

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

January 5, 2009

[Members Present: Heather Cairns (in at 1:08); Julius Murray (in at 1:14), Enga Ward, Pat Palmer, Christopher Anderson, Deas Manning, Wes Furgess, Elizabeth Mattos-Ward]

CHAIRMAN MANNING: I'd like to call the January 5, 2009, Planning Commission meeting to order. I need to read this public statement into the Record. "In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration building." [Inaudible] fairly light agenda today. I'm glad we are starting off a New Year. I hope everybody got their continuing education complete [inaudible]; everybody's able to vote today?

MS. ALMEIDA: Today, yes. February, we don't know yet.

CHAIRMAN MANNING: We still have a few hanging out?

MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN MANNING: Uh-oh.

MR. PALMER: Well you need to know it's not done on a yearly basis, it's done by your appointment date.

CHAIRMAN MANNING: Oh, so -

MR. PALMER: [Inaudible] Cause I didn't quite make that one. [Laughter]

CHAIRMAN MANNING: Well if you want to make a motion to make sure that that's apparent?

MR. PALMER: Just so that you – everybody knows that. It's not done on a yearly basis, it's done by your appointment date.

1 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you. First item today is the election of officers
2 and in the past we have normally had the Vice-Chair, Secretary, move up in the rotation
3 but I would like to open it up if anybody would like to nominate anybody for Secretary,
4 Vice Chairman, or Chairman, we will take that [inaudible]. Any nominees they'd like to
5 present?

6 MR. PALMER: I'll nominate Chris for Chair, Anderson, and Wes Furgess for
7 Secretary.

8 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay. And you were Secretary last year and would like
9 to seek the Vice-Chair? With that on the table does anybody have a second?

10 MS. MATTOS-WARD: I second.

11 CHAIRMAN MANNING: Got a motion and a second. All those in favor please
12 raise your hand. All those opposed?

13 *[Approved: Ward, Palmer, Anderson, Manning, Furgess, Mattos-Ward; Absent:*
14 *Cairns, Murray]*

15 CHAIRMAN MANNING: I would guess that I needed to switch chairs with you
16 immediately.

17 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: No, you can actually take it over.

18 MR. PALMER: All you got to do is move that one stick from this side to this side.
19 *[Laughter]*

20 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yeah, that actually work. I want to thank everybody
21 and congratulations on the new appointments of Vice-Chair and Secretary and thank
22 Deas Manning also for his year of great service. Next item on the agenda is the
23 December Minutes. I was made aware that they were just given to us so.

1 MR. FURGESS: Mr. Chairman, I move that we skip the December Minutes since
2 we just got them and at our February meeting we would vote on both meetings.

3 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Got a motion. Do we have a second?

4 MR. MANNING: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All those in favor of moving the February, or excuse
6 me, the December Minutes to February, please signify by raising your hand. Opposed?

7 *[Approved: Ward, Palmer, Anderson, Manning, Furgess, Mattos-Ward; Absent: Cairns,*
8 *Murray]*

9 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Alright. Agenda amendments?

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, we have several changes. We would request that
11 your second page ordinance, Section 26-180, Signs, be repositioned to number one
12 under Text Amendments if that would be acceptable. And we would like to defer the
13 following text amendments. Section 26-171, under Protection of Buffers and Common
14 Areas, we'd like that deferred to the February Planning Commission meeting and
15 Section 26-184, Parks and Open Space, we'd also like deferred to the February
16 Planning Commission meeting. And those are all the requested changes.

17 MR. MANNING: So just for clarification we have two deferrals and one we're
18 moving?

19 MS. ALMEIDA: One repositioning. If we could please hear Section 26-180,
20 Signs, first under Text Amendments.

21 MR. PALMER: I have a question about Section 26-180, for Legal. It's my
22 understanding that the Appearance Commission has brought this language to us for
23 consideration; is that correct?

1 MS. LINDER: I believe that they have reviewed it and want it to be considered,
2 yes.

3 MR. PALMER: It's my understanding that the Appearance Commission doesn't
4 have the authority to change or to propose changes to the ordinance; is that correct?

5 MS. LINDER: That is correct. You are the recommending Body.

6 MR. PALMER: How did it get on our agenda?

7 MS. LINDER: The Appearance Commission worked with Staff and this is also in
8 conjunction with Staff's recommendations.

9 MR. PALMER: So the Staff is recommending it?

10 MS. LINDER: That is correct.

11 MR. PALMER: Not the Appearance Committee?

12 MS. LINDER: It's joint.

13 MR. KOCY: Well the intention was the incentive to get it on [inaudible], yes.

14 MR. PALMER: But it's been through the Staff and the Staff has looked at it and
15 has no changes from what the Appearance Commission -

16 MS. LINDER: The Staff did make some changes to it and this is Staff's version.

17 MR. PALMER: Okay. Is there an Appearance Commission version as well?

18 MS. LINDER: I do not believe so. Nothing in draft form, no.

19 MR. PALMER: Okay. So -

20 MS. ALMEIDA: They agree with Staff's recommendation that's in this packet.

21 MR. PALMER: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any other questions?

1 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment if I might. It might be
2 helpful [inaudible] upcoming year. As of late we have continually gotten more and more
3 text amendments [inaudible] it would be helpful in my opinion if Staff or Mr. Kocy if you
4 could outline to the Commission what you think needs addressing over the course of the
5 year rather than just having these things here before us each month. Obviously we
6 don't get our Minutes and our Agendas until late it gives us very little time to review
7 some of those. Some of them are rather lengthy and sometimes controversial so I think
8 it would be a good idea if y'all could, Staff could prepare just a broad outline of things
9 that you see that need to be changed and why and then give that to the Commission
10 and let's some dialogue before we get to [inaudible] but we seem to be doing three or
11 four every month.

12 MR. PALMER: Right. And also some sort of possibly how it came about. I
13 mean, was it something from the community? Did the community see something that
14 occurred and they want it changed or is it a directive of Council or is it a directive from
15 some other commission or how the whole thing manifests, you know, is going on and
16 what [inaudible]?

17 MR. KOCY: We can do that.

18 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any other questions, comments? The next section is
19 New Business.

20 MS. ALMEIDA: The 2009 calendar. Staff has as you can see tried to work
21 around holidays. We'd like you to review this and if acceptable approve the calendar for
22 today(?).

23 *[Ms. Cairns in at 1:08 p.m.]*

1 MR. FURGESS: Anna, question. Are we still going to have the August meeting
2 because every year, you know, there's been a debate whether –

3 MS. ALMEIDA: Right. You can choose to cancel it and take it off the Agenda as
4 of today or you can choose not to have that meeting once June or July rolls around. It's
5 really up to your pleasure, the pleasure of this Board. But normally we do cancel the
6 August Planning Commission.

7 MR. PALMER: Yeah. I think sometimes what we do is we schedule it then if we
8 don't have a heavy agenda if we want to cancel it we'll do that then. We'll go ahead and
9 put it on that schedule so we –

10 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any comments, questions?

11 MR. PALMER: I make a motion to approve the calendar.

12 MR. MANNING: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All those in favor? Opposed?

14 *[Approved: Cairns, Ward, Palmer, Anderson, Manning, Furgess, Mattos-Ward; Absent:*
15 *Murray]*

16 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Next item on the agenda, Subdivision Review, Case
17 No. SD-05-231, Pinnacle Ridge at Lake Carolina.

