

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
December 5, 2011

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Present: Heather Cairns, Olin Westbrook, Kathleen McDaniel, David Tuttle, Patrick Palmer, Stephen Gilchrist, Deas Manning, Howard Van Dine, III, Wallace Brown, Sr.

Called to order: 1:00 pm

CHAIRMAN PALMER: We'll call the December meeting of the Planning Commission to order. Let me read this into the Record, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio, TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board in the lobby of the County Administration building. Everybody get a copy of the November Minutes?

MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that the Minutes for the November meeting be approved.

MR. WESTBROOK: I'll second.

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

[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Manning, Van Dine, Brown]

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any Agenda amendments?

MS. LINDER: Yes sir, Staff would request the first Text Amendment, making the CRD and the DBWP Decker Boulevard/Woodfield Park Overlay Districts mandatory, that we defer that until Staff is ready to present that. Possibly next month.

CHAIRMAN LINDER: Okay.

MS. LINDER: Thank you.

1 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, if I could back up for a minute and make a motion
2 that the road names as submitted be approved [Perimeter Point, Cordage Drive,
3 Rockfish Drive].

4 MR. BROWN: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Did everybody get a copy of those? We have a motion
6 and a second. All those in favor please signify by raising your hand.

7 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Manning, Van Dine,*
8 *Brown]*

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Do we have a motion to approve the Agenda as
10 amended?

11 MR. VAN DINE: So moved.

12 MR. GILCHRIST: Second.

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

15 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Manning, Van Dine,*
16 *Brown]*

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Map Amendments, case number 11-20 MA.

18 **CASE NO. 11-20 MA:**

19 MR. LEGER: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon Members of the Planning
20 Commission. We have one application for a rezoning this month and we put a little bit
21 more effort into our PowerPoint presentation so hopefully you can see it this month as
22 opposed to it being dark and blurred, so hopefully you can read that a little better and
23 the public can as well. The one application, project 11-20 MA. The Applicant is Claire

1 Baxter and the property is owned by the Columbia Agape Presbyterian Church. It's
2 located on 251 Rabon Road, it's just a little under a half an acre in size, it's currently
3 zoned RU, Rural District, and the Applicant is requesting an OI, Office and Institutional
4 District. The property was originally RU, Rural District, in 1977, and has about 70' of
5 road frontage on Rabon Road. The surrounding area is occupied by a number of
6 different uses; primarily to the north we're zoned RS-MD and it occupied by residential
7 structures, to the south the property is zoned RU, Rural District, and it is currently
8 vacant, to the east we have RU and GC districts, a mixture of vacant property and
9 storage, kind of mini-warehouse storage facility, and to the west we have RU and
10 residential occupancy. The Comprehensive Plan recommends suburban uses for this
11 property, essentially commercial and office activities in locations where other office and
12 commercial uses are located. Again, the vicinity of this property is really a mixture of
13 uses, some residential, some commercial, some light industrial, warehouses, etc. so
14 there is a good bit of mix in this area. The property currently contains the church
15 structure itself and parking onsite. It is an unpaved parking lot, red brick church
16 structure. There is a concrete block structure to the rear of the church facility. I'm not
17 sure of its use, probably for the church as well. Based on the surrounding uses, the
18 surrounding zoning and the Applicant's request, the Staff can recommend approval of
19 this request at this time. If you have any questions I'll be glad to try and answer them.

20 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman? To the Staff, what would this zoning change
21 accomplish? Why is it being requested?

22 MR. LEGER: To be honest with you I'm really not sure. The Applicant might be
23 able to address that better than I. I thought it had something to do with setbacks and

1 parking, but I was not in on the pre-application conference with the Applicant, so you
2 can probably address that with the Applicant.

3 MR. PRICE: Yes, I mean, he is correct that originally this came before us, did
4 the little site plan and of course there were some issues as far as accommodating the
5 parking and being able to develop the site according to the Code was one of the
6 reasons, and then of course there's the other one of, you know, we get back to this rural
7 zoning and on Rabon Road, and if you take out the church and it was just a vacant
8 parcel the question is, is that an appropriate location for rural or more appropriate for
9 office or some type of commercial use.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other questions for Staff? Mr. Brown, did that answer
11 your question?

