

1 **RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
2 **April 4, 2022**  
3

4 *[Members Present: Jason Branham, Stephen Gilchrist, Christopher Yonke, Mettauer*  
5 *Carlisle, John Metts, Gary Dennis, Bryan Grady, Terrence Taylor, Beverly Frierson]*  
6

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

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, thank you very much for being here this  
9 afternoon everyone. I'm going to call the meeting to order. This is the Richland County  
10 Planning Commission meeting on April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Thank you all for being here. Staff, if  
11 you would please confirm the following, in accordance with The Freedom of Information  
12 Act a copy of the agenda was sent to the news media, persons requesting notification  
13 and posted on the bulletin board located in the county administration building. Is that  
14 correct?

15 MR. CROOKS: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm gonna  
17 talk through some, some preliminary stuff. I'm going to try and explain best I can, you  
18 know, where we are with, with the meeting and the Agenda as, as we move ahead. As a  
19 reminder the Planning Commission makes recommendations to County Council as to  
20 whether to approve or deny zoning map amendments. County Council will conduct its  
21 own public hearing and take official votes to approve or deny these map amendment  
22 requests on a future date to be published by the county. Council typically holds Zoning  
23 Public Hearings on the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of the month. Please check the county's website for  
24 updated agendas, dates and times. Please take note of the following guidelines for  
25 today's meeting. Turn off or silence any cellphones or pagers. Audience members may  
26 quietly come and go as needed. We've got a good number of people here today so

1 sheriff's deputy did as me to remind folks to please avoid congregating along that back  
2 wall. Applicants are allowed up to two minutes to make statements. Citizens signed up  
3 to speak are allowed up to two minutes each. Redundant comments, please minimize  
4 those. Only address remarks to the Commission and don't expect the Commission to  
5 respond to questions from the speakers in a back and forth style, that's just not what the  
6 purpose of today's meeting is. And please no audience or speaker interchanges or  
7 exchanges. No audience demonstrations or other disruptions to the meeting are  
8 permitted nor are comments from anyone other than the speaker at the podium. Please  
9 remember the meeting is being recorded. Please speak into the microphone and give  
10 your name and address. We've got two podiums, one on each side here and you're  
11 welcome to use either one. Abusive language is inappropriate and will not be tolerated.  
12 Please don't voice displeasure or frustration at a recommendation as the Planning  
13 Commission is still conducting business. If you have any questions or concerns you  
14 may contact the Richland County Planning Department Staff. And now onto Agenda  
15 item three. Are there any motions for additions to or deletions from the Agenda?

16 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Chair? Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Crooks?

18 MR. CROOKS: The Applicant has requested a deferral for Case Number 22-006  
19 MA and I wanted to make note to that.

20 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, thank you. I also wondered whether there was a  
21 motion to defer the neighborhood pre-application meeting discussion, but the Chair will  
22 entertain a motion.

23 MR. GRADY: So moved.

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: The motion on the floor is to amend the Agenda to  
2 remove case 22-006 MA and to defer discussion on the neighborhood pre-application  
3 meeting, is that correct?

4 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman, if I may?

5 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes.

6 MR. GILCHRIST: Just to make sure I heard Staff correct. Was that a Staff  
7 deferral or did the Applicant choose to defer it, Mr. Crooks?

8 MR. DELAGE: Yes sir, Mr. Gilchrist, the Applicant did send Staff to -

9 MR. GILCHRIST: I'm sorry.

10 MR. DELAGE: Because the Applicant requested but it fell within that window with  
11 the Agendas that had already gone out, Staff wouldn't have been able to  
12 administratively defer it, which is why we're having to defer via the additions and  
13 deletions.

14 MR. GILCHRIST: Thank you Mr. Crooks [sic].

15 MR. DELAGE: Sure.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, thank you so did I get the motion right, Mr.  
17 Grady?

18 MR. GRADY: Yes, to remove consideration of case 22-006 which has been  
19 withdrawn and to defer action on the neighborhood pre-application meeting criteria.

20 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you. Is there a second?

21 MR. TAYLOR: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, seconded by Mr. Taylor. If the Staff would take  
23 a vote on that motion, please?

1 MR. CROOKS: Alright, roll, for a roll call vote. Yonke?

2 MR. YONKE: Aye.

3 MR. CROOKS: Carlisle?

4 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

5 MR. CROOKS: Frierson? Not here.

6 MR. CROOKS: Metts?

7 MR. METTS: Aye.

8 MR. CROOKS: Branham?

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Aye.

10 MR. CROOKS: Grady?

11 MR. GRADY: Aye.

12 MR. CROOKS: Taylor?

13 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

14 MR. CROOKS: Gilchrist?

15 MR. GILCHRIST: Aye.

16 MR. CROOKS: Dennis?

17 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

18 *[Approved: Yonke, Carlisle, Metts, Branham, Grady, Taylor, Gilchrist, Dennis; Absent*  
19 *for vote: Frierson]*

20 MR. CROOKS: Unanimous vote, carries.

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, motion carries. Thank you. Item four, the Chair  
22 notes that individuals are signed up to speak on Case 22-001 MA. As such the Chair  
23 will entertain a motion to amend the Consent Agenda so that these cases are, that case

1 is removed from the Consent Agenda and the Commission will hear public input on it  
2 today.

3 MR. DENNIS: Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes.

5 MR. DENNIS: I make a motion to pull Case Number 22-001 MA for public  
6 participation and discussion.

7 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright we have a motion. Second? Is there a second?

8 MR. YONKE: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, Mr. Yonke seconds. And Staff please take a  
10 vote on that motion.

11 MR. CROOKS: Alright, to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Roll call  
12 vote. Yonke?

13 MR. YONKE: Aye.

14 MR. CROOKS: Carlisle?

15 MR. CARLISE: Aye.

16 MR. CROOKS: Metts?

17 MR. METTS: Aye.

18 MR. CROOKS: Branham?

19 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Aye.

20 MR. CROOKS: Grady?

21 MR. GRADY: Aye.

22 MR. CROOKS: Taylor?

23 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

1 MR. CROOKS: Gilchrist?

2 MR. GILCHRIST: Aye.

3 MR. CROOKS: Dennis?

4 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

5 *[Approved: Yonke, Carlisle, Metts, Branham, Grady, Taylor, Gilchrist, Dennis; Absent*  
6 *for vote: Frierson]*

7 MR. CROOKS: Unanimous vote.

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, and just, just to be clear the Road Names that  
9 were a part of the Consent Agenda, that was the one remaining Consent Agenda item,  
10 so by that motion they are approved. Alright, we move ahead to Case 22-001 MA. And  
11 again ladies and gentlemen, I'll try and give some introductory remarks as to where we  
12 are in the process and then also give Staff an opportunity to present any information  
13 that they may want to. So last year Staff presented a proposal, a proposed full  
14 replacement of the Land Development Code. After review by this Commission and  
15 some modifications to the draft along the way, County Council voted to adopt the new  
16 replacement code. Included in the new Land Development Code is a new set of zoning  
17 districts. Every parcel of land in the county that is not inside a city or town has a zoning  
18 designation assigned by the county. With the adoption of this new code each parcel  
19 must be assigned a new zoning designation. County Staff prepared a draft map. The  
20 draft map is now available for public viewing via the county's website. Numerous  
21 informational meetings throughout the county have also been conducted by county  
22 Staff, and every application to amend the zoning map comes to the Planning  
23 Commission for review. Due to the high levels of public interest and the broad impact of

1 this case, the Commission determined to provide opportunity for public input, not just at  
2 our March regular meeting, but also at today's regular meeting. Today we will hear  
3 public comments up until around 5:30 pm. This case is set on today's meeting Agenda  
4 as one on which the Commission is scheduled to take action. In this process the  
5 Commission serves as a recommending Body to County Council. So ultimately our vote  
6 will be that of one to make one or more recommendations to Council. Council will then  
7 perform its own independent review of the draft zoning map. Council will provide an  
8 opportunity for public input at one of their meetings prior to voting on it. Council's vote is  
9 the official binding vote as to whether the draft zoning map is adopted. The draft map is  
10 subject to change during the process prior to being adopted by Council. If you do not  
11 feel that you need to speak to the Commission today but are simply seeking information  
12 about how the draft zoning map would impact your property or those immediately  
13 around your property, Members of the Planning Commission Staff are available to  
14 speak with you right now downstairs on the first floor of this building at the Planning  
15 Department's counter. And thank you for your patience. I hope that information was  
16 helpful. Before we receive public input, Staff would you like to present any updated  
17 information on the draft zoning map?

18 MR. CROOKS: Yes sir, so as we mentioned at the work session on Friday, so we  
19 were looking to make some additional changes to our recommendation based on some  
20 additional feedback. We did do that and those are, is posted now on the viewer; if it's  
21 not there, it's still in the process of being loaded. There are a handful of changes that  
22 we looked at particularly to an area between Dutch Fork Middle along Old Tama to  
23 Kennerly Road, probably about seven or so properties looking at the rezoning or

1 recommendation to RT. There was one property near Gervais and Two Notch originally  
2 being recommended for EMP. We are looking at recommending that for RC instead.  
3 And then recommendation for, I think one or two properties south of Eastover going  
4 from AG to I believe RT. And those would have been the only other potential changes to  
5 the recommendation, beyond what was made previously.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, alright.

7 MR. GILCHRIST: Chairman?

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Gilchrist?

9 MR. GILCHRIST: So question for the Staff. Those changes that were made to  
10 the Land Development Code, were they in response to what we heard during the public  
11 input session a few days ago?

12 MR. CROOKS: So in terms of Staff's recommendation, so what is there now? So  
13 yes, so as Staff's recommendation changed from the prior meeting to, I think it was  
14 Monday of last week when the new, yes, so a lot of that has been based on the  
15 feedback that we've been hearing, not just at this meeting but also at the various  
16 meetings, as well as phone calls, emails, letters that we have been receiving throughout  
17 this process, based on that feedback.

18 MR. GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Anything else just kind of preliminarily before we hear  
20 from the public? Alright, I will go ahead and proceed with public input. Mr. Vice Chair, if  
21 you would please call the name of the first person that's signed up. Reminder to each  
22 speaker you have two minutes to speak and you should state your name and address  
23 before you begin.



1 MR. DENNIS: Alright, I'm going to give this a shot. If I butcher your name I am  
2 very sorry, but 20 years in the military I've done it a lot, so. First off we have Lisa  
3 Boarder, Borden?

4 **TESTIMONY OF LISA BORDEN:**

5 BORDEN: Like the cow or the milk, yeah. No relation.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Staff, would you please keep time for us?

7 MS. BORDEN: My name is Lisa Borden, I live at 116 Rideout Point Road, Irmo  
8 South Carolina. Set timer for two minutes. The citizens of Richland County are fighting  
9 for democracy and the right to address growth, development, economic issues, health  
10 issues and safety issues in our communities. We are speaking out for all of the quality  
11 of life on behalf of ourselves, our children and our grandchildren. The county  
12 Commissioners are responsible for protecting our community, its health, safety and  
13 environment, and implementing the will of the people expressed by our votes. The  
14 Planning Commission has been appointed by the commissioners to fulfill this  
15 responsibility to the citizens of Richland County. The citizens of this county have spoken  
16 loudly through petitions, emails, phone conversations, one on one meetings and public  
17 hearings that we do not support the massive rezoning of our county to increase density.  
18 Changing 78% of the county zoning from RU rural district to more intense development  
19 is not what the citizens of this county want. Of the six residential zoning districts, only  
20 Residential 1 limits development to one single family detached dwelling per lot. Every  
21 other residential district R2 to R6 permits four family dwellings, three family dwellings,  
22 two family dwellings, family group homes and single family detached homes. Now the  
23 Planning Staff explained to me that this is not multifamily housing, but even a

1 kindergartener knows that four, three, two, are more than one, which is the definition of  
2 multi. The proposed zoning map will destroy single family neighborhoods that are not in  
3 HOA's in unincorporated Richland County. Mayor Frank Brunson of Forest Acres took a  
4 strong and successful position in support of his citizens to preserve their quality of life.  
5 All of the residential areas in Forest Acres were changed to R1, one single family  
6 dwelling per lot. The Planning Staff are recommending that you pass the proposed  
7 zoning map. Please listen to the citizens of this county. Uphold democracy and deny  
8 this immense increase of density for our county. It is time to rework this document with  
9 the quality of life and economic development being considered as equal partners. Good,  
10 smart growth is a goal we can all buy into.

11 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Please hold your applause. Everyone please hold  
12 applause. We need to try to make sure we get everybody heard that wants to be heard  
13 in the time we have.

14 MR. DENNIS: Alright, we have Pam Selkinghaus.

15 **TESTIMONY OF PAM SELKINGHAUS(?):**

16 MS. SELKINGHAUS: Hi, I am Pam Selkinghaus and I reside at 1944 Marina  
17 Road, Irmo. Marina Road and surrounding residents in the Ballentine area are  
18 adamantly opposed to the county's rezoning plan. These 948 signatures petition the  
19 county to continue as currently zoned and continuance of our single family designation.  
20 The only zoning that is single family appears to be R1. In alliance with Johnson Marina  
21 Road petition, we have approximately 1,344 signatures requesting the same. Many  
22 more signatures are being added every day. Furthermore, I would like to add that these  
23 signatures were not gathered via the internet. We met and discussed this issue at,

1 personally with each and every one of these citizens. We took the time to do this. Not  
2 on the internet. Please don't be fooled by the developers and their cries about first time  
3 home buyers. This rezoning is all about the developers filling their pockets with money  
4 at the expense of Richland County, its tax payers and our already overburdened  
5 infrastructure. In closing, the lifelong American dream of home ownership is owning a  
6 single family home. It's not about owning a duplex or a tri-plex in rural areas of this  
7 county. Please do not allow the developers to ruin our county and our way of life just so  
8 they can get rich. Thank you very much. And I'd like to submit these, ongoing.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, Tommy or one of the Staff, would you please  
10 take that?

