

Minutes
Regular Meeting of the Florence County Planning Commission
Tuesday, June 23, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.
County Complex, Room 803
180 N. Irby St., Florence, South Carolina 29501

The Florence County Planning Department staff posted the agenda for the meeting on the information boards at the main entrance and lobby of the County Complex and on the information board in the lobby of the Planning and Building Inspection Departments office.

The agenda was also mailed to the media.

I. Call to Order:

Chairman Cheryl Floyd called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. Attendance:

Commissioners Present: Cheryl Floyd, Chairman
Dwight Johnson, Vice-Chairman
Allie Brooks
Doris Lockhart
Glynn Willis
John Martin
Chris Mishoe
Jeffrey Tanner
Gregory Miller

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: J. Shawn Brashear, Planning Director
Ethan Brown, Deputy Director
Holly Smith, Senior Planner
Patrick Ward, IT Dept, A/V Support

Public Attendance: See sign-in sheets on file with the Florence County Planning Department.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd led the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag and provided the invocation for the meeting.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the meeting and recognized Commissioner Glynn Willis for his service to the Citizens of Florence County and to the many appointed Commissions' to which he has served over his many years in Public Service. This would be his last Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Glynn Willis thanked everyone for their kind words and for the opportunities he has had in service to the Citizens of Florence County. It has been his honor to have served.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd requested a review of the Planning Commission meeting minutes from May 26, 2026.

III. Review and Motion of Minutes:

- **Meeting of May 26, 2026**

Motion to approve minutes – Commissioner Allie Brooks made a motion to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of May 26, 2026 / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / Unanimously approved 9 to 0 the minutes of the May 26, 2026, Planning Commission meeting.

IV. Public Hearing:

Map Amendments:

PC#2026-44

Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Three Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. Furthermore, The Requirements Of Florence County Code Of Ordinances, Chapter 30, Zoning Ordinance, Article II. – Zoning District Regulations, Division 7, Corridor Overlay District, Shall Apply To The Property Included In This Amendment That Lays Within Five Hundred Feet (500') Of The Corridor. Any Parcel That Extends Beyond 500' From The Corridor Shall Be Wholly Covered By The Overlay District If The Outer Area Is Twenty Percent (20%) Or Less Of The Total Parcel Size. This Measurement Shall Be Taken From The Roads Edge, Or Curb, And Extend Landwards. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90143-01-006, 90143-01-007.

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <https://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear, Director, Florence County Planning and Building presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the item had been deferred from the May 26, 2026, Planning Commission meeting as staff requested time to make sure that they had the zoning correctly applied to the uses of the property. The unzoned properties are a part of the Highway 76 Corridor project and they are in County Council District seven (7) and the recommended zoning for the properties is CMU, Commercial Mixed Use District. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation providing images of the two properties. He stated that it was debatable whether the properties were landlocked as Day Street ran along the back of the property, and is an unimproved access road owned by the railroad. There are two parcels right beside the properties that were previously recommended for CMU zoning designations. The properties are vacant and wooded lots with one of them being partially used by a neighboring lot. Staff has received no inquiries or comments regarding the recommended zoning for the properties.

There were questions and comments from the Commission.

In response to questions and comments from the Commission Mr. J. Shawn Brashear stated that the properties combined are ten (10) or more acres.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of the Commission if there were any additional questions or discussion from the Commission.

There were no questions, comments or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the forum for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson made a motion that the requested map amendment **PC #2026-44** be approved as presented / Second – Commissioner John Martin / The Commission voted 9 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC #2026-44 for a CMU, Commercial Mixed Use District, zoning designation.**

PC#2026-55

Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Amend The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Three Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. Furthermore, The Requirements Of Florence County Code Of Ordinances, Chapter 30, Zoning Ordinance, Article II. – Zoning District Regulations, Division 7, Corridor Overlay District, Shall Apply To The Property Included In This Amendment That Lays Within Five Hundred Feet (500') Of The Corridor. Any Parcel That Extends Beyond 500' From The Corridor Shall Be Wholly Covered By The Overlay District If The Outer Area Is Twenty Percent (20%) Or Less Of The Total Parcel Size. This Measurement Shall Be Taken From The Roads Edge, Or Curb, And Extend Landwards. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90150-01-043 And 90150-01-044.

