

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 6, 2022

Work Session

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

Called to order: _____

CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay everybody, we are ready to get going. Well for, let's just call this work session to order, work Session of the Richland County Planning Commission. Today is June 6, 2022, and just for the Record Mr. Gilchrist had to depart after the regular meeting concluded today so, we got Mr. Yonke, Mr. Carlisle, Mr. Dennis, I'm Mr. Branham, John Metts, Mr. Grady, Mr. Taylor, are present. Alright, and Staff again would you just, as to this work session, confirm that we've complied with the Freedom of Information Act?

MR. PRICE: Yes sir, we have.

CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, thank you. Are there any motions for additions or deletions to the Agenda? None. Alright, Item IV, 2021 Land Development Code remapping restart and, you know, Staff would you like to just kind of tell us where we've taken this through map addition 0.1-0.2?

MR. CROOKS: Yes, so as the Commission may recall as it relates to the last work session on the 18th we discussed the equivalency table and where we didn't have a one to one equivalent at that time. So looking at how the equivalency table exists, what some better replacements could be, so you know, thinking about certain districts we had the RU, RR and the OI being some of those that had a one to many equivalency. So, you know, how do those look out or how do those play out? So after

1 that discussion which leads us into map 0.2 the RU becomes RT, RR becomes R1, OI
2 becomes INS. And then kind of where we're at now in relation to that discussion would
3 be that we're still kind of missing something for OI, or excuse me, not OI, MH and I think
4 that was one of the things that we wanted to, or the Commission wanted to discuss in
5 more detail related to the text. But as it relates to the map specifically kind of map 0.1
6 we, we kind of I think come to an understanding or come to a point where I think the
7 Commission was in relative agreement as well as Staff with how that should look. So
8 then we have 0.2 for further exploration, and then needing to kind of figure out what we
9 do in more particular ways with the MH district; how that could potentially work and how
10 that could potentially look. And I think from a mapping standpoint then where do we go
11 forward from there as it relates to the conversation. But essentially taking that feedback,
12 taking those points of discussion from the May 18th work session, applying those to a
13 second edition of map 0 and then looking to continuing that forward as we go.

14 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, so 0.2 this map it's just done away with HM and
15 AG?

16 MR. CROOKS: At this time, they would not be mapped. No, sir. So, so not done
17 away with, so those districts would still exist textually, they just would not be mapped.
18 So for instance within our 2005 Land Development Code, we have the Parks and
19 Recreation District, that is not actually one that is mapped. So it exists as an option, it
20 exists to be utilized, but it is not mapped. I think from our standpoint as it relates to
21 those, I think that's where we begin to see those within, say map 2. So thinking in terms
22 of how this could potentially play out process wise, you know, map 1 becomes a full
23 equivalency table map, so once we kind of have everything being a one to one, looking

1 at what that equivalency table or I think at that point needs to be changed to a
2 translation table, so where we have a more specific translation table versus an
3 equivalency table. Translation table becomes map 1. Map 2 becomes things related to
4 the future land use map. So how would the recommendations of the future land use
5 map apply to how an area is or isn't zoned? So for instance where we have the rural
6 large lot or the conservation districts, what do those become map wise? Where R1
7 wouldn't necessarily be a most appropriate, RT would be but in certain instances AG
8 may be there as a more particular option. Same way with HM. But I would also point out
9 again that the AG and HM districts are special purpose districts. So those are more
10 specific to working lands or moderate scale farming with residential but are not
11 particularly catered towards, say residential uses. Those are specific to more rural
12 lands, more particularly working lands, as well as farming and things of that nature. So
13 where those things come into play, I do believe it to be more so application of the future
14 land use map to the baseline map itself. Does that make sense?

15 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: I think I hear what you're saying. So everything that was
16 RU is that now labeled RT?

17 MR. CROOKS: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. And is there proposed criteria for identifying the
19 HM and the AGs in the future of this process?

20 MR. CROOKS: I think that's, that's something that we can definitely propose.
21 We, we have some of that currently as it relates to the prior mapping process, so some
22 of the things that we utilized for that. So we have some of those as part of our technical
23 rules that we utilized. I think that's also something that can be part of conversation with

1 the Planning Commission as well. So I'm not gonna say no, but yes we have some of
2 those and I think they can also be expanded or tweaked as we go forward.

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Obviously you have a, I'm just trying to think of potential
4 criteria. I mean, you have stuff, it's taxed differently that might help you identify like
5 working lands?

6 MR. CROOKS: So, so I guess kind of thinking of the way that we looked at the
7 previously, so one of the things that we utilized was land use information from the
8 Assessor's Office. So they have, you know, various land use categories and then
9 applying those to parcels. So looking at, you know, is that an agriculture use, is that a
10 residential use, is that a residential with agriculture, is that, you know, so how do those
11 things play out? We also looked at things related to the overall acreage of a site. So
12 there's a variety of different components that you could utilize as it relates to what an
13 area could be. So, so to kind of give you an idea about the process that we used, so the
14 original process for the, I guess before the restart. So map 1 in that case was the
15 equivalency table so more so from a translation standpoint. So everything that was RU
16 is RT. And then map 2 utilized the future land use map information along with lot sizes.
17 So if something was within the rural large lot future land use designation and it was, say
18 20 acres or greater, okay that became homestead or agriculture, you know, kind of
19 giving you an idea of how some of things are. May not necessarily be 20 acres, I think it
20 was more so probably like 150, but still various sizing of acreages related to those
21 future land use categories. So the same way was if we were in a neighbor low density
22 future land use designation, okay that number might be 500 acres for that map 2. And
23 then moving into map 3 which looked at more particularly land uses. So each iteration

1 again, kind of going back to that brief presentation I would say that we had that one day,
2 each iteration built upon itself. So iteration 3, followed iteration 2. So looking at, you
3 know, the future land use stuff and how that was determined to be recommended. Then
4 when we look at that land use that coincided with that, okay, that's a commercial or
5 industrial use so the activity is showing us commercial but the function of that property
6 is showing as a automotive repair. So maybe that's something that's not appropriate for
7 whatever it was in that previous iteration, maybe that should be a commercial zoning
8 district. So different so, so to kind of give you an idea each thing kind of played on to
9 each other and then going into that fourth iteration we looked at the neighborhood
10 masterplans, priority investment areas, more specifically policy guidance beyond just
11 the future land use map; various locational factors and things like that from the Comp
12 Plan itself and then moving into the fifth one was kind of bringing it all together. So
13 looking at it from a more cohesive complete standpoint of saying, okay a lot of this area
14 is showing as, you know, R3 or several other things are also R4. Okay well, majority of
15 this kind of interspersed throughout all of this it's R4 so then we recommended R4
16 versus R3 because you can have something that's a more intense zoning district be
17 conforming versus something that is less intense typically and be conforming. So kind
18 of, kind of thinking about the process that we took and I think where we'd be happy to
19 share those again, those principals that we use as well as how some of those rules,
20 those technical rules played out within, from those principals, cause again thinking
21 about it from a whole perspective the things that we are trying to achieve with
22 remapping and then the technical rules for each of those iterations. So I think, you
23 know, we'd definitely be able to look at something similar, could probably be scaled

1 down a little bit more as well, but I mean I think, I think it really just comes down to kind
2 of how, how the Commission would want to take that process.

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah. Well, you know, just general comment to the
4 Commission. I, I want to go over the map and then I know I would also like to touch on
5 these legacy rural district issues that we've kind of touched on just now. And then I also
6 want to touch on the manufactured homes, so just for general structure sake if we
7 wanna talk, so. I guess it's pretty difficult, right? I think we've talked about the technical
8 aspects of trying to make these interim draft maps like searchable and, you know, with
9 the layers and things like people are used to being able to access.

