

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

January 7, 2008

[Members Present: Heather Cairns, Julius Murray, Enga Ward, Christopher Anderson, Patrick Palmer, Wes Furgess; Howard Van Dine, Eugene Green, Deas Manning]

CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Call to order. First on the agenda is election of Commission officers for 2008.

MR. VAN DINE: You might want to read that little thing in the Record.

CHAIRMAN FURGESS: But they got that, public notice Thursday.

MR. VAN DINE: You want to do that first?

CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Let me read into the Record. "According to the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the agenda was sent to radio, TV stations, newspapers, person who request notification and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building." At this time we're asking everyone to cut off their electronic devices that they have. Thank you. At this time we'll go back up to number two and let you know Commission officers for 2008.

MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, as part of the Nominating Committee we have been requested to put the following names for nominations of the various officers. Deas Manning as Chair, Chris Anderson as Vice-Chair, Pat Palmer as Secretary. Obviously, if anybody else has any nominations they wish to make at this time but that is the recommendation of the Nominating Committee for the officers for 2008.

CHAIRMAN FURGESS: You've heard the nominations for officers for 2008. All approve of the officers for 2008 by a show of hands. Opposed?

[Approved: Cairns, Murray, Ward, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Van Dine, Green, Manning]

1 CHAIRMAN FURGESS: Thank you. At this time I would like to thank the Board
2 for giving me the opportunity to serve for this year, this past year and now I turn it over
3 to Deas Manning so he can do his thing. [Applaud]

4 MR. GREEN: Does that mean I get Wes next to me?

5 MR. VAN DINE: That's right.

6 MR. GREEN: Do I get Doritos too?

7 MR. FURGESS: Yeah.

8 MR. VAN DINE: Doritos go with it.

9 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I'd first like to thank Wes for all his hard work this year
10 and it's really nice to see him back here healthy. He's been in the hospital a little while
11 and we were thinking about you while you were gone but glad to have you back.

12 MR. FURGESS: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN MANNING: With that out of the way I guess the first order of
14 business is to approve the Minutes. Unfortunately, I don't have the December Minutes.
15 I was sent the November Minutes. Were they prepared – the December Minutes?

16 MS. SWORD: Yes, sir, they've being proofed.

17 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Proofed?

18 MR. FURGESS: Can we have the one, on the November Minutes?

19 MR. GREEN: Did we approve the November last time? Does anybody recall?

20 MS. HAYNES: No.

21 CHAIRMAN MANNING: So we did not approve the November Minutes at our
22 last meeting? Okay. Has everyone had a chance to review them?

1 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, I move we accept the Minutes for November 5,
2 2007.

3 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN MANNING: All in favor? Opposed?

5 *[Approved: Cairns, Murray, Ward, Anderson, Palmer, Furgess, Van Dine, Green,*
6 *Manning]*

7 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay. Are there any Agenda amendments for today's
8 meeting?

9 MS. ALMEIDA: No. None. There are no amendments.

10 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Under Old Business we have the Steeplechase appeal.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is just an update for the Planning
12 Commissioners on exactly what has been – what has transpired since our last meeting
13 of the appeal. We have gotten, since this memo was put together, we have received
14 word from DOT and hopefully that matter will be brought before you in your February
15 Planning Commission meeting.

16 CHAIRMAN MANNING: And that will be a public meeting where we will –

17 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

18 CHAIRMAN MANNING: - take input on the appeal -

19 MS. ALMEIDA: You will hear the appeal.

20 CHAIRMAN MANNING: - and take a vote as to whether we are in favor or not in
21 favor?

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct. All parties will be here and you can act at that time.
23 This is just an update so just for informational purposes only.

1 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a question. Are we allowed to
2 know what DOT said as a forewarning or is there something you would prefer to hold on
3 to until our February meeting?

4 MS. ALMEIDA: I prefer to hold on.

5 MR. PALMER: I talked with Thad today. I can tell you.

6 MR. VAN DINE: I'm willing to hear anything.

7 MR. PALMER: The report has just come back in this week that there is no need
8 for a light at Rabbit Run. There was a request made but the report is not out yet but
9 there will be no light at Rabbit Run and there has been no request on the part of the
10 developer to access Trotter Road. They have two encroachment permits requested at
11 the two access points on internal roads that was in the package but there have been no
12 formal requests from the developer for access off Trotter Road.

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Staff did receive that email from DOT, that response as you very
14 well put it Mr. Palmer. But Staff asked the pointed question if the developer had
15 proposed an access onto Trotter would DOT approve it, and that's the response we're
16 getting. And I believe that's the response that everyone would like to hear at the
17 appeal.

18 MR. PALMER: Yeah. I think at this point they actually have some – they need a
19 traffic impact study. Simply they have not approved the encroachment permits for the
20 two access points that they've applied for yet. They're requesting a traffic impact study
21 on those two points, so I think they're quite a -

22 MS. ALMEIDA: That traffic study was submitted to them some time ago.

1 MR. PALMER: Yeah. I mean, they're quite a bit of ways away from still doing
2 anything with it. So anyway that's what I got today from Thad.

3 CHAIRMAN MANNING: In regards to Steeplechase were there any other
4 conditions other than the DOT approval or clarification that we needed to have for the
5 next meeting?

6 MS. ALMEIDA: That was the big question. It was the access. That's what the
7 appeal was focusing around, the access.

8 CHAIRMAN MANNING: So there were no other concerns on the Planning
9 Commission that we needed other information to make that decision? I mean, we had
10 dry pond issue –

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. We'll provide everything –

12 CHAIRMAN MANNING: - in the conditions.

13 MS. ALMEIDA: - and the developer will be here at the next Planning
14 Commission meeting.

15 MR. VAN DINE: Okay. And we are going to notify the –

16 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

17 MR. VAN DINE: - parties again that we're?

18 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

19 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Item number six on today's agenda is the text
20 amendment A. Digital Billboards. Staff, would you like to bring us up to date on this?

21 MR. KOCY: Sure. Mr. Chairman, the – excuse me, County Council forwarded
22 three proposed legislative changes allowing digital billboards in the County. The easiest
23 way to describes these would be: A is language that was proposed by the billboard

1 industry; B is language that was proposed by the Chairman of the Council; and,
2 although it's not listed I believe there's a third recommendation in here that was
3 Savannah. Excuse me, A is Savannah. It was an ordinance written for Savannah,
4 Georgia that was written in our code format for proposed implementation here. B is the
5 industry's recommendation, and C is something that was drafted by Mr. McEachern.

6 MR. GREEN: So I can be clear, is A the one that's on page five and six?

7 MR. KOCY: Yes.

8 MR. GREEN: And B is the one on page seven and eight of our report?

9 MR. KOCY: That is correct.

10 MR. GREEN: And C is on nine through 60-some?

11 MR. KOCY: Nine through 30, yes.

12 MR. VAN DINE: Again. Just so I'm – A is Savannah's ordinance?

13 MR. KOCY: Correct.

14 MR. VAN DINE: B is whose ordinance?

15 MR. KOCY: The industry, the billboard industry's recommendations.

16 MR. VAN DINE: And the last which is basically an amendment to the use table is
17 the Council?

18 MR. KOCY: Correct.

19 MR. VAN DINE: Is that all that Council sent back? Did they ever hold any
20 committee meetings or anything else where they're going to come up with some
21 additional language?

22 MR. KOCY: No.

1 MR. LINDER: But they are open to any recommendations or amendments that
2 you as a Body would like to make.

3 MR. KOCY: They just forwarded these three suggestions as fodder for
4 discussion.

5 MR. VAN DINE: Has Staff had an opportunity to look at these and come to any
6 recommendation regarding which if any of them they wish to have us look at more
7 closely or?

8 MR. KOCY: We've come to a recommendation. The recommendation is from
9 me on page 31 and my recommendation is that you take no action until the federal
10 digital billboard study is complete and recommendations are issued by the federal
11 government. There are three studies that are being underway right now; one from the
12 Federal Highway Administration, a second from the American Association of State and
13 Highway Transportation Officials, and a third from the Transportation Research Board.
14 There is a concern that digital billboards cause distraction to drivers and might cause
15 safety on roadways. And my recommendation is until these reports are done and the
16 distraction and the safety questions are better addressed that you take no
17 recommendation

18 MR. PALMER: When are these reports scheduled to be completed?

19 MR. KOCY: The Federal Highway Administration report is scheduled to be
20 released a year - approximately a year from today. Well, I shouldn't say from today - in
21 early 2009. AASHTO and the Transportation Research Boards are just starting up their
22 studies right now.

23 MR. PALMER: So how long do you expect?

1 MR. KOCY: I have no idea.

2 MR. PALMER: How long did the Federal Highway Administration take?

3 MR. KOCY: The Federal Highway Administration's started at the tail end of '07.

4 MR. PALMER: About two years?

5 MR. KOCY: A little over a year.

6 MR. PALMER: A year?

7 MR. KOCY: They're two ways – well, if I might continue, sir? Thank you. There
8 are two concerns that I have. One is the safety concern that all these reports – the
9 reasons that these reports are being issued is that there's the distraction concern. The
10 second is if digital billboards are allowed and then there is a safety concern and the
11 Council decides to remove the billboards there is the investment that a billboard
12 company needs to be reimbursed for. So it's not only a safety issues, it's a financial
13 concern for the County.

14 MR. PALMER: I thought the state legislature had in it that, to take – if it becomes
15 a safety issue then compensation doesn't have to be made to take the billboards down.

16 MR. VAN DINE: I think it's not only just compensation for taking the billboards
17 down but also -

18 MR. KOCY: It's lost revenue.

19 MR. VAN DINE: - for lost revenue that has to be reimbursed if a sign is taken
20 down.

21 MR. PALMER: If it's a safety issue I don't think that applies though.

22 MR. KOCY: This state is unusual. This is the only state that I'm aware of that
23 the legislature has declared that outdoor advertising is of economic interest to the state,

1 an economic concern of the states. No other state to my knowledge makes that bold a
2 statement saying that billboards are good for the economy of the state. So I don't know
3 that the courts have addressed that issue yet and it could be a very expensive answer.

4 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Did the Council's recommendation or draft I should say,
5 did it take into consideration your recommendations or was this something that
6 [inaudible]?

7 MR. KOCY: The Council has not addressed this issue at all, Mr. Chairman.
8 They have forwarded it to this Board for consideration.

9 MR. VAN DINE: There's also in our package pages, page 33 of Mr. Price's
10 concerns, questions concerning the language that's found on page 26 and 27, of the
11 Council recommended language that addresses a number of issues.

12 MS. LINDER: If I just may correct that it's not Council recommended [inaudible].

13 MR. VAN DINE: I understand.

14 MS. LINDER: An individual Council member proposed it.

15 MR. VAN DINE: I don't know how else to describe it in relation to the other three
16 so [inaudible] I understand it's not actual Council language

17 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Mr. Kocy, I understand if there is some action taken
18 today that timing is important in order to get to the Council for their next meeting; is that
19 correct?

20 MR. KOCY: Correct.

21 CHAIRMAN MANNING: And a special workshop would have to be called, a
22 special meeting.

1 MR. KOCY: We have scheduled a work session for today after the regular
2 agenda meeting that you could hold a work session on billboards but in order to take
3 action to pass a formal recommendation back to the Council you would need to hold a
4 special meeting to take a vote and forward a recommendation.

5 MR. VAN DINE: Is – I'm sorry? So are we having, as far as text amendments,
6 are these for information purposes only or are these to be – the potential for dealing
7 with them today?

8 MR. KOCY: Yes to both. They were forwarded for information purposes only
9 and it's up to the Board whether you want to make – address this issue today.

10 MR. VAN DINE: So in essence if we're going to hold a workshop after this
11 meeting then we will have to have some kind of a motion to either postpone or do
12 something with the actual ordinance until after the workshop because if we're going to
13 vote on something then what's the purpose of the workshop. I mean, the workshop is
14 designed to try and deal with the language I would assume, and it seems to me we'd
15 have the cart before the horse at that point.

16 MS. LINDER: You could possibly recess until after the work session.

17 MS. ALMEIDA: I believe what Council would like you to do is to consider the
18 three ordinances whether you agree or disagree and if the three are not acceptable to
19 come up with one that would be acceptable.

20 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Assuming that –

21 MS. ALMEIDA: That could be – right. And that could be done at the workshop
22 following your scheduled Planning Commission meeting.

1 MR. VAN DINE: Is there not a fourth alternative and that is to say that we don't
2 want anything to be done at all?

3 MS. ALMEDIA: Correct.

4 MR. KOCY: Correct.

5 MR. VAN DINE: It's not a chose one of these three; it's the floor is open for all?

6 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

7 MS. LINDER: If you choose to do nothing Council may take this up on their own
8 initiative without your input.

9 CHAIRMAN MANNING: So basically Council would like a recommendation from
10 us –

11 MS. LINDER: [Inaudible]

12 CHAIRMAN MANNING: - whether to proceed or not proceed. Ya'll have
13 provided us with the information if we so choose to proceed to evaluate, have a
14 workshop, and then call a special meeting?

15 MR. KOCY: That's correct.

16 CHAIRMAN MANNING: It kind of appears to me that what we've got to do then
17 is decide regardless of the language we've got is this something that we want to
18 consider? I mean, I – do you want to consider digital billboards period?

19 MR. VAN DINE: Can I ask one more question before we get to that? Am I to
20 understand Council is sending these as options to us? Because my understanding was,
21 what you just said was that Council has not adopted any language or sent anything.
22 This was an individual Councilman's language choice. So what is exactly Council
23 asking us to do?

1 MS. LINDER: To look at the three ordinances and make a recommendation on
2 each of the three ordinances or any amendments to such ordinances.

3 MR. ANDERSON: So we can take votes on each individual ordinance up or
4 down and -

5 MS. LINDER: Or if you'd like to amend any one of those three or make a
6 recommendation for a fourth or make a recommendation to not approve any of them.

7 MR. FURGESS: Clarification on this. This – you keep saying it's an individual
8 that sent these from County Council? All three of these are from an individual or from -

9 MS. LINDER: All three of them are from an individual. The Savannah ordinance
10 was introduced by – to us by a Council member. The special exception was introduced
11 to us by an individual Council member and the one was introduced – the industry one
12 was represented by an individual.

13 MR. FURGESS: Okay.

14 MR. PALMER: All the same individual or all different?

15 MR. KOCY: No. Different individuals.

16 MS. LINDER: Each of these ordinances has a different sponsor.

17 MR. PALMER: But none from the Council as a whole? No directive from the
18 Council as a whole to say we want to address this issue?

19 MR. KOCY: That is correct.

20 MR. PALMER: It's just three individual Council members who want to bring the
21 issue up?

22 MR. KOCY: The issue addressed by the entire Council was do we want to
23 amend our billboard ordinance to allow for digital billboards.

1 MR. PALMER: And what'd they say?

2 MR. KOCY: And that's the question to you.

3 MS. LINDER: Yeah. Council wants the billboard issue to be taken up by you to
4 decide that issue and to make a recommendation.

5 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Mr. Green?

6 MR. GREEN: Well, if we're ready to get things started, you know. It's my belief
7 that the recommendation of our Director of Planning and Development Services makes
8 the most sense to me. Whether you're for these things, whether you're against these
9 things, it strikes me that I haven't had days and weeks to look at whatever studies have
10 been done on digital billboards. I did take a little bit of time; I could not find a lot to be
11 honest with you in my searching around of anything that was very definitive on the
12 safety issue relative to these billboards. And I think since we are a year – we're only a
13 year away from having an exhaustive, what appears to be an exhaustive national study
14 of the safety issues with these things I would hate to send any recommendation to
15 Council and find out these things are unsafe. Likewise I would hate to vote for the
16 industry against something if they're proven to be safe. And I think taking a step in
17 either direction, given what's in the process of going on we can well wait a year to get
18 the right answer and that that answer's important enough to wait on. And therefore I will
19 at the appropriate time, depending on what the rest of the Commission wants to do
20 either make a motion to table this pending receipt of the federal study or vote against
21 each of the versions individually.

22 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, if I could? I would have to agree with Mr. Green.
23 I think there are some additional reasons for delaying and that is whatever action may

1 be taken could open the door to allowing digital billboards in, especially without any
2 study of such things as the request to allow changes in the supports and to modernize
3 or to increase the structures for support of these things, places what amounts to a
4 financial responsibility on the County in the event that we are required to backtrack at
5 some point in time. And I wouldn't want to open the door at this point in time to having
6 to someplace down the road have to come back here and all of a sudden say well we're
7 in a position of now having to say that these are no longer appropriate and now we're
8 going to have to pay for all of the costs that are associated with that including under
9 state law the loss of revenue that would be generated. If you notice from some of the
10 material that was provided to you that revenue can be substantial and is substantial per
11 billboard not as all of the billboards. The other is we don't know sufficiently as to what is
12 actually out there. Lamar's told us they have 180 out of the 480. Mr. Stevenson told us
13 he only had 15. I mean, where are the 280 other ones, where do they sit, what are they
14 situated in, how close to residential areas are they. I mean, there are so many
15 questions that are unanswered at this point in time that a more in-depth study of actually
16 what exists in this County is necessary for me to have a comfort level as to what can
17 and cannot be done. So I will actually place it in the form of a motion that we table all of
18 the actual ordinance requests and the discussion until such time as the National
19 Transportation Board's study is published and we have an opportunity to look at the
20 safety issues and at that time I think we also need to address whether or not these
21 types of things belong in Richland County and in fact whether or not we can financially
22 afford the position that we may be put in. That's my motion in the form of a motion.

1 MR. PALMER: Do you want the transportation board or do you want the Federal
2 Highway Administration?

3 MR. VAN DINE: The highway – I'm sorry. Yeah. The National Highway
4 Transportation Safety Administration which is an ongoing study and I, you know, from
5 other discussions we've had with some of the other localities there are some of them
6 that are actually reconsidering the fact that they have allowed the digital boards in their
7 area because of some problems. I think we need to take time in order to properly
8 review this. And in full disclosure just so everybody understands that I will probably not
9 be here at the time that that comes forward so I'm not as invested in that as perhaps
10 others may be.

11 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I share in some of Mr. Van Dine's concerns. I guess
12 another concern I've got is that if the Council does take this up without our input then
13 we've the lost the opportunity to have any input. I don't know whether they will or they
14 won't but there's clearly a lot of issues, some brought to light by Mr. Price, some by the
15 other communities, and if there was going to be an action by the Council I would hope
16 that we would have our input and I'm afraid we're going to miss that if we don't do
17 something here today. And I - with all respect to Mr. Kocy's recommendation I share
18 that concern but I'm also concerned that something may get passed that may not
19 [inaudible].

20 MR. KOCY: The Council – I heard at the last Council meeting that the Council
21 feels that we owe the industry an answer and I think if we tell the industry we're going to
22 wait a year until our safety concerns are addressed, that's an answer. To date this
23 issue has been bounced back and forth between this Board and the Council and no one

1 has ever addressed just the first question - is do we want to address digital billboards?
2 And if Mr. Van Dine and Mr. Green are correct I heard we will not address them until we
3 have – the federal study is complete and we have some research to base our
4 discussion on.