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <https://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear, Director, Florence County Planning and Building presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the unzoned properties were part of the Highway 76 corridor project in County Council District Seven (7), east of the City of Florence. He continued with the presentation providing images of the properties across from some of the Airport property. The properties are presently vacant and staff spoke with the property owners, who have indicated that they are fine with the recommended zoning of B-3, General Commercial Use; as this is the best fit for the properties fronting E. Palmetto Street and being the main vein to properties in the back which are zoned B-6, heavy industrial, and allow for a variety of commercial uses.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of the Commission if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

There were no questions, comments or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the forum for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Commissioner Glynn Willis made a motion that the requested map amendment **PC #2026-55** be approved as presented / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / The Commission voted 9 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-55 for a B-3, General Commercial zoning designation.**

PC#2026-56 Map Amendment Requested By McG Capital LLC, (Browder McGill) To Change The Zoning Designation For Property Of Tax Map Number 00275, Block 01, Parcel 134 Located At 4617 East Palmetto Street, Florence SC, From FO/LI, Flex Office/Light Industrial District To CMU, Commercial Mixed-Use District And R-3A, Single Family Residential District.

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <https://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the approximately forty-one point zero nine acres (41.09 acres) of property on the east side of the City of Florence was in County Council District Six (6) and the owner of record was S&P Campbell Enterprises, LLC. Mr. Brashear further stated that some years ago the property was before the Commission for zoning from unzoned to Flex Office/Light Industrial. Sometime after that approved zoning, the area was approved for some multi-family housing along the front of the adjacent properties. At that time the market analysis study identified that multi-family housing was needed in that area around the College. The developer has now come along and intends to do pretty much the same thing. The property is directly across from the Francis Marion Ball Field and years ago was a manufactured home park. The property is currently zoned Flex Office/Light Industrial with the gateway overlay over the frontage of the property. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation showing images of the property and the lines of where access roads previously existed. The applicant and owner of record has presented staff with a plat requesting that the property be split zoned with commercial zoning to the front and residential zoning to the rear. The recommended split zoning does fit the overall goals and plans for the property, to preserve the frontage with commercial uses and housing opportunities in the rear. Presently, the applicant is asking for consideration of the recommended zoning map amendment as they will have to present a sketch plan for consideration review and approval at a later time for the development of the property. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation providing images of the property and the adjacent properties.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of the Commission if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission Mr. Brashear stated that staff had not received any comments or inquiries regarding the requested zoning map amendment. He further stated that the adjacent property consisting of warehouses to the left of the property were Flex Office Life Industrial.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the forum for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

Mr. Gary Finklea, Esq., 814 W. Evans Street, Florence, SC, was present in the meeting and spoke in favor of the requested zoning map amendment. He stated that he was retained by the perspective purchaser for the property and they support the requested zoning map amendment. They were hoping that the recommended zoning map amendment is accepted by the Commission as they were also made aware that no comments or inquiries were received regarding the requested zoning map amendment. The property has been sitting idle for years and the recommended zoning fits the vision for the corridor. The company Browder McGill is actually the principal behind the group that is purchasing the property. McGill's is from Kingstree and they have a footprint within the Pee Dee. They have done their homework and he was glad that they selected him to come, present and speak for them at the Commission meeting. He feels that the split zoning is a great vision for the property, improving the corridor and a compliment to Francis Marion University. He owns property on Freedom Boulevard and they are excited to see the changes to come to bring everything together.

There were questions from the Commission.

In response to question from the Commission, Mr. Finklea stated that a partner of his firm had spoken with the President of the University and he also spoke with Ken Jackson regarding Francis Marion development plans for student housing. With his property on Freedom Boulevard which does have sewer access, they were not interested in student housing at that time. They feel that there is a need for additional student housing in that area especially with the intersection changes, the corridor improvements and the development growth in the area. That side of town is ripe to grow and the City of Florence is working on the infrastructure of water and sewer systems in that area.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any additional public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

There was no other public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Commissioner John Martin made a motion that the requested zoning map amendment **PC #2026-56** be approved as presented / Second – Commissioner Glynn Willis / The Commission voted 9 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC #2026-56 for a portion to CMU, Commercial Mixed Use District zoning designation and a portion to R-3A, Single-Family Residential District, zoning designation.**

