

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

March 5, 2007

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

7
8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: The meeting please come to order. I need to read this
9 public notification for the Record. "In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a
10 copy of the agenda was sent to radio, TV stations, newspapers, and persons requesting
11 notification, was posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County
12 Administration Building." Also we would like for you to cut off all of your electronic
13 devices; telephones, cell phones, beepers, whatever you may have, please. At this
14 time we would like for you to cut that off. Also, when you come to the mic to speak, we
15 allow you two minutes. Make sure you state your name and address at that time when
16 you come to the podium to speak. We will call your name if you signed up on the sign
17 up sheet to come, the ones that wanted to speak. At this time we're going with the
18 agenda on hand. Thank you. The Minutes approval at this time. I need a vote on the
19 Minutes that we received.

20 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chair, I make a motion we pass the minutes from
21 February 5, 2007.

22 MR. GREEN: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the second. All those in favor by raising
24 your hands, please. Opposed?

25 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Furgess, Green, Manning; Absent: Palmer, Van Dine,*
26 *McBride]*

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Thank you. Agenda Items? We need to know
2 any adjustments or any changes on the agenda.

3 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Since this will be the first time I'm
4 addressing you, my name is Jennie Sherry-Linder and I'm the Land Development
5 Administrator sitting in for Anna Almeida who is not here. We have three items to
6 change on the agenda.

7 MR. GREEN: If you could pull that mic a little closer to you that'd be great.

8 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: We have three items on the agenda –

9 MR. GREEN: Thank you.

10 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: - to change. Case No. 07-15, has been deferred. So
11 has 07-16. And in the middle of the page there, 07-20, has been withdrawn.

12 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: 07-15, has deferred; correct?

13 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Correct.

14 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: And 07-16, has been deferred?

15 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Correct.

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: 07-20, withdrew?

17 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Withdrew. That's correct.

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Thank you.

19 MR. GREEN: Amelia, do we need a motion to defer on those two items?

20 MS. LINDER: These have been administratively deferred.

21 MR. GREEN: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. New Business, Zoning Map Amendments.

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

1 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Our first case is on Broad River Road, approximately
2 3.63 acres. Request a zoning from Rural District to Rural Commercial. Staff
3 recommendation is denial.

4 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Let's go back, excuse me.

5 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I'm sorry.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Let's go. The case, the first case will be 07-02?

7 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Correct.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. That's the one we need to – we'll go that way.
9 That's on page one. Go ahead.

10 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Okay. The Rural Commercial District recognizes the
11 need to provide areas within Richland County, where residents are more isolated, for
12 some services primarily and some commercial uses. The 20/20 objective from the
13 Comprehensive Plan lists commercial uses but in concentrated locations usually where
14 there is a major traffic juncture. This particular rezoning request for this parcel is
15 located approximately 1,500 linear feet from the nearest minor intersection. It is
16 currently surrounded by residential use including the Courtyards of Rolling Creek and
17 the Westcott at Peake was recently also approved which is that slight blue section at the
18 top there. The Courtyards is the existing subdivision right next to it. Because of the
19 proximity to existing and proposed residential uses and the proposed use of the subject
20 property incompatible the permitted uses under Rural Commercial range from
21 amusement parks, civic, institutional, professional, personal services, accommodations,
22 retail, vehicular sales and warehousing which is only permitted by – with special

1 requirements. Staff does not find the rezoning request nor the proposed use as
2 compatible with the adjacent uses.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions from the Commissioners to Staff? No
4 questions? We do have some people that signed up to speak. When I call your name
5 please come forward. Robert Thompson? Please state your name and address, sir, so
6 we can have it on Record.

7 **TESTIMONY OF ROBERT THOMPSON:**

8 MR. THOMPSON: Robert Thompson, 5 Whetstone Creek Court, Irmo 29063.
9 Gentlemen, I am a resident of said subdivision, Courtyards at Rolling Creek. My
10 property adjoins the subject property of this case. I'd like to say first that, you know,
11 when I moved to the Columbia area 20 some odd years ago I moved here for what was
12 at that time in my area a uniquely rural area, part of Lexington County. Someone who
13 obviously had more wisdom than me finally decided to build a federally-subsidized
14 housing project that backed up to the subdivision that I lived in, Quail Valley, Lexington
15 County. So two and a half years ago I decided that I wanted to get back to uniquely
16 rural so I bought a lot in Courtyards at Rolling Creek and when I bought that lot and built
17 that house that I built at 5 Whetstone Creek Court – can I take just a moment and show
18 you a quick picture? Just walk it in front of you? This is the view –

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Just take it, sir, and we'll pass it down.

20 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. This is the view off of my deck of what I see right now
21 which is nothing but heavily forested area with lots of birds, deer that come and graze in
22 that woods behind my house. And we're talking about, you know, coming in here
23 possibly and building what I see on this agenda as an office warehouse space in my

1 backyard. And I am vehemently opposed to allowing that to happen as are my
2 neighbors that adjoin me on both sides as far as down as you can go – let's put it that
3 way. And I think there are letters on file as I understand it either with Bill Malinowski or
4 with the Planning Commission to that affect. And I would like to ask that you certainly
5 consider that. I do have one other thing that I'd like to bring to your attention, however.
6 I just found out from my next door neighbor that a letter that I received dated February
7 21, 2007, informing me of this meeting, he did not receive a copy of that letter. I don't
8 know that my other neighbors did. I didn't bother to ask. I assumed if I got one as an
9 adjacent property owner that everybody in the neighborhood got one but I don't know
10 that for a fact. I also would like to bring to your attention that the sign posted along
11 Broad River Road in front of that site says that this meeting is going to be held on
12 February the 5th. There is no sign that says March the 5th whatsoever. Therefore, I
13 don't know that any of my other neighbors were even aware of the fact that this meeting
14 was going to be held and they would have an opportunity to speak out against it. But
15 I'm sure that had they known you would have at least six people here standing up to
16 speak.

17 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you, sir.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

19 MR. GREEN: A question for Staff. Do we know how many letters went out to
20 adjacent property owners?

21 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: We send them to all of the – I believe it's within 300' –
22 all of the adjacent property owners.

1 MR. GREEN: Is there any reason to believe that the letters didn't get to
2 everyone or -

3 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Not to my knowledge. I mean, I know that we – I signed
4 them and they were being sent out.

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you.

6 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: This was deferred from the February 5, 2007, Planning
7 Commission.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Next person to come up and speak is Edward Barnhill?

9 **TESTIMONY OF EDWARD BARNHILL:**

10 MR. BARNHILL: Thank you. My name is Edward Barnhill. I'm an attorney at
11 Nelson Mullins. I represent the Ellisor family that bought this property as part of the 205
12 or 10 acre tract in 1950 when Broad River Road was dirty – was dirt, was nothing but
13 dirt. They've lived there ever since. Ms. Ellisor is 91 years old and her health won't
14 allow her to come today but I'm speaking on behalf of all the Ellisors. I was the
15 president of a company that owned part of this land until a few years ago when we sold
16 it back to a member of the family. The house that's immediately adjacent to it on the
17 little narrow strip of land there is where General Sherman spent the night in the front
18 yard after burning Columbia. And Ms. Ellisor still goes – she lives with her son who
19 owns the other land all the way down to the pond and he's here today. And she gets in
20 the car and rides over there and spends the day in her house and comes back to his
21 house at night and spends the night there. The provisions in the rural commercial –
22 number one, this is a residential area. There's a residence on this home now that was
23 owned by Ms. Ellisor's daughter. Sold it to the current owners and they've all been

1 good neighbors for a long time but there was never any intent for the property to be
2 used commercially. It's really, would be sitting right in the front yard of one of the most
3 beautiful places you could ever build a house in South Carolina. The house that's there
4 now has been there since 1790-something. And the zoning change would allow lots of
5 things that wouldn't be compatible with the current use of the property and in the
6 immediate area it's not, it's really not ready for that. And there hasn't been any contact
7 with members of the Ellisor family about what we could do to screen, buffer. If you look
8 at the Rural Commercial there's no side lot limit. There's a 20' limit rear lot setback and
9 I think it's just completely inappropriate for a piece of property like this. It needs to be
10 preserved. There are oak trees in the yard that four people could reach around. And
11 for that reason the Ellisor family would be opposed to the rezoning. Thank you very
12 much.

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. The next person is David Ellisor.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He doesn't need to say anything.

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay then. Thank you. That's all that's signed up to
16 speak.

17 MR. GREEN: Is the applicant not here?

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: The applicant is not here. Is the applicant here? The
19 applicant is not here. Any other questions or any other discussion on this?

20 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think this – in my mind I'd have to agree with the
21 two speakers that we had. Given the surrounding land use and Staff recommendation I
22 would make a motion we send this forward with a recommendation for denial to County
23 Council.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Is there a second on that?

2 MR. MANNING: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the second. We need to send this to County
4 Council with denial on 07-02. All that is in favor that we send it forward as denied raise
5 your hand. Opposed?

6 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Furgess, Green, Manning; Absent: Palmer, Van Dine,*
7 *McBride]*

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Next on the agenda is 07-11.

9 MR. GREEN: When will County Council actually -

10 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: March 27th.

11 **CASE NO. 07-11 MA:**

12 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: The next item is 07-11, off of Horseshoe Drive. Less
13 than a half an acre going from residential multi-family with the highest density to general
14 commercial. Staff's recommendation for this is approval. According to County records
15 the original zoning as adopted September 1977 was office institutional. Some time just
16 prior to 1997, there was a map amendment for residential multi-family, which is the high
17 density it has now. The objectives for the comp plan are in line with this. As it states it
18 has adequate infrastructure for the surrounding commercial uses and the surrounding
19 areas of those zoned residential are currently vacant. The existing commercial uses in
20 the area are accommodations, residential care facility, wholesale and services. And the
21 Planning Staff does recommend approval of this map amendment.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any discussions of Commissioners for Staff about the –
23 did they have any questions?

1 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: The large red section on the west side is the
2 Travelodge. Directly across the street from that is the LaQuinta Inn. The areas across
3 the street from our site have two office buildings and some intermixed residential.

4 MR. MANNING: Are any of the multi-family sites shown up there?

5 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: The multi – I apologize. The rear portion of that whole
6 Horseshoe is all multi-family apartments.

7 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: No one signed up to speak on this project so I need a
8 motion on this, please; how you want to send it up to Council?

9 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chair, I make a motion that we send Case No. 07-11 MA
10 ahead with a recommendation of approval.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Need a second.

12 MR. MURRAY: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: All in favor that we send it to County Council for
14 approval please raise your hand. Denied?

15 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Furgess, Green, Manning; Absent: Palmer, Van Dine,*
16 *McBride]*

17 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Next on the agenda is 07-14 MA.

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

19 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: 07-14 is off of Wessinger Road and U.S. 76. It is less
20 than three acres. Point five acres roughly of this particular parcel is in the Lexington
21 County jurisdiction and it is zoned intense use, which is similar to our general
22 commercial. The general commercial is intended to accommodate a variety of general
23 commercial uses and non-residential uses characterized primarily by retail office and

1 services. The comprehensive plan lists this commercial and office activities to be
2 confined to clusters and this area is though identified as residential low-density
3 according to a land use plan in that comprehensive plan. The surrounding parcels are
4 zoned general commercial and they reflect the original zoning as adopted in 1977. The
5 subject parcel was completely encircled with commercial zoned or zoned RU which is
6 consistent with the parcels across the street. In January 2000, a 3.5 parcel across the
7 street on Wessinger Road was rezoned to light industrial MI and has a commercial
8 operation on there now. The subject parcel is contiguous to general commercial less
9 than three acre sites and Planning Staff does recommend approval of this amendment.

10 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: From the Commissioners any questions to Staff? I
11 need a motion on that, please.

12 MR. GREEN: Anybody signed up?

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: One person signed up. Gary?

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't really need [inaudible], unless y'all just want me to
15 speak.

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. He's for it. Need a recommendation.

17 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we send project
18 number 07-14 MA forward with a recommendation for approval.

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Need a second.

20 MR. MURRAY: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the second. All those in favor by raising
22 your hand. Against? No one.

1 [Approved: Murray, Anderson, Furgess, Green, Manning; Absent: Palmer, Van Dine,
2 McBride]

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: It'll go forward to County Council and that meeting will
4 be March 27th. Next we have two defers and those are – we'll go to the next one. It'll
5 be 07-18 MA.

