

**RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Special Called Zoom Meeting**  
**June 14, 2021**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

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

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

MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes sir, Mr. Price?

MR. PRICE: Alright, so it's 3:01 so we'll just get to the meeting [inaudible] you know, you do have a quorum, not sure if we wanna just go ahead and wait?

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. We do have a quorum to get started?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, well if everybody's ready to roll we can move forward.

MR. PRICE: If you would just give me about 10 seconds.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, take your time.

MR. PRICE: We're just preparing the live stream so Mr. Yonke won't have to remind me. Okay, we can begin.

CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, well good afternoon everyone. I'd like to call the June 14<sup>th</sup> called 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. And so we certainly appreciate the public joining us here

1 today on our called meeting and at this time I will turn it over to Staff to begin  
2 covering our first Agenda item.

3 MR. PRICE: Alright, for today's meeting I'll turn this over to Mr. Crooks and I  
4 believe previously we deferred this because there were some questions about some  
5 of the comments that y'all had received, and I know some of you had not had a  
6 chance to really go over those I guess extensively enough that you felt comfortable  
7 with it. So that was the main reason for the deferral. I believe right now we're here  
8 to help answer any questions that you may have and also we'll look forward to  
9 answering those and hopefully we can provide any clarity that you may need.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Price. And just one comment of  
11 note to the Staff, thank you all for sending over some of the clarifying information  
12 and documents that the Planning Commission did receive. And we know that  
13 several Commissioners wanted to have the opportunity to explore some of that a  
14 little bit further and so Commissioners, thank you for your time and attention today  
15 to begin to do that so that we can be prepared and informed to send the Land  
16 Development Code over to Council for their consideration. And so at this time if  
17 there are any additional comments from Commissioners regarding the information  
18 we've received, we can begin to explore that at this time.

19 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair, I've got some if nobody else wants to go ahead.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, Mr. Branham, thank you. Okay, yes sir, go  
21 right ahead.

22 MR. BRANHAM: Thanks. So on page 2-24 of the draft from April, I'm looking  
23 at the subsection iii towards the top of that page, page 2-24, the zoning map

1 amendment procedure, and I wanted to, you know, request some sort of additional  
2 potentially that says something like, if a recorded plat showing the location and  
3 boundaries of the subject area is not already in place in the county register of  
4 deeds, that the application should include a rezoning plat showing the location and  
5 boundaries of the map area. We've run into this before from experience where  
6 we've just got rough lines and rough estimates for portions of parcels that are  
7 applied for a rezoning, and it's just not as exact as it seems like it should be for  
8 something that is that important. So that was just one thing that I wanted to note  
9 and –

10 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Branham?

11 MR. BRANHAM: Yes.

12 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Chair, may I be recognized?

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes sir, Mr. Crooks, go right ahead.

14 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so Mr. Branham, I just want to make sure, get  
15 clarification on that. So you're saying that as part of the zoning map amendment  
16 procedure including a specific requirement on there in relation to having that survey  
17 or plat or what have you? So you're saying that you have to have a registered plat  
18 for that submittal in relation to the zoning map amendment.

19 MR. BRANHAM: I'm just saying it certainly doesn't need to be recorded but I  
20 would like something that was actually surveyed by a registered surveyor so that we  
21 knew with certainty what was the subject of the case and the application before us.

22 MR. PRICE: Have we not been requiring that previously?

1 MR. CROOKS: I believe so, Mr. Price. I was thinking that was more so  
2 related to our application requirements. Let me see if I can pull that sheet up that's  
3 on there. But I wanna say there's, it's either a survey or a copy of the plat or  
4 something along there that is required as part of [inaudible].

5 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, we haven't been provided it, if it's been required we  
6 haven't always been provided it.

7 MR. PRICE: Mr. Branham, one of the things that we don't include in the  
8 package is the actual plat itself. However, for an application, especially for cases  
9 when they're only doing a portion, we do require them to provide us with a survey  
10 showing that portion that is the subject for the request. And our GIS actually shows  
11 that when they do the zoning map that's provided to you, they use that to make that  
12 determination. But we do require for Staff as part of the package that you do provide  
13 us with a survey plat showing the subject parcel for the remapping request.

14 MR. BRANHAM: Okay, yeah. So again, we just haven't always been provided  
15 as a Commission, and it seems like it would be a good idea to go ahead and  
16 document that and make it a requirement, codify it while we're –

17 MR. PRICE: Well I mean, if that's the case I think what you're asking is that  
18 we just include the plat as part of your package for each case.

19 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, you could take it that way, I just don't know if an  
20 applicant would push back on you and say, the LDC doesn't require that I do that,  
21 so.

22 MR. PRICE: Okay. I mean, I get what you're saying, go ahead and have it in  
23 the text so if someone – but that has always been a requirement.

1 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, some of my comments and questions are gonna be  
2 more technical, some will be higher level, that was just one. On page 2.4 the, under  
3 the Powers and Duties of the Planning Commission, there's no reference to street  
4 naming. Is that gonna go away?

5 MR. CROOKS: That would not be going away. I think that's just a missing  
6 element. So that would be one that we need to include, Mr. Branham, today.

7 MR. BRANHAM: So you got that.

8 MR. CROOKS: So that would be – approval of street names.

9 MR. BRANHAM: You got that noted then?

10 MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir, I have that written down now.

11 MR. BRANHAM: Alright. On page 2-9, and tell me if you already caught this,  
12 but subsection B(i) there, it says the purpose of this section, it's just missing the  
13 word 'of'.

14 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so that would be a scrivener error and so that one we  
15 wouldn't need to take any type of formal action on.

16 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. Alright, on that same page, this is related to one of  
17 the recently proposed changes, the subsection 2 I think with the applicability pre-  
18 application neighborhood meetings, and I think some of the comments of the Staff  
19 get to the same point that I had in mind as well. And I don't know, maybe I'd  
20 mentioned it already but the draft said the pre-application neighborhood meeting is  
21 required, and then the updated recommended change eliminates it completely. But  
22 there is a note, the last note says, an alternative would be to make it required for  
23 those application types but only of a certain size, and you know, that seems like that

1 makes a lotta sense to me. I mean, we would swing completely to one extreme or  
2 another, but that might be a good middle ground.

3 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so Mr. Branham, I think that would be a good  
4 discussion point here. And so looking at that recommendation this is where  
5 originally, if you go back to modular one draft where at that point in time it was  
6 optional for both of those. But based on a lotta feedback and comments that had  
7 been received, looking at requiring it for certain application types, and then again  
8 here, you know, kind of how do we expound upon that a little bit better because  
9 again, you know, there's gonna be moments where we get, you know, thinking  
10 about the applications, you know, not thinking about who the applicant is where it's  
11 just the applicant. And the applicant can be, you know, a developer as we a lotta  
12 times think of them, or they could be somebody's grandmother. And so you know,  
13 that applicant is not treated any different, and so we would be then at that point, you  
14 know, looking at the alternative option treating the applications different versus the  
15 applicants. And so that way if it's of a certain size or of a certain number of units,  
16 that becomes a little bit, you know, I guess more of a feasible option. But a lotta of  
17 these for us in terms of Staff's perspective, you know, a lotta those are by right uses  
18 and so don't think it's necessarily worth having that neighborhood meeting where  
19 that by right use is gonna be that by right use, or pigeonholing a map amendment.  
20 But you know, again looking at those thresholds of where it becomes a little bit more  
21 of a significant impact based on application type, that's where we feel it could be a  
22 little bit more appropriate for that to be required versus leaving it as optional.

1 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah. Yeah, agreed. On page 2-12 on subparagraph 3, it  
2 looks like –

3 MS. CAIRNS: Hey Jason, could I cut in for just a second?

4 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah.

5 MS. CAIRNS: This is Heather. And maybe I'm just, like not only hearing every  
6 other word or something, but back at this pre-application neighborhood meeting, I'm  
7 stumbling – so I'm back on page 2.9 – so (B)(1) says that these are optional and  
8 then (B)(2) says the meeting shall be conducted by the applicant. And right off the  
9 bat I'm like, wait a second, are they optional or are they required?

10 MR. CROOKS: Right. So yes, ma'am, so Ms. Cairns, so 2(a) says that a pre-  
11 application neighborhood meeting shall be conducted by the applicant, etc., etc. for  
12 zoning map amendments, major land development permit or a major subdivision  
13 sketch plan. And then any other application type is optional.

14 MS. CAIRNS: I don't think that's clear at all. Cause this one starts out by  
15 saying they're optional. So every zoning map amendment has to have a pre-, the  
16 neighborhood meeting?

17 MR. CROOKS: That's what the public hearing draft, the way it is written,  
18 that's what that would require, yes ma'am.

19 MS. CAIRNS: That seems insane. Sorry.

20 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, that's where that second recommended change that  
21 we got last week tries to, you know, modify that, walk it back a little bit. And that  
22 was my comment is that maybe just on, based on the scale of the proposed change

1 as it relates to land area, that might determine whether they're just advisable versus  
2 required. But, okay so yeah, that was that part.

