

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 7, 2007

1
2
3
4
5 *[Members Present: Heather Cairns, Enga Ward, Julius Murray, Christopher Anderson,*
6 *Patrick Palmer, Wes Furgess, Howard Van Dine, Eugene Green, Deas Manning]*

7
8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Please come to order. Let me read into the record. "In
9 according with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the agenda was sent to radio,
10 TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin
11 board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building." At this time all the
12 Commissioners would like for everybody to cut off their electronic devices, cell phones,
13 whatever you might have electronic that make noise. We'd like you to turn them off,
14 please. At this time we have a new person that's with us, Heather Cairns.

15 MS. CAIRNS: Cairns.

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Cairns. Okay. I'll get it right. Glad to have you aboard.

17 MS. CAIRNS: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Join in with us –

19 MS. CAIRNS: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: - and make sure that we do the right thing on that end.
21 Keep that end straight. I got to keep this end straight.

22 MS. CAIRNS: I'll do my best.

23 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Glad to have you aboard with us. At this time for the -
24 any changes on the agenda?

25 MS. ALMEIDA: No, sir.

26 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. No changes on the agenda. Go forth with the
27 minutes for approval.

1 MR. VAN DINE: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

2 MR. MURRAY: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the approval of the minutes and the second.

4 All in favor by raising your hand. Opposed?

5 *[Approved: Ward, Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Van Dine, Green, and Manning;*

6 *Abstained: Cairns]*

7 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Thank you. Next on the agenda item is New
8 Business, map zoning.

9 **CASE NO. 07-22 MA:**

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The first application 07-22 MA, William
11 Patterson, the applicant – the existing zoning on the property is RS-LD. The applicant
12 is requesting to rezone the property to RM-HD. The parcel's located on Weston
13 Avenue, approximately 2.23 acres. It has approximately 273 linear feet of frontage.
14 The area is predominantly an older, established neighborhood with residential parcels
15 and they average about 6,000 square feet. The boundaries of the City of Columbia
16 presently terminate at Oakland Avenue which is south of the site if you look on the
17 screen, right there. There is water and sewer availability on site. The level of service
18 on Weston Avenue is a level of service A. Staff does encourage in-fill development and
19 this is a good area for that in-fill development. However, it is Staff's opinion that the
20 zoning request is too high for this area and incompatible with the existing neighborhood.
21 Therefore Staff is recommending denial.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions? No questions? Is the applicant here?
23 Mr. Patterson?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You may come up and speak at this time. State your
3 name and address, sir.

4 **TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM PATTERSON:**

5 MR. PATTERSON: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Bill Patterson, 505 –
6 excuse me, 5 Oak Mist Court, Blythewood, South Carolina 29016. I'm a retired Army
7 officer with 20 years of military service. I'm a disabled veteran. My heart goes out to
8 them. Over 50% of the homeless is veterans so I wanted to provide some type of
9 affordable housing for them. I'm very active within the community and the church. I
10 started the Adopt-A-Highway Program with my fraternity and I was the project manager
11 for a \$1.5 million church in Northeast off of Lee Road. I attended the Palmetto
12 Affordable Housing Forum, January the first, January the 31st and 1 February and the
13 Richland County Neighborhood Planning Conference building healthy communities.
14 Affordable housing is a crisis within the county and the city and I wanted to do
15 something about that. My goals and objectives strive to insure low to moderate income
16 families have a safe place to live, bring up the land value in the area, uplift the
17 community, and give back to the community. The advantages: Rapid development of
18 the neighborhood. This project can offer rapid development of the neighborhood. This
19 area is very similar to the Ridgewood neighborhood off of Monticello Road but on a
20 smaller scale. This area has a lot of potential and community resources. It's walking
21 distance from J.P. Thomas Elementary School. There are numerous churches in the
22 neighborhood. This first one is Bethel Baptist Church. The next one is the True
23 Believer Church of Our Lord and Jesus Christ. The next one is a [inaudible] Gospel

1 Word and Worship Church. The area also has an Eckerd Drug Store, a Piggly Wiggly,
2 a Family Dollar, a Superstore, a Farmer's Market and public transportation which is
3 near. Again I would like to increase the land value in the area and to restore a sense of
4 pride in home ownership in the area. This house right here is just across the street from
5 the subdivision and these are very nice houses. This house right here is just beside
6 that particular subdivision. And this house right here just up the street from that
7 subdivision. However, there are more abandoned and boarded up homes than owner
8 occupied homes. This one is on Weston Avenue just up the street, just down the street,
9 at the corner of Weston and Oakland, corner of Weston and Oakland and on Weston.
10 Again, I think this project will improve the area within this neighborhood. It could also
11 generate new property tax dollars and sewer revenue. Another advantage is it could
12 create economic development in the area. My plan is to use the local work force in this
13 area on this project. A local electrician has compiled a list of local trade persons in the
14 neighborhood that would be willing to work on the project. Reduce the amount of crime
15 and gang activity in the neighborhood. A lot of abandoned houses has a lot of gang
16 graffiti in the area. Increase the affordable housing stock within the county and the city
17 – another advantage.

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Sir, could you kind of wind it up because we've got –

19 MR. PATTERSON: Yes. It's the last one.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay.

21 MR. PATTERSON: And have local support for Mr. – Councilmen Mr. Jeter and
22 Davis. And I have a petition signed by local residents. Eighteen people signed that

1 they are for this particular project. Again, I'm going to use the local work force and I'm
2 going to start a neighborhood association in this particular area also. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Any questions to the applicant? Any
4 questions to the applicant? Thank you, sir. Anything that y'all want to discuss?
5 [inaudible]

6 MR. MANNING: Yeah. I have a question for Anna. Directly across the street it
7 appears that the zoning on most of those lots is RS-HD.

8 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

9 MR. MANNING: And he is asking for an RS-HD.

10 MR. PALMER: RM-HD.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: No. RM-HD.

12 MR. MANNING: RM-HD?

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

14 MR. MANNING: Okay. That answers the question.

15 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, if I may?

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Yes.

17 MR. VANDINE: I'm not hearing much in the way of discussion up here so to get
18 the ball rolling I would put a motion forward that we send this forward with a
19 recommendation of denial. Had this come in as an RS-MD or HD, I would have been in
20 support of it. But the fact is this area is single-family residential. It is not multi-family
21 and to inject a multi-family structure within this area I don't think would be in keeping
22 with the area itself. I certainly understand the need for in-fill projects and I would think
23 that if we were doing this on a single-family residential, high density I would certainly be

1 in support of it but not under multi-family [inaudible]. Therefore my motion is to send it
2 forward to Council with a recommendation of denial.

3 MR. PALMER: I'll second that. There's multi-family property available in that
4 area. It's not high density but it's medium density right around the corner – quite a bit of
5 it actually. I just don't see putting multi-family into an established neighborhood like
6 that.

7 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions, discussion? You heard the
8 motion and the second. All in favor that we send it to County Council for denial raise
9 your hand. All disapproved raise your hand.

10 *[Approved: Cairns, Ward, Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Van Dine, Green, and*
11 *Manning; Opposed: Murray]*

12 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you.

13 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Patterson, just so you're aware. We are just a
14 recommending body. County Council has the final say in what is going on and the
15 meeting, if I understand it, is May 22nd. The County Council will take it up under first
16 reading unless you meet with Staff and come up with an alternative that you want to
17 delay that process. So you can either to wait for County Council or you can talk with
18 Staff but we are not the final say. County Council has that final say.

19 MR. PATTERSON: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Next we have Case 07-23 MA.

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

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, this application Ideal Construction, Stan Mack, it's
23 a site approximately 3.51 acres. The existing zoning is OI. The proposed zoning that

1 the applicant is requesting is a PDD. The site is currently located on Farming Creek
2 Road which is a farm to market road. The site is approximately 51 linear feet in
3 frontage. As you can see from the Staff Report this existing zoning on the property
4 back in 2001 was RU, Rural. The applicant was granted a map amendment in 2001 to
5 a C-1. The applicant has since been before you twice for a request of rezoning and
6 withdrew the application. The site is surrounded by pastureland, an active farm, an
7 existing rail line, some single-family homes on large lots. The area is rural in nature
8 with little intrusion of any commercial or industrial uses. Broad River Road at that
9 intersection is at a level of service F. I want to point out that there are concerns of a
10 storm water basin and preservation and protection of existing agricultural lands adjacent
11 to this development. There is an issue apparently down in that area that the residents
12 have brought to the attention of Staff and others but I believe that the applicant is aware
13 of that situation. And the applicant was before the DRT on April 26th of '07, and you can
14 find those conditions that the DRT requested on page nine. Staff did receive a letter
15 that attempted to address some of these concerns that the DRT had. We feel it does
16 not truly address all of the concerns that the DRT had with respect to those conditions.
17 And so Staff's recommendation is for denial but if you choose to recommend approval
18 we have on page 10, some conditions that we feel need to be addressed. So Staff
19 recommendation is for denial.

20 MR. GREEN: Anna, was the application complete? Did it address everything
21 required in the PDD?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Very broadly. That is why the DRT wanted specifics. And
2 normally those concerns are addressed and the document is revised prior to you all
3 receiving it and that was not the case in this instance.

4 MR. VAN DINE: Will you refresh for me real quick why the suggestion was made
5 to come forward with a PDD in February?

6 MS. ALMEIDA: The applicant is requesting to have an outside storage for his
7 business and it's somewhat of a construction type business and I feel that from these
8 notes that you all, the Planning Commission felt that locking him into a PDD would
9 secure those concerns that you all had as far as noise and nuisance.

10 MR. VAN DINE: Okay.

11 MR. MANNING: Anna, do the PDD conditions that Staff recommended
12 incorporate all of the Development Review Team required?

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes. Yes. Very specifically if you look at all those conditions.

14 MR. GREEN: I always get concerned when things aren't clear and just, I was
15 curious, under proposed PDD condition 12, it says, "The Applicant shall work closely
16 with Public Works to exceed minimum storm water standards."

17 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

18 MR. GREEN: Is there a standard by which y'all are recommending this
19 [inaudible] or just - is it one inch over the minimum standards? You know, it's kind of
20 vague -

21 MS. ALMEIDA: You know -

22 MR. GREEN: - as to what that means.

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Like I said, there's a pond that apparently has some issues and
2 that would be something that Public Works would have to investigate and look at.
3 Unfortunately it has to be that broad because we don't know the extent of what's in the
4 pond and we feel that it has been contaminated due to an existing gas station and what
5 the applicant is requesting to do, which is maintaining equipment and servicing
6 equipment, that that may add to the existing problem.

7 MR. GREEN: That's not covered by parts of the code?

8 MS. ALMEIDA: Not to that extent.

9 MR. MANNING: Well as part of DRT you've got a prohibition against fuel storage
10 and hazardous materials. Is that taken into consideration in the PDD conditions?

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Well the applicant wrote the PDD quite broadly and did not – just
12 what they did was they took the zoning code and just transformed the zoning code uses
13 into the PDD. We felt there were many uses that they included in that PDD that were
14 just not compatible to what should be there. And that's what – this is just an example -
15 that we went down the list and we requested that they take out of their list of permitted
16 uses in their PDD.

17 MR. GREEN: Typically we're provided PDD applications so we can better
18 understand them. We weren't – did anybody else receive the PDD detail? All I
19 received was a Staff Report. I did not receive a copy of the PDD for this applicant.

20 MS. ALMEIDA: They were delivered.

21 MR. GREEN: Not in my envelope.

22 MR. PALMER: Not in my envelope.

23 MR. ANDERSON: Not in mine either.

1 MR. PALMER: That was going to be my question. I didn't know if we got the – if
2 there was a complete application or not.

3 MS. ALMEIDA: There was.

4 MR. GREEN: That's where my concern is -

5 MS. ALMEIDA: There was.

6 MR. GREEN: - cause we – I didn't receive one.

7 MR. MACK: I delivered 35 of them.

8 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes. And they were put in mail boxes and they should have
9 been stuffed and sent to you all. That's the procedure.

10 MR. GREEN: Anybody here get any?

11 MR. VAN DINE: Nope. Across the board [inaudible]. Let me ask you a real
12 quick question, Anna. I looked on page 14 and 15. It looks like there's a proposed out
13 parcel portion of it; is this one tax map number or are these two separate tax maps?

14 MS. ALMEIDA: They're two different parcel numbers. I don't – it was subdivided
15 off. It was split as you can see from page 12.

16 MR. VAN DINE: The pond that we're talking about with potential problems; is
17 that the one where on page 14 the site arrow is sort of sitting on top of it?

18 MS. ALMEIDA: I believe it – I'm not sure to be perfectly honest.

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: The pond is not on the property?

20 MS. ALMEIDA: I'm sorry.

21 MR. VAN DINE: The pond is off the property and you said it was contaminated
22 by gas – by a –

1 MS. ALMEIDA: From a gas station. An existing – not the applicant. It was a gas
2 station.

3 MR. VAN DINE: Is that the one that's all the way over on Broad River and
4 Farming Creek Road that they're saying is contaminating that?

5 MS. ALMEIDA: I believe so and I believe it is the pond in the back of the
6 property. But the applicant is here and can address some of those questions.

7 MR. VAN DINE: [Inaudible] that. Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN VANDINE: Stan Mack?

9 **TESTIMONY OF STAN MACK:**

10 MR. MACK: I'm Stan Mack. I work with ReMax Real Estate Services. I'm
11 representing the applicant Ideal Construction Company. We stood before you 90 days
12 ago and we were asking for an LI, I think it is Light Industrial. The two adjoining
13 property owners also showed up. They were not against what Ideal Construction
14 Company wants to do with the three and a half acres on the back but they were
15 concerned about – Mr. Koon was concerned about the erosion or whatever into his
16 pond which we assured him would be taken care of by the engineering. We also have
17 an engineer here with us today that can answer those questions who works for Ideal
18 Construction Company. We were told by Planning or advised by Planning Commission
19 that day that – to go back and reapply which took us 90 days and \$7,000 more dollars
20 to do this. So we're back here today applying for the same request but with PDD rather
21 than LI. And if you have any questions about any property in that neighborhood I'll be
22 glad to answer them.

1 MR. MANNING: Is the concern downstream for that little pond; is that what we're
2 talking about?

3 MR. MACK: That's the concern that Mr. Koon had and David Koon owns 200
4 acres or so where the pond is – has his cows and pigs and all and he brought that
5 question up about runoff into his pond which is a good concern.

6 MR. MANNING: That is the normal flow, direction –

7 MR. MACK: Correct. Correct.

8 MR. MANNING: - of the flow is through that pond? The property above the long
9 linear detention basin – the use of it would remain? That's not on the property. That's
10 zoned Office Institutional above?

11 MR. MACK: This property was originally zoned rural and then the prior or
12 previous owner, Danny Mangum came in in 2001 I guess it was and had it rezoned C-1.
13 Why, no one knows. He never did anything with it. And when Ideal Construction
14 Company bought it this past year they – their proposal and their initial intentions were to
15 keep the back three and a half acres for their own use. Build a 10,000 square foot
16 garage to park the cars and vehicles, trucks and vehicles in and then we have the other
17 five and a half acres on the front that we're going to cut up into four or five one-acre
18 parcels. We're not going to change the zoning on that. They're going to be sold to be
19 used with the current zoning – C-1.

20 MR. MANNING: Those four or five lots would drain into the upper proposed
21 retention pond?

1 MR. MACK: That's correct. They'll actually – yeah. They're going to put two
2 retention ponds on the property; one to catch the four acres in the front and then one
3 behind the building. So there are going to be two retention ponds on that property.

4 MR. MANNING: And Mr. Richardson would be doing that?

5 MR. MACK: Yes, sir.

6 MR. MANNING: Both of them up front?

7 MR. MACK: Yes, sir.

8 MR. MANNING: Thank you.

9 MR. MACK: And Mr. Richardson is here and so is his engineer if you have any
10 other questions.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions for Mr. Mack?

12 MR. GREEN: I just wanted to know if the applicant has had an opportunity to
13 review the proposed conditions listed in the Staff Report and had any – there are 16
14 conditions and to see if they had any response with regard to those 16 conditions?

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just received my official copy this morning [inaudible]

16 MS. ALMEIDA: They were mailed out a week ago.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: This is dated May 1st but I didn't get it until this morning.

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Greg Sellers? Is he here?

19 MR. VAN DINE: Did you want to speak on it?

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Speak on this?

21 MR. MACK: I've never seen this before. The date on it's May the first. Now they
22 had the meeting, which I wasn't made aware of, wasn't invited to, on April the 26th – the
23 Department of Planning and Development Services. Here's a note here. You might not

1 have a copy of this either. "Dear Sir: Please be advised the master plan entitled Ideal
2 Construction Company Planned Development District located on Farming Creek Road
3 dated February 15, 2007, for the subject property has been conditionally approved at
4 the Development Review Team meeting on April 26, 2007. The Development Review
5 Team conditions of approval are as follows."

