MR. LAWTON: Thank you Mr. Commissioner and Commissioners as well as  
3 Staff. My name is Tony Lawton, 158 Bell Valley Lane, Columbia, South Carolina. I'm  
4 representing the owners of 113 Sease Road. As Mr. Price mentioned, yes I came  
5 before you a year ago where you guys approved it going from RU to GC. The property  
6 in the front of it is currently C3. The property to the right and to the left is GC or C3. This  
7 went before City [sic] Council for the simple fact that there was a miscommunication  
8 between Councilman Malinowski and myself of which I've had some documentation as  
9 it relates to the miscommunication of whether or not I spoke with him in reference to this  
10 particular property of which I did. Since then once it was approved to go before them we  
11 have since spent numerous dollars on the architectural plans, surveys, things of that  
12 nature. This is an economic development project of which trying to bring the family  
13 business back to the area. I have since then spoken with Mr., Councilman Branham  
14 who was the chairperson at the time who recommended approval of this to share even  
15 more of the project and what it is that we're doing to move forward. So I'm just asking  
16 that you guys approve this once again so that we could bring that family business back  
17 to the community. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir. Commissioner Siercks, anyone else signed  
19 up to speak?

20 MR. SIERCKS: Kim Murphy.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: One more time, come on down Mr. Murphy.

22 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

1 MS. MURPHY: Kim Murphy, 154 Old Laurel Lane. Yes, this was put in front of  
2 the Planning Commission and County Council denied it and it wasn't just because of a  
3 miscommunication thing. Mr. Malinowski said that it is because it was on a dirt road,  
4 and if you pull up your map you'll see that it actually is a dirt road that crosses a railroad  
5 track into Friarsgate. Potentially this paving of this road with county tax dollars which  
6 would be needed, I mean, they need to have a dirt [sic] road in order to develop this.  
7 They can put housing units up there, I think is it 16 maybe per acre that we'd be using  
8 taxpayer dollars to fund this for a developer. It's unfortunate that you didn't have that  
9 history in your packet since it was fairly recent, but the – tomorrow night is the public  
10 hearing for the road ordinance that's gonna be removing the 25% threshold that would  
11 allow property owners on the road to object to the road paving. We're hoping it's not  
12 gonna pass. The 25% of the owners do not want the road paved but if this goes on, if  
13 you approve this on a dirt road and that 25% passes, that means you're gonna be  
14 opening up the area into Friarsgate for more development and this paving is gonna be  
15 done with taxpayer dollars. I'm very much opposed to this and anyhow it's on a dirt  
16 road. You can't develop on a dirt road. You won't be able to do that. If they put in high  
17 density housing, one of the Councilmembers, Livingston, said that that's an extremely  
18 busy area right there, that it would be dangerous and that was one of the reasons he  
19 was opposed to it. Thank you very much.

20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Ms. Murphy. And if you caught me looking  
21 down there, I'm trying to pull up the street view. Staff, can you pull up street view in this  
22 app or Google? I wanna see that intersection there where it turns into a dirt road. That's  
23 the same picture I saw, you zoom in there's, like a big van coming down this street or a

1 bus. The image says May 2023 and it's got the notice sign up, is that for this? Oh, that's  
2 another one. We need to clean those up. Okay. I'll open this up to the Commission for  
3 discussion and motion. Question for Staff, just looking at the map is that a different  
4 owner across the street? You see all the cars?

5 MR. DELAGE: At least from the assessor's database it appears to be different  
6 owners.

7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So there is a business operating at the end of that dirt road.

8 MR. DELAGE: I don't know if I'd call it that without doing the research, but it  
9 could just be –

10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, or that residence owns a lotta cars.

11 MR. DELAGE: Could be.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: But the only access to this area is down Sease Road,  
13 which is dirt road. Is this a county maintained road?

14 MR. DELAGE: It's not showing up as road maintenance authority when I click on  
15 it. I'd have to do a little bit more digging because typically when you don't see a parcel  
16 line here where you can't click on it and highlight it that there's some kind of right-of-way  
17 associated with it. Even down here it looks like there's some that terminates where the  
18 railroad is.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any discussion Commissioners or a motion? I'm reading  
20 the Staff's conclusion again, they recommend disapproval but they also say however  
21 that the proposed zoning would be in character with the adjacent zoned general  
22 commercial parcels.

23 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair?

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant.

2 MR. DURANT: Question for Staff just for clarification. The parcels that are  
3 colored purple which is C3, I think you said that's essentially general commercial?

4 MR. PRICE: Yes. Okay, those parcels are actually zoned GC but when we, I  
5 can't remember when we did it but when we converted to more of a digital map you'll  
6 find a couple of parcels may have been lost during, when they were translating from the  
7 previous zoning to the current zoning. But again, C3 and GC are basically the same  
8 zoning designation. So we're making those necessary corrections so that parcel is,  
9 those three that you see in purple that are C3 are actually GC and we'll just make those  
10 changes probably by the time this gets to the zoning public hearing. We just became  
11 aware of it.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other thoughts, comments from my fellow  
13 Commissioners? I see this block as all GC per the zoning, but still undeveloped in a  
14 lotta ways. Staff, we had a training last year offsite, might've been last year or the year  
15 before, it talked about developers when they develop they do need to make their own  
16 driveways, entryways in and out. I'm unaware of this paving dirt road situation so I'm  
17 just trying to go off of what I know and what you guys have trained us with. If they were  
18 to develop they would be doing driveways in and out per DOT? Does this sound familiar  
19 at all? Like DOT standards, access roads to it?

