



MEMBERS OF LANCASTER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

CHARLES DEESE, DISTRICT 3, CHAIRMAN  
JERRY HOLT, DISTRICT 7, VICE CHAIRMAN  
VEDIA HATFIELD, DISTRICT 2  
TOMMY DABNEY, DISTRICT 5  
SHEILA HINSON, DISTRICT 6  
JAMES BARNETT, DISTRICT 4  
DAVID FREEMAN, DISTRICT 1

**LANCASTER COUNTY SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING FOR  
REPEALING THE LANCASTER COUNTY UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT  
ORDINANCE AND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP**

**OCTOBER 03, 2016  
MINUTES**

Members Present: Charles Deese, Vedia Hatfield, Jerry Holt, Sheila Hinson, Tommy Dabney; David Freeman. A quorum of Lancaster County Planning Commission was present for the meeting.

Others Present: Judy Barrineau, Clerk to Commission; Penelope Karagounis, Planning Director; Elaine Boone, Planner II; Alex Moore, Planner II; Nick Cauthen, Planner I; Andy Rowe, Planner I; Gavin Witherspoon Jr., Zoning Officer; Kenneth Cauthen, Zoning Officer; Paul Moses, Lancaster County Airport Manager; Ken Holt, SCAA; Jamie Gilbert, LCEDC; Jack Estridge, County Council Member; Steve Willis; County Administrator; John Weaver, County Attorney.

Others Absent – Jim Barnett, Planning Commission Board Member

The following press were notified of the meeting by mail or by fax in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act: The Lancaster News, Kershaw News Era, The Rock Hill Herald, The Fort Mill Times, Cable News 2, Channel 9, and the local Government Channel. The agenda was also posted in the lobby of the County Administration Building the required length of time and on the County website.

Call meeting to order

Chairman Deese called the meeting of Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

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

VOTE:                      UNANIMOUS                      MOTION CARRIED

Citizens Comments

No one signed up to speak.

### Approve Minutes

Jerry Holt made a motion to approve the August 04, 2016 Workshop Minutes and the August 16, 2016 Regular Minutes; Vedia Hatfield seconded the motion.

### Director's Report

Penelope Karagounis – Good evening, the Lancaster County Planning Department has been working for the past 18 months to revise their Unified Development Ordinance rewrite. The County first received zoning back in 1998 and we had a very outdated document. With the help of Catawba Regional Council of Governments we've been working the past 18 months revising the Unified Development Ordinance. The intent of this revision was to create new zoning districts that are flexible and regulations that are very black and white and no gray areas and to have a better user friendly document. Also, the intent that we received from County Council was with these new zoning districts was to try and not create non-conforming uses and that is what we have strived to do the past 18 months. In the 18 months with the Unified Development Ordinance we have been out in the public and we have probably met over 400 people. We started off last August with four community meetings throughout the county and we then had large stakeholder meetings. County Council gave us the names of people that owned large acreage and we met with them. In the spring time we also had six focus groups that we involved citizen's and also private developers, surveyors, engineers, and other people from surrounding counties that are dealing with all this explosion growth that we are experiencing in the Carolina's. Since March we have had open sessions where people could come and actually view the documents. Also, over the summer we had a public input session and we had sort of a trial and error type of public hearing to prepare for this public hearing tonight. On August 23<sup>rd</sup> we also had our first public hearing where this board heard a lot of the edits that we had made and this Planning Commission board decided to continue for it tonight. So tonight what we are doing is, once we advertised it for 30 days on September 2<sup>nd</sup>, we've had additional revisions and the consultant Kara Drane will be doing a presentation tonight to identify some more of the revisions that we have made. The feedback from staff, citizens, and local groups that have had some concerns was also part of our revisions. When you come up here to speak during the public hearing please state your name and address. You have five minutes to speak in front of this Planning Commission and direct all your comments to the Planning Commission and do not direct your comments to the audience. Please respect the time of five minutes. We will be timing you and once the buzzer goes off if you can just wrap up your comments and we will move to the next person. Thank You

**Repeal the existing Unified Development Ordinance (UDO); repeal certain related chapters in Code of Ordinances, and to adopt a new Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) as so authorized by the South Carolina Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act of 1994, Title 29, Chapter 6. (UDO 016-001 Unified Development Ordinance) (See Schedule A & B)**

Kara Drane & Penelope Karagounis

Kara Drane – Good evening and before I begin I would like to ask if anyone did not pick up a copy of the handout called “proposed edits by chapter” since September 2<sup>nd</sup>; they are at the back on the table. It has a list of the revisions that we are going to talk about this evening. At the first public hearing I went into more detail about the purpose and intent of the chapters and I provided more background. Tonight I will give more of a summary of each chapter and focus more on what were some of the substantial changes between the July 24<sup>th</sup> version and the September 2<sup>nd</sup> version. Also what edits we have received since it was published on September 2<sup>nd</sup>. So Chapter 1 is the Introductory Provisions and this chapter sets the legal framework for the document and since it was posted on September 2<sup>nd</sup> we had a couple of minor things that changed in this chapter. That includes the deletion of the pipeline overlay and also some clarification of the terminology. In Chapter 1 it says certificate of zoning compliance and if you notice the redline version that says zoning permit. So as I’m going through these changes; if you would like to look at where they are located in Chapter 1, the handout provides the page number and the section numbers. So you are able to look and see where those are located in Chapter 1. Chapter 2 has our District Descriptions and has the Use Table for the Unified Development Ordinance. Some of the significant changes since the July 24<sup>th</sup> posting include the addition of wineries, distilleries, solar farms and Class II Landfills. The proposed revisions since September 2<sup>nd</sup> we received comments on our terminology called “factory farming”. So what you see in the proposed edits for this evening is found on page 2.13 and Section 2.5.3 and you will see where we have deleted the terminology “factory farming” and it has been changed to “animal production facilities – non swine”. We have added another section called “animal production facilities – swine”; the difference here is that on the use table you’ll see that for animal production facilities that do not include swine; that use has been changed from a special exception to permitted with review in the AR District. With the animal production facilities – swine; it is a special exception in the AR District. You will see as we go through the other chapters and when we get to Chapter 5 you are going to see some revisions with those regulations because you’ve had changes in Chapter 2. Likewise when we get to Chapter 10 and we look at the definitions; those definitions are going to change as well. The other items that are in Chapter 2, you can see where there is a deletion to the pipeline overlay. There are also some corrections on some of the tables; page 2-6 to 2-8. On page 2-7 there is the addition of a reference on accessory structures on corner lots in LDR. One of the other comments we received had to do with our minimum acreage in light and heavy industrial districts. That is on page 2-8 and that is section 2.4. You will see that the revisions are shown on that chart and the change was for light industrial which we had 10 acres and it has been changed to 3 acres. Heavy industrial we had as 20 and that has been changed to 6. This is feedback we got from the Economic Development Director. In addition you will see on page 2-10 there was a multi-family was shown as a conditional use in General Business and Institutional and that has been deleted. The multi-family and regional business has been changed to permitted with review. On page 2-11 it was a typo correction so chapter 2 had several changes; some of them dealt more with the factory farming change that we talked about but also some other corrections that have been noted. If you look at Chapter 3 the Mixed Use Districts, this chapter focuses on creating a walkable bikable district in your pedestrian centers and your employment centers that are noted on your future land use map. These mixed use districts, this chapter is focused

just on those special districts that include your urban residential, high density residential, residential mixed use, mixed use, and industrial mixed use. The significant changes in this chapter since the July 24<sup>th</sup> posting included that there is some additional standards that were added on density, building elements, rules for all building types, land use, site development, and street types. I would like to point out on the density that is noted on page 3-5; and while that is no change from what was posted on September 2<sup>nd</sup>, that is something that shows the density that's allowed by right and also some incentives for the mixed use districts. The proposed changes since the September 2<sup>nd</sup> posting; the only changes on the very last page of chapter 3, there was a section that had been noted as reserved. This deals with if you have buildings that are currently in place in a mixed use district zoning area. If someone wants to add on to that building what are the ways that those buildings could be added onto and what would be allowed and what would not be allowed. If we look at Chapter 4 which is the Overlay Districts and the significant changes since the July 24<sup>th</sup> posting; initially there were some changes in the Pipeline Overlay and the Carolina Thread Overlay. But what has been proposed to be revised since September 2<sup>nd</sup> has included some additional edits to the McWhirter Field Aviation Overlay, the deletion of the Pipeline Overlay, and edits to the Highway Corridor Overlay. If we look at the handout that has the summary of the edits in Chapter 4, you will see that those include the deletion of the Pipeline Overlay on the first page and then also some changes in the Aviation Overlay that deal with the reference of the map and some clarifications in the terminology of the map also noting that the overlay map is a part of the Official Zoning Map. One of the things that I would like to point in the Aviation Overlay is on page 4-3 and that is Section 4.2.1, E-1. There was an additional zone that was created, there is a Zone C that was split and it deals with some of the land use, the compatibility land use. I will talk more about that when we get to the zoning map. But one of the things that it does is the land use compatibility or table in this section and it there was some issues about different land use compatibility within that Zone C. The reason we created a Zone C-1 and C-2 is because Zone C-2 and Zone B-1; the land use compatibility would be similar. The way that it was done initially, it didn't allow for that. In order for that to occur we needed to subdivide Zone C. So that is the changes that you see related to the Aviation Overlay and there was also an addition of the definition of Zone F. If you remember when we had the public input session it was called a landfill boundary or landfill zone. The Zone F is a six mile boundary from McWhirter Field that prohibits landfills within all of the zones. Also in chapter 4 there was one other change related to the Aviation Overlay; there was a terminology change on page 4-9, changing a word from awarded to granted. The table key was relocated and again we talked about the deletion of the Pipeline Overlay; one of the things that I would like to make a note of is in the Highway Corridor Overlay on page 4-22. There was deletion of language prohibiting side yard parking at an intersection street; that is Section 4.3, 2-G, 1-A, and also H. So you can see Chapter 4 had some significant changes, not only from the July 24<sup>th</sup> posting but we've also gotten some additional revisions since it was advertised on September 2<sup>nd</sup>. Chapter 5 is the Use Regulations chapter and the Use Regulations chapter spells out what is required for certain land uses so you want to protect the surrounding uses from certain types of uses. So in chapter 5 there are several things that are noted on the handout and I'll go through those with you. On page 5.2 to 5-3 there was a deletion of the multi-family from the general business and institutional