5 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Mr. Palmer.

6 MR. PALMER: The only problem I have with that and I understand where Mr.
7 Green and Mr. Van Dine are coming from is that we have a specific directive and we're
8 appointed to make recommendations to Council. Council has sent us three options;
9 they didn't send us the fourth option. No Council member sponsored a fourth option to
10 do nothing, in all due respect Mr. Kocy. They sent us three options. Now we can just
11 say we don't like all three options but I think we need to address the three options and
12 say no this option is not good, no this option's not good, no, this option's not good as
13 opposed to just saying we don't want to touch it right now. We – it's – we don't have
14 enough information, because we could always say we don't have enough information on
15 every kind of topic. There's always some study being done about whether something
16 should be allowed or not but that's just my opinion. I mean, we're here to make
17 recommendations; that's what we were appointed for and if they sent it down for us to
18 do so I think we should.

19 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think, you know, I would – I understand your
20 position and I hear what Pat's saying. I think what I disagree with with that is that if
21 Council as a Body had sent us three choices to look at that would be different and I
22 would agree of feeling compelled to do something with one of the three. On the other
23 hand my understanding is these are three proposals that have come to us not by

1 Council as a Body but by – have come from individuals as possible alternatives to
2 consider. And I think there's a big difference if I'm understanding correctly how these
3 got to us.

4 MS. LINDER: I apologize for any misunderstanding. The three ordinances were
5 sponsored by three different individuals or bodies but collectively Council sent all three
6 to the Planning Commission for recommendation.

7 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Well, if that's the [inaudible] is a part why I'm concerned
8 that something's going to take place without our input and I think we can add to that
9 discussion and debate and it very well may be that you come back to we wait for further
10 information. But if we don't take the next step then we're not going to have that choice.
11 Any further discussion? We've got a motion on the floor and a second. All in favor say
12 – raise your hand please. All opposed?

13 MS. CAIRNS: Which is the motion?

14 MR. PALMER: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

15 MS. CAIRNS: I'm sorry, I apologize.

16 MR. VAN DINE: My motion was to just delay doing anything with this until such
17 time as the safety – excuse me, the –

18 MS. LINDER: And who seconded it, please?

19 MR. MANNING: Mr. Green.

20 MR. VAN DINE: - the National –

21 MR. FURGESS: The National Traffic Safety -

22 MR. VAN DINE: Yeah.

23 MR. FURGESS: - Administration study?

1 MR. VAN DINE: [inaudible] come out in 2009 as [inaudible].

2 CHAIRMAN MANNING: We've got a motion and a second. And do you know
3 what the vote was?

4 MR. FURGESS: Well, we'll revote because we didn't understand.

5 MR. VAN DINE: I think we were asking for clarification so it's revoked.

6 CHAIRMAN MANNING: All in favor? Opposed?

7 *[Approved: Cairns, Ward, Anderson, Van Dine, Green, Furgess; Opposed: Murray,*
8 *Palmer, Manning]*

9 CHAIRMAN MANNING: And for the Record, I'm opposed because of the
10 unknown. I'm not opposed to Mr. Kocy's recommendation. I think it is a valid
11 recommendation but if there is going to be a vote at the Council level I'd like to have the
12 opportunity to have some input in it.

13 MR. PALMER: And same with me. I just – if Council wants us to address it I
14 think we need to at least discuss and address it and take it up as opposed to not doing
15 anything; that's why I voted the way I did.

16 MR. VAN DINE: Does this – we don't – we can certainly take up this and have a
17 work session after this meeting even without having had the thing, and we can certainly
18 have our discussion -

19 MS. LINDER: Yes.

20 MR. KOCY: That's correct.

21 MR. VAN DINE: - in that time but my feeling is [inaudible] pressure having to
22 make a decision where individual language is crafted into any [inaudible] that time. And
23 I would therefore recommend that we do stay afterwards and have a work session to

1 discuss those things, discuss issues that are present [inaudible] but under the pressure
2 of having to make a decision on a [inaudible].

3 MR. PALMER: I don't know. I would think that whoever would be here to vote
4 on that would need to be present for discussions and I know someone will be taking
5 your spot. I don't know how long the report will take but we may have one or two more
6 people on when it comes times to vote on it. I don't know why we'd have a work
7 session a year before we're going to vote on something.

8 MR. VAN DINE: Well, I'm not suggesting that we are going to vote on - what I'm
9 suggesting is that the discussions we had to raise the issues that are of concern to
10 people and we will weigh some of the issues if in fact Council wants to take up at that
11 time. At least they will have the benefit of our discussion at the work session to look
12 back on. While we would not be making actual recommendations the concerns would
13 be raised and would be discussed during our work session.

14 MR. ANDERSON: Well also, Mr. Price brought up some good questions that I'd
15 like answered; dimensional standards. I know this is awhile away but I'd like to look at
16 some of the information or some answers to some of the questions he had regarding his
17 memo.

18 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Well, we're assuming that it's going to be awhile. It
19 could be next month they could take it up and vote on something and that's why I would
20 like, as Mr. Van Dine said, have the work session, have our comments be heard, and at
21 least have that go to Council if in fact they do take up something other than our
22 recommendation.

1 MR. KOCY: We have advertised for a work session after your agenda meeting
2 today so you are perfectly legal to have that work session on billboards.

3 MR. VAN DINE: And if we need it in the form of a motion to have it afterwards I'd
4 be more than happy to have a motion to hold the work session immediately after this in
5 order to take up those issues.

6 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Second?

7 MR. PALMER: I think it's on our Agenda.

8 MR. VAN DINE: I was just saying I didn't know if we needed one or not.

9 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Basically you will send forward to the Council the
10 recommendation that we table this until the traffic, I mean, the study, the [inaudible]?

11 MR. KOCY: Yes, sir.

12 MR PALMER: Just for clarification, Howard do you recognize that the National
13 Highway Traffic Safety Administration study [inaudible] issued in '06? I think you meant
14 to say the Federal Highway Administration.

15 MR. VAN DINE: Yes. I'm sorry. The Federal Highway Administration that is
16 coming forward in 2009.

17 MR. PALMER: Does that need to be a new motion or -

18 MS. LINDER: That's noted.

19 MR. VAN DINE: I think I referenced the '09 timeframe – got it wrong, pardon me.

20 MR. GREEN: Okay. You know, not to belabor this any longer but both from the
21 industry's perspective and from other perspectives, I mean, proposal A and B are so
22 drastically different. One changes signs every six seconds, one changes it every ten.
23 One has 1,000 NITS, the other's 7,500. One's 1,000' spacing, the other's 5,000'

1 spacing. You know, these are fairly technical issues that, you know, some how other
2 than just – what I don't want to do is just vote on this thing because I have the
3 impression it's either one thing or the other. And without the existence of some
4 technical data to assist us, you know, is it 1,000', is it 5,000', is it 2,500'. I mean, I am
5 literally guessing. And again I don't think it's fair to any of the parties involved for us to
6 simply be guessing at what is in essence to me very technical issues. You know, the
7 difference between 7,500 and 1,000 candles per square meter to me strikes me as a
8 pretty substantial difference. And I don't want to be in the business here of just running
9 averages out on all this stuff to say well we'll give everybody a little bit and we'll take
10 halfway in between. I'm not really sure how to deal and those seem to me to be the
11 very substantive issues of this thing.

12 MR. PALMER: Yeah. I'm not arguing for or against. I'm just saying we need to
13 act on it and I thought we could act on it after our work session where some of your
14 questions could be resolved but as now we won't act on it for a year. That's all I'm
15 saying.

16 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Well, we'll at least get our concerns out there on the
17 table and Council to deal with however they want. Okay. Item number seven, the
18 Comprehensive Plan.

19 MR. KOCY: Yes. This month's chapter is the housing element.

20 MS. LINDER: Excuse me, you've got item Text Amendment B.

21 MR. KOCY: Excuse me, I'm sorry, yes. Text Amendment B. Currently our
22 zoning code allows for, in the GC zone for residential housing to be used. It was
23 suggested by one of the County Council persons that it be amended to allow to be more

1 restrictive and not allow housing to be the 100% use. And the way we have drafted it in
2 Text Amendment B is that if it was going to be a stand alone housing it would be limited
3 to 25% of the site or if it's going to be a mixed-use you could have housing above the
4 first floor. The first floor would have to be general retail or services.

5 MR. GREEN: I guess my first question for Staff would be it hadn't been that long
6 ago where we adopted the current code and has there been a compelling reason why
7 this particular change is before us? I mean, obviously we talked about this at length
8 when we adopted the current Land Development Code.

9 MR. KOCY: It was a concern from a Council person that several large parcels
10 that had been rezoned were developed as housing and we were losing too much GC to
11 residential uses.

12 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I think the option of the mixed used is a good idea but
13 I'm not so sure that restricting it to 25% makes sense to me. I think flexibility in design
14 in the uses that you can put in there are beneficial. So I have a little bit of a problem in
15 taking the actual GC zoning or limiting GC zoning to reduce multi-family. I think it's – if
16 it's part of what we were trying to accomplish in the [inaudible].

17 MR. PALMER: Here's the problem that I have. I'm 100% in favor of a new
18 zoning classification which has all the GC uses in it but none of the residential, and that
19 if someone wants to come in and apply for that or apply for some other zoning and
20 Council says, no we don't think you should get the GC with the multi-family, you should
21 be just simply commercial then that's what it needs to be. But to go back and create
22 legal non-conformings of apartments that are built on general commercial properties
23 and other parcels that people perhaps didn't know what they were going to put there but

1 they applied for it knowing they had the flexibility. It's the same argument we had with
2 the M-1 zoning when M-1 got a sunset provision put in the old Land Development Code.
3 You know, basically this is - it's a down zoning of people's property. You're taking away
4 something that they currently have the opportunity to do and tomorrow they won't have
5 that opportunity when they got their property rezoned in the first place to include that.
6 So anything moving forward I would be absolutely in favor of a new zoning classification
7 that said here's the general commercial uses with none of the residential uses. We still
8 have GC on the books that includes the residential uses and it just has to go through
9 the rezoning process just like everything else. If you want to call it GC II or whatever it's
10 a new zoning classification just like we did with the TRO district. But as far as
11 amending the current GC and, I mean, there's no way to even – I mean, have you guys
12 taken a look at how many legal, non-conformings it will create?

13 MR. GREEN: I would think that – Mr. Chairman, I would think a refinancing of an
14 apartment complex built in a GC district would be daggone near impossible. You can't
15 rebuild, who's going to finance it?

16 MR. PALMER: Or expand.

17 MR. GREEN: Or expand.

18 MR. VAN DINE: Let me ask – it's not an outright ban however.

19 MR. KOCY: That's correct.

20 MR. VAN DINE: This is saying you can go forward with it as a special exception
21 so I don't think you actually create non-conformities because those properties would be
22 allowed – still allowed and anything coming forward would have to comply with those

1 particular special exception requirements. So I'm not sure you actually are creating
2 non-conformities by doing this.

3 MR. KOCY: That's correct.

4 MR. ANDERSON: It would still have to come before - if there was an existing
5 project, let's say a multi-family project and they were in phase one but they were going
6 into phase two and we enact this they would have to come back before us to finish that
7 phase?

8 MR. VAN DINE: No. If you're going to phase two they'd have to simply meet the
9 requirements that would be in effect at that point in time. I'm not sure -

10 MR. PALMER: Which is severely -

11 MR. VAN DINE: Yeah. I agree.

12 MR. PALMER: - less than -

13 MR. VAN DINE: You're right. There's no question about that. But I'm not sure
14 that you actually create a non-conformity, legal or a illegal non-conformity under the way
15 that it is proposed because special exception presupposes that it's allowed to happen,
16 there's just going to be certain requirements for you doing so.

17 MR. PALMER: No. That's special requirements not special exception.

18 MR. VAN DINE: Same thing.

19 MR. PALMER: Special exception still has to get approved from the Board of
20 Zoning Appeals.

21 MR. VAN DINE: Right.

22 MS. LINDER: This is not a special exception, just special requirements.

1 MR. PALMER: So as long as you would allow one single apartment to be built
2 on the site it would not be a legal non-conforming?

3 MR. VAN DINE: I'm not sure.

4 MR. PALMER: That's what Howard's saying. Is that as long as you allow them
5 to do –

6 MR. KOCY: More than 25% of the site could not be dedicated to stand alone
7 housing or if you were going to do housing at one building you could not have housing
8 on the ground floor. It would have to be non-residential on the ground floor if it was one
9 large building or if you had several buildings, 25% of the site could only be residential.

10 MR. PALMER: I think as a practical matter I think if like Gene says, if you try to
11 refinance an existing structure and you can't rebuild that existing structure on the site
12 it's not possible.

13 MR. KOCY: You could rebuild the existing structure, you just couldn't have –
14 you'd have to have non-residential on the ground floor.

15 MR. PALMER: You can't rebuild what's there.

16 MR. KOCY: You can't rebuild exactly what's there but you could rebuild high-
17 density housing. It would just have to have the first floor non-residential use.

18 MR. PALMER: Right. You could not rebuild what is there. You'd have to go
19 above and beyond what's there or build less than what's there.

20 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Which is going to require retail or commercial on the
21 ground floor -

22 MR. KOCY: Correct.

1 CHAIRMAN MANNING: - and it may not be appropriate. The market may say
2 that's not a good idea.

3 MR. KOCY: No. But it's on a site that's zoned for GC I would hope that enough
4 forethought went into zoning a site GC that it would be appropriate for non-residential
5 uses.

6 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Well, in a mixed situation it may change. I wish I was
7 smart enough to know where every apartment site should be and every commercial,
8 you know, and not be confined just to the zoning district. I'm not and the market
9 changes and the location is going to change too. So how did the 25% come about, not
10 50 or 40?

11 MR. KOCY: Just a number.

12 MS. CAIRNS: For the parcels that are zoned GC right now that are used
13 exclusively for multi-family could they just get – is the process of this get rezoned to –
14 because we have a classification for multi-family, right? They could be – I don't know
15 the codes and whatnot but there's another code that would allow them to be as they are
16 and rebuild as they are?

17 MR. KOCY: Yes.

18 MS. CAIRNS: So, I mean, to me this is sort of fixing a mistake in our code that
19 we allowed 100% residential in an area that was intended to be mixed use or 100%
20 commercial.

21 MR. KOCY: Correct.

22 MS. CAIRNS: So, I mean, there's a solution to avoiding that sort of grandfather
23 legal non-conforming issue –

1 MR. KOCY: Yes.

2 MS. CAIRNS: - for those sites that it's appropriate that they stay multi-family
3 regardless of their destruction by some forces?

4 MR. PALMER: Yeah. But you weren't here for the discussion on the new Land
5 Development Code when it passed and M-1 was supposed to be streamlined when it
6 came back through for rezonings from – if people had M-1 property and they wanted it
7 to be rezoned something that made sense and that's certainly not happening. So while
8 you say, yeah –

9 MS. CAIRNS: Well, I think it's because it's – I think it's because of this housing
10 element though. I mean, if GC didn't allow 100% – I mean the ones that I've seen that
11 have come forward on that where they're asking to go from M-1 to GC, you know, the
12 white elephant in the room is always that could go 100% housing.

13 MR. PALMER: Which is why we need to have a new land development new
14 zoning category that allows for commercial but doesn't allow for residential.

15 MS. CAIRNS: But to implement that land zoning on existing land would require
16 an entire like the whole comprehensive plan because –

17 MR. PALMER: We just did the TROS district.

18 MS. CAIRNS: - [inaudible] Council right now that changing this would be a down
19 zoning and I would offer you that nobody's going to come in and personally request a
20 down zoning of their property so we're going to create a land use category that won't
21 apply anywhere until we go through a whole comp plan.

1 MR. PALMER: No. It'll apply. We have a general – we will create a new zoning
2 district just like we did with the TROS district that's simply for intense commercial that
3 people come in and ask for that – it'll solve the problem from here on out.

4 MS. CAIRNS: Well, what would it allow that this doesn't, the current code
5 doesn't?

6 MR. PALMER: It will not allow multi-family, no residential.

7 MS. CAIRNS: Okay. So why would someone ask for it if all it does is eliminate
8 something they can currently have?

9 MR. PALMER: Because it gives you two, two possible requests now. You can
10 either request to have general commercial which has multi-family in it or you can
11 request general commercial without multi-family and when a tract clearly does not make
12 sense to have multi-family on it then they're not going to get approved for it. It's like
13 somebody comes in and asks for GC and it's clearly a neighborhood commercial they're
14 not going to get approved for it.

15 MS. CAIRNS: Right. But that doesn't address the currently rezoned GCs where
16 they're vacant lands nobody has, you know, invested in them outside of the purchase of
17 the land that right now could go 100% commercial. You're talking about the possible M-
18 1 people who come forward and say –

19 MR. PALMER: That.

20 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. But there's also the issue of all the existing GC that's not -

21 MR. PALMER: Yeah. All I'm saying is going back and – going back to '77 or '76
22 when the zoning codes were first initiated and people asked for C-3 and they got it and

1 they've had in their plans all these years well I don't know what's going on on this site
2 but I know I've got the option to do commercial or multi-family.

3 MS. CAIRNS: But you don't get vested rights in vacant land for the use.

4 MR. PALMER: I understand that. I'm saying it's the principle of it. I understand
5 because we've rezoned the TROS people and I understand they didn't have vested
6 rights either. So I understand what you're saying but I'm just saying as matter of
7 principle I consider it to be a proactive down zoning when you take away a person's use
8 that they currently have and tomorrow they won't have it.

9 MS. CAIRNS: Right. But if they've done nothing to act on it that's a right we
10 have.

11 CHAIRMAN MANNING: [inaudible] the text amendment it would reduce it by
12 25% and we need to look at changing the ordinance to separate residential and
13 commercial we could do that at another time but, you know, we need to address the
14 ordinance before us today.

15 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, you know, my concern has been over the loss of LI,
16 HI land going to residential more so than GC going to residential. I think we have a real
17 problem in the LI and HI categories. I'm not so sure that at least I've seen a problem
18 with having too little of GC zoned property. You know, I agree that going forward we
19 should address this but I would prefer to do it by creating a commercial only zone rather
20 than going through the process of – even if we could go back and notice everybody that
21 had apartments built on GC land and gave them an opportunity to come in and see
22 whether they wanted to rezone their land or not I think a cleaner way is to create a new

1 category. And therefore I would make a motion that, against changing the current code
2 as proposed.

3 MR. PALMER: Would you include in that motion that Council address creating a
4 simply - a purely commercial – a district without multi-family in it?

5 MR. GREEN: I would suggest that we as a Planning Commission request Staff
6 to bring us something to look at to recommend to Council.

7 MR. PALMER: I second that.

8 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Can you repeat your motion?

9 MR. GREEN: My motion would be to vote against the proposed change in the
10 Land Development Code as proposed and that we concurrently request Staff to create
11 language for a new commercial building district for our consideration to recommend to
12 Council -

13 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman.