18 **CASE NO. SC-05-231:**

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, Mr. Chairman and Planning Commission Members, we
20 have this subdivision before you today which is a little unorthodox. This is part of the
21 Lake Carolina Development Agreement which requires that all subdivisions go before
22 the Planning Commission that was written into their Development Agreement. As you
23 can see it's pretty self-explanatory. Lake Carolina, their subdivision called Pinnacle

1 Ridge, is approximately 31 acres. The existing zoning is a PUD 2. They're proposing
2 130 lots. They have adequate access. They are still within their allowable density
3 under residential units as you can see. The approved Development Agreement and the
4 approved PUD allowed 7,177 residential units. To date they have proposed or
5 constructed or been approved for 3,259 residential units. They're requesting an
6 additional 1,315 residential units in the future, proposed. We have reviewed the
7 Development Agreement and they're within their limitations and their requirements.
8 They're up-to-date on all of their requirements. The proposed lots do have frontage on
9 the Lake Carolina Boulevard and Lake Carolina Drive. It is a 66' right-of-way which can
10 handle the added traffic and as you can see on page four, under Conclusion, Planning
11 Staff recommends the following conditions one through nine which are pretty self-
12 explanatory. Public Works approval, flood approval, E911 approval, fire marshal
13 approval. We have not received all of those approvals in so this would be a conditional
14 approval.

15 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Thank you. Any questions for Staff?

16 MR. PALMER: How come we don't get the full package on this like we used to
17 on the other subdivision approvals where it shows the plot layouts and all that kind of
18 stuff? I'm sure y'all have that, don't you?

19 MS. ALMEIDA: We do – you don't. You mean years ago?

20 MR. PALMER: Yeah. I mean, we're being asked basically to do the same thing
21 that we were asked to do years ago, right?

22 MS. ALMEIDA: To give a subdivision approval, yeah.

23 MR. PALMER: But we don't have the same information?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: I mean, we can. It's –

2 MR. PALMER: I mean, I just wondered, I mean, I guess we don't see many of
3 these.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: We don't normally but we can provide that.

5 MS. CAIRNS: I have a question. On the master plan it shows this area as being
6 called Town Center. Did the original PUD indicate that there'd be 1,300 residential units
7 in the Town Center?

8 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, it did. Worked with – Mr. Tuttle is here from Lake Carolina.

9 **TESTIMONY OF DAVID TUTTLE:**

10 MR. TUTTLE: Good afternoon. Thank everyone for their time. Actually the
11 Town Center area, there are three distinct parcels related to Town Center commercial.
12 They're exempted from the numbers that Anna quoted earlier and that are in your
13 package, as noted in your package. We're actually going from a commercial, an area
14 that was designed for commercial to a residential type zoning so we're far under our
15 pre-development quota if you will for density. But the 1,300 units she referred to were
16 en massed to the rest of the development of Lake Carolina not for this parcel.

17 MS. CAIRNS: Well, I mean, I guess that's the one thing that – I mean, if this
18 area had been designated as commercial and now we're switching it to residential?

19 MR. TUTTLE: Well actually the way that it's, the way that it's zoned it's a mixed-
20 use commercial that has -

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

22 MR. TUTTLE: - the ability to have residential and/or commercial office.

23 MS. CAIRNS: [Inaudible]

1 MS. ALMEIDA: And those numbers would be part of that –

2 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah.

3 MS. ALMEIDA: - against that total number?

4 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah. But the 1,300 isn't relative to this parcel. That's for the
5 completion of Lake Carolina overall which we're only going to end up being in,
6 somewhere the 60, 65% of the original density quoted.

7 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. I mean, my only concern was just that it looked as if it had
8 been designated for commercial [inaudible].

9 MR. TUTTLE : Yeah. It was actually a mixed –

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Mixed used.

11 MR. TUTTLE: - use –

12 MS. CAIRNS: That's fine.

13 MR. TUTTLE: - classification.

14 MS. CAIRNS: We don't have that little detail in our packet.

15 MR. TUTTLE: I understand. Sure, sure.

16 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Mr. Tuttle, for the Record, please state your name
17 and address, please?

18 MR. TUTTLE: I'm sorry. I'm David Tuttle and I live at 115 Lake Carolina
19 Boulevard.

20 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Thank you.

21 MR. TUTTLE: President of Lake Carolina Development.

22 *[Mr. Murray in at 1:14 p.m.]*

23 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Thank you. Any questions?

1 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, given the fact that this is well within the purview
2 of the PUD Agreement, Development Agreement, I make a recommendation we send
3 this forward [inaudible].

4 MR. FURGESS: I second subject to the conditions.

5 MR. MANNING: Subject to the conditions outlined by Staff [inaudible].

6 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right. All those in favor of sending Case No. SD-
7 05-231 –

8 MS. LINDER: This would be final approval. It would not be forwarded anywhere
9 else.

10 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. Sending final approval for Case No. SD-05-
11 231, signify by raising your hand. All opposed?

12 *[Approved: Cairns, Murray, Ward, Palmer, Anderson, Manning, Furgess, Mattos-Ward]*

13 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Next on the agenda, Text Amendments. Sign
14 ordinance, Section 26-180.

15 MR. KOCY: Good afternoon. Mr. Chairman, let me give you a brief history of
16 this. This request came from the County Administrator and from Council. Illegal signs
17 generate probably the highest number of citizen complaints about the Planning
18 Department to the Ombudsmen call center and the specific complaint is why does it
19 take so long to get rid of offending signs. And the reason is our Code is very onerous in
20 how we go about to get rid of illegal signs. The Appearance Commission volunteered
21 and initiated the work on a solution for this coming up with new Code language. They
22 worked with Councilman Malinowsky on this. They reviewed enforcement language for
23 the City of Columbia, Georgetown City, and Georgetown County, and this is the

1 language we came up with. Ryan Nevias of the Appearance Commission is here today.
2 She did most of the heavy lifting on this Code and she's here to answer any questions
3 with me. Our current Code requires the Department to, you know, find the offenders,
4 send him a registered letter, give them 30 days to respond. The City of Georgetown,
5 the County of Georgetown and Columbia, if you have an illegal sign they just take it and
6 I think that's a much faster solution to getting rid of offending signs.

7 MS. CAIRNS: What's the prescribed time going to be to cure?

8 MR. KOCY: If it's illegal, immediate. We'll call the offender, most of these signs
9 that are illegal don't have addresses, don't have businesses. It's call for, you know,
10 cheap computers, or going out of business or the new [www.weightlossclinic](http://www.weightlossclinic.com). We're just
11 going to pull them down and keep them and tell the offender.

12 MS. CAIRNS: Well, but if it's in the right-of-way, yeah, y'all can just take it.

13 MR. KOCY: Right.

14 MS. NEVIAS: That's what we're talking about.

15 MS. CAIRNS: On private property –

16 MR. KOCY: The private property we'll go after the traditional route. Contact the
17 property owner to tell them it's an illegal sign you should take it down. We're primarily
18 focused on the visual litter that –

19 MS. CAIRNS: Public property?

20 MR. KOCY: Right.

21 MS. CAIRNS: You gave up your ownership right?

22 MR. KOCY: Correct.

23 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. I get that.

1 MR. PALMER: Is the highway right-of-way, I mean, would y'all have – why would
2 the county take the authority? Why wouldn't have be a state issue?

3 MR. KOCY: The state already does that. The state already takes them without
4 bothering to call anybody.

5 MS. NEVIAS: Only on their roads.

6 MR. KOCY: Only on state roads.

7 MR. PALMER: Why – is this going to apply also to political signs as well?

8 MR. KOCY: Political signs are a different animal. They're protected speech. We
9 send a letter at the beginning of every campaign seasons to candidates reviewing what
10 the proper way to have political signs. We're not going after political signs. We're going
11 after commercial signs.

12 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Real estate signs? Real estate directional signs
13 also?

14 MS. NEVIAS: Any signs that are on the road.

15 MR. KOCY: We're working – we have a meeting scheduled two weeks from
16 Wednesday with the homebuilders to discuss real estate signs to see if we can come up
17 with a solution there. Traditionally in the last six months those have not been the
18 primary violators. It's been commercial businesses going out of business or, you know,
19 www for this new, you know, weight loss, cheap computers [inaudible].

