RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION September 7, 2023

1 2 3 [Members Present: Christopher Yonke, Beverly Frierson, Frederick Johnson II, Gary 4 Dennis, Charles Durant, Terrence Taylor, Bryan Grady, Chris Siercks; Absent: John 5 Metts1 6 7 Called to order: _____ 8 9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Before we get started, last call for the sign-up sheet. 10 Anybody needs to speak, we have it up here now. Okay. We'll go ahead and get 11 started. I'd like to call to order the September 7th, 2023 Richland County Planning 12 Commission meeting. Staff, please confirm the following, in accordance with the 13 Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to the news media, persons 14 requesting notification and posted on the bulletin board located in the County 15 16 Administration building. Is that correct? MR. DELAGE: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. 17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Staff, can you please take attendance for 18 19 today's meeting? MR. DELAGE: Alright, Taylor? 20 MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible] 21 22 MR. DELAGE: Grady? MR. GRADY: Here. 23 MR. DELAGE: Frierson? 24 MS. FRIERSON: Here. 25 MR. DELAGE: Yonke? 26

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Here.

27

MR. DELAGE: Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: Here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DELAGE: Durant?

MR. DURANT: Here.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: So we're missing Commissioner Metts today.

MR. DELAGE: Yes sir, so Mr. Metts, Mr. Siercks, oh, we got a late arrival.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah. I timed it like that to give you some more time there. Alright, very good, thank you, Staff. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the September 7th, 2023 Richland County Planning Commission meeting. As Planning Commissioners we are concerned residents of Richland County who volunteer our time to thoroughly review and make recommendations to County Council. Our recommendations are to approve or deny zoning map amendment requests. Per Title VI, Chapter 29 of the SC Code of Laws Planning Commission may also prepare and revise plans and programs for the development or redevelopment of unincorporated portions of the county. The County's Land Development Code rewrite process conducted last year is an example of this. Once again, we are a recommending body to County Council and they will conduct their own public hearing and take official votes to approve or deny map amendments and text amendments on a future date to be published by the county. Council typically holds Zoning Public Hearings on the fourth Tuesday of the month. Please check with the County's website for updated agendas, dates and times. Please take note of the following guidelines for today's meeting. Please turn off or silence any cellphones. Audience members may quietly come and go as needed. Applicants are allowed up to two minutes to make statements. Citizens signed up to speak are allowed up to two

minutes each. Redundant comments should be minimized. Please only address
remarks to the Commission and do not expect the Commission to respond to questions
from the speaker in a back-and-forth style; this is not the purpose of this meeting.
Please no audience or speaker exchanges. No audience demonstrations or other
disruptions to the meeting are permitted nor are comments from anyone other than the
speaker at the podium. Please remember the meeting is being recorded. Please speak
into the microphone and give your name and address. Abusive language is
inappropriate and will not be tolerated. Please don't voice displeasure or frustration at a
recommendation while the Planning Commission is still conducting business. If you
have any questions or concerns you may contact the Richland County Planning
Department Staff down below here. Okay, we're going to move onto number 3 on the
Agenda today, is additions and deletions to the agenda. Are there any motions,
Commissioners, for additions or deletions to today's Agenda? Or are there any motions
to amend the Agenda? Okay, hearing none.
MD DELACE, Mr. Chair?

MR. DELAGE: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes?

MR. DELAGE: Sorry, just real briefly, Ms. Tindall is the Addressing Coordinator and she had mentioned that the number, sorry, the street name review for, on the third name is for the proposed Scout Motors, that needed to be pulled from the Agenda today.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you. Okay, we'll go back to that when we look at the Consent Agenda but then let's go ahead and look at the item number 4, the approval of Minutes. Staff included July 10th, 2023 in our Report. Commissioners, have

- we have time to look over this, do we have any comments or changes that need to be
- 2 made to these Minutes? Hearing none, is there a motion to approve the Minutes from
- 3 July's meeting?
- 4 MR. DENNIS: Chair?
- 5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes?
- 6 MR. DENNIS: I make a motion to approve the Minutes from July meeting.
- 7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Great, do we have a second?
- 8 MR. GRADY: Second.
- 9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, please take a vote?
- MR. DELAGE: Durant?
- MR. DURANT: [Inaudible]
- MR. DELAGE: Dennis?
- 13 MR. DENNIS: Aye.
- MR. DELAGE: Yonke?
- 15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.
- MR. DELAGE: Frierson?
- 17 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.
- 18 MR. DELAGE: Grady?
- 19 MR. GRADY: Aye.
- MR. DELAGE: Taylor?
- MR. TAYLOR: Aye.
- MR. DELAGE: Johnson?
- MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

MR. DELAGE: Alright, it's approved.

[Approved: Durant, Dennis, Yonke, Frierson, Grady, Taylor, Johnson; Absent for vote:

Siercks; Absent: Metts]

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you again Staff. With that housekeeping cleaned up we have move onto number 5 which is the Consent Agenda. We use a Consent Agenda to move forward with items that don't need to be discussed based off of the Staff's recommendations. I see here we have from the Staff recommendation everything is disapproval so it looks like all of these will be removed from the Staff, from the Consent Agenda. So I believe we are only going to have road names and we were just talking about the one from Scout Motors we're going to remove. So the Chair makes a motion to, on the Consent Agenda to remove items 5b, all the amendments and to remove, Staff what do I call this one, is there a road name number assigned to it? Proposed Scout Motors.

MS. TINDALL: Black Forest Road.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Black Forest Road. Thank you. And remove the Black Forest Road from the Consent Agenda today. So only the other road names will be on the Consent Agenda.

MR. DELAGE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: That's my motion. If that made sense, do I have a second?

MR. GRADY: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. Staff, please take the vote. Which would be approving the rest of the road names.