districts. If you remember when we talked about that in chapter 2 then again you see the corrections in chapter 5. There was also a correction of some language on page 5-4 dealing with mobile homes. On page 5-6 and you will see this one that we mentioned earlier in chapter 1 about the change in the certificate of zoning compliance to zoning permit. I won't repeat those but everywhere you see that is again just a correction in the code as for that terminology. For food trucks on page 5-13 there was a change in the separation and there were also some revisions in the hours of operation. There were some corrections in the terminology that is used in that particular portion of chapter 5. On page 5-17 under Outdoor Shooting Range, there was an increase in the separation to residential uses from 1,000 feet to a half a mile. That also includes some other uses, there is civic and educational. On page 5-24 there was a deletion of canopies over gas pumps. That was removed from page 5-24 item H. On page 5-25-32 there was a distance requirement change and that was dealing with outdoor storage yards. That distance was changed from 500 to 300. There was also a correction in the terminology, it referred to a parallel conditional district and that was just an error. The next item that is on the list again deals with the animal production non swine and then also the animal production swine. What happened is, there was feedback that we received last week and the feedback that we got we decided to split those. You will notice that in the requirements in chapter 5 when it deals with non swine it refers to State DHEC requirements; the items that were in there that had separation requirements that we had shown as removed. If you look at the swine portion, there is some separation requirements in there related to animal production facilities that have swine. So that was a big change of comments that we've received since September 2<sup>nd</sup> and then the other items that you see in chapter 5 include some revisions of some of the language that again deal with the zoning permit. There was an item that dealt with farmers markets. We had a line that said it couldn't be on a four lane or higher road. That was shown as being removed and then we have on page 5-41 the deletion of residentially zoned properties and the clarification of language to residential uses. That was dealing with a solar farm; that was some correction in our setbacks dealing with the solar farm language. In Chapter 6 that deals with our Subdivisions and Infrastructure Standards; you will remember that this chapter is the one that takes a lot of the road standards from the black book and also in your current code. It also includes an Appendix C which is a Manual of Specifications Standards and Designs. This chapter has some minor revisions since the September 2<sup>nd</sup> posting which included some clarifications on requirements for plat approvals. I don't have many items to share with you on chapter 6 but you can see that it is on page 6-2. In Chapter 7 General Development Standards, this chapter has parking, lighting, signs, buffers, and landscaping. Since the July 24<sup>th</sup> posting there some minor edits to some of the parking requirements, if you remember there was a table that had parking and bicycle standards. When we deleted the bicycle column it inadvertently deleted some of our roads on our parking so that was just a correction, mainly a typo correction. Since we posted on September 2<sup>nd</sup> we did have some edits regarding some of the standards on landscaping and again, you can see the revision and the change of the compliance certificate to zoning permit. Those are really minor items that were shown in Chapter 7. One of the things I will add that came out today is on page 7-25, there was some additional language that was added related to parking and the AR district. This was language in your current code that was brought forward and that is on page 7-25, Section 7.2.5F. This is if someone is

driving a truck with a trailer cab that they can park it in a rural area. Chapter 8 is the Natural Resources Protection and of course this chapter has our regulations for storm water and flood plain standards. There were some minor edits to the river buffer that is included in this chapter since it was posted on July 24<sup>th</sup>. Some minor revisions that have happened since September 2<sup>nd</sup> include some additional references to the flood plain and also some clarifying language about elevated stream crossings and those are on page 8-6 and also 8-28. Chapter 9 is the Administration Chapter and this chapter includes administrative agencies, administrative bodies, it has information on the process but also non-conforming uses and violations and penalties. Chapter 9 had two items that were added since the July 24<sup>th</sup> posting, it dealt with the mixed use district master development plan approval and also the addition of the development agreement language. The proposed revision since the September 2<sup>nd</sup> posting includes language about some non-conforming uses and also language about the compliance certificate where we changed that to zoning permit. You will see that on the list those pages and section numbers are noted. There was some correction and a couple of items related to flood plain, V Zone is not applicable, and some additional deletion of some language that is not applicable. Also in Chapter 9 you can see on page 5 of the handout that there are some additional revisions to the language. One item that was added and I will point out is on page 9-51 and that is the additional language regarding extensions for non-conforming uses by the administrator. This is item C that was added and this deals with if you have a non-conforming use and it allows for a 180 days but this language that was added gives the administrator the option to do a request for additional time if needed. You will also see some language at the bottom of that page on non-conforming structures that change from 180 days to one year. If you have damage of a structure it gives the property owner a longer time to rebuild or reconstruct. This is due based on the amount of time that it may take somebody with insurance and just to redevelop their property. Chapter 10 is the Definitions chapter and this chapter has our use definitions and also the general definitions for the code. Here you see a lot of things that we have already talked about in chapters 2 and 4 and 5 that deal with animal production facilities and also the deletion of the definitions that dealt with the pipeline overlay. The definitions that defined the pipeline and also the high consequence land use and then there were just some minor corrections to a few of the definitions in chapter 10. Lastly, the appendices, there are three appendices in the UDO and the first appendices has the planned development districts. Appendix B has the supplemental diagrams for the highway corridor overlay and Appendix C of course is the Manual Specifications Standard which we mentioned earlier when we talked about chapter 6. These appendices have not changed since the posting on September 2<sup>nd</sup> but since it was posted earlier in July we did add three details; one dealt with open cut repair for roads, a trail detail, and also a parking standard. That concludes my presentation of the Unified Development Ordinance as presented and published on September 2<sup>nd</sup> and it also includes the revisions that staff and myself would like to recommend. Thank You

Charles Deese – We will now go into public hearing on this matter.

R. Don Broughton – 3584 McIlwain Road, Heath Springs SC – I have several items that I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of the public. Number 1 is the

document itself, we have been trying to see the changes and deletions to this document for several weeks now. It only became available this morning at 11:30 and that is not enough time for the general public to go through and review and ascertain their agreement or disagreement. I had the opportunity to know that it was put out there and I spent about 2 ½ hours on it this afternoon reviewing it myself. So given that, I would like to suggest that you give more time for the public to look at it and to make sure that we do it. In business life I always kept a little tag on my desk that said why is there never enough time to do the job right but there is always time to do it over. So let's make sure we get this right and give the people adequate time to review what is there; thanking the committee for the hard work they've done however I think it is a necessary item that the general public get adequate time to review. Speaking of the document itself, we still have several questions, one is the administrator; there is no definition in there for that job. There is no job requirement for that job. There is no education requirement for that job. There is in the document no job description for that job. So what is it? Is it a person? Is it a committee? What does it do and how does it go about its business? It needs clarification. Lastly, I speak in opposition to the new UDO. We have a UDO that was lengthy and it took a lot of hard work to hammer it out and it has been useful. I think the new one in the opinion of myself and some associates that I have been in contact with think it is unnecessary and is government intrusion; further government intrusion on the rights of the citizen's of Lancaster County. In conclusion, strict or overly strict land usage and development ordinances can result in running potential taxpayers from Lancaster County to Chester and York County. Thank You

Ben Levine – 5062 Terrier Lane, Indian Land SC – I'm here tonight to speak about two items from the new UDO. The first is 9-41, this is where the UDO discusses text amendments and rezoning's. There is a difference here in 9.2.15 which is text amendments and rezoning's and 9.2.16 conditional use; where at the end of conditional use is still states that there is a waiting period for subsequent applications. In section 9.2.15 rezoning's, we currently do have a waiting period between rezoning's of 12 months which does not apply to items which are brought forward by the County. I'm not exactly sure why we would want to change this process. Right now if somebody wants to rezone an area they are going to come with their best foot forward because they know they can't just do it the next month. If we allow it to just come immediately back then it's more of bargaining chip then if someone can just come back and make a slight change on the next month. This would not get in the way of any County items because it would not apply to the County the same that it is done today. The other change that I would like to talk about is in Chapter 4, 4.2.2 this is the Carolina Heelsplitter Overlay. There is a section in here still that says the Heelsplitter Overlay will not apply to the installation maintenance or operation of water and sewer services by Lancaster County Water and Sewer District. By all means I don't want to make it hard for Lancaster County Water and Sewer District to do their job but at the same time I don't know if you are familiar with the movie "My Cousin Vinny" but the guy asks about the pants that he is wearing and before he goes out hunting his girlfriend says does the deer really care what kind of pants you are wearing. Well if the Heelsplitter are wiped out by careless subcontractors of Lancaster County Water and Sewer or any other contractors, it doesn't really matter it is still going to wipe them out. I think there is probably a good way of

going in there and maybe making it easier for them and just giving them a blanket exemption. Thank You

