

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

February 5, 2007

1
2
3
4
5 *[Members Present: Julius Murray, Chris Anderson, Marcia Lucius, Wes Furgess, Pat*
6 *Palmer, Gene Green, and Deas Manning; Absent: McBride and Van Dine]*

7
8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Let me read this so we can have it in the minutes. "In
9 accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of this agenda was sent to
10 radio, TV stations, newspapers, persons who request notification and posted on the
11 bulletin board located in the lobby of the Administration Building." So everything has
12 been here, been placed in the proper places. We would like for all electronic devices
13 cut off, cell phone, beepers. We need those items cut off, please. When you are called
14 to the podium to speak, we allow you two minutes. Also give your name and address
15 where you live if you've signed this to come and speak at the time. Please remember to
16 give your name and address so we can have that recorded. At this time we will start
17 with the meeting. The minutes for last month – we need a motion.

18 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I move that we move to approve the minutes
19 from the January meeting.

20 MR. ANDERSON: I'll second.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

22 *[Approved: Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Murray, Manning]*

23 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Anna, is there anything with the agenda that needs to
24 be changed?

25 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have two deferrals, one being 07-07
26 MA. The applicant has submitted a request for a deferral. And Case No. 05-36.

27 MR. MANNING: Which was already –

1 MS. LUCIUS: Yes. It's already marked deferred.

2 MR. GREEN: Do we need a motion?

3 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

4 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we deferred item 07-07 MA and
5 05-36 MA until the next Planning Commission meeting.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: And that is March.

7 MR. GREEN: Until the March Planning Commission meeting.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We need a second on that.

9 MR. MANNING: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the second. All those in favor by saying –
11 raising your hand. Those opposed? Okay.

12 *[Approved: Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Murray, Manning]*

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. First on the agenda is 07-02 MA.

14 **CASE NO. 07-02 MA:**

15 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, this application is approximately 3.63 acres. The
16 existing zoning is RU. They're requesting for proposed zoning of RC, Rural
17 Commercial. Currently the site is located on Broad River Road with approximately 275
18 linear feet of frontage. According to our county records there have not been, there has
19 not been a request for rezoning. And Staff recommendation is for denial.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions to Anna?

21 MR. GREEN: Anna, would you just review Staff's thinking on it for us?

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Well Staff felt that due to the proximity to existing and proposed
23 residential uses this proposed use would not really – as you can see from the slide –

1 would not be appropriate at this time for that zoning change. And as you can see from
2 Staff Report on page three the Rural Commercial District does provide for a range of
3 different allowable uses.

4 MR. PALMER: Approximately how large are those tracts of M-1 across the
5 street?

6 MS. ALMEIDA: Well we have Wescott, which is shown on the upper left-hand,
7 northwest side of the slide that was approved; that was about 102 acres. That was the
8 most recent that we have had – activity in the area.

9 MR. PALMER: But the M-1 across the street; how much – I mean this looks like
10 a pretty large tracts of M-1.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, they do. I don't have an idea of how large those tracts are
12 but I would venture to guess they're probably about 50 plus acres a piece. And the
13 closest commercial use we approximated at about a 1,000 linear feet from this site.

14 MS. LUCIUS: Is that Rubino's? How far down Broad River is that Rubino's
15 restaurant?

16 MS. ALMEIDA: I'm not quite sure.

17 MS. LUCIUS: Because I remember – are we going to have any people talking on
18 this?

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We got one.

20 MS. LUCIUS: I can wait and ask. I can wait and ask my question.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We got one person.

22 MS. LUCIUS: All right. I'll just wait.

23 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other person need to say anything? Go ahead.

1 MR. MANNING: Anna, this intended use is for a warehouse?

2 MS. ALMEIDA: Well we really don't know what it's intended for.

3 MR. MANNING: I couldn't tell from the –

4 MS. ALMEIDA: They're just asking –

5 MR. MANNING: - conclusion whether that was the intention or not.

6 MS. ALMEIDA: That is one of the permitted uses, yes, in the RC District. And
7 we felt it wasn't near a node and it was adjacent to an existing residential subdivision.

8 MR. PALMER: Are we trying to keep Rural Commercial near nodes as well?

9 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

10 MS. LUCIUS: Um-hum (affirmative).

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We have one person that signed up to speak and it's J.
12 Whitechurch?

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Whitehead?

14 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Yes.

15 **TESTIMONY OF JOHN WHITEHEAD:**

16 MR. WHITEHEAD: Jonathan Whitehead, 144 Windjammer Drive, Leesville,
17 South Carolina 29070. I'm here representing Mr. Weaver for the application. Our
18 intended use here is to – there's an existing one-story house on this site – our intention
19 here is to make that into a construction office and put in an enclosed fenced storage
20 area in the back. When I met – at the pre-application meeting we originally wanted to
21 go M-1 but during the pre-application meeting, speaking with Jennie that M-1 was no
22 longer a earmark I guess for rezoning and she recommended us going residential – I
23 mean, Rural Commercial. And I've looked over all the I guess the guidelines as far as

1 the setbacks and everything – the outside storage and we're able – we're willing to meet
2 the setbacks for that. And that's the only intention. There's no intention of bulldozing
3 the house and putting up offices or warehouses or anything like that. The whole intent
4 of the application is to use the house as a commercial establishment.

5 MR. MANNING: Mr. Whitehead – did you have a question you wanted to ask?

6 MS. LUCIUS: Not of the applicant.

7 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Yes.

9 MR. MANNING: Mr. Whitehead, you do intend to have some outdoor storage?

10 MR. WHITEHEAD: Yes, sir.

11 MR. MANNING: And how much of the site would be allowed for that?

12 MR. WHITEHEAD: The back portion of it, behind the house. Probably, probably
13 about two-thirds of it.

14 MR. MANNING: As a part of that do you intend on buffering that –

15 MR. WHITEHEAD: Yes, sir.

16 MR. MANNING: - from the neighborhood?

17 MR. WHITEHEAD: Yes, sir. I think there is a – based on like a special exception
18 for the RC, I think there's I think a 25' buffer that you could start your fence on the
19 adjacent property lines.