11 PAM SELKINGHAUS: These are ongoing.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you. Alright.

13 MR. DENNIS: Next we have Melinda Ray.

14 **TESTIMONY OF MELINDA RAY:**

15 MS. RAY: Hey, my name is Melinda Ray. I reside at 105 Shell Cracker Court,  
16 Irmo, South Carolina. When I initially found out about this, I was very shocked and very  
17 upset. I'm a realtor and I understand the meaning of rural designation and R1 and all of  
18 that, that's what I do, I've done it since 2014, and I love where we live. I think everybody  
19 in this room loves where they live. And I happened to go back and review some of the  
20 zoning ordinance that we had been using until recently as it's beginning to turn more  
21 grey. We used to say that it was, our ordinances were defined as to promote and  
22 protect public health, safety, morals, convenience, order, prosperity and general welfare  
23 of the community. And in some of the last planning acts it also stated that a local

1 government must reasonably consider the following purposes where applicable.

2 Number one, to include preventing land overcrowding, avoid undue concentration of  
3 population and lessen street congestion. Your plan promises to give us more  
4 congestion without considering the overcrowded roads that you have refused to address  
5 and solve. Your plan of the goal of zoning should be to help create a convenient,  
6 attractive and harmonious community. This new plan does not create a convenient and  
7 harmonious community as we watch you take away our land and not sure whose  
8 interest we're promoting. It certainly isn't us. I mean, we've been so proud of Richland  
9 County all of our life and now we're hearing this? It's just, it's hard. And I appreciate all  
10 the work and all the fine people I've got to know through this process and we hope y'all  
11 will do what you're supposed to. Thank you.

12 MR. DENNIS: Once again please hold your applause. We have David Cather.

13 **TESTIMONY OF DAVID CATHER:**

14 MR. CATHER: I'm Dave Cather from Blythewood, 1912 Lorick. I've never done  
15 this before. This is the first time.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: You'll be fine.

17 MR. CATHER: And I read in the paper the other night over the weekend about all  
18 this so this is all new to me. I moved here from Detroit, like I said six years ago and  
19 everybody is talking about this great town in Blythewood, old country town. In fact,  
20 people refer to it as a strip of land that connect to Columbia to Ridgewood, Ridgeway.  
21 So I bought, I bought it, I got chickens, I got an orchard, I got a corn field, I wanna have  
22 a riding stable with the horses; I plan to retire in five years. And from my understanding  
23 what the article said anyways, I'm not allowed to have riding stables, I'm not allowed to

1 have horses, I'm not allowed to have my chickens. You know, and the neighbor next  
2 door has got steers, he's got pigs, you know, is he in the same boat. And then over on  
3 Swygert Road 234 acres, Mungo Homes is supposed to build a big old subdivision.  
4 Blythewood is getting swallowed. You know, I started watching this show on TV, it was  
5 called Yellowstone, and I'm watching this poor from Montana and he's got this cattle  
6 ranch been generations and generations, you know, the kind of, the stories I hear about  
7 Blythewood and South Carolina, generations and generations of families have just, they  
8 had land and now their rights are being taken away. And the article in the paper says I  
9 can have a variance, well I don't want a variance, I want to maintain what I have right  
10 now, my zoning right now. So in five years from now I can build a stable, I can ride  
11 those horses. This is what I wanted to do and this is all new to me so I really don't know  
12 what to say, I don't have a big old elaborate speech or nothing like that but I  
13 recommend you either postpone this for 30 years, I won't be around no more. If you  
14 can't recommend denial just postpone it. But we don't need these new zoning rules. I  
15 appreciate your time.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you for being here. Stick around.

17 MR. DENNIS: Alright we have Virginia Tansel?

18 **TESTIMONY OF VIRGINIA TANSEL:**

19 MS. TANSEL: Virginia Tansel, 6401 Winya Drive, 29203. Denny Terrance is the  
20 perfect blend of seclusion and community. Its city convenience and country charm, I  
21 want to keep it that way. Section 6-29-510 of the South Carolina Comprehensive Plan  
22 Act only ask to update and revise, not necessarily change zoning. It states that a local  
23 comprehensive plan be done, including housing that protects health, safety, welfare of

1 residents. Section 6-29-710 states zoning ordinances must guide development in  
2 accordance with existing and future needs, promoting health, safety, morals, order,  
3 appearance, general welfare, preventing overcrowding, avoiding undue concentration of  
4 population. Cramming families together to give, to save green space is unwise. Today  
5 folks are ruled by their feelings and they tote guns and the people not the guns are the  
6 problem. The county fails to keep landlords accountable now. Can't even keep up with  
7 solid waste picked up or worse more people. The South Carolina Act also says zoning  
8 must be made in accordance with a local comprehensive plan. Denny Terrance  
9 repeatedly asked but was denied that. We have been shown no good reason why our  
10 historic community now needs to be divided into two or three zones. I object and  
11 respectfully commit, request for R1 for all of our community be the zoning; not subject to  
12 cluster or zero lot line development. Thank you very much for your consideration. Thank  
13 you.

14 MR. DENNIS: Alright we have Jennifer Mankey.

15 **TESTIMONY OF JENNIFER MANKEY:**

16 MS. MANKEY: My names is Jennifer Mankey and I live at 320 Clearview Drive,  
17 Hopkins, South Carolina. When I was high school, I was a recent transplant from  
18 Massachusetts and my friends and I got, went through our kitchen draws and pulled out  
19 all the keys and mailed them from Sumter to Columbia to the State House saying, you  
20 are the key to save the swamp. That was a long time ago, I hate to think how long ago it  
21 was. But you also are the key to saving the swamp because I went to Congaree  
22 National Park today and walked through the parking lot and wrote down 29 state's  
23 license plates, plus a couple from France and two from Ontario. And I am here to speak

1 for people who come to see our National Park of which we're not proud enough, we're  
2 not tourist in our own area. Many of us have never been there, but 29 different states  
3 were represented, only four empty parking places in the whole park, and it was nine  
4 from North Carolina, four from Illinois, two from New York, one from Colorado, nine from  
5 Georgia, three from Massachusetts, three Ohio, one Utah, 12 from South Carolina,  
6 thank God, four from New Jersey, three from Indiana, one was a motorcycle, two from  
7 California, three from Iowa, four from Florida, two from Ontario, one Oklahoma, nine  
8 Virginia, four Pennsylvania, one Maine, one Kentucky, one Rhoda Island, one Arkansas,  
9 one Wisconsin, three Maryland, three Texas, one South Dakota, one Mississippi, three  
10 Michigan, one Maryland, one New Mexico. I spoke at length with the people from  
11 France who said their having trouble parking their rented RV; they didn't know where  
12 they were going to go besides Walmart. I'm speaking today to say please in your  
13 deliberations and in your recommendation to City [sic] Council, don't forget the tourism  
14 plan. The things that you are doing are negating the tourism plan and I don't want you  
15 to do them until you take the tourism plan into consideration.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright ma'am, that is your time. Thank you for being  
17 here.

18 MS. MANKEY: Thank you.

19 MR. DENNIS: Alright, next we have Donna Cole.

20 **TESTIMONY OF DONNA COLE:**

21 MS. COLE: Good afternoon Commission and Staff. My name is Donna Cole. I  
22 reside at 209 Amenity Road in Chapin, South Carolina 29036. I am here to present the  
23 Johnson Marina Road and surrounding residents within Chapin, White Rock and

1 Ballentine who are adamantly opposed to the Richland County's rezoning plan. Our  
2 infrastructure is already inadequate to support the density that already exists and there  
3 doesn't seem to be any effort in trying to improve what we have now. This includes  
4 water pollution, sewer issues, congested traffic and increase crime. These 396  
5 signatures petition to continue density as currently zoned with the continuous of true  
6 single family housing. In alliance with the Marina Road petition we presently have  
7 approximately 1,344 signatures requesting the same. Our petition is stated on each  
8 signature page. Thank you for listening to this plea.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

10 MR. DENNIS: Christina Kanous?

11 **TESTIMONY OF CHRISTINA KANOUS:**

12 MS. KANOUS(?): Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Christina Kanous  
13 and I live at 3406 Overcreek Road in the Northeast area near Forest Acres. I'm one of  
14 those areas that is an unincorporated lot surrounded by Forest Acres. We are currently  
15 zoned for R1 and this code would change us to R3 or as what I was understood might  
16 change us to R2. But that would still allow for multi-family dwellings and manufactured  
17 homes in our neighborhood. Our family has been on this property for 54 years. My  
18 parents bought the house because they wanted single family zoning, and I'm here to tell  
19 you that the other people in my neighborhood want to keep it family zoning. Not only to  
20 keep our property values intact and our natural resources, but I've gotta tell you the  
21 infrastructure for our neighborhood cannot take anymore density. Our roads are failing  
22 right now. We're serviced by City of Columbia water that is 4,000 work orders behind.  
23 Our schools are overcrowded. There's traffic jams. Richland County EMS that serves us



1 is having a personnel and equipment crisis and we've had a crime problem. Do you  
2 know that in the past five years there have been six people shot to death within a ten-  
3 minute walk of my house? So obviously law enforcement is being challenged. So I'm  
4 begging you to let us stay R1 and please let us keep our single family zoning and  
5 please deny this land code the way it's written because it's going to be a negative effect  
6 on rural areas too. And the final thing is I had somebody from the county tell me at a  
7 meeting that there was a calendar that needed to be met. Let me tell you something,  
8 there shouldn't be a deadline when you are dealing with lives and livelihoods of people.  
9 It is your responsibility to do what's right for the people you serve and not do what's  
10 right by a calendar or a clock. You need to think of lives and livelihoods instead. Thank  
11 you.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

13 MR. DENNIS: Leslie Tweed?

14 **TESTIMONY OF LESLIE TWEED:**

15 MR. TWEED: My name is Leslie Tweed and I'm with the Ballentine Civic  
16 Association or Community Association. I've delivered a package to each of you because  
17 it's a lot easier to put it all in writing. You have to contend with 500 pages of things and  
18 all kinds of codes, commercial etc. We focused on all the things that actually create an  
19 issue for the homeowner. This is a single family home area. Anything west of route 6  
20 and south of 76 are peninsulas that jut out into the lake. And as it states in the  
21 paperwork there you'll see that there's single roads going in and out. This density idea  
22 that Staff works with, because it's for the big picture, but the problem is it doesn't take  
23 into and consider also population. You know, if you go and take our properties and turn

1 them into R2s, which the whole peninsula of Marina Road is, except for they even put  
2 R3s at the end, you're talking about taking in area and if you have a home there and  
3 you got two cars fine and all that but they're gonna increase it, you know, that could be  
4 like three duplexes. So now you got six families there. None of the schools, the schools  
5 are maxed out. Ninety percent of everybody is on a well. Ninety percent of everybody  
6 because there's no city water and they are all on septic tanks in the let system which  
7 are 30 year old pipe holds, a six inch pipe is supposed to take any excess waste away  
8 and it can't handle it on rainy days now. So if you go and increase the amount of  
9 families you're going to increase the population by a huge amount, and this type of  
10 infrastructure does not work. The single roads that go up and down Johnson Marina  
11 Road and in Shadowood and everything, if you have all this additional traffic one  
12 accident high up on Marina Road will block a few thousand people from even getting  
13 out. They can't get in, now you can't get fired, you can't get to work, can't, the students  
14 can't go to school. So I'm asking you to add something to this either - you have three  
15 choices - make us R1, that's as close as we can get cause R2 as it states the exact  
16 things from your code book.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: I need to you finalize now, Mr. Tweed.

18 MR. TWEED: Okay - that you give us an opportunity to plead for something for  
19 this zone which is so sensitive to the lake.

20 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, thank you sir.

21 MR. DENNIS: Janet Robinson.

22 **TESTIMONY OF JANET ROBINSON:**

1 MS. ROBINSON: My name is Janet Robinson. I live at 1170 Hollis Pond Road  
2 and I am a fourth-generation owner of the property that I reside on. My family, matter of  
3 fact I still go up and down the same dirt road my ancestors went up in horse and buggy  
4 when they farmed that road. Quite interesting some days when it rains. We love our  
5 rural community. I've stood before, probably not all of you guys but 22 years ago,  
6 begging, begging this county to have some vision to not allow the density that has been  
7 crammed out our throats. I'm not anti-development in any means but I am for smart  
8 growth and what smart growth looks like to me is being respectful of the homes and the  
9 community and the people who have supported and been the cornerstone of this very  
10 county. Those of us that own rural land and live on rural land, and I'm curious of all of  
11 you sitting up here before me, how many of you live on rural property? Nobody, you  
12 know, I -

13 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: We're not answering any questions, okay. This is not  
14 the purpose of the meeting.

15 MS. ROBINSON: Okay, and I respect that and I can do my own research but that  
16 perplexes because, you know, we have supported this community. We have been here,  
17 we have, you know, watched our taxes go up, watched our roads collapse, watched our  
18 schools, watched all of our emergency services, and at the same time it's like to me the  
19 message being sent is the rural voice is no longer wanted or is no longer needed. We  
20 no longer would have a voice when developers come before you to rezone for high  
21 density, we no longer have voice to come up here and show our concern. To me let's  
22 look at how do we make what we have better? Maybe developers should start setting  
23 aside land to farm, to teach the communities how to come together, teach our children

1 how to grow our food. There is a different way. There's a better way. And I think that  
2 there's a lot of smart people sitting in this room and it just cannot be about the  
3 overgrowth because we are getting hammered where I live and I live very close to  
4 where the Mungo development is going in. So I beg, I implore you to deny this or if you  
5 cannot deny it for whatever reason to please to defer it so we can continue to have  
6 open creative conversation to keep Richland County a great place to live because if this  
7 happens it's really not a great place to live. It's being told what we have to do to  
8 appease somebody else. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

10 MR. DENNIS: Brad Everhart?

11 **TESTIMONY OF BRAD EVERHART:**

12 MR. EVERHART: Good afternoon, my name is Brad Everhart. I live 10 Morning  
13 Star Court. I also have a State Farm Insurance office at 1530 Dutch Fork Road in Irmo.  
14 The Lake Murray situation that was last talked about, we're not, it can't handle much  
15 more as far as – you got one way in and one way out all the way up through Lake  
16 Murray, through Marina Road, through Johnson Marina Road. There is a lot, a lot of  
17 different roads going back up through there and it cannot handle much more growth.  
18 The sewer systems can't handle much more. The water systems cannot handle much  
19 more. The roads can't handle much more. R1 looks like it's gonna be the only way to  
20 keep things from just getting completely out of hand in this county. So please consider  
21 this. Thank y'all.