10 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, I think it's, it's doable, it can be done. I think it's just gonna
11 be one of those things where how often we're gonna be making these updates. And
12 then, cause I think in terms on static map perspective, that's easy. So you can see how
13 each one those things has changed as it's gone along that process. But each one of
14 those for the digital map viewer as those changes occur those changes are going to be
15 occurring, depending on the breadth of those changes it could take a couple days, it
16 could potentially take a couple weeks. So that'd be something we'd have to discuss
17 more specifically with IT to figure out how some of those things could play out, because
18 when I say the, the internal workings of the data will have changed. Without getting too
19 technical on I think, you know, Chris probably has an idea of what I'm gonna be talking
20 about here, but basically as we are changing the overall structure of the data base that
21 we're using that's going to impact how that app can be quickly updated. So they're
22 gonna have to do more, more detailed changes to the app itself to match the data that
23 we're trying to input to it. So that's why I'm saying it could be, it could be a week, it could

1 be two weeks, it could just be a day. It's just really going to depend on how, how long
2 they need to make those changes as well as what they're work load from a Staff
3 perspective could be also.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Like just a better resolution of these images?

5 MR. CROOKS: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Where you can zoom into the point of seeing, like street
7 names?

8 MR. CROOKS: Well, so I think that, I think that was just kind of an oversight on
9 our point of not including the street names cause those - we, we have those, those can
10 be added. And I'm going to say with these typically, I mean, they're relatively high-
11 resolution PDF so I mean, even scrolling in to, you know, 300% you can, you can get a
12 pretty good detail as it relates to some of those things. So I mean those little grey lines,
13 that's the space between the parcel lines, that's just where they're not showing because
14 they're not necessarily drawn. So I mean, you can get some pretty high level detail even
15 with the PDF maps. I think it's just -

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay.

17 MR. CROOKS: - how, how easy is it gonna be for people to navigate the maps
18 and that's, you know, some people don't know how to necessarily navigate a map,
19 some people do, some people it's, you know, kind of in-between. I think that's where the
20 next iteration definitely looked to include the street names.

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah.

1 MR. CROOKS: But I think in terms of getting to this a, having these as a digital
2 map again, I think we can get there, I'm just not gonna be able to give you a strong
3 timeline.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: I think that would be really helpful just having the street
5 names and knowing that the resolution could, could go down that far to the point where
6 you can read them.

7 MR. CROOKS: Yeah.

8 MR. DENNIS: Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Dennis?

10 MR. DENNIS: So, so I would, I kinda like having the street names on there. I
11 mean, it's not necessary for me but I do know the public likes it. But I really think going
12 in the future whatever we make, I think we need to stay with these types of maps, that
13 interactive map because I think as we go forward, we're gonna have a lot of changes.
14 And I know editing GIS maps based on my experience in the military can sometimes
15 take a while, especially if we're changing text that could also change zones. So this
16 would be a much quicker way to get it out to the public versus the other way. I mean,
17 this right here shouldn't take that long if I'm correct, right, Mr. Crooks?

18 MR. CROOKS: Yeah I mean, the PDF map is just gonna be doing, doing
19 whatever changes in the next export. I mean that's, that's a relatively simple process.
20 So in terms of the digital map, the first version is going to be the more complicated one.
21 After that it's just going to be a two-to-three-day process and that's just gonna be to
22 upload the data, refresh the data, make sure everything is working data wise that it
23 needs to, and then basically quality control stuff at that point. So that's, so the initial

1 iteration of the new digital map, that's gonna be the most complicated thing. Refreshing
2 it as changes are made, it's just a couple days. But, so that's not going to be as, as
3 complicated app wise, so it would be the same process as this it's just the next iteration
4 of the paper map if you will; that's going to be a much quicker process for this next initial
5 route.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Was it your intention to pretty soon create that initial
7 version?

8 MR. CROOKS: I mean, I think if that's, if that's what, you know, what Planning
9 Commission's looking for, I think we can definitely do that. I guess it's just gonna be
10 what - I think one of things I think with that would be is I would probably recommend
11 having that digital map until we have full 1, so I guess until we get to map 1, if you will.
12 So rather than map 0.3 or zero whatever, until we get to map 1 let map 1 be that first
13 cause that would be a, it's like a true baseline starting point, where right now we're still
14 missing data. You know, we don't, we don't know what some of those things are gonna
15 be versus having everything all up there all at once and then letting that be that kind of
16 starting point from a digital perspective.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay.

18 MR. DENNIS: Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah, Mr. Dennis?

20 MR. DENNIS: Yeah, I think using these maps that we have in front of us until we
21 get to a spot where we all feel comfortable with producing a different style map, I think
22 we should just focus on these, because that initial could take a while. And I know they
23 can change it once the initial stuff's done but until we get a good feel for what we're

1 doing forward I don't - being prior government, the Air Force, we used to do a lot of
2 things real quick like this and wasting a lot of time, a lot of money, a lot of man hours.
3 And I just don't want to waste man hours and money that we can utilize to get us
4 answers on other things as we're going forward. But once we get to a map where we're
5 a little more feel good, where we can start, then I would say let's just continue doing
6 maps like this.

7 MR. TAYLOR: By this are you calling this static versus –

8 MR. DENNIS: Yes, yes.

9 MR. CROOKS: Yes.

10 MR. DENNIS: Yes, when I say this it's the map, it's the PDF maps.

11 MR. CROOKS: Yeah.

12 MR. DENNIS: Versus the GIS running map.

13 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, yeah. So yeah, Mr. Taylor, when I'm talking about a static
14 map versus a dynamic map I'm talking about the navigational standpoint of, you know,
15 being able to zoom in on level of details, searchable, things like that.

16 MR. TAYLOR: I have a question, Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Mr. Taylor, yes?

18 MR. TAYLOR: So do we know, and maybe IT can tell us, I don't know if it's
19 helpful or not, do we know how much traffic these maps get from the public? Cause I
20 know a lotta times we're, I think some of thing we're talking about doing is making this
21 stuff more accessible to the public, and even through some of these, you know, public
22 sessions, I think it'd be good to be able, just some quick and dirty numbers just to see if,
23 you know, people are going to them because, you know, we're putting this information,

1 we're putting a lot of time and energy into making it available. I'd like to be able to talk to
2 constituents and say hey, have you gone to the, you know, to the website and looked at
3 the maps and, you know, look at the things that we're putting in place, again just so
4 things don't seem to be, you know, as close session and clandestine but, you know,
5 everything is kinda open and we're putting it all out there. I don't know if any kind of -

6 MR. CROOKS: And I think that's a, that's a question we can ask. I'm not sure, I
7 mean, I know we as Staff we were using this every day, multiple times a day so I mean,
8 when we were getting our hundreds upon hundreds of phone calls every single time we
9 got one of those calls we used it. So, and that's what we directed people to go look at
10 was, hey I got a question about X, Y, Z about this other property or, you know, I'm
11 trying to see what this is zoned; it's, okay well, you know, here you can go here, you use
12 this, do that. So I mean, I know we used it and we used it a lot so I don't know how that
13 changes cause we only opened it once and probably just left it open, but still. I think it's
14 a question worth being asked if that data can be captured, if that's something that, that
15 we can, we can see.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Yonke?

17 MR. YONKE: I know noticed today that the LDC [inaudible] that the 2021 LDC
18 zoning map app is back up. Are we gonna pull that back down so there's no
19 contradicting these 0.1, 0.2 maps? If we call that 1.0.

20 MR. CROOKS: So I think the, the app itself is still there.

21 MR. YONKE: Yeah, it's up.

22 MR. CROOKS: So the app still works but I thought, I was thinking we might have
23 removed the link to it from the, from the main page. So anybody who's using it has to

1 have, would have to have the link or would have to go find the link so anybody that's
2 coming to this new, yeah it's, so it's still a live link and we would probably use the same
3 thing. We would just probably make a more specific comment towards it here as well as
4 the information on the app viewer itself. Yes, it's a live app, I don't necessarily know if
5 we want to pause it, I mean, I guess we could because it's, I guess, I'm gonna say in
6 part it's still a recommendation that's out there but it's obviously not the way that this
7 process is moving forward. So we know it's not necessarily gonna be utilized but it's
8 still, I don't know, it's kind of one of those grey areas. But I think that's what we would
9 go back and utilize for the new information if that makes sense?