20 MR. MANNING: There'd be a fence of – a solid fence or would it be
21 landscaping?

22 MR. WHITEHEAD: It would be a solid fence with landscaping, whatever we had
23 to do to meet those requirements.

1 MR. MANNING: And this would be for storage of what?

2 MR. WHITEHEAD: Boats, bricks, whatever. I mean nothing hazardous or
3 anything like that.

4 MR. MANNING: Thank you.

5 MR. GREEN: Just out of curiosity, for Staff. Just a quick check of the RC
6 category. I don't see any category that allows outside storage in an RC District or am I
7 looking at the wrong – construction with outside storage. I don't see any of them that's
8 a permitted use.

9 MS. ALMEIDA: I don't either. I don't either.

10 MR. WHITEHEAD: I think it had to fall under a special exception. According to –
11 I mean this is what - according to Jennie in the pre-application meeting.

12 MS. ALMEIDA: Oh, a special exception would then have to go to –

13 MR. GREEN: I don't even see outside – construction company with outside
14 storage, I don't even see listed as a special exception.

15 MS. ALMEIDA: I don't either. And keep in mind Staff, when they meet at the
16 pre-app with the applicant, make recommendations and offer choices. We do not steer
17 anyone in any one direction. But I don't see it either.

18 MR. WHITEHEAD: Just one quick question. Is the M-1 totally out with the M-1
19 being across the street?

20 MS. ALMEIDA: M-1 is no longer an option for –

21 MR. WHITEHEAD: Okay.

22 MS. ALMEIDA: - a zoning designation. You'd have to go LI or HI.

23 MR. WHITEHEAD: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions? Thank you, sir.

2 MR. WHITEHEAD: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay Staff. We need to bring it to a vote. How you
4 gonna vote on this?

5 MS. LUCIUS: Well according to what I'm hearing the zoning he's asking for is
6 not what he needs --

7 MR. GREEN: Right.

8 MS. LUCIUS: - for outside storage.

9 MS. ALMEIDA: You know, we have applicants that come in and want a
10 rezoning. I'm really not sure what transpired but we have to go with what the
11 application and what the applicant requests.

12 MS. LUCIUS: I'm not sure how to proceed now.

13 MR. GREEN: It would strike me that, first of all I would -- this property backs up
14 onto seven houses or seven residential lots -- and it strikes me that the applicant's
15 intended use with outside storage isn't permitted either as a special requirement or as a
16 special exception. I certainly don't mean to suggest to anybody they withdraw their
17 application but -- or defer it but.

18 MR. PALMER: Well I think this is the reason -- one of the reasons why
19 personally I don't look at uses for rezonings. A prime example of why we just need to
20 take a look at this case simply based on do we think that the neighborhood or
21 residential, Rural Commercial is a applicable zoning for this tract of land. Because
22 you've got to look at Rural Commercial and what's allowed there and do you think that's
23 appropriate for this site.

1 MS. LUCIUS: The reason I asked how far down the road Rubino's was because
2 I remember and I went back and read my minutes and we specifically said we did not
3 want to bring any sort of commercial any further up Broad River Road than Rubino's.
4 And even Mr. Dunbar agreed with me on that which was highly unusual. So for that
5 reason I would be opposed to the Rural Commercial to begin with; any commercial
6 whether it's rural or whatever. We made that very plain when we made that zoning
7 change.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Anna, with this case does the applicant need to come
9 back to you on this before we take a – I mean –

10 MS. ALMEIDA: No, sir.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: - a vote?

12 MS. ALMEIDA: It would be up to the applicant whether they would want to defer
13 or withdraw prior to zoning public hearing and depending on your recommendation.

14 MR. PALMER: Or they could defer or withdraw. They could make that request
15 now.

16 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

17 MR. PALMER: The applicant – with you representing the applicant – could ask
18 for a deferral until next month's meeting or withdraw from the application at this time if
19 you would so wish to. That's just an option for you.

20 MR. WHITEHEAD: Okay. I'll request for a defer until the – and hopefully we can
21 get everything squared away.

22 MR. PALMER: I make a motion to defer the case until next month's meeting.

23 MS. LUCIUS: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Second. How do you vote? Raise your hand.

2 *[Approved: Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Murray, Manning]*

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: What we do is recommend. We're a recommending
4 body. So we recommend this to County Council and – okay. It'll come back to us then
5 we take vote on it.

6 MR. WHITEHEAD: Okay. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Next March meeting. What date is that in March?

8 MS. ALMEIDA: I believe the fifth.

9 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: March 5th? Okay.

10 MR. PALMER: Mr. Whitehead, I'd make a recommendation that you get in touch
11 with Staff and tell them exactly what you want to do on the site and find that in the – in
12 our code of ordinances where it's allowed and proceed forward from there.

13 MR. WHITEHEAD: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Next on the docket is 07-04 MA.

15 **CASE NO. 07-04 MA:**

16 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, this site is located on Farming Creek Road. It is
17 approximately 3.22 acres. The existing zoning is OI. The applicant is requesting to be
18 rezoned to an LI District. The applicant – the site pretty much has approximately 51
19 linear feet of frontage on Farming Creek Road. Surrounding the area are farms. There
20 is some commercial up near the intersection of Broad River Road and Farming Creek
21 Road. There was, in 2003, a request for a map amendment by the Planning
22 Commission to rezone this property from OI to GC and the applicant withdrew that
23 request at that time. And just for reference, on the corner of Broad River and Farming

1 Creek Road there is an existing boat business and that is approximately 800 linear feet
2 from the corner. And Staff's recommendation is for denial.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions?

4 MR. MANNING: Anna, as far as outside storage, this is a permitted use in LI;
5 correct?

6 MS. ALMEIDA: That is correct.

7 MR. MANNING: You had a comment in the conclusion that this district contains
8 an environmental clause and I wasn't clear what you meant by that. It's in the last
9 paragraph of your conclusion.