22 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

23 MR. DENNIS: Don Alt?

1 **TESTIMONY OF DON ALT:**

2 MR. ALT: Hey my name's Don Alt. I'm 4672 Oak Wood Drive. Forest Acres area  
3 29206. I apologize I'm probably going to be the least articulate person up here so if y'all  
4 will just bear with me. I'm opposed to what is going on here with the elimination of single  
5 family zoning in Richland County. R2, R3 are what we're going to and both of these  
6 allow multi-family housing. I mean, there's, there's a little bit of disingenuousness when  
7 county is telling us that these not multi-family but they are. It's duplexes, triplexes,  
8 quadraplexes, these are all multiples of one. This is all multi-family. The way the county  
9 went about this and passed this legislation without anyone knowing about it is just  
10 disheartening. You are going to destroy our property values. You're going to create  
11 more traffic. You're going to introduce more crowding into our schools. You're going to  
12 increase the incidents of crime and you're going to further overload our utilities. The  
13 most common opinion, I've talked to people all over the county, and the most common  
14 opinion that I have is that is of disdain for what the county is doing and how they've  
15 gone about it. It's almost as if they've tried to sneak it through without public, public  
16 notice. I don't think this is going to happen now, the public seems to be very aware of it.

17 MR. DENNIS: Please hold your applause, let the man speak.

18 MR. ALT: But when we complain about it, we complain the 3R is gonna allow  
19 multi-family housing. Well the common solution from county representation is, well we  
20 can rezone you as 2R but that still allows multi-family zoning. I mean, it just shows the  
21 county representation just does not get it. The problem is multi-family housing. The  
22 problem is that you've eliminated multi-family, single family housing in the county and  
23 that's just, just not acceptable. It's going to destroy this county. Only thing I can ask is

1 that y'all revisit the code and eliminate single, the multi-family allowance from the code,  
2 R2 and R3, just take it out. It's an easy fix.

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you very much.

4 MR. ALT: Thank you.

5 MR. DENNIS: Thank you. We have Fred Ange.

6 **TESTIMONY OF FRED ANGE:**

7 MR. ANGE: My name is Fred Ange. I live at 5619 South Woodrow Street in  
8 Columbia, South Carolina. I also own a home at 201 Jessy Derek Road, Irmo, South  
9 Carolina in the Dutch Fork Community. I first learned of this when I received what  
10 looked like a tax bill with a note that said this is not a tax bill. Before that I received no  
11 other communication either by phone, US mail, email, did not see any signs in the  
12 affected areas of the county notifying residents of your intentions. The information was  
13 not provided in other languages meaning these communities might not even know what  
14 you're trying to do. Hispanics and Asians make up 8.3% of the county's population,  
15 8.5% of residents do not have a high school diploma and 16% live below the poverty  
16 line. These people may not even know what you intend to do to them. My lot is an acre  
17 and a half and other lots in my neighborhood range from one to ten acres with an  
18 average size of three acres. Your proposal to change our zoning from Rural to R3  
19 shows a lack of understanding of the community and how these properties are used.  
20 For comparison an R3 zoning alone allows four houses on a lot the size of a football  
21 field. Additionally, you have not provided me with the information on how the  
22 neighboring properties are going to be rezoned. I saw your proposed map on your  
23 website. It's a joke, it lacks any meaningful detail and I have a right to know what the

1 proposed zoning is for nearby properties. I ask the county downstairs at the Planning  
2 Commission what the zoning was and was told I had to fill out a Freedom of Information  
3 Act request. What are you trying to hide? Kennerly Road has traffic count comparable to  
4 Harbison Boulevard. It's mixed income neighborhoods, has pedestrian traffic walking to  
5 the grocery stores. It's also narrow, winding and has no should. The area is a frequent  
6 source of accidents and fatalities which will be made worse by increasing the population  
7 density. The *State Newspaper* reported that South Carolina ranks 48 out of 50<sup>th</sup> in  
8 quality of education. According to LR5 School District, six schools are at capacity and  
9 two have a freeze on new enrollment. Contributing to the existing problem by increasing  
10 population density and forcing children to commute to schools outside their  
11 neighborhoods is irresponsible and shows a lack of care. Homes in my particular  
12 neighborhood operate off wells and septic tanks as public water and sewer lines stop at  
13 Kingston Forest.

14 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, sir. If you could go ahead a wrap up.

15 MR. ANGE: Okay, I'll wrap up. I grew up in Raleigh, North Carolina. I'm planning  
16 to move back to Raleigh, North Carolina. Somebody asked me the difference between  
17 Raleigh, North Carolina and Richland County. I said Raleigh, North Carolina is featured  
18 on Love It of List It, Richland County is featured on Live PD.

19 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you, sir.

20 MR. DENNIS: Elaina Shafter?

21 **TESTIMONY OF ELAINA SCHAFFER:**

22 MS. SCHAFFER: Good after, my name is Elaina Schaffer, I reside 212 Magnolia  
23 Bluff Drive and that's in Lake Carolina, Northeast Columbia 29229 zip code. I'm actually

1 here as a resident and also as a legislative advocate for AARP senior issues. The  
2 things that have struck me about this whole situation is I did not find out, I could not find  
3 out based on your maps and your codes where my, our housing fit into all of this. Was  
4 anything gonna be changed, where, you know, what goes on. Your maps, as one  
5 person mentioned, are basically illegible; you go on the map, you go into the website,  
6 you get to the map, you plug in your address and it brings you to an area that has  
7 writing over the top of map, you can't see what's in there unless you can enlarge it so  
8 much that you can actually find streets. Again, it becomes impossible to understand. I  
9 made a phone call today and I was informed that Lake Carolina is not going to be  
10 touched, it's an established community. However, when you live in Lake Carolina you  
11 live, you come and go through Hardscrabble Road entrance and Hardscrabble Road on  
12 our side, and forgive me I'm challenged when it comes to direction, just across the  
13 street, I believe it's West but I'm not sure, when you're coming out of that main entrance  
14 to Lake Carolina you realize that you're taking your life in your hands. They're in the  
15 process of expanding the number of lanes of Hardscrabble Road, and in effect it will be  
16 five and six lanes, depending upon turning pieces and so on. First and foremost, it's a  
17 safety hazard if you're adding housing to the area. And I will tell you that when we come  
18 out of Lake Carolina across Hardscrabble the building that's going on there now, the  
19 home construction that's going on there now, it is happening so fast and so furious and  
20 yet and still it's well hidden.

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Ma'am, your time is expired. Thank you so much.

22 MS. SCHAFFER: Thank you.

23 MR. DENNIS: Matt Kneece?



1 **TESTIMONY OF MATT KNEECE:**

2 MR. KNEECE: Can y'all hear me? Thank you so much for the chance for public  
3 input on this. My name is Matt Kneece. I'm at 825 Cross Hill Road. I'm near Fort  
4 Jackson. I'm a Richland County resident, proud Richland County resident, but more  
5 importantly I'm here in my capacity as policy coordinator for Carolina Farms  
6 Stewardship Association. We're a two-state non-profit member based. We serve and  
7 advocate for small and medium sized family farms throughout both Carolinas, including  
8 here in Richland County. In fact, our members here in Richland County alerted us to  
9 this, this rezoning a few weeks ago and these are all farms who are 15, 20, 25 acre  
10 multi-generational farms who farmed the same plot of land from Eastover out to  
11 Blythewood for the last 100 years, 125, 150 years. And they got a letter in the mail that  
12 said that you must be mistaken, this is not a multi-generational full time family farm, this  
13 is in fact a hobby farm. You are no longer a farm, in fact those 20 pigs you have on your  
14 property, those may look like livestock but their actually pets. So these ad  
15 reclassifications will drive, unintentionally, small farms out of business. In fact it's hard to  
16 be a farmer from weather problems to supply chain instability, COVID, it's very difficult,  
17 the margins are so small. And they've all made one thing clear to us and it's that  
18 micromanagement on their property and their plots of land will force them to sell their  
19 farms, will force them out of business. And in fact to protect farmers livelihoods the  
20 State of South Carolina has a law on the books called The Right to Farm Act. And The  
21 Right to Farm Act makes it clear that counties and municipalities aren't allowed to  
22 implement stricter regulations against, strict regulations than the state legislature on  
23 what you can do on your property. And in fact to close you cautioned earlier that this is

1 strictly to recommend to County Council what should take place, what actions should be  
2 taken on this rezone. So this is your chance to protect Richland County Council from the  
3 inevitable lawsuits that will come from the small family farms that will sue when they are  
4 forced out of business. So we encourage you to not tamper with the existing Ag  
5 reclassifications, to keep the existing Ag reclassifications. Perhaps table this we can all  
6 come to the table and figure out a solution that works for everybody, but as it's written  
7 this will drive small farms out of business. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you. Just a reminder for in the room too, when  
9 you're not speaking County Council has, you know, enacted those ordinances regarding  
10 masks so we would ask you to wear those. Alright, next speaker.

11 MR. DENNIS: I want to say Michael Hagler?

12 **TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL HAGLER:**

13 MR. HAGLER: My name is Michael Hagler. I live at 1529 Elm Abode Terrace and  
14 I'm here representing the 300 residents and my neighbors who live in the Elm Abode,  
15 Huffman Heights Neighborhood Association. You should have gotten a packet in your  
16 information for this meeting from us and it has a lot more detail that I'm going to be able  
17 to cover, and I'm going to try to emphasize things I have not heard mentioned as you  
18 requested. One item is that we feel like these multi-family developments, the burden  
19 that has been placed is gonna be put on the residents, not on the developers who's  
20 wanting to do this and it seems unfair to put the burden of proof or the burden of  
21 defense on fourth generation neighbors rather than people who want these high density  
22 multi-family developments. As others have mentioned many of people have been here  
23 fourth generation built and moved into these neighborhoods for the purpose of having

1 large lots and peace and quiet, and it doesn't seem fair to have that background ripped  
2 out, the rug ripped out from you by planners and county. What is being proposed will  
3 effectively kill single family neighborhoods. And it's also in our neighborhood being killed  
4 by mixed used development, also being proposed by these maps. Encroachment,  
5 Richland County has historically been very protective of neighborhoods against  
6 encroachment, not only multi-family but commercial, and so we remind you of that  
7 history and it has protected neighbors. We feel like this is classic encroachment of multi-  
8 family develop and, in our case, also mixed-use development. Density, we're not  
9 against density, we're just against density on the back of single family neighborhoods.  
10 We feel like density could happen in many vacant properties all over the county that  
11 wouldn't damage existing single family residences. But even the density I think, you  
12 know, maybe when this was begun, this research was began there was a trend towards  
13 density. We're finding there's a trend towards less density with people moving from New  
14 York, New Jersey, Ohio, coming to less dense neighborhoods, and our neighborhood is  
15 very close to town, has been less dense and we're seeing all uptick interest.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Sir, that's your time.

17 MR. HAGLER: And that's what I wanted to say, so.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

19 MR. DENNIS: Helen Bradley.

20 **TESTIMONY OF HELEN BRADLEY:**

21 MS. BRADLEY: Good afternoon, I'm Helen Taylor Bradley. I live 1916 Martin  
22 Luther King Boulevard in Hopkins, South Carolina. No stranger to coming here. I have  
23 been coming to County Council to different meetings pleading for our community for

1 close to 45 years. We live in a rural community. We love our community, but then now  
2 that Richland County has gone everywhere it can go, now it's time to come to Lower  
3 Richland County. But just not Lower Richland, you hit everybody this time. So it makes  
4 me feel good see all of these people here today pleading for the same thing. We want to  
5 be able to live comfortable in what we've worked for all of our lives. I just read in the  
6 paper last week or so 1,700 homes are gonna be put on Lower Richland, on Garners  
7 Ferry Road in Lower Richland, 1,700 in a 1.8 mile radius on both sides of the highway.  
8 If you come Garners Ferry Road and you try to get across from Atlas Road to go over to  
9 the day care, which I try to do every morning to take my grandbaby, I have to wait  
10 because the traffic is so congested to when the light changes nobody stops because  
11 they wanna go because they've been sitting there for 40 minutes trying to get across.  
12 So if you bring all of that, those more houses plus all of other developments that are  
13 coming down there, we're not gonna be able to move, we're gonna be at a standstill.  
14 The roads not, the roads need fixing, trees need cutting, some of everything that you  
15 can mention needs to be done in the Lower Richland area improved. I sit on the  
16 transportation committee and I have to argue to get them to come to cut the sidewalks  
17 so the people will be able to use the sidewalks. I have to argue to get them to come cut  
18 the limbs across the road that pose a threat to people's lives. They have not, they  
19 cannot fix what is going on in the county now, so why add more burdens. Let those  
20 developers go someplace else. They've already maxed out Richland County. We want  
21 to live comfortable, thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you ma'am.

23 MR. DENNIS: Marie Knight.

1 **TESTIMONY OF MARIE KNIGHT:**

2 MS. KNIGHT: I'm Marie Knight and I live at 105 Bridle Ridge Road, it's an Irmo  
3 address but we're in the rural area, close to Dutch Fork High School and lot of  
4 development that has gone on. I've been before County Council several times in the  
5 past when large density neighborhoods first came to our area. We are, thought we were  
6 a little protected area in this, we moved there thirty-five years ago. It was developed into  
7 acreage of, it started out three to five acres but some on the front, the developer  
8 allowed to be split so they're like two acres. We are requesting that we stay rural. We  
9 have single family homes. We have people that have animals on their property. We  
10 have a restricted covenant which I had to search for the, to make sure it was registered.  
11 It is registered and it doesn't allow anymore develop on these lots, which your zoning  
12 will. And I was told that we could take our covenants and go to court and fight for our  
13 rights, and think that is terribly wrong. The intersection of the interstate there 97 exit, if  
14 you've been out that way heading toward Chapin you realize the development of that,  
15 that is going on. There's gonna be one exit for people to come off of and from Koon  
16 Road on out those people that live, they could exit earlier but they're not providing for  
17 that. So I see that South Carolina DOT does not work with local developers, we have all  
18 complained, we have said you need more exits. They're gonna all come off of one exit  
19 and go right by our development. We now can hardly get in and out, the traffic is awful  
20 and the trees have all been cut in-between the interstate and close to our property, so  
21 it's, it's very noisy.

