

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
November 9, 2020 Zoom Meeting

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

[Members Present: Jason Branham, Heather Cairns, Stephen Gilchrist, Christopher Yonke, Bryan Grady, Gary Dennis, Mettauwer Carlisle; Absent: Beverly Frierson, Terrence Taylor]

Called to order: 3:00pm

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Hello everyone. Mr. Branham, can you hear me?

MR. BRANHAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Let's try to chat after this call if we can for just a minute.

MR. BRANHAM: Sure.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, great. Thank you.

MR. PRICE: Alright Mr. Chair, it's 3:00.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Are we ready, Mr. Price, is Staff ready?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Well, we will call the November 9th Planning Commission meeting to order. Please allow me to read into the Record: In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was posted on our bulletin board in the County Administration office, sent to radio, TV stations and newspapers, and persons requesting notification in the County. So we certainly appreciate the public joining us here on our Zoom call, Planning Commission call today. And we look forward to not only your participation but the Commissioners and their participation as well, so thank all of you for being here. The first item on our Agenda is our Consent Agenda and basically what happens with our Consent Agenda is a – we will look at the cases if we've had some requests for persons to speak either for or against cases so we make a

1 determination whether or not those cases should be placed on, or not placed on our
2 Consent Agenda and we'll start from there. And so Mr. Price, before we make a motion
3 on our Consent Agenda or have someone do that are there any cases where folks have
4 signed up to speak against any of these cases?

5 MR. PRICE: Sir, under Map Amendments, Case No. 1, which is Case 20-031,
6 we've had a number of people to sign up for comments. For Item No. 3, which is Case
7 20-033 MA, we also have comments for that request. And those are the only ones
8 we've had opposition comments submitted regarding those cases. We do have letters
9 from Applicants for the other cases, but we do not have any in opposition to the
10 requests.

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. So the only case in that would be removed from
12 the Consent Agenda would be Case No. 1. And of course included in that would be our
13 Presentation of Minutes and our Road Names. Can I get a motion from a Commission
14 to approve the Consent Agenda and, with those amendments?

15 MS. CAIRNS: I'd be happy to make a motion that we accept the Consent Agenda
16 as offered; approving the Minutes, the Road Names, Map Amendment No. 4 and 5,
17 hearing testimony on 1, 2, and 3.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Is there a second?

19 MR. BRANHAM: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we
21 approve the Consent Agenda as stated. All in favor signify by roll call vote.

22 MR. PRICE: Okay, Gilchrist?

23 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

2 MS. CAIRNS: Yes.

3 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

4 MR. YONKE: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

6 MR. CARLISLE: [Inaudible]

7 MR. PRICE: Carlisle? Dennis?

8 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

9 MR. PRICE: Grady?

10 MR. GRADY: Aye.

11 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

12 MR. PRICE: Branham?

13 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

15 MR. PRICE: That motion passes.

16 *[Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Branham; Absent:*
17 *Frierson, Taylor]*

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you. So we'll move right along then to our
19 first case, Mr. Price.

20 **CASE NO. 20-031 MA:**

21 MR. PRICE: Okay. First Item is Case 20-031 MA. The Applicant is requesting to
22 rezone approximately 40 acres from M-1, which is Light Industrial, to RM-MD, which is
23 Residential, Multi-family, Medium Density. The parcel is located along Rivkin Boulevard,

1 more specifically it's right behind the Walmart off of Two Notch Road. Staff recommends
2 approval of this request. And we based our recommendation on the fact that the
3 Comprehensive Plan recommends a desired development pattern of medium density
4 residential neighborhoods which would provide a mix of residential uses and densities
5 within the neighborhoods, and that the proposed rezoning to RM-MD would allow for the
6 recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan as prescribed.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay Mr. Price, thank you. Are there any questions for
8 the Staff? Mr. Price, has the Applicant submitted any testimony for this particular case?

9 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Yes, sir, we do have comments from the Applicant. And
10 again as stated we also have comments from the, in opposition to the request.

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

12 MR. PRICE: I'll actually, I can read the letter from the Applicant, Mr. Fuller,
13 Bobby Fuller.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

15 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, this Application is being pursued
16 by Jim Chapman Communities in order to establish in the Columbia/Richland County
17 market a specialty rental homes community similar to the developer's niche market
18 plan, proven successful in Atlanta, Highlands and similar residential localities. The
19 proposal is not a typical large lot upscale subdivision. This for-rent community
20 development plan appeals to high level workforce and an active adult seniors'
21 demographic that prefer to rent rather than own. In each operating locality, this type
22 community constitutes an integral and significant lifestyle choice as part of the overall
23 neighborhood area. By the nature of its customer constituency the for-rent community

1 seeks locations in close proximity to established residential communities. This
2 development model is established specifically to provide a desirable residential option. It
3 is not a start home or a transitional market. The for-rent community is a permanent
4 destination residential community designed and operated for appeal to a particular
5 constituency. This proposed development is located on approximately 40 acres on
6 Rivkin Boulevard between the Wildewood Community and Two Notch Road. It will
7 consist of 200 to 250 single story and one and a half story townhome units,
8 approximately five to six units per acre. The property will be leased and maintained by a
9 professional management company. Townhome buildings will be constructed to include
10 between two to eight attached units per building. The development will be a gated
11 community with a pool, clubhouse, gym and dog park as amenities. The project will
12 consist of two to three bedroom units with rents ranging from \$1500 per month to \$1900
13 plus per month. Each dwelling unit is an individual rental residence; not a condominium
14 or shared ownership unit. This community will be unique to the Northeast Columbia
15 market. We urge your recommendation of approval for this Application to enable a
16 compatible alternative style, beneficial accommodation to an already prominent, viable
17 and vibrant residential area of Richland County. Robert F. Fuller, Attorney for Applicant.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Price. Are there any comments for the
19 Staff regarding Mr. Fuller's information to the Commission? Okay. Mr. Price, you
20 indicated that there are folks signed up to speak.

21 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. I think with the discussions with Staff we have probably
22 close to 70 comments against the request. Staff has had an opportunity to review the
23 comments that were submitted, and while a lot of them share the same sentiment, you

1 know, again we did receive close to 70, and Staff will read each one into the Record
2 until the will of the Planning Commission is that you've heard enough that you can then
3 make your determination.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Price, thank you for that information and sending
5 over the information to the Commission so that we would also have an opportunity to
6 review the information as well. So then as we go through this we can not only get an
7 opportunity to get a feel for what the community is saying, but to your point we wanna
8 make sure that we hear the case in its totality so that if there are comments that are
9 consistent feel free to make sure that we get a sense of what the community is saying
10 holistically and that way we won't have to worry about too much redundancy. Mr. Price?

11 MR. PRICE: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Did you hear me?

13 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

15 MR. PRICE: Mr. Crooks?

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: With that being said we could move forward and then
17 we'll get a sense of where we are and then make a determination at that time.

18 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

19 MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir, so Mr. Gilchrist, Commission Members, ready for me to
20 start?

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir. Go right ahead.

