

recession. They completed one phase but the other phases have not been completed. We felt because it has been eight years ago they needed to go through the DRC process in order for all the local agencies to be involved in any issues. That meeting will be on August 25, 2015 starting in the morning at 9:00am. We are continually working with Kara Drane our consultant with analyzing the site data that we did over the summer with the interns we had and planning staff. Our community meetings and focus groups will begin in September. Right now we have three of the recreational centers scheduled for September and working on some issues with the Indian Land recreation center regarding times and dates. We may have to find a different location in Indian Land. We will know something further in the next week or so.

RNC-015-007 – Road Name Change Application – Downing Street

Andy Rowe – Presented the report.

Chris Nunnery – Discusses with the audience the reason for the road name changes.
(Unable to hear due to addressing the audience)

Brenda Smith – 2763 Downing Street, Lancaster SC. My husband had a massive heart attack and August 6, 2015. I talked to the driver of the ambulance on the way to the hospital and asked him if he had any problem finding my house. He said no we came straight to it. We have been there for 48 years. We've got widowed neighbors that have been there for 52 years. We will be there until we die. There are a lot of changes to be made if the road name is changed. Please do not change our address. It's just a matter of we would have to change everything.

Charles Deese – This Planning Commission is bound by state law. We have no choice but to change a road name if Public Safety Communications requests it because of a complication of roads by being more than one of the same name or when a name sounds the same on the telephone. The road name changes we have here tonight have been requested by Public Safety Communications Director. It is something that has to be done by state law. I have a question for Mrs. Hinson. When I saw Regency Road I remembered that we have a Regent Park Way, is there going to be a complication?

Trish Hinson – I went back to our telecommunications center and asked their opinion as well. Regent Park Way and Regency Road sound far enough apart but we have provided a second choice if this board chooses to use it.

Brenda Smith – We rode over to Downey Drive and our street is Downing Street.

Charles Deese – They sound the same on the telephone and that is the reason for the change.

Jim Barnett made a motion to approve with the road name change of Clayforest Road; Sheila Hinson seconded the motion.

Jerry Holt – Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that since we do have residents here that are effected and they are the only ones that showed up; I would suggest that we give them the opportunity to express their preference.

Audience expressed their gratitude in letting them have a choice of the new street name and preferred to have their street named Regency Road.

Jim Barnett and Sheila Hinson both withdrew their motions.

Jerry Holt made a motion to approve with the road name change of Regency Road; Tommy Dabney seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7 AFFIRMATIVE 0 NEGATIVE MOTION CARRIED

RNC-015-008 – Road Name Change Application – Ferguson Lane

Andy Rowe – Presented the report.

Jerry Holt made a motion to approve with the road name change of Broadway Court; Sheila Hinson seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7 AFFIRMATIVE 0 NEGATIVE MOTION CARRIED

RNC-015-009 – Road Name Change Application – E Hartwell Pl

Nick Cauthen – Presented the report.

Jerry Holt – The next item that we are going to hear deals with the name change for W Hartwell Pl. This is one continuous street that is divided by Reynolds Drive. Why do we have to have this one and what is right across the street which is really a continuation; one was E Hartwell and one was W Hartwell. Since the numbers run consecutively in the two segments of this street; is there a reason why we could not change them both to the same proposed name of Cardinal Pl?

Charles Deese – Could Mrs. Hinson or Chris Nunnery answer this?

Jerry Holt – It really doesn't have to be directional because on E Hartwell the numbers run from 2500 up to 2600 and then on W Hartwell they start with the 2700 block.

Chris Nunnery – There is no way to visually determine. The road numbers are not on the signs, just the road name on the sign itself. That is why the two names are separated and that is why we have gotten away from directional; East West North and South. That is why it was proposed to separate the names and have two different names.

Jerry Holt – But how is that different than a street that runs several blocks long and its one name regardless of how many blocks it goes through?

Chris Nunnery – The continuity of that one street, the main thoroughfare street is what you are referencing. The streets off of it that dead end with cul-de-sacs are where the difference terminates. That main thoroughfare the main street is the mainstream of two feeder streets, the side roads, the end of the cul-de-sac; those are not a connective road as such as the main feeder road or feeder path of it.

