

1 **RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **September 8, 2014**
3

4 *[Members Present: Heather Cairns, David Tuttle, Patrick Palmer, Stephen Gilchrist,*
5 *Christopher Anderson, Wallace Brown, Sr. (in at 1:03); Absent: Beverly Frierson,*
6 *Marilynn Joyner, Bill Theus]*

7 Called to order: 1:00 pm
8

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, we'll call the September meeting of the Richland
10 County Planning to order. Please allow me to read this into the Record. In accordance
11 with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio and TV
12 stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, as well as posted on the bulletin
13 board located in the lobby of the County Administration building. Did everybody get the
14 July Minutes?

15 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we approve the Minutes
16 as submitted.

17 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any Agenda amendments?

23 MR. HEGLER: No, sir.

24 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we have a motion?

25 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move we accept the Agenda as submitted.

26 MR. GILCHRIST: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, we have a motion and a second. All those in favor
2 say aye.

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

5 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we approve the Road Names
6 as submitted in the package. [Road names not provided]

7 MR. GILCHRIST: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: A motion and a second. All those in favor say aye.
9 *[Approved: Cairns, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson; Absent for vote: Brown; Absent:*
10 *Frierson, Joyner, Theus]*

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, first case. Case No. 14-20 MA.

12 **CASE NO. 14-20 MA:**

13 MR. LEGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everyone. This first
14 case, the Applicant is Mr. Craig and Ms. Martha Addy. The property is located in the
15 frontage on Wise Road, just off of Bickley Road up near Ballentine Elementary School.
16 The property's just a little over an acre in size, it's currently zoned RU, our Rural
17 Residential District, and the Applicant has requested RS-MD, which is Residential
18 Single-Family, Medium Density District. The RU District, current zoning is the original
19 zoning from 1977. The properties in the vicinity, mostly zoned RU [inaudible]. We've got
20 some vacant property, remaining forested and/or a trucking company to the northwest
21 there at the intersection of Gates Road –

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He needs to speak up.

23 MR. LEGER: - and Wise Road.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear him.

2 MR. LEGER: To the south there's property zoned M-1, which is the Ballentine
3 Soccer complex park which is our Light Industrial District. To the east we've got
4 property zoned RS-MD, which is the Medium Density Residential District, it is
5 undeveloped. And directly to the west the property is undeveloped and zoned RU as
6 well. The subject property is small in size and it's currently undeveloped, it's mostly
7 heavily wooded. I believe there's a utility easement running through the center of it. The
8 majority of the area is really either undeveloped or residential, and some of the
9 properties along Bickley Road have other zoning districts applied to them. You do have
10 the park and the elementary school nearby. The Comprehensive Plan recommends
11 priority investment for this area, which calls for a little higher density, between 4 and 16
12 units an acre. The Staff felt like the application met the intent of the Comprehensive
13 Plan and for that reason we felt like it was in compliance. Based on the zoning districts
14 in the area and the uses nearby and the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan,
15 the Staff recommended approval of the rezone at this time.

16 *[Brown in at 1:03]*

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Craig or Martha Addy? Are they
18 available, the Applicants for this case? Okay. Patricia Neese? If you would, when I call
19 your name if you'd come down to the podium and give us your name and address for
20 the Record. And we try to limit the comments to two minutes if, if you can.

21 **TESTIMONY OF PATRICIA NEESE:**

22 MS. NEESE: I wasn't going to speak but I feel like someone should be here to let
23 you know that this causes upheaval and pain, so, and forever will change our beautiful

1 little area. So, but I want to start is by saying, I'm Patricia Neese, I live on Brighton
2 Road, nice street, it's attached to Wise Road. And it's two and a half blocks long. When
3 the Mungo's built their subdivision a block over, we went along with that and approved
4 it. We had fought other ideas for our land, like a cement plant that was going to be built
5 475 yards across the street from me. But what I want to say is this, and I know this is
6 not sensible or professional, I've lived out there ever since I was a young person, my
7 family has been out there. We were active, we were in the Ballentine Civic Association,
8 we've done everything to be good citizens. And it's like a giant foot can come out of the
9 sky and stomp us into oblivion and we can't do anything about it. I know that all of this
10 has already been decided, but I want to just tell you one other thing. Mr. Wise, the road
11 was named after him, he was our Ballentine policeman, he was a wonderful man and
12 everybody loved him. And there was a little lady down the street on Bickley Road who
13 started bringing his food to him, and when he died, instead of leaving the land to his
14 relatives, he left his land to that little lady. Her children were the beneficiary of that
15 because she died shortly afterwards, but it was such a heart rendering, touching thing
16 along the way. And now we're going to have dense housing in that area. And I think Mr.
17 Wise would, he would be so upset because he loved his land. So, I, I just want you to
18 know that and I want you to know that my neighbors are young people who have to
19 work and they can't be here. The other thing I want to say is, I'm from Eau Claire, why
20 can't y'all build an Eau Claire, why can't you build on Broad River Road, dense housing
21 in a parking lot. That area is rotting and it needs help.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. That's all we've got signed up to speak on the
23 case. Any thoughts? Any motions?

1 MR. TUTTLE: I just wanna make – can I ask a quick question, cause I just wanna
2 make sure I’m looking at the map correctly. The, the parcel directly adjacent is a similar
3 zoning as the request?

4 MS. HEGLER: That’s correct.

5 MR. TUTTLE: Okay, thank you. Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we send
6 Case, what are we on here, 14-20 MA forward to Council with a recommendation for
7 approval.

8 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. I’m gonna hand this over to Mr. Gilchrist now. I’ve
14 gotta recuse myself from this case.

15 MS. HEGLER: Mr. Gilchrist, before you proceed can we alert the speaker to the
16 fact that this is just a recommendation to the final -

17 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes.