22 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, Ms. Knight thank you very much. That's your  
23 time.

1 MS. KNIGHT: Okay. I just want to say one more the that the county said they  
2 were promoting public health safety, morals, convenience, order, appearance,  
3 prosperity and general welfare and I don't think that's taking place. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

5 MR. DENNIS: Alright, we have Clifford Myers.

6 **TESTIMONY OF CLIFFORD MYERS:**

7 MR. MYERS: Hi, my name is Cliff Myers and I live 413 Old Bluff Road in  
8 Hopkins, South Carolina. And the, I have a form that I requested, a written statement  
9 that should be submitted for public records please.

10 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, if Staff would please take that.

11 MR. C. MYERS: Today's Agenda, excuse me, today's Consent Agenda, item  
12 number 4(B)(ii) should be removed from the Consent Agenda and subject to decisions.  
13 We believe our new destination in this proposed map amendment will damage the  
14 unincorporated rural areas of Richland County for generations to come. Specific in  
15 some of those proposed new zoning district will result in very negative down zoning that  
16 will deprive landowners and their children of the property rights. We believe the  
17 proposed map amendment contains down zoning are detrimental for five reasons. The  
18 purpose of down zoning will encourage additional population decrease in Richland  
19 County. The proposed down zoning will make Richland County third of the big three  
20 South Carolina counties in less than one generation. The proposed down zoning will  
21 make an economic burden in Richland County because they will dramatically reduce the  
22 potentials for population growth in the area where the county has invested millions in  
23 water and sewage infrastructure. The proposed down zoning will immediately decrease

1 the value of landowners will suffer from immediate change for the simple requirement of  
2 a ¾ acres to a new home being developed has to be three acres for each new home. In  
3 this, families could not subdivide five-acre tracts for themselves and two children. They  
4 could only consist, construct one home. This restricts no progress.

5 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you, Mr. Myers. That's your time. Thank you for  
6 being here.

7 MR. MYERS: I appreciate the opportunity to speak. But it is depriving us of quite  
8 a bit in Richland County. Thank you.

9 MR. DENNIS: We have Ted Myers.

10 **TESTIMONY OF TED MYERS:**

11 MR. T. MYERS: My name is Theodore Myers. My residence is 7758 Bluff Road  
12 in Gadsden, South Carolina. And I'm here because I would like to speak for some of the  
13 ministers in our area. I pastor a church on Congaree Road in Gadsden. We represent a  
14 pretty fair congregation. And I think that in my communication with the ministers we find  
15 it very difficult to find any of our congregates who are willing to think that this proposal is  
16 a positive one. One of the reasons is that family members have been in these areas for  
17 quite some time and they treasure the idea of being able to pass land onto their  
18 children. Many of them, you'll find communities like Myers Town where the grandfather  
19 some years ago left property to his children, and today his grandchildren have formed a  
20 wonderfully, beautifully working community right there in that rural area. What are we  
21 asking for? We're not asking for the conglomeration of a lot of traffic and freedom to just  
22 do anything. We're asking that we look at what is needed in developing this area and  
23 allowing this area to have growth, positive growth for the future. Our schools are

1 presently undergoing a number of people who are dropping out. People are moving to  
2 other areas. Young people are not building in our area. We must have reason to bring  
3 them back and allow our schools to grow rather than our school's decline. We're  
4 currently in a position in the Gadsden and the Eastover area of seeing our schools fall  
5 into depopulation because people are moving out. We ought to have an opportunity to  
6 have people to come back and build homes. Instead of saying three acres currently it's  
7 3/4ths, but -

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you very much.

9 MR. MYERS: We would suggest either  $\frac{3}{4}$  or  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

10 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you very much for being here.

11 MR. MYERS: Thank you very much.

12 MR. DENNIS: Thank you, sir. Andrena Johnson.

13 **TESTIMONY OF ANDRENA JOHNSON:**

14 MS. JOHNSON: Andrena Johnson, 3555 Old Eastover Road, Eastover, South  
15 Carolina 29044. The proposed down zoning will encourage additional population  
16 decreases in Richland County. Recent census data indicates that unlike Charleston,  
17 Greenville and Lexington Counties, Richland County experience negative growth; that is  
18 fewer people moved into the county than the number who moved out. We believe the  
19 proposed down zoning will drive the numbers exiting Richland County sharply upward  
20 and continue this negative trend. Indeed, nothing in the new Land Development Code  
21 encourages new growth in areas that have seen significant population decline, like  
22 areas in District 10 and District 11. This negative population growth already has led to  
23 the loss of one South Carolina House seat in this area. We believe that if current trends



1 continue and the down zoning is indeed implemented, it will result in the loss of schools  
2 as well. Currently landowners and their children can build on family tracts so long as  
3 each home as 2/3<sup>rd</sup> acres of land dedicated to it alone. This regulation was necessary  
4 when private wells and septic tanks alone were the only infrastructure available.  
5 However, large areas of Richland County have recently seen the deployment of water  
6 and sewer infrastructure. We see no need for more rather than less available land being  
7 dedicated to private wells and septic tanks where they are no longer in use. This land  
8 code proposal immediately makes impossible for children with parents owning five  
9 acres of land, for example, to build a second house in that expensive acreage. Where  
10 then will they live? Perhaps Lexington or Kershaw Counties where such burdensome  
11 downsizing has not occurred. We see no logic in our capital county, Richland County,  
12 adopting reckless policies that will reduce its population and political power for the next  
13 generation. We urge the Council to reject this code change. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you, ma'am.

15 MR. DENNIS: That would be Lindsey at 1640 Saint Gorden Place?

16 MR. LINDSEY: I'll pass.

17 MR. DENNIS: Okay. Arla Jackson?

18 **TESTIMONY OF ARLA JACKSON:**

19 MS. JACKSON: Good afternoon, I'm Arla Jackson and I live at 4722 Old  
20 Leesburg Road, Hopkins, South Carolina. My parents purchased this property in 1962,  
21 so I've lived out there the majority of my life. I acquired the property in 2004. It's a  
22 6.7acre property where I have a farm with horses, other livestock, barns, buildings. All  
23 of my neighbors next me they pretty much have the same type of acreage. We're farm

1 land and we went from rural to R2. There's also a housing development planned to be  
2 put behind us. I think in that case the developer should have to put up some kind of  
3 barrier for protection so we can remain rural. We lived, moved out there to live in the  
4 country. My neighbors moved out there to live in the county. I live on a dirt road. I'm  
5 constantly pulling people out that get in wrecks on the dirt road when over exaggerate  
6 the running down the dirt road and thinking they can control it. True story. I think my  
7 area should be HM at least for homestead or squash it all together and leave us as a  
8 rural community because that is what Hopkins has always been, and I live in the Lower  
9 Richland Community. Thank you for your time.

10 MR. DENNIS: Melinda Kelly Finkle?

11 **TESTIMONY OF MELINDA KELLY:**

12 MS. KELLY: Good afternoon, I'm Melinda Kelly I'm with the Finkle Law firm, 1201  
13 Main and also 4000 Fabor Place in Charleston. I'm here for two clients; one is Dr.  
14 Serban, Steven Serban, and we wanted to just say that we really support the  
15 recommendation for that property at 1721 Horseshoe. The other client, so we're  
16 supporting that, we're very happy about that. The other client is C.L. Corley Lawn and  
17 Construction. Mr. Corley is here today, I'm not sure where he ended up getting seated,  
18 there he is. He's got 12 properties and five were recommended for zoning that we are  
19 very happy about so we really appreciate that. I sent in a letter, I wasn't sure if it was put  
20 in your packet so I brought copies today. There are seven pieces that we would like to  
21 basically leave the same as what they are now, or the same density. So one of them is  
22 M1 and that is on, excuse me, Monticello Road 5731. And the other one is LI and that's  
23 7521 Fairfield. The other five are all RU now and in looking at the R2 that was

1 recommended the density jumps, I think I put on my letter threefold but I think it's  
2 actually six. I think it's six units per acre for R3, or excuse me R2, and we would ask  
3 that if you, if County Council is definitely set on getting rid of RU, which we would prefer,  
4 that R1 would be better so that it wouldn't, because it's very close in density, it allows  
5 close to one unit per acre. So it's the density that we're looking at and we would just ask  
6 that those five properties stay as is and those are 1820 Crane Church Road, 1316  
7 Corley Ford, there's some more vacant land on Crane Church, 1812 Heyward  
8 Brockington, and 1228 Cedar Creek, and these range in size from -

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, thank you very much.

10 MS. KELLY: - two to 12 acres.

11 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay.

12 MS. KELLY: And we would appreciate that.

13 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

14 MS. KELLY: Thank you.

15 MR. DENNIS: Kathleen McDaniel?

16 **TESTIMONY OF KATHLEEN MCDANIEL:**

17 MS. MCDANIEL: Good afternoon, my name is Kathleen McDaniel. I'm an  
18 attorney here in Columbia and I'm here on behalf of the Elm Abode, Huffman Heights  
19 Neighborhood. Three points I want to make. One, this process has been moved too fast  
20 for the neighborhoods and the public to have proper input. Two, there are another, there  
21 is another option which is to already been suggested, to remove the multi-family aspect  
22 from R2 and R3, that could be done through an amendment through the code that  
23 already exists. And then finally there has been some mention of an unfair shift of burden

1 and what that is, is in this situation you are opening up all of the neighborhoods - well,  
2 the neighborhood I represent, you're opening them up to greater development, which  
3 puts the burden on the neighborhood to protect itself every time a developer wants to  
4 put in duplex or a quadraplex. Leave the density as it is and then that puts the burden  
5 on the developer and the market to find those places where those types of housing  
6 situations are appropriate. When you put out a policy, you put out a zoning map that is a  
7 reflection of what is the priority of the community, what is the priority of the county. And  
8 the zoning map reflects greatly increased density across the board, especially in what  
9 are currently single family neighborhoods, that shows a priority and that you are putting  
10 priority on density and development at the expense of existing neighborhoods. This, my  
11 clients only received notice of this middle of February, so we are a month and a half into  
12 them even knowing about this. In that time, they have organized the neighborhood, they  
13 have hired me as an attorney, and I'm not doing this for free, they have had  
14 neighborhood meetings, they have met with their County Council Member. We have  
15 met with Staff and I have lots of conversations with Geo. They are working as hard as  
16 they can to protect their neighborhoods.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. Thank you, Ms. McDaniel that is your time.

18 MS. MCDANIEL: What we are asking is that you either defer voting on this today  
19 so that there will be additional time for input or simply deny, recommend denial to  
20 County Council.

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

22 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman?

23 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes sir, Mr. Gilchrist?

1 MR. GILCHRIST: I just wanted to point a personal privilege and, and say hello to  
2 Ms. McDaniel. She actually served on the Planning Commission with us and I had the  
3 pleasure of working with her early on.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Very good.

5 MR. GILCHRIST: So good to see you.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Very good.

7 MR. GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

9 MR. DENNIS: Evenhouse on Indian Summer Point? Pass. Kim Murphy.

10 **TESTIMONY OF KIM MURPHY:**

11 MS. MURPHY: Good afternoon, 154 Old Laurel Lane in Chapin. In response to a  
12 question asked by one of the commissioners Mr. Crooks responded that the process  
13 began several years ago because folks wanted to have a way of protecting the rural  
14 character of the county. I was one of those folks and I support that notion. At the  
15 invitation of Mr. Crooks a group of citizens began having discussions in 2017 to  
16 advance that notion. I attended one of the first LCD citizens' input meetings here,  
17 hosted by Staff. At the end of the meeting Staff stated that the stakeholder meetings  
18 would begin that week. And I thought to myself, well who are we? Are we not  
19 stakeholders? When I asked, I was told county organizations, EMS, developers, and I  
20 was told that the developers meeting was not public. So between then and now and in  
21 all of the input meetings and official meetings of Council and Planning Commission that  
22 I have seen or attended there has been no correlation made or directly stated that  
23 building standards to protect the rural character would lead to Council giving up their

1 right to manage growth across 100% of the county, or to be able to weigh in on whether  
2 roads and schools and other infrastructure could handle the development. There was no  
3 correlation made that building standards would lead to losing the privileges that we as  
4 property owners all have now because of a proposed mass rezoning. There was no  
5 mention that now multi-family, triplexes and quadplexes, which are likely rental units,  
6 would be constructed within an established neighborhoods or areas that are composed  
7 of strictly single family detached homes. There was no mention that families owning  
8 land could no longer carve off a ¾ acre tract to give to an heir. There was no mention  
9 that this would lead to a mass rezoning of over 110,000 parcels. Staff has worked very  
10 hard, the devil's in the details and one of the details that was left off was that Council is  
11 delegating their authority to manage growth to a map.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you, Ms. Murphy.

13 MS. MURPHY: Thank you. I appreciate what you're doing and I'd ask that you  
14 deny it, keep the current zoning map, take the existing zoning that we have from the  
15 2005 Code, implement that into the code and update those standards, make those  
16 good.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

18 MS. MURPHY: Thank you.

19 MR. DENNIS: Karen Fleck, Freck? I'm sorry.

20 **TESTIMONY OF KAREN IRICK:**

21 MS. IRICK: My name is Karen Irick.

22 MR. DENNIS: Irick.

1 MS. IRICK: I am, I live at 101 AC Avenue in Hopkins, in the Franklin Park sub-  
2 division. Today I stand before you to ask this Body to deny remapping of the Lower  
3 Richland Unincorporated area. I ask that on behalf of my community, Franklin Park. You  
4 have a presentation that I realize it couldn't be shown so they're going to distribute it to  
5 you, number one. Number two, I didn't realize, it's been a while since I've been here,  
6 that I couldn't come in with a bag so I took my bag back to my car and left my glasses.  
7 So bear with me. I want to say to you as a Body I understand that some of you may  
8 have some concern with the trust of the people, trust in you, this Body. I ditto everything  
9 that everyone here has said, particularly Ms. Bradley, good to see you, girl. We both live  
10 in Lower Richland. In 2005, and here's why you need to be concerned, why we don't  
11 trust you, in 2005, the Franklin Park Community came before County Council asking for  
12 clean water. February 2012, we were connected to a water system. October 2005, our  
13 then County Council representatives for District 10, somewhere along the line this  
14 sewer thing got into the conversation. We were only asking for clean water, and so  
15 when the sewer came up we automatically said, we don't have a fight in this, we don't  
16 have a lagoon in this fight.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, Miss, I need to you finalize your comments right  
18 now, thank you.