22 MR. CROOKS: Alright. From Gil Bragg, president Wildewood HOA, 31 Duck
23 Road, Columbia, South Carolina 29223. To the Richland County Planning Commission:

1 The Richland County Planning Commission is considering a request to change the
2 existing zoning on a very large parcel of land that backs up to our Wildewood
3 neighborhood along the area behind the intersection of Leaning Tree Road and Old Still
4 Road, and is located immediately behind the Walmart Super Center. The proposed
5 change is to take the zoning from M-1 to RM-MD, it is Case No. 20-031 MA, see
6 attached maps of property adjacent to Wildewood. Our HOA board and residents are
7 concerned that any large multi-family housing development that backs up to our
8 neighborhood could be detrimental to our property values, result in increased crime and
9 will result in more and more pressure on our schools, our roads and community
10 infrastructure in our neighborhood. It appears the access in and out of this property
11 would be via Rivkin Boulevard onto Two Notch Road. We are adamantly opposed to
12 having any access given to our neighborhood for vehicles or foot traffic. A review of the
13 property surrounding the Wildewood community and the crime map shows we are
14 surrounded by retail corridors and/or large multi-family properties, apartment
15 complexes, etc., where crime is prevalent. Virtually all of our public neighborhood roads
16 are in horrible condition even though we have withstood many tax increases and we
17 have been told by Richland County officials that none of the money from the penny tax
18 increase can be used to improve our roads inside our neighborhood. Our infrastructures
19 are crumbling yet Richland County continues to approve large density residential zoning
20 changes without addressing solutions for currently existing neighborhoods. Our HOA
21 board is against this rezoning change to allow a large density of residential homes.
22 Gayle Bragg, president, Wildewood HOA. And I believe you have the attached map and
23 photos I was referencing previously.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: That is correct, yes.

2 MR. CROOKS: Alright. Next comment, Ron and Evelyn Hobson, 89 Running Fox
3 Road, Columbia, South Carolina 29223. To the Richland County Planning Commission:
4 We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed change to the zoning
5 from M-1 to RM-MD, Case No. 20-031 MA. The proposed rezoning will be detrimental
6 not only to our neighborhood but also to the area. As you can imagine nearly all of the
7 residents in the Wildewood neighborhoods are completely opposed to the rezoning to
8 increase to RM-MD, multi-family housing that will cause traffic and safety problems,
9 increase the neighborhood crime concerns, destroy local wildlife habitats, and a high
10 potential of lowering the existing home property values, and lastly a completely invasion
11 of privacy to the adjacent tax paying homeowners' properties. Below is a brief overview
12 as to our valid concerns. Traffic and safety are major areas of concern. Traffic jams in
13 the Northeast area of Columbia, specifically Two Notch Road, already spans the
14 distance between Parklane Road to Clemson Road for much of the day. And the
15 intersections are routinely blocked by traffic during rush hours with the length of rush
16 hours increasing. [Inaudible] during morning and afternoon rush hours will also
17 negatively impact safety for our children since students are traveling to and from school
18 during these times. In general the area traffic is continuing to increase and heavy traffic
19 is already common which may not have been anticipated during the Council's past
20 rezoning approvals. We concur that crime prevention is not a one size fits all effort,
21 however, with experiencing an ever increasing crime rate of the community it goes
22 without saying the proposed rezoning will dramatically affect the crime concerns of all
23 Wildewood homeowners. We're a neighborhood that is already experiencing car break-

1 ins, thefts and vandalism and we ask that you not approve the rezoning as it directly
2 affects the safety within our neighborhood. Wildlife has been observed in the area and
3 any development will destroy their habitat. Any planned development of the property
4 should consider the continuing impact of local wildlife habitat and a species study
5 should be conducted by the appropriate agency prior to any rezoning consideration.

6 Property values are likely to go down in the area if you approve rezoning to allow multi-
7 family apartments or condominium construction. It is understandable Richland County
8 would be interested in the increased tax revenue, however, as a new homeowner to the
9 neighborhood we ask, are you willing to jeopardize the property values of over 1,000
10 Wildewood homes? Lowering the property values of existing homes results in
11 substantial reduction in taxes being collected by Richland County. Another important
12 fact to consider prior to committing to new roads with any new rezoning is to address
13 the crumbling road infrastructure within our neighborhood as well as others. We urge
14 you to give real consideration to the across the board impact the rezoning will have on
15 the area and disapprove the proposed rezoning. From recent discussions with my
16 neighbors I know our opinions are shared by many. We ask that you give our homes
17 and our neighborhood the same consideration you would if your home backed up to the
18 proposed rezoned property. In fact, we invite you to schedule a time to meet with us to
19 look at the properties that would be directly affected by this rezoning. We are more than
20 happy to meet with you at your convenience. Thank you for your continued service and
21 support of our community. With best regards, Ron and Evelyn Hobson. Next comment,
22 no address from Heather Alexander. Hi, I live in Wildewood and I'm adamantly opposed
23 to the rezoning of this land to multi-family/high density. This would be a significant

1 impact on the neighborhood and the area overall. There are plenty of apartments
2 already within one to two miles. Multi-family housing adds many cars to Two Notch
3 Road, Polo Road and Sparkleberry. These roads are already congested. Mallet Hill has
4 become a thoroughfare even though it's a neighborhood road. I watched a large
5 speeding tow truck pass a car yesterday on Mallet Hill, which is all a no passing zone.
6 This is a common occurrence. The other roads are already severely congested and
7 speeding and running red lights are normal. It's highly unfair to the residents in
8 Wildewood who purchased homes to be away from high density and crowded areas.
9 This is a huge blow to the serenity of the neighborhood and will only lower values. I
10 would ask that you not allow rezoning. Thank you, Heather Alexander. Next comment,
11 326 Leaning Tree Road, Maxy and Karen Joy. To the Richland County Planning
12 Commission: My wife and I oppose the rezoning of land that runs behind Walmart and
13 homes on Leaning Tree Road from Light Industrial to residential medium density. Our
14 home at 326 Leaning Tree Road is at ground zero for the impact of the rezoning. In
15 addition to opposing the rezoning from M-1 to RM-MD, we feel that granting any access
16 to our neighborhood for vehicle or pedestrian traffic will have a negative impact on our
17 quality of life and our neighbors. Please enter this email into the Record for Monday,
18 November 9th meeting. Col., US Army Retired, Maxy and Karen Joy. Next comment,
19 117 Silver Lake Road, Kathleen Linty. Dear Sirs, this letter is to express my strong
20 opposition to the zoning change, Case 20-031, currently proposed for the area behind
21 Walmart on Two Notch Road butting up to the Wildewood neighborhood. The Northeast
22 area is currently awash with vacant apartments, there are over a dozen apartment
23 complexes within five miles of this proposed zone. For example, Sandhills is full of