10 MR. YONKE: [Inaudible] that help out at all? As a GIS guy, offline or somewhere
11 else, let me know. Cause it looks like the 2021 app is great and we would just have to
12 upload these parcels from this. Whatever created the PDF map, that data is our current
13 so we just make that a map service.

14 MR. CROOKS: Right.

15 MR. YONKE: But I know that takes a long time to upload this many parcels.

16 MR. CROOKS: Yeah so, I mean that's what, I mean, kind of this is, this is just
17 kind of they piggyback off of the, the baseline GIS app that we have, so. Mr. Price, you?
18 Yeah, so, so the link, like you said Chris, the, Mr. Yonke, the link still works and the link
19 is still active but it's not on the County's planning page. So it might still be on a couple
20 of, say press releases or something that have happened or event notices but otherwise
21 if you don't, if you have the link it will work, if you're trying to find it new, it's gonna take
22 you a little, little bit of time to get there. So we, we can potentially ask for them to just go
23 ahead and take it offline, I think, if y'all think that would help or.

1 MR. YONKE: [Inaudible] at one point.

2 MR. CROOKS: Okay.

3 MR. YONKE: Last week I tried to go to it.

4 MR. CROOKS: I think that one might have just been everything in general
5 because there was, yeah, there was lotta stuff for us that was also not loading so I
6 don't, I don't know if it was purposeful or not but.

7 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. So if nothing else like specific to just like the
8 map production or whatever, let's, I wanted to cover some of the rural, you know,
9 formerly rural issues, which will I think play further into advancing the mapping process.
10 So again at this point basically anything that was already RU Staff has plugged it in as
11 RT on the, the map.

12 MR. CROOKS: Yes, sir.

13 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. And, you know, RU was a little bit of a catchall
14 previously under the 2005 Code and with the map. We talked about issues related to
15 minimum lot size and that there was concern when it comes to subdividing some of
16 these rural properties, family lands, what have you, where the, the minimum lot size was
17 gonna be much larger than it is currently under the RU. So we, we've talked a lot about
18 trying to transition our districts towards use based districts. Can you talk to us a little bit
19 more about why that might be important versus just leaving something with a RU type
20 designation?

21 MR. CROOKS: So, yeah, so I wanted to kind of point out some of these areas.
22 So anything that is currently RU goes to RT, right? So this is Broad River Road, kind of
23 more so in town, right adjacent to the city. So we've got RU right here, so these

1 therefore would then be considered, you know, as most people think about it that's then
2 a rural area where you're surrounded by the city limits, you're surrounded by high
3 relatively high density development or rather high intensity development. Same way
4 with, you know, a tract here that is actually in process of being annexed by the city.
5 Again, something right off of Broad River Road near the intersection of Greystone we've
6 got RU zoned property. So it's just one of those things where really RU has been
7 something where nothing has either ever happened or it's not ever tried to be rezoned
8 again. So that's why it's kind of a catchall but we know in many, many instances it still
9 doesn't necessarily work. So, kind of again, kinda pointing on another one kind of in the
10 very urban area. So if we do take that approach where everything goes from RT or
11 excuse me RU to R2, excuse me, RU to RT, there's gonna be lots of places where that
12 doesn't really necessarily make sense. Which I think why we're talking about, you know,
13 still taking this area to process, applying that future land use map in certain areas where
14 we have RU existing right next to city limits, whether that's Columbia, Arcadia Lakes,
15 Forest Acres where it is zoned RU but it's not a rural area. It's not appropriate for the
16 RU zoning district. So in those instances then where, say this is going to be mixed
17 residential, high density, okay that becomes, say R3 depending on what kind of
18 everything else around it looks like or maybe R4 or what have you, or it becomes a
19 commercial district, depending on what it is, what that use is, variety of things. So where
20 it becomes something more appropriate for that area but also for, you know, the context
21 of that property if that makes sense. So that way not everything just becomes what was
22 RU becomes RT, well in certain instances yeah, but that makes plenty of sense and that

1 works perfectly fine. But then in other areas it doesn't because that's part of the issue
2 that we have right now with how a lotta the county is zoned.

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: I will just say personally I don't believe we're gonna be
4 able to solve all of these. The level of issues with this process is something that
5 certainly I think we can look at in, like future waves of, of work but I think your point is
6 well taken that it's probably time that we look at what's zoned as RU and try to figure out
7 if we want to take it to another level of specificity. And I think that's, you know, one of
8 the reasons why there was a proposal for an AG district, an HM district and an RT
9 district. And so I kinda wanna talk a little bit more about those things and, and again sort
10 of the criteria that we might apply to figure out what the legacy RU tracts ought to be,
11 whether again it's based on taxation or also potentially the combination of lot size, and
12 do we still need both AG and HM. I know there's very little difference in the permitted
13 uses between those two districts. So as I recall the tract size point of demarcation
14 between AG and HM was 35 acres, is that right?

15 MR. CROOKS: So the AG requires a district minimum of 35 acres. So you could
16 have something that was say 10 acres that's zoned AG but you have to be contiguous
17 with 35 acres total, and that's either adjacent to another AG or HM. So if you've got, you
18 know, you got your 10 acre parcel, you've got a 20 acre AG next to you, and then
19 you've you a five acre HM next to you, you can be AG, if that makes sense?

20 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay.

21 MR. CROOKS: Yeah.

22 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Where, where'd that number come from, the 35 acres?

1 MR. CROOKS: I believe that was from input that we received from the
2 Conservation Commission related to kind of the best acreage size wise for a working
3 farm. So that was kind of some of the information that they had sent us that we utilized
4 for coming up with that number.

5 MR. DENNIS: Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Mr. Dennis?

7 MR. DENNIS: So that Conservation Commission that provided those was that
8 our own or a state entity?

9 MR. CROOKS: Yes, that was ours, yeah.

10 MR. DENNIS: Okay. The reason why I'm asking that because I've done a lotta
11 looking trying to figure out this rural stuff, and when I stuff I mean a melting pot of
12 properties, because there's a lotta people out in the rural area that actually do the hobby
13 farms, real farms, and so that made me start digging in federal government land uses
14 and how they distinguish stuff. And tell you the truth when I look at it, you know,
15 anything as long as they can make \$1,000 a year that's pretty much, federal
16 government considers it a farm. So in my back yard I could grow collard greens and if I
17 sell \$1,000, guess what, I'm a farm, according the federal. But we got to, that's not a
18 way that we should do business here in Richland County because I keep trying to find a
19 way to differentiate these farms, and when I say farms like true farms versus smaller
20 hobby farms versus smaller farms than that, like community farms and things like that, I
21 think we do have the places in Richland County that we can really differentiate the RU
22 area. And you just have to figure out a way to make the RU, the AG and the HM, and
23 also where it's a transition to RT, like the map in front of us that we have those RT

1 areas are very, to me kinda easy to do, because I mean they are encompassed around
2 other things. It's just what are they being used for? Why are they doing? How much of it
3 do they own? Are they doing small things? We just kinda have to make sure we protect
4 them by making sure they can still do some of the stuff in the RT that they're currently
5 probably doing. So, you know, looking forward I really think we can find a way to do AG
6 and HM. And, you know, last night I looked at a few things this morning and I almost
7 came up with a, with another group, but then I said no I think we should just figure out
8 the AG and HM. But I almost had a third one other than that for farms and rural land.