Jim Barnett – What you are saying is when an ambulance is coming down the street, all it has is a sign and he doesn't have time to determine whether 2700 block is right or left.

Chris Nunnery – A lot of communities have block numbers. So you may have a 6000 block or 4000 block; we don't have that. You are on the main thoroughfare wherever that street may be and it tells you to take this street or that street. They are feeder streets and they don't go anywhere but to that dead end.

Jerry Holt – If you go into Bridgemill off Highway 521 and go down Bridgemill Road and follow that street through to where you get to Reynolds Drive. Reynolds Drive is a T-intersection so you can either turn left or you can turn right. It's the same name regardless of the way that you turn. If you turn left and go down to East and West Hartwell, you've got the same decision. You can turn left or turn right. So it's no different at that intersection than it would be at the other intersection with Reynolds.

Chris Nunnery – Other than with these two feeder streets with East and West Hartwell Streets, they terminate; those streets are not connective as far as anything else other than those.

Jerry Holt – Actually Reynolds is the same thing, it is longer.

Chris Nunnery – Reynolds is but the two streets in question for the proposed road name change are not. As we evaluate the system, as the addresser allows the name of each street, it does not see that as a continuous point. That is one street segment. When we lay in Reynolds that is one continuous segment that has ranges within it; that is how the system looks at it and that is what we base our decisions off of. That is why we got away from East West. Once you get out of the center corridor, out of the main grid, East West doesn't work and North South doesn't work.

Sheila Hinson made a motion to approve with the road name change of Cardinal Pl; Jim Barnett seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7 AFFIRMATIVE 0 NEGATIVE MOTION CARRIED

RNC-015-010 – Road Name Change Application – W Hartwell Pl

Nick Cauthen – Presented the report.

Wendell Roth – 2784 W. Hartwell Place, Indian Land SC – This is a very disturbing meeting because of the implications of what this is going to require for the least effected number of people on our block and hundred other streets that are proposed to be changed by the 911 system. I would like to start out by saying this – deeds, mortgages, insurance, drivers license, registration, title of cars, credit cards, conceal carry, water, power, cable, banks, magazines, newspapers; just to name a few. Surprisingly every month my water bill and my power bill show up at my address without any problem whatsoever. As a matter of fact my tax bill showed up and I didn't get any for Hartwell Lane. I went to Hartwell Lane and it starts with the number 2000 and terminates with the number 2300. Our blocks start with 2600 and ends right now with 2784 because the rest have not yet been built out. If you've been to Atlanta you've probably been on Peachtree. There is Peachtree Place, Peachtree Way, Peachtree Street, Peachtree Drive, Peachtree Court, and North West South and East, and the list continues. What is happening here is you are changing the names of the streets and affecting a lot of people. We are not looking at the system that we are using which is probably an antiquated system that needs to be examined. It doesn't seem like there has been any public input. I would like to hear more data before we start changing the names of the streets that we live on. Right now we are sitting at 101 N. Main Street and right across the street is 101 S. Main Street. If there was a 911 call to this building I suspect that they would get here pretty quickly and they wouldn't question South or North. Why is it being questioned for us? This is a huge inconvenience as you can only imagine. This is something that I don't even want to know how we got to this place. When John Weiland Homes developer of Bridgemill and the developer of Sun City which is where the Hartwell Lane is located which is Del Webb; applied for their roads and applied for permits to build, they had to put the names of the streets in at that time. At that time I'm surprised that nobody looked at it and said hey we already have one of those, let's don't allow that name. Although we are the least effected number of people, you are affecting a lot of people and this is going to require a lot of time and effort. You are saying it is state law well then we have to challenge the state law. Frankly, there are people in Bridgemill that have the means and the will that they don't want this to happen because it is going to be a tremendous inconvenience for their business and for their personal lives. Also you are going to have the people that have home based businesses that are going to be affected. I'm pleading with you to reconsider this postpone this, allow some more discussion to take place and find an alternative method that allows the 911 system to respond properly but doesn't impact so many peoples lives. We moved into the Fort Mill/Indian Land area just last year and then we moved into our permanent address, two moves in a year. Now you are essentially asking me to move again without packing a box. For a concealed carry license when do the Feds starting looking at me and saying "Hum three addresses in one year". Why is that occurring? Please delay this decision for W Hartwell and for all the other streets. Have more discussion on it and see if there is a better system that we can implement for 911 versus impacting all the citizens lives.