14 MR. GREEN: - to address the issue.

15 MR. VAN DINE: If I could? I have a couple of concerns. The first is when multi-
16 family goes into a commercial district you start to get some of the uses where there may
17 not be appropriate buffers or other step downs if you will between the uses. While I
18 understand that it's now presently allowed in general commercial the question becomes
19 really is whether or not we ought to be doing that because of the fact that if you take it
20 all residential then you start to run into the problems of the residents saying, hey wait a
21 minute here so and so over there in the commercial district is starting to do something
22 wrong to me and they forget immediately that they are also in a general commercial
23 district and perception becomes reality and it doesn't really matter what we have for

1 underlying zoning. So I can understand the need to try and limit the use of commercial
2 for strictly residential uses and while I have [inaudible] with 25% and a few other
3 numbers which are arbitrarily chosen I think there has to be some way to deal with it
4 within the actual general commercial that we have presently. Setting up a new category
5 in my opinion simply throws another layer on top of things which nobody will ever use.
6 Because using the exact logic that Mr. Palmer's used why would you give up something
7 to simply go into a general commercial when you can sit there and leave all your options
8 open down the road and say, you know what? I don't know if I'm going to use this for
9 residential or not. It seems to me there ought to be some restrictions on the inclusion of
10 residential property within the general districts and I would be opposed to a new
11 category all together. I think the better approach is to take it in the form of special
12 requirements or some other form like that. I'm not suggesting that the ones we had
13 before are the appropriate ones -

14 MR. PALMER: [Inaudible] who will use it. It's people that tomorrow want a
15 commercial piece of property that may currently be zoned, you know, M-1 or, you know,
16 whatever – RS-2, and it's clearly a commercial tract of land and they want it to be
17 commercial. They'll come in and apply for the commercial rather than apply for the
18 general commercial that has multi-family in it because it's a commercial piece of
19 property. It's not a residential piece or property. But to penalize people who already
20 have the general commercial who don't know what they're doing with the property and
21 yesterday you told them they have the right to do this and tomorrow you have the right
22 to do this minus one is not fair.

1 MR. VAN DINE: But you're not telling them they can't do that and that is the
2 whole fallacy of the premise. You are telling them that they can do it but there are
3 special requirements that you must follow in order to do that. It is not an open-ended
4 approach putting residential in there, but it's certainly is an approach that allows them
5 the use but only under special requirements. So I don't think that we need, you know,
6 again I don't – if it's going to be looked at in the form of the Commission, Staff coming
7 back and giving us recommendations I'm not sure we need a whole new category. I
8 think you get the same benefit if you simply apply special requirements to future
9 developments that take place. You're not then forming any non-conformities or any
10 other type [inaudible] so. I know we have a motion on the floor to deny the request and
11 I think that's probably all I need to say at this point in time.

12 MR. GREEN: Just a question for Staff. You know, if, you know, if this change
13 were made and someone had a 80/100% site that was multi-family zoned GC and there
14 was a natural disaster and they needed to rebuild, then my interpretation of the way that
15 this thing is written is that they could only rebuild on 25% of that site.

16 MR. PALMER: Or they had rebuild with commercial underneath.

17 MR. VAN DINE: If adopted in the present terms and I'm suggesting that there
18 are other requirements that need to be looked at. I'm not saying these are the
19 requirements we ought to follow but I don't see the purpose of just trying to get an entire
20 new category because one of the things that we did do when we did the Land
21 Development Code was we tried to eliminate categories to lessen the amount of things
22 we had to keep track of and at this, you know, if we just add another one here and
23 another one here and another one here I think you start to get into more tracking

1 problems and more problems with what's going on. I'm not suggesting that these here
2 would be the right requirement and for that reason I would support Mr. Green's motion
3 to not send this forward with a recommendation of approval but I don't think we ought to
4 be going down the other road of developing new categories.

5 MR. GREEN: I would like to amend my motion simply to be a half of what my
6 motion was and that would be to not recommend adoption of this particular language
7 but to look further at the issues created by trying to deal with multi-family in a GC
8 district.

9 CHAIRMAN MANNING: We have a motion.

10 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Palmer would have to deal with that second.

11 MR. PALMER: I don't think we're quite grasping this. Let me just give you a
12 personal example. I came in or my company came, the company I work for came in
13 with a piece of property at I-77 y'all are familiar with it, I-77 and Killian Road. If there
14 was a classification available that was simply for commercial that would have been what
15 we applied for but that wasn't available. But the people who already have general
16 commercial property I don't think it's fair to penalize them. So that's who would apply
17 for it in the future. Those kind of tracts of land that are truly commercial. But to
18 penalize people that already have the option to go one way or the other and they've
19 assessed those and they don't know what they're going to do with them yet. I know
20 those tracts are out there. There's a lot of that stuff out in this County. And to tell those
21 people now, no you know what, your piece of property's really not commercial and you
22 probably were going to put multi-family on it whether it be town homes or apartments or
23 whatever it is, duplexes. Now you've got to go back through this whole rezoning

1 process and you've got to do additional things whereas yesterday you had the right just
2 to go out to your development community and get it developed. I don't think that's right.
3 I think in the future if we have a problem with this where there's too much multi-family
4 going on in GC and people are coming in and requesting GC and they're really putting
5 multi-family on it because they didn't want to go through the argument of putting multi-
6 family on it, then we need to stop that by saying, no there's a district that simply allows
7 commercial and if you want to put commercial on it that's what you apply for and that's
8 what you get. But I don't see that's what we're doing.

9 MS. CAIRNS: I believe you're talking about a parcel that was currently zoned M-
10 1?

11 MR. PALMER: It was.

12 MS. CAIRNS: Which allows virtually all commercial uses that GC allows.
13 Setbacks are a little bit different and this and that but, I mean, it allows commercial so
14 that was why that was the big underlying question, was why would go from M-1 to GC
15 when really all you do is add housing?

16 MR. PALMER: Well, because of the sunset provision that's in M-1. The
17 [inaudible].

18 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. But that's for - any vacant land has a chance of being
19 rezoned.

20 MR. PALMER: But not as high a chance as this does. When the Council has
21 said we are going to readdress this and people know that and banks know it and
22 potential tenants know it that they're going on a piece of property that's not zoned
23 commercial. But that's a different case; we've already had that discussion. But whether

1 it be M-1 or whatever else you're zoning to we just need a simple, pure classification for
2 commercial property and we don't have that.

3 MR. VAN DINE: And I guess what's before us right now is this language which it
4 seems to me that, and I may be wrong, but it seems to me it's pretty universal that the
5 language that's being proposed is not acceptable to the people here. Whatever
6 mechanism we want to alter that to make it work seems to be what we're talking about
7 here and so that we can deal with the issue before us I second Mr. Green's amended
8 motion that we just say we do not approve of this language that has been presented
9 here. I mean, the other discussions we're having are – will be for down the road and
10 how do we fix it and I don't think we're here today to make that decision.

11 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay. We got a motion on the floor and a second.
12 Yes, ma'am.

13 MS. LINDER: Just for clarification purposes then what you're saying at this time
14 is you do not want to take up the issue of allowing, of disallowing the multi-family in the
15 general commercial and that you do not want to propose any amended language to go
16 forward at this time?

17 MR. GREEN: I think what we would do is request of Staff, given the
18 conversation they've heard today and understanding the additional issues that have
19 been brought forth, that we look at different language.

20 MR. VAN DINE: Alternatives to what is being proposed.

21 MR. GREEN: Right.

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. So you're denying the ordinance that's before you -

23 MR. GREEN: That's right.

1 MS. ALMEDIA: - in this written form?

2 MR. GREEN: But requesting that we continue to work on the issue given the
3 items that were raised today.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: That's right.

5 MR. PALMER: But Council will address this issue at their next meeting because
6 our recommendation of denial will go to them and then they'll take action on it?

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Right.

8 MR. KOCY: That's correct.

9 MR. VAN DINE: Or – and I would just ask that Staff please let Council know that
10 this is not something we're just dumping back on them. It's something we want to
11 address but the language that was proposed was not language that we could support
12 assuming that's what [inaudible] comes down.

13 MR. PALMER: I think they'll probably get that message.

14 MR. VAN DINE: I'll call the question, Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay. All those in favor raise your hand. All opposed?

16 *[Approved: Manning, Ward, Anderson, Palmer, Murray, Van Dine, Green Furgess;*
17 *Opposed: Cairns]*

18 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Next order of business. Item number VII,
19 Comprehensive Plan.

20 MR. KOCY: This month's installment is the housing element of the
21 comprehensive plan. And I'd like to introduce the senior researcher and author of this
22 element, Julie Wilke.

1 MS. WILKE: Hello. How's everybody doing today? Okay. So this is the housing
2 element. Can you hear me? Second of nine that you've heard from population and
3 now housing. The housing element is going to address location, type, age, condition,
4 occupancy, and affordability of existing housing and projections for housing needs for
5 the future population. In 2000, the County had 129,793 housing units. This is a 42%
6 increase from 1980. Between 2000 and 2005, the County added an additional 16,047
7 housing units in that graphic just shows the change between 2000 and 2005. Currently
8 the Beltway has almost half of the housing units in the County at 49.3% and the North
9 Central planning area contains about 3%, that's the smallest amount of housing units in
10 the whole County. Between – we looked at permits that, residential building permits
11 that were issued in the whole County between January of 2000 and August of 2007,
12 and found that 26,870 residential permits were issued in the unincorporated parts of the
13 County. The majority were issued in the Northeast at 58% and the least amount of
14 residential building permits were issued in the North Central at 3%. This graphic here
15 shows occupied versus vacant housing throughout the County. Basically it just shows
16 that in the whole County, the County as a whole and the unincorporated parts of the
17 County, the occupied versus vacant ratio is the same; it's about 92 ½%. The Central
18 Midlands Council of Governments provided us with some housing projections through
19 2035 for occupied units. We weren't able to find any projections for total number of
20 units in the County but the COG provided projections on the total number of occupied
21 units and you can see that by 2035 the County will experience a 41% increase in the
22 number of occupied units in the County. This is an additional 1,400 occupied units per
23 year. The Northeast is anticipated to have the most growth at 89.3% and the Beltway's

1 expected to have the smallest at 14%. This graphic just shows in 2000, 92 ½% of
2 housing units were occupied, 61% by owners and 39% by renters. Among the Richland
3 County population, the Black population has the highest percentage of renters at 50.4%.
4 The White population has the highest percentage of homeowners at 63.2%. The North
5 Central Planning Area has the highest percentage of owner occupied homes at 77.1%
6 and the Beltway has the highest percentage of renter occupied homes at 48.4%. I'm
7 guessing the reason that number's so high though is probably because there's a lot of
8 collect students that reside in the Beltway so most of them rent.

9 MR. PALMER: Do you take into account, I guess you do, the incorporated areas
10 of Richland County as well?

11 MS. WILKE: Yeah.

12 MR. ANDERSON: How about the Fort?

13 MS. WILKE: Hum?

14 MR. ANDERSON: How about the Fort?

15 MS. WILKE: What's the – what do you mean?

16 MR. ANDERSON: Fort Jackson .

17 MR. FURGESS: Military.

18 MS. WILKE: The renter versus?

19 MR. FURGESS: Right.

20 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah.

21 MS. WILKE: I don't know exactly. I mean, that's something that would be easy
22 to find out but I didn't look at that exact – that particular. I think Fort Jackson is a
23 census tract all in itself and so it'd be easy to look at to find out. In 2000, 61% of homes

1 in the County were occupied by either one or two people and the average household
2 size was 2.4 persons. That's a decrease from 2.6 in 1990, and as we went over in the
3 population element that's – household size is continuing to decrease which is why the
4 number of housing units becomes important as the population increases and household
5 size decreases. You have to make sure you have enough housing to accommodate a
6 growing population. This graphic here I just liked because it shows the number of one-
7 person households, two-person households, and you can see two-persons households
8 are the largest percentage of the County at about 32% and then six and seven plus
9 households are below 5%.

10 MR. GREEN: One of the things we discussed in the population element was the
11 forecast that housing, household size was going to stabilize or maybe even lift up a little
12 bit and I notice that we still have that in here. Have we been able to go back and kind of
13 look at that issue?

14 MS. WILKE: The, all the statistics that we've seen show that household size is
15 decreasing. Even the statistics – well, there was some discussion with Ms. Cairns
16 about the statistical significance of numbers and things like that which I'm not a
17 statistical person so I'm not exactly sure how all that adds up but all the statistics that
18 we've seen show that household size is decreasing, not increasing and it's not really
19 stabilizing. It's decreasing at least slightly.

20 MR. GREEN: And I would just ask maybe in that – we don't need to get into a
21 discussion of maybe just to relook at Table 2-7 –

22 MS. WILKE: Okay.

1 MR. GREEN: - that basically shows over a 35-year period that statistic staying
2 relatively static. If we could just look at 2-7.

3 MS. WILKE: Okay. Do you want me to look at it right now?

4 MR. GREEN: No.

5 MS. WILKE: Oh, okay. I was just making sure.

6 MR. GREEN: Outside of our meeting.

7 MS. WILKE: Okay. I'll definitely look at that. Let's see, where was I? Oh, yes.
8 In 2000, 62% of housing units in the County were single-family detached. However,
9 between 1990 and 2000, multi-family dwelling units experienced the largest increase of
10 all types of dwelling units. They increased by 72% and the number of mobile homes in
11 the County increased by 19.6%. They also looked at the aging condition of homes.
12 Seventy-three percent of homes in the County are between 18 and 67 years old,
13 meaning they were built between 1940 and 1989. Census tract 10303 which is in the
14 North Central Planning Area has the youngest housing stock at a median age of five
15 years. It could just be because in 2000, when it was done there was a brand new
16 housing development in that census tract, but interesting enough. And Tract 7 which is
17 in the Beltway in the City of Columbia has the oldest homes at a median age of 61
18 years. Also in terms of condition in 2000, .5% of homes lacked adequate plumbing and
19 .4% of homes lacked adequate kitchen facilities. Home value is another indicator of
20 condition and kind of provides insight into the value of neighborhoods and communities.
21 In 2000, the median value of owner-occupied homes in the County was \$95,000. The
22 Northeast had the highest average value at \$103,545, and the North Central had the
23 lowest at \$65,067. And the way we were able to derive these numbers was by looking

1 at the value of homes in each census tract so it's an average of the median if that
2 makes sense. So you see we gave you the lowest median value for each planning
3 area, and then the average, and then the high. In the Beltway there's a large
4 discrepancy. See from \$51,00 at the low to \$226,000 at a high. Affordability. This
5 one's a little confusing. I tried to make this as simple as possible for presentation
6 purposes but when you read it in the actual element it's a little bit easier to comprehend.
7 The affordable housing, the Priority Investment Act addresses affordable housing and
8 provides a really precise definition which I didn't put here in the slide but it's provided on
9 page 12. It's kind of long and you have to read it about six times to really understand it
10 but it's based – affordable housing is based on 80% of the area median income. In
11 2007, the area median income in Richland County was \$58,200, so 80% of that number
12 is \$46,560, meaning that families that make, or individuals that make in that price range
13 would be, they could have affordable housing. The Priority Investment Act says that no
14 more and 28% of this \$46,000, should be spent on a mortgage, rent, related expenses
15 such as taxes and insurance and things like that in a given year. So based on how the
16 Priority Investment Act defines affordable housing, it could determined that in Richland
17 County affordable housing can be defined as housing costing no more than \$1,086, a
18 month or \$13,037 per year for a family that makes \$46,560. No more than three times
19 the person's salary should be spent on housing. In 2000, the median household income
20 for a family of four was \$39,961. Three times that amount is \$119,833. So when we
21 looked at the price of a median, a median price of a single-family home in 2000 it was
22 \$112,800, meaning that we had affordable housing in the County. However, it's
23 changing and since 2000, the median sale price of homes is rising faster than the

1 median household income and we're getting into a situation where now the median
2 price of a home is more than three times the median family income. So it's – while it's
3 not a huge problem right now it's becoming a problem so we just probably need to really
4 keep our eye on that. Goals for the housing element. The first goal is to provide
5 efficient housing opportunities that meet the employment base of the community. This
6 can be achieved through concentrating residential growth near employment centers and
7 creating development regulations that reduce sprawl. The second goal is to focus on
8 neighborhood revitalizations in areas that are in need. In order to improve this situation
9 the County should focus revitalization in areas where neighborhoods have reduced
10 housing values. Sorry. The third goal is to create a variety of housing choices such as
11 type, size, and price in every neighborhood in the County in order to accommodate all
12 different types of citizens. Hopefully this would lend itself to people living closer to
13 where they work which would reduce commuting costs, traffic, air pollution, and things
14 of that nature. There are several implementation strategies to achieve this goal
15 including providing workforce housing in all neighborhoods, creating a community land
16 trust, allowing greater density in subdivisions, developing affordable housing on County
17 owned land, providing incentives for builders that provide affordable housing and the
18 construction of senior housing in areas where seniors already reside, allowing them to
19 age in place. As an alternative to sprawl that's so prevalent in the County we should
20 focus on in-fill in order to accommodate a growing population while maximizing the use
21 of existing infrastructure. This can be achieved through neighborhood master plans that
22 offer a variety of housing options, identifying areas in the County that are prime in-fill

1 opportunities, amending the zoning ordinance to allow more units per acre and
2 developing an in-fill housing program. And that's it for housing. Questions?

3 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Yeah. I've have a question. The goals that are
4 established here are those the same goals that were published in the master
5 comprehensive plan?

6 MS. WILKE: No. These would be new goals.

7 CHAIRMAN MANNING: These have been revised?

8 MS. WILKE: Um-hum (affirmative)..

9 MR. KOCY: Yes, sir.

10 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I think it'd be great to be able to take, you know, a
11 workshop after each one of these sessions or, in the future, and sit down and go
12 through these goals item by item, line by line so that we don't get at the end of the
13 process and then have to come back through all of this but I think it would be helpful.
14 Part of the Staff [inaudible] workshops [inaudible].

15 MR. KOCY: Next month we'll do a work session, a workshop at the end of the
16 session to go over the goals for the housing, population and then next month we have --

17 MS. WILKE: Cultural resources.

18 MR. KOCY: - cultural resources and natural resources. We can do all four at
19 once.

20 CHAIRMAN MANNING: That'd be great.

21 MR. GREEN: Great.

22 MR. VAN DINE: Can I ask one question? When you're dealing with affordable
23 housing we always get into this discussion of what is -- what are we talking about

1 affordable housing? And I understand the definition that is being used here but to a
2 number of people the numbers that you're talking about as far as affordable housing
3 would not be considered affordable at all. And the question becomes how many people
4 actually fall below that level of affordable housing and some people may call it
5 subsidized housing or other things like that that come into play. And I'm wondering how
6 that factors into the housing element and the implementation tools that you've looked
7 at?

8 MS. WILKE: You're saying you want us to look at how many people would
9 actually fall in the range and be able to afford affordable housing?

10 MR. VAN DINE: Yeah, because I - affordability that I mean I hear - doesn't
11 afford like affordability under the federal standards that talk about affordable housing.
12 And I'm not sure whether we're taking that into consideration when we're dealing with
13 some of the implementation tools. It seems to me we're dealing with certain types of
14 housing above and beyond what may possibly be true affordable housing under the
15 federal standard.