12 MR. BROWN: I still don't understand why it's being requested. That was my –

13 MR. PRICE: Well, I mean, it's, it's kind of two-fold. Once again, one of the
14 reasons that they're asking for it is because it would allow them to meet certain
15 setbacks and requirements for the continued development of the parcel for the church.
16 That's one. And, you know, the second one could be, you know, the appropriateness of
17 rural, you know, [inaudible] they could come in and ask for a rezoning from rural to this,
18 the question is, is that an appropriate location for rural or even for the proposed zoning
19 district.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other questions for Staff? Mr. Sun Kim? We have a
21 podium and if you'd like to come up and speak, we try to limit comments to two minutes,
22 if you would give your name and address, anything that you think we might want to
23 know about the case, feel free to let us know.

1 **TESTIMONY OF MR. SUN KIM:**

2 MR. KIM: How are you? Hello. Yeah, this is, I am pastor of Columbia Baptist(?)
3 Church and we bought that church maybe three months ago. So when we bought that
4 church we don't know about the, just the church, so church buy church. So we apply
5 the parking lot, okay, month, Richland County, so our church is, side space very narrow.
6 We have [inaudible] space, so they said that we needed to change zoning to pavement
7 parking lot, so that's why we apply there. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Mr. Sun Sook.

9 **TESTIMONY OF MR. SUN SOOK:**

10 MR. SOOK: Hi, how are you? Almost same as our Pastor Kim told you people,
11 okay, like he said, we just a church. We bought the church and tried to pavement, we
12 try to pull out the permit for paving, so Richland County ask us about, you have to
13 rezoning, so we step by step and then that's why we are here right now. And as I know,
14 there was, the building was built 1950, whole [inaudible] whole, many, many, many,
15 many years they were church over there. Thank you very much.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. That's all we have signed up to speak. Any
17 other questions, comments?

18 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we send this forward with a
19 recommendation of approval.

20 MR. BROWN: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and multiple seconds. All those in
22 favor please signify by raising your hand.

1 [Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Manning, Van Dine,
2 Brown]

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: And none opposed. Mr. Kim, we're recommending
4 Body to County Council. They will have final say on this case, whether or not it receives
5 the final zoning and they will be meeting back here in these same chambers on
6 December the 20th so I'd recommend you come back on December the 20th, same
7 room, 7:00. Thank you. Text Amendments, Text Amendment No. 1 has been deferred.
8 Moving on to Text Amendment No. 2.

9 **TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 2:**

10 MR. PRICE: This is the item that we deferred from last meeting to get some
11 more information, and there were a couple of questions. One of them was dealing with
12 the number of people that would be allowed in a group home, excuse me, what the
13 maximum number would be and Ms. Linder did some research on the numbers and if
14 I'm correct I believe if you go over 15 then DHEC considers it to be an institutional use,
15 so based on some of the discussion that we had at the last meeting and with that
16 information, we capped the number at 15. So in this case it will be group homes for 10
17 to 15 individuals and that will still fall under residential use. And also we limited the
18 square footage of the structure to 5,000 square feet.

19 MS. CAIRNS: Is there a reason for the 5,000?

20 MR. PRICE: One of the reasons is because previously when most of the uses,
21 and we're going back to kind of the old Code when a lot of uses were allowed,
22 especially when they were allowed by special exception, 5,000 was the number that
23 they were limited to.

1 MS. CAIRNS: I'm just, I was a little baffled by that cause I was like, there could
2 easily be a big, old existing house that was more than 5,000 and so they would be, they
3 would not, you know, even an existing structure that was there, they wouldn't be able to
4 convert it?

5 MR. PRICE: I think –

6 MS. CAIRNS: Unless they took the wing off. I mean, you know, I just, I mean,
7 you know, I come from big, old houses and, I mean, you know, there's a lot of old
8 houses that will be over 5,000 square feet that probably would convert to a group home
9 pretty easily.

10 MR. PRICE: Yeah, and that question does come up a couple of times, other
11 uses. And I'm not sure if maybe there's some language we could change to it – you
12 know, for new construction maybe, I'm not sure what the appropriate answer that would
13 be.