18 MS. HEGLER: - to the prior case.

19 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, this is a recommendation to Council. We’re
20 a recommending Body to Council. The public hearing will take place –

21 MS. HEGLER: The 23rd.

22 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: - yes, so you’re welcome to come at that time.
23 Thank you. Okay, next case. Before we go into this next case, “Dear Mr. Gilchrist, I

1 must request to be excused from participating in discussions or voting on Agenda Item
2 #14-21 MA, which is scheduled for review and/or discussion at today's Planning
3 Commission meeting. It is my understanding of the Rules of Conduct, provisions of the
4 ethics, government accountability and campaign reform laws, that since I represent the
5 landowner I will be unable to participate in this matter through discussions or voting. I
6 would therefore respectfully request that you indicate for the Record that I did not
7 participate in any discussions or vote relating to this item representing a potential
8 conflict of interest. I would further request that you allow this and direct this letter to be
9 printed as part of the official Minutes and excuse me from such votes or deliberations,
10 and not such in the Minutes. Thank you for your consideration. Mr. Patrick Palmer.”

11 Thank you. Okay, next case, Case No. 14-21 MA

12 **CASE NO. 14-21 MA:**

13 MR. LEGER: Thank you, Mr. Gilchrist. The Applicant is Mr. Patrick Palmer. The
14 property is located at the intersection of Killian Road and Wilson Boulevard. It's almost
15 three acres in size, it's currently zoned RU, which is our Rural Residential District. The
16 Applicant is requesting the RC, which is our Rural Commercial District. The subject, well
17 the application is made up of, of two parcels; one actually on the intersection, and one
18 adjacent to it. The original zoning is RU from 1977. Properties in the vicinity are all
19 zoned RU, which is our Rural Residential District, in all directions. And for the most part
20 properties in all directions are residential in nature or undeveloped. Again, the property
21 is made up or two parcels as you can see on the map. Again, one of them has frontage
22 on Killian Road and Wilson Boulevard, the other frontage only on Killian Road. The
23 property has a single-family residential structure on the larger piece and what appeared

1 to be a single-family structure on the smaller piece, although it was hard to tell if the
2 smaller home was occupied or not. The Comprehensive Plan recommends suburban on
3 this parcel where commercial or office activity should be located at traffic junctions. We
4 found that this property is obviously at a traffic junction, intersection of two roads.
5 Because the application meets that intent of the Comprehensive Plan we recommended
6 approval of the application at this time.

7 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you. Are there any questions for
8 Staff? We do have some persons signed up. If you would please when we call your
9 name come and give us your name and your address for the Record we would certainly
10 appreciate that. Ms. Susan and Larry Dunster?

11 **TESTIMONY OF LARRY DUNSTER:**

12 MR. DUNSTER: Yes, sir. Larry A. Dunster, Reverend Larry Dunster. And my wife
13 and I live in Heritage Hills Court at 6 Heritage Hills Court, Columbia, 29203. And I regret
14 that I am not in favor of this because the young man whose family is represented,
15 they're friends of ours and I hope that our friendship continues, but this is my and our
16 feelings about the matter. We do pick up the litter on 1.5 miles of highway so I'm very
17 familiar with this highway from Wilson all the way to the interchange. When the ADTs
18 were looked at in 19, or 2012, they said there were 12,400 or so on Wilson Boulevard.
19 The bottom line is that this has changed dramatically in the last two years. We've been
20 there six years. We have approximately seven or eight new car dealers not too far from
21 the Walmart, they have brought hundreds and thousands of new residents and, or new
22 customers. Also about 4:00 in the afternoon, from 4:00 until approximately 6:30 when
23 folks are coming home, the rush hour, the traffic is backed up at the corner of Killian

1 and Wilson for, sometimes a mile to a mile and a half. Personally my wife and I seek
2 alternative routes to go home because of that. If we go to the Walmart we have to go
3 around. Secondly, in addition to the traffic congestion, etc., when people, if you put a
4 commercial property there and when they exit and if they come out onto Killian, the only
5 way for them to go will be to the right, because to go across the lane of traffic and make
6 a left-hand turn it will be next to impossible with the traffic that we have certain times of
7 the day. Other than that, I wish our neighbor and our friend all the best. I'm just sorry
8 that we are against it and I feel strongly that this is a very bad recommendation to turn it
9 into Rural Commercial. Thank you, sir.

10 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you. Mr. Keith Lomas, the Applicant?

11 **TESTIMONY OF KEITH LOMAS:**

12 MR. LOMAS: I'm Keith Lomas, 1311 Forma Road, Blythewood, South Carolina,
13 and I agree with the recommendation. Larry, just to let you know, DOT has approached
14 us about putting a signal in there, and to widen the lanes, just to let you know. And I can
15 answer any questions.

16 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Applicant to say that DOT is
17 gonna put a stoplight there?

18 MR. LOMAS: Yes.

19 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: That's right.

20 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

21 MR. LOMAS: Yes. And for all the reasons that Larry mentioned is, with all the
22 development going up and down Killian Road is why we don't see it tangible to keep it
23 residential.

1 MR. BROWN: That's a definite, they are going to do that.

2 MR. LOMAS: Yes, sir, I have the paperwork with me.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

4 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any other questions for the Applicant?

5 MS. HEGLER: Mr. Brown, just to, I guess clarify that. That is an intersection
6 improvement project that's part of the penny, the transportation penny sales tax to
7 improve that intersection.

8 MR. BROWN: The reason I asked definitely is because that, I travel that all the
9 time and that is a problem. That's why I'm delighted to hear they're putting a traffic light
10 there.

11 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any additional questions for Staff, the
12 Applicant? Motions?

13 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I'd like to make a recommendation we
14 send Case 14-21 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval.

15 MR. BROWN: Second.

16 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: We have a motion and a second. All in favor
17 please signify by raising your hand. All opposed?

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

20 VICE-CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you. Just as we stated last, this is a
21 recommendation Body to Council and the public hearing will be taking place on
22 September the 23rd if you would like to come back. Thank you. Welcome back, Mr.
23 Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thanks. Alright, next case, Case No. 14-22 MA.