19 MS. IRICK: Alright so, what I'm asking you to do is take into consideration that  
20 we were told that a sewer treatment facility was not going to be placed in Franklin Park.  
21 Instead February of this year, February 11<sup>th</sup>, a sewer, the Franklin Park Sewer Lift  
22 Station was placed on my street. I live at the beginning of AC Avenue. The lift station is  
23 at 229 AC Avenue.

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, Ms. Irick. Thank you very much, your time is up.  
2 Thank you.

3 MS. IRICK: Please look at the presentation that I made.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay.

5 MS. IRICK: You need to take into consideration what you're doing to  
6 communities. It's not fair to put a sewer lift station on a residential street in a  
7 subdivision, and you need to make sure that doesn't happen anymore while you're  
8 doing this. Please deny.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you for being here.

10 MR. DENNIS: Elizabeth Slicon? 532?

11 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Hopkins, that may be Harmon, Harmon Road? Anybody  
12 here from Harmon Road in Hopkins? That needs to work on their penmanship, alright.

13 MR. DENNIS: Sean Greenwood.

14 **TESTIMONY OF SEAN GREENWOOD:**

15 MR. GREENWOOD: Thank y'all for the time. My name is Sean Greenwood. I'm  
16 here representing the City of Forest Acres. I'm the City Administrator. We're coming  
17 today to ask y'all to, for procedural stuff. I'm very happy to hear all these people making  
18 comments about the various neighborhoods, but procedurally we think that y'all should  
19 recommend Council not approve the map and to amend the text to push back the  
20 effective date of the current text, push it back, the effective date that's on May 2<sup>nd</sup>.  
21 Council has two meetings this week and could get in first of three readings if they move  
22 fast. And I think the reason we need to do that procedural process is because the  
23 problem is not necessarily with the map itself, as a couple of people have said the



1 problem is with the actual text that's already been approved November. You have your  
2 use tables for your various uses and as people have said you've got R1 that's single  
3 family and then nothing else is strictly single family. If you want a single family small lot  
4 designation R2 is not gonna get it done. You know, in your package y'all have some  
5 letters from the city from the City Council itself and we wanted to just make sure that  
6 y'all understood taking it from R3 to R2 is actually worse for us in this case because the  
7 R2 designation in your text allows for everything R3 does and manufactured homes. So  
8 R2 is actually worse than R3 if you're in a single family residential community, which the  
9 entire City of Forest Acres is. So what y'all need and what we think needs to be  
10 recommended is that the text needs to be amended first, because you can't expect the  
11 public to give you valid input on a map based on use tables that are flawed. So we're  
12 asking that you ask for the text amendment first, get the use table straightened out, then  
13 allow the public to vote on the maps.

14 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, thank you very much.

15 MR. GREENWOOD: Thank you.

16 MR. DENNIS: Tom Andrews.

17 **TESTIMONY OF TOM ANDREWS:**

18 MR. ANDREWS: Hey, my name is Tom Andrews. I'm a member of Forest Acres  
19 City Council. I'm here with Sean to express some our opinions. I wish I weren't here. I  
20 wish I were at the CLA welcoming Dawn Stanley back but this is an important issue and  
21 so I wanted to be here. We ask that all donut holes in Forest Acres that are  
22 unincorporated areas of Richland County be rezoned as R1 which would be single  
23 family residential. Residents aren't just residents of Forest Acres but they're also

1 residents of this county and they vote in this county. And they purchased homes with  
2 expectation that they were single family residential not duplexes, triplexes or  
3 quadraplexes. We're concerned about the stress that they're going to put on the roads,  
4 schools and resources of our area. Procedurally I would echo what Mr. Greenwood  
5 said, we need to get the use tables straightened out before you vote on this map, and  
6 I'd encourage you to do that. Ultimately, I don't think this is a lake problem, a rural  
7 problem or a Forest Acres problem. I think it's a use table and a map problem and I  
8 think y'all need to make sure those get fixed so the public has adequate time to address  
9 them. Thank you.

10 MR. DENNIS: Henry Martin Junior.

11 **TESTIMONY OF HENRY MARTIN, JR.:**

12 MR. MARTIN: Henry Martin, 124 Winding Road in Ballentine area and you've  
13 heard quite a bit today. I want to, as we've gone through this, one of the things I tried to  
14 do and one of the things I've tried to do in my whole life and I've lived here, I was born  
15 in Rosewood, went to school here, went away, but one of the things I've tried to do  
16 always is as an engineer is you try to explain it to where people can understand it. If you  
17 can't explain something where you can understand it then the document is flawed, okay.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Mr. Martin, I'm not sure if the microphone is picking you  
19 up.

20 MR. MARTIN: Not picking me up, okay. You need to have me on the tape here is  
21 that what you're saying? Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: We want to hear you, too.

23 MR. MARTIN: Alright, okay.

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: We have glass in between us.

2 MR. MARTIN: Well, okay, I can speak louder?

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: That's fine.

4 MR. MARTIN: What I wanted to say is [timer] that was my time that I was going  
5 to have to go but not now, my times up. I wanted to say thank you for these people. I  
6 wanted to turn around and say thank you to them because sometimes when we got  
7 involved with some of this with some of the groups, you kinda wondered because when  
8 I first started looking at it I thought it was a local problem but it's not a local problem as  
9 he just said. And we're trying not to repeat this stuff. It's a big problem all over and I  
10 wanted to make sure other people, so we started messing around and sending stuff out  
11 to people and we spread the word that you need to look at this, because the first thing I  
12 said to Council when I met Brian and stuff like this is when they did the presentation  
13 style that they did it was just like here's the map, take a look at it. I'm like this is all  
14 wrong. You got to speak and explain this to us. So number one, I sent them a message  
15 to the Planning Commission to send to the Council Members. We need a frequently ask  
16 questions, we need to have the map redone to show what the comparisons are, okay?  
17 Maybe that's too late now because it's been exposed. We need to know which changes  
18 have affected you and not just something that comes in the mail that says you're now  
19 R3. Well, we aren't now R3 cause it hasn't passed yet but it gave you the impression  
20 that you was already passed, it was already done; it was passed then it's used there.  
21 And Jason when you get onto Council, I guess you'll get to hear all of this come again.  
22 So how and why did we get here? We never got that answered well. We didn't  
23 communicate well, we didn't get answers. I asked about environmental impact to the

1 lake or any other place for the number of homes that's going in there. Well, they do that  
2 when they do the, developers do that when they get in there. Bull. Not when they do  
3 multiples ones of those, they don't go and look at it all along. So they never committed  
4 to doing the process.

5 MR. GILCHRIST: Chairman, I think we need to call time on this?

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Here it is.

7 MR. MARTIN: Huh? Am I done?

8 MR. GILCHRIST: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: That's it, Mr. Martin. Thank you very much.

10 MR. MARTIN: We need to have this delayed or changed as they said. I agree  
11 with that 100%. Thank you very much.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright.

13 MR. MARTIN: Thank you guys for all your input.

14 MR. DENNIS: Vanessa Patrick?

15 **TESTIMONY OF VANESSA PATRICK:**

16 MS. PATRICK: Hello, I'm Vanessa Patrick. I live Pomaria but I'm a real estate  
17 agent and low density developer. I know a lot of the people here, been doing this many  
18 years. Spoke to Geo the other day and I get along great with all the Staff and listened to  
19 everything today and the notes I had prepared. You need to kill the map. The map as  
20 everybody has pointed out, it limits the flexibility, it gets far away from the real  
21 procedure of how development works. The text that's already been approved is full of  
22 contradictions, issues, errors, as has become abundantly clear. So it should not be  
23 crammed in until it can be fixed. I think we can all agree on that from all the viewpoints

1 we have. You can do all the zoning you want to on paper but the true driver, when I go  
2 to develop a piece of land I look at where is that land, what's the accessibility of public  
3 utilities or not, I look at the roads, I look at the shape of the tract, I look at topography;  
4 that's what drives how a piece of land is used not a piece of paper with a map. You look  
5 at who's already living there, what the use already is, those are the factors that should  
6 always be looked at and not just this color coded piece of paper that someone puts out  
7 because it does not apply. It's way to general, it causes conflict across the board. Just  
8 kind of a joke, I mostly do my work in northwest Richland County; that land, if you're not  
9 familiar with it, is very hilly and very rocky in most places. I kinda gotta laugh because a  
10 lot of the parcels that I have subdivided over the years into let's say two to eight acre  
11 lots, now all of a sudden you have a seven-acre minimum. And I'm like, really cause  
12 there's so many places that the land, a parcel of land is cut by creeks or cut by hills so I  
13 may need to put three two acre lots here but have a 12 acre lot over here but I can't do  
14 that with all these regs, this just, it doesn't make any since in this practice.

15 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. Thank you, Miss Patrick. That's your time.

16 MS. PATRICK: Okay. So once again kill the map, do a rewrite and let's make it  
17 all make sense. It can make sense. I think we all agree with that.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

19 MR. DENNIS: Okay, alright. I cannot read the name very well so I'll call out the  
20 address. It's 8017 Wilson Boulevard.

21 **TESTIMONY OF MARK:**

22 MARK: My name is Mark from 8071 Wilson Boulevard, right across the street  
23 from the school bus lot. And honestly, it's a little difficult to talk about this without

1 getting, some might say passionate, angry, is a little better. I moved to this country  
2 about 20 years ago, it took me about that long to get my citizenship which I just got  
3 about six months ago and it was a fairly emotional deal. Come from a place where  
4 people don't really respect personal freedoms, and here's it's a little bit different. And  
5 honestly it took these 20 years between me and my wife to get the property that we got.  
6 We got 84 acres. It's a beautiful piece of land. I mean, I have three creeks. I have, you  
7 know, probably 70 of forest and it's gorgeous I love it. It's rural. Right next to me there's  
8 the Tractor Supply on Killian. Just behind, right off of Sharp Road we have Sal's Ole  
9 Timey Feed and Seed, which is like sort of a small co-op. We're trying to have like a  
10 little vegetable store up front and all that stuff. I have chickens, geese, you know, pigs  
11 and I have two Great Pyrenees and all of that stuff, and when I looked at this map with  
12 an eye of someone whose, my brother was in highway development, this looked like  
13 either, I really don't mean any offense, but it looked like either sheer incompetence or a  
14 money grab. And that's what it looked like, because there's land over there, I mean, like  
15 it's all farmers from where I am, all the way out to Killian Road. We have, like donkeys  
16 and, you know, and horses and all kinds of stuff like - and I, it's really hard not to make  
17 this personal because I know especially that it involved so many people. I didn't know  
18 that it was, like everything else. I looked at my own map, because that's what I saw and  
19 that's what I was angry about, but like this involves everyone. And roads are terrible to  
20 the point they're so bad in South Carolina that insurance company will just replace your  
21 windshield once a year for free.

22 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. Thank you sir, your time is up. Thank you.

23 MR. DENNIS: Alright and lastly -

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Just a reminder for anybody please, just wear a mask in  
2 the county building, that's the county ordinance, okay?

3 MS. FRIERSON: Point of personal privilege?

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Ms. Frierson.

5 MS. FRIERSON: I'm not trying to be rude, I'm Commissioner Frierson. I'm 70  
6 years old. The reason I was slightly late, I just left the doctor's office, my sister is 69. I  
7 know that you're concerned about these issues as am I, but there really is a mask  
8 mandate and when you laugh about it, I mean, that's your privilege but I wrote  
9 Commissioner and Chairperson Branham three times. I went out and spoke to the  
10 sheriff's deputy. It's not a laughing matter. Please be kind enough to put on your mask.  
11 Please. If you don't care about your health, at least be somewhat concerned about  
12 others. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, and the deputy has masks if you need them. He's  
14 walking around right now.

15 [Audience members]

16 MS. FRIERSON: I had mine on, ma'am.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: I want to encourage all the Commissioners to put them  
18 on, obviously I've been doing a lot more talking.

19 [Audience members]

20 MS. FRIERSON: I had mine on the entire time.

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. If we can get the next name called.

22 MR. DENNIS: Levi Myers.

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Please, please let's have order. Let's have order in the  
2 meeting, please.

3 MR. YONKE: I'd like to take a moment of personal privilege. I just wanna say, I'm  
4 Chris, I live in Lower Richland County. I love this county. I am fresh face. I've been in  
5 this county for 14 years and I'm just here to volunteer my time. I'm a state employee,  
6 okay. I'm here because I love this county and I want to hear from you guys. So let's be  
7 positive and helpful. Thank you.

8 **TESTIMONY OF LEVI MYERS:**

9 MR. MYERS: My name is Levi Myers. I live at 431 Old Bluff Road, Hopkins. And I  
10 oppose this new zoning law because I don't think it's fair to the landowners. Now as far  
11 as the, I'm not a builder, I'm not a contractor, but my concern is for my children and for  
12 my grandchildren. I kinda encourage them if they can come home to live. But I don't  
13 think it's fair to change the rules that much that they would have to have three acres of  
14 land to put one house on because we, they're not planning to be a builder nor a  
15 contractor. But when I ride down Sumter Highway and I look at Burnside Farm, it's  
16 awful. And I know I shouldn't have to be punished because of what somebody else  
17 started. Give me and my children or grandchildren a right to have a small plot of land  
18 that we can live on in peace. I had a rezoning that had much about 30 acres rezoning  
19 was agriculture use, under the rezoning it's no longer agriculture use and it's nothing but  
20 trees on it. Nothing that I can do with. So I'm asking you whatever that you can do to fix  
21 the situation that has occurred to please try to fix it.