6 MR. GREEN: Are there 16 stipulations there, Mr. Mack?

7 MR. MACK: Sir?

8 MR. GREEN: Are there 16 items listed in that letter?

9 MR. MACK: Twelve.

10 MR. GREEN: Okay. We haven't – what I'm interested in is when the applicant
11 was aware of the 16 specific conditions over and above what is outlined in the PDD if
12 the applicant has had an opportunity to review those 16 conditions; that if we were to
13 pass this those conditions be attached to.

14 MR. MACK: When they met on the 26th of April - again I wasn't here, they made
15 notes, questions that Jennie or someone raised – they made notes of what those
16 questions were and they made an addendum to the PDD last week because I hand
17 delivered that myself. And they should have covered all of the questions they have
18 here. So everything's been answered. Can Carl come up here? He's the one that's –

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Excuse me one minute.

20 MS. LINDER: It appears that some of the Staff conditions are just generic
21 conditions saying he'll comply with certain provisions of the ordinance. We're not going
22 to be responsible for deed enforcement and just generic requirements that would apply
23 whether it was written into the ordinance or not. And the reason Staff puts them in is

1 just to emphasize the importance of these sections but those are just – he’s going to
2 have to comply with them whether or not they’re in the ordinance or not.

3 MR. GREEN: But there are in fact many very specific PDD conditions.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: They were reiterated in the DRT.

5 MR. GREEN: But my – but what I’m trying to understand is if the applicant has
6 had an opportunity to review those conditions and has any response to any of them? I
7 know a lot of times that Staff recommends certain conditions be attached to the PDD
8 but often, you know, and so we’re being – the recommendation to us as a Commission
9 is that we approve this sub – if we approve it we add these additional stipulations on it.
10 I think it’s important that we hear from the applicant what their response to those
11 stipulations are.

12 MR. PALMER: Did you send them a copy of these PDD conditions?

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes. The Planning Commission’s Staff Report – the one you
14 have before you was sent to the applicant, put in the mail on Tuesday. Mr. Stan Mack,
15 as far as the DRT, is not the applicant listed on the application form. When we send out
16 notification we go by this application form. And whoever filled this out has the applicant
17 and project as Ideal Construction and I have here Timothy Richardson and Robert
18 Richardson as the representative contact person and their address.

19 **TESTIMONY OF CARL BECKER:**

20 MR. BECKER: My name’s Carl Becker. I’m a project manager with the
21 engineering division for Ideal Construction and I worked on the preparation of the
22 document here. It’s my understanding, my experience in the engineering business that
23 typically that – I know the comment was made that our information was somewhat

1 broad in nature. That during the planning process that you don't get into specific design
2 criteria until you're actually submitting for a zoning or landscaping permit which is a
3 precursor to going in for a land disturbance permit for actual construction on [inaudible].
4 But to ease the minds of everyone here is first of all the storm water. The way that we
5 have set this up. The size of the parcel by state and county regulation requires water
6 quality to be a part of the design criteria going into it. We split the ponds in two because
7 of having development that we plan on the front portion of this project which fronts
8 Farming Creek Road. This pond will design and filter the water. It will be connected to
9 the back pond which will discharge out. It will discharge out by state law no greater
10 than the predeveloped rate and also will meet the water quality requirements that are
11 stated by state regulations and also county regulations. So we – our design will take
12 care of making sure that the water that's discharged is clean and will not cause any type
13 of contaminants in doing so. Certainly our design, when we go to building this are going
14 to meet all the necessary codes and guidelines regarding building setbacks and
15 necessary buffers and such things to be included with that. So we want to make
16 assurance to you folks that that will be taken into account as dictated on that.
17 Regarding the size of the building, again we outlined all that information. A 10,000
18 square foot building. The building will basically house our equipment. We're in the
19 construction business. If our equipment isn't out on the jobsite making money then
20 there's a problem with that. So at any given time we don't expect any more than a
21 handful of pieces of equipment to be there because it's not making money for us. And it
22 will be there only for vehicle maintenance and to turn it around and send it back to a
23 jobsite again.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Next we have –

2 MR. MANNING: Excuse me. Let me ask him one question before he goes.
3 How would you operate without storage of fuel if you're in the construction business?

4 MR. BECKER: Typically that fueling is portable and it is located out on jobsites.
5 We don't – for fueling purposes those things are portable and they're typically located
6 on jobsites that we have.

7 MR. MANNING: And no pumps there?

8 MR. BECKER: No. There will no underground storage tanks onsite. Not at all.

9 MR. MANNING: As far as maintenance that you're doing on equipment all that –

10 MR. BECKER: Basically just changing oil and doing mechanical maintenance,
11 that's all.

12 MR. MANNING: All collected and disposed of?

13 MR. BECKER: Correct. Yes.

14 MR. MANNING: There's not possibility of that getting into the ground water flow?

15 MR. BECKER: No. No, sir. And the majority of that will be done – all that
16 vehicle maintenance will be done within that building itself so it will be contained in
17 there. The only thing that we'll have stored outside is miscellaneous equipment. We're
18 in the, like I said, utility and the building construction so there'll be miscellaneous
19 [inaudible] building materials out there and none that could produce any type of
20 contamination. And any vehicle – any oil or gasoline spills that may occur is - by
21 dismantling the equipment will certainly be contained, soaked up and disposed of in
22 accordance with regulations for hazardous waste.

1 MR. MANNING: Do you have any type of septic system that picks that up rather
2 than having it go into the detention pond?

3 MR. BECKER: If that's – and we don't plan on letting that be discharged in that.
4 Like I said we will I guess contain it in there, put it in receptacles and take it off to the
5 appropriate disposal sites for that to take place. Our sewer system for that is going – for
6 the building we plan on one bathroom in there and there'll also be restrooms located in
7 the spaces out front and our plan of design for that there's no current wastewater in that
8 part of the street there and we're going to design an onsite pump station and collection
9 system and propose to pump that down to the intersection of Chadford and Farming
10 Creek, which system is owned and operated by Carolina Water Systems. We've
11 already been in preliminary discussions with them about doing so. The City of
12 Columbia has a 54" waterline that runs along there. When it was designed it had
13 specific taps that front each property and we will tie onto that again with their permission
14 at those areas for infrastructure.

15 MR. MANNING: Thank you.

16 MR. GREEN: Currently what's the size of the building plan?

17 MR. BECKER: Of the building itself? It's 10,000 square feet.

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions from Commissioners? Thank you.

19 MR. BECKER: Thank you for your time.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Mr. Richardson? Robert Richardson?

21 **TESTIMONY OF ROBERT RICHARDSON:**

22 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, sir.

23 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Do you want to speak on behalf of this or?

1 MR. RICHARDSON: I don't really care to.

2 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay.

3 MR. RICHARDSON: [inaudible]

4 MR. GREEN: Quick question. The pavement – I would assume that the gray
5 area here is all paved as opposed to being gravel or is this -

6 MR. RICHARDSON: We would probably prefer to have just a crush and run
7 base.

8 MR. GREEN: That's not – the driveway and the parking lot area is not paved?

9 MR. RICHARDSON: No, sir.

10 MR. GREEN: Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. RICHARDSON: Any other questions?

12 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Mr. David Koon? Thank you, sir. Mr. Koon here? He's
13 not here? Do you want to speak, sir, against?

14 **TESTIMONY OF DAVID KOON:**

15 MR. KOON: I'll defer for right now. I just came to listen to see if everything's
16 going like I was promised.

17 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Thank you. Discussion?

18 MR. GREEN: I'd like to walk through some of the recommended – again has the
19 applicant - I'm interested in whether the applicant's had a chance to review the 16
20 additional conditions that Planning Commission has recommended be attached to the –
21 to our recommendation and the response of the applicant, if any, to those conditions. I
22 guess I'd like to ask Staff just some questions with regard to their recommendations on
23 conditions. I understand the 10,000 square foot building. Is the applicant aware that

1 Staff is recommending that the construction on this site be limited to 10,000 square feet
2 of building and that that would be a condition that would go forward with the property?

3 MR. BECKER: That was our recommendation from the start – the building size.

4 MR. GREEN: Okay. I'm interested as to the requirement that they be shielded
5 from the rail line.

6 MS. ALMEIDA: Well we require all shielding around the property.

7 MR. GREEN: Irrespective of what's next to it? Okay.

8 MS. ALMEIDA: That is correct. Staff would like to delete condition eight
9 because the applicant only has 51' of frontage and that is partially his access way into
10 the property.

11 MR. PALMER: If I'm reading these conditions correctly they would not have the
12 option to pave the driveway or the parking lot? Am I reading this right that there's a
13 20% maximum impervious surface on the site?

14 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. We're not talking about driveway entrance. Because the
15 applicant did not – what you see before you is a visual depiction of what they want to do
16 but to address that we need to have it quantifiable. Unlike what the engineer had stated
17 when we pull out this PDD and we get a site plan it must match the PDD document. It
18 has to address your design standards at that time. We need to know how large the
19 parking lot will be. Okay? We can't just visually – it looks right. I mean we need to
20 know how big these things are. The limit of parking. These are the things that were
21 lacking and on a PDD document that's their zoning. It has to be locked in at that point
22 in time when you all recommend or if it gets approved, not at the site plan stage. And
23 that's where we're – Staff is having difficulty. You know yes, it looks like a buffer but,

1 you know, we're looking for a wider due to the business that's going in there. We're
2 recommending 20'. And the applicant in this document that was given to you or given to
3 Mr. Green it does state that a 20' buffer is agreeable. But these are things that were
4 lacking in the PDD. We just felt that they were very vague and so we were very specific
5 in our conditions.

6 MR. GREEN: In the condition number one that says 50' minimum buffer for
7 neighboring agricultural, Anna, is that setback or is it something intended to be a buffer?

8 MS. ALMEIDA: It includes a setback as well.

9 MR. GREEN: But when this recommendation says 50' minimum buffer for
10 neighboring agricultural lands; is that intended as a 50' setback or something to be done
11 in the buffer?

12 MS. ALMEIDA: No. Your setback would be in the buffer.

13 MR. GREEN: I understand that.

14 MS. ALMEIDA: Right.

15 MR. GREEN: But what –

16 MS. ALMEIDA: A vegetative buffer.

17 MR. GREEN: - this doesn't say what the buffer is. What is the buffer other than
18 just a setback?

19 MS. ALMEIDA: It's vegetated. The site currently is vegetated.

20 MR. GREEN: Well in one place it says a minimum 20' vegetative buffer and
21 another place it says a 50' minimum buffer so I'm confused about what the applicant's
22 being asked to do here.

23 MS. ALMEIDA: All right. I'd like to correct item nine to 50'.

1 MR. GREEN: Is the applicant aware of the request for a 50' vegetative buffer?

2 MR. BECKER: Excuse me. [Inaudible] We don't have a copy of that
3 information.

4 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Come to the mic, please.

5 MR. VAN DINE: While he's coming up. First of all I'm not sure you can put a 50'
6 vegetative buffer along the driveway because it's only 51' wide anyway.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Yeah. It's 50 against agricultural and 20 across the – next to the
8 rail line.

9 MR. BECKER: Begging everyone's indulgence. We don't have a copy of
10 whatever you're reading there. So we don't know, I mean, whatever requirements - and
11 I again reiterate the state of – reiterate the stand of our company that these are not, you
12 know, issues that are reasonable and in line with the regulations as stated forth. We
13 don't have a problem making sure that our development adheres to these things and
14 we'll take care of that. That's not an issue for us but we just want to be aware of what
15 the ground rules are. That's all. And we'll make sure as we go to the next process –
16 part of the process that those will be incorporated into that. But we don't have a copy of
17 what you're reading, gentlemen.

18 MR. VAN DINE: I just want to clear something real quick for the applicant's
19 perspective. By submitting a PDD you are going beyond typical normal zoning
20 changes. You are telling everybody specifically what is going to be in your thing as to
21 setbacks, buffers, amount of impervious surfaces. That is your responsibility as part of
22 this document. While you may not have stated that because you didn't understand that
23 was required, that is what we're trying to get to right now is what those additional

1 requirements would be if this Body were to go ahead and approve it at this point. So
2 whether or not it's there or not it's before us now to discuss those specific issues and
3 that's what we're doing right now. That's what we're trying to accomplish.

4 MR. BECKER: Absolutely and we appreciate that. And again we're not – we
5 want to stand before you in our cooperation with the County in that regard. Again not
6 an issue for us. That we want to make sure those things are taken care of. And again
7 for the nature of our – you know, we were directed – in the path that we've taken we
8 were directed to do so in that. So, you know, what we need to do, we'd like to do, you
9 know, to be able to get that taken care of so that we can go ahead with the development
10 of the property so.

11 MR. VAN DINE: What you are proposing then from Staff was a 50' rear setback
12 which is in essence the agricultural property?

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Rear and side yard.

14 MR. VAN DINE: And 20' setback on any other place?

15 MS. ALMEIDA: Just along the rail line.

16 MR. VAN DINE: Along the rail line. Okay. What about where the building fronts
17 the – where it would be up [inaudible]?

18 MS. ALMEIDA: It would be a 50' because the front – well the front parcel we're
19 assuming is still agricultural. So anything that's still agricultural, farm.

20 MR. VAN DINE: And if that converts to OI which is what it currently is designated
21 would that be –

22 MS. ALMEIDA: We're not – we don't -

23 MR. VAN DINE: Would that be a 20' setback?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: No. We don't go by the zoning; we go by the use so.

2 MR. VAN DINE: But my question is let's assume for a minute they go ahead and
3 they're going to start to put in an office or something else?

4 MS. ALMEIDA: It would be 20'.

5 MR. VANDINE: It would be 20.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions to the applicant or to the staff?
7 Any other [inaudible]?

8 MR. MANNING: Yeah. I'm kind of going back to a couple points that were
9 brought up up here as well as what Anna brought up a minute ago [inaudible] specifics
10 to deal with and items 10 and 12 are vague in what the expectations is of the applicant.
11 So I would like to try to figure out how to specifically state something that both the
12 applicant and the Staff would be comfortable with.

13 MS. CAIRNS: Is that not something that's the job of the applicant?

14 MR. MANNING: Excuse me?

15 MS. CAIRNS: Is that not something – the job of the applicant? I mean, listening
16 to the discussion so far it's as if we're going to sit now in this public meeting and design
17 the PDD that was not – I mean a PDD was submitted but missing, you know, vast
18 quantities of typical information and I just don't think it's appropriate in a public meeting
19 to try to craft the missing specifics.

20 MR. MANNING: Well unfortunately we're missing materials that the applicant
21 sent in as well as the application and the applicant is missing information that the Staff
22 requested that they just got recently. So in an effort to try to come up with something
23 that is appropriate from both parties, that's why we're having this discussion.

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Well normally after the DRT the chain of events is that the
2 applicant goes back and obviously modifies this document. We sit down as a Staff if the
3 applicant is not, you know, amenable to the conditions of DRT. I mean those things
4 have to be ironed out. The applicant never got back to us as far as wanting to revise
5 these. We got this email from Mr. Mack on the third and with all due respect he did get
6 – the letter was dated the first and they tried to at least get back to us by the third but I
7 think there was a lot that needed to be hashed out before the Planning Commission and
8 normally the document is tweaked and modified in order to meet both parties' conditions
9 before it's brought before you.

10 MR. BECKER: With all due respect if I could interject. We tried starting last
11 Monday. We had this meeting on Thursday and again we didn't receive anything in
12 writing which was typical that normally as engineers, developers or what not are
13 directed. Typically that's done so in written form. We didn't receive this letter until
14 today which appears to be different from what you folks are reading from. And we did
15 make an attempt on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday to get a contact. We actually
16 didn't break through and again, that's fine but I just want it to be stated that we tried to
17 set up meetings and to try and come and sit down before we got to this venue and not
18 being fully prepared. We did try to make a due diligent effort to try and amend these
19 things and receiving that this morning did not allow us the time to make any necessary
20 changes to that document and have it here by our meeting. I'm sure you'll understand
21 and agree with that.

22 MS. ALMEIDA: I think Staff is trying to [inaudible] the process trying to meet the
23 needs and deadlines of the applicant. Clearly what should have happened was this

1 application should have never been on this Planning Commission agenda. But in order
2 to try to appease the applicant in getting on the Planning Commission in a timely
3 fashion or at least expediting it due to the situation that had occurred three months prior
4 and it really binds Staff into a corner where we're not completely satisfied, the
5 applicant's not completely satisfied, you all are getting documentation late. Okay? As
6 you all have reiterated, you want your packages at least seven days prior. We're trying
7 to meet that deadline. It has become a challenge. But clearly from seeing this chain of
8 events this application should have been taken off the Planning Commission and you
9 should have seen it at least on June 4th.