20 MR. PRICE: Alright, so what you have before you is the actual, a rezoning  
21 request, you know, here's a parcel, we would like to change the zoning to allow certain  
22 uses on that parcel and all of the development standards that go along with developing  
23 that parcel. However, any parcel that comes before Staff to actually develop the site is



1 required to submit plans and part of the plans is that we will also review access. So if  
2 there are gonna be necessary improvements to the road that would be required. If,  
3 they'll have to give us, you know, some cases where they have to dedicate part of the  
4 parcel to help bring the road into compliance, that is a case. If the road is not sufficient  
5 to handle traffic both ways and thus pose a hazard that is something they would have to  
6 address before they would get approval to develop the site. So there are other things  
7 that we'll be looking at. You know, what you have before you I guess you can look and  
8 make a decision on whether the site can be developed, you know, that's something, you  
9 know, again the zoning doesn't necessarily mean it can be developed or it will be  
10 developed, it's just that is the zoning appropriate at that location is what you have  
11 before you. Just looking at that picture there are some things that would need to be  
12 addressed, especially you're talking about the ingress/egress from that site. Anything  
13 else that may have been there is either nonconforming, I think you were looking at some  
14 of the other parcels in the area, either nonconforming or it could be illegal. We would  
15 have to take a look into this and make that determination.

16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, thoughts, motions?

17 MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

19 MR. SIERCKS: Just briefly on this one, you know, I understand the, the, what is it  
20 the four parcels that are either near or adjacent to this parcel are GC, but that to me  
21 standing on its own is not enough to make a recommendation for approval if it doesn't fit  
22 within the, or if it would be inconsistent with the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

23 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Siercks. Is this a motion?

1 MR. SIERCKS: If there's no other comments I'd make a motion but I yield any  
2 time for any other comments.

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. My thought with this one is a year ago this was  
4 here before me and we, Planning Commission voted approval. If none of my fellow  
5 colleagues are gonna make a motion I'm just gonna be consistent with my motion from  
6 a year ago and I'll, I make a motion to approve.

7 MR. GRADY: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Got a second from Commissioner Grady. With that let's  
9 take a vote. Staff, please?

10 MR. PRICE: Get my notes right. Alright, so the motion is for approval of Case  
11 23-026 MA. The rezoning request is from rural to general commercial. I guess prior to  
12 us taking the vote you're gonna state your reason for going against Staff's  
13 recommendation?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, I'll state my reasoning is based off of prior decision  
15 when I was on the Commission as well as Staff's however since the proposed zoning  
16 would be in character with the adjacent general commercial district. Looking at this map  
17 in front of us which parcel doesn't look like the others, you're saying the purple is  
18 supposed to be red, so it would be in character with the surrounding parcels as the Staff  
19 is stating.

20 MR. PRICE: Correct. Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Take the vote, please?

22 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor and the motion is for approval of this case so  
23 a yes is for approval, those in favor, Siercks?

1 MR. SIERCKS: No.

2 MR. PRICE: Metts?

3 MR. SIERCKS: Yes.

4 MR. PRICE: Durant?

5 MR. DURANT: Yes.

6 MR. PRICE: Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Yes.

8 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes.

10 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

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

13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: This goes as our recommendation to County Council. It  
14 will be the fourth Tuesday of the month of July which you're familiar with it seems.  
15 Alright, thank you. That was case number 8 which wraps up Item 5. We now move on to  
16 number 6, Chairman's Report. I just wanna add my gratitude to my peers who are here  
17 with us today. I miss those that couldn't make it. So thanks again to my fellow  
18 Commissioners for all their time and effort they invest each month in this Commission.  
19 Staff received our available dates for offsite training and will brief us in the Planning  
20 Director's Report. We can move on to our Planning Director's Report, number 7.

21 MR. PRICE: Okay. The Planning Director's Report if you look under Report of  
22 Council you can see the actions that Council took at their last zoning public hearing  
23 meeting as it relates to some of the cases that you previously heard. And as you can

1 see there are a number of cases that were deferred cause Council had a number of  
2 community meetings to discuss it further with their constituents. So you will see a lot  
3 more cases, you know, most likely with the next Report of Council. As the PC  
4 orientation and training, looking at the dates that you have and we're still trying to  
5 secure speakers for the training, but we're looking at August, I think I had the dates  
6 August 10<sup>th</sup> and the 11<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup>, it'll be one of those three days but we hope to let  
7 you know quickly when that will be. But we, you know, we just wanted to make sure that  
8 we could secure the speakers for that training.