Winston Smith – 842 Southlake Drive, Lancaster SC – The Aviation Overlay District on page 4-9 half way down the page says “no permit of any type shall be issued for any development” and on further down says “until Lancaster County has an opportunity to be granted an aviation easement by the property owner in a form prescribed by the Lancaster County Airport Commission”. I went online and read the state suggested aviation easement language and its quiet involved. Ms. Karagounis says this would only apply to trees getting in the way of the flight path. If that’s all it applies to, put it in here. Second thing, this is conditioned and triggered on a permit. If the permit triggers it, there has probably only been two or three permits issued for the Cedar Pines Lake area over the last five years. I don’t know how long it would be, it might be a 100 years before you get the easement on all the property. If the easement is important enough to get, have the Airport Commission go ahead and get the easement on everything at one time and don’t have something that you are going to potentially hold up someone over building something. Like Mr. Holt mentioned, this might not apply to all the properties in zone B-1. If it doesn’t, that is fine. Ya’ll have all the information or your consultants do, to tell you which properties it is going to apply to and not. Lastly, if this only concerns the trees, the ones on the properties that you don’t get the easement for awhile; a tree is still going to grow there. It is not going to stop them. That is a concern that it is like extorting someone to provide an easement. Thank You

Mike Mitchum – 2349 Dover Lane – I reviewed the new UDO and one of the things that appeared to me as I read it, was the document is a major change in the way you do zoning. Our current zoning ordinance is agricultural, commercial, and residential with lot sizes, and you have all the rights that you own except for what is restricted by the state and additional paragraphs by the county. So all those rights belong to the individuals and the county moves back what is required for protection for development for people who are developing their land, for people who have businesses, and that is a major way of doing business for zoning. However, you are changing, you are now moving to a zoning of zones. You’ve got zoning and now you have districts. Then you go and have three letter look up tables. I call them three letter look up tables; most of the zones have agricultural ARG or they have low medium housing and that sort of thing and you go to a look up table. A look up table tells you what you are permitted to do. Not that you have the rights, those rights are pulled back to the county and they tell you what you can do. If you are not in that particular zone then it’s not a permitted use. That can work too. There is nothing really wrong with it. It’s just more indicative of a large city, of a large established building area; maybe Columbia South Carolina. I just picked something. Since this is such a big change and yes this is a big change; you are changing from one way of doing business that people understand to another way of business that has 100 changes you are going to make. You can’t really tailor yourself to each person’s individual need. The chance that you are going to rezone somebody that doesn’t want to be rezoned is very high and it’s going to happen. Somebody is going to have a piece of land that they’ve been using that way since their grandfather gave it to them and so I am addressing a grandfathering clause; an improvement to the grandfathering clause that we

find in paragraph 116 subsection C. I really don't want to read to you because it's really mute. You can read it yourself but for public consumption it's really really tough that under your initial provisions what you have is all existing lots record platted prior to the adoption of this ordinance and upon which no buildings have been erected; shall be grandfathered upon the date of adoption of this ordinance and shall not be subject to the new lot standards. However, buildings upon such lots shall be subject to all standards including all related site improvements. That is your grandfathering clause. I'm going to address chapter 9 in a minute because you'll be jumping around saying oh we put stuff in there and you did, but that is not enough. That just says that you are grandfathering blank land and everybody else is going to be subject to this UDO however you write it. Without regard to what their investments are and without regard to how long it took them to get you there and you just want to take away everything they've done and you'll tell them whether they are conforming or nonconforming. You are going to have some nonconforming police because zoning is a policing action. A lot of people look and say oh this is just a zoning ordinance. Zoning is a policing action; these are the ordinances that you are going to use to enable you to police your zoning. So now you have in this policing action, you have zones and you now are creating zones of zones and you are calling them districts. What is going to happen when you do that is you are going to push some of the people who are working as public servants into the arena of some of the people who are legislatures and you are going to push some of the people who are legislatures into judicial actions. You can't help it, it happens. They are going to be doing judicial actions and you have a regime stacking. I would like for you to say that any properly previously recorded plat or zone associated permitted uses conforming or nonconforming are grandfathered and protected out of this UDO. It is straight forward and very simple.

Rick Chandler – 2346 Old Camden Highway, Lancaster SC – I was here before opposing the Railroad Overlay and had some questions about the Carolina Thread Overlay. I enjoy my little farm in Elgin community. My neighbors and family will tell you I have an obsession with my gardens and my orchards and the raising of the bees, chickens, and geese. Everything on my farm is done on schedule and I am so obsessed that I prepare the schedule for something on the farms weeks in advance. So when I was here a month ago on a Monday night that had been an evening I had set aside to pick butterbeans and peas. Necessity required the neighbors in my community and myself to be here to express the significant and substantial concerns that we had at that time over the railroad and the Carolina Thread Overlay. That cost me a couple bushels of vegetables that were lost but that is ok. The concerns over the overlay ordinances were important. Tonight I'm again neglecting my garden. I had set aside this day a week ago to harvest a brand new crop of green beans. Tomorrow lots of those green beans will be lost and will not be up to quality for sale but that is ok, it was important that I be here again tonight. It is important that I be here tonight to personally thank Lancaster County Council, the Planning Commission, for not only listening to our concerns but for addressing our concerns as well. While the new overlay ordinances as they pertain to my community are not perfect, these new overlay ordinances have elevated the harsh unbearable and ridiculous requirements of their original ordinances. Many times I think in today's society we forget little simple words, thank you. Heinrich Heine said once "God has

given us tongues that we may say something pleasant to our fellow men". So tonight I wish to express to each of you, County Council, the Planning Commission, my appreciation for the changes and again just to say thank you.

Ken Faulkenberry – 3022 Mulberry Lane – I haven't read this and the only thing I do is I look at and it looks like it is about three times as thick as it used to be. What I wanted to make sure of and from what I understood and this is street talk and this may not be true, so when these ladies come back they can address it. I understood we had setback on fence and had setback on streams. A prime example is my son and I own 21 acres in Buford. It is 500 feet wide and 8 ½ acres deep but the fence setback if that was true what I was told, and the stream setback, we could actually use 9 acres out of the 21 acres. If the stream setback was a 100 foot each way you automatically took 8 ½ acres off of it to start with and then you took the 15 foot around the perimeter. I understood that has been taken out of there but I didn't hear any mention of it tonight of it being taken out and what the guidelines really are. This has really come about because of the growth in Indian Land. I don't think we need to worry about punishing the rest of the county. Everybody that is a farmer put that fence on the property line because he knew where his property was; he didn't have to go out there 10 years from now, 15 years from now hunting a property line. He had his fence six inches off the property line so he knew where his property line was. I hope we are not in here worrying about global warming and we are worrying about keeping cows and everything else out of a creek. There are ways more deer in Lancaster County than there are cows. Of course its election year and all we hear is government over regulation but from what little I've been here to two meetings and seen this, this is about as over regulation as you can get. Every time we come there is nobody in the audience that really understands it and evidently nobody does because we are constantly making changes. When are we going to quit making changes to it? We think it's something that we can live with. I didn't see a whole lot wrong with the UDO we had. I knew it needed tweaking but I hope we aren't setting this up to pacify a certain area of the county. We had a lot of that already set up where they were under different guidelines than the rest of the county. People in the south end of the county don't care and you can see there are not any of them here tonight. Their theory is I'm going to do what I want. I hope we really look at this and decide that big government isn't always best. I've seen a ton of times that the government made change and I can't ever think of one time that it was good for me. Not one time have they ever made a change that it came out good for me and for the public. Thank You

Steve Willis – 522 Briarwood Road, Lancaster SC – Mr. Chairman and members, I would like to stress that I am not here in any kind of official capacity this evening. I'm speaking as just a citizen of Lancaster County. The draft UDO has been a leading document. As you have heard tonight there has been a tremendous amount of public input given by citizens and a lot of those changes were implemented. It has been something that has been a work in progress. Various drafts have been online and available for quite some time but again as public input has been received, the draft has been amended. There is no perfect Unified Development Ordinance, it just doesn't exist. If it existed the National Association of Counties would have it online and all you would have to do is insert the name of the jurisdiction and viola! Everything would be happy

and we could move on. It just doesn't exist. One thing I would submit to you is the proposed UDO is better than what we have today. I think ya'll have heard various complaints on everything from business entities to being able to move forward with different kinds of zones. Today in commercial, we have B-1, B-2, B-3, and that is it and those are your choices; end of discussion. If you want to do something new and innovative with mixed uses, you are hung. Our UDO simply doesn't allow that, even though adjoining counties do. You have seen some great examples, whether it's Baxter or Birkdale, places like that. If we are going to keep up with the times, we've got to move forward. One of the things I would certainly commend the staff and the Planning Commission for making sure it was in there; annual reviews and updates of the UDO so that it doesn't become a stale document like we have today. There have been knee jerk reactions and things have been changed and you go to change one section to satisfy one little group and now it doesn't conform with other sections of the UDO and we have mismatches of requirements. It is a real problem and that is one of the things that I think that is very positive about the proposal that is being presented. Annual reviews don't do knee jerk reactions; take time to study it in depth with Planning Commission and Council to determine should those changes be made. Again, I would simply submit to you, is this a perfect document that has been presented, no it is not. It doesn't exist but again I would submit to you; compared to what we have today and the ability to respond to what the citizen's seem to want, whether it's in various new types of residential development, commercial development, our current UDO simply doesn't allow that. If we are going to move forward with the times, we are going to have to change the permits that go with it. Thank You