10 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions from the Commission?

11 MR. VAN DINE: Well I guess my – at this point in time my question is eliminating
12 item eight. If you guys want to have – I'll be more than happy to hand you my version of
13 it so you can take a look at the conditions that are here. If you don't have it you can
14 take a look at it right now.

15 MR. GREEN: Could we table – could we give them an opportunity to look at
16 that?

17 MR. VAN DINE: And let's come back.

18 MR. GREEN: Let's table this and bring it back up and we'll probably get to the
19 other agenda items in 30 to 45 minutes. And if there's no issues with this – I just feel, I
20 feel hesitant to move forward with this without an applicant even having an opportunity
21 to read what the conditions are. I would make a motion to table and to move this to the
22 back end of our agenda.

23 MR. VAN DINE: Second.

1 MR. MURRAY: Let them have a Staff person if necessary to help – assist them.

2 MR. VAN DINE: And their out there looking at the copy.

3 MR. MURRAY: I was just amending his motion, his recommendation to provide
4 whatever assistance he needs from your Staff so that [inaudible] expedite.

5 MS. ALMEIDA: Well and clearly we were trying to accommodate their sense of
6 urgency and we are now put into a situation where we shouldn't and, you know, I think
7 we need to adhere to our policy that if the document is not revised it is not put on the
8 Planning Commission period.

9 MR. VAN DINE: We've got a motion on the floor to [inaudible] until later.

10 MR. GREEN: Make it the last item of New Business.

11 MR. VAN DINE: And a second was –

12 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: All in favor that – of the motion please by raising your
13 hand. Opposed?

14 *[Approved: Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Van Dine, Green, and Manning; Opposed:*
15 *Cairns; Abstained: Ward and Murray]*

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: [inaudible] put this at the back of the agenda. Next on
17 the agenda item is 07-26 MA.

18 **CASE NO. 07-26 MA:**

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this application is located on Bluff Road.
20 The applicant is requesting to rezone approximately 26 ½ acres from RM-MD to RM-
21 HD. The current zoning allows for eight units per acre. The request is going to 16 units
22 per acre. Shop Road is classified a four-lane, undivided major arterial. The current
23 level of service is B. The zoning would be consistent with the adjacent residential

1 development. That recently received a map amendment. The surrounding
2 development is industrial. It includes a steel manufacturing warehouse and industrial
3 uses. The parcel currently has water and sewer and the adjacent residential
4 development is Copper Beach that has been approved. The Planning Staff
5 recommends approval.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any comments to Staff by Commission?

7 MR. VAN DINE: I just have one question. Are we intending to continue to inject
8 residential into this industrial area? I mean, it seems to me that – I don't know whether
9 the area is changing so much that it's going to become residential or whatever but we
10 seem to be jamming more and more residential. We do it in the form of multi-family
11 apartments and stuff but frankly the people in an apartment just have as much right to
12 not have all of the industrial intrusions as anybody else does.

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Right.

14 MR. VAN DINE: So what are we attempting to do here?

15 MS. ALMEIDA: Well I guess we were looking at this and this, of course, is
16 Copper Beach right now and there is a bakery of some sort – a company that makes
17 baking goods and this parcel had been before you quite some time ago and withdrew
18 for apartments as well. It would just compliment really what's there down that road. But
19 yes that's a policy issue that's being brought before Council to discuss even farther
20 north on Bluff Road near the University.

21 MR. VAN DINE: Well because you got this steel plant which is still down below it
22 and you got the chicken Tyson plant which is right there. So it's not like – and at least

1 the chicken processing is a fairly new operation so it's not like that's going to close
2 down any time soon.

3 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. But we felt that due to the existing apartments or
4 townhouses if this was reserved for industrial it just wouldn't really compliment that
5 dead-end area.

6 MR. VAN DINE: I think my concern is are we creating a situation in which down
7 the road we're going to end up having people in those residential units starting to
8 complain about the industrial that's down in there and how is the county going to resolve
9 and deal with the fact that we're actually injecting that in?

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Well interestingly enough it seems to be the opposite. Up on
11 Bluff Road we've been having complaints from the industrial uses complaining about the
12 student housing and the traffic and the tractor and trailers trying to get out and, you
13 know, students zipping back and forth. It's actually the opposite and that is something
14 that we're looking into.

15 MR. MANNING: Well the question here really is is do we want 16 units per acre
16 or eight units per acre?

17 MR. GREEN: Right.

18 MR MANNING: So the residential's already going in on that site.

19 MR. VAN DINE: Yeah. Now I'm just going – this seems to me that we're just
20 sort of sticking it in the middle of industrial. And I understand it's already there but –
21 and for the rest of the area, I mean, it seems we're starting to create more problems. I
22 recognize that this is already there and the question is increased versus -

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions? No one's signed up to speak on
2 this property here on this one. May I have a motion?

3 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think, you know, we've already got it residentially
4 zoned. A little bit higher density there compatible with the adjacent density I wouldn't
5 have a problem with so I would recommend approval.

6 MR. ANDERSON: I'll second.

7 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the motion and the second. Is there any –
8 you heard the motion and the second. All in favor of sending this to County Council with
9 approval please raise your hand. Opposed?

10 *[Approved: Cairns, Ward, Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Van Dine, Green, and*
11 *Manning]*

12 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Unanimous. Next on the agenda item is 07-28 MA.

13 **CASE NO. 07-28 MA:**

14 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the applicant is requesting to rezone 178.9
15 acres from RU to PDD. The parcel is located on Garners Ferry Road and Lower
16 Richland Boulevard. They have submitted a PDD. The PDD is located within the
17 Southeast Richland Neighborhood Master Plan that was developed with a mix of
18 housing types, commercial uses and public amenities. Forty-four acres of the PDD is
19 proposed to be detached single-family residential development, 12 acres of attached
20 single-family residential development, 98 acres of multi-family, 62 acres of commercial
21 and office along Garners Ferry Road and Lower Richland Boulevard and the applicant
22 is also proposing a 50' vegetative buffer between the commercial lots and abutting
23 roads. The DRT did review and recommend approval on April 26th. And you will see

1 those recommendations from the DRT on page 25. And I just want to point out that the
2 traffic on Garners Ferry Road at the count station 171 that we looked up, and that's
3 west of Lower Richland Boulevard currently is classified at a level of service D. And
4 Staff is recommending approval.

5 MR. MANNING: And where is that station?

6 MS. ALMEIDA: I'm sorry, 171 on Garners Ferry, west of Lower Richland
7 Boulevard.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions to Staff by Commission?

9 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, just one quick question. Anna, you guys appear
10 to be recommending inclusion of the corner –

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

12 MR. VAN DINE: - general commercial as part of the PDD?

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes. This parcel had been previously rezoned to GC and we felt
14 that it really needed to adhere to and be part of the parcel – the PDD document.

15 MR. VAN DINE: If you were to do that would that impact any – the curb cuts or
16 the entrances that you specified in number five?

17 MS. ALMEIDA: No. We would want those curb cuts for that parcel.

18 MR. VAN DINE: Okay. You'd want internal connecting -

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

20 MR. VAN DINE: - as opposed to connection onto the road?

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We have a person – Ken Simmons?

23 **TESTIMONY OF KENNETH SIMMONS:**

1 MR. SIMMONS: My name is Kenneth Simmons. I'm a landscape architect, land
2 planner. I'm representing the Bunch family who live on Spring Lake Road in Columbia.
3 Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, we concur with all of the conditions except three
4 of them. Item number two, item number five, and item number ten. I'll take item ten
5 which is the easiest one which basically is probably a standard condition [inaudible]
6 deferring. I'm talking about the Corps of Engineers wetlands. If you look in appendix C
7 you'll see the letter from the Corps that declares there are no wetlands on the site so
8 the fact that we provided I don't think it needs to be a condition of the [inaudible]. Any
9 questions on that before I move on?

10 MR. MANNING: Yeah. On item number five you would oppose the limitation of
11 curb cuts and could you give me some [inaudible]?

12 MR. SIMMONS: Yes, sir. As you know in the PUD process if we have an arrow
13 there it just says that we have the right to go talk to DOT and negotiate whether or not
14 they will allow an encroachment permit to put in a road. We were required as part of the
15 PUD submission process to provide a traffic study by a reputable traffic engineer, Wilbur
16 Smith. They have in the back of this report an additional thicker book documenting all
17 of these entrances. All we're asking is the right to take what we have here and then go
18 to the next step which is to meet with DOT traffic engineer, the traffic engineer and
19 determine the appropriate amount of intersections. I'm also working on a project down
20 the road – I'm very aware Garners Ferry Road is busy but there are traffic – other
21 elements that will enhance entrances like making double left lane turns. It's a very
22 complicated – to answer your question, this is a very complicated intersection, very
23 complicated and in my opinion it needs to be traffic engineers making the decision not

1 just saying we feel there's too many – again emphasizing just because they're there
2 doesn't mean the DOT are going to give us encroachment permits for those. So we
3 would like to leave them where they are with the understanding that the next step is
4 then our traffic engineers talk to DOT traffic engineers and work out a technically
5 complicated proper solution.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any questions from Staff? Staff have any –

7 MS. ALMEDIA: Well Staff would like to just reiterate in the Southeast Master
8 Plan one of the things on Lower Richland Boulevard is pedestrian friendly, that
9 boulevard affect. As you can see they're providing a 50' buffer between the roadway
10 and their property. One of the things is limited access. By just placing so many curb
11 cuts it really doesn't bring the intent of what that really means. And the buffer along
12 Garners Ferry, we feel that there are main entrances into the site that would adequately
13 serve their commercial and office requirements that the applicant is requesting. That's
14 one of the reasons we really encourage the spine road to limit those access points on
15 Garners Ferry and Lower Richland Boulevard.

16 MR. SIMMONS: We see the two on – the two that are not the major ones on
17 Garners Ferry Road are probably going to be right in, right out. We know they would
18 not be completely left turn in but we do feel again that this is a complicated traffic area
19 and it needs to be handled by traffic engineers and that's all we're asking is to leave this
20 and let us go to the next step to work with traffic engineer with traffic engineer to work
21 out the proper, safe solutions.

22 MR. VAN DINE: Let me ask you a quick – I am most concerned about the Lower
23 Richland Boulevard. You've got six entrances off there in what amounts to an area near

1 high schools and all of the other things of that nature. Plus you're also as stated that
2 Southeast Richland Plan we're talking about trying to provide a boulevard type affect to
3 that road. If you put six entrances at a minimum in that area regardless of what DOT
4 says, and I can tell you quite frankly I'm aware of at least three instances where PDDs
5 were put out and DOT let them do additional cuts beyond what was in the PDD. So I
6 don't have a whole lot of faith in DOT limiting the number of road curb cuts. So just
7 saying go to DOT and see what they say, they're going to give you whatever you want
8 to do for all intents and purposes. I seriously have concerns over Lower Richland and
9 the number of access points on to there. I'm a little less inclined on Garners Ferry
10 because if I look at the map it looks as if there are already turn cuts through the middle
11 of the median in those areas anyways. So my main concern would be on the Lower
12 Richland side. Three cuts onto that seem to me to be appropriate as opposed to the six
13 that have been proposed.

14 MS. ALMEIDA: And keep in mind that the parcel, the out parcel. Of course we
15 have no control at this point of how many the applicant would be willing to acquire as
16 well.

17 MR. VAN DINE: And let me ask you a question on that one. You said that you
18 were not in favor of item number two [inaudible] in. What is the reason for that?

19 MR. SIMMONS: Well the reason is is several. One is that that site came before
20 y'all less than a year and a half ago. It's already been rezoned. Both Planning Staff,
21 Planning Commission and Council approved that zoning at that time. The owners just
22 happen to be the people that own the rest of it. If it wasn't the same owner there
23 wouldn't even be a debate here. But they feel that the zoning is appropriate. Now I

1 also remind all of us, which I'm sure you're aware of, you're going to have a chance to
2 look at that development when it comes before you in preliminary subdivision plan, a
3 sketch plan or whatever you review. So you'll have an opportunity.

4 MR. PALMER: We don't.

5 MR. SIMMONS: And I understand the concern. The concern is to extend the
6 buffer down to the intersection. But we just – the owners feel that the zoning is
7 appropriate and they don't feel it should be added in this. And, you know, it's interesting
8 to me because I've been doing this 30-something years and I've never seen
9 requirements on property outside of the zoning request being applied to the zoning
10 request.

11 MR. VAN DINE: I'm not going to debate that particular question. But as Mr.
12 Palmer stated while you were talking, we don't get to see any site plans of any kind –

13 MR. SIMMONS: Okay.

14 MR. VANDINE: - which is another discussion we will probably be having at the
15 end of this meeting.

16 MR. SIMMONS: You used to. I apologize. I know you used to and now you
17 don't. But the County has an opportunity to look at the plan before they get a permit.

18 MR. PALMER: But I do agree –

19 MR. SIMMONS: I understand where you're coming from on that.

20 MR. PALMER: I do agree, Mr. Simmons, that the application should stand on the
21 property that's submitted and not be pushed outside to encompass any other property
22 that's not requested of the applicant to be zoned. Also I'd like to keep in mind that –
23 how much frontage do you have along Lower Richland Boulevard? Do you know?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: It's included in your packet.

2 MR. SIMMONS: It's 4,600' of buffers on both roads. I can't remember the
3 breakdown on the two.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: We've got 2,400 linear feet of frontage on Garners Ferry Road,
5 2,700 linear of frontage on Lower Richland and 3,000 linear feet on Rabbit Run Road.

6 MR. VAN DINE: Is that inclusive of –

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Approximately.

8 MR. VAN DINE: - the general commercial or exclusive of the general
9 commercial?

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Exclusive.

11 MR. SIMMONS: Exclusive.

12 MR. VAN DINE: Exclusive.

13 MR. PALMER: You've got 2,700' and you're only looking for three curb cuts to
14 service a populated area when the school across the street has one, two, three, four to
15 service the football field, baseball field and a parking lot?

16 MS. ALMEIDA: Well we're trying to Master Plan the area. If you – I mean, look
17 at the Village at Sandhills. We try to limit our curb cuts and have things internally. It's
18 safer, it's a better design. The high school's been there for years and we know that just
19 adding curb cuts is not a good design function.

20 MR. SIMMONS: May I interject one thing. We had a – I didn't tell y'all but we've
21 had several meetings with Councilman Jackson who was on the Planning Commission
22 when the Lower Richland Plan was approved. We also met with some of the leaders
23 from the neighborhood. As you know you sent out a notice and everyone doesn't attend

1 but Mr. Gurley who was one of the most vocal people in Lower Richland, all of them
2 were excited about this plan and I think the fact that you don't see any of them here
3 today kind of says something. But the feeling was – they were excited about this plan
4 for two reasons. One is the internal road with the round about that we have, they felt
5 very strongly would take a lot of traffic off of Lower Richland Boulevard. And also you
6 notice on the western side we have reserved a 50' buffer which could be used based on
7 the Lower Richland Plan if you connected Century Oak which the Lower Richland Plan
8 proposed into Rabbit Run. So we have designed into this plan possible ways to reduce
9 the traffic on Lower Richland Boulevard. And that was one thing the local
10 neighborhoods were very pleased to see in this plan. So that's even more reason why
11 we feel that we're helping the process rather than increasing the problem.

12 MR. MANNING: Mr. Simmons, I've got two questions. One, the spine road and
13 the traffic circle that's in the center of the property, I was unclear why y'all would have
14 the road not pushed over to the west and follow the land use rather than having the
15 road split up your multi-family tract or your single-family tract.

16 MR. SIMMONS: Well the feeling of it is that the roads would address the front
17 doors. In other words between on the left-hand side of the road in the multi-family you
18 could have multi-family facing that spine road. I don't like as a land planner to have a
19 road backing up -

20 MR. MANNING: Do you want to have frontage on both sides of that road –

21 MR. SIMMONS: That is correct.

22 MR. MANNING: - with multi-family backing up to – I mean backing up to single-
23 family.

1 MR. SIMMONS: Single family. So your buffers at the rear of the two pieces of
2 property back single-family up to multi-family rather than have them face each other
3 across the road.

4 MR. MANNING: You're not concerned about setbacks?

5 MR. SIMMONS: Well we are concerned but again, you know, this is our best
6 guess until we get into working with a developer on how they exactly want to do it. And
7 if it comes out that they need to change it over then we'll come back and ask for
8 modification. But this our best guess of how we felt like would be appropriate.