14 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, wouldn't that be appropriate for a variance or
15 some other issue that comes before the Zoning Board, if it's gonna actually –

16 MR. PRICE: No, sir. The additional requirements that are found from the special
17 requirement or even also a special exception cannot be varied by the Board of Zoning
18 Appeals.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I would think that 5,000 square foot limit is a pretty, pretty
20 big size building, that if you're putting that out in the rural areas, you start getting over
21 that, while you may occasionally have instance of it being, you know, a 6,000 square
22 foot house or something, I mean, you really start getting into the institutional use, I
23 mean, just thinking about the neighborhood would you really want, you know, a 7,000

1 square foot building with, you know, that's turned into a group home? I mean, you
2 know, you really start getting into where they should not, in my opinion, be out in the
3 rural area you start getting into these larger facilities. I mean, a 5,000 square foot group
4 home is a pretty fair size for a rural area.

5 MR. MANNING: Mr. Chairman, it is substantial but by the nature of putting a
6 5,000 square foot restriction on it, it's almost impossible to get 15. I mean, I think the
7 bedroom sizes would have to be some nominal that, you know, your dining facilities
8 would be cramped, you know, I don't know that it could work at 15 and 5,000 square
9 feet.

10 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Manning's point, is there some relative
11 requirement from DHEC per occupant as to a minimum amount of space? I mean, I'd
12 hate for us to impose 5,000 feet if that doesn't comply with the DHEC requirement for
13 15 people.

14 MR. MANNING: Right.

15 MS. LINDER: Well, if it did not comply they would have to decrease the number
16 of residents.

17 MR. TUTTLE: Right, which – I mean, why would we draft an ordinance that
18 wasn't compliant? I mean, I think we need to know the relative amount of space
19 required per occupant to then tie – if you choose to tie that to a square footage number
20 there should be some correlation between those two relative to the Code, rather than it
21 being arbitrary. That's just my question.

22 MR. PRICE: I'll be – oh, I'm sorry.

1 MR. BROWN: No, I'm sorry. Go ahead and answer his question and then I'll
2 come back.

3 MR. PRICE: [Inaudible]

4 MR. BROWN: Are there other amenities required if you're gonna have 10 to 15
5 people in the house at one time for it to comply with DHEC requirements, not just how
6 much space per person, but are there other things in there that would have to be and
7 should we consider that in an ordinance?

8 MR. PRICE: I mean, what we're looking at is, you know, from a zoning
9 standpoint, just from the County's standpoint is here's the structure, 5,000, you need to
10 meet all of the requirements based on that 5,000. If DHEC says that they need, you
11 know, something additional onto the home and it's gonna increase that size, then
12 essentially that would just eliminate the location. I mean, I think –

13 MR. MANNING: Going to Mr. Brown's point, I mean, I don't know whether DHEC
14 requires a minimum square footage per occupant for sleeping facilities, or requirements
15 for kitchen facilities and, you know, if they said 400 square feet per occupant, you're at
16 6,000 square feet just in bedroom space. So you couldn't get to 15. So I think, you
17 know, going back to Mr. Brown's point, it would seem like we would want to know what
18 DHEC is requiring and kind of blend the two together.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Mr. Price, do you think that the square footage size
20 would be kind of an open ended issue that could potentially come back and really harm
21 the county? Do you see a lot of these larger facilities – I guess what I'm getting at is I
22 know this has been on our Agenda for two months now, would you even see the need
23 at this point to put in a square footage requirement as opposed to if it becomes an issue

1 in the future bring it back to us and then we'll take a second look at the square footage
2 requirement, but at this point just not even include one?