MR. DELAGE: Alright, Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible] 1 MR. DELAGE: Taylor? 2 MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible] 3 MR. DELAGE: Grady? 4 MR. GRADY: Aye. 5 6 MR. DELAGE: Frierson? MS. FRIERSON: Aye. 7 MR. DELAGE: Yonke? 8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye. 9 MR. DELAGE: Dennis? 10 MR. DENNIS: Aye. 11 MR. DELAGE: Durant? 12 MR. DURANT: Aye. 13 MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion approved. 14 [Approved: Johnson, Taylor, Grady, Frierson, Yonke, Dennis, Durant; Absent for vote: 15 Siercks; Absent: Metts] 16 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Okay we're going to move right along to 17 our first map amendment today. Which is item 5b1. Go ahead and take it away, Staff? 18 19 **CASE NO. 23-030 MA**: 20 MR. DELAGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And just real quickly I apologize I forgot to mention this earlier. Our transcriptionist had asked that when we recognize or the 21 22 Chair recognizes someone that if you could mention their name it would be very helpful 23 for her references.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Will do, thank you.

MR. DELAGE: But, thank you. Alright, so our first case is Case 23-030 MA. The Applicant's name is Fan Disharoon, and I apologize if I mispronounce any names. The request from the Office and Institutional district to the Residential Single-family Low-density district. The property is located at 1528 Legrand Road. The Staff's recommendation is for disapproval. This is based off of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan desired land, or desired development pattern and the land use and design recommendations. So the proposed request is not consistent with the objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed commercial district is, or the current commercial district, commercial district is in character with the land use and desired development pattern recommended in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan so principally Staff recommends disapproval of this map amendment. However, approval of the rezoning request would be in character with the existing development and patterns and zoning districts along this section of Legrand Road.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, thank you Staff. Do we have any questions for Staff, Commissioners, before we ask for our first speaker? Okay, hearing none, Vice Chair Commissioner Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: Thank you. We have one person who has signed up to speak and that's the Applicant, Fan Disharoon.

TESTIMONY OF FAN DISHAROON:

MS. DISHAROON: Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Good afternoon. Please remember to state your name and address.

1 MS. DISHAROON: Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. DISHAROON: I'm Fan Disharoon. I'm at 40 Polo Ridge Circle in Columbia 29223. My husband and I bought 1528 Legrand in 2015 to house our residential real estate firm. It's really a four bedroom, two and a half bath brick ranch with a kitchen, a living room, a dining room and a two-car garage built in 1970. It spent well over 30 years fulfilling that function as a residence before being bought and eventually rezoned by Milliken Forestry in the early 2000's so that they could use it for storage. We did some landscaping and made some county required alterations to the outside like a cement ramp up to the door. None of those things that we did to it would preclude it from being a great house for people to live in and no changes have been done to the inside that would preclude it from being a great house again. It sits on the end of a culld-sac, there's only three houses on that end of the cul-de-sac. The one directly beside us shares our property line, is a residence. It is and always has had a family living in it. On the other side of the road up on the corner, Milliken owns another house that is actually zoned commercial right now. The only commercial sign out there is our sign that we're getting ready to remove. The, there's a fence at the end of our property, at the end of the cull-da-sac because there's a big drop off right there where the hotel next to it has a backup parking lot down there. From our property you really don't see it and you're not really bothered by it because of the fence and also because our property is very wooded. The entire cul-de-sac has the appearance of an established residential area with mature landscaping. We're at a place in our lives, my husband and I, where we want to retire and the equity in this property is vital for us to be able to do it. Being in

the real estate business ourselves we know that there's far greater need for residential property than there is of commercial property of this type right now in Richland County. We've been trying to sell this commercial listed through our MLS and also online for months with no luck. We do however have people who would buy it tomorrow if it was rezoned residential. In the conclusion of the Planning Commission's report, it does say that even though it's against the Comprehensive Plan making it residential again would be in character with the existing development patterns and zoning districts along that section of Legrand Road. So we ask that you please approve this rezoning so that the property can be returned to the use for which is was designed, to add an affordable home to the limited availability in Richland County and to prevent it from sitting empty as another unwanted, unneeded commercial property. Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for your time. Is there anyone else signed up to speak, Commissioner Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: No one else is signed up to speak.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. If no one else from the public signed up I have this now opened on the floor for discussion amongst the Commissioners.

MR. GRADY: Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady?

MR. GRADY: Question for Staff here. Is, cause I mean I think, I certainly understand the concern of the Applicant that they are looking to dispose of this property as a residential property. The main concern I have is that inconsistency with the plan.

So I guess the question I would have is, is there another classification that would allow

1 2

3

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

19

22

23

the property to be disposed of as a residential property but not preclude redevelopment at a later point that is more consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?

MR. DELAGE: Well given the parcels acreage there's certain requirements that it would have to meet to make that rezoning request to a different zoning district that may allow for the opportunity for both residential and commercial. Because it's less than two acres it's limited to certain criteria of being either abutting a particular zoning district of, you know, that they can request or in this case because it's less than two acres and adjacent to RSLD, that's the zoning district that they chose to go with as the intended use would be residential. Given next door that, you know, GC for the, general commercial for the hotel that, that's an option, however, I think that that would be, be the most intense district and may not be as compatible with the surrounding uses and zoning districts that's currently on this section of Legrand Road.

MR. GRADY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any others questions for Staff or comments?

MR. JOHNSON: The house diagonally across –

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Commissioner Johnson, sorry. I know that that's, yes, what is that actually being used for regardless of the current zoning. What's the current use on that structure?