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Is that found on page nine?

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: On page nine.

12 MR. MANNING: On page nine

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Oh, okay. What that's discussing is the comprehensive plan
14 does talk about in one of its objectives, you know, if you have environmentally sensitive
15 lands that, the use – going to a use like this should be prohibited. So that's the
16 environmental clause that I was talking about.

17 MR. MANNING: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions? We have some names for this.
19 First will be Stan Mack.

20 **TESTIMONY OF STAN MACK:**

21 MR. MACK: My name is Stan Mack. I work with ReMax Real Estate Services.
22 I'm representing Ideal Construction Company who has purchased this property. I have
23 some background with it. I sold it to two previous owners; the first one in 2001. When

1 they bought it it was zoned rural and they had it rezoned to C-1 for their intended use.
2 And before they ever developed it they changed positions and the company has moved
3 out of town. Then I had it under contract in 2003 and that's when we applied for C-3
4 because a gentleman was going to buy it and develop it into an office park. And before
5 we came to zoning he bought 24 acres on Broad River Road so that's why we withdrew
6 it at that time. I have since sold it to Ideal Construction Company and the property is
7 still all zoned C-1, the entire nine acres. They only want to change the back three and a
8 half acres because their use is they're going to build a 10,000 square foot warehouse
9 because they're in the construction business and they're now located – as a matter of
10 fact next to the property you had on the board awhile ago up at the Peak exit on 76.
11 And they will be selling that property eventually and relocating to Farming Creek Road.
12 And the reason we have had to apply for LI, and I've spoken with a couple of the
13 Planning Commission Members over the past couple of months; I withdrew it last
14 month, is because of the outside storage. They do have some sewer pipe, water pipe,
15 block, brick and that sort of thing that they do keep on their yard. Now they're putting
16 this on the back of the property for several reasons. The front is going to stay zoned C-
17 1 and they're probably going to, some time in the future, cut it up into three or four one-
18 acre lots and it'll still be restricted for the C-1 use. They'll end up selling it to a couple of
19 doctors, accountants, or whatever that allows C-1 construction. The way the property
20 lays now, where they're going to put their building on the backside, it backs up to David
21 Koon's farm and we're going to put the retention pond on the backside too because it's
22 the lowest. But it's over 27' lower than the road. We're going to leave a 20' buffer all
23 the way around and put an eight-foot stockade gate all the way around the portion that's

1 going to have the outside storage. Now I talked to – when I first applied for the zoning,
2 one of the Planning Commission Members told me I probably needed to apply for PDD.
3 So then I went and talked to Geo Price and he said that PDD was – or PUD was
4 primarily for larger tracts of land that's going to be partially commercial, partially
5 residential and that sort of thing. So we went back to the LI because it outright allows
6 outside storage as you discussed while ago. There's no other zoning that allows
7 outside storage other than LI. If there was another one we would apply for that.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you.

9 MR. MACK: And I have talked with several of the property owners, which – the
10 two larger property owners are here. Mr. and Mrs. Metts and Mr. Koon and I think they
11 signed up against it because they have some questions about what can be done with it.
12 What – how it can be used and they had never seen the site plans before today. So
13 we've talked with them further. If they want comment that'll be fine. We'll answer any
14 other questions that they have.

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you, sir. We have some others that want to
16 speak. Bobby Richardson?

17 MR. MACK: And I have the site plan. If you want me to leave it up here and
18 show it to you or [inaudible] do it.

19 MS. ALMEIDA: It's irrelevant.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Is Bobby Richardson here?

21 MR. RICHARDSON: I'm here and I wish not to speak.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Ones that are against is Metts.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We're here but [inaudible]

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Howard M –

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't wish to speak.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. How about Koon? David Koon?

4 **TESTIMONY OF DAVID KOON:**

5 MR. KOON: I'll talk with you a little bit.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: First state your name and address and you have two
7 minutes.

8 MR. KOON: Yes, sir. I'm David Koon, 10355 Broad River Road and I've got the
9 farm that butts up to this property. And I have no problem with what they want to do.
10 My major concern is run-off. I've got a gas station right on Broad River Road that's
11 impacting my pond up there – sealed it up and I don't want the same thing to happen
12 with this one. And Mr. Richardson assured me he would take care of it but on the
13 proposed map back up in there they've got a retention area and that's back up the hill.
14 The low area is about 200' down and he said he could adjust that but that was my major
15 concern since I have my livestock and everything. You can see where the pond is down
16 there and there's a little spring back up there that's about 200' from that corner, right
17 corner. And that was just my main issue. You know, I'll go along with it but I just want
18 to be protected, you know. That's, I just – that's why I showed up to speak a little bit
19 today. I didn't want to get run over and I wanted to be informed of what was going on.
20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you, sir. There's no one else to speak. Staff – I
22 mean, Commissioners do you have anything else you want to discuss?

1 MR. PALMER: I have a question. Who owns the property between this and the
2 road there by the railroad tracks? Does this property not abut the railroad tracks there?

3 MS. ALMEIDA: No.

4 MS. LUCIUS: It does not?

5 MS. ALMEIDA: Part of Mr. Koon's.

6 MR. PALMER: So, Mr. Koon, you own that?

7 MR. KOON: Yes, sir.

8 MR. MANNING: Do you access your house on that strip of land between the
9 subject property and the railroad?

10 MR. KOON: No. I access my farm.

11 MR. MANNING: That is where you access it?

12 MR. KOON: Yes, sir.

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions?

14 MR. MACK: [inaudible] expand on what Mr. Koon just answered [inaudible] walk
15 over here? Oh, walk over –

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: No. Oh, over here.