3 MR. PRICE: I will say no. The reason why I say that is because if you look at, if
4 you kind of look at the other group homes that we allow in your more, in your traditional
5 residential neighborhoods for nine or fewer, we've seen a good bit of them come before
6 County Council because by state code they're required to go before Council to get
7 approval. There's no mention of a size requirement and we've seen them vary in size.
8 You know, I've seen relatively small homes, I've seen, you know, pretty large homes. I
9 mean, I guess the idea is really, you know, the County would allow these uses under
10 certain requirements and then DHEC would then tell them, you need so many square
11 feet per resident so that means just limit the number they have there.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So that may be a way to move forward, just take the
13 square footage completely out, if it becomes an issue Mr. Price can bring it back to us
14 and say, hey look, we've been having these issues, we've got to readdress this. Does
15 everybody -

16 MR. MANNING: I don't know, I need to think about that for a second.

17 MS. CAIRNS: But groups homes of up to nine, there's no square footage
18 requirement. And, I mean, I – I've just lived in houses over 5,000 square feet in the city,
19 you know, so I mean, so I just, you know, I didn't used to know foot sizes but I know that
20 a couple of the houses that I've lived in were over 5,000 square feet, so it's just kind of
21 weird. I mean, you couldn't get 10 or 15 people as a group home, and I just think it's a
22 weird limitation, that's all. I just, and you know, so up to nine it could be any size house.

23 MR. PRICE: Once again, I'm, I've been to a –

1 MS. CAIRNS: I just think there are a lot of houses that are 5,000 square feet in
2 the county.

3 MR. PRICE: Right. I haven't been to a lot of these homes, I've been to a couple
4 for some, and I know some of them they actually shared rooms. So, I mean, you're
5 talking about, you know, maybe needing six rooms.

6 MS. CAIRNS: Right, I mean, with so many uses it wouldn't be any bigger than it
7 needed to be, but I just, I find the 5,000 square foot is sort of an arbitrary number that
8 I'm not comfortable just tossing out and saying, if you need 10 or more you can't have
9 more than 5,000 square feet. It's not that big a house.

10 MR. PRICE: And I think you're correct, you know, to come up with a number, but
11 then, you know, what would that number be, absent them just not having a requirement
12 for square footage? I mean, I think you could argue, unless we know of some DHEC
13 requirements.

14 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, I'm uncomfortable with removing all reference to
15 square footage sizes, I think that if you do that you're, you open yourself up to some
16 very large, they could only have 10 people, but you could have some very large facilities
17 or whatever and I would prefer – I know we have to move it to another month or
18 whatever, but I'd prefer to know if DHEC has some requirements per person and some
19 of the other requirements for size and try and link that into our square footage
20 requirements.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Let's assume DHEC does have a minimum square
22 footage, are we gonna try to go with the minimum and if somebody wants to make a
23 larger one, I mean, you know?

1 MS. CAIRNS: I mean, somebody could go build a 10,000 square foot home and
2 put however many, you know, put their, and no one in the neighborhood can have an
3 issue or say no that's too big a home. And it's like we're limiting the number of people,
4 so it's like, it's kind of like what difference does it make how big a structure it is? It's
5 limited by how many people and what the uses can be? I'm not necessarily saying it
6 should be unlimited, but I, you know, I just think it's weird that –

7 MR. VAN DINE: I think if we don't have a limitation it is unlimited by nature and
8 we have always on this Commission been cautioned that we need to look for the things
9 that can happen if we don't do certain things, and that is if you rezone something
10 because someone says they want to do something, there's a whole lot of other things
11 they could do in that rezoning.

12 MS. CAIRNS: Sure.

13 MR. VAN DINE: And the same thing goes here if we don't deal with a size
14 limitation at some point in time we are going to run into that problem down the road,
15 which is gonna become a problem for somebody, and I don't feel comfortable just
16 saying there's no limitation on the size. Regardless of whatever, I would rather tie it
17 back to something realistic, such as the DHEC requirements.

18 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I think the square footage per person and the
19 amenities that are required by DHEC, I think we need to have, need to understand all
20 that for these facilities. Cause this is not like a regular home, you are providing a
21 residence and people are being paid to provide that space and so forth, and also to
22 manage the people in that facility, and so if we're going to have that it seems to me we

1 need to understand what DHEC requires. If they have no requirements that's one thing.
2 But if they have requirements, if have an ordinance it should comply.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, so at this point it seems like we've got an issue with
4 the square footage. Is there any other issues with the language proposed?

5 MR. BROWN: I need to understand the amenities to support the number of
6 people that would be in the facility.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: The total square footage for each piece of the home
8 required by DHEC, whether it be, you know, restrooms, kitchen –

9 MR. BROWN: Dining.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - dining.

11 MR. BROWN: All of it.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What are the requirements from DHEC for the size of, of
13 the facility to service 15 people?

