

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 7, 2010

1
2
3
4 *[Members Present: Olin Westbrook, Kathleen McDaniel, David Tuttle, Pat Palmer, Deas*
5 *Manning, Elizabeth Mattos-Ward, Wallace Brown, Sr.; Absent: Heather Cairns and*
6 *Stephen Gilbchrist]*

7 Called to order: 1:02 pm

8 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: I'd like to call the June 7th Planning Commission
9 Meeting to order. I need to read into the Record, pursuant to the Freedom of
10 Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio, TV stations, newspaper,
11 persons requesting notification, and was posted on the bulletin board located in the
12 lobby of the County Administration Building. First order of business is to approve the
13 Minutes from the May meeting.

14 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that the Minutes from May
15 2010 meeting be approved.

16 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: Do we have a second?

17 MR. WESTBROOK: I'll second.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN MANNING: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor
19 please raise your hand?

20 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, before we vote, I raise a question here. This is the
21 second set of Minutes I've received and you have inaudibles in here and I'm a little
22 concerned about that.

23 VICE-CHAIRMAIN MANNING: Okay.

24 MR. BROWN: And I just want to know how that can be dealt with?

25 MS. CAIRNS: We need to stop mumbling.

26 [Gilchrist in @1:04]

1 MS. SWORD: I mean, honestly, speak loud and clear.

2 MR. BROWN: Okay.

3 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: Was there any inaudibles that you were
4 concerned that the Record may be –

5 MR. BROWN: There were a couple that I had but I thought I was speaking up
6 but I'll endeavor to do better and I'll monitor that.

7 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you, sir. We have a motion and a second.
8 All those in favor please raise your hand. All opposed?

9 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Manning, Mattos-Ward, Brown; Not*
10 *voting: Gilchrist; Absent: Palmer]*

11 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: Next we have road name approvals.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that the road name
13 approvals be approved.

14 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: Second?

15 MR. WESTBROOK: I'll second.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN MANNING: A motion and a second. All those in favor please
17 raise your hands. Opposed?

18 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Manning, Mattos-Ward, Brown; Not*
19 *voting: Gilchrist; Absent: Palmer]*

20 VICE-CHAIRMAN MANNING: Agenda Amendments.

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, we do have –

22 MS. LINDER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to request an Executive Session for the
23 purposes of giving legal advice to the Board?

1 VICE CHAIRMAN MANNING: Do we need to do that before the Agenda
2 amendments or after?

3 MS. LINDER: You could just add it and then if we could take up the Executive
4 Session before we go any further.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN MANNING: Fine. Is everybody okay with that? Agenda
6 Amendments?

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Before we go to Executive Session, there is an amendment to
8 the Agenda, Case No. 10-17 MA Woodcreek Development Partnerships. That
9 application, that request from the Applicant to defer this item until the September
10 Planning Commission.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay. I believe Mr. Gosline also would like to
12 move the Complete Streets Program up in the Agenda behind street names if that's
13 okay with everybody? Are there any objection to that? So that will be next on the
14 Agenda after we get back from Executive Session. We're going to take a few minutes,
15 we'll be back just -

16 *[Executive Session]*

17 VICE CHAIRMAN MANNING: Ms. Linder, can you call us out of Executive
18 Session?

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, the Planning Commission went into Executive
20 Session to receive legal advice, no action was taken during that session. Thank you.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you. Mr. Gosline?

22 MR. GOSLINE: Good afternoon. I'm going to introduce the chairman of the
23 Complete Streets Committee and he's going to go through a brief presentation and we'll

1 answer any questions. You've seen part of this before, this is – we're taking the next
2 step to try and identify some objectives and ways to measure those. This is Steve
3 Hooker.

4 [Palmer in @1:10]

5 **TESTIMONY OF STEVE HOOKER:**

6 DR. HOOKER: Good afternoon. This will be very brief. Just wanted to remind
7 the Commissioners that in March of 2009, County Council adopted the strategic plan
8 which included a desired outcome to implement a Complete Streets Program. And this
9 program recognizes the need to consider all potential users of the streets; pedestrians,
10 cyclists, wheelchair users and of course, many types of motorists and other vehicles.
11 So to address this desired outcome County Council adopted a Complete Streets
12 Resolution in September of last year. This resolution included the statements regarding
13 regulatory and procedural changes in support of a complete streets program. This
14 resolution also stated that all streets are different and in each case user needs must be
15 balanced. And then in February of this year, the Planning Commission approved a draft
16 of Complete Street goals for Richland County. Today as Chair of the Complete Streets
17 Steering Committee, which has been diligently working with county Staff over the past
18 several months, I'm pleased to speak in support of a document that's been prepared
19 titled *Richland County Complete Streets Program Goals and Objectives*. Now this
20 document is a much more polished and refined and focused set of goals and objectives
21 than was originally presented in February. This document has been vetted several
22 times by county Staff, the Complete Streets Steering Committee and various groups of
23 interest including the Homebuilders Association, State Department of Transportation,

1 Central Midlands Council on Governments, Advocate for Persons with Disabilities and
2 Advocates for Senior Citizens. They're five overarching goals that are focused on
3 conditions that can be reasonably accomplished by June of 2014. Each goal is
4 connected with goals in the strategic plan and thus these goals and objectives will help
5 facilitate the attainment of established county policy. Now additional details of
6 regulatory policy and procedural changes in support of a Complete Streets Program will
7 be brought forth for your review over the next several months. However, it's proposed
8 that these potential changes be developed with the input of two important groups; a
9 Technical Advisory Committee and a Citizens Advisory Committee and go forward on
10 the document before your calls for the establishment of these two committees within six
11 months of formal adoption of these goals and objectives by County Council. And we
12 would really strongly recommend and encourage you to provide suggestions to Staff on
13 the types of interests and people that should be represented on those committees. So
14 on behalf of the Complete Streets Steering Committee, I want to thank the county Staff
15 who have shepherded the committee through this process; Members of the Planning
16 Commission who have support our efforts to implement policies to ensure multi-level
17 travel opportunities our principle consideration in Richland County. Lastly, we ask that
18 you recommend approval of the Complete Streets goals and objectives to County
19 Council at your earliest opportunity to do so. I thank you for your attention and I am
20 willing to entertain any comments or questions you may have and Rachel Kafolas is the
21 Vice Chair of the Committee and she's also here with me.

22 **TESTIMONY OF RACHEL KAFOLAS:**

1 MS. KAFOLAS: I'll speak briefly and then we'll take any questions. As Dr.
2 Hooker said, my name is Rachel Kafolas and I'm the Executive Director of the Palmetto
3 Cycling Coalition. We're a statewide bicycle advocacy non-profit. As I will describe
4 shortly, I've had the honor of working with Dr. Hooker and several others over the past
5 year to implement the Richland County Complete Streets Resolution. In my capacity as
6 Director of a statewide organization, however, I've had the opportunity to work in many
7 communities throughout South Carolina and their promotion of policies that positively
8 impact bicycling as a safe and friendly form of transportation, recreation, tourism and
9 economic development. I'm delighted to report that alongside Richland County,
10 Complete Streets policies have been gaining traction as more cities and counties
11 statewide realize the benefits of having safe, accessible and healthy streets for
12 improved quality of life. I also stand before you today as Dr. Hook said, as the Vice
13 Chairperson of the Richland County Complete Streets Steering Committee which was
14 formed to initiate the Complete Streets resolution. And for the past year Dr. Hooker and
15 I have partnered with several others from, whose backgrounds range from regional
16 planning to the promotion of physical activity together representing a diversity of interest
17 including those of elderly and the disabled. The steering committee developed the
18 goals which you approved in February of this year and we also drafted the objectives
19 and effectiveness measures which we are presenting to you today. I would like to thank
20 you for your past support of Complete Streets efforts in Richland County and ask that
21 you recommend approval of the goals and objectives to Council at your earliest
22 opportunity. It is crucial that we maintain this momentum in time for the county's June
23 2014 strategic plan deadline which is a deadline that the goals and objectives were

1 based upon. So, I thank you again for your support and also for this opportunity to
2 speak to you today and we'll entertain any questions you may have.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. I apologize for being late. Does anybody
4 have any questions for Dr. Hooker?

5 MR. MANNING: I guess we've already adopted the policy statement. They're
6 asking us to adopt goals one and two today or [inaudible]?

7 DR. HOOKER: I believe there are five overarching goals with objectives and
8 they have timelines and different kinds of measures to evaluate whether they're being
9 successful over time, so we're asking that you would approve the entire set of five goals
10 and pass those on to County Council for their consideration.

11 MS. KAFOLAS: As Carl pointed out and I'd like to reiterate, the goals have
12 somewhat been changed since February, the last time that you all approved them, so
13 we are asking as Dr. Hooker just said, that you approve the entire goals and objectives
14 document, with the changes to the goals and then the objectives.

15 MR. MANNING: Yeah, I didn't see anything that struck me concerning but I
16 guess do we have another opportunity to visit this before the Council adopts this
17 completely?

18 MR. GOSLINE: I'm sorry, what was the question?

19 MR. MANNING: Will we have another opportunity to see this? We haven't seen
20 it since some of the goals changed back in March of 2009 and the Council will – if we
21 approve something today, this would go to the Council, they would adopt it.

1 MR. GOSLINE: Yeah, if – we're hoping that you'll approve them today so it can
2 go to Council Committees this month and be adopted by them next month before their
3 August.

4 MR. MANNING: So, there wouldn't be any ability to review?

5 MR. GOSLINE: Well, I mean, this is going to obviously be a living document, it's
6 not the Ten Commandments or five commandments.

7 MR. MANNING: Okay.

8 MS. MCDANIEL: So what is the – I guess I don't quite understand what the step
9 is after this, because I'm just looking at [inaudible] and I think, I like the goals in
10 decreasing pedestrian and bicycle accidents but the effectiveness of that measure
11 seems rather vague. Is the next step to flesh out the specifics of how this is going to
12 happen?

13 MR. GOSLINE: The effect of your action and County Council's is to – then the
14 real work will start doing regulations, policies, details. The effectiveness – we use that
15 term because that's what the strategic plan uses but it's basically some ideas about how
16 to judge the progress you're making and it's certainly not cast in stone. We'll be coming
17 up with new ones as we go along, I'm sure.

18 MS. MCDANIEL: So new regulations might come out?

19 MR. GOSLINE: Oh, absolutely. All the regulations will have to come back
20 through you because they'll be part of the, probably part of the Code in some way, is
21 yeah. That's probably not going to be this calendar year. And like Rachel said and
22 Steve said, you know, we certainly will need to get your ideas about the committees and
23 certainly the HBA and roundtable and those kinds of people, plus what I call user

1 groups; you know, citizens and stuff, so. I get, you know, we want to be sure that
2 everybody understands this is not, I mean, we need lots and lots of involvement of lots
3 and lots of people over a long time to get this done.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That was one of my concerns Carl was that when I
5 looked at the Complete Streets Steering Committee, I see a lot of organizations on here

6 -

7 MR. GOSLINE: Correct.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - that have, you know, and not wrongfully so, but they
9 just have different agendas.

10 MR. GOSLINE: Correct.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And currently in our county the way that we build
12 sidewalks was through development. I mean, developers build the sidewalks as part of
13 their communities.

14 MR. GOSLINE: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And I just didn't see any representation from that side on
16 these steering committees as far as what these goals should be and how they should
17 be implemented.