3 MS. CAIRNS: Okay, so there's ambiguity and just sort of a seemingly crazy  
4 request that every zoning map amendment would require a public meeting. Okay.

5 MR. BRANHAM: Kind of in the scrivener's error realm, that subparagraph 3  
6 on page 2-12, the second to last line in that subparagraph 3, determination as to  
7 whether to not the proposed development . . . Seems like it should say, as to  
8 whether or not the proposed development . . .

9 MR. CROOKS: So where at, Mr. Branham?

10 MR. BRANHAM: Page 2-12.

11 MR. CROOKS: Subsection 3.

12 MR. BRANHAM: Yep, the second to last line.

13 MR. CROOKS: Second to last line, determination as to other – so whether or  
14 not rather than whether to not?

15 MR. BRANHAM: I think that's what was meant there.

16 MR. CROOKS: I'd say that's also a scrivener's error.

17 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, okay. On page 2-16, the table, type and timing of  
18 required public notification, under that notes area, the one and only note says,  
19 posted notice is not required for a zoning map amendment [inaudible] parcels that is  
20 initiated by the County Council. I was curious as to why that would be?

21 MR. CROOKS: So, so a good example of that would be, for instance, the  
22 remapping. So we're doing multiple parcels and, you know, thinking about this  
23 mapping every parcel in the county, do we go out and post every single parcel? So



1 that's kind of where it's just, where you're doing a larger percentage of, say like in a  
2 whole neighborhood area kinda thing. So you know, let's say as another example,  
3 we proactively looked at rezoning Hardscrabble Road. You know, so where we had  
4 multiple requests come in over the past couple years, instead we took a proactive  
5 effort and say, alright hey, land use wise, zoning wise, we think this makes the most  
6 sense. So rather than posting all, you know, hundred or so properties that may be  
7 affected by that, you know, just providing that notice otherwise – Mr. Price, you got  
8 any comments in relation to that one?

9 MR. PRICE: No, sir. I think you actually addressed that exactly what I was  
10 going to state.

11 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, okay. Yeah, it's just a, you know, a strict reading all  
12 you've gotta do is get County Council to be the ones to initiate it, even if it's only  
13 two parcels you could move it through without the same kinds of notice that would  
14 be given to other rezoning, map amendment requests.

15 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, I see that. You know, if we were still doing, you know,  
16 five parcels kinda thing or like the example that we talked about last week up off of  
17 Blythewood Road, you know, we'd still post those, that was three or four properties  
18 kinda thing, those were still posted but it's not kind of a large swath of area. Like it's  
19 just where you get to an exorbitant amount of parcels where that posting, you're  
20 really kinda looking at a, at that point it's becoming effective.

21 MR. BRANHAM: I don't know if there's just another way to say that. A literal  
22 reading could just be two parcels, you know? Page 2-17 –

23 MR. DENNIS: Real quick I got something to say about that one. Chairman?

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sorry about that, Mr. Dennis, I was on mute but  
2 yes, sir, go right ahead.

3 MR. DENNIS: Yes, sir. So going back to what Commissioner Branham was  
4 talking about, the posted notice is not required for the zoning map amendment  
5 initiated by County Council. I understand what Crooks is saying, however, I think we  
6 need to find a way to word that, because I understand it, however, in the nature of  
7 things that we are in with this, we need to make sure that it's worded correctly so  
8 that it doesn't allow us to do something without the public knowing it in the future. I  
9 understand why we got it, but we just need to really work on the wording on that;  
10 maybe, you know, say just for the LDC rewrite or something, I don't know exactly  
11 how to put it. I couldn't wrap my head around it last night. I kept thinking about it,  
12 kept thinking about it, but I mean, you know, in all transparency to the citizens of  
13 Richland County I do think we need to have some limitations on that.

14 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah. Yeah. Alright –

15 MR. CROOKS: Well, and I guess my question, and I guess to speak for all  
16 Commissioners, I guess, so what would be an appropriate, I guess threshold at that  
17 point? Cause I mean, really that's what it comes down to cause I think, you know,  
18 two that's a little too small because that's a little bit, you know, if we're looking at  
19 specific codified language, well that's a little too specific but at what point do we,  
20 you know, look at a generalized area or do we look at, you know, size or do we look  
21 at number, you know, what becomes that threshold measure then for what that  
22 would entail?

23 MR. BRANHAM: Could it be a newspaper publication?

1 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so we would still have to post newspaper and follow the  
2 other posting requirements in relation to that, but we just wouldn't be posting the  
3 property specifically. But we'd still do, publish notice and all of that, yeah, that would  
4 still take place.

5 MR. BRANHAM: That and some kind of "requirement" that the County  
6 Council's agenda specify the parcel numbers to be considered, just thinking out  
7 loud.

8 MR. DENNIS: Yeah, I agree with Commissioner Branham on that. I mean,  
9 you know, as long as we put that in there I think that covers it to show the  
10 transparency, what we're trying to accomplish with this. You know, where we still  
11 have it posted, cause I mean, the way you read it now you wouldn't have to post  
12 anything.

13 MR. CROOKS: So we wouldn't have to post the property but we would still  
14 have to publish the notice of the map amendment in the paper.

15 MR. DENNIS: Well then can we just add to publish it in the paper and, I  
16 mean, that extra wordage onto that note?

17 MR. CROOKS: I mean, I suppose so but that's, I guess that's already  
18 included within the chart. The footnote would only be specifically for the posting of  
19 the signs at the property, that's all that footnote would be about. It wouldn't deal with  
20 doing mailers or publishing in the paper, it would just be about posting that specific  
21 property.

22 MR. DENNIS: Well then why don't we just change it to posting sign notices  
23 not required for zoning amendment map, multiple parcel?

1 MR. CROOKS: So just turning that language around in the footnote?

2 MR. DENNIS: Yeah. I think that would ultimately get what we're trying to, you  
3 know, what we're talking about here done. I mean, that's me, of course there's other  
4 Commissioners on here so, you know.

5 MR. BRANHAM: No, I get it. I mean, I think Staff and whoever drafted this  
6 intended posting, you know, it means putting a sign in the ground.

7 MR. CROOKS: Yeah. Yeah.

8 MR. BRANHAM: Not like putting something with the Post Office or whatever.

9 MR. DENNIS: But I mean, the reason why I say that is because, you know,  
10 the people out there that read this that aren't in it like we are [inaudible] nobody had  
11 to tell us, and I think that this covers transparency with the public.

12 MR. CROOKS: So could you repeat what you were saying, Mr. Dennis, for  
13 me?

14 MR. DENNIS: I think the post, in note one where it said, posted sign notices  
15 not required for zoning map amendment for multiple parcels.

16 MR. CROOKS: So posted sign notes, so adding sign in there?

17 MR. DENNIS: Yeah, just you know, the signage that we stick in the ground,  
18 but you know, everything else I think does suffice by, you know, it's on the agenda,  
19 it's taking out in the paper, all that other stuff is already being handled. You know,  
20 we were just looking to get rid of the signs and I think that covers us to ensure that  
21 the other stuff is still done.

22 MR. CROOKS: Gotcha, okay. That makes sense.

1 MR. BRANHAM: So if I could move on and cover the next item I had, it's  
2 page 2-17, section (b), posted notice requirements, and I know I covered this with  
3 Staff but just wanted to say it again, this is changing the minimum distance between  
4 signs that are required to be posted on properties that are up for map amendments.  
5 The current distance as referenced in the footnote is between every 100' and 300'  
6 of road frontage, and the new draft proposes one notice for every 1,000' or fraction  
7 thereof. So that's approximately, having signs approximately 10 times farther apart  
8 than they are right now in providing posted public notice. Just, I don't see the  
9 wisdom in that when it comes to encouraging public engagement or at least  
10 providing public notice of what's going on in the community. I think that's a lot easier  
11 for somebody to take a route that doesn't involve them passing a sign that's 1,000'  
12 apart versus signs that are 100' apart. So anyway I'll just leave that at that. But the  
13 footnote on page 2-18, I was wondering, the one that's number 44, this section  
14 includes requirements for the Planning Commission's public hearing and  
15 recommendations. Should that say public meeting or are we, cause we currently call  
16 our –

17 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, that should be public meeting, yes sir.

18 MR. BRANHAM: Okay, I didn't know if we were changing the –

19 MR. CROOKS: I believe that's – let me go and make sure, cause I think we  
20 do, let's see.

21 MR. PRICE: There are cases, just to chime in, Mr. Branham, there are cases  
22 when the Planning Commission does actually hold a public hearing. Typically it's not

1 for the map amendments or text amendments, but you can hear for appeals dealing  
2 with land use of the Department to actually be a public hearing.

3 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. Within the context of that footnote though it should be  
4 meeting?

5 MR. CROOKS: I think that one itself would be public hearing. So we're talking  
6 about, so 2-18 subsection (c) at the top, time/date/place of the public hearing.