MR. DELAGE: Just like the Applicant stated we do have it listed as a nonresidential property. It, my understanding is it was used as an office. I can't speak to say with 100% certainty as it's being used, you know, right now today. However, the street view does and, you know, looking from the road it does show a non-residential kind of

parking area, which I can actually show, pull up here. Well I should say atypical 1 residential parking area. 2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We're looking at the house across the street, right? 3 MR. DELAGE: Yes sir, that's correct. 4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay. Staff, would you mind flipping the map around so we 5 can look at the property in question right here? This property does appear to be pretty 6 residential. Any other comments? Discussion? Or motions? 7 MR. DENNIS: Chair? 8 CHAIRMAN YONKE: I didn't mean to cut you off. Commissioner Johnson, go 9 ahead. 10 MR. JOHNSON: I apologize. Clarification, because of the two different versions 11 of the Agenda [inaudible] hard copy says approval. 12 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, the, we were sent a revised Agenda where that was 13 14 just a typo from the Staff. MR. JOHNSON: Okay. 15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff's recommendation was disapproval on this one, yeah. 16 17 Did Staff want to go ahead and explain that again? Why it goes against the Comp Plan? MR. DELAGE: Sure. 18 19 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thanks. 20 MR. DELAGE: So, so the area is identified as part of the mixed-use corridor which kind of extends along Two Notch Road. The recommended development pattern 21 22 is that, and I'll kind of get into the meat of it is that suburban commercial quarter should 23 be transferred over time from traditional strip, commercial development to mixed use

convert single story, single use developments on individual lots to multi story mixed use
formats that organize uses in a pedestrian friendly format. That's the desired
development pattern recommendation. And then as far as for - yeah, okay, thank you.

Mr. Smith was pointing out that there's a, this section of Legrand Road is actually
included in kind of a large bump out on the future land use map, which I can actually
show here. Again, being that it's kind of a, a broad brush I think just trying to encompass

connecting activity centers. Between activity centers corridors should be redeveloped to

show here. Again, being that it's kind of a, a broad brush I think just trying to encompass some of the uses that were existing there. So however, this section of Legrand Road is, is, is kind of an established residential area that was is, it'd been in existence prior to the 2015 plan.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Dennis, would you still like to be recognized?

MR. DENNIS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Dennis, go ahead?

MR. DENNIS: Yeah, so I drove around that area yesterday and it's primarily residential houses down Legrand minus the OI across the street and the OI right next to it, and then of course you have the hotel and kitchen right off of Two Notch. With the amount of residential houses there and that hotel being there and there's no other main road going to that area, you know, I struggle with trying to keep it OI and commercial with all those other residential houses there, and the fact that that house was technically built as a residential and then it was rezoned later on. And I understand where our plan is going but to me it looks more like this would be more in line with the surrounding area. So if nobody else has anything I do have a motion.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright. 1 MR. DENNIS: Yes, I move to pass Case Number 23-03 [sic] MA to County 2 Council for approval, reason being it does fit the current characteristics of the area 3 around it and also there's not a main road that it's on, it is on a residential road. That's 4 my reasoning for approval. 5 MS. FRIERSON: Second the motion. 6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, we have a motion on the floor with a second. Staff, 7 would you go ahead and take a vote please? 8 9 MR. DELAGE: Alright, the motion is for approval. Durant? MR. DURANT: Aye. 10 MR. DELAGE: Siercks? 11 MR. SIERCKS: Aye. 12 MR. DELAGE: Dennis? 13 MR. DENNIS: Aye. 14 MR. DELAGE: Yonke? 15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye. 16 MR. DELAGE: Frierson? 17 MS. FRIERSON: Aye. 18 MR. DELAGE: Grady? 19 20 MR. GRADY: No. MR. DELAGE: Taylor? 21 22 MR. TAYLOR: Aye. 23 MR. DELAGE: Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]

MR. DELAGE: Alright, motion approved.

[Approved: Durant, Siercks, Dennis, Yonke, Frierson, Taylor, Johnson(?); Opposed:

Grady; Absent: Metts]

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. This map amendment goes on to County Council as a recommendation from us for approval and it will be at the next Zoning meeting which will be on the website or County Staff to tell you the date on that one, thank you. We will move right along to Case Number 5b2. Case 23-031 MA. Staff, please inform us about this one?

CASE NO. 23-031 MA:

MR. DELAGE: Alright, so the applicant is Mohammad Baddourah. The location is 825 Hallbrook Drive. The parcel acreage is 16.25 acres. The existing zoning is RU or rural district and the request is for the general commercial district. Sorry, I just noticed there might be a slight typo there. Okay, sorry I just noticed that it says RCG instead of GC it through me off there for a second so. But the parcel is located within the Comprehensive Plan's identified neighborhood activity center, so within there, there are some recommended land uses. The primary land uses are grocery stores, restaurants, bar, professional services, professional office, financial institutions, small format medical office, personal services, drugstore and smaller scale retail shopping are appropriate within there. Secondary land uses are multi-family housing, commercial uses, such as drive-thru restaurants and convenience stores and gasoline stations. Staff, in Staff's recommendation the request is not located near a traffic junction so Staff believes that approving commercial zoning outside of a traffic junction where a clear terminance has

been established for those commercial zoning and uses would not maximize the existing commercial zonings in the immediate area and could further spread commercial zoning into areas where more transitional zoning may be appropriate. Approval of the zoning request would permit uses which would be out of character for the existing surrounding development pattern and zoning districts in the area and for these reasons Staff recommends disapproval of the map amendment.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. With this one can we go ahead, yeah, I was going to say pull that map up. I'm very familiar with this area and Hallbrook is a residential street so just to note that as we get started. Actually, I think the Richland County map would be good to look at. Thank you. See the surrounding, so the GC is up and down Garners Ferry Road, but Hallbrook is all the traditional built like 1960's housing, okay. Mr. Frierson, do we have anyone, do we have an Applicant to speak?

MS. FRIERSON: No, we don't have the Applicant but we do have three people who have signed up to speak.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Do we have any questions for Staff before we turn the floor over to the public? Okay, hearing none, we'll go ahead and take our first speaker.

MS. FRIERSON: Our first speaker is Morgan Graham.