9 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so, so one thing that I wanna point out there is the, the
10 primary word that you were using was farm, that's not a land use. So the land use would
11 be agricultural, so it's agricultural uses or somewhere within that classification,
12 somewhere within that category we have a specific use type. Whether that's going to be
13 agricultural specifically, agricultural supporting services, you know, riding and boarding
14 stables, so those are gonna be the various, you know, specific use components. So we
15 don't have a farm as a land use so in terms of that, you know, anything like you're
16 saying could be a farm. So it's gonna be more so what is that specific use that you're
17 doing on your property. And so I think those are one of the things that I think a lot of the
18 questions that we have received throughout this process, and I think one of things that
19 we still believe there are kind of going to be a lot of kind of misunderstandings,
20 miscommunication on is how those things actually play out within the Code, how that
21 actually works and functions, because if you're this farm like you're talking, about well
22 one, you should be licensed with a business license, but two, you know, how, how are
23 you actually operating, what are you actually doing on your property? Is it a primary use,

1 that is an agriculture use or is it something that is incidental or secondary to your use as
2 a residence? A lot of questions and things that we were seeing throughout the process
3 was that it's my, I have my primary residence there that is the primary thing that you are
4 doing on your property. Agriculture is not the principal land use of what you're doing. It
5 is something that is incidental or is an accessory use to that. I think I mentioned this
6 maybe last meeting but we have four accessory uses within the 2005 Land
7 Development Code, that's it; swimming pool, accessory dwelling unit, outdoor storage,
8 shipping containers, those are the four accessory uses. So everything else that can be
9 determined as being incidental or accessory to that primary use is considered an
10 accessory use. We spell out several more things within this new Code because they are
11 more highly specialized. Because of that those received greater identification but
12 because we know in Richland County agricultural uses are relatively ubiquitous, we
13 didn't need to feel the need to then specify it. I think that's something that we can do as
14 an accessory use within the Code to bring those out into more detail. But that's, I think
15 that's the key distinction there is just because you're, you're a farm, yes you are a farm,
16 there's, we're not saying you aren't, and that's where I think we've been using the
17 terminology, you know, thinking about pets or gardens and things of that nature
18 because in terms of zoning we, the farm is not a land use, its agriculture, but it's a
19 principal land use that, that would be that thing. So you got your, your residence on
20 there with your swimming pool in the back yard and you've got, you know, chickens, you
21 got goats, you got cows, you got whatever, okay yeah, you got a farm, that's fine. The
22 Code's not saying that you can't cause your principal land use is that of a residence.
23 Your principal land use at that point would not be an agricultural use. I mean, yes there

1 becomes a fine line where you're either 50/50 or your principal land use is that, but at
2 that point that's where you're gonna be a secondary thing.

3 MR. DENNIS: Yeah, I think I, I -

4 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so.

5 Mr. DENNIS: - I kinda agree with you on that cause I mean we'll just, I'm just
6 gonna use personal experience. So growing up, I grew up on a chicken farm. We had
7 the house, we lived in the house. However, you know, you got 300,000 chickens at one
8 time in three chicken houses, you also are growing back in the day tobacco cause it
9 was in Tobacco Row and, you know, that's, we had cows and pigs, like it was a working
10 farm. And we had, our principal use for me was the farm. That's what we were there for,
11 you know, the house was pretty much secondary even though that was the primary
12 residence, it was really secondary because it had been built on year after year. But
13 when you look at it in the other grand scheme of things getting down to these AG areas,
14 you know, I was like well how does that work here in Richland County. So then I went
15 on to the, I forgot the name of it but it was part of DHEC, I went over to DHEC and I
16 looked at how many chicken farms, swine farms we had and I think there was only four
17 chicken farms, two swine farms in all of Richland County. So I was, and when I say
18 farms that's a loosely used thing because I understand that you can have a primary and
19 secondary use but I think it comes down to the fact we got a, we, we gotta look at what
20 is really a, truly a farm and to me a farm would be AG, agricultural because that's what
21 you're doing.

22 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, and that's -

23 MR. DENNIS: You're doing some sort of agriculture.

1 MR. CROOKS: And that's, that was the intent behind the AG is that was
2 something that was lacking in our 2005 Code and for most of the, say most of the area
3 within the county that was something that okay, we need something that is more
4 specific to that versus is primarily a residential district which is what the RU is, where it
5 is specifically a working lands district. So where you can have, I'm gonna say more so
6 industrial uses that are appropriate in character to that area, which I think that's also
7 one of the things that, that I would, I would point out to the Commission as well is, you
8 know, the realm of uses that are related to that. You know, are you going to want, you
9 know, if we're mapping AG relatively broadly versus kind of being relative specific to
10 that, think about some of those uses because that is what that district is intended for.
11 You know, it's more for more so industrial farming but also some of those associated
12 uses that go along with that versus someone has 100 acres and they got a residence,
13 okay, yeah, cool. But that's, they could have that in any other district also.

14 MR. DENNIS: Right, cause one of the ways I looked at it I looked at Cottle Farms
15 that is a huge operation. McClendon Farms up in McBee, I mean, that's not part of us
16 but that's a huge operation compared to some of these farms that we have around here
17 that they're wanting to be called a farm and they're doing farming things, but we also,
18 they're not like that industrial farming. That's where I think AG is that industrial cause
19 when I look at a farm and I think industrial size farm I think of like five or six tractors
20 plowing fields versus me on my International 440 rolling out there and getting it done in
21 one day.

22 MR. CROOKS: Right.

23 MR. DENNIS: That's kinda how I look at it.

1 MR. CROOKS: Right. So, so I think just kind of going, going back to that so kind
2 of what the, the current definition within the, so the 2021 Land Development Code, so
3 for accessory use or structure; use or structure that is clearly incidental to and
4 customarily found in connection with a principal building or use is subordinate to and
5 directly serves the principal building or use and is subordinate in area extent and
6 propose to the principal building or principal use served. An accessory structure must
7 be on the lot on which the principal use is located. So again, going back to again, even
8 if we're focusing in on RU do we then want to, let's say spell out these accessory uses
9 more particularly, I mean, which we can, but I think that's also the thing is right now you
10 could be an R4 or R5, you know, same way with right now you could be an RMMD,
11 RMHD you could still technically be a farm in any of those districts. You know, cause
12 you can still have some of those things that coincide with that, cause I think that's one of
13 the things where I think it's just people aren't, they're not seeing the language and
14 maybe that's the issue, or I mean just, when we're telling them they just don't
15 necessarily trust or believe us when we say it which, you know, that could be part of it
16 as well. But that's why, you know, and every single time we've said it we're not taking
17 anyway anybody's ability to do that. They're gonna continue on being able to do that.
18 And I think to your point Mr. Dennis of we, I think we are very much comfortable with
19 including a definition for a farm on this. I think what we looked at language wise in terms
20 of what our recommendation could potentially be related to that would be including the
21 USEDA(?) definition but expanding on some of their other definitions related to that,
22 looking at I believe it was like subsistence farming, commercial farming and then, and

1 hobby farming is kind of those three, and elaborating on those a little bit more but those
2 still don't I think from our perspective need to be individual uses.

3 MR. DENNIS: No. I think those individual uses like that, that you're talking about
4 the hobby farms, I think that really fits into the HM area. It's a homestead. You're living
5 on it and doing stuff for yourself and you got a little side business going on in your farm.
6 When it gets to the AG that's where you're producing to say, hey Food Lion come get
7 my strawberries, we're mass producing them. Like let's get it, let's get that out there.
8 And I just I think there's just some areas, and you did hit it when you talked about AG, it
9 doesn't have to be one tract of 35 acres, it can be a few because there are instances
10 where people lease land. You know, somebody could own that and, but they're leasing
11 it to the guy that has his house next door to another 15 acres and they're leasing that to
12 run their farm business. I mean, there's, there's so much out there I still haven't figured
13 out the whole RU thing. I, I keep coming back to what do I consider a large farm, which
14 to me is something that should be agricultural. And then what do I consider a rural farm,
15 which should be the HM, a homestead. Kind of like back in the 1800's you know, you
16 got your little thing, homestead like Where the Red Fern Grows, that's a homestead to
17 me. You know, that's kind of how I see it but I just wanna make sure going forward
18 though that we allow, that we ensure that you can do on those areas that you can
19 continue to do. There are certain things that I don't think should be on there, like an HM
20 area, I don't think poultry and swine farms should be in there because being around that
21 in my life that takes a lot of land. That would definitely be an AG. To me that is
22 agricultural. But, and if I'm not mistaken in order to be called a swine farm you got to

1 have over 100 pigs according to DHEC. So if they got 99 that's just using, that's not,
2 that's not even a swine farm, they can just have pigs.