7 MR. BRANHAM: It was footnote 44, wasn't it?

8 MR. CROOKS: Oh, specifically on a footnote?

9 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah.

10 MR. CROOKS: Oh. I don't think it necessarily matters in that one or the  
11 footnotes, cause the footnotes are, right now they're just used as footnotes, you  
12 know, they're gonna be removed in the final version. And so really this is just, the  
13 footnotes are there for informational purposes as needed.

14 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. Gotcha. Yeah, I guess at the bottom, page 2-25 kinda  
15 gets to some of the criteria that we would be looking at on zoning map amendments  
16 under the proposed LDC. This reference here in footnote, it says 58 I think, carries  
17 forward 26-52 except it does not require the Planning Commission to determine the  
18 amount of land in the general area having the same district classification as that  
19 being requested. So that's just something I wanna call out. And then it's kinda  
20 relatedly on page 2-26, where it gets into, that subsection (4) gets into the decision  
21 standards for zoning map amendments. As I frequently reference in our meetings  
22 we currently have four criteria, and with the current LDC we're supposed to review  
23 this [inaudible] seven, that second one, I think as it were, speaks more specifically

1 to uses, and by doing so, you know, the emphasis on density and setbacks and  
2 things like that is diminished or eliminated. So I'm not sure if that's what we really  
3 want. Just something to think about. I know that's a general theme in some of the  
4 proposed changes, increased density. I was interested on that note, too, just page  
5 2-29 under section (H) there, item 2, this is from minor deviations in developments,  
6 the increase in residential density of 10%, you know, that's deemed just a minor  
7 deviation, so definitely have very much a pro density worded provision as are some  
8 others.

9 MR. CROOKS: So Mr. Branham, to that one for the minor deviations, I mean,  
10 if I don't – you're looking at kinda those as all [inaudible] and so, you know, there  
11 may not only be just one thing but also how does it affect the rest of them, too. So if  
12 you were gonna increase something, but then you're gonna increase your overall  
13 density, you know, well maybe it's just looking at, alright we've got to remove  
14 another land use from single family for going multi-family and multi-family to single  
15 family. A lotta that language is similar to what we have in the current Code also.

16 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. And I just wanted to specifically turn to the  
17 recommended changes that were most recently provided there over the last week.  
18 With that first line item, to remove section 26-1.9(E) zoning districts from the text  
19 with the rationale the transition table would not be applicable as there's no single  
20 equivalency for all of the districts in most cases and keeps with the message as an  
21 entirely new code. So I guess does that mean if, you know, I was standing on a  
22 residential lot or I picked one out in Richland County, not in a municipality, and I

1 was just like, what is this gonna be zoned as when the LDC is adopted, you  
2 wouldn't be able to tell me with certainty, would you?

3 MR. CROOKS: Not 100% certainty, no. But that's where we were talking  
4 about things being equivalent right now where we're saying this is the most  
5 equivalent to this. So if you're in an area where you're not really seeing, you know,  
6 or expected to see any type of growth development kinda thing, you know, or any  
7 change really, if your place is really, you know, it's built out, it is what it is, so you're  
8 currently zoned as an RSMD, you're probably gonna expect to be whatever the  
9 most equivalent to RSMD is. So you're likely to be that R3 or whatever in that place.

10 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. Yeah. That gives me a lot of pause, just the reality of  
11 that.

12 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, and again, Mr. Branham, and that's again, you know,  
13 recommendation but just don't wanna conflate that district that is most equivalent is  
14 what this district is in the new Code or vice versa.

15 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, I mean, you're not –

16 MR. CROOKS: And that's just our kinda justification, rationale behind that.

17 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah. No, it's, again the second comment says, equivalency  
18 tables are currently available but shouldn't be relied upon once the Code is  
19 adopted, so that makes it clear you're not making any guarantees for the  
20 equivalency there. And this as a section, you know, you have these changes that  
21 reduce determination times for various types of, I guess, permits, applications and  
22 things for development from 30 days to 17 days. It more closely aligns with codified



1 language with internal process of having an overall review of around 28 days was  
2 the rationale?

3 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so right now, so thinking of the overall review process  
4 where we can say, alright 10 days to determine the application complete and then  
5 we'd have 30 days to then review that application. So the way the internal process  
6 works is basically we have, once something is determined complete we basically  
7 have a turnaround time of around, I wanna say three weeks. This is something that  
8 I'm not as well versed in, usually Mr. DeLage or Mr. Price could probably speak a  
9 little bit better to it. But basically on, you know, applications that have been  
10 determined complete on this Wednesday, then they enter the review cycle and it's  
11 about the third Friday after that is when a determination is made. So that's really  
12 kind of the internal process even though the codified language that we have is  
13 currently a 30 day window. Mr. Price may be able to address that a little bit more  
14 eloquently than I can.

15 MR. PRICE: No, you're on point.

16 MR. BRANHAM: So I appreciate the ambition of the expediency for sure. The  
17 consequence of not issuing a decision within that timeframe based on what I'm  
18 understanding in the draft though is that it's, a lotta applications are deemed  
19 approved or deemed exempt for whatever if there's no response from the Staff in  
20 that timeframe. So is Staff that confident that, you know, they're not gonna have  
21 items kind of passing or becoming law as it were due to lack of response, going  
22 down to 17 days?

23 MR. CROOKS: I'd say no. Mr. Price, you wanna address that one?

1 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I mean, again our process that we've been using over the  
2 last number of years, has been using the 17 day review cycle. And we've pretty  
3 much met all of those requirements for getting out our responses at the end of that  
4 17 day review cycle.

5 MR. BRANHAM: Okay.

6 MR. CROOKS: And this would be, Mr. Branham, this would be looking at  
7 business days versus just calendar days.

8 MR. BRANHAM: Right, so it seems a little bit snug with your 21 day average,  
9 calendar day average, but. I like the confidence in the turn times. The next line item  
10 under that entire section towards the bottom there of that page is one that  
11 references a new subsection 5 to include language about cluster developments and  
12 the standards that can be superseded as part of those provisions includes reduction  
13 of 75% of the dimensional standards. And then a lot width removal for R2 through  
14 R5 if clustered development provisions. So that seems pretty noteworthy. Can that  
15 be, can we, you're gonna have density, I guess credits would still be available  
16 through the open space provisions and then potential [inaudible] credits?

17 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so one of the changes that's happening with this Code  
18 from the current Code, so right now there are no minimum open space requirements  
19 and the incentives are automatic if you use those provisions. And so what we're  
20 doing with the proposed Code is we are making mandatory minimums for open  
21 space and the incentives are not gonna be automatic. So the incentives now go into  
22 the green development [inaudible], so you've got to work a little bit more to get  
23 them, but because we're going to a density based zoning the need for the lot width

1 as part of the cluster, that could be reduced, because otherwise if you're still having  
2 to cluster with 240' wide lots, is that really a cluster? And so in order to preserve  
3 more of that space within that overall development, so whether that's, you know,  
4 trees, scenic views, etc., you know, you're able to cluster a little bit more specifically  
5 reduce those lot widths up to a certain amount, that would still be in relation to what  
6 the Code is trying to achieve for those areas.

7 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, yeah to the tune of 75% reduction on dimensional  
8 standards.

9 MR. CROOKS: Yeah.

10 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah. So that's pretty big. Just jumping over to the second  
11 page of what you provided to us for these recommended changes over the last  
12 week, just looking specifically at the residential classification that's proposed and  
13 looking to figure out again the equivalency of the current residential zoning district  
14 that is estate, for example. In looking at the draft Code, I think it's section R2 that,  
15 the proposed district R2 is the one that is replacing the Estate district?

16 MR. CROOKS: So I think that's where in the footnote it's, the way the  
17 consultant was looking at it and the way that we were looking at it varied and may  
18 not have incorporated a lot of the changes and things between the initial modular  
19 one and then what became the public hearing draft. So we as Staff, we're viewing  
20 R2 being equivalent to RSE. And then R1, excuse me, R2 being equivalent to  
21 RSLD, R1 being equivalent to RSE.

22 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. So you provided me a draft zoning equivalency chart  
23 and I appreciate that. In the absence of, you know, a binding equivalency, these are

1 the things that, you know, come to my attention because certainly there's a great,  
2 great difference in the proposed R2 densities from the existing RSE densities. So  
3 obviously R1 would be a fair amount closer to the current RSE district. So can we  
4 have that footnote removed or moved to a different location, move up to -

5 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, I mean, yeah I think that's something that we can do is  
6 we can just edit that footnote in relation to, you know, a final draft. You know, the  
7 final draft is not gonna have the footnotes and what is eventually adopted will not  
8 have footnotes either.