18 MR. GOSLINE: We took the goals, the previous set of goals, and these haven't
19 changes a whole lot from the previous set, we took them to the HBA, David, back in
20 March? Something like that.

21 MS. ALMEIDA: These have been discussed with the HBA and certain other
22 stakeholders. Once they are considered for adoption by County Council, then we would
23 sit down with the roundtable. Some of these were part of the 22 principles that were

1 discussed in those roundtable groups and they will be addressed at that time and
2 crafted in ordinance form and then would come back to you in that form. But right now,
3 we want the acceptance of the idea, the policy in order to move forward if in fact, that is
4 the way the county wants to move forward with the Complete Streets.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. I have a couple of other concerns. Are you
6 finished?

7 MS. MCDANIEL: I'm done.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I looked through here at these goals of the bike paths.
9 Do we currently have any mechanism for installing bike routes?

10 MR. GOSLINE: Do we have, I'm sorry what?

11 MS. ALMEIDA: We do.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: How do we install bike routes now in the county? Is that
13 done by private funds or –

14 MR. GOSLINE: It's a combination. First of all, the county doesn't do a whole lot
15 of that. But it's a combination. The issue here is at this point, Mr. Chairman, is not who
16 does what to whom, it's what's the policy that we want to pursue.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

18 MR. GOSLINE: And then obviously those details will have to be worked out and
19 that's why it's going to take forever.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right, I'm just trying to understand that we're looking to
21 increase by 15% something that we may not even have going on right now.

22 MS. ALMEIDA: The Council of Governments has a bike plan that covers the
23 county. It's concentrated in more urban areas but it does cover the county and if

1 adopted by the county, as far as a policy, we would encourage that and link into a some
2 of those existing linkages. We do have developments that do have bike paths now and
3 we would like that to be a continuous or contiguous type of path. That's what our
4 objective for green space what we're doing; we're trying to make it a linear linkage
5 instead of piecemeal pods everywhere.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That kind of goes to – and skipping ahead a little bit
7 under 3-A it talks about voting for this plan you'll be looking for the county to adopt all
8 [inaudible] regional pathways plan. I just haven't seen that. Don't know what that is and
9 voting -

10 MR. GOSLINE: Well, we would –

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - [inaudible] and you basically endorsing that plan and
12 saying this is –

13 MR. GOSLINE: Once again, we would, you know, as part of, as we go on with
14 the implementation of this, all these things will come back before you. The idea, Mr.
15 Chairman, right now is to get agreement with, between you and the County Council on
16 the policies that we want to pursue so that we don't waste our time going in directions
17 that don't have any chance of going ahead.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, let me just go through these in order here, some of
19 the concerns I have. This Objective 1E, this seems to be somewhat contrary to where
20 we've been in the past, where we've been trying to increase buffers between
21 commercial and residential and increase those distances and now it seems like we're
22 trying to get those distances closer together.

1 MR. GOSLINE: Well, I would not interpret that objective being that limiting, as
2 limiting as you're suggesting.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I just use –

4 MR. GOSLINE: I understand.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I got the word closer proximity and we've been trying to
6 not be closer proximity.

7 MR. GOSLINE: I understand.

8 MS. CAIRNS: Also, I must say we've had ordinances before us to try to allow
9 much more mixed use development. Like Decker Boulevard –

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, but those are in specific zoning classifications.
11 This is a broader plan that we just want to be able to get commercial and residential
12 closer together now. All across the county, not in this specific elements, where it makes
13 sense but we want that to happen –

14 MS. CAIRNS: Well, but this would be consistent, you know, establish policies,
15 incentive and regulations to encourage in closer proximity; like Decker Boulevard would
16 be an example where, the Decker Boulevard overlay, where this was a policy to
17 promote that.

18 MR. GOSLINE: Mr. Chairman, would it make you feel better if we take out the
19 word closer, closer.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, I don't have a problem with what it's doing –

21 MR. GOSLINE: Oh, okay.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - it just seems like it's different than where we've been
23 trying to go in the past in the county and we hear on this Planning Commission at the

1 time “we like our rural”, “we don’t want stuff coming in here”, keep, you know, “give us
2 wide open spaces” and we hear that. This just seems to be a different policy in the
3 county if we’re heading down this route because of our Complete Streets and –

4 MR. GOSLINE: It would be some change if the Council agrees with you or
5 agrees to adopt this, it would be a little bit different than they way we’ve done business
6 in the past, that’s correct.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Under Goal 1 under the same objective there,
8 implements the following provisions of the March 2009 County Strategic Plan. Growth
9 Strategy 6, identify and target areas where growth will and will not be encouraged. How
10 are we going to go about doing that? What’s your plan on that?

11 MR. GOSLINE: Well, this is out of the strategic plan. This is verbatim out the
12 strategic plan that the County Council passed a year ago in March.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I understand but how are you planning on doing that?

14 MR. GOSLINE: Well, that’s, the devils in the details, so to speak.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I just wondered if you had any idea, I mean, about you –

16 MR. GOSLINE: Well, there’s lots of ideas. We have to –

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Zoning or –

18 MR. GOSLINE: Hum?

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Through zoning and –

20 MR. GOSLINE: Lots of things – zoning, capital improvements.

21 MS. MCDANIEL: I mean, correct me if I’m wrong, but those decisions won’t be
22 made in a vacuum by this committee.

23 MR.GOSLINE: Absolutely not.

1 MS. MCDANIEL: So we'll be looking at and working with the rest of the
2 community and it's not just growth will or will not be encouraged for bicycle lanes. I
3 mean, that is for the entire county not just [inaudible].

4 MR. GOSLINE: That's correct and one of the things we try to do with, under
5 each one of these goals is to show you where the policies already are that have been
6 adopted and how they relate to the goal. But, Mr. Chairman, you're correct, you know,
7 how are we going to do all these things is going to be a long touch job to sort through.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Didn't we already identify these areas though in the comp
9 plan?

10 MR. GOSLINE: The priority investment areas?

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

12 MR. GOSLINE: That's one of the areas but this doesn't directly speak to the
13 priority investment areas. Now, I know that the Council's talking about doing some
14 more work on that this fall or even after the election, I would guess.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. You know, I just have a problem, it's not going to
16 keep me from voting for it, but I just have a problem of pushing the plan with a regional
17 pathways plan that I haven't seen. By voting for this, and it very specifically says the
18 county – that if I vote for this I would be saying that the county needs to adopt the
19 [inaudible] of a regional pathway plan.

20 MR. GOSLINE: That's one of the effectiveness measures. I forget where it is
21 right now.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, but it would endorsing that plan that I just haven't
23 seen.

1 MR. GOSLINE: It's an effectiveness measure, you're not adopting the
2 effectiveness measures. Let me, that's, probably should be sure of that. What we want
3 you to do is adopt the goals and objectives. The effectiveness measures is just to give
4 you some idea about how we would measure whether we're meeting the goals and
5 objectives.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

7 MR. GOSLINE: They aren't cast in stone by any stretch of the imagination.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, that helps me a lot then. That the effectiveness
9 measures are not part of what we are –

10 MR. GOSLINE: We would make that very clear to the Council as well.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Alright, under Goal 4, actively engage all effective
12 parties. It just happened to mention here, state and local government agencies. I
13 would imagine that's going to be quite broader than that.

14 MR. GOSLINE: Oh yeah, definitely.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I just didn't know why those were spelled out and nothing
16 else was.

17 MR. GOSLINE: Well, I mean, we, the development community is certainly one of
18 the key players and the roundtable and/or the HBA group or however, plus whoever
19 else, you know.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I know, this is in black and white –

21 MR. GOSLINE: Right, I understand.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: You know, perhaps if we took state and local government
23 agencies out of that and just left it.

1 MR. GOSLINE: Well, the state and local governments have to be involved, don't
2 you think?

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure they do, so do a lot of others.

4 MR. GOSLINE: Yeah, but you're looking at -

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: [Inaudible] listing -

6 MR. GOSLINE: Four B?

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Four. This Goal 4 in the box.

8 MR. GOSLINE: All affected parties, state and local, okay, I mean, we could - I
9 see what you're saying. We could -

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Just eliminate the parentheses.

11 MS. CAIRNS: I think it may just be because they're not usually thought of as
12 parties, they're agencies.

13 MR. GOSLINE: That's fine. If that gives you -

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. I just didn't understand the wording under Page
15 96 under Goal 4, the first bullet under the December 2009 heading. Under the
16 comprehensive plan. I just didn't understand the sentence, it might just be.

17 MS. CAIRNS: I think it's just saying that in the December '09 plan there was
18 nothing on point like this.

19 MR. GOSLINE: Oh, right. Yeah, that's right, I'm sorry. There was nothing in
20 the, no specific policy in the current comprehensive plan that addresses this cooperative
21 arrangement.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Gotcha. The word "none" was throwing me off. Okay.
23 We take out the effectiveness measures, that really -

1 MR. GOSLINE: Got it.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER – [inaudible] quite a bit.

3 MR. GOSLINE: Great decision. One, you want to take out the goal, one on the
4 goal and was there another one?

5 MS. CAIRNS: There's a rogue apostrophe in Goal 2 that needs to be deleted.

6 MR. GOSLINE: Okay.

7 MR. GILCHRIST: Carl?

8 MR. GOSLINE: Yes, sir.

9 MR. GILCHRIST: I noticed on the Steering Committee there were no
10 neighborhood groups listed, is there a reason for that or they going to be considered in
11 the user component of this thing?

12 MR. GOSLINE: The way that this committee got set up was when the Council
13 passed the resolution last September; part of it has always been to have, you know,
14 outside involvement in several different entities, the ones listed, were just initially
15 involved. We certainly want to get the neighborhood groups that would be what I would
16 call the users side. They at this point are a little disorganized but that's, those are
17 exactly the types of people that we need to get on the user group.

18 MR. GILCHRIST: Yeah.

19 MR. GOSLINE: Any suggestions you have we'd love to get them. I'm sure the
20 Council would too.

21 MR. GILCHRIST: Well I, you know where I'm going with this. Clearly when
22 we're talking about development, I'm always concerned about the role that communities

1 have in the process. It just seems to me that we ought to make a concerted effort to try
2 to encourage neighborhood groups to participate in this process.

3 MR. GOSLINE: Definitely. I mean, particularly in this particular program it's
4 absolutely essential to have the support and we're certainly not going, I mean, I'll be
5 going to meetings most of the time if this thing gets all set up the way it is.

6 MR. GILCHRIST: I certainly have some ideas on that.

7 MS. MCDANIEL: And it looks like that would be addressed under your Goal 4
8 objective 4-B.

9 MR. GOSLINE: Excuse me?

10 MS. MCDANIEL: It looks like involvement of the neighborhood – [inaudible].

11 MR. GOSLINE: Yes, absolutely. That's the whole point of going forward. The
12 whole point of is as broad of involvement as possible.

13 MS. KAFOLOS: You have one of the committee members, the Steering
14 Committee members works for the City of Columbia, she's a community liaison and she
15 works directly with neighborhood groups. So, she would be direct connection for us to
16 get with neighborhood groups and [inaudible] like that.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Perhaps a recommendation to maybe our neighborhood
18 liaison –

19 MR. GOSLINE: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - perhaps just [inaudible] the City of Columbia [inaudible].

21 MR. GOSLINE: If any of you have any ideas about specific people, just email
22 them to me and we'll visit – this is going to take some time to put together.

1 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that the city liaison that works
2 with the neighborhood associations don't work with the county outside of the City of
3 Columbia. They work within the City of Columbia.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Absolutely correct.

