

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

February 2, 2009

1
2
3
4
5 *[Members Present: Heather Cairns; Julius Murray, Pat Palmer (in at 1:12), Christopher*
6 *Anderson, Deas Manning, Wes Furgess; Absent: Enga Ward, Elizabeth Mattos-Ward]*

7
8 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We'll call this Monday, February the 2nd, 2009,
9 Planning Commission meeting to order. I'll read the public announcement for the
10 Record. "In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the agenda was
11 sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, and posted
12 on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building."
13 Presentation of Minutes. Has everybody had a chance to read December and January
14 Minutes?

15 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion we approve the Minutes
16 for December and January.

17 MR. FURGESS: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All those in favor please signify by raising your hands.
19 All opposed?

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

22 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Agenda amendments.

23 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure that everyone's aware
24 that there were two text amendments that were taken off the Agenda. They were
25 deferred to our March PC. And that would be Chapter 26, Section 26-180, Signs, and
26 our Chapter 26, Section 26-184, Parks and Open Space.

27 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Those are going on next month's Agenda?

1 MS. ALMEIDA: That is correct. March.

2 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I have a request. I guess we have an Executive
3 Session scheduled for right now or right after this, the Agenda amendments, and I was
4 wondering because it's kind of a short agenda if anybody cares if we push that to the
5 back and get through the text amendments first? Does anyone have a problem with
6 that? Let's see. First case is 09-01 MA, PDD amendment?

7 **CASE NO. 09-01 MA:**

8 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This, as you can see on your packet, page
9 three, this is an existing PDD, Eagles Rest. It was approved October 26, 2004. I tried
10 to be as specific as I could in my memo identifying why this is before you today. It had
11 been approved by the Planning Commission October 4th with 279 dwelling units on a
12 13.9 acre park and open space and buffers and four different residential densities. It
13 went to the zoning public hearing at the end of October to County Council but was
14 approved with modifications as normally sometimes that does happen. Those
15 modifications put a cap on the total number of units to 220 and it basically identified
16 three different residential densities and of course as you can see, the common area,
17 open space, and buffers were increased to 25%. Since then the subdivision has
18 received approval for phase 1-B which is 93 lots in the estate lots and there was no
19 problem. Our Zoning Administrator had no problem reviewing it. Recently when the
20 developer came in with some more lots in different sections we started identifying the
21 ordinance which I have submitted a copy for you on page five and they have met the
22 intentions of the ordinance but their actual general development plan there was some
23 question as to lot sizes. This is basically – we had the developer come in and the meat

1 of the description of the PDD to complement the actual ordinance so that there would
2 be no problem in identifying lot sizes in the future. Currently Staff does things a little
3 differently so that we don't have these problems. In our new PDDs if there is a
4 modification at the Council level we don't allow it go to third reading until the actual
5 document is corrected to reflect Council's wishes so that we don't have this
6 discrepancy. So this is basically information. It is an amendment but we want this to –
7 for you to look at so that the actual document that has all the other criteria for the
8 development complements the actual ordinance that you see on page five. And the
9 developer has done that.

10 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Thank you. Would the applicant like to speak?

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'll answer any questions if anybody has any.

12 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any thoughts?

13 MR. MANNING: Given Staff's report this seems to be something that we need to
14 move forward with [inaudible] so and I would recommend we move this forward with a
15 recommendation of approval.

16 MR. MURRAY: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All those in favor of sending Case No. –

18 MS. ALMEIDA: This does not go forward to Council.

19 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: It does not go forward?

20 MS. ALMEIDA: Just this minor modification.

21 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. All those in favor of sending, of approving
22 Case No. 09-01 MA please signify by raising your hand. All opposed?

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

3 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Next is the Text Amendment.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. On page 15 you will see the text
5 amendments regarding the protection of buffers, common areas, open space. There is
6 an explanation on page 15. We did meet with the homebuilders and other stakeholders
7 involved and the outcome is what you see. I believe we have Staff that can elaborate
8 further if you have any questions on this matter.