Waylon Wilson – 15117 Legend Oaks Court, Indian Land SC – I'm one of the blue eyed devils that moved in to the upper part of the county. Although I was born and raised in South Carolina, I love this State and I like this county. I'm a little bit miffed that so much of the negativity is being placed on the Indian Land area. I don't know of anyone person that actually asked for this UDO rewrite that lives in that area. I'm not saying it's a good document and I'm not saying it's a bad document. I do say that the federal government mandated that this part of Lancaster County is no longer rural, it is urban. We didn't ask for that, it was mandated. I know the county has to react to that mandate. Also I think it needs to be realized that it has been the Lancaster County Government that has allowed the development in Indian Land that is causing some of the problems. So I'm part of the problem but so is the county government, just recognize that. The thing I want to say about the UDO rewrite; much as been said that changes will have to be made, numerous times. Please implement some kind of foot noting mechanisms that when changes are made you identify what those changes are and what the dates are. If we don't we will have the same problem we have now with existing UDO although we know changes were made and a date, we don't know exactly what was added or deleted unless we go back. That is going to be a hardship on developers and property owners. I also think that Chapter 9 needs to be further identified in the term administrator. It's so widely used, everyone is an administrator. Why can't it be a zoning administrator? A building official administrator, the county administrator; identify who that administrator is for the various sections that has that responsibility. Please do that, thank you very much.

Jerry Baker – 1077 Greenbriar Drive, Lancaster SC – I’m handicapped, disabled, and I can’t drive or work for over three years now but Social Security says I’m not. It makes you wonder who the government is working for; your government, federal government and city government. I’m state licensed and I’ve pulled permits from municipalities all over the place. I live in a residential area, Baker Place subdivision – Antioch for 42 years. Mr. Blackmon is probably going to be speaking on the same thing. He has been there over 50 years. Me and him were master masons for over 40 years. We have laws in zoning where you can’t have businesses out there. We’ve had them out there for years. They were notified by Lancaster County almost 4 years ago and they haven’t moved yet. I would personally like to know everyone of your names on this board and your credentials and see why they state seems to be doing no better than ya’ll. You have a lot of residents mad about this UDO rewrite and you didn’t even straighten out stuff from 4 years ago; what do you expect us to do. I have a two year degree and state board licensed and my attitude is if people ask me something on the street; build it on Saturday and don’t tell the county anything. I’ve been married 45 years and the older I get the less I understand you people. You don’t work for the public anymore; you do what you want to do for yourselves. I appreciate your time.

Ned Blackmon – 816 Greenbriar Drive, Lancaster SC – I’m up here to talk about the UDO and zoning. I think it’s one of the finest things to ever happen to Lancaster County and I’ll tell you the reason why. Out in the area where I live the area has been zoned since 1991 residential and agriculture. I’ve been out there for almost 82 years. I was coming home the other Sunday from church and I counted 15 commercial trucks. A cleaning business and a towing business right in my front door. We have a UDO and we have zoning in that area. The towing business people are claiming that is his work truck. The truck sits out there 99% of the time blocking a third of the road. That is a work truck and he is running a towing business out there. That comes under home occupation and I’ve got a copy of it right here. Who is going to enforce this new UDO? It hasn’t been enforced out there in the last 13 years. Mr. Bob Bundy is the finest county council member we’ve had out there in the last 20 years. He has worked hard trying to get these trucks and business away from out there. It wakes me and my wife up about 3:00 or 4:00 am every morning and we are not in good health. They sent him a letter about 4 years ago giving him 45 days to remove his truck from out there. They are still out there. One is blocking part of the road and I had Barry Faile come out there and he did make them get it off the road. Like I said, there are 15 trucks out there and 3 houses. I have been told they wanted him to move on his own. They didn’t want to make him mad. He was supposed to move on his own but he hasn’t gone anywhere yet. I have 83 names on a petition out there and I could have had a 150 as far as that goes. I figured 83 would be enough to get him moved from out there. He is still there. Right in my front door I have a ton truck with a farm tag on it; I had been to Chester to get some fertilizer and I had a fertilize spreader behind my truck and I stopped by the house to get a sandwich and go to my farm at Flat Creek and come to find out this bird takes a picture of it and brings up to the zoning officer. The zoning officer told me I had the truck parked out there for two weeks. I guess I’m dumb enough to pay rent on that fertilizer spreader for two weeks. I’ve been out there raising cattle for 50 years. The zoning officer threw that picture up in my face and I said what in the world is going on. I have two acres of residential and

about 80 acres of farm land and he was saying something to me about my truck sitting out there. Thank You

Charles Deese – We are out of public hearing at this time.

Penelope Karagounis – I would like to start off by saying about the comments that the revisions were put online today at 11:30 am. Those were just revisions how I stated we received on Thursday at the I & R meeting from county council members and certain citizens and also department heads. We were instructed we needed to make some last minute revisions which we were making them until today at about 10:45 am in Rock Hill. That is why they were updated at 11:30 am. However, the document by state law has been online, the first document July 24<sup>th</sup> and the second document from the revisions from the August 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting; online on September 2<sup>nd</sup>. All those documents today that we had updated, they are redlined, I know there was a person that mentioned how they would like to know what has changed. If you look online today and the documents that you have in front of you; red line and blue line is basically changes that we made after the September 2<sup>nd</sup> advertisement.

Kara Drane – Also I just wanted to specify the item about the administrator in the code. The administrator is defined at the beginning of Chapter 9 and it defines those individuals as the Planning Director, the Zoning Official, the Public Works Director, the Building Official, the Fire Marshal and the Public Safety Director. For the sake of the ordinance, it says administrator, it could mean depending on whose duty that particular topic is assigned to. Within Chapter 9 it says generally what the individuals' responsibilities are; but for the sake of the ordinance sometimes titles change over the life of the code and county and that is why it's more of a general terminology. I just wanted to state that it is defined by who those individuals are and their responsibilities and what their areas of expertise are. We spent more time at the first public hearing talking about the purpose of the districts and the intent of the different districts and how it supports your comprehensive plan. You have zoning districts today in your current ordinance but the zoning districts that are proposed in your new ordinance are different but they support the rural living areas and also your urbanized areas. I just wanted to point that out. Within Chapter 2 at the beginning there is a detailed description of what each zoning district is. There is also a detailed description of each overlay district and what the intent of those overlay districts are. We have some questions and comments related to the Aviation Overlay and we also had a couple comments about the Carolina Thread Trail Overlay. We have some individuals that are here this evening that may would like to respond to some of those comments when Penelope and I are finished. The comment by Mr. Faulkenberry about the fence, that was removed and that was in Chapter 5. In one of our earlier versions we did have a setback where the fence had to be off the stream and that has been taken out of Chapter 5 and that is why you don't see that any longer. Within Chapter 8 we it has the storm water requirements, there are some setbacks and buffers that deal with streams and tributaries that are related to the storm water ordinance. The comment about the fences and the setbacks for cattle and livestock; that is not in Chapter 5 any longer.

Jerry Holt – Is that red lined or did it just disappear?

Kara Drane – It went away because when we re-advertised. I can't remember if that was changed before July 24<sup>th</sup> or if that was changed when we published for September 2<sup>nd</sup>. It was not red lined but I can show Mr. Faulkenberry a previous version where it was located.

Penelope Karagounis – If you all remember the July 7<sup>th</sup> the Public Input Session, it could have been from that meeting because there were a lot of citizen's who came out that day as well. We can take a look and see but it was removed before we re-advertised it for the September 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Jerry Holt – Would you be able to show him that? What he talked about in losing that much land is pretty significant.

Penelope Karagounis – We would be happy to. The Carolina Heelsplitter is an endangered species and the actual ordinance that was proposed back when the county adopted it, and I believe it was in 2005 with Fish and Wildlife; now with these corrections and revisions again, we have expertise from Fish and Wildlife. That was a suggestion I know one comment from a citizen talking about the subcontractors with the water and sewer district. I can ask again but that is coming from the Federal Government. Before you start asking questions from Kara and I, would you like for the people to speak that are here regarding the Aviation Overlay? We have Mr. Ken Holt and Paul Moses that can respond to some of the comments that citizens had voiced.

Ken Holt – 3914 Kenilworth Road, Columbia SC – I am with Holt Consulting Company.

Paul Moses – 3409 Penshurst Road, Rock Hill SC – I am the current airport manager at the Lancaster Airport.

Ken Holt – The one comment that I noted was about the Aviation Overlay which was from Mr. Winston Smith. He made reference to a portion of the proposed ordinance on page 4-9 and it's all underlined under 2. What it's saying here is that the opportunity and opportunity is I think an operative word here; is given to the county to be granted a navigation easement. The opportunity is so that it can be evaluated. Where we are talking about is zoned B-1 which is an extension and is actually a portion of the approached slope to the runway. As the terrain underlaps and the elevation changes there may be some properties if a permit is a needed; it triggers the opportunity to do that evaluation. I believe what Mr. Smith was suggesting is that we and just get all the easements at this time, of course that is a local decision to make that determination. The way it is written right here is that the permit would actually trigger that evaluation and it may be determined that a navigation easement is not needed. So all that you are requiring or what a navigation easement is; basically you are purchasing the air rights and it's based upon where the property falls in relationship to what the approach slope is at that point. As it changes and as it continually inclines as it goes away from the runway

and then you have the property or the terrain undulating, that is what would require an analysis at that time and may be determined that it's not needed.