20 MS. NEVIAS: Single [inaudible]

21 MR. KOCY: Right. Singles.com. Those have been the offensive signs, not real
22 estate directional signs.

1 MS. CAIRNS: Oh, but they will all be, I mean, the Code, I would hope the Code
2 would be enforced equally.

3 MR. KOCY: Correct.

4 MS. CAIRNS: I think a lot of directional signs are off-premises –

5 MR. KOCY: Correct.

6 MS. CAIRNS: - signs.

7 MR. KOCY: We're working on a parallel path with the homebuilders to come up.
8 Other jurisdictions have legal real estate kiosk signs at key intersections as a kiosk to
9 put, to properly place real estate signs so they're not in the right-of-ways, so they don't
10 interfere with line of sight, so they're maintained and aren't litter.

11 MR. MANNING: I thought there was a provision that allowed placement in the
12 right-of-way that – with a time limit. For a weekend that you could place a sign and
13 actually I know –

14 MS. NEVIAS: I believe there's something for churches and things of that nature.

15 MR. MANNING: - that the signs would put out on Friday afternoon and picked up
16 on Sunday afternoon.

17 MS. NEVIAS: On other people's property. In other words but not in the right-of-
18 way.

19 MR. KOCY: The horizontal nodding of my colleague behind me informs me that
20 that is not the case.

21 MR. PALMER: That's what they do in Lexington. I think they hire people to put
22 them out on Friday and pick them up on Sunday.

1 MR. KOCY: That is something that we'll be looking at with the homebuilders for
2 a mechanism to create a legal venue for real estate signs.

3 MR. MANNING: We need to be able to have some temporary mechanism of
4 advertising, directions primary just because people riding around and never being able
5 to find what they're looking for.

6 MR. KOCY: Our current Code does not permit that.

7 MR. MANNING: But the highway, I mean, the state does it. They pick up the
8 signs. They don't do a very good job of it. [Inaudible].

9 MR. PALMER: I do it on our property all the time, the back of my truck gets full
10 of them.

11 MS. NEVIAS: The state will only do it [inaudible] I-20. They won't do it on the
12 intersections [inaudible].

13 MR. MANNING: [Inaudible] the off ramp going to [inaudible].

14 MS. CAIRNS: [inaudible] in the county.

15 MR. KOCY: The special services from Public Works which frequently takes
16 inmates to collect litter on the side of the road has already discussed with us that they,
17 as part of their litter sweeps, they would do illegal signs.

18 MR. MANNING: So basically you're bringing this forward as a recommendation
19 right now. You're going to wait to have discussions with the real estate community,
20 Homebuilders Association or the [inaudible] as far as directional signs?

21 MR. KOCY: That would have to be yet another part of the Code because
22 currently real estate signs are not allowed and this doesn't address that. This just
23 addresses illegal signs.

1 MR. PALMER: I'd like to see it addressed all at the same time.

2 MS. CAIRNS: This is saying that if you put a sign up in the right-of-way, which
3 you're not allowed to do, it's going to be gone. And I don't think there's anything wrong
4 with saying you can't post a sign in the right-of-way. It's not legal now.

5 MR. MANNING: The only problem I have with it is that there are a lot of people
6 who obviously don't understand. You know, if we had a sweep in the next month and
7 high jacked all these signs it's going to be costly to replace.

8 MR. KOCY: Well we won't do the sweep until after this goes to the Council for
9 zoning public hearing and we have the public information office here which is doing the
10 press release to announce that the sign legislation might be changing to alert citizens to
11 the proper location of signs of which the right-of-way is not a proper location.

12 MR. PALMER: I think if we tied it together I think it would possibly force the issue
13 that we do adopt some language that would allow for some temporary signs like
14 Lexington has it, and tie them both together and they could [inaudible] the other. So in
15 that venue I would make a motion to defer this change in the Code until next month's
16 Agenda when we can have time to speak with HBA and have a work session and find
17 out how we can get the issue resolved.

18 MS. CAIRNS: But the signs are illegally in the right-of-way right now. The
19 mechanism is what, to try to find, you have to try to find who owns them?

20 MR. KOCY: Correct.

21 MS. CAIRNS: So that's all we're doing is changing so you can start enforcing
22 that but it's just too onerous.

1 MR. KOCY: It's too onerous. It's a registered letter; they get 30 days to respond
2 and –

3 MS. CAIRNS: When it's an 800 number.

4 MR. KOCY: When it's an 800 number or a web address it's almost impossible to
5 find out who the owner of the sign is.

6 MS. NEVIAS: And may I say that the city, they are aware of it because the city
7 picks them up on a regular basis and they don't have it specifically in their Codes but it
8 is a given that if, that they are in the right-of-way. Atlanta does this, Charlotte does this.
9 These are considered litter. When there's something in the right-of-way it's considered
10 litter. People do know it's illegal.

11 MS. CAIRNS: Can we – I have one question. Could we add to this that like for
12 the first 30 days of enforcement if a local number is provided the number will be
13 contacted before it will be removed? I mean, would that? I think delaying this is bad
14 because we have got way too many junk signs out there and I understand the concerns
15 of homebuilders but to hold the whole thing up for a month we're talking months before
16 anything gets done. I mean, what if we just say that so long as there's a local number
17 associated with it or a local agency that they get contacted so they have time to move it.
18 You know, give them two weeks to move if they get –

19 MR. PALMER: I think we're just talking 30 days here. I mean, this thing's been
20 in the process for years. I think we're talking about –

21 MS. CAIRNS: Maybe. But if you're tying it to approval of a right-of-way for
22 Homebuilders Association signs that could delay it a lot. I don't want to link those two
23 things.

1 MR. PALMER: I think the homebuilders are very –

2 MS. NEVIAS: [Inaudible]

3 MR. PALMER: I think the Homebuilders Association is very much in favor of
4 getting something worked out very quickly with Staff.

5 MS. CAIRNS: But I think we can push –

6 MR. PALMER: And they've already been in contact with the Staff to try to get
7 something done. I think next month we could get something resolved on it.

8 MS. ALMEIDA: I would also like to add that approximately almost a year ago we
9 did have a sweep because it is within our jurisdiction and we have taken all those signs
10 out. We kept them in the back and tried to contact as many people as possible and
11 then discarded. So it is in the Code that we can go out there and do sweep so we're
12 just trying to be a little more proactive about this.

13 MR. MANNING: I understand. I'd just like, rather than having the process half
14 complete let's go ahead and get it done, get the language put in there that everybody
15 can agree on and adopt it good, bad or indifferent.

16 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I don't think passing an ordinance that allows a private
17 entity to place a sign in the public right-of-way is an easy thing to do. I think simply
18 saying and making it clear as a bell if you go stick something in the public right-of-way
19 you've given up ownership rights. It's just like putting your trash at the curb. Once you
20 put it out there anyone's allowed to take it.

21 MR. PALMER: I'm not saying that it's not that way now. I think it's that way now.

22 MS. CAIRNS: I know. So I think we let this go forward because all it does is
23 clarify the, you know, what's going on and if we want to drop in there that the first, you

1 know, sweep of enforcement will – I mean, is that too onerous to try to contact those?

2 You know, if it's an 800 number then.

3 MS. NEVIAS: We did that for a few months to call people, the Appearance
4 Commission did that and people ignored us because the signs didn't go away. The
5 other thing is that if you allow one industry to do it how can you legally [inaudible].

6 MS. CAIRNS: Well that's exactly – passing something for the Homebuilders
7 Association is not going to be an easy task. Trying to figure out what kind of signs are
8 okay to place in the public right-of-way, that's not going to be an easy task.