9 MR. MANNING: I have a question. Basically the problem y'all were
10 experiencing at the Staff level was the utility companies were coming in after these
11 buffers had been approved and easements were being placed through them and there
12 was no -

13 MS. ALMEIDA: The developer was at times caught in the middle because the
14 utilities would want to obviously lay the lines down their buffer areas which they have
15 committed to the county. Utility companies are required to get permits from DHEC so
16 we feel we have them looking at utility lines currently so we feel we have a handle on
17 that situation where they have to come before us now to get a permit to place a line.

18 MR. MANNING: But normally don't they submit preliminary plans showing the
19 utility layouts when they come for you, come to you all for -

20 MS. ALMEIDA: The developer?

21 MR. MANNING: - approval? The developer.

22 MS. ALMEIDA: There have been instances where it's not clearly laid out or
23 alignments change for whatever reason and we have not seen them in the past. But

1 this will clearly also give builders, developers the ability to say the utility companies I
2 can't, you know, this is forbidden. Here it is in the ordinance. It just gives a lot more
3 weight.

4 MR. MANNING: This language as written was crafted between utilities, Staff,
5 and the Homebuilders Association trying to deal with this problem? I mean, was
6 everybody in sync on this?

7 MS. ALMEIDA: We did meet with the homebuilders and they were in favor of
8 this, yes.

9 MR. MANNING: I mean, the language appears to me to be fine but I guess the
10 one thing that might [inaudible], you know, I mean, obviously things sometimes change
11 in the best engineering.

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

13 MR. MANNING: Gets thrown out the window for some reason or another but it
14 says, "the project cannot be disturbed," "any project cannot be disturbed." That if there
15 is a need to go into a buffer area is that disallowed or can they come back and replant?

16 MS. ALMEIDA: They would have to come before us.

17 MR. MANNING: Right. But, I mean –

18 MS. ALMEIDA: Absolutely. We'd have to work with the developer, the utility
19 company, yes. We would need to have a lot more coordination, yes. Not just after the
20 fact.

21 MR. MANNING: But if they had an easement that did not disturb the buffers and
22 then the city said this is the only place we can take it and it's got to go through that
23 buffer.

1 MS. ALMEIDA: And we've had instances where we have negotiated obviously
2 with – to give you an example. Prior to this because we stood our ground the city did –
3 they started out wanting 25' and they wound up being very happy with 12. So if we
4 hadn't come to the table or if we hadn't played hardball, they would have wanted the
5 25'. So I think we've made some progress.

6 MR. MANNING: And they are required to replace trees or shrubberies in that
7 easement?

8 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes. Depending on the utility because there are utilities that
9 obviously you can't, for whatever reason, plant in there.

10 MR. MANNING: Right.

11 MS. ALMEIDA: So those are things that we want to be able to sit down and
12 review and comment on.

13 MR. MANNING: Right.

14 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

15 MR. MANNING: I guess my main concern is that the buffer areas along the
16 major roads where there was trees there that blocked the –

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

18 MR. MANNING: - neighborhood from, you know, not the right-of-way but the
19 buffer area and those came down and didn't get replaced. So there's a mechanism for
20 that?

21 MS. ALMEIDA: There would be, yes.

22 MR. MANNING: All right.

23 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any other questions for Staff?

1 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion that we adopt Text
2 Amendment No. 26-171 as shown on page 15.

3 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Got a motion; is there a second?

4 MR. FURGESS: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All those in favor of sending Text Amendment 26-171,
6 adopting that in our text, please signify by raising your hand. All opposed?

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

9 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Next on the agenda is the Comp Plan.

10 *[Mr. Palmer in at 1:12 p.m.]*

11 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Real quick, I want to thank everybody for working on
12 this and getting the information to us so quick. Just as a follow up, how are the public
13 meetings going in the areas and could somebody just give me a little brief summary of
14 the feedback from these meetings?.

15 MS. WILKIE: Sure. We've had one public meeting. It was in the Southeast
16 portion of the county that was last Wednesday. We had a relatively good turnout I
17 would say, about 30 people from that area. And we had some, we got some pretty
18 good feedback. You know, we got some suggestions of things that they would like to
19 see in the plan. We're keeping a response document so we can keep up with
20 suggestions to that we can incorporate those that are able to be incorporated into the
21 plan. For the last – we're having one public meeting every Wednesday through the last
22 Wednesday in February.