6 **CASE NO. 07-18 MA:**

7 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: 07-18 MA is being submitted by Carolina Ceramics off
8 of Hidden Valley Road and Highway 232. They are requesting from rural district to high
9 industrial. The RU rural district as established in 1977 did allow landfills, solid waste
10 managed facilities, and composting facilities. It also allowed by special exception
11 burrow(?) pits, gravel and, for fill dirt and those types – some of those types of uses
12 were actually allowed to expand without having to go back to the Board of Zoning
13 Appeals as long as they were contiguous. But according to county records this is the
14 original zoning as it was reflected in 1977. It is the only – the heavy industrial is the only
15 zoning district that we have that allows resource extraction. And as with mining
16 operations it really is where the deposits are as to where the mining can actually go on.
17 I do have some information from the applicant. They have, at Staff's recommendation,
18 sent letters to the neighbors in their area and all of the residential housing that is there
19 now started after or constructed after this operation was in place. It does say 1974,
20 1975, though the – let's see, the Staff Report does say I believe 1979 which would have
21 been two years after zoning but instead it's actually prior to zoning. So the map
22 amendment is – will bring these existing uses into conformity with current zoning
23 regulations. And although this area is very rural in nature the immediate area of course

1 is the mine that's been there some 28 years. Planning Staff does recommend approval
2 of this map amendment.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions for Staff?

4 MR. GREEN: Is it fairly typical in ordinances, and I know this is fairly new that HI
5 opens up so many variety of uses that - and this isn't I guess germane in this particular
6 case that I just wonder if we shouldn't look at other designations permitting that use that
7 don't open up an area to the huge list of things that our heavy industrial classification
8 opens a property up to.

9 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Resource extraction to me is the highest and most
10 intense use because they have to do reclamations and to - in order to restore the land
11 to its, some - I guess use after they're done. I believe they told me that this will be
12 somewhere around 2040 is when they'll be complete. But in essence they're just taking
13 away out of the land, they're digging.

14 MR. MANNING: So there is no requirement for them to -

15 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Yes, yes. DHEC does require them to do reclamation
16 and they are in the habit - they are in the process of doing that as they leave a
17 particular site they do that and they plant.

18 MR. MANNING: Not specifically the reclamation; I'm talking about the rezoning.
19 Would they be allowed to continue to mine under their existing zoning?

20 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: They could but they could not expand. It's because it
21 became a non-conforming use after, I'm assuming July 2005, when it was changed,
22 they would not be allowed to expand. So that is the reason for the rezoning.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGSS: Any other questions? We have some people to sign up
2 to speak. Ken Newell?

3 **TESTIMONY OF KEN NEWELL:**

4 MR. NEWELL: Ken Newell with Carolina Ceramics, 9931 Two Notch Road,
5 Columbia 29223. We've been mining the property on the right as you understand from
6 the late 70s. There is a creek that runs across the backside of the property. DHEC has
7 been out many times, the land resources people, to inspect us over this time and
8 they've had no problems at all in the 28 year we've been mining out there in their
9 inspections of anything going on. We're hauling clay out of there one day a week, 40
10 loads a day. At this point we do not anticipate any increase in activity. We've maxed
11 out the facility site where we manufacture the bricks on Two Notch Road. As far as the
12 reclamation side we are regulated and we currently have a plan that is approved and we
13 actually went public Friday in the newspaper with an approved plan from DHEC and so
14 that notice period actually even started. They like the plan and as we mine we reclaim
15 as we go with the grass, with the pines that are native to area and some silt fencing in
16 appropriate areas. It was just six weeks ago I believe it was when DHEC was out and
17 they did a mine inspection and the gentleman who has been watching over our pit now
18 for at least the last 20 years that I've been with the company, he said everything looks
19 fine. And within the design of this expansion with a silt basin and with the new design
20 that we've taken care of the expanded property that's allowed to go through has a 97%
21 retention of the sedimentation into the pond. So at this point I don't believe anybody on
22 the neighbors would see anything different than what they've been seeing for the past
23 year and a half – traffic or anything like that.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Next person. Rose Jackson?

2 **TESTIMONY OF ROSE JACKSON:**

3 MS. JACKSON: Good afternoon. My name is Rose Jackson. My current
4 residence is 417 Blackberry Place in Lugoff, South Carolina. However, I'm a joint owner
5 of the property directly across from the mining site at the corner of Mobley Road and
6 Hidden Valley, and my concern is, just as the Commissioner stated earlier, when I saw
7 that this was being rezoned to heavy industrial, my family has owned that property for
8 over 20 years and we've never had a problem with the mining company across the
9 street. But when we saw the classification of heavy industrial our concern is that this is
10 moving from resource extraction where they are regulated for reclamation of the land to
11 heavy industrial which would allow a chemical plant to come in later on or an industrial
12 park. And this land was built – we bought this land along with the neighbors for rural
13 reasons and for residential purposes so our concern is down the road. In the event the
14 mine closes and they sell to another site and it's classified as heavy industrial what type
15 of company can come in and use that land? So that is my major concern. It's not the
16 concern that they expand the mine for resource extraction as they do today but the
17 classification does not distinguish in my opinion.

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Next to speak is Lord?

19 LAYTON LORD: Layton Lord?

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Yes.

21 **TESTIMONEY OF LAYTON LORD:**

22 MR. LORD: Thank you. You heard from Ken. I'm with Carolina Ceramics also.
23 I'm their attorney. He was the most important speaker for the company because he

1 knows the details. And I would just point out; I heard the lady's concerns and as you all
2 know if we want to mine it we've got to zone it heavy industrial. That's the designation
3 that works for mining and the existing mine would be very difficult to make into an
4 industrial site because we've got a big pond there, because after we mine we create a
5 pond. So we sort of – actually create almost a better environment that might be
6 conducive to a residential development some time in the future. But we have no
7 intention other than to mine it. Carolina Ceramics is a brick company and we need the
8 shale so that's why we are asking for this. And one thing I'd like to just point out
9 because Ken covered the most important points is this is a very low key mine if you will.
10 There aren't a whole lot of trucks, just a couple of days a week, maybe 40 trucks or so a
11 week, couple days a week. There's no blasting that goes on. This isn't deep rock
12 mining. It's most sort of a surface type mining and it's heavily regulated by DHEC.
13 We've got reclamation plans with DHEC about how we need to cover things up, plant
14 vegetation, put that native trees and I think most of these sites end up if you go to the
15 old mine - end up looking like a very nice piece of rural property while we're mining it
16 and when we're finished. We think it's consistent with the nature. We've got a timber
17 company next door. We've got some houses. We've got other uses around. We don't
18 see any change to the environment other than the mine that's been going on since the
19 70s. We don't think the neighbors are going to notice any difference whatsoever and
20 there will be a buffer which DHEC is requiring. There will be a buffer of trees between
21 the road. So unless – I don't think anyone will actually see any change from the road as
22 we go forward. And again, traffic will still be limited. We're not trying to really expand

1 the mine, we're just trying to as one of them matures let the mine grow and cover new
2 areas. And with that I'll stop. If you have any questions.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Steve Neal?

4 **TESTIMONY OF RICHARD S. NEAL:**

5 MR. NEAL: My name is Richard S. Neal. I live at 1300 Hidden Valley Road,
6 Elgin 29045. I live directly across the street from the mine. I live on the opposite
7 corner. My residence is on the opposite corner. And when they came – Carolina
8 Ceramics has been very good about coming out, letting us know what's going on.
9 They've sent letters. They've been absolutely great neighbors to us. If there's ever
10 been any problems, which there haven't been, but if there has been any problems
11 they've already addressed them that day. They've left their buffers exactly like they
12 said. They've done everything exactly like they were supposed to. We talked to the
13 DHEC people and they've been nothing but great neighbors for us. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Jack Neal?

15 **TESTIMONY OF JACK NEAL:**

16 MR. NEAL: My name is Jack Neal. I live at 128 Mobley Road, Elgin 29045. It's
17 right down the side of that property. I own that property; I bought it about 30 years ago.
18 These people have been over there that long. I give some of it away. I sold some of it.
19 Mine – I live back in the back on the backside. Absolutely the best kind of neighbors.
20 They respond. We don't have any kind of loud noises. The trucks are orderly coming
21 and going. They're in there by 7:00 in the morning and they're out of there by 4:00
22 o'clock in the afternoon. So I – they're just good neighbors and I can't recommend
23 highly enough that you listen to their request. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: That's all the people that have signed up to speak. Any
2 questions? Anything that you need to discuss here? A motion?

3 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I – you know, it is the only category the applicant
4 can come in under. I'll vote for approval or recommendation for approval but I would
5 ask Staff if they could between now and our next meeting come back to us with a
6 suggested set of language where we can isolate mining and extraction activities as a
7 single use category in our ordinance. We went through this six months ago with a
8 granite quarry. Obviously you can't get, you can't go any where to get granite but
9 because of the location of that particular piece of property on one of our major rivers
10 giving that piece of property an HI designation was of concern to us as well. So I think
11 we're going to, you know, we're likely to see more of this and we ought to have greater
12 flexibility for applicants to be able to go into a category that's more limited in nature and
13 is more protective of the adjacent landowners. So I would request that Staff come back
14 to us with language to create a single – in essence, a single use district for mining. And
15 with that I'll make a motion to send this forward with a recommendation for approval.

16 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the second. All that is in favor of sending
18 this forward for approval of 07-18, please raise your hand. Opposed? No one.

19 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Green, Manning; Absent: Van Dine,*
20 *McBride]*

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: This will go before County Council May [sic] 27th, so
22 you need to be there.

1 MR. PALMER: I just have a question on [inaudible] if I could. This was created
2 out of our new Land Development Code and the new zoning regulations? They were
3 able to do what they were doing under the old code?

4 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: They I believe were in existence before zoning because
5 our first zoning ordinance was 1977, and I was originally told 1979, and new information
6 I have says they started in '74 or '75.

7 MR. PALMER: So this was one of those that we knew would come up -

8 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: So they were there before we were.

9 MR. PALMER: [Inaudible]?

10 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you.

11 MR. GREEN: And I would imagine we have the right to go back and proactively
12 visit with the land users in this category if we're able to create something -

13 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Um-hum (affirmative)

14 MR. GREEN: - new?

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Next is 07-19 MA.

16 **CASE NO. 07-19 MA:**

17 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Case No. 07-19 is off of Bluff Road and Adams Pond
18 Road. It's 158 acre site currently zoned rural district and the proposed request for
19 rezoning is light industrial. According to County records no map amendment has been
20 requested to date and the current zoning of rural district reflects the original zoning as
21 adopted in 1977. Light industrial's intended to accommodate wholesaling, distribution,
22 storage, processing, light manufacturing, and general commercial uses, and such uses
23 are usually controlled operations, relatively clean and quiet and free from exceptional

1 hazard elements such as smoke, noise, odor. The comprehensive plan finds this map
2 amendment not in compliance. The site is bound by southeast and west by rural
3 property, single-family homes, and environmentally sensitive lands. The parcel is
4 currently wooded and vacant and the current use by Richland County residents appears
5 to be a hunting refuge and as such the grounds are natural and undisturbed. The
6 nearest developments are residential in nature and a few small commercial businesses.
7 We also have adjacent to this much of the light industrial M-1 that is currently not in use
8 or remains undeveloped. So the Staff recommends denial of this in lieu of other lands
9 already available for them to use rather than expand that zoning district. So Staff
10 recommendation is denial.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Question to Staff. This is one that kind of puzzle you
12 because you've got rural and farmland beside it.

13 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Um-hum (affirmative).

14 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: But yet that light industrial and heavy industrial around
15 it's mixed use -

16 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Yes, sir.

17 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: - all in that, right?

18 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Um-hum (affirmative). And it's light industrial, the M-1,
19 similar uses.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: The thing is how far Staff want businesses along the
21 Bluff Road corridor to go, right?

22 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I'm sorry.

23 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: How far you want businesses?

1 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I guess the feeling – the Staff recommendation is based
2 on the fact that we already have light industrial there but it's not being utilized. Why
3 would you increase the boundary of that type of use further into the rural areas when
4 you already have it and it's not being used if I'm understanding your question.

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Any other questions? We do have some
6 people signed up to speak at this time. Bruce Harlem(?)? Please state your name and
7 address for the Record.