3 MR. CROOKS: Yeah.

4 MR. DENNIS: Because it's considered animals, you know.

5 MR. CROOKS: DHEC has certain requirements and restrictions related to poultry
6 and swine farms.

7 MR. DENNIS: And I think that's why I'm having a, I thought I could get through
8 this a lot quicker but in order to figure it out I'm having to go to DHEC and see how they
9 do things and what, and so that we ensure that people out there can continue to do
10 what they're doing. And then in future as we do progress and do we grow if they do
11 decide to sell and things like that, that they're not limited to that.

12 MR. CROOKS: Right. So I think this is where you're kind of going back a couple
13 of places. This is where I think from the get go we've been saying that RU, RU doesn't
14 have a real true replacement. You know, there's, there's four things that really the RU
15 can become. So if you're taking it on its face RT is probably the most true between the
16 four but it's still not a perfect match. I mean, it's more so 75% accurate but the other one
17 that next closest is probably 70% accurate. So, you know, R1 from a residential
18 standpoint gives you the same exact thing as RU does. RT gives you the same exact
19 thing use wise but much less density than what RU was. And then HM and AG, HM
20 gives you about the same land uses but it's, you know, significantly less dense than
21 what RU allows for. So rather three quarters of an acre it's three acres pretty much.
22 Same thing with AG, AG is something relatively entirely different. You know, it's still
23 closely related because it's meant to be a rural zoning district in terms of kind of the

1 applications, the way it was created, where it was ideated if you go back to the
2 assessment. If you look through the various drafts of the text, that's really where it's
3 meant to play out is your large working lands whether that's a tree farm, whether that's
4 a horse farm. So again, going back to this farm word but also, you know, where you're
5 doing, again more so from a commercial perspective. And then so the homestead kind
6 of came about as a in-between this RT and AG because, you know, there was kind of
7 this missing space as we were going about looking through this, applying the mapping,
8 looking at everything as well, you know, that's really kind of too far that way, that one's
9 kinda too far that way, so kind of meeting in the middle between the two, cause if you
10 look at the land uses between HM and RT they're relatively similar. The main difference
11 is going to be that allowed density. So it still gives you a zoning district that is not as
12 working lands oriented as the AG would be and it's still more so a - but still allows for a
13 broad variety of agricultural uses but it's still not as, not as low density or so - so I think
14 to your point of, you know, where you're saying there's not a good replacement, well I
15 would tend to agree because there's, there's not on its face one that wholly represents
16 what it is or what it could be, like say R5 is to RM, RMHD, or RMMD. So I think that's
17 where looking at the future land use map is really going to help provide a better idea of
18 how some of these things could play out, cause if you again, go back to the Code
19 assessment, go back to some of the drafts with the foot notes the end notes it's, okay
20 AG district is intended for working lands primarily found within the rural future land use
21 designations. Same way with some of the other drafts, the AG is really kind of intended
22 to apply the future land use designation, policy recommendations, found within the rural
23 large lot and rural small lot areas. So I think that's really gonna provide us with some of

1 the, the distinguishing factors for what area should become one of these things else
2 wise. Otherwise, I think we have to put a very tight lens on what potentially comes AG,
3 what potentially stays RT. And then I think making the decision of do we really then feel
4 the HM is necessary or not. And the same way with some of these where it was R1 and
5 just or RU and developed primarily as residential, as a residential subdivision, okay
6 that's, that's R1 cause it's the same level of density, same use that's allowed, just you
7 lose the primary uses of the agriculture standpoint.

8 MR. DENNIS: Do we have a way of figuring out what people are actually using
9 their land for?

10 MR. CROOKS: The best thing we have is the Assessor's Office information. So
11 those and/or business licenses. But I feel like business license may provide a bit of a
12 gap. It will help maybe fill in some information but otherwise, I mean, we could, those
13 would be the two best data sources that we could potentially have versus going back
14 through and looking and seeing if anybody's submitted any plans for any of those sites.
15 And even depending on what it is some of those may not, we may not have plans for.
16 So really the, the best that we're gonna have is gonna be the accessor's information,
17 second best is gonna be any business license information that we have.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah, the accessor's information might help with, even
19 locate the contiguous parcels that would add up to the 35 acres.

20 MR. CROOKS: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair?

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: I can wait if we need to. I was just saying that the
22 Assessor's Office might help use identify the contiguous parcels that add up to the 35
23 acres for the AG.

1 MR. CROOKS: It could. It could. So -

2 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: So this is where I wanna go. I wanna go to, like figuring
3 out the criteria so we can move ahead.

4 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, yeah.

5 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: And, you know, keep track of that.

6 MR. CROOKS: No, I think the, I think the assessor's information is gonna be, it's
7 gonna be the best resource for us to determine that, that level of specificity within, within
8 the sites. I mean, it's not; it's not gonna be perfect but it's gonna be the best that we
9 have and it's typically gonna have activity uses as well as potential structure uses. So
10 we can see whether that is, you know, a warehouse, or that's going to be a, you know, a
11 barn or just a residence or things like that.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah.

13 MR. CROOKS: So kind of gives a multi-layer look that we could potentially utilize.

14 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, so with - I'm just pitching that, we go off of the
15 taxation plus the business license records to figure out the contiguous 35 acre
16 minimums and those get labeled AG. We're probably not gonna upset anybody if we do
17 that, right? Cause it's probably going to be an actual agricultural use taking place and it
18 gets labeled AG. I mean, we can still mess with the density if we wanted to, but.

19 MR. CROOKS: I think, I mean, I think that's a fair starting point. I think you would
20 probably still wanna add some additional criteria to look at. so besides just having that
21 35 acre minimum, I think it would also be beneficial to look at, I'm gonna go back to the
22 future land use map, I think that's gonna be helpful in being a criteria to look at beyond
23 just land use or what the assessor has listed as the, the land or the taxable end, cause

1 again going back to, you know, if there's an area that - you can still have an agricultural
2 tax reduction, put it that way, and still be in an area that may not necessarily truly be
3 rural. So those are gonna be some of those things that are gonna have to be, I'm gonna
4 say pulled out in more detail if you will as a contributing or not contributing factor.

5 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah, I mean, right now that's not what the text calls
6 for, for eligibility anyway, right? It's got to be 35 acres contiguous with HM and AG.

7 MR. CROOKS: Yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay.

9 MR. CROOKS: Yeah.

10 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: So, I mean, what does the Commission think about
11 that? Trying to advance this conversation. If we had the Staff look at the taxation and
12 the business license records as to present uses that are agricultural in nature and to
13 whatever they can figure out, that's 35 acres or more that's contiguous with other, you
14 know, such uses. Let's label that AG as a start. What do y'all think about that?

15 MR. DENNIS: I mean, to me that's kind of the direction that I was looking to go in
16 my train of thought. I would like to hear everybody else what they think about it.

17 MR. YONKE: [Inaudible] data, use the data to move it in the right direction.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. Anybody opposed to asking Staff to do that with
19 the draft of the map? Okay. You got that Staff? Okay.

20 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair?

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Dennis?

22 MR. DENNIS: Real quick, we're going to do 35 consistent acres using the
23 Assessor's Office and business license, to try to figure out?

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes.

2 MR. DENNIS: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: So then after that, I mean, we're looking again at HM.
4 Mr. Crooks brought it up, do we need to eliminate all together and just let everything
5 below AG go towards RT or R1? Anybody have any thoughts on that? I think there's,
6 like five or six permitted uses in AG that are not there for HM. I think with the main one's
7 being poultry and pork, swine.

