

**RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**June 7, 2021 Zoom Meeting**

*[Members Present: Stephen Gilchrist, Heather Cairns [in prior to first Map Amendment] Christopher Yonke, Mettauier Carlisle, Gary Dennis, Bryan Grady, Terrence Taylor, Jason Branham, Beverly Frierson]*

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

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well let me call the June 7<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting to Order. Please allow me to read into the Record. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio, newspapers and television stations, and persons requesting information, and posted on the bulletin board in the County Administration building for our Agenda on this June 7<sup>th</sup> day. So we thank you for being here as the Commission and members of the public joining us in this meeting. First item on our Agenda today is our Consent Agenda and the Chair will entertain a motion on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Price, is there – I don't think there are any modifications to what we have, so we can, if someone wants to make a motion on which items we want to place on our Consent Agenda that would be great and I will get a second on that and move forward.

MR. BRANHAM: [Inaudible] no cases for which public comments were submitted?

MR. PRICE: We have the comments for, okay excuse me, going back, Case No. 2, or item no. 2 which is Case 21-016 MA, the Applicant has submitted a request for deferral. They stated they would still like to have opportunity to meet with the community so that item has been removed from the Agenda.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

1 MR. PRICE: Case No. 1, we have a, which is, excuse me, item no. 1 which is  
2 Case 21-015 MA, we have one comment and that is from the Applicant. Item no. 3  
3 which is Case 21-017 MA, we also have one comment and that is also from the  
4 Applicant. And Case No. 4, item no. 4, Case 21-018 MA, we do not have anything  
5 from the Applicant at this time.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, so the only items that would be on the  
7 Consent Agenda then would be the Road Names and the Agendas, is that right? So  
8 the Chair will entertain a motion on that.

9 MR. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Chair, yes. Any item that y'all feel that you're in  
10 agreement with Staff you can put on the Consent Agenda as there was no  
11 opposition to those requests; as you traditionally do.

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Price. So may I get a motion from  
13 the floor regarding items for the Consent Agenda?

14 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Branham, Commissioner Branham?

16 MR. BRANHAM: I'll move to remove items C. 2, 3 and 4 from the Consent  
17 Agenda.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

19 MR. DENNIS: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that  
21 we remove items C. 2, 3, and 4 from the Consent Agenda. All in favor signify by roll  
22 call vote, Mr. Price.

23 MR. PRICE: Okay, those in favor, Gilchrist?

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

3 MR. YONKE: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Carlisle? Carlisle?

5 MR. CARLISLE: [Inaudible]

6 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

7 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Grady?

9 MR. GRADY: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

11 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Branham?

13 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

15 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

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

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And Mr. Carlisle, I think he may have been on mute.  
19 Wanna try him one more time? Mr. Carlisle?

20 MR. TAYLOR: Ms. Frierson, you're unmuted.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, Ms. Frierson, you probably can mute your –  
22 there you go, thank you. Mr. Carlisle, can you hear us? Okay, we may be having  
23 some technical difficulties. Okay Mr. Price, we'll move on to our first case.

1 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes.

3 MR. PRICE: If you would indulge me for a moment. I wanted to send the link  
4 to Ms. Cairns. She seems to not have gotten the link that was sent out to everyone.  
5 She contacted me so if you'll just give me one moment and I can sent that to her.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure.

7 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chair, while we're waiting for him to do that, and I  
8 apologize for being unmuted, I was looking at the presentation of Minutes for  
9 approval. Again, the Minutes for the February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021 meeting and the Minutes for  
10 the March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021 meeting contain an error in both of those at the very top, line 5,  
11 I'm listed as being absent and I was not absent at either meeting. And I was looking  
12 at it carefully, I think what might be happening, whomever is doing the Minutes  
13 might be using a template and not just changing it and just maybe not being careful  
14 about looking at the fact that people were present when they are listed as absent.  
15 And it is irritating to me and I want it corrected, because it occurred to me that, say  
16 if County Council were looking at it, sometimes people don't have time to read  
17 through the whole [inaudible] and they might look at that and say, well Frierson is  
18 just not attending the meetings, and I am. So could it please be corrected?

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Commissioner Frierson, thank you for raising that.

20 MR. PRICE: That's been noted and we will make sure that's addressed,  
21 okay?

1 MS. FRIERSON: But, now I don't, I'm not, I don't know, cause I keep hearing  
2 it's been noted and it'll be addressed and it keeps happening each time. So what is  
3 the problem?

4 MR. PRICE: Well I believe this, this has been brought up before but I'll make  
5 sure. We brought it up and basically it's been addressed and we've amended the  
6 Minutes prior to the approval. But again, we will talk to the transcriber about this,  
7 you know, hopefully to ensure that this does not happen again.

8 MS. FRIERSON: Okay, thank you so much. I appreciate it.

9 *[Note to Commissioner Frierson, Commissioner Taylor, Planning Commission*  
10 *and Planning Staff: This is totally on me. I was using a template which has*  
11 *now been removed. Please know that I will do my very best to ensure the*  
12 *attendees are correct. I have corrected the February and March Minutes and*  
13 *resubmitted. Please accept my sincere apologies. Stephanie]*

14 MR. YONKE: Will we need Mr. Carlisle?

15 MR. TAYLOR: I think Mr. Carlisle's already in, he doesn't have to try to get in.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, and [inaudible] if he can hear us, Mr. Carlisle,  
17 I think you're already on. Yeah, he can't hear us. [Background recording] Mr.  
18 Carlisle?

19 MR. PRICE: I've had to mute Mr. Carlisle, but Ms. Cairns is now on board, I  
20 think we can proceed on, Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you Mr. Price. And Mr. Price, just for  
22 the Record, if we can, I know Commissioner Frierson has brought that issue up a  
23 couple of times regarding the record reflecting her presence at the Commission

1 meetings. The – well March and February meetings, to ensure that that is correct,  
2 and thank you for that.

3 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. We will, our apologies.

4 MR. YONKE: Before we begin, Mr. Price, could we have the YouTube feed  
5 starting up? I usually check on that and it doesn't seem to be working.

6 MR. PRICE: It is coming now, thank you.

7 MR. YONKE: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Yonke.

9 MR. PRICE: Okay, thank you Mr. Yonke.

10 MR. YONKE: Alright, my pleasure.

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: If there is nothing else to claim our attention before  
12 the first case we'll get into our first case. Mr. Price?

13 **CASE NO. 21-017 MA:**

14 MR. PRICE: Alright, so we've got a case which is Case 21-17 MA, which is  
15 our third Map Amendment case. The Applicant is Kevin Steelman. The Applicant is  
16 requesting to rezone a little less than 45 acres off of Old Tamah Road from Rural to  
17 RSE. Staff has reviewed this request. Being that the specific site is located within  
18 the neighborhood medium density designation of the Comprehensive Plan, Staff  
19 recommends disapproval of this request, again to be consistent with our  
20 recommendations of following the Comprehensive Plan. However, we would like to  
21 make a note that the adjacent subdivision, which is east of the subject site, was  
22 previously resolved to RSE as stated in your Staff Report back under Case Number  
23 18-002 MA. However, looking at the surrounding developments in that area this

1 request again would not be consistent with those zoning designations or again nor  
2 the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, that's better. If everyone got that, are there  
4 any questions for the Staff on this particular case?