2 **CASE NO. 14-22 MA:**

3 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. The Applicant in this case is Mr., I'm
4 assuming, I apologize for the pronunciation, I'll do my best, Quadir Muwwakkie. The
5 property is located with frontage on Dartmouth Road and Club Road, just off of
6 Monticello Road, north of the city limits of the City of Columbia. The property's about 1/3
7 of an acre in size, zoned RM-HD and RS-HD. The RS, well both of those districts are
8 the original zoning from 1977. The zoning, the land use in the vicinity, to the north we
9 have RM-HD and GC, which is an auto body shop, which is nonconforming and a
10 vacant commercial structure of Dartmouth and Monticello. To the south we have
11 undeveloped lot, as well as residential subdivision. To the east we have a school and a
12 church type facility. And to the west it's vacant property, immediately to the west vacant
13 property and residential structures. The two properties are relatively small in size, both
14 are currently unoccupied, very little slope, very hard to distinguish from some of the
15 adjoining properties, but again are unoccupied at the moment. The Comprehensive
16 Plan recommends urban use for this property where commercial and office should be
17 located at traffic junctions or along arterial roads or whether other commercial uses are
18 located and should not encroach into residential areas. The Staff felt like these two sites
19 were not in keeping with those recommendations as the property is really not at a traffic
20 junction or located along an arterial, although they are located adjacent to commercial
21 properties along Monticello Road. Basically for those reasons the property's not on a
22 major arterial or located at a traffic junction, and will encroach on a residential area the
23 Staff recommended disapproval of the rezoning at this time.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Any questions for Staff? I've got the Applicant as
2 Maseed Osolam?

3 **TESTIMONY OF OMAR SHAHID:**

4 MR. SHAHID: Yes, good afternoon. My name is Omar Shahid. I'm the, the
5 [inaudible] at the location at 5119 Monticello Road. We have been there for many years.
6 When we first went into that area back in 1979, '79, it was a club and the area was
7 heavily blighted, very depressed area. Since we have been there we have sought to try
8 to help clean up the area. We've been there since '79. And we're proposing to build
9 some facilities that would accommodate our religious activities and also be a source of
10 income, provide some income for us. It's already GC, the property's already General
11 Commercial, and the two areas that we was trying to get GC so we could have a little
12 parking in the rear because we would like to put up a business plaza. That, that is
13 already connected to the property that we're trying to get zoned. I have my, I know I had
14 my two minutes but I have my notes. The two pieces of property that we were talking
15 about, what is, it's R09309(?) and R09309, yes, R09309. Are we showing that up here?
16 Okay. I'm having a little trouble. With what, now? Yeah, so those pieces of property,
17 everything else in that really belongs to us, in that area, except for one piece that's
18 there, so encroaching upon the neighborhood, we're not trying to go in there with any
19 business, we just want it for a parking area. So really not, it's really adjacent to what we
20 already have. So what was the, you said disapproval at this time?

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir, that, the Staff has recommended to not approve
22 the zoning request.

1 MR. SHAHID: Okay, so our strategy from this point would be to what? Because
2 the Staff had, who is the Staff?

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: This is the Staff, and then we'll –

4 MR. SHAHID: This the Staff right here?

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right, and then we're a recommending Body to County
6 Council so we'll deliberate, see what the thoughts are and we'll make a
7 recommendation to County Council as to which way they should proceed. And
8 ultimately the decision is up to them.

9 MR. SHAHID: Oh.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: As to what happens.

11 MR. SHAHID: So from this point on we just have to wait until we hear from you?

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, let's see what we do and then we'll make a
13 recommendation to County Council, and then they will see this at the end of the month.

14 MR. SHAHID: Okay. Alright, thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir. There's one more name on here and I'm sure I'll
16 butcher it, Zacua Orr? Okay. Is there anyone else who wants to speak on this case
17 that's here? Alright, that's all we've got signed up to speak. Any deliberation?

18 MR. TUTTLE: I have a question for Staff. Is, the combined acreage of the two
19 parcels is .31?

20 MR. DELAGE: Correct.

21 MR. LEGER: They're both very small.

22 MR. ANDERSON: It, it, I mean, with the buffering that's required how, I mean, is
23 that even gonna fit? Like, for a parking lot? If it's residential behind it?

1 MS. CAIRNS: Probably would become the buffer for the parking lot on existing
2 land.

3 MR. ANDERSON: Right.

4 MS. CAIRNS: Is what it would become.

5 MR. ANDERSON: But would it need to be rezoned if it was just the buffer?

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think what he's asking, Geo, is if they're buying these
7 parcels –

8 MS. CAIRNS: Well, it sounds like they already own them. He said they own
9 them.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - or own them, and they're wanting to make a parking lot
11 out of it, is it necessary to rezone to General Commercial for parking?

12 MR. PRICE: This was zoned for a parking spot, a parking lot for a business it has
13 to have a commercial zoning, or industrial.

14 MS. CAIRNS: But basically it's gonna become the buffer, right?

15 MR. PRICE: They will have to also install a buffer along that parcel also.

16 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, in essence if you look at it right now I think if they did a
17 buffer it would encroach into the General Commercial property?

18 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, no I mean, I – yeah.

19 MR. TUTTLE: Right, so I mean, right.

20 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, it seems like the lots, I mean, those two lots by themselves
21 aren't anything until they get combined to something.

22 MR. TUTTLE: Staff, what – do you know the width of the frontage on Club Road
23 and the other road, I guess it's Dartmouth, are those –

1 MS. HEGLER: I think there is a plat in here, one second.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I, I don't know. What I'm looking at – I don't think so –
3 what I'm looking at here also is although these, these parcels are zoned RM-HD it looks
4 like there's, what, a junkyard on one of them?

5 MS. CAIRNS: I think it was referred to as an auto, nonconforming auto repair
6 shop.

7 MS. HEGLER: It seems to be about 55 to 60', if I can read this correctly.

8 MR. TUTTLE: And what would be the, I'm sorry I don't know this, if those were
9 standalone parcels what would the minimum frontage for a commercial parcel be?

10 MR. PRICE: There is none.

11 MR. TUTTLE: There is none?

12 MR. PRICE: No, sir. You just have to meet the required setbacks and also any
13 required landscaping but there's no minimum lot area.

14 MR. TUTTLE: And the, the buffer distance between General Commercial and
15 RS-HD or RM-HD would be –

16 MR. PRICE: It's gonna be about a 10 foot buffer required between.

17 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir?

19 MR. BROWN: How many residential sites are between Ridgewood Avenue,
20 Monticello Road, Club Road and Dartmouth Avenue?

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, I guess, one, two, three – I guess, what, 16?