9 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, okay. Again, in the absence of the equivalency chart  
10 that's binding, these are the things that I'm looking at more closely. And [inaudible]  
11 sharing today, of course, that those footnotes will not be in place in the draft that  
12 may or not may not be passed by County Council. And then one of the last notes  
13 that I had specifically was just towards the bottom of the page 3 that related to the, I  
14 guess it was the green measures, increase in density from 5% to 20% in the R2 to  
15 R6 districts. So those are density credits, right, for -

16 MR. CROOKS: Yes, and those are not automatic. Those would have to  
17 achieve based on the various menu in order to receive those incentives. Those  
18 could be a variety of incentives, but the density ones we felt at 5% was not any way  
19 significant and would not be something that really would be, especially not worth  
20 what is required to achieve it.

21 MR. BRANHAM: So again, sort of I guess relatedly in my mind to that, the  
22 open space credit, you mentioned there will be, there's a mandatory minimum for  
23 open space.

1 MR. CROOKS: Yes. So that's gonna be, let's see, I'm gonna tell you the page  
2 that it starts on, Mr. Branham. But there's now minimum requirements for open  
3 space for certain types of developments, if not all developments. So it's gonna be  
4 on page, starting on page 5-78 is gonna be that section.

5 MR. BRANHAM: 5-7?

6 MR. CROOKS: 5-78. So page 358 of 569 if you're looking at the PDF, 5-78 of  
7 the hard copy. Or the printed number.

8 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. So these are mandatory, and together with the  
9 mandatory requirement though is there density bonuses there?

10 MR. CROOKS: No, all the density bonuses would come through those green  
11 incentives.

12 MR. BRANHAM: Okay.

13 MR. CROOKS: So that's what we're saying, so we're making minimum open  
14 space required and we're not giving automatic incentives. So you have to achieve  
15 those certain incentives through the green development incentives versus just doing  
16 X amount of open space that the current Code would allow for.

17 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, okay. So those were my specific notes and I just  
18 generally wanted to offer, again I really like the style of the draft LDC and the way  
19 that it's laid out. I do feel like it will be more user friendly if it's enacted. I really like  
20 the picture examples, the charts, the attempts at, you know, a layout that is easier  
21 to follow. It's a lotta, lotta pages, so it's daunting for someone who sits on the  
22 Planning Commission to try to, like digest it all, and so I'm happy to feel that, you  
23 know, the general public will have an impression of greater accessibility if it is

1 enacted. And I do thank the Staff for their work. I do generally wonder if the move,  
2 overall move towards what I believe are pretty substantial density increases for the  
3 various zoning districts, is really what the citizens of Richland County want. I feel  
4 like there is a desire to, you know, modernize the approach. I feel like I see that in  
5 the way that this is constructed. But I really don't know that, again the citizens of  
6 Richland County, unincorporated Richland County, which is what this Code would  
7 cover, it's got nothing to do *per se* with the City of Columbia other than comparing  
8 notes, or any other municipality, this is unincorporated Richland County that is  
9 covered by this, and I think that by and large you're looking at suburban settings,  
10 transitioning toward rural settings and rural settings. And while I understand that  
11 development will continue with a growing population, you know, I do have some  
12 question about the, what I feel like is aggressive move away from the current levels  
13 of density in the development that's happening in Richland County. And that's  
14 something that, you know, the density levels that are in place right now is something  
15 that builders and developers and individual property owners and developers have  
16 lived with for a while. If we are striking a balance, we're striving to strike a balance,  
17 I'm not certainly not anti-development. My record bears that out in the voting on the  
18 Planning Commission. But I do have some question and concern about the idea that  
19 we might be deemphasizing harmony of development looking at the context of the  
20 surrounding area. And also a very big concern for me is the, a lack of the binding  
21 equivalency chart when it comes to converting from the current LDC to the  
22 proposed LDC. So I thank you for your time and I'm gonna leave it at that for now.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Branham. Are there additional  
2 comments for the Staff?

3 MR. DENNIS: Commissioner? Chairman?

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Go right ahead, Commissioner Dennis.

5 MR. DENNIS: Yes, I wanna thank Commissioner Branham for going over all  
6 the stuff that he had questions about and proposed changes. I'm glad him and I  
7 actually kinda have some of the same ones. It makes me feel good, like I did my  
8 homework. But I do wanna say, you know, when I'm looking at this I understand that  
9 Richland County is getting bigger, but I almost feel like with the density proposals  
10 that we have it's almost too aggressive for Richland County. You know, if this was  
11 Charlotte/Mecklenburg or Columbus, Ohio, hey I'm all for it, it would fit. But I think  
12 Richland County being the county, the unincorporated areas as Commissioner  
13 Branham said, I'm struggling really hard to look at this. Now, there is another way  
14 that we can also look at this. You know, with what we do have in front of us, if we  
15 were to adopt all this and increase the densities, then we would really need to, once  
16 all this is done, we would really need to look at our Comprehensive Plan. And  
17 instead of using wide brush strokes that we've used in the past, we would really  
18 need to be more fine with our brush strokes and really look into it. You know, with  
19 the proposed density that we're going with on some of these, our infrastructure here  
20 in Richland County just has not kept up with it. I mean, I'm up here in the northeast,  
21 you know, we had a school bond get passed, half a billion dollars, in order to keep  
22 up with the old way we were doing things, and this is even more than what we got  
23 going on currently. And I mean, our infrastructure is just not there. I think there's a

1 lot more that needs to be done just with this, but in other areas in the county, not  
2 just the Planning Commission but bringing and getting our infrastructure up to par  
3 so that we can tackle increased density like this. That's just how I see it, and I  
4 mean, I love the fact that we're growing in Richland County. I love the fact that we're  
5 looking to grow. I love the fact that, you know, Richland County is not far from my  
6 hometown, Rockingham, North Carolina, it's not, it's virtually the same type of  
7 people, same type of area, same type of mindset, and I love it here. And I just, it's  
8 just hard for me to get onboard, and hearing when you're out in public and you're  
9 hearing everybody, we're just packing them in, we're just packing them in, the voice  
10 of the people kinda resonated in my head a little bit. And I mean, I just have to really  
11 think about that cause I mean, that's also part of how we look at things in this. This  
12 is a whole new way of doing business. This is a way that, you know, it can prepare  
13 us when we catch up with infrastructure to go over that hump and really be the next  
14 big thing. Or it could also cause us to have a tidal wave and fail. We just really need  
15 to look very closely at what we're doing, and that's my piece for this.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Commissioner Dennis. Any additional  
17 comments for the Staff? Well let me say just to Commissioner Branham and  
18 Commissioner Dennis, thank you so much for your comments regarding the Land  
19 Development Code. You know, for those of us who've sat on the Commission for  
20 the last four years and who had an opportunity to weigh into this in terms of the  
21 creation of this document, I just wanna thank the consultants and the Staff and the  
22 Commissioners for the work that's gone into this product. I echo Commissioner  
23 Branham's comments earlier regarding one of the important steps in creating this



1 new document was to make sure that it was user friendly and that it was something  
2 that the public would have the ability to be able to easily, not only access but  
3 understand. And so the consultants took much of that discussion among the  
4 Commissioners along with other very important items regarding just bringing the  
5 Code up to the current day standards and has come up with what we think is a  
6 product that is worthy of being able to be adopted by this Commission and sent to  
7 County Council for their review as we prepare to have a new Land Development  
8 Code in Richland County. And obviously this is on the heels of adopting the  
9 mapping, and so you know, again I wanna thank the Commissioners for weighing in  
10 on this and if, once again ask if there are any additional comments regarding the  
11 Land Development Code from anyone else?

12 MR. GRADY: Mr. Chair?

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes sir, go right ahead, Mr. Grady.

14 MR. GRADY: Hi, yes. I just wanted to briefly sort of summarize comments  
15 that I provided to Staff that I believe were sent out to other Members of the  
16 Commission just so that, I think I'm somewhat on the other side of embracing this  
17 move towards a more dense development pattern. I certainly understand the worry  
18 of a lack of infrastructure and I share that as well that if we're going to emphasize a  
19 denser development pattern, if we're going to do all these other things that are  
20 spoken about in the Comprehensive Plan, that there needs to be, you know,  
21 increased, obviously some road infrastructure as well as transit infrastructure,  
22 biking, walking, all those other things that make that denser development work  
23 rather than being a burden on the community. So that was sort of my main

1 takeaway from the plan. I certainly also appreciate the other Commissioners who  
2 went with a little more of a fine tooth comb to highlight some of the procedural items  
3 is concerned. So that's essentially all I have.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Commissioner, for those comments for  
5 sure. And it's our hope that, you know, as Commissioner Dennis I think may have  
6 referred to the amount of development that's actually going on in the northeast area  
7 with the schools and all, that somebody will get the message that it's important to  
8 begin to pay more attention to these things, and more specifically be smarter about  
9 how we look at development. Hopefully our Code will begin to yield some results in  
10 that regard, and to make everyone a little bit more cognizant of how we be a little bit  
11 more judicious and a little bit more methodical about how we think about what  
12 development should look like in the county. So thank you, Commissioner, for those  
13 comments. Any additional comments?

14 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Mr. Branham.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes sir, Mr. Branham?