8 MR. DENNIS: It's poultry, swine and farm supply and machinery, sales and
9 service.

10 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. Anybody have any thoughts on eliminating HM or
11 should we just leave it and have that be the stuff that's less than 35 acres that also per
12 tax and business license records is a present agricultural use?

13 MR. DENNIS: I personally like the HM. It does give us that extra layer before we
14 get to RT because I mean, RT when you really look at it, HM it says low intensity
15 agricultural, agricultural support uses, that's what is there. And then when you get into
16 the RT it says low intensity residential development outside urban and suburban
17 settings. And it goes through, you know, it talks about very low intensity rural. So to me
18 that would be, you know, just a small piece of land, I'm growing potatoes in my back
19 yard just for me to eat, that would kind of be that transition versus HM where you might
20 have 15 acres that you're actually using it for something.

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: When I was putting some notes together, I had the idea
22 of HM going from under 35 acres down to 1.49 acres. I don't know, I can't remember if
23 that was just cause that's where kind of RT fell in there.

1 MR. CROOKS: That would be the minimum for RT. So HM would have to be
2 anything, it would have to be between three and one and a half would have to be HM, or
3 excuse me, would be RT at that point. HM wouldn't be able to go below three.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Not below three?

5 MR. CROOKS: So, yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: So how about we use the same criteria to identify the
7 parcels as we talked about for AG and it's anything that's under 35 acres, not
8 contiguous, all the way down to three acres that's currently zoned rural. We could look
9 at that as being HM. I mean, we can mess with the densities later, I'm just -

10 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, I would say that's a proper threshold if that's how you're
11 trying to go about it.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Any, okay, any thoughts or, you know, objections to that
13 from the Commission?

14 MR. DENNIS: I would like to see it go from three acres down to two. I think. I just
15 kinda, looking at it I mean, I looked at a lotta specific parcels out in the rural area and
16 that's kinda how I came to that conclusion.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: That would overlap with current -

18 MR. DENNIS: Current.

19 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: - RT.

20 MR. DENNIS: Yeah, like I said -

21 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, the minimum of RT is one and a half. So one unit every
22 one and a half acres. So that would be the minimum that you would have to have for at

1 least one unit, would be one and a half. So anything that would be - for it to be a
2 conforming lot under HM you'd have to have at least three acres for one unit.

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah.

4 MR. CROOKS: For it to be a conforming lot in RT you'd have to have at least one
5 and a half or greater for one unit. For AG you'd have to have technically 6.67 for it to be
6 a conforming lot for one unit.

7 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: What if we just start there with basic steps.

8 MR. DENNIS: Basic steps. We'll just take the baby steps first.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah, yeah. Alright.

10 MR. DENNIS: I mean, I've just been, I've been working on it so long, I'm just
11 ready to jump before I look.

12 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, my recommendation in that case would be use the, use
13 the minimum as the, the threshold points and then, then go from there.

14 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah.

15 MR. DENNIS: So we're doing 35 acres to three acres.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Three. Alright.

17 MR. DENNIS: Based off assessors and business.

18 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Grady?

19 MR. GRADY: I do want to circle back to say that, that Mr. Crooks brought up
20 which is the future land use map. I feel like that does need to be an integral part of this
21 calculation in some way. I don't think we should be designating something, particularly
22 agricultural, if the future land use map indicates that it's going to be a [inaudible] land
23 use. [Inaudible] at that map in some capacity for it to reflect [inaudible]. I'd be interested

1 in Mr. Crooks or anybody else if you could elaborate on what you think the interplay is
2 there, maybe how, your recommendation on how we should take the future land use
3 map into consideration when we're talking about this, cause I don't think we should just
4 do a blanket maneuver where we recommend everything over a certain number of
5 acreage just all get zoned a certain way without, without taking that into account.

6 MR. CROOKS: So I would recommend that you use the future land use map with
7 those thresholds. So within this designation, so in this case the, the threshold that we
8 just talked about, in the rural large lot future land use designation or the conservation
9 future land use designation, so those two, let's just go ahead and combine those for, for
10 sake of clarity here. I think that would be an appropriate one where you then say okay
11 anything that's 35 or above, AG. I think for this, in terms of this exercise that makes
12 sense because the way that those designations are set up, AG would for the most part
13 be an appropriate district in many instances, particularly to the, the rural large lot. Same
14 way with, so then we go to the rural small lot okay, maybe rather than 35 acres we
15 bump all of those thresholds up to where rather than doing the minimum we do
16 something slightly above the minimum. So rather than saying 35 acres maybe at that
17 point we double it and say 70 for AG. And then maybe everything that's 35 to, you
18 know, whatever that previous threshold was three, okay, or 75 to 35 that's HM and then
19 35 to one and a half at that point, that's RT. And then same way with, say neighborhood
20 low density, okay kind of triple that number from the starting baseline where you have
21 neighborhood low density okay, anything that is 140 acres let's just go ahead and take it
22 up to make it a little more even number now 150 acres or greater that becomes AG.
23 Anything that's 150 to 70, HM. Anything that's 70 to 35, RT, 35 to three quarters of an

1 acre, R1. And then kind of using that so that way you're still using the, the guidelines
2 and recommendations of the future land use map modifying those thresholds for each
3 one of those designations what that policy recommendation is but still has a similar
4 process that you're using for that zone. Am I making sense?

5 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: No, I think I would ask that we incorporate that as
6 maybe like a next level criteria, cause I mean, I'm certainly not saying this is like a final
7 proposal, this is just moving us one step at a time in a direction that I hope is
8 constructive and that we can build on.

9 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so I guess that, that would be my recommendation
10 specifically but if, you know, that's not how the Commission wants to go at that point I
11 think you do, I think Mr. Grady was alluding to it as I mentioned earlier, you do need to
12 consider the future land use map within that, within those thresholds in some way.
13 Whether that's gonna be a next iteration of building upon those thresholds and see what
14 modifications need to be made, but I think there does need to be some type of inclusion
15 for that future land use map as you're looking at the RU. Just because again, how
16 broadly it exists it's going to be across pretty much every single different designation.
17 Yeah, I'm pretty sure all of them, so there's RU in every single one of the different
18 designations. So that should be considered in some type of way no matter what, so.

19 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. Well I did wanna note for the Record Mr. Taylor
20 had to depart the meeting. And it is 7:00 so I just want to check in with the Commission
21 to see if we want to continue or if we wanna postpone further discussion until our next,
22 you know, work session or regular meeting? Can I get some input from the
23 Commission?

1 MR. DENNIS: Well, I mean, here's, here's my problem, I'm ex-military so I like to
2 go forever. So I'm just whatever the will of Commission is that's the will of the
3 Commission, but I will sit here to midnight, 1am if needed as long as somebody has
4 coffee.

5 MR. YONKE: I have thoughts.

6 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Mr. Yonke?

7 MR. YONKE: We have Mr. Crooks here, is this your last time with us, right? And
8 you've been very helpful, you've been very helpful. So as much as we can pick your
9 brain.

10 MR. CROOKS: Mr. DeLage, I mean, Mr. DeLage knows more than I do, so, I'm
11 not trying to pawn it off on you, Tommy, but, you know.

12 MR. YONKE: Before we lose this resource, anything else we need to ask him?

13 MR. DENNIS: I got his cellphone.

14 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: He's not gonna answer anymore. He'll be off the pay
15 roll. Mr. Carlisle?

16 MR. CARLISLE: No.

17 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. Alright well I know we wanted to touch on
18 manufactured homes, if there's no motion to adjourn?

19 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes.

21 MR. CROOKS: Just really quick, would it be helpful if we sent the Commission
22 the, I'd say the thresholds that we use initially with, with our iteration process, I think
23 would that be -

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Sure, yes.