1 vacancies as are the apartments near the Wildewood area. Adding even more
2 residential homes and apartments on this land would put additional pressure on the
3 infrastructure, traffic, roads, schools, that is already insufficient for the current residents
4 in the Northeast. The road widening project currently under construction on Clemson
5 Road still will not be sufficient in addressing the traffic issues for the residents in the
6 Northeast. That project was launched with residential numbers from five years ago.
7 Again, I respectfully request that you deny this proposed zoning change. The current
8 residents of the Northeast do not deserve additional pressure on our schools or more
9 gridlock on our roads. Thank you, Kathleen Linty. Next comment, I do not see an
10 address from Polly Andrews. Dear Richland County Planning Commission, we are very
11 much opposed to the proposed building. The safety of our family, friends and neighbors
12 are important. The pressure on infrastructure and increased crime may result from a
13 large density of new apartments/homes. Our neighborhood is zoned low density. It will
14 not help our property values or safety. Thank you for your time and attention to help us
15 make our voices heard. Sincerely, Polly Andrews. Next comment, Gretchen Shoal I
16 think is how you say that, 5 Charlie Horse Road. Dear Planning Commission, I am
17 writing about Case No. 20-031 MA regarding rezoning some of the land that runs
18 behind Walmart along homes on Leaning Tree Road. I am opposed to the rezoning as I
19 do not want increased population in our area. Speeding cars, the number of cars, crime
20 generally and people wandering our streets who do not live here have all increased in
21 the last two to three years due to other similar developments surrounding our
22 neighborhood. Every single day all four members of my family walk, bike and run along
23 Old Still Road and Leaning Tree. If this new residential construction goes forward I am

1 afraid I will have to prohibit my children from independently exercising along these
2 roads. I am also very concerned about the ever increasing crime in our neighborhood.
3 More than once in the last three years I have seen through our home camera system
4 strangers in my yard and on my front porch just examining the property. When we first
5 moved here in 2014 this never happened. This is very disconcerting and frightening.
6 Please do not move forward with this rezoning proposal until you have heard from the
7 people who live near the area and directly experience up close every day. Next
8 comment, Mr. Price, would you make sure that I am within two minutes, this one's a
9 fairly lengthy comment. From Ramone M. Majia, 121 Sparkleberry Crossing Road. What
10 can I say a day before the meeting to encourage responsibility and community decision
11 making concerning project development? Logic says nothing. You people will not listen
12 to low grade communications, written protests from highly educated or barely even
13 Jesus Chris speaking in your dreams. You probably are not believers anyway except in
14 the business of taking money from the low hanging fruit trees, which is the belief system
15 if you act on it. The continued destruction of communities by abandoning principles,
16 foundations, tax base systems, etc., does not deter irresponsible development 90 to
17 99% of the time. Why would you be any different? I was at the meeting four years ago
18 when the first attempts to hide the truth and push a decision to connect Two Notch
19 Road to the recreational center on Polo Road were passed in front of the public.
20 Unfortunately, I knew then what I know now; some people in decision making roles in
21 Richland County are being baited with money motives to try and change the landscape
22 of our community. While the community has undoubtedly changed in the last 30 years
23 I've been in Northeast Columbia, the change being peddled concerning the space

1 between Two Notch big business centers and a vital tax base is better defined as
2 destruction. We call it change sometimes because it takes long term point of view and
3 knowledge to understand destruction versus change. So you sell change like it's snake
4 oil and destruction is mostly understood as tearing something down in a day or two not
5 a decade or two. This is a case of destruction, not change and certainly not responsible
6 development; hence this stakeholder speaking out passionately. The only measure we
7 can provide to sway your preemptive opinions is producing short-term alternative values
8 in place of the money being dangled like a carrot for a rabbit to chase. So what can we
9 offer you people that is better than money in assuming your consciousness [inaudible]
10 for future like the last 30 years of change and responsible development has afforded is
11 not on the table. Clearly, I would not be addressing this group of individuals if your
12 conscience and consciousness of the future was already understood, so I'm not out on
13 a whim with the assumptions; hence the diatribe hitting home, God I hope so anyways,
14 because a diatribe is all we are given with a day's notice, and the full intentions of using
15 underhanded community planning and passing it all for the shear ballgame has been
16 the status quo for some time. This is also a very effective way to dismiss the collective
17 consciousness of the stakeholders in a geographical area under pressure. Even our
18 little league ballers at Polo Road Rec Center know the difference between underhanded
19 games and fair ball.

20 MR. PRICE: Brian, that was two minutes.

21 MR. CROOKS: Okay. Next comment, Marta Tremolata, 68 Running Fox Road.
22 Dear Sirs, this letter is to express my strong opposition to the zoning change, Case 20-
23 031 currently proposed for the area behind Walmart on Two Notch Road, leading up to

1 the Wildewood neighborhood. The Northeast area is currently awash with vacant
2 apartments, there are over a dozen apartment complexes within five miles of this
3 proposed zoning; for example, Sandhills is full of vacancies as are the apartments in the
4 Wildewood area. Adding even more residential homes and apartments on this land
5 would put additional pressure on the infrastructure that is already insufficient for the
6 current residents in the Northeast. The road widening project currently under
7 construction on Clemson Road will still not be sufficient in addressing the traffic issues
8 for the residents in the Northeast. The project was launched with residential numbers
9 from five years ago. Again, I respectfully request that you deny this proposed zoning
10 change. The current residents of the Northeast do not deserve additional pressure on
11 our schools or more gridlock on our roads. Thank you, Marta Tremalato. That appears
12 all to be the same comments as previously. There's comments from, no address,
13 Amadao and Amy Zefferino. Our neighborhood is currently zoned low density. The
14 approval of Case No. 20-031 MA will result in more and more pressure on our schools,
15 our roads and community infrastructure in our neighborhood. This Monday, November
16 9th meeting is not interactive for the public. We are sending you this email to express
17 our disapproval of the zoning change case and please enter the Record count if there is
18 one. By the way, are you going to publish the count for approval versus disapproval?
19 Your decision based on our voice is greatly appreciated. Thank you and best regards,
20 Amadao and Amy Zefferino. The next comment, Eddie Tremalato, 68 Running Fox
21 Road is the same comment as the one before from Marta Tremalato. Mr. Chair, would
22 you like me to read that one in the Record, or? It expresses verbatim the same
23 comments.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: If it's verbatim the same thing we can move forward to
2 the next one.

3 MR. CROOKS: Okay, the next comment, no address listed, Jan Sol. My husband
4 and I have lived on Charlie Horse Road in the Wildewood subdivision for 33 years, are
5 adamantly opposed to the rezoning of the land that runs behind Walmart and the homes
6 on Leaning Tree from Light Industrial to Residential, medium density. Our neighbors are
7 all opposed as well. Please hear our voices and do not let this go forward. Our deepest
8 thanks, Jan Sol. The next comment, Angelo Tremalato, 68 Running Fox Road. Again,
9 same comment as before voicing disapproval. Next comment, Miriam Scari Tremalato,
10 68 Running Fox Road. Also expressing the same concerns and disapproval for the
11 request. Next comment from Buddy Parker, no address listed. Hello, as a resident of
12 Wildewood I would like to express my concern over the zoning of the Leaning Tree and
13 Old Still Road area. I am vehemently opposed to creating any kind of zone that would
14 allow building even more multi-unit housing. As you are all well aware I'm sure there are
15 increased issues with adding more pressure on an area that does not have the
16 infrastructure to accommodate this kind of growth. You would be adding a burden to
17 residents of Wildewood by allowing these plans to move forward. I hope you will agree
18 to hear the residents' feedback and to take it seriously. We are not in favor of this move.
19 Regards, Buddy Parker.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Crooks, if I may? I wanna pause just for a second,
21 give you a break, but also I ask the Commissioners, you know, how they feel thus far
22 about the testimony that they've heard from our residents in the County. Obviously there
23 is some concern that the folk in the area are not in support of this map amendment, but

1 we want to just give the Commissioners an opportunity to decide whether or not they've
2 heard enough information to begin to make an informed decision, or if we should
3 continue to hear some additional testimony. So any Commissioners wanna weigh in on
4 that?