9 MR. PALMER: I think Ms. Best could help us out a little bit.

10 MS. REBECCA BEST: Rebecca Best with Homebuilders and the Realtors
11 Association. We're not trying to say we don't need to clean up signs. We talked with
12 Joe about some opportunities to do something that's maybe a little more tasteful as far
13 as directional signs and we have some examples in other locations and so we're not
14 saying that – in the right-of-way we know that's wrong but maybe we can come up with
15 something that's more appealing and works better. Let's try something new. So we're
16 just trying to work on that.

17 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, the thing is that, you know, signage ordinances need to
18 be content neutral, okay? So we can't treat the builders any different than we can the
19 barber shops.

20 MS. BEST: I mean, I'm not saying we're trying to ask for special –

21 MS. CAIRNS: I understand. But I mean, in asking to be allowed to put
22 something in the right-of-way is an enormous [inaudible] and I mean there's also – the
23 thing is is that it's my understanding of the sign ordinances and stuff, particularly an off-

1 premises sign even if it's on my, you know, if I say to the builder around the corner,
2 yeah I'm going to let you put a sign in my front yard, on my private property to tell them
3 about – I can't do that. That's an off-premises sign and it's a billboard. It's got to be
4 zoned for a billboard. It doesn't have to be the size of a billboard but in essence that's
5 how, you know, so my whole point is you put something in the public right-of-way you've
6 given up ownership right. All this is is a clarification of the law and to slow it down until
7 we can get something that passes muster to allow the developers signs that's an
8 enormous, I mean, maybe we need to start that process but that shouldn't be linked to
9 cleaning up the right-of-way [inaudible].

10 MR. PALMER: Somehow Lexington has been able to do it.

11 MS. BEST: We worked with Lexington on theirs and, you know, times are tough
12 anyway and when – Deas had a good point – when you're trying to find a subdivision
13 and you're driving around and we're – I'm not saying that we're trying to do anything
14 illegal. We want to work together to come up with a tasteful compromise.

15 MS. CAIRNS: I'm not against –

16 MS. BEST: And I don't think we're asking for –

17 MS. CAIRNS: No. Granted. I'm not against them. I think some of the
18 prohibitions on off premises signs that are directional are very difficult to allow a
19 community to function well. Okay? But the fact that Lexington County has something I
20 would say doesn't necessarily mean it's constitutional. They also have blue laws which
21 frankly aren't constitutional if anybody wanted to challenge them. So, you know, that's
22 not necessarily standard but I just think we've got a problem with illegal signs in the
23 right-of-way. I think this should go forward, start the process to get this approved. All it

1 does is in essence clarify what is reality. And then we'll start addressing the issue of
2 off-premise directional signs to assist in other commercial enterprises.

3 MR. MURRAY: Well, right now you have signs on the right-of-way, state
4 property. You'll see the grass cutters, the state employees taking the signs up. If
5 they're political signs what happens is the state will pick them up, take them to the
6 maintenance shed whether you're in Eastover or whether you're back up 215 and they
7 will place them there and if someone knows anyone whose signs are up there they can
8 go back, the owner of that sign can go back and pick it up because normally it's that
9 four by eight firewood signs that they manufacture and they'll give you your signs back.
10 So things are working relatively well now with that part of it but I understand that there
11 are other signs, you know, all kinds of signs. I don't know what you're going to do with
12 the ones that Sears has up now. If you look over Atlas Road –

13 MS. CAIRNS: The city is addressing that.

14 MR. MURRAY: - they have those mobile signs, guys who are hired around all
15 the subdivisions – stores 40 to 80% off. Sears going out of business. You know, but
16 those are human signs. You might want to take them. Put them over at the [inaudible].

17 MS. CAIRNS: [Inaudible]

18 MS. NEVIAS: And I think they're allowed as long as they're not placed in the
19 ground. Someone's holding it.

20 MR. MURRAY: You're all right.

21 MS. NEVIAS: That's how they get away with it.

22 MR. PALMER: I'm just simply saying that we need – I'd like to wait 30 days and
23 defer for 30 days until we can – its been this way for a long time. I think we need to wait

1 30 days and see if we can get something figured out in these economic times we're in to
2 see if we can get some sort of signage thing figured out with HBA.

3 MR. MANNING: Is that in the form of a motion?

4 MR. PALMER: That is. I make a motion.

5 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: There is actually a motion on the floor; is there a
6 second?

7 MR. MANNING: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Please raise your hand sending Case – Section 26-
9 180 to defer until the February meeting. Please signify by raising your hand. All
10 opposed?

11 *[Approved: Murray, Ward, Palmer, Anderson, Manning; Opposed: Cairns, Furgess,*
12 *Mattos-Ward]*

13 MR. MANNING: What was the vote on that?

14 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: It was four to three.

15 MR. PALMER: Five.

16 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Excuse me. Five to three in favor.

17 MR. MANNING: Five to three in favor?

18 MS. CAIRNS: In favor of deferral.

19 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: The next item we'll be taking up on the Agenda is
20 Text Amendment addressing day cares, Chapter 26, Land Development Code. Mr.
21 Kocy?

22 MR. KOCY: Mr. Chairman, this too is a referral from the Council. Our current
23 Code had omitted a couple of zoning categories of where a day care could go so for

1 some applicants it required rezoning for an office commercial use. That didn't set well
2 with the Planning Department and it didn't set well with some Council Members so we
3 have amended the Code to allow day care, adult day care, kiddie day care, in more
4 zoning categories than the Code currently allows.

5 MR. PALMER: Just to get things started I make a motion to send this forward to
6 Council with a recommendation of approval.

7 MR. MANNING: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Motion and a second. Any discussion?

9 MR. FURGESS: Is this a day care for, adult day care, is this for, you know, like
10 the [inaudible] have day care in subdivisions [inaudible].

11 MR. KOCY: Just for six or fewer for home occupation.

12 MR. FURGESS: Right. This ordinance will do that?

13 MR. KOCY: Yes. But just in one zoning classification in the RU. It typically was
14 not in the RU district.

15 MR. PALMER: How does that, you know, they have big driveways, they have big
16 buses, all that stuff, and I guess they can have six or fewer adults living there in their
17 own residence?

18 MR. KOCY: Right.

19 MR. PALMER: In one house or –

20 MS. CAIRNS: This is day care, not [inaudible].

21 MR. KOCY: Not home care, just day care, to drop a senior off and pick him up –
22 children or adults.

23 MR. PALMER: Okay.

1 MR. KOCY: It's not overnight.

2 MR. PALMER: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I have a motion and a second on the floor. All those
4 in favor of sending this forward with a recommendation of approval please signify by
5 raising your hand. All those opposed?

6 *[Approved: Cairns, Murray, Ward, Palmer, Anderson, Manning, Furgess, Mattos-Ward]*

7 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Next item on the Agenda, Land Development Code
8 concerning Green Code Section 26-186. Mr. Kocy?

9 MR. KOCY: Again, Mr. Chairman, this is a minor revision requested by the
10 County Council. The current threshold for a site to apply the Green Code is ten acres.
11 We're amending this down to two acres. That's also consistent with the size of a site for
12 a PDD, two acres. That's the only change.

13 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, to get a discussion started on the floor, I'd like to
14 recommend we send it forward with a recommendation of approval.

15 MR. FURGESS: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any discussion?

17 MS. CAIRNS: What was the rationale behind the ten acres in the beginning?

18 MR. KOCY: No rationale, really. Our consultant brought this forward. He's an
19 Atlanta-based consultant. This was used in several Atlanta counties and ten acre was
20 the threshold there. We never really thought much about it.

21 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, in the sense of Staff that two acres, that you can
22 accomplish the preservation of elements within a two acre?