23 MR. MANNING: Can y'all give us another copy of the meeting places and times?

1 MS. WILKIE: Sure.

2 MS. ALMEIDA: We can have that emailed to you. Absolutely

3 MS. WILKIE: Yes. No problem. This document that I've given you is basically
4 just a summary of all the changes that we made to the Comprehensive Plan based on
5 the public workshops, the workshops that we had. If you guys want to take a moment to
6 read over it and then if you have any additional questions about any changes that were
7 made we can answer those for you

8 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I just want to make a general comment.

9 MS. WILKIE: Sure.

10 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: These changes are great. I can remember us talking
11 about most of these [inaudible] but with the changes coming down the pipe so quick I'd
12 like to see, I know the public's going to get involved throughout these meetings. What I
13 would like to see is the public to get involved and then maybe have a representative
14 from some of those meetings come in an actual public forum. And maybe defer what
15 we have here today. And have all those in a public setting maybe next month. Say
16 your last meeting is the 15th, February the 15th?

17 MS. WILKIE: I think it's the 24th.

18 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: The 24th? Have all those stakeholders come in and
19 let their, present their opinion to the Planning Commission. Basically you're asking us
20 to vote on this today; correct?

21 MS. WILKIE: I'll let Mr. Kocy address that.

22 MR. KOCY: We need a draft document. We need an official draft document to
23 go forward with public comment, for public comment. What we are doing is compiling a

1 list at every meeting of every comment any citizen has they're getting to us and we're
2 going to compile them all and present a response document that lists every single
3 comment we had. Whether we think it's good and we include it; whether we think it's
4 bad and why we're not including it. We'll bring back a revised draft to this Board with
5 the response document so you can see the changes we've made and every single
6 public comment we've had. The difficulty of bringing members of the public to this
7 Board is you meet Monday afternoons and a lot of people work and just find it very
8 impractical to come here on an afternoon to engage in a debate with the Planning
9 Commission on the Comp Plan. So that's why we're doing – first round of meetings
10 after we have the revised draft plan we're going to do a second round of public
11 meetings not on a Wednesday night. I've learned the hard way that Wednesdays in
12 South Carolina not a good time for public meetings. And we'll probably have more than
13 five meetings. We'll have more than five, hopefully we'll have fewer than 11. But we'll
14 have a second round of public meetings and then a final polishing of the document
15 before we take it to County Council. So you'll get a couple of opportunities to look back
16 at this document before we go forward. But I need an authorized, official draft Comp
17 Plan to take out for public comment.

18 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: So you're asking for us to approve it the way it stands
19 right now with these changes?

20 MR. KOCY: As a draft document; correct. Just as a draft document.

21 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: [Inaudible] I guess why would you need an approval
22 from us to take it to them?

1 MR. KOCY: As a draft public – as a draft document that you have had
2 opportunities to review for the last 12 months just so the public knows it's not Joe
3 Kocy's draft of the Comp Plan that he's going out for public comment on.

4 MR. MANNING: What is the normal protocol for adopting the Comp Plan? Is it,
5 is there a requirement for public hearing at either the Commission level or the Council
6 level? Do the meetings -

7 MR. KOCY: Yes. At both levels at the Commission and at the – excuse me, at
8 the Planning Commission, yes and the County Council.

9 MR. MANNING: So basically if we were to adopt the draft you would take that
10 out, have the public hearings or the public meetings in the various districts, rewrite the
11 draft, come back to us, and then there would be a formal vote on the document with no
12 public input or?

13 MR. KOCY: No. There will be public input when you have the next formal round
14 of polishing, of a more polished, of the second draft before we go forward again.
15 Absolutely.

16 MR. MANNING: And what is your timeframe?

17 MR. KOCY: I would hope to have this wrapped up by May or June. I mean,
18 completely -

19 MR. MANNING: Council or back to us?

20 MR. KOCY: Council. I hope to have it back to you by March, end of March, early
21 April.

22 MR. MANNING: And during this process suggestions from the Planning
23 Commission as well would be something like [inaudible]?