2 MR. CROOKS: - helpful for some of you.

3 MR. DENNIS: Please.

4 MR. CROOKS: Okay, those have changed since as we went through the process
5 but I think we've got them from when we originally started. So we can share those with,
6 with the Commission for additional discussion or as y'all kind of look at this in a little bit
7 more detail if that helps.

8 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay. So yeah, if we want to pivot for a minute to
9 manufactured homes.

10 MR. DENNIS: I don't want to pivot right yet. I got one question.

11 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Go ahead, Mr. Dennis.

12 MR. DENNIS: Yeah, so when we're looking at AG, HM, RT, R1, R2, R3, I mean,
13 you go all the way up to LI and then you go CC1, CC2, CC3, and we talking about a
14 community garden. What would be the reasons why we would have an AG, HM and RT
15 a community garden as a permitted by right. I mean, to me that should just be -

16 MR. CROOKS: Are you asking why do we have it by special requirements versus
17 just permitted? Let's go look at the standards?

18 MR. DENNIS: I mean I pulled it up and I just -

19 MR. CROOKS: I think it's, I think it's also in part to the definition of that use as
20 well. But I think just looking at just some of those standards and if it's gonna be a
21 principal use it's, it's, you're kinda looking at something that's going to be a little bit, I'm
22 gonna say not as normal if you will, but the definition is kind of specific where it's, it's
23 really, I'm just gonna say it's different from most -

1 MR. DENNIS: Yeah.

2 MR. CROOKS: - from most normal uses. I don't have a good word to detail it but.

3 MR. DENNIS: Well, the reason why I asked is when I look at a lot of this stuff and
4 a lot of the issues in the community, when people talk to me that are out in the rural
5 area, and they do live on the land but yet they do things like this, I'm wondering why we
6 gotta have an SR, but I'm also sitting there wondering why do we have it, why don't we
7 have it in the accessory table instead of a primary use table, cause we know most of
8 these areas are, you know, primarily their residence. So could we add some of this stuff
9 to this accessory table? I mean is that doable?

10 MR. DELAGE: I think you could. But also as a community garden you, you can
11 have instances and they are such instances around the county of it being on their own
12 parcel, not as a part of necessarily a formal residential subdivision. So there's one
13 actually, it's in the city but it's off of, you're going up Gervais, cross over Millwood, is
14 that North Millwood, and then up on the left there is one. That's an example of one
15 really close. But there's one in Olympia that's on its own parcel. Of course, Olympia
16 there's not, they don't have a HOA or a POA like a traditional subdivision would, so. I
17 think that was the reason for them trying to call it out is for those instances where
18 maybe a group of property owners just wanted to get together and then basically
19 establish a principal use as a community garden.

20 MR. DENNIS: Yeah, I, I was just, I mean, I see in those instances and where
21 they're at but I was just kinda curious about the AG, HM and RT area. I mean, to me
22 that's just, that's primarily what they're doing anyway. And if they wanted to let people
23 come in there and have a little garden on their land and they had a business license,

1 like I mean, I mean it kind of fits into the community garden thing. I mean I pulled up the
2 thing cause I didn't want to say something until I reread the definition. So I mean, I just
3 it's just food, food for my thought for future stuff, thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. Again, if we just, if we wanna talk about
5 manufactured homes now or we can do it at a future meeting. We had on a tentative
6 schedule that we would conduct a special call meeting at 5:30 on Monday, June 20th
7 [inaudible] on that date and time or whether we need to have that meeting?

8 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chair, I just, that was the meeting that I would not be at.

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, thank you Mr. Dennis.

10 MR. DENNIS: That's my anniversary. If I come here instead of there, I will not
11 make any more meetings after that because I will be six feet under.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright. Alright well, manufactured homes here we are.
13 So we've got mobile home, manufactured home parks are currently allowed in HM, RT
14 and R5. Does that sound right, Mr. Crooks?

15 MR. CROOKS: Yes. Sorry, yes, I was trying to show them all there.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, and I noted that the setbacks, the density and the
17 mobile home minimum park sizes are all the same in the prior Code as they are in the
18 2021 Code. Does that sound right?

19 MR. CROOKS: I believe so. Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay.

21 MR. CROOKS: If not the same, very similar.

22 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah. Okay, and then individual manufactured homes,
23 yeah currently AG, HM, RT, R1, R2.

1 MR. CROOKS: Yes, so basically the, the “rural replacements” and R2.

2 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, so that’s why R1 is there cause it’s -

3 MR. CROOKS: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: - you guys interpret it as rural replacement and then
5 where does R2 come in?

6 MR. CROOKS: I think R2 is just kind of keeping in with having another one that is
7 a more moderate intensity district. So not quite going up to the level of R3 in intensity
8 but still being allowed in a typical residential district, cause where previously HM, or
9 excuse me, MH the manufactured home district in the 2005 Code it has, I think it’s
10 7,260 square foot minimum lot size or so. So that would be more closely aligned with
11 the R3 lot size equivalent but as part of the process as we’re going through this we did
12 receive a lot of feedback related to, say including it in R4 or R3 those districts. And so I
13 think as part of that it was then, okay we kinda need to include it somewhere besides
14 just the rural areas. And then R2 was I think the more appropriate choice out of those in
15 that situation, so.

16 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah, without R2 you would potentially be either an
17 individual manufactured home in a maybe more rural area or in a mobile home park,
18 manufactured home park. Which could be R5.

19 MR. CROOKS: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Okay, got it. Anybody else want to discuss
21 manufactured homes? Okay.

22 MR. YONKE: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yes, Mr. Yonke?

1 MR. YONKE: R2, that covers a lot of our single-family housing neighborhoods.

2 MR. CROOKS: Correct.

3 MR. YONKE: [Inaudible]

4 MR. CROOKS: I think, I think RSLD, so if you equate that with R2 so just looking
5 at it from a translation standpoint it, RSLD is probably one of our more heavily mapped
6 districts from a residential standpoint. So even in terms of acreage not just from parcels
7 it's, I think it was like three and a half percent of the county which again relative terms to
8 other districts is one of the higher percentage ones. So I think without up zoning any of
9 the other districts, so also assuming that, you know, two, three and four family dwelling
10 units were to be removed from R2, you know, then - sorry I lost, I lost where I was going
11 with that. Mr. Yonke, could you repeat that question? Sorry, I just blanked.

12 MR. YONKE: It's okay, it's a long meeting I understand. R2 that's where a lot of
13 our single-family housing and roads are.

14 MR. CROOKS: Yes.

15 MR. YONKE: My neighborhood is like that in southeast Columbia and it almost
16 feels like the Wild West as you're driving through, you don't really know what's, where's
17 the manufactured homes or brick homes.

18 MR. CROOKS: Yes, yeah, so, so RSLD.

19 MR. YONKE: It feels like there is no zoning.

20 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, gotcha, gotcha.

21 MR. YONKE: I'm talking about Leesburg Road and Garners Ferry, in-between
22 there.

1 MR. CROOKS: Yeah, so RSLD if it, if it goes to, you know, straight translation to
2 R2, you know, I think that's going to be roughly three and a half percent as its mapped.
3 So you're looking at, you know, a large percentage of, say established neighborhoods if
4 you will potentially allowing for those manufactured home districts at that point. And I
5 think that's the concern that we've been hearing from the public. You know, I think
6 there's several people that brought it up today and that's been I think one of the things
7 that once everybody started looking past two, three and four family dwelling units and
8 then they saw oh, that, that use as well. So I think, you know, if this was to be removed
9 from this district I think we need to then look at where else could we potentially include
10 that? Whether that is going to be one of the more intense districts also, cause I think it,
11 it becomes then problematic if you're only including them in the rural areas and "rural
12 areas" based on typically how those other zoning districts would typically play out,
13 cause then I think you're just kind of pushing them out to an area and from an
14 affordability standpoint I do believe manufactured homes do provide a good way of
15 being able to afford a home while still owning your lot as well. And a lot of cases I think
16 that's typically what we generally see with those here in the county versus just, you
17 know, someone's renting them renting their plot if you will in a manufactured home park
18 or the like. So I think it is a good option that exists, especially for an unincorporated
19 area, to have that in a variety of ways. So I think if we were to take it out of R2 I do think
20 we should probably look at where else it could be allowed even with the same, same
21 restrictions as we do or other restrictions if it was to be kept where it is or even
22 expanded into other districts. So I think that's just kind of my twenty-five cents on that.