17 MR. MACK: Mr. Koon's farm is on both sides of the railroad track. This is all part
18 of his farm. This is part of his farm. His home is somewhere in this area right here is
19 where his house is. He farms this area; he farms this area. To get to this portion here
20 he has to drive down Farming Creek Road and this little piece right here which is about
21 20 to 40' I guess that abuts up to the railroad which the railroad's tried to take from him
22 because they want to expand this and put a third rail in here. But that's his access to
23 this portion here. Now there's a pond here and there's a barn here. This is the only

1 structure I believe, aren't they Davis, on this [inaudible]. Then he has his cattle in his
2 area. Does that clarify your question [inaudible]?

3 MR. MANNING: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions? Any other discussion? Need to
5 bring it to a motion.

6 MS. LUCIUS: I have some questions but I don't know how to ask them.

7 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, now the current applicant's intended use and the
8 site plan all seem to be reasonably structured for this but, you know, I get back to what
9 Pat just said before and it's an issue that we face all the time on Planning Commission,
10 is if you look at the table of permitted uses in an LI District, while that's not the intent of
11 the current owner, if we rezone this LI we're permitting any number of industrial uses on
12 this piece of property, and I guess our question has to be, are we comfortable with all
13 the uses that could potentially one day go on the piece of property? Again that has
14 nothing to do with the site plan or the current use of the applicant but to rezone
15 something in this area for light industrial use with all the array of things you could put on
16 this piece of property in the absence of any other nearby industrially zoned property I
17 think is inconsistent with what as a Planning Commission we've tried to do in areas. So
18 my recommendation would be to agree with Staff and to send this forward with a
19 recommendation for denial.

20 MS. LUCIUS: This property's already been purchased by Ideal Construction?

21 MR. MACK: Yes, ma'am.

22 MS. LUCIUS: And I mean, I guess I'm just kind of perplexed. Did they not know
23 they couldn't have outdoor storage when they bought it?

1 MR. MACK: No, ma'am.

2 MS. LUCIUS: So they were depending on getting zoning [inaudible]?

3 MR. MACK: Well if they can't do what they want to with it, they can do
4 something else.

5 MS. LUCIUS: They'll do something else.

6 MR. MACK: [Inaudible]

7 MS. LUCIUS: C-1, okay.

8 MR. MACK: [Inaudible] buy some other property somewhere and put a building
9 up.

10 MS. LUCIUS: I understand.

11 MR. MACK: There are a lot of other things like apartments or a business to put
12 on this property like it is.

13 MS. LUCIUS: On a C-1?

14 MR. MACK: [Inaudible]

15 MS. ALMEIDA: OI.

16 MR. MACK: Whatever you want to call it. Ya'll changed it.

17 MS. LUCIUS: Yeah, well it's OI now but I mean, okay. OI allows some?

18 MR. MACK: And that's why they did the site plan the way they did to keep it off
19 the road so it won't be as visible and put the fence around it too. And I understand
20 there's a lot of other things that can be done with LI but just for outside storage that's
21 what they have to have also. There should be another zoning to permit that but there's
22 not.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Come to the mic, sir. [Inaudible] come up to the mic so
2 they can -

3 MS. LUCIUS: The transcriber can't hear you.

4 MR. MACK: They are doing everything they can to appease the neighborhood
5 and zoning and everyone. They could applied to have this done on the, on Farming
6 Creek Road where everyone riding up that road could see it but no, they've got a 50'
7 entrance going to the backside of the property, backing up to a farm, backing up to a
8 railroad track and there's a farm across the street. One the other side of the railroad
9 track is a sawmill. Beyond the sawmill is the Ray Clipper Marine. Across the street
10 from this property is a heating and air conditioning company so there are other
11 commercial uses in the area too.

12 MR. MANNING: Going back to the discussion about the site plan and what Mr.
13 Green suggested that that looked appropriate, you mentioned you were asked to
14 consider a PUD or a PDD earlier. And I think if one was applied for given that site plan
15 that would be overcoming the objections about multiple uses and what could happen. I
16 mean obviously 27' lower; it's out of sight, screened properly and it might be a – might
17 overcome a problem we face all the time which is having a wide-open array of uses and
18 some would not be compatible with the area.

19 MR. MACK: Are you saying that if we come back and apply for a PDD or a PUD,
20 whichever, we can do what we want to do. But if he decides to sell the property two
21 years down the road that'll preclude anyone else from -

22 MR. MANNING: Well I can't say the Commission would agree to that. I'm just
23 suggesting that limiting your use to a specific use might be more compatible with the

1 Commission. There's no promises there but, you know, we're concerned about having
2 multiple uses that if Mr. Richardson decided to sell the property anything in that
3 category could be placed there.

4 MS. LUCIUS: But you're right. If you ever decided to sell it –

5 MR. MACK: My understanding [inaudible].

6 MS. LUCIUS: [Inaudible]

7 MR. MACK: Yeah. That's like M-1. The 30 acres I just sold at the Peak exit is
8 zoned M-1. You can put a junkyard there, a chemical plant or anything else but we're
9 putting a shopping center there.

10 MS. LUCIUS: Uh-huh (affirmative).

11 MR. MANNING: Right.

12 MR. MACK: All right. Which would you rather have, a shopping center or a
13 chemical plant? But the owner's elected to put a shopping center rather than something
14 dangerous or environmentally hazard.

15 MR. MANNING: Well once it's already zoned we don't have any control.

16 MR. MACK: I know. And it's been zoned M-1 for a long time. But if I understand
17 correctly, if we go back and apply for a PDD they can do what they want to do with this
18 intended use? But if they sell it whoever buys has to continue doing the same thing
19 they're doing?

20 MR. MANNING: Correct.

21 MR. PALMER: Or reverts back to the previous zoning.

22 MR. MACK: Okay.

23 MR. PALMER: It'll go back to C-1 or OI.

1 MR. MACK: That answers my question. I wasn't told that 45 days ago but –

2 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: [Inaudible] need to answer any questions or clarify
3 anything?