Paul Moses – Maybe to clarify that a little bit; when you take off and land an aircraft that is the approach slope coming in to the runway. We have runway 6 and 2-4, Mr. Smith's property is in runway 2-4 approach area. When you come in with the airplane for a landing or taking off, it is contingent upon how low you can get in bad weather. The lower you can get the better and it's better for the county to let these corporate aircraft come in here. So the lower you can get the better it is. If you allow trees or a structure such as steeples, cell phone towers whatever; to go very high, then the FAA will come in and make those approach minimums higher and that is less attractive to the corporate community.

Ken Holt – The only other thing I would like to add is the FAA's position has been particularly when you are dealing within the approach slope, is that you control the air rights through an navigation easement versus zoning if possible.

Paul Moses – That also affects your grants for improving the airport.

Charles Deese – We will now take questions or comments from the board members and we will start with David Freeman.

David Freeman – I don't have any questions I just think the updated version being posted this morning did not give citizen's ample time to review. It is a lot of information.

Sheila Hinson – I feel the same way. It doesn't seem like since they were just posted today but I do know they have been there the whole time. If you've been looking at it the entire time it wouldn't be hard to run back and look at it quickly today. Some people could have been busy and not be able to do that so I definitely understand that too. Staff and Kara and Penelope have worked very hard on this but I don't like a lot of change and I don't like a lot of things coming down different and changing and government so I truly know where you are coming from. After talking with staff though, the UDO really needed some changes and I'm not saying the old one is bad. This one might be a little more intense but they really tried hard to make it better than what it was. What worked ten years ago or five years ago sometime doesn't work as well now because we have more people living here in Lancaster County. Indian Land has a lot different needs than we do in Kershaw. We've got different needs in Kershaw, totally. Everything I have asked them to do that I looked at and thought this just didn't look right; they have tried to change it and go a different direction and I appreciate that. I appreciate them on how they have worked with the Planning Commission and other people in the county. I am very proud of our county. I do think some people might need a little more time to look at it. My hat is off to you for everything you've done.

Tommy Dabney – I think we have a fairly good document here and I support the document as a whole but most of the county didn't even know when it went online. We thought this thing was going to be ready Thursday or so and then we had some changes

from the I & R meeting and stuff like that. I would really love to see us postpone the vote tonight and I know it puts us in a little bit of a pinch but I just feel like we need to let the rest of the county as a whole see that we've got a document and look at the changes. So of the changes we made did affect the sections that we were looking at and I think to the better even. It could cause some trouble for some and I would like to see us push the boat out.

Jerry Holt – There was a comment or a suggestion made regarding 1.1.6 and it had to do with conformance and it's on page 1-2 under 1.1.6 item C. This is where it talks about basically vacant land and it says that it shall be grandfathered and the suggestion was made that we add the phrase “and protected”. It goes on to say that it shall not be subject to the new standards herein. We have pretty much covered the protection? Ok, then I don't have any trouble with leaving it as it's worded then. On page 4-16, this deals with the heelsplitter and at the top of the page on item C where specifically it says that the CHO will not apply to the installation, maintenance, or operation of water and sewer services by Lancaster County Water and Sewer District. Seems to me that when the Federal Government or State Government has regulations whether it's protected species or protected area, other government agencies have to respect those restrictions also, just as the rest of the public or other businesses would. I question why we exempt them from having to comply with that overlay.

Penelope Karagounis – That question I cannot answer but this board when you are making your motions tonight; if you feel that needs to be deleted, that is recommended. I agree with you on why they are excluding them but I don't for the fact if in 2005 somebody from the water and sewer district came to the meeting and asked for that. I can't honestly give you an answer for why it's there. I'm not sure if Jeff Catoe is in the audience but he wasn't here back in 2005 but that is a good point. When you are doing your motions for tonight just remember because of the state law we have to move this forward. We've already continued it one time. Even if we don't get a recommendation tonight, unfortunately it has to move to County Council on October 10<sup>th</sup>. However, this board can make amendments and they can make motions to delete page 4-16 subsection C for restrictions and limitations exclusions.

Jeff Catoe – The thing on water and sewer is something we can check but as Ms. Karagounis said, that is something that came from the US Fish and Wildlife Service not directly. What I can tell you on some experience with that is it is a two fold question because one is water and sewer operating systems, filter plants, and waste water treatment plants. As it is included to water and sewer lines or construction of lines; they are associated with the Clean Water Act as well and what happens with that is when we are working on a road and we hit a line and we call them, it's usually a creek crossing and we are fixing a pipe or something. That triggers other agencies like DHEC and the Clean Water Act where you have to account for as much as either the chlorinated water which is in the water line or any type of municipal sewer that discharges into the system. The meaning for the UDO is it brings in other agencies that look out after that. It is sort of a muddy question and we will definitely discuss with them.

Jerry Holt – They are afforded other protections from these other agencies so there is no reason they we would need to give it to them. If they’ve got an exemption from something that is granted by someone else...

Jeff Catoe – I don’t want to say it’s an exemption without maybe talking to water and sewer or the federal levels of that. I just do know that they are monitored and in the construction the comment was made what if the subcontractors and contractors do a poor job. They do follow under the permits that they use in operating these systems; certain types of federal inspections. We just hit a two inch line and we called them and they have to report that before they even repair the line. If a concrete wash out gets into the creek that triggers other things as well. That might be why that is in there but I will be glad to try and assist planning staff in getting a more clear answer for that.

Jerry Holt – The final thing that I had was the issue that Mr. Faulkenberry brought up. Before we take action on this I would like for him to concur that the portion that he was referring to and how it consumes so much of his usable land and has in fact been addressed.

Charles Deese – Can we just show him that?

Ken Faulkenberry – I’ll take your word for it. If they say it’s not in there, I don’t have a problem with that.

Jerry Holt – Then I’m good.

Kara Drane – What is not in there is the fencing setback. If you remember back when we had an earlier version of Chapter 5, there was a section in there that dealt with animal production and in that it had a setback for a fence off the side property yard. That was regulations that went away totally because animal production went from permitted with review to permitted by right with no standards. So that is gone and now in Chapter 8 that deals with storm water, there are things that deal with our rivers and creeks and tributaries that deal with storm water setbacks. But the item that I believe Mr. Faulkenberry is referring to is when we had animal production in chapter 5 as permitted with review and we had a distance I think of 100 feet from the side property line. That has been removed and if you look at Chapter 2 in the Use Table, you will see that animal production is a “P” and not a “PR”. There is no reference to a section in chapter 5. In earlier versions of chapter 2 and chapter 5 we had it noted animal production as “PR” and we also had those standards, so that has been removed.

Jerry Holt – He discussed both the fence setback and the stream setback of 100 feet. You have addressed the fence or the side yard.

Kara Drane – Yes, chapter 5 the fence. I was just referring to chapter 8; we might like to see if Mr. Catoe would like to help with this particular discussion. But in chapter 8 we have our storm water and flood plain regulations and in chapter 8 we also have some setbacks that deal with our creeks and tributaries and such. It is dealing with our storm

water ordinance and regulations. There is nothing that would prevent a farmer from having their livestock and the normal way that they farm. I don't believe there is any setback for the animals from the creek. That is what we had in chapter 5 and that is what has been taken out.

Tommy Dabney – Today the way they farm will still be the same after this new UDO.

Kara Drane – That is my understanding yes Mr. Dabney.

Charles Deese – I would like to make this statement that the two ladies standing at this counter and the staff that has been working with them so diligently on this and not only during an 8 hour work day but also Saturdays and Sundays. They had to ride back and forth to Rock Hill time and again and in this office; we all thank you. It has been a hard job and you've done a yeoman's job on it. I've had several questions regarding the UDO through the process and have been involved with it quite a bit. Every comment that I had and every question that I had at this point has pretty much been addressed. I again say thank you.

Kara Drane – I know we had some discussion about the proposed revisions that we presented to you this evening and I know the list looks fairly long and in a way it is because when you change one thing in one chapter, you change sections throughout the whole document. When we deleted the pipeline overlay we made changes in many chapters. When we made a change and created the new use and new regulations, again we made changes in two and five and ten. So sometimes although it may seem like a minor change since the code is interrelated in the different chapters and they refer to each other, when you do make one change it does have an effect where you are making changes throughout. But from a larger picture, most of the changes that were proposed and red lined today are the items about the factory farming, the change in the terminology, the creation of the swine and the non-swine. You also had the deletion of the pipeline overlay. We did have several tweaks with the aviation overlay. If you remember as we went through this review process your overlay districts were re-evaluated to see what needed to be revised. Your aviation overlay was one that we looked at the state model ordinance for the aviation overlay and so that one needed some minor revisions. I didn't mention when we went through chapter 4 but the Carolina Thread Trail, that overlay is geared toward major subdivisions only and that was one of the revisions when it was re-posted on September 2<sup>nd</sup>. I just wanted to try to just stress that while we did go through many items because by law we have to go through and share with you everyone that was changed since it was advertised September 2<sup>nd</sup>. Generally the topics are kind of similar but there are some minor tweaks that were made based on comments we got from the I & R committee and also comments that we received from the public. In addition, we felt like it was important to post it as we were going to present it today instead of posting it and then posting another revision. In hind sight we could have done that but we did post it today based on what we are presenting to you this evening.