5 MR. BRANHAM: I have a question.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes sir, Mr. Branham?

7 MR. BRANHAM: The, in conversations with the Applicant is the Applicant of  
8 the subject parcel also the owner or developer or have some relationship to the  
9 adjacent parcel which is on Koon Road?

10 MR. PRICE: I believe that there may be access from that adjacent property. I  
11 believe this subdivision's Abbott Glenn. I believe there may be connectivity between  
12 those developments.

13 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: But, I mean, as far as you can tell is there some  
14 intent to have the subject parcel be a part of the development that appears to be  
15 going on on the property that's on Koon Road that's not developed at this time, that  
16 was rezoned RSE in 2018?

17 MR. PRICE: I believe they're two separate developments, it's just that, you  
18 know, they'll just provide connectivity from one to the other.

19 MR. BRANHAM: Okay, thanks.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Commissioner Branham. Any additional  
21 comments for the Staff? Mr. Price, do we have any persons signed up for this case?

22 MR. PRICE: I believe we have, the only comment we have is from the  
23 Applicant.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

2 MR. PRICE: And Mr. DeLage will read that.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. DeLage, go right ahead.

4 MR. DELAGE: Alright, this is from Kevin Steelman. It says, I am writing  
5 concerning our application for rezoning TMS numbers 0341000203, 04 and  
6 05, 44.64 acres. We are currently developing the adjacent property on Koon  
7 Road which has RSE zoning. We plan to extend the development into these  
8 tracks and request the same zoning classification as it is sufficient to  
9 accommodate our planned development for these properties. We are aware  
10 that the other adjacent communities and the Comprehensive Plan for the area  
11 have higher densities but we believe our request is appropriate given that it  
12 will be accessed through our community currently under development. As  
13 such we request that you recommend approval of our application to County  
14 Council. Respectfully, Kevin Steelman.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Mr. DeLage. Were there  
16 any other comments regarding this particular case?

17 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

18 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Gilchrist, I'd like to comment, if I could.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Commissioner Branham, brown go right  
20 ahead.

21 MR. BRANHAM: So I, I feel like I understand Staff's recommendation  
22 and definitely appreciate it and appreciate the fact that they offered kind of  
23 some additional commentary as well that that would encourage, you know,

1 additional conversation beyond just a look at the text of the Comprehensive Plan.  
2 We talk about it on a regular basis but, you know, we've got these four factors that  
3 we're supposed to consider in these types of requests and one of them being  
4 harmony with the general planning program that would include the Comprehensive  
5 Plan. So you know, the minimum density of the RSE would be about .45 acres and  
6 that would be before the open space bonuses that the Applicant might apply for.  
7 When I look at the need and the justification, you know, which we look to under the  
8 ordinance as one of the factors, you've got lots of large wooded parcels in that area  
9 but you also have these less dense neighborhoods. It's very near two large schools  
10 in Dutch Fork Middle School and Dutch Fork High School and so it's within walking  
11 distance of those two schools. Another factor just looking at the effect on the  
12 subject parcel as well as surrounding properties, the estate density that's proposed  
13 is pretty equal to, well it's equal to the sister parcel on Koon Road, which apparently  
14 is going to be part of the same development, and it's also equal to the lot sizes and  
15 Stone Gate and in Palmerston as they're actually built. They have different zoning  
16 designations but the actual build densities are very harmonious with the RSE  
17 density. And then that third factor being the amount of land in the general area with  
18 the same classification. Again that Koon Road tract that it's attached to and it's  
19 going to apparently be a part of the same develop, it's got the same classification,  
20 then a portion of Stone Gate, at least a portion of Stone Gate, has the same. So to  
21 me it looks right that it that it would fit in with the surrounding neighborhoods as far  
22 as that density goes. And you know, as far as general planning program goes, again  
23 it's near a school it promotes walkability it reduces commutes for shuttling students

1 back and forth, so. And if I could note I did have some people trying to reach  
2 out to me from the community. I did direct them to submit commentary one  
3 way or the other to the county and I did not entertain any communications  
4 advocating for one way or the other but they did make inquiries about, you  
5 know, which parcels were in fact the subject of the case just because of the  
6 property being landlocked, there were signs on the, on Koon Road itself right  
7 in front of the parcel that's already being developed so there was some  
8 clarification given there about what was the subject of the case. And then  
9 there was a question about the fact that mobile homes manufactured homes  
10 might be placed on the property under that zoning classification and, you  
11 know, my reading of the county ordinance shows that they would be  
12 permitted under RSE as a special requirement. But I would note that  
13 manufactured homes are also an option on the property as it's currently  
14 zoned RU and the RU requirements for manufactured homes are lower than  
15 they are under RSE. So I know there's a concern generally in that area about  
16 density, the same conversations were had when we were dealing with the  
17 tract of land that's right on Koon Road, and so I would just say that, you  
18 know, there there's definitely pros and cons there. If you're looking to  
19 advocate for RSLD what you're gonna get, no possibility of manufactured  
20 homes, which again it's not a slight on manufactured homes, it's just a  
21 question of, you know, does it feel harmonious with the surrounding area and  
22 that's why I think we're hearing about it from other people. But with LD you're  
23 going to also have minimum lot sizes being 40% smaller than they are under

1 the RSE designation, which is what the Applicant has requested. So I apologize for  
2 speaking at length but I certainly looked closely at the matter and I'm, I would make  
3 a motion that we send this to County Council with a recommendation of approval.

4 MR. DENNIS: I second that motion.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded. Any  
6 discussion? Mr. Price, just for the Record, Mr. Branham mentioned a couple of  
7 times that he had had several inquiries regarding this particular property so we did  
8 not receive anything additional from any of the folk in the community?

9 MR. PRICE: No, sir, we didn't. No, sir, we didn't.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright, it's been moved and properly  
11 seconded then that we send this case forward to County Council with a  
12 recommendation of approval based upon the observations and recommendations  
13 from Commissioner Branham. Any additional discussion?

14 MR. GRADY: If I might, Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Grady, go right ahead, please.

16 MR. GRADY: Yeah, so, so I certainly appreciate Mr. Branham's thoughts  
17 there and certainly the additional local context I think is, is helpful, but I find myself I  
18 think on the other side of the fence here. I find that the comments from Staff fairly  
19 convincing that, you know, when you set a Comprehensive Plan that says this is  
20 medium density residential that there should be some, some commitment to  
21 following through on that. And it's interesting that you, you bring up the proximity to  
22 schools; that would seemingly be a reason we would want to, to have a higher level  
23 of density in that, in that area to ensure that, that more students are able to access

1 sort of a neighborhood school context. So I, I would, you know, sort of  
2 advance those as reasons why I would not be inclined to vote for this, this  
3 amendment.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Commissioner Grady. Any  
5 additional comments? Okay, if not, it's been moved and properly seconded  
6 that we moved this case forward with a recommendation of approval. All in  
7 favor signify by roll call vote, Mr. Price.