16 MR. KOCY: The federal government has a very general definition of affordable
17 housing and that's 30% of your income should go to housing costs. And so affordable
18 housing is a range of housing choices, housing types, for people that have very low and
19 no incomes to multi-millionaires, that's the 30% target. So there will be, at the lower
20 income levels affordable housing might be subsidized rental housing to just rental
21 housing that, although it's not subsidized, it's got a very affordable rent for somebody
22 making you know \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year. And then there is the purchased, you
23 know, fee simple housing that would be affordable for incomes in the \$30,000, \$40,000,

1 and \$50,000 range. So affordable housing is a range of housing options. It's not a
2 housing unit that cost \$119,000. That's only affordable for a very narrow income
3 bracket. But you are correct, we should be, the Board should be considering a range of
4 housing options for affordability as we go through the comprehensive planning process.

5 MR. VAN DINE: And I guess what I don't see is, in the implementation that we're
6 dealing with the range of housing options and perhaps locations and perhaps other
7 things of that nature because as you said apartments are different depending on your
8 income levels or apartments are different depending on where you live.

9 MR. KOCY: Right.

10 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Also I think that it'd be important to break that down by
11 planning area. I mean, the Northwest is obviously different than the Southeast. She
12 indicated that we're having, beginning to experience some problems with affordable
13 housing where we weren't in 2000. It'd be good to know where, where are the problems
14 in 2008? Is the Beltway – the growth was not as high as in the Northeast but affordable
15 product was harder to find there. So that if you're going to direct incentives and certain
16 types of proactive measures to help stimulate that you'd know what area you're talking
17 about.

18 MR. KOCY: The incentives that would be most beneficial I think to the
19 development community would be to have realistic zoning categories throughout the
20 County. I think Richland County is no different than any place else in the U.S. The
21 affordable, the affordability problem is nationwide. The affordability problem in this
22 County is County wide. Throughout the County there are difficulties for people today
23 trying to find housing that matches their income. So the best chance to implement

1 affordability issues will be as the County relooks at their zoning and relooks at
2 development regulations to find, to create regulatory incentives for the production of
3 housing at all income ranges.

4 CHAIRMAN MANNING: But we, you know, in every one of the master plans that
5 we've dealt with to date incentives have been a part of that or least discussed as a way
6 to implement the plan. Yet have we've seen concrete incentives put on the table for
7 developers to look at. I mean, there may be some in development agreements on
8 special projects but from an overall master plan, incentives are always tossed out there
9 and density is always used as kind of a compensation for making these things happen
10 and that's not always the case, I mean. So I think we've got to direct some focus to
11 quantifying those -

12 MR. KOCY: Right.

13 CHAIRMAN MANNING: - and seeing if that can't become a reality. The County's
14 got to obviously participate in that process and it's how much money is – they're willing
15 to put on the table to create [inaudible].

16 MR. VAN DINE: I wonder about whether or not there's like a laundry list of
17 incentives that can be developed because as Deas is saying we basically have one
18 incentive that we've ever used as far as I know in the time I've been sitting up here and
19 that's a density bonus. There's got to be other incentives that can be made available to
20 make things happen and I'm not sure that we've ever looked at or gone down the road
21 of being able to create a list or create something that allows that list to be used.

22 MR. PALMER: Well, I not only – I would not only want to look at the housing
23 aspect of it and providing the housing but as we all know affordable housing is also a

1 function of our income. And as opposed to just providing lower income housing also
2 take a look at what we can do to get the income up so you don't have to provide as
3 much lower income housing. You know, it's which do you attack or do you try to attack
4 both? I mean, I'm sure people rather live in a nicer home, making more money so, you
5 know, I'd like to take a look at what can we do through this comp plan to incentivize
6 people to bring more better, higher paying jobs [inaudible].

7 MR. VAN DINE: I think there's also another [inaudible]. While we are talking
8 about the housing element right here incentives that we ought to be talking about are
9 not just incentives for housing development but commercial, and industrial, and other
10 type incentives that need to be in place in order to help. As Pat's saying, just because
11 you've got a house there there are services that go along with it. There are other things
12 that are necessary and those ought to be components of how we create a synergy or a
13 mass that can move forward. I mean, I think, I don't know that we've ever seen
14 anything on a development commercial side for an incentive that we've been able to
15 offer to somebody to come in to in-fill or to revitalize or do anything else. I mean, it's
16 always been talked about but we never actually get anything that says this is what we
17 think we can offer you or this is what we think we could do. And I'd love to these some
18 of those ideas just to float out there and see if there's anything out there that we can try
19 and get; understanding that Council's got to approve anything, but it certainly wouldn't
20 hurt to throw some of those things on the table for discussion.

21 MR. KOCY: Mr. Van Dine, your timing is perfect. The first item on our workshop
22 to begin immediately after the agenda session is the Decker Boulevard Redevelopment

1 Overlay which contains regulatory incentives to encourage reinvestment in the Decker
2 Boulevard.

3 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I think that's great.

4 MR. VAN DINE: I look forward to that discussion.

5 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Because all of the master plans need different types of
6 incentives. I think it would tend to have a credible discussion with the development
7 community if they knew what those were as opposed as having them [inaudible] into a
8 master plan as a way to get what we're trying to accomplish [inaudible] in each master
9 plan.

10 MR. KOCY: Mr. Manning, I have a PowerPoint presentation that I could certainly
11 show the Board next month at the workshop that discuss the regulatory incentives for
12 affordable housing. It's about a half a dozen regulatory tools that would be – that this
13 Board would have the authority to implement in the future and so I can certainly give
14 you that quick PowerPoint overview.

15 MR. PALMER: We don't have any authority do we? [Laughter]

16 MR. KOCY: Excuse me, to make - you have the authority to make
17 recommendations to the Council. Thank you.

18 MR. ANDERSON: I just have a quick question. There has been talk about
19 potentially putting a lot of this real time via the Internet. I know we're looking at some
20 statistics from 2000 as we rezone and as areas grow having that real time data via a
21 website or some type of local online where we can, where our comprehensive plan is a
22 work in motion rather than just this is what it is now, this is where we'd like to see it. We

1 can mold it to wherever the market goes. There had been mention of some of that – am
2 I bringing up? Is that ix-nayed now?

3 MR. KOCY: Well, we are getting ready to post the two elements that you have
4 reviewed so far on the Internet so people can pull them down and read them now as
5 opposed to a year from now when you adopt the whole document and forward it to the
6 Council. Real time data, I don't understand.

7 MR. ANDERSON: Not necessary real time data but the comp plan being
8 [inaudible].

9 MR. KOCY: Yes. We –

10 MR. ANDERSON: To where, you know, yes we're rezoning certain properties
11 and here's where the Southeast is, here's where we'd like to see it. Here's an overlay
12 of that. Here's where we need to scale back, and at the same point that we were
13 making earlier here where some possible affordable housing could go if we, you know,
14 can get some industry in here; if we can get some M-1, some factories to come in or
15 some HI.

16 MR. KOCY: We're not looking to rezone the County just quite yet but we are
17 posting the – all the community plans that have been adopted. They will be online as
18 will each element of the comprehensive plan after we present it to you. We're going to
19 put it online and solicit feedback, comments, critiques, from the public. We'll obviously
20 compile any feedback and critiques we get and forward them to the Board for your
21 consideration. But yes, we are going online by the end of this month with all these
22 documents.

23 MR. ANDERSON: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I don't know how the rest of the Commission feels about
2 this but I, you know, I thought we were going to be able to have some dialogue about
3 each element prior to posting. I would hate for the cart to get in front of the horse and
4 then we change something in it and, you know, we create a little bit of a problem in what
5 the community thinks.

6 MR. KOCY: They're going – well I'm suggesting we post them just as draft
7 documents, not that you've adopted anything, just for a public comment.

8 MR. PALMER: And we'll have a public work session prior to the adoption of this
9 thing all at once?

10 MR. KOCY: Oh, absolutely. Yes, yes, yes.

11 MR. PALMER: And possibly even, you know, work sessions on each individual
12 element like we did with the Land Development Code? Yeah. We put a draft of the
13 Land Development Code every time we did a draft, didn't we? Then people came to the
14 work sessions and commented on them.

15 MR. VAN DINE: They were changing even as the day that we were having the
16 meeting. [Laughter]

17 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Is that the end of the comp plan?

18 MS. WILKE: That's it.

19 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you.

20 MR. GREEN: Thank you.

21 MR. PALMER: What do we got left – how many have we got left?

22 MR. KOCY: Two down, seven to go and we're doing two next month.

23 MR. GREEN: Great.

1 MR. PALMER: Nice.

2 MR. GREEN: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN MANNING: So the next item for us to go over is the Decker
4 Boulevard?

5 MR. KOCY: Road name approvals is the next item.

6 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Who will give us the –

7 MR. PALMER: I make a motion to approve road names.

8 MR. GREEN: Second.

9 MR. VAN DINE: With one exception. We would hope that the spelling of the
10 name in the – at the -

11 MS. ALMEIDA: [Inaudible]?

12 MR. VAN DINE: Proposed [inaudible], something like that?

13 MS. ALMEDIA: I hope it's a misspell but I'm going to check them.

14 MR. PALMER: Getting approved as is right here. If they want to change it
15 they're going to have to come back and change it.

16 MR. VAN DINE: Let's post that on their sign.

17 CHAIRMAN MANNING: All in favor say aye. All opposed?

18 *[Approved: Cairns, Murray, Ward, Anderson, Van Dine, Green, Manning, Palmer,*
19 *Furgess]*

20 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I'd like to make a motion to adjourn temporarily and then
21 we'll come back to the Planning Commission workshop.

22 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, just as a, you know, I'm curious with the number of
23 people that we have here for the work session. If there's a preponderance of people

1 here for one issue versus the other maybe we can take that issue up first because I
2 suspect both work sessions may get extended in time.

3 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Would anybody be opposed to taking A and B out of
4 order?

5 MR. GREEN: I'm just curious what everybody's here for.

6 CHAIRMAN MANNING: All of those? Could we see a show of hands for those
7 who are here for digital billboards? For the Decker Boulevard redevelopment? I think
8 then we will go to the billboards first and get that out the way and come back to the
9 Decker Boulevard.

10 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, I move we adjourn to reconvene into work
11 session after a short break.

12 CHAIRMAN MANNING: All those in favor?

13 *[Approved: Cairns, Murray, Ward, Anderson, Van Dine, Green, Manning, Palmer,*
14 *Furgess]*

15 *[RECESS]*

16 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I'm going ahead and call the workshop [inaudible] to
17 order. I spoke a little hastily regarding the order of the workshop. We're going to
18 change back. The Decker Boulevard redevelopment is going first and then digital
19 billboards. We have [inaudible] from out of town and he needs to get back and we're
20 going to have a short presentation as I understand it and have a public hearing next
21 month.

22 MR. KOCY: Whenever you would like.

1 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay. With that being said could we go into the digital
2 billboard discussion?

3 MS. CAIRNS: Decker Boulevard. [Laughter]

4 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Decker Boulevard.

5 MR. PALMER: You're going to get fired the first day. [Laughter]

6 CHAIRMAN MANNING: First day.

7 MS. RUTHERFORD: We appreciate you guys. We appreciate you really
8 reconsidering your agenda. We do have some business owners from Decker who
9 we've graciously asked to come out today to just listen to the regulations and how it
10 would affect them and we do want to get them back to their businesses as soon as we
11 can. I'm Tia Rutherford, the neighborhood planner. We're going to present to you
12 today the redevelopment language, the corridor redevelopment overlay district for
13 Decker Boulevard primarily dealing with commercial corridor on Decker. It does not
14 encompass the entire planning area for the Decker Boulevard master plan. I do want to
15 introduce to you John Cock. I think he just stepped out of the room to check his cell
16 phone and I'm going to go find him. He is from The Lawrence Group, worked on the
17 Decker Boulevard master plan; Lawrence Group again out of Davidson, North Carolina,
18 worked on the Decker Boulevard master plan and again his firm was commissioned to
19 create for you the corridor overlay district. And as soon as he comes up we'll have him
20 talk about it. We did do an 8:00 o'clock presentation this morning to the ULI group.
21 They allowed us to come in. We got some really good comments from them and we're
22 hoping that what you see before you is going to jump start some innovative
23 development within that corridor.

1 MR. VAN DINE: Can I ask you a question real quick while we're waiting?

2 MS. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

3 MR. VAN DINE: Page three of what we handed out under C on E, it says,
4 "outdoor advertising signs" and then it says, "outdoor off premise advertising signs" with
5 a question mark after it.

6 MS. RUTHERFORD: Right. We're going to get some clarification for you on that
7 today as well. But again those are not permitted uses and we can answer that question.
8 Again and I'll let John Cock do that for you without us confusing ourselves as to what
9 we intended by this document. So again, Mr. Cock, if you could.

10 MR. COCK: Good afternoon. Good to see y'all again. John Cock with The
11 Lawrence Group. We're a town planning and architecture firm out of Davidson, North
12 Carolina and we had the pleasure of working with you all, and the County, and the
13 citizens of Decker Boulevard area on the Renaissance Plan which I believe y'all, or the
14 County adopted last March; is that correct? And so I'm here to talk today about the
15 implementation, one of the implementation steps of that plan. One of the
16 recommendations was some new regulatory measures for this corridor and I'll just get
17 right into it then. Let me get a copy [inaudible]. So again this is – what we're talking
18 about today is one of several dozen implementation recommendations out of the
19 Renaissance Plan but one of the priority recommendations was for new development
20 standards to help make, to help allow the type of development that was envisioned for
21 this area become a reality. All right? I'm [inaudible] I apologize for that. And you'll
22 recall the study area is that two-mile corridor that stretches from Two Notch Road to
23 Percival and it is about 731 acres in area of the 10 identified neighborhood planning

1 areas identified by the County. And looking at the existing zoning you'll see in red there
2 is the GC zoning that exists along most of the frontage of Decker.

3 MR. PALMER: Can you go back one slide?

4 MR. COCK: Sure.

5 MR. PALMER: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. COCK: And the lower density, single-family and - my mouse, I mean, my
7 pointer – lower density, single-family and higher density, multi-family that exists kind of
8 immediately off the corridor. So the plan itself just kind of as an overview had several
9 major recommendations; changing the perceptions on the corridor, both the physical
10 perceptions but also the mental perceptions that people have of this area through
11 economic development, through branding, through marketing but also through changing
12 the physical reality in the public realm as well as in the private realm. Part of what this
13 study included was looking at market potential or commercial and residential
14 development in the corridor and what that study showed is that in the near term housing
15 has the greatest potential. Commercial redevelopment will – is also possible but, you
16 know, our immediate need is new housing, new rooftops to help fill the need for the
17 growing demographic and also for potential employees from the base, for empty
18 nesters, and the earlier statistic that showed the folks that are living in one and two
19 persons households. Also a big demand for public open space and improvement of the
20 natural environment in that area. So the plan conceptualized commercial and
21 residential redevelopment along the corridor with mixed used buildings, higher density
22 housing off the Decker Boulevard frontage and wholesale redevelopment of some of the
23 vacant and underutilized parcels there. This is the intersection with Trenholm Road.

1 And looked at, you know, how the form of that development might take on the corridor in
2 the long term as some of these existing properties turn over. And this is a concept of
3 mixed used building with housing at the site of the existing Bi-Lo grocery store. And
4 again one of the primary recommendations of the plan was that there be new regulatory
5 tools to help make possible the type of development that was envisioned for the corridor
6 and applying the redevelopment overlay district which currently has a place holder in
7 the County code and the primary approach was twofold. One is to increase
8 development potential on the existing properties, through density, height, and the
9 number and types of uses that are allowed, reducing parking standards, reducing
10 buffers so that the people can get more on the land that they currently own, and at the
11 same time asking in return that there be higher standards for the development that is
12 the new development that is put in place on the corridor. And so what we have – the
13 draft that is in front of you we're proposing to call the corridor. We've changed the
14 name slightly, the Corridor Redevelopment Overlay District, and using the language
15 from the County code for the most part. The intent is very much the same; to promote
16 revitalization, to encourage reinvestment, and to encourage economic opportunity.
17 Again using existing County language the application of this overlay would require a
18 redevelopment plan such as the Renaissance Plan. It would be an overlay on existing
19 zoning, it would allow for higher density and mixed used development, and it would use
20 form based standards which pay more attention to the form of development. They don't
21 ignore use but place a higher emphasis on form versus current zoning standards which
22 are very much use based and largely ignore the form of development. And just a
23 couple of quick slides about form based coding. Again the emphasis is on the form.