Charles Deese – Do I have a motion regarding UDO-016-001?

Jerry Holt – Mr. Chairman a question first. Would the motion include both the recommendation for the adoption of the new ordinance and the repeal of the old ordinances, or would they be treated separately?

Charles Deese – They are combined, that is the way I read it.

Jerry Holt made a motion to adopt the new Unified Development Ordinance with a recommended change. That change is that we remove Section 4.2.2.C which exempts Lancaster County Water and Sewer District from compliance with the section on the Carolina Heelsplitter Ordinance and also that we repeal the existing UDO, however, I would like to do that with an accompanying recommendation to council. I'll just make that as a comment later.

Charles Deese – I have a motion do I have a second?

Vedia Hatfield seconded the motion.

Charles Deese – The motion is to repeal the existing Unified Development Ordinance, to repeal certain related code chapters in the Code of Ordinances and to adopt a new Unified Development Ordinance as authorized by the South Carolina Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act of 1994, Title 29, Chapter 6 with this change; that we remove Section 4.2.2.C. Can I have a roll call please?

VOTE:            3 AFFIRMATIVE    3 NEGATIVE       MOTION FAILED

The three negative votes came from Tommy Dabney, Sheila Hinson, and David Freeman.

Charles Deese – Since the motion failed it goes to county council with no recommendation.

**Repeal the existing Zoning Map, and to adopt a new Official Zoning Map as so authorized by the South Carolina Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act of 1994, Title 29, Chapter 6. (UDO 016-002)**

Kara Drane & Penelope Karagounis

Kara Drane – You see the proposed zoning map and the districts before you and the zoning map also includes your overlay districts which includes the Carolina Thread Trail, the Highway Corridor Overlay District, the Aviation Overlay District and the Equestrian Overlay and also the Carolina Heelsplitter, and the Cluster Subdivision Overlay. Since the map was presented and posted on September 2<sup>nd</sup> we have received additional comments and I'm going to ask if Penelope wants to cover those other items.

Penelope Karagounis – In front of you there is a list with all the proposed edits. The first one is Tax Map 0060-00-089.00. Today it is zoned R-30 and when it was advertised on

September 2<sup>nd</sup> on the record it was low density, we are now proposing institutional. The next one is off of Collins Road and we had seven or so parcels. I'm going to read out this tax map numbers for the record: Tax Map 0010-00-060.08, 0010-00-060.04, 0010-00-060.03, 0010-00-060.09, 0010-00-060.05, 0010-00-060.06, and 0010-00-019.02. Today with current zoning that we have for this part of Indian Land it is zoned R-15P; before September 2<sup>nd</sup> we had it as low density residential. Residents reached out to us and voiced their concerns about some rural agricultural areas and so from the LDR they wanted the RN. You do all have I believe a letter in front of you from Mr. Holland. He is included in one of those parcels. He is fine with the RN but he is upset that the RN only allows one unit per acre instead of the one and a half with the LDR. However he is in support and he wanted to be RN like his other neighbors. The third slide shows an area off of Doby's Bridge Road and 521. As you can see from the future land use map this is the mixed use node pedestrian center that was identified when we adopted the comprehensive plan. Residents or property owners that have this land did not want to see it as mixed use, they would like for it to stay as general business. So the tax maps that we are changing: Tax Map 0013-00-011.00, 0013-00-011.01, 0013-00-012.00. Tax Map 0010-00-052.00, 0010-00-053.00, 0010-00-054.00, 0010-00-052.01, 0010-00-052.02, 0010-00-052.03. Today it is zoned B-3 and we had proposed as mixed use and the property owners want that to change to general business. The next slide as you see here is Tax Map 0013-00-045.00 and Tax Map 0013-00-044.00. This property the Griffin's, they petitioned to change it from R-30P and it was LDR. They are contract I believe for an actual facility there for a private recreational that will be complimentary with the high school and the middle school site so they are asking for institutional there. This is off of River Road and Collins Road at 521. With this process going on we only had a moratorium North of Hwy. 5, so we could not take any rezoning applications North of Highway 5 however, South of Highway 5 we've had business as usual. This board has seen rezoning cases and the next slide that I'll be talking about; they are still in the rezoning process. They have not received third reading but this one did receive third reading. There are a number of slides that you are going to see now that either they just got their zoning or we need to give them this new zoning that we are proposing. For instances, Ms. Lineberger, her property is 0081N-0B-006.00, 0081N-0B-005.00, 0081N-0081-00-031.00, 0081-00-032.00, 0081-00032.01, and 0081-00-034.01. The property is basically heavy industrial which is I-2 so today the I-2 is now heavy industrial. So this is why we are changing it, to reflect the zoning that she just received last week. This one is 156 at 0001, it is basically today multi-family and it was RR and this is going to HDR. This is Mr. Blackwell's property and he is almost at third reading. The third reading will be on October 10<sup>th</sup> and it is our understanding that council will approve it since they have approved 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> reading. The same thing here with this property; Tax Map 141, Parcel 24, again changing it to the HDR. This is another rezoning; Tax Map 0107-00-046.00, today it is B-2 and we had it proposed as rural neighborhood and now because of the rezoning they are going through it is rural business. This one is Ms. Snipe's property. She was the lady that needed to be able to keep her mobile home where it was and she went through the process for rezoning. Tax Map 102, Parcel 106, property from R-15S was MDR but because it's about to get approved by county council to be able to have a mobile home. Mobile Homes are allowed in the AR and RR and this is in fact for RR. 82-D Block P and Parcel 14 this is another rezoning, it was currently B-3 and we had it

has MDR and he is going through the process and we are changing it to GB. This is off of Little River Road and I believe this is an existing church and we had missed this one so someone had told us that there is a church going back there on Little River Road so that is why Tax Map 0013-00-034.07 needs to be changed to institutional. This is a newly established church. This is the Duke Power station right there across from Inspirational Network. The property is Tax Map 0010-00-049.00 and current zoning was B-3 and we had proposed neighborhood business but there is no reason for it to be neighborhood business once we knew that substation was going there. That is why we are zoning it to institutional. That was one that we had missed and this is part of the revision. This one the property owner has asked for this and is the back portion of Possum Hollow Road and is also the Edgewater Business Park. They have subdivided that piece of property. The whole property there is B-3, the Edgewater Business Park. We had it as regional business and the property owner wants it to have mixed use.

David Freeman – What was the slide right before that with the Tadlock property?

Penelope Karagounis – The Tadlock is neighborhood business. I had a conversation with Mr. Kenneth Cauthen because she had contacted him. Today it is B-3 and they had directed us to whatever was commercial keep it commercial, so we did. It's neighborhood business because of the issue with her parcel. She has frontage on 521 but then it goes really deep all the way back to Lake View Landing. So that is why the neighborhood use is for neighborhood business.

Charles Deese – At this time we will consider ourselves in public hearing.

Ben Levine – 5062 Terrier Lane, Indian Land SC – Is it possible to go back to that last slide that was up on Possum Hollow? This is right up the street from me and I got to say I've been watching this whole rezoning map the whole time to know what is going around my house and for this to come up right here at the end is pretty surprising to see something like this. There are also some properties across the street there. The light purple properties just above the yellow which used to be residential but they are now neighborhood business. I'm not really sure why they are changing from a residential to one of these other uses; the B-3 just to change mixed use. I haven't even had a chance to look up and see what mixed use can be used for at this point because it hadn't been around my property. The other thing that I would like to note is just south of what is actually shown here is a parcel that is surrounded by neighborhood right on Possum Hollow. The number for this property is 0008-00-063.00. I did receive an email back from Mr. Cauthen last October that the suggestions were taken as the better use of what I sent him. When I saw on the map that this parcel was still listed as MDR instead of LDR I sent an email. The planning department does a great job with responding and I don't want to say that they don't because I ask a lot of questions and I get a lot of responses. But this property is one house on six acres and seems like because of it's location I guess it's being changed from R-15P to MDR instead of LDR. If you go down the street about 600 feet there is a property that is on .95 acres and it is going to stay LDR and everything south of there is also LDR regardless of the size. Because this property is in my back yard I have an interest in keeping it LDR as opposed to MDR. I note there aren't a lot of

changes in use that can be done there but I was thinking most of this rezoning would be more of a translation than actual choosing a new zoning type for this. That one property with the six and a half acres behind my house; I would like to know why that wouldn't be LDR. This mixed use I don't have the time to prepare and figure out what the uses are that mixed use can be. We walk up the street everyday and right now it's basically waiting for a regional business and I don't know what this difference in mixed use is going to bring. Thank You

Waylon Wilson – 15117 Legend Oaks Court, Indian Land SC – Throughout the process of the zoning map there has been a statement made that there needs to be a close coordination between the existing approved land use map and the zoning map and I support that. The land use map shows the employment centers and pedestrian centers as a very wide circle on the map. I think that needs to be translated onto the zoning map as a very narrow pen circle so that the people that own those parcels will know that they are in the employment center or the pedestrian center for sake of clarity. To me that would be very important to the property owners in that area. I know that the proposed zoning can be picked up parcel by parcel with a little icon on the zoning map but I think this generic land use circle should be reflected on the zoning map. Thank You

Charles Deese – We consider ourselves out of public hearing. Do you ladies have any rebuttal?