8 MR. PRICE: Okay. Gilchrist?

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: No.

10 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Heather, you're on mute.

12 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, I know, I got it. No. I vote no.

13 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

14 MR. YONKE: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Carlisle, you're on mute we think?

17 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

18 MR. CARLISLE: No.

19 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

20 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Grady?

22 MR. GRADY: No.

23 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

1 MR. TAYLOR: Nay.

2 MR. PRICE: Branham?

3 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

5 MS. FRIERSON: No.

6 *[Approved: Yonke, Dennis, Branham: Opposed: Gilchrist, Cairns, Carlisle, Grady,*  
7 *Taylor, Frierson]*

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, what is that count, Mr. Price?

9 MR. PRICE: That motion fails 3/6.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. So that motion has failed and the Chair will  
11 entertain an additional motion.

12 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir?

14 MR. GRADY: I would move that we forward this amendment 21-017 MA to  
15 Council with a recommendation of disapproval for the reasons that Staff outlined in  
16 their Report.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is there a second?

18 MR. DENNIS: Point of order.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'm sorry?

20 MR. DENNIS: I wanna make a comment before we move forward.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Dennis.

22 MR. DENNIS: You know, we just had a motion on the table and we only had  
23 one person to speak out in opposition, many followed Staff. And I'm just wondering,

1 you know, I agree totally with what Mr. Branham said, that's how I seen it,  
2 that's how I looked at it. I mean, you already have a parcel there that is  
3 already zoned for that, they're looking to expand out for a, you know,  
4 everybody in this county is always talking about development, development,  
5 development, we're packing in houses, packing in houses, and now we  
6 actually have a chance to have a development that's not packed in. And I  
7 understand we have a plan, master plan, but however you know, we also  
8 have to look forward and look at different items. And I think, you know, this  
9 would have been a good thing for that area, but as it sees, it looks like other  
10 people don't agree. But I just wanted my, my view to be seen on that so that  
11 everybody knows where I stand with that. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Commissioner Dennis,  
13 absolutely. Any additional comments?

14 MR. YONKE: I'll comment, piggyback on Commissioner Dennis. This is  
15 Mr. Yonke. Right on Koon Road, Meadow Estates (?) zone previously  
16 approved. There obviously is a continuation of that and it's kind of a break in  
17 that density there. So to me this is kind of a common sense. Like, for  
18 everyone else who voted no I'd like to hear your comments.

19 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I'll chime in a little bit. I mean, I, I mean, density  
20 is just such an interesting thing. I mean, it's weird to say to a developer, well  
21 you're not making it dense enough. I don't agree with this, I mean, I  
22 understand that our road system is being challenged by growth, but we are a  
23 growth area and density in the long run saves us all money; that's my belief is

1 that with density you get a better tax ratio to cost from a tax standpoint. I mean, it is  
2 it is weird to say to a developer, you need to make smaller houses or you need to  
3 make denser development when they don't want to but I think that, you know, if  
4 we're saying that based on - and I agree that this is close to schools and so greater  
5 density is actually better, obviously the developer could zone it denser and make  
6 the lots bigger. It's usually that you can't go the other way. But I do think that the  
7 comments that were offered is to the fact that Staff's got a good reason for what  
8 they're doing is what swayed me on my vote.

9 MS. FRIERSON: Point of order, Mr. Chair? I think it's inappropriate once the  
10 vote has been taken to then go back and start arguing points back and forward. I  
11 move what I've - not moved - and I would appreciate it if we would move forward  
12 because the vote has already been taken. But.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Commissioner Frierson. I certainly  
14 want to acknowledge those that may have a different opinion to be able to help to  
15 voice that. Certainly I would agree with Commissioner Cairns, I think the Staff's  
16 recommendation is, certainly had a large impact on my view of voting for this. I  
17 agree that it's not, I mean, I don't think any Commissioner needs to feel like they're  
18 obligated to have to justify their vote, if they feel like that's something that they want  
19 to vote they can do that. But I certainly want to give the platform, the audience or  
20 anyone that wants to weigh in on it to do so. So thank you, Commissioner Frierson  
21 for that. Are there any additional comments? And Commissioner Cairns, thank you  
22 so much for your comments as well.

1 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, I mean, it's a motion, there hasn't been a  
2 second yet, but. S if we want to wait for the second, you know, it's  
3 appropriate that we debate this motion. I don't I think it's ineligible for debate,  
4 so I'll be happy to wait for a second, but you know, and then I might add  
5 some additional debate.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure, no absolutely. So there's not been a  
7 second yet so if anybody wants to add a second we certainly can do that and  
8 continue to talk.

9 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chair, my comment, it's not that it's inappropriate  
10 to hear from Commissioners, it's just that the original vote had already been  
11 taken. It would just seem to me that it would have been appropriate for the  
12 discussion to occur prior to that first vote, that's my point.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes ma'am, I, I hear you loud and clear. The  
14 first vote actually failed and so what this required us to have to actually go  
15 back uh and reconsider a vote and allow Commissioners to weigh in on it. So  
16 certainly understand your perspective but we want to make sure that  
17 everyone has an opportunity to, to hear, for us to hear their arguments on the  
18 case for sure.

19 MR. TAYLOR: I'll second the current vote on the floor.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'm sorry, Mr. Taylor?

21 MR. TAYLOR: I'd just like to second Commissioner Grady's motion.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded that  
2 we send Case Number 21-017 MA forward to Council with recommendation of  
3 disapproval. Any further discussion?

4 MR. BRANHAM: And just briefly in opposition to the motion, you know, I  
5 again respect everybody's perspective on this, but I'm not, we've asked before in  
6 meetings past to the Staff, you know, what are you looking at when you make  
7 recommendations. They're looking at the Comprehensive Plan, and that's one of  
8 four factors, one of four, so part of my effort was to just provide a more  
9 comprehensive analysis as directed by the county code. And I'm not looking at it as,  
10 you know, there's a scale of possibilities, this is multiple choice, maybe I would  
11 prefer it to be more dense; I'm looking at it as what is the application in front of me.  
12 It's currently zoned Rural and the application is for RSE. Does that seem to be  
13 appropriate under all four factors, you know. I, in a way it feels like the Planning  
14 Commission is less relevant if we are looking at the same exact type of analysis that  
15 Staff engages in so that's why I think it's understandable that Staff reviews  
16 according to Comprehensive Plan. We look at all four factors and that's why I  
17 wanted to highlight those four factors because it does seem very much appropriate  
18 within the context of the immediate vicinity. So thank you for your time.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Commissioner Branham, thank you for bringing that  
20 point up. It kind of buds into something that I've often talked about in the Planning  
21 Commission; that is whether or not we should have any recommendations from  
22 Staff, but that the Planning Commission makes the decision about what should  
23 occur. So I, you know, I certainly would love to work with you on maybe taking a

1 look at whether or not we should even have recommendations so that it gives  
2 us an opportunity to have more, more robust discussion about exactly what  
3 direction we should go in with regard to these cases. Thank you, sir. Okay,  
4 it's been moved and properly – any, any other comments? It's been moved  
5 and properly seconded that we send Case Number 21-017 MA forward to  
6 Council with recommendation of disapproval. All in favor signify by roll call  
7 vote, Mr. Price.