4 MS. ALMEIDA: If it's rezoned to a PDD and the applicant sells the property and
5 they want something other than the PDD they'd have to have it rezoned again. It
6 doesn't revert back to the existing zoning. So it would go --

7 MR. PALMER: Oh. I was under the understanding –

8 MS. ALMEIDA: - through the rezoning request all over again.

9 MR. PALMER: It's always that.

10 MR. GREEN: So it's rezoned?

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Yeah. It's rezoned.

12 MR. MANNING: Right. It would remain PDD specifically for that use.

13 MS. ALMEIDA: And all its limitations.

14 MR. MACK: One other question before I sit down. Should I withdraw it now and
15 go ahead and reapply for Planning next month and have a PDD application ready?

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: That's a decision you have to make. We can't make
17 that decision.

18 MR. MACK: But is that the way it works? If I withdraw it now I can come back
19 next month with a PDD?

20 MS. ALMEIDA: Not next month. There is a waiting –

21 MR. MACK: The month after next, yeah. As long as I do that before the Council
22 meeting? Can I make that decision between now and the next Council meeting? When
23 do I need to make it?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Before it's posted.

2 MR. MACK: Okay.

3 MS. ALMEIDA: Fifteen days prior. So you'd have to get back to Mr. Price within
4 the next week.

5 MR. MACK: Okay. Thank you very much.

6 MR. PALMER: I second the motion.

7 MS. LUCIUS: What was the motion?

8 MR. GREEN: For denial.

9 MR. PALMER: Gene made a motion for denial.

10 MS. LUCIUS: Did he not want to consider withdrawing?

11 MR. PALMER: He's going to wait until after.

12 MR. GREEN: He has the right to withdraw before –

13 MS. LUCIUS: Before Council?

14 MR. GREEN: - the County Council meeting.

15 MS. LUCIUS: All right.

16 MR. PALMER: I would like to make – say something. That I think that we need
17 to take a look at outdoor storage and see if there's any areas in the current zoning
18 where we could make some special requirements, special exceptions under some other
19 classifications other than LI so that it would be a possibility for people to do that. Go to
20 the Board of Zoning Appeals and, you know, with setbacks, buffering and all that kind of
21 stuff to allow it. It's just not allowed any where else except for LI. If we could take a
22 look at doing something like that I'd appreciate it.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the motion. All those in favor of it raise your
2 hand for denial. Against?

3 *[Approved to deny: Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Murray, Manning]*

4 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We'll send this to County Council and that meeting is
5 February 27th. Next on the agenda is 07-08 MA.

6 **CASE NO. 07-08 MA:**

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, this application is approximately 10.02 acres
8 located on Piney Wood Road off of Piney Grove Road. The existing zoning is M-1. The
9 applicant is requesting to get rezoned to a GC. The site has approximately 160 linear
10 feet of frontage. There has never been a rezoning on this property. The current level of
11 service has been estimated at a Level of Service A. And Staff is recommending
12 approval.

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: [Inaudible]

14 MS. LUCIUS: Is anyone signed up on this one, Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: No. No one signed up on that one.

16 MS. LUCIUS: I would like to go ahead and make a motion if I may. I think this is
17 a good rezoning. I would make the – well we just rezoned that, all of that in red in
18 February of '06 and it seems reasonable to me to rezone that other small portion. I
19 would make a motion that we send this to Council with a recommendation of approval.

20 MR. GREEN: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions? All those in favor of sending it for
22 approval to County Council raise your hand. Those who disapprove? Thank you.

23 *[Approved: Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Murray, Manning]*

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Next on the agenda is 07-09.

2 **CASE NO. 07-09 MA:**

3 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, this application is located on Bluff Industrial
4 Boulevard, southwest side of Bluff Road. It's approximately 3.54 acres. The current
5 zoning is M-1. The applicant is requesting to be rezoned to GC. The site has
6 approximately 370 linear feet of frontage on Bluff Industrial Boulevard. Bluff Industrial
7 Boulevard, as you can see from the slide, county maintenance ends at the end of that
8 little line. We have been in touch with Public Works and they have indicated that their
9 intention, even if the applicant obviously is to extend that road and create a cul-de-sac,
10 it would not be in the interest of Public Works to accept that road for maintenance. And
11 the Staff is recommending denial.

12 MS. LUCIUS: Can I ask a question of Staff? Anna, what was their reason for
13 that? Is that common for them to just to say they don't want to accept?

14 MS. ALMEIDA: There are instances, yes. We just wanted to double check
15 ownership of the road.

16 MS. LUCIUS: But they didn't give any reason, environmentally or anything like
17 that?

18 MS. ALMEIDA: Huh-uh (negative)

19 MR. MANNING: Anna, they are – they're saying they don't want to accept –

20 MS. ALMEIDA: For the maintenance.

21 MR. MANNING: - the addition of a cul-de-sac further down?

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

1 MR. MANNING: But they could actually create a cul-de-sac adjoining that road if
2 they got the property to –

3 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. The applicant is proposing to extend the road and create
4 a cul-de-sac but Public Works is saying that what they maintain today is what they will
5 continue to maintain and that is it.

6 MR. MANNING: Do they maintain – it is a county road all the way to the end of
7 that road?

8 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. To where it exists today.

9 MR. MANNING: Right. And engineering would not want a turn around on the
10 end of that road? I can't imagine that.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: They're not – they said they don't want to take on that
12 responsibility. I have no – that was just something that we wanted to investigate. And
13 as you can see the surrounding area is industrial. You do have some student housing
14 located on the northwestern side of Bluff Industrial Boulevard. But the bulk of the use in
15 the surrounding area is industrial in nature.

16 MR. MANNING: Is this – is your recommendation consistent with the same as
17 other student housing requests that have been in the railroad property on the other side
18 of Bluff Road as well as the student housing that is located next door to this?

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Well the applicant has – we don't distinguish between student
20 housing and residential condos. The application was – which shows [inaudible] bearing
21 but it's just the use.