9 MR. MANNING: It seems like you might risk not being able to use some of that
10 land [inaudible].

11 MR. SIMMONS: Well we may – we're crystal balling now. I understand it's
12 difficult for ya'll, it's difficult for us because of the zoning process without doing the
13 detailed planning. But – excuse me. I do have to emphasize this is a little bit different
14 because this family has owned this property for generations. They're not developers so
15 we don't have the input of the final user as we would on many zoning applications.

16 MR. MANNING: The other question I've got is the commercial property that
17 comes off of Lower Richland Boulevard extends out – you've got an entrance going out
18 to Rabbit Run.

19 MR. SIMMONS: Yes, sir.

20 MR. MANNING: Is that area going to be sizeable enough to do anything there?
21 It appeared in one of the plats or maps that you gave us that that is in the floodplain or
22 there's a creek that runs through there?

1 MR. SIMMONS: There is a dry weather creek that runs through there that,
2 according to the Corps of Engineers letter, is not freshwater wetlands. We haven't done
3 the engineering yet but the fact that it is not wet enough to be a freshwater wetlands
4 leads us to believe that it is in an area that a road could be built. But again we haven't
5 gotten into the engineering. One of the concerns, if I may, of the neighborhood and one
6 of the - according to the neighbors down there a tremendous amount of traffic on Lower
7 Richland Boulevard is coming from the many housing units that are on Rabbit Run
8 Road. And the feeling is that if those users wanted to use what we feel probably more
9 like neighborhood commercial on Lower Richland like a dentist office or something like
10 that then they could come down the road you're talking about there. Obviously when
11 the major commercial on Garners Ferry Road is developed they were excited about the
12 central road because that would again allow everyone on Rabbit Run Road as
13 residential to get to those major commercial without having to go out onto Lower
14 Richland Boulevard. Also hopefully in the future the major middle entrance on Garners
15 Ferry Road is across from Square D which would be the logical traffic light location. If
16 that was installed then a lot of people on Rabbit Run Road would not use Lower
17 Richland Boulevard in the morning or afternoon going to and from work. And then, of
18 course, if Century Oak ever got built that would be another cut to bypass Lower
19 Richland Boulevard. So, you know, we have worked very closely with Councilman
20 Jackson who is from this district and is certainly aware of all those concerns and he kind
21 of advised us on some of these ways to help reduce the traffic on Lower Richland
22 Boulevard and really concentrate it more on the school.

1 MR. MANNING: Well is the area that's off of that road coming into Rabbit Run
2 sizeable enough to do anything? I guess my question is do you want –

3 MR. SIMMONS: No, sir. I think if you're talking about the little triangles up
4 there?

5 MR. MANNING: I am. Correct.

6 MR. SIMMONS: No, sir. That was basically – the Bunches worked a land swap
7 with the church there just to get access on Rabbit Run that would - basically you're
8 talking about allowing access to the commercial that's on Lower Richland Boulevard
9 without having to get on Lower Richland Boulevard. So those would end up in – one of
10 the conditions is five percent open space. I feel sure that those pieces of red would be
11 part of that five percent open space. And, of course, we tried to have the linear green
12 space along the lower areas and preserve as much of that watershed as we could. And
13 those of y'all that aren't familiar with that the water flow is from the up, down this way
14 through the site.

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions? We'll take a vote of how we need
16 to send this to County Council.

17 MR. SIMMONS: Thank you.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have – this invitation.

19 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Excuse me, sir. Please. I think you signed up on the
20 wrong sheet.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Exactly.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Mr. Sellers? Are you Mr. Sellers?

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I came in and they told me to come over this way and
2 [inaudible] just sign in.

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Are you Mr. Sellers?

4 MR. SELLERS: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. We'll put you on the other sheet. Come down –
6 come to the mike and give your name and address. Are you for or against?

7 **TESTIMONY OF GREGORY SELLERS:**

8 MR. SELLERS: I need to find out what's being built. That's what I want to find
9 out because my back door is about 40' from Rabbit Run and their property line,
10 according to this map that I'm holding - my name is Gregory Sellers, address, 164
11 Alexander Point Drive - and their property line according to this map is running right
12 about 40' from my back door. And what I would like to know is what am I going to be
13 looking at that's going to be built right outside of my back door?

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible].

15 MR. SELLERS: Alexander Point and Rabbit Run this is the property from what
16 I'm understanding; I live here.

17 MR. SIMMONS: You will be back up – Alexander Point is right there. So that is
18 why we have single-family buffering single-family and single-family. So what would be
19 across the street from him is single-family and that's the reason this single-family is
20 [inaudible]. So you would just have houses very similar to what you're living in across
21 Rabbit Run Road from you.

22 MR. SELLERS: How much of that 178 acres [inaudible]?

1 MR. SIMMONS: See this light yellow? That is proposed to be single-family
2 residential. I believe that is, if I'm not mistaken, I believe that is the entrance into
3 Alexander Point right there.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: I think it is, yes.

5 MR. SIMMONS: So if we're way over here so – it would go back to the little area
6 map that showed. There's Alexander Point there -

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

8 MR. SIMMONS: - so this was all single-family residential.

9 MR. SELLERS: That's on the back of Rabbit Run?

10 MR. SIMMONS: Across Rabbit Run from you will be single-family residential.

11 MR. SELLERS: Okay. And – but adding that additional family units there they
12 plan to widen that road or something, because it's too narrow as it is now.

13 MS. ALMEIDA: DOT. That would addressed at the time of subdivision with DOT
14 as far as widening is concerned.

15 MR. SIMMONS: That's the next level [inaudible] after this.

16 MS. ALMEIDA: Right.

17 MR. SELLERS: Okay and so the rest of this [inaudible] is gone further on away
18 from me?

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes. The other subdivisions that you're talking about that have
20 been approved?

21 MS. SELLER: No. This says mixed development so you're talking about
22 commercial [inaudible].

1 MR. SIMMONS: The commercial is down here on Garners Ferry. It's listed as
2 red. That's the fire station and the church right there. This right here is commercial and
3 the commercial is down here and you're back over here.

4 MR. SELLERS: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you, sir. Does that answer your question, sir?

6 MR. SELLERS: Yes, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. SELLERS: [Inaudible] I just want to see what I'll be looking at out my back
9 door. Y'all have a good day.

10 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. We need to take a vote on this. Make a motion.

11 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to get a motion on the floor that we send this
12 forward with a recommendation for approval with the proposed PDD, including the
13 proposed PDD conditions on page 25 and 26 with the following exceptions. That we
14 delete item two and that I think I agree with Howard's statement that I would be
15 particularly concerned about the curb cuts on Lower Richland Boulevard and on Rabbit
16 Run. So I would like to strike the three main entrances on Garners Ferry Road from my
17 motion but leave the two on Lower Richland Boulevard and the three on Rabbit Run.
18 And number ten, just a question for Staff is is the letter provided in the application from
19 the Army Corps consistent with what your request was?

20 MS. ALMEIDA: That's something that the floodplain manager has to review and
21 that's why the condition states, "If applicable." So that's something that the floodplain
22 manager would review and determine at that time.

1 MR. GREEN: So my recommendation – my motion is to delete two and delete
2 the reference to Garners Ferry Road in item five.

3 MS. ALMEIDA: So you're indicating that we're not limiting the main entrances on
4 Garners Ferry Road to three?

5 MR. GREEN: Correct.

6 MS. ALMEIDA: We're taking all – Staff recommended one, two, three and you're
7 saying take them all out?

8 MR. PALMER: We're saying leave five.

9 MR. VAN DINE: He said he's going the opposite direction which is –

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Right.

11 MR. VAN DINE: - there is no limit to the number of –

12 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. So we're allowing three on Garners Ferry?

13 MR. PALMER: No. As many as DOT will allow.

14 MS. ALMEIDA: Oh, sorry.

15 MS. LINDER: So that condition would have to be reworded to allow as many
16 curb cuts as he wants on Garners Ferry?

17 MR. GREEN: No. All I'm doing is striking the words, "shall be limited to" and
18 then jump to the reference to Lower Richland Boulevard and Rabbit Run. I'm simply
19 striking the phrase, "three main entrances on Garners Ferry Road."

20 MS. LINDER: That sentence would then allow no entrance on Garners Ferry.

21 MR. GREEN: No.

22 MR. PALMER: No.

1 MR. VAN DINE: No. You're not even referencing Garners Ferry. It said, it
2 [inaudible] shall be limited to two entrances on Lower Richland and three on Rabbit Run
3 period.

4 MS. LINDER: All you would be allowed. You'd be allowed two on –

5 MR. GREEN: No.

6 MS. LINDER: - Lower Richland and three on [inaudible] but none on Garners
7 Ferry? If that's not your intent it needs to be rewritten.

8 MR. VAN DINE: How do you get – we don't even reference it, how do you even
9 get a reference where there isn't?

10 MS. LINDER: Because you're limiting the entrances. In this paragraph you're
11 saying these are where the entrances are going to be and on which roads and if you
12 don't mention Garners Ferry then Garners Ferry's not going to be included.

13 MR. GREEN: Okay I'll change my motion to read, "the applicant shall be limited
14 to DOT approved entrances on Garners Ferry Road, two on Lower Richland Boulevard
15 and three on Rabbit Run."

16 MS. LINDER: That works. Thank you.

17 MR. VAN DINE: I will second the motion.

18 MR. PALMER: Let me just mention this. And I don't know if y'all have thought
19 about this but Gene, limiting to the three on Rabbit Run it made sense to me to
20 decrease the traffic on Lower Richland Boulevard, the access point coming in to the
21 commercial. And then you've got one access point for the attached residential, you
22 know, maybe duplexes or something like that and then two entrances to the single-

1 family residential with no other entrances on Rabbit Run for the single family for 44
2 acres. I would hate for the commercial to be taken away as one of the –

3 MR. GREEN: Is it your thought that we just increase that number?

4 MR. PALMER: To the four that he's requesting. It seems like it makes sense to
5 me for the fourth one to be there for the residential and that they be – it would relieve
6 the traffic on Lower Richland Boulevard if the people coming from this residential area
7 can get into the commercial without getting out there.

8 MR. GREEN: I'll amend my motion to make it four on Rabbit Run.

9 MR. VAN DINE: And I will amend my second.

10 MR. MANNING: One other thing, Gene.

11 MS. CAIRNS: I would like to discuss a little bit the curb cuts back on Garners
12 Ferry. Paragraph five distinguishes the difference between curb cuts and main
13 entrances. I think limiting the project to three main entrances which is not the same as
14 three curb cuts on Garners Ferry is inappropriate. I think leaving it to DOT is not
15 necessarily the proper place for us to take our recommendation. I think that, you know,
16 that applicant is only showing three main entrances but I believe the potential for two
17 additional curb cuts but not main entrances.

18 MR. GREEN: My impression was Staff really meant curb cuts and –

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

20 MR. GREEN: - not main entrances.

21 MS. ALMEIDA: That was our intention that the curb cuts be limited to those
22 three main entrances.

23 MS. CAIRNS: Okay.

1 MS. ALMEIDA: So we will clarify that.

2 MS. CAIRNS: Okay.

3 MR. MANNING: I would like thought, I mean, the PDD specifically locates those
4 curb cuts or entrances along Garners Ferry and rather than leaving that open with no
5 definition of where they gonna to be I think they're already lined up with the
6 intersections and turning lanes on Sumter Highway. So I'd prefer we go back to that if
7 we're going to not limit those curb cuts and that they be specific as they presented in
8 the plan.

9 MS. CAIRNS: My guess would be that some of those existing left curb cuts, you
10 know, the center curb cuts are not or whatever you want to call them but those
11 crossovers as they exist now will not survive the increased traffic on Garners Ferry and
12 will indeed be closed off.

13 MR. MANNING: That may happen but that would be part of their DOT planning
14 but rather than just saying we're going to have curb cuts anywhere along Garners Ferry
15 which is I think what the motion would allow that it be limited to the five that are shown
16 in the PUD plan.

17 MS. CAIRNS: I mean do we want to consider that there would be potentially
18 three with, you know, subject to DOT approval but three with left-hand turn lanes and
19 two with right-ins, right-outs only.

20 MR. MANNING: There again I think that would be worked out with DOT.

21 MR. MURRAY: And those curb cuts – if Norman has been down there – Mr.
22 Jackson, Councilman Jackson, I'm sorry - he's been down there working in that area
23 and they've gone over – they've had meetings after meetings after meetings down there

1 over on BC old place, the Defender Chemical, and they have hashed it out and they
2 have studied it. They know where they want those cuts and what have you and if
3 they've got the planners working with it whatever we do today – we could spend some
4 more time on it but what's going to happen is when, whatever we recommend and
5 sends to County Council Norman and those are going to take it and fine tune it. So we
6 should be in very good shape now.

7 MR. MANNING: I'm fine with the five cuts that they're showing on the plans if
8 they've already approved them.

9 MR. MURRAY: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR. SIMMONS: Could I make one suggestion? If your motion just said the only
11 thing you're doing is reducing the curb cuts on Lower Richland Boulevard to three I think
12 that's all you need to say based on what I'm hearing y'all talk about it. Rather than try to
13 go back and rehash what you're doing on Lower Richland and Rabbit Run.

14 MR. PALMER: If we approve this plan then in essence don't we approve the
15 plan with the exceptions of reducing the number of curb cuts on Lower Richland
16 Boulevard?

17 MR. MANNING: Correct.

18 MR. PALMER: So then you don't specifically need to say which curb cuts you're
19 leaving open?

20 MR. MANNING: That's my point. I mean, they show on the plans –

21 MS. ALMEIDA: When you say you're limiting they can choose whichever ones
22 they want but we have chosen the main entrances. The two main entrances on Lower
23 Richland Boulevard so it would be this main entrance and of course this main entrance.

1 And understand we did that with the understanding that we don't have truly any control
2 of however many they're going to get here.

3 MR. GREEN: Let me just get a clarification from Staff since we are appending
4 Staff's verbiage to the motion. Is it the intent of the Staff recommendation to limit
5 access on Garners Ferry Road to three main entrances but not to limit curb cuts to
6 three?

7 MS. ALMEIDA: No. When we indicated it, it is – we're limiting the curb cuts to
8 these three or we were recommending these three main entrances.

9 MR. GREEN: So if you were to re-write number five it would say shall be limited
10 to three curb cuts on Garners Ferry Road?

11 MS. ALMEIDA: True.

12 MR. GREEN: And what about regard Lower Richland Boulevard? Would that
13 still read two main entrances or two curb cuts?

14 MS. ALMEIDA: We would prefer the main entrances as designed in this PDD
15 document but yes.

16 MR. GREEN: But your verbiage would be curb cuts and not main entrances,
17 correct?

18 MS. ALMEIDA: Right.

19 MR. GREEN: Unless it – to get this on the floor for at least a vote and for further
20 discussion my motion will stand with shall be limited to three – shall be limited to DOT
21 approved curb cuts on Garners Ferry Road, two on Lower Richland Boulevard, and four
22 on Rabbit Run Road. That's my motion.

23 MR. VAN DINE: It was [inaudible] second.

1 MR. MANNING: So the motion would allow how many curb cuts on Garners
2 Ferry?

3 MR. GREEN: As approved by DOT.

4 MR. PALMER: Three. As approved by DOT. What does that do to the access if
5 something were to be worked out with the adjoining access point to the residential? On
6 the backside of the single-family residential he has some possibility.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: What? Through here?

8 MR. PALMER: No. No. No. From the adjoining neighborhood.

9 MS. ALMEIDA: Right here?

10 MR. PALMER: Yeah.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Sure. That's not – we don't have a problem with the interior
12 here.

13 MR. SIMMONS: We have not talked to [inaudible] work on developing that. We
14 don't know.

15 MR. PALMER: Yeah. I know it's a possibility but –

16 MR. VAN DINE: That has no impact upon either Rabbit Run or Lower or
17 anything. That's an internal access.

18 MS. CAIRNS: Well, I think it does in that the reserve for future county road or
19 buffer which is the left-hand most upper portion of this, there is the possibility that
20 [inaudible] become another road which would be an additional.

21 MR. VAN DINE: But that would be a County road. That would not be a road that
22 would be dealt with. That would be something [inaudible].

1 MR. SIMMONS: That is correct. And of course the Lower Richland plan when it
2 talks about interconnectivity between subdivisions and that's why we put those two
3 arrows in there to try to give this developer the opportunity to work with the adjoining
4 property owners.

5 MR. GREEN: I mean we could, you know, I don't know that at this stage of
6 development we can address all issues. Village at Sandhills has come back for three or
7 four modifications and Lake Carolina's come back for seven or eight modifications. So
8 as things unfold, you know, we can always, you know, provide greater flexibility if it's
9 appropriate.

10 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard the motion and the second with the
11 necessary corrections to send forward to County Council.