1 Uses are secondary because the notion is that buildings' uses can change over time but
2 the if the form of the building is good it will stand the test of changes in technology,
3 changes in demographics, and you witness the reuse of buildings in your, in the historic
4 core of your County and your city that maybe once were large single-family houses that
5 are now law firms or something of that nature but the form of that building is the same.
6 The emphasis on mixed use building and in-fill and paying greater attention to the public
7 realm that buildings help create and so kind of in the hierarchy of standards. You know,
8 you begin at the street and look at how the building relates to the street in terms of
9 where the parking sits, the height of the building in relationship to the street, the roof
10 types, so that pitched roofs for example are typically residential in nature, flat roofs are
11 more commercial, building design, and then finally looking at the use. And so the draft
12 code that you have in front of you details six different building types and has
13 development standards for each of those types. The civic and institutional buildings
14 have the fewest design standards but the intent is that these are buildings that should
15 create anchors for the community whether it's schools, police sub-stations, or a city
16 government building as in this picture. The residential building types and the things that
17 make residential building types discernable as that type even though the use may be
18 something other than residential but are things like useable front porches that have a
19 depth that makes them useable versus just cosmetic. Garage doors that are behind the
20 front façade of a house, entrances that are raised above the sidewalk grade, and this
21 would apply both to higher density residential building types as well such as apartment
22 buildings. For mixed used buildings there are requirements for the amount of [inaudible]
23 windows and doors along the frontage to create pedestrian friendly spaces, inviting

1 spaces, that entrances would be where pedestrians can easily access them and that
2 building requirements would be appropriate to the area and to the type of [inaudible].
3 So what Staff asked us to do was kind of look at the development standards in this
4 proposed district and compare them to the existing development standards and since
5 the majority of the corridor is GC and since initially the proposal is that this would just be
6 applied along the corridor frontage and not necessarily in the neighborhoods, we looked
7 at what is allowed in GC and compared it to what is proposed in the draft CRD
8 regulations. You can see in these pictures this is kind of what 16 units to the acre can
9 get you. In Florida [inaudible] to 16 so this is not a high density and that's kind of where
10 you're capped out in GC currently. What the CRD is saying is that the density would not
11 be capped, it would be however much you could get based on the dimensional
12 standards would be what that density is allowed. But the hope is that it could go above
13 16. That maximum height, the buy right maximum height would be increased from three
14 stories which is currently allowed in GC to whatever the width of the fronting road is.
15 And in the case of Decker Boulevard that's 65' from face or curb to face of curb which
16 yields a four to five story building depending on the types of uses that you would put in
17 that building. But, you know, easily that's four to five stories. So a greater buy right
18 building height is proposed. And again just showing the notion of the relationship of the
19 building height to the fronting street and that's a three-story building but you can see
20 that it has a presence of a larger building. You can go higher than that currently. In GC
21 you can go higher than six stories but it requires a special exception and limitations on
22 lot coverage. What we're proposing in CRD is that there would be no maximum lot
23 coverage and that you could actually get one additional story if 100% of your parking is

1 behind commercial buildings. We're also proposing to reduce the setbacks, the building
2 setbacks so that buildings could be closer to the pedestrian realm of the street. This is
3 a picture from Boulder, Colorado on a similar arterial type street, new mixed use in-fill
4 product. That parking requirements would be dramatically reduced with the notion that
5 the developers are best suited to determine how much parking they would need but also
6 to allow them to take advantage of sharing parking with surrounding property owners
7 and making use of on-street parking where that would be appropriate; but another way
8 to allow more development potential for building versus storage of motor vehicles. And
9 part of that is allowing on-street parking to count towards your minimum parking
10 standard and allowing for landscaped areas that are required in parking lots to be
11 combined so that you could take your total area of landscaping and put it into larger
12 combined areas that would have a bio-retention function which would also as an
13 incentive count towards any required open space that you're required to provide so
14 we're trying to kill several birds with one stone in that process. And furthermore
15 reducing the actual amount of space that you need to provide for a parking stall;
16 currently it's 18' but what this, the draft code is saying is that you could – two of those
17 18' or more than 10% could be given over to overhang into a bio-retention field
18 landscape area that would serve to take some of that storm water runoff. So again
19 reducing the amount of area that you have to devote to parking but also increasing that
20 storm water function. The draft text also proposes that no buffers would be required
21 within the district between uses. You would still need to provide buffers between less
22 intense uses that are outside the district and screen things like solid waste areas and
23 parking lots that abut the street but not to buffer between uses. And this is a

1 requirement that already exists in your town and country district. We took that language
2 and a lot of the language we tried to use as much as possible language that you have
3 already adopted in your Land Development Code. One of the recommendations of the
4 Decker Plan is to increase the pedestrian facilities in the area and so the CRD district
5 proposes that versus that kind of the one size fits all sidewalk requirement that currently
6 exists that your sidewalk requirement would be based on your use, the type of fronting
7 street, and so on major arterials for example you'd be required to provide at least six
8 feet. Where ground floor retail abuts the sidewalk you would be required to provide
9 wider sidewalk and where uses were contemplated to be more sidewalk intensive, retail
10 or sidewalk cafes you might provide up to 16'. Signs is another difference in this district.
11 Currently in GC you can build a free standing sign up to 50'. You can only build a 35'
12 building by right but you can build a 50' sign. And one of the comments from
13 stakeholders in the plan was just the visual character of Decker needing to be changed.
14 So much of it is defined currently by this barrage of pole signs so make – outlawing
15 those as well as billboards and making ground mounted signs the standard in the
16 district is in the current draft. In terms of open space, currently in GC open space
17 applies to residential subdivisions only up to 10% of the area only 50% of which has to
18 be usable. We're proposing in the CRD that the amount of open space provided would
19 be based on the number of units and as your development gets closer to publicly
20 accessible open space the less you have to provide. So if you're next door to a park or
21 across the street from a park you would provide no additional open space in your
22 development. The further away you go you would provide more up to 2% of the area in
23 a mixed-use development. And it would have to be 75% usable. We've also written in

1 a payment in lieu option such, so that new open space could – payment for open space
2 could be provided to develop new open space, public open space in the corridor. And
3 then have extensive design standards for that open space in the district. In terms of
4 streets we've included recommendations and again all of these recommendations are
5 referenced directly and come from the recommendations in the plan, things we heard
6 from the public and from property owners and business owners on the corridor but –
7 that streets shall interconnect, that street frontages shall be upgraded in accordance
8 with streetscape recommendations in the plan, that new driveway spacing standards
9 would be implemented to improve motor vehicle/pedestrian safety along the corridor.
10 That planning strips would be required between the sidewalk and the street. This is
11 from a major arterial in Denver, Colorado and notice the ground mounted sign there and
12 the street trees. As well as pedestrian scaled street lighting and traffic impact analyses
13 for developments of significant impact. Now the draft also includes a list of uses that
14 would not be permitted in the overlay and many of these again were identified through
15 the planning process but these are things that currently are allowed in GC; pawn shops,
16 truck washes, motor vehicle go cart tracks, sexually-oriented businesses, etc. But the
17 draft also includes some additional uses that are not currently allowed including many
18 different types of dwelling units. So the draft proposes that these dwelling unit types
19 would be allowed by right and that residential uses in the overlay would not comprise
20 more than 75% of a new development. And just to finish up, I have a 20/15 vision of
21 what development might look like on the corridor according to these standards. And I'll
22 take your questions.

1 MR. GREEN: Since – I guess one issue for me is you were mentioning that this
2 overlay district would not apply to the entire study area.

3 MR. COCK: That's the proposal and I'll let Joe respond to that.

4 MR. GREEN: Correct. This is a map that shows the area -

5 MR. KOCY: We will – I mean, I have drawn up a map. This is primarily with
6 properties that front on Decker Boulevard itself.

7 MR. GREEN: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN MANNING: So the plan that we approved previously [inaudible]
9 incorporated a much larger area so are we eliminating that from the plan or are we
10 going to –

11 MR. KOCY: This is phase one. This is the phase one implementation of just the
12 primarily commercially zoned properties, many of which are vacant or underutilized that
13 front Decker Boulevard. The communities behind it are more residential in nature, are
14 much more stable. There's not nearly the vacancy that there is on the commercial
15 properties. We'll deal with them in the future.

16 CHAIRMAN MANNING: John, as that picture shows the whole plan really is
17 [inaudible] in my opinion and to create that kind of look up and down Decker Boulevard
18 is going to take a huge amount of money. And all we've heard for the last three or four
19 years about redevelopment downtown and the cost overruns and the delays. You
20 know, it didn't go as well as everybody expected. Is there any public funding element
21 attached to this because I'm concerned we're going to do this and if we don't have a
22 capital facilities plan in place to implement we've done nothing but create a catch 22 for
23 a lot of people that live there.

1 MR. COCK: I'll give you – Joe, let me respond and then I'll let you answer the
2 capital question. You're absolutely right but remember this is one, this is just one piece
3 of probably close to 50 total recommendations that are in this plan and many of those
4 recommendations have to do with capital investment. So this is just the regulatory
5 piece but you're absolutely right, it has to go hand in hand with public investment. But
6 just to put it in perspective let's say just to be wildly, wildly optimistic the County had \$50
7 million to spend on Decker Boulevard to get all of this done. That would probably be on
8 the order of magnitude close to what one private redevelopment project might cost. So,
9 you know, when you're comparing that the public investment is going to be is so
10 important and it's so symbolic but it's going to be like this compared to the private
11 investment and, but you're right, it's very important. But not – it's separate from the
12 regulatory piece which is trying to promote the private investment.

13 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Are you saying we need to have an element attached or

14 –

15 MR. COCK: I'm not –

16 CHAIRMAN MANNING: - [inaudible] do the regulatory [inaudible] and then worry
17 about that later?

18 MR. COCK: I think the regulatory piece can happen today because folks want to
19 reinvest and they want to get the maximum utilization of their property today. They can
20 do that and then hopefully as the years progress, the County and the state can come up
21 with some money to complement that. But I don't think you need to hinge one upon the
22 other. The City of Charlotte is doing, and I know people never like to hear analogies
23 from places up North, but the City of Charlotte your northern neighbor is doing these

1 types of overlays on about a dozen first ring suburban commercial strips and at the
2 same time they – I mean, well the overlay was put in place first because that was the
3 cheapest, most efficient thing the city could do. A couple of years later they – well
4 maybe five or six or 10 years later they might come up with one or two million dollars
5 per quarter but, you know, again that's small change compared to the private
6 investment which is going to be tens and hundreds of millions.

7 CHAIRMAN MANNING: There's a lot of private investment in Charlotte
8 [inaudible].

9 MR. COCK: That's correct.

10 CHAIRMAN MANNING: They've got funding sources that [inaudible].

11 MR. COCK: Well, they have the same very nominal funding sources which is
12 why they ask the private sector to get involved and the idea is we allow you more
13 development potential and what we're asking in return is you give us a better
14 streetscape.

15 MR. VAN DINE: If I understand what is being proposed this is an overlay district
16 not mandatory on anybody. If it's put in place everything that's presently there can be
17 done same as it could under the present rezoning. If you would chose to adopt to come
18 under this then you have to meet these requirements; is that -

19 MR. KOCY: Correct. If I could expound on that just a bit. This overlay's an
20 option and it provides a wider range of development options for property owners. I think
21 the overlay does a very good job of recognizing that redeveloping a site, especially
22 redeveloping a large site, has much greater cost than redeveloping a green site. And in
23 return this overlay provides a – what greater return on your investment and greater

1 development potential on each site. It allows for bigger buildings with no limit on density
2 just a limit on the size of the building, greater mix of uses, taller buildings, much lower
3 parking standards including minimal spaces, shared parking and on-street parking to
4 count toward your parking requirement. It does require greater amenities for the
5 community by having better landscaping, smaller signs and fewer signs, and requiring
6 some bio-retention for storm water which are more beautiful than storm water detention
7 basins and also enhance water quality. But in general we provide much greater
8 development options that would be – again an option but a greater range of
9 development choices for any commercial properties inside the development overlay
10 district.

11 CHAIRMAN MANNING: So explain to me how you create the overlay but
12 [inaudible] in or out. Is there – how does that work? It seems to me that everybody
13 along Decker Boulevard would have to [inaudible]?

14 MR. PALMER: Just for example if Decker Mall – if somebody came in and
15 bought it and wanted to put something else that conforms to the current GC zoning.
16 They wanted to put a shopping center on the street with two rows of parking in front of
17 it, typical storm water retention on an acre pond, they can do that?

18 MR. KOCY: They could do that or they could use the development overlay
19 options and go up to five stories as opposed to the three story that the current zoning
20 allows for and put up one-fifth the amount of parking that the current zoning allows for.
21 They could do that too.

22 MR. PALMER: They chose between either option?

1 MR. KOCY: They could chose between either option. What they could not do is
2 do three story as under the current zoning and then chose to put in 20% of the parking
3 as proposed by the overlay option.

4 MR. PALMER: Right.

5 MR. GREEN: So you get that - anybody can opt out of this if they want to?

6 MR. KOCY: That's correct.

7 MR. VAN DINE: This is more an opt in than an opt out.

8 MR. KOCY: This is more opt in than opt out. If you're going to, and primarily it's
9 going to be people – encouraging people to tear down obsolete or abandoned buildings
10 and put up much bigger facilities than currently exist.

11 CHAIRMAN MANNING: What about the uses, is that opt in or opt out?

12 MR. KOCY: If you – there are some non-permitted uses in the overlay. No
13 motor vehicle repairs, no outdoor storage of cars, no sexually-oriented businesses.
14 There are a list of available current uses in the underlying zoning that would not be
15 available if you chose to take advantage of the optional zoning.

16 MR. PALMER: So if I bought Decker Mall and I wanted to put in a topless auto
17 dealership I could do that?

18 MR. KOCY: You could do that but not under the development regulations of the
19 overlay district.

20 MR. GREEN: Your father wouldn't like it but –

21 MR. PALMER: No. I wouldn't have a job anymore.

22 MR. VAN DINE: Just out of curiosity it seems to me we've been having problems
23 with DOT allowing things like even sidewalks on Clemson Road and a few other issues

1 like that. How much are we going to be able to actually do on Decker Boulevard without
2 DOT or the state's approval of what goes on them? I mean, are they going to have to
3 have input on to what happens and what doesn't happen, because it's a state road as I
4 understand? So –

5 MR. PALMER: And one side of it's in Forest Acres.

6 MR. VAN DINE: Let's assume that we have – we come up with \$5 million and
7 you decide to do something along that road, the state has to approve whatever you do;
8 correct?

9 MR. KOCY: I don't know how South Carolina DOT works but I have yet to find a
10 state DOT if you came to them with a check for \$5 million to invest in the beautification
11 of a state roadway you wouldn't get their immediate attention and maximum cooperation
12 from them.

13 MR. VAN DINE: I'm thinking of access points and other things like that that
14 would be in the mix as to -

15 MR. COCK: Mr. Kocy, if I could – if you don't mind I'll be happy to add to that.

16 MR. KOCY: Certainly.

17 MR. COCK: We met with SCDOT during the charette process and, you know,
18 every cross section that is presented in the plan we kind of vetted through them. So
19 there's not really anything in there that's kind of way out there that they wouldn't be
20 willing to consider. They are very much – they want to reduce driveways, they want to
21 limit access. Those are all things that they are already today in favor of and in terms of
22 other things, we're talking about 11' lane widths which are things, you know, they - if

1 you talk about nine and 10 they start to get heartburn but they can live with 11. So it's
2 nothing that radical and it's completely consistent with things that they would approve.

3 MR. VAN DINE: It seems to me from an implementation process, as Deas was
4 saying the first step has got to be dealing with the road. How are you going to get
5 somebody to come in to an overlay zone where there's been nothing occurring out on
6 the road which is the public aspect of it, and I'm not sure how you get somebody to
7 come in say, hey this is a good idea let's go ahead and do this unless we're willing to
8 make an investment up front; a public investment, not a private investment.

9 MR. PALMER: This is the same DOT that won't allow a private entity to put
10 sidewalks on Clemson Road so why are they going to let us put vegetation in the same
11 strip that's going to possibly fall on someone's car that they've got to maintain.

12 MS. ALMEIDA: We have been dealing with DOT in the past couple of months
13 and they are revisiting the issue of the sidewalk situation on the right-of-way. One of
14 the things that we have encountered, in order for the County to go after any sort of
15 federal funding we need to have a plan in place. That is the first thing they ask and
16 DOT works in the same venue. They want to see a commitment from the County, they
17 want to see a plan that we endorse, and they want to buy in or buy out but they want to
18 see something master planned out and this is what this is in order to get their okay.

19 MR. VAN DINE: But don't they also want to see you taking affirmative steps to
20 implementing the plan?

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Absolutely.

22 MR. VAN DINE: And I guess my question is where are we getting the affirmative
23 steps or where are we getting the funding to start the affirmative steps to move forward

1 into something like this to make people that really believe that we're serious about what
2 we're doing.

3 MR. KOCY: I think the first affirmative step this Board could take would be to
4 adopt some flexible land use regulations to create a favorable environment for
5 investment and redevelopment. Unfortunately, the current state of affairs in the County
6 and in the state with the slow down in the economy there is not, there are not millions of
7 dollars available to spend for public improvements on the various corridors in the
8 County that we would certainly like to see the investments occur in. What we could do
9 is create a favorable environment on underutilized properties in Decker Boulevard to try
10 to attract reuse.

11 CHAIRMAN MANNING: At the same time I think we need, from the public side,
12 we need to create tax incentives maybe like the Vista did. There's got to be funding
13 sources put in place to make this happen or you won't see the [inaudible]. And I'm not
14 saying you don't go forward with the overlay; that is the first step. I understand the
15 federal side [inaudible] a plan but there's got to be a commitment from Richland County
16 to say, okay we're going to follow this plan through. We've had two or three plans come
17 before us, this one, the Southeast Master Plan, and none of them have that funding
18 element attached to it and if they sit there and don't go forward as planned we've lost
19 the public trust. And I think if we're going to spend our time doing the hard work and
20 getting their – the people who live there to buy into the plan then we certainly owe to
21 them to follow through with that step which is most critical.

22 MS. RUTHERFORD: I want to address [inaudible]. Staff has looked into funding
23 options, you know, the streetscape, federal grants that are available to Richland County

1 to use as an implementation tool for your streetscaping. But those plans again are
2 calling for a master plan that's in place that identifies where the improvements should
3 be. So I think we are taking the appropriate steps in creating the master plan, creating
4 the overlay regulations, and then now turning to you as a Planning Commission for your
5 recommendations to Council as to what's our next step for that large funding pool. As it
6 stands right now Richland County is eligible for a T-21 grant that's 80/20% match.
7 Richland County needs 20%. You know, we've heard earlier the idea of under
8 grounding utilities what have you, that's a pretty expensive feat. So we're looking right
9 now, let's do it in phases, let's start with the private reinvestment back into the corridor
10 that kind of got us where we are now. We've let some realtors move a little further up
11 the highway. Let's come back and reinvest in this community and then phase – go into
12 a phase into a possible streetscape if that's the next step as to how we make this
13 picture come to fruition.

14 MR. PALMER: How is this, and I guess I'm just reading it wrong but if the
15 Council imposes this overlay district, they see one or more – two or more of these
16 conditions apply and they impose a overlay district on Decker Boulevard, everyone has
17 to abide by this to redevelop.

18 MR. KOCY: No.

19 MR. PALMER: Then how's it going to work at this – I take it for granted this is
20 where the Bi-Lo Center is; this is where this snapshot's taken from because I see the
21 McDonald's or something.

22 MR. KOCY: Right.

1 MR. PALMER: All right. Say somebody wants to come in and put you know \$10
2 million into that and the guy next door all the rest of the way down, you know, he doesn't
3 want to do anything and that gets redeveloped as a typical auto dealership or whatever
4 else. It's – how are you going to get somebody to go spend that kind of money when
5 they're next door neighbor's not going to?

6 MR. KOCY: Are you directing that question to me?

7 MR. PALMER: Anybody that can answer it.

8 MR. KOCY: I think with the overlay district if you put enough incentives to abide
9 by the overlay district you'll make it financially – so financially feasible no one will want
10 to do the base zoning because the return on their investment is so much greater by
11 taking advantage of the overlay.

12 MR. PALMER: And how's that initial desire going to be there to get those
13 tenants back there? What's going to bring Target back to this area?

14 MR. KOCY: Two things; favorable land use regulations that will allow them to
15 build a large enough store with not too much parking so they're not buying more ground
16 than they need.

17 MR. PALMER: Those guys love parking.

18 MR. KOCY: And demographics of the surrounding community to know that the
19 market currently exists in the Decker Boulevard sites, that there are enough rooftops
20 there to support a Target.

21 MR. PALMER: It's the same rooftops that were there when they left.

22 MR. COCK: Well, actually what the market study said is that although they
23 maybe the same rooftops in numbers they – it's a different demographic because

1 basically the rooftops that are there have kind of aged out. And so what is needed is
2 that new disposable income group, you know, the first time homebuyers, the young
3 renters. There needs to be more new housing options and that's what will bring back
4 more commercial is – and that's kind of what we heard from retailers.

5 MR. PALMER: How do you get the rooftops back? How do you get young
6 people to want to live there when they can go live out at the Village for the same price
7 they're going to live here and they've got all the shopping and the –

8 MR. COCK: Well, I think there are demographics. There are folks that work at
9 the base that would love the location of Decker if there were some other housing
10 options available for example. I mean, locationally this is a great spot but in terms of
11 the housing options very, very limited.

