

Comprehensive Plan Changes

Below are all the changes made to the Comprehensive Plan by the Edgefield County Council during first, second, and third readings, in meetings held April 2, 2019, May 7, 2019, and June 4, 2019.

Recommendation 1: That County Council on this third reading of a revised Comprehensive Plan at the June 1, 2021, meeting vote to reverse the Comprehensive Plan to the original version of the Plan as given to the County Council by the Planning Commission in February 2021. In other words, reverse all the changes made by County Council during the three readings.

Recommendation 2: That County Council delay voting on this change for one month and take up this recommendation at the July 6, 2021, County Council meeting. This delay gives citizens and Council an opportunity to review these proposed final changes thoroughly. This delay does not impact or delay in any way the work ongoing on the Land Management Ordinance (LMO) or small group meetings.

The following 10 changes were made to the Comprehensive Plan by Council during its three readings. The impacts of changing the Comprehensive Plan back to the original document delivered to County Council by the Planning Commission have been reviewed by Roger LeDuc, Doc Hart, John Ford, and Kevin Singletary. All four agree that reversing all changes to the Comprehensive Plan as described above are very small impacts or no impact at all, and all changes will not impact the County's future in a negative way.

Those changes made by County Council are:

- 1) Brought forward from previous comprehensive plan a bullet that says we'd encourage retail development around existing urban areas.

Impact of changing the wording back to the original wording: No impact to the Comprehensive Plan or to the County if we revert back to the original language prior to first reading. This kind of development will occur at all places zoning allows it to. If this change is needed, the Planning Commission can take it up and make a specific recommendation.

- 2) Two charts don't reflect multi-family residential in three different zoning areas.

Impact of changing the wording back to the original wording: No impact to the Comprehensive Plan or to the County if we revert back to the original language prior to first reading. Multi-family residential topic is included in the Planning Commission's version of the Comprehensive Plan and will be included in the LMO. If this change is needed, the Planning Commission can take it up and make a specific recommendation.

- 3) Adds 5 overlay districts

Impact of changing the wording back to the original wording: Removing these 5 new overlay zones has no impact to the Comprehensive Plan or to the County if we revert back to the original language prior to first reading. If this change is needed, the Planning Commission can take it up and make a specific recommendation.

4) Renumbering Chapter 9

Impact of changing the wording back to the original wording: No impact to the Comprehensive Plan or to the County if we revert back to the original numbering prior to first reading.

5) Change to Estate Residential section, page 7.6, by adding the following language: “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).”

Impact of changing the wording back to the original wording: No impact to the Comprehensive Plan or to the County if we revert back to the original language prior to first reading. If this change is needed, the Planning Commission can take it up and make a specific recommendation.

6) Change in Table 7.4 on page 7.11 on the Suburban Density Residential line would read straight across as All Single Family Residential/Light-residential-oriented commercial/Commercial and Industrial.

Impact of changing the wording back to the original wording: No impact to the Comprehensive Plan or to the County if we revert back to the original language prior to first reading. If this change is needed, the Planning Commission can take it up and make a specific recommendation.

7) Estate Residential section changed to: 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) 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.

Impact of changing the wording back to the original wording: No impact to the Comprehensive Plan or to the County if we revert back to the original language prior to first reading. If this change is needed, the Planning Commission can take it up and make a specific recommendation.

8) Map amended by removing the densities from the map only.

Impact of changing the wording back to the original wording: No impact to the Comprehensive Plan or to the County if we revert back to the original map prior to first reading. If this change is needed, the Planning Commission can take it up and make a specific recommendation.

9) Changed language on page 7.9 under the Suburban Residential section to remove “Average lot size may vary from 0.5 acre to 2 or 3-acre lots depending on sewer service or requirements for septic tank fields.” and replace it with “Natural conditions, connectivity to utilities and the market are to determine lot sizes.” This section now reads: “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.”

Impact of changing the wording back to the original wording: No impact to the Comprehensive Plan or to the County if we revert back to the original language prior to first reading. If this change is needed, the Planning Commission can take it up and make a specific recommendation. Planning Commission already recommends changing this language back to their original language.

- 10) Change in 7.6 Estate Residential category to: “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.”

Impact of changing the wording back to the original wording: No impact to the Comprehensive Plan or to the County if we revert back to the original language prior to first reading. If this change is needed, the Planning Commission can take it up and make a specific recommendation. Planning Commission already recommends changing this language back to their original language.