



# **Edgefield County Planning Commission**

**County Council Chambers  
March 11, 2021  
Work Session 5:00 PM  
Meeting 6:00 PM**

***Chair: James Burt – Dist. V***

***Vice-Chair: Brett McNeill – At Large***

***Joel Presley – At Large***

***Rodney Ashcraft – Dist. II***

***Tracy Hamilton – Dist. III***

***Karlene Butler – Dist. IV***

***Todd Brown – Dist. V***

***TBD – County Council Liaison***

***The next Planning Commission Meeting is scheduled for April 8, 2021***



# **Table of Contents**

<b>March 11, 2021 Planning Commission Work Session Agenda .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>March 11, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Comprehensive Plan Reexamination Memorandum .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>January 27, 2021 Planning Commission Work Session Minutes .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>February 11, 2021 Planning Commission Work Session Minutes .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>February 11, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes .....</b>	<b>25</b>



**Edgefield County Planning Commission**  
**Work Session Agenda**  
**County Council Chambers**  
**March 11, 2021**  
**5:00 PM**

---

<b>Chair:</b>	James Burt – Dist. I	<b>District Seats:</b>	Rodney Ashcraft – Dist. II
<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Brett McNeill – At Large		Tracy Hamilton – Dist. III
<b>At Large Seats:</b>	Joel Presley		Karlene Butler – Dist. IV
<b>County Council</b>	TBD		Todd Brown – Dist. V
<b>Liaison:</b>			

This agenda may be modified at any time prior to or during the meeting described herein.  
The meeting may begin after the advertised start time if a reasonable adjustment to the  
advertised start time is needed for any reason.

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Guest Speakers**  
No Guest Speakers
- III. Old Business**  
No Old Business
- IV. New Business**
  - A. Prospective Subdivision Application (Hollow Oak) Parcel ID: 176-00-00-018-000, Sunnybrooke Rd. and Fish Farm Rd. by JSMG Development, LLC. Philip Green the project P.E. with Southern Partners, Inc. is here to join the Planning Commission during the work session.
  - B. Rezoning Application Rural Residential (RR) to Industrial Development (ID) Parcel IDs: 145-00-00-(063, 064, 085, 086, 087, 088, 089)-000, Rainbowfalls Rd. by William Ellis and Southern Felt Company. John Lewis the President of Southern Felt Company is here to join the Planning Commission during the work session.
  - C. Comprehensive Plan Reexamination per County Council Resolution Number 20-21-1136 at the March 2, 2021 County Council Meeting.
    - i. Resolution "This resolution is a request for the Planning Commission to reexamine the section of the Comprehensive Plan that were changed at third reading and approval of the current plan in June 2019. Specifically, The Estate Residential element and the Suburban Residential element. The Planning Commission is being asked to provide a recommendation concerning should these sections be changed to the original wording."
- V. Adjourn**

*Page intentionally left blank*

**Edgefield County Planning Commission**  
**Meeting Agenda**  
**County Council Chambers**  
**March 11, 2021**  
**6:00 PM**

---

<b>Chair:</b>	James Burt – Dist. I	<b>District Seats:</b>	Rodney Ashcraft – Dist. II
<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Brett McNeill		Tracy Hamilton – Dist. III
<b>At Large Seats:</b>	Joel Presley		Karlene Butler – Dist. IV
<b>County Council</b>	TBD		Todd Brown – Dist. V
<b>Liaison:</b>			

This agenda may be modified at any time prior to or during the meeting described herein. A vote may be held on all agenda items. The meeting may begin after the advertised start time if a reasonable adjustment to the advertised start time is needed for any reason.

- I. Call to Order**
  - A. Invocation
  - B. Pledge
- II. Approval of Agenda**
  - A. Approval of March 11, 2021 Meeting Agenda
- III. Approval of Minutes**
  - A. Approval of January 27, 2021 Work Session Meeting Minutes
  - B. Approval of February 11, 2021 Work Session Meeting Minutes
  - C. Approval of February 11, 2021 Meeting Minutes
- IV. Guest Speakers**

No Guest Speakers
- V. Reports**
  - A. Land Management Ordinance (LMO)
    - i. Community Small Group Meetings Update from staff on the number of individuals who have signed up to participate in the to be scheduled District level meetings.
    - ii. Post Card Notice at the March 2, 2021 County Council Meeting  
County Council authorized the County Administrator to mail notice to property owners regarding the LMO and community small group meetings.
  - B. Moratorium On Major Subdivisions at the March 2, 2021 County Council Meeting  
County Council approved the first reading of Ordinance Number 20-21-1137 as amended.
    - i. Ordinance "This ordinance would prohibit Edgefield County from receiving any new plans for major subdivision for 90 days. The ordinance would not affect the issuance of building plans or final plat approval for subdivision that have previously been approved by the Planning Commission.
- VI. Old Business**

No Old Business

**VII. New Business**

A. Comprehensive Plan Reexamination per County Council Resolution Number 20-11-1136 at the March 2, 2021 County Council Meeting.

i. Resolution "This resolution is a request for the Planning Commission to reexamine the section of the Comprehensive Plan that were changed at third reading and approval of the current plan in June 2019. Specifically, The Estate Residential element and the Suburban Residential element. The Planning Commission is being asked to provide a recommendation concerning should these sections be changed to the original wording."

ii. Planning Commission Review

**VIII. Executive Session**

No Executive Session

**IX. Comments by the Planning Commission Chair**

**X. Adjourn**

# Memorandum

---

**To:** Edgefield County Planning Commission  
**From:** Kevin Singletary, Edgefield County Planner  
**Date:** March 11, 2021  
**Re:** Comprehensive Plan Reexamination Per County Council Resolution

## **County Council Resolution**

At the March 2, 2021 County Council Meeting Council passed Resolution Number 20-21-1136. The resolution reads as follows: "This resolution is a request for the Planning Commission to reexamine the section of the Comprehensive Plan that were changed at third reading and approval of the current plan in June 2019. Specifically, The Estate Residential element and the Suburban Residential element. The Planning Commission is being asked to provide a recommendation concerning should these sections be changed to the original wording."

## **Comprehensive Plan Text Comparison**

**Original: Estate Residential** – This category features very low-density single-family residential development on large lots. The overall density of residential development is projected to be about one house on five acres. However, the minimum lot size in this land use area is assumed to be approximately two (2) acres in size to provide developers with flexibility in creating affordable home sites. Water, power, and communications cables are assumed to be tied to the local dedicated street system with substantive added costs in extending into deep lots. The areas in this land use category are not considered likely to provide adequate densities to support the expansion of extensive public sewer collection systems or wastewater treatment and may require higher costs for other utilities as a trade-off for more land.