14 MR. PRICE: We want to find the DHEC spacing(?) requirements?

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

16 MR. PRICE: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, any other issues with the language? Okay. Do we
18 have a motion?

19 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, I'll move that we defer this till our next meeting
20 when we, Staff can come back with the certain requirements regarding what DHEC
21 requires spatially on these facilities.

22 MR. BROWN: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. Geo, are there any
2 pending cases on that or is it just something you're looking at?

3 MR. PRICE: Something we've been looking at.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. We have a motion and a second. All those in favor
5 please signify by raising your hand.

6 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Manning, Van Dine,*
7 *Brown]*

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, Text Amendment No. 3?

9 MS. LINDER: This is just a clean up ordinance. When the Legal Department
10 sent all our ordinances to American Legal Publishing, they noticed that §26-184, it has
11 been deleted or just reserved and yet we were making cross-references to it so this is
12 just cleaning up section numbers to appropriate go to the right sections.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Do we have a motion?

14 MR. VAN DINE: Move we approve.

15 MR. GILCHRIST: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and multiple seconds. All those in
17 favor please signify by raising your hand.

18 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Manning, Van Dine,*
19 *Brown]*

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: There's none opposed. Okay. Other Business?
21 Everyone, I sent this out to be put in the Other Business section. It's an issue that's
22 come up a couple of times in our industry, kind of county-wide and what it is is that
23 automotive repair uses that typically like to locate near, and it makes sense for them to

1 be near automobile dealerships, they have to be in the HI district. They can't be in a
2 general commercial district. So I had several people in the industry call me and ask me
3 about this and want to put it on the Agenda for discussion and bring it back next month,
4 possibly with a text amendment if you guys agree that it's something that we need to
5 take a look at. We can take a vote to put it on the Agenda for next month and whether
6 or not to put automotive repair uses, auto body shops like Summit Collision or whoever,
7 John Harris Body and all that kind of stuff, in a general commercial zoned piece of
8 property, or do they need to stay in the HI districts, which are typically on the kind of
9 outskirts, away from the commercial area? But if you're getting auto body work done on
10 your car, and Geo and I talked about it, and whatever – not an, my proposal would be
11 not an outright permitted but to put special requirements on those businesses such as
12 the size, perhaps screening, perhaps a vehicle not being on site longer than a given
13 timeframe, 30 days or something to that matter so it doesn't turn into, you know,
14 sometimes these things have the potential to turn into salvage yards and the cars sit
15 and that kind of stuff. Whatever's required not to do that. But it just makes sense, in my
16 opinion, for those to be in a general commercial zoned area. So that was just my
17 thought for putting it on the Agenda for discussion to get the Commission's thoughts on
18 it.

19 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I move the Chairman's recommendation.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion to place this on next month's Agenda
21 for discussion with some recommendations from Staff as far as what they think may
22 work. Do we have a second?

23 MR. TUTTLE: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor please
2 signify by raising your hand.

3 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Manning, Van Dine,*
4 *Brown]*

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: None opposed. The adoption of the 2012 calendar.

6 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, so you want, you'd just like to look at ideally repair and
7 maintenance services, excuse me, major repair and maintenance services for
8 automobiles, to kind of look at that in the gist as GC district also?

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: As allowing it as a special requirement in the GC district
10 and whatever your thoughts are as far as the problems that, I guess, require it now to
11 be in the HI district, kind of on the outskirts of town, how can we solve those to allow
12 them for the customer service to be more in the, in a business type setting/environment
13 in the general commercial zoned properties?

14 MR. PRICE: [Inaudible] we can come up with a few recommendations, I'm sure.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

16 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, do we have somebody who's out there, who's
17 actually wanting to put something in some place that can't do it because of this, or is
18 this, I mean, what's the genesis of why we're looking at it?

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I've got some landowners called that, you know, with the
20 car dealerships moving around town now, out on the Clemson Road corridor, that
21 property's all been zoned general commercial along Clemson Road and I think probably
22 rightfully so, I mean, that's the, and you don't want to put HI on Clemson Road, but they
23 can't put the auto – from my understanding those auto body shops are looking out in

1 that area for land to go and they have to go, you know, next further out, further out, and
2 it makes sense for them to be by the dealerships. It did to me, so I just thought I'd bring
3 it up and see what everybody thought about it.