1 MR. KOCY: Absolutely. On a smaller parcel, two or three acres you might not
2 be able to qualify for the density bonus but it gives you the flexibility to preserve
3 wetlands and stream buffers and scale your lots down to very tiny.

4 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any other questions? Got a motion and a second on
5 the floor. All those in favor of sending Section 26-186 forward please signify by raising
6 your hand. All opposed?

7 *[Approved: Cairns, Murray, Ward, Palmer, Anderson, Manning, Furgess; Opposed:*
8 *Mattos-Ward]*

9 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That completes the Text Amendment Section. Moving
10 on to Comprehensive Plan.

11 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a comment [inaudible]
12 discussion of various elements. I think we are opening up the door constantly by
13 classifying the Comprehensive Plan is for smart growth and obviously [inaudible]
14 balance and better growth than we've had but that definition is different for many, many
15 people. The connotation brings out emotion as well and I just think we're here to adopt
16 a comprehensive plan whether you call it smart growth or not. I don't think the name or
17 the attachment does anything for the actual end product.

18 MR. PALMER: I agree.

19 MR. MANNING: I'd like to see it changed but we'll discuss this.

20 MR. KOCY: Mr. ex-Chairman, that's a great idea. It's just currently we have this
21 Town and Country Plan and we were referring to the comp plan and people were like
22 what plan are you talking about? So we just came up with a name. I'm open to
23 suggestions. It's just it can't be Town and Country Plan Two.

1 MR. MANNING: I'd just call it the Richland County Comprehensive Plan.

2 MR. KOCY: That works.

3 MR. DELAGE(?): Good afternoon everyone. Depending on how, which one
4 you'd like to start on. We're open either way for that but we, to kind of continue the
5 process we did before we're just going through each page and see if there's anything
6 that's not jiving. And I will say before we start the Natural Resource element is just the
7 Cultural Resource element. It's just kind of broad kind of categories we're going
8 through. We're really not trying to inventory anything specific. Really the biggest thing
9 that we're trying to focus on with that is the goals and implementation strategies. Also
10 the Transportation element, lot of it was taken from Parsons Brinkerhoff study on the
11 different technical memorandums. So a lot of the goals in there are either partially or
12 are fully from their recommendations as well.

13 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any questions? I just had one quick question and
14 pardon me, I didn't see this in there. We do face having rivers around and rock
15 quarries, certain natural elements that are specific to an area that you can't go to the
16 Sandhills and get. Does the Natural Elements address some of those natural resources
17 and -

18 MR. DELAGE: Well, near the end we talk about the different like with clay being
19 over in the Horrell Hill area. Of course granite with the City of Columbia and if I
20 remember it correctly is it Calib(?), Kalon(?)? I always mix that one up but with that but
21 other than that we don't do anything really too specific.

22 MR. MANNING: One other point on goal 5, implementation strategies, it talks
23 about environmental conditions by creating [inaudible] pass DHEC's regulatory

1 minimums and when they need to be changed and more stringent, I'm in favor of that
2 but I think policy just to say DHEC, which is our environmental state agency, they
3 should surpass that in a blanket statement is far reaching. If we need to address
4 regulations [inaudible] taking our natural resources, let's deal with that [inaudible]
5 implementation policy surpass DHEC's standard policy [inaudible].

6 MR. DELAGE: What'd you mean if they were just removing DHEC from the
7 bottom; that will surpass regulatory minimum just to kind of take DHEC out of there
8 would be a simple, quick fix.

9 MR. MANNING: Well, I just think that if their ordinance needs to be, if the county
10 feels that that is a particular ordinance that needs to be addressed [inaudible] by all
11 means address it.

12 MS. CAIRNS: If it says, you know, create local regulations which address local
13 issues.

14 MR. MANNING: I think that's better than surpassing DHEC minimum
15 regulations.

16 MS. WILKIE: We'll just cut it off at the first condition. [Inaudible] we'll just put a
17 period right there and just take the rest of that out, which basically says [inaudible]
18 comply with DHEC.

19 MS. CAIRNS: No I wouldn't – no, don't.

20 MS. WILKE: You don't think?

21 MR. MANNING: I don't think you need to say [inaudible]

22 MS. CAIRNS: No. Because there will be times that the DHEC minimum I would
23 offer is not going to be the best thing for the county.

1 MR. MANNING: Well in some situations [inaudible].

2 MS. CAIRNS: It might be fine but to say that the DHEC minimum is always
3 acceptable.

4 MR. MANNING: [Inaudible] minimum might be sufficient [inaudible] natural
5 resource.

6 MS. CAIRNS: I think where it says, "improve environmental conditions by
7 creating local regulations" that's fine. I mean, the idea that we should have local
8 regulations I think is appropriate.

9 MR. KOCY: Done.

10 MS. WILKIE: I don't think that's – is that what you were saying?

11 MS. CAIRNS: Well, I liked that it talked about creating local regulations which
12 you - heavy handed delete key. That's right. The big undo arrow.

13 MS. WILKIE: Well we can add something in there that says maybe something
14 like -

15 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, I think it's good that it is part of one of our goals is to have
16 local regulations where appropriate.

17 MS. WILKIE: I tell you I feel the pressure now.

18 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any other questions, comments? Next?

19 MR. DELAGE: All right. Transportation Element. Do you want to go ahead and
20 move onto that? If y'all prefer to start, just go ahead with the text and then go into the
21 goals afterwards or do y'all feel comfortable with the text of the Transportation Element?

22 MS. WILKIE: Tommy read all those long technical memorandums that Parsons
23 Brinkerhoff prepared and he pulled what he felt like was kind of the highlights from all of

1 those [inaudible] even the state statute even said we could have just said at the
2 beginning of the Transportation Element [inaudible] Transportation Element and said
3 see Parsons Brinkerhoff study but we thought we would add a little something additional
4 in here so.

5 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Are there any questions regarding the text? Or the
6 goals?

7 MR. MANNING: A couple questions on goal five, implementation strategies.
8 What is exactly [inaudible] transportation [inaudible]?

9 MR. DELAGE: If I remember correctly and [inaudible] jump in here, it'd be
10 signage just to allow –

11 MR. MANNING: Signage?

12 MR. DELAGE: It would say congestion ahead or I believe in some places they
13 might actually – I mean, we don't have that here but it would, you know, have kind of
14 like an ex or a green arrow saying that, you know, to go. It's kind of just more of a –
15 you(?) seen a more integrated intelligent highway systems where they actually have the
16 lanes with a little slot for certain portions of the day but I think mainly what that, what the
17 intent with that is just, you know, let you know where there's congestion.

18 MR. MANNING: And the Land Development Code [inaudible] to allow traffic
19 calming techniques; that'd be speed bumps, narrow streets?

20 MR. KOCY: Yes.

21 MR. MANNING: How are we doing with – is that something that Public Works is
22 moving forward with?

1 MR. KOCY: We're looking at that as part of the development roundtable process
2 where we've hired a consultant to work with six members of the public, six members of
3 the homebuilders, and then the Staff to go through the entire land development
4 regulation part of the Code and streets and parking are a major part of the component
5 of that. So we aren't there yet but we will be bringing recommendations to you in the
6 next 12 months, yes.

7 MR. MANNING: I think we've been having those discussions with the
8 engineering department for years really [inaudible] techniques.

9 MR. PALMER: Isn't there an issue with fire trucks getting around those traffic
10 circles and EMS [inaudible]?

11 MR. MANNING: A multitude of problems but if we don't - and goal number
12 seven, [inaudible] traditional neighborhood developments. I would make the suggestion
13 that that whole classification be [inaudible] do you know how many T&Ds we've had
14 applied for [inaudible] since that Code went into effect?