**Change: Estate Residential** – This category features very low-density single-family residential development on large lots. However, the minimum lot size in this land use area may vary on the basis of suitable topography and access to utilities. It is assumed that some portions of this area may be developed at 0.5 units per acre (approximately two acres in lot size) or conditional higher densities where appropriate to provide developers with flexibility in creating affordable home sites. Water, power, and communications cables are assumed to be tied to the local dedicated street system with substantive added costs in extending into deep lots. The areas in this land use category are not considered likely to provide adequate densities to support the expansion of extensive public sewer collection systems or wastewater treatment and may require higher costs for other utilities as a trade-off for more land.

**Original: Suburban Residential** – This category indicates single-family residential land uses and lots in a suburban scale subdivision pattern typical of development from the 1950’s to the 1990’s. Streets may be curvilinear to fit topography and limits of the original parcel size and shape. Although the pattern of development can be limiting, streets should provide multiple access and egress to reduce length of utility lines and redundancy for access. Average lot size may vary from 1/2 acre to 2 or 3-acre lots depending on sewer service or requirements for septic tank fields. Some areas within this category may have deeper lots to ensure building and septic field site development.

**Change: Suburban Residential** – This category indicates single-family residential land uses and lots in a suburban scale subdivision pattern typical of development from the 1950’s to the 1990’s. Streets may be curvilinear to fit topography and limits of the original parcel size and shape. Although the pattern of development can be limiting, streets should provide multiple access and egress to reduce length of utility lines and redundancy for access. Natural conditions, connectivity to utilities and the market are to determine lot sizes. Some areas within this category may have deeper lots to ensure building and septic field site development

### **Staff Analysis**

The Comprehensive Plan adopted on June 4, 2019 by County Council was the conclusion of a yearlong process that began with Edgefield County contracting with Robert & Company for the writing of a new Comprehensive Plan. John Ford, Vice President of Robert & Company was the County’s primary consultant and author of the text. Informally the interpretation of these sections of the Comprehensive Plan by staff, for both versions of the text, have been consistent with the interpretations of the Consultant. However, upon passing of the resolution by Council, staff felt it necessary to formally requested the interpretation of the Consultant on both version of the Comprehensive Plan. Please see the request and response below. Staff is in agreement with the interpretation provided by the Consultant. It is the opinion of staff that both versions have caused confusion and misinterpretation, primally with the understanding of “minimum lot size” and “average density”. Staff find’s the last paragraph in the letter from John Ford to best capture the meaning of this language; “The density numbers in the original (3/17/19) text were not intended to be minimum lot size. The intent of identifying an average density was to help guide applicants, decision-makers, and community advocates evaluate the applications for development density compared to the land use area recommended by the adopted plan. The average density also provides decision-makers and utility providers with information regarding the level of services that should be provided over the next twenty years by multiplying the land area by number of units that can be expected to be developed.” Staff has no specific recommendation for the Commission regarding either text, other than suggesting that any recommendation forwarded to Council specify any interpretation of the text differing from that of the Consultant for the benefit of the Council and Staff. Staff is aware of other aspect to the Comprehensive Plan the Commission may consider recommending changes to, however staff would advise at this time providing recommendation specific to the resolution of Council only, and addressing other potential changes in future.

## Staff Request Letter



EDGEFIELD COUNTY BUILDING & PLANNING  
210 PENN ST. EDGEFIELD, SC 29824  
Kevin D. Singletary Jr – County Planner  
[ksingletary@edgefieldcounty.sc.gov](mailto:ksingletary@edgefieldcounty.sc.gov)  
(803) 637-2101

March 5, 2021  
John Ford  
VP, Robert and Company  
229 Peachtree Street NE  
Suite 2000  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dear Mr. Ford,

At the March 2, 2021 Edgefield County Council meeting, the Council voted on a resolution to have the Planning Commission reexamine the Edgefield County Comprehensive Plan; "This resolution is a request for the Planning Commission to reexamine the section of the Comprehensive Plan that were changed at third reading and approval of the current plan in June 2019. Specifically, The Estate Residential element and the Suburban Residential element. The Planning Commission is being asked to provide a recommendation concerning should these sections be changed to the original wording." I have enclosed a copy of the specific language that was changed at the third reading and is in the current Comprehensive Plan adopted in June 2019. I have also enclosed a copy of the language as it was written at the second reading of said Comprehensive Plan.

To best inform the Planning Commissioners as they consider this matter, I am requesting a formal interpretation from you, the consultant the County contracted with for the writing of the Comprehensive Plan. I would like your specific interpretation of the meaning of each version, and what the impact and implications are of each version if maintained or changed, respectively. Please feel free to elaborate beyond my request if doing so is necessary to provide context and information relevant to the Commissioner's consideration and potential recommendation to County Council.

In presentation of your interpretation to the Planning Commission, Edgefield County Building and Planning Department Staff may state their partial or full agreement with your interpretation, or their partial or full disagreement with your interpretation. Any difference in interpretation by Staff will be present to you for response, and said response will be shared with the Commission. We appreciate you taking the time to respond to this formal request, as we believe it is important for the understanding and consideration of the Planning Commission.

Thank you,

Kevin Singletary  
Edgefield County Planner

## **Consultant Accompanying Email and Response Letter**



Sun 3/7/2021 9:26 PM

John Ford <j.ford@robertco.com>

RE: Letter Request

To Kevin Singletary

Cc Hart Clark



RAC Letter to Edgefield County 20210307.docx  
.docx File

CAUTION: This message originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content to be safe.

Kevin,

I don't believe that the changes to the text have a significant effect on the interpretation of the plan although there may be a subtle interpretation that the changes reduce the intent by opening up the plan categories to more variance in interpretations of what densities are acceptable. Although the changes primarily delete the stated assumption of average densities for the whole planning category for Estate Residential and for Suburban Residential, these are two large areas that may have variable natural and man-made conditions that can create a significant range of variables affecting land development types and densities. The wide range of stated densities for the Suburban Residential area were dependent on the size of the defined planning area. A large subarea or a smaller piece of the total area identified in the land use category can be expected to raise or lower the average density considered appropriate.

The revisions made by County Council appear to make the land use categories in the plan more vague by removing the specific identification of average densities. However, I believe that either text should be acceptable because both versions maintain support for a range that allows densities to be determined by appropriate zoning and building codes. The average densities are a starting point but actual lot size and development densities should be interpreted through the more specific analysis provided by site plans and applications for zoning and building.