TESTIMONY OF MORGAN GRAHAM:

MR. GRAHAM: Members of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: How you doing? Please remember to state your name and address.

MR. GRAHAM: My name is Morgan Gram, 828 Hallbrook Drive 29209. Just a short seven years ago I was in this same place, going over this same thing. And as

you've already pointed out Hallbrook Drive is a residential area built in the '50s and '60s and it has become our little neighborhood. We already have commercial activity just to the, I guess it would be the southern side of that in the form of a strip center with a Food Lion and such. But we do not need that developed into a multi, multi-family apartment complex based on the fact that just to the north of that is Mallard Point which has gone completely down to the point that it probably should be razzed and done away with. I would like to stand here and put forth my request that this action not be allowed to go from rural to general commercial based on the fact that if you want to make it residential single-family homes that's fine. Build it like the neighborhood it's in. Do not tangle it up with more things that are destined to fail. And that is my request. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

MS. FRIERSON: Next person who is signed up is Melanie Graham.

TESTIMONY OF MELANIE GRAHAM:

MS. GRAHAM: Hi everyone, my name is Melanie Graham. I live at 828 Hallbrook Drive also and we're not against growth in our area. We've had a lot of growth in that area. We just want, we don't really want to give a blank check to someone to be able to come in and put anything there. We would, we do have the apartments and we have the grocery store and there's a lot of foot traffic up and down that road and we have a lot of ambulances and firetrucks. And we already have some problems with traffic coming out of the grocery store shopping center and there being accidents and things like that. So we just really want a little more, I don't know if the word is control, but for y'all to have a little more input as to what's being put there because we don't want, you know, like a motel or, you know, it was just looking at the general commercial structure, there's just

too many different things that could happen. And so like, my thought was I don't want to give this person a blank check to be able to come in and put anything there. So if we could get the zoning a little more controlled that would be better. And so we're just asking for y'all to look at that cause we are a neighborhood. We know our neighbors, we wave at the people walking up and down the street and it's a good place to live even though we deal with ambulances and firetrucks and we sleep through it all. So we just want y'all to realize that we are a neighborhood. Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yeah.

MS. FRIERSON: The last person signed up to speak is Deon Sanders.

TESTIMONY OF DEON SANDERS:

MS. SANDERS: Hi, I'm Deon Sanders of 812 Hallbrook. I think my primary concern is currently Pine Belt has been widened, that's increased traffic tremendously on Hallbrook. And if we look around our neighborhood there has been extensive development and it's been rapid development, and I would say it borders on unchecked sprawl. We've been inundated with housing and it turns our road into again, a main thorough fair. Overdevelopment has a negative impact upon our neighborhood, our quality of life and our environment, not to mention displaced wildlife. Development would be oppressive and intrusive and borders on overdevelopment. In spite of the rapid development our residents have managed to maintain a quintessential small town feel and I think that's something that none of us want to lose. So we're asking that you please help us to preserve our neighborhood and the integrity of our neighborhood and the safety of our children because these, this road is a main thoroughfare. People drive up and down it like they're on the interstate. We already have our problems and it's

already heavy problems that we're dealing with, trying to maintain. We ask that you not 1 put anything, other burdens on us. Thank you. 2 3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. MS. FRIERSON: There are no other names on the list to speak. 4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. We'll now have this 5 6 open on the floor for discussion, Commissioners, or also for a motion. MR. DENNIS: Chair? 7 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis? 8 MR. DENNIS: I have a motion for this one as well. I move to send this to County 9 Council for disapproval, Case Number 23-031 MA. 10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Second. I don't normally second, but second. You have 11 anything else you want to say? 12 MR. DENNIS: Yes, while I do struggle with the need for housing and things like 13 14 that, the Comprehensive Plan and where this development or where this parcel sits on Hallbrook with it being a residential area it's kind of hard to put something general 15 commercial there straight across the street from all those houses. So I mean, while I 16 17 don't like telling people what they can and can't do with their land at the same time we have laws and it, that's where we're at with this one. The law actually supports the 18 disapproval. 19 20 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Dennis. MR. GRADY: Chair? 21 22 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes. 23 MR. GRADY: Can I ask a question of Staff at this time?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Go ahead.

MR. GRADY: Alright.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Grady.

MR. GRADY: Thank you. So alright, so, so the write up from Staff indicates that this is a, a neighborhood activity center and it says neighborhood activity center should provide a commercial and institutional use as necessary to accommodate demands of the surrounding neighborhood for goods and services. So I'm curious as to why that is, is seen as a less important element to this than what is stated in conclusion that it is a, essentially not close enough to a, a major road is that sort of the, the implication and, and how did this, how did Staff balance those two considerations?

MR. DELAGE: Sure, so the proximity to a major road junction is part of it, however, I think the biggest thing in, and this might have been inadvertently left off from my explanation earlier, is the existing zoning districts of similar character that's identified in the Comp Plan. And what they're kind of looking at as far as when, talking about the neighborhood services or stuff that would be permitted under the office and institutional district as well as the neighborhood commercial district and then potentially within a PDD depending on what those allowed land uses are so based off by that the GC is, is a more intense zoning district as far as for those commercial uses that we typically wouldn't want to see outside of a major traffic junction or along a major road.

MR. GRADY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Okay, so we have a motion and I second so we'll go ahead and take a vote.

MR. DELAGE: Alright then, so the motion is for disapproval. Mr. Johnson?