5 MR. GRADY: Certainly. I would say that materially speaking that the comments
6 were, you know, expressed the same type of issues – traffic, infrastructure, concern
7 about density, property values, crimes, I mean, I think that's a consistency throughout.
8 So I would personally suggest that I think we have a good sense of the public opinion in
9 the area.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any additional comments from the
11 Commissioners on that? If not, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Price, I would certainly like to turn this
12 back over to the Commission and let us ask you a few questions about this if we may.

13 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Mr. Price, I heard a couple of references to the
15 school traffic. Will you, did you guys reach out to the school district and did they in any
16 way comment on this particular proposed map amendment?

17 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. As part of the notification process we do send all of our
18 agendas out to the school district, and then for District Two we sent the agenda out to
19 the Planning Director for School District Two. We also had a conversation just to make
20 sure he did receive this. But as of this time we have not received any comments either
21 for or against the project from School District Two, but they are aware of the project.

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you. Are there any additional comments
23 from the Commissioners regarding this case? No comments from the Commissioners?

1 If not, the Chair will certainly entertain a motion on this particular case, Case No. 20-031
2 MA; whether or not we want to send this forward to Council with a recommendation of
3 approval based on the Staff's recommendation, or if we want to send this forward to
4 Council with a recommendation of a denial. I'll accept a motion and then additional
5 comments.

6 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I will comment on this one. I think that looking at the
7 location in some ways this is kind of like the perfect place for this type of development.
8 It's got access out to a major arterial on a road that already has a traffic signal, it does
9 back up to a single-family residential neighborhood but it does not appear to have any
10 access through that neighborhood. I do think that this type of project in this type of area
11 is something that is consistent with our overall plan and something that we should send
12 forward to Council with a recommendation of approval. So I'll make that a motion.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you Commissioner Cairns. Is there a
14 second on that motion?

15 MR. BRANHAM: I second.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded then
17 that we send Case No. 20-031 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of
18 approval. Any further discussion? If not, we will vote by roll call vote.

19 MR. PRICE: Okay. Gilchrist?

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

22 MS. CAIRNS: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

1 MR. YONKE: No.

2 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

3 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

5 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

9 MR. PRICE: Branham?

10 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

11 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

12 MR. PRICE: Okay, so that passes 6 to 1.

13 *[Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Branham; Opposed: Yonke;*

14 *Absent: Frierson, Taylor]*

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Again, we are a recommending Body to County
16 Council and they will meet on November 19th, I'm assuming they're still doing Zoom, is
17 that right, Mr. Price?

18 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, so they'll meet on the 19th with their Zoom call
20 and the public can feel free to weigh in at that time.

21 MR. PRICE: And also the comments that were submitted to the Planning
22 Commission, we did not receive any new ones from the residents that opposed this

1 particular request. We will forward those same comments on to the County Council for
2 the Zoning Public Hearing meeting.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, great. Thank you.

4 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair, can I ask a question?

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure, Mr. Branham.

6 MR. BRANHAM: Thanks. These folks that wanna stay engaged in the process
7 going forward, who should they reach out – is there anyone they should reach out to
8 specifically on County Council, being that, you know, Mr. Jackson who was the
9 Councilman for this area has passed away?

10 MR. PRICE: Yes, I believe at this time the Chair of the Council is receiving
11 comments, but they can feel free to contact any of the Councilmembers. So they can
12 contact Councilman Livingston who is the Chair of County Council at this time, or you
13 can also reach out to any of the other Councilmembers to express your, either your
14 concerns or support or opposition to the request.

15 MR. BRANHAM: Alright, thank you.

16 MS. CAIRNS: I have one quick question for Mr. Price. I could not hear Taylor or
17 Frierson and I don't see them on my listing?

18 MR. PRICE: No, they are not on. I just made that call just in case they happened
19 to come. But they were not on.

20 MS. CAIRNS: Okay, so I'm not crazy. Thank you. At least not for that reason.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Any additional comments?

22 MR. DENNIS: I got one. We just need to make sure that the people out there
23 understand that we are a recommending Body as Mr. Gilchrist said and we have certain

1 rules that we have to follow. And if you guys out there that oppose this, make sure you
2 reach out to County Council because they're the ones that vote on that. We are just a
3 recommending Body based off our putting pieces together.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Dennis. Any additional comments?

5 MR. CAIRNS: I mean, I understand what Mr. Dennis is saying but I also just think
6 it's important for the public to understand that we are a county that's growing, we have
7 population growth and that land gets developed. It's not that there's malfeasance or any
8 ill-intent but, you know, we do look at these things and we take them within, I mean, I
9 look at these issues and this greater global concept of the County, the fact that we are
10 in a process of growth and, you know, where should it go and how should it go, and it
11 should be diversified, it should include multi-family and single-family, it should include
12 large lot and small lot. And when a parcel comes up that, granted it butts up against
13 single-family but, you know, different land uses that back up to each other are often
14 much more compatible than sometimes other times when they face each other. So I
15 mean, I, you know, we are a recommending Body but I think that we do make our
16 decisions based on a lot of factors.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Ms. Cairns, for that comment. One of the
18 things that – and I would remind this Commission – that the purpose of why we
19 undertook a significant Code rewrite was just that point that Ms. Cairns raised; to ensure
20 that not only are we a recommending Body, but we do have a responsibility to the
21 taxpayers in this County to ensure that we're doing development or proposing that we
22 do development the right way in planning. And so the opportunity to be able to not just
23 approve these rezonings in a vacuum is very important and I appreciate what this

1 Commission does in terms of its homework to ensure that when we cast a vote that
2 we're doing it by ensuring that we are, we're doing what's in the best interest of the
3 County. So Commissioner Dennis, Commissioner Cairns, thank you all for those
4 comments. Any additional comments?

5 MS. CAIRNS: And actually I will have one more. And again it's just, I like to hear
6 from the Commission Members what's their thinking. So I mean, if anybody is, you
7 know, opposed, you know, to please offer why. I mean, I've been guilty of the same,
8 there's times I vote opposite in a motion without ever making a comment so I
9 understand there's times it just is what it is. But I think it would be really great if, as
10 Commissioner Members, that you know, if you have an opposition to something please
11 speak up, I wanna hear it.

12 MR. YONKE: Okay, this is Chris, I'll explain my vote. I voted no. I'm a map guy
13 by my profession and I've just been scrolling around this area and it's so packed
14 already. There's a new development you can see on Google Maps just up, what, north
15 of Old Still Road, that has a similar type of multi-family there. There's opportunities for
16 renters in this area and we've all driven up and down Two Notch Road and we know
17 how dense it is. And I'm looking at behind Walmart and how they would be coming in
18 and off of that major route and it just doesn't seem that smart to me. So that's why I
19 voted in that direction. Thanks.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Commissioner Yonke. Any additional
21 comments?