8 **TESTIMONY OF BRUCE HOLLIMAN:**

9 MR. HOLLIMAN: My name's Bruce Holliman. I live at 1101 Montgomery Lane,
10 Columbia 29209. I moved out on this area in 1989. I have 11 acres and a house out
11 there. And what – it's completely rural. I mean we have – well we have one industry
12 right at the end of Bluff Road that they managed to get in there about five or seven
13 years ago but other than that everything in this area is completely farmland, rural. It's
14 almost flood land. The land's real low. It goes across I think – it almost adjoins Mill
15 Creek there and actually goes into the Congaree National Forest. So I went through the
16 neighborhood and I have about 35 signatures opposed to this. Seems like maybe the
17 County might be on our side with this because there's plenty of land up on Shop Road
18 before you get to Pineview that's already zoned for this that's not used. And I just don't
19 see the use of playing it out any further. And honestly everybody in the neighborhood
20 talked to me – actually thanked me for going through there and signing the petition. So
21 if y'all will care to look at it, I have it. I think we have plenty of people opposed to this.
22 There's no access in it from the Montgomery Lane side and the only access in it is
23 access through Bluff Road.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you, sir.

2 MR. HOLLIMAN: Not the fit for that part of the County.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Deborah Potts? Excuse me. We'll have to
4 go to Executive Session on this for one second. We'll be back out.

5 MS. LINDER: Are you looking for legal advice?

6 MR. PALMER: Yes.

7 *[Executive Session]*

8 MS. LINDER: Mr. Chairman?

9 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Yes.

10 MS. LINDER: The Planning Commission went into Executive Session to receive
11 legal advice and no action was taken during that meeting.

12 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, I just got off the phone with the applicant for the case
13 that you're hearing now. There seemed to be some confusion as to when the actual
14 date for this Planning Commission meeting would be. He received the neighborhood
15 notification letter and he saw the zoning public hearing for the 27th so he assumed that it
16 was the date but he also said he just got his Planning Commission letter. So there
17 doesn't seem to be adequate notification for the applicant to be here which explains his
18 absence.

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay.

20 MR. MANNING: So is the applicant requesting a deferral?

21 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry. Yeah. The applicant requested this be deferred until the
22 April agenda so we can get everyone here.

1 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we defer this case until our next
2 Planning Commission meeting. However, there are people that are here that signed up
3 to speak. They may or may not be able to be here at the next meeting and I believe we
4 ought to give them the opportunity to address the Planning Commission who will take
5 their comments into consideration next month when this case does come before us. So
6 my motion is to defer but also to allow anyone that has signed up to speak that wishes
7 to, to have an opportunity to address the Commission today. And that these people be
8 permitted to speak at our next regular scheduled meeting when the case comes up as
9 well.

10 MR. PALMER: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: All those in favor that we defer 07-19 MA, raise your
12 hand. Disapprove?

13 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Furgess, Green, Manning; Absent: Palmer, Van Dine,*
14 *McBride]*

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Thank you. Those people that were speaking
16 on this case do you want to continue to speak that I have the names down or come
17 back next month when this case comes back before this Body? Those people who
18 signed up to speak. Okay. When I call your name you can go ahead if you want to
19 speak now.

20 MR. PRICE: The property will be reposted and advertised as if it was being
21 heard for the first time on the April agenda.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Potts if you're going to speak .

23 **TESTIMONY OF DEBORAH POTTS:**

1 MS. POTTS: I'm Deborah Potts. I live at 5400 Bluff Road. My husband and I
2 purchased this property about 20 years ago. It's a very quiet neighborhood. We have
3 about 4.5 acres. My next door neighbor has eight and [inaudible] it's all a nice, quiet
4 neighborhood that's surrounded by woods and I would hate to see buildings or parking
5 lots next to us. And I'm also concerned about the traffic. That's the first point on Bluff
6 Road where people can actually pass. There are a lot of accidents out there as there is,
7 and there would be a big concern for businesses [inaudible] people turning off of Bluff
8 Road there may be a lot of accidents. But I would also like if that did happen to get
9 approved – I would like a buffer between my property. I've always had woods
10 surrounding me and I don't want to see parking lots or buildings. It's a major concern.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Thank you. The next person to speak is Frank
12 Van? Vaughn? Van?

13 **TESTIMONY OF FRANK VAUGHN:**

14 MR. VAUGHN: Hello. My name's Frank Vaughn. I live at 238 Langston Trail,
15 Columbia. I'm right around that property they're talking about. The posted signs had
16 the date when we was all supposed to meet here. I don't know what the man's excuse
17 was. But we hunt out there and fish out there and I've been out there 25 years and I
18 would sure hate to see any type of industrial come in there, especially some type of
19 packaging plant or processing plant because of the smell. We've been hearing rumors
20 and until today we didn't know what was going on. We heard about dog kennels,
21 processing plants. We got stuck with the prison right down the road – the jail and now
22 they've got a road coming through us soon. And they just, you know, they're just taking
23 all the country away from us. That's all I got to say.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Seth?

2 **TESTIMONY OF SETH GILES:**

3 MR. GILES: My name is Seth Giles. I live at 9 Lykesland(?) Court. As far as
4 industrial coming through there I've got little kids that like to play in the woods and do
5 their thing. The road that I live on is a dirt road. You put trucks and everything else
6 going through Montgomery Lane, Bluff Road, you're going to have people going to work
7 that's going to take a short cut going towards my house. As far as the smell is
8 concerned like Frank said, I don't want anything to do with a hog farm or anything like
9 that. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. John Dinkins?

11 **TESTIMONY OF JOHN DINKINS:**

12 MR. DINKINS: My name's John Dinkins. I live at 103 Langston Trail. I've been
13 out there about 19 years myself. And these signs have been posted; how come the guy
14 who's having it is not here? I mean we have time, we have to get off work and come
15 down here the same way. And I'm against all this stuff and, you know, how come it can
16 be changed whenever we're here and they're not? I don't understand that. Nobody's
17 told us what's going in there or anything else. So I just want to be able to voice my
18 opinion. I don't understand this; I don't think it's right.

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Buddy Baker?

20 **TESTIMONY OF BUDDY BAKER:**

21 MR. BAKER: My name's Buddy Baker and I'm a resident at 5404 Bluff Road and
22 my property abuts the property in question. I'd like to thank Richland County Planning
23 Commission for allowing us to come down here and speak our voices on this petition.

1 I'd like to first state that I am in opposition to the petition. It will change the complexion
2 of our community. I bought my home a little over 20 years ago and I chose this location
3 because of my desire to live away from the complex, busy and noisy environment of the
4 city. That was the reason why I moved to this area that was zoned rural. And I found
5 my home on Bluff Road to be a very beautiful and quiet place and I've enjoyed raising
6 my family there. It's been a safe place and a good community and as you heard from
7 the other people that spoke we're very passionate about the landscape and we pretty
8 much all moved out there for the same reasons and we'd like for those reasons to stay
9 intact. As I stated my home fronts Bluff Road. I've got two immediate neighbors and
10 the three of us are an in holding which is shown in the southwest corner of the property.
11 So the property abuts us on two sides and I feel very certain that if the property's
12 rezoned to an industrial type of zoning then it would set a precedent for that property
13 that's currently owned by the same property owner across Bluff Road to be zoned
14 similarly. When that happens my neighbors and I would then be an island in the middle
15 of a hodgepodge of a variety of industrial properties. The aesthetics of our current
16 forested community will forever be gone. The residential values, the resale values of
17 our properties will immediately decline. Gentlemen, one of the things that I really
18 appreciate about my home – excuse me? One of the things I really appreciate about
19 my home is that oftentimes when visitors come, especially the first time visitors they
20 really brag about the beautiful setting that my home is in. I take great pride in that. I
21 really appreciate that and it's not uncommon for people when they come to visit to tell
22 me that if ever you decide to sell your home, you know, please let me know about it. If
23 the purpose of our community is rezoned to convert it to an industrial and commercial

1 site the setting for my home will no longer be the envy of my friends and no longer will
2 people dream of owning my home. The resale value will decline. I'd also like to say
3 that our forested community us a haven for wildlife. If you look at the juxtaposition of
4 this property with the floodplain of Mill Creek and it flows into the Congaree floodplain,
5 we're a wildlife haven. My family, my girls and I we really enjoy observing deer, fox,
6 quail as they travel through our yard. In fact in the past three years the wild turkey
7 population in the Congaree River Swamp has expanded into our community. The
8 property in question has now got turkeys for the first time in nearly a decade. We're
9 excited about that. Most of us have hunted in and around this property. We enjoy the
10 outdoors. My children enjoy the outdoors. And I can assure you that if these properties
11 are converted to an industrial site those sightings of wild animals in my yard will not
12 decline; they will end. I think it's also worth noting that the property abuts a designation
13 by the Department of Natural Resources a group of properties that have been
14 designated as Congaree Floodplain Wildlife Habitat Protection Initiative. There are
15 environmental partners working right now vigorously trying to preserve these properties
16 from development to protect them for wildlife. And while this property is not actually
17 inside of that initiative it abuts that initiative and I think it's safe to say that industry on
18 this property will certainly compromise that effort. I try to stay involved in – yes?

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You need to bring it to a close.

20 MR. BAKER: I'll bring it to a close. I try to be involved in the County's planning
21 processes and I know that in those discussions there's been discussed by your Staff
22 that one of the likely places to end this type of development would be the Mill Creek
23 floodplain. I'll go ahead and conclude by saying that we're not really certain why the

1 petitioner did not get notification but we feel like it's an injustice to us. You're looking at
2 middle-class, working people who took time off from work today to be here. We cannot
3 afford to take time off and be back at the next meeting. And while we – yes, we have
4 had the opportunity to voice our concerns we will not be here physically to hold you
5 guys accountable so we're putting a lot of trust in you to make the right decision. We're
6 not wealthy; we cannot afford an attorney and we can't afford to take time off again.
7 We're not politically connected but we appreciate that this process will work and we
8 thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

9 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Next on the agenda, the agenda item that we have is
10 07-21. Oh, I'm sorry - excuse me, excuse me. This gentlemen here will need to speak.
11 I just got –

12 **TESTIMONY OF JOHN AIKEN:**

13 MR. AIKEN: I'm John Aiken. My farm kind of wraps around this property. You
14 can see the clear space there and it's 5412 Bluff Road. I don't live there but I'm thinking
15 of building a house – thinking – but this gives me room to think. I've got a nice, clean
16 farm, well kept. I grow blueberries. I've got all kinds of animals and everything. It's a
17 real farm. But this is encroachment - and if it does I'll just have to take it. Not what I
18 want but it's encroachment. And there are very few farms left in Richland County and
19 this is a farm worth looking at. But I don't – I'll just have to take what comes and I don't
20 like it.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you, sir.

22 MR. AIKEN: So thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Excuse me. Suzie, would you step to the podium one
2 second, please. Thank you. We'll go now to 07-21 MA. We'll go now to 07-21 MA.

3 **CASE NO. 07-21 MA:**

4 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: The next file for consideration is 07-21. It is an existing
5 PUD that is being requested to be zoned, Lake Carolina Planned Development District.
6 It is located – it's approximately 3,800 linear feet on the frontage of Bud Keef Road. It
7 says in the Staff Report that it's 450 – excuse me, 445 single-family home lots and that
8 is a misprint; it's 456. The next page is correct. Lake Carolina wants to absorb this –
9 excuse me, 167 acres into the Lake Carolina Planned Development. It will not increase
10 their total density of 6,988 units. Their current acreage is 1,679. This will add 167
11 acres to that Lake Carolina. It is contiguous. The Development Review Team reviewed
12 this on February 15th and has four items that they are requesting to be part of the
13 recommendation. The wetlands buffer, sidewalks to be provided to operational
14 standards, Public Works requested an open span crossing bridge for the wetlands, and
15 the Fire Marshal wanted to explore secondary access for concerns for parcels A and F.
16 The proposed PDD conditions are listed and inclusive of the DRT recommendations. I
17 bring your attention to Item No. 14 where the Planning Commission and County Council
18 may require enhancements to proposed recreation and open space areas. Planning
19 Staff does recommend approval.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions from the Commissioners to Staff?

21 MR. GREEN: Where do we reference parcel A and F in the documents we
22 have?

1 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: It should be on their – let's see if it's in here. I thought it
2 was part of the package. It was an exhibit that we used at the DRT and I just apologize
3 – I assumed it was part of this.

4 MR. GREEN: I think I found it. It's exhibit B in the book. I guess my question
5 with regard to that from a Staff recommendation standpoint is that item number four
6 under the DRT conditions, it says, explore secondary access and proposed PDD
7 conditions under provision number two is a recommendation I guess from Staff to limit
8 the access points. So I'm trying to understand which position Staff is recommending.