***Robert and Company***

John Ford

404.880.7003 direct

404.863.4844 cell

[j.ford@robertco.com](mailto:j.ford@robertco.com)



**Robert and Company**

229 Peachtree Street, NE  
International Tower, Suite 2000  
Atlanta, Georgia, 30303  
TEL: 404.577.4000 FAX: 404.577.7119

7 March 2021

Mr. Kevin Singletary  
Edgefield County Planner  
210 Penn Street  
Edgefield, SC 29824

Dear Mr. Singletary,

In response to your letter of 5 March 2021, I offer the following comments:

On 7 May 2019, the Edgefield County Council held a meeting to discuss the draft Comprehensive Plan adopted by the Planning Commission and forwarded to the County Council. The draft text adopted by the Planning Commission and forwarded to County Council was dated 17 March 2019.

At the 7 May meeting, Edgefield County Council asked to make two changes to the text in Chapter 7 Land Use.

**Estate Residential**

Change #1 was to change the second and third sentences in the description of "Estate Residential" land use on page 7.6 in as shown below:

Original Text dated 17 March 2019	Revised Text dated 9 May 2019
<p>"Estate Residential – This category features very low density single-family residential development on large lots. The overall density of residential development is projected to be about one house on five acres. However, the minimum lot size in this land area is assumed to be approximately two (2) acres in size to provide developers with flexibility in creating affordable estates."</p>	<p>"Estate Residential – This category features very low density single-family residential development on large lots. However, the minimum lot size in this land use area may vary on the basis of suitable topography and access to utilities. It is assumed that some portions of this area may be developed at 0.5 units per acre (approximately two acres in lot size) or conditional higher densities where appropriate to provide developers with flexibility in creating affordable home sites."</p>

The first sentences are identical. The second sentence in the original (3/17/19) draft states the projected density would equal approximately one house on five acres (0.2 units/ acre). This is a statement of the plan preparer’s opinion for the overall area of Estate Residential land based on projected growth rates where the Estate Residential land use is identified. This sentence was not retained in the revised (5/9/19) text.

The third sentence in the original (3/17/19) text states that the minimum lot size is assumed to be 0.5 units/ acre to allow some variation in development.

The second sentence in the revised (5/9/19) text expands the discussion regarding minimum lot size to note that minimum lot size may vary on the basis of suitable topography and access to utilities. The third sentence identifies the minimum lot size as 0.5 units/ acre. It also notes that

some minimum lot sizes may be conditioned at higher densities where appropriate. Although this statement is somewhat vague regarding higher densities, it may allow an applicant to insist that a density higher than 0.2 units/ acre should be allowed for a specific piece of property.

The above discussion does not address where subdivision of a lot in the Estate Residential Land Use area could allow development at a density of 1 unit/ acre when the applicant is applying for a minor subdivision of less than five parcels. Therefore, the provisions in the zoning ordinance (or the proposed LMO) to allow for a minor subdivision could allow a higher density in the Estate Residential land use area. In either alternative, the minimum lot size should specify "within a major subdivision".

**Suburban Residential**

Change #2 was made to the fourth sentence in the description of the "Suburban Residential" land use on Page 7.9 as follows:

<b>Original Text dated 17 March 2019</b>	<b>Revised Text dated 9 May 2019</b>
<i>"Suburban Residential – ... Average lot size may vary from ½ to 2 or 3 acre lots depending on sewer service or requirements for septic tank fields."</i>	<i>"Suburban Residential – ... Natural conditions, connectivity to utilities and the market are to determine lot sizes."</i>

The original (3/17/19) text states that average lot size in the Suburban Residential land use area may vary depending on access to sewer service and provided an expected range from 0.33 units/ acre lots to 2 units/ acre. As above, the average density identified is the plan preparer's estimate of projected development within the overall designated area of Suburban Residential land based on market projections for the next twenty years.

The revised (5/9/19) text description for the Suburban Residential land use area deletes the reference to average lot size and identifies adds natural conditions as a contributing determinant on average lot sizes. Although the revised text leaves out the reference to average density, the change to the text has minimal impact to the description and leaves the appropriate density up to county decision-makers.

The density numbers in the original (3/17/19) text were not intended to be minimum lot size. The intent of identifying an average density was to help guide applicants, decision-makers, and community advocates evaluate the applications for development density compared to the land use area recommended by the adopted plan. The average density also provides decision-makers and utility providers with information regarding the level of services that should be provided over the next twenty years by multiplying the land area by number of units that can be expected to be developed.

Best regards,

Robert and Company



John Ford, AICP  
Vice President and Director of Planning

CC: Hart Clark

### **Planning Commission Action**

Following Planning Commission review the Commission may consider a motion to make a recommendation(s) to County Council regarding the Comprehensive Plan. The request from Council via resolution was; "to reexamine the section of the Comprehensive Plan that were changed at third reading and approval of the current plan in June 2019. Specifically, The Estate Residential element and the Suburban Residential element. The Planning Commission is being asked to provide a recommendation concerning should these sections be changed to the original wording."

*Page intentionally left blank*

**Edgefield County Planning Commission  
Work Session Minutes  
County Council Chambers  
January 27, 2021  
5:00 PM**

<b>Chair:</b>	James Burt – Dist. I	<b>District Seats:</b>	Rodney Ashcraft – Dist. II
<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Brett McNeill – At Large		Tracy Hamilton – Dist. III
<b>At Large Seats:</b>	Joel Presley		Karlene Butler – Dist. IV
<b>County Council Liaison:</b>	TBD		Todd Brown – Dist. V

The Edgefield County Planning Commission Work Session was held on Thursday January 27, 2021 at the Edgefield County Council Chambers at 225 Jeter Street in Edgefield at 5:00pm. Notice of the time date and agenda of this meeting was provided to The Edgefield Advertiser and others when requested. Any questions regarding the Planning Commission should be directed to the County’s Planner Kevin Singletary [ksingletary@edgefieldcounty.sc.gov](mailto:ksingletary@edgefieldcounty.sc.gov)

**Members present:** Burt, McNeill, Butler, and Brown.

**Members late:** Ashcraft and Hamilton.

**Members absent:** Presley.

**Staff present:** Clark, Marine, Paradise, Singletary, Wall (Virtual).

*No votes held during work session.*

**I. Call to Order**

Burt called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

**II. Guest Speakers**

A. John Ford the Vice President at Robert and Company and primary consultant to Edgefield County on the Land Management Ordinance (LMO) project.

i. Introduction

Ford introduced himself as the project manager for the Land Management Ordinance and welcome each of the Planning Commissioners.

ii. Presentation

Ford started by explaining that the purpose and intent of the Land Management Ordinance (LMO) is to guide development in accordance with the existing and future needs of the county and to promote the public health, safety, morals, convenience, order, appearance, prosperity, and general welfare of the property owners and residents of the county, and other members of the public. He reminded everyone that the LMO is

still just a working draft, it has had some review but not complete review yet and will continue to evolve. He said if they have questions feel free to contact them in writing so they can understand what the comments are and follow up on them. He went on to say that Kevin Singletary as the County Planner is coordinating it for public comments.