22 MR. DENNIS: I will say this. I actually live in the area and I understand the
23 concerns of the citizens. I understand the citizens' pushback on this, however, as Ms.

1 Cairns said, we are a growing community, this does fit our plan perfect. As somebody
2 that lives here wholeheartedly I understand where they're coming from, but when you
3 look at it from growth of the community, how we are putting the pieces together, this
4 actually fits perfectly. And I drive that area every day cause I live less than a mile and a
5 half from it.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Dennis. Any additional comments? I
7 was about to ask for a motion for a vote but we've already voted on it. So we can
8 certainly move on to the next case, Mr. Price.

9 **CASE NO. 20-032 MA:**

10 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Alright, the next item is Case 20-032 MA. The Applicant is
11 Ryan Maltba. The location is 4551 Hardscrabble Road. The Applicant is requesting to
12 rezone a little less than an acre of land from Rural which is RU to General Commercial
13 which is GC. Staff recommends disapproval of this request and our request is really, it's
14 kind of more principally for disapproval. According to the Comprehensive Plan the
15 subject site is not located along a main road corridor or within a distance of a primary
16 arterial. And that is one of the recommendations for projects along this corridor
17 according to the Comprehensive Plan. However, the requests to rezone would be
18 compatible with adjacent land uses and the current development patterns for
19 commercial development, and also the current district has become out of place with this
20 type and intensity of development surrounding it as the character of the area is more
21 consistent with that of the proposed request than the Rural district. So again, Staff
22 recommends disapproval for this request but only principally according to the Comp
23 Plan.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Are there any questions for the Staff?

2 MS. CAIRNS: I have one quick question. I would've thought Hardscrabble was a
3 major arterial.

4 MR. PRICE: No, ma'am. And actually this has come up before with some other
5 requests but at this time it is not, according to the Comp Plan.

6 MS. CAIRNS: So we, in our Comp Plan, establish what our major arterials, it's
7 not based on any objective, it's just that sort of subjective?

8 MR. PRICE: Could you repeat that? I'm sorry.

9 MS. CAIRNS: I'm just, so you're saying the determination of what is or is not a
10 major arterial is based on the Comp Plan which I would offer is subjective.

11 MR. PRICE: I did not mean, I'm sorry I should not have said that. That's not
12 based on the Comp Plan. The recommendations for where certain uses and the
13 guidelines for development are in the Comp Plan but however, the determination of the
14 role of classifications is not in the Comp Plan, that's based on DOT standards and
15 requirements.

16 MS. CAIRNS: Well, okay. I mean, I will not end this in a motion cause I'm
17 curious if anybody else has any discussion, but I feel that supporting this being rezoned
18 to GC is only natural. I mean, I am not about spreading commercial up and down roads
19 willy-nilly, but certainly the commercial on that section of Hardscrabble is pretty well
20 established and to say this property needs to stay residential is, just feels wholly
21 inconsistent with what exists out there and not proper.

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Ms. Cairns, I would 100% support your comments on
23 that. Are there any additional comments regarding this particular proposal? You know,

1 every time I see this, particularly with all of the improvements that are going on to
2 Hardscrabble Road, and Mr. Price and I had a conversation about this earlier and I
3 wanna talk about this in my Chairman's Report, but some of the improvements that we
4 do have going on around the County and for some of these roads to continue to still be
5 designated as Rural is just absolutely something that we've gotta take a more proactive
6 approach to try to address this because it is causing us to be in conflict with the very
7 thing that we experienced just a few moments ago in the first case; that we're trying to
8 be judicious about how we plan adequately and recommend appropriately to the
9 Council about what it is that they should be doing. And this type of case here is just
10 another example of why I strongly support and appreciate the Commission moving
11 forward with the rewrite. But again, Commissioner Cairns I certainly would support your
12 comments on this particular case. Are there any additional comments on this case? Mr.
13 Price, do we have anybody signed up to speak?

14 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

16 MR. PRICE: Comments. Planning Commission Members, Thank you for your
17 service to the community and your time today. As both the Applicant for the 4551
18 Hardscrabble Road map amendment and owner of the adjacent retail center, I would
19 appreciate your support rezoning from Rural to General Commercial. Two concerns
20 pertinent to the amendment requests are the classification of Hardscrabble Road as it
21 exists today and the impact on the surrounding character of the area. The South
22 Carolina Department of Transportation's plan to widen and upgrade Hardscrabble
23 appears to be underway with land disturbance aprons already placed along the right-of-

1 way. In an effort to mitigate any concerns I have preliminary feedback from DOT and
2 with their recommendation intend on sharing access to 4551 with the adjacent center.
3 Thus, the DOT is aware and no new points of access to Hardscrabble will be made. The
4 map amendment will not create new traffic as the traffic is already present. The
5 character of Hardscrabble has changed lockstep with residential growth of the
6 Northeast, pushing well beyond its boundaries from a decade ago. Commercial
7 development has followed the rooftops to provide necessary services, goods and food.
8 A non-exhaustive list of existing businesses within 3/10ths of a mile in either direction
9 are Frank's Discount Tire, Sonic, Sparkle Car Wash, Napa, O'Reilly's, Pope Davis Tire,
10 Walgreens, San Jose Restaurant, Marcos Pizza, Spinx gas, Bank of America, Publix,
11 and Doctors Care. Almost directly across from 4551 is a new Murphy's Gas which
12 opened in 2020. Immediately across from 4551 there are 19 acres of property zoned
13 General Commercial. It is my opinion and hope for your support that the character of
14 Hardscrabble Road will not change with a map amendment of .88 acres. Thank you,
15 Ryan Maltba.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

17 MR. PRICE: And that's the only comment, Mr. Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright. So that's the Applicant's comments. Any
19 additional comments for the Staff regarding the Applicant's statement?

20 MR. DENNIS: I have one. So the Applicant is actually the one that owns the
21 complex directly north of it, the Beef O'Brady's, Marcos Pizza and I wanna say
22 Japanese takeout restaurant that's in there if I'm not mistaken, is that correct?

1 MR. PRICE: I believe that's what the Applicant has stated and we can confirm
2 that.

3 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Price, it shows it's Baker & Baker Real Estate Developers,
4 LLC.

5 MR. PRICE: Yes, thank you. So they may be – and of course our records may
6 not reflect any recent deals of acquisition, but according to the Applicant he states that
7 he owns both parcels.

8 MR. DENNIS: Okay.

9 MR. BRANHAM: Well, that's critical to the propriety of the Application, right? Due
10 to the size of the subject parcel?

11 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

12 MR. BRANHAM: No?

13 MR. PRICE: No, sir. I mean, if, even if he didn't own this parcel could this site be
14 developed? It just really just depends on what the intended use would be on the
15 property.

16 MR. BRANHAM: Okay.

17 MR. PRICE: And meeting development standards. And if DOT would be willing to
18 grant them an access from Hardscrabble Road to this site, or if they would require some
19 type of connectivity through an adjacent commercial property.

20 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. DENNIS: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any additional comments? The Chair will
23 entertain a motion if there are not.