9 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: The A and F I believe were internal. Let me just see
10 here if I can find this road here. Because it was, limited the access but those two
11 sections of the development have quite a few numbers and housing and I believe it
12 does have one entrance off Bud Keef. I'm sorry, I don't think I have an answer to your
13 question except that the Fire Marshal wanted to request that they explore secondary
14 accesses and the site is limited to one off of Kelly Mill Road.

15 MR. GREEN: That's the only question I had.

16 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I'm sorry; I don't think I have an answer for you. The
17 Fire Marshal when they see – since this is just the rezoning, when they see the actual
18 subdivision plan for that community they will be addressing I guess to get more access.
19 And currently it is limited to one.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions? We have one person to sign up
21 to speak. Excuse me, sir. This young lady.

22 **TESTIMONY OF RUTH RUSSELL:**

1 MS. RUSSELL: My name is Ruth Russell. I live at 318 Water Hickory Way
2 29229. The back of my home butts up against this property. I believe in private
3 property rights and not trying to prevent people from making money with their property
4 but I also believe in being a good neighbor. I have a few concerns. I know that it is
5 already zoned for homes. Some of the concerns I have are for one, Bud Keef Road is
6 very close to those homes that go along [inaudible] Water Hickory. And my concern is if
7 that road becomes wide that will become a quick short cut from Hardscrabble to Kelly
8 Mill, instead of people following Hardscrabble up to the stop sign and turning. It's going
9 to become a short cut and a hazard to the people living in those homes because that
10 road is very close to those back homes. Right now it's a dirt road and if anybody drives
11 through there they're going to take the bottom of their car off. So that is a big concern I
12 have. The other – several other concerns I have are that area right now is being, is
13 used for deer hunting. There are quite a few deer on that property and I know that they
14 will be building homes nonetheless, but my concern is lot size, that the homes are not
15 put on small lots. That there aren't – plenty of trees left and areas for the deer because
16 they're already kind of becoming part of the development and getting in people's yards.
17 So the trees and the road are a big concern for me. Just something to consider. I'm not
18 completely against somebody building something because I know that people have a
19 right to their property. I just want to make sure that what is built there does not become
20 a detriment to the value of the property and the safety of the people living in that area.
21 And I thank you for your time.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Thank you. That's the only one that signed up
23 to speak. Are you the applicant? Okay. Come forward [inaudible].

1 **TESTIMONY OF CHUCK MUNN:**

2 MR. MUNN: Thank you. I'm Chuck Munn, 1426 Dearborn Road, the applicant in
3 this matter. I apologize taking a decongestant about an hour ago. It's kind of dried me
4 up. But I understand as the applicant I believe we have five minutes and I'll try to make
5 that as quickly as I can. Pardon?

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Two minutes. Five? Okay.

7 MR. MUNN: I did want to say that we were surprised when we read the
8 proposed conditions from Staff. We actually did not receive those until this morning; we
9 tried to get them the end of last week. And we don't want to be penalized for
10 purchasing this property. We – especially when we feel we've done a good job in
11 developing Lake Carolina and being a good steward of the land. I did want to note on
12 the density that Ms. Linder noted, not only would this not increase the overall density,
13 but what we've done is the remaining allowable development property in Lake Carolina,
14 we're willing to reduce that density of the allowable remaining development by 170 units
15 to offset the 71 additional units we were looking at on this property so that there's a net
16 decrease of 99 units on the remaining development. What that would mean at build out
17 is not the 6,900 odd units that Ms. Linder noted, we will actually only end up with about
18 64% of that number of units in Lake Carolina. Roughly a 2,500 unit reduction. Excuse
19 me. With regard to – we have five – we have no problem with most of the conditions
20 but I wanted to note on the buffers the Corp has delineated property. There are 21
21 acres of wetlands; that's what's been there since the original delineation. We're very
22 use to buffers in Lake Carolina. We have some buffers now. Those were a result of
23 mitigation because of construction of the lake. I understand the concern when wetlands

1 are included on the rear of a property, actually in the lot, that that can be an issue. But
2 we actually plat only to the wetlands. All the wetlands are given to the homeowners
3 association. So we do not want the extra condition of a 30'. In this case it would
4 increase the wetlands 21 to 30 acres, a 50% increase. And that would make the
5 housing less affordable. The current [inaudible] property could be, for that additional
6 property could be built as is today and there would be no additional buffers. So we in
7 fact in that regard would be being penalized by having to impose additional buffers that
8 are not there today. We will work to put some additional buffers in the jagged areas of
9 the wetlands. As you can see it's a very irregular wetland. We've done that throughout
10 Lake Carolina. We have between four and six acres of additional wetlands that we think
11 we'll be adding to the 21, based on making those cleaner edges and not trying to
12 develop every square foot that we can. With regard to sidewalks, we will have internally
13 sidewalks that connect to our over 30 miles of sidewalks and bike trails in Lake
14 Carolina. Along Kelly Mill Road we're being asked to put a sidewalk where there are no
15 sidewalks. There are not even any sidewalks on Kelly Mill that go to the schools that
16 exist. And the city is looking at starting a 30" water main very soon. When they do that
17 it will tear any sidewalk up that is put in. So we have no problems with sidewalks except
18 along Kelly Mill. With regard to the open span bridge, it is our intent to build the same
19 type of bridge we've been building throughout Lake Carolina. It's an easy to maintain
20 conspan(?) section. It will be easy for the County or the homeowners association,
21 whoever gets that, to maintain. It'll cost us about \$250,000 each. We built three of
22 them and they're not inexpensive to build but they're good for maintenance purposes.
23 I'm not sure the County wants to take a bridge and have the expense of maintaining an

1 open span bridge over time. And if they don't want to do that – I noticed you said Public
2 Works had wanted that but they maybe thinking that the homeowners association is
3 going to take maintenance of that bridge. If that's the case we need something that the
4 homeowners association can maintain at a more reasonable expense than an actual
5 bridge. And we have had no problems with the quality of wetlands where we have used
6 conspan sections. The additional right-of-way reservations that are being requested,
7 we have no issues along Kelly Mill Road. We do want to note that along Bud Keef
8 Road from Kelly Mill to the current Lake Carolina entrance, that right-of-way has already
9 been reserved with a 66' and the conditions didn't give a width that you wanted the
10 additional widening but our assumption is if it's a normal 50, 66 will be an additional 16'.
11 No problem on Kelly Mill. Bud Keef's already taken care of. That's already been
12 deeded to the County up the point of the entrance in Lake Carolina. And the rest of Bud
13 Keef, we have no desire to improve Bud Keef. We would love to work with the County
14 to actually abandon Bud Keef at some point. One of the reasons is we found out when
15 we were doing the first part with Richland County that there's a title glitch in there that
16 Richland County actually has no right-of-way on the part that Ms. Russell I believe is
17 talking about – that they have no right-of-way there and so we would like to work with
18 the County. We have the same concerns that Ms. Russell does there and that was the
19 reason that we did not plat her lot and the other lots all the way up to Bud Keef Road
20 but in fact preserved a 50' buffer in case this ever came to be an issue. So the – what I
21 would say is we certainly appreciate Staff's thorough review of this and their analysis
22 but we would respectfully request to you to send forward a recommendation for
23 approval but we would ask that items three, four, five, and six be eliminated. That

1 number 12 be modified to require only the additional right-of-way along Kelly Mill Road
2 since the other has already been done and finally that number 13 be modified to delete
3 any references to external sidewalks. And I thank you for your time. Be glad to answer
4 any questions.

5 MR. MANNING: Mr. Munn, I've got one for you. Regarding the condition
6 number five with the bridge across the wetlands. Is there a creek that you are crossing
7 or is just a wetland?

8 MR. MUNN: It's just a wetland. I might add – the very start of that wetland is up
9 at Kelly Mill Road, basically come in – starts about oh, 50' in from there. It's really the
10 start of the wetlands so there is no creek there. And right at the head of that wetlands is
11 about oh, like more than 50', maybe a 100' from the edge of the wetland to Kelly Mill
12 Road. That area is an area that's being – we've been asked by the City to donate that
13 land to them for a water booster pump station so we're looking at doing that. So at the
14 very start of the wetland and there is no open creek running through it.

15 MR. MANNING: Don't you normally go through the review process with the
16 Corps on the wetlands as to whether that kind of bridge is necessary or not?

17 MR. MUNN: We are – well this is a very narrow wetland. We've picked the
18 narrowest spot to try to cross it and it's our intention to do so with a Corps of Engineers
19 nationwide permit. It fits the criteria for a nationwide permit so we agree. It would seem
20 to us that the criteria for what type of bridge is part of a negotiation with the Corps rather
21 than with the County.

22 MR. MANNING: Thank you.

23 MR. MUNN: Yes, sir.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions?

2 MR. MANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. You're quite welcome. Ready for a motion on
4 this please.

5 MR. GREEN: Just a quick question for Staff. On this bridge issue the applicant
6 has suggested that they're going to work with the Corps to get approved an appropriate
7 bridge. I would just like to hear the thinking of Staff on the recommendation for the
8 open bridge versus the approach the applicant mentioned.

9 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I'm sorry.

10 MR. GREEN: My question was with regard to the bridge. The applicant has said
11 that they're going to work with the Corps to build the appropriate bridge over the
12 wetlands crossing and I was just curious as to Staff's recommendations with regard to
13 an open bridge and was also curious why, since there's extensive comments in here
14 why the applicant didn't have an opportunity until Friday to even hear about the
15 comments that have been made.

16 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I don't know why he didn't get his copy of the package.
17 It was mailed to him. The – and when I received the information he didn't have it I
18 emailed to him this morning. But I don't know if you realize we have about I'd 15
19 computers that our down in our department because of a unfortunate problem with the
20 Dell motherboard. So we're just basically having to use laptops and things like that so
21 some of our messages are not getting to us and it's unfortunate. We were told it would
22 be fixed in two weeks so we're waiting. I mean I think the two weeks is now up. But as
23 far as the conspan bridge that was brought up by public works at the DRT. So I would

1 think they would address those comments as far as – that was the type of bridge that he
2 was looking to review it and design.

3 MR. GREEN: Was he given any background as to why that bridge versus what
4 would be acceptable to the Corps would be inappropriate?

5 MR. PALMER: Not to mention there's three other bridges of a different type
6 already in Lake Carolina?

7 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I thought that's what he had said that they already have
8 this type of bridge – open span bridge.

9 MR. PALMER: They have three different types.

10 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: That was one of the things that Public Works, Charles
11 Beam(?) asked for, asked to see plans on. Do you want to address that?

12 MR. CRISS: Sure.

13 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Go ahead.

14 MR. CRISS: If I may respond to that question. The idea was to protect the
15 ecological integrity and continuity of that wetland system instead of having
16 embankments and culvert. And according to the applicant it was feasible but there may
17 be some additional construction expense and of course maintenance of any road and
18 bridge system is of continuous concern to Public Works.

19 MR. MANNING: I think Public Works will maintain either conspan or free
20 spanning bridges or other bridges that they have in Lake Carolina. I'm a little bit
21 concerned about putting that condition as part of the PUD approval when we're
22 approving other types of bridges in other subdivisions outright. Typically the Corps of
23 Engineers would take a position as whether a free span bridge was necessary to

1 mitigate any wetland impact. If it doesn't have a stream there typically you don't need to
2 span that wetland if it's a very narrow crossing. This is something else I think that we
3 need to discuss as far as flood conditions.

4 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions?

5 MR. GREEN: Let me just – I'm curious with the – we have in front of us DRT
6 conditions as well as proposed PDD conditions. Is our motion on this, irrespective of
7 the motion, have to address both the DRT conditions as well as the PDD conditions?
8 Or legally is this incorporated into the PDD conditions? We have two sets of conditions
9 in Staff Report.

10 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Right. They are – I believe they're, they're repeated in
11 the PDD conditions. The DRT ones are repeated.

12 MR. GREEN: So with it –

13 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Right.

14 MR. GREEN: - our motion does not have to include –

15 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Correct.

16 MR. GREEN: - anything with regard to the DRT conditions?

17 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I believe that they are one, two, three. Yes. They're
18 included as the same recommendations for the PDD, the first four or five items. It's the
19 same thing.

20 MR. GREEN: So this is really DRT review rather than DRT conditions?

21 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: They were –

22 MR. GREEN: The conditions are stated in the PDD.

23 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: - conditions of approval. Yes, sir.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions?