22 MR. PRICE: You want existing?

23 MR. BROWN: Yes.

1 MR. PRICE: Structures?

2 MR. BROWN: Yes.

3 [Inaudible discussion]

4 MR. PRICE: Maybe six.

5 MR. BROWN: Six?

6 MR. PRICE: Looks like, maybe about five.

7 MR. BROWN: So all the rest of that is Commercial?

8 MS. HEGLER: It's either that or a vacant lot.

9 MR. BROWN: Or a vacant lot. Okay.

10 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question of Staff. If the Applicant wanted
11 just, an Applicant wanted to combine these parcels would they have to rezone prior to
12 combining?

13 MS. HEGLER: No, it'd just be a split zoning. They still, I mean, it's, it'd still be
14 limited in its use.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And when it's gotta be a Commercial zoning, does it have
16 to be a General Commercial zoning or could it be a less intense Commercial zoning to
17 take advantage of the parking?

18 MR. PRICE: It could be a less intense.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Hmm. Alright, what are the thoughts?

20 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, my reason for my question, I'm trying to look at the
21 impact if in fact this parcel had been rezoned, you can't put a building on it, can you?

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I –

23 MR. BROWN: Is it big enough for a building?

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: A very small one. I mean, if you got 60 foot and you got
2 setbacks, is that 60 foot of frontage on –

3 MS. HEGLER: Um-hum (affirmative).

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - Dartmouth? So the rear's probably –

5 MS. CAIRNS: Half that.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - yeah.

7 MS. HEGLER: And one of those I think, I think on one of the streets there's really
8 only 55.

9 MR. BROWN: So actually the only thing you really can use the parcel for is
10 parking, is that fair?

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That would seem to be a good use for it.

12 MR. BROWN: And then I don't understand how that really encroaches on the
13 residential, that's what I'm trying to –

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right, I understand.

15 MS. HEGLER: It's a General Commercial rezoning.

16 MR. BROWN: Because it's commercial already except for six residential lots.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any –

18 MR. TUTTLE: I'm trying to think how to –

19 MS. CAIRNS: Me too, I mean, it just looks like the whole area – I mean, you
20 know, granted our aerial photographs aren't precision based, but it looks as if the
21 existing commercial building sits very near its own property line. So if anything it would
22 let there be a buffer, cause if that – right now that could become a house and there'd be
23 no buffer. I mean, they'd know that going in, but. It just seems that those two lots don't

1 have any use on their own, their only use, best use is to be combined with something,
2 and we've got somebody asking to combine it. I mean, if it was front, you know, if it was
3 all one lot there wouldn't be the, well it's not on an arterial. It'd be on an arterial if it was
4 combined.

5 MS. HEGLER: Right.

6 MS. CAIRNS: So that's kind of a nullity. Cause it's being combined with a lot that
7 is a frontage lot.

8 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, the property is on Monticello and Club
9 Road and Dartmouth, that stretch there, is that the current property owner that's making
10 this application?

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The owner of the three lots up front, yes. That is the
12 current Commercial site is –

13 MR. BROWN: Okay, and those are already Commercial, am I correct in that?

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Correct.

15 MR. BROWN: Okay. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that we send this
16 proposal to the Council for approval on the basis that the request is basically going to
17 allow the use for a parking area and not large enough, does not necessarily encroach
18 on the residential area.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion, do we have a second?

20 MS. CAIRNS: I'll second.

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

22 All those in favor say aye. Are there any opposed?

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

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Again, we're a recommending Body to Council.
4 They'll see this case again on September the 23rd in these same Chambers. Okay.
5 Case No. 14-23 MA.

6 MS. HEGLER: Before you begin I do believe you have a new map –

7 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah.

8 MS. HEGLER: - for that one. Okay.

9 **CASE NO. 14-23 MA:**

10 MR. LEGER: Alright, the Applicant in this case is Mr. Joe Jackson. The
11 property's located at 2803 Padgett Road. It's one acre in size, it's currently zoned MH,
12 which is our Manufactured Housing District. Mr. Jackson is asking for OI, Office and
13 Institutional. The MH District was original zoning from 1977. In the vicinity we have
14 several properties to the north and the south zoned RU, which is Rural Residential
15 District. To the north is a place of worship, a church. To the south we have residents
16 and manufacturing housing. To the east zoned RM-HD, those manufactured housing as
17 well. And to the west zoned MH, also occupied by manufactured housing. There's
18 plenty of manufacturing housing in the vicinity. The site contains a manufactured home
19 on the front nearer to Padgett Road, and behind the residential structure, the
20 manufactured home is a commercially designed structure which is occupied currently as
21 a child daycare facility. Like I said, most of the area is residential in nature,
22 manufactured homes, single wide's and double wide's. There is a church to the north
23 and the daycare facility on the rear of the subject property. The Comprehensive Plan

1 recommends for suburban use where commercial and office activity should be located
2 at traffic junctions or near other existing commercial. The Staff has found that this site is
3 not along or near or on a traffic junction or on a major arterial, it's surrounded by
4 residential for the most part, and approval of the rezoning would constitute an
5 encroachment into residential area. At this current time because the site, in the opinion
6 of Staff, does not meet the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan the Staff
7 recommends disapproval of the request currently.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, any questions for Staff?

9 MR. TUTTLE: I have a quick question. Is this property serviced by public sewer
10 or septic or?

11 MR. LEGER: Water is provided by the city, sewer, septic tank.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Joe Jackson?

14 **TESTIMONY OF JOE JACKSON:**

15 MR. JACKSON: My name is Joe Jackson, 8 Sleepy Hollow Lane, Hopkins, South
16 Carolina. I own this piece of property and also the church right across the street. This
17 building was built in 1991, we was there for about 23 years running as a daycare, and
18 what we want to do is turn the daycare into a Christian private school. And there will be
19 no change in character in the neighborhood, nothing gonna change, it just gonna be
20 from a daycare to a Christian private school. And just want to make it more conforming
21 by making it legal, because at the time when we did it, we had an exception to policy to
22 put a daycare there and we just wanna change, get the zoning changed where we can

1 do a private school, Christian private school, right across from our church, right across,
2 right across the street from, from that property.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Any questions for Mr. Jackson? That's all we've got
4 signed up.