Rod Brown – 2781 W. Hartwell Place, Indian Land SC – I appreciate my neighbor and my friends passion for the subject. I agree with him on most counts. What I ask is that we table this decision until more research can be done. I came here in hopes that I would see a presentation about the research, the study, best practices, and the way this implemented across the country. I'm sure we are not the only group dealing with this particular issue. I was hoping for more of an opportunity to participate in the process. I ask for it to be tabled until a later date.

Jerry Holt made a motion to approve with the road name change of Royal Place; Vedia Hatfield seconded the motion.

Sheila Hinson – We just went through this several years ago and they changed my road to Asgill Lane. Have you ever heard of such a stupid name? I didn't like it but you know we lived with it and we had to change everything. We had to do everything that you are talking about tonight. I can understand if it saves one persons life from getting confused on these names. If it saves one persons life then its worth changing that name for. You've got to consider that when people call 911 and I would be one of those people; they could be very emotional and forget the address. You've got to have a system in place that everybody will understand the road name. I don't think anybody is trying to screw up the names or make things difficult. The 911 folks are trying to make things safe for people.

Penelope Karagounis – Tonight I think we made one mistake at the beginning; we allowed dialogue between the first lady speaking. Typically in a public hearing setting you sign up to speak and the applicant is the last person. Since we allowed those ladies to speak after the public hearing I think what this citizen is asking is I guess an alternate name. Just bear with him if you may and that is why we need to be careful with the process when it goes to public hearing because we have opened up Pandora's box tonight. It is not going to be fair to not allow him the same option. You are the chairman and I would just like to state that for the record.

Rod Brown – I certainly appreciate the fact that we have life safety concerns. I would ask that more opportunity for research and conversation happen. I was fully in support of that conversation until we just approved Regency as a name. I'm flabbergasted that you accepted Regency when there is a Regent Park Way. It makes no sense to me when I compare Hartwell Place to Hartwell.

Jerry Holt – I will withdraw my motion for the name of Royal Place; Vedia Hatfield withdrew the second for the motion.

Jerry Holt made a new motion to approve with the road name change of Disney Place; Jim Barnett seconded the motion.

Jeff Fehr – 2729 W Hartwell Place, Indian Land SC. Whose responsibility is it in Lancaster County to make sure when all these developments are going up that you don't keep having this repeated problem? Who approves it and who makes sure it is not a

duplicate name? I was fine with Royal Place but I'm not sure on Disney because mainly it sounds commercial. I don't want people thinking it's not the elegant street it is. Two years from now am I going to be here because Royal Place or Disney Place is now being used by somebody else?

Jerry Holt made a new motion to approve with the road name change of Disney Place; Jim Barnett seconded the motion.

VOTE: 5 AFFIRMATIVE 2 NEGATIVE MOTION CARRIED

The two negative votes came from Tommy Dabney and Charles Deese.

RZ-015-013 – Rezoning application of Steve Willis, Lancaster County Administrator to rezone ±15.58 acres from B-2, Community Business District, to I-1, Light Industrial District.

Penelope Karagounis – Presented the report.

Steve Willis – PO Box 1809 Lancaster SC. The only thing just for further information for the commission; County Council is in negotiation to sell that building. We are still the owners as of today but it is possible during this rezoning process the building may actually be sold to another party. For that reason as part of any closing, we would obtain certified and notarized letter for the planning file that we would be carrying on at the owner's request all the way through that. This authorization was made by county council to request this rezoning.

Jerry Holt made a motion to approve and Tommy Dabney seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7 AFFIRMATIVE 0 NEGATIVE MOTION CARRIED

Penelope Karagounis – This rezoning request is going to County Council on September 14, 2015.

RZ-015-014 – Rezoning application of Red Head Properties to rezone ±0.95 acres from R-15, Moderate Density Residential/Agricultural District to B-3, General Commercial District. The applicant is proposing a convenience store.

Nick Cauthen – Presented the report.