9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Anything else for the Planning Director's Report?

10 MR. PRICE: I would wanna point out one thing, and I do this real quickly. You  
11 know, I was looking at, you know, a couple of the cases you had, especially the last  
12 one, you know, you had a little more discussion on it in your vote. You know, I think you,  
13 sometimes we kind of have to look at the, I know y'all do a lot of consent agenda which  
14 I'm not against, but you remember sometimes when you do the consent because they  
15 went along with the Staff Report and also nobody showed up. But sometimes that can  
16 leave out some discussion that may be relevant for the case coming back or other  
17 parcels in that general area. So just something to kinda think about, you know, when  
18 you're doing your consent agenda.

19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: So for today we just had the two on the consent agenda.

20 MR. PRICE: Right. You know, but something like that probably, it makes sense,  
21 it's clear. But I mean, you know, any time you start looking at other designations, you  
22 know, especially commercial in nature you should, you know, I'm not saying you  
23 shouldn't have a consent agenda but I'm just saying sometimes things can change in an

1 area that you may want to be able to kinda refer back to previous decisions, especially if  
2 it's denied at a Council level and it comes back in a year or two when you're still here on  
3 the Planning Commission.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I think this would be a good topic for our training to talk  
5 about the consent agenda and how useful it is and like what you're saying there.

6 MR. PRICE: Yes. I will tell you that even from a Staff, if there's something that we  
7 think that is worthy of a discussion and y'all are looking to put it on the consent agenda,  
8 we will kind of state, make a request that you not put it on consent because we feel that  
9 the topic is worthy of discussing. That is it for us. Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Matthew Smith has  
10 something quickly to give each one of you.

11 MR. SMITH: So the handout that you guys got is just a brief breakdown of  
12 literature preparing your mind and your time to the Comprehensive Plan that is to come.  
13 Last time we did it was in March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2015, that's when it was adopted. It takes about  
14 18 months for this process to go through. We are at the cusp of that 18 months so we  
15 need to go ahead and take movements towards this new Comprehensive Plan, planning  
16 to plan whether it's getting our budget together, our timeline. The literature I've given  
17 you just is kind of a quick breakdown of how things have done and been in the past and  
18 for you guys just to start getting your ducks in a row for that situation.

19 MR. DURANT: I think he's saying time to start planning to plan for the  
20 Comprehensive Plan.

21 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Absolutely.

22 MR. SMITH: I know it's kind of redundant but if you read the literature in itself, the  
23 worst thing you can do is just step right into this without knowing what you're doing. A

1 lotta times you will jump into a project and you won't read the instructions. So what I'm  
2 trying to say is read the instructions before we begin this process because it takes some  
3 time and it takes some real planning to do it. It's a lot, it involves housing, economics,  
4 you know, there's 10 elements between existing conditions, cultural resources,  
5 community facilities, you know, transportation, priority investment, land use, the list  
6 goes on and on and you can just see we barely touch base with it here with just land  
7 use. And as a Planning Commission you must establish and maintain the planning  
8 process that results in the systematic preparation, continuing evaluation and updating of  
9 the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission must use this process for each  
10 Comprehensive Plan element as our *South Carolina Code* 6-29510(a).

11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. So it sounds like this is our legal tasking. Okay.  
12 I'm just thinking that I've been working on the Land Development Code since 2019 and  
13 you said it's gonna take 18 months. Well that took longer than 18 months, so you know,  
14 let's plan to plan and plan some time. Can we talk about this during our training  
15 orientation, how we get started on the right foot with this? We could plan our  
16 Commission meetings on having time at the end of each meeting to work on this. We  
17 could plan ahead for workshop sessions that would work best for our time so we come  
18 on this the right way and serve our County cause that's what we're up here for.

19 MR. SMITH: Yeah, our goal is to have a speaker at the training that has done a  
20 Comprehensive Plan very recently because there will be an added element that no one  
21 has done which is the resiliency element and so that'll be a new element that we'll have  
22 to deal with on the fly.

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I'm looking at the Planning Commission agenda and I  
2 thought we were in the 29201 zip code.

3 MR. SMITH: I keep telling these guys to change it.

4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Just FYI. Thank you. I don't know, my eyes went blurry  
5 after a while. Okay, so can we move on to number 8, is the Chairman Report complete?

6 MR. PRICE: Yes. The Director's Report is complete, yes sir. The Planning  
7 Director's Report is complete.

8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Fellow Commissioners, number 8, any other items up for  
9 discussion? Alright. Again thank you. If there's nothing else to talk about then the Chair  
10 makes a motion for adjournment, do I have a second?

11 MR. METTS: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Mr. Price, please take a roll with a show of hands.

13 MR. PRICE: Alright, those in favor, Yonke?

14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Metts?

16 MR. METTS: Aye.

17 MR. PRICE: Durant?

18 MR. DURANT: Aye.

19 MR. PRICE: Siercks?

20 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Grady?

22 MR. GRADY: Aye.

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

3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We are dismissed. Thank you everyone.

4

5

*[Meeting adjourned]*