County Council Retreat January 2020





- July 2, 2019 County Council approved contracting with Robert and Company to develop a Land Management Plan
- Robert and Company had previously developed the Comprehensive Land Use and Transportation Plan that was adopted by Council on June 4, 2019.
- The experience with the development of the Comprehensive Land Use and Transportation Plan for Edgefield County placed Robert and Company in a uniquely knowledgeable position concerning Edgefield County issues.



LMO Steering Committee was designed by the Planning Commission with input from County Council with the following members:

James F. Burt "Fab" Planning Commission Chairman

Franklin Gabriel Planning Commission

**Buddy Smith Planning Commission** 

James Johnson Planning Commission

**James Oliver Planning Commission** 

George Thornton Vice-Chairman Planning Commission

**Brett McNeill Planning Commission** 

Arthur Biggs Council Liaison to Planning Commission

Tracy Freeman Chairman County Fire Board

John Hare Director of Edgefield County Water and Sewer Authority

Dr. Kevin O'Gorman Superintendent of Edgefield County Public Schools

Charles Blackston Developer Representative



- On August 27, 2019 the LMO Steering Committee met for the first time.
- It was decided that the Committee would meet once monthly on the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday at 5pm in the County Council Chambers, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday in November and December due to Holidays.
- The first major topic of discussion was the schedule for the Committee and listening meetings (Meetings designed for public input). Listening meetings were scheduled for October 15,16,17, and 21. Staff identified McKendree UMC church, Sweetwater Community Center, Johnston Town Hall, and Edgefield County Council chambers as locations that would carry the information gathering sessions to all parts of the County



- Review of the process and public involvement lead by the consultant. The consultant went over the process the Steering Committee would partake in.
- Consultant shared plans and ideas for public engagement with the Committee.
- The consultant asked the committee to review a list of stake holders that had been identified.
- The committee confirmed that the list was wholistic and would notify the Consultant if any individuals or groups came to mind that needed to be included.



#### On October 24, 2019 Meeting

- The focus of this meeting was to summarize what had been learned from the public during the listening meetings, and identify next steps.
- Ford reported that the meetings in total had a signed in attendance of 103 individuals. County Council members, Planning Commissioners, Committee members, County Staff, and members of the public were among those who attended.
- It is anticipated that perhaps even more came, since not everyone signed in. Ford stated he was pleased with this level of turnout, and suspects more will be at the next round of meetings in February when draft materials are prepared.



- Consultant went over what was learned from the listening meetings, interviews, and surveys. He went over the surveys and broke down the answer to each question by percentage.
- Each Committee member shared what they thought about the Public Listening Meetings. Ford explained how all this information was gathered and what the point was. Ford stated that we learned what is going to be appropriate in one part of the County, likely will not be in another, which was anticipated.
- Growth is a major concern for people, particularly in the southern end of the County. In the northern some protections are desired.
- Much of what was learned reinforced what was learned during the creation of the Comprehensive Plan. Ford discussed the potential overlay districts that may be needed on Martintown Rd, Sweetwater Rd, Hwy 25, and around the towns of Edgefield and Johnston. The overlays would mainly protect the aesthetic nature of these locations with the exception of Hwy 25, it could be used to define an aesthetic.



#### November 19, 2019 Meeting:

- The sub-consultant Paige Hatley gave a description of all 11 articles contained in the LMO, there relation to each other, and the current order
- Ford stated that figuring out the order, and where things should be was much easier at this stage, then when the drafting has begun. The consultants asked for discussion and suggestions.
- The order that staff presented was one of following the land development process, where sections where in order of occurrence. There was general consensus that this order made since, and could be used going forward. There was also discussion about making the document understandable, navigable, and readable.



- Consultants presented the Committee with a packet of definitions.
- Highlighted was the way the definitions had been set up, and that he had pulled from multiple communities, including the County's current ordinance.
- Ford specified that they were not suggesting to use all of the definitions, but to show the Committee what was out there and for them to consider them. Ford explained how the building code definitions are adopted, as are the NACIS codes, and what is shown in the latest Webster's dictionary, unless otherwise stated in the definitions adopted in the ordinance.



December 17, 2019 Meeting

- Steering Committee agreed on a heading format for LMO
- Replicates the use of the State Laws use in identifying sections
- Should provide easy and concise referencing



- Ford reviewed the table of land uses from the Comprehensive Plan and the land use maps
- He described each use and what elements were considered allowed, conditional, and not allowed. There was a question about changing the status of an item, from allowed to conditional.
- It was also noted that in some areas a land use that is identified as allowed, may have a zoning within that area that has limitation on it. This being because land use maps are broad guidelines, where zoning is parcel specific.



- Ford conceptualized a zoning district that would be very basic that would be in place for most of the County.
  - that would broadly allow many uses, but have some protections for high impact uses, such as a chicken or hog farm.
  - There was also discussion of an agricultural business/industrial zoning, that would be for large scale agricultural business uses, such as processing and distribution. This district would also have some potential residential allowances, for farm homes, and worker housing for seasonal jobs.



#### **Commercial Zoning**

- The two districts that had been conceptualized could be described as general commercial, and neighborhood commercial.
  - Neighborhood commercial being the more residentially serving, and less intense type
  - General commercial being larger stores, high traffic impact



## Land Management Ordinance Residential Zoning

- Ford identified about 4 zonings that would fall into this category.
- Tentatively identified as:
  - Residential Estate (RE)
  - Residential Large Lot (RL)
  - Residential Suburban (RS)
  - Residential Village (RV)



# Land Management Ordinance Overlay Districts

- Sweetwater Road
- Martintown Road
- Hwy 25
- Corridors around Towns of Johnston and Edgefield
  - Each District will address aesthetic values of the particular district.



# Land Management Ordinance Path Forward

- Define Zoning District
- Identify Uses Allowed by Zoning District
- Develop Design Standards for Zoning Districts (lot sizes, setback, etc.)
- Develop Standards for Overlay Districts