

## **AGENDA**

### **PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE OF COUNTY COUNCIL**

Heckle Complex  
Large Conference Room  
1070 Heckle Boulevard  
Rock Hill, South Carolina

Tuesday, February 11, 2025  
5:00pm

Committee Members  
Chairwoman, Debi Cloninger  
Council member, Andy Litten  
Council member, Tommy Adkins

**A. Call to Order**, Debi Cloninger, Chair

**B. Order of Business**

- Discussion regarding the Rural Zoning Project
- Committee to approve the minutes from the December 19, 2024 Planning and Zoning Committee meeting.

**Executive Session**

**Matters for Consideration Following Executive Session**

**Adjournment**

## Minutes

### Planning and Zoning Committee Meeting

December 19, 2024

6:00pm

The York County Planning and Zoning Committee met on the above date at 6:00pm, in the large conference room, 1070 Heckle Boulevard, Rock Hill, SC, with the following members present; Council member, Debi Cloninger and Council member William “Bump” Roddey. Also present were, County Manager, Josh Edwards, Assistant County Manager, Tom Couch, County Attorney, Michael Kendree, and Clerk to Council, Karen Brogdon.

Jonathan Buono, Rachel Grothe, Josh Reinhardt, Diane Dil, Jeff Kirchner and Rick Abboud also attended.

Chairwoman Debi Cloninger called the meeting to order.

**Discussion regarding minor subdivision lookback:** Jonathan Buono explained that the subdivision issue needs clarification as it is being raised to the Committee by staff.

Mr. Buono reported that it is undefined how far back in time staff should look to determine if another minor subdivision can be created out of a previous minor subdivision.

Potential Options:

1. No change – rely on similar 20-year timeframe for family exemptions.
2. Add definitive clarity for property owners and sub-dividers:
  - a. Set a specific timeframe to specific # of years
    - i. Typically, between 2-10 years
  - b. Set to specific date, where after no further minor subdivision can be done
    - i. Creation of minor subdivisions: 10-21-2019
    - ii. Land Development Code update: 3-1-2022

Motion was made by Council member William “Bump” Roddey and seconded by Council member Debi Cloninger to recommend for consideration by full Council option 2(b)(i) to set to specific date, whereafter no further minor subdivision can be done, creation of minor subdivisions: 10-21-2019. Motion Carried.

**Discussion regarding non-conformities:** Rachel Grothe, Zoning and Development Supervisor explained that non-conformity is existing development that lawfully existed prior to zoning, or a zoning code change, but does not otherwise comply with the effective zoning code.

Lots – property may not meet minimum lot size or dimensional standards (width, depth)

Site Improvements – site may not meet all requirements as prescribed under current code (buffers, landscaping, tree save, amenities, parking)

Structures – structure may be located within a required setback (front, side, rear)

Uses – use may no longer be permitted within the zone district in which it's located

Ms. Grothe explained that combining nonconforming lots issue may need to be changed, raised to the committee by staff.

Problem: code does not allow for the recombination of nonconforming lots unless it results in a conforming lot. Therefore, the potential to lessen a nonconformity is lost.

Potential Options:

- No change – nonconforming lots cannot be combined unless the combination will result in a property that is conforming
- Change the code to allow nonconforming lots to be made less nonconforming, for example by adding more land to them.

Motion was made by Council member William “Bump” Roddey and seconded by Council member Debi Cloninger to recommend for consideration by full council to modify the code to allow nonconforming lots to be made less nonconforming. Motion Carried.

### **Non-conforming Uses – Residential**

Rachel Grothe explained that this is the ability for property owners to add accessory structures and additions to nonconforming residential uses may need to be changed, raised to the committee by staff.

Problem: improvements such as additions or accessory structures like decks and sheds cannot be added to lots that contain nonconforming residential uses.

Potential Options:

- No change – accessory structures (decks, sheds) and additions cannot be added to existing legal nonconforming residential uses.
- Change code to allow property owners the ability to add accessory structures and additions to their existing legal nonconforming residential uses
  - Place a limit on expansion area;
  - Allow expansion provided no additional dwelling units are added

Motion was made by Council member William “Bump” Roddey and seconded by Council member Debi Cloninger to recommend for consideration by full council to modify the ordinance to allow expansion of nonconforming residential uses that does not increase the number of dwelling units. Motion Carried.