5 MR. BROWN: The unincorporated areas don't have that kind of –

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: You're absolutely correct.

7 MR. BROWN: - liaison.

8 MR. GOSLINE: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sounds good. Any other questions or comments?

10 MS. MCDANIEL: Alright Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we recommend
11 approval of the City [sic] Council of the Complete Streets Program Goals and Objectives
12 as amended considered here today.

13 MR. GILCHRIST: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The only amended part I know about is the deletion of
15 the state and local government agencies? Anything else?

16 MS. CAIRNS: Just correcting the typographical error –

17 MS. MCDANIEL: And making sure that it's clear that the effectiveness measures
18 are not part of what we're approving.

19 MR. GOSLINE: I think that would be a good thing to put in the motion;
20 specifically saying that you're not adopting the effectiveness measures.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Perhaps, take the effectiveness measures out and add
22 them as another [inaudible].

23 MR. GOSLINE: Advisory.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - but not as part of the package of -

2 MR. GOSLINE: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Is that the motion?

4 MS. MCDANIEL: That's the motion.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Second?

6 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor of the motion, please signify by raising
8 your hand.

9 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward,*
10 *Gilchrist, Brown; Opposed: None]*

11 MR. TUTTLE: I do have one question just for clarity. So what will go before
12 Council will just be the goals as amended?

13 MR. GOSLINE: Goals and Objectives. And Mr. Tuttle, we will, somehow we will
14 put the effectiveness measures in there as advisory only or something like that. Thank
15 you.

16 MR. MANNING: Carl, what's the implementation start of that process?

17 MR. GOSLINE: It's already started.

18 MR. MANNING: For the Chairman, you know, the mapping, all of those details,
19 as that evolves -

20 MR. GOSLINE: Right.

21 MR. MANNING: - it'd be helpful to see it as it evolve rather than coming in here
22 one day and saying, Council needs to approve it next week.

1 MR. GOSLINE: No, no, o, no, no. I mean, this is going to be a piecemeal kind of
2 thing and we get, you know, sidewalks are probably going to be the first thing up cause
3 we've got problems with sidewalks in other areas. But, I would –

4 MS. ALMEIDA: You'll get a quarterly update on all of the different items that'll be
5 before you.

6 MR. GOSLINE: Right.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: I know that's been a request from the Planning Commission in
8 the past.

9 MR. MANNING: Thank you.

10 MR. GOSLINE: No, we're not going to come in and dump this on you and say,
11 adopt it tomorrow. It'll be more regimented. In the first place, we can't do it that fast.

12 MR. MANNING: That would be appreciated.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That wouldn't work that way would it?

14 MR. GOSLINE: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Are we heading back to the [inaudible] now? Would you?

16 MR. MANNING: Yeah [inaudible].

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Case No. 10-12 MA.

18 **CASE NO. 10-12 MA:**

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, Planning Commission Members, this, I'd like to
20 bring you to the next five map amendments, just a brief description of what we're going
21 to do in the next five map amendments. We have never brought before you a
22 conservation overlay district. These are existing zoning districts that will have this
23 conservation overlay over them. This has been at the request of the Richland County

1 Conservation Commission and Mr. Jim Wilson is here in the audience to address any
2 concerns or questions that you may have. We will go case by case but just as a brief
3 understanding of what a conservation overlay provides we've given you a summary of
4 that in each of the Staff Reports but I don't want to have to reiterate the purpose of that.
5 All of these five map amendments, the property has been deeded to Richland County
6 and the county's purpose is to keep it in this kind of an overlay district for preservation
7 designed to allow development but of course preserve views and natural corridors and
8 all of the things that we feel and Mr. Wilson feels that are important for a conservation
9 overlay. And Jim, if you'd like to give kind of brief understanding of what the
10 conversation overlay will do, and then we can go case by case.

11 **TESTIMONY OF MR. JIM WILSON:**

12 MR. WILSON: Thank you, Anna. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Planning
13 Commission, I appreciate the opportunity to just to share a little bit of conservation
14 zoning if we can call it that. Let me digress just a minute to say that I guess the
15 Conservation Commission for particularly new Members of the Commission that have
16 come on recently, Conservation Commission is chartered by County Council for green
17 space and preserving natural resource areas as well as some historic preservation. I'm
18 on Staff with the Planning Office to support the Commission and bring forth
19 conservation issues to you as well as County Council. Our Conservation Commission
20 has about 30 tracts of land at this time in this conservation program of protection.
21 Majority of those are owned by the private sector; it's just a partnership with Richland
22 County to preserve a given area that protects streams, wetlands, floodplains, wildlife
23 areas and there's a certain criteria we go by to put in the program that not only meets

1 our objectives on behalf of the county, but it also makes it eligible for the landowner to
2 get some tax benefits from it through the state and federal IRS. So we kind of held that
3 program. These five have come to us as a donation to Richland County. Some private
4 landowners, some from a developer, there have been a piece of a development that
5 they realized that they couldn't develop anyway. It was mostly wetlands, so they really
6 didn't want to hold on to it, it didn't have any use and in some cases the homeowner's
7 association may or may not be the proper entity to look after it. So our Conservation
8 Commission is bringing to you these five tracts that we own, it's a county entity. And
9 the only way that we felt, or one way that we felt, I guess, the best way to try to elevate
10 the natural resource component of that is a zoning overlay. It's currently on the books
11 so we're not creating a new zoning district, we're trying to apply an existing
12 conservation overlay district to these parcels. The original zoning still stays there. This
13 is just a layer of protection for both the county or some entity of the county parks or
14 whatever you want, wants to use the property later or sell it or get rid of it or whatever,
15 they would actually have to come back to you. It would actually have to come back to a
16 public hearing and talk about the use of that land. And so this would allow us the
17 opportunity to have good dialogue about the value of the corridor, protection of
18 wetlands, adjacent buffer areas, and when you decide then that land can be use for X,
19 whatever it may be, then at that time, the overlay district would give guidance to what
20 protection we should still have. Maybe two lots could be cut out of it on the fringe that
21 could be used. But at this time the land owner or the developer who donated it to
22 Richland County saw no use for that. And again, I'd say 90% of it is wetlands, streams,
23 floodway areas, forested lands that we have, that the county and our greenway program

1 and in these corridors and connectivity of green space throughout the county, we would
2 like to see them preserved as they are. That means not necessarily cutting the timber
3 but just leaving them in a natural habitat. So, I think it's a valuable tool that we have, we
4 just haven't been in this program long enough to have a lot of parcels, so these have
5 accumulated over the last couple of years. Three of them actually came through
6 Forestry(?) Land Commission that some of y'all may be familiar with or all of you should
7 be whereby somebody doesn't pay taxes and then the Forestry Land Commission has
8 got the authority to try to do something with them. So, they in turn turn them over to the
9 Conservation Commission as fee title to the county. So anyway, we own them, we're
10 trying to protect them. They're a valuable resource for the county and working with
11 Planning Staff we felt that this was an appropriate protection zoning class for your
12 consideration today. That's all I have. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

13 MS. ALMEIDA: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

15 MS. ALMEIDA: So, we'll go one by one. The first map amendment 10-12 is
16 located on Longgreen Parkway and Longtown Road. The existing zoning currently is a
17 planned development. Of course, we're requesting that that parcel or pieces be added
18 to a conservation overlay district. The previous zoning to the planned development
19 back in 1977 for this property was M2 heavy industrial. We feel as a Staff the
20 conservation overlay district will not alter any existing zoning of the PDD. So, all of the
21 underlying zoning district standards will remain in effect in addition to being subject to
22 the standards of the conservation overlay district. We see no conflict between the

1 overlay district standards and general use district standards. Of course, the stricter will
2 apply. Staff is recommending approval.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Questions for Staff? We have no one signed up to speak.

4 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion 10-12 MA be sent
5 forward to council with a recommendation of approval.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we have a second?

7 MR. WESTBROOK: I'll second.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other discussion? All those in favor of sending Case
9 No. 10-12 MA forward to Council with a recommendation of approval, please signify by
10 raising your hand. None opposed.

11 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward,*
12 *Gilchrist, Brown; Opposed: None]*

13 **CASE NO. 10-13 MA:**

14 MS. ALMEIDA: The next Case No. 10-13 again this piece or parcel is located in
15 the Blue Ridge Terrace area. The existing zoning is RU rural. We're requesting that
16 conservation overlay be proposed on this parcel. We feel it will not be in conflict with
17 any underlying zoning on the parcel, nor with any future plans for development and Staff
18 is recommending approval.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And there is no one signed up to speak. Any questions
20 for Staff?

21 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to recommend that we send this forward
22 for approval Case No. 10-13 MA.

23 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor of the
2 motion, please signify by raising your hand. None opposed.

3 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward,*
4 *Gilchrist, Brown; Opposed: None]*

5 **CASE NO. 10-14 MA:**

6 MS. ALMEIDA: Case No. 10-14 MA also it is a planned development. We are
7 requesting that the conservation overlay be applied. It is located on Rice Meadow
8 Circle. Staff feels that it will not alter any of the existing zoning and is recommending
9 approval.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No one signed up to speak. Any questions? motions?

11 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chair, I would like to recommend that Case No. 10-14 MA
12 move forward to Council with the recommendation of approval.

13 MR. WESTBROOK: I'll second.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor of the
15 motion, please signify by raising your hand.

16 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward,*
17 *Gilchrist, Brown; Opposed: None]*

18 **CASE NO. 10-15 MA:**

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Case No. 10-15 MA an existing zoning of PDD. The parcel is
20 also located on Rice Meadow Circle. Staff is recommending approval.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No one signed up to speak.

22 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to recommend that we send Case No. 10-
23 15 MA forward with the recommendation of approval.

1 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The motion has a second, all those in favor of the motion,
3 please signify by raising your hand.

4 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward,*
5 *Gilchrist, Brown; Opposed: None]*

6 **CASE NO. 10-16 MA**

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Case No. 10-16 MA the application existing zoning on the parcel
8 is RMHD. The parcel is located on Farrow Road and Staff is recommending approval of
9 the conservation overlay.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No one signed up to speak.

11 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to recommend Case No. 10-16 MA go
12 forward to Council with the recommendation of approval.

13 MR. WESTBROOK: I'll second.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor of the
15 motion, please signify by raising your hand. None opposed.

16 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward,*
17 *Gilchrist, Brown; Opposed: None]*

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I'd like to let Staff know that we are recommending Body
19 to Council. [laughter]

20 MS. ALMEIDA: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Text amendments.

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, we have a text amendment before you and we
2 have our zoning administrator Mr. Geo Price who will be here to discuss the text
3 amendment with regard to some modification of Section 26-141.

4 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, I've got a question for Staff while we're waiting
5 on Mr. Price. Typically we have text amendments before us there's public comment
6 and in this situation I think there's a large number of people from the neighborhoods
7 who have an opinion about this. And I didn't know what the Staff's opinion was of input
8 in a text amendment?

9 MS. ALMEIDA: One of the, the main goal of this text amendment, it was brought
10 forth, requested by Council and I would direct you to the special exception which is the
11 modification to this text amendment which is to permit dormitories in the Office
12 Institutional district and the GC district with special requirements. I'm sorry, it would be
13 a special requirement.

14 MS. LINDER: It would be moved from special exceptions to the special
15 requirements. So now it would be a special requirement to be permitted as long as it
16 meets the requirements.