15 MR. GOSLINE: Four or five.

16 MR. MANNING: We've had that many? It was a PUD, it was a PUD, a PDD.

17 MS. ALMEIDA: We've had none actually T&D.

18 MR. MANNING: Right.

19 MS. ALMEIDA: We have PDDs and PUDs that have integrated a lot of the
20 philosophies and standards.

21 MR. MANNING: Right. In the Town and Country District?

22 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

23 MR. MANNING: Itself. I don't think -

1 MS. ALMEIDA: We have not had any, correct.

2 MR. GOSLINE: The other think is a portion – some portions of Lake Carolina are
3 designated T&D. Individual portions like behind the entrance.

4 MR. MANNING: But when you're referring to T&D that's traditional
5 neighborhood's not Town and Country District?

6 MR. GOSLINE: No.

7 MR. MANNING: [inaudible] okay. [Inaudible] traditional development in the
8 Code seems awfully cumbersome and just a lot of details that probably [inaudible].

9 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any other questions on goals?

10 MS. CAIRNS: You know, one of those things you included in our packet had to
11 do with the problems with everything with funding. Do you have any goals that try to
12 address – I mean, to me the things that seem to be repeated in that is one, no money
13 and no hope of money, no source of funding. But also one of the things that stuck in my
14 craw was the unrealistic estimates. Can we have something that tries to say that when
15 we estimate a road expansion to have it be realistic because I don't think it helps to
16 have unrealistic road estimates?

17 MR. DELAGE: I agree. And most of our –

18 MS. CAIRNS: Is that too detailed for this plan or something? But I just thought, I
19 mean, you gave us this really detailed thing that had enormous challenges. I'm not sure
20 if we're trying to address –

21 MR. GOSLINE: I'm not sure I understand the question.

22 MS. CAIRNS: Well just, you know, I mean, you gave us the packet, you know, a
23 couple of pages that just talk about –

1 MR. GOSLINE: Background stuff?

2 MS. CAIRNS: - [inaudible]. You know, to me like the things that we out to see in
3 this plan is, you know, creating a funding source and getting public transit that works.
4 It's ridiculous that we don't have a public transit that works at all in this area. And also
5 that one of the things that just really stuck with me is I think in here that we ought to
6 have maybe as one of our goals of our transportation plan or whoever comes up with
7 those estimates that the number is more realistic. You know, I don't know quite who all
8 the players are but all I know is that person was saying these estimates are just not
9 accurate by any stretch.

10 MR. GOSLINE: Well –

11 MS. CAIRNS: I don't know where the estimates came from obviously not –

12 MR. GOSLINE: Unfortunately, the long range traffic planning process is a lot of
13 guesswork because you're – the way it's done now you assume the way it's been done
14 will continue for the next 25 years and part of the message and the data is we can't do
15 that. We can't, we've got to do something different. And so I think some of the stuff we
16 have here now will get us going in that direction, you know. It's such a huge problem
17 it's very difficult to get your arms around it.

18 MR. MANNING: From a traffic [inaudible] do you agree with the priority list that
19 COG has presented to you?

20 MR. GOSLINE: That's a subject of some discussion. The – I don't have any
21 particular reason to disagree with it. There's – Lexington County has some problems
22 with the way it was done but that's what the Board adopted and that's what's going to
23 move ahead. You know, what their objections – it's hard to tell what difference it would

1 make in the ranking but Richland County has four projects in the top ten I think and the
2 reality is, you know, I think in the memo is try to show you that there's just no money.

3 MR. MANNING: Right.

4 MR. GOSLINE: And so in a sense you're fighting over pennies.

5 MR. MANNING: So in that regard would it make sense as in the capital facilities
6 plan that there are recommendations and priorities out there –

7 MR. GOSLINE: Right.

8 MR. MANNING: - come back to the Planning Commission [inaudible]. Would it
9 make sense to have someone come in here and talk about those plans and us a
10 Commission come up with different priority lists knowing that we only have limited
11 dollars to fund something. You don't need to look at something we can't do.

12 MR. GOSLINE: Right. You know, part of – the process is pretty much controlled
13 by the feds. If you want fed bucks you've got to do it the way they do it. And the way
14 it's being done now is the way you can do it. Now the one cent sales tax study talked
15 about sort of outside the federal dollars, running it through one cent sales tax and then
16 doing their own improvements based off of that funding revenue.

17 MR. MANNING: Are C funds designated to dirt roads only?

18 MR. GOSLINE: Excuse me?

19 MR. MANNING: C funds?

20 MR. GOSLINE: Yes. C funds are – the county gets about a million and a half
21 dollars a year. That comes straight out of state dollars; that's not federal dollars.

22 MR. MANNING: But have we as a policy or [inaudible] proscribed that dollar only
23 to dirt road paving or is that used for other [inaudible]?

1 MR. GOSLINE: That money is the, I forget the formula but it's straight funded
2 out of state dollars and it's, there's some way they divide it up which I forget for every
3 county and the money has to be used for non-federal roads. So in the case of most
4 places in Richland County it's sidewalks, some paving, some things like some
5 intersection improvements, things like that. So, but even those are terribly expensive.

6 MR. MANNING: It appeared to me that last time we had this discussion there
7 was a lot of reluctance to even have any discussion about C funds [inaudible]
8 underserved as well and I'm not trying to say they're not [inaudible] best way to spend
9 those dollars. You're getting a mile and a half of paved roads, I mean.

10 MR. GOSLINE: Well the cost, DOT figures it costs roughly six to seven hundred
11 thousand dollars to pave a dirt road to reasonable standards and the county gets, once
12 you take away the share that is obligated to the city that's about what's left.

13 MR. MANNING: Going back to what Heather was talking about is public
14 transportation.

15 MR. GOSLINE: Right.

16 MR. MANNING: Taking some of those dollars and putting in rain shelters or
17 benches out to get people to use those facilities. I mean, -

18 MR. GOSLINE: Right.

19 MR. MANNING: - [inaudible] six percent adequate.

20 MR. GOSLINE: The C funds process is one of, anybody can propose a project
21 and the current, there's a current backlog of \$5.5 million worth of projects of which they
22 get maybe \$600,000 a year to do. So, and you know, I go to the - I'm not [inaudible] on
23 the [inaudible] committee of the CTC, and there is a process by which you rank them

1 but, you know, you have to choose between having a sidewalk for school or an
2 intersection or putting a sidewalk over a bridge so people don't have to walk out into the
3 traffic to get across the creek. You know, that kind of stuff. It's really tough to do.

4 MR. PALMER: I have a question. One of the goals is creating what a
5 transportation director?

6 MR. GOSLINE: That was in the, that was one of the recommendations of the
7 Parsons Brinkerhoff study.

8 MS. WILKIE: [Inaudible] implementation [inaudible].

9 MR. PALMER: Yeah.

10 MS. WILKIE: I think these goals come straight from the Parsons Brinkerhoff
11 study.

12 MR. PALMER: Right. We're looking to create a whole other department?

13 MR. GOSLINE: That was their recommendation. I guess the choice that you all
14 have is whether you think that's worth pursuing. I mean, that's what – spend a lot of
15 money to have people who really know what they're doing suggest it ought to be done
16 so.

17 MR. PALMER: They even got down to getting paid the same as Joe, huh?

18 MR. GOSLINE: Yep.

19 MR. KOCY: How about that?

20 MR. WILKIE: Carl said he'll take that job.

21 MR. PALMER: So what is this going to be a whole other department? There'll
22 be more staffing, more offices, more hardware, more cars, more?

1 MR. KOCY: I believe the recommendation in the Parsons Brinkerhoff study was
2 a very small staff to just focus on transportation, road issues and that's it.

3 MR. PALMER: And would that be to take a look at transportation plans that
4 came in with developments and evaluate those, would that then get off of the DRT kind
5 of issue or what?