1 MR. KOCY: Of course. I mean, as part of the response document we will have
2 itemized every public comment we had and if, you know, on page, you know, four, item
3 64, you disagree with what my recommendation is you can tell me, you know, put that
4 document – put that comment in; we think it was good. Or conversely if I put a
5 comment in the plan that you don't agree with have me take it out.

6 MR. PALMER: We've never voted on drafts before. There's never been a
7 formal, I mean, you guys just put together the ordinances as you see fit and put it out to
8 the public and then we take input from the public as well but to formulate our thought
9 process I, I don't know that, you know. The problem I have is in my opinion and in my
10 opinion there's not been any input from the public in this document at all.

11 MR. KOCY: That's what we're going through now.

12 MR. PALMER: Right. So I don't understand we would be taking a vote on
13 anything even in draft form. Our role is to take in those comments as well.

14 MR. KOCY: There's been opportunities for the public to show up on all of your
15 meetings for the last year that we've had this on the agenda. There's been an
16 opportunity for anyone from the public to show up and participate. And again you meet
17 Monday afternoons. It's an awkward time for the public to participate. That's why we're
18 going out to the public. This is just an early draft but I need a, you know, an official
19 endorsed document to go out to let the public know that this has gone through some
20 public scrutiny in front of the Planning Commission.

21 MR. MANNING: I think that really probably is better Pat in that, you know, we've
22 had the opportunity to sit down and go through it. It might not be exactly what any of us
23 want in the final. I mean, but we've had the opportunity to effect the way this thing's

1 been written. They need something to go out to the public with which would be – is a
2 better process than having the public create the document then it bring it back into us -

3 MR. KOCY: Right.

4 MR. MANNING: - then we have to go through it line item by line item

5 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Basically we're stamping it with our approval, you're
6 taking it out there, bringing it back to us with public input?

7 MR. KOCY: Correct.

8 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And we'll have another public forum -

9 MR. KOCY: Correct.

10 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: - in the Planning Commission.

11 MR. KOCY: Correct.

12 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: [Inaudible] okay. That's fine. I just wasn't aware of it.

13 MR. PALMER: But in this whole process anything in the Comp Plan is still
14 subject to change?

15 MR. KOCY: The entire document is subject to change. It's just a draft
16 Comprehensive Plan; correct. Nothing's been adopted yet.

17 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any comments, questions?

18 MS. CAIRNS: I just have some comments about it. I was reviewing parts of it
19 and this and that and I think that it unfortunately is sort of woefully inadequate to
20 address how do we go forward and also to address the control. I mean, we've seen a
21 fair number of years here pretty inefficient land use development patterns and I don't
22 see anything in our Comp Plan that gives us any mechanism to change that. You know,
23 a lot of it is the problem of the fact that we have three-quarter acre lots throughout the

1 entire county and the only mechanism that slows it down is lack of infrastructure which I
2 don't really think is good planning. Because we don't have any control over that lack of
3 infrastructure also. So, you know, and I just kind of take deep breaths, sit back, what
4 does this do, where are we, and where do we need to go and how does this help us get
5 there, I don't think it does because it still, you know, when it, you know, in the land use
6 section when it just starts out and says there's no rezoning proposed in any of this, you
7 know, and we're still just going to allow individual landowners to come forward and ask
8 for basically increased density. I don't think anyone's ever going to come forward and
9 ask for decreased density except for under conservation concepts and whatnot. It
10 doesn't have anything to stop what's going on and we've got a completely
11 unsustainable development pattern that's only going to I think get worse if we go
12 forward. So I just, you know, I got to the point today where I was just like I don't even
13 think I can support it because I don't think it gives us anything that's useful for
14 controlling our issues. That's my comment.

15 MR. MANNING: Well I kind of agree with you Heather in that [inaudible] a wide
16 net, you know, areas [inaudible] medium density versus lower density without getting
17 into the specifics of every property out there which I don't we'd be able to do.

18 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, you know, understand that –

19 MR. MANNING: I hear what you're saying though and we don't effect some of
20 the things that do change land use patterns.