22 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Myers.

23 MR. DENNIS: That's the last one signed up to speak.



1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. Now that we've completed the public input  
2 portion is there anything that Staff wants to add before we open it up to the  
3 Commissioners for any questions or comments that they might have for Staff?

4 MR. CROOKS: So I would say one thing Mr. Chair. So I think as we discussed at  
5 the work session on Friday, we did note that Staff would be looking to bring certain text  
6 amendments back before y'all. We were looking at potentially the May meeting,  
7 obviously subject to, you know, any other deferrals or anything else as it relates to that,  
8 or even with the map itself. But we were looking to bring some of those text  
9 amendments back based on a lot of the feedback that we've been hearing, a variety of  
10 different things, so anything from uses to development standards to, you know, variety  
11 of different things based on the feedback that we've been receiving. So did want to note  
12 that, that was something that we were planning to bring back before you all. We're  
13 looking at the May meeting, but I think as we see what happens with everything else if  
14 that ends up where, you know, timelines are extended or anything like that, you know,  
15 we have a little bit more time. So that way once we have those amendment language  
16 proposed be able to do what we need to with that in terms of any additional meetings or  
17 the like as well.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, so you're just saying if the Commission proposes  
19 amendments to the text that we would, you know, set those on an Agenda and then  
20 potentially take action on those at a later meeting?

21 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, if y'all have specific - yeah so, there's that. I just wanted to  
22 know that as we discussed on Friday at the work session that we were planning to bring  
23 back the text amendments to y'all anyway, but if there are other amendments that you

1 all have then yeah, you would just need to either, you know, vote those up or down and  
2 then once those go, you know, however that motion carries then we'll look to have that  
3 language included and then bring that before you on an additional Planning  
4 Commission meeting.

5 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. Alright. I mean, I have comments but I want to  
6 hear from everybody else on the Commission that wants to comment or ask their  
7 questions.

8 MR. GILCHRIST: Chairman, I'll have a, if I may?

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Gilchrist?

10 MR. GILCHRIST: I have some questions but I the first question I want to ask  
11 Staff is, and I think we talked about this at the work session last week, what is the  
12 timeline, are we on a timeline to get this to Council, Mr. Crooks?

13 MR. CROOKS: So this is currently on the agenda for the Zoning Public Hearing  
14 on April 26<sup>th</sup>.

15 MR. GILCHRIST: Which is when?

16 MR. CROOKS: April 26<sup>th</sup> but that would be subject to Planning Commission's  
17 action today. But if Council was to or, excuse me, Commission was to recommend or,  
18 you know, take action to defer this as y'all's action that would be something where it  
19 wouldn't go before planning or, excuse me - Planning Commission, you all today, take  
20 action to defer this item, so defer action on this, it wouldn't go before County Council at  
21 the April 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. But if you take action to make a recommendation specifically  
22 such as recommendation of approval, recommendation of approval with changes,

1 recommendation of disapproval, etc., then it would go before planning, go before  
2 County Council at the April 26<sup>th</sup> Zoning Public Hearing meeting.

3 MR. GILCHRIST: County Council expecting this on the 26<sup>th</sup>?

4 MR. CROOKS: So yeah, it would be on the agenda so.

5 MR. GILCHRIST: It's already on the agenda.

6 MR. CROOKS: So we just notify them based on action that occurs today.

7 MR. GILCHRIST: So input that we have received today, how would that align  
8 with the fact that it's already on the agenda for the 26<sup>th</sup>?

9 MR. PRICE: For clarification, at the beginning of each year County Council just  
10 as the Planning Commission does, adopts a calendar for all of their dates. So the date  
11 for the Zoning Public Hearing for April has already been adopted. As far as what items  
12 will go to them, you think, we have a couple of days before we have to advertise for that  
13 meetings so the specific -

14 MR. GILCHRIST: So this is not on the agenda.

15 MR. PRICE: - not specifically there yet, yes sir.

16 MR. GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Price, for that. Mr. Chairman, I'll defer  
17 my other questions until I hear from other Commissioners, thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

19 MR. DENNIS: Chairman?

20 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Dennis?

21 MR. DENNIS: Alright. I'll do it. Okay, so listened to the public. Thank y'all all for  
22 being out here today. It really means a lot. I live up in the northeast area and there was  
23 a question asked earlier who lives in a rural area. I do not. However, I do have farm up

1 in North Carolina that I wanna keep rural. I grew up with chicken houses and all that  
2 stuff and then I joined the military and this is where I call home now with my family. And  
3 I just wanted to say that, thank you very much for coming out here because I can look  
4 through this text all day long and some things make sense, somethings don't but I won't  
5 know until it affects each and every one of you and how it affects you, okay? So thank  
6 you for that. To Staff, I was looking at a few things in here, and how does the new  
7 zoning district in the RU area to AG, HM, RT, R1, affect the subdivision of land for  
8 generational land transfer to the family members? That was one of the things that I  
9 found digging through some things over the weekend that I didn't like, personally. And  
10 that does affect a lot of people in here, as we heard today.

11 MR. CROOKS: Right. So assuming that's an heir subdivision, so the family  
12 subdivision standard within this Code, so makes it where you don't have to abide by  
13 certain development standards, you could subdivided off of an easement versus off of a  
14 constructed road. So as it relates to the RU district currently so the rural zoning district,  
15 be a minimum of 33,000 square feet or larger as required by DHEC, that DHEC  
16 standard would still apply in the current Code in any case. As it relates to the change to  
17 the R1 it would be that same residential standard, so 1.33 in terms of a density would  
18 be one unit every about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an acre or so. Then RT would be one every 1.5 acre. So  
19 that density standard of .67 would be one every 1.5 acre. HM would be a density  
20 standard of .33, three which is one unit every three acres. AG would be .15 which is one  
21 every 6.7 acres or so, every 6.67, excuse me, every 6.67 acres or so. So if you had for  
22 instance say, 10 acres currently and you were zoned RU you could potentially get 13

1 lots out of that. If you were looking at homestead for instance, you could get three,  
2 potentially, so.

3 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Dennis, please, no, go ahead.

4 MR. DENNIS: So if we, some of these that are going from rural to homestead  
5 that actually hurts them if they have a couple of kids.

6 MR. CROOKS: In that instance, yeah.

7 MR. DENNIS: Okay, thank you.

8 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman?

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Gilchrist?

10 MR. GILCHRIST: So along those lines, Mr. Crooks, I heard some conversation  
11 about encroachment in the - just talk to me a little bit about, you know, and I agree with  
12 the sentiment earlier that Richland County in the past has done a really good job with  
13 dealing with encroachment. How are we seeing that now in the new zoning  
14 classifications?

15 MR. CROOKS: Would you elaborate, Mr. Gilchrist?

16 MR. GILCHRIST: Well, I'm just curious to know in the various classifications that  
17 are being identified just how does encroachment impact or not?

18 MR. CROOKS: I mean, I think it would how something is being zoned cause  
19 within the zoning you're gonna have a variety of uses that could or couldn't be allowed.  
20 And then from that you're gonna have to abide by various developments standards.

21 MR. GILCHRIST: So you feel good that current encroachment -

22 MR. CROOKS: So this proposed Code actually has something that our current  
23 doesn't.

1 MR. GILCHRIST: Okay.

2 MR. CROOKS: In the way of neighborhood capability standards. So that is a  
3 specifically new section within in the Code that we do not have under the 2005. So  
4 those look at you have, say a nonresidential use or even certain types of residential  
5 uses where those are abutting or adjacent to either residentially zoned properties or  
6 residential uses. So it looks at having a variety of other standards related to typically the  
7 performance of a use as well as the overall form and scale of that use also. So it puts  
8 some limitations on the potential impacts that those could cause based on the  
9 performance or the form and design of that nonresidential use.

10 MR. GILCHRIST: Right.

11 MR. CROOKS: So that's one thing specifically as it relates to, you know,  
12 potential encroachments as you are alluding to that wouldn't be able to be addressed in  
13 the current Code.

14 MR. GILCHRIST: Thank you for raising it, Mr. Price.

15 MR. PRICE: I'll come back to that.

16 MR. GILCHRIST: Okay. And then my, and the Staff just can make sure that I'm  
17 clear on this, all meetings that we've had in the county whether it's been with the public,  
18 citizens, neighborhoods, developers, have all those meetings been public meetings?  
19 Meaning that can anyone attend those meetings? Have we had meetings in the county  
20 where the public has not been invited to come to those meetings? About the LCD?

21 MR. CROOKS: As far as I'm aware.

22 MR. GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright. That's all I have for this deferment, Mr.  
23 Chairman. I'll be back in a minute.

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Anyone else?

2 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Branham, I mean, Chairman Branham?

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Commissioner Frierson.

4 MS. FRIERSON: I apologize, I just had to step out for a moment. Are you asking  
5 us to ask questions? Would you please repeat what you're asking us to do right now?

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Discussion and questions.

7 MS. FRIERSON: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: I indicated earlier that I had some comments but I'd like  
9 to lay back and I just want to hear from everyone else before I make any.

10 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, well whenever it's my turn I'll speak up.

11 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: We're ready for you, if you'd like?

12 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, yes.

14 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you so much, I appreciate it. One of my concerns was  
15 that one of the constituents asked where do we live, and it bothered for this reason,  
16 even though I live in Lake Carolina, I'm very, very concerned about protecting the  
17 community, and when I say that I mean rural, urban, whatever you might want to call it. I  
18 am concerned no matter where my physical residence is. Another concern was I heard  
19 about clock and calendar and some of you have already perhaps mentioned this. I  
20 personally don't feel the pressure of what County Council might have on its calendar  
21 because Mr. Price explained that well. I'm far more concerned about hearing the  
22 constituents. And I took notes as each one spoke today and the last time we met, and  
23 couple of things bother me. Along time ago before COVID I remember we had a public

1 meeting, I believe it was at Dreher High school. I don't remember the exact time of that  
2 meeting but one of the things that concerns me is that when we have these meetings at  
3 3 o'clock I am of the impression that we are excluding lots of working-class people who  
4 really would love to be here to express their concerns. I'm not blaming any of you on  
5 Council, I mean, on this Commission. But the other thing that bothers me is because of  
6 COVID and it's no fault of any of us, I think that it's only fair to hear more from our  
7 citizens. You know, it's not necessarily a numbers game but in my little notebook almost  
8 everyone spoke against what is currently being proposed, this time and the last time.  
9 Now there was some gentlemen here today, I think it was from the Forest Acres area,  
10 and they said something that really stuck in my mind. They said it's not so much a  
11 problem of the map as it's so much, as it is a problem with the text. Now if it's true that  
12 there are some errors in the text, if it's true that it's not really user friendly and the  
13 layover part makes it difficult for average Joe blow citizen to receive that letter in the  
14 mail, go to the internet or whatever and find what it actually means and where it actually  
15 impacts, then there's a concern. I, I know you didn't ask us to vote yet. I know which  
16 way I'm gonna vote, but in the interest of hearing from the citizens not just the ones that  
17 can take off from their jobs and come here but from citizens that work 9:00 to 5:00 and  
18 perhaps need an evening meeting. In the interest of correcting things that perhaps that  
19 were not intentionally done unfairly but things that may be confusing citizens, I think it's  
20 best to pull back, allow more time to correct things. And there was one man that spoke  
21 to us on Friday. I apologize, I can't remember his name but he's a new assistant to Mr.  
22 Price I believe, and he spoke about the fact - and it really made me think - about the  
23 right question is not necessarily who benefits but look at things in a different way. You



1 know some people talked about land that's been passed on from generation to  
2 generation and their desire to want to subdivide it and pass it onto friends, not friends  
3 but family members and others that see it differently. It doesn't necessarily mean that  
4 one is right and one is wrong. We just have to realize that the developers are not the  
5 people that really make our community the best it can be. In my opinion we really have  
6 to pay attention to the citizens. I don't live in the rural area but I respect it greatly. I  
7 realize things have to change, but one of the reasons I wanted to be on Planning  
8 Commission years ago was because I wanted there to be planned intentional land  
9 development, not just willy-nilly. So I, when it's time to vote, am not gonna vote for us  
10 passing this on as it is right now. I'm personally gonna vote for deferral so that we can  
11 get this thing right.

12 MR. GILCHRIST: If I may, I just want to -

13 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Mr. Gilchrist?

14 MR. GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to go back to the map  
15 situation. Mr. DeLage, can you walk us through, is there a way that we can on our  
16 computers in front of us walk us through what the map currently looks like? Is that, can  
17 we do that?

18 MR. DELAGE: I think we can pull it up and look at specifically properties or areas  
19 in generally, it just depends on kind of what you mean by -

20 MR. GILCHRIST: Well I heard a couple of reference to the fact that people pulled  
21 up the map and they didn't really understand.

22 MR. PRICE: Yeah, Mr. Gilchrist, I think -

23 MR. GILCHRIST: Okay.

1 MR. PRICE: - I think what you may be asking is Tommy can you just, you're a  
2 citizen and go to our county website and kind of show the process of what we would go  
3 through to get to that.

4 MR. GILCHRIST: Yeah, yeah, I guess that's what I'm asking.

5 MR. PRICE: And also, if I could just have a moment. Ms. Frierson first of all  
6 thank you for the promotion, but the gentlemen that you spoke about was Eric Genson  
7 the Assistant County Administrator, I report to him but thank you.

8 MS. FRIERSON: Oh, well I think you may need a promotion, Mr. Price. Whatever  
9 a sister can do to help a brother out.