6 MR. KOCY: It was to focus on again just transportation issues, road networks,
7 interconnectivity, congestion problems, coordinating with mass transit. Again focusing
8 on that, not looking at subdivisions, not looking at site plans, landscaping, parking lots,
9 just focusing on roads and vehicle movement issues. And this was all going to be
10 funded if the county passed the one cent sales tax. That was a portion of the dedicated
11 transportation funding was to hire somebody to just focus on how the transportation
12 funds were going to be spent.

13 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: What's Council's thought on that?

14 MR. KOCY: I don't know that it ever got that far because they did not have the
15 referendum on the penny sales tax.

16 MS. CAIRNS: Who does the work now that a director of transportation would
17 do? How was that work handled now in staff?

18 MR. KOCY: We don't have the huge revenue stream to do all these
19 transportation improvements so there's no need to study how to spend all this money
20 we don't have.

21 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, so but, I mean, even just – but so is there no one who just
22 looks at transportation as a fundamental issue and problem?

1 MR. KOCY: We don't look at it comprehensively; we look at it site plan by site
2 plan and Carl and the COG look at some of the major issues in the county when it
3 comes time to divvying up federal highway funds. But yes, this analysis is not currently
4 done.

5 MR. GOSLINE: Joe's right. I mean, we do what we can do with what we've got.

6 MS. CAIRNS: Sure.

7 MR. GOSLINE: But without, you know, a separate money source to operate sort
8 of outside the normal COG process.

9 MR. PALMER: But just like you said, I mean, why would we create a department
10 to just generate more information when there's no money to do anything with the
11 information that's generated? At least in the foreseeable future there's no money for it.

12 MR. GOSLINE: Presumably, Pat, and the CIP and some other, some of these
13 other we're going to get some money eventually. It just says - because it says create it
14 doesn't mean tomorrow and no I want to be - no. Let Tommy do it.

15 MR. DELAGE: The thought behind that I think mainly for us including it was at
16 the time we'd had, we were just doing that site by site basis and we're hoping to get
17 some more long term. And I think with that their recommendation for the director of
18 transportation is just to have someone solely focused on that, just [inaudible]

19 MR. KOCY: We keep referring to the Parsons Brinkerhoff plan but it was really
20 done by a citizen committee, a very large citizen committee so it was - Parsons
21 Brinkerhoff just acted as an editor from a technical resource group that included a wide
22 range of citizens and business leaders in the county. So rather than try to, excuse the
23 pun, reinvent the wheel, we just synopsisized what the Parsons Brinkerhoff study said.

1 MS. WILKIE: And also this is ten year plan, the comprehensive plan is, so. You
2 never know what can come about.

3 MR. PALMER: Yeah, but this was three to four years.

4 MS. WILKIE: [Inaudible]

5 MR. PALMER: And it's the first one.

6 MS. WILKIE: Yeah, it is.

7 MR. GOSLINE: I might suggest, Mr. Chairman -

8 MS. WILKIE: Not in any particular order though.

9 MR. GOSLINE: Members, I might suggest that if it would make you feel more
10 comfortable you could add something like when funding – something at the end like
11 when the funding, a dedicated source of funding becomes available or some such
12 words if that'd give you more comfort.

13 MR. PALMER: It wouldn't even be funding. I'd feel more comfortable if it was
14 funding would be available to implement strategies that were produced by the
15 Department.

16 MR. GOSLINE: Okay.

17 MR. PALMER: I mean, you understand what I'm saying?

18 MR. GOSLINE: Yeah, [inaudible] want to add that?

19 MR. PALMER: Sure. [Inaudible] strike the regular transportation [inaudible]?

20 MS. CAIRNS: I think the, I mean, I think that somebody ought to be responsible
21 for, I mean, because sometimes just how you handle signaling and stuff like that, just
22 how you figure out how to move traffic through surface streets that exist and how to plan
23 intersections. I mean, sometimes, you know, I mean, to me it makes sense that there

1 ought to be somebody. You know, whether we can afford that person today or not
2 granted but, I mean, I think long term yeah, we should absolutely be looking at having
3 somebody who has the responsibility of just keeping track of how traffic's working and
4 anticipating, you know, when large developments get approved or large areas go under
5 development, how do we start addressing all of the transportation needs from that
6 source into the city?

7 MR. PALMER: I just think that would fall under another, you know, staff level of
8 the current Staff that we have. I mean, have some sort of transportation czar through
9 Public Works or somewhere as a –

10 MS. CAIRNS: But they're not planners. It needs to be a planner based person.
11 It needs to be somebody [inaudible] Public Works is like –

12 MR. PALMER: [Inaudible] an equation of numbers. I mean, it's synchronizing
13 lights and that kind of stuff. I mean, it's dealing with what you have.

14 MR. GOSLINE: Let me – the way it's done now. First of all most all the roads,
15 all the roads except in subdivisions are DOT maintained. They have people that,
16 engineers and all this that do signaling. We get traffic management plans which tell us
17 the improvements needed to mitigate the traffic generated by projects. They usually
18 have intersection improvements, signals, that kind of stuff. So that the way it's done
19 now it's mostly through DOT. Public Works has, well first of all they've hired a new
20 County Engineer from Charleston and so they have some involvement in that but really
21 the signalization and all that is left to consultants and DOT. Because virtually all the
22 roads are DOT maintained and owned.

23 MR. MANNING: [Inaudible] City of Columbia size, would that -

1 MR. GOSLINE: Right. In the City of Columbia they have David, they have a City
2 Engineer who does that and they, you know, I know they've gotten some grants to –

3 MR. MANNING: Like Greenville or Charleston --

4 MR. GOSLINE: - synchronize the signals.

5 MR. MANNING: - a separate transportation director?

6 MR. GOSLINE: Excuse me?

7 MR. MANNING: Does Charleston or Greenville or Charlotte have a separate
8 transportation department or director?

9 MR. GOSLINE: Oh, Charlotte certainly does. Greenville, they have I think, I'm
10 not sure but I know there's a couple people in the Planning Department that do that kind
11 of work.

12 MR. MANNING: That are designated for just –

13 MR. GOSLINE: Right.

14 MR. MANNING: - transportation?

15 MR. GOSLINE: Um-hum (affirmative).

16 MR. MANNING: I think they need to have some distance, separation, I mean,
17 the Planning Department zoning and sign removal, Public Works to get some people
18 out there who can do some thinking without having to worry about taking up signs on
19 the right-of-way. I just, we need some good planning as we grow.

20 MR. GOSLINE: Let me just ask you something so we can get some resolution
21 on this. Are you uncomfortable with a separate department or are you uncomfortable
22 with the, more or less the function?

1 MR. PALMER: Me personally it's the creation of a whole new department and
2 the generating of more funds that have to support all that. I mean, it's not just one
3 person's salary, it's all the hardware that goes along with it and the department and the
4 space and the computers and the, I mean, it's everything.

5 MR. GOSLINE: And that – never mind.

6 MR. PALMER: That's the problem I got with it. I think that somebody dealing
7 solely with transportation if you want to put them under Public Works or wherever you
8 want to put them at, I mean, I don't care. But a Director of Transportation which has the
9 same salary as Joe Kocy, that's just. I don't know. That's the only issue I had with it
10 because it's creating a whole new department just for transportation. I mean, are the
11 other elements not as important? Do they not need directors either I guess?

12 MR. GOSLINE: I'm sorry, what?

13 MR. PALMER: Do the other elements, are they not as important as
14 transportation? Do they not need directors?

15 MR. GOSLINE: Of course not.

16 MR. PALMER: Transportation's more important – is the most important
17 element?

18 MR. GOSLINE: Of course.

19 MR. PALMER: That needs a director? What about a Director of Natural
20 Resources?

21 MR. GOSLINE: Works for me.

22 MR. PALMER: Do you want that one?

23 MR. KOCY: How about that?

1 MR. PALMER: Yeah. You can go back to three or four years on that if you want
2 to.

3 MS. WILKIE: I like the five better.

4 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any other comments, questions, positions?