8 MR. PRICE: Alright, the recommendation, excuse me, the motion was  
9 for disapproval of the request.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes.

11 MR. PRICE: Gilchrist?

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

13 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

14 MS. CAIRNS: Aye.

15 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

16 MR. YONKE: No.

17 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

18 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

19 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

20 MR. DENNIS: Nay.

21 MR. PRICE: Grady?

22 MR. GRADY: Aye.

23 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

1 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Branham?

3 MR. BRANHAM: No.

4 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

5 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

6 *[Approved to deny: Gilchrist, Cairns, Carlisle, Grady, Taylor, Frierson; Opposed:*  
7 *Yonke, Dennis, Branham]*

8 MR. PRICE: Alright, the motion passes.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. And again, we are recommending Body to  
10 County Council. I would certainly encourage not only the Applicant but for those  
11 Commissioners that that feel very strongly about this case to convene with the  
12 County Council on June 22nd at their public hearing and have an opportunity to  
13 come in and weigh in on the case at that time. Thank you. Next case.

14 **CASE NO. 21-018 MA:**

15 MR. PRICE: Aright, the next item is Case 21-018 MA. The Applicant is  
16 requesting to rezone 94 acres from Rural to RSE, which is residential single family  
17 estate. Staff recommends disapproval of this particular request as we feel it would  
18 not be consistent, it is inconsistent with the objectives outlined in the  
19 Comprehensive Plan. The Plan recommends manufacturing, warehousing and  
20 logistics centers, light and heavy industrial, research and industrial facilities,  
21 business parks and other employment uses, which are the recommendations of  
22 being within the economic development center corridor designation. Excuse me, the

1 RSE district would not allow for development to be consistent with these  
2 objectives. So for that Staff recommends disapproval,

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you Mr. Price are there any  
4 questions for the Staff on this one?

5 MR. DENNIS: Do we have any comments on this?

6 MR. PRICE: Yes, prior to the meeting we did not have any, but we did  
7 we did just receive comments from the Applicant regarding this case and Mr.  
8 DeLage has those and he's going to read those into the Record.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Price.

10 MR. DELAGE: Alright, this is from Josh Rabon PE on behalf of D.R.  
11 Horton. We met for a pre-app meeting with county Staff on May 18, 2021. We  
12 received positive feedback at that meeting. Given this is inside the economic  
13 development center corridor, we are requesting zoning less than the adjacent  
14 RSMD and respectfully ask that PC recommend approval to County Council.  
15 Respectfully, Josh Rabon.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, is that all we have to sign up, Mr.  
17 Price?

18 MR. PRICE: That is it, yes.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Are any additional comments for the  
20 Staff on this particular case?

21 MS. CAIRNS: I have a question.

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Ms. Cairns, yes.

1 MS. CAIRNS: It's my recollection that at least somewhere somewhat near this  
2 property we've done that large economic area to allow research I think it was. So, I  
3 mean, my question is, so the Staff is saying this should be, more likely to be  
4 industrial than residential, but I'm thinking that we actually created a significant area  
5 near this that I don't think was part of the Comp Plan to be that type of use. I hope  
6 I'm making sense, and if I'm not I'm sorry.

7 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I'm going back and I do ask Mr. DeLage or Mr. Crooks to  
8 weigh in; in this particular area along Hardscrabble and I-77, I'm not familiar with  
9 another rezoning request that came before the Planning Commissioner and Council  
10 but that may have been something I may have missed. Mr. DeLage or Mr. Crooks?

11 MR. CROOKS: Yes, I think Ms. Cairns, I think the one you may be referring to  
12 is the one that was off of Blythewood Road.

13 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah.

14 MR. CROOKS: that was about two years ago, somewhere around that time.  
15 There's, that's where that new economic development park is by the county, so that  
16 would that may be the one that you're thinking of.

17 MS. CAIRNS: That's exactly what I'm thinking of, and I was, I was not certain  
18 that we had, I mean, my thought is that that decision to make that area has created  
19 sort of the economic, or is planning for an economic engine for this area that maybe  
20 this parcel not becoming part of the economic engine is not, doesn't have the same  
21 degree of miss with the Comp Plan based on what we did just up the road. I mean,  
22 to me two miles is close.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Ms. Cairns. Mr. Price, is this  
2 particular parcel land in any master plan in the county?

3 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It does not exist? What, what is the  
5 closest master plan to this particular –

6 MR. CROOKS: You're referring to the neighborhood master plans that  
7 our department is in charge of, Mr. Gilchrist?

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir.

9 MR. CROOKS: So the most closest one would be, most likely would be  
10 the Crane Creek master plan.

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

12 MR. CROOKS: If not it then I would, I would probably say – well, I think  
13 Trenholm Acres in the Newcastle neighborhood is actually the closest.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Trenholm Acres, is that right?

15 MR. CROOKS: Trenholm Acres in the Newcastle neighborhood, yes,  
16 sir, that plan is actually, I think that's probably the closest.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you Mr. Crooks. Any additional –

18 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair. For those who may not be familiar with  
19 that, that is near Columbia Mall, near Shakespeare and somewhere bordered  
20 between Two Notch Road, Shakespeare and Farrow Road, just to kinda give  
21 you an idea of the location.

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you very much. Any additional  
23 comments for the Staff, Commissioners?

1 MR. YONKE: I have just that question/comment. So this stretch of  
2 Hardscrabble Road, while it's a long 77, there's not an exit there directly. If I'm  
3 correct as I look at the map. But yet this is still part of an economic corridor?

4 MR. PRICE: According to the Comprehensive Plan, yes sir.

5 MR. YONKE: Okay, thank you.

6 MR. DENNIS: Commission, I got a few things.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Dennis.

8 MR. DENNIS: So going back to that I was looking at this quite extensively on  
9 Friday through the GIS and everything like that, and directly to the left of it as you  
10 look at it, you know, we actually have a RSMD, which we already have residential,  
11 we have residential below it, and it kind of opens it up. But the one thing that I  
12 looked, when I was looking at this I'm thinking, okay I know it's in that economic  
13 area, but Mr. Yonke hit on something that I thought of when you do some stuff for  
14 economic development, when you're looking at industrial you're wanting to be right  
15 off of a interstate interchange. There's not one there. You would actually have to get  
16 off down where 77 and 277 meet and then you would actually drive through quite a  
17 few development areas of residential to get to that little parcel. Or you would have to  
18 get off up where Midlands Honda, the Lexus and all that is and then have to come  
19 back down Wilson Boulevard and then hit Hardscrabble and come over. And  
20 Hardscrabble is not designed at all for industrial, no matter how you look at it. It is a  
21 small road. I mean, and I know they're redoing some of it, but out there it just  
22 doesn't fit. It, it really to me in that little area, I think that should be residential. I  
23 think it fits kinda how that area has been developed already over near Lake

1 Elizabeth and areas such - I cannot remember the name of that other -  
2 Jasmine Place is one of them. I mean, we've already got it right there, I think  
3 having a residential area in that zone is where we need to be because we  
4 don't have an interchange, no company is going to come out there and put  
5 anything industrial if they don't have that. I mean, that's just how it is, I mean,  
6 unless we're looking to put an interchange there to help them out. I don't I  
7 don't see [Inaudible] would actually recommend approval for this.