4 MR. VAN DINE: Do the dealerships have any, would they not be able to offer as
5 part of the dealership – I understand there are people out, but the dealerships
6 themselves, can they offer body repair and all of that stuff as part of their dealership or
7 do they need to actually have it as a separate, move that offsite as well?

8 MR. PRICE: The, those type of services that you just referenced are allowed as
9 accessory uses with the dealerships.

10 MR. VAN DINE: So what we're looking at is people who want to set up
11 independent –

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: My understanding of the process is that they don't, the
13 body work, like if you wreck your vehicle, they don't do that work, they'll farm out to
14 these guys.

15 MR. VAN DINE: I understand, but I'm – so we're looking at not the dealerships
16 having problems, but the people who want to do –

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's the actual wrecked car problem, not the engine repair
18 and oil changes and that kind of stuff.

19 MR. VAN DINE: Got it.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All that stuff can go in GC, I mean, you can do oil
21 changes all you want.

22 MR. VAN DINE: Yeah.

1 MR. PRICE: Or ideally Staff will come up with a number of recommendations,
2 different avenues that you could take to accomplish this and this would be for the
3 January Agenda. And during that time y'all then kind of take a vote and we'll prepare an
4 ordinance for the February Agenda?

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, I think we, what the motion, and what I would hope
6 would happen would be that we would get language back for us potentially act on in
7 January that will then go up Council, if we voted to recommend approval of it or
8 whatever. But to have that in our package seven days beforehand so that we can take a
9 look at it, discuss it and possibly take action on it in January.

10 MR. PALMER: That may end up requiring us drafting maybe two or three
11 different ordinances to try to address this, because I don't think there's one, just doing it
12 by special requirements there are a couple of ways that we could accomplish this.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Whatever you thinks best. I mean, if you look at three
14 options that's great, but I would like a recommendation out of Staff to say, this is the
15 way we propose to handle this issue. Or if you don't think it should happen say, we don't
16 think we should change it. Whatever Staff thinks.

17 MR. TUTTLE: To Mr. Price's point though, is there a compelling reason it needs
18 to get done that quickly, because them having to prepare three alternative ordinances
19 for us to vote on rather than just having discussion then coming back with a tight
20 ordinance the next time might be more efficient? Unless there's an urgency involved.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I don't know that there's urgency, I just know it's an issue
22 that's out there and, I mean, if issues so, you know, Geo and I talked about this and it
23 [inaudible] days to get on this Agenda, then it's 30 days just to talk about it, and then –

1 MR. TUTTLE: I mean, if you think there's an issue out there, I mean, I'm all for
2 moving it but, I mean, to Mr. Price's point it seems inefficient for him to have to draft
3 three alternative ordinances if that's not the case.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What I'm just looking for is just really just one, but if Mr.
5 Price thinks there needs to be three, but I'm just looking for one recommendation out of
6 Staff.

7 MR. PRICE: Just to kind of give you an example of what my thinking is and I
8 think you and I did discuss this, you know, one option could be to move, you know,
9 major repair and maintenance services to allow it in the GC district, that's pretty simple.
10 Or what we could do is actually, we would almost have to amend the definition, but we
11 could actually establish a separate use for, you know, I don't know what you call them,
12 fender bender shops, paint shops, and just create a use for those separately with
13 special requirements, so see, you know, those are just two that have come up.

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

15 MR. VAN DINE: But Mr. Chairman, in doing that I think we have to make sure
16 that we're looking at all of the aspects; like you said, screening, parking, I mean,
17 lighting, all of this stuff has got to be looked at as far as whether or not it's appropriate in
18 what could be a GC district. So I don't think we can, I mean, if we're gonna do special
19 requirements or special, or something like that we need to have all of those addressed
20 as part of the ordinance, not just, as we saw here, there's only two things addressing
21 the group homes, I mean, I want to see it addressing other things as well.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I mean, whatever you thinks, I mean, if it's too much of a
23 burden to bring it back next meeting, then –

1 MR. PRICE: I mean, we can work on it and – I was just trying to get some
2 direction, because you know, clearly once it's brought before you, you as a Body can
3 make all kind of amendments to it yourself.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right. And if it's something we can come to an
5 agreement next meeting, great. If not, if it's got to be pushed out and people need more
6 thought on it or whatever, it gets pushed out. Alright? The calendar for 2012? Do we
7 have any motions on the calendar?