Phillip Scott – I am a broker with HYC Real Estate and I am representing Red Head Properties. In 1997 when they were rezoning property this piece of property was skipped over. It was a business at that time and was operating as a convenience store. In the past it has been a laundry mat, an automotive garage, and several different things. We are not real sure how it got zoned R-15 as it currently is today. We were approached about six weeks ago and an entity has written a real estate contract for purchase on this property pending rezoning. So Red Head Properties petitions the Planning Commission to rezone this so that we can sell it and advance the property as it has always been for a commercial use. They want to put in a convenience store without gasoline.

Howard Sellers – 1195 Grace Ave., Lancaster SC - I'm under the impression that once you rezone it to B-3 you can put anything in there. I don't have a problem with a convenience store but I am not for turning it into a pool room, or somewhere to hang out at all night. There are some more people here to speak so maybe they have a different opinion.

Lonnie Williams – 938 Confederate Ave., Lancaster SC – I think we have enough buildings and stuff over there on the Erwin farm. I think we need to leave it as residential and do not put anything else in that old building.

Angela Rainey – 1295 Grace Ave., Lancaster SC – It has been a convenience store in the past and almost for the entire time. Right now it is actually a church. I just don't think rezoning it to commercial with so much residential around it would be a good thing. You just don't know what could end up there in the future. I've lived in that area my entire life. Right now DHEC as a case going on where they are trying to clean up the proposed property, my property and the property behind it. This is due to all the gasoline that leaked out of the tanks for all these years. Every quarter I get this huge report from DHEC because they are still working on cleaning up the gasoline and by products that is in the water. How could you have a convenience store without gas in this day and time? Who is going to stop? I would ask that you do not rezone it to commercial and leave it residential.

Jerry Holt – I was by there a little over a week ago and I couldn't tell if there is a continuing operation in there or not. It does appear that there is a church operating there. Since that has been a convenience store and since it does appear that there is continuing operation of some kind in that site; can they continue as a pre-existing non conforming use at that site?

Penelope Karagounis – Because it was a non conforming, they have up to six months; from what I've heard it is a church. A church can go in any zoning district, so it's not a non conforming use at this time. But back when the convenience store closed, they had six months to basically be able to put another convenience store in there. That is why now the property is a non conforming use and would not be able to get a permit from the zoning department because of the property being zoned R-15. We are working on the Unified Development Ordinance rewrite and some of these areas that we are doing field analysis on; we have identified stores like this one that have been there for years but when zoning was created in 1998 there wasn't any field checks done. What we are doing with a lot of these community commercial store businesses is proposing to rezone them to rural business. So some of the issues that the neighbors had; if it's zoned rural business they could put a convenience store in the area but there are more restricted uses and not just a B-3 everything goes. It could be March of next year before everything is completed. I know they have somebody under contract to buy the property now. The county is taking into consideration some of the older buildings that have been there for forty years and there is a need for revitalization in certain communities that don't have your typical grocery store and rely on these convenience stores for services.

Jerry Holt – Last month this commission voted to deny the rezoning application for McClancy Seasoning in Indian Land due to the issue of spot zoning. Looking at the site I could understand why a convenience store might be suitable for that but I think to be consistent with the issue we addressed before I would feel to be compelled to vote against the rezoning of this one as it stands now.

Tommy Dabney – Could we have a picture of the current location? The appearance of that location is not the best in the world right now. If the applicant is going to put a convenience store there and improve the looks of it, can he do that with B-2 and not allow gasoline?

Penelope Karagounis – I think the convenience store has to be in a B-3. I can check and see if a B-2 would work.

David Freeman – It's a B-3 if I'm not mistaken.

Penelope Karagounis – For Kenneth Cauthen to have said B-3 for a convenience store it probably is correct with our current zoning regulations.

Tommy Dabney – Who is going to buy this knowing there are problems with EPA and the gasoline situation?

Penelope Karagounis – That would have to be disclosed in the closing.

Tommy Dabney – Is that official regarding DHEC?

Penelope Karagounis – Yes I read the report.

David Freeman – The state will take that up because I know due to buying a piece of property like that one time. They made me clean that property up. They will be required to clean that site up.