8 MR. GRADY: I do have a question and I guess this is directed at, at  
9 Staff. Do we have some further clarification on what exactly this road  
10 improvement will, will entail, what this road will look like this time next year?

11 MR. CROOKS: I think that's, I think that's an inaccuracy in relation to a  
12 Hardscrabble section, Dr. Grady, I believe those road improvements for  
13 Hardscrabble would be from Farrow to Kelly Mill, so the other side of  
14 Hardscrabble that most people are familiar with, those improvements taking  
15 place currently.

16 MR. GRADY: Okay, sorry.

17 MR. CROOKS: Just to make sure.

18 MR. GRADY: Okay, thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, that was gonna to be my question, too,  
20 so thank you, Mr. Crooks, for sharing that with us. Any additional comments,  
21 Commission?

22 MR. BRANHAM: Thank you. Yeah, I went out and drove it yesterday  
23 and man, it's just kind of a quiet, very rural feeling stretch of Hardscrabble

1 through there. And the interstate is close and you've got the tract that's zoned M1  
2 which, hey you know, doesn't shock me, it's right on the interstate. There's just  
3 nothing being done with it right now, it just, it all just looks like farmland, it looks like  
4 Lower Richland County almost driving around there. There's, there is a residential  
5 component to the economic corridor, it kind of specifies medium and high density  
6 residential uses, which I could see. I mean, obviously you need some residential  
7 support to economic centers, employment centers, so you know, it's, RSE would be  
8 more dense than Rural which it is right now, and it would it would arguably fit in  
9 with, with what's there, I mean, as I recall that other side of the street is,  
10 Hardscrabble is just pretty fully developed just with houses spread out on large lots.  
11 So yeah, I definitely wondered if, you know, an RSE neighborhood could meet that  
12 definition of the residential component described in the economic corridor  
13 designation and just again kind of acknowledgement of the fact that painted with  
14 broad strokes whenever you look at those types of designations over large swaths  
15 of land.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner. Any additional  
17 comments from the Commissioners? If not the Chair will obtain a motion on the  
18 case, sending Case 21-18 forward to Council with a recommendation.

19 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to send Case 21-018 MA to  
20 County Council for approval.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, and since that's going against the Staff  
22 recommendation can you give us an explanation as to why?

1 MR. DENNIS: exactly. Alright, as I stated before, because of the  
2 surrounding area already has residential around there, there's no way that  
3 there's a direct interstate access right there. With it leaning on already  
4 residential areas, I think it is worth the fit to have it as a residential area,  
5 RSE. That is the way I see it.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Dennis. Is there a  
7 second for Mr. Dennis' motion?

8 MR. YONKE: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly  
10 seconded that we send Case Number 21-018 MA forward to Council with the  
11 recommendation of approval based upon Mr. Dennis' recommendation.

12 Additional questions, comments?

13 MR. GRADY: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Grady?

15 MR. GRADY: Yeah, it's been a weird meeting. I, I find myself again at,  
16 at odds with the, the motion that's been advanced here. It, it strikes me as  
17 extremely odd to argue that, that an RSE designation is, is - this strikes me  
18 even less compatible with the Comprehensive Plan than the previous case  
19 that we just voted on. You have a site that, that is bordered on two sides –  
20 sorry?

21 MR. DENNIS: Point of order. We've had a, we've had –

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Grady? I mean Mr. Dennis, can we allow Mr.  
2 Grady to finish his point, then we'll certainly come back to you. Is that okay?

3 MR. DENNIS: Yes, I just think we, you know, we had something, we asked,  
4 we made a motion, I would just like to go ahead and just move on with it. But that's  
5 up to the Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well, we have the opportunity to have a  
7 conversation, Mr. Dennis, so Commissioner Grady's right to comment before we  
8 vote on the motion. I'm sorry, Commissioner Grady, you can proceed, please.

9 MR. GRADY: That's, that's alright, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So we  
10 have a site that is bordered on, on two sides by this, this industrial zoning to the  
11 north and to the east. You know, when I think about the, the economic development  
12 center corridor designation that strikes me as something that is supposed to have,  
13 you know, office park elements, it's supposed to be, have, have sort of amenities  
14 that survey a corporate and industrial, you know, land use and, and customer base  
15 essentially. And it strikes me that it would be very hard to reconcile that sort of  
16 vision as articulated with a, you know, with an RSE designation with a, with a very  
17 low density residential infrastructure. I'm also concerned about, about building  
18 housing this close to an interstate, I'm not sure the exact minimum distance  
19 between the edge of the parcel and the highway but that's, it's substantial. There's  
20 certainly a risk of, of, you know, having undesirable land uses in, in close proximity  
21 to one another. And so overall I think, again I believe that Staff made that made the  
22 right judgment call here so I would be opposed to the motion as presented.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Commissioner Grady.  
2 Commissioner Dennis?

3 MR. YONKE: May I comment?

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure, Commissioner Yonke, but I wanted to  
5 go back to Dennis before to see if he had any additional comments.

6 MR. DENNIS: No, I didn't have any additional comments, I just thought  
7 we had a, you know, you had asked for any other comments, nobody made  
8 anything so I waited, I made my motion and gave my piece. And then it was  
9 properly seconded, I was just ready to get on with it, because I thought the, I  
10 thought we missed that timeframe but guess not.

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Not yet. Mr. Yonke?

12 MR. YONKE: Alright, so east of 77 we have Briarcliff subdivision which  
13 seems to be about equal distance to this other property here that's on the  
14 west side. We've used that term this broad paintbrush in planning in the past,  
15 if you look at the future development map that's a whole swath of pink but this  
16 is an area that does not have a highway exit. This area is different, I am very  
17 familiar with this area. And just to comment off of Ms. Frierson earlier, we did  
18 have a proper second so I love discussion and I feel like we should have that.  
19 But is the discussion happening before the motions or after? I'm done.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: The, the discussions actually can take place  
21 after both the motion and the second, before you take the vote on the –

22 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, it seems like - if I could, Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Go ahead, Mr. Branham.

1 MR. BRANHAM: Sometimes it's before and sometimes it's after. It doesn't  
2 bother me as long as we all understand, you know, that that's how it might, might  
3 go. I know I've asked about that before myself. But yeah, I think, you know, to the  
4 discussion at hand in this case it, you have the M1 zoned parcel right now next to  
5 77 in between the interstate and this parcel. Potentially it's jarring to, to go from M1  
6 to RSE right next to it. That's, that's the - everybody's still there?

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, I think we gotta – okay, somebody pulled up  
8 a map.