5 MR. BROWN: One, one question, Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes.

7 MR. BROWN: It is my understanding the church is on Padgett Road?

8 MR. JACKSON: The church is on the corner of Lower Richland and Padgett,
9 Padgett Road. Right on the corner.

10 MR. BROWN: Is that, is it right, is the property that you have in question right
11 behind that property? That, where the church is, this property in question is right behind
12 it?

13 MR. JACKSON: It's in front of it, across the road, across Padgett Road.

14 [Inaudible discussion]

15 MR. PRICE: Mr. Brown, the church is [inaudible].

16 MR. BROWN: Okay, and then the site is right across the street from it. Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, thank you. That's all we've got signed up to
18 speak.

19 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir?

21 MR. BROWN: What it appears to me unless I'm missing something here, is that
22 what the Applicant is doing is seeking an expanded use of the property to include more
23 grades than preschool or what we would call preparatory school, so it's really the same

1 use that the property is being used for now. And so in view of that I move that we send
2 this proposal forward to Council with approval.

3 MR. GILCHRIST: I'll second the motion, Mr. Chairman.

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

5 [Inaudible discussion]

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I would think so. Is that sufficient reason for going against
7 Staff recommendation? I guess, Geo? Because it's an expansion?

8 MR. BROWN: Of the current use.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's, the current use that is there, it's bringing the property
10 into conformity, the, allowing the zoning to – is that what you would need for your -

11 MR. PRICE: Well, I mean, whichever you state we're gonna put it down. Of
12 course, the current use is a daycare.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

14 MR. PRICE: Which changing that to a private school is not necessarily an
15 extension, that's just an opinion.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

17 MR. PRICE: Because that's why they're categorized as two different uses. But,
18 however, we'll go with whatever you state.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Alright. Well, so we got a motion and a second.
20 Any other discussion? All those in favor say aye. Are there any opposed?

21 *[Approved: Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Anderson, Brown; Opposed: Cairns; Absent:*
22 *Frierson, Joyner, Theus]*

23 MS. CAIRNS: Opposed.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Were you opposed, Heather?

2 MS. CAIRNS: Huh?

3 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Were you opposed? You want me to take a –

5 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, I think she got it.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Take a hand vote, if we –

7 MS. CAIRNS: I like throwing my hand up.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, let's – next case, Case No. 14-24 MA.

9 MR. BROWN: You probably need to explain what happens here, Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, we're a recommending Body to County Council,
11 again, so the case will be heard back here in these same Chambers, I believe it's on the
12 23rd of this month. Let me verify that real quick. Yes, the 23rd of this month. So anybody
13 that has an interest in the case, come back, Council will have final say on it. Next case,
14 Case No. 14-24 MA.

15 **CASE NO. 14-24 MA:**

16 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, thank you Mr. Chairman. The Applicant in this case is Ms.
17 Sherry Jaco. The property is located at 1170 Olympia Avenue, not far from Carolina
18 stadium. The property is .2 acres in size, it's currently zoned RM-HD, which is
19 Residential Multi-Family, High Density. Ms. Jaco is asking for NC, which is our
20 Neighborhood Commercial District. The property was originally zoned RG-2 in 1977,
21 which is basically the equivalent of the current multi-family, high density district, which
22 was changed to that district in 2005. In the vicinity, to the north the property is zoned
23 RM-HD and is either residential in nature or some sort of a business selling recyclables

1 or reusable items or something of that nature. The property is nonconforming at this
2 time at that intersection. To the south we have RM-HD, the property brown in color is
3 occupied residentially. To the east we have RS-HD, which is a school, the Olympia
4 Learning Center. And to the west we have RM-HD as well and those are residences
5 also. The property has frontage on Olympia Avenue and Virginia Street, it's a relatively
6 small lot and is occupied residentially, what appears to be a single, two-story single-
7 family residential structure. A little slope on the property, there is some sort of a garage
8 which appears to have been converted into an apartment or something behind the main
9 structure. It's kinda hard to tell what it was. The Comprehensive Plan recommends
10 urban for this site where commercial office should be located at traffic junctions in the
11 vicinities of other commercial. We found that to be the case. You have a Neighborhood
12 Commercial nearby, you also have GC across Bluff Road. Because of the commercial
13 use in the vicinity, because of property is at an intersection, the Staff felt comfortable in
14 recommending approval of the rezone to NC at this time.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Any questions? Sherry Jaco? If you'd like to say
16 anything, you, you certainly can.

17 MS. JACO: No, unless y'all have a question I'm fine.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. That's all we've got, we don't have anybody else.

19 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I make a recommendation we send Case 14-24 MA
20 forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

21 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And there's none opposed. Alright. That closes out our
4 Map Amendments, so next we have the Comprehensive Plan Update?

5 MS. HEGLER: Yes, we're gonna do a brief presentation. Leann King will do a
6 brief presentation of what we're doing this week with our public meetings, a little bit of
7 background or I guess some results from our last set of meetings which we held in early
8 July. We'll tell you a little bit about what we've done since we last met during our work
9 session in August, and then open it up for discussion.

10 MS. KING: Good afternoon, everyone. We're nearing the end of this process. I'm
11 so happy to be in front of you here. I know that you've had a couple of weeks now to
12 take a look at the [inaudible] plan in the draft that you were presented in early August,
13 so we're gonna be talking with you about that. But before we get into that we wanted to
14 just provide you with an update on where we are with the project and the series of
15 meetings that we'll be holding this week with the public. So first project update, you've
16 seen this slide a couple of times. We've got a four part process for engaging the public,
17 we held our community conversations in April. We did our choices workshops back in
18 July. And this week we're back to provide a public review of the plan, give the public an
19 opportunity to take a look at the draft version of the land use and priority investment
20 elements, and provide us feedback on those. And the fourth opportunity for the public to
21 engage is to come to the formal plan adoption hearings that are scheduled to occur in
22 November and December of this year, so again we're right here, about $\frac{3}{4}$ if not a little bit
23 more of the way through the process. Findings from the community choices workshops