2 MR. ANDERSON: Just to be real clear. On condition number four, Mr. Munn,
3 sidewalks on exterior roads - which road did you say that – was it Kelly Mill Road? It
4 was Kelly Mill Road on condition number four?

5 MR. MUNN: The external road would be Kelly Mill Road. There are no
6 sidewalks whatsoever on Kelly Mill now including in front of the school. But we'll have
7 full sidewalks internal to the project as we have throughout Lake Carolina.

8 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Mr. Chairman, the Lake Carolina was approved prior to
9 the July 2005 change in ordinances and that is what requested sidewalks external to all
10 developments, commercial or residential.

11 MR. PALMER: But they were approved prior to that?

12 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Correct. But the, Lake Carolina basically is asking for
13 their development agreement and their boundaries to be changed and as such are
14 being asked to bring it to comply with some of the requirements that are in the new
15 ordinance.

16 MR. MUNN: Our Development Agreement does allow however for additional
17 property to be brought in.

18 MR. MANNING: The original Development Agreement does not require
19 sidewalks on the existing side of Kelly Mill Road at this time?

20 MR. MUNN: No, sir.

21 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Huh-uh (negative). Does not.

22 MR. PALMER: Which means if they build sidewalks here there would never be
23 any sidewalks after it because they have the other property [inaudible]?

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions?

2 MR. GREEN: I'd just like to, so I'm clear from the applicant. Provision number
3 six says, "The applicant shall explore secondary access for parcels A and F as
4 mitigation for single access." I wanted to just simply get the applicant's perspective on
5 that recommendation.

6 MR. MUNN: Well two things; the notebook that you have in front of you that we
7 prepared also has a traffic summary section. As this PUD was originally improved –
8 approved years ago before us it had two distinct sections that were not connected such
9 that everything dumped onto Kelly Mill Road or onto Bud Keef Road. We've now
10 provided an internal circulation because being part of Lake Carolina we think people
11 want to be connected to the community that they are a part of. We had the same
12 concern, Mr. Green, when we read a condition that said one, a point - only one point of
13 entry onto Kelly Mill Road but then trying to explore secondary access and we, you
14 know, it seemed to me you could have one but you couldn't have both. So we were
15 concerned about that. We have numerous communities within Lake Carolina that come
16 off of our boulevard road system much as this would do that work just fine without
17 having any access problems because of internal – once you get into the community
18 there's not just one way in and out. There are multiple roads that do connect. They
19 loop around. So we don't see where those two section – if you said parcel A does front
20 on Kelly Mill Road so the only way to get a secondary access to A would be to put in an
21 additional cut onto Kelly Mill. F is back in the far corner. It does not abut any other type
22 of road and it's 75 units in that section. So our traffic study indicated the plan we have
23 is a better traffic and circulation plan than that which is currently existing because we

1 think many of the residents will want to utilize the internal circulation to Lake Carolina to
2 get to the schools, to get their amenities.

3 MR. GREEN: So your preference would be for item six to be deleted from the -

4 MR. MUNN: Three, four, five, and six with the two changes that we had to 12
5 and 13.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions from the applicant at this time?
7 Thank you, sir. Ready for the vote?

8 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to place a motion on the floor that we send
9 this forward to Council with a recommendation for approval subject to the PDD
10 conditions specified by Staff on page 51 and 52 with the following exceptions: That
11 provision three be deleted, provision four be deleted – or provision four be modified to
12 say, “. . . except for Kelly Mill Road.” Provision five be deleted, provision six be deleted.
13 Provision 12 state that the right-of-way – the 66' right-of-way shall be along Kelly Mill
14 Road only, and that provision 13 be modified with again regard to the external sidewalks
15 along Kelly Mill Road.

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We heard the motion; need a second?

17 MR. PALMER: If you exclude Kelly Mill would you not need to exclude Bud Keef
18 also if you're going to keep -

19 MR. GREEN: Well that would be internal, that would be internal. My
20 understanding is Bud Keef is now totally internal to the development and you would
21 want to retain sidewalk along Bud Keef Road since it's internal and not an external
22 sidewalk.

23 MR. PALMER: Unless they don't use it.

1 MR. MUNN: Bud Keef Road is at this point is a Richland County right-of-way
2 and the only pavement is from the Lake Carolina entrance which is down Bud Keef
3 about 500 yards to Kelly Mill. So again you'd be putting in a sidewalk to go to Kelly Mill.
4 [inaudible] problem putting one; it's a relatively short distance but it's not going to go
5 anywhere would be the problem with it. We were really wanting to eliminate the
6 language about the two external roadways.

7 MR. GREEN: Well I'll modify my motion with regard on 13 to – with the
8 exception of external sidewalks.

9 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Heard the motion. I need a second.

10 MR. ANDERSON: I'll second.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: All in favor by raising your hand that we send this
12 forward to County Council with a recommendation.

13 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Green, Manning; Absent: Van Dine,*
14 *McBride]*

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. That'll be March 27th. The next agenda
16 item is 07-03 MA. Let me read into the minutes that Mr. Manning's company is involved
17 with this so that he has to excuse himself due to Ethics and Government Accountability
18 Act and so he cannot vote or discuss this matter. He will excuse himself from this room
19 at this time.

20 **CASE NO. 07-03 MA:**

21 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Mr. Chairman, 07-03 map amendment Congaree Point,
22 110 acre site currently zoned light industrial and general commercial requesting to be
23 rezoned to a planned development. It has 250 linear feet on Atlas Road and

1 approximately 1,300 linear feet on Bluff Road. It does reflect the original zoning as
2 established in September 1977. It does follow the – is in line with the comprehensive
3 plan for high density and residential developments where – also gives a variety of
4 housing. It encompasses 143 detached single-family homes, 160 town homes, 36
5 garden villas and predominantly designed for active seniors, and 40 villas and an 8.8
6 acre site for commercial. The 17-acre recreational facility park is in negotiations with
7 Richland County and I understand that those negotiations are complete and it does now
8 belong to Richland County. They also doing several pocket parks throughout the
9 development. Richland County Development Code establishes minimum standards for
10 landscape parking and landscaping pedestrian amenities, etc. and we're looking for
11 them to plan developments to meet and hopefully exceed those minimum standards.
12 There is a concern for level of service. The Planning Staff does – the transportation of
13 level of service – the Planning Staff does recommend approval of this amendment. It
14 came before the Development Review Team on February 15th and with three conditions
15 of approval meaning sidewalks, the vegetative buffer, and dedicated right-of-way to
16 accommodate a dedicated left turn – left and right turn lanes on Bluff Road. Planning
17 Staff does recommend approval of this map amendment.

18 CHAIRMAN FURGES: Any questions from Commissioners to Staff?

19 MR. GREEN: I guess I'll get in the PDD conditions after we hear from –

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any of the applicants who are [inaudible] please come
21 forward at this time.

22 **TESTIMONY OF DARRELL STROUD(?)**:

1 MR. STROUD: Good afternoon, gentlemen. I'm Darrell Stroud, 4500 Fort
2 Jackson Boulevard, Columbia, South Carolina 29209. First I'd like to say there are a
3 couple other members here for the applicant as this is a cooperative effort between
4 myself and Hallmark Homes and our team as well as the Bible Way Church of Atlas
5 Road, and Senator Jackson is here as well, and the Executive Director of the Midlands
6 Community Development Corporation [inaudible] back here as well so talk to any of the
7 three of us [inaudible]. I certainly want to thank the Staff - Congaree Point, the
8 development piece of this is 106 acres combination of mixed use facilities as you heard
9 with the Richland County Recreation Commission as well as some commercial portions
10 of it which include a general practitioners' office, a number of general practitioners will
11 go in that. And then about 43 acres of residential of which that's the piece that I can
12 talk, talk to you specifically about. I certainly want to thank the Staff. They're a great
13 help in putting this together and we are excited to do this. There are a couple of things
14 that I'd like to ask you to look at with the conditions. Since we're on limited time here I'll
15 kind of get to that and then answer questions. On proposed PDD conditions number
16 one just to make sure that we understand, those numbers that are listed there for 143,
17 160, 36, and 40, those are the numbers that are currently designed in our sketch plan.
18 In our PDD we'd actually ask for a high and low end number. The high end number on
19 that was 150 for the detached single, 180 for the town homes, 45 for the garden villas,
20 and 45 for the Hallmark villas. And under number eight, access subject site shall be
21 limited to five curb cuts on Atlas Road and one curb cut on Bluff Road. I really don't
22 have any problem with the number on Atlas Road but Bluff Road we think deserves
23 probably at least one more curb cut given the two different [inaudible]. There – one of

1 those really specifically looking at Richland County Recreation facility of that. Number
2 nine – I'm really confused about the all internal streets shall be owned and maintained
3 by - not by Richland County. We would certainly like to have the opportunity at some
4 point in the future to turn those streets over to Richland County because they will meet
5 all the requirements that we typically do but that's a discussion thing. And then certainly
6 the widen the Bluff Road making sure that we all understand Bluff Road's a five-lane as
7 it is right now so the left turn of that would really be a restriping. A deceleration lane on
8 the right side is an not an issue with us certainly. And then on number 14, a 20'
9 vegetative buffer along north and eastern property lines. We're actually looking for 10'
10 vegetative buffer because we have it on the eastern version of that because an SCE&G
11 power line runs there so we've already got a line there as well and a significant buffer.
12 The other piece is these are large stand pines that we are willing to leave in place.
13 Because this is a residential location we're a little concerned that we might get some of
14 the weather that we've had recently and have a tree come down on a house or set it up
15 for that possibility so we're looking for ten for that. And other than that gentlemen, I
16 [inaudible] your questions.

17 MR. PALMER: I have a question for you. Condition number two. What's the
18 whole deal with that? You want to leave places of worship in parcel A but they want to
19 take it out. What's the –

20 MR. STROUD: Yeah. Parcel A really what we were trying to do is there's a
21 portion of parcel A that is a reflection of where Bible Way Church of Atlas Road came
22 from in the past. It is a little red church that sits across the street from the worship
23 center where actually the church would stare at where it came from and that little red

1 church we were looking for – it's in parcel A right now. We wanted that church to be
2 available for a worship or prayer service or something like that. So that's specific
3 facility. It's not an issue to us right now at this point in time.

4 MR. GREEN: All right. What is Staff – Staff is recommending that it not be
5 allowed for a place of worship?

6 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: The – from what I understand the current ordinance
7 considers places of worship as commercial uses and this was in a residential area. So
8 that was the reason it was asked to be removed because it was a commercial use.

9 MR. GREEN: We permit places of worship in any zoning district in the county.

10 MR. PALMER: Right.

11 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I think it's by special requirements. But that was what I
12 was informed on the reason for that decision was that it was considered a commercial
13 use -

14 MR. GREEN: The applicant –

15 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: - and it was in a residential section.

16 MR. GREEN: The applicant would prefer that condition two be deleted?

17 MR. STROUD: We would prefer that it be deleted; correct.

18 MR. GREEN: I just want to understand from Staff just to know. It says, "The
19 applicant shall remove reference to parcel F and its intended uses from the PDD
20 document." I'm just scratching my head to understand what that means.

21 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: This was the park that was being purchased by
22 Richland County, the 17 acre park. It should have been a lot more explicit. I apologize.

23 MR. GREEN: So –

1 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: So it's now owned by Richland County so it's not part of
2 the planned development from what I understand. So it's being removed as parcel F.

3 MR. STROUD: Gentlemen, it is not officially owned by Richland County at this
4 time.

5 MR. GREEN: But don't we want to –

6 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Sorry.

7 MR. GREEN: - as part of our PDD say that this property should be for these uses
8 because that's part of the master plan?

9 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Correct.

10 MR. GREEN: So we can eliminate provision three?

11 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: It has to do with the process of an approval for a
12 planned development.

13 MR. GREEN: I guess the question – why is it spelled out specifically? Doesn't
14 that apply to any time somebody comes in with a –

15 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: That's correct.

16 MR. GREEN: - a change?

17 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: It seems to have been a requirement of all the planned
18 developments that have been going through the Planning office.

19 MR. GREEN: This is just referring back to the code that if you change it –

20 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Correct.

21 MR. GREEN: - you've got to follow the code?

22 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Correct. Correct.

23 MR. PALMER: Is the County not in the practice of accepting roads anymore?

1 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Not to my knowledge. I was under the impression that
2 they would be public roads but I see this condition here as not. I can't answer you but
3 maybe since the applicant is saying that maybe it is in fact a typographical error. I don't
4 know the answer to that.