22 MR. MANNING: But in those previous applications your recommendation was
23 for denial because of having residential in a industrial area; is that correct?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: I believe that how that student housing was created off of Silo
2 Court was by a special exception. It did not come before the Planning Commission for
3 a rezoning. It was under the old code prior to 2005, which was allowed. Multi-family
4 was allowed with a special exception.

5 MR. MANNING: So the adjoining property was that way but we just rezoned
6 some student housing in an industrial area on Bluff Road.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Down Bluff Road.

8 MR. MANNING: Correct. Right.

9 MS. ALMEIDA: Way down, easterly.

10 MR. MANNING: Okay. I didn't know whether those were the same – okay.

11 MR. GREEN: Is there some nuance? I thought when M-1 transferred from the
12 old code to the new code that all rights under the old M-1 stayed in the M-1. So if there
13 was an ability to put multi-family housing in the old M-1 if that transferred all the rights
14 and entitlements of the old M-1 why – I guess my question is -

15 MS. ALMEIDA: Our Board of Zoning Appeals is not -

16 MR. GREEN: But there's no SR or SE attached to the M-1.

17 MR. PRICE: [Inaudible]

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You need to come to the podium.

19 MR. PRICE: [Inaudible] out of the code. [Inaudible]

20 MR. GREEN: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Anybody else have any questions? Mr. Sharp?

22 **TESTIMONY OF ROBERT FULLER:**

1 MR. FULLER: Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert Fuller. Mr. Sharp is the
2 applicant here. I represent Mr. Sharp today and we are here to present this application.
3 If I might precede Mr. Sharp in speaking to you.

4 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay.

5 MR. FULLER: Prefer that order. You have heard the presentation and you are
6 aware that what the intention for this property is is to utilize the existing 3.54 acres as a
7 site for a student residential condominium complex. It is true that it is situated in M-1
8 zoning and it is true that there is a large amount of M-1 zoning and some M-1 use in the
9 vicinity but to characterize it as being centered in an area that is completely industrial is
10 a misapprehension of what the fact is on the ground. There is a substantial amount of
11 M-1 zoning here but there is a multiple listing of commercial uses that are in the area
12 that are not industrial use by nature. There are 266 apartment units in this area along
13 the river adjacent to the property that are residential apartments used for student
14 apartment housing, and behind the National Guard Armory adjacent to those properties
15 is another large complex of student housing apartments. What is proposed by this
16 applicant that distinguishes it from some of that is is that this would be a rather small
17 project limited to about 48 units on the three acres, three and a half acres of property
18 that would be in a condominium context, which would mean it would be single
19 ownership of the individual units as opposed to a large, multi-family complex of rental
20 apartments. As that area transitions from what it is with the removal of the Farmers
21 Market, which is absolutely going to come to that location, and the University acquires
22 that property, it is going to change the complexion of uses so that those things that are
23 in that vicinity will tend to follow what comes to the location and those things that were

1 there to begin with because of proximity to the Farmers Market, warehousing and large
2 truck treatment facilities and such things are going to follow the Market, are going to
3 move away. So it really is more of a transitional opportunity than placement of
4 something that is not already in this area as compatible use. We selected the GC
5 zoning because it does permit the residential in a commercial area. So the underlying
6 zoning would be totally compatible with the adjacent M-1 zonings. The use as
7 residential condominiums would be totally compatible with the existing uses of student
8 housing and apartment complexes that are already on the ground there. It seemed a
9 good mix or a good placement for a three and a half acres parcel of property that's
10 really on the river. The probability of the extension or not of industrial, Bluff Industrial
11 Boulevard is irrelevant to the placement of this project. All it needs do it attach to it and
12 it has frontage on the extension already. There's no necessity for the extension of
13 county maintenance there. It simply becomes an entrance to this property. There is no
14 need to extend it further. There's nothing beyond it but the river. So we are here to
15 suggest that this is really not an incompatible use with what is presently on the ground
16 in the area. It is simply a necessary change in the zoning classification because, as Mr.
17 Price has already told you, residential was totally withdrawn from the existing M-1 listing
18 of uses prior to the conversion of the code in July. I am here and can answer any
19 questions. Mr. Sharp is one of the developers, a principal of the developer who has
20 presented to the Council a binder of material that will identify [inaudible] in Morgantown,
21 West Virginia to serve the University of West Virginia in a very similar manner. If you
22 have questions he and I will be glad to answer them for you if we can.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Do any Commissioners have any questions?
2 [Inaudible] to staff? If not, need a motion on this.

3 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to send this forward with a
4 recommendation of approval given the fact that there's already substantial residential,
5 multi-family units in the area so the compatibility question really is one that I, I don't feel
6 so concerned about. And I think it would be a good use being that close to the Carolina
7 Stadium.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We need a second on that.

9 MS. LUCIUS: I'll second, Mr. Chairman. When you look at the map [inaudible] is
10 a lot of gray in one but I think that sort of belies what's actually taking place on the
11 ground. I see it as an extension of what's already happened there and we have done a
12 lot of infill of housing in industrial areas recently, especially downtown closer to the
13 University. For those reasons I don't really see the problem with this one so I would
14 second.

15 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would agree. We're starting to see a substantial
16 change in the character of what's going on between literally Blossom Street from the
17 University all the way out past the stadium, and I think it's a natural evolution of this part
18 of town as the University grows. And I do agree with Mr. Fuller that this is a
19 transitional and it's going to be mixed for awhile. But I don't think we should
20 discourage that transition and I think it's going to speed up when the Farmers Market
21 relocates. So I would also support the motion.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions Those who are in favor raise your
23 hand. Okay.

1 *[Approved: Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Murray, Manning]*

2 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We'll send this forward to County Council and that'll be
3 February 27th it will go before Council. Next on the agenda is 07-10 MA.