1 that were held back in July, we held five workshops; one in each of the five planning
2 areas within Richland County over a four day period. We had about 169 attendees, we
3 got a little bit better attendance than the previous set of meetings. Very similar numbers
4 in terms of who came to those meetings, about, almost 70% were from the
5 unincorporated portions of the county, about 20% from the City of Columbia, and 11%
6 from somewhere, some other community in Richland County. A good cross section of
7 folks in terms of their tenure, how long they've been in Richland County; 34% between 0
8 and 19 years, 30% between 20 and 39, and 36 for 40 plus years. That's very good,
9 that's actually a better cross section than I've ever seen in any community I've ever
10 worked in. Ninety-one percent of those folks that attended work in Richland County or
11 are retired, and 88% own property, that's very similar to what we saw in our attendees
12 in the previous set of meetings. There is a formal report that has detailed information
13 including verbatim comments and maps that show different comments that we received
14 during the five meetings. Today, because we wanted to make sure we had enough time
15 to go over the draft version of the Comp Plan, what I'm gonna share with you is very
16 high level and quick summary. So in terms, we, we shared with them first off the guiding
17 principles that we had discussed with you in previous meetings. And we did a keypad
18 polling exercise with them and asked them for their level of support on each of the
19 guiding principles. What we learned is overall we got good support on the draft guiding
20 principles, more supported than did not support all the principles. We did get a lot of
21 questions about specific terms, what they meant and needed more explanation, so that
22 was something that we heard and we took back and made some adjustments. And this
23 is just an example here of one of the polling responses for the first guiding principle we

1 presented to them, which is Richland County will balance land planning and
2 development goals with private property rights, and you can see on the slide the
3 distribution there with, you know, more than 50% either strongly or somewhat
4 supporting that. So that was a very similar type of sentiment for all of those guiding
5 principles. We also shared with them goals that we had worked with you on, we tested
6 the goals at some of the workshops, not at all of them. We actually got into a lot of
7 discussion about the guiding principles. We had a mapping exercise so we wanted to
8 make sure we got folks time to go and take a look at the maps so we cut it short on the
9 goals on a couple of the workshops to, to allow that time to review the maps. Several
10 folks had questions, specific questions again about the goals and wanted more
11 explanation so we took that into consideration and made some adjustments on those.
12 And in general the input we received during the five workshops on the goals has been
13 used to, to flesh out the ones that we're taking out this week, and also the ones that we
14 shared with you back in, in early August. We provided a county-wide and a focused
15 planning area a future land use map at each of the meetings. We shared with them
16 what those, what the drafts were in terms of what the categories are and the different
17 areas within Richland County. We got good input from folks, we got a lotta detailed
18 comments, again that report that's on the project website has maps that detail out what
19 all of those comments were. But again, we took those back and made adjustments and
20 that's what's in the August version that was sent to you. Okay, so this week this series
21 of meetings is called viewing the plan, so this is a draft version of the plan. We've talked
22 about this all along, this is a fairly aggressive schedule so while you're reviewing the
23 public is also reviewing this, too, there's kind of a reviewing going on on both ends. So

1 over the next four days what we're gonna be sharing with citizens is what we learned
2 during the planning process, especially for those that haven't attended the last two
3 series of meetings. We'll give them an update on the planning process and also share
4 with them what we've learned at the other two meetings. The real focus on the meetings
5 are to provide them with kind of an open house format to provide comments on the draft
6 land use and priority investment goals and strategies, we're also asking them to give us
7 some priorities in terms of the strategies that they would like to see the county
8 undertake. Again, we're giving them an opportunity to see the updated future land use
9 draft map that has the priority investment areas. So the website has this information as
10 well, these are the five meetings just in case you weren't aware, we did have to change
11 one of the meetings that was originally scheduled for Tuesday, tomorrow night, in
12 Eastover. That is now Thursday night in Eastover, at Eastover Park, so anyone who's
13 interested in going to that one, check out the website for more details, or you can ask
14 Staff or myself. We're gonna have the guiding principles, both kind of the key kind of
15 captions for those as well as some description of what those guiding principles mean.
16 People were clear in the meetings that they didn't understand just from the caption what
17 we were talking about, so we provided some description there. And then these are all of
18 the goals and implementation strategies for both the land use and priority investment
19 elements, and we're gonna ask folks to take a look at those and again, using little sticky
20 dots, colored dots, we're gonna ask them to tell us what their five priorities are in terms
21 of strategic implementation items, the five top things they would like the county to, to
22 see implement out of these two elements. We'll also have the future land use map, both
23 county-wide and the focus on the planning area. And we'll have the words that show

1 what each of the future land use classifications are and provide, you know, a pretty
2 good description of what the intent is for those different categories and they'll be able to
3 interact with Staff and ask questions, and we'll be taking comments via comment cards,
4 we'll also be writing notes on the maps as well. So any questions about anything I've
5 just shown or the meetings for this week? Okay, well I think at this point we can jump
6 into the discussion about the draft land use and priority investment elements that you all
7 had discussed at your last workshop. So the point of today is to get more input from you
8 about comments that you have or adjustments that you'd like to make to the draft
9 version. Tracy, did you want to –

10 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, I can do, I can do this.

11 MS. KING: Okay.

12 MS. HEGLER: What we did want to go over quickly though, just to make sure we
13 have incorporated what we discussed last, to tell you what we have changed and that
14 way maybe, you know, we can jump through your comments fairly quickly. We had a
15 lotta conversation at the work session in August about the rural categories that we
16 introduced and, and understandably some concern over the use of rural residential or
17 rural neighborhood. So we did make the change to turn those categories into rural large
18 lot and rural small lot, and I think those do still flow nicely with the rest of the hierarchy
19 as we have it proposed. We merged the military installation and joint land use area
20 categories, I think as we move forward there's a lotta recommendations for specific joint
21 land use policies and, and really sort of more code specific items that we may be
22 introducing. But that may be a better suited for a Code update or some rezonings and
23 not really prudent quite at this high level of a discussion. So we do still identify the