12 MR. PALMER: Did you address number ten?

13 MR. GREEN: I didn't mention that in my motion.

14 MR. SIMMONS: My client's concern is on Lower Richland Boulevard, if he wants
15 to sell – there's 2,400' there and these arrows are 400' apart. If he has a doctor's office
16 that wants to buy one lot how does he get out?

17 MR. GREEN: I think the arrangement that's at the front of Village at Sandhills
18 has worked and I come through that area a minimum of twice a day and 15 times a
19 week probably and it has worked well with six and seven out lots stacked up there
20 where they have two main entrances as opposed to let's say Clemson Boulevard at I-20
21 where you take your life in your hands with a curb cut two, in some cases two curb cuts
22 for every one acre out parcel and I do think that that's been shown to work and be safer

1 with the limitation on curb cuts, especially in an environment where you could potentially
2 have curb cuts you know eight, ten, twelve, fifteen curb cuts.

3 MR. SIMMONS: I understand that but would you at least consider one, two, four
4 curb cuts on Lower Richland? One up by the fire station and then one somewhere in
5 that middle of that block because y'all are talking about 2,400' of road frontage there.

6 MR. GREEN: I wouldn't be adverse to four.

7 MR. SIMMONS: As opposed to six. If we could negotiate to four I think that
8 would be a better [inaudible] solution.

9 MR. VAN DINE: I am adverse to four and the reason I'm adverse to four is
10 because the Southeast Plan that was developed was to provide that that area was
11 going to have limited access and a boulevard affect. Every time we start adding these
12 little curb cuts we have now chopped it up further and further and it's supposed to be
13 pedestrian friendly. You know, I think the two are fine because you can have internal
14 access onto those areas and then out onto Lower Richland. Not everybody should
15 have access out into a main flow. I think there ought to be developments such as this
16 which are designed to have internal components with them. Therefore I think that two is
17 sufficient on that road, especially considering the fact that you have the school, fields
18 and everything else that are in that area which will provide recreational activities for the
19 people that are in that area.

20 MR. SIMMONS: Well, you know, this one is right across from a major school
21 entrance and this one is right across from a major school entrance. So I don't see – I
22 mean, you already have access here and here so if we could eliminate this one and that

1 one. If it wasn't and that not that I say I disagree with you but if you didn't major access
2 across the street.

3 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, we have a motion on the floor and I'd like to call
4 the question at this point in time.

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You may call for the question. Take the vote.

6 MR. VAN DINE: I'm calling the question. I'd like to take a vote on the motion as
7 it's presently worded.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Call for the vote.

9 MR. PALMER: Do we have to vote on calling the question?

10 MR. VANDINE: No. I called the question [inaudible].

11 [Inaudible discussion]

12 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Vote on the motion that we have on the floor.
13 [inaudible] vote. All in favor that we send this to -

14 MR. MURRAY: Let's repeat that motion, please.

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Repeat that motion.

16 MR. GREEN: The motion is that we send this forward to Council with a
17 recommendation for approval subject to proposed PDD conditions outlined on pages 25
18 and 26 of our Commission document with the exception that we exclude item number
19 two and that we modify item number five to read "The applicant shall be limited to DOT,
20 SCDOT approved curb cuts on Garners Ferry Road, two on Lower Richland Boulevard,
21 and four on Rabbit Run.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: All those in favor of the motion, raise your hand.

23 Opposed:

1 *[Approved: Cairns, Ward, Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Van Dine, Green, and*
2 *Manning]*

3 MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We are sending this forward to the meeting with County
5 Council Mary 22nd.

6 MS. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I need to excuse myself. I need to go get a recusal
7 form

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Next on the agenda.

9 MS. LINDER: If you would just allow a brief recess for Ms. Ward to fill out her
10 recusal form and we can get that into the record.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay.

12 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: I'd like to read this into the record. "Mr. Furgess:
13 I must request to be excused from participating in discussion or voting on agenda item
14 number 07-29 MA regarding Farrow Road Joint Venture which is scheduled for review
15 or discussion at today's Planning Commission meeting. It is my understanding of the
16 Rules of Conduct and Provisions of Ethics, Government Accountability and Campaign
17 Reform Laws that I work for the engineering firm representing this item. I'll be unable to
18 participate in this matter through discussion or voting. Enga Ward." Do you need a
19 copy of this? Mr. Chairman, Mr. Furgess asked me to sit in temporarily for him on this
20 case. He'll be back. We have 07-29 MA next.

21 **CASE NO 07-29 MA:**

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, the applicant is requesting to rezone 116.8 acres
23 in an existing business park from heavy industrial, HI to GC. The business park is

1 located on Farrow Road with approximately 2,780 linear feet of frontage on both sides
2 of Farrow Road. Along Hardscrabble you're looking at 1,575 linear feet of frontage. If
3 you will recall back in 2005 – 2003 there was a special exception for some existing
4 residential – the Beach Company residential apartments that received a special
5 exception and then this year there was another parcel that was before you to have it
6 rezoned to GC for additional apartments in that area. The applicant is requesting to
7 come in and actually rezone the entire business park and some additional lots that the
8 applicant owns as well across the street to GC. To reiterate a couple of points in my
9 Staff Report on page 33 the current level of service for Hardscrabble is a level of service
10 D. It's actually on Farrow Road between Rabon Road and Hardscrabble. I'm sorry that
11 is a – so it's Farrow Road that's a level of service D. Okay? The existing businesses
12 within the business park are more in keeping with general commercial. There is some,
13 very few industrial. Obviously this business park is adjacent – has attracted a lot of
14 general business type uses due to the hospital, the Northeast – Providence Northeast
15 Hospital that's located there on I-77 and Farrow Road. Therefore the Staff is
16 recommending approval.

17 MR. VAN DINE: Can I ask Staff a question(?)? Did those two apartments
18 actually get rezoned to GC?

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, they did. County Council did approve that.

20 MR. VAN DINE: So then our map on 34 is not correct as to the –

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct. That just passed Council I believe a month ago or a
22 couple weeks ago.

1 MR. VAN DINE: Are there other parcels along that business park boulevard
2 which are not part of this? And my reason for asking and I don't know the answer so
3 maybe somebody over here can help us but Dr. Sussman's office –

4 MS. ALMEIDA: There are.

5 MR. VANDINE: - is in that back area and so some of these tax map numbers
6 may not be correct. In dealing with this thing I want to make sure that we don't end up
7 having somebody zoned who's not -

8 MS. ALMEIDA: No. There are some doughnut holes as you can see on page 35
9 and the applicant did meet with Staff and indicated that they were unable to acquire the
10 paperwork for those applicants to have them rezoned. One of the – I wouldn't say
11 conditions, recommendations that Council made in order to rezone the apartments in
12 the back of the business park was to have the applicant come in and rezone the entire
13 park. They are diligently trying to get those out parcels as you can see here [inaudible].
14 These two are rezoned to commercial, to GC – oh, multi-family, I'm sorry. But there are
15 certain out parcels that the applicant was unable to acquire at this time. The applicant
16 is here and would like to address the Board – can go further into that, into what they've
17 come against in order not to be able to get the entire park.

18 MR. VAN DINE: I just want to make sure that when – because we're talking
19 about a certain tax map numbers or whatever.

20 MS. ALMEIDA: Staff's been working with the applicant for weeks now to try to
21 get those tax map numbers correct because actually the applicant also had some
22 problems with the tax map numbers. So we've been working diligently with the
23 applicant to get those tax map number correct.

1 MR. VAN DINE: If we don't know the specific tax map numbers or how they're
2 delineated, how do we go about –

3 MS. ALMEIDA: The tax map numbers are correct in the Staff Reports. The
4 applicant can –

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [inaudible]

6 MS. ALMEIDA: - okay. Can go ahead and describe to you the out parcels.
7 Okay? I know it's very hard from some of these pictures in your packet.

8 MR. VAN DINE: Maybe we can do that during the discussion. I just want to
9 make sure because I didn't – wasn't sure that we had the right.

10 MS. ALMEIDA: We do.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We made changes based on hand-made corrections
12 [inaudible] office. The maps that are on-line or on record aren't correct because there's
13 been a couple of revisions of property and renumbering. So what we had originally was
14 not correct but we've corrected those errors since thanks to Geo and [inaudible] who
15 told us [inaudible].

16 MS. ALMEIDA: It's been a task

17 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: Any other questions for Staff? Signed up to
18 speak, Mr. Fuller? Give your name and address, please.

19 **TESTIMONY OF ROBERT FULLER:**

20 MR. FULLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Robert Fuller. I'm an
21 attorney and practice at 1728 Main Street in Columbia, South Carolina. I am here this
22 afternoon representing the applicant for the rezoning of the 77 Business Park property
23 which does include the 116.8 acres that has been demonstrably shown on the various

1 exhibits that are a part of the application. By and large the application is processed by
2 Kahn Development or interest of Alan Kahn. And there are also Letters of Agency from
3 several of the existing owner/users within the business park property that are part of the
4 application's process. I'm going to pass up beginning at this end of the dais for you to
5 have in your packets. The blue notation on properties is a compilation of the properties
6 that are subject of the rezoning from present zoning of HI, Heavy Industrial to GC,
7 General Commercial. Only the portion of the property that is outlined – excuse me, is
8 shown in blue represents the parcels that are subject of the application at this time. As
9 indicated to you the entire business park was initially zoned M-2, Heavy Industrial
10 zoning in Richland County to comply with the anticipated development plan for the I-77
11 corridor as an industrial corridor with exclusively industrial uses in that corridor. Of
12 course, you realize that when M-2 zoning was in place in the county it was a form of a
13 catch-all up to and including zoning which enabled a great deal of uses that were not
14 truly industrial uses. When the property was converted on July the 1st of 2005, under
15 the new Land Development Code to HI, heavy industrial classification it converted a
16 number of lots that had uses on them already which are not in compliance with the
17 zoning classification and descriptions applicable to HI. They were available under M-2.
18 They do not characterize the same way in the HI zoning. The second representation
19 that you'll be passed up today indicates existing HI zoning and the purpose of that map
20 is to indicate to you that there are numerous properties presently in the park that were
21 zoned M-2, now zoned HI which are non-conforming uses within the park layout as it
22 exists today. The third in the series of maps that I want to pass up to you, and we can
23 discuss the measure you deem necessary, is primarily a green and hatched-marked

1 design that shows what will happen if the recommendation of the – or the application is
2 acted on favorably and it goes to County Council and the property, the 116 acres of the
3 park that are asked for rezoning to GC are rezoned, then the uses and the proposed
4 development properties will represent in the aggregate businesses and commercial
5 uses that will, in the rezoned GC business and commercial park, represent uses that
6 are in compliance with the general commercial zoning. So that you will not have any
7 longer a heavy industrial tract of property with predominantly nonconforming uses
8 situated in it. You will have a general commercial development area that will be
9 essentially occupied by conforming GC uses and properties that will be subject to future
10 development that would be, required to be under the code requirements, in conformity
11 with the GC zoning which would put it in compatibility with everything that is already in
12 use, in place and is being attracted to that corridor. Mr. Kahn has owned this property
13 or controlled this property for a number of years. There are really only a couple of uses
14 that are situated on the property now in the industrial park that are actually HI
15 classification uses. They will remain there, they will remain zoned HI. They are
16 manufacturing businesses but they are not heavy industrial or heavy intensity
17 businesses so they live very compatibly with the types of commercial development that
18 has grown into the park and around the park. The location of the hospital near this site,
19 the development of the Farrow Road corridor through there has simply moved the
20 commercial development line further up I-77 than was characterized by the
21 development plan that called all of that corridor an industrial corridor. There is simply
22 no demand in the area for heavy industrial uses and there is a high demand for
23 continuation of the types of development that have followed the hospital and the other

1 businesses into that community. We submit to you that it is a very adaptable
2 circumstance to the exact character of what is there and has been developing there for
3 the last eight or ten years. And it brings the park into a substantially conforming use
4 with the zoning that would be imposed upon it. Mr. Van Dine, we did make and have
5 made and are continuing to make a very careful analysis of the property descriptions in
6 there. Not only are the tax maps utilized for the purposes of the descriptions but Cox
7 and Dinkins and Kahn Development have gone back and we do have appropriate metes
8 and bounds descriptions for each of the property parcels that comprise a part of the
9 application including those that are not under the Kahn umbrella but have already been
10 sold to other users or are in place and in process and in use at this time. So we are
11 convinced that the – in the aggregate the property descriptions including the tax map
12 references and the portions that are available will be - are and will be assured to be
13 correct prior to enactment of the final ordinance.

14 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Fuller? Any for
15 Staff?

16 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, I – assuming of course that all of the parcels and
17 parties are correct and that we figure out who owns what and all the rest of it and
18 they've got, they sign on the bottom line I would make a motion we send this forward
19 with a recommendation of approval.

20 MR. GREEN: Second.

21 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: We have a motion and a second. All in favor of
22 sending this forward with a recommendation of approval say aye or raise your hand.

1 *[Approved: Cairns, Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Van Dine, Green, and*
2 *Manning; Recused: Ward]*

3 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: Mr. Chairman, you can have it back.

4 MR. FULLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: At this time we will go back to MO – I'm sorry, 07-23
6 MA. Would you come forward Mr. Mack? You have had time to go over the material
7 that you were handed; any adjustments?

8 MR. MACK: Yes, sir. And again, the engineer can probably do it better than me
9 but the paper that I gave Mr. Green at the beginning which we had delivered to Staff last
10 week answers the majority of these 12 questions on this letter that we received from
11 them when they approved it subject to these conditions. Even though most of them
12 have already been taken care of in the original PDD or the one I delivered last week
13 they will take care of the rest of these in a new format and have it hand-delivered by the
14 end of this week.

15 MR. GREEN: Does that mean that – I guess my question was are all these
16 proposed PDD conditions outlined by Staff acceptable to the applicant?

17 MR. MACK: With the exception of the 50' buffer. When he did the site planning
18 and all he was only shown 20'. Fifty foot is a lot of difference and we'd like to know why
19 we're being required to have 50' when it backs up to a pasture.

20 MR. VAN DINE: The one that I've got was in a proposed condition would be
21 number one, a 50' minimum buffers for neighboring agricultural lands. That's the only
22 one that was objectionable?

23 MR. MACK: Yes, sir.

1 MR. VAN DINE: Is that?

2 MR. MACK: Yes, sir.

3 MR. VAN DINE: And if that were a 20' buffer that that would not be
4 objectionable?

5 MR. MACK: Correct. Yes, sir.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Is that in the code, Anna?

7 MR. GREEN: In our buffer requirements between the two zones that we're
8 talking about are the two type uses we may even have a bigger buffer than that, right?

9 MS. ALMEIDA: Well the problem might be that he'll be required to put up a
10 fence.

11 MR. MACK: We're putting a fence up anyway.

12 MS. ALMEIDA: No. A stockade fence.

13 MR. MACK: A what?

14 MS. ALMEIDA: A stockade fence.

15 MR. MACK: Wasn't that addressed in the PDD? Yeah. That was addressed in
16 the PDD.

17 MS. ALMEIDA: Your PDD did not talk about, under landscaping, a wooden
18 fence.

19 MS. CAIRNS: And the PDD also had a 25' wide buffer.

20 MS. ALMEIDA: True.

21 MR. BECKER: [Inaudible].

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Under Type D, 25 would not require a wooden, stockade fence.
23 But a 20' would

1 MR. BECKER: Right. We're using a 25'. We've maintained a 25' buffer around
2 the site.

3 MS. ALMEIDA: And you can maintain the 25' along the rail line between the
4 roads?

5 MR. BECKER: We can shift it to be such.

6 MS. ALMEIDA: Well that's -

7 MR. MACK: [Inaudible] along the rail.

8 MR. BECKER: Our property is not contiguous to the railroad. There is a strip of
9 property that exists in between the railroad right-of-way and ours back there. I believe
10 Mr. Koon's property is actually contiguous to the railroad.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Right.

12 MR. BECKER: Ours is not.

13 MS. ALMEIDA: We would require you to - on your property to put that 25 or 20'.

14 MR. BECKER: Certainly. And we'll maintain that.

15 MS. ALMEIDA: So it would be 25 so you wouldn't have to put up the stockade
16 fence?

17 MR. BECKER: Correct. That's what we'd like to do if that's required. That was
18 our rationale based on how we interpreted the buffer requirements and regulations.

19 MR. VAN DINE: So if I'm hearing it, just to make sure, that the number condition
20 one you would be agreeable to a 25' minimum buffer for agricultural lands and on item
21 nine that you would provide a minimum 25' vegetative buffer; is that correct?