4 **CASE NO. 07-10 MA:**

5 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, this application is located on Bluff Road and
6 Southerly Drive and the existing zoning is HI. The applicant is requesting to be rezoned
7 to RM-HD. The acreage is approximately 5.46 acres and it has approximately 405
8 linear feet of frontage on Bluff Road. It was subdivided back in 2006 from a 25-acre
9 parcel. That was done due to wetlands. And unlike the previous application Staff is
10 recommending approval due to the fact that we have approved right next door some
11 townhouses which is part of this Copper Beach. Like I said they had subdivided this
12 5.46 acres off because of floodplain.

13 MS. LUCIUS: So they just wanted to add it back?

14 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

15 MS. LUCIUS: Mr. Chairman, do we have anyone signed up to speak on this?

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Yes. We have two people signed up for. John
17 Lanchey?

18 **TESTIMONY OF JOHN LANCHEY:**

19 MR. LANCHEY: John Lanchey. I'm here to represent Copper Beach today. I'll
20 try to be brief and just build on the argument you've already heard. I mean, clearly this
21 part of town's changing. We were here in front of you I guess in late spring, early
22 summer. We've got the 25 acres adjacent to this under construction. This is merely

1 adding another five acres so we can build an additional 50 units. I'll be happy to answer
2 any questions you have. I think, you know, everything I could say you've heard

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Can you please state your name and address?

4 MR. LANCHEY: John Lanchey, 1901 Main Street, Columbia 29201.

5 MR. MANNING: Mr. Lanchey, you say the five acres that you're adding –

6 MR. LANCHEY: We're going to combine it with the town home project that's
7 under construction now so it will be part of a seamless development.

8 MR. MANNING: And it was held out because you were concerned about
9 wetlands/floodplain issues and those have been resolved?

10 MR. LANCHEY: Correct.

11 MR. MANNING: And how many additional units will you add?

12 MR. LANCHEY: Approximately 50. Any other questions? Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Mr. Rogers, do you want to say anything, if necessary?

14 MR. ROGERS: I don't need to.

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions? If I could have a motion on this.

16 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to send this forward with a
17 recommendation to approve.

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Is there a second?

19 MR. PALMER: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: All those – you heard the motion - all those in favor of
21 sending it to County Council raise your hand. Denial?

22 *[Approved: Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Murray, Manning]*

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: This will go before County Council on the 27th. We're
2 just a recommending body and this will be before County Council on the 27th of
3 February. So you have to be there to see what they're gonna do.

4 MR. LANCHEY: All right. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You're welcome. Okay. Under new business we have
6 06-28 PS [sic].

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: SP, I'm sorry. SP-06-28.

9 **CASE NO. SP-06-28:**

10 MS. ALMEIDA: This application is a site plan that was approved by the DRT. At
11 that time it is for the Long Creek Presbyterian Church which was located down the road
12 on Clemson Road relocated to this site. And during the approval process as one of the
13 conditions of approval for site plans our code requires sidewalks. The applicant was
14 unable to accommodate the sidewalk on their property due to topography as you can
15 see from page 40, 41. And therefore Staff recommended that they work with DOT in
16 placing the sidewalk on DOT property which in most cases DOT is willing to work with
17 the property owners. DOT felt that on this portion of Clemson Road it would not be wise
18 to put a sidewalk and therefore as you can see from Mr. Pepin's letter, DOT has denied
19 him the installation of sidewalk on their property and therefore we are requesting a
20 waiver of that requirement.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions from the Committee?

22 MR. MANNING: Anna, there was a photograph of a sidewalk along the bridge.
23 Is that on the other side of the road?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: No. That's on the same side but on the bridge.

2 MR. MANNING: That's on the same side of the road as the church property?

3 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

4 MR. MANNING: Is that considered a sidewalk?

5 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes. That's considered a sidewalk.

6 MR. MANNING: All right. Well would that not suffice – accomplish the same
7 thing as the sidewalk that you were going to have placed -

8 MS. ALMEIDA: Right.

9 MR. MANNING: - on the church property?

10 MS. ALMEIDA: It would have to continue down as some previous pictures show.
11 They're just not willing at this time to have the church install the sidewalk at this time.

12 MS. LUCIUS: It wouldn't really lead anywhere, would it?

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Well our mind thought on that is, you know, obviously we want to
14 encourage sidewalk/pedestrian/bicycle activity due to ozone attainment and other
15 problems that we have in this region because that does affect our federal funding that
16 we receive, and that is one of the reasons that we are pushing for the sidewalk. But
17 when we cannot accommodate it at this point and DOT's not willing to accommodate it,
18 Staff feels that because we don't have another option, we are looking into the option of
19 paying a fee in lieu of in those instances where it either makes no sense to have the
20 sidewalk or be able to put it in more needed areas. So we are working with applicants
21 on a case by case basis.

22 MR. MANNING: So it's your recommendation that we approve it?

23 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct. The request, yes.

1 MR. PALMER: I make a motion to approve.

2 MR. GREEN: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: All those in favor raise your hand. Denied?

4 *[Approved: Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Murray, Manning]*

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Let me pause for a second here. I know the next on
6 the agenda is comprehensive plan, but Ms. Lucius has someone in the audience she
7 want us to meet.

8 MS. LUCIUS: Yes. Thank you. Well today will be my last meeting with the
9 Planning Commission and come three months in May would make nine years if I was
10 still on here. And it's – oh, and this is for the benefit of Chairman Furgess. Mr.
11 Chairman, with your permission I've jotted down a few remarks I'd like to make.
12 *[Laughter]* Do I have two minutes? That's a joke. That's a joke. If I could have just a
13 couple of minutes.

14 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Yes, you may.

15 MS. LUCIUS: You know, I've spent so much time with all you people. And
16 there's been a lot of frustration, a lot of frustration and a lot of joy with the Staff and with
17 my fellow Commissioners, and a lot of long hours, a lot of long meetings. But I, you
18 know, a lot of personal time, even finance. I mean, you know, we have to pay our own
19 gas, of course, you know. But I started thinking about all that you know how much it's
20 been in nine years but I thought, you know, personal sacrifice. But then I thought you
21 know that's really not true because when you really do something you really care about
22 it's not a sacrifice. And I've really enjoyed being here and y'all are like my family. I'm
23 going to miss you all. We didn't always agree with each other but we always respected

1 each other and liked each other. And it's going to be really hard, you know, to leave but
2 I just wanted to be able to say those things. And I wanted to recognize my husband
3 who's in the audience. Gene, would you please stand up, honey. [Laughter] I'm sorry.
4 But he's been such a support to me.