17 MR. PRICE: In addition to that will be the provisions for, that were found under
18 the special exception have been changed or modified to when they went into the special
19 requirement.

20 MR. MANNING: I understand that but that didn't answer my question.

21 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry.

1 MR. MANNING: My question is are we allowed to have public comment for text
2 amendments? I want to know how we're going to direct, the Chairman may want to
3 direct -

4 MS. LINDER: If someone has signed up and they want to speak, it's at your
5 discretion.

6 MR. MANNING: Well, there was no sign-up sheet for them.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, we got it.

8 MR. MANNING: Oh, there was. Okay, I was under the impression that they
9 were told not to sign anything.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Mr. Price?

11 MR. PRICE: Okay. As I guess was previously explained to you, there are two
12 parts to this. One, previously stated, to allow dormitories by special requirements in the
13 GC and the OI district. Currently, dormitories are allowed in the GC district by special
14 exception, which means they have to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals. One of the
15 issues with that is one of the provisions states that, and this cannot be varied by the
16 Board of Zoning Appeals, that it has to be within a half mile of the principal campus.
17 What one of the major changes that you will see under the special requirements
18 proposal is that that distance has been increased, it's been increased to seven miles,
19 and the rest of the provisions that will be included with this are more for buffering
20 purposes such as the landscaping, the fencing and the lights. That's one part of it and
21 the other part was definitions from a previous issue that the county had. We found it
22 would be wise to come up with definitions for certain uses and that's what you have
23 before you. So it's definition for dormitories, hotels, motels and transient lodging have,

1 that's coming before you, is just to add to our Code. I guess for more clarification, not
2 only for Staff but for also applicants.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I understand what you're doing. I don't understand why
4 the requirements in front of Board of Zoning Appeals simply was not changed from the
5 half mile to the seven miles but still have the public hearing process still go on to have
6 dormitories. In other words, keep it as a special exception just change from a half mile
7 to seven miles when it goes in front of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

8 MR. PRICE: That is an option. That is an option that can come about from your
9 recommendation.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Because of the impact to the community, I mean, just
11 allowing the community to have a say at some point in the juncture as opposed to just
12 simply outright allowing something like that. I was wondering if that's something that
13 you guys thought about and if you ruled it out, why you did or did not or –

14 MR. PRICE: Really that was more of for guidance from Council from this
15 particular case. And once again if that's something that you, the Planning Commission
16 feels is warranted, it can be part of your recommendation.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: One more question. Is this Staff's recommendation of
18 what Staff would like to see happen to the ordinance or is this a Council
19 recommendation that the Council would like to see happen to the ordinance.

20 MR. PRICE: It's primarily Council.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

22 MR. PRICE: With some input from Staff, some suggestions but it was primarily –

23 MS. ALMEIDA: It was Council initiated.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

2 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, simultaneously Staff, is there a first reading on
3 our recommendation to Council –

4 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

5 MR. MANNING: - that we sent forward last month?

6 MR. PRICE: No.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Hum-um (negative).

8 MR. PRICE: No.

9 MR. MANNING: Where is that? That was –

10 MR. PRICE: The intent was, I think Council attempted to give it first reading, and
11 correct me if I'm wrong, on the text amendment, however, they needed a unanimous
12 vote for that. And that was not given so it was sent forward to the Planning
13 Commission; they have not had first reading on that.

14 MR. MANNING: [Inaudible] taking on the recommendation of Council, I mean,
15 from the Commission?

16 MR. PRICE: No, sir.

17 MS. ALMEIDA: Are you referring to the map amendment?

18 MR. MANNING: Correct.

19 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir. I'm sorry; I was referring to the definitions. No first
20 reading was given for the map amendment.

21 MR. MANNING: Okay.

22 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, this matter was before us and we made a
23 recommendation to Council, it's back before us. What –

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Brown, could you –

2 MR. BROWN: We discussed this matter, Mr. Chairman, at our last meeting we
3 made a recommendation to Council, now its back before us again.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: No, sir.

5 MS. CAIRNS: This is an ordinance.

6 MR. PRICE: What you had before was a map amendment to rezone that
7 property to RMHD from the general –

8 MR. BROWN: I understand that.

9 MR. PRICE: Currently, this is just a text amendment.

10 MR. BROWN: The impact of these changes will be [inaudible] for that
11 community.

12 MR. PRICE: Well, I try to look at the dormitories, just definitions as a whole for
13 the county. Just -

14 MR. BROWN: I understand that.

15 MR. PRICE: - [inaudible] where you're going.

16 MR. BROWN: Well, go where I'm going.

17 MR. PRICE: Go where you're going. The effect would be either by a map
18 amendment or by the approval of this proposed ordinance; that dormitories would be
19 allowed on that parcel.

20 MR. BROWN: So that would be the impact of this?

21 MS. LINDER: But I would like to add to what Mr. Price is saying that with the text
22 amendment, you've got some regulations; whereas with the map amendment straight

1 out, there would not be these additional safeguards that were put in by County Council,
2 at County Council's recommendation.

3 MR. BROWN: And which I understand. But my question then goes back to what
4 was raised earlier, which it substantively is, has the community, has this been discussed
5 with the community, have they had an opportunity to have input on this matter as to how
6 it would impact them?

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Well, that's today.

8 MS. LINDER: I suspect that that will happen at the zoning public hearing when
9 notification goes out.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And we have citizens signed up to speak today as well.

11 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you. I want to give the citizens -

12 MS. LINDER: In addition, at the zoning public hearing last month, a lot of the
13 community members were present when Council made this recommendation on the text
14 amendment.

15 MR. TUTTLE: But maybe I'm not clear here. If this were to pass, then the case
16 that was before us with the seven mile distance would then not have to go through any,
17 it would automatically on special requirement be approved.

18 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

19 MR. TUTTLE: And there would be no further public hearing. In fact, it wouldn't
20 even have to go to Council.

21 MS. LINDER: That is correct.

22 MR. TUTTLE: It would be approved by right. Is that correct?

23 MS. LINDER: As long as it meets the requirements. That's correct.

1 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The only input the citizens would have would be on this
3 one ordinance.

4 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: As the text amendment which affects the whole county,
6 not just that one parcel.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

8 MR. MANNING: Well, Mr. Chairman, the last meeting there was an 8-2 vote to
9 deny.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

11 MR. MANNING: The rezoning. And everybody at this table could have had a
12 different reason for that or for or against it. But, it's clear to me that the process is to
13 circumvent the Planning Commission vote and to take it back to where you create an
14 exception or special requirement that will allow the end to justify the means. I think
15 when we narrowly craft ordinances to make special exceptions, the county's going to
16 get in trouble more times than not.

17 MS. CAIRNS: There's also, I mean, I understand that and certainly when we
18 have a text amendment come on the heels of a pretty controversial map amendment
19 request that at the same time it also did illustrate some holes that we had in our Code,
20 cause we didn't have a definition of dormitories and we didn't – and dormitories
21 probably ought to be special requirements when they do go in. But I am completely in
22 agreement with the distastefulness of what it does to what we did last week and I
23 understand that completely. But I think addressing the issue of should we fixing our

1 Code to address these sort of semi-unique land uses, I think the answer is yes. And so
2 what I would like to do is to address this issue and as much as possible to distance it
3 from that map amendment, cause I think that there are some very good parts about this,
4 but I would offer that as it's written right now, I would not support but not because of last
5 week.

6 MR. MANNING: I think it does provide some definition. It does provide some
7 avenues of requirement that would have to be thresholds would have to be down the
8 road. But if the intent of this Commission was to deny that based on the neighborhood,
9 if the intent of the Commission at the last month's meeting was to not allow that use in
10 there because it was going to be detrimental neighborhood, this negates that.

11 MS. CAIRNS: I understand, I follow that.

12 MR. MANNING: Okay. So I think, just my personal opinion, I mean. the
13 Chairman does what he wants to as far as the discussion on this, but that discussion
14 should take place at another date and time. It shouldn't be today.

15 MS. CAIRNS: But what would make another date and time more magical than
16 today?

17 MR. MANNING: Well, you know, we're here because the council wants to give,
18 provide a mechanism to allow Benedict to use it as a dormitory and your point about
19 changing the language, "we've got holes in our Code," well we deal with those all the
20 time, we don't necessarily need to deal with right now if the intent of this Commission
21 was not allow that use. But if we want to have a discussion, that's up to the Chairman,
22 I'm fully prepared to do that. I just, I think the result to come back to these people right
23 here. How's it going to impact them?

1 MS. CAIRNS: Right.

2 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, there's a text amendment before you and
3 whatever the outcome is, there should be a recommendation and we can take it to the
4 Council.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, the way that we're going to proceed is to address
6 the text amendment as we would any other text amendment. However, the public
7 comment, I would like for it to be addressed to the amendment and not to a specific text,
8 not to a specific map amendment which may have occurred last month. If you address,
9 when you take the podium, I'd like for you to address your thoughts on what this
10 ordinance will do to the county as a whole, not specifically to one piece of property or to
11 one neighborhood. We had that discussion last month and we understand where
12 everybody's at on that as well. Let's go ahead and get to the public input and –

13 MR. TUTTLE: Well, I did have a question for Mr. Price.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure.

15 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Price, just refresh me. So now there's as it relates to
16 dormitories, there's a seven mile range from the campus?

17 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

18 MR. TUTTLE: Okay. What was the rationale behind the magic of seven miles?
19 It seems like an unusual number, I could see 5, 10, and 15. Is there a specific rationale
20 behind that number?

21 MR. PRICE: I'm sure there was but that as the discretion of Council.

22 MR. TUTTLE: Thank you.

1 MS. CAIRNS: I also just, I just want one quick question cause looking at the
2 chart in our packet; it still shows dormitories just being simple permitted in the RMHD? I
3 mean, it seemed that it would be more consistent for them to be special requirements
4 anywhere and everywhere. Is that a mistake or was that, I mean, it looked to me like it
5 was intended to be deleted, but wasn't.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, I thought of that too and I thought that perhaps the
7 reason for that would be that you already have apartment style living in those zoning
8 district.

9 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, but apartments are very different than dormitories.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I don't know that there – I lived in an apartment a lot as a
11 student, and there's a lot of students' apartments.

12 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, but apartments are different than dormitories because of
13 the relationship of campus, the fact that they're not self sustaining that you're linked to
14 the university. They have periods of emptiness and periods of use. I mean, just
15 dormitories are different than apartments. I mean, I'm not saying they shouldn't be
16 allowed to be in RMHD but I'm just not sure that to have them, to not have special
17 requirements about distance from the campus is my concern. I mean, I just, one of the
18 things I like about this draft amendment is that there's suddenly now this proximity
19 requirement, which I think is a good thing, whereas if you just simple allow them in
20 RHMD, you could have a dorm anywhere in the county. So that's why, you know, I'm
21 not opposed to them being an RMHD, I just think that all dormitories should be special
22 requirements and that there should always be a proximity issue associated with a
23 dormitory. Now, what that distance should be? I haven't yet addressed.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

2 MR. MANNING: I have another question for Mr. Price on that. The seven mile
3 question came up, what do you think the reasoning behind the half mile limitation was?

4 MR. PRICE: If I had to, I hate to say an educated guess cause that would put
5 too much on me. But, I guess the assumption is that typically I found that dormitories
6 would located right near the campus, either on the campus or right in the proximity or
7 properties located next to it.