23 MR. DENNIS: Chair?

1 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Oh, yeah, Mr. Dennis?

2 MR. DENNIS: So on our old Code we did not allow manufactured homes under
3 RSLD, correct?

4 MR. CROOKS: Correct.

5 MR. DENNIS: But we did allow them by SR for RU, RR, RSE and in the M1 area.
6 Or what I'm looking at right here so -

7 MR. CROOKS: Mr. Price is shaking his head, so.

8 MR. PRICE: Yes.

9 MR. DENNIS: Okay, so if we looked at it from a standpoint of kinda the way
10 people were asking today and talking about it, basically it would, they would be
11 permitted in AG, HM, RT and R1 if we kept it the same, correct?

12 MR. CROOKS: If you kept it all the translation districts with the exception of MH
13 then, then yes. With the exception of R2 because again RSE I think as we kind of
14 discussed last time RSE is more true to R2 then it is to R1. So from that standpoint it
15 would still be considered an equivalent versus R2, or R1 rather. So, so R2 is a relative
16 translation of RSE and RSLD. So that could also in part be why because it was being
17 treated as a replacement for RSE throughout most of the drafting process and as part of
18 the assessment.

19 MR. DENNIS: So it, so R2 was kinda like a conglomerate of RSE and LD?

20 MR. CROOKS: Yes, in part because also the original recommendation was to
21 move RSLD and it gets combined with RSMD. So those would have both effectively
22 become R3 at that point, but because of some of the other changes as the draft went

1 along, we were kind of seeing still having the need for a separation between those two.
2 And so RSLD kind of then goes R2 versus goes into R3, if that makes sense.

3 MR. DENNIS: Okay. And we got the manufactured home parks and I found a few
4 of them in the GIS, like where they're at. I just, I, when I look at everything, like the
5 problem with manufactured homes is, is they are perfect affordable housing. They are. If
6 you look at it from the grand scheme of things, if you get a piece of land they are a
7 cheaper option then building a home on it by a lot. And that's kind of where I'm
8 struggling with it. I just, I can't see where to put them because I mean you - I don't know
9 where to go with them, I really don't. I mean, I almost just want to say hey, let's just do
10 what we did with the one, let's just rotate it straight into the new one and leave it at that.
11 But I mean, the way the housing crunch is and people in future, I mean, it's a good way.
12 And I just, I don't know, I mean, that's me looking at it and I have to look at it the way I
13 see it, the way the text intends it, and the way the people want it, I gotta find a way to
14 come together with it all. I can't make everybody happy but I can, if I can, if I can make
15 most of them that would be great. But as far as the mobile home parks, like how do
16 those fit in, how could we utilize those and let's say R4, R5 and R6? I mean, is that
17 doable, because I mean the density, if I remember from the others were there. So I
18 mean it would have to be a park, it couldn't just be a single mobile home, it would have
19 to be the park.

20 MR. CROOKS: I didn't necessarily follow that, Mr. Dennis.

21 MR. DENNIS: So instead of a single mobile home in the R4, R5 and R6, if I did
22 the math correct, you'd have to have a few of them. So that's where you could put the
23 mobile home parks in R4, R5 and R6, if my math was correct.

1 MR. CROOKS: So manufactured home park, the standard caps the density at six
2 dwelling units per acre so even though it's allowed in R5, it basically cuts that density
3 that would be allowed for a normal incidence in a half.

4 MR. DENNIS: They couldn't be used in R5?

5 MR. CROOKS: I may not be understanding the question, but yeah you could
6 create a manufactured home park in R5 just capped at six dwelling units per acre,
7 having a minimum site of five. So, you know, just from that standpoint you'd be allowed
8 30, 30 plots per site, if you will, under R5. And that would be kind of be the maximum
9 that you could get it. I think it'd be a little bit different for AG or HM and RT.

10 MR. DENNIS: So it is doable but there's no way to do it for R6?

11 MR. DELAGE: Essentially though you could. I mean, at the end of the day you
12 could identify it as a use, either by special requirement or permitted outright. And I
13 mean, I think it would work from a numbers standpoint. It just, you wouldn't ever be able
14 to go get the true R6 density because the special requirements for that manufactured
15 park, home park put it at six units per acre.

16 MR. DENNIS: So we wouldn't be able to get the true, but I mean, we can make a
17 special requirement.

18 MR. DELAGE: Yeah, yeah, and you could potentially make it, you know, where in
19 the R6 district you could add a requirement that in the R6 district you could increase the
20 density to eight or 10 or 11 or whatever number that y'all decide is most appropriate.

21 MR. DENNIS: What you're telling me with the special requirement I can pretty
22 much do anything I want to do as long as I figure out the special requirement.

23 MR. DELAGE: That's correct.

1 [Inaudible]

2 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Thanks everybody.

3 MR. PRICE: And that also applies to special exceptions, too.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Also applies to special exceptions, too.

5 MR. PRICE: As far as you just need to meet the requirements, I mean, basically I
6 mean you've been on the Board so.

7 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah.

8 MR. PRICE: You know, I only bring that up because I know notice that we have a
9 number of uses that are allowed by special exception which, you know, we could go
10 through this later on and look at it, but I don't believe that they need to be special
11 exceptions when this special requirements will, you know, work for it.

12 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah, they'll suffice. Okay. Alright well, if there's nothing
13 else right now I did wanna kind of move towards adjournment. Any, I would like to, you
14 know, just confirm that we want to direct Staff to work on the map as to those RU
15 districts based on the criteria we discussed with the acreage 35 and three and then how
16 they're taxed with the business license to help us determine present uses, and to add
17 the street names to the draft map. Any objection that? Okay, thank you. If you would do
18 that, we'd appreciate it. Staff, thank you again, Mr. Crooks in particular. Anything else
19 from Staff before we entertain a motion to adjourn?

20 MR. PRICE: This kinda goes back to I guess the regular scheduled Planning
21 Commission meeting. How are we looking to treat future motions for amendments and
22 was that, you know, for the other, I guess for the Planning Commission Members. Is

1 there something they should just submit to Staff directly and then we'll add that to the
2 Agenda?

3 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: I think it's worth a shot. Just going that route. Again, it
4 gives us something, like very clearly that we can review in advance of the meeting that
5 will help direct our discussions. Just kind of do like we did today as far as call for a
6 second on the motion during the meeting? Yeah. I mean, if it gets out of control maybe
7 we'll change our thoughts on that?

8 MR. DENNIS: Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Mr. Dennis?

10 MR. DENNIS: Thoughts on that, I think it would be great. We just, I think you as
11 the Chair should reach out to everybody and let them know if they do have a motion to
12 submit it and we just need to make sure that it's submitted to Staff way in advance?

13 MR. PRICE: I mean, if you would like we can send something out to each of
14 Members, Planning Commission Members prior to us actually putting the Agenda
15 together so that we'll have it in time to incorporate it.

16 MR. DENNIS: Cause I'd like to see it come to Staff, you know, a few days before
17 y'all really start putting it together, just in case there's an issue where we, the person
18 making it could alter and it and get it done correctly so you guys aren't having to go
19 back and redo it later.

20 MR. PRICE: Understand.

21 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Yeah. That sounds good. And I'll probably just send an
22 email and we'll check availability regarding a special called meeting June 20th at 5:30.
23 And if there's nothing further, the Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn?

1 [Inaudible]

2 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, moved. Second?

3 MR. DENNIS: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Seconded. Alright. All in favor raise your hand?

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

7 CHAIRMAN BRANHAM: Alright, unanimous. Thank you, we're adjourned.

8 *[Meeting adjourned]*