5 MR. MANNING: He might want to address the podium. [Laughter]

6 MR. LUCIUS: Well if you're going to give me that opportunity, let's make a
7 motion that you – there's all this talk these days about raising the minimum wage. I
8 think y'all make zero.

9 MS. LUCIUS: We get lunch.

10 MR. LUCIUS: At least make a motion that your wage be raised from zero to
11 maybe 50 cents an hour. [Laughter]

12 MS. LUCIUS: Thank you. But as you know it's not just the time up here. You
13 multiply the time up here several times to get the amount of time that you have to put in
14 to prepare to come up here so, you know. And all the extra meetings. But I just do
15 want to, you know, all these people, all my friends I've made, you know, we're all in
16 different walks of life and our paths would never have crossed if it weren't for the
17 Planning Commission and I really like y'all and I'm going to miss y'all. But I'll leave you
18 with one word now that I've spread the love. Cut down my trees and I'll have to hurt
19 you. [Laughter] But thank you, Wes. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you so much.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Again, as Chairman and talking – I won't speak for all
21 the Commission; they can speak for themselves, again, Marcia, we're going to miss
22 you. I won't have anybody to tease anymore. I'm out to find someone that I can enjoy
23 teasing and put up with it.

1 MS. LUCIUS: You can call me on the phone.

2 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. With your permission.

3 MS. LUCIUS: You have my permission.

4 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: I'm talking about Gene. [Laughter] Again, thank you.

5 MS. LUCIUS: Thank you.

6 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say I've had the fortune of serving
7 with Marcia for six years and as she said, we've disagreed at times but there is no other
8 Commission Member that served in the six years that I've been on the Commission that
9 comes as well prepared, spends the time necessary to be ready to discuss each and
10 every rezoning than Marcia.

11 MS. LUCIUS: Thank you.

12 MR. GREEN: And it's just, it's a pleasure to – it's been a pleasure to serve with
13 you.

14 MS. LUCIUS: Thank you. I appreciate that.

15 MR. PALMER: I couldn't have said it any better.

16 MS. LUCIUS: Thank you.

17 MR. PALMER: I've only had four years but they've been good.

18 MS. LUCIUS: And we've agreed a couple times. [Laughter]

19 MR. PALMER: We have. You started coming around the last couple years.

20 MS. LUCIUS: Oh, I thought you were coming around. [Laughter] Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you very much. At this time [inaudible] come up
22 comprehensive plan.

1 MR. CRISS: Tia Rutherford, our neighborhood planner, sends her regards. I
2 think you have a memo from her in front of you about the rescheduled, postponed public
3 meeting that the Planning Commission asked for on the Decker Boulevard/Woodfield
4 Park Neighborhood Master Plan now set for February 15th at 5:00 o'clock here in the
5 Council chambers. And of course the originally scheduled meeting was postponed due
6 to inclement weather. Sorry for the folks that showed up. I couldn't get the word out
7 that day to everyone. About a half a dozen people at least arrived here at the building
8 but I think they understood. Hopefully they can return on the 15th. The South East
9 Planning Area 10 Year Future Land Use Map is still in production. I'm about half way
10 through. I don't have a draft for you yet. I certainly will have it by the next Planning
11 Commission meeting. And there is another series of training opportunities available for
12 the Commissioners. Mr. Murray is the newest appointed member who'll be looking to
13 the six-hour orientation training some time during calendar year 2007. So there's time
14 to get that in. And the other members who remain will be looking toward fulfilling the
15 three hours of continuing education requirements some time during 2007 and the
16 Central Midlands Council of Governments and our Planning and Development Services
17 Department and City of Columbia, Lexington County have joined forces to provide a
18 series of training opportunities over at the COG several times a month, alternating
19 between the six-hour orientation training series and the three-hour continuing education
20 series. And I'll hand out a schedule to you in a moment.

21 MR. MANNING: Michael, on the South East Plan, explain to me what is in
22 production and where we –

1 MR. CRISS: The 10 Year Future Land Use Map. You have now received the
2 North East, North West and then North Central 10 Year Future Land Use Maps. You'll
3 be getting one like that for the entire South East which of course is about half the county
4 and little bit more territory to cover. We are still in production on that.

5 MR. MANNING: Okay. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you.

7 MR. CRISS: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Next on the agenda is the road name approval.

9 MR. PALMER: I can't believe Boardwalk hasn't been taken yet.

10 MS. LUCIUS: Well I have a hard time deciding if I want to live on Compassion,
11 Faithfulness, Kindness or Patience. [Laughter] I'm sorry.

12 MR. PALMER: Or football, racquetball.

13 MS. LUCIUS: Or soccer.

14 MR. PALMER: Basketball and Big Game Circle. I live at the corner of Basketball
15 and Big Game. Motion to approve.

16 MR. GREEN: Leavenworth.

17 MS. LUCIUS: Leavenworth.

18 MR. GREEN: There was not an Alcatraz in here too.

19 MS. LUCIUS: I guess not.

20 MS. ALMEIDA: Not yet.

21 MR. PALMER: We are really scraping for names now, aren't we?

22 MR. GREEN: Can we make a recommendation to the county they invest in a
23 directory of possible street names for developers?

1 MS. LUCIUS: That's my position. There you go. Street names.

2 MR. GREEN: Street names. Second.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: All those in favor – you heard the motion, all those in
4 favor raise your hand. Denied?

5 *[Approved: Anderson, Lucius, Furgess, Palmer, Green, Murray, Manning]*

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. This is the end. Meeting's adjourned.

7

8

[Meeting adjourned at 2:04 p.m.]