12 MR. VAN DINE: I think it's interesting, one of the things that was just said. I live
13 in Forest Acres not too far from Decker Boulevard and when I moved in 15 years ago I
14 was like a baby on the street. Everybody else who was there was either over 55 or
15 getting ready for whatever home they were heading to. In the last 15 years I think that
16 there are now probably only two original residents and we have more kids running up
17 and down our street than we've ever had and that's in the area. I don't know if it's
18 moving further and further out or it's a Decker area but if that's true of the area that's out
19 there then there would be a new demographic change and there would be younger
20 people.

21 MR. COCK: That's not really happening in Woodfield Park unfortunately. I
22 mean, you have 1,100 square foot houses that were built in the '50s, '60s, and '70s and

1 for what you can – it just cannot compete with the new housing that's being offered two
2 and three and four miles out.

3 MR. VAN DINE: If I go back to my original question, not to put too fine a point on
4 there, is the County willing to put its money where its mouth is to make this work? And
5 I'm sure anybody in this room can answer that question but it seems to me that you
6 need a commitment for that very thing in order to make something like this work. You
7 can put all the great plans you want to in place but if the County's not willing to support
8 it financially then I'm not sure how much is actually going to work to put these plans in
9 place. I'm not suggesting the plan isn't a good idea as a starting point but I question,
10 based upon the eight years I've spent here, how much the County is really willing to put
11 its money where its mouth is.

12 MR. KOCY: I don't know that the County has enough money to put where its
13 mouth is for all the areas that need attention in the County. I can tell you based on the
14 very restrictive, existing zoning and land use regulations that are in place on Decker
15 Boulevard the reason those buildings sit vacant is because they're obsolete buildings
16 and the cost of rehabbing them or tearing them down and replacing exactly what's there
17 doesn't make financial sense to any landowner. What this optional overlay is is just an
18 option and it's the first step and it's really a no harm, no foul step. If you do the optional
19 overlay and it's a bust and it doesn't provide enough incentive for any property owner to
20 reinvest in his site it doesn't harm anybody. It's just – it's an overlay optional regulations
21 that no one's taken advantage of.

22 CHAIRMAN MANNING: The only thing that would concern me about that is how
23 will the potential buyer of that corner right there where that building is [inaudible]

1 everybody and it didn't turn out to be that. It's just a weak link in the chain. I mean, if
2 you don't create the total vision I don't think you'll ever get to the end.

3 MR. KOCY: How does the County create a total vision along that highway that's
4 made up of dozens of different property owners?

5 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Well, just – Pat was mentioning a minute ago if you
6 decide to go in there and do the topless auto wash right there –

7 MR. PALMER: Dealership.

8 CHAIRMAN MANNING: - what would invest next door to him?

9 MR. KOCY: Right now the current zoning does not prohibit him, Mr. Palmer,
10 from opening a topless car dealership there. The new overlay would prohibit that. But
11 there's – other than the County condemning the entire corridor and taking control of all
12 the properties and ensuring that nothing went in that would harm any other County
13 investments that's the nature of land use regulations; that any property owner anywhere
14 in this County has – always has the potential for a bad neighbor moving next door, be it
15 a commercial or residential neighbor.

16 MR. VAN DINE: I think fundamentally what we're looking at is we need to take
17 the first step.

18 MR. KOCY: Correct.

19 MR. VAN DINE: And I think what you're saying a plan such as this – maybe not
20 in its exact form but such as this is the first step provided it's a voluntary plan and not a
21 – not something that is required of people. Is that what I'm basically hearing?

22 MR. KOCY: Correct. We're not trying to make outlaws of anybody on Decker
23 Boulevard. We're just giving them options if they want to do something different.

1 MR. PALMER: I don't think the incentives are there. For example, with Target,
2 those guys want more than four per thousand; they don't want less.

3 MR. KOCY: That's an option for them to put more than four.

4 MR. PALMER: What I'm saying but that's one of your incentives. What would be
5 in the incentive? I'm Target, I come – all right. I'm going to look at Decker Boulevard
6 again. I get to add a fourth story to my building. You know, I get to put vegetation in my
7 parking lot. I don't understand what – why I would go there as opposed to going
8 somewhere else that's cheaper dirt and I can build exactly what I want on it as opposed
9 to trying to retrofit something for Decker Boulevard?

10 MR. KOCY: Because you're surrounded by existing housing on Decker
11 Boulevard and there are 4,400 civilian employees a mile up the street at Fort Jackson
12 that would be your potential customers.

13 MR. PALMER: But they've already left that once.

14 MR. COCK: Well, I think Target may not be – Target's not going to be the first
15 folk, set of folks in the door. Again, kind of the market study said the commercial is not
16 going to be the first set of redevelopment out here; it's going to be the housing. The
17 base wants to relocate 80% of their on base housing off base.

18 MR. PALMER: Okay. With all that general commercial out there somebody can
19 put 16 units per acre, since we didn't change that today. They can only put multi-family
20 out there. But there's obviously not a need for it or someone would have done it by now
21 because there's large enough tracts out there to do it but nobody's done it so there's
22 nobody knocking at Decker Boulevard's door saying, I need apartments out here or
23 somebody would have done it.

1 MR. KOCY: Maybe 16 units per acre isn't enough for the redevelopment cost of
2 Decker Boulevard or tearing down a building and ripping up asphalt.

3 MR. COCK: Aren't there new town homes going up behind the old Target site?

4 MR. PALMER: There are. There are. And it's still up in the air to see how they'll
5 do.

6 MR. VAN DINE: I guess fundamentally it boils down to, is this a good first step
7 on a voluntary basis to see if it works? If it doesn't work, other than perhaps someone
8 making an investment based upon something like this, what harm is it to take the first
9 step? I mean, that's fundamentally what it comes down to and, you know, I, obviously
10 I'm not in the development community but, and they would all look at each one of these
11 incentives or other things and perhaps want additional incentives that they might be
12 able to negotiate. I don't know. But, you know, if we're doing it on a voluntary basis
13 and it's something for the entire area to try and get behind it's a good step to head in
14 that direction. I don't know why we wouldn't want to do that.

15 MR. GREEN: All I would ask is, because I read this thing pretty carefully, is I
16 didn't see any opt in language in the ordinance.

17 MR. PALMER: I don't either.

18 MR. KOCY: We'll make it very clear in the next edition we give you that it's an
19 overlay.

20 MR. GREEN: I was reading it from a very different perspective than what, you
21 know, I'm hearing today so the opt in language would be important for me to see in the
22 final version.

1 MR. KOCY: I'll make sure we put a preamble that describes that an overlay
2 gives you a choice.

3 MS. LINDER: Or that could be handled when we zone the districts to the overlay
4 district, assign that to that.

5 MR. VAN DINE: The purpose of the district is –

6 MS. LINDER: Because I'm anticipating there will be two ordinances.

7 MR. KOCY: Right.

8 MS. LINDER: One would be the regulations and the other would be to put the
9 actual zoning overlay district on the property.

10 MR. KOCY: Right. To do a map.

11 MS. LINDER: And that would probably where the opt-in language is.

12 MR. VAN DINE: But I still think you need this and it's just to clarify the
13 requirements.

14 MR. GREEN: I would assume then that we in essence will have two plans in the
15 comprehensive plan with regard to Decker Boulevard. One plan that would say if you're
16 opting in this is what you go by and another plan is if you're not opting in so we'll have
17 as part of the comprehensive plan in essence two plans for Decker Boulevard.

18 MR. KOCY: No. What we will have is a comprehensive plan that's a general
19 philosophical policy driven plan for the County and we will have a range of very specific
20 community plans that are auxiliary documents to the comprehensive plan providing
21 much more detail on neighborhoods and smaller communities and this Decker
22 Boulevard is one of those very detailed community type plans.

1 MR. GREEN: Would a rezoning then – would Staff comment on a rezoning after
2 adoption of a new comprehensive plan relate their recommendations to the master plan
3 or to – somebody comes in for a rezoning and it's not in conformance with the
4 redevelopment plan is that a basis for which to deny the rezoning since you have a
5 redevelopment plan –

6 MR. KOCY: Correct.

7 MR. PALMER: - that's different

8 MR. KOCY: Any rezoning – hopefully a zoning overlay like a Decker Boulevard
9 overlay would reduce the number of rezoning requests that come in because we
10 provide so much flexibility in the plan. But if someone decided on the overlay district
11 that they wanted to do a topless car dealership, yes, we would base Staff
12 recommendation not only on the comprehensive plan but on the community plan too.

13 MR. PALMER: In the floodplain overlay district that we currently have if that's in
14 place on a property, that takes precedent over the underlying zoning; correct? This
15 doesn't operate the same way?

16 MR. KOCY: No.

17 MS. LINDER: No. This is little bit unique.

18 MR. PALMER: I agree with Gene. I read it and I didn't see where if it's just an
19 overlay – overlays to me mean a top layer and when the top layer doesn't apply then
20 you go to the bottom layer. But I don't know. I just [inaudible].

21 MR. VAN DINE: This is more like the conservation easement, the zoning overlay
22 that we have presently that exists in our ordinance. A conservation easement was an

1 opt in, the conversation district was an opt in district that you could seek if you wanted
2 to.

3 MR. KOCY: Correct.

4 MR. VAN DINE: And I don't know that anybody has ever sought it but it was an
5 opt in that you could request. It was not something that was put on you automatically.

6 MR. PALMER: But this says that the CRD overlay district may be approved and
7 designated by County Council if two or more of the following conditions or
8 circumstances are evident.

9 MR. VAN DINE: I think that they need to modify the thing to make sure it's clear
10 that it's an opt in.

11 MR. KOCY: No. Your language – the language you're referring to Mr. Palmer is
12 this overlay district could be used on other commercial corridors in the County if the
13 County Council determined based on those two things, those two findings that they
14 could use this overlay district in other commercial corridors.

15 MR. VAN DINE: It would still be opt in.

16 MR. KOCY: It would still be opt in. Right now we're suggesting that the first
17 corridor that we would like this commercial overlay looked at for potential
18 implementation is the Decker Boulevard corridor.

19 MR. PALMER: I've just got to see the opt in stuff [inaudible] fine with it and my
20 said comment is I don't think we go far with the incentives to really get people in here to
21 do this thing.

22 MR. KOCY: With the regulatory incentives or the -

23 MR. PALMER: Regulatory incentives.

1 MR. KOCY: I would be delighted to hear what other incentives you think we
2 should put in.

3 MR. PALMER: Okay.

4 MR. KOCY: Do you want to e-mail me some suggestions I truly would
5 appreciate that.

6 CHAIRMAN MANNING: One other question [inaudible]. In our previous
7 discussions we were concerned that we didn't want establish design standards for every
8 neighborhood [inaudible]. And is this just a template that we're using for that
9 neighborhood out of other areas as well as how are the -

10 MR. PALMER: Couldn't you just leave it open that it could apply to others if the
11 Council sees that it should?

12 MR. KOCY: Correct. I mean, this is the first real detailed community overlay or
13 community plan that we've come up with. I suspect that many – these design standards
14 in this overlay district are what other communities will opt into also.

15 CHAIRMAN MANNING: But the actual you call form standards, form based
16 standards? I mean, obviously the neighborhood character has to be taken into
17 consideration for a lot of this. A lot of the examples we're using are, you know,
18 downtown.

19 MR. KOCY: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN MANNING: So this is just a template to go forward on the next one?

21 MR. KOCY: Correct.

22 MR. GREEN: So we might actually have this come back to us where the zone is
23 the Decker Boulevard corridor redevelopment overlay district?

1 MS. LINDER: The way I've written this ordinance based on what was given to
2 me was going under 26-83 where you established the different districts and right now
3 we've got three different types of districts; we've got the general and use districts,
4 planned development districts, and the overlay districts. Because this new proposal
5 was so unique I've created it as another category of types of zoning districts. So it's not
6 based under the overlay district, it's actually being called a Corridor Redevelopment
7 Overlay which distinguishes it from the traditional overlay.

8 MR. PALMER: And will a map be attached to this?

9 MR. KOCY: It would be part of the implementation, correct, delineating clearly
10 which properties are in or out.

11 MS. CAIRNS: Are eligible to elect.

12 MR. KOCY: Correct. Are eligible to adopt the optional standards, correct.

13 MS. LINDER: But the map will not attach to this one, it's going(?) to attach to like
14 Mr. Kocy said the implementation one, to the actual [inaudible] on the properties.

15 MR. PALMER: So it wouldn't, that map wouldn't become actually part of an
16 ordinance, it's just something you guys keep in-house?

17 MS. LINDER: The map would be part of an ordinance but it would be like a map
18 rezoning ordinance.

19 MR. PALMER: It would be rezoned.

20 MR. KOCY: We would just be applying the boundaries of an overlay.

21 MS. CAIRNS: Well, but that, yeah. I mean, but that way it would stop somebody
22 from –

1 MS. LINDER: We have the TMS numbers or we'd have a map to show which
2 parcels would be eligible for that.

3 MR. PALMER: When do we hope to see this again?

4 MR. KOCY: Bring it back next month - if you'd like.

5 CHAIRMAN MANNING: One other last question. The low-impact development –
6 do we actually have standards in our Land Development Code now or is this just
7 something we're talking about?

8 MR. KOCY: Public Works is working on low-impact development standards
9 primarily for storm water reduction.

10 CHAIRMAN MANNING: And can y'all bring something back to us to approve as
11 a part of this because for years now we've been dealing with Public Works and
12 everybody wants to go to low-impact but we can't quite seem to get there. Now if we're
13 going to make it a part of this ordinance [inaudible].

14 MR. KOCY: I don't believe we'll have those available by next month. We can
15 certainly bring in somebody from Public Works to give you a sneak preview of the
16 regulations that they're working on but low-impact development standards are
17 scheduled for adoption later this Spring but they will not be available next month.

18 MR. PALMER: Well, the only thing I have a problem with that I've heard so far
19 today then is that this will be used as a basis to deny rezoning.

20 MR. KOCY: No. This would be used for reviewing a rezoning proposal.

21 MR. PALMER: But in denying it – in Staff's recommendation all other factors
22 being equal and it just doesn't apply – it just doesn't, you know, coincide with this

1 redevelopment overlay district no one would say because it does not comply with the
2 redevelopment overlay district we recommend denial of this rezoning.

3 MR. KOCY: We would probably say because it does not comply with the base
4 zoning or the overlay district zoning. Because it complies with neither we would
5 recommend reject.

6 MR. PALMER: [Inaudible] with the base zoning.

7 MR. KOCY: It would be fine.

8 MR. PALMER: But what I'm saying is if normally without this being in place Staff
9 would have said, yeah, this is a good area for RM-HD but because of this
10 redevelopment overlay district the plan calls for it to be general commercial is that some
11 reason for denial?

12 MR. KOCY: Could you translate RM-HD for me; I'm not that -

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Residential, high density.

14 MR. KOCY: Okay. The community desires wherefore for this strip of land that
15 we're looking at right now to be multi-family – excuse me, to be general commercial.
16 The overlay zoning does allow for mixed, higher density residential to be part of it. It's
17 limited though. It cannot be 100% of the site.

18 MR. PALMER: So it would be used as basis for denial?

19 MR. KOCY: It could be used as basis for denial; correct.

20 MR. PALMER: Okay. That's the only problem.

21 MS. CAIRNS: One question.

22 MR. PALMER: If it's an opt in, it shouldn't be that way.

1 MS. CAIRNS: I have one question for the – I'm sorry, I forget your name, Mr.
2 Cock?

3 MR. COCK: Yes.

4 MS. CAIRNS: These – have you seen the, like options similar to this used in
5 other communities in other areas that this alone is enough to allow the revitalization of
6 degraded commercial areas?

7 MR. COCK: I would in no way want you to understand that this alone is enough.
8 This is one of about 50 recommendations. You know, as you all mentioned from the
9 beginning, the street, the nature of that street has to be dealt with. Crime and the
10 perception of crime have to be dealt with. Marketing and dealing with the business
11 community have to be dealt with. Upgrading out. Existing housing has to be dealt with.
12 All of those and so this is just one of the pieces and none of those in and of themselves
13 will make redevelopment happen.

14 MR. PALMER: Let me tell you one major problem that somebody might want to
15 take a look at. There's an off ramp of I-77 Southbound that goes directly onto Decker
16 Boulevard. Cars are coming off there 65 miles an hour if they catch the green light
17 going down Decker Boulevard. I don't know how you stop that, reduce that or do
18 whatever but, you know, Decker's supposed to be what? 35?

19 MR. KOCY: Forty-five.

20 MR. PALMER: Forty-five? And we're trying to get pedestrians to walk down it?

21 MR. KOCY: I mean, that's one of the big issues and a big part of their plan
22 actually recommends dealing with each of the intersections and the nature of the street
23 itself. Yeah. It's a big problem and part of the solution.

1 MS. CAIRNS: [Inaudible] thing that makes the street feel more pedestrian tends
2 to calm traffic by itself to a certain extent anyways.

3 MR. KOCY: Correct.

4 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, what it is right now there's nothing to convince you to slow
5 down.

6 MR. KOCY: Right.

7 CHAIRMAN MANNING: All right. Any other questions? Thank you.

8 MR. KOCY: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Appreciate it. We'll go back to the workshop for the
10 digital billboards. I guess what would be helpful is if you could go through once again
11 the three options that were presented to us. I don't know whether we want to take
12 public comment or not but I know we have some people from the industry here as well
13 as some that are in opposition. But we will defer that until we get further into this after
14 questions being raised by the Commission [inaudible].

15 MR. KOCY: If you're ready Mr. Chairman, I am.

16 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I am.

17 MR. KOCY: On page five, the first generic billboard ordinance you see was
18 really an adaptation of the Savannah, Georgia city ordinance. If I can synopsise this in
19 one sentence it would be that this was designed for the geographic, the geographics
20 and the zoning and the existing conditions of Savannah and it's not really applicable
21 here.

22 MR. GREEN: This is a municipal ordinance as opposed to Chatham County or?

1 MR. KOCY: This is a municipal ordinance and it's based on the fact that the City
2 of Savannah has very few four-land roads or wider, has very many historic districts and
3 the zoning – this billboard ordinance says that the billboards can only be in non-
4 residential areas, they must be along wider roads, and they can't be in any historic
5 districts. So that eliminates much of the city from having billboards. Unfortunately we're
6 a different community, we have got a much different physical layout than Savannah
7 does so I think that this draft regulation on page five really doesn't translate well to our
8 existing conditions. It works well in Savannah though.

9 CHAIRMAN MANNING: [Inaudible] to bypass the issue of whether we should
10 have digital billboards or not because they knew that they weren't going to have any
11 [inaudible].

12 MR. KOCY: There are very - if you would look at a map of Savannah that the
13 areas that once you go through the various you know P-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and take out
14 everything that this doesn't apply to there's very little space of Savannah that these
15 billboards, that any billboard can be used in.