## **Nonconforming Uses – Nonresidential**

Rachel Grothe explained that adding accessory structures or small additions to nonresidential nonconforming uses may need to be changed, raised to the committee by staff.

Problem: reasonable additions and expansions are not permitted to nonconforming uses.

Potential Options:

- No change – nonconforming nonresidential uses cannot be expanded, enlarged, or increased in intensity
- Change code to allow property owners that ability to add a reasonable amount (10%-20%) to their existing legal nonconforming nonresidential uses.
  - Allow expansion of use internal to an existing building;
  - Allow for special exception for expansions beyond admin

Motion was made by Council member William “Bump” Roddey and seconded by Council member Debi Cloninger to recommend for consideration by full council to modify the ordinance to allow expansion of nonconforming nonresidential uses to allow property owners to add up to 10% of their existing legal nonconforming nonresidential use, if more than 10% then it must go to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a special exception and to allow expansion of use internal to an existing building. Motion Carried.

## **Discussion regarding Wall Signs**

Jeff Kirchner, Associate Planner explained that the number or area of wall signs per wall may need to be revised, as raised to the committee by staff.

Problem: large buildings and buildings suitable to display signs for more than one business identification sign are currently not allowed more than one wall sign, up to 200sf. This may be too restrictive both for buildings with large wall façade areas, and multi-tenant buildings with multiple business signs.

Reasons to allow more than one wall sign:

- Already allowed on multi-tenant buildings
- The county has existing buildings with multiple wall signs which are now nonconforming
- Other jurisdictions generally allow more than one with the restriction being on the total wall sign area

Reasons to modify maximum wall sign area:

- Large building walls may need more than the maximum 200sf total for displaying signs
- Some other jurisdictions allow more than 200sf total sign area

- A greater maximum are can be conditioned on wall area, zoning district, sign district, uses, or by a special exception

Potential Options:

- No change – new developments will only have one sign per wall, and a 200sf maximum message area.
- Do no limit the number of signs per wall, and keep the total maximum allowed sign message are at 200sf.
- Do not limit the number of signs per wall and allow more options for maximum wall area.
  - Option A – increase the total maximum area for multiple signs, but keep the 200sf area for any individual sign
  - Option B – increase the maximum area for an individual sign and/or total wall message area.
  - Option C – Increase the maximum wall sign area, but only for certain zoning districts, sign districts, uses, or by a special exception.

Committee members requested that staff research further and provide additional options regarding the percentage allowed in the total sign area.

**Discussion regarding the rural zoning project – scope update**

Jonathan Buono, provide information regarding the Rural Zoning Project:

1. Purpose
  - a. What is the purpose of each rural zoning district?
  - b. Are the purposes distinct and are all rural needs met?
2. Implementation
  - a. Does the implementation of each district and related code provisions, match its intended purpose?
  - b. Do the rural districts collectively implement the Comp Plan?
3. Outreach
  - a. Stakeholder focus groups, community meetings
    - i. Rural residents, farmers, developers, PC
  - b. What does the community see as appropriate for rural areas?
4. Options
  - a. What could be changed to align the Comp Plan, district purpose and community expectations?
    - i. Does the Plan or district purposes need to be changed?
  - b. What are the outcomes to land use into the future for potential changes?
    - i. Text amendments, county-initiated rezoning?

Rural Zoning Districts and related code provisions:

- Agricultural Conservation (AGC)

- Agricultural Conservation – I (AGC-I)
- Rural Development (RUD)
- Rural Development – I (RUD-I)
- Rural Commercial (RC)
- Rural Industrial (RI)
- Uses
- Residential subdivision developments
- Lot size
- Dwellings per one lot
- Setbacks
- Road frontage
- Family exception (road access)
- Lot area (right-of-way)
- Tree conservation and open space
- Evolution of County code

Staff and Management reported that a consultant will not be hired for this project, it will all be done in house by staff. This could take at least 6 months.

A memo will be provided to Council with a full timeframe of the project.

Motion was made by Council member William “Bump” Roddey and seconded by Council member Debi Cloninger to approve the minutes from the October 23, 2024 Planning & Zoning Committee meeting. Motion Carried.

Motion was made by Council member William “Bump” Roddey and seconded by Council member Debi Cloninger to adjourn the meeting. Motion Carried.