22 MR. BECKER: That is correct. Yes.

1 MR. VAN DINE: Based upon those, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion
2 we send this forward with a recommendation of approval subject to the changes and
3 proposed – subject to all the conditions that are set forth on pages 10 and 11 with the
4 modification to items number one and nine to change the 50' buffer in one to 25' and the
5 20' buffer in nine to 25'.

6 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would second that if the motion would also delete
7 item number eight which Staff said they would –

8 MR. VAN DINE: Oh, I'm sorry. You're correct.

9 MR. GREEN: - think is appropriate [inaudible].

10 MR. VAN DINE: As I handed my copy over to the applicant for them to look at –
11 oh, you can keep it. That's all right. I didn't have it marked off. Eliminate number eight.

12 MS. ALMEIDA: Can we clarify the 25' vegetative buffer along the – what is that
13 the – is that west? I'm sorry.

14 MR. VAN DINE: It's a 25' vegetative buffer – that's number nine, a 25' vegetative
15 buffer along the agricultural land. It is 25'.

16 MS. ALMEIDA: And what is the 20? Okay. So it's just 25' completely around
17 the property?

18 MR. VAN DINE: That's correct.

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Is there a second?

21 MR. GREEN: I seconded, subject to also deleting eight.

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. You heard the motion. If you would send this
23 forward with approval please by stating, by raising your hand. Opposed?

1 *[Approved: Ward, Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Van Dine, Green, and Manning;*
2 *Opposed: Cairns]*

3 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We'll send this forward to County Council. This will go
4 before County Council May 22nd.

5 MR. MACK: Do I need to make 35 more copies of this and hand deliver it myself
6 to the Council to make sure they have them?

7 MR. VAN DINE: Thirty-four.

8 MR. MACK: Thank you. I appreciate it very much.

9 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Comprehensive plan.

10 MR. GREEN: While we're setting up for the comprehensive plan I was interested
11 in what action County Council took on the zoning – rezoning request for the industrial
12 park on Bluff Road. We recommended denial. I did not know whether it's gone before
13 County Council yet or not.

14 MS. ALMEIDA: The recommendation I believe was for denial.

15 MR. GREEN: Our recommendation was for denial.

16 MS. ALMEIDA: I believe the recommendation – the first reading was for denial.

17 MR. VAN DINE: Which one?

18 MR. GREEN: On Bluff Road where they wanted the – they didn't come in with a
19 PDD, they came in with a straight LI rezoning for about 60 acres.

20 MR. MANNING: Oh, that was [inaudible].

21 MS. ALMEIDA: I'm sorry. They withdrew. They actually withdrew.

22 MR. GREEN: They were approved?

23 MS. ALMEIDA: Withdrew.

1 MR. GREEN: Oh, withdrew. Oh. Thank you.

2 MR. CRISS: Commission Members [inaudible] map is part of the [inaudible].
3 First is a new composite 10 year future land use [inaudible] planning areas [inaudible]
4 more detail. I think I've got it, thanks, Geo. And the other map or sheet we'll get to
5 shortly. The principal difference between this version dated May 4, 2007 and the prior
6 versions is that you now have the designation of urban areas, the orange patches,
7 some inside the priority development areas. In the Northeast we have the Village at
8 Sandhill on the I-77 corridor. Also in the Northeast planning area we also have the
9 proposed Killian's Crossing, an orange patch. Inside the Beltway we have the Decker
10 Boulevard revitalization area. Less conspicuous but nonetheless present in the Dutch
11 Square/Broad River Road corridor in the Northwest planning – I'm sorry, inside the
12 Beltway near the Northwest planning area we also have urban lands designated.
13 Outside of the Beltway in the Southeast planning area we have the new Congaree Point
14 Urban Village designated and then inside the Beltway again on upper Bluff Road
15 corridor a significant portion of that corridor designated as urban including industrial and
16 residential. And we got into the beginning of an interesting debate for the future of that
17 corridor. A real tension going on between the established industrial and the market
18 driven multi-family student oriented housing. Again some of the principal planning
19 policies and principles that are embedded in this future land use class map are the
20 establishment of suburban/rural boundaries in the Northeast and Northwest planning
21 areas as well as the Garners Ferry Road corridor in the Southeast, the designation of
22 some 14 priority development areas many of which are oriented toward the interstates.
23 We've got along Interstate 77 Wilson Boulevard, Killian, Farrow Road intersections, the

1 Village at Sandhill itself off the interstate but near I-20. Along I-20 we have the Fairfield
2 Road interchange. Along I-26 we've got Broad River Road at Irmo and Broad River
3 Road at the Peak exit. And off of the interstate the established rural communities but
4 now starting to suburbanize Ballentine and White Rock. And in the Southeast planning
5 area we have the Garners Ferry Road/Lower Richland Boulevard area that you were
6 just discussing and debating for a map amendment. The one rural community
7 designated so far for priority development, Hopkins in need of affordable housing and
8 improved water/sewer service and the Congaree Point mixed used urban village
9 proposed for Atlas Road at Bluff.

10 MR. GREEN: Michael, the numbers attached to the road improvements; is that
11 their priority on the COATS plan?

12 MR. CRISS: Yes. These brown road segments are the few long-range
13 transportation plan projects included in the Central Midlands Council of Government
14 COATS or Columbia Area Transportation Study. At this point in time they are not yet
15 funded and the small numbers indicating the various segments do reflect their priority
16 ranking in the current list. You'll notice that Hardscrabble is broken into two segments.
17 I believe there are two numbers associated with that project. We've got a 10 year future
18 annexation boundaries - sorry.

19 MR. GREEN: So if I read this correctly, the priority to widen 76 or beyond
20 Ballentine is higher than the priority to widen Hardscrabble Road?

21 MR. CRISS: I believe you're correct. I can't see the numbers from here. And
22 you may have some thoughts on the relative ranking of these road projects and
23 suggestions for others. We have a parallel planning process underway in Richland

1 County, a 39-member transportation study commission created by the County Council,
2 supported by an outside consultant, P.B., Parsons Brinkerhoff. For the next 18 months
3 they'll be working on a, what I would call a transportation element of the Comprehensive
4 Land Use Plan. They might call it a transportation plan. Multi-model - cars, buses, rail,
5 sidewalks, bikeways, greenways. I don't know about the airline component since the
6 major airport in the region's over in Lexington County but of course we do have Owens
7 Field in Richland County. That group will be making recommendations by summer of
8 2008 to the County Council which may or may not include a recommendation for a local
9 option sales tax referendum on the November 2008 ballot.

10 MR. GREEN: The COATS plan does not rank or include interstate [inaudible]?

11 MR. CRISS: There are no interstate road improvements programmed at this
12 time.

13 MR. MANNING: And it's the COG that establishes the priority for these road
14 improvements?

15 MR. CRISS: The Council of Governments works with the local government
16 representatives on its Board, the planners and the various jurisdictions effected studying
17 primarily the Columbia Area Transportation Study urban area. It doesn't cover quite all
18 of Richland County but most of Richland County except for the most southeastern
19 portion of Richland County. And that's of course - COATS, the Columbia Area
20 Transportation Study really affects primarily Richland County and Lexington County,
21 City of Columbia of course, a little bit of Kershaw County. I believe it bleeds over into a
22 portion of Calhoun County. The COG serves Richland/Lexington/Fairfield/Newberry *per*
23 *se*. But the - for metropolitan transportation planning purposes that COATS study area

1 includes a small portion of Kershaw and Calhoun and really [inaudible] to Fairfield and
2 Newberry at this time.

3 MR. MANNING: Is timing critical if we were to want to make a recommendation
4 for reprioritizing some of this road system?

5 MR. CRISS: The timing is perfect in that the Central Midlands Council of
6 Governments staff are now revisiting, revising the long-range transportation plan for the
7 Columbia region. And we would welcome – I would certainly welcome this Planning
8 Commission's recommendations on road improvement priorities – selection and priority
9 ranking. That may be a task that you decide to take on sooner than later in this
10 comprehensive plan update. I encourage you as Commissioners to participate as much
11 as you can in the deliberations of the transportation study commission. They now have
12 a link on the county website, on the main page where their various meetings and
13 agendas and other materials are listed. There's a series of public meetings coming up
14 the end of May and early June I believe. And it would be helpful, I think beneficial for
15 you to participate in some of those. There's another gathering on May 17th that I don't
16 know enough about yet. A municipal growth and annexation summit being coordinated
17 or hosted by the Richland County Council at the Greater Columbia Convention Center
18 apparently inviting municipal government officials to meet with Richland County Council
19 and discuss broad issues of growth and annexation. And I would again encourage you
20 to participate in that meeting if at all possible. I don't know if you'll be getting a special
21 invitation or if you heard about it here first. Thursday, May 17th, 8:00 o'clock in the
22 morning to 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon, Richland County Municipal Planning Summit at
23 the Greater Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center. And I'm afraid I don't know

1 anything more than that at the moment. That sounds like an opportunity perhaps to
2 discuss the mutual interests of the 10 year annexation boundaries that we have on this
3 future land use map. Columbia looking at taking in the Village at Sandhill already up to
4 the Midlands Technical College Northeast Campus and the Carolina Research Park and
5 apparently poised to annex them. And over the 10 years ambitions up to as far as or
6 maybe beyond the Killian Road interchange. Irmo's interested in annexing up to Lake
7 Murray; they've already reached it in small measure. Arcadia Lakes and Forest Acres
8 are basically rounding out their boundaries and trying to fill in the various exclusions or
9 unincorporated areas that pepper their jurisdictions.

10 MR. PALMER: Do you have those maps where those lines currently are?

11 MR. CRISS: The Richland County on-line GIS system has the most current
12 municipal boundaries thanks largely to Betty Etheridge.

13 MR. PALMER: Even the Arcadia Lakes one and Forest Acres and those
14 [inaudible]?

15 MR. CRISS: If you zoom in, turn on that municipalities, it's called it should show
16 the latest information that we have received.

17 MR. PALMER: Thanks.

18 [Inaudible discussion]

19 MR. CRISS: It's slow. Forest Acres actually has a railroad right-of-way to the
20 Northeast annexed out to 277 or beyond and so they're poised to take lands on either
21 side of that railroad right-of-way. Arcadia Lakes basically just trying to round out it's
22 irregular border. Thank you, Betty. So we can see lots of unincorporated Richland
23 County, your planning jurisdiction, surrounded completely by either Forest Acres or

1 Arcadia Lakes. Arcadia Lakes down in here, here's unincorporated Richland County,
2 Forest Acres over here, unincorporated Richland County. The lines on the 10 year
3 future land use map are my best estimate of where these jurisdictions might want to
4 annex over the next ten years. They're not official statements by these governments as
5 yet, though the Blythewood Town Council and Planning Commission might actually
6 come to some official announcement whereby they could collaborate, coordinate with
7 Richland County officials on land use planning in areas that they hope will become part
8 of their jurisdiction over the next 10 years or more.

9 MR. MANNING: Michael, the Lower Richland area I know there's a lot of
10 discussion about the water and sewer in the planning area that we just were discussing.

11 MR. CRISS: Yeah. especially to serve the 2500 plus lots that are already
12 proposed for that one-mile radius around Lower Richland Boulevard and Garners Ferry
13 Road. We don't yet have to my knowledge a water/sewer solution. I hear developers in
14 negotiating with the City of Columbia. The Richland County Public Utilities Department
15 has proposed that the county get into the water and sewer business in that part of
16 Richland County. One of the engineering obstacles is that the land is lower than the
17 City of Columbia's gravity fed sewer pipes closer to their treatment plant further west.
18 And so the limited sewer service in that area feeding into the City of Columbia's system
19 is a force main. But those lines are not adequate to serve the substantial single-family
20 residential and other development that is proposed for –

21 MR. MANNING: If the city did provide the service they more in likely would want
22 to annex that area?

1 MR. CRISS: I do show on the 10 year future land use map in front of you a
2 rather substantial expansion of the City of Columbia's waters out to – well Lower
3 Richland Boulevard.

4 MR. VAN DINE: Can I ask you a question what you guys are playing with that up
5 there? You're looking at parts of Forest Acres and Arcadia Lakes. The gray is Richland
6 County?

7 MS. ETHRIDGE: Yes.

8 MR. VAN DINE: You've got to be kidding me.

9 MR. CRISS: It's Swiss cheese.

10 MR. ANDERSON: I live right in the middle of that and I was like one out of six on
11 my street that was in unincorporated.

12 MR. VAN DINE: Well I just saw my street and the two people across the street
13 from me are in Richland County and I'm in Forest Acres and everybody else around
14 them is all Forest Acres.

15 MR. CRISS: There has been legislation introduced in the General Assembly to
16 make it easier for municipalities to unilaterally annex those lands that they already
17 surround which would be a good first step in reforming the annexation laws in South
18 Carolina.

19 MR. PALMER: Would you think that all the creeks and things that are inside
20 those boundaries are under their jurisdiction?

21 MS. ETHRIDGE: They annex the ponds.

22 MR. CRISS: They do?

23 MR. PALMER: They do?

1 MS. ETHERIDGE: And now they branch off of the ponds.

2 MR. PALMER: So you can run up a pond and get access somewhere, up a
3 creek?

4 MS. ETHERIDGE: Up a pond.

5 MS. CAIRNS: If you take your paddles.

6 MS. ETHERIDGE: It's just part of [inaudible].

7 MR. VAN DINE: Unbelievable.

8 MR. CRISS: It's a service delivery nightmare.

9 MS. ETHERIDGE: All these ponds are in Forest Acres so you see this lot here is
10 annexed into Forest Acres. [Inaudible]

11 MR. CRISS: So this [inaudible] appropriate for our municipalities to grow I would
12 argue in a planned predictable manner and that's part of the purpose of these 10 year
13 Annexation boundaries that we can debate where they actually ought to be located. It's
14 also the responsibility in my opinion of jurisdictions like the City of Columbia to take in
15 lands that they have skipped over for various reasons. I think we can make a strong
16 planning case that all the lands inside the Beltway should be municipal; Columbia,
17 Forest Acres, or Arcadia Lakes over time. Meanwhile you have planning responsibility
18 for about one-third of the land area inside the Beltway, scattered as it is. About a third
19 inside the Beltway is unincorporated Richland County. That Bluff Road corridor that we
20 were just talking about, some of the North Columbia neighborhoods. Remember when
21 we did the Broad River Neighborhoods Master Plan? That's just off of Sunset Drive,
22 well inside the I-20 Beltway. That's unincorporated or at least it was until the city
23 annexed the middle portion. What was Roosevelt Village will now become Village at

1 Rivers Edge. So I think it's incumbent on our urban counterparts or our municipal
2 counterparts to take in lands that they've skipped over. Not just new undeveloped lands
3 at the perimeter, the periphery of their jurisdiction. The other map that we gave you
4 today is the latest population projections. Yes, ma'am?

5 MS. CAIRNS: I just have one quick question back on this colorful map. What
6 was the distinction used between suburban and rural?

7 MR. CRISS: Yes. We have a generalized description of urban versus suburban
8 versus rural landscapes and I'll catch you up on that handout a little later. It's yet to be
9 fully resolved. Urban would typically imply mixed used, residential, commercial, multi-
10 story buildings, walkable, more availability of transit. Suburban is typically going to be
11 dominated by the single-family detached residential as has been the case for a couple
12 of decades now in Richland County. The rural, certainly your agricultural and forestry,
13 hunting and fishing and other traditional rural activities, but also rural residential and one
14 of the big planning policy decisions for us is well where's the density break between
15 urban and suburban, between suburban and rural? This Planning Commission
16 recommended to the County Council a couple of years ago that rural start at one
17 dwelling per acre and up, one dwelling on an acre or more of land. But the reality is that
18 the rural district that was eventually carried forward in the new land development code
19 only requires three-quarters of an acre and that district is the one that goes out to the
20 county line. So in effect we're zoned for suburban scale residential out to the county
21 line. We don't have any truly rural district in our code at present though the RU Rural
22 District does of course allow agricultural and forestry and other traditional roll of land
23 uses. Suburban densities could be from say one to five or six dwelling units per acre.