16 MR. BRANHAM: If I could just to confirm, Mr. Crooks, you're going to move  
17 that footnote in the RSE designation, correct?

18 MR. CROOKS: I'm sorry, could you say that again, Mr. Branham?

19 MR. BRANHAM: You're gonna move the RSE –

20 MR. CROOKS: Yes, I'll update the footnote. Yeah. Yeah, I will update those,  
21 so whatever happens here, so basically whatever changes or no changes that the  
22 Planning Commission recommends, whatever y'all's recommendation is to County

1 Council, we'll be including that as a redline document and I will make those  
2 footnotes, those changes in relation to those as part of that redline document also.

3 MR. BRANHAM: And to me, I've said it before, the equivalency chart, it's  
4 critical, it's critical to what happens next, and what is the anticipated process for  
5 locking that down; for labeling every parcel in Richland County with the updated  
6 zoning classification, if the LDC passes this draft?

7 MR. CROOKS: So I guess that would be the mapping process. In terms of  
8 what is or isn't equivalency, I mean, I think really that's – the equivalency is really to  
9 provide a guide of what was the current Code, what was included in it so you kinda  
10 have this base reference point that you can refer back to. And say, okay well now  
11 I'm this so how is that equivalent to what the old Code reads? Really it's just giving  
12 you a snapshot or baseline in terms of that current Code that we have now in  
13 relation to the proposed Code. But otherwise in terms of determining what you  
14 would be or wouldn't be, that is going to be the remapping process in a nutshell.  
15 And so really the next step in relation to the Planning Commission, once you all are  
16 done with the text our intention is to then have a work session as we did similar to  
17 County Council, in regards to the mapping and what all does that look like, what all  
18 are we looking at, what all does that entail, and so that way we can get some input  
19 from you all in relation to it. But Mr. Branham, I guess my understanding of your  
20 question, that would be done as part of that remapping process, is when everybody  
21 would know what would be the zoning that I'm gonna be having under the new  
22 Code. That would be the remapping process.

1 MR. BRANHAM: So I'm sure thought was put into this, I'm just wondering, so  
2 an alternative might be to just have a strict conversion table as a starting point so  
3 that the public and County Council and whoever else would have a little bit more  
4 level of confidence and comfort level as far as, this is what I own right now and  
5 these will be the permitted uses and the density if and when the LDC draft passes.  
6 Why are we going that route?

7 MR. CROOKS: I mean, I guess we could. I guess our point being that the  
8 zoning district table, you know, as it's noted within §26-1.9 as part of these  
9 transitional provisions, there's nothing that's gonna be a guarantee that, okay you  
10 are this thing that you are becoming that [inaudible]. And I think that's what we're  
11 trying to get at is, there's not gonna be 100% guarantee. There's gonna be some  
12 where, yeah you're gonna be, you know, 90%, 95% certain that if you're this, yeah  
13 you're probably gonna become that. But there's not gonna be that overall guarantee  
14 as it was with, say the 2005 Code that if you were of that district that you become  
15 this district. There's not going to be that guarantee with this Code. But in terms of  
16 providing a table as part of that draft that says, here's what generally is the most  
17 equivalent and then note what we think is, you know, how we're defining  
18 equivalency, what all that entails, yeah we can do that. That's fine. We just kind of  
19 from our point being that this is a new Code, we don't want to, you know, again just  
20 being an update, this is a new Code. So, but if that is the recommendation of the  
21 Commission we can definitely include that.

22 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, that's the tremendous risk. That's the tremendous  
23 step into the dark, whatever you wanna call it, of faith is that nobody knows what

1 any parcel in Richland County is going to be zoned for, if we pass this. And it just  
2 seems like it's avoidable. I think you could go back and do fine tuning after the fact,  
3 but right now we're relying on, like you know, the guidance in the charts as far as  
4 general description goes, and we're relying on footnotes that we understand are not  
5 going to be codified. So, that's just me and that's just my opinion and I'm having a  
6 hard time getting past that and I just feel like it's avoidable. So that was kinda my  
7 question is just why not, why would we not go ahead and do that, especially in light  
8 of the fact that it's a wholesale replacement of the current LDC.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Branham, for those comments. Mr.  
10 Crooks, did you mention earlier, did I hear you correct earlier that you sent Mr.  
11 Branham the equivalence chart, is that right?

12 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, did that not get through to anybody else?

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I just wanna make sure that all Commissioners  
14 receive that.

15 MR. CROOKS: Okay, let me forward that back out to everyone. It's also the  
16 chart that was in the various presentations that we've been having.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Correct.

18 MR. CROOKS: Let me send this back out to you all. So I just sent that back  
19 out.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, great. Thank you so much for that. Mr.  
21 Branham, are there any additional comments?

1 MR. BRANHAM: No, I guess Mr. Crooks answered my question as best he  
2 could, but that was just the question was, why not go that route, for providing the  
3 chart.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you, sir. Any additional comments from  
5 Commissioners? Thank you all so much for the healthy discussion regarding our  
6 Land Development Code. These are great questions and very good information to  
7 have logged as we go before County Council. And let me ask one other question to  
8 the Staff. In no way, if the Commissioners adopt the plan today and it goes before  
9 County Council, will the Commissioners still have an opportunity to weigh in on that  
10 during County Council's deliberations? If they so choose to do so?

11 MR. CROOKS: I don't know why you couldn't submit comments. Mr. Price?

12 MR. PRICE: No, I was just gonna ask, are you looking to comment as the  
13 Planning Commissioner or just individual citizens?

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well, I think if individual Commissioners have  
15 additional comments or concerns about it, certainly I don't see any reason why they  
16 couldn't submit those comments, is that right?

17 MR. PRICE: Yes, I mean, right. Your rights as a citizen are still being  
18 observed, so as a citizen of Richland County if you do have some comments that  
19 you would like to provide to Council you can. I was just trying to make a distinction  
20 between the individual comments versus those coming in additionally from the  
21 Planning Commission.

22 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Right, yeah. I think once the Planning Commission  
23 adopts it, if a certain Commissioner wanted to go and further provide commentary,

1 and I guess we could define that as an individual citizen that there shouldn't be any  
2 provision that prevents them from doing that, is that right?

3 MR. PRICE: That's correct.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, sir. Any additional comments  
5 from the Commissioners? Any additional comments from the Staff?

6 MR. CROOKS: So I guess, Mr. Chair, I guess kinda the question being, how  
7 would the Commission prefer to move forward with their recommendations, you  
8 know, especially looking at our recommended changes from Staff, you know, taking  
9 those as a one by one or selecting certain ones out or I guess what would be the  
10 preference on how that is done?

11 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Crooks, I missed the last part of what you were  
12 saying, I'm sorry, could you repeat that, please?

13 MR. CROOKS: I guess process or procedure wise, what would be the  
14 Commission's preference in terms of how the recommended changes, do you take  
15 them up as a whole, individually so go line by line, or pulling out certain  
16 recommendations, whether or not there needs to be additional discussion or  
17 thoughts related to those? How would the Commission wish to proceed with that?

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well obviously, this is Gilchrist speaking, if there  
19 are additional concerns that we want to address based upon the feedback you  
20 received today, it may be worth just taking those items and providing some clarity  
21 back to Commissioners, if I'm understanding your question correctly.

22 MR. CROOKS: Yes, so Mr. Chair, I would say then I guess based on that, I  
23 would say we take up the recommended changes as a whole and move certain lines

1 as we've had kind of comments and discussion about some of those made, based  
2 on what some of that input was, and then go from there if that works for the  
3 Commission.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: So when we say go from there what do we mean,  
5 adopt, help me understand what you mean by that.

6 MR. CROOKS: So recommending as a whole these changes with the  
7 exception of certain ones, and then taking those recommended changes up  
8 individually for the Commission to either say, yes or no for that recommendation. So  
9 for instance, you know, looking at recommended change number 1, so remove §26-  
10 1.9(e) zoning district from the text, so taking that one out and then voting on others,  
11 so we know which ones are getting taken out and then which ones to take up  
12 individually. Does that make sense?

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I think so. That would require obviously a motion  
14 from either Commissioner Branham and/or Dennis regarding those sections that  
15 they raised. And I guess we vote on them one by one, is that what you're asking, is  
16 that right?

17 MR. CROOKS: Right, yeah. So I guess my question is, do we wanna vote on  
18 all of them one by one or only certain ones one by one? So basically dividing the  
19 question of, in terms of the recommendations and taking them in parts?

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I certainly think we would wanna do it in parts, but I  
21 would certainly yield to the Commissioners that raised some concerns about that.  
22 Commissioner Dennis and Branham, do you have any thoughts about that?



1 MR. BRANHAM: I mean, there's certainly ones that I feel more strongly about  
2 than others. Obviously I've spoken to that first line item, so that is a good example  
3 of one that I would really like to see removed, that recommended change. But I  
4 guess then the question is, what gets inserted into that section?

5 MR. CROOKS: So it would just be leaving that section as is, so that table  
6 would get thrown out. So if the Commission did not recommend to remove that  
7 section, then that section would get filled.