5 MR. PALMER: Let me just ask you a question and I know I was late and I
6 apologize for that. Do we have people that sit in on these meetings that's here today?
7 Why was – where did this come from that the County doesn't want these roads? Donny
8 or Michael?

9 MR. CRISS: Mr. Commissioner, I presume it's a mistake. I believe that the
10 applicant's intent is that these roads be built to County standards and turned over to the
11 County for maintenance. That this was not going to be a gated community. That would
12 be the only reason to go private in my opinion. If you limit access then you can't expect
13 the taxpayers to maintain the roads but this will be an open community with a diversity
14 of uses; a new urban village on the perimeter of the Beltway of the capitol city.

15 MR. GREEN: So it's an error in this –

16 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I believe so.

17 MR. GREEN: - the conditions.

18 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Yes.

19 MR. GREEN: You know, the applicant has talked about Bluff Road being five
20 lanes at this point with regard to a separate left-turn lane which I assume already exists.

21 MR. STROUD: There's no designated lane use but there is a central lane. Yes,
22 sir.

1 MR. GREEN: I'd just like to understand Staff's thinking on this requirement given
2 the five-lane – the existence of a five-lane road at present.

3 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I guess based on the traffic information that we had felt
4 like it was a necessity.

5 MR. GREEN: Would that create two left-turn lanes if they're asked to put in
6 another one?

7 MR. PALMER: It seems like to me it would create a turn lane plus a storage
8 median. It doesn't make sense.

9 MR. GREEN: No. On the buffer, the vegetative buffer issue, we of course have
10 in our current code under buffer transition yards certain requirements in the width and
11 vary depending on the type of planting that's done, etc. I would assume that even with
12 the PDD that if there are buffer requirements specified by County code between certain
13 types of lots or certain types of uses that - wouldn't they prevail as opposed to PDD
14 conditions unless PDD were more restrictive?

15 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: The planned development – I mean the section of the
16 code that deals with planned developments says that we encourage planned
17 developments because they are supposed to be innovative to exceed the minimum
18 requirements of Richland County. So Richland County's minimum requirement is ten
19 feet. So in the DRT meeting that is when that 20' vegetative buffer came up and from
20 what I understand it was agreed upon by the applicant.

21 MR. GREEN: Because as I read the code if you stay in the ten to 15 –

22 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: That's correct.

1 MR. GREEN: - range you're required to build an eight-foot stockade fence and
2 this would especially apply to lots, the residential lots abutting the industrial park. And
3 I'm assuming that that would still apply in this case.

4 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: What we're asking – I believe I'm answering your
5 question, is for them to exceed that ten to 15, by five feet. We're asking them to exceed
6 the minimum requirements.

7 MR. GREEN: That answers my question.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: On page 61 here you have that – that's wetlands there
9 on page 61 there on the front on Bluff Road?

10 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I think it's floodplain, floodplain.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: It is?

12 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: That's what that blue –

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: [Inaudible] green space for that area?

14 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I'm sorry?

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: That would be the green space for that area?

16 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: You can build in a floodplain. You have different
17 requirements but you can build in a floodplain. But that would match the design that
18 they have for Bluff Road does not – it appears that it does have an open space in the
19 front there at Atlas and Bluff which is what that looks like that is.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: So that is part of the floodplain or just -

21 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Yes.

22 MS. GREEN: Just a question for Staff. If, you know, we are including parcel F in
23 the PDD would it not make sense to permit two curb cuts on Bluff Road rather than one

1 since one is accessing the residential and commercial area and the other would be a
2 separate entrance for the park?

3 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I think this was based on a consensus that the review -
4 and their actual diagram only shows the one access. But I was under the -

5 MR. PALMER: It shows three.

6 MR. GREEN: It shows three.

7 MR. PALMER: It shows three access points.

8 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I'm sorry?

9 MR. GREEN: It shows three.

10 MR. PALMER: Their diagram shows three accesses on Bluff.

11 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Well, okay. One, two – okay. I'm sorry. It does show
12 three. I'm sorry. But I think that the information that I have from the Richland County
13 Parks and Recreation was that it was completed so I apologize for that misinformation.
14 That's information I was given.

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: So that should be, instead of one should be three
16 anyway, huh for Bluff Road? On number eight?

17 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: I know that we accepted what they had given us as far
18 as their three accesses on Bluff Road. I'm almost positive. So the only thing I can think
19 of is that it's another typing mistake. I don't have an answer for you.

20 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, for purposes of getting a motion on the floor I would
21 like to move approval of the PDD with the conditions as outlined by staff on page 59 and
22 60 with the following modifications. Under number one, that a maximum of up to 150
23 detached, single-family homes, 180 town homes, 45 garden villas, and 45 Hallmark

1 villas amend the current language of provision one; that provision two be deleted; that
2 provision three be deleted; that provision eight be amended to allow for three curb cuts
3 on Bluff Road; that provision nine be deleted; that provision ten be deleted; and that
4 provision 14 be deleted with the understanding that setbacks and buffer yards will be
5 per County code which would be the standard as well. And that will be my motion.

6 MR. PALMER: I'll second the motion.

7 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the motion. All in favor of sending 07-03 to
8 County Council for approval raise your hand. Those opposed?

9 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Green, Manning; Absent: Van Dine,*
10 *McBride]*

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: It will go to County Council. Make sure you're there on
12 March the 27th when it will go before County Council. Ms. Linder, is the text amendment
13 - text amendment?

14 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: The text amendment's included in here and I believe
15 Geo Price may like to address some questions if there are any. I guess if you have any
16 questions about – this is the part that was actually left off the previous one that came in
17 with tattoos and I believe this was – if I remember correctly. No?

18 MS. LINDER: Mr. Chairman, this is a Council initiated ordinance. It's already
19 received first reading and whereas tattoos is going as a special except – excuse me, as
20 a special exception, the body piercing is proposed with special requirements.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Go ahead.

22 MR. PRICE: Any questions? [Laughter]

1 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think the changes in the text are consistent with
2 what we've talked about previously in terms of what we needed to do. So that Council
3 will direction from us, since they've already voted in favor of it, I would recommend that
4 we send this forward with a recommendation for approval.

5 MR. PALMER: Let's here from the – we have people signed up to speak?

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible]

7 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Have a second on it?

8 MR. ANDERSON: I'll second.

9 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. All in favor that we send this forward for
10 recommendation of approval please raise your hand.

11 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Green, Manning; Absent: Van Dine,*
12 *McBride]*

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. New business on the agenda. Any new
14 business? Next we have Decker Boulevard Master Plan.

15 MS. TIA RUTHERFORD: In front of you you have a memorandum from Staff
16 concerning the Decker Boulevard Master Plan in referenced to the work session on
17 February 15th. I'll read verbatim. Again, during the work session on the 15th of February
18 there were a number of issues and concerns brought forward for clarification to the
19 Decker Boulevard Master Plan. And they are stated here. The festival marketplace at
20 Decker Mall will remain as a suggested activity that should take place within the corridor
21 as two prior international festivals occurred at this location on November 1st, 2003, and
22 November 14th, 2004. However, all references to that festival infrastructure remaining
23 as permanent structures will be removed. That was one of the biggest issues of

1 contention during the work session meeting is that the tent-style tent was a permanent
2 fixture on Mr. Theus' and Mr. Taylor's property. So again all references to permanent
3 infrastructure at Decker Mall or tents or festivals will be removed thus allowing the
4 owners of the property the ability to develop according to standards that will be set forth
5 in the Decker Boulevard Master Plan, the Richland County Comprehensive Plan and
6 any other document in association with the Master Plan. Thus, the Decker Mall
7 proposed site plan on page 19 will be changed to reflect the removal of the tent-style
8 canvas tent for outdoor market and community green with amphitheater. Those two
9 references in that site plan, proposed site plan on page 19 will be removed. Okay.
10 Another issue that was brought forward during the work session was median crossings.
11 The planted median the length of Decker Boulevard. Median crossings within the
12 corridor will continue to reflect a planted median the length of the corridor with left-turn
13 lanes being placed accordingly. The planted median again is a suggestion within the
14 plan to place Decker on a road diet(?) thus slowing vehicular movement within the
15 corridor. The Decker Boulevard Master Plan did not call for the designing of the
16 roadway thus, the exact left-hand turn lanes and breaks within the suggested planted
17 median are neither available nor applicable at this time. Again, one of the – a large
18 issue of concern for the Commissioners and some residents within the area is the
19 planted median. And because the roadway has not been designed for streetscaping at
20 this time it's a suggestion. I could not tell you where breaks in the median would be but
21 again, once the roadway is designed for any streetscaping that should take place it will
22 be addressed at that time. Okay? Another issue of concern, Staff has made several
23 requests for lighting and I do have a follow up to the request for lighting. In the corridor

1 one of the major concerns that came out of the work session meeting by a number of
2 residents was that there were several dark areas and low lighting the entire length of
3 Decker. So what Staff has requested through Richland County Ombudsman Office to
4 SCE&G that a lighting study be conducted for the entire length of Decker Boulevard by
5 SCE&G. They will in turn give to us their findings. My exact request was that I've
6 received several concerns from residents of Decker Boulevard regarding the street
7 lighting in the community. They have reported that lighting is not adequate along
8 Decker Boulevard and it's been an ongoing issue over the years. I'm requesting that a
9 representative check to ensure the lighting is appropriate in the entire Decker Boulevard
10 area. I'm also requesting a lighting survey be conducted on the entire length of Decker
11 with a report from SCE&G as to the current coverage and needed coverage as blind
12 spots and very dark areas are concerns for citizens within the corridor. And again,
13 SCE&G will give to us their lighting study report and that will be presented back. The
14 concern has also been forwarded to Councilman Montgomery as well as what's taking
15 place. Again, a lighting survey has been ordered for the entire length of Decker
16 Boulevard. And lastly, the redevelopment district for Decker Boulevard Master Plan will
17 be developed by the Lawrence Group. We're currently in contract and scope
18 negotiations with the Lawrence Group and that will come to you at a different time.
19 There's a place holder within the current land use plan for redevelopment district and
20 Decker Boulevard could be the first, or will be the first example presented for the
21 redevelopment district.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions?

1 MR. MANNING: Tia, will we be given the public comments? Was that
2 transcribed and is that something that we should get?

3 MS. RUTHERFORD: I did not – there was not a person here to transcribe
4 verbatim every concern that was brought forward. I do have my personal notes that
5 were brought forward but again issues dealing specifically to the Decker Boulevard
6 Master Plan and all the issues that were presented within have been addressed in the
7 memo.

8 MR. MANNING: I'm reading your memorandum and all of these things were
9 discussed but one major area that doesn't seem clear to me in this memorandum was
10 the discussion revolving around whether the Decker plan would be really suggestive at
11 this point or would it be used to implement what's in the plan as shown in the book?
12 And we had a good bit of discussion about that –

13 MS. RUTHERFORD: Um-hum (affirmative)

14 MR. MANNING: - that we needed something to be attached to the ordinance
15 that would specifically say that this was suggested in use only at this time until those
16 standards and details created by the Lawrence Group were agreed upon and made a
17 part of the overall development plan.

18 MS. RUTHERFORD: Okay, from what I recall the largest issue again of
19 contention was for the Decker Mall area and whether or not the site plan and the
20 [inaudible] tent would be one of those uses required for that property and that's been
21 addressed because we have removed all of that language.

22 MR. MANNING: There was suggestion – I mean, there was a lot of discussion
23 about the festival marketplace but also I had concerns about the rental properties that

1 were being discussed as part of the plan; how we were going to implement that in an
2 effort to try to reduce the rental properties in the area. So it really - in my mind it was
3 not just the festival market that created concerns. I'm concerned about any landowner
4 or property owner in the area that is - or somebody coming in to do something that
5 might be beneficial to the area and the standards are not in place at this point and the
6 master plan would be used as a guide at this point but could not be used to implement a
7 code that's not established; that we would use our existing code until that was done.

8 MS. RUTHERFORD: And the redevelopment district will be developed at the
9 same time. However, it was stated at that time that we could bring forward the Decker
10 Boulevard Master Plan in lieu of the redevelopment district language. It will in fact take
11 care of design issues, tax incentive issues.

12 MR. MANNING: Yeah, I understand that and that's why I would like to attach
13 some language to approving the master plan so that I would be a policy guide until
14 those standards are designed.