1 You could consider urban residential densities starting at six or eight dwellings units per
2 acre and up. For support of transit you're probably in the seven to eight dwelling units
3 per acre range and up to sustain a bus and possibly future rail system. We have on this
4 Future Land Use Map identified the transit stations from the Central Midlands Council of
5 Government commuter rail study. The idea is that they could become bus stations first
6 and rail stations later. We also have highlighted in the purple the rail lines coming in
7 from Charlotte and Greenville/Spartanburg as potential high speed rail connections in
8 the somewhat distant future. The importance of showing them on this map is to remind
9 us to conserve these rail corridors for their future use either as local or regionalized
10 commuter rail or maybe eventually inter-city high speed rail. But they're not going to be
11 able to go very fast on the current track alignments because they're rather curved. So
12 suburban/rural boundary, priority development areas, annexation boundaries [inaudible]
13 implied in a map like this and we're proposing to now go to the next level and peel back
14 the yellow suburban and start populating it with more detailed land use categories,
15 residential, commercial, office, institutional, agricultural, military, etc. One place – well
16 let me get to this second map before we run out of time. This is the latest population
17 projections from the Central Midlands Council of Governments. They've been working
18 with Richland County, City of Columbia, and Lexington County in particular and are
19 projecting population in the region but specifically in front of you, Richland County bi-
20 census tract out to the year 2035, second to last column. The census tract is the U.S.
21 Census Bureau's identification for the different census areas in Richland County in the
22 first column. The 2000 column represents the actual 2000 census count for those
23 tracts. The next column over 2005 is what we call a modified base year. We didn't like

1 the numbers that the U.S. Census Bureau had been coming up with for 2005 base year.
2 Commissioner Green and others raised questions about the accuracy of those numbers
3 and whether they were too low to account for all of the especially single-family
4 residential detached growth and development in Northeast, Northwest, and other parts
5 of Richland County in recent years. So the Council of Government staff took our
6 Richland County building permit information and essentially added those buildings and
7 their [inaudible] people occupants to the 2000 census to come with a new base year
8 calculation for 2005 and then to go into the future years of 2015, 2025, 2035, they're
9 using Woods and Poole growth ratios projected for this region.

10 MR. GREEN: Mike?

11 MR. CRISS: Yes, sir.

12 MR. GREEN: You know, one of the big things that we have to use as part of our
13 long-range planning process is at least some reasonable expectation of growth. And
14 what this says is in a five-year period the county grew by 36,000 people and for the next
15 10 years it's going to grow by 28,000.

16 MR. CRISS: The next 10, okay.

17 MR. GREEN: So we're going to go – we rudely stopped in '05 from going at
18 7,200 a hundred for the next 10 years to go to 2,800? That doesn't seem very logical to
19 me.

20 MR. CRISS: Just Richland County you're talking about?

21 MR. GREEN: Yeah.

22 MR. CRISS: We've been growing at about 3,000 to 3,500 a year as I recall.

23 MR. GREEN: The whole county, not just the –

1 MR. CRISS: The whole county.

2 MR. GREEN: Unincorporated?

3 MR. CRISS: Yeah. The whole county.

4 MR. GREEN: I mean, we've been building – our building permits have been over
5 – our single-family building permits have been over 3,000 a year, much less population.

6 I mean these – the table on this map says we went from 320 to 356 in five years. That's
7 36,000 people and for the next ten years we're going to grow by 28,000 which is less
8 than half the rate in the early 2000 period. I just don't know how that makes sense.

9 Building permits haven't slowed.

10 MR. CRISS: Not until recently, correct. And it remains to be seen whether that
11 will be sustained. The Midlands region has been relatively steady statewide compared
12 to the coast and the I-85 corridor.

13 MR. GREEN: Is somehow this politically – political issue in that they don't want
14 to show certain census tracts as losing population?

15 MR. CRISS: Well again the numbers that the COG is using at present comes
16 straight from the U.S. Bureau of the Census which of course can be debated – 2000
17 census. And our own building permit data added on top of the 2000 population to come
18 up with a 2005 base year. Now admittedly the occupancy rate is drifting downward.
19 The number of people per dwelling is assumed to be in gradual decline.

20 MR. GREEN: That's been the case now for 40 years so I mean that's not exactly
21 a new phenomenon.

22 MR. CRISS: Yeah. Now we think what's happening in part is we've got more
23 household formation with the same people but that only –

1 MR. GREEN: I mean that's been going on for 40 years.

2 MR. CRISS: -- that only explains part of the less aggressive population increase.

3 The COG is still studying these numbers and welcomes input from all sources. They
4 are going to populate the traffic assignment zones that make up smaller portions of
5 these census tracts with population and housing in order to feed it into their transcad
6 transportation model. And clearly we'll want to have participation in that process.
7 Better numbers than before, at least higher numbers. Showing 95 hundred thousand
8 [sic] person population increase over the 30-year period of 2005 to 2035. Will we have
9 the greatest amount of population increase in this northeastern tract? Well that remains
10 to be seen but under current trends, under recent growth development patterns, yes
11 that's where folks have been going for the most part, and northwest in second place.
12 This I-77 corridor is starting to light up not only with residential but also commercial and
13 that brings me to my last two exhibits. [Inaudible] Betty and the GIS staff have been
14 taking a look at the industrially zoned properties in Richland County showing up in the
15 purple on this map. Betty's got that one on the screen so it showed up. The darkest
16 purple area such as this patch at McEntire is the HI Heavy Industrial. The lighter purple
17 color is M-1, that's your old light industrial zoning district from the previous zoning
18 ordinance which you can think of as a combination of the new LI Light Industrial and GC
19 General Commercial because it has a long list of light industrial and commercial land
20 uses allowed. We do have at least one patch of the LI Light Industrial down in the Bluff
21 Road corridor which has come along in the last couple of years through a rezoning.
22 And we decided to take a closer look at the I-77 corridor which is what you see up on
23 the screen. The industrial zoned properties cluster along I-77, Interstate 20, both

1 eastward toward Camden as well as in the North Central planning area, the Crane
2 Creek area. There's a strong concentration down in the Bluff Road corridor bleeding
3 out the Garners Ferry Road, Shop Road area and of course patches such as McEntire
4 and the Wateree station down on the Wateree. On the screen is a close up if you will of
5 that heavy industrial zoning in the darkest purple, the M-1 light industrial in the medium
6 purple shade and I don't think there's any LI Light Industrial on this particular image.
7 We see, in the red outline the business parks identified by the South Carolina Chamber
8 of Commerce. Betty got a data set from them a few weeks ago that has about 300
9 industrial listings locations for Richland County and there are a couple of dozen of them
10 indicated on this map in the various colored dots. And I do have a handout to tease
11 your interest. The listing of the industries from the Department of Commerce database
12 in this I-77 corridor. Jennie will hand those out to you. One way to start peeling away
13 these land use classes and getting to the more detailed land use categories is to
14 perhaps start with the industrial maybe in this I-77 corridor although the Buff Road
15 corridor is of renewed interest because of the increasing conflict between existing
16 industrial and again that market driven, student oriented multi-family housing. You dealt
17 with one of those today and we see at least one more in the pipeline, Anna, and
18 perhaps more. It's evidently a hot market. Taking a quick look at the Bluff Road
19 situation it may not be resolvable easily. The market may transition some of the older
20 industrial to student oriented multi-family housing over time but there's a lot of well-
21 established businesses down there that I don't see relocating any time soon. Perhaps
22 the best we can do is try to make the two disparate land uses more compatible with one
23 another. And I'm not sure how to do that. Perhaps one way is to down zone some of

1 the HI Heavy Industrial in the Bluff Road corridor to LI Light Industrial where it wouldn't
2 hurt an existing business. In other words let's keep the chemical plants away from the
3 houses. You have dealt with this I-77 corridor not too long ago. The Northpoint
4 Business Park is well established on the west side of I-77 and Steve Corboy came in
5 with a residential proposal in the middle of this industrial park and eventually that was
6 denied. County Council saw fit to retain the industrial nature of this proposed land use.
7 I've heard expressions from both Commissioners and Council members about the
8 availability of industrial property. So one approach to that is to look at the vacant land
9 that is zoned industrial and see if the Commission is satisfied with its current location
10 and configuration. Now we could start in this I-77 corridor, Bluff Road comes to mind
11 because of recent market pressure.

12 MR. GREEN: Is there any action afoot – Lexington County within the last six
13 months has gone out and put together a 900-acre industrial park. Newberry County
14 went out less than a year ago and put together a 750-acre industrial park. Has there
15 been any discussion that y'all aware of in Richland County that anything like that's been
16 considered?

17 MR. CRISS: I don't hear anything yet of that scope or scale. Of course the
18 county does have an industrial park off of Clemson Road but limited capacity.

19 MR. GREEN: Very limited.

20 MR. CRISS: Yeah. There are significant – sorry.

21 MR. GREEN: [Inaudible] two publicly owned large industrial parks. Calhoun's
22 got two?

1 MR. CRISS: And it's not just residential in the I-77 corridor that is competing for
2 what you might argue is valuable industrial land. We also have the commercial, the
3 Wal-Mart, the Killian's Crossing mixed used development are encroaching on, if that's
4 the proper term, industrially zoned property.

5 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Any other questions for Mike?

6 MR. CRISS: Betty, if you'll pan up to Blythewood, please. This HI Heavy
7 Industrial property is being eyed by Google for about 80 acres of building stuffed with
8 computers attended by well-paid, knowledge workers. I can imagine that the
9 Blythewood, I-77 corridor could indeed become a high-tech industrial corridor. They're
10 going to have to do a lot of planning to conserve their small town character and
11 accommodate the growth that might attend a Google or similar industrial location. They
12 - again their County Council and Planning Commission have expressed interest in
13 working with this Commission and County Council on mutual land use issues
14 surrounding the Town of Blythewood. Though I don't have any specific proposals or
15 invitations at this point, I have made several presentations there and they seem
16 receptive to working with you. There's something of a water war going on between the
17 Winnsboro system coming down from Fairfield and the Columbia system coming in from
18 - well I'll say Lake Murray. Betty, if you'll pan down to this site. Thank you. That's
19 where Walter Taylor and Bill Theus are doing their mixed use, largely residential
20 development inside the triangle here of Wilson, I-77, and Marthann. One advantage to
21 trying to peel off the industrial land use first is that it's so precious, valuable, important
22 and there isn't all that much of it, it might be easier for us to tackle than say going
23 straight after the - well, pick your land use. Single-family residential which is all over

1 the place. We could start with industrial and then maybe make our way toward
2 commercial. We can pick on specific corridors like I-77 or we can say let's look at all
3 the industrial county-wide and try to get a sense of where we want that to be 10 ten
4 years out. Where it is now and where it might be in the not too distant future.

5 MR. VAN DINE: All of these maps are useful but how – when are we going to
6 get into trying to do something to put them all together into some fashion that actually
7 creates a document that we're going to be able to deal with?

8 MR. CRISS: Are you talking about maps that let you make land use decisions
9 like your zoning recommendations?

10 MR. VAN DINE: No. I mean all of this is put together in the form of dealing with
11 the comprehensive plan and the update that's taking place.

12 MR. CRISS: Okay. Thinking regulations beyond that perhaps or -

13 MR. VAN DINE: I'm trying to figure out frankly – it's all valuable information and
14 I'm learning a lot but where's it getting us?

15 MR. CRISS: It needs to get you to a future land use map that you can use to
16 make land use decisions and that means another level of detail beyond where we are
17 right now.

18 MR. VAN DINE: How long before we're actually going to get into any
19 discussions about any of that stuff?

20 MR. CRISS: Well I think we've just begun.

21 MR. VAN DINE: And [inaudible] I've got ten months left on this Commission.

22 MR. PALMER: Starting about 11.

1 MR. VAN DINE: If somebody'll just tell me that I can go eat some more pie back
2 here while we're talking about this. [Laughter]

3 MR. MURRAY: Shouldn't it be up to us though in a sense? Got to plan what you
4 want to do. You've got to make up your mind what you want to do whether it's industrial
5 or where you're going once you get there and you're going to get your preliminaries like
6 you've already – you're giving us all a lot of preliminaries, a lot of background
7 information. So at some point you've got to prioritize where we're going and once it's
8 prioritized then you can begin to deal with those – do our planning.

9 MR. CRISS: Well we want to give you a future land use map that shows you
10 eight or ten categories of land uses from residential to commercial retail, commercial
11 office, industrial, ag, mining, military, etc. That would be a useful tool for your
12 recommendations on zoning map amendments, on intergovernmental agreements with
13 municipalities, on developing a capital improvements program for where water and
14 sewer and roads and storm drainage and other infrastructure should be located in the
15 future. That is not, as you know, a zoning map and there will be considerable disparity
16 between your future land use map and the current zoning.

17 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: I'll tell you what I'm going to do. I'm going to get with
18 Staff and we're going to come up with some ideas on what [inaudible] from the
19 Commission –

20 MR. CRISS: That would be very helpful.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: - [inaudible] Staff and maybe two people from County
22 Council so we can get together to find out what direction that we need to go in because

1 we've been hollering about this ever since I've been on the Planning Commission. And
2 come up with some idea that we can go forth and start working on this thing.

3 MR. CRISS: You've got 80 pages of planning principles in your adopted plan but
4 does it tell you how to make land use decisions on specific properties?

5 MR. GREEN: Well we don't – we aren't even looking yet at definitions for these
6 sub-areas. I mean what is suburban; what are the principles in the suburban?

7 MR. CRISS: Well you have had one draft but I agree that would be a great place
8 to go right now. Could we agree, for example, on residential density in urban versus
9 suburban versus rural? That'd be a good place to start. I've got my ideas. I'd put them
10 out there but I need decisions from this Body. Is rural residential density three-quarter
11 acre lots or is it one acre or more?

12 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: I thought we'd been through this one time before.

13 MR. CRISS: Well we have with the Land Development Code.

14 MR. MURRAY: Well your one acre was a starting point when you started doing
15 the zoning text. Travis Bianca(?) up in that Blythewood area was concerned about the
16 size of your lots versus your mobile homes and things of that nature. That's when we
17 came up with one acre for a mobile home. Of course that for rural areas. Now if you
18 going to three-quarters it's taken us 30 years almost to get there. So –

19 MR. CRISS: The areas that you see in light green are proposed to be
20 predominantly rural landscapes 10 years from now. What does that mean in terms of
21 residential density to this Commission? Although it's a separate document the zoning
22 map has really more to say about rural development in the northeast, northwest and
23 southeast than the comprehensive plan. And it allows three-quarter acre minimum lot

1 size. You're currently zoned for suburban scale residential out to the Kershaw County,
2 Fairfield County, and other county lines. Is that what you want for Richland County's
3 10, 20 year future? If it is we might as well just turn all this yellow and give up on the
4 rural landscape and plan for expansion of infrastructure to support residential densities
5 say in the one to five, six dwelling units per acre range. Do you want to prioritize
6 development areas for flexible zoning, mixed use, county infrastructure investments in
7 the areas tentatively designated on this map or do you just want the market to dictate
8 where the growth will go and we'll chase after it with services and infrastructure.

9 MR. VAN DINE: You know, we have done – talked about this for two years now
10 that I can think of. We were dealing with the original comprehensive plan. The way it
11 was being generated was somebody was generating documentation and proposals and
12 then the Planning Commission would sit up here and debate it. We would have all the
13 discussions you're talking about but we would have it in the framework of a document
14 before us and we either liked it or we didn't like it. That's what we did with the Land
15 Development Code. We had a document that was presented to us and we debated
16 point by point through that document to come forward. For two years I've been sitting
17 here saying how come we can't get a document that is in front of us that says –

18 MR. CRISS: You were given a document, 80 pages from the existing –

19 MR. VAN DINE: We were given the existing documents.

20 MR. CRISS: - [inaudible] Richland 20/20 comprehensive plan.

21 MR. VAN DINE: We were given the existing document which had no
22 modifications that I can recall. And I, you know, I'm only going to be here for less than a
23 year and I'll tell you right now sitting here very frustrated because for two years I've

1 been trying to work with this thing and trying to get moving and we're not going
2 anyplace. We get maps which are very nice to have but they're not leading us any
3 place. I would like to see a document put in front of me that we could sit down then and
4 have special called meetings and all of the other things we did for the Land
5 Development Code and go through it and say this is what we like, this is what we don't
6 like, this is how we have to get there. We're not even in that phase of discussion.
7 We're not even in a phase of this is what we like and this what we need to go to get
8 there. And I don't know what else we're supposed to do but I would love to see a
9 document put in front of me that we could then debate. And – you know, last year we
10 put together a schedule in January that by last summer we were supposed to have such
11 an animal. It hasn't arrived. We're a year later. It's time that we had it so this Body
12 could talk about it and I just – we can make excuses and everything else we want to as
13 to why it's not there or what's been happening and there's been a lot of work that's gone
14 in behind the scenes but frankly we're not at the point where this Body can get what we
15 want.

16 MR. CRISS: What is it that you want? Do you want an explanation of population
17 projections?

18 MR. VAN DINE: No.

19 MR. GREEN: No. The draft – a draft comprehensive plan.

20 MR. VAN DINE: That says here's what we need to do. Here are our goals, here
21 are our -

22 MR. CRISS: [inaudible] required elements obviously.

1 MR. GREEN: I'm talking about whatever – assuming you were writing the plan
2 that was going to go on the shelf and take effect tomorrow, this is what we
3 professionally recommend for Richland County. Just like we got the draft for the Land
4 Development Code.