16 MS. CAIRNS: But does Savannah still allow -

17 MR. KOCY: Yes. Savannah does allow digital billboards.

18 MS. CAIRNS: New – but I mean they allow new billboard. We have a ban on
19 billboards –

20 MR. KOCY: Correct.

21 MS. CAIRNS: Except for the existing, they're grandfathered. Savannah allows
22 new billboards subject to their limitation –

23 MR. KOCY: Correct.

1 MS. CAIRNS: - whether they're digital or not.

2 MR. KOCY: This one was specifically digital.

3 MS. CAIRNS: But I mean in – I mean, do they have a basic ban on the creation
4 of new billboards?

5 MR. KOCY: Now that I don't now. We just got the copy of their digital billboard.

6 MR. ANDERSON: [Inaudible] is in number five it says new locations for signs
7 [inaudible].

8 MS. CAIRNS: Right. So that's another big difference from – regulatory from us
9 to them.

10 MR. KOCY: But if you look at their zoning map that there is much of Savannah,
11 the City of Savannah is a historic district so it's all billboards are precluded from that.
12 It's primarily the two interstates that ring the city are where you're going to find most of
13 your new billboards and your digital billboards.

14 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I think that one thing that if the Council does elect to
15 take anything up that it would help if they were to clarify billboards and digital on and off
16 premise. I think that I was a little bit confused when reading the three different
17 ordinances is this just for billboards existing?

18 MR. KOCY: All three of these ordinances I believe were forwarded to this Board
19 – Commission, excuse me, for digital billboards.

20 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. We're not at all addressing the issue of on-site digital
21 displays.

22 MR. KOCY: No. Just billboards.

1 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. Because some of these sounded like they were on-site
2 digital display issues. That's why it was confusing. I was confused by that.

3 MR. KOCY: We'll confuse you at a future meeting on that.

4 MS. CAIRNS: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN MANNING: The Savannah, Georgia was submitted by who?

6 MR. KOCY: A member of the Council.

7 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay.

8 MR. ANDERSON: I've just got a quick question. One thousand NITS. The
9 billboards on Harden Street maybe the industry – explain N-I-T-S or NITS because I just
10 see there's a difference between 1,000 to 500 –

11 MR. VAN DINE: Seventy-five hundred.

12 MR. ANDERSON: - to 7,500.

13 MR. KOCY: On page five the 1,000 deals from dawn to dusk.

14 CHAIRMAN MANNING: [Inaudible] Go ahead.

15 MR. KOCY: Okay. I'm sorry. Deals with dusk to dawn at night. The one on
16 page seven is got two different numbers for daylight hours of operation and evening
17 hours of operation and thank goodness the industry's here to address this because I
18 don't know what I'm talking about.

19 **TESTIMONY OF SCOTT SHOCKLEY:**

20 MR. SHOCKLEY: Good afternoon. My name is Scott Shockley. I'm with Lamar
21 Advertising. In the vernacular it's NITS and it's simply candelas per square meter. I'm
22 not an electrical engineer but it basically is a method for defining brightness as opposed
23 to light throw which your current ordinance deals with in terms of foot candles. So when

1 you look at Savannah's versus one of the other proposals, Savannah's deals with a
2 maximum NITS at 1,000 from dusk until dawn. The proposal we've supported reduces
3 it to 500 which is consistent with other static displays that have a different means of
4 illumination where it's an external illumination showing up on the face itself. So it's
5 simply a measurement of brightness.

6 MS. CAIRNS: What is the NIT level like the billboard at Harden and Gervais?

7 MR. SHOCKLEY: It is at night around between four and five hundred. It's very
8 bright.

9 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I would offer that it's very bright at night. Incredibly bright
10 when it's a foggy day.

11 MR. SHOCKLEY: Well, it is – I've got some pictures to share with you that would
12 compare that particular face with another static display face within about a 500 to 1,000
13 feet and if you look at the picture – it was not doctored – it is consistent. If you also are
14 at that intersection and look at the canopy lights underneath the canopy that shields the
15 gas pumps right there at the Exxon station the brightness level of those canopy lights
16 are significantly brighter than the visual display. So we've gone to great measure to
17 make sure that the brightness levels of our displays are consistent with our static
18 displays.

19 MS. CAIRNS: The other – I mean, I mentioned Gervais and Harden just
20 because that's the one I see daily. Are all the – are, for the Lamar digital billboards that
21 are visible both in Richland County and Lexington County right now for people who
22 might see them on occasion, do all of them drop down to that four to five hundred at
23 night or do you have some set differently.

1 MR. SHOCKLEY: No. They are all on automatic dimming devices and when you
2 consider the nature of LED devices unlike what you see in the County in terms of on
3 premise signs most of the on premise if not all of the on premise LEDs that I've seen
4 have no dimming feature whatsoever. So whatever they're cranking out during the day
5 is exactly what you see at night which is full bore.

6 MS. CAIRNS: We're going to address this on-site [inaudible] day.

7 MR. SHOCKLEY: Right. But ours reduce it significantly on a location by location
8 basis because obviously you have less ambient light to compete with the brightness of
9 the display itself. You don't have the sun, you know. You've got the most powerful
10 incandescent out there so during the night they reduce significantly and they're all on
11 automatic dimming devices.

12 MS. CAIRNS: That are automatic based on the – well it measures whether
13 there's sunlight or not?

14 MR. SHOCKLEY: Correct. Correct.

15 MR. VAN DINE: Was the industry in favor of the Savannah ordinance?

16 MR. SHOCKLEY: The industry in this case is our company, Lamar Advertising.
17 So Lamar worked out apparently in Greenwood the City of Savannah I have no idea
18 about the nuances of that agreement but I would echo Mr. Kocy's comments that in
19 Savannah you have a playing field, if you will, with which you can build new signs. We
20 don't have that opportunity in Richland County and I do believe that our company
21 agreed to take down some signs and I'd be happy to share with this body the number of
22 signs that our company has taken down over the last eight to 10 years and
23 unfortunately we will be continuing to take down based upon the fact that we have no

1 opportunity to rebuild should there be a development on site or things like that. So
2 there's quite a bit of difference between the circumstances in Savannah and the
3 circumstances in Richland County.

4 MR. VAN DINE: Well, the reason I asked was because in Savannah it seems as
5 though they were accepting a 10 second interval versus a six second interval that
6 obviously then translates into additional advertising revenue or whatever and I'm
7 wondering why the six was for here and the 10 was for down there.

8 MR. SHOCKLEY: Because it's consistent with state law. In the State of Georgia
9 their requirements is a minimum 10 seconds and the State of South Carolina the
10 minimum is six seconds. So there's a consistency with which the displays are provided
11 throughout that state's jurisdiction and it varies from state to state anywhere from
12 probably six to 10 seconds. Some have eight.

13 MR. VAN DINE: So basically you're saying that it's all right for them at 10 over in
14 Georgia but here in South Carolina you're going to do six because you can get away
15 with it?

16 MR. SHOCKLEY: Well, I would say that we are consistent with what the state
17 provides. I wouldn't characterize in terms of what we can get away with.

18 MR. VAN DINE: All right. The other question I have is they're talking about
19 digital signs are permitted within 300' of a residential district. That's a football field and
20 frankly if I were living a football field away from one of these signs I would need blackout
21 shades on my windows in order to be able to get any sleep. It seems to me that 300' is
22 a substantially undersized distance from a residential district especially for people that
23 are trying to have a normal existence within [inaudible] and it seems to me frankly that

1 the distance has got to be greatly expanded from a residential district for me to have
2 any support of anything relative to digital signs. I just can't imagine having a digital
3 billboard with the brightness that I've seen on specific one that Ms. Cairns was talking
4 about 300' from my house or my apartment or anything else. And that is a serious
5 concern I have relative to this type of an issue.

6 MR. SHOCKLEY: And I certainly appreciate your concern. That 300' is
7 consistent with what exists in the City of Columbia and also exceeds what is existing
8 presently in Lexington County, West Columbia, and also the City of Irmo.

9 MR. VAN DINE: And I'm not suggesting that it doesn't – isn't consistent with
10 other things. I'm suggesting that we're a completely different area and that we may
11 have a little bit more concern for our citizens than certain other jurisdictions may have.
12 And just 300' is just woefully inadequate for what needs to be done. I mean, there are
13 other ones as well. I mean, I think the spacing between digital signs at 1,000' and
14 1,000' or whatever across the road is inadequate. As it sits right here you told us the
15 last time you were here there's 180 of your signs and virtually all of them are on arterial
16 roads. That means that if we were to adopt this you can change every single one of
17 them and I can guarantee you there's a whole lot of them out there that would create
18 eye sores just by having them out there; that many that are existing. You're only a part
19 of the market.

20 MR. SHOCKLEY: That's correct and we did not suggest the last time that all 180
21 signs would be appropriate for digital. In fact the criteria established in this proposal
22 reduces that applicable inventory significantly between the spacing, between the
23 setback, between the steel structures, and also between the set back from residential.

1 MR. VAN DINE: The additional concerns I have relate to the fact that in essence
2 you get to rebuild all of the signs – all of the billboards that are in existence now in order
3 to adapt them to the digital. You get to replace the steel structures, you get to upgrade
4 all of those into present condition when the moratorium that was placed was under the
5 theory that those would ultimately be aged out. And I have a serious problem of
6 allowing the modernization and the improvement of existing structures in order to be
7 able to extend the life expectancy of those. Especially in conjunction with the state law
8 which would require this County to undertake a substantial financial input if they were
9 ever to remove any of those billboards or have to remove them for whatever reason.
10 Not only the cost of the billboard which would be enhanced and improved by the
11 improvements that you would be making to them but also the revenues that can be
12 generated as a result of all of the signs that you can put in. And I don't know if I've
13 heard or seen the numbers but the numbers I've seen are that each sign creates a
14 substantial financial profit especially if you're doing every six seconds and you can
15 change those by the hour if you wanted to to get additional people in place depending
16 on the time of day that somebody wanted to go buy a particular sign. So I'm seriously
17 concerned with the financial implications to this County if in fact we turn around and
18 were to adopt on a broad scale basis allowing digital billboards any place that they
19 could be put on, any arterial road, or any other area. And I just think we're buying
20 something that we don't understand and we don't see the full ramifications of. I think
21 someone needs to be looking into the full amounts of what it could cost this County if in
22 fact you had to start and try to take some of those down.

1 MR. SHOCKLEY: And with all due respect I understand your concerns. The
2 current regulations on state statutes require for any takings of off premise signs to
3 consider relocation first and foremost. Secondly, if relocation cannot be satisfied
4 between the parties then just compensation is required whether it be a static display,
5 the signs that exist out there right now or digital display.

6 MR. VAN DINE: Our present ordinance that is in place now that supersedes and
7 does now allow for us to take on additional responsibility by expanding what is presently
8 in existence to include digital signs with a multitude of advertising and the extensive
9 amount of income that can be generated. As it exists right now there may be certain
10 exposure but it is substantially less than the exposure that would exist if the digital
11 billboard issues were allowed to come into play.

12 MR. SHOCKLEY: And I'd also bring in to your consideration that the bulk of the
13 arteries and streets, the arterials with which this proposal would allow are on the state
14 system currently which even previous to that statute passing a couple years ago would
15 require the payment of just compensation.

16 MS. CAIRNS: Well, but certainly the amount of what's considered just
17 compensation was significantly altered by the passage on the state level.

18 MR. VAN DINE: And would be substantially altered if this were allowed to take
19 the – of the static billboards were allowed to be replaced through the digital billboards
20 with the number of advertising [inaudible].

21 MR. GREEN: Just a couple quick questions for Staff. You mentioned the origin
22 of the Savannah language and we know that what we're calling version B is being
23 suggested potentially by the industry. Version C – what was the origin of – I see the

1 biggest difference in C and B being two miles between signs versus 1,000' and I was
2 just wondering if this was based on some ordinance somewhere or –

3 MR. KOCY: [Inaudible]. Version C allows for one digital billboard per [inaudible]
4 district.

5 MR. GREEN: Right.

6 MR. KOCY: That's it, just one. So if version C got passed we would see a total
7 of nine digital billboards in the County; that would be it.

8 CHAIRMAN MANNING: But with those do they delete any billboards in the
9 process?

10 MR. KOCY: I do not believe they did. Oh, excuse me.

11 MS. CAIRNS: It did say that the applicant has to have removed at least one
12 since -

13 MR. KOCY: Yes.

14 MS. CAIRNS: - 2005 but it's very conceivable that all applicants would have
15 already moved one somewhere for some reason.

16 CHAIRMAN MANNING: And that brings up a good point. I think, you know, if
17 the Council does consider modifications that allows one per district to me really didn't
18 make a whole of sense. I mean, placement of these is more important to the district
19 and how it affects neighborhoods. But it would seem to me if there is going to be a
20 reduction is should come from the area that a new sign was going in. Those are
21 generally going to be the most – the areas the signs are most prolific. Going back, I did
22 have another question for Mr. Shockley if you don't mind. You're talking about
23 distances from residential zoning areas.

1 MR. SHOCKLEY: Yes, sir.

2 CHAIRMAN MANNING: And that varied in all these ordinances from 75' to 300'
3 and kind of reiterating what Howard was saying about being 300' away from the digital.
4 Is there any way that you can test to see an impact on a neighborhood whether it be
5 300' or whether it be 1,000. I know that years ago a sign was placed on Clemson Road
6 that a special exception – 125' and you could see it all the way from Clemson at 20 all
7 the way back to Two Notch. It had a huge impact on the neighborhoods and it finally
8 came down. But is there any way to know the impact to an area before putting a sign
9 up?

10 MR. SHOCKLEY: And if I may ask I think they – specifically since you're talking
11 about was an on premise sign -

12 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Right.

13 MR. SHOCKLEY: - for a gas station or Hardee's or McDonald's or something
14 like that? I'm not aware of a temporary set up with one of these LED displays for
15 instance on the bed of a tractor trailer because you're talking about somewhere
16 between 240 square feet upwards of 600 square feet. So I'm not aware of a temporary
17 mechanism and of course if you did it in that style it'd be close to the road as opposed
18 to the current sign height which is typically any where from probably 15 to 30'. And I'm
19 not sure if there is any other mechanism to be able to create that environment.

20 CHAIRMAN MANNING: But I just didn't know whether the industry had some
21 [inaudible].

22 MR. SHOCKLEY: Yes, sir.

1 MR. GREEN: Just a technical question. You know, I've seen these lap top
2 computers where they've got them designed so someone sitting in the next airplane
3 seat can't even read the lap top screen. Does any technology like that exist so the
4 angle of your ability to see a sign is restricted like – I don't know if I'm explaining myself
5 very well.

6 MR. SHOCKLEY: So it's more focused?

7 MR. GREEN: Yeah. Is there any technology that exists today that would allow
8 that kind of range of restricted view of both the light and the message?

9 MR. SHOCKLEY: If there is I'm not aware of it but this technology is developing
10 with advancements all the time in terms of energy usage and things like that. So I can
11 check into that and see if there's additional studies and engineering done to look at
12 more of a directed focus. At this point in time I'm not aware of anything.

13 MR. GREEN: And I guess this is a question for both Staff and for the industry. I
14 think as we go forward, and I don't know what Council's going to ultimately do but I think
15 it would be helpful certainly for me to understand if in a situation where a sign needed to
16 be removed for a road improvement and it had to be compensated for I would just – I
17 mean, this is another one of those areas where we talk about all kinds of ranges without
18 really knowing but if we could get some sense of what the cost to the County would be I
19 would think that would be an important part of our consideration in language, you know,
20 whether this remains tabled until the study comes out, the safety study comes out or
21 whether it comes back on the table. I know that's one piece of information that should
22 be important to the industry and to the County.

1 MR. VAN DINE: One of the things that – there's some material that was
2 provided to us last month or whatever – it's a series of things. My indication and correct
3 me if I'm wrong but something to the tune of a half a million dollars in income is
4 generated per year, per sign and that was based upon some study that was done not in
5 this area – some place out West. I can't remember whether I was St. Louis or whatever
6 it was but it was some number like that. The way the damages would work is it's not
7 just one year's income. It's the lifetime expectancy of that particular sign that you're
8 taking down. You have to then determine not just the cost per year that you're doing
9 but the expectancy of that technology plus the structure that has to come down. For
10 one sign you could be talking substantial amounts of money for one sign. If they had to
11 take the one down at Gervais and Harden right now under the state law I would venture
12 to say that the city would be paying in the millions of dollars to have that sign taken
13 down for compensation. So it's not just one year in cost, it's one year over time
14 discounted to present value.

15 MR. SHOCKLEY: But please keep in mind as well that we exist as a business
16 entity to support businesses. We provide an advertising mechanism. So it is not our
17 desire to cash out if you will. It would be our desire to work with the local municipality or
18 County to find an alternative site that is amenable to both parties. And to Mr. Green's
19 point when you talk about relocation for a road there's actually language on the books
20 that provides for relocation costs by the state when you have expansion for extra lanes.
21 That happened about three years on Airport Boulevard between 26 and the airport
22 entrance. There were about three signs in that stretch that had to be relocated because

1 they added a center turn lane. There was not condemnation, there was not a takings
2 issue, it was simply relocation cost to move the signs straight back.

3 MR. GREEN: But whatever potential costs, I just think it's information we need to
4 have to make -

5 MR. KOCY: That's a valid point. I don't know how I could get that for you. Any
6 cost of relocating a sign I think would depend on the stream of income that a sign
7 generates. I wouldn't have that data.

8 CHAIRMAN MANNING: One other thought.

9 MR. GREEN: Is it legal to have in an ordinance – we can't restrict state law or
10 the interpretation of state law by local code. So is there any way we can get towards a
11 number that at least give us that information?

12 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Regardless of the number I'm wondering obviously the
13 liability issue is a concern for the County is there any way to mitigate that? I mean,
14 could the industry indemnify the County for the permit to allow them to do that?

15 MS. CAIRNS: That'd be pretty tricky because it's a state law. I mean, because
16 of the whole supremacy.

17 MR. VAN DINE: We can't trump state law. I mean, state law says what state law
18 says. We can be more restrictive but we can't be less restrictive than state law.

19 MS. CAIRNS: When I – one of the things that – I mean, I just think all of this
20 discussion needs to be held under the tenet that we currently have an ordinance that
21 doesn't allow the building of billboards and only allows – I mean, even the changing of
22 face is very restrictive. I mean, Savannah allows billboards, allows new billboards
23 under their current limitations. We don't allow new billboards and I think it's interesting

1 that we're, you know, the whole question, do we want digital displays? I mean, right
2 now as the ordinance is written in Richland County we have got an ever decreasing
3 number of billboards through factors such as redevelopment of lots, built, you know, the
4 wood rots because they're not allowed to replace the wooden supports. Is the whole
5 thing about, you know, to what extent do we want to allow if at all digital displays on the,
6 you know, every diminishing desire to have billboards in Richland County because of
7 the existing ordinance. And I just think it's important that we need to constantly kind of
8 remind ourselves we have an ordinance right now that doesn't allow the erection of any
9 new billboards and very limited changes on the faces. I mean, I'm sorry to kind of bring
10 us back to that but I just think that's an important element.

11 MR. VAN DINE: This discussion would in essence be an opening of the door
12 relative to the present laws that are in existence. We would be opening a major door
13 not only to billboards but I can, I would venture that once billboards happen you're going
14 to see on premises signs coming in and saying the exact thing. You let them do it, how
15 come you won't let us do it? This is selective enforcement. So this is one step after
16 another that could end up creating a major problem for the County.