Ford went over how the LMO will be used by Edgefield County

- Objectives
  - Facilitate Transparent, Citizen-led Discussion
  - Document Collaborative Community Review
  - Establish Continuing Communications
  
- Desired Results
  - Implement the County's Strategic Vision
  - Include "Big Ideas" and Unique Corridor Overlays
  - Add Visual Examples for Better Understanding of Scenarios

Ford said just because a plan has a draft that's adopted and moving forward with the County doesn't necessarily means its ever completely finished because as laws need to be changed, they usually are changed. He said it does provide a start point and is also intended very strongly to be a point of departure for discussion in addition to laying down the requirements. He said the result is to try and tie the County's strategic vision, which was completed almost three years ago now, and the County's Comprehensive Plan with the actually implementation ordinances to carry forward the County's preferred vision and goals. He said the main thing that was part of the process was to establish some big ideas, not just a proforma update of the ordinance but to really take a serious look at the existing ordinance, which was written many years ago and was written primarily for a small rural county, changes have happened in that period of time including the big ideas, we also had some ideas that were identified in the Comprehensive Plan regarding some of the unique corridors inside the County and we wanted to make sure our plan addressed some of the specific issues that needed to be evaluated and assessed as development occurs along those corridors. He said they also wanted to add some visual examples, which is the next thing to look at. He said the recommended elements are to take a look at what the land uses were, what the limitations are, what the opportunities and standards are, to establish procedures for future development within the County. He then went over the status of the LMO

- The Land Management Ordinance Steering Committee discussed the requirements of the ordinance, received

and read drafts and recommended edits to the draft text and maps and forwarded the draft to the Edgefield County Planning Commission for review and action.

He said the committee itself was primarily comprised to start looking at some of the more generalized issues, the specific adoption process begins with the Planning Commission and is completed by the County Commission.

- The Planning Commission will review, hold a public hearing, and make recommendations regarding the draft to County Council for review and action.
- County Council will review the draft in at least three (3) readings, hold a public hearing, approve appropriate edits, determine the dates for implementation after the Planning Commission completes its review and recommendations. The County Council will also repeal of existing ordinances, and approve adoption of a final ordinance.

Ford then went over the time line for the Edgefield County LMO.  
2019

- June - Comprehensive Plan Adopted
- August - LMO Committee Created
- October – Public Information Meeting
- November – Review of Comparable Ordinances
- December – Draft Districts Proposed

2020

- January – Draft Districts Reviewed and Revised  
He stated the only big change was they decided to consolidate a couple of the proposed districts and he believes they have a much stronger ordinance because of that.
- February – Area Public Information Meetings
- April – Draft Outline Presented to LMO Committee
- May & June – Zoning Map drafted by Staff
- August – Consultants Completed Detailed Draft Text
- September – Work deferred to 2021 by County due to CoVid-19

2021

- January – PC work sessions resume to review/edit draft. He stated this is just a draft and they still have lots of work to do and lots of details to be completed. He went on to outline the plan moving forward.

- February – PC reviews Draft to discuss text edits/alterations, and zoning map
- March – PC to complete edits and forward to County Council
- April – First reading to County Council
- May – 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading to County Council
- June – 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading to County Council/Anticipated Adoption
- July – Proposed Effective Date

Ford said the 2019 Comprehensive Plan was adopted with a lot of attention as to what was stated in public meetings and the final product is 98% of what those public meetings were, maybe has some additional changes that were edited in the last reviews but that is essentially provides us with a Comprehensive Plan that serves as the launch point for this ordinance. He then went over the visual zoning maps comparing the current map to the drafted one. He said most of the zoning and development are along the southern southeastern edge on the county and in the triangle of Edgefield, Trenton and Johnston. He said the existing ordinance has (GD) General Agricultural, (RD) Residential Agricultural, (RR) Rural Residential, (LC) Limited Commercial, (ID) Industrial Development, and the overlays include a plan development special district, flood hazard, airport compatibility overlay and a highway overlay.

- Current zoning includes 5 general zoning districts plus 4 special use and overlay districts:
  - GD / General Agricultural Development District
  - RD / Residential Agricultural Development District
  - RR / Rural Residential Development District
  - LC / Limited Commercial District
  - ID / Industrial Development District
  - *PD / Planned Development Special District*
  - *FH / Flood Hazard Overlay*
  - *AC / Airport Compatibility Overlay*
  - *HOD / Highway Overlay*

He said if you compare that to what other communities have, you will see that Edgefield has three districts that are primarily agricultural. He said Greenwood County has seven agricultural districts, some of that is providing an opportunity for looking at agricultural as the primary product within that community. He said one of the other aspects to this is more of a limitation in terms of Edgefield only having the three districts as it becomes a rural fringed county and get a lot more development around it. He went on to go over the next couple of maps and slides

comparing Edgefield County to the surrounding areas of McCormick, Aiken and Greenwood.

He said they came up with twelve chapters and then went over the LMO Zoning Districts and Land Uses.

RA – Rural Agricultural

RC – Rural Conservation

RE – Rural Estate

RL – Residential Large Lot

RS – Residential Suburban

RV – Residential Village

He said essentially, you're going from one district to six districts that's to provide a step-down approach in terms of density and type of development which would be allowed. He said there are two commercial districts proposed which are:

LSC – Light Service Commercial

GSC – General Service Commercial

He said one of the big differences between the two is the amount of parking and outside storage.

He said there are two Industrial Districts:

LIM – Light Industrial Manufacturing

GIM – General Industrial Manufacturing

He said the biggest difference is primarily intended to be the intensity of which it may affect surrounding properties through outside storage and outside impacts. He said they are proposing two Special Zoning Districts:

PUD – Planned Development Districts

PRD – Planned Residential District

He said is very similar to the existing zoning district, however we felt very strongly that there needs to be a consideration of something that's not quite that intensive or requires commercial so they came up with Planned Residential. He said the biggest issue they face with PUD Districts is that you must have commercial as part of a PUD in the state law. He then said they came up with three other overlay districts:

CDP – Corridor Design Protection Overlay District

He said each of the Corridor Design Districts may have different requirements because they don't believe Highway 25 and Sweetwater Road have the same requirements, for instance Highway 25 is really a commercial corridor and Sweetwater Road is more residential and transportation corridor but they want to limit how intense the development is along that corridor. He said it's also intended to capitalize on the desirability of the Sweetwater Corridor as a place for residential development. He went on to the next district.

ACP – Airport Compatibility Protection Overlay District

He said staff has been working with the State Aviation Commission and he thinks some of those issues are

straightened out to where they can move forward. He said they looked at a Flood Hazard District but so far, we felt like it was somewhat repetitive to the controls that have already been established by the County through the Environmental Regulation.