1 MS. CAIRNS: I'd be happy to make a motion that we send Case No. 20-032,
2 4551 Hardscrabble Road, forward to Council with a recommendation – and the reason
3 for going against Staff is that given the lot's size and its location being immediately
4 adjacent to large commercial on a road that has become that character, that it is
5 appropriate in this situation to go against the Comp Plan.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, is there a second?

7 MR. BRANHAM: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that we
9 send Case No. 20-032 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval based
10 upon the recommendation from Commissioner Cairns. It's been moved and properly
11 seconded, any additional discussion? If not, the Chair will entertain a roll call vote.

12 MR. PRICE: Okay. Gilchrist?

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

15 MS. CAIRNS: Yes.

16 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

17 MR. YONKE: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

19 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

21 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Grady?

23 MR. GRADY: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

2 MR. PRICE: Branham?

3 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: And Frierson?

5 MR. PRICE: That passes 7/0.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I thought I heard an opposition there? Did I not hear
7 that Taylor opposed that?

8 MR. PRICE: No, sir. I called out their names just in case it happened to show, but
9 no sir.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Again, we are a recommending Body to County
11 Council and they will meet on the 19th to consider this case. So we thank those of you
12 for participating and thank you, Commissioners. Moving right along, the next case.

13 **CASE NO. 20-033 MA:**

14 MR. PRICE: Okay, the next item is Case 20-033 MA. The Applicant is Yani
15 Mouratev, I hope I'm saying that close. The location is 115 Tims Road. The parcel is a
16 little less than 70 acres, and the Applicant is requesting to rezone from RR, which is
17 Rural Residential to Heavy Industrial which is HI. Staff recommends disapproval of this
18 request as it wouldn't be consistent with the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, as
19 the Comprehensive Plan designates this area as neighborhood low density and
20 provides that industrial development with significant community impacts, you know,
21 meaning noise, exhaust, odor or heavy truck traffic, is discouraged in these areas. And
22 being that the HI district allows for uses that promote those impacts Staff does
23 recommend disapproval. However, the request to rezone would be compatible with the

1 adjacent land uses and current development pattern for industrial development uses in
2 the surrounding area. So again, Staff recommends disapproval but it's more principally
3 based on the Comp Plan, however, upon looking at the character of the surrounding
4 area for the request, it would be compatible.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, any questions for the Staff?

6 MS. CAIRNS: I actually do have a question for Staff. So it seems that in part of
7 the Applicant's letter to us, I felt like he was offering there was some unique features of
8 this piece of property with respect to its ability to support the intended use, which I think
9 was to continue quarrying or to do quarrying?

10 MR. PRICE: Yes.

11 MS. CAIRNS: And so my question is, is there something environmental special
12 about this parcel that makes it more compatible for that use than maybe other parts of
13 the County? I think I asked that right.

14 MR. PRICE: Yes, and – Commissioner Cairns, I really wish I had a better answer
15 for you than what I'm giving, because this question has come up actually on a number
16 of occasions for rezonings that have taken place in this general location. So kind of in a
17 summary, they typically mine where it is and they really aren't other places in the
18 County – at least wherever you see your mining operations that is where the resources
19 and minerals are that they're looking for and this area, not too far from the Broad River,
20 has been shown to have the required minerals that they're looking for. Like I said this
21 question has come up a good bit and I probably could do a little more research and find
22 it from the answers that were given previously.

1 MS. CAIRNS: And we do in our Comp Plan have buffering requirements for
2 heavy industrial versus other differently zoned properties, correct?

3 MR. PRICE: Well in our Land Development Code we have buffering
4 requirements.

5 MS. CAIRNS: Thank you. Obviously I said the wrong word, I apologize.

6 MR. PRICE: Yes.

7 MS. CAIRNS: So. Okay. I'm just curious to hear anybody else's comments.

8 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Um-hum?

10 MR. BRANHAM: Could the Staff pull up, just as a preemptive request, could the
11 Staff pull up the mapping so that we can see the location of 124 Tims Road, being that
12 that's the location owned by someone who wrote in a written opposition to the request?

13 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. I believe it's on the screen, Mr. Branham. You see the little
14 blue dot in the middle of the screen? We can zoom in if we need to. But that is 124 Tims
15 Road.

16 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. And the subject parcel is where in relation?

17 MR. YONKE: Can you turn on the zoning layer? It helps. I'm looking at it, too.

18 MS. CAIRNS: This is why I love having two monitors cause I can make it big.

19 MR. BRANHAM: And so the person, Mr. William Vincent, said he drives through
20 the subject property to get to his property?

21 MR. PRICE: Yes.

22 MR. BRANHAM: What would that road route look like on the map?

1 MR. PRICE: Well you can see Tims Road, I think Tommy, yeah Mr. DeLage,
2 actually where his mouse is you can see Tims Road and it looks like there's more of an
3 easement that leads through to Mr. Vincent's property.

4 MR. BRANHAM: Interesting. Okay.

5 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, to me it just like this is, there's a whole number of just
6 landlocked parcels that don't have any frontage on a public road in this area.

7 MR. PRICE: Correct.

8 MS. CAIRNS: Including this parcel doesn't have frontage, Mr. – the fellow behind
9 Mr. Vincent, we've got a number that don't have frontage. I mean, we just encounter
10 that all over the place.

11 MR. BRANHAM: Alright, thanks.

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Branham. Ms. Cairns, did they
13 adequately answer your question?

14 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, I think so.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Price, do we have folks signed up to speak?

16 MR. PRICE: Yes, we have actually a comment from the Applicant and we have
17 three comments of opposition for this.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

19 MR. PRICE: I will read the comment from the Applicant. Again, I hate to butcher
20 names so I apologize, Yani G. Mouratev, property owner is Vulcan Materials Company,
21 115 Tims Road. Dear Commission Members, Vulcan Materials seeks rezoning of the
22 subject property from Rural Residential to Heavy Industrial for future phased use of the
23 existing neighboring Dreyfus Quarry. Rezoning the subject property will not contribute to

1 a detrimental significant community impact through increased activity, but will provide
2 necessary support for the local economy. The subject property aligns with the character
3 of the surrounding development pattern for a parcel location that would otherwise find
4 strained interest and viability for a single-family neighborhood development or
5 neighborhood commercial establishments. Dreyfus Quarry makes a necessary product
6 for a growing economy and supplies crushed stone aggregate that is used in all types of
7 construction, including schools, homes, hospitals, libraries, commercial construction,
8 places of worship and of course roads and bridges. The material is currently shipped to
9 construction sites throughout the Metropolitan Columbia area and to sales yards in
10 South Carolina's Low Country where there is not an available supply of quality granite
11 materials for construction. Traffic is unlikely to increase as approval of this application
12 will not increase the market demand for this product. Moreover, no new quarry locations
13 are likely in Richland County and because Richland County will soon see the closing of
14 the Olympia Mills Quarry, it is imperative to protect those few resources that Richland
15 County has available to it. Vulcan plans to utilize significantly greater buffer areas than
16 those mandated by DHEC and Vulcan constantly monitors all its activities to ensure
17 compliance with regulatory limits. All future plans will be subject to DHEC approval with
18 public participation and all impacts to the surrounding area will be considered and
19 approximately addressed by Vulcan. Moreover, future reclamations of the site could
20 include reservoirs, subdivisions, campuses or recreational uses as dictated by the land
21 uses at the time of reclamation. The Dreyfus Quarry is ideally located in the area that is
22 already considered a mostly heavy industrial area. It's location next to the Richland
23 County Landfill has saved the County literally millions of dollars over the years by

1 providing dirt cover that could be directly moved to the landfill site, often using Vulcan's
2 equipment. Vulcan has proven to be a good neighbor at its location at the Dreyfus
3 opened in 1950s in Columbia opened in 1870s. Quarries have contributed to the
4 economic tax base as well as provided quality jobs. Vulcan looks forward to continuing
5 the relationship with Richland County that it has built over the last 150 years for
6 decades into the future. Thanks for your favorable consideration of this Application.
7 Yours Truly, Jimmy Fleming, Vice-President of Permitting and External Affairs, Vulcan
8 Materials Company.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any questions for the Applicant?