5 MR. DELAGE: That's all we've got so I guess all that's left is a vote.

6 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Are we, just for clarification, we're not voting, we're
7 not taking a vote right here?

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

9 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We are taking a vote –

10 MR. KOCY: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: - on the entire? I wanted a name of the actual
12 comprehensive plan. There was some discussion about that.

13 MR. KOCY: 2009 Comprehensive Plan.

14 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Everybody in agreeance with that?

15 MR. PALMER: And did we change the maps to include the suburban area higher
16 up?

17 MR. WILKIE: We're going to. Brenda's been out. She's going to edit the line for
18 us as soon as she comes back so that maps once it gets to County Council it'll be like
19 you asked.

20 MS. CAIRNS: [Inaudible] took the word rural out of any of our [inaudible]?

21 MS. WILKIE: We changed the name to, from rural to – I can find that for you.

22 MR. PALMER: What are we being asked to vote on; the whole comp plan?

23 MS. WILKIE: We've already passed –

1 MR. KOCY: We passed seven.

2 MS. WILKIE: - six or seven of them.

3 MR. KOCY: Seven of the nine.

4 MS. WILKIE: These are the last two.

5 MR. PALMER: With the new language in there?

6 MR. KOCY: Yes.

7 MR. MANNING: And [inaudible] as we [inaudible] give us an opportunity to take
8 a look if we needed to or had a suggested change but [inaudible].

9 MS. WILKIE: The classification was, the new classifications are urban,
10 suburban, and low density suburban instead of rural. There's no rural.

11 MR. PALMER: And what did we take -

12 MR. DELAGE: It's not even low density, three quarter acre lots. I mean, there's
13 nothing low about that.

14 MR. PALMER: Everything that's currently classified as rural it'll go to what?

15 MS. WILKIE: How do you mean go to what? Like in terms of acreage? I mean,
16 in terms of -

17 MR. PALMER: What will the name of it be?

18 MS. WILKIE: Oh, low density suburban whereas before we had rural - I mean,
19 rural, urban, and suburban. Now we have urban, suburban, and low density suburban.
20 No rural. And we have conservation areas but that's just [inaudible].

21 MR. PALMER: I'd like to just see that before I voted on the whole thing
22 altogether.

23 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We don't have to vote on the whole thing right now.

1 MS. CAIRNS: Do we vote on these just parts and then we're done?

2 MS. WILKIE: As we've been reviewing them you all have been approving them
3 based on the changes that you asked us to make.

4 MS. CAIRNS: Right. So I mean, we have two today to vote on?

5 MS. WILKIE: And that's it.

6 MR. KOCY: That's it.

7 MS. CAIRNS: And we don't vote on the thing [inaudible]?

8 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We don't vote on it as a whole.

9 MR. PALMER: So we're sending each individual element up to Council?

10 MS. WILKIE: Resolution says the whole thing too.

11 MS. LINDER: Mr. Chairman, I would recommend, I mean, it's certainly fine that
12 you recommend one element at a time but for purposes of sending this to Council I
13 would recommend that you give it a one-time vote that we're sending the
14 Comprehensive Plan in its entirety to the County Council because you do have to do
15 this by resolution and it's a lot cleaner and simpler if you're saying we're sending the
16 Comprehensive Plan forward.

17 MS. CAIRNS: Do we want to see some of the parts that we amended?

18 MR. PALMER: I would think so. Yeah. Because we're saying, you know, before
19 they give the map and then also the rural, how all that stuff flushed out with the three-
20 quarter acre lot what all it says in writing so I could see it.

21 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Can we pull that up right now?

1 MS. WILKIE: We can go grab it. We don't have the – I have it here in writing. I
2 can answer any questions you want or I can show it to you. I don't have it on here but
3 we can go get it.

4 MR. PALMER: Yeah. Could we just see it for next – can we just see it for next
5 month. I mean, I wouldn't have a problem passing this and approving it just –

6 MR. KOCY: We'll bring it back in February and have the completed document.
7 We'll show you on the screen. We'll give you copies on disks.

8 MR. PALMER: And we'll get a copy, a full copy – well you'll probably get that for
9 us in the next week or so, right? [Inaudible]

10 MR. KOCY: We could.

11 MS. WILKIE: I could email it to you too. Whatever you prefer.

12 MR. PALMER: Pretty big?

13 MR. KOCY: Yeah. It's a pretty big document.

14 MS. CAIRNS: I'm not sure your server wants to be handling that.

15 MR. KOCY: [Inaudible] server it doesn't go to many.

16 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Just for clarification do we need to vote on these two
17 elements?

18 MR. KOCY: That would be nice to give us some finality that we can continue to
19 edit as you've directed.

20 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any motions?

21 MR. PALMER: Motion to approve.

22 MR. MANNING: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All those in favor please signify by raising your hand.

2 All opposed?

3 *[Approved: Cairns, Murray, Ward, Palmer, Anderson, Manning, Furgess, Mattos-Ward]*

4 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right. Road names.

5 MR. KOCY: Mr. Chairman, before we move along. We have scheduled a series
6 of public workshops the last Wednesday of this month and every Wednesday in
7 February in various county locations, primarily libraries and rec areas. We're going to
8 have large posters made of one per element of the comp plan with a general
9 introduction to that element and then the goals spelled out. We'll send you a meeting
10 schedule in case you want to stop in and take pride as authors of this document or
11 critique it with a fake beard. But it will be every Wednesday in February and the last
12 Wednesday of January.

13 MR. MANNING: On Wednesdays in January and February?

14 MR. KOCY: Just the final Wednesday in January and every Wednesday in
15 February. We have one meeting per planning area.

16 MR. MANNING: How are we coming along with the provisions to the Southeast
17 Master Plan?

18 MR. KOCY: Mr., Councilman Jackson has a meeting tentatively scheduled with
19 the community for some time in January. I don't know, do we have a date? We don't
20 have a definitive date yet but Mr. Jackson wanted to have one final meeting with his
21 constituents to give us some guidance as to where we're going with this thing.

22 MR. MANNING: [inaudible] the final draft of the document – the revisions haven't
23 been made to the Southeast Master Plan?

1 MR. KOCY: We've made them but we haven't brought them back to you yet just
2 because we had a public meeting in November that didn't go real well so we're
3 uncertain what to do.

4 MR. MANNING: That meeting being the one we had here or a public meeting?

5 MR. KOCY: A public meeting.

6 MR. PALMER: I have one other thing too before we do road names. I've asked
7 probably four times about a subdivision on Windsor Lake Boulevard which has, should
8 have had shared access points. Did someone take a look at it for me? It's on Windsor
9 Lake Boulevard.

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Do you know the name?

11 MR. PALMER: It doesn't have a name. It's actually on the Boulevard but it's
12 between Oak Crest and Alpine. You can tell where they started out having shared
13 driveways and then all of a sudden people quit checking them.

14 MS. ALMEIDA: I thought Mr. Price got a hold of you on that.

15 MR. PALMER: He didn't.

16 MS. ALMEIDA: Okay. That'll be emailed to you.

17 MR. PALMER: Because I almost hit cars going down there but I'm doing 25.

18 MS. ALMEIDA: Drive slower.

19 MS. CAIRNS: [Inaudible] your driving skills.

20 MR. PALMER: I'm doing 25. When my kids have their hands over my eyes.

21 Make a motion to approve road names.

22 MS. CAIRNS: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All in favor?

1 *[Approved: Cairns, Murray, Ward, Palmer, Anderson, Manning, Furgess, Mattos-Ward]*

2

3

[END OF RECORDING]