1	MR. JOHNSON: Aye.
2	MR. DELAGE: Taylor?
3	MR. TAYLOR: Aye.
4	MR. DELAGE: Grady?
5	MR. GRADY: No.
6	MR. DELAGE: Frierson?
7	MS. FRIERSON: Aye.
8	MR. DELAGE: Yonke?
9	CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.
10	MR. DELAGE: Dennis?
11	MR. DENNIS: Aye.
12	MR. DELAGE: Siercks?
13	MR. SIERCKS: Aye.
14	MR. DELAGE: Durant?
15	MR. DURANT: Aye.
16	MR. DELAGE: Alright, the motion is approved.
17	[Approved to deny: Johnson, Taylor, Frierson, Yonke, Dennis, Siercks, Durant;
18	Opposed: Grady; Absent: Metts]
19	MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman?
20	CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson?
21	MR. JOHNSON: I just, suggestion for Staff. When this goes to Council, double
22	check the Staff report sheet proposed zoning.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

MR. DELAGE: Yes, thank you. It does, there is currently that, that typo, it does request residential on that Staff Report instead of general commercial. So we will make sure to correct that for our Zoning Public Hearing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, thank you, Staff. So that does go to the Zoning Public Hearing as a recommendation for disapproval. We will move on to our third map amendment for today. Agenda item 5b3 Case Number 23-036. Take it away, Staff.

CASE NO. 23-036 MA:

MR. DELAGE: Alright, the Applicant is Carl Gibson and the location is on Montgomery Lane. The acreage is approximately, sorry, I want to double check Staff Report because I know there was a revision on that one. So looks like 2.5 acres. The existing zoning district is RU or rural and the Applicant is proposing the LI light industrial district. This particular parcel falls within the identified rural land use category on the future land use map so the desired development pattern for those areas are, should be designed to accommodate single-family residential developments in a rural setting. This includes master planned rural sub-divisions, open space developments that set aside open space and recreational areas or an alternative for those rural developments. And then as part of that Staff's conclusion the intent of the light industrial district is to accommodate uses of wholesaling, distribution, storage, processing, light manufacturing and general commercial uses. Staff is of the opinion that rezoning this to LI would be inconsistent with the intentions of the 2014 [sic] Comp Plan as industrial uses are not supported by the desired development pattern nor is the district supportive of agricultural uses. Approval of the requested rezoning would be out of character with the

existing uses in the area and for those reasons Staff recommends disapproval of the map amendment.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Have any questions for Staff before we open this up to speakers? Hearing none, Commissioner Frierson?

MS. FRIERSON: First speaker is the Applicant, Mr. Carl A. Gibson.

TESTIMONY OF CARL GIBSON:

MR. GIBSON: My name's Carl Gibson. I'm located at 1014 Montgomery Lane. I just want to, I know a lot of the community have a concern. I been there for like six years. The property that on the front side of the property is only 150' additional to the property that I already have and I was trying to just, just more or less get the property rezoned where I can extend my business as far as the parking, etc. But then at the same time I'm still not trying to do anything to hinder the community, of course, on they side of the fence. But that's, it's not a whole lot there, I didn't want to speak a whole lot I just wanted to try to get it rezoned. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, sir.

MR. GIBSON: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Next person is Mika Caskie

CHAIRMAN YONKE: State your name and address.

TESTIMONY OF MIKA CASKIE:

MR. CASKIE: Thank you, Chairman, Commissioners. My name is Mika Caskie.

My office is actually just across the river at 146 State Street. I'm here on behalf of Mr.

Gibson and you just heard from Carl. What I wanted to try and do is add a little bit more context to what, what he's trying to do here. He acquired this property as he said about

six years ago and if you look at the parcel that's currently highlighted which is the parcel we're seeking the rezoning for, in fact I brought some pictures but it may be easier if Staff could pull up, up the street view. What he has there is a truck repair business that predominantly serves dump trucks and trucks of that sort. And when those trucks are, are repaired he wants to be able to park them on that adjacent property. Importantly, along the, the northern fence line, so the left side of the screen it's all fenced in. That, that fence you see, that, that right corner that's the edge of, of the property we're talking about and so as a practical matter this is a contiguous piece of property. It's already been cleared, he just can't, because that parcel section there is zoned rural, he can't park trucks there. And he didn't realize that at the time that he got into this and it sort of defies common sense, if you were to approve this change the community wouldn't see any difference than what it sees right now. He just wants to be able to park the trucks there as he's finished them or staged them. Right now, he's got to turn around, you can kind of see here how they're all jammed up in there. He's got a little bit more room in trying to operate in a safer way. So this wouldn't have any significant or really even measurable impact on the community. This isn't going to create more business for him, bring in anymore traffic. What this is only going to do is allow him to function in that lot a little easier. I, I do recognize that this is a request that was made some years ago. It wasn't really clear how it all happened but that request was for a heavy industrial zoning. I met with your Staff some time ago to try and figure out how we could crack this nut and, and get what he needed accomplished and so the answer was the light industrial zoning. If you got to just park vehicles zoning, we'll take that. Thank you for your time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Next person who is signed up to speak is Mr. James Davis.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES DAVIS:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DAVIS: Thank you for listening to me, you know, my name is James Davis. I live at 1116 Montgomery Lane, the residential area there. I've been there for almost 50 years. The whole problem with this thing started in 1990. We've been dealing with it since 1990. They built these buildings without having the area zoned. We beat it, we defeated it. Three months later they changed it back. One of the rules was changing it back that two acres they talking about Curtis Henson was going to build his residential home on it. Anyway, that didn't never happen, well we knew that wasn't going to happen. But they done they built that land up and it's a flood zone through there. It floods the road. They keep the road tore up, these big trucks is racing up and down the road, trying them out after they get them fixed, up and down Montgomery Lane, in front of our houses at night, during the day, trying them all out. But they tore the roads up, there's not a retention pond there and they been parking all kind of trucks on this property. This is ain't just something that, that looks like that. The trucks has been there the whole time. They've misused the whole thing, which we talked to Myers about it, she was handling it. They wasn't even supposed to fill the land in. The land is, is all, it floods that whole road, you can see the road cracked all up. It floods that whole road because there's nowhere for the water to go. So we've had constantly gone about cleaning the ditches and the things out like that and have a retention pond cause all this oil, everybody down there's on well water. We're not on city water or nothing, so we do have well water there. And like I said it's everything up that way is residential. That

property was supposed to have been residential in 1990 when they did deal with this then which should never happen. None of that stuff ever happened. So, but the flooding, the retention, it's just a numerous problem there with this going on there. And it ain't like they showing it now though, I can tell you that now cause they be using the property the whole time. Trucks on it all the time doing the same thing, so that hadn't, you know, it hadn't changed none, so. But that's our, one of my complaints, we got plenty of them coming but appreciate it, appreciate the offer to say what I got to say and thank you for that.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you for coming out, thank you for speaking.