10 MR. DELAGE: Alright so we'll start off at our main webpage where actually the  
11 location is down here, a vision for the future, it can be clicked on either via the image or  
12 via the zoning. That will redirect you to the planning page. Down here below we had the  
13 land, the different of course divisions that will take you to their main homepages, but  
14 down here below we had the Land Development Code rewrite, it's got the adopted  
15 code. We do have the PDFs but rather than going to the PDFs you can have an  
16 interactive map to be able to actually zoom in and search specific properties. It works  
17 similar to our IMS, so for example - it's running a little slow because it knows it needs to  
18 work. So you would pull it up and if I could type correctly at that point it will take you to a  
19 specific addresses, and it's thinking, but just for example 2020 Hampton, it pulls it up.  
20 It's within the City of Columbia so it's not gonna show a zoning layer but the layers can  
21 be manipulated; typically the base zoning is by default and then it has the overlay  
22 districts as well. And then some minor information on the side, different layers that can  
23 be turned on or off. It's not as inclusive as our IMS because we didn't want to lag down

1 and slow the data, but of course you can pull it up on either the zoning map to show the  
2 different layers and then query other information on the IMS. So, and just for example  
3 so, this is I-20, 26 as you can see kinda the different parcels if you click on them. It will  
4 show basically your assessor's information and what the current code is or according to  
5 previous Land Development Codes so residential, multi-family, high-density. The  
6 recommended zoning district which is R6 and of course it has the acreage and the TMS  
7 number as well.

8 MR. GILCHRIST: Alright. Thank you. I appreciate that.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Anyone else on the Commission? Mr. Grady?

10 MR. GRADY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So I spent a great deal of time this  
11 weekend looking over the map, looking over the Code. Obviously I have listened to all  
12 of the feedback that we've received today. And the conclusion I think I've come to is that  
13 we may be talking past each other a bit. So I have some questions that I would like to  
14 direct at Staff and this may be a little bit of a gotcha so I apologize in advance. Just to  
15 step back, and this may be helpful for the people in the audience and others, the, one of  
16 the purposes of this Land Development Code update and the attendant rezoning is to  
17 implement the county's Comprehensive Plan of 2015. Would that be a fair statement?

18 MR. CROOKS: Yes.

19 MR. GRADY: Okay. So the question I have is, when I read through the  
20 Comprehensive Plan yesterday and at other times, I felt like the map did not reflect the  
21 goals that were articulated in the plan and, but on the other hand I also realize that there  
22 is in fact, for those of you who don't know, for the previous three years I worked at the  
23 State Housing Authority and was deeply enmeshed in the fact housing in this county

1 and throughout South Carolina is becoming less available and less affordable, and that  
2 those trends have only accelerated in recent years. So I understand the, the need for  
3 houses for people who are living here, for children who are leaving their parents homes,  
4 for people who are coming to South Carolina for a better place to live. So the question,  
5 so I have a few snip-its from the, from the plan, and I will ask the audience to not freak  
6 out half way through the quotes. The plan states that the county should “support higher  
7 residential densities in priority development areas” and I’ve asked the Staff how do you  
8 believe or if you believe this plan accomplishes that objective.

9 MR. CROOKS: So as it relates to the primary investment areas, so those are  
10 specifically designated to the future land use map. There is 11 or so different priority  
11 investment areas. And so one of the things that we have tried to do with it as it relates to  
12 the various principals that we’re using for this mapping process itself was in those areas  
13 look at higher intensity zoning. So where you have places like say, just to kind of pull  
14 one off the top of my head here, we’ll see where Tommy is going first, but just say for  
15 instance the intersection of, you know, pick a good one here, Lower Richland and  
16 Garners Ferry, so it’s one of those primary investment areas. So having an appropriate  
17 level of intensity that could be allowed through the zoning district but also something  
18 that’s still is compatible with how the area has been growing, how the areas been  
19 developing but still what is also that type of character that we’d expect to see there. So  
20 where you have something that say predominantly a lesser developed area, lesser  
21 intensity developments, so for instance that intersection particular where you have had  
22 some things that have been coming along that have been growing, not going leaps and  
23 bounds above what is already there. So take for instance, that lower portion of that

1 intersection where on the left hand side you've got a lot of current RSMD. The right-  
2 hand side basically up zoning things to mirror that at R3 versus leaving it as say R1 or  
3 R2 in that capacity; where it is still compatible with what's there but you're still up zoning  
4 it in a way, in a way. Same way with some of the other priority investment areas is you  
5 take it, we take to a little, take it has high as we think we could potentially recommend  
6 with still being something that is relatively compatible but is still something that again is  
7 compatible but also I'm gonna say, could be an appetite for. You know, where it's not  
8 going to be something so outlandish that it's leaps and bounds beyond what you could  
9 otherwise expect.

10 MR. GRADY: Okay. So another quote from the plan, and again I would ask you  
11 to pontificate on whether you believe this is being accomplished by this map, does the  
12 map work to "increase the proximity of residential, commercial, office and civic land  
13 uses for reduced distances, automotive travel and air pollution"?

14 MR. CROOKS: I'd say as best it can. So I think one of the things that we've  
15 heard a lot of as part of this is, and I think just in general, so where do those commercial  
16 uses then go? How does those then coincide with residential areas? So I think one of  
17 the comments we heard was about that mixed use or commercial encroachment into  
18 residential areas. So where do we then look at how that could play out? So being able  
19 to provide those various uses through those zoning districts as it relates to where we  
20 have established populations. So how do we then look at either having a lower level of  
21 commercial uses or if there's already an area where it's kind of in and out of  
22 commercial, do you tie everything back together commercially, do you leave it as kind of  
23 piecemeal residential, commercial? So what we've tried to do in a lotta cases with our

1 recommendation then is, again to the extent that it makes sense up zoning those to  
2 commercial areas and then relying upon those neighborhood compatibility standards  
3 where we do have those existing residential uses, those potential for residential use  
4 where you could still have those services there, but again not where they're going to be  
5 so out of character, so incompatible with what's there that you could still have them. So,  
6 so, to extent we're doing our best with that one as well.

7 MR. GRADY: Okay. Thank you. I have several more quotes but I will just slide  
8 past those. So I would suggest that the choice that we've faced as a county is not solely  
9 between let the real estate developers do whatever they want, wherever they want and  
10 let real estate developers do absolutely nothing anywhere. And I wonder if the concern  
11 that has been expressed in this room quite clearly is a function of the fact that we are  
12 going down the same path we have for decades, that we are promoting automobile  
13 based development, that clearly people are experiencing decreased quality of public  
14 services, people are, you know, finding all of these problems that they have I think  
15 internalized and have come to us today to say, things are not going the right direction.  
16 So I guess the final point that I have is that we need to figure out, I definitely have  
17 concerns that this map does not reflect the goals of the consolidated plan that were also  
18 discussed broadly and debated Council, debated by this Commission and, you know,  
19 when I look at, the solution is obviously not to, to see our population decline. I've, I grew  
20 up in the rust belt, that does not work. I've studied the overregulation of land use in  
21 California, that does not work either. And I would just say that I certainly hear the voice  
22 of, of asking for a delay. I will consider that as I hear from my fellow Commissioners and

1 would ask that we think about these issues more deeply. With that I yield back, thank  
2 you.

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you.

4 MR. DENNIS: Yes, sir. So I'm just going to wrap it all into one. You know, going  
5 through here I remember when we started this whole process when I got appointed. I  
6 remember looking at the R3, R4 area, R2 and the minimum houses that we had for  
7 those acreage, and I remember we thought pretty good looking through there and  
8 gotten them even lower density. And then going through a few more things, talking to  
9 people sitting out there, I've come up with, looking at that table, you know, when we did  
10 it I still don't remember the dual dwellings, the quad-plexes and triplexes and  
11 townhomes type thing like that I just, I still don't remember that. But it's in there and, you  
12 know, I was looking through how to incorporate that into the new map such as taking it  
13 out of some of those other density, or less dense areas and move them around, putting  
14 special regulations on them. And then I started looking even more into that table and I  
15 was looking at Long Tree, Pet Control Services and the impact they would have for the  
16 HM and RT districts cause that's where a lot of people have some of these businesses  
17 out there. I was also looking at the farm, rural, barns, areas for weddings, wedding  
18 venues, looking at people that grew small farms because this right here it does take like,  
19 where I grew up a farm is a farm. So we get to small farms and we get to large farms,  
20 chicken farms, I mean, a farm is a farm if you're growing stuff on it and you're producing  
21 for people. And then I started looking down through it even more and I was looking at,  
22 you know, how the garden centers and retails for those AGs, HM areas, maybe RT,  
23 vehicle repairs for those areas, cause it just gets to the, some of that stuff I think should

1 be out there and allowing people to use their zoning and their property that they have  
2 for whatever they wanna use it. And then, you know, I saw, I even talk about the  
3 subdivision of generation of land, and then one of the other things I've had a lot of  
4 questions are, you know, and I did a lotta digging and looking back, you know, people  
5 are, one of them was how does this new thing affect me, I can't have my boat in my  
6 front yard or I can't have it on the side of my house anymore. And so I started doing  
7 digging on that and I found even in our old text you couldn't have it there either. So I  
8 mean, I was straightforward, like why can't we do that, and then I had to go back and  
9 look at it. And so just kind of looking more and more you know, as somebody that  
10 served in the military I love the fact that people have their homes, they have their land  
11 they can do what they can want. And then the other fact is I became a realtor and funny  
12 fact about realtors are a lotta people think that hey, we're out to build everything. In fact,  
13 realtors are about property rights, people's property rights and I'm a real stickler for that.  
14 I love people's property rights. And the more I look at this, you know, I, and hearing from  
15 people and looking at it, it just, it doesn't sit well with me. It really doesn't. I don't think  
16 Richland County, even if we do this and we move forward, I just don't think Richland  
17 County is ready for the growth that could happen smartly if we don't look at it at the  
18 basis and build it smartly. If we don't look after our people, it's just not gonna work. And  
19 that's just kind of where I'm standing with it right now.

20 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman, I agree with -

21 MR. DENNIS: I got a - oh, sorry.

22 MR. GILCHRIST: No, go ahead Dennis, yeah.



1 MR. DENNIS: And I got a lot more stuff that, I mean, I could but I think looking  
2 from here on out we might need to just really dig into this.

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: And I just have some comments, hopefully before  
4 anybody just makes a motion, so.

5 MR. GILCHRIST: That's fine Mr. Chairman no, I, I, just want to echo both with  
6 Ms. Frierson, Commissioner Frierson and Commissioner Dennis both have, and  
7 Commissioner Grady. I mean, earlier I asked about the, the map, I mean excuse me,  
8 the calendar and whether or not there is some urgent need for us to do this now in light  
9 of not accepting the information that we've received and use it as a basis for us going  
10 forward. Seems to me that the only urgency, Mr. Chairman, is for the fact Council has a  
11 public hearing scheduled for the 26<sup>th</sup> but the agenda does not include this particular  
12 item. And so for me I, I do think as I stated at our meeting last week, it's important to  
13 make sure that anytime we hear from the public that we take a minute to massage what  
14 we're hearing from the public to insure that the document that we want the public to live  
15 by is one that is comprehensive enough to address the things that we care about in the  
16 county. And so I too would be very open to, you know, looking at some way to not delay  
17 it but to defer it until such time that we have an opportunity to incorporate some of this  
18 information that we've heard both from last week and from this week. So that's all I have  
19 Mr. Chairman.

20 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair?

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Taylor.

22 MR. TAYLOR: I do have a quick question for Staff, and Mr. Crooks you can  
23 correct me if I'm wrong. You said some recent changes or corrections were made based

1 on emails and phone calls that you had gotten. What, what were those corrections to, or  
2 those changes? Do you remember that statement?

3 MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir, so those were further updates of Staff's  
4 recommendation based on some additional feedback that we received. So those were  
5 along - so a handful of properties along Old Tama that were previously being  
6 recommended for R2 changing to RT and then one or two south of Eastover going from  
7 I think AG to RT and then one property that was originally being recommended for the  
8 employment district so EMP recommendation for general commercial GC.

9 MR. TAYLOR: So in light of that it sounds like even it's, it's still moving and, and  
10 changing based on input and based on the input that we receiving today. I would also  
11 kind of support stepping back a minute and addressing the concerns that are coming  
12 forward. My only question would be to the Commission and, you know, when do we, we  
13 do we stop, when is it enough? This is so subjective because again, no matter what we  
14 do not everyone is going to be satisfied with it. I mean, that's, that's just, that's just a  
15 truth. So one of the things I would want us to consider is, you know, how far do we push  
16 this out. How far do we defer until, you know, what time, and maybe that's something  
17 we can discuss amongst ourselves.

18 MR. GILCHRIST: That's a good point.

19 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you. I mean, if there's nothing else right now, I'd  
20 thought I'd just go ahead and share some of my thoughts and ask you to bear with me. I  
21 made some notes and we've been patiently listening for a long time, and maybe haven't  
22 shared our perspectives as much just yet, so it's for good reason that this process is  
23 drawing so much attention. It impacts roughly 375,000 acres of land and over 100,000

1 individual parcels by assigning virtually everyone a new zoning district. In commenting  
2 today I don't mean to allege any ill intent from anybody who is a part of this process. I  
3 believe that a community that is not growing in good ways is probably a community that  
4 is unhealthy and dying. We need residential and non-residential growth that is  
5 manageable and responsible and growth we can be proud of. We need the many  
6 different elements of infrastructure provided by government to complement growth and  
7 to keep it manageable and responsible. Balancing these things along with our desire to  
8 respect property rights is not easy. The drafting and the adoption of the Land  
9 Development Code resulted in a complete total replacement of the prior Code adopted  
10 17 years ago. Naturally it has created and will continue to create change and  
11 adjustment for developers and property owners and users, the true extent of which  
12 remains to be seen. The new LDC creates a, includes a zoning district equivalency  
13 table. We, we fought hard as a Planning Commission to see that that equivalency table  
14 was included in the Land Development Code. Even following that table the default new  
15 equivalent for most residential districts, meaning R3 through R6, is already going to be  
16 more dense than under the prior LDC. This is true even after this Commission last year  
17 rolled back last minute proposed additional residential density increases. Today the  
18 business at hand is the fact that a new zoning map must be adopted to use the new  
19 zoning terminology and the new LDC. Very few, if any, exact equivalence exists. That  
20 being said the amount of proactive up zoning, meaning more intense use, more  
21 permitted uses in this proposed map to something other than the closest new district to  
22 an existing district assignment seems to be much more than just what would be deemed  
23 by and large obviously needed to match existing uses and zoning assignments. The

1 future land use map which is part of our county's comprehensive plan and our actual  
2 current zoning map are two different things with two different purposes. If they were  
3 intended to be the same, they would be consolidated into one map. We should not be in  
4 affect replacing the current zoning map with the future land use map. See pages 24 and  
5 25 of the Comprehensive Plan wherein it is emphasized that the future land use plan is  
6 "provided solely with the intention of providing guidance to local decision makers" not  
7 intended to provide site level guidance with regard to development decisions. There  
8 does appear to be an element of one fell swoop, somewhat aggressive of up zoning in  
9 the proposed zoning map. This has in effect materially modified an existing practice  
10 which involves the naturally increased time, effort, diligence, given to typical individual  
11 for rezoning applications, which involves a site-specific application, communications  
12 with Staff, review and input and recommendation with the Planning Commission,  
13 hearing from the community, and review and input and vote by Council, which is often  
14 accompanied by community meetings and site-specific agreements as to development.  
15 I don't know that such a material change is wise or desired by Council or residents. The  
16 Comprehensive Plan emphasizes at least twice that discretion should be used by both  
17 Staff and decision makers that ultimately "rezoning decisions are legislative decisions  
18 made by the County Council". This Commission and County Council pressed for the  
19 inclusion of the equivalency table found in the new LDC. My thought is that if any up  
20 zoning is to occur that does not align with that table it should be a very limited scope  
21 such that it can reasonably be reviewed by key parties and discussed in a targeted way  
22 that creates minimal disruptions to the communities understanding of the thorough  
23 review and the level of site-specific interaction that typically occurs in rezoning requests.