8 MR. BRANHAM: Okay.

9 MR. CROOKS: Does that make sense, Mr. Branham?

10 MR. BRANHAM: It does, but I mean, it gets filled in after we've already voted  
11 so that it's like still just a blank space?

12 MR. CROOKS: No, no, so we would be filling it with what, so I guess you  
13 could take it two ways; is we fill it with what that equivalent would be, or as part of  
14 the recommendation of the Commission recommend that x, y and z textually occurs.

15 MR. BRANHAM: You could, potentially you would fill it with the zoning  
16 equivalencies table that you provided me?

17 MR. CROOKS: Basically yeah, but it would be the complete table for all the  
18 zoning districts versus just the residential districts, and a couple of commercial.

19 MR. BRANHAM: I gotcha.

20 MR. CROOKS: So we'd basically be adding the language that says, this is  
21 the equivalency coming from the old Code to the new Code, here's the old districts,  
22 here's the proposed new districts and their most equivalents.

23 MR. BRANHAM: Is that in the LDC draft from April?

1 MR. CROOKS: It is not, it just says 'insert zoning district transition table', so it  
2 was one of those kind of missing pieces based on everything that would get  
3 finalized as part of the Code itself.

4 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. I feel like that, obviously I feel like that's very  
5 important to me and to the people so I would really like to see that as part of a vote  
6 on the whole thing. So first things first, I mean, if I could make a motion to delete the  
7 top recommended change, which is to remove §26-1.9(e) zoning districts from the  
8 text, and then we could just take a vote on that, cause obviously I don't know how  
9 the bulk Commission feels about it.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. So if I'm hearing correctly there's a motion  
11 that's been made by Commissioner Branham, is there a second?

12 MR. DENNIS: I second that.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded then  
14 that we remove that section from the Code and take it up as a separate issue. Is  
15 that right, Mr. Branham, is that correct?

16 MR. BRANHAM: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. All in favor, we can take a roll call vote, Mr.  
18 Price. Mr. Price?

19 MR. PRICE: Apology, I was muted. I was just asking, could you restate, Mr.  
20 Branham, could you restate again what it is that we're removing at this point?

21 MR. BRANHAM: Yes, the motion is to remove the recommended change that  
22 was presented by Staff to the Planning Commission, which is described as remove  
23 §26-1.9(e) zoning districts from the text. And my motion is for the purpose of

1 including a zoning district transition table in the version of the LDC that the  
2 Commission would then vote on potentially as a whole.

3 MR. CROOKS: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, and that motion has been seconded by Mr.  
5 Dennis, is that right?

6 MR. DENNIS: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay.

8 MR. PRICE: Alright, roll call. Gilchrist?

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

11 MS. CAIRNS: [Inaudible]

12 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

13 MR. YONKE: Aye.

14 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

15 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

16 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

17 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Grady?

19 MR. GRADY: Aye.

20 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

21 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Branham?

23 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

2 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

3 *[Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns(?), Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Taylor, Branham,*  
4 *Frierson]*

5 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

6 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Chair?

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, go right ahead.

8 MR. CROOKS: And Mr. Price, Mr. Branham, I want to make sure I  
9 understood that motion correctly. So we are saying remove that recommendation as  
10 it was listed and now to include the transition table itself within the Code. Is that  
11 correct?

12 MR. BRANHAM: Yes, and –

13 MR. CROOKS: Alright, that was how I understood it, I just wanted to make  
14 sure that was what it was.

15 MR. TAYLOR: The transition table you provided for Mr. Branham was an  
16 abbreviated one that only included residential, is that correct?

17 MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir. So there is residential and I think it had, like General  
18 Commercial and NC on there, but the version that gets included here will be all of  
19 the zoning districts. But it would just be the zoning district to the zoning district, it's  
20 not gonna have, like their density or any of that stuff. It'll just be, what is the  
21 equivalent district in terms of what it is and what the new potentially is.

22 MR. TAYLOR: Just wanted to be sure it wasn't an abbreviated version. Thank  
23 you.

1 MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir.

2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor, for clarification.  
3 Okay.

4 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Chair, if I could.

5 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Branham?

6 MR. BRANHAM: To ask Staff were they able to provide us with the complete  
7 table now?

8 MR. CROOKS: Let's see. We can, I can, I don't know if I'll be able to pull it  
9 together right now, right now, but for the most part everything else would be  
10 generally what is listed in the [inaudible].

11 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah. Okay, so the zoning equivalency abbreviated chart  
12 provided to us is fully in harmony with the table that would be inserted.

13 MR. CROOKS: Yeah. Yeah. So it'll be the residential stuff, and I think that's  
14 also, that table's noted in our "cheat sheet" that's on the Department web page in  
15 relation to the Code and that's the same table that's been elsewhere. So looking at  
16 the few residential districts and that handful of commercial ones. So we would just  
17 have all of the zoning districts included that's missing.

18 MR. BRANHAM: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Crooks. Thank you, Mr.  
20 Branham. Any additional comments? If there are none, Mr. Price, we are to now  
21 take a vote on adopting the Code, is that right?

22 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Well, if there are no additional comments the  
2 Chair will entertain a motion to adopt the Land Development Code.

3 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes?

5 MR. CROOKS: This would be based – recommending with the recommended  
6 changes from Staff?

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'm sorry, say that again, Mr. Crooks?

8 MR. CROOKS: So your motion to adopt the – I'm sorry, so your  
9 recommendation includes the recommended changes?

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: That's correct, yes.

11 MR. CROOKS: Alright, just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

12 MR. BRANHAM: Can I try to clarify? I'm sorry.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Yonke, yes go right ahead.

14 MR. BRANHAM: This is Mr. Branham.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Oh, I'm sorry Branham.

16 MR. BRANHAM: No problem. The zoning equivalency chart provided to us,  
17 does that not differ from some of the recommended changes as it relates to, like the  
18 residential zoning district densities?

19 MR. CROOKS: I'm sorry, I don't think I'm understanding.

20 MR. BRANHAM: The zoning equivalency chart that was provided that you've  
21 indicated is in line with the table that will be inserted –

22 MR. CROOKS: So where it's got new and where it's got old, that would be  
23 what we're including. We wouldn't be including an equivalency, an equivalent

1 density. It would just be what the district, the old district is and what the new district  
2 is.

3 MR. BRANHAM: And the new district densities match the recommended  
4 changes for densities? Cause I feel like I'm seeing a difference. R2 for example on  
5 the chart says three and then the recommended changes says four.

6 MR. CROOKS: So that would be, so we wouldn't be including the density in  
7 the equivalency table under Article I. That equivalency table would only be shown in  
8 the zoning district from the old Code and the zoning district from the proposed  
9 Code. It wouldn't have any other information in terms of that chart.

10 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. So I guess I would make a motion then to have the  
11 densities for the districts set forth in the equivalency table be the densities that are  
12 included in the table for the draft LDC.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, is there a second on that motion?

14 ? : I'll second it

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that  
16 we include the densities on the draft, on the proposed Land Development Code as  
17 proposed by Commissioner Branham. Any additional discussion? If not, Mr. Price  
18 will take a roll call vote.

19 MR. DENNIS: I have, I just wanna make sure I'm understanding this.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah. Commissioner Dennis.

21 MR. DENNIS: So what we're saying is we're voting on the density that was on  
22 the zoning equivalency table versus the changes that were made on page 2, or on  
23 page 2, line item one, two, three, four, five and six.

1 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, I would say that, if I could clarify my motion.

2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, please.

3 MR. BRANHAM: The densities, the new densities on the zoning equivalency  
4 chart, my intention would be to have those be in place of the recommended  
5 changes as they relate to those R1 through 6 set forth on the recommended  
6 changes chart.

7 MR. DENNIS: So basically –

8 MR. BRANHAM: It would be more than density, it would be all of the other  
9 changes parameters set forth as to each one of those residential districts. So I  
10 guess at the end of the day it's like delete, my motion is to delete the first six  
11 changes on page 2.

12 MR. TAYLOR: And include them in the chart?

13 MR. BRANHAM: And include the densities on the chart as they are currently  
14 set forth. Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

15 MR. TAYLOR: Yes, sir.

16 MR. DENNIS: Okay. I understand that now. I just wanted to make sure that's  
17 what we were doing.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Branham, for  
19 clarification on that. Is there a second on that motion?

20 ? : I second it.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. It's been moved and properly seconded. All  
22 in favor signify by roll call vote, Mr. Price.

23 MR. PRICE: Okay. Gilchrist?



1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

3 MS. CAIRNS: [Inaudible]

4 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

5 MR. YONKE: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

7 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

9 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Grady?

11 MR. GRADY: No.

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, Taylor, Branham, Frierson;*

19 *Opposed: Grady]*

20 MR. PRICE: Alright, that motion passes.

21 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. So that brings up back to the adoption of the

22 entire Code, is that right, Mr. Price?

23 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Chair?

1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes.