21 MS. CAIRNS: I just think we need more key, I mean, you know, we allow
22 increased density out in areas that create even more and more unsustainable growth in
23 terms of the infrastructure costs long term.

1 MR. MANNING: Well that's –

2 MS. CAIRNS: And there's nothing in this document that, I mean, I'm not – I
3 shouldn't say there's nothing. There are suggestions and comments that are attempting
4 to put some concept of slowing that down but I don't think it's enough. I don't think
5 we're really addressing eyes wide open where we're going to be if we continue business
6 as usual and how awful it's going to be.

7 MR. MANNING: Well I think the dollar is gonna dictate a lot of that and that's
8 why I was so particular about the CIP element.

9 MS. CAIRNS. Right. But I think that, you know, I mean, I can appreciate you
10 guys as developers and knowing what dollars do and don't allow in the way of
11 development but we're a Planning Commission and I think we should be looking with
12 Planning Commissioner's heads on and not letting market forces be what slows down
13 our development.

14 MR. MANNING: Exactly. And I'm not looking at it from a development
15 perspective. I'm looking at it from schools and churches and infrastructure that is critical
16 to the wellbeing of the community and I think that we've not planned according to what's
17 available resource for us to grow from. So we do have a lot of things that we've got to
18 consider but Richland County's never had to do that.

19 MS. CAIRNS: Right. I just don't think this document does anything to change
20 the status quo.

21 MR. KOCY: I don't disagree. This document was initiated a year ago when we
22 had very little guidance from the Council and what they wanted us to do as far as land
23 use mechanisms. I would not be surprised to see more direction coming from Council.

1 If you've seen the Council's strategic plan most of their strategic plan deals with land
2 use with one exception, more public outreach. So it's dealing with everything we're
3 dealing with in this document, land use and lots of public outreach. I suspect in the next
4 six to 12 months after this document's been adopted we will see instructions from the
5 Council on mechanisms to implement these broad policies including perhaps not a lot
6 by lot but a focused view of various regions of different zoning categories to implement
7 this document. But you're right. Today this is very broad. That's what it's supposed to
8 be. Start broad with a policy based document and then work on implementation
9 mechanisms.

10 MS. CAIRNS: I don't mind that it's broad but I just think that even within it the
11 comments about how are we going to address changes just don't have enough teeth to
12 stop what's been occurring. I mean, I understand this is broad. It's not going to have
13 specific stuff but I don't think that future, you know, with this is our policy statement in
14 future map amendments that come to us, you know, we have nothing to stop just
15 increased densification away from the urban core in an ever unsustainable - I just, you
16 know, as I was reading it the end of my notes I just simply wrote, "no teeth." I mean,
17 there's nothing to change the status quo in this even though it is a broad based policy
18 but I think that you can make broad based policy, you can set a tone and just say, you
19 know, we're not going to allow, you know, densification away unless someone can
20 show, you know, have a higher burden of proof to show that it's necessary or that it's
21 truly consistent. I'll stop. I'm repeating myself.

22 MR. KOCY: No teeth but it's got strong gums.

23 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Comments, questions?

1 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, given the fact they need a draft document I
2 would propose we adopt this as a draft document. Send it forward [inaudible]
3 responses and hopefully the Commission can address some of their concerns during
4 the process as we go forward. You couldn't hear me? I apologize. Mr. Chairman, I
5 propose we adopt this document with the changes that have been provided to us, send
6 a draft back out into the community, request that we get feedback and input from
7 community and Staff and from the Commission to enhance the document as we want it
8 [inaudible].

9 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We've got a motion; is there a second?

10 MR. MURRAY: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All those in favor please signify by raising your hand.
12 All opposed?

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

15 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right. Next on the agenda.

16 MS. ALMEIDA: Road names.

17 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Road names? Road names. Any discussion?

18 MR. FURGESS: Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept the road name changes.

19 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Got a motion, is there a second?

20 MS. CAIRNS: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All those in favor of sending road names ahead with
22 approval please signify by raising your hand. Opposed?

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

3 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right. Executive session.

4 MS. LINDER: Mr. Chairman, [inaudible] purpose of seeking legal advice.

5 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

6 *[Executive Session]*

7 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: The Planning Commission has returned.