8 MS. ALMEIDA: For dining purposes, for recreational purposes.

9 MR. MANNING: So, it made more sense to have students residing in close
10 proximity to where they went to school instead of having to bus them?

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Normally the dormitories don't have full cooking facilities.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, I guess only the downside of the half mile is you can
13 certainly get landlocked when you have a school that's in a inner city and certainly
14 obtaining land that would be compatible within a half mile can be very difficult. So yeah,
15 I don't know what the right distance is, probably somewhere between that and 100
16 miles. [laughter]

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other questions for Staff? Thank you Mr. Price.

18 MR. PRICE: I'll, if you're going to open this up to the public hearing, I'll leave my
19 book here and it has those provisions so the applicants can speak, excuse me, those
20 who signed, they can speak on those provisions.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Thanks. We have Sara Locklear, Sarah Murphy
22 signed up to speak.

23 MS. LOCKLIER: Did someone call for me? [Inaudible]

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, ma'am. And if you would, if you would try to limit
2 your comments to two minutes and if you would give us your name and address for the
3 Record, we would appreciate it.

4 **TESTIMONY OF SARA LOCKLEAR:**

5 MS. LOCKLEAR: I'm Sara Locklear and at 7315 Sara Drive and that's 29223,
6 Columbia. And I'd like to answer the question, I mean, that was not asked of me but I
7 would think one of the reasons a half mile would be safety also. I mean, there's a
8 number of issues, they could walk to the library, they can walk to get food, they can do
9 all these things. And maybe it's landlocked it would, a half mile is kind of restrictive but
10 seven is kind of crazy but it does seem like within walking distance of your campus
11 would seem reasonable. A mile, something to that effect, so they don't get landlocked.
12 And it's hard to address this without being personal but I know that y'all said that we
13 couldn't say about our neighborhood, so I'll try not to do that, but this judicial process
14 that we're going through, no matter how you look at it, it does relate to this specific thing
15 before us. And y'all in the past had said no. And so I feel like, you're right it does need
16 to be addressed but if you address it and you go for seven miles and you do this, it's in
17 my opinion reversing what y'all had said before. But - that's all.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Sarah Murphy? Okay. Senator Scott?

19 **TESTIMONY OF SENATOR SCOTT:**

20 SEN. SCOTT: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Members of this Planning Commission.
21 I know that you asked that they do not address what y'all already did, talked about last
22 week. In my opinion, it's very unfair because this particular text amendment is all about
23 what y'all did last week and this is how Council has circumvented the law and sent it

1 back to this Commission so this Commission addressed not only just dormitories
2 dealing with colleges and university, the Department of Mental Health, I'm supposed to
3 tell them – tough budget times, if Mental Health decides to build a new dormitory, I need
4 to pay for an eight foot fence just because one school or university decided to
5 circumvent the law and send you a text. I'm supposed to tell them in a middle of a
6 planning situation I need additional shrubberies, I need to also buy additional space for
7 setback. This thing is all about Council circumventing the law and yes, sir, you are
8 correct. There needs to be a public hearing, I sat on County Council for many years,
9 I've never known an ordinance to pass that there was not a public hearing, that did not
10 have the public input. It's a shame and disgrace when the community has come before
11 Council and Council sends it back to you, that you've already said no to, trying to find a
12 way to circumvent the law so that they can open a dormitory. This is not the way the
13 law is supposed to work. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Senator, I'm going to take the liberty and move you from
15 the for column over to the against column. [laughter]

16 SEN. SCOTT: If that puts me where I need to be, thank you, sir. You did a good
17 job. At least we agreed one thing today. [laughter]

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Ed Bergeron?

19 MS. CAIRNS: Geo would like to say something.

20 MR. PRICE: Yeah. Senator Scott was saying that if the Department of Mental
21 Health wanted to put up a dorm. This wouldn't necessarily apply to them because just
22 with the definitions, this would be limited to dormitories for academic institutions. So
23 these provisions wouldn't apply to them.

1 SEN. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman?

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir?

3 SEN. SCOTT: [Inaudible]?

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Very quick, sir.

5 SEN. SCOTT: Very quick, 26 says dormitory. B says for colleges and
6 universities, C set it separate and apart, we still back to the 26 it says dormitory. If you
7 want a dormitory use, you should have put dormitory/colleges and universities so it
8 shows in the Code that you actually separated the two or you went to the dormitories
9 and universities and you wrote the Code that way. It says dormitory, No. 26. Thank
10 you, sir.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Mr. Bergeron, followed by Alfonso Jacobs and
12 then Harry Green.

13 **TESTIMONY OF ED BERGERON:**

14 MR. BERGERON: My name is Ed Bergeron, I live at 7827 Mel Street. Right
15 down the street from the hotel currently or whatever. I just want to say amen to what he
16 said. We didn't have an opportunity to talk to these people and find out what they were
17 going to do. I have things that I had written up so if you'd consider it or whatever.
18 These are some examples and rebuttals to the meeting that I went to at the County
19 Council, some of the things that were said there that the residents didn't have a chance
20 to have any input into. One of the main things is that everybody from Mel Street was
21 represented at the Council meeting saying that they were opposed to this. Everybody
22 from Horseshoe had a petition that I think 30 out 32 had signed the petition saying they
23 did not want this. The people who were for it were from across the lake and weren't

1 going to be impacted by it. So, there's things on there that I don't want to even read in
2 public. If you'll look at item number 4, you're going to get the police involved in things
3 out there that haven't been involved before. There's just a lot of problems that came up
4 from the month that these people were out there with the dormitory.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I appreciate it. And if we could address the ordinance as
6 a whole for the county, we'd certainly appreciate it folks. Alfonso Jacobs, followed by
7 Harry Green then Reverend James Cooper.

8 **TESTIMONY OF ALFONSO JACOBS:**

9 MR. JACOBS: Thank you sir. I'm Alfonso Jacobs, I live at 7324 Sara Drive. My
10 backyard runs into the back of the motel parking lot. I'm amazed at how this system
11 works. I'm sitting here, just getting all confused; I'm going to make a movie out of it one
12 day. I'm nervous; I'm upset because I'm too old to move. But I do think if you put that
13 dorm in our neighborhood, 180 rooms if I'm correct, times 3, you've got 600 kids in our
14 neighborhood, no sidewalks, no nothing that going to take care of them. I'm opposed to
15 this, I got a little frustrated last week, I went up to see Leon Lott and ask him is opinion.
16 He did say one of the Council members called him but he didn't ask his opinion. Leon
17 Lott says, I could quote him, "It's not a place for a dorm". Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Mr. Green? Followed by Reverend Cooper,
19 Andrew Meade?

20 **TESTIMONY OF HARRY GREEN:**

21 MR. GREEN: Good evening council. I'm Harry Green, I live at 7309 Sara Drive.
22 And we've been fighting this battle a little while and we all know that Benedict have
23 been there a while and they've left us with a real bad taste. When things, when they

1 were there, we had a ball of confusion with things that was going on within the
2 neighborhood and to reinvent the wheel, come back and say now, it's good for them to
3 come in, I object to the idea because of the quietness of the neighborhood and
4 members of our neighborhood who represent Springwood Lakes Association. Thank
5 you.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Andrew Meade followed by Desmond
7 Meade.

8 **TESTIMONY OF JAMES S. COOPER:**

9 MR. COOPER: I'm James S. Cooper and I live at 7908 Springflower Road and
10 I'm the President of our neighborhood association. The neighborhood association just,
11 we're appalled that the County Council would send you an amendment to circumvent
12 the law.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Andrew Meade? Desmond Meade? Then
14 Ross Carlyle?

15 **TESTIMONY OF DESMOND MEADE:**

16 MR. MEADE: Yes, I'm Desmond Meade. I'm at 7303 Sara Drive. And I support
17 everything that was said before. Most of the things that were said earlier, I'm in
18 approval with it, with my residents here.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you.

20 **TESTIMONY OF ROSS CARLYLE:**

21 MR. CARLYLE: Good afternoon, I'm Ross Carlyle. I live at 7819 Nell Street,
22 Columbia, South Carolina 29223. First of all, this is my first time reading the
23 amendments to these dormitories Code but speaking from, I'm four years out of college

1 from USC downtown Columbia, from the seven mile limitation, just speaking to that, we
2 don't have sidewalks, we don't have bike access. As a student, to get to classes you
3 would either take a bike or walk or take a public bus that was set up a USC downtown
4 to get all over the campus. The seven mile limitation would require that you either take
5 a bus or the shuttle which runs every I believe it's half hour to an hour from that location
6 to your dorm. Getting back and forth to go home to eat your lunch or prepare
7 something at your dorm would not be feasible for those students. I also see the – I
8 have to collect my thoughts, give me a second please. As far as the quality of life for
9 the students at those places, many of you, if you went to college would have like to
10 have enjoyed nightlife at bars or dance halls, whatever you prefer. The nearest ones to
11 them are in the Vista which is seven miles away. Or you can go to Sandhills which I
12 believe is another six miles give or take in either direction, so you're out of walking
13 distance to either of those locations. Now, I'm not going to comment to what they're
14 doing there but alcohol may or may not be involved, you can't drive those distances;
15 you'd have to take a bus or shuttle to get there, or taxi. Being a college student, they
16 don't have the money to do that. I think that location would be a bad location from a
17 student's perspective to house me. I, myself, would not want to live that far from my
18 campus. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, ma'am. Did you wish to speak?

20 MS. JACK: Yeah, I was on the list – I think Joy Jack? Joy Jack? [Inaudible]

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think you were signed up to speak on the next issue.

22 MS. JACK: Oh. I was looking at the wrong sheet.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's okay, come on down, we'll put you on this one.
2 But you do still have to speak to the next one whether you want to or not.

3 **TESTIMONY OF JOY JACK:**

4 MS. JACK: Whether I want to or not. Well, I would just like to say that you guys
5 have a wonderful opportunity here because this is about the distance. I mean, this is
6 more about the distance than the neighborhood or anything else. This about the bigger
7 picture and seven miles is way too far to be away from a campus for security reasons,
8 for all the reasons stated before. So I think even though County Council, I think did the
9 wrong thing by pushing this back to y'all they don't want to make the decision. Y'all
10 have an opportunity here to make a great decision for the entire county and I hope you'll
11 make it. Because this really matters for the entire county, there are so many colleges in
12 this county. So, thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. That's all who have signed up to speak.
14 Yes, sir. Knew you were coming.

15 **TESTIMONY OF JOE MCEACHERN:**

16 REP. MCEACHERN: Oh, I'm sure it was planned. Of course, I'm
17 Representative Joe McEachern, plus a part of [inaudible] Spring Well Lake. First of all, I
18 take issue with what's been before you because it's fundamentally asked you to change
19 from special exception to special requirements. And so, I just kind of have an issue with
20 that with because you're changing that from a category that's going to be across the
21 board change that will impact a lot of institutions in Richland County specifically.
22 [Inaudible] shall have what which is before you is that you're getting into what they call a
23 security issues by, you know, some by visitation of these kinds of issues. And you're

1 taking responsibility for these dormitories being from there. I mean, and then you're
2 talking about, which are a big issue of a half mile to seven miles, when you start talking
3 about those kinds of issues, now you begin to get into an area of just of regulating, you
4 know, positions of campuses. And if so, I just think if you're going to take these issues
5 up, you need a lot of deliberation, a lot of input on these things. I mean, you start
6 talking about seven miles, you know, it specifically talk about one issue, but you're also
7 talking about the fact of are you talking about getting to another campus? I mean, its
8 one thing being a half a mile, another seven. I mean, why don't you just create another
9 campus instead of a dormitory being that far? And so, then you start talking about how
10 you going to regulate them, how are you going to enforce these regulations and who
11 going to be responsible for these enforcement regulations? And so, I think you're in a
12 variety of decision making and position on these things. I mean, what do you do with it?
13 Go back to the Board of Appeals to say that now this is what you have to abide by or
14 this specific issue to this? So there are several fundamental problems with this. So, all I
15 ask you to do is look at them, deliberate, while I like – yeah, it's nice to hire out these
16 regulations as far as dormitories are concerned but you just have fundamental issues
17 that this just creates a horrible problem for you. And so, the only thing is, you know, just
18 simple put, just trying to circumvent a decision. Thank you for hearing me out on that.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you, Representative. Yes, sir. Come on down if
20 you would. Give your name and address.