Sheila Hinson – When you say convenience store, are you talking about selling alcohol also? Is that permissible to be that near to a church?

Penelope Karagounis – Some of the issues have to deal with licensing through the state.

Sheila Hinson – Isn't it right there at the church?

Charles Deese – The state controls that with alcohol permits.

Penelope Karagounis – That is the issue with us recommending denial. It's all the uses that are allowed in a B-3. That is why with the UDO rewrite we feel like some of these areas need to have some revitalization when you have infrastructure out there but with our current zoning we can't support B-3. There are a lot of uses that could be detrimental to those citizens that live right next door.

David Freeman – You remember when the county was sending out those letters about zoning. A lot of folks just didn't pay any attention to them. They were not using the store at the time and didn't realize that if they didn't respond there zoning fell back to whatever the county designated it as.

Penelope Karagounis – In 1998 they didn't even send out notices. It was just basically advertised in the paper. I remember asking Elaine Boone since she has been here the longest and she said there were no individual letters sent out. It was done by the elected officials at that time. We have a lot of data we have been analyzing all month for the UDO rewrite regarding issues just like this where buildings exist and could be revitalized if we zone it rural business.

Jerry Holt made a motion to deny and Vedia Hatfield seconded the motion.

VOTE: 5 AFFIRMATIVE 2 NEGATIVE MOTION CARRIED

The two negative votes came from Tommy Dabney and David Freeman.

Penelope Karagounis – This will go to County Council on September 14, 2015.

RZ-015-015 – Rezoning application of Bradley J. Mullis to rezone a 1 acre portion of ±5.657 acres from R-45B, Rural Residential/Business/Agricultural District, to B-3, General Commercial District. The applicant proposes to build a 40' x 60' building for an auto machine shop.

Andy Rowe – Presented the report.

Bradley Mullis – 3116 Whittle Street, Lancaster SC. I've lived on that piece of land since 1975. My father bought it and everything on that side is my family and everything on the other side is the Evans family. The only work I've ever done is automotive machine work and I'm just going to be rebuilding engines inside a 40 by 60 steel building. There is not going to be any cars parked around outside. I'm not working on cars. I am just rebuilding engines and everything is done on the inside. I need this to support my family and I would appreciate it if you could allow this rezoning so I can have a building put up and go to work.

Jerry Holt – I looked at the property and it's not clear. This map shows basically this being the third tract South of Shiloh Unity Road. The house looks like it faces Shiloh Unity Road. Behind the house is some existing structures that looks like....

Bradley Mullis – There is a shed.

Jerry Holt – Is that what is currently being used for work?

Bradley Mullis – Yes sir.

Jerry Holt – Is the proposal to get rid of that or just expand?

Bradley Mullis – No, I'm just going to put a metal building there. I'm going to move into that piece of property right there. Brief discussion regarding the aerial map on the screen as to where the proposed building will go.

Sheila Hinson – Was there any opposition to this?

Andy Rowe – No one has called the office and no letters were sent in.

Jerry Holt – It looks like there is an operation similar to what he is describing that already exists back there in an older structure.

Bradley Mullis – That barn is in pretty bad shape. I talked to a guy about putting a roof on it and he wanted \$10,000.00 just for a roof. If I was going to put that much money into something I would like to build a nice steel building. It will be more money but I would rather spend that \$10,000.00 on a new fresh building on this other piece of property.

Jerry Holt – That appeared to be very isolated out there and the proposed use seemed consistent to me with the way that the area looked. I have no problem with this.

Jerry Holt made a motion to approve and Tommy Dabney seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7 AFFIRMATIVE 0 NEGATIVE MOTION CARRIED

Penelope Karagounis – This will go to County Council on September 14, 2015.

Old Business: Penelope Karagounis - We are still working on the field analysis while we are doing the concept map that we discussed on Thursday at the workshop. Kara Drane will give Mr. Holt and Ms. Hinson an update regarding the UDO rewrite on Wednesday, August 26, 2015.

Jerry Holt made a motion to adjourn and Tommy Dabney seconded the motion.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS MOTION CARRIED

Respectfully Submitted,



Charles Deese
Chairman



Penelope G. Karagounis
Planning Director