9 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. So anyway, it's, that's the balance we're definitely  
10 dealing with especially when we're trying to drive a potential agenda to, to the very  
11 specific level, you know, of everything within these large tracts of land driving future  
12 development. Right now you've got a bunch of basically like country homes in a, in  
13 a row on Hardscrabble Road, that one tract that's currently zoned, I think it's GC out  
14 there, that's the small engine repair, you know, it's probably lawnmowers and  
15 tractors and stuff like that. So it's tricky, I mean, if that M1 were developed right  
16 now, you know, it could be a very different look as we're contemplating RSE right  
17 there. As it is right now it's just, it's just wooded and it's undeveloped, and I think  
18 that there's, you know, a difference there that's worth noting though when it comes  
19 to a completely undeveloped tract of land like, you know, maybe the economic  
20 development group department of the county looking to put, do like a business park  
21 in a specific area, targeted reason, plan in place and all that stuff, and otherwise  
22 undeveloped versus this little area right here. I mean, this is just like a pinch of a  
23 little slice in one on one side, a neighborhood on the other side, country southern

1 homes on the other side, so yeah, I mean, it's, I don't think there's anything  
2 clear-cut and it definitely makes me think hard whenever I think about trying  
3 to drive a change down to a very specific road and stretch of road that is  
4 going to feel very different from what's there right now. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Commissioner. Are there any  
6 comments, additional comments? It's been moved in properly second that we  
7 send Case Number 21-018 MA forward with a recommendation to County  
8 Council, recommendation based upon Mr. Dennis' observations. All in favor  
9 signify by roll call vote, Mr. Price.

10 MR. PRICE: Alright, Gilchrist?

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: No.

12 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

13 MS. CAIRNS: Yes.

14 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

15 MR. YONKE: Yes.

16 MR. PRICE: Carlisle? Carlisle?

17 MR. CARLISLE: [Inaudible]

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I think he's - we didn't hear what you said,  
19 Mr. Carlisle.

20 MR. BRANHAM: Can he go thumbs up or thumbs down?

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thumbs up? Yeah he says yes, okay.

22 MR. PRICE: Alright, so he's for the motion.

23 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes.

1 MR. PRICE: Gary Dennis?

2 MR. DENNIS: Yes.

3 MR. PRICE: Grady?

4 MR. GRADY: No.

5 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

6 MR. TAYLOR: Nay.

7 MR. PRICE: Branham?

8 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

9 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

10 MS. FRIERSON: No.

11 MR. PRICE: The motion passes. I just want to make sure. So I have those for  
12 the request I have Cairns, Yonke, Carlisle, and Branham.

13 MR. DENNIS: I also voted yes.

14 MR. YONKE: And Dennis.

15 MR. PRICE: Sorry. And Mr. Carlisle voted for, so that motion passes 5/4.

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

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. And again we are a recommending Body to  
19 County Council. They will meet again on the 22<sup>nd</sup> to consider this case at that time  
20 so we certainly would invite the Applicant and those that are interested in the case  
21 to participate in the meeting at that point. Alright, thank you all for that discussion.  
22 Let me just say for the Record that for many years on this Planning Commission we  
23 have always encouraged the healthy discussion and debate about issues and, and I

1 want to thank this Planning Commission for that, those healthy discussions  
2 because I think that's very important as we seek to get consensus about what  
3 needs to happen in the county. And so as your Chair I want to make sure that  
4 we have the opportunity to listen to every viewpoint before any vote is taken  
5 to ensure that everyone has an opportunity to weigh in on what we're trying to  
6 do for the best interests of the citizens of the county. So I want to thank you  
7 for your diligence in respecting that protocol. Alright.

8 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, I [inaudible].

9 MS. FRIERSON: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, ma'am, Ms. Frierson?

11 MS. FRIERSON: If I may. I just wanted to say something, I think I  
12 heard one of the Commissioners say something about maybe unlike Ms.  
13 Frierson who didn't wanna hear discussion, and if that is not what the person  
14 said I apologize. But my only point is this, and I agree with you  
15 Commissioner, I meant Chairperson Gilchrist, discussion is healthy. My  
16 concern is process, protocol and decorum, and I just think that sometimes  
17 what we make the mistake of doing is making comments, in my opinion, at  
18 the inappropriate time, and I remember some time ago we mentioned that  
19 there is some training involved in becoming a Commissioner and I don't think  
20 some people have availed themselves of that opportunity yet. I am not  
21 against discussion and I don't want to be characterized by any Commissioner  
22 as a person against it, but again process, procedure, decorum, parliamentary

1 procedure, etc., are paramount to me and that's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: No, thank you, Commissioner Frierson for that and  
3 thank you for reminding us all of that as we continue to do the work for the people of  
4 the county so thank you for that. Alright Mr. Price, number four, the Land  
5 Development Code rewrite.

6 MR. PRICE: Yeah, excuse me Mr. Chair, before we get to that particular part  
7 of our Agenda, and I'll be turning that over to Mr. Crooks and Mr. DeLage, I do want  
8 to point out one thing and I know this just kind of came up and I'm sure we'll be  
9 open to have more discussion on this, now [inaudible] some questions really  
10 regarding Staff's recommendation. Again, if you, looking at the discussion if we took  
11 off the part just as Staff's recommendation or even just gave it, we would still  
12 provide a conclusion based on the Comprehensive Plan. So if we did say Staff  
13 recommends approval or disapproval instead what you would get is consistent,  
14 inconsistent, which you know, essentially comes to being the same thing. One of the  
15 Staff, again we just use Staff, that Staff has reviewed this and we compared it to the  
16 Comprehensive Plan that was reviewed and approved, recommended by the  
17 Planning Commission and ultimately approved by County Council just as a reminder  
18 of what was approved previously and as a way to say look you're going to go  
19 against what was previously reviewed and approved of the Comprehensive Plan or,  
20 you know, you're going to go along with it. And there may be some times where you  
21 may want to go against the Comprehensive Plan and those are things that we will  
22 look at, look at later on when we go to review the Comprehensive Plan to determine  
23 if some amendments need to be made to that. But again, if we were to take out just

1 overall the full Staff's recommendations essentially we would be almost  
2 taking out any type of reference to the Comprehensive Plan.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Price for sharing that  
4 information with us. And we certainly will, certainly will weigh in on that again  
5 as we certainly consider aspects of the new Land Development Code. So  
6 thank you.

7 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Alright so I'll turn this back over to you for the  
8 next item.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. Number four, Land Development  
10 Code rewrite. Exciting.

11 MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir Mr. Chair, so as you'll recall a couple weeks  
12 ago we had the work session in regards to the public hearing draft text and  
13 we have had since a variety of meetings with various stakeholder groups,  
14 some single individuals, as well as our public forums that we had over the last  
15 couple weeks. And so we've had various engagement opportunities where  
16 we've been discussing this, going over some of those big ideas, similar to the  
17 discussion that was had at the work session. And so this is now back before  
18 you as a Body to take action on and so we are asking the Planning  
19 Commission to make a recommendation for the code rewrite. And one thing  
20 that we did provide to you all was some additional recommendations from  
21 Staff based on the feedback that we had received so far and so that was sent  
22 out to you all on Friday, so we just wanted to request you all take action on  
23 this item with your recommendation and any discussion that needs to be had.