MS. FRIERSON: Next speaker is Ms. Mary Richburg.

TESTIMONY OF MARY RICHBURG:

MS. RICHBURG: Good afternoon, my name is Mary Richburg and I live at 1120 Montgomery Lane. I have numerous issues that the neighborhood has already vocalized and they were planning to present on the 26th. We didn't realize we could speak tonight so only three of us showed up. Otherwise, you'd be here till midnight so it's a good thing. I have a couple of issues, one is that that back area. It is already being using that way and we were told by the predecessor on your Council that that land was not to be used or changed. It had a natural retention pond, approximately 75 to over 100 dump truck loads of dirt were brought in after they clean cut it. So, yes, it is cleared now but it creates a drainage problem. The other issue I have that I feel is important, and I hope y'all can explain to me how this works, but it was my understanding if you have a business of that size you need two entrance/exits in case of fire, you have to have a secondary. The primary was always Bluff Road. When this property was purchased,

and I brought this up several times in the past to Ms. Myers when she was a Council member, never got an answer, never seemed to go anywhere, but my understanding was if you want to change an entrance to a business that you have to get y'all's approval and typically they will do a traffic study to make sure it's not going to impact what is being proposed to change to. This has been a great impact. I can tell you right now twice last week I had to go in an opposite direction to get out of there to go to an appointment. That's over seven miles out of my way, because tractor trailers were parked in the middle of the road blocking it. I can't get by. There are drainage ditches on both sides, they're deep. I don't feel like losing my car to that. That's all I have to say. So we would appreciate if what you ruled before, you understood it then, I hope you understand it now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: Next person is Mr. David Wellsford.

TESTIMONY OF DAVIS WELLSFORD:

MR. WELLSFORD: My name is David Wellsford. Carl and I bought the property together so half of the property is mine, half the property is his. When we bought the property, we were unaware that this was like this. This was a big factory, lots and lots of traffic. They made all of the signs for the Ford dealerships all across the nation. This was a very, very active factory. Lots and lots of square footage. So when we bought it we split it up. Half went to Carl, half went to me. We were unaware that there was some rural zoning there. I also live on the street, I live on Montgomery Lane also. The flooding happens on this street all up and down the street. It's not caused because of this property. The trucks in the road is a problem because he doesn't have enough parking

so the problem that she's referring to is true. He needs some parking. So this would be more resolved if he had more parking. So half of that lot is zoned for him, half of that lot is not zoned for him. So all we're asking for is that little piece right there, and I think that he would be better served and the neighborhood would be better served. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, thank you for your time.

MS. FRIERSON: The next person is Brandon or Brando, I cannot read that last name. Thank you, Hartley.

TESTIMONY OF BRANDON HARTLEY:

MR. HARTLEY: My name is Brandon Hartley and I live on 1311 Montgomery

Lane and I, I've stayed there for a little while now and, and I've never had any issues

with Mr. Carl or his trucks or anything, you know. So my, my vote would be to, to let him

do what he needs to with the land so he can have some more room to park the trucks.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: And the next person it's a little difficult to read some this, but it looks like Marcus Green?

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS GREEN:

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Marcus Green.

MR. GREEN: Good afternoon. Just like the previous speakers also said, you know, I also live on Montgomery, and just that little piece of land is all we're asking for. I think it would help everybody out in that situation. So I as well see no issue with that as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MS. FRIERSON: That's the last person who was signed up to speak on this 1 issue. 2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, while we have this street view up, is it possible to 3 click where it says 'May 2022'? It doesn't give you any other dates. I know street view 4 has some history now at the top right. Yeah. More dates, yes they're there. This gives 5 6 us a history of that area, thank you. Okay, so there was no fence in 2021. The fence went up in 2022. This is now open on the floor for discussion with the Commissioners, 7 thank you. 8 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair? 9 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis. 10 MR. DENNIS: Could Staff just hit those last two pictures on that property for me, 11 please? The August 2011 and the August 2007. Thank you. 12 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman? 13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Johnson. 14 MR. JOHNSON: Staff, can we look at the zoning map for a second? And let me 15 just ask a 4th grade question. The requested zoning is what? 16 17 MR. DELAGE: It is the LI, light industrial district. MR. JOHNSON: So the requested zoning is not what the current operation is 18 19 zoned. 20 MR. DELAGE: I believe that the portion of the property that's currently operating is zoned M1, light industrial. So the Applicant wouldn't be able to request the M1 district, 21

actually no one's allowed to request the M1 district cause it's a legacy from our old

22

23

Code.

MR. JOHNSON: So I think the sentence you just said is that they could not match the current zoning of the current operations, is that what you said?