1 military installations, we identify those as land uses and that they have some policy
2 guidance with them but not as specific as some of those joint land use areas might've
3 been. I had a lot of conversation about densities and minimum acreage sizes, we did
4 take that out. I mean, I, I think for this point in a planning process, understanding
5 character, understanding kind of really what the, the crux of these land use categories
6 are intended to be, is appropriate. So hopefully that will take away some of the concern
7 over whether these are rezonings or where, you know, minimizing people's rights, I
8 think we're just really trying to, you know, lay out a framework for the types of
9 characters and land uses that we want in Richland County. So we removed all
10 references to densities, acreage minimums, as well as the zoning districts so some of
11 the things that you reviewed had proposed and recommended and current zoning
12 districts. We just, we just took that out so we're just really trying to get a, a sense of land
13 use character at this point. We streamlined a little bit the I-77 economic development
14 corridor after giving it a little more review, so this is something that's reflected on the
15 map. It seemed to kind of spread a little far into some of the more residential areas. We
16 also extended the neighborhood low density which is kind of one of our more suburban
17 land uses. Near Blythewood it had been coded rural, but we changed that to
18 neighborhood low density, and we actually made that consistent with the Richland
19 School District II boundary. We still need to cross check that with some conservation
20 areas to make sure we haven't gone off path with that, but we extended a little bit the,
21 the suburban areas around Blythewood. We fine-tuned the activity corridor centers, we
22 had a few residential areas in those that we removed. And we have listed, we have not
23 mapped yet, but we have gotten a list of the landfills in the county, so we'll provide that

1 to you when we have them mapped. But would certainly ask you at this point, cause
2 that has come up by, you know, a Commissioner a couple times, what sort of policy
3 guidance you do want us to include in a land use element about landfills. So that, that's
4 what we've done since we met in August 11th. You've had a copy of the land use
5 element and the priority investment area elements, those are the two that are being
6 substantially changed. I understand it was the Chairman's request to go over those
7 comments or changes or corrections or whatever edits you wanna make for today. We
8 can do that a number of different ways. We have the Word document, we can pull it up
9 and redline, we can take copies from you, we can have general comments or all of the
10 above. So I would ask the Chairman how he'd best like to proceed there. But I do have,
11 at this point, that one question about what we might wanna say in terms of landfills as,
12 as we understand what's in those, those categories for land uses.

13 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I, personally what I'd like to see with respect to that
14 is not only the identification of where those landfills are, but looking at any expansion of
15 them, of those landfills and their impact on the water in the area, the surrounding areas
16 themselves. And to make sure that whatever we come up with from the standpoint of a
17 policy guidance, that we, we say to those along those landfills, whether they're public or
18 private, that they have to be limited in some way.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Limited in size or?

20 MR. BROWN: In size as well as limited in the amount of waste that can go in
21 there and the types of waste. Looking at the types of waste.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I don't know how big a landfill usually is.

23 MR. BROWN: I don't either to be honest with you.

1 MS. KING: One, one additional thing to look into is existing capacity at the sites,
2 so are they nearing, you know, the end of their capacity –

3 MR. BROWN: Exactly.

4 MS. KING: - and so the county's gonna be looking at having to expand or find
5 another location, so that's something to be considered.

6 MR. BROWN: Cause that's gonna impact on the, the, the livability in those areas,
7 it's going to eventually impact on the sales of property as well as types of use in
8 property that you can have near those landfills.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

10 MS. KING: Thank you.

11 MS. HEGLER: So we can research their capacities and any thoughts that they
12 have on future growth. And then I guess be thinking about to the degree that we want to
13 limit them, what that language would look like, what, you know, what we would be
14 suggesting. But we can report back.

15 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, I mean, I assume if you're gonna do that you'd have to try to
16 understand from a cross jurisdictional perspective how much of their current waste is
17 from out of the county –

18 MS. HEGLER: Right.

19 MR. TUTTLE: - and how it relates to the capacity. If you're trying to, I assume
20 what we're trying to do is forecast future needs over the period of the Comp Plan, is that
21 what we're saying? So then we could determine if there is a capacity, where the
22 appropriate place for a new landfill might be relative to this plan, is that the goal?

1 MS. HEGLER: Well, that could be the statement you make in the plan. I mean,
2 you could actually be making that statement that we consider growth, or a possible
3 expansion of these landfills and have a more, you know, coordinated effort of, of
4 planning where they, they should be. I mean, it could be that that's actually the
5 statement that's in the plan, cause I don't know the level of detail we can get at this time
6 that would –

7 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, cause it –

8 MS. HEGLER: - actually make sense in a, in a 30,000' Comp Plan.

9 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, because you know, as you start to look and, and clearly the
10 ones in northeast Richland County are very close to county lines so there could –

11 MS. HEGLER: Right.

12 MR. TUTTLE: - we could do whatever we want to and there could be one pop up
13 over the line that would take capacity away, or future use away from us, so you know,
14 how much of our own use do we need to plan for long term, I don't know.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

16 MR. BROWN: You can't control what goes on across the county line at all, can
17 we?

18 MR. TUTTLE: Well no, but I clearly can control how much trash from Kershaw
19 County or from any other county may come into our Richland County landfills –

20 MR. BROWN: I agree with you.

21 MR. TUTTLE: - so it's, I was trying to come up with a, a correlation between our
22 needs and the existing capacity to figure out if it's even an issue that we need to look at
23 in this 20, 30 year window. It may not be, I don't know.

1 MR. BROWN: You're, and I agree with you on that. What I would wanna see is if
2 it appears there's going to be an impact from county's outside of Richland, that we
3 come up with some type of recommended policy that limits what they can do in Richland
4 County from outside the county so that we're not in a position of reaching capacity and
5 we're still building in our county, and thus have to seek outside the county where we're
6 gonna put our waste.

7 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, I certainly understand your premise, I'm not sure that's
8 what's in our purview, but it's certainly a very valid point.

9 MR. BROWN: We can certainly raise it because if we don't it's gonna bite us
10 down the road.

11 MS. KING: So if I heard you correctly that there might be a consideration of
12 agreements with neighboring jurisdictions about the level of –

13 MR. BROWN: Um-hum (affirmative).

14 MS. KING: - waste that the county landfills could take.

15 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah.

16 MS. KING: And capacity, of course, will play a big role in that.

17 MR. BROWN: That impact is very important because if you're going to look at, at
18 the price of property, if you're going to look at the ability to live on that property, given
19 the, what those landfills do, you're gonna have to look at all that.