Penelope Karagounis – In regards to this parcel right here, this whole property is in the node of the pedestrian center. There was dialogue with all the Edgewater Business Park because one time we had it as mixed use and then it went back to regional business. Now at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour unfortunately but it did come in last week, they subdivided about 30 some acres and they would like for that to be mixed use. Just to clarify what Mr. Levine had stated, with a mixed use district, just because they get the zoning district as a mixed use doesn't mean it's a done deal. They have to come back with an actual plan. In chapter 9 as we stated with these revisions if it passes with County Council; you are not going to be able to submit bubble plans like they did for PDD's. You are going to have to show and identify the true pedestrian aspect. You have the surrounding area where it is still regional business because it has been built out. That is why the rest of Edgewater is not mixed use zone because we have existing regional businesses corporations there. That was the reason why this raw land, they would like to see that as mixed use. I believe they are looking at some type of residential to compliment the businesses that are surrounding in red for the regional business. I just want to make sure for the record that just because it is zoned mixed use it does not mean it is approved. The mixed use master plan would have to come back through my department and then through Planning Commission for a public hearing which all the surrounding neighbors would be notified. It would then go to County Council for three readings. In regards to the light purple, if you go to the site today there are residential homes there and because of what happened with Bailes Ridge in the back where there is that multi-family the apartments; those homeowners want to sell their property. They pretty much told us they do not believe this needs to be residential and that is why we gave it the lesser commercial zone for that light purple. We stopped there because of the close proximity to the back part of the PDD where those

apartments are. There needs to be something that is neighborhood related because of the changes that have occurred in the past and those neighbors that notified us would like to see that as neighborhood business.

Jerry Holt – The tract up here in blue and I'm looking at the online map and it looks like the top section is urban residential.

Penelope Karagounis – Which top section?

Jerry Holt – You can't see it on that because it's not subdivided.

Penelope Karagounis – That is another parcel.

Jerry Holt – Ok, as you expand it and tap on it to me it looks like it's the same parcel number.

Penelope Karagounis – It is 0008-00-026.03 and it says here 52 acres. It is not 52 acres. What they subdivided was about 30 some acres. (Mr. Holt and Ms. Karagounis look at online map where he is seated) I don't know why it is loaded like that it is supposed to be the mixed use, the whole 30 acres. I'll take a look at it. That is on the north side of that Lenger's Way, that parcel. So that would be the tax map 0008-00-026.03. I don't know why on the shape file it is like that but I can ask Rob Jackson at the COG why that parcel data still has 56. It is the 30 acres.

David Freeman – Just like the situation right there, that is stuff we are supposed to just take their word for and we are going to fix it. If it's not right we don't need to pass it. We've done this over and over to ourselves. Just like what I asked about earlier regarding Tadlock, it is B-3 and it has always been B-3 and now it's mixed use. It is right between an industrial park and the rest of those properties up there with B-3. You put this online today at 11:30 and the map doesn't even reflect what is online now. It seems like to me that every obstacle that has come up its well we need to delete this and take this off and let's get this on through here. I don't understand why we are pushing this to be done. If it's not right let's hold off and do it right. I can't help the deadlines we have to meet. It's not reflecting on the map now and that is what the folks are seeing and that is what we are voting on; I have a problem with that.

Jerry Holt – I'm opposed to including the rezoning of that tract from B-3 to MX because I think that is a significant change from what we currently have with the expectation that it was going to be regional business. That is what the rest of the tract is. The other question that I had deals with the change for the RN districts. For the whole Van Wyck area and for the area that was around Collins Road and we addressed some of the parcels on there; for the most part those parcels are currently either R-15P or R-30P. They've got one and a half dwelling units per acre. We are going to RN and we are changing substantial acreage to one dwelling unit per acre. Have there been many comments or objections to that? I know you have one that you mentioned but for the most part have there been any other citizen's comments or inputs?

Penelope Karagounis – Yes, the reason why we went back and my planners actually went and rode all of Collins Road, there were issues with all that area being low density and you have people who have commercial horse stables out there or some type of agricultural. The LDR that we were proposing for that area would make them non-conforming. When we had created that rural neighborhood because of the mobile homes since Van Wyck citizens did not want to have mobile homes; the rural neighborhood allows the agricultural uses that they are currently doing today. So that is why we went back and changed it to RN because it is really unique how Indian Land is urbanized but parts of Indian Land that are off of 521 and 160 are still rural. Collins Road outside of that PDD that is being developed right there at the Publix, it is very rural with horse farms. A lady that lives off of Collins Road is going to have a farm and she is also going to do the agritourism and she is one of the people who told us we needed to go back and look at that whole area. That is why we changed it. We met with Mr. Holland and he agreed with the RN because he wants to be able to have the AG uses but he feels that you are taking away his right from one and a half units to one unit. So we are playing with a half a unit but we have not received any other feedback other than Mr. Holland. He is not here today because he is traveling. I did provide his comments in front of you. Going back to Mr. Freeman's comments, there are about 13 slides here and when you make your motion you can make a motion to delete slide 13 that is proposing mixed use and it can stay as regional business. That is an option for any other slide also. I have not received anything from Ms. Tadlock but if this board feels that her property needs to go to GB, then this board can make the motion. Just don't think that you cannot make any motion here tonight. The zoning map is about 98% really good because we have spent 20 months on it. This is just a couple things that have come up because of property owners either subdividing their property or having certain businesses or opportunities that they want to develop. You have a right with these 13 slides to make changes. You just have to state for the record which slide you want in or out. We can do that one by one and I can write down all the tax map numbers or if you want to delete all 13 of these slides and not have the recommendation. If you don't want these because they are coming last minute to you that is fine but this other stuff needs to get recommended.

Jerry Holt – I know Mr. Holland did raise the issue but in also looking at the areas that are now RN which would be effected by the decrease in density; it's almost the entire Van Wyck area. I was just curious as to whether or not you had gotten any comments from them.

Penelope Karagounis – RN is one acre and unless they were R-30P which was one and a half...

Jerry Holt – The ones we looked at were R-30P.

Penelope Karagounis – But you have to understand with the R-30P in those areas if there is no sewer, it's one acre regardless because they are all on a septic tank. Now like Treetops or something that has the one and a half units, they bring in the sewer. If they don't have sewer out there and a lot of Van Wyck does not have sewer, even though it

says you can develop one and a half, they really can't because somebody has to bring in the sewer.

Jerry Holt – Ok, thanks.

Charles Deese – Thank you for the work you've done on the map.

Jerry Holt made a motion to repeal the existing zoning and to adopt a new Official Zoning Map however I would want to make one exception or exclusion to the changes that we discussed and that is on the slides that Ms. Karagounis has just shown us. I would want to remove Tax Map 0008-00-026.03 which was the proposed change from Regional Business to Mixed Use. I think that deserves a separate hearing if the owner chooses to do that.

Charles Deese – We have a motion to approve with the exclusion....

David Freeman – What about the parcel I was asking about? Can I also exclude the parcel that I was asking a question about?

Penelope Karagounis – It wasn't on the slide and Mr. Holt has made a motion. Do you know her name and tax map number because I don't have that?

Jerry Holt – We can pull it up here. (Mr. Holt is looking online from his device) So it is parcel number 0010-00-050.09 and right now it is I-1 proposed light industrial. Is that the right tract?

Penelope Karagounis – No, it is below and is proposed neighborhood business. We have the map up there that we can zoom in and take a look.

Jerry Holt – Was it above Northfield or below Northfield?

Penelope Karagounis – It is below.

Charles Deese – We will take a 10 minute break and get this number pulled up. If you will find your seats please. This meeting will now come to order. Did we get that parcel number taken care of?

Jerry Holt – On that last parcel, we are going to exclude it.

Charles Deese – I have a motion on the floor to approve the Official Zoning Map with the exclusion of 0008-00-026.03, is that correct?

Jerry Holt – Correct.

Charles Deese – There was one other parcel number that was in question.

Jerry Holt – This will be the only exception.

Charles Deese – Do I have a second?

Tommy Dabney seconded the motion.

Charles Deese – You have before you UDO-016-002 the Official Zoning Map, to repeal the existing Zoning Map and to adopt a new Official Zoning Map as so authorized by the South Carolina Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act of 1994, Title 29, Chapter 6; with one exclusion – To exclude parcel number 0008-00-026.03. Can I have a roll call please?

VOTE:            6 AFFIRMATIVE    0 NEGATIVE       MOTION CARRIED

Charles Deese – This will go to County Council with a positive recommendation.

Penelope Karagounis – I need a little clarification. There was some dialogue about also changing the zoning of Tadlock.

Jerry Holt – That was withdrawn.

Penelope Karagounis – So we are not changing it, ok thank you for the clarification. So basically the recommendation was to repeal the zoning map as is except deleting tax map 0008-00-026.03 from the slide.

Kara Drane – I would also like to state for the record that the pipeline overlay was also removed from the proposed map as well.

Charles Deese – I again say thank you for the work you've done Ms. Kara and staff and also you Judy for the work you do keeping up with everything.