1 And we are here to address any questions that you all might have as part of that.

2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you Mr. Crooks. Before we get into it  
3 let me just say again that I had the opportunity to weigh in on several of the  
4 community meetings and I want to thank you guys for not only conducting these  
5 meetings but making sure that the public was well informed about what we're what  
6 we've done over the last few years with the code rewrite. This has been a major  
7 undertaking by this Commission and the Staff and the consultants, and so we, I  
8 want to personally thank you for the work that you've done as a Staff to get us to  
9 this point. And I'm excited about the fact that before some of us who have been on  
10 here for the last four years working on this vacate the premises that we'll get an  
11 opportunity to see a new Land Development Code that we all believe is very  
12 consistent with where we're trying to go in the county. So you know, I just want to  
13 make comments on that, I think the document is, is going to be a very useful and  
14 user-friendly document for the public and I know County Council is excited about  
15 our work with in that regard and I'm excited to be able to move this forward to the  
16 Council so that we can begin to move forward with the adopting the mapping soon.  
17 So I just wanted to comment on that and then thank you for the work. Any  
18 comments for the, for the Staff, Commissioners?

19 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Branham?

21 MR. BRANHAM: So we got, I think by my account it's, on the recommended  
22 changes that came in late Friday, it's around 80 line items, are we, what are we  
23 being asked to do as to these 80 recommended changes?

1 MR. CROOKS: So a lot of those are textual changes so not necessarily  
2 scrivener's errors, there are a couple of those, but these are things as part of  
3 our review of this draft as it's been released as well as comments and  
4 feedback that we have received as part of the engagement process. Those  
5 are changes that we as Staff feel addressed variety of feedback that we have  
6 received and is still meeting the overall objectives of the plan. And so a lot of  
7 those that you will notice are in relation to plan use permissions, most of  
8 those are in relation to the homestead district where from our look it appears  
9 to where information was just missing or included incorrectly from what it was  
10 originally recommended and supposed to be. But a lot of those are going to  
11 be changes based on that feedback that we have received so far.

12 MR. BRANHAM: Okay, so it's Staff's intent to incorporate every one of  
13 these into the proposed draft of the LDC.

14 MR. CROOKS: That would be correct, yes sir. Based on Planning  
15 Commission's recommendation.

16 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, just at a glance definitely seeing lots of  
17 different uses possibly coming into play for different zoning districts towards  
18 the end of the list and through the middle more density for at least six of the  
19 residential zoning districts. It was a lot for me to digest over the weekend. I'd  
20 provide, I'd prefer to postpone a vote on this so that, you know, the  
21 Commission has more time to fully digest these proposed changes. So I can  
22 make a motion to postpone and see how the Commission feels about it.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, Mr. Branham. I think I saw Mr. Dennis' hand  
2 raised, is that right?

3 MR. DENNIS: Yes, sir. I'll second that and the reason why I would second it,  
4 you know, we got these in Friday and I, I mean, for the good - we talk about how  
5 we're trying to do good for the community and I appreciate the Staff giving us these  
6 recommendations, but the fact is I did not, I mean, I received them Friday but I did  
7 not check my email Friday cause I didn't know. Because I got our packet on  
8 Thursday and I pushed through Thursday and I pushed through on Friday as I'm  
9 driving up to a wedding, or my wife was driving up to a wedding, to get everything  
10 ready for this meeting and I, I didn't get, but I would hate to push something through  
11 that I didn't get a chance to look at fully for the county. I, and I'll be straight up  
12 honest with you that's why I feel like it should be postponed. And I hate to postpone  
13 it because I'm ready to get this thing done but at the same time there's a lot of  
14 things in there and there's a lot of going back and forth on these pages and  
15 references just to double check and make sure that we're hitting on all cylinders.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: It certainly was a lot, for sure. Any additional –

17 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair?

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes sir, Mr. Price.

19 MR. PRICE: Yes. Kind of as the discussion seems to be leaning toward a  
20 deferral of this, of this item the question is, are we looking at deferring this until the  
21 July 12<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting or are we looking to have a special call  
22 meeting, you know, between now and the next Planning Commission meeting?

1 MR. BRANHAM: I mean, for what it, for what it's worth as the  
2 movement, I don't mind if it's a special called meeting. I know we're  
3 balancing, you know, haste and expediency but also due diligence.

4 MR. DENNIS: I, I'm along with Mr. Branham on that. I mean, 24 hours,  
5 48 hours I would be ready, I just need to really go through, double check all  
6 these points before I, you know, give a vote.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well I, you know, I'm open to a called  
8 meeting, I don't want to do a call meeting in 24 or 48 hours, but I think we can  
9 certainly look at an option to do that and, so that we can get it to County  
10 Council, cause I don't think they meet in August, is that right?

11 MR. PRICE: County Council does not meet in August, and this is  
12 scheduled to go before the Planning Commission on the 22nd of June.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: You mean the County Council.

14 MR. PRICE: I mean County Council, I apologize. Yes, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Well I'm certainly open to having a  
16 meeting that maybe, I guess to give everybody a break this weekend and go  
17 into next week - I guess I should ask Staff what would be your thoughts on  
18 that since we have to get it to them by the 22<sup>nd</sup>? Could we potentially do, oh  
19 let's see, maybe the following Monday? That'll give everybody at least a week  
20 to kind of go through the document.

21 MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir Mr. Chair, I think we would recommend the  
22 13<sup>th</sup> so the Monday, the 13<sup>th</sup>, excuse me, 14<sup>th</sup>.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, I was gonna say, yeah okay. Yeah, the  
2 following Monday, the 14<sup>th</sup>, okay.

3 MR. TAYLOR: Since the motion was moved and seconded does it, can it be  
4 amended to include the date?

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: It would have to be.

6 MR. BRANHAM: I'm happy to amend it. Motion to postpone until special  
7 called meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup>.

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

9 MR. DENNIS: I'm happy to second that amendment.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Any discussion? If not, Mr. Price will take a  
11 roll call vote.

12 MR. PRICE: And that will be at 3 pm also or are you looking at another time?

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I guess we could do it, is everybody okay with a  
14 3:00pm time? Right? Same time? Okay.

15 MR. TAYLOR: That's fine, yes.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, we'll meet at 3:00.

17 MR. TAYLOR: That was just my vote, I'm not, I see some other folks kinda  
18 doing a mental scan. I'm just saying I don't have a problem with it.

19 MR. DENNIS: Yeah, and I'm good with that also.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'd say it seems to be okay with that, so let's, let's  
21 go ahead and take the roll called vote, Mr. Price.

22 MR. PRICE: Okay. Those in favor of the deferral of this item until the June  
23 14<sup>th</sup> 3:00 pm special call meeting. Gilchrist?

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

3 MS. CAIRNS: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

5 MR. YONKE: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Carlisle? Thumbs up.

7 MR. CARLISLE: [Inaudible]

8 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

9 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Grady?

11 MR. GRADY: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

13 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Branham?