15 MS. RUTHERFORD: Okay.

16 MR. PALMER: Mr. Chairman, I do have language to that effect that I would like
17 to submit and I've presented each of you with a copy of it and have some here for the
18 Staff as well. This language to be put into the plan and proper placement of it in my
19 opinion would be in the executive summary on page one at the end of the section that's
20 called, "Implementation." Or in the implementation strategies on page 52, as an
21 additional section. One matter, I was told earlier this week that perhaps this wasn't
22 noticed properly. Legally have we noticed this properly to take any formal action on this

1 today or how would that process go? I was told earlier in the week that we may not
2 have done that.

3 MS. LINDER: I'm not sure I understand the question.

4 MR. PALMER: Can we take any legal action on the Decker Boulevard plan
5 today, any formal vote? I know that we've had a work session but we haven't had a
6 formal public hearing on this matter.

7 MS. RUTHERFORD: The public hearing process is in front of Council so it
8 comes from the Planning Commission as a recommendation to Council for inclusion in
9 the comprehensive plan and it goes through three readings.

10 MR. PALMER: Right. But we do have a public hearing process in front of us as
11 well?

12 MS. RUTHERFORD: And - would the work session having been one of the
13 processes of public hearing?

14 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: It's a work session when they came before us. That
15 was a work session not a public hearing. So that's the question.

16 MR. CRISS: Well the matter was of course on a prior Planning Commission
17 agenda regular session. So you can take it up and vote on it when you're ready to do
18 so with any modifications you want to propose.

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: So the answer is that we can take this up and vote on
20 it, put some modification to it [inaudible] Council as part of the comprehensive plan?

21 MS. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

1 MR. PALMER: I would be prepared to vote on it as long as the inclusion of the
2 language I presented as well as the statements from Ms. Rutherford, but that's up to
3 you guys.

4 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: [Inaudible].

5 MR. PALMER: I would submit the question as to whether or not you guys would
6 want to hold a public hearing or not. It's up to y'all. I'd go either way on it, because if
7 we make a motion it's going to be voted up or down as opposed to whether you guys
8 would want to hold a public, formal public hearing on it. I'm game either way. I'm
9 personally okay as long as the language is passed that was presented.

10 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Put it in a motion in a form that we send it forward – the
11 comprehensive plan [inaudible] public.

12 MR. MANNING: I'm fine with that as well.

13 MR. PALMER: I'll make a motion to send this forward to Council – the Decker
14 Boulevard plan forward to Council with a recommendation of approval. In addition to
15 the Decker plan that was presented by the Lawrence Group, the addition of the
16 language which I presented today as - to be inserted in either of those two sections and
17 I think we have that on Record. As well as the suggestion that was given to us in
18 memorandum form from Ms. Rutherford.

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Need a second.

20 MR. MANNING: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: All in favor that we send this forward with a
22 recommendation to County Council please raise your hand.

1 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Green, Manning; Absent: Van Dine,*
2 *McBride]*

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Denied none. Thank you.

4 MR. MANNING: Ms. Rutherford, I hate to even bring this up but right after our
5 public work session there was an article in the paper regarding the crime issue in the
6 Decker area and a child was unfortunately murdered. And there was some discussion
7 in the neighborhood work sessions about is the crime perception or reality and it was in
8 the paper it said "Two Notch Road, Decker Boulevard area and Northeast Richland was
9 a killing zone last year." And so I think the perception is reality and that area really
10 needs to have some emphasis put on it. Crime is a community problem and I would
11 hope the Lawrence Group could look at things beyond their scope that they've already
12 talked to the neighborhood about and trying to correct that problem. Because without
13 that issue being resolved I don't know that this is going to be effective.

14 MS. RUTHERFORD: Do you have a suggestion?

15 MR. MANNING: I really don't have any answers to it. I wish I did. But it's going
16 to take a lot of thought community wide for that matter to be able to address that issue.
17 It is a community problem that needs to be addressed.

18 MR. PALMER: The suggestion I have because I'm on a Region Two Citizen
19 Advisory Board is an increased presence of police officers. And I know that's a funding
20 issue for the County. At any given time there's between three and four deputies on
21 patrol in Region Two which covers from Percival to 555 from Decker to Clemson. One
22 major call gets them all off the street. Now I know that's a funding issue for the County
23 and, you know, but just an increased police presence I mean you can't beat it. The

1 more police officers you see whether in uniform or actually walking the street, it's been
2 my thoughts that, you know, even down in Five Points and things when there's been
3 officers out there on the street it makes a big difference.

4 MS. RUTHERFORD: Okay. Staff will send this recommendation to the Council
5 person and the administrator. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Comprehensive plan. I have a question
7 when we get started. Could we take a five-minute break?

8 *[Break]*

9 MS. CRISS: [Inaudible] planning areas that you guys [inaudible] comprehensive
10 plan [inaudible] southeast planning area and a ten years future land use map and a
11 [inaudible] land use map. Like the pairs of maps you received for the northwest
12 [inaudible]. One more remaining after this one is the Beltway inside I-20 and I-77. This
13 is the southeast planning area for your consideration and comment, feedback, now or at
14 a later time. Then the yellow area indicates the extent of suburban dominated land
15 development for the ten-year horizon. The eastern border of that yellow area is
16 basically following a piece of Ridge Road and then some property lines down to the rail
17 line and the lower part of the suburban boundary is Mill Creek. I'd note that the light
18 industrial rezoning that you deferred at this meeting – the Tyler Stone property is just
19 outside of that Mill Creek suburban, rural boundary proposed on [inaudible]. Of course
20 this map has not yet been officially adopted [inaudible] Staff Reports. The orange
21 circles indicated proposed priority development areas around the Lower Richland High
22 School, Southeast Neighborhood Master Plan area. Rural Hopkins to the south and
23 closer into the Beltway virtually centered on the Congaree Point proposal that you

1 considered at today's meeting – a new urban village on the Bluff Road corridor. The hot
2 pink line if you can follow it is the projected annexation ambition of the City of Columbia
3 in the southeast in the next ten years.

4 MR. GREEN: Which means they're taking in – you suspect everything that's
5 going to be developed?

6 MR. CRISS: Yes. Well, not quite. We do have some suburban extending
7 beyond that Lower Richland Boulevard area but that city boundary is fairly coincident
8 with the anticipated extent of suburban development. Notice that they apparently would
9 like to have a considerable chunk of the Congaree River floodplains south of the
10 Beltway as well. On this map and revisions to the other maps that you've already
11 received you'll start seeing the long-range transportation plan of the Central Midlands
12 Council of Governments. Their COATS planning process Columbia Area
13 Transportation study – that's the heavy brown corridors representing the few projects
14 that have made it to the road wish list at the COG. The one to the – call it northwest
15 closest to the Beltway is the Pineview Road improvements. And then this arm coming
16 off of that would be the proposed [inaudible] Road extension which of course doesn't
17 exist. It would be a new road alignment. That was the road extension or improvement I
18 think referred to by some of the citizens concerned about that light industrial rezoning
19 proposal off of Bluff Road. Those are the highlights. The brown hash marks with brown
20 boundary [inaudible] U.S. census 2000 urbanized area. In most cases we've extended
21 the anticipated suburban far enough out to include. We did not do that in this particular
22 case as we've done in the other planning areas because of the sparse development this
23 far out the Leesburg Road corridor, though you may want to debate that. Of course one

1 of the major factors in suburban style development even this far out as shown on this
2 ten-year future land use map is the availability of water and sewer. Generally the City's
3 system – how shall I say it – is limited. The City of Columbia's water and sewer system
4 is limited [inaudible] Mill Creek at this time. Of course, the County Public Utilities
5 Department has made a proposal to County Council about getting into the water and
6 sewer business further east in the Lower Richland/Hopkins area perhaps.

7 MR. MANNING: If that was to come about the area in and around Hopkins that's
8 circled as potential annexation, would that be off the table if the county were to -

9 MR. CRISS: If the city were to serve [inaudible]?

10 MR. MANNING: No. If the county were to get into the water and sewer business
11 those areas that are circled that might be potential – yeah – that one, the one south of
12 that. That one.

13 MR. CRISS: This is the anticipated City line. I would expect that the City would
14 aim to annex those areas regardless of the [inaudible]. But of course they have an
15 advantage [inaudible] water then they can require the annexation. So if they don't serve
16 –

17 MR. MANNING: So they're not providing it in those circled areas, how could they
18 do that?

19 MR. CRISS: Right.

20 MR. PALMER: They could do it through petition.

21 MR. CRISS: Well [inaudible] essentially voluntary annexation. It would be a
22 greater challenge. A much greater challenge for the city if they weren't providing the
23 water.

1 MR. GREEN: I have just two questions. One's specific to this area, one applies
2 to this area and really all the other areas that we've looked at so far. Is there any need
3 to provide a special consideration for the Fort? I know in the past that Chamber and
4 others, that one of the criteria when they review - the BRAC Commission looks at
5 various issues is the protection of boundaries around military installations and the desire
6 for encroachment not to just get right up to the boundary. Do we need to – since the
7 Fort is fully within this planning area, is there anything in particular that we could or
8 should do on that issue in terms of protecting potentially it and McEntire's situation?

9 MR. CRISS: Excellent question. And indeed I think the Planning Commission
10 and County Council should consider special protections for specifically Fort Jackson
11 and McEntire. I don't show anything on this map yet because there are various
12 deliberations, collaborations going on in the region right now about how to protect not
13 only Fort Jackson and McEntire but also Shaw and the Poinsett Bombing Range as a
14 regional approach. And so we're looking for a Richland County/Sumter County/City of
15 Columbia/U.S. Department of Defense/non-profit land trusts partnership. Indeed we
16 even have an unofficial consortium of MAJIC, M-A-J-I-C, the Midlands Area Joint
17 Installations Consortium in meeting about monthly to discuss approaches to protecting
18 the military missions for those four facilities with conservation buffers and other tools.
19 Specifically with Fort Jackson, it's in the City of Columbia. So we don't have any
20 planning authority over the Fort itself but we sure do have planning authority on the
21 perimeter. We're already seeing sprawl encroachment on the northern, southern flanks
22 if you will and the only thing open is on the eastern side. There are no explicit desires
23 from the Department of Defense, Department of the Army to expand the physical

1 footprint of Fort Jackson eastward towards the Wateree at this time but that's logically
2 the only place it could physically expand if it needed to in the future. They've got 50,000
3 acres and they're not using all of that intensively. Most of it is an urban wildlife
4 preserve. But out of the 50,000 maybe five or ten thousand used intensively. That
5 looks like it's going to increase. Of course you've got the cantonment area on the
6 western edge where the Army operates. You've got the bombing range in the middle
7 and then you've got McCrady Army Reserve in that southeastern corner. So those are
8 the areas that are used most heavily, most intensely. But they of course want to keep
9 their options open about training missions that involve aircraft noise. Night operations.
10 They are worried about encroachment of especially residential around the perimeter of
11 the Fort. McEntire is of course an airfield. And what we should be doing there in my
12 opinion is adopting noise contours around McEntire that would preclude the most noise
13 sensitive land uses from getting too close to the airfield. We already have between this
14 proposed suburban extension and McEntire itself a pocket of large lot rural residential,
15 farms and hobby farms. In other words a fairly well-established land use pattern that's
16 not likely to change for a few decades that in essence is buffering in my opinion
17 McEntire from the encroachment of more intense suburban residential moving
18 eastward. I'm not saying that's enough protection. I'm just saying it might provide the
19 opportunity to divert encroachment, residential encroachment especially from locating
20 very near to McEntire. But they're going to need additional land use controls beyond
21 their base perimeter. They need to own the crash zones. They need to own the critical
22 areas so that they can completely control those land uses where the aircraft land and
23 take off for example. Did you know that there are a lot of helicopter missions that come

1 out of McEntire up to Fort Jackson? I think you'll see more of that. So is there some
2 way to provide conservation opportunities or lower density residential or more
3 compatible land use development between McEntire and Fort Jackson? I'm not saying
4 we can buy up the whole corridor and keep it wild. Some of it's already fairly well
5 developed as rural residential. But we do need to take a look at providing more
6 protection to the integrity of the military mission of Fort Jackson and McEntire whether
7 or not this regional effort with Shaw and Poinsett comes to fruition.

8 MR. PALMER: You wouldn't want to just shoot in the wind though. I mean we
9 need to get some recommendation from Shaw as to what they thought we may need to
10 do or.