8 MR. VAN DINE: So moved.

9 MR. TUTTLE: Oh, I'm sorry. It's been brought to my attention, Mr. Chairman,
10 that there should be some discussion relative to the time of day the meeting takes
11 place.

12 CHAIRMAN PALMER: If, it seems like sometimes we have issues with the
13 meetings and stuff, if, just next month if you guys would come back, if there's a better
14 time that first week of the month, I know nobody's ever really thrown it on the table, but
15 if there's a better time or better placement of the meeting since we typically have about
16 a two hour meeting now, they don't really go the five, six hours like we have before, if
17 there's a better time that suits everybody, great. If not, we'll keep it the same time,
18 same place, but just thought we'd take a look at it and I know it's probably never been
19 changed before, but if there's a better time that suits everybody, let me know.

20 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, just as your personal opinion, is there a time that
21 you would deem ideal from your perspective?

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Since we have about a two hour window to these
23 meetings, I was thinking about possibly putting it at the end of the day as opposed to in

1 the middle of the day so that when you're done with the meeting you can probably wrap
2 up and go home as opposed to trying to put stuff back in at the end of the day. So
3 maybe a 3:00 start time or a 3:30 and then at the end of the day wrap it up.

4 MS. CAIRNS: Five o'clock.

5 MR. BROWN: [Inaudible] that creates a problem for me, Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Sure. I mean, and it might, and I mean, that's fine.

7 MR. BROWN: Yeah, I know it does.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Or in the morning, maybe earlier rather than later.

9 MR. BROWN: Earlier is fine, but.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's just an idea, it's not a preference. It's whatever you
11 guys want to do. It probably seems like with nine people that the, the normal time will
12 probably work for everyone, so. If anybody's got any changes to it, just let us know next
13 month and we may change it, we may not, but probably won't.

14 MS. LINDER: But for the January meeting it'll be at 1:00 on the first Monday.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, ma'am.

16 MS. HAYNES: [Inaudible]?

17 MS. LINDER: No, it'd be the second, it's the second Monday, I'm sorry. It's the
18 second Monday because the first Monday is a holiday.

19 MS. HAYNES: No, we're doing it Thursday I believe.

20 MS. LINDER: Is that a Thursday, the 9th?

21 MR. PRICE: Notice the 9th is the –

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yeah, the first Monday's the Capital One Bowl. [laughter]

23 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, January the 2nd is the Capital One Bowl.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Is there a motion to adjourn?

2 MR. TUTTLE: Well, I did have a quick question for counsel real quick.

3 MR. PRICE: The 9th is a Monday.

4 MS. LINDER: It's a Monday. It's the second Monday.

5 MS. CAIRNS: Yeah, it's the second Monday.

6 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair, do you want us to look at how some other municipalities
7 do their meetings?

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: No, sir, I think it really just applies to what the people on
9 this Board want to do for the next year.

10 MR. TUTTLE: I think someone on the Board did ask is it legal for someone to
11 attend by Skype? I'm making a joke, never mind. [laughter]

12 MS. LINDER: I'd have to look into that.

13 MR. VAN DINE: The look of panic that was out there. [laughter]

14 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other motions, except to adjourn?

15 MR. BROWN: So moved.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So we're gonna meet on January, right? And do we want
17 to approve the calendar?

18 MR. VAN DINE: My suggestion is we approve the calendar and we can address
19 it next time. If we want to make a change we can always bring it up again.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion, do we have a second on the
21 calendar?

22 MR. GILCHRIST: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a second. All those in favor please signify by
2 raising your hand.

3 *[Approved: Cairns, Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Manning, Van Dine,*
4 *Brown]*

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: None opposed. Alright, motion to adjourn?

6 MR. GILCHRIST: So moved.

7

8 *[Meeting Adjourned at 2:45 pm]*