MR. DELAGE: Yes, sir. So at least as far as from a standpoint of requesting the M1 because the M1 in the way that it carried over from the 2005 Code, the M1 was kind of a hybrid of the LI and the GC district. So after that was adopted it has been basically ineligible for rezoning to the M1. So that was kinda split up in our current Code, the 2005 Land Development Code to either be the light industrial district or general commercial district rather than sharing those uses. So in order to accommodate or to get a zoning district that would accommodate the existing use, at a minimum it would have to be the LI, light industrial district. But it would be different from the current M1 zoning that's there now.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Staff, can you show us the Richland County map again, and zoom out a little bit? One of the speakers mentioned how this limited access, or that you have to go around trucks on Montgomery. Could you just zoom out some more? That is the only route that connects from Bluff Road, top of the screen, Old Hopkins, the air base, Garners Ferry, yep.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Yeah, I'm struggling because I understand what the community's saying and they got the issues with the trucks on there, but if he's not using that land to park I think the reason why is he's pulling those trucks out and having to turn around in the road to move them around on his property so that he doesn't get, you know, fined or hammered for not using it correctly. So I mean, while our Code says one thing, common

sense says another. And then we have to err on the side of caution on that, too, so I 1 mean, I'd like to hear something from some of the other Commissioners before I move 2 forward. 3 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Dennis. 4 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair? 5 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant. 6 MR. DURANT: Yeah, question for Staff. We heard earlier that the use for this 7 land is simply to park the trucks, but if this rezoning is approved in the future it could be 8 9 used for anything that comes under light industrial category, correct? MR. DELAGE: Yes sir, that's correct. So in order to use a property that basically 10 is adjacent for parking it has to be zoned for the use that's intended for the parking. 11 That's kinda where the issue is coming in is that it would need to be a light industrial or 12 heavy industrial to allow for that kind of off or remote parking or basically parking that's 13 14 off the site. However, at any point in time anything that's permitted as stated could go there, or if it changed hands anything that's permitted in the LI district could be placed 15 there. 16 17 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Any other comments, questions, motions? I would like to see the street view again if you don't mind. And take it to May 2022, how it looks now. 18 Thanks. 19 20 MR. DURANT: Mr. Chair? CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Durant. 21

MR. DURANT: Just a question based on this picture. Is the property, does it go from the end of the developed part where the building is to the tree line, is that the width of it?

MR. DELAGE: So based off of the aerial and then of the street view I believe you can kinda see where there's been some attempt to delineate where the property line is. So in this case the property kinda is a, the property line is set off a little bit from the structure where the operation is taking place. If you kinda look at the street view you'll kinda see some areas where it's roped off in an attempt to prevent, you know, parking or any of that spillover from the existing use. I wouldn't call that, and it may be the exact line, but without seeing the property pin and something to say for sure I would say that's, you know, a good approximation of where the property line is.

MR. DURANT: Thank you.

MR. SIERCKS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Siercks?

MR. SIERCKS: Just a point of clarification for Staff. On the conclusion it says the intent of the HI district is to accommodate uses of manufacturing and industrial nature.

And this is for LI, right, is that – my question is, is that just a typo or would that change anything about the recommendation or the intended uses?

MR. DELAGE: So no sir, Mr. Siercks. So we had done a revision, it should say LI, so that was an error on Staff. But the recommendation from the Comp Plan would be the same based off of the LI or the HI district.

MR. SIERCKS: Thank you.

MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Grady.

MR. GRADY: Alright, so something that occurs to me is that a lotta times we have a recommendation and the Staff recommends disapproval but then there's an addendum that says, but such and such use as proposed here would be in keeping with the neighborhood context or something to that effect. So it says in here approval of the requested zoning would be out of character with the existing uses in the area, but we see that immediately next door it's not the same zoning classification but it's a similar type of zoning. So I'm curious why that sort of statement that we've seen in a lot of cases does not apply here where certain times it's noted in the recommendation that there's similar zoning nearby where in this case it was not. Can you explain Staff's thinking on that?

MR. DELAGE: Sure, so I think in this case a lotta times when we have certain zoning districts in an area you can kinda see where there's – and granted this is kinda getting into, you know, in a perfect world you would see a delineation between kinda different zoning districts, different land uses. However, in this case the original rezoning of the parcels to the south took place, you know, well prior to our current Comprehensive Plan and in most cases even in our previous one from our 2009 Plan we would've made recommendations against kind of establishing an industrial, especially as it kinda penetrates into an area where there's uses, typically you would wanna see that at, you know, within our industrial parks or within areas that have been identified along the economic development corridor for our current Plan as an example. But the idea would be that in rezoning this particular parcel you're kinda continuing to encroach upon the residential uses and zoning districts along Montgomery Lane rather

being located along Bluff. So that was one of the reasons that Staff didn't have a kinda 1 2 'however' statement associated with this particular request. 3 MR. GRADY: Thank you. ?: I just wanted to add to that, simply put we tend to stick to the primary uses and 4 the surrounding neighborhoods and the way that area is developed. 5 6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Commissioners, great discussion. Anymore? Any motions? 7 MR. JOHNSON: I think Commissioner Dennis framed the issue earlier, is that I 8 mean, under almost any other condition it'd be a fairly easy denial, but I mean, are we 9 making it worse by doing that as opposed to the existing conditions that approval to at 10 least alleviate some of the issues for the residents? It's a fundamental challenge. 11 CHAIRMAN YONKE: We are charged with this challenge. 12 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chair, I like the wording – 13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Yes, Commissioner Frierson. 14 MS. FRIERSON: - that Commissioner Dennis said when he said the Code says 15 one thing but common sense says something else. So if you could put that in the form 16 17 of a motion I would second it. MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair? 18 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Commissioner Dennis. 19 20 MR. DENNIS: Yes sir, I have a motion. I move to pass Case Number 23-036 to County Council for approval. Reason being is the, it might not match the surrounding 21 22 area but the adjacent property based off of the old Code to the new Code cannot be M1,

- has to go to LI, it would help alleviate as a common sense type motion, to alleviate the traffic congestion on Montgomery Lane. That's what I'm going with.
- 3 MS. FRIERSON: Second.
- 4 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay Staff, with that motion and a second can you please 5 take a vote?
- 6 MR. DELAGE: Alright, so the motion is for approval. Mr. Durant?
- 7 MR. DURANT: Ney.
- 8 MR. DELAGE: Siercks?
- 9 MR. SIERCKS: Aye.
- MR. DELAGE: Dennis?
- 11 MR. DENNIS: Aye.
- MR. DELAGE: Yonke?
- 13 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Aye.
- MR. DELAGE: Frierson?
- MS. FRIERSON: Aye.
- 16 MR.DELAGE: Grady?
- 17 MR. GRADY: Aye.
- 18 MR. DELAGE: Taylor?
- 19 MR. TAYLOR: Ney.
- MR. DELAGE: Johnson?
- 21 MR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible]
- MR. DELAGE: Alright, that motion is approved.