Ford went over the color chart in the legend of the Zoning Map. He went on to point out in the map that Rural Conservation and Estate Rural are dominant, they're very large areas in the County he said this is proposed primarily to acknowledge what is currently developed within the County. He said there's large areas that provide the assets that most people identified in the Comprehensive Plan as what they want to preserve.

He said the LMO proposed districts for review is:

- The January Presentation is intended to update the status of the LMO draft and assist the Planning Commission in reviewing the draft and text as submitted by the LMO Subcommittee.

He said the subcommittee had some comments which was edited and changed and those edits were included in the July and August draft.

- Summary overview slides for each district are provided in the Planning Commissioners' packet to provide further information regarding each proposed new district and may be called up during the presentation at the wishes of the commissioners to review and serve as a starting point for reviewing the Subcommittee's recommendations.

He said he hoped that would give them the opportunity to coordinate and direct questions to himself in the public meetings and to Kevin Singletary who is the day-to-day person coordinating this. He handed out a spreadsheet with comments and questions about the LMO, and explained that he and Kevin would like to start acting on these comments in terms of the draft. He went on to say that the draft is nowhere near perfect and said it needs illustrations to help provide better information.

### **III. Old Business**

No Old Business

### **IV. New Business**

- A. LMO Schedule** Staff and the Consultants have prepared an outlined schedule for the remainder of the LMO drafting process to discuss and review with the Planning Commission.

Singletary went over the upcoming schedule and how it would include the public and incorporate their comments and concerns.

- February 11<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting with Public Hearing
- February 25<sup>th</sup> meeting – consultant team demonstrate edits and make sure they match what the Planning Commission directed.
- March 11<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting with Public Hearing
- March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting – review edits

He said if the Commission makes its recommendation to County Council in March, their process will start in April and the three readings will go through its three readings in April, May, June and if they adopt it in June it could have an effective date of July. He went on to explain the significance of the new LMO and County budget starting in July because it will change some of the fees in the Building and Planning Department. Brown stated they had a lot of work ahead of them and would like to see 3 or 4 work sessions a month and expressed his concern of not having enough face-to-face time to get it done. Singletary clarified that the LMO will be discussed in the Work Sessions as well as the regular meetings in February and March as well as the Called Meetings and they can also have none quorum small group meetings. McNeill asked if the Commissioners would get a spreadsheet on the public comments and Singletary said it would be included in the Feb 11<sup>th</sup> packet. McNeill went on to ask if Singletary could hold some none quorum meetings to get the new Commissioners that were not on the LMO Steering Committee up to speed and Singletary agreed.

Singletary said they will be discussing the LMO during the regular meetings and asked the Commissioners what they felt the best use of the Work Session proceeding that would be. That would prepare and set them up for discussion during the regular meeting

B. Questions from the Planning Commission on any items covered by the Consultant.

They went through a few questions and answers.

Brown asked how much flexibility is in a Land Management Ordinance as a County against what a state law tells us, once we have all these zoning designations, is it set by the County itself or are there State laws above us that flow down and Singletary said it's a combination of both but primarily the state law establishes limitations. He said the state establishes what powers the local government have in terms of limitations and zoning and that's all available in the Planning and Enabling Act.

They discussed the Use Table

They discussed the comparison to surrounding areas with the LMO and what was similar.

Ford explained PUDs require commercial whereas we haven't seen any legislation, restrictions or court decisions that say you can't do a similar in terms of a residential development so we were trying to come up with an opportunity for that. Trying to float that by the region or Rick Green and haven't heard back and we are going to get feedback from the other counties to make sure we are compatible because you don't want people competing one county against the other.

Singletary stated that Chapter 2 (Zoning) and 3 (Overlay) are where the consulting team and Steering Committee took the most uniquely Edgefield path. He said the conservation subdivision and zoning come from the principal book "Rural by Design" and is unique in that you don't usually see a zoning district where the min lot size is 5 acres, however there's some crucially rural parts of the County that is unique to its culture and the ascetic and heard from the commission and public their desire to preserve it and that is reflected in this zoning and you don't see elsewhere.

Singletary said chapters five through eleven is where it gets heavily influenced by the state law.

Ford added that a Sign Ordinance specialist wrote the sign ordinance. He went on to say it was very strong and specific because you cannot adjudicate what a sign says so it's somewhat labored in its structure in order to be protective of the County's intents.

Singletary said the Comprehensive Plan is the guide for the LMO.

#### C. Open Discussion on the LMO.

Burt said they've done a lot of work on the LMO and there's been a lot of shift in members and we didn't want it to be too strict but they wanted it to stay close to the Comprehensive Plan.

McNeill asked how the County was getting the word out to the public and Singletary said through the County website, in the Edgefield Advertiser newspaper, on Facebook, email distribution list and at the Courthouse. He went on to say that public hearing in March will be more important than the Feb 11<sup>th</sup> because the Planning Commission will have made some changes and edits and will be considering making its recommendation to County Council, so public input will be important to get anything they've over looked before the recommendation to County Council.

There was a discussion on which chapter of the LMO to start reviewing first. The decided to pair Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 6; Chapters 1, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 11; and Chapters 7 and 12. He said for the February 11<sup>th</sup> meeting they would focus on Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 6. Ford added that any comments or questions the commissioners have, the earlier they get that to staff, the quicker the meeting will go.

There was a discussion about setting up some none quorum meetings in order to get into the details and stay on schedule. They discussed the pros and cons of live zoom meetings or Saturday meetings.

**V. Adjourn**

Burt adjourned the Work Session at 6:27 pm.

*Page intentionally left blank*

**Edgefield County Planning Commission  
Work Session Minutes  
Sweetwater Baptist Church Gymnasium  
February 11, 2021  
5:00 PM**

<b>Chair:</b>	James Burt – Dist. I	<b>District Seats:</b>	Rodney Ashcraft – Dist. II
<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Brett McNeill – At Large		Tracy Hamilton – Dist. III
<b>At Large Seats:</b>	Joel Presley		Karlene Butler – Dist. IV
<b>County Council</b>	TBD		Todd Brown – Dist. V
<b>Liaison:</b>			

The Edgefield County Planning Commission Work Session was held on Thursday February 11, 2021 at the Sweetwater Baptist Church Gymnasium at 198 Sweetwater Road in North Augusta at 5:00pm. Notice of the time date and agenda of this meeting was provided to The Edgefield Advertiser and others when requested. Any questions regarding the Planning Commission should be directed to the County’s Planner Kevin Singletary [ksingletary@edgefieldcounty.sc.gov](mailto:ksingletary@edgefieldcounty.sc.gov)

**Members present:** Burt, Presley, Hamilton, McNeill, Butler, and Brown.

**Members absent:** Ashcraft.

**Staff present:** Clark, Marine, Paradise, Singletary, and Wall.

*No votes held during work session.*

**I. Call to Order**

Burt called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

**A. Opening Remarks and Invocation**

Given by Dr. Paul Noe

**II. Guest Speakers**

No Guest Speakers

**III. Old Business**

No Old Business

**IV. New Business**

- A. Subdivision Application (Annslee Cove) Parcel ID: 163-00-01-091-000, Woodward Lake Rd. by JSMG Development, LLC. Gary Thigpen the developer with JSMG Development is here to join the Planning Commission during the work session.