17 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. On-site digital displays I think we've all seen, you know, in
18 not a whole lot of time a pretty rapid proliferation of on-site and certainly anything like in
19 terms of a six second change you can count on every McDonald's, every everything
20 having on-site digital displays. They're going to allow rapid changing of messages. So,
21 I mean, this is not, you know, yeah, we're not going to be able to say you can only have
22 digital displays that change every six seconds if you're off premises. I mean, that's
23 going to be ludicrous. So we are, you know, while we're not specifically address on

1 premises signs certainly we have to take that into account. So, I mean, I just, you know,
2 and I just wonder, I mean, one of the things I'm curious about, I mean, I know the
3 industry offers that they exist to help businesses in the County. I don't really see that
4 the County needs digital displays. I don't really see the benefit to the County. You
5 know, and considering that a couple of years ago the County specifically said we don't
6 any more digital – we don't want any more billboards. And we've decided that the
7 aesthetic quality of the communities are such that we don't want to address these things
8 that – I don't really see where the benefit to the County is to adding digital billboards. I
9 mean, we've all seen a few come up in our communities between Lexington County and
10 the City of Columbia. I don't drive to Irmo much but I didn't know that they had them. I
11 got the impression that they had approved them. I mean, I'm just kind, you know, I
12 would just like to know why. Why we should be adding this and taking into account the
13 whole, you know, issue with the fact that's going to get trickled down onto on premises
14 signs.

15 MR. GREEN: Do we have a plan at this point to look at on premises signs?
16 Because I know at least with the digital billboards they aren't supposed to be animated,
17 continuous moving, rolling. I drove down Two Notch Road the other night from the
18 Village at Sandhills to I-20 and saw I think it was nine, maybe it was 10, many of them
19 moving, many of them animated. If, you know, I don't know whether the national study
20 will determine what degree of safety there is in these signs but -

21 MS. CAIRNS: None on Two Notch.

22 MR. GREEN: - but those continuous flashing, moving signs, you know, if we're
23 going to address the issue, let's address the issue.

1 MR. PRICE: Yes. We've had some of the officers go out and identify the
2 locations of these signs that you've mentioned and we have begun to notify the owners
3 that they're in violation of the code and hopefully within the next few weeks we'll kind of
4 remedy whatever violations that are out there.

5 MR. GREEN: You live out that way, don't you, Geo?

6 MR. PRICE: Oh, yes.

7 MR. SHOCKLEY: May I address the question that Ms. Cairns provided and
8 rather [inaudible] from me because you both question about what's the benefit. I think
9 there are two significant benefits to this technology. One to business and one to
10 community involvement in terms of law enforcement and there are couple of people
11 here who can speak directly to that because I'm sure you're tired of listening to me and
12 talk to people that are more versed in the subject. Is that appropriate?

13 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I think we've all [inaudible] deferring the action
14 [inaudible] workshop here today was [inaudible] allow [inaudible] take place [inaudible]
15 both Council and the Staff [inaudible]. I don't think there's really anything else that we
16 can offer other than, you know, I'm sure at some point in time y'all are going to be back
17 in front of us again after the studies are done and [inaudible] Council. But at this point I
18 don't - I'm not sure what you're asking me to do.

19 MR. SHOCKLEY: I'm asking if Mc. McCleas whose with the Chamber can come
20 to speak to the business benefit and Lieutenant Cowan with the Sheriff's Department
21 Crimestoppers talk about the benefits of law enforcement.

22 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Absolutely. Please, sir.

23 **TESTIMONY OF IKE MCCLEAS:**

1 MR. MCCLEAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Ike McCleas. I
2 represent the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce, an organization with 3,000
3 business members in a four-county area of the Central Midlands of South Carolina.
4 Eighty-five percent of our businesses who are members of the Chamber are small
5 business, less than 50 employees. The outdoor industry provides an additional
6 inexpensive advertising opportunity, and advertising for any business is a critical link to
7 survival. The digital technology allows for more options for small business. It allows
8 them to change their message frequently. It allows for more advertisers to share a
9 board and thusly open it up for even more small businesses. Our issues committee and
10 our executive committee adopted a resolution supporting the utilization of digital boards
11 in Richland County because we see it as a pro business option and because it is being
12 allowed in the City of Columbia, Lexington County and other surrounding areas. So we
13 are in support today – appear in support of the digital option for Richland County.

14 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. McCleas, can I ask a question? It is my understanding that
15 Lexington County is revisiting its ordinance to allow digital. Are you aware of that?

16 MR. MCCLEAS: I am aware that they currently allow it.

17 MR. VAN DINE: Are you aware that they are revisiting the effort [inaudible] the
18 ordinance in an effort to determine whether or not it is in fact a useful and safe option?

19 MR. MCCLEAS: I'm not aware of that. It currently is allowed.

20 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you.

21 MR. MCCLEAS: Thank you, sir.

1 MR. KOCY: Mr. McCleas, I don't mean to sound like a smart aleck but do the –
2 does the Chamber also support local radio stations and *The State* newspaper as an
3 advertising option for small businesses?

4 MR. MCCLEAS: We support competition and the local radio stations and
5 newspapers certainly present an alternative.

6 MR. KOCY: Thank you.

7 MR. MCCLEAS: You failed at your objective.

8 **TESTIMONY OF LISA MOSLEY:**

9 MS. MOSLEY: I'm Lisa Mosley and I'm the Executive Director of the South
10 Carolina Law Enforcement Officers Association and I also serve on the Board of
11 Directors for Crimestoppers of the Midlands and the Amber Alert Steering Committee
12 for the State of South Carolina. And our perspective is that these billboards are very,
13 very effective in dealing with public service and public safety issues. They can certainly
14 be utilized by Crimestoppers and Amber Alert. Also Homeland Security issues that
15 might come up and any kind of emergency services issue. I want to give you two
16 examples. One is with Crimestoppers. We've been using billboards with
17 Crimestoppers for a couple of years now and here's an example of the billboard that we
18 used in 2006. And from the time we decided to use this billboard until the time we got it
19 up it took us about 30 days to get the sample created and get it posted, but from the
20 time it went up until the time we were able to make an arrest with Crimestoppers was
21 two days. Now if we had had access to the electronic billboards at that point it would
22 have been probably about half a day from the time we made the decision, got the
23 billboard posted, and were able to make an arrest. And there are a lot of examples.

1 The *Today Show* on Christmas Eve ran a show, ran a segment about the FBI utilizing
2 these billboards to make arrests with wanted fugitives and here's a copy of that and I'll
3 give this to y'all so you can look at it at your leisure. But also with Amber Alert these
4 billboards can be unbelievably effective with Amber Alerts because in any Amber Alert,
5 time is of the essence. With – from the time an Amber Alert is issued until a child is
6 safely recovered the most important window of time is the first two hours that a child's
7 missing. And so these billboards could be extremely, extremely effective when an
8 Amber Alert is issued. So there are some significant benefits to these types of
9 billboards in public safety issues. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you.

11 MR. GREEN: Just a question for the industry. The technology to change a
12 message – where does that occur? Do you have to go to the billboard? Do you do it
13 remotely?

14 MR. SHOCKLEY: It's all remote. DSL or cable so we have templates set up for
15 Amber Alert, also for fugitives that may be on the run. We've also established a
16 relationship with Lexington County, we're a step away from the City of Columbia to do
17 some additional work on emergency messaging whether it be hurricane, chemical spills,
18 and things like that. So when we get notified basically any copy changes have got to go
19 through our network operating center for obvious reasons in terms of content control.
20 Once we receive it it goes immediately to display. I've seen it when we receive it and
21 send it out it gets to display within five minutes. We typically advertise with our
22 customers that we can get it changed within an hour.

1 MR. FURGESS: Mr. Chairman, this young lady back here has her hand up to
2 speak.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: [inaudible] allow [inaudible]?

4 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Yes, ma'am. We will.

5 **TESTIMONY OF RYAN NEVIAS:**

6 MS. NEVIAS: I am Ryan Nevias, Chair of the Richland County Appearance
7 Commission. In our last workshop we evidently hired this, an expert to, a planner to
8 advise us on how to redevelop blighted areas. We just saw what a blighted area looked
9 like; that Decker Boulevard area with its hodgepodge of signs, no trees. A very sad
10 area with vacant businesses that have failed despite the advertising that's there.
11 Plagued by vacant houses. Study after study in city planning development issues have
12 stated that good zoning and good design equals good business and high property
13 values. People want tree-lined streets, not billboard lined streets. We have a
14 representative from the Richland County Neighborhood Council that I think wants to
15 advise you what neighborhoods in Richland County would like to see. We also saw
16 mixed use is a reality of the future in the things that you were discussing today. If we
17 allow digital billboards that may negatively impact the validity of a property or the
18 viability – excuse me, of a property to become a mixed use development because all of
19 a sudden we have a residence where it was a commercially zoned area. So how will
20 we address those? Mr. Shockley states that the lights from the Exxon station are
21 brighter than the digital billboard, the ambient lighting is brighter. However, if you're
22 working in the evening on the fourth floor of this County building it isn't the ambient light
23 that is distracting but the flashing colors from that street, from the Harden Street sign

1 that will drive you crazy. I support Ike McCleas' good to great. I think it's a wonderful
2 noble thing for the Midlands area to go from good to great. And I think in this election
3 year the theme that is emerging from the people is no more special interest. We get to
4 decide through our votes, through our initiatives, through the people that we elect and
5 the people that serve us what we want our County to look like. So I ask you to consider
6 these things. I ask you to consider the pictures that you saw on Decker Boulevard, the
7 areas that are filled with billboards and 30' signs. I ask you to consider the fact that the
8 industry expert said that these signs could be seen from two miles. That was the point
9 that you made Mr. Manning that that sign from the McDonald's could be seen all the
10 way to Decker. It truly changes the character of our landscape. It changes – we can't
11 turn it off. You can't turn – you can turn radios off, you can unsubscribe to papers, but
12 you must watch when you're driving. It is I believe in the billboard industries when
13 they're selling their customers they say, these things cannot be ignored. And I think that
14 if we drive by them we realize they cannot be ignored. I'm not going to argue the safety
15 issues. I'm only going to say to you as the Appearance Commission we have sent you
16 a letter, we sent County Council a letter. We are saying that we truly believe that the
17 appearance of Richland County will be degraded if we allow this type of display. Thank
18 you.

19 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Can I ask you one question?

20 MS. NEVIAS: Yes, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN MANNING: If safety was not an issue which I have no way of
22 knowing.

23 MS. NEVIAS: I'm not an engineer.

1 CHAIRMAN MANNING: And the industry was bringing to a reduction in signage
2 in certain places for the ability to place a sign in a certain area how would you feel about
3 that?

4 MS. NEVIAS: I feel that our moratorium has been designed to do one thing and
5 that is to rid Richland County of billboards. It was a tough fight and I believe we have a
6 leader of that fight here today. I think there was a lot of effort that went into it, a lot of
7 thought and concern and a lot of energy. So I really believe that display advertising
8 negatively affects property values both in residential and in business. It's what I believe,
9 it's what studies have – there are a lot of land use studies that have gone on. There
10 was one piece of property in Pittsburgh that when the billboards went down the property
11 value went up 200%.

12 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Do you have any idea how long it's going to take for
13 these billboards to be eliminated?

14 MS. NEVIAS: I don't. I don't have – I would love to see, I would love to see a
15 map. I would love to see the age and where these things are. I also know, being a
16 proponent of trees, that we have to keep the right-of-ways clear so that would mean that
17 if Ms. Dickerson wants to redo Broad River Road, which I know is a very, very personal
18 objective of hers, is that we would have to be careful about where we planted trees so
19 that they wouldn't block the billboards. And I think that's sad. That the public, the public
20 property or the public feeling of the community just because one person gets money
21 from a sign on their property, I can't have high grass in my yard because I might affect
22 the property value of my neighbors. I can't park my car in my yard. It has to be in a
23 driveway. I live in the city. And those ordinances are designed to protect property

1 values and I think that we need to sit this ordinance, this moratorium to let it do its job
2 however many years it's going to take and rid our Richland County of these unsightly
3 displays. The other thing that I'd like to add is Van Kornegay is in Europe and he
4 couldn't be here and he had done some research with the DOT about Amber Alerts.
5 They don't even use – they don't even put the Amber Alerts up on all of their digital
6 displays because of the traffic safety issues. They found that traffic slows dangerously
7 when Amber Alerts are put on these digital displays. So I urge you before you take that
8 into consideration that you research that or the Council when they're looking at that and
9 using that as an argument that we really make sure that that digital display on the
10 Amber Alerts is something the DOT is going to allow on these signs, on these roads,
11 state roads.

12 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you.

13 MS. NEVIAS: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Any questions from the Commission or do we have
15 anybody else who would like to speak?

16 MS. CAIRNS: Well, she's – yeah. Come on down. One of the other things that I
17 want to just – it was mentioned at one of our previous public hearings by a member
18 from the audience and it stuck in my craw and I kind of wanted to – to me it's an issue.
19 Is the amount of energy that it takes to drive these things. I think, you know, we're
20 starting to hear sort of as a culture that the ability to afford energy really shouldn't be the
21 question. I mean, the fact that I can afford to put a hundred dollars of gas in my truck
22 every week or whatever it is isn't necessarily the question. The question is how much
23 energy as a community are we using and what's the overall cost. And I think that – I

1 mean, well I'm curious and I don't know the answer for but somebody offered a number
2 as to how much energy it takes to drive these digital billboards. It's – how many homes
3 does that equal and do we really want to be building infrastructure and supporting
4 energy in vast – I mean, if it's inconsequential, if it's similar then so be it but, I mean, if
5 indeed driving these billboards takes an enormous amount of energy whether we have
6 the capacity today it – you know, we're going to be providing energy for these things. I
7 think about, you know, on those hot Sunday afternoons when we have to dump Lake
8 Murray onto the river and hope nobody drowns because we have spike. Do we want
9 more of those spikes because we've got digital billboards? You know, I mean, is this
10 indeed going to be a large drain and my sense is that based on the number that fellow
11 offered is that these things are huge drains and the fact that the industry can afford it
12 because of the amount of revenue they produce I don't think that's a factor. I just think
13 that we also need to look at the energy footprint that we're allowing for these things and
14 sorry to be obscure and esoteric but I think that was relevant. Okay, I'm done.

15 **TESTIMONY OF CAROL KOZOSKI:**

16 MS. KOZOSKI: My name is Carol Kozoski. I'm with the Richland County
17 Conservation Commission and I'd like to address the issue that Ms. Cairns just spoke
18 about because we sent a letter as a matter of fact the Richland County Conservation
19 Commission unanimously approved a letter objecting to any change in our existing law
20 relative to the digital billboards and we sent it to County Council. So we have gone on
21 record unanimously disapproving of digital billboard introduction. And this on
22 conservation grounds now, I'm speaking only on conservation grounds, I won't discuss
23 about the issue of the safety. It has been shown that electronic billboards have

1 negative environmental consequences and I'm going to make two points. One has to
2 do with the amount of electricity which the billboards take. It's been shown in Florida
3 that video billboards consume over 15 times the amount of electricity as regular
4 billboards. They are designed to be brighter than the sun in order to be seen in
5 daylight. It takes over 100 tons of coal to power one video billboard for a year. With the
6 Columbia region already facing dangerous ozone levels the local problem would be
7 exacerbated. As you know we are really being observed and carefully monitored by
8 DHEC right now on ozone levels. And at a time when we should all be conserving
9 energy to combat global warming these signs would add an even greater consumption
10 of energy burden. The second point that I'd like to mention again is video billboards
11 greatly increase light pollution. Light pollution is not only offensive to people its harmful
12 to migratory animals and nocturnal animals. And the video billboard industry has
13 successfully supported laws requiring trees to be removed from the public right-of-way
14 so billboards won't be obstructed. Trees that would otherwise help protect our air and
15 water quality. The signs are very bright and they're on 24 hours a day. I have no other
16 comments to make, just those two main comments. One, video billboards consume
17 over 15 times the amount of energy that regular billboards do and secondly, that they
18 greatly increase light pollution. And also just to point out to you that your very own
19 Conservation Commission has gone on record against the introduction of these video
20 billboards in unincorporated Richland County. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Any other comments?

22 **TESTIMONY OF WALLACE WRIGHT:**

1 MR. WRIGHT: I've got one, just a quick remark. My name is Wallace Wright.
2 I'm President of the Greater Woodfield Community Association and also Secretary of
3 the Richland County Neighborhood Council. I just wanted to inform you that my
4 neighborhood association is 100% opposed to the electronic billboards and when just
5 recently at a meeting two months ago with the Richland County Neighborhood Council
6 with 28 neighborhoods represented, 27 of them voted their opposition to the billboards
7 and one of them abstained. So that's pretty close to 100% opposition to the billboards.
8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you. Further discussion?

10 MS. CAIRNS: I'll add – I just want to add a couple comments because I think
11 one of the things also about the whole brightness factor. I think those are very difficult
12 to ascertain but I think without question these billboards can be viewed from a far
13 greater distance than any other type of billboard that exists that I've ever seen. But I
14 think it's interesting about the birds. I actually did a ton of bird research and light and
15 they will be drawn to anything bright. Just natural reaction animals generally, all
16 animals are drawn towards brightness and so it will affect migratory birds. I'm not
17 saying they're all going to die but I'm telling you there's amazing research out there
18 about birds flying into light and not knowing how to get out of light and the fact that
19 these things can be seen for miles is a factor. Sorry. I'll quit being esoteric.

20 MR. VAN DINE: I think, Mr. Chairman, just one last thing. If anybody really
21 wants to see the amount of light that's generated, drive on I-77 sometime. Before you
22 ever cross the river you'll see an ambient and the light on the one billboard directly
23 above Lamar's headquarters on the curve of I-77. You may not be able to see the

1 actual billboard itself but you can see the light reflected above the trees and above
2 everything else for miles.

3 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Mr. Kocy, any other comments from Staff?

4 MR. KOCY: No, sir.

5 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Well, I hope [inaudible] get to Council in time for their
6 meeting; is when?

7 MR. KOCY: Tomorrow.

8 MR. GREEN: And we don't know at this point whether we'll ever see this again.

9 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Well, good luck.

10 MR. GREEN: We're not. We're not?

11 CHAIRMAN MANNING: With that I'd like to conclude the workshop.

12 MS. LINDER: Mr. Chairman, there will be a report from Staff at the zoning public
13 hearing that, Planning Commission's action on this.

14 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you.

15 MR. VAN DINE: Is there any way discussions that were had during this work
16 session can somehow get to Council before they deal with this?

17 MS. ALMEIDA: We could try to get them copies of the minutes.

18 [Inaudible discussion]

19 MR. GREEN: Do we have any sense of how many rezonings we have next
20 month and how much time we're going to have for work sessions?

21 MS. ALMEIDA: I'm sorry?

22 MR. GREEN: Do we have any sense at this point how many rezonings we're
23 looking at for next month?

1

MS. ALMEIDA: You might be looking at two.

2

3

[Meeting Adjourned at 4:45 p.m.]