21 **TESTIMONY OF ANTHONY KENNEDY:**

22 MR. KENNEDY: Good afternoon, I'm Anthony Kennedy. I live at 8001 Spring
23 Pond Road, same neighborhood. I'm also the first vice president of the Neighborhood

1 Association. We spoke of the issue of effecting counties. Well, it seems to me plainly if
2 this change to allow Benedict to come over there, that means other schools and
3 colleges will be able to bring dormitories anywhere in any neighborhood, if I'm not
4 mistaken there. And it just seems kind of crazy if you're that, seven miles away from
5 your own campus where it should be a dorm on campus, it just seems not right. Also,
6 as it affect the whole county would be the same issues that we would have in our own
7 county in our own neighborhood; that is loitering, kids doing whatever they want to
8 unsupervised. Shrubbery and lights is not going to keep away vandalism to different
9 neighbors, homes, property, hanging out, drinking all the things that comes with a
10 dormitory. We've been there, done that. And to me, that would affect the whole county
11 if you start expanding other dorms in other places in the county. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That would conclude our public input session. Any
13 discussion?

14 MS. MCDANIEL: I have more questions for Geo, if that's appropriate at this
15 time? I don't quite understand – the County Council initiated text amendment, is that
16 correct Geo?

17 MR. PRICE: Yes.

18 MS. MCDANIEL: Okay. So is there anyone from County Council here to answer
19 questions about it about the need for it? Are you going to speak on behalf of - okay.
20 Alright. [laughter]

21 MR. PRICE: I mean, I can only explain, you know, talk about some of the
22 provisions, but I can't speak of their intent.

23 MS. CAIRNS: It doesn't matter why.

1 MS. MCDANIEL: Okay.

2 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, on my deliberation.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I have a couple of comments. I have two real issues.
4 One, and I am completely divorcing this from the map amendment which came before
5 us last month and looking at it solely as how this applies to our county as a whole
6 number one in my opinion, this needs to stay a special exception. Dormitories have
7 such an impact on the surrounding communities that surrounding communities need to
8 have an input into whether or not they go there anywhere. Just because of the impact,
9 the potential impact they have the community. So, it needs to stay as a special
10 exception in my opinion. Second major issue, is with the distance it is from the campus.
11 Seven miles, I'm imagining it may get you from somewhere around Taylor Street maybe
12 out to, I don't know, maybe I-77 or something, which would be a pretty good distance for
13 a college student to try to get to and from class, back to home, from any function that
14 they have on campus, if they're involved in a club of some sort and they need to get
15 down there sometime at night when the club meets or some kind of fraternal or sorority
16 organization or something, there's no way to do that other than through a taxi or through
17 the school providing transportation. I think some kids could possibly get into some
18 situations where they may not understand what's going to happen to them if they live
19 that far off campus. So, I certainly have an issue with the distance. I can see where the
20 half mile would not be appropriate, but I also would wonder if we couldn't give that also
21 to the Board of Zoning Appeals as a reason for a variance is if that was proven to the
22 Board of Zoning Appeals that, you know look we understand that this rule is a mile,
23 maybe it needs to, you know, we found this one location that's a mile and half off and

1 allow the Board of Zoning appeals the ability to grant that specific variance in those
2 instances. But you said, that they could not put that one mile?

3 MR. PRICE: The Board could not vary from the criteria for the special exception.
4 So that half a mile that's currently in our Code for a dormitory at – that's the rule no
5 exceptions.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is there any way to craft the ordinance so that they
7 could?

8 MR. PRICE: Thank can be, I mean, through a text amendment, sure.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So, that if it's a mile, I mean, you're good, you're okay,
10 you can do it, but anything over a mile can be granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals
11 with a public hearing and so forth?

12 MR. PRICE: I think you would almost have to have certain standards for different
13 - within a mile you have certain provisions for establishing it; over, let's say, one and
14 half or excuse me, a one mile plus to a certain, you might want to have some different
15 provisions for establishing those.

16 MS. CAIRNS: That's what, I mean, I was just looking at this and sort of reading
17 what the standards are for special exceptions versus special requirements and I think
18 that it would be reasonable to say that it should be a special requirement within my
19 guess, would be a mile of campus. And then beyond a mile, to allow special exception
20 to consider it but still not any further than like another mile. Because I think if you buy
21 property within a mile of campus, I think it's reasonable for that person to think that
22 someday that campus might expand a little bit. Certainly if you buy seven miles out, I
23 don't think it's reasonable to think that you're going to end up with a campus event in

1 your backyard. You know, I think there should be some, I think that the campuses
2 deserve the right to have special requirements if they stay truly close.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

4 MS. CAIRNS: And so then it's just administerial. But in terms of beyond a mile
5 or maybe it's a half mile to two I don't exactly what the number is but I don't think there
6 should be dorms more than two miles from campus period. I think once you're more
7 than two miles away, you're not a dorm. You're some rogue thing.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

9 MS. CAIRNS: And so, but I think somewhere between all of them being special
10 exceptions and all of them being special requirements, I'd like to see within a half mile
11 maybe they're a special requirement, and then between a half mile and two miles,
12 they're special exceptions. And, I mean, to me in terms of that, on page 54, number 26,
13 that's all I want to see changed is that. But, I still have some heartburn with why they're
14 just simply permitted in RMHD. I think, they need to be SRs and/or SEs wherever they
15 occur because they are just such unique facilities. And whether that includes RMHD is
16 a possible underlying land use, I don't have any heartburn with that, but I have
17 heartburn with it being just plan old permitted without any requirements.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So would you be okay then with the special requirements
19 staying as is but only apply to the first half mile from campus?

20 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Anything between a half mile to two miles, the special
22 requirements would apply; however, it would be a special exception be granted by the
23 Board of Zoning Appeals but all the same requirements will apply?

1 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah. And then also adding in the RMHD, either adding RMHD to
2 that category or eliminate it is an underlying zoning. But I think it should probably just
3 be added in.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think it should copy what's in OI and -

5 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah.

6 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, is that the list of special requirements?

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's all you got to do.

8 MR. MANNING: That's it. I think there needs to be a lot of additional
9 requirements. And I think that's dealing just with that particular site. An issue of the
10 fence is directly related to this site, the landscaping. I think there needs to a whole
11 range of other requirements that might deal with security, it might deal -

12 MS. CAIRNS: But that's not a land use issue.

13 MR. MANNING: Well, to have a special requirement to allow.

14 MS. CAIRNS: That'd be a permitting thing; they'd be in different section of the
15 Code.

16 MR. MANNING: Well, you know, then, you know, you got to go back to the
17 special exceptions. I mean, there's got to be a criteria that's stronger than just this to
18 allow a use.

19 MS. CAIRNS: But it's got to be something very specific to land use.

20 MR. MANNING: Well, I just think it needs to be more stringent.

21 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, as a Body why would we want to remove this from
22 our purview and let the Board of Zoning Appeals have purview over this situation?
23 Wouldn't we rather see the cases one by one and be able to judge them on their

1 individual merits than create a template where stuff that would have come before us is
2 no longer coming before us?

3 MS. CAIRNS: But that would be spot zoning, you can't do.

4 MR. TUTTLE: I'd be leaving things as they are.

5 MS. CAIRNS: Well, as they are we don't see it. I mean –

6 MR. TUTTLE: We just did.

7 MS. CAIRNS: - but then.

8 MR. TUTTLE: We just saw a map amendment in a particular case.

9 MR. MANNING: This is basically spot zoning [inaudible].

10 MS. CAIRNS: Well because of the seven mile, short of the seven mile, I would
11 disagree.

12 MR. TUTTLE: I guess – alright, let me approach it a different way. Why would
13 we want to create something out of the standard zoning package for a dormitory that,
14 specifically for a dormitory versus something else?

15 MS. CAIRNS: Because just like any other land use, they have the natural need
16 to grow and have some predictability with that.

17 MR. TUTTLE: That's what I - I'm sorry. Why wouldn't they just come before us
18 in a normal manner then on each individual?

19 MS. CAIRNS: Well, I mean, when commercial developers are here, we're talking
20 about the MI, there's this desire to just simply know that you have the right to do things.
21 And if we require a university to come in front of us every single time they want a dorm
22 for a map amendment, I think there's a problem with that.

1 MR. TUTTLE: Well no, it's not every time they come. It's my understanding right
2 now in RHMD that they are, they can build a dorm regardless of where it's located.

3 MS. CAIRNS: They can, which I don't think is a good – which means that if this
4 property had been zoned RMHD, there'd be dorm seven miles from campus.

5 MR. TUTTLE: Right.

6 MS. CAIRNS: Which I don't think we as land use body should be encouraging or
7 desiring. I think we've got a problem with our Code. I think it's interesting the way it
8 came to us.

9 MR. TUTTLE: Well –

10 MS. CAIRNS: But I don't think that simply allowing it as a permitted by right use
11 in one specific land use is the way to go either. Because dorms ought to be close to
12 campus.

13 MR. TUTTLE: I'm not sure I differentiate between some of the condominiums
14 and apartments that are built off campus now that provide busing, so on and so forth, to
15 the campus, I'm not so sure fundamentally from our seat that those are different than if
16 the school's managing it or some private property management company managing it.
17 So, I mean, there clearly has to be some zoning that would be appropriate for
18 dormitories and it would be my theory that you either get the land rezoned to that
19 particular zoning to make it fit or it doesn't work.

20 MS. CAIRNS: Well, but I mean, clearly there's something unique about dorms or
21 this would just be an apartment complex. I mean, that's the whole thing is if Benedict
22 had wanted to buy this property, convert those into individual apartments and operate it
23 like the things we see down on Bluff Road, well then we wouldn't even be here.

1 MR. TUTTLE: Right but what – then all – but I mean.

2 MS. CAIRNS: I know, but they wanted a dorm. We're looking at dorms. Dorms
3 are unique beasts.

4 MS. MCDANIEL: Well, I think that problem too with that idea which is creative, I
5 like it, the problem is when, if they can, if there was only one zoning classification where
6 dormitories were allowed, there are other uses that would be allowed other than a
7 dormitory. So, it would have to be for all the possible uses that could be created on the
8 property under a rezoning, not just looking at whether a dormitory -

9 MR. TUTTLE: Right, but I mean, I guess my point is if I want to build a machine
10 gun factory, there's one zoning in which that's appropriate. If I want to build a golf
11 course, there's a particular zoning for that so why would dormitories fit into a different
12 mold, just odd.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The main issue I see with the dormitories is the amount
14 of people. You see, I understand where RMHD, for example, student housing that's out
15 on Shop Road, that's 16 units per acre. That's the most you can put there. Dormitories
16 for some reason are basically unregulated with the amount of people they can pack into
17 an acre. So there's some difference there and if dormitories would stick to the same
18 standards as RMHD and you can only put 16 units per acre -

19 MS. CAIRNS: You just killed every university.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - but that's what I'm saying. But I would agree with
21 outright allowing them in the RMHD but they don't play by the same rules that RMHD
22 does. Which everybody else who builds apartments has to live by those 16 per acre.
23 The same thing with GC, I mean, this is zoned General Commercial so theoretically, if

1 they were to put 16 units per acre on there as dormitory units, I wouldn't have a problem
2 with them but –

3 MR. PRICE: It wouldn't be dormitory units, they would be apartments.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right, I understand but – if they were to do that, but you
5 know, that's not what happens with dormitories. It becomes a number of people you're
6 packing into that small area, it becomes an issue.