20 MS. HEGLER: I think we can make a couple quick calls and see if the answer to
21 those questions are simple. They're probably not, but if they are we can come back in
22 October with some thoughts. But I think at, at the least we can make a statement in the
23 land use element that asks the county to consider this as we move forward.

1 MR. BROWN: I might just raise this with you, look at the impact of not only the
2 water tables but the lakes and streams and so forth, all of that is, is the part of making
3 Richland County a good place to live and those neighborhoods good places to live.

4 MS. HEGLER: Yeah, protection of water quality was the, we heard almost more
5 than any other priority goal for, for our citizens. So we could, I think we could leave that
6 in there. I just wanted to understand the concern before we moved forward cause I, it's
7 not something we've heard a lot about from the public. But as a general statement of
8 water quality I, that does make sense.

9 MS. KING: And this is an area I'm definitely not an expert but I do believe that
10 there are certain regulations, probably the state and possibly federal level, that are
11 gonna regulate and protect, you know, watersheds from direct impact from landfill sites,
12 so they have regulations in terms of how those are structured and how they go about
13 making sure that there's not a seepage from them, but it's obviously important
14 consideration.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

16 MS. KING: Thank you.

17 MS. HEGLER: So how do you want to proceed?

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is, are people ready to comment on the Comp Plan
19 today? It doesn't look like we're ready.

20 MS. HEGLER: And maybe it's just great. I mean, I, maybe it's perfect. I'm cool
21 with that.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, I think we're also missing, what –

23 MS. HEGLER: A few folks.

1 MR. GILCHRIST: Board Members?

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

3 MS. HEGLER: Okay, well I mean, we can take comments as you go. I don't know
4 if you're redlining, if you're that type of a reviewer, or if you're just writing down general
5 thoughts. I mean, whatever you can be sending to us, we can always be –

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think we're at the point though where we need to get the,
7 the document that you guys are, I mean, are y'all ready to –

8 MS. HEGLER: Of the nearly final, you don't want –

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah.

10 MS. HEGLER: You, you had, you have an element, you have an actual
11 document but we can get you what we're considering our close to final, it's now up to, to
12 you and your recommendations I think to make changes. Or anything we hear that's
13 really earth shattering over the next few days.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah. I think we're just ready to start working with as
15 close to the final document as, as we can get.

16 MR. TUTTLE: Cause expectations are that they'd want to vote on November 3rd.

17 MS. HEGLER: Yeah. So we still actually have another month of a meeting with
18 y'all where we could be having plenty of dialogue.

19 MS. KING: Right, so the goal coming, we would synthesize the community input
20 and if you wanna provide any input over the next month we could incorporate that. And
21 then the plan would be to come to another work session or meeting October 6th to do a
22 review and at that point would be the full plan. So you might recall that Council directed
23 Staff to prepare an update to, a focus update to the land use and priority investment

1 elements. We did update kind of data and trends for the other elements, but the, the,
2 the goals and strategies focus updates are really on the land use and priority investment
3 elements. But that, so the point of today was to look just at those two elements and then
4 provide you the full plan in October, but we can, we can just basically keep with that
5 plan and bring the full plan with community input and adjustments in October.

6 MS. HEGLER: It's just gonna be a far bigger document but you don't need to
7 review it all.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What happens if we don't come to an agreement
9 November the 3rd?

10 MS. HEGLER: If we, if we were to update it in five years it needs to be adopted in
11 December. But it's not a requirement. So we were just aggressively trucking along to a
12 December adoption by Council.

13 MR. TUTTLE: The, the updated version with the public comments incorporated,
14 when, when do you think that would be in a form to, to get out to the Commission?

15 MS. KING: If, so, and so that you would have enough time to prepare for your
16 October 6th meeting.

17 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, that's what –

18 MS. KING: So that's a very good question. I think we would definitely need, you
19 know, at a, at a minimum kind of a week and a half to, to get this together, if not two
20 weeks. And then Staff's gonna need some time to take a look at it too, so I don't have a
21 calendar right in front of me unfortunately. I can grab my phone and see how many
22 weeks we've got between now and then. So we've got one, two, three weeks, three
23 solid weeks starting next Monday before the October 6th meeting. So it's, it's roughly,

1 with all of the elements it's roughly a 100 page document. There also is an appendix
2 that has the data, it's kinda like the data dump, which is summarized in the plan
3 document. But we tried to keep those separate, that's kind of the going way of doing it.
4 You know, the world is a fast place, data's updated regularly, so we're kind of
5 separating those two pieces because plans get kind of put on the shelf because you
6 open them and you see data that's five years ago and you say, well this is irrelevant.
7 Whereas the policies and strategies actually might still be relevant today, so those are
8 separate. The Appendix is a much bigger piece but I don't think that's necessarily as
9 important for you all to be reviewing. So we've got three solid weeks starting next week
10 before that October 6th meeting.

11 MS. HEGLER: And we deliver packets, yeah, two Fridays before.

12 MS. KING: So that would give us –

13 MS. HEGLER: And you want a full week, two weekends to review it.

14 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, I was just thinking it would probably make sense if you had
15 a, you know, sooner the better but if you had a week to review it so you're not just
16 coming in cold on October 6th with a document you hadn't even looked at, and I'm not
17 sure you'd get much – I'm trying to push it toward November –

18 MS. HEGLER: Y'all wouldn't have time to review it, right. So I guess we can see,
19 I mean, we're turning these around pretty quickly. We'll know better probably Friday
20 morning what we're hearing from the public. If we've gotten a lot of support for what we
21 present we won't have a lotta changes to make. We could send that to you fairly quickly.

22 MR. TUTTLE: Okay.

1 MS. HEGLER: If, if we find no, we really walked down a few wrong paths, then
2 we'll need the time anyway to make some corrections and we can report that to you
3 October 6th and then talk about a plan B, which might be a workshop or something
4 between then and November. To keep us on track, or off track, and it's really fine, not a
5 big deal.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Sounds good.

7 MS. KING: Well, thank you very much.

8 MR. TUTTLE: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And that's it, right?

10 MS. HEGLER: It is. The rest are reports for your information.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yep. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

12 MR. TUTTLE: So moved.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Second?

14 MR. GILCHRIST: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor say aye.

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

18

19 *[Meeting Adjourned at 2:15pm]*