Burt asked the developer, Gary Thigpen, to update the commissioners on the project. Thigpen said at the last Work Session the Commissions gave some suggestions and since then they have created one acre lots that back up to the airport side and they are also in line with the Aeronautics commission. Brown asked what the typical use for the

common space was. Thigpen said it will be for community use such as a venue or playground, he went on to say that all homeowners will have access to the pond through a gated access.

- B. Land Management Ordinance (LMO) Chapter Review Per Planning Commission discussion at the Work Session on January 27, 2021 chapters will be reviewed by the Planning Commission in three separate groups. The first group is Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. John Ford the Vice President at Robert and Company and lead consultant on the LMO is here to join the Planning Commission during the work session.

Ford said he would be leading a presentation in the regular meeting but was there to answer questions. He went over what has been proposed which is doing a very significant review of chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 as part of the first element in reviewing the detail of the proposed ordinance. He reminded the Commissioners that the draft they are reviewing is a July draft and they know there will be more changes to be made that's part of this process. He asked if they had any questions regarding the schedule or how they needed to proceed. Brown asked if they were allowed to bring the dialogue with people in the Work Session and Marine, the County Attorney, said they are supposed to wait until the Public Hearing at 6pm.

**V. Adjourn**

McNeill made a motion to adjourn. Presley seconded the motion. Burt put the motion to a vote. All voted in favor (6-0). Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 5:10pm.

**Edgefield County Planning Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
Sweetwater Baptist Church Gymnasium  
February 11, 2021  
6:00 PM**

---

<b>Chair:</b>	James Burt – Dist. I	<b>District Seats:</b>	Rodney Ashcraft – Dist. II
<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Brett McNeill – At Large		Tracy Hamilton – Dist. III
<b>At Large Seats:</b>	Joel Presley		Karlene Butler – Dist. IV
<b>County Council</b>	TBD		Todd Brown – Dist. V
<b>Liaison:</b>			

The Edgefield County Planning Commission Meeting was held on Thursday February 11, 2021 at the Sweetwater Baptist Church Gymnasium at 198 Sweetwater Road in North Augusta at 6:00pm. Notice of the time date and agenda of this meeting was provided to The Edgefield Advertiser and others when requested. Any questions regarding the Planning Commission should be directed to the County’s Planner Kevin Singletary [ksingletary@edgefieldcounty.sc.gov](mailto:ksingletary@edgefieldcounty.sc.gov)

**Members present:** Burt, Presley, Hamilton, McNeill, Butler, Ashcraft, and Brown.

**Staff present:** Clark, Marine, Paradise, Singletary, and Wall.

**Guests:** John Ford

**VI. Call to Order**

A. Opening Remarks and Invocation

Given by Dr. Paul Noe

B. Pledge

**VII. Approval of Agenda**

A. Approval of February 11, 2021 Meeting Agenda

McNeill made a motion to approve the February 11, 2021 agenda. Ashcraft seconded the motion. Burt put the motion to a vote. All voted in favor (7-0). Motion passed.

**VIII. Approval of Minutes**

A. Approval of January 14, 2021 Work Session Meeting Minutes

Brown made a motion to approve the November 12, 2020 Work Session Meeting minutes. McNeill seconded the motion. Burt put the motion to a vote. All voted in favor (7-0). Motion Passed.

B. Approval of January 14, 2021 Meeting Minutes

McNeill made a motion to approve the November 12, 2020 Regular Meeting minutes. Butler seconded the motion. Burt put the motion to a vote. All voted in favor (7-0). Motion Passed.

**IX. Guest Speakers**

A. John Ford the Vice President at Robert and Company and lead consultant to Edgefield County on the Land Management Ordinance (LMO) project

i. Introduction

Ford explained that he was he was the consultant for Edgefield County and he hoped this would resolve some of the misinformation and questions people had.

**X. Reports**

A. LMO Schedule Staff and the Consultants have updated the schedule for the remainder of the LMO drafting process per Planning Commission discussion at the January 27, 2021 Work Session.

Burt said that all the Commissioners should have a copy of this schedule and there were no reports from staff at that time.

**XI. Old Business**

No Old Business

**XII. New Business**

A. Subdivision Application (Annslee Cove) Parcel ID: 163-00-01-091-000, Woodward Lake Rd. by JSMG Development, LLC.

i. Public Hearing

There were no comments.

ii. Planning Commission Review

Burt stated that the subdivision was compliant with the regulations of Edgefield County for preliminary approval and asked for a motion. McNeill made a motion to approve the preliminary plans for Annslee Cove. Presley seconded the motion. Burt asked for a discussion, there was none. Burt put the motion to a vote. All voted in favor (7-0). Motion passed.

B. Draft Land Management Ordinance and Draft Zoning Map

i. Consultant Presentation

Burt turned the floor over to Ford for his presentation.

Ford went over the following topics in his power point presentation.

- The purpose of the Land Management Ordinance (LMO).
- How the LMO will be used.
- The Timeline for the LMO and the process
- The LMO Code update process
- The status of the LMO as of February 11, 2021
- What is currently zoned in Edgefield County and that map
- The current zoning categories
- The 2019 Comprehensive Plan and the takeaways

- The LMO big issues
- If Zoning is not provided
- Why the LMO is needed and why it should move forward
- What is needed from the public
- What the LMO consists of and the existing County Codes
- What is drawn from Current County Codes
- The LMO reorganizes complex information
- The LMO Outline
- Comparison with other Jurisdictions and how its unique to Edgefield County
- The Proposed LMO Zoning Districts and draft Map
- Chapter 2 Use Table (difference between Principal and Accessary Use Tables)
- Chapter 2 Zoning – Rural Residential Zones
- Chapter 2 Zoning – Suburban Residential Zones
- Chapter 2 Zoning – Commercial & Mixed-Use Zones
- Chapter 3 Overlays
- Chapter 4 Restrictions on Particular Uses
- Chapter 6 Building and Site Design
- Contact Information for Public input
- How the LMO will be used by Edgefield County
- Chapter 18 – Environment
- Chapter 24 – Land Development
- Chapter 30 -Manufactured Housing
- Chapter 44 – Streets & Sidewalks
- LMO draft zoning districts residential, non-residential, special zoning, and overlays)

Burt thanked Ford for his presentation and the public for their patience in listening.

ii. Public Hearing

Burt opened by saying that due to the number of public comments received from the website and in emails, the County Attorney (Marine) recommended the Commissioners read them later and make them available to the public. He asked Marine to explain the process. Marine stated there are approximately seventy comments from members of the public introduced online and said some are two pages long so if they read them all out loud the people here tonight will not get a chance to speak so he suggested the comments be placed on public record and the record be put on the website so members of the public can also view it. Burt asked for a motion. McNeill made a motion. Ashcraft seconded the motion and added he was requesting the additional letter he received at the beginning of the meeting be added to the rest for the official motion. Marine added all

comments that have been received. Burt put the motion to a vote. All voted in favor (7-0). Motion passed.