11 MR. CRISS: Shaw's got some good noise contours in place and some neighbor
12 notification when you buy a house, buy a lot to build a house near the airfield. Of
13 course having been notified ten years ago and then sold it to somebody else
14 supposedly these notices go to all the successors in title but getting that word out
15 consistently into the real estate community can be a real challenge but another tool to
16 consider. Does that diminish the complaints that you might get or Council might get in
17 future years about noise from aircraft? Oh, the other intrusion would be your convoys.
18 There's going to be presumably increased need for truck convoys and other military
19 vehicles on our rural roads especially between say McEntire and Fort Jackson. So we
20 might also want to collaborate with the military leadership on the most important convoy
21 routes to keep open accessible to avoid land use conflicts where possible. You don't
22 want school buses mixing it up with humvees.

1 MR. GREEN: My other question was – again not targeting this area of the county
2 but in thinking of all areas. Several people have expressed to me a concern that we are
3 running out of larger industrial sites in the county. That if we look up I-77 we're rezoning
4 industrial for residential, varying densities, and we're really not going in and setting
5 aside anything for industrial, especially larger industrial sites.

6 MR. CRISS: Such as operational mines.

7 MR. GREEN: And not even thinking of mines but you know if a 200 acre
8 industrial user were to walk into the county tomorrow and say where are your ready-to-
9 go sites that I know I don't have to get rezoning and it was a compatible industry with
10 good employment – are we running out of places to put them or opportunities to put
11 them somewhere and are we adequately - I notice for instance on this plan there's
12 nothing in here probably that would be consistent with this master plan if a large
13 industrial user looked to this part of the county.

14 MR. CRISS: Well industrial can of course go in urban, suburban, and rural areas
15 with appropriate design and protections.

16 MR. GREEN: If you look at the comprehensive plan one of the reasons for
17 rezoning is consistency with the plan and we have a large rural expanse.

18 MR. CRISS: This layer is just the first cut. Now we have to, after we get through
19 the five planning areas, then we have to peel back the yellow and green and decide,
20 okay, where do you want those major categories of land use to locate. More precisely
21 in the urban and suburban and rural and in some cases conservation lands.

22 MR. GREEN: So we'll see a third version of this -

1 MR. CRISS: So you're looking at the broad outline of urban, suburban, rural,
2 conservation lands, priority development lands, annexation.

3 MR. GREEN: I just wonder where we're going to put it.

4 MR. CRISS: Yeah. Well –

5 MR. GREEN: [inaudible] that large tract industrial. You know, Blythewood's
6 trying to down zone that innovation park or whatever. Whatever they brought that in the
7 Town of Blythewood under they're already trying to provide greater limitations on it.
8 You know, again we're starting to rezone a lot of stuff up I-77 for commercial and
9 residential, you know. Lexington's gone out and put together a 900 acre large site
10 industrial park. Newberry just finished a 700 acre large site industrial park. We don't
11 really have an animal outside of what's inside now the Town of Blythewood and the
12 couple hundred acres that the company that everybody knows, that nobody knows is
13 looking at, I don't know where else somebody in this county would go assuming we
14 want to provide for large site industrial uses.

15 MR. CRISS: Indeed if it's high tech like – may I say Google, the I-77 corridor is
16 an obvious candidate because of the possibility of water, sewer and interstate
17 transportation. If you're a –

18 MR. GREEN: We've got to start – if that's what we want to do we need to start
19 looking at where we want to preserve access to those sites.

20 MR. CRISS: Right. And part of the intent of the new LI Light Industrial zoning
21 district in your 2005 code was to strip out all those competing commercial uses from the
22 MI light industrial that we used to have that carried forward into the new code. I would
23 agree with you. We do not have enough prime industrial space set aside for major

1 [inaudible] development opportunities. Some of them of course area already out there.
2 The Wateree plant of SCE&G and paper plant where they had to be near cooling water;
3 they're resource dependent. But a lot of the economic development I think you're
4 referring to is probably knowledge economy, high tech, more interstate and truck
5 dependent and would likely be located on or near interstates. We don't have those in
6 lower Richland but we do have significant rail capacity and what happens if McEntire
7 does close? Does that become an industrial redevelopment potentially?

8 MR. GREEN: I just don't want us to lose sight of that issue as we look at these
9 and, you know, we start narrowing in you've got a tendency to say well let's draw the
10 boundary here and all of a sudden we've got a hard boundary and you go out to pick up
11 a site for a quality employer and it's in conflict with the comprehensive plan because we
12 don't have adequate sites in the county.

13 MR. CRISS: You need a big enough site, you hope that you have limited
14 incompatible land uses nearby. You hopefully to have major support services,
15 transportation, water, sewer. That doesn't even get into labor pool and all the other
16 issues but as far as the land use plan component yeah, I think we should explicitly
17 identify properties perhaps in concert with property owners where you could
18 recommend industrial zoning. You can proactively zone. And we have not yet gotten
19 into that level of detail with this plan. First we have to provide a broad outline of are we
20 going to have a distinction between presumably inner Beltway urban and outer Beltway
21 suburban and rural? Are we going to manage that suburban residential expansion or
22 not. That will have a lot to say about the residential commercial development.
23 Industrial is oft overlooked and we agree and needs exclusive attention in this plan.

1 Perhaps this should be looked at on a regional basis or at least the Richland County,
2 Lexington County, City of Columbia metropolitan area. The COATS transportation
3 planning process of course involved the three jurisdictions and the other smaller
4 municipalities.

5 MR. GREEN: If those jurisdictions spoke to one another it might be possible.

6 MR. CRISS: Pardon?

7 MR. GREEN: I said if they actually spoke to one another it might be possible.

8 MR. CRISS: Well, these plans are one way of speaking to each other. Indeed I
9 guess we are speaking to them when we put 10 year annexation lines on maps.
10 Blythewood is pursuing further discussions of the draft 10-year annexation boundaries
11 for their municipality again next week and presumably thereafter. I don't know if they
12 want to modify the draft map that we produced or just discuss further. That is one of the
13 maps that you already have. That's the northeast.

14 MR. PALMER: How's that agreement – excuse me - that agreement coming with
15 Winnsboro [inaudible]?

16 MR. CRISS: I don't know. I've heard mixed messages. Cliff Kinder told me that
17 he is not pursuing his 700 house project near the heart of Blythewood because of
18 inadequate water. I hear from the town that Winnsboro is interested in providing but it
19 may take a year or two for them to decide whether they want to expand their capacity to
20 be able to serve.

21 MR. GREEN: My understanding is that someone's picking up Mr. Kinder's
22 position in that property and is close to solving whatever issues.

1 MR. CRISS: I've heard that as well. So it appears to be a water supply limitation
2 at the moment on that particular project, which brings into focus the need for
3 intergovernmental collaboration on utility extensions. How can you plan future land use
4 unless you know where the water and sewer's going to be? So I think next meeting we
5 hope to have the fifth and final planning area, the Beltway done in similar fashion and
6 then we proceed to the next phase.

7 MR. MURRAY: Before you can do a whole lot of planning you've got to be able –
8 should be able to identify where you're going to have your water and your sewer. Then
9 you can kind of go that way. If you don't do any planning toward those kind of things
10 you could have a person who want to put a subdivision in, industrial base. Yeah.
11 We've got a lot of railroads; we've got railroads down in lower Richland but until such
12 time as you have something to provide the utilities that they need nobody's going down
13 there.

14 MR. CRISS: Yeah. Right now there's just through trains.

15 MR. MURRAY: Yeah. Uh-huh (affirmative). That Seaboard and Norfolk
16 Southern.

17 MR. CRISS: But of course the Shop Road Extension is intended to tie into Air
18 Base Road and improvements to Air Base Road to provide a parallel commuter route to
19 Garners Ferry. Not yet budgeted but starting to show up on important plans.

20 MR. MANNING: Will this [inaudible] be in the 2025?

21 MR. CRISS: The Central Midlands Council of Governments' long-range
22 transportation plan for the year 2025 includes these projects –

23 MR. MANNING: Shop Road and Pineview?

1 MR. CRISS: - and a handful of others in Richland County.

2 MR. MANNING: And what's the reality that that could happen sooner?

3 MR. CRISS: Ah! It's all about the funding.

4 MR. PALMER: You say sooner?

5 MR. MANNING: Sooner.

6 MR. POPE: The Transportation Committee is supposed to finalize [inaudible]
7 you've got to look at those particular items. Now in the COG's plan that is in their long-
8 range plan but it is – there is no funding [inaudible]. But of course this transportation
9 committee is also coming up with funding strategies for how to be able to kind of place
10 some of this on infrastructure and road network improvements in our county. So that's
11 the scope of one of the things it will be dealing with and all of us really know from a rally
12 standpoint is really only one thing out there that's viable right now that will allow us to
13 even consider these massive projects and that will be the transportation bill(?). And
14 that's the only thing that's out there right now [inaudible]. The committee's work may
15 come up with something ingenious but as to what's provided a statutorily right now I
16 mean that's really the only thing out there.

17 MR. MANNING: How soon did you say those recommendations or thoughts
18 would be known?

19 MR. POPE: Well there are several benchmarks and what County Council has
20 adopted in the ordinance. The first preliminary and I mean it won't be much but an
21 update I think it will be in May this year, then we have one in the Fall which should be
22 more substantive. And then I think the final, the final recommendations are due in 2008.
23 But really to be quite honest with you, one of the things they're looking at is pretty

1 similar to what Charleston County did with their transportation study. It's broken down
2 into three components: Transportation, Greenways, Bikeways and Public Transit. So
3 those are three committees that are going to be established and of course the Richland
4 County Planning Commission of course once the scope is done I mean you guys will be
5 [inaudible] and involved because I think you need to have a part in this as well in the
6 three commissions' work. That scope probably's going to come to County Council on
7 the – I think it's on the 13th to approve that scope of service and once that's done then
8 they begin their work. But it will look at the entire network of the county and actually
9 across some of our boundaries because of course we're interconnected with Lexington
10 County and lots of things that happen there so this committee's looking at all of that as
11 well as the transportation issue with the buses, greenways, those type things. The
12 COG is actually recently – Michael's probably shared that with you but recently
13 completed a bike and pedestrian study.

14 MR. CRISS: The Regional Bike and Ped Plan.

15 MR. POPE: So all of those things are being looked at and where we don't kind of
16 duplicate efforts of what they're doing. But it should be - and of course and also they're
17 going to come out with recommendations on land development tools to be able to help
18 and mitigate future problems as well.

19 MR. CRISS: The work of this Transportation Study Commission could indeed be
20 the foundation for the transportation element of your updated comprehensive land use
21 plan. I guess that's all I have for today, Mr. Chair. [Inaudible] questions.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Do you have the update on the County Council Staff
23 action report?

1 MR. CRISS: Jennie? Do you have anything further?

2 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't know you were talking to me.
3 The Development Review Team, the February 15th meeting had two items, had three
4 items on it, two of which we've already discussed, Lake Carolina and Congaree Point.
5 The other item was Woodcreek Farms was a road connector. And those were the three
6 items. The actual detailed spreadsheets will be available in April's packet, I'm hoping.

7 MR. GREEN: County Council's actions, zoning actions?

8 MS. SHERRY-LINDER: Oh, I'm sorry. I just realized what you're asking me.
9 Did not get that from Anna. I'm sorry. It's not included in this packet so I will have to
10 have those for you at the next meeting.

11 MR. CRISS: One addendum, Mr. Chair, if I may to the comprehensive plan
12 update. The request for qualifications [inaudible] consultant [inaudible] comp plan was
13 issued by procurement. The responses that we received from five vendors are now
14 setting up an evaluation committee to look at those qualifications. I expect that all these
15 firms will qualify and then the question is what funding may be available to actually
16 issue requests for proposals for them to do specific planning tasks. As Mr. Murray
17 alluded to one of the needs is a county-wide water and sewer map. Need to know
18 where those lines are now and what ones are proposed so you can see where the
19 growth is and where it might go. Thank you.

20 MR. MURRAY: Thank you very much.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Next we have the approval of road names.

22 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair, I would move that we approve the road names
23 submitted in our monthly report

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: A second?

2 MR. PALMER: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Heard the motion. All in favor to approve the road
4 names raise your hand. No opposed.

5 *[Approved: Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Green, Manning; Absent: Van Dine,*
6 *McBride]*

7 MR. PALMER: It's not quite as fun without Marcia, huh? [Laughter]

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Meeting adjourned.

9

10

[Adjourned at 3:45 p.m.]