8 MS. LINDER: Mr. Chairman, the Planning Commission went into Executive
9 Session to receive legal advice. No action was taken formal or otherwise.

10 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Thank you. That's it. Motion to – oh, I'm sorry.

11 *[Inaudible]*

12 MR. KOCY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to give you – alert the Commission Members
13 to what you'll be considering next month. The homebuilders and I have worked on
14 three changes to the sign code. One is a new classification for off-premise, temporary
15 off-premise directional signs. The second is for weekend signs, and the third is for
16 enforcement of illegal signs. That'll all be on the Agenda next month. I'm also bringing
17 forward some new definitions in our development regulations, primarily dealing with
18 transportation issues, like transportation impact studies. And finally the County Council
19 has directed the Planning Commission to consider changes in the GC zoning, limiting
20 residential development in the GC zoning classification. It was the same proposal you
21 heard a year ago and did not approve. The County Council is sending you the
22 document for your reconsideration.

1 MR. MANNING: Can you give us a little background on that? I remember that
2 we decided from the Commission that we wanted to keep residential that was in GC.
3 We sent that to the – how'd it go to the Council as part of a –

4 MR. KOCY: It was a request from the Council for the Planning Commission to
5 make a recommendation up and I believe your recommendation was no change. And
6 the Council now would like to limit the amount of residential in the GC. There is concern
7 that a lot of GC is being converted into residentially-zoned property which is limiting our
8 GC base. And there's also a concern that a lot of – there have been instances where
9 the first development on a large parcel of GC is residential development and then when
10 other non-residential uses come forward the residential residents are concerned about
11 traffic and noise and impact on their quality of life on a parcel that's zoned and has been
12 zoned commercial, non-residential. So the Council would like you to consider limiting
13 the amount of residential that could be used on a GC parcel.

14 MR. MANNING: In GC now you can develop at 16 units per acre?

15 MR. KOCY: You can develop at 100% residential.

16 MS. CAIRNS: Was that one of the things we discussed was creating a new land
17 use that would not only allow but force a mixed use?

18 MR. KOCY: That would allow a mixed used. The Council wants the new GC
19 recommendation, the recommendation from the Council for you to consider next month
20 is limiting GC to, if it's a stand alone GC, residential use, one-quarter of the site
21 maximum could be residential or if it's going to be residential it must be mixed used,
22 commercial at the ground floor, residential above.

1 MR. MANNING: I think we had some discussion that that was a limitation on a
2 classification that somebody may have gone and –

3 MR. KOCY: That will be coming back to you next month, and three map
4 amendments.

5 MR. MANNING: Three maps?

6 MR. KOCY: And that's it.

7 MR. MANNING: Last meeting we had some discussion about the text
8 amendments and thanks for letting us know those are coming back. Do you see, you
9 know, we talked about on the horizon these broader changes and if so have you been
10 able to work on an overall list of things that you think we're going to need to address this
11 year?

12 MR. KOCY: In approximately 60 days I hope to have the results of the first sit
13 down of the development round table where the homebuilders and I and the
14 environmental community sits down and reviews our code. I'll certainly share that. It's
15 called a COW, a Comprehensive Ordinance Workshop. And it's really a grading of our
16 development regulations, you know, A through F. A means we do a good job, F means
17 we should rewrite. I can give you a copy of that document in a couple of months and
18 you'll all have an idea of what we'll be tasked with creating better -

19 MR. PALMER: Back to the GC thing. Did they ever take a vote on, I mean, we
20 sent up not to change it. Did they ever take a vote to change or not to change? Was it
21 formally voted on?

22 MR. KOCY: I can't recall. It came out of, this last request came out of the D&S
23 Committee last month.

1 MR. MANNING: [Inaudible] go to the full Council.

2 MR. PALMER: Did they consider a new zoning classification without?

3 MR. KOCY: No. They want the Planning Commission to look at a mixed-used
4 zoning classification.

5 MR. PALMER: I make a motion to adjourn.

6 MS. CAIRNS: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All in favor?

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

10

11

[Meeting Adjourned at 1:55 p.m.]