2 MR. CROOKS: I just want to get some clarity on that motion again. So for  
3 that motion, was that just for the densities or did that also include elements related  
4 to lot widths and setbacks?

5 MR. BRANHAM: All of the elements. That was what I clarified before the vote.

6 MR. CROOKS: Okay, so all the elements listed in there, okay.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is that good, Mr. Crooks?

8 MR. CROOKS: I believe so.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. And again, you know, I just want to remind  
10 the Commissioners that this will be sent to County Council for their review and I am  
11 sure Council will have the ability to weigh in on this in a much more detailed manner  
12 based upon their respective districts which they represent. And so I know I will be  
13 encouraging Council to be mindful of the recommendations that this Body has made  
14 and to make sure that as they think about the planning efforts to, in the county and  
15 what they want a Planning Commission in the future to, you know, really be focused  
16 on as it relates to the new Code that that's consistent with what we are seeking to  
17 adopt here today, so. Alright, any additional comments? So does that bring us back  
18 to adopting the Code, Mr. Price?

19 MR. PRICE: I believe it does, sir.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, alright. Well, if there are no additional  
21 comments I will certain entertain a motion from Commissioners to adopt the new  
22 Land Development Code to be prepared to send forth to County Council. Is there a  
23 motion to do so?

1 MR. BRANHAM: I'll make the motion, Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Is that Commissioner Dennis?

3 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Branham.

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Commissioner Branham, okay, alright. I'm sorry I'm  
5 missing everybody's name up here.

6 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, I need to get my video feed back for you.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: No, you're fine, you're good.

8 MR. BRANHAM: Thank you for guiding us through this conversation today,  
9 much appreciated. And yeah, my motion is to send this to County Council with a  
10 recommendation of adoption with the recommended changes, minus that those that  
11 we removed or modified today by vote.

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, is there a second?

13 MR. DENNIS: I second.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, it's been moved and properly seconded that  
15 we send the new Land Development Code forward to Council with an adoption by  
16 the Richland County Planning Commission, minus the changes we made today and  
17 the recommendations set forth in the new proposal. If there are no additional  
18 discussion, Mr. Price, will prepare for the roll call vote.

19 MR. PRICE: Alright. Gilchrist?

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

21 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

22 MS. CAIRNS: [Inaudible]

23 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

1 MR. YONKE: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

3 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

5 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

9 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Branham?

11 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

13 MS. FRIERSON: Yes.

14 *[Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns(?), Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Taylor, Branham,*  
15 *Frierson]*

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I think that's a unanimous vote, is that right, Mr.  
17 Price?

18 MR. PRICE: Yes, it is.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well, hip-hip-hooray dance today for a very long  
20 journey to get to this point. But I can't thank this fine Commission enough for the  
21 work that you put into this and to our wonderful Staff who has guided us through this  
22 process for these number of years to get us to this point. This is very exciting for the  
23 county, it's very exciting for the citizens of the county. I think it accomplishes what

1 we set out to do the day we decided that we would move forward with updating our  
2 Land Development Code in Richland County. As someone who's been around this  
3 work for a very long time, I'm excited about what we've accomplished in Richland  
4 County and I wanna thank you for taking on this task and being very diligent about  
5 ensuring that we provide a sound document for planning purposes in this county  
6 going forward. And so with that I wanna thank you. Any additional comments from  
7 Commissioners? Commissioner Dennis, sure, go right ahead?

8 MR. DENNIS: Yeah, I just wanted to personally thank Staff. Thank you very  
9 much for getting all this stuff out. I know we ask for the extra time, but I needed it. I  
10 definitely needed it to go through this line by line and go through this thing with  
11 those changes. Thank you to all the other Commissioners working with us, getting  
12 this done. I look forward to the future and I can't wait to see what this holds.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you, Commissioner Dennis.

14 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chair, this is Commissioner Frierson, I have a question.

15 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, Commissioner Frierson?

16 MS. FRIERSON: The June meeting of County Council, will it be in person or  
17 Zoom meeting?

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Do we know that yet, Mr. Price?

19 MR. PRICE: Yes. Council is scheduled to meet in person on July the 13<sup>th</sup>, so  
20 just to answer your question directly, Commissioner Frierson, that meeting on the  
21 22<sup>nd</sup> of June will be a Zoom meeting.

22 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you. And what time will that meeting be?

23 MR. PRICE: 7:00pm.

1 MS. FRIERSON: Thank you so much.

2 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Frierson.

3 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, is that Mr. Crooks?

5 MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir. There's a couple of other points that the  
6 Commissioners noted today and I just didn't know if we wanted to go ahead and  
7 take those up now since they weren't specifically listed in the recommendation list,  
8 or just leave those off? So for instance, clarifying the language about posting of  
9 signs, the missing power and duty related to approving the street names. We would  
10 need specific motions related to those since they were not included in that  
11 recommendation list.

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. I think we can go back and make an  
13 amendment, can we make an amendment to the Code for those items, Mr. Price?

14 MR. CROOKS: Or you could just do an additional motion rather than having  
15 to do an amendment. You would just –

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, that's fine.

17 MR. CROOKS: - do a motion to make those changes or have those be  
18 included in the recommended Land Development Code.

19 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. The Chair will entertain a motion to include  
20 those items.

21 MS. FRIERSON: Mr. Chair, before you all do that would you all repeat  
22 specifically what it is that we are asking be done, please?

1 MR. CROOKS: Yes, ma'am. So in relation to some of the points that were  
2 brought up earlier in the conversation, so on page 2-4 there's missing information  
3 related to the Commission's powers and duties on providing street name approval.  
4 So we would just add that power under §26-2.3(B)(1)(b), add that language there.  
5 And then under the table for 26-2.4(G)(2) on page 2-16, clarify the language in the  
6 table note related to posting sign notice. And those are the two that were mentioned  
7 specifically by the Commission earlier.

8 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Does that help, Commissioner Frierson?

9 MS. FRIERSON: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, just a couple of administrative things that we  
11 needed to, I think Commissioner Branham brought those up earlier. The Chair will  
12 entertain a motion on those items.

13 MR. BRANHAM: So moved.

14 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Second?

15 MR. DENNIS: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. All in favor –

17 MR. TAYLOR: I have a question.

18 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay, Commissioner Taylor.

19 MR. TAYLOR: Was the, with the distances for the sign postings, was there a  
20 recommended change for the distance or was it to leave it where it was? I think the  
21 way I understood it is moving it to 1,000' was gonna be too much. Did that mean  
22 just leave it where it was, Commissioner Branham?

1 MR. BRANHAM: I would amend my motion to include that provision. I just  
2 wasn't sure of the, you know, appetite of the Commission and whether we should  
3 vote on that separately from the other two, but I would like for us to take a vote on  
4 that. So I'll amend my motion – and request that it revert to the current distances set  
5 forth in the current LDC.

6 MR. TAYLOR: Gotcha.

7 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: And the second still remains?

8 MR. DENNIS: The second still remains from Commissioner Dennis.

9 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Alright, any further discussion?

10 MR. CROOKS: Before we call for the vote can you give Staff a second to take  
11 a look at that language again?

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Sure.

13 MR. CROOKS: Cause I just wanna make sure that what we're – in relation to  
14 it. So Mr. Branham, are you saying change it from 1,000' to 300'?

15 MR. BRANHAM: I want it to say what the current LDC says, if we can use  
16 those same distances and scenarios, I don't have the exact wording in front of me.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, Mr. Crooks, what is it showing on the current  
18 LDC?

19 MR. CROOKS: That's what I wanted to check on, cause this is not something  
20 that I deal with on a regular basis, that's usually Mr. DeLage.

21 MR. BRANHAM: It's 26-52(F)(2)(c) on the current LDC.

22 MR. PRICE: So we're looking at what our current Code requires for sign  
23 postings?



1 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Correct.

2 MR. PRICE: Okay.

3 MR. CROOKS: Because I know one major change is simplification of the  
4 overall process and procedure, cause right now we have, like different thresholds  
5 basically in relation to that, but. So that's why I wanted to get some clarification.  
6 Sorry, Mr. Price.

7 MR. PRICE: No problem.

8 MR. BRANHAM: I feel like the distances set forth in the current LDC are  
9 acceptable, are adequate, are reasonable. Apparently there's some variation for  
10 some scenarios because the footnote referencing it on page 2-17 of the draft LDC  
11 says, requires one every 100 to 300' of road frontage, depending on the size of the  
12 lot or parcel.

13 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so there's five different potential ones.

14 MR. BRANHAM: I mean, obviously I'm just trying to provide the public with a  
15 reasonable opportunity for notice.

16 MR. CROOKS: Right. I don't, I just, you know, that's why I was asking would  
17 you want it to be – cause right now it's listed, so the current language is, hearing  
18 notices shall be located as follows: 1) for lots or parcels with road frontage of 100'  
19 or less one hearing notice shall be placed on each lot or parcel; 2) for lots or parcels  
20 with road frontage greater than 100' but less than 500' one hearing notice shall be  
21 placed for every 100' of road frontage or portion thereof; 3) for lots or parcels with  
22 road frontage greater than 500' but less than 1,000' one hearing notice shall be  
23 placed for every 200' of road frontage or portion thereof; for lots or parcels of land

1 with road frontage of 1,000' or greater one public hearing notice shall be placed for  
2 every 300' of road frontage or portion thereof. And then the fifth option is basically  
3 the footnote related to the multi parcel posting.