10 MR. BRANHAM: Could I ask a question?

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure, go right ahead.

12 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Price, do you know that to be true, the statement that this
13 company has saved the County millions of dollars by providing dirt cover at the adjacent
14 landfill?

15 MR. PRICE: No, sir. I'm unable to address that at this time.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Branham. Any additional comments for
17 the Staff? Mr. Price, we'll listen to the other comments from the public.

18 MR. DELAGE: Alright. So I have a comment from Cheryl Davis Perrell. In
19 reference to Case No. 20-033 MA, I disapprove because of the dust and the noise that
20 would be generated. Alright, and then I have one from Mr. Timothy Vincent, it says,
21 Dear Mr. Gilchrist and fellow Commission Members, I am writing to voice my concern of
22 the request for changing the zoning of the Vulcan property located at 115 Tims Road
23 from an RR to the Heavy Industrial. This area has been pounded by rock and trash

1 trucks for a long time now, it seems the noise keeps getting closer to the residents who
2 live in the surrounding area. Please support your Staff's disapproval recommendation to
3 help slow the growth of this type of activity. We want to give our kids a chance to enjoy
4 a peaceful life as they begin to live and raise their own families in the future within these
5 surrounding areas. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. And then I have one
6 from William P. Vincent, Jr. It says, Please accept this email on behalf of my brother,
7 Pat Vincent. Thank you. Dear Mr. Gilchrist and other Commissioner Members, my name
8 is Pat Vincent, I live at 7323 Monticello Road but own land at 124 Tims Road next to
9 115 Tims Road. I agree with the Staff recommendation to disapprove the request for
10 this zone change. A meeting held at the Cedar Creek Landowners Association when
11 Vulcan was buying the land from Richland County, as well as the parcel adjacent to
12 mine, the question was asked what they're going to do with the lands they were buying.
13 Mr. Elliott Botses, and I apologize if I butcher the name, BP and GM for Vulcan,
14 repeatedly said they wanted these lands for a buffer zone. He didn't know that someone
15 in his group had called the office in Atlanta and was told they were going to use it as for
16 overstock and junk equipment storage. I have to drive through this property to get to
17 mine and I don't think that it will pretty knowing how their other site looks. I also wonder
18 why they need HI zoning when their main operation in this area currently has an RU
19 zoning for the property. I would respectfully ask that you would hold up your Staff's
20 recommendation of denial. Respectfully, William P. Vincent, Jr.

21 MR. PRICE: And those are the three comments in opposition to the request.

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright, are there any additional comments from
23 the Commission? Motions?

1 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir?

3 MR. BRANHAM: Something to be said for the Planning Department's comment
4 that the rezone would be compatible with adjacent land uses and current development
5 pattern. In response to the opposition letter and the intended use, you know, the letter of
6 the Applicant seems like they make it pretty clear when they say, it will be several years
7 before there is mining activity on the subject property, they intend to mine that property.
8 But agreed when you review the current zoning map it's harmonious with the
9 surrounding tracts of land if you were to rezone it to HI. Certainly the provision of
10 crushed stone for all the various types of construction projects that require that in a
11 metropolitan area, there's a great need and justification for that generally speaking. I'm
12 not an industry expert but there's already a site, there's already a quarry, this would be
13 an expansion of that quarry it sounds like, potentially just for the opportunity to be able
14 to move once they've completed mining the tracts they're mining right now, to be able to
15 move to that southerly tract, which is neighboring – I can see a lotta justification for it. It
16 seems like there's not a lot of residential close by, which again it's harder and harder to
17 come by in a metropolitan area. Those are my comments for now.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any additional comments? Mr. Branham, is that
19 a motion that you wanna put those comments into a motion? I think you're on mute. I
20 think you're still on mute.

21 MR. BRANHAM: Hey, look at me! Third time's the charm. If you could read my
22 lips I was saying, I'd like to move to send Case 20-033 MA to Council with a
23 recommendation of approval. And the basis being that the request to rezone is

1 compatible with adjacent land uses and the current development pattern for industrial
2 development and uses in the area. And I do believe that there is an adequate need and
3 justification for the uses that would be permitted with that zoning designation.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Is there a second?

5 MS. CAIRNS: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded that we
7 send Case No. 20-033 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval based
8 upon the recommendation from Commissioner Branham. Any further discussion? If not,
9 the Chair will entertain a roll call vote.

10 MR. PRICE: Okay. Gilchrist?

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

13 MS. CAIRNS: Yes.

14 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

15 MR. YONKE: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

17 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

19 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Grady?

21 MR. GRADY: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Taylor? Not here. Branham?

23 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: And Frierson? Also not here. That passes 7/0

2 *[Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Branham; Absent:*
3 *Frierson, Taylor]*

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And again, we are a recommending Body to County
5 Council. They will meet back on the 19th of November and the public is welcome to
6 weigh in at that time. Thank you very much. I think that is all the map amendments that
7 we have today. And we can move right along to our next Agenda Item which is the
8 presentation for the Code Rewrite. Is that right, Mr. Price?

9 MR. PRICE: You're correct.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. And I think our consultants are here with us
11 today, is that right?

12 MR. RICHARDS: Yes, thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well, welcome aboard. Welcome, welcome, welcome,
14 we're excited to hear about where we are and what you guys have been up to and all
15 that good stuff, so thank you for the great work that you've been doing on this rewrite
16 and more specifically some of our new Commissioners who are now on the Commission
17 since we undertook this endeavor. So this will be a great opportunity to get updated, so
18 thanks guys for participating today for sure.