Penelope Karagounis – We thank you all for taking the time to read so many multiple versions and we really appreciate the respect that all seven of you have given to the Planning Department and my staff and also to the consultant. We really appreciate it. This will go to County Council on Monday, October 10<sup>th</sup>. County Council has decided that will have another public hearing, they don't have to but they will have a public hearing at second reading. So that will be at the end of October for a public hearing and if you all have time you all are welcome to come to the County Council meeting as well and it starts at 6:30pm. Also a reminder that we have a workshop next Thursday, October 13<sup>th</sup>. Thank you

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

VOTE: UNANIMOUS MOTION CARRIED

Respectfully Submitted,



Charles Deese  
Chairman



Penelope G. Karagounis  
Planning Director



## UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE PROJECT KEY FACTS SUMMARY SHEET – OCTOBER 3, 2016

### Purpose

The purpose of the Unified Development Ordinance Project is to develop an updated code and a new official zoning map that implements the new Comprehensive Plan, incorporates applicable ordinances from the Code of Ordinances, and includes districts that support both rural and urban communities.

### Background

- Analysis of the UDO completed in June, 2014 and the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in December, 2014.
- Rewrite of the UDO, including a new zoning map, began in 2015. A Public Input Session was held on July 7, 2016 in advance of the official public hearings to gather feedback on the draft new UDO and Official Zoning Map.
- The 1<sup>st</sup> public hearing before the Planning Commission was held on August 23, 2016 and the 2<sup>nd</sup> public hearing before the Planning Commission is set for October 3, 2016.
- Project only includes the unincorporated areas of Lancaster County and does not include the City of Lancaster and the towns of Kershaw and Heath Springs.
- Revisions have been made to the July 24, 2016 version of the UDO and The Official Zoning Map based on feedback and comments.

### UDO Key Facts

- Public input included four community meetings held in September and October, 2015, individual stakeholders meetings conducted between November, 2015 and January, 2016; six focus group sessions held in March, 2016; two day open house in March, 2016; Public Input Session in July, 2016; civic and neighborhood community meetings; and Planning Commission workshops.
- Information has been available on the websites of Lancaster County and Catawba Regional Council of Governments on the draft materials and the preliminary zoning map as well as final versions since July, 2016. The public has been able to comment online and in person.
- The intent is to apply zoning districts to parcels as conforming uses; however, in the event a non-conforming use is created, the use may continue to exist.

### The Official Zoning Map

- The following is a breakdown of the proposed zoning as of September 2, 2016 of the total 39,626 parcels in the unincorporated areas of Lancaster County by categories:

— Rural Districts:	36%
— Residential Districts:	38%
— Business Districts:	3%
— Institutional Districts:	1%
— Open Space Preservation:	.2%
— Industrial Districts	1%
— Mixed-Use Districts	4%
— PDD Legacy	17
- The following is a breakdown of the proposed zoning as of September 2, 2016 of the total 340,113.45 acres in the unincorporated areas of Lancaster County by categories:

— Rural Districts:	74%
— Residential Districts:	13%
— Business Districts:	1%
— Institutional Districts:	1%
— Open Space Preservation:	3%
— Industrial Districts	4%
— Mixed-Use Districts	.4%
— PDD Legacy	3%

UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE**PROPOSED EDITS BY CHAPTER SINCE SEPTEMBER 2, 2016****CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTORY PROVISIONS**

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
1-4	1.2.1.B	Deletion of Pipeline Overlay
1-5	1.3.2	Deletion of Pipeline Overlay
1-10	1.4.7	Change Certificate of Zoning Compliance to Zoning Permit

**CHAPTER 2 DISTRICT STANDARDS**

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
2-1	2.2.1	Deletion Pipeline Overlay
2-6 to 2-8	2.4	Deletion of Chapter 7 reference for open space and park space
2-7	2.4	Addition of a reference on Accessory Structures on Corner Lots for LDR
2-8	2.4	Decreased minimum acreage for Light and Heavy Industrial
2-10	2.5.3	Deleted Multifamily from GB and INS and changed RB to PR
2-11	2.5.3	Deletion of reference 5.4.3
2-13	2.5.3	Deletion of Factory Farming and addition of Facilities, Non-Swine, change from SE to PR in AR District
2-13	2.5.3	Addition of Animal Production Facilities, Swine, SE in AR District

**CHAPTER 3 MIXED-USE DISTRICTS**

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
3-40	3.12.2.E	Addition of Nonconforming Build-to Requirement

# UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

## CHAPTER 4 OVERLAY DISTRICTS

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
4-1	4.1.2	Deletion Pipeline Overlay
4-2	4.2.1.B	Change in reference to map adding the words Aviation Overlay and deleting Restriction and Limitation
4-2	4.2.1.D	Clarification of location of overlay map with the Official Zoning Map
4-3	4.2.1.E.1	Revision of Zone C to Zone C1 and addition of Zone C2
4-4	4.2.1.E.1	Addition of Zone F with description
4-5 to 4-6	McWhirter Field Land Use Compatibility Guidance Table	Revision of Zone C to Zone C1, addition of Zone C2, addition of Conditional Land Use references, and addition of Zone F
4-7	Table Key	Relocated to after the table, clarifications in density reference, and revisions to C3, C4 and C5 descriptions
4-9	4.2.1.G.2.c	Changed word awarded to granted
4-10 to 4-12	Compatible, Incompatible, and Conditional Land Use Tables	Revisions of Zone C to Zone C1 and the Addition of Zone C2
4-16 to 4-17	4.2.3	Deletion of Pipeline Overlay
4-18	4.3.1.A and 4.3.1.B	Language corrections
4-22	4.3.2.G.1.a and H	Deletion of language prohibiting side yard parking at intersecting street and correction on Chapter reference

## CHAPTER 5 USE REGULATIONS

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
5-2 to 5-3	5.2.2	Deletion of multi-family from GB and INS districts and addition of standards on building type and density
5-4	5.2.6.2	Deletion of language regarding mobile homes

# UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
5-6	5.2.7	Change Certificate of Zoning Compliance to Zoning Permit
5-13	5.5.3.B and F	Change 100 feet to 250 feet separation, revise hours of operation, and correct single-unit or two-unit dwellings to single-family and two-family
5-17	5.5.12.C	Increased separation requirements for outdoor shooting range
5-24	5.8.6.H	Deletion of Canopies over Gas Pumps
5-32	5.9.10.A	Change in distance requirement from 500 to 300 and deletion of language referring to conditional district
5-37 to 5-38	5.10.1 and 5.10.2	Addition of language for Non-Swine that matches SCDHEC, removal of language for previous Factory Farming, and the addition of Swine language and separation requirements
5-39	5.10.3.A	Deletion of language regarding four-lane corridors
5-40	5.11.1	Change Certificate of Zoning Compliance to Zoning Permit
5-41	5.11.4.B	Deletion of residentially zoned properties and clarification of language to residential uses only
5-48	5.12.4.A.1	Change Certificate of Zoning Compliance to Zoning Permit

## CHAPTER 6 SUBDIVISION AND INFRASTRUCTURE STANDARDS

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
6-2	6.2.2.F.2 and 3	Clarification of language about requirements prior to plat approval

# UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

## Chapter 7 General Development Standards

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
7-2	7.1.1.B	Change Compliance Certificate to Zoning Permit
7-16	7.1.7.C and D	Reference to trees and shrubs list in Chapter 4, clarification of language regarding small trees and overhead power lines, and reference to Chapter 6 site distance triangles
7-25	7.2.5.F	Addition of language for parking of truck cabs in AR District
7-32	7.4.2.A and C	Change Compliance Certificate to Zoning Permit
7-37	7.4.6	Change Compliance Certificate to Zoning Permit
7-42	7.4.7	Change Compliance Certificate to Zoning Permit

## Chapter 8 Natural Resources Protection

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
8-6	8.2.2.B.2	Addition of references for floodplain
8-28	8.6.2.B.7.d	Clarification of language about elevated stream crossings

## Chapter 9 Administration

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
9-7 and 9-9	9.2.3 and 9.2.5	Change UDO Compliance Certificate to Zoning Permit
9-10	9.2.5.B	Change Compliance Certificates to Zoning Permits
9-12 to 9-13	9.2.7.A.1, 3, and 8	Change Compliance Certificate to Zoning Permit
9-17 to 9-20	9.2.8.C	Addition of Section Reference Numbers
9-18	9.2.8.C.1.b.iii	Deletion of V-Zone Certification / not applicable
9-20	9.2.8.C.1.g.i and iv	Deletion of language that is not applicable

# UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
9-29	9.2.9.B.12	Change Compliance Certificate to Zoning Permit
9-51	9.3.5.B.3.c	Addition of language regarding extensions for nonconforming uses by the administrator
9-51	9.3.5.D.2	Change timeframe for non-conforming structures from 6 months to 1 year and provide review by Administrator
9-54	9.4.1.E.3	Revision of language regarding removal of sign violations
9-57	9.4.6.A.2.e	Revision of language regarding erosion violation administration

## Chapter 10 Definitions

PAGE NUMBER(S)	SECTION NUMBER(S)	CONTENT / SUBJECT MATTER
10-2	10.3 Animal Production Factory Farming	Deletion of reference to Factory Farming in Animal Production, change Factory Farming to Facilities, Non-Swine and Addition of new definition for Animal Production Facilities, Swine
10-5	10.3 High Consequence Land Use	Deletion of definition
10-21	10.4 Hazardous Liquid Pipeline	Deletion of definition
10-25	10.4 New Manufactured Home Park or Subdivision	Addition of Date
10-30 to 10-31	10.4 Subdivision, Major	Correction in language