4 MR. BRANHAM: I know that's a lotta words but I'm comfortable with what it  
5 says.

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yeah, I'm perfectly comfortable with that.

7 MR. DENNIS: Yeah, I like, I'm perfectly comfortable myself.

8 MR. CROOKS: So I guess, I mean, I think one thing I guess from our  
9 perspective, would it be easier then to just say one every 150' otherwise? That way  
10 it's a one number and we just list it as, we just have the one every time and it's 150'  
11 for every, so rather than 1,000' we say 150'?

12 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: I'm fine with that language.

13 MR. BRANHAM: Mr. Price, do you have any input on that?

14 MR. PRICE: I was reading, sorry, I was just reading over the language so I  
15 apologize. Could you repeat that, I'm sorry?

16 MR. BRANHAM: I just asked if you had any input on that.

17 MR. PRICE: The posting requirements?

18 MR. CROOKS: I mentioned one every 150' instead of one every 1,000',  
19 rather than having the four options that are currently listed within the Code.

20 MR. PRICE: Yeah, I think one of the issues over the years what we have  
21 found, and I apologize, you know, Mr. Branham and the rest of the Commission that  
22 we don't, I don't have a specific distance in mind for you at this point. But one of the  
23 things that we have found over the years is that, you know, from posting properties,

1 remember I'll just use my own time being here, is that just by the requirements of  
2 what's in the current Code I think sometimes we've just over-posted a property. I  
3 mean, I think it's just required way more than is totally necessary. And there have  
4 been actually times when we've actually squeezed in, you know, squeezing in a  
5 sign unnecessarily. So one of the things I think that the proposed Land  
6 Development Code was trying to do is just kinda reduce that a bit. Now I believe in  
7 your opinion, I guess I'll just point to you Mr. Branham, is that maybe it was a little  
8 excessive on what we were trying to reduce. So what we probably wanna look at is,  
9 I think as Mr. Crooks is alluding to, maybe something more of an in-between,  
10 because one of the things as a Staff that we do is we make sure, it's not a matter of  
11 the number of signs that you're posting, it is always about the proximity of the sign  
12 to the traffic that, you know, we are trying to advertise towards. So for example,  
13 there are times that we actually, you may actually have a parcel, let's say it has no  
14 street frontage, but we actually go beyond that than just putting up one sign. There  
15 are some cases where a parcel has less than, let's say 100' but we will put up  
16 additional signs because what we wanna make sure of is that it is clearly advertised  
17 and noted to the public that a request is coming. I don't know how we can  
18 necessarily address that with that language, but understanding, you know, requiring  
19 a certain number of signs doesn't necessarily guarantee that everyone will be  
20 notified. It's all about the location of where we place the signs.

21 MR. BRANHAM: Yeah, and I know we don't wanna get into requiring specific  
22 locations and points of interest and landmarks and all that stuff, so I can appreciate  
23 just a desire for simplicity. The proposal was for at least one every 150'.

1 MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir, that's what I mentioned and if there's another  
2 number that the Commission has in mind, you know, I'm just kinda throwing that out  
3 there as food for thought that in relation to, you know, what is generally listed it's  
4 either 100' or 500'. So I mean, I feel like 150 is kind of, it's generally 100, 200 or  
5 every 1,000 is really kinda what, or 300, so I mean, 150, 200 that kinda seems to be  
6 the sweet spot for some of these, but for some of those smaller parcels maybe 150  
7 is more appropriate. So I would suggest 150 or 200.

8 MR. BRANHAM: Okay. Alright, I'm happy to amend my motion, particularly for  
9 simplicity sake of the LDC, but kind of the posting requirement distance be reported  
10 as requiring to include at least one notice for every 100', or 150' or a fraction thereof  
11 of street frontage. And that's the third component of the motion that's on the table.

12 MR. DENNIS: I still second.

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright. So it's been moved and properly seconded  
14 then that we modify the motion to include the 150'. Any discussion? Okay, if not Mr.  
15 Price will take a roll call vote.

16 MR. PRICE: Okay. Gilchrist?

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

18 MR. PRICE: Cairns?

19 MS. CAIRNS: [Inaudible]

20 MR. PRICE: Yonke?

21 MR. YONKE: Aye.

22 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

23 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

1 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

2 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

3 MR. PRICE: Grady?

4 MR. GRADY: Aye.

5 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

6 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

7 MR. PRICE: Branham?

8 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

9 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

10 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

11 *[Approved: Gilchrist, Cairns(?), Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Taylor, Branham,*  
12 *Frierson]*

13 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. Motion passes and I think that concludes our  
14 business for the day, is that right, Mr. Price?

15 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

16 MR. CROOKS: I believe so.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Mr. Crooks, do you agree with Mr. Price?

18 MR. CROOKS: I believe so. I don't think there's anything else that I can think  
19 of.

20 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Well again everybody, thank you for weighing in on  
21 this. As I mentioned before this will get to County Council and they will have the  
22 opportunity to kind of chime in on this and individual Commissioners who would like  
23 to comment as citizens of the county and unincorporated areas of the county, feel

1 free to consider that as we move forward. But again, I wanna thank all of you for  
2 your diligence and your work on this document. I'm excited about what we hope this  
3 will mean for the county's future development project. If there's nothing else to claim  
4 our attention the Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.

5 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Yes, sir, Mr. Price?

7 MR. PRICE: Of course you know I can't just let y'all go straight to an  
8 adjournment, so I apologize. The Planning Commission is scheduled to meet on  
9 July the 12<sup>th</sup>, and that potentially will be our last Zoom meeting. You know, I know  
10 some things are still up in the air but potentially that will probably be our last Zoom  
11 meeting. And of course y'all don't meet in August. One of the things that I know we  
12 briefly touched on I guess for the year, during this year, is potentially looking at a  
13 retreat that we have done previously for the Planning Commission. And so we may  
14 wanna just start looking into that, you know, especially as we kind of get into the  
15 August break which we typically have, or maybe some time in September. And so I  
16 would just ask that as we go to our July 12<sup>th</sup> meeting or any time before, if any of  
17 the Planning Commission Members would have any specific topics that you would  
18 like addressed during the retreat. I thought the last retreat we had was we brought  
19 in members from the residential and commercial and industrial industries, and I  
20 thought that was a very beneficial and probably one of our better retreats. And so  
21 what we would just look at is which specific topics that the Planning Commission  
22 Members would like for us to try to address during the next retreat.

1           CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Thank you for bringing that point up, Mr. Price. You  
2 know, I know when this Commission decided to do retreats about four years ago or  
3 however long it was, you know, I think they all were very beneficial, they have been  
4 very beneficial. And I think not only have the members of the public including  
5 commercial and residential organizations have benefited from it, but even our own  
6 county Staff has benefited from being able to participate in those retreats. So yes, I  
7 would echo your sentiments that, you know, as we think about what that agenda  
8 should look like if there are Commissioners who have been and some of the  
9 Commissioners who have not had an opportunity to participate in one of our annual  
10 retreats, but it's always a great opportunity to really refocus our efforts to begin our  
11 planning work in the county. And certainly I would say that that's a critical thing to  
12 occur this year given the fact that we have now moved the Land Development Code  
13 on to County Council for their approval. So yes, thank you Mr. Price for bringing that  
14 up and we will, we can discuss this a little bit more in detail at our July 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.  
15 Okay, anything else?

16           MR. PRICE: No, sir.

17           CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Okay. The Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.

18           MR. TAYLOR: So moved.

19           MR. BRANHAM: Second.

20           CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Alright, all in favor roll call vote, Mr. Price?

21           MR. PRICE: Okay. Gilchrist?

22           CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Aye.

23           MR. PRICE: Yonke?

1 MR. YONKE: Aye.

2 MR. PRICE: Carlisle?

3 MR. CARLISLE: Aye.

4 MR. PRICE: Dennis?

5 MR. DENNIS: Aye.

6 MR. PRICE: Grady?

7 MR. GRADY: Aye.

8 MR. PRICE: Taylor?

9 MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

10 MR. PRICE: Branham?

11 MR. BRANHAM: Aye.

12 MR. PRICE: Frierson?

13 MS. FRIERSON: Aye.

14 *[Approved: Gilchrist, Yonke, Carlisle, Dennis, Grady, Taylor, Branham, Frierson; not*  
15 *present for vote: Cairns]*

16 MR. PRICE: Alright, 7/0 (sic), that motion passes so we are now adjourned.

17 CHAIRMAN GILCHRIST: Have a good weekend everybody.

18 *[Meeting adjourned \_\_\_\_\_]*