Burt went on to say they were limiting comments to two minutes for the sake of time.

Rick Oster – District Two

Stated he chose to live in Edgefield County at the end of a dirt road so he would be left to his own devices and personal liberties to manage his property in the way he sees fit, He said the LMO and subsequent zoning is not primarily for the protection of the property rights, they will facilitate the needs and wants of developers and be part of the county they ultimately deem profitable once they're in place and can be changed at the whim of this council or future council all the while instituting the prospect of extreme oversight in regards to their property. He wants to preserve his individual property rights as they are.

Curt Barnes – District Five

He said he wanted some clarification on the corridor in the Merriwether area. He read Section 3.7.8 and the section 3.7.8.1.1 and said he is strongly against any overlays in the Merriwether area except on Highway 25. He stated he also had questions about what types of buildings were allowed in the corridor and who determines the setbacks. He expressed that Aiken County doesn't have overlays on those same roads coming into Edgefield County from Aiken and added that Edgefield's maps are dated 2005 and 2014 and need to be updated.

James Oliver – District Five

He thanked the Commissioners for everything they are doing and said he was a Commissioner for approximately seven years himself. He stated he had a copy of his statements that he wanted included in his official record. He stated Mr. Cooper fired him because he didn't want Annison Point to be a proposed development due to high density and the drainage problems. He expressed that he thought the Comprehensive Plan should be the overriding document for the County. Then he went on to say the Planning Commission should have been put on a moratorium along with the LMO because it made it hard when new developments came in to be approved and all the Commissioners had to use was the Comprehensive Plan.

Dione' Carroll – Attorney in Aiken County (Carroll Law Offices, P.A.)

She said she was representing at least nineteen citizens of Edgefield County and just saw the LMO last week and was shocked and amazed, so they organized very quickly and has submitted written comments. She recognized how difficult it was to put together but begged them not to rush through it in a month and do it halfway and let the County suffer. She said the people of Edgefield County needed the opportunity to meaningfully comment, meaningfully propose revisions, in order to have a meaningful LMO that they can recommend or no LMO at all. She gave some examples of why she thought the LMO was wrong and explained why solar farms shouldn't be classified as commercial or light industry and allowed in residential areas. Then she went on to say that people need to vent and be heard and two minutes isn't sufficient for that. She suggested getting people in small groups for the Commissioners to hear their comments and how this will impact them.

Ashley Williams – District Two

He said he lives adjacent to where Tavern Hill will be built and has a cattle farm that's been there since the sixties and warned anyone moving into Tavern Hill that they will be living next to a cattle farm and all that it entails. He went on to say he thought people on the Commission had financial gain as a motive. He added he agrees Edgefield needs guidelines but not the ones being proposed.

There was some discussion about people that had signed up to speak but because of COVID-19 restriction were not allowed in the building, it was suggested that some people could go out so these people could come in and speak.

Jason Furmage – Coronet Drive, District Five

He said his subdivision, Spring Crest, would be zoned Village Residential and expressed his concern for the development that would be allowed. He said he came before this committee last year opposing a new subdivision, which was thirty tri-plex's being allowed in the existing footprint and stated they have a protective convenance only allowing single-family residents. He asked for them to at least be put under Large Lot Residential or Suburban Residential. He also asked anyone on the Committee that had a financial interest to recuse themselves from voting on it.

Tim F. Smith – Woodward Lake Rd

He explained he moved from Aiken County to get away from development and asked if the County was interested in making

money or interested in the people having a say in what they want.

Jason Kreps – District Five

He started by saying he opposed any type of zoning. He said he owns property at Martintown Road and Bella Vita Way and he is opposed to any type of zoning. He went on to explain why saying that zoning takes away the core of what makes Edgefield County attractive. He said they purchased property in Edgefield County to escape overcrowded North Augusta and the HOA in Aiken County. He said the proposed zoning would put his property in a commercial zone and would prevent him from building his dream home and the government should not be able to tell him what to do with his land.

Ricky Medlin – District Two

He said he has lived here thirty-six years and built five homes here. He expressed not wanting to be turned into Evans Georgia and said \$280,000 was wasted on the firm to tell us what we need here and added that if Edgefield County members were not happy in Edgefield County they should move to Evans or North Augusta. He said that the lots for proposed subdivisions will not perk and then if they come and tell him if he can or can't have a trailer in his yard, and "woe be you (the Commissioners) when you tell me that."

Louis Pazdalski - Rolling Hills Ct

He said they moved here about a year and a half ago to be left alone and not to have the government tell them what to do. He said he did not locate to a rural property to have high taxes and zero rights. He said the LMO is poorly developed and was asinine.

Tammy Benenhaley – District Two

She said she loves where she lives and was raised there and asked them to take the time to talk to the people here and listen to them and let them determine the best interest of the County. She said Edgefield is known for its history and she doesn't want to see it turned into a metropolitan area. She said the development is nice in certain areas but for the majority of them they don't want to see it and want to live in the country and do what they want in their own yards.

Sara Dimsdale - Bobwhite Ln

She said they moved here two years ago for the sole reason of getting out of LMO's and HOA's. She said they came from rural areas that have been taking over and said they can have a community that can prosper and flourish for everyone and still

be a rural community. She added she hoped they would consider their constituents in the County that has elected them because this is not what they want.

Lisa Whitaker - Windy Rd, District Four

She said they moved here nine years ago from a housing development from outside of Washington swamp DC. She said for the \$290,000 they paid the suits, they could've used to revitalize up town, refurbish the buildings so it could bring business downtown. She said this is the wrong way to go.

Ken Richardson – District Two

He said since they had a quorum and were conducting business, he prompted the Commissioners to make a motion to throw the LMO in the trash. He told them to vote on it right now and stop it then there would be no more hearings and they would be done with it.

Burt said that wasn't in order and they couldn't address that during the Public Hearing. Richardson continued to tell them to make a motion. There was a lot of disruption and yelling from the crowd speaking out of turn and calling for motions and votes saying it was all about money. Burt called for order. Marine said this was a Public Hearing and this was not part of the agenda. The yelling out of order continued with the attendees demanding a vote and started voting amongst themselves.