15 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

17 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

18 *[Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns, Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Taylor, Branham,*  
19 *Frierson]*

20 MR. PRICE: Alright. Is there any additional information that any of the  
21 Members of the Planning Commission will need prior to this meeting? And  
22 you don't have to have an answer right now. If you think of something later on  
23 please give Staff a call or send us an email.

1 MR. DENNIS: I, this is Commissioner Dennis, no I'm just glad to have this  
2 extra time. I really want to get this rewrite done correctly and make sure it's right for  
3 the future.

4 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, and Commissioners as y'all are reading this if y'all have  
5 questions or if you want to get some more clarity on any of the points just, you  
6 know, let us know, shoot us an email or give us a call, either one, and we can, you  
7 know, show you where we're coming from on those various changes.

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

9 MR. DENNIS: I do have one question.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes sir, Mr. Dennis?

11 MR. DENNIS: A lotta these changes come from those meetings that we,  
12 those public meetings from YouTube, correct?

13 MR. CROOKS: Public meetings, stakeholder meetings, so those two are the  
14 main ones that they're coming from, yeah.

15 MR. DENNIS: Okay, so most of my questions if I have them should be  
16 answered because I got to attend I think two of those. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. Moving right along to item five Chairman's  
18 Report. I don't really have a report except to just thank you guys for the great work  
19 that you continue to do each month. Mr. Price, we, we know that County Council is  
20 considering potentially meeting again in person, is that right? And obviously that we  
21 will potentially follow suit on that based on what the county is going to do. Any  
22 updates on that?

1 MR. PRICE: I believe that the Council is scheduled to meet on the 13th  
2 of July, it'll be their first in-person meeting. So no one else is scheduled to  
3 meet before County Council does, so I would say unless you have some type  
4 of special call meeting prior to the September Planning Commission meeting,  
5 July would be your last zoom meeting and your next meeting after that would  
6 be in person in September.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. That's all I have for the  
8 Chairman's Report. Moving on to item six, items for discussion.  
9 Anything that anybody needs to bring to the Planning Commission's  
10 attention?

11 MR. TAYLOR: I did want to also mention, I just wanted to wait to the  
12 end and circle back around. Ms. Frierson brought up the error, I was also  
13 present at the meeting and it was noted that I was absent.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay Commissioner Taylor we'll –

15 MR. TAYLOR: That was February and March.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, this is happening pretty frequently so  
17 we probably need to really check the Record to ensure that all  
18 Commissioners who have been present to make sure that that's reflected in  
19 the Records. It's extremely important.

20 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, again our apologies and we will definitely look  
21 into this and hopefully get all of this straight so we don't have this issue occur  
22 again.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Price. Thank you, Commissioner  
2 Taylor. Planning Director's Report.

3 MR. PRICE: That is in your packet at this time regarding the Report of  
4 Council from their last Zoning Public Hearing meeting.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It's my understanding, Mr. Price, that our  
6 Planning Director has seen, moved on to greener pastures, is that right?

7 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Yes, our CP&D director has accepted another position  
8 elsewhere so Mr. Boinyer(?) is no longer with Richland County.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well, thank you for sharing that with us. We  
10 certainly applaud his work while he was here, brought a great deal of expertise to  
11 the county and we certainly appreciate, you know, his work and hopefully he  
12 learned a lot from Richland County to take to wherever he's gonna be going. So our  
13 hat's off to him. Alright, thank you for the report in the packet and if there's nothing  
14 else to claim our attention the Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.

15 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, one of the things that we've been talking about for  
16 years, and so I think as I say that I believe only Commissioner Cairns may have  
17 been around during this time. But we were looking to update our Planning  
18 Commission's Rules of Procedure. And again I guess this is something we probably  
19 need to bring forward to you. I don't know if we'll have everything in place by July  
20 but we may give an attempt to it or at least give a couple of, you know, give you the  
21 a copy of it also with some of some of Staff's recommendations, if y'all don't mind,  
22 regarding the Rules, because I think some of them may be a little bit outdated at  
23 this time, and a few things to look at. But just as I've been looking at the Rules of

1 Procedure based on the discussion that was had today according to section  
2 10 under Procedures, (e) and (f), that's upon completion of any discussion on  
3 any item and that's, you know, from the public or the Applicant, the Chairman  
4 shall close the public discussion and open the discussion among the  
5 Commission Members. And (f) when the Commission discussion has  
6 concluded the Chair or a Commission Member may call the question and the  
7 vote shall be taken in public. So that's what's currently in your Rules of  
8 Procedure.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Yeah, please resend that to all of us. I  
10 know when we had our last retreat that was one of the things that we  
11 discussed going through our Rules just to make sure that they're applicable  
12 now. And we had had some conversations about that but obviously since the  
13 pandemic we have not been able to have our annual retreat as we've had in  
14 the past. So thank you for sharing that and if you will, particularly for a lot of  
15 the newer Commissioners, please send that around just so that we can have  
16 it.

17 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

18 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chair, this is Commissioner Frierson. There's one  
19 thing that we brought up in the past and it had not been resolved and that  
20 was the issue of email addresses for Commissioners, and we wanted to,  
21 there to be consistency. Have we come to a conclusion yet or can we bring  
22 that up maybe at the next meeting or whatever you think is appropriate?

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I think that was, we talked about the possibility of  
2 Commissioners actually having I believe county email addresses or something like  
3 that, just so that we could, the county would have a way of communicating. I mean, I  
4 know we've talked about that in the past and I don't know where any of that landed.  
5 I think, the last conversation I remember with some of that was it was going to be  
6 referred to the Administrator to have a conversation about it. And obviously we've  
7 changed Administrators so I don't know, Mr. Price, if we've had a discussion about  
8 that any further or not.

9 MR. PRICE: No sir, not with the, with our current Administrator. I'm sure  
10 that's a discussion that we can have and we can be prepared to discuss that at the  
11 July meeting.

12 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you for bringing that up. Anything else guys?  
14 Alright if not, the Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.

15 MR. DENNIS: I make a motion to adjourn.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. Is there a second?

17 MR. BRANHAM: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright, all in favor of adjourning signify by  
19 roll call vote, Mr. Price.

20 MR. PRICE: Alright, Gilchrist?

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

23 MS. CAIRNS: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

2 MR. YONKE: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

4 MR. CARLISLE: [Inaudible]

5 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

6 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

7 MR. PRICE: Grady?

8 MR. GRADY: Aye.

9 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

10 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

11 MR. PRICE: Branham?

12 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

13 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

14 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

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

17 MR. PRICE: Alright, [inaudible] days. We have the motion for  
18 adjournment is approved.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Price, before we just get outta here, just  
20 please remind us all about the meeting for next Monday, too, just so that we  
21 have it on the calendars.

22 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. Actually we're going to go ahead and send that  
23 out shortly, I'll send out the meeting request. And just to make sure

1 everybody is. Everybody remembers I'll do something I haven't done in a while and I  
2 will send you a text message reminding you about the meeting also.

3 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Bless you. That works good. Alright guys, have a  
4 good week everybody.

5 MR. BRANHAM: Thank you, you too.

6 MR. DENNIS: Thank you, you guys have a good week.

7 [END OF RECORDING]