[Approved: Siercks, Dennis, Yonke, Frierson, Grady Johnson(?); Opposed: Durant, 1 Taylor; Absent: Metts] 2 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Our recommendation goes forward as 3 approved and will be at the next County Council Zoning Public Hearing. That is our last 4 map amendment for the day. So we – yes, Commissioner Taylor? 5 MR. TAYLOR: Question for Staff. 6 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Okay, yes. 7 MR. TAYLOR: So, and I'm fine with what just happened but the question I have 8 is, when other things are being considered, cause LI wouldn't look good on any other 9 property there – 10 CHAIRMAN YONKE: One second, Commissioner Taylor, we'll just wait for 11 people to exit. 12 MR. TAYLOR: Okay. 13 14 CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you. MR. TAYLOR: I guess – 15 CHAIRMAN YONKE: You guys can go ahead and take your conversations 16 17 towards the door as we wrap up. Thank you. We appreciate you coming out. MR. TAYLOR: I guess the question is, how do we guard against LI creeping into 18 19 other areas in these rural districts, cause I guess my thought is if that does go through, 20 and I know we're just recommending but let's say it does get approved, things are 21 brought to you for review, are there ways to keep it from creeping out into, you know, 22 some of these rural districts? Cause technically once it gets in it seems like it's an open 23 door to expand it beyond where we've allowed it. So I guess that's kinda the question.

2

1

4

5

3

6

8

9

7

11

10

13

12

15

14

17

16

18

20

19

21

22

23

?: So if you noticed earlier you would see on the previous street views back in 2011 and 2007 it was a heavily vegetated buffer between the two, and so that usually would standalone be the line that we need to differentiate, you know, those uses. But because they took it upon themselves to clear cut the land they imposed their self and made the area look like it belonged. So it's a little bit difficult when it comes to that.

MR. DELAGE: But I think I would also mention too, as far as for, you know, the Comp Plan is a broad brush, I mean, I know Staff says that just about every meeting, but you're always gonna kinda have kind of certain unique cases that, you know, could, you know, potentially make sense from the Planning Commission's purview to make a recommendation for approval. However, I would say though that under the new proposed Code one of the things that the new AG district and some of the other agricultural, truly agricultural districts that were adopted will do is allow for certain uses that would be basically somewhat of, would be considered almost an industrial use, but you know, it's really the agricultural. So that should potentially prevent requests for what would currently be needed under this Code as a light industrial or heavy industrial to continue those operations. That's probably not gonna cover every situation in cases especially like this where you've got existing uses that were zoned in the '90s, you know, and they're still in continuous operations. But however, that's one way to do it, the other one I think is just also again, you know, looking at any relevant small area plans, looking at the existing zoning districts in the area, the existing uses, road types, things of that nature and it's all gonna be kind of site specific, but that can kind of help in guiding your decision as far as for these light industrial or even heavy industrial districts in the rural areas in the future.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Staff. Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. We're gonna go ahead and move on to our Chairman's Report, number 6. Thank you, Staff, for hosting a very valuable Planning Commissioner training session last month. For anyone who missed it Mr. Price and the team went beyond my expectations this time, they lined up a great set of speakers at a beautiful venue and even opened it up to our community of commissioners across the county, so great job, Staff, thank you so much for all the hard work you did for that, it was impressive. And that's all I have for the Chairman's Report. As always, thank you all for all your time and effort you do every month. We'll go to the Planning Director's Report.

MR. PRICE: Just the report of Council so you can see their actions from the July Zoning Public Hearing.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you.

MR. PRICE: It's in your package.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Also in our packet some supplemental information from the Planning Commissioner's training.

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Great, thank you. Okay, and then number 8, I have another item I'd like to discuss from Commissioner Dennis. Can I give you the floor?

MR. DENNIS: Yes, sir. Thank you, Chair. Fellow Commissioners, Staff, this is my, possibly my last meeting cause I did not seek to come back to the Planning Commission so my time is coming up. And I wanted to thank each and every one of you and I'm sorry that I missed the July meeting but I had some issues at home and I started ramping back up my business, so that took priority over the training cause I had

a client issue. But thank you each and every one of you, it's been a pleasure working with you. I look forward to seeing what else you guys come up with cause I know y'all are about to get charged with something next year that's gonna be pretty cool and it's gonna help mold the community. One of the thing I will say that I learned when I first got on here, I was very new and had really no clue how to do things, and then as I got older in my tenure here I kinda learned that that broad brush is just a broad brush sometimes and it's really hard to tell people what they can and can't do with their land based off laws and things like that, and you know, at times we've all voted different from one another and we've always had good reasons to vote the way we vote. And I just wanna thank each and every one of you personally, thank you for working with me and thank you for also being a voice against things, cause I mean, people have changed my mind and that's a good thing and that's what I think this Commission needs. And then y'all, I mean, I won't say anything here, but I mean, y'all will see what I'm doing in the future, I just don't feel like this is a platform to say. Thank you all.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Thank you, Commissioner Dennis, for all the time and extra effort you put in, especially with that Land Development Code, all of the extra hours. You always seem to have your iPad cued up and ready to pull that document and get into the details, so thank you. Alright, with that I'll make a motion for adjournment. Do I have a second?

MR. DENNIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN YONKE: Alright, and with that Staff take a vote of hands.

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