7 MR. MANNING: But along with that number of people are other issues because
8 of that.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's right.

10 MR. MANNING: Just like in industrial where we got buffers and requirements for
11 HI and then RNLI cause your worried about what goes on in that plan. You know, it's
12 the dangers there's liability there so, in having kids off campus, I think you're got to
13 address security standards that minimize that impact on the surrounding area.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's why I agree with Heather that I think this is a, I
15 understand how it came about but still dormitories are a different animal just like other
16 things in our Code have special requirements/special exceptions from strip clubs to
17 whatever, there's certain things that if you're going to do it, you got to do it under these
18 guidelines. Dormitories seem to fall under that category and if you're going to put a
19 dormitory up, we want them to be a certain way in this county. Not just simply be
20 outright loud, and you can build them up and pack a bunch of people in there. But I
21 think it needs to fall under either special requirements or special exception, have rules
22 as to the dormitories. In my opinion, it is, and I kind of agree with Heather a little bit that
23 the first half mile, special requirements, half mile to two or whatever, special exceptions

1 so that the neighborhoods have an opportunity to at least come out and voice their
2 opinion whether or not they should be in their community or not [inaudible] miles away
3 from campus. But under no circumstances do I think they should be seven miles.

4 MR. MANNING: Well, Mr. Chairman –

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But if you would allow, I would support taking a hard look
6 at the requirements over the next 30 days or so and seeing what requirements, if any,
7 we or other counties have done or what other things are, you know, I'm sure that the
8 colleges themselves have development guidelines for their dormitories that they use. I
9 understand what you're saying that this list of requirements is very small.

10 MR. MANNING: Well, I'm not prepared to create a list here and I think we got to
11 take action today because Council is waiting for something to come back either or
12 approve or deny. If we don't approve something, I'm not so sure the Council doesn't
13 have by right the ability to move forward anyway.

14 MR. PRICE: Within 30 days.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: After 30 days.

16 MR. MANNING: Well, if we got 30 days then they've got to hear it two weeks
17 after that?

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, we can defer it for a month.

19 MR. TUTTLE: For instance, [inaudible] I was involved with the new dormitories
20 at Allen University. And that was done in a PDD where all the concerns that
21 everybody's voicing here were outlaid and committed to with a specific parking plan,
22 even a pedestrian plan etc., etc. So, I certainly see where you're coming from, I just
23 don't that we could react quick enough to have something that makes sense.

1 MR. MANNING: Council is off in August.

2 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

3 MR. MANNING: So if we met in July –

4 MS. ALMEIDA: They could have a special called meeting.

5 MR. PRICE: [Inaudible] special called meeting [inaudible] 30 days from
6 [inaudible].

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We could meet within 29 days to address the issue.

8 MR. MANNING: Why don't we just vote this up or down and then come back and
9 address it later? We could still look at it. Yeah, but clearly the language that I think I've
10 heard here is not seven miles. And so, if we come back with something other than –

11 MS. CAIRNS: Well, can we do the crazy thing where we do an up/down as
12 written and then amend it and do an up/down on an amended; for the vote?

13 MR. MANNING: I'm in favor of that.

14 MS. CAIRNS: I think our rules let us do that.

15 MR. MANNING: So then we could come back and [inaudible] special –

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: If we just vote up/down on this as is, I'm not sure that we
17 can just initiate a new route.

18 MS. CAIRNS: I don't know, I don't know how the rules work.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: [Inaudible] this route public notification in the [inaudible].

20 MS. CAIRNS: Let's ask them.

21 MS. LINDER: You can certainly make your recommendations and we will
22 prepare a memo to Council as to what you're recommendations are.

1 MS. CAIRNS: So in other words, we can do an up/down vote as written and then
2 have. also then go forward the list of recommendations that we'd like to see in an
3 amended ordinance but not actually amend the ordinance?

4 MS. LINDER: Well, I guess if you have amendments that you want to make to
5 the existing ordinance that's before you, you could tell us what those amendments are
6 and I can do a memo to Council saying, yes, you elect the ordinance subject to, for
7 example, the distance being a shorter distance or subject to having the RMHD as a
8 special requirement or you could tell me what it is that you want specifically and then I
9 can relay that to County Council.

10 MS. CAIRNS: But can we do both? I mean, can we do an up/down vote as
11 written and them also do a –

12 MS. ALMEIDA: A substitute ordinance?

13 MS. CAIRNS: A substitute ordinance?

14 MS. LINDER: Well, I think that is what you're doing, you're saying no unless or
15 you're saying yes, subject to.

16 MR. TUTTLE: Are you saying that would be in a memo form just because that's
17 the customary way you've done it?

18 MS. LINDER: I would do it as a memo because if you were to come up with
19 another ordinance it would be, in my opinion would be confusing. Council would have
20 two different ordinances and it'd would be easier to read just to see what your changes
21 are.

22 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, I just know in the past when we've gone the memo route is
23 seem like we don't have a real document in front of them, it's just like, oh, by the way,

1 here are some notes, you can either look at or not. And I would rather have an
2 ordinance that was crafted the way we saw it that was before them that they would in
3 turn have to modify if they didn't like it.

4 MS. LINDER: I could certainly draft an ordinance; the question would be whether
5 Council would desire to see –

6 MR. TUTTLE: Well there would modifications to this. I'm just saying do it in an
7 ordinance format rather than a memo.

8 MS. ALMEIDA: Right.

9 MS. LINDER: I don't believe I have that authority to amend what Council has
10 brought before you.

11 MR. TUTTLE: Well, we have the ability to amend it correct?

12 MS. LINDER: You have the ability to make recommendations on changes to
13 what the Council wants.

14 MR. TUTTLE: And that has to be in a memo form, we can't change this
15 ordinance?

16 MS. LINDER: No, I could create the changes and create another document.
17 Then it would be up to Council as to whether they want the two ordinances side-by-side
18 in their agenda package.

19 MR. TUTTLE: Why would the original ordinance go back to them?

20 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

21 MR. TUTTLE: I'm confused. If we modify this ordinance, why would there be
22 two ordinances before Council? The ordinance they sent to us would have died or been
23 modified here, correct? Or not?

1 MS. LINDER: Because this was Council initiated, I would be reluctant to change
2 anything that Council has initiated. I'd be more comfortable and I think it would be more
3 appropriate for you to say, no thank you Council but we would be able to sort of live with
4 this other document. But I think Council has the right to have that ordinance they sent
5 to you, come back to you – come back to them with your recommendation on it.

6 MR. TUTTLE: Okay, I mean, it's kind of semantics, but I mean, I'm just asking.
7 There's a perceived difference there.

8 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman?

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir.

10 MR. BROWN: I don't know if it's in order, but Sen. Scott was trying to get your
11 attention.

12 SEN. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me to? I think in here – I think in
13 your earlier discussion as it relates to this ordinance you said it was not about one
14 particular property you guys had already ruled upon. And we've got so many other
15 colleges and universities that this ordinance is going to affect. I've got about eight or
16 nine of them right in my senate district. I would appreciate it if you would take the 30
17 days that you would allow those colleges and universities to participate in this
18 recommendation that you're going to send back. These schools, these new colleges
19 are coming in; South University, Phoenix and so many others, Webster's and so many
20 others, that if we're going to do an ordinance if we're going to make that kind of change,
21 that they do have some kind of input to what we're making. I don't see the importance
22 of trying to speed something back to Council for the purpose of something that y'all
23 have already made a decision on, especially, if we're going to put a permanent

1 ordinance on the books that's going to affect that many colleges and universities in the
2 greater Columbia area. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Appreciate it, Sen. Scott. Here's the way that I would like
4 to see us proceed with this. And this is where I think we would get our biggest bang for
5 the buck would be for us to defer this for 30 days and for us to have a work session two
6 weeks from today maybe or some time that's good for everybody. I mean, it can be
7 after hours, that's fine.

8 MS. CAIRNS: My June is slammed. My June is so slammed.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And here is the reason for that, it would be at our next
10 scheduled Planning Commission meeting we would have on there, on the books for a
11 public hearing an ordinance that we've initiated that may address the same issues so
12 therefore, an ordinance in Code form goes in front of Council that the Planning
13 Commission has recommended, and I'm not saying that we're going to vote up or down
14 on this dormitory, I have an inkling as to which way the Planning Commission will vote
15 as to - but the way I think we would get the most effective way would be for us to vote
16 yes or no on the draft as it came from Council and for us to at the same time, if we were
17 to vote no, were to have something that is our recommendation that we think this is the
18 way that we should change this ordinance language and have it going through the
19 proper channels of being advertised, and addressed and it's a vote of the Planning
20 Commission that this is how we think it should be addressed. If not, it's going to be the
21 same issue that we always have that if we just vote no on this and with no input, and it's
22 going to be looked upon as, well, they voted no but they didn't give us any guidance.
23 And if we give guidance, it's going to be in memo form that, you know, so. That's the

1 way I think we would get the best bang for our buck and I understand that – and I would
2 imagine the work session may could be done over somebody's lunch period. Not lunch
3 period but I'm saying Over an hour of lunch. I mean, I don't think it's going to be a long
4 work session is all I'm saying.

5 MR. MANNING: So, you're saying we vote this up or down and make a
6 recommendation for legal to take back to Council or we defer this and have a work
7 session, craft the language that we want to see in it -

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Correct.

9 MR. MANNING: - and then send that forward.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And have that on our next Agenda along with this Case
11 No.

12 MR. MANNING: Is it both, one or the other?

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, we'd have this case on this next month's Agenda as
14 well as whatever we came up with at our work session and voted on our next meeting.
15 Either we would vote this up or down and we would vote on the ordinance that came out
16 of the work session up or down.

17 MR. MANNING: But if we vote it up or down, the Council would have the right to
18 take that document and say, we don't agree with it, this is what we're going to do.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The difference would be that there would be two legal
20 ordinance changes sitting in front of them as opposed to one ordinance change with our
21 memos attached to it.

22 MR. MANNING: But if we defer this, and wait and bring it back next month, that
23 action the Council can't take.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Correct.

2 MR. MANNING: They can't.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

4 MR. MANNING: So, I would recommend that we defer this.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's what I'm saying.

6 MR. MANNING: Without an up or down.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. That's what I was saying. Is that we defer for 30
8 days and within those 30 days we have the work session so at our next Planning
9 Commission meeting on our Agenda are two different case numbers; one with what
10 Council sent us and one with whatever we come out of the Planning Commission work
11 session with. We vote those two items up or down at our next Planning Commission
12 meeting. That would be my recommendation.

13 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman, was that in the form of a motion?

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I don't know that I really should.