A man stood up and didn't give his name and said the consultant needed to wear boots because he was getting deep in the corner he was in. He started pointing his finger at the Commission and Burt asked him not to. He went on to say he would if he wanted to, but he wouldn't. Then he said his family has owned land here for 125 years, in the country, and said who the hell does the commission think they are to come and tell him what he can and can't do on his property. He asked if Burt was the captain and Burt said this was a Commission and they were only doing their job and said if he continued to be out of order he would have to call the deputy. The gentleman continued to ask who their boss was and Burt asked him to take his seat in which he replied no, so Burt asked the officers to come and remove him. The crowd erupted into loud disapproval. He went on to say the Commission was greedy and they lie to feed their greed. The officers came and took the microphone and asked him to sit down and he eventually did.

Lesley Joyner – District Five

Stated that she just heard about this and said its insane that they have rules for their rules. She went on to say she got a

letter stating her tire decorations are a nuisance and she can't have them within thirty feet from the road, but yet there's trash all over the county. She said she's not allowed to put decorations up at her shop and has to park her truck behind the shop but she's expected her to clean it and maintain it. She went over some of the rules the LMO was proposing and said they are asinine and needs to go away.

Steven Bryant – District One

He stated he's a professional engineer and has degrees in Agricultural Engineering and currently makes his living developing subdivisions, but he doesn't do them in Edgefield because the people love their country life. He went on to say he's going to move his family here and doesn't want to see Edgefield turn into North Augusta. He added the consultant from Atlanta doesn't understand the value of Edgefield.

Allen Berry – Cedar Creek Rd

He emphasized that people in Edgefield County are farmers so they didn't need an LMO to protect them against pig and cow farmers. He went on to call the consultant a smuck and criticized the County for paying \$180,000 to have someone from the city come and tell them what's best for the farmers in the country. He asked who was going to protect the farmers from people like him (the consultant). He said he doesn't want the government telling him what he can do on his land.

Karen Thomas – District Two

She said she and her husband moved here forty years ago, and that Cheves Creek flooded and destroyed their walking bridge. She said they (the Commissioners) have a progressive agenda that's trickling down from the UN Twenty-third agenda and told them to stop the ten-year plan.

Howard Hensley – District Two

Said he moved here from Columbia County and stated they could always follow the dollar if they wanted to end up like Columbia County. He said he's a retired DNR captain in Georgia with twenty-eight years in law enforcement and said he had empathy and listened to people. He asked the Commissioners to have empathy towards the people speaking.

John Blume – Hwy 19

He said he has 233 acres and according to the zoning plan they will make 7% of it either commercial or industrial. He said he was here with some of beekeepers and according to the plan he can't have bees, goats, or chickens. He said he knows it's a work in progress and the Commissioners will address some of

these issues but he doesn't want his property commercial or industrial. He said he didn't understand why that stretch of land couldn't stay agricultural since there's only one business between Greenhouse Road and the Aiken Countyline. He said the County should put this on a ballot and let the people vote on what they want in the County. He stated the people there (at the meeting) was the County, not people that come from Aiken and want to turn Edgefield into Aiken.

Marcie Horner – Murrah Forrest

She said she moved from a small lot in Aiken to Edgefield and said she's a professional facilitator and her recommendation is to get people from the County in each zone together and let them provide input on what they want for the County. She said she would volunteer to facilitate it for free.

Emily Floyd – Windy Ridge

She said she owns a 27-acre sheep farm and said they are not zoned, but they are trying to make it large lot. She said her farm is up for sale and this affects whoever buys it. She expressed concern for the six-month grandfather clause.

Paige Ouzts Owens – District One

She stated they want to clear 1200-aces and put 800-acre solar farm 300 feet from her house. She argued that a solar farm is not agricultural, she feels it is industrial and added a Council member said the LMO is to prevent industrial in a residential area. She went on to give reasons why she didn't want it near her house and said the LMO will not protect her because it classifies a solar farm as utility. She said the proposed land is not worn out or unusable, there's pine trees there, but it will be ruined after the solar farm.

Commissioner Ashcraft stated he was on County Council for eight years and they had some experience in looking at the Comprehensive Plan but they didn't think it would go this far this quick. He said he was new to the Commission and he would have to vote no against it. He asked for the citizens to give respect to the members of the Planning Commission because it's harder than Council and they are going to have to really look at it and make a good decision.

Burt said they appreciate the comments and they were not said in vain. He said they would go through the written comments and the LMO and make a decision they've been charged with. He said to continue sending comments to Kevin (Singletary) and they will review those as well.

McNeill said they appreciate all the comments and they do read them all and asked them to please keep in mind that this is the start of the process with the Planning Commission and stated they needed constructive comments from the entire County.

Burt closed the Public Hearing at 8:08pm

iii. Planning Commission Discussion

Brown said he was the Commissioner for District 5. He said he agrees that this is being done too quickly. He went on to say it means a lot to him too because he lives here and grew up here and said it's not about us versus you, it's about coming up with what is best for Edgefield County. He explained zoning is a protection and not a restriction and said his concern is they will open themselves up as a County to any and everything if they don't come up with some sort of organization as to what can go there. He encouraged the citizens to be specific and constructive about what they wanted to see in the County.

Presley said he cares about farm land and is a member and a supporter of three major conservation groups and has helped put hundreds and hundreds of acres under permanent conservation so they could not be developed. He said he wants to simplify and protect property rights and facilitate citizens to be able to do what they want to do on their land, but at the same time wants to try to protect them from things they don't want like solar farms. He said it can be hard to give you complete freedom to do anything you want to do and then take your neighbors freedom away to not use his land as a solar farm. He said his understanding is that the Planning Commission cannot vote on this LMO, the vote is with County Council so what they legally can do is recommend something to County Council and asked the citizens to please have understanding and patience while they continue this process.

Hamilton said she's from District Three and explained that she has also had issues about being told what she could and couldn't do on her property so she understands where they are coming from but that's why it's important for them to make recommendations and work together on this. She added that arguing, name calling and badgering the Commissioners is wrong and unfair and promised that she would not agree to it if it wasn't right.

**XIII. Comments by the Planning Commission Chair**

Burt said he appreciated all the comments and the Commission will continue to do what their charge is. He said they're going to do what's best for the community and urged citizens to come to the meetings and sit in on their discussions

**XIV. Adjourn**

Burt made a motion to adjourn. McNeill seconded the motion. Burt put the motion to a vote. All voted in favor (7-0). Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 8:27pm.

***Attached:*** Submitted comments for the Planning Commission meeting, website comments, map comments, comments received for the Planning commission after the meeting deadline.