5 MS. ALMEIDA: Administration has in the new budget appropriated some pretty
6 nice funds at least to begin to chew away at certain elements that might take priority
7 and Staff is going to sit down and prioritize those elements and farm them out but
8 keeping control and hopefully we can get a consultant on board to be awarded at least
9 some of those elements so you all can see something.

10 MR. CRISS: Most of the elements required by the '94 Planning Act are
11 inventories of existing conditions; your population, your housing, economic
12 development, cultural resources, natural resources, community facilities. The
13 culmination of the plan is the future land use map. This is an outline, broad classes but
14 one level below this is where you want residential, commercial, industrial, etc., other
15 land uses to be located.

16 MR. MANNING: Anna, is there a request for proposal out for a consultant now?

17 MS. ALMEIDA: We have been working with procurement in order to get that list
18 in order to – there are several consultants that have been approved.

19 MR. CRISS: There are many consultants available; it's a question of funding.

20 MS. ALMEIDA: And it's the funding.

21 MR. MANNING: Have they – County Council committed to any level of funding?

22 MR. CRISS: They're deliberating as part of their budget process for 2007-2008.

23 MR. MANNING: And when will that be final?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: July.

2 MR. MANNING: July.

3 MR. CRISS: May, June.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: It'll be available in July.

5 MR. CRISS: They're having budget work sessions now.

6 MR. MANNING: Once that happens then to get the consultant in [inaudible]
7 request, appropriations, so on and so forth we'd be looking at next year to bring them
8 on.

9 MS. ALMEIDA: No.

10 MR. MANNING: To really start [inaudible].

11 MS. ALMEIDA: We're looking at –

12 MR. MANNING: July.

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Quickly.

14 MR. CRISS: It usually takes until August to procure in the new budget year.

15 MR. MANNING: So you're anticipating money and you're sending out proposals
16 right now to begin working on it.

17 MR. CRISS: No. We can't send out any proposals without secured funding. We
18 are soliciting interested vendors to have a short list, a head start on who would be
19 interested in helping.

20 MS. ALMEIDA: And the process wouldn't be so long, yeah.

21 MR. MANNING: [Inaudible] consultants on board.

22 MR. CRISS: And of course the Council's just committed to Parsons Brinkerhoff
23 in the next 18 months to do what is in effect the transportation element.

1 MR. PALMER: It'll definitely be next year before we get a document in front of
2 us.

3 MR. GREEN: It'll be after I'm gone, after I follow Howard off.

4 MR. MURRAY: Now you guys –

5 MR. GREEN: I don't know how much later than when I leave but maybe by the
6 time you leave, Pat.

7 MR. MANNING: [Inaudible]

8 MR. CRISS: One of the debates that you often have considering zoning map
9 amendments is how far commercial should extend from an existing node. Is that the
10 kind of detail that you're looking for?

11 MR. VAN DINE: I am looking for somebody to present us with their best ideas
12 forward so that we can debate amongst us what we think is right and wrong. To have
13 the kind of debate that is necessary to come to a consensus of the people up here.
14 That's what I'm looking for.

15 MR. CRISS: Well there's a [inaudible] yellow.

16 MR. VANDINE: Wait a minute, wait a minute.

17 MR. CRISS: I'm sorry.

18 MR. VANDINE: To sit here and ask me what I think about a discrete point
19 without having any context for what I'm doing is asking me to throw darts at the wall.
20 And I can't do that. We did not do that with the Land Development Code. It was not
21 done the first time the comprehensive plan went around. Why would we want to change
22 and just throw darts at a wall for somebody to pick anything out of it? We need
23 something that we can actually sit down and be all on the same page talking about

1 whether or not that particular provision makes any sense for what we're trying to do.
2 And I – perhaps I'm being overly dramatic and overly harsh on everything but it has
3 been two years that I have been having the same discussions and we sit up here and
4 talk about the same thing and we are in my opinion no further along now than we were
5 two years ago. We have some maps, we have some background information but
6 frankly that doesn't do anything for this Body moving forward and getting a document
7 which can be put before County Council. Because maybe I was naïve but I thought that
8 we were going to have that document so that we would be talking about right now the
9 capital improvements plan and budget which was going to be a forerunner for a lot of
10 other things that were going to take place. The way I'm looking at it if you want to talk
11 about a capital improvement budget you'd better put some time around 2012 for that
12 time because we're not going to get there until then.

13 MR. CRISS: If Planning Commission were to agree to suburban rural boundaries
14 such as those proposed on this map it implies that you might have corresponding
15 policies on the extension of water and sewer. You're going to serve the yellow and
16 maybe not serve the green.

17 MR. VAN DINE: What are your recommendations?

18 MR. CRISS: That. If you're going to have a true –

19 MR. VAN DINE: Then put it forth – then put it before us in the form something so
20 that we can do it.

21 MR. CRISS: Written policies attached to this map would be helpful?

22 MR. VAN DINE: Yeah. Absolutely.

23 MR. ANDERSON: Could we see those next month?

1 MR. CRISS: Point taken, yes.

2 MR. MURRAY: Do you need any help?

3 MR. CRISS: Yeah. We need all the help we can get.

4 MR. MURRAY: I want you to have resources in order.

5 MR. CRISS: The most help you can provide is policy guidance; how you
6 envision the future landscape of Richland County, whatever aspects that may be. Since
7 single-family residential growth and development is the dominant form of growth in
8 Richland County present then a policy consensus on where future single-family
9 residential should be located.

10 MR. GREEN: We didn't have a big, long policy discussion before we had a draft
11 Land Development Code.

12 MR. MURRAY: This is different.

13 MR. CRISS: Well actually -

14 MS. ALMEIDA: We knew where we wanted to go.

15 MR. CRISS: - there were quite a few policy discussions. There were about 24
16 versions of that code.

17 MR. GREEN: But we had something to start from.

18 MR. CRISS: Yeah. Regulations, of course, are very language specific whereas
19 plans tend to be map oriented but I take your point. You want to see some specific
20 policies married to this map and its successors.

21 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Can you do that for us?

22 MR. CRISS: Yes. Is the industrial land use issue an important one, a priority for
23 you or is commercial or residential? Is there some -

1 MR. MANNING: Industrial seems to be an easy one. Why don't we just next
2 time take industrial up and we'll decide on, you know, begin the dialogue on where it
3 should go to.

4 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You think industrial?

5 MR. CRISS: I think that's very helpful.

6 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Okay. Can you do that for us?

7 MR. CRISS: I can.

8 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. County Council, Staff action report? Any
9 action from County Council? No action?

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Sorry?

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: How about the County Council Staff action report?

12 MS. ALMEIDA: There's no action.

13 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. Okay.

14 MR. GREEN: There's no DRT action that's been taken since our last meeting?

15 MS. ALMEIDA: Which – we're trying to update that list for you.

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Next is –

17 MR. GREEN: We were getting the votes back by County Council on how they
18 acted on zoning change and I didn't know if we'll continue to get that.

19 MS. ALMEIDA: We're trying to get those too.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You're trying on a lot of things.

21 MR. PALMER: Make a motion to approve road names.

22 MR. VAN DINE: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: It's been moved and second. How we vote for that? All
2 approved?

3 *[Approved: Cairns, Ward, Murray, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Van Dine, Green, and*
4 *Manning]*

5 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman. I have one quick thing I'd like to raise with Staff.
6 Can you explain to me how come Staff is telling County Council that we don't want to
7 see the subdivision review because it would be too much work for us to have and we
8 have to have all these additional meetings and everybody's throwing as many
9 roadblocks in the way as possible?

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Administration asked for a position paper from Staff, okay,
11 objective as to what it would take and what does this mean and that's what we had to
12 put together.

13 MR. GREEN: The thing that confuses me about the letter is that we had
14 subdivision approval for the first five years I was on Planning Commission? And we
15 never had to have double meetings. We rarely ran passed 5:30 unless we had a big
16 zoning issue. We all especially I mean there's not a case in point that says the Bunch
17 property is a great case in point where we're seeing half the picture but we're being
18 asked to make decisions based on seeing half the picture when for years, not for a
19 week, a month or whatever but for years this Body dealt with subdivision approval.
20 We've asked for it for two years to get back. The reason we were given was that
21 County Council doesn't want to give it back to you when the truth of the matter is Staff
22 doesn't want us to have it back for some reason. And we have told Staff repeatedly we
23 need subdivision approval to do our job correctly.

1 MS. ALMEIDA: We don't have that authority. We are asked as an arbitrary party
2 objectively and you all in your previous – when you all were approving subdivisions you
3 were supposed to be approving also site plans, land development projects. You were
4 not, for some reason, given those. It was omitted from those packages and those are
5 substantial. So you would be – your volume would be larger than it was previously, so.

6 MR. GREEN: We're just asking back what we had before.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: But you can't just have what you had before. You have to take
8 the whole package which is more than what you had before, which is fine. I mean,
9 Staff's position is objective and administration asked what does this mean. That's all we
10 put together.

11 MR. VAN DINE: Well the fact is I talked with Councilman Jackson and he says
12 that in essence his motion was undercut by your positions taken and expressed to
13 County Council people regarding what the immense pressure it would be on this Body
14 and all the rest of the things like that and frankly we're sitting up here trying to figure out
15 half the things that are going on. We don't see how of the plans that are out there and
16 we've been asking to review those things. If in fact there's a problem that Staff has got
17 with us having it back you sure haven't expressed anything to us every time we've
18 asked and we've asked you to go directly and say that we want it back again and all
19 we're getting is [inaudible] Norman called me up and said, "I need your help because
20 nobody believes me."

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Well I was not at that meeting, number one, but to make a point,
22 Mr. Jackson did make some points that were incorrect and Staff had to correct him.
23 Okay? But Staff has gone to administration because that is the steps in which we work

1 under and we go to administration and we give them or we pretty much tell them what
2 you all direct us or want to do and administration takes that to Council. Not the
3 Planning Staff.

4 MR. MANNING: I think one of the recommendations that the Commission made
5 was to keep DRT in place and everything I read was saying it would be eliminated.

6 MS. ALMEIDA: It would have to because the process would double in the
7 timeframe.

8 MR. MANNING: Why would it have to? I mean DRT is going to meet whether
9 they're a formal body or not to answer questions on applications. Staff is – y'all have a
10 Staff recommendation and a DRT recommendation right now on these PDDs.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: No. It's the same.

12 MR. MANNING: Not always. I mean if you looked – if you went back and looked
13 at the Bunch –

14 MS. ALMEIDA: Right.

15 MR. MANNING: - today, no, the first PDD we had on the OI and the construction
16 equipment.

17 MS. ALMEIDA: Um-hum (affirmative). Ideal.

18 MR. MANNING: Those were two different recommendations. Now you could
19 interpret that the Staff –

20 MS. ALMEIDA: We incorporate.

21 MR. MANNING: - incorporated the DRT.

22 MS. ALMEIDA: But there are standard conditions that are put into the format and
23 that's what you see.

1 MR. MANNING: So you've got Staff and Staff –

2 MS. ALMEIDA: Right.

3 MR. MANNING: - is really what you've got. You could have Staff
4 recommendations. I mean nobody's said get rid of the overview process by Staff.

5 MS. ALMEIDA: But you would be making the public go to two boards, two
6 meetings for no reason. I mean, really DRT is comprised of all the professionals who
7 review the site plans and subdivisions.

8 MR. MANNING: As they should.

9 MS. ALMEIDA: It would work as before. They would give their written
10 recommendation but would not go to a DRT and come before you all.

11 MR. MANNING: I just don't see why that would go away. I mean, nobody has
12 advocated that go away. It's necessary.

13 MS. ALMEIDA: I think it's the timeframe that you're looking at; that is the big
14 question.

15 MR. VAN DINE: I will again express my desire to see subdivision review back in
16 this Body so we know what is going on, that we know that when we approve one thing
17 something down the road has already taken place where we are aware of it. Those are
18 the reasons. We are only getting half the information in order to make these decisions
19 on rezonings. It was – our approach was to expand these discussions, expand these
20 things to the point where it wasn't just looking at the property specific issues. It was
21 looking at things around it. If we don't have the information about what's around we
22 can't make those decisions.

1 MR. GREEN: We don't even know what's approved by Staff. We don't know if
2 there's 100 acres that's zoned properly but it'd come in for a development plan that's
3 approved by Staff we don't even get a piece of paper that says we approve this 100
4 acre subdivision with 612 houses on this road.

5 MR. MANNING: That was one thing you all were giving us that by district the
6 number of units.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Well since we lost Staff and we're getting new Staff members in
8 June, we will start to do that. We're working on a shoestring downstairs, literally. Like
9 three people.

10 MS. CAIRNS: I think that's some of the challenges, some of the, you know, map
11 planning is that, you know, to a certain extent when I look at a zoning map and see it's
12 all zoned rural, I say okay anticipate that's all three-quarter acre lots. Because the way
13 that the things are written now it's all three-quarter acre lots and I think that's where, you
14 know, the challenge comes back to us to come up with a plan that, you know, if the
15 whole county became three-quarter acre lots which in essence it could now, I don't think
16 any of us want that. That's where we come back on the comprehensive plan and say
17 how can we – I mean, yes, subdivision review helps but at the same time if you – you
18 know, if somebody has done something and it complies with code it's kind of
19 challenging to say they can't do it. I mean, the fact that whether the next door neighbor
20 has already gotten approved a three-quarter acre lot subdivision or not it's, you know,
21 as it is right now it's doable. There's nothing that would stop it as I understand the
22 interplay with code and the plan right now.

1 MR. GREEN: A lot of times we're faced with connectivity issues that could make
2 traffic flow better. Where entrances are allowed and permitted. Where in the range of
3 what somebody can build in a particular area.

4 MS. CAIRNS: I totally agree with additional review. Don't get me wrong there.
5 But I mean that's I think part of the limit of where we are now with our plan. It just
6 simply allows us three-quarter acre lot development everywhere. And I think yeah
7 review is good but I think we need guidelines too to let the review be legitimate.

8 MR. GREEN: I think we all recognize that we continue to ask County Council to
9 properly fund what you're trying to do and we're trying to do. And we know they
10 haven't.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: We're getting there but.

12 MR. MURRAY: Why haven't they?

13 MR. MANNING: Excuse me?

14 MR. MURRAY: Why haven't they?

15 MR. MANNING: Good question. I guess – it generally comes down to money.

16 MR. VAN DINE: A lot of other things they have that they decide are more
17 important.

18 MR. MANNING: How many positions do y'all have open right now?

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Ah, three. I've got one so.

20 MR. MANNING: I'm seeing two and I'm seeing five. [Laughter]

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. And I have one that's been – these are positions that
22 exist, that have not been filled. But we definitely even with three, we're looking at
23 needing more. I mean the volume.

1 MR. MANNING: [Inaudible] you know not just a Planning Department [inaudible]
2 and that's like part of y'all's problem. [Inaudible].

3 MS. ALMEIDA: Well, you know, it's so much the numbers. It's you know if you
4 have people who are highly qualified and can do the job and hit the ground running you
5 don't need five, you can do with three. The problem is our pay scale is so low that we
6 can't attract those people –

7 MR. MANNING: Exactly.

8 MS. ALMEIDA: - with experience and therefore –

9 MR. MANNING: [Inaudible]

10 MS. ALMEIDA: - we're always asking for the sheer numbers.

11 MR. MANNING: You become a training ground and they go to Greenville or they
12 go to Camden or go to –

13 MS. ALMEIDA: That's right.

14 MR. MANNING: - wherever they.

15 MS. ALMEIDA: So we're trying to attract people who can deal with the volume.

16 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Anything else?

17 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I brought that up to take us [inaudible].

18 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: [Inaudible – laughter]

19 MR. PALMER: You know who you need to talk to – Marcia.

20 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Be like Marcia junior.

21 MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman?

22 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: We need a motion.

1 MR. MURRAY: If you have a problem and there are some concerns based on
2 what I've heard today, why can't we or why can't you assign three or four people to
3 meet with the so-called leadership of Council? With maybe four of those persons, tell
4 them what you need, why you need it and when you need it. And once you've done that
5 and if you do a thorough job, a persuasive job of taking care of that part the money
6 ought to come. Okay? Because this is one of the most important things that you have
7 left in the county. You all and you have some folks on there with enough knowledge,
8 enough brain power to understand that but you've got to tell them because they'll sit
9 there doing the other things and worrying about roads and Public Works, they'll forget
10 everything. So we have got to do that. That's the first thing you got to do.

11 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. We'll take that under advisement and get
12 with Staff and then we'll pick three people from this Body here to serve on that
13 committee. Thank you. I need a motion for adjournment.

14 MR. VAN DINE: So moved.

15 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You heard it. We're adjourned.

16
17 *[Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.]*