15 MS. CAIRNS: Mr. Chairman can't put that in form of a motion.

16 MR. BROWN: I move the Chairman's recommendation.

17 MS. CAIRNS: The Chair can't make a motion.

18 MR. BROWN: Yeah, he can't. I said, I move the Chair's recommendation, not
19 his motion, his recommendation.

20 MS. LINDER: Which is to defer this item?

21 MR. BROWN: Which is to defer.

22 MS. CAIRNS: And to have a work session.

23 MR. BROWN: And to have a work session.

1 MR. GILCHRIST: I'll second that, Mr. Chairman.

2 MS. LINDER: And do you have a date for the work session?

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We will be within our 30 days at our next Planning
4 Commission date.

5 MS. CAIRNS: When was our next Commission, is it the 5th?

6 MS. HAYNES: No, it's that Thursday.

7 MS. ALMEIDA: The 8th?

8 MS. HAYNES: Yes.

9 MS. CAIRNS: Oh.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So, we did move it to the 8th?

11 MS. ALMEIDA: Yes.

12 MR. GILCHRIST: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We'll need to move it back then.

14 MS. CAIRNS: No.

15 MS. MCDANIEL: Well, the 5th is a holiday.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, they won't –

17 [Inaudible discussion]

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I'm out of town all next week so the week of the 21st
19 would work well for me.

20 MR. MANNING: The 21st that week works.

21 MS. CAIRNS: The week of – oh wait, I'm on July. Okay.

22 MR. GILCHRIST: That week works for me.

23 MR. BROWN: Yeah, it works fine for me.

1 MS. CAIRNS: Are we talking about on the 21st? On Monday?

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It actually works fine for me on that Monday, so –

3 MR. BROWN: Fine with me.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Y'all want to do it late, early, lunch?

5 MS. CAIRNS: Late.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: During your lunch period?

7 MS. MCDANIEL: Sure, do it at recess.

8 MS. CAIRNS: Do you get one of those?

9 MS. ALMEIDA: That's June 21st?

10 MS. CAIRNS: Yes, ma'am.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Can we get in here or do we have to go to the 4th floor?

12 MS. ALMEIDA: We'll have to check.

13 MS. HAYNES: I could reserve a room.

14 MS. ALMEIDA: Are we meeting at noon, 1:00?

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Whatever works with you.

16 MS. CAIRNS: Can we go at 3? I mean, I need to not lose my day.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: You want to do it at 4?

18 MS. CAIRNS: Sure.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is that okay for everybody?

20 MR. BROWN: Fine.

21 MR. TUTTLE: Four o'clock.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Will 4:00 o'clock work?

23 MR. GILCHRIST: I'll sacrifice.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So your work days.

2 MR. GILCHRIST: That's exactly right.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, we'll have a work session on this on the 21st at
4 4:00 o'clock somewhere down here 4:00 till -

5 MS. LINDER: And then from the work session you will give me some language
6 to craft into an ordinance to take to your July Planning Commission meeting?

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It will actually be a, not a work session but a special call
8 meeting, because we'll take action at it.

9 MS. ALMEIDA: Oh, okay.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We'll vote on something there to be on our Planning
11 Commission Agenda.

12 MS. LINDER: You're not expecting me to craft an ordinance to present to you at
13 the work session/special called meeting?

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Correct. We'll have a work session from that we'll have
15 something placed on our Agenda – and what's the advertising time on that?

16 MS. HAYNES: Fifteen days. For what, the special call? Twenty-four.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: For the Agenda.

18 MS. HAYNES: Fifteen days.

19 MS. ALMEIDA: Twenty-four.

20 MS. HAYNES: The Planning Commission would be 15 days also.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, so we far within our timeframes? Okay, that will
22 work.

1 MS. LINDER: Okay, this is going to be work session not a special called
2 meeting?

3 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, you want to carry the motion?

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second for us to defer this text
5 amendment, text amendment one on our agenda till our next Planning Commission
6 meeting and also for us to have a work session scheduled on the 21st at 4:00 o'clock to
7 address language as it pertains to dormitories. We have a motion and second on that.
8 All those in favor, please signify by raising your hand. None opposed.

9 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward,*
10 *Gilchrist, Brown; Opposed: None]*

11 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, can I make a request to Staff?

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Absolutely.

13 MR. TUTTLE: Is there anyway Staff could pull the dormitory regulations that the
14 City of Columbia has been using? Maybe that might help us as a guideline?

15 MR. PRICE: [Inaudible] already established them.

16 MR. TUTTLE: And any regulations that relate to it as far as –

17 MR. PRICE: I can tell you the definitions pretty much follow the City of
18 Columbia's.

19 MS. CAIRNS: But yeah, with all the other stuff.

20 MR. PRICE: But the other, I'll find out how they deal with –

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Criterion.

22 MS. CAIRNS: Anything in their land use code that regulates dormitories.

23 MR. PRICE: I can tell you one of the – I guess we can.

1 MR. MANNING: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Next Amendment?

3 MS. ALMEIDA: Mr. Chairman, found on Page 97 – 87, page 87, we are
4 addressing and amending an ordinance Section 26-59 on PDD to correct that reference
5 so the PDD regulation. And Ms. Amelia Linder is here to address any questions or
6 concerns.

7 MS. LINDER: This is just a corrective ordinance. We had added new zoning
8 districts in that way and that cause this particular Code section to reference the PDD
9 sections at the wrong section number and it's just to correct the correct section number.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have no one signed up to speak.

11 MS. CAIRNS: I make a motion to approve.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor, please signify by raising your hand.
14 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Manning, Mattos-Ward,*
15 *Gilchrist, Brown; Opposed: None]*

16 MS. LINDER: Under other business No. 2.

17 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, there was nothing in our packet. M1s on our Agenda.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, M1 was on our agenda, but there wasn't anything
19 on there.

20 MS. HAYNES: It was a handout.

21 MS. ALMEIDA: It was a handout submitted in your package regarding the

22 MS. MCDANIEL: No, we didn't have anything.

23 MS. CAIRNS: It wasn't in the packet.

1 MR. BROWN: General development plan, Woodcreek.

2 MS. LINDER: Either Mr. Price or I could explain what this involves.

3 MS. CAIRNS: Just didn't have any time to, I mean, I didn't notice, I look at the
4 packet, not the agenda, so I didn't come in prepared to talk about M-1. I mean, I
5 apologize for that but.

6 MS. LINDER: This is time sensitive, or it's becoming time sensitive. There was
7 an ordinance and we did the map amendments for the :and Development Code that we
8 allowed the M-1 to stay in place.

9 MS. ALMEIDA: We will bring information into the packet for the July 8th Planning
10 Commission and if you would entertain the thought of maybe discussing some of that
11 information at your work session, if you have any questions, we'll provide that ahead of
12 time for you. And maybe we can address both items if time allows. But it will be on the
13 July Agenda for action.

14 MS. CAIRNS: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I do have one request. I know that the M-1 zoning was a
16 very hotly contested issue back when the ordinance passed. I would like to see those
17 same people at the discussion table as to what goes on with the M-1 zoning. The M-1
18 owners. I mean, we've got a letter here from some interested parties. Maybe if they
19 could be contacted or if there's some sort of M-1, I know there's a lot of people that
20 came out and spoke in favor of M-1 and against M-1.

21 MS. ALMEIDA: Well, what will happen is once it's on your July Planning
22 Commission for action, that will be advertised and people will come out to discuss it.

1 MS. LINDER: If your recommendation is to change the M-1 to L-I we would have
2 to go through a rezoning process. And then the property owners would be notified.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What's – I understand it's time sensitive, what happens if
4 we don't meet the deadline in the Code?

5 MS. ALMEIDA: Something – we would have to bring this before Council and
6 Council will have to make some sort of recommendation either to make a proposal and
7 bring it back to Planning Commission for recommendation, but it would have to be
8 brought to Council's attention for action, some action.

9 MS. CAIRNS: What does the Code say if we do nothing?

10 MS. MCDANIEL: It does say. I think it says that it's –

11 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, I thought it said something that if we fail to act there's some
12 provision.

13 MS. MCDANIEL: Yeah, it does. Hang on two seconds. Within 30 days from the
14 date of any proposed zoning amendment, unless a period of longer time has been
15 mutually agreed upon by the Council and the Planning Commission, have to submit
16 your report – if you don't submit a report within a prescribed time, County Council may
17 proceed to act on the amendment without further awaiting the recommendations of the
18 Planning Commission.

19 MR. PRICE: Actually, the – this is what we're looking at when –

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's different.

21 MR. PRICE: - as the ordinance that for the M-1 –

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

23 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, it's to the specific M-1 thing.

1 MS. MCDANIEL: Oh, oh sorry.

2 MR. PRICE: And essentially, there's no, there isn't any language in there as to
3 what would happen exactly, it just says that, all property with the zoning district
4 classification of M-1 light industrial as of June 30, 2005, shall on July 1, 2005 and
5 thereafter until further amended have the zoning classification of M-1 light industrial as
6 described and regulated in the Land Development Code adopted on November 9, 2004,
7 with all the of the uses permitted therein provided, however, within the five years from
8 the effective date of this ordinance, the Richland County Planning Commission shall
9 make a recommendation as to whether or not the current M-1 zoning districts should be
10 amended to LI zoning districts under the Land Development Code and any
11 amendments thereto and whether or not the M-1 zoning district and any reference
12 thereto should be deleted from Chapter 26 of the Richland County Code of Ordinances
13 and shall forward such recommendation to County Council for their consideration.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So, we only have two questions in front of us. It's not
15 should M1 go to anything else, it's only should M1 go to LI? And should M1 be taken out
16 of our Code?

17 MR. PRICE: That question has come up to you – can you talk about that?

18 MS. LINDER: Yes, in essence, the M1 was allowed to stay in place but we're at
19 this point now where we need a recommendation as to whether to change all the M1s to
20 LI and remove the M1.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

22 MR. PRICE: But if that's the question, do they have the option of doing anything
23 else besides those two?

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We can initiate anything we want to initiate but as it
2 addresses to that ordinance and the time sensitivity of that ordinance, we need to
3 answer two questions. Do we think it should go from M1 to LI and do we think that M1
4 should be taken out of our Code?

5 MS. LINDER: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

7 MS. CAIRNS: Our recommendation could be no. At which point, M1 just lives
8 on.

9 MR. MANNING: Correct.

10 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

11 MS. CAIRNS: And the sunset and the grandfather and all that stuff just dies.

12 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

13 MS. CAIRNS: Until there's further action.

14 MS. LINDER: If Council agreed with your recommendation, that's correct.

15 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Until Council or somebody else wants to come up with
17 M1 to anything else or –

18 MS. ALMEIDA: Correct.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - modify M1 or whatever. But for now, unless we want to
20 initiate –

21 MS. CAIRNS: Right, no right, right. That all we have to decide is do we switch it
22 to Li or do we just let it go on and it's just like any other zoning classifications subject to
23 change just like anything else.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Have somebody else come up, either Staff or us or
2 Council come up with some other kind of modification that they see best.

3 MS. CAIRNS: The only thing is, I think – isn't it in the Code that we can't rezone
4 into M1?

5 MS. ALMEIDA: That's correct.

6 MS. CAIRNS: So that would be the only thing is if maybe clear that up inside of
7 this?

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, do we have a motion to adjourn?

9 MR. BROWN: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

10 MR. GILCHRIST: Second.

11

12

[Meeting Adjourned at 3:00 pm]