19 MR. RICHARDS: Thank you, Commissioner, and we appreciate the opportunity
20 to be here and it's good to see some familiar faces and be back with you again to talk
21 about this project. We're reaching an exciting point in the project and look forward to
22 sharing with you the results of the testing phase. And to those of you who are new to
23 the Commission, we look forward to talking with you and sharing those results as well. I

1 have a presentation that I will share with you. Hopefully you can see that. Can
2 everybody see that? Great. Fantastic. Well, so my name is Tim Richards and I am a
3 principal with Clarion & Associates based in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. And with me
4 today is Jonathan Woker who is with McBride, Dell, Clarion which is a sub-consultant on
5 this project and that firm conducted most of the testing that we'll talk about with you this
6 afternoon. I wanted to start out with a, just a brief introduction and I've got about 10
7 windows open so bear with me while I find the one that will connect me to the
8 PowerPoint. So I wanted to give you a quick update on the project status and then, and
9 so I'll do that and then I'll turn it over to Jonathan. Jonathan will describe the testing
10 process and then we'll walk through each of the testing sites with you and we will open
11 it for discussion for Commissioners to ask questions or make observations on each of
12 the testing sites. And then if there are more general questions or discussions we will
13 also have time for that following the summary of each of the test sites. So some of you
14 have seen this graphic before but it's slightly different in that we've completed the task 3
15 drafting of the Land Development Code and we spoke with you last time we were with
16 you on the consolidated draft. Now we are at the tail end of task 4. Task 4 involved
17 taking that consolidated draft of the Land Development Code and seeing how it would
18 be applied on actual sites within the County, and four sites were selected for testing. So
19 we're at the point where we drafted the modules with different installments. They've
20 been knit together into a consolidated draft. We've now seen how that draft would play
21 out in kind of real life or I guess hypothetical development scenarios in different sites in
22 the County. So following this testing stage, we'll move into the public hearing draft and
23 we've been working with Staff very closely as they have been consolidating comments

1 and receiving input and conducting outreach to various stakeholder groups. We've had
2 meetings with the County Council as well and so Staff is continuing assemble input that
3 we will then translate into edits on the consolidated draft and produce a public hearing
4 draft. The timeline for that is early December when we expect to have a consolidated
5 set of comments that we can then go in and begin editing the master document and
6 produce the public hearing draft. But we're happy today to share with you the results of
7 the testing of task 4. And I will turn it over to Jonathan to describe what the objectives of
8 that testing is and how they went about it. So Jonathan, do you wanna take it from
9 here?

10 MR. WOKER: Yeah, thank you Tim and good afternoon to everybody. I'm
11 Jonathan Woker. I'm the planner with the firm McBride, Dell, Clarion. I'm in Cincinnati,
12 Ohio, and we teamed with Clarion & Associates on the Land Development Code
13 Rewrite, primarily to provide the role of code testing of the proposed Land Development
14 Code. Code testing is a tool to evaluate proposed zoning regulations and standards
15 based on review of proposed regulations and then using real development sites as a
16 form to evaluate the proposed regulations. And so we'll go into the process a little bit
17 more detailed and then present our four test cases here briefly. But there are four main
18 objectives to the code testing. First was to evaluate potential impact of the proposed
19 new districts and regulations on recently approved development, and as you'll see we
20 worked with Staff to identify four locations that would help us to evaluate specific
21 proposed regulations of the Land Development Code update. Second goal was to verify
22 whether the proposed Land Development Code achieves the rewrite of the project
23 goals. You know, I think that's an assessment that we'll need to make with you as

1 stakeholders and then with the Staff to do that, but we think the code testing has
2 accomplished the intent to look at specific types of regulations that are proposed and to
3 show what potential impacts those could have on development. Third, to determine
4 whether adjustments might be needed. Again that's an assessment that we need to do
5 with you and with the Staff based on the findings we come up with. And then fourth goal
6 objective was to demonstrate how the proposed Land Development Code could alter
7 future development patterns. And I think as you'll see in some of the illustrations that
8 we've prepared and the assessment of the four test cases that we were able to do that.
9 So let's talk about the methodology that we used. [Presentation not transcribed]

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, any additional questions for Tim or Jonathan or
11 the Staff? Well guys, thank you absolutely. This has been great. We have a couple of
12 items on our Agenda. The next item is to receive a briefing on the Opportunity Zones,
13 but I wanted to gauge the Commission, you know, it's about 20 minutes after 5:00. I
14 know we've had a pretty long day today. I'm fine with deferring that until our next
15 meeting, because one of the things, I don't know if the Staff has had opportunity to
16 share their findings about what could potentially be done with this with these
17 consultants, but if that has not occurred it might make more sense to do that just so that
18 we can understand what they're saying about the interest so that we could present that
19 comprehensively to the Commission at the next meeting. So if everybody's okay with
20 that I can certain defer that to our next meeting. Everybody cool with that?

21 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah.

22 MR. DENNIS: I'm fine. I got till 6:00 before I've got another meeting I've gotta be
23 at with the school board, so you keep rolling, I'll keep going.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Price, were you gonna make a comment about
2 that?

3 MR. PRICE: Well no, I'll let you decide if y'all are gonna continue and then we
4 can talk about it.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Well, if everybody's okay with that, Mr. Dennis,
6 you know, we'll give you time to get to your school board issues and then we can talk
7 about this in December. I'm in no rush to get it, but if we're gonna defer it and if we
8 haven't had a conversation with these guys who are helping to work on our plan I would
9 love to have that a part of our conversation next time. Alright, do we need to make a
10 motion or anything to do that, to defer that to December?

11 MR. PRICE: No, sir. I believe you can just, this can be something we'll just pick
12 up next time since you weren't gonna take any formal action on it. We can defer it.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. And the only thing on the Chairman's Report,
14 just thank you guys for your commitment during these Zoom calls. It's been great to see
15 all of you and I hate we can't see each other in person, but hopefully we'll be able to do
16 that in the not too distant future. But we wanna do if we do it safely, so we certainly want
17 to continue to remind everybody to continue to be vigilant about your safety and stay
18 committed to what we're doing. One of the things I mentioned to Mr. Price, we're gonna
19 have a new County Council coming up here in, at the beginning of the year. And I've
20 had the opportunity to speak with several members, they're excited about the work not
21 only that Staff is doing but also about what the Commission is involved with. And I think
22 it'll be a great opportunity on the front end to have an opportunity for them to meet us
23 and us to meet them and so that, just tuck that away in the back of your mind because I

1 think it's important, particularly as we embark upon this rewrite and other planning ideas
2 that you have, that it's important to make sure that with this new Council we try to create
3 that relationship since they're the ones that appoint all of us. So that's something that
4 we'll talk about as we get closer to that time. Other than that that's all I have on the
5 Chairman's Report today. Thank you guys for your attendance today. Let's see,
6 anything else on our Agenda? Planning Director's Report?

7 ? : No, sir, nothing to report other than what's in your Agenda packet.

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright, that sounds like a plan to me. Anything
9 else to bring to our attention today?

10 MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair, I just wanted to make one quick item for you
11 all. I just wanted to introduce our new Comprehensive Planner with the County. His
12 name's Matt Townsend and he's on the line with us right now.

13 MR. TOWNSEND: I'm happy to be here and I look forward to get into the future
14 projects.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Townsend, well welcome aboard. Welcome
16 aboard, you've joined a great team and I'm sure they're gonna take really good care of
17 you.

18 MR. TOWNSEND: Thank you. Thank you very much.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Absolutely. We look forward to meeting you soon in
20 person. Thank you. Anything else for the Commission? Okay, I'll entertain a motion to
21 adjourn.

22 MR. BRANHAM: So moved.

23 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. Bye y'all.

1

[END OF RECORDING]