1 Staff provided us some data in an Excel spread sheet. If I read it correctly by their  
2 labeling up zoning that was not equivalent totaled over 16,000 parcels and over 34,000  
3 acres. Prior to serving on the Planning Commission, I was asked to get involved with a  
4 rezoning application of a large tract of land from rural to one of the residential districts.  
5 After weeks of communications between parties including the County Councilmen, the  
6 residents and the developer, a compromise was struck and the parcel was up zoned  
7 from RU to RSE. The equivalency table says RSE is equivalent to R1. It is just now  
8 being developed into a neighborhood. It concerns me that this same parcel is now  
9 presented on the proposed zoning map as being further up zoned; not to R2 but to R3  
10 which is two density districts away based on the adopted equivalency table. The same  
11 is true for three adjoining parcels. It triples the density from an average of .46 acres per  
12 dwelling unit to .17, providing for two, three and four family dwellings. These four lots  
13 combines 84 acres, that would result approximately in 504 new units on those four  
14 tracts of land. So I also believe the new LDC defines the term multi-family in a way that  
15 is different from what most people would expect, as we heard today. Two, three and  
16 four family dwellings are not considered multi-family as defined by the new LDC, they  
17 are in one way or another permitted by right in residential districts R2 to R6. Multi-family  
18 dwellings are an important part of a large communities housing needs. By their nature  
19 they would be expected to create greater population density than single family dwellings  
20 and as such we need to look seriously at either how we define those terms or we need  
21 to review the districts and locations in which those two plus family dwellings are  
22 appropriate and permitted in the principal use table of new LDC. Or if we leave that stuff  
23 all the same then we should consider more carefully where we put R2 through R6 on

1 the zoning map. I have also, I have pause when I think that a large up zoning in bulk is  
2 proposed in conjunction with the new LDC's allowance for more dense clustering of  
3 houses with open space density bonuses. And while I understand that some reserved  
4 open space have been or may be deeded into someone, I'm not sure who, other open  
5 spaces may only be reserved by placing a label on a map while leaving the possibility  
6 that those open spaces will later be subject to additional fill in development. So I would  
7 think that with all those potential avenues for future increases and density we ought not  
8 be aggressively up zoning in mass at this time. The now existing LDC is basically brand  
9 new and is a complete replacement of the old. I would think it wise to live with it for a  
10 while before up zoning in mass. We need to grow in good ways that our community can  
11 be proud of, and we need development that supports that growth while not  
12 overwhelming us. While I thank the Staff and others for their work on this ongoing  
13 necessary map project, I cannot in good conscious vote to approve the proposed zoning  
14 map last updated on or about March 28<sup>th</sup> 2022. If the map moved on the County Council  
15 for a vote regardless of our recommendation, I implore Staff and Council to review the  
16 number residential districts that permit dwellings that are something other than single  
17 family housing, to reconsider the impact of the lot size requirements for a dwelling in the  
18 AG, HM and RT districts, to otherwise exactly follow the adopted equivalency tables for  
19 all properties covered by districts listed therein, and to consider submitting any further  
20 multi-parcel request to up zone or change zoning use types in small and reasonably  
21 related groupings that will facilitate Staff, this Commission, the public and County  
22 Council in exercising the diligence and discretion described in our Comprehensive Plan.  
23 Thank y'all for your patience. Any other comments or notes for discussion? Mr. Price?

1 MR. PRICE: Yes sir, you're going to send that to us, right?

2 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: What, my statement?

3 MR. PRICE: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: I can.

5 MR. PRICE: Thank you. It will be helpful; they take all the notes.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay.

7 MR. PRICE: Alright, so what it seems like, I just want to make sure I point this out  
8 to the Planning Commission. Just based on some of the discussion that you're having it  
9 sounds like you want to look at this a little further before, you know, rather defer it so  
10 you can have some more discussion regarding this. Now, I want to point out according  
11 to 26-52-(E)(2) of the Richland County Land Development Code, within 30 days from  
12 the date any proposed rezoning amendment is first considered by the Planning  
13 Commission at a scheduled meeting unless a longer period of time has been mutually  
14 agreed upon between the County Council and the Planning Commission in the  
15 particular case, the Planning Commission shall submit its report and recommendation to  
16 the County Council. The recommendation of the Planning Commission is advisory only  
17 and shall not be binding on County Council. If the Planning Commission does not  
18 submit its report within the prescribed time the County Council may proceed to act on  
19 the amendment without further awaiting the recommendations of the Planning  
20 Commission. Now, I read that, and this of course this is more from Staff throwing some  
21 suggestions out there. It sounds like you have a lot of things that y'all want to discuss  
22 whether it be the mapping and some of the proposed zoning designation throughout the  
23 county, also looking at some of the text. You may have to go back to that. If you defer

1 today, it'd be scheduled to come back to the Planning Commission on the 1<sup>st</sup> Monday of  
2 May, I think that's May 2<sup>nd</sup>, I'm not sure of the date, but it'll be coming in May. Then it  
3 would be scheduled to go before County Council. Of course as I state County Council  
4 could go ahead and pull this and take action on it even if you didn't take any action on  
5 the 2<sup>nd</sup>. My suggestion would be that if you decide to defer that the Chair meet with the  
6 Chair of County Council to discuss this as I stated and see if you can come upon a  
7 mutual date. I don't believe that, you know, I don't want to speak for Council, but I  
8 believe they'd be willing to wait until you're very comfortable in what you send to them in  
9 your recommendation. I don't think they just want you to force something there, whether  
10 it be for or against. So I believe that they will be willing to wait as long as it takes for you  
11 to work on this. Also, we would just as a Staff we would ask that you be specific as to  
12 what it is that we'll be working on so Staff can be able to prepare. And I believe that this  
13 is probably going to take, and I'll go back to in the last Land Development Code was,  
14 was adopted by County Council, we had a number of meetings with the Planning  
15 Commission, usually, you know, evenings, they were just work sessions. So I'm thinking  
16 it would be best that we go ahead and establish a number of work sessions going  
17 forward because I don't believe this is something, at least based on some of the  
18 comments that y'all have expressed and also from what we've received from the  
19 citizens of Richland County, that something we can do at every, you know, the regularly  
20 scheduled meeting for County Council. Excuse me, Planning Commission, sorry.

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: So potentially how quick could Council pull it up? If they  
22 wanted to?

23 MR. PRICE: May.



1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Take it away from us.

2 MR. PRICE: May. Their May zoning public hearing.

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. What did we say that was, is it the 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursday  
4 or 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday?

5 MR. PRICE: It's the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of each month.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Fourth Tuesday.

7 MR. PRICE: And that's what it's scheduled for. So that would be the 24<sup>th</sup>. Thank  
8 you, Tommy.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah, I mean, again, I don't want to speak for the  
10 Commission as a whole as far as like what are will is on, on this matter. I don't  
11 personally, you know, I'm open to doing something other than just putting up a  
12 concrete wall and saying, you know, we don't want to talk about it anymore. Anybody  
13 have any other thoughts on the Commission right now about how to proceed? I mean,  
14 one way to start figuring things out obviously is for, for people to make motions and we  
15 can take votes on motions.

16 MR. GILCHRIST: Chairman?

17 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chair? Since you were asking for -

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Ms. Frierson.

19 MS. FRIERSON: - suggestions - this is not a motion. I think that our work session  
20 the other day was helpful, and as Mr. Price so accurately stated there are a number of  
21 concerns that came out today from the residents and from the Commissioners, and  
22 since this is just the early part of April, I suggest that we as a Commission have another  
23 work session – or maybe don't call it work session – to discuss these issues in time

1 whereby we would be willing to come up with some more definitive decision right before  
2 the May meeting. So just another time that we get together as commissioners in April to  
3 work on this again. I mean, not work not it but to air out some of our concerns along with  
4 Staff, of course.

5 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman, if I may?

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Gilchrist.

7 MR. GILCHRIST: Yeah so, I concur with Commissioner Frierson. And I listened  
8 very attentatively to your list which is extraordinarily comprehensive. So it will take a few  
9 sessions to work through some of that. So yeah, I would support the fact that we try to  
10 have some time to, to meet prior to the May 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. I'm open to that.

11 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: And I did speak with the Chair of Council, Chairman  
12 Walker a couple few days ago and we, we indicated that we would want to speak again  
13 this week. So I'm happy to touch base with him as far as timing on things goes.

14 MR. PRICE: Yeah, whatever the decision comes from between the two of you.  
15 I'm sure I think Council may have to take action on that to, you know, defer to the next  
16 public hearing, which would be the one in May. So if you would just advise Staff of what  
17 comes about from that we would be appreciative.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Any, can anybody voice if you have an objection to us  
19 looking to, you know, conduct one or more work sessions before our May regular  
20 scheduled meeting? Okay, I'm not hearing any objections of that course of action. So if  
21 we want to go that route I can speak with Chairman Walker and work on a schedule and  
22 then circulate proposed dates for work sessions among the Commission for April?  
23 Okay. I guess we take a motion to defer?

1 MR. PRICE: You would, yes, you would need to take action regarding this, what  
2 you have before you. And then you can come back and if you want to talk about the  
3 dates or get more specifics on what we'll be talking about at the work session, we can  
4 do that afterwards.

5 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chair, I'll make the motion.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson.

7 MS. FRIERSON: I so move that we the Planning Commission defer action on this  
8 Land Development Code until such time as we as Commissioners can have additional  
9 work sessions prior to the May, our regular May meeting. And if I may add in the interim,  
10 we also ask that of course you and Chairperson Walker of County Council continue your  
11 discussion.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thank you. Motion on the floor, do we have a second?

13 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

14 MR. DENNIS: I second.

15 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. We have a second. If Staff is ready we'll take a  
16 roll call vote please.

17 MR. PRICE: Alright, sorry about that. Alright, so the motion was for deferral of  
18 Case 22-001 MA that will go to, it will be scheduled for the May 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. Those in  
19 favor of that motion? Yonke?

20 MR. YONKE: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

22 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

1 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Metts?

3 MR. METTS: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Branham?

5 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

9 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Gilchrist?

11 MR. GILCHRIST: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

13 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

14 *[Approved: Yonke, Carlisle, Frierson, Metts, Branham, Grady, Taylor, Gilchrist, Dennis]*

15 MR. PRICE: Alright. Unanimously passes.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. Thank you and motion carries. Don't have  
17 anything else under other agenda items. Chairman's report, nothing at this time.

18 MR. PRICE: Excuse me, Mr. Chair again.

19 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes.

20 MR. PRICE: For those of you who have remained with us today because the  
21 Planning Commission did not take any action there will not be a public hearing on the  
22 26<sup>th</sup> of April. No cases.

23 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: No, no County Council Zoning Public Hearing.

1 MR. PRICE: Public hearing, right, right.

2 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: On April 26<sup>th</sup>.

3 MR. PRICE: Right, right. There's no items to bring forward.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Because this Commission deferred. Okay. Thank you.  
5 Planning Director's report, anything else? Mr. Price.

6 MR. PRICE: No, sir. I still think we still probably need to get more specific as to  
7 what we will be looking to do at the work sessions, what items we'll be looking to take  
8 up. And again as I think as I've stated I believe, just in my opinion, it's probably going to  
9 take a few work sessions with the, the Planning Commission, so if you will make sure  
10 you establish probably the time that you're going to have devoted to it for each case and  
11 also again, what specifically we'll address at each of the work sessions.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, we can, we can work up something in writing and  
13 just circulate it amongst the Commission so that Staff is aware of what we want to tackle  
14 in advance, is that okay?

15 MR. PRICE: Yeah. The sooner you get to us the better we can kind of help  
16 prepare any documentation that's necessary.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. Something from Mr. Dennis?

18 MR. DENNIS: Does Staff have, like a running tally of stuff the public sent us  
19 because, I mean, I got my own list but if we're working it, like let's work it? Okay. Could  
20 y'all bring that to the table as well?

21 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

22 MR. DENNIS: And I'll type up my list and email it.

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. Thank you. Alright. Last item on the Agenda is  
2 other items? If there's nothing further Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.

3 MR. GILCHRIST: So moved.

4 MR. PRICE: Alright.

5 MR. DENNIS: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, seconded. Staff will you please take a vote?  
7 Motion to adjourn?

8 MR. PRICE: Alright. We have a motion for adjournment. Those in favor? Yonke?

9 MR. YONKE: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

11 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

13 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Metts?

15 MR. METTS: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Branham?

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Grady?

19 MR. GRADY: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

21 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Gilchrist?

23 MR. GILCHRIST: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

2 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

3 *[Approved: Yonke, Carlisle, Frierson, Metts, Branham, Grady, Taylor, Gilchrist, Dennis]*

4 MR. PRICE: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: We're adjourned. Thank you.

6 [END OF RECORDING]