PC#2026-57

Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Three Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. Furthermore, The Requirements Of Florence County Code Of Ordinances, Chapter 30, Zoning Ordinance, Article II. – Zoning District Regulations, Division 7, Corridor Overlay District, Shall Apply To The Property Included In This Amendment That Lays Within Five Hundred Feet (500') Of The Corridor. Any Parcel That Extends Beyond 500' From The Corridor Shall Be Wholly Covered By The Overlay District If The Outer Area Is Twenty Percent (20%) Or Less Of The Total Parcel Size. This Measurement Shall Be Taken From The Roads Edge, Or Curb, And Extend Landwards. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90117-08-003, 90117-08-004, 90128-05-001, 90128-05-002, 90128-05-003, 90128-05-004, 90128-05-005, 90128-05-007, 90128-05-012, 90128-05-013.

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <https://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear, Director, Florence County Planning and Building presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the unzoned properties were part of the Highway 76 corridor project study in County Council District Seven (7), and the recommended zoning was B-3, General Commercial District. The properties are just outside the City limits east of the municipal boundaries, close to the hospital. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation providing images of the properties showing the overlay district, which extends five hundred feet

(500'), and extends over into some of the properties on Cheves Street. The general commercial zoning district of B-3 allows single family dwellings within this district. No changes would have to happen to the residential properties and it could make the residential properties more marketable to someone who would like to invest in the future; considering the location and the City zoning beside it which is totally commercial, as a campus district zoning and the commercial mixed use, CMU to the rear. Staff has looked and evaluated the properties and feel that the best use of the properties would be a business district. Single family homes are allowed within a B-3 business zoning district and the residents could continue to live there. If the next investors desire to continue to keep the property as a residence they could, the business zoning just gives them more options, vice locking them into a single-family zoning district particularly within the location of the properties and the commercial uses surrounding them. He additionally informed the Commission that some of the property owners could be present in the meeting and may desire to speak regarding the zoning recommendation.

Mr. Shawn Brashear, read the comments and inquiries received pertaining to the requested zoning map amendment. (A copy of the call log, comments and inquiries are maintained at the Florence County Planning and Building Department.)

Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation showing images of the properties and the adjacent properties.

There were questions, discussion and comments from the Commission.

In response to questions, discussion and comments from the Commission, Mr. Brashear stated that letters had been forwarded to the property owners, public notices provided and the public meeting published in the newspaper per Florence County Ordinances. If someone sold their home and the new owners wanted to place say a 7-Eleven in the residential area there would be nothing to prevent it other than the parcel size. Presently, within that area businesses are beginning to encroach within the residential properties. Allowing the B-3 zoning designation just makes the properties more marketable to the area and a financial benefit to the owners. There are a broad variety of retail uses allowed in a B-3 zoning designation, and there are some restrictions based on the surroundings as well as to what can be placed in that zoning designation. The property owners are not presently seeking any development in the area; they are just caught up in the loophole of the Florence County's zoning study. Presently, the properties are unzoned and any of the same scenarios could happen or worst.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the forum for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson made a motion that the requested zoning map amendment **PC #2026-57** be approved as presented / Second – Commissioner Jeffrey Tanner / The Commission voted 4 to 4 on the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-57**. (Commissioner Gregory Miller rescued himself from voting on the requested zoning map amendment as he indicated that he owned property within the proposed zoning area).

Chairman Cheryl Floyd called for a revote of the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-57**. The Commission voted 3 to 5 to deny the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-57**. Chairman Cheryl Floyd stated that the requested zoning map amendment would appear before the Florence County Council at the July 16, 2026 meeting as the Planning Commission was a recommending body and not a definitive body for zoning map amendments.

PC#2026-58

Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Three Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned And R-4. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90116-01-018, 90117-07-002, 90117-07-003, 90117-07-004, 90117-07-005, 90117-07-006, 90117-07-007, 90117-07-010, 90117-07-011, 90117-07-012, 90117-08-005, 90117-08-006, 90117-08-008, 90128-04-001, 90128-04-002, 90128-04-003, 90128-04-004, 90128-04-005, 90128-04-018, 90128-05-008, 90128-05-009, 90128-05-010, 90128-05-011.

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <https://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear, Director, Florence County Planning and Building presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the unzoned and R-4 properties were part of the Highway 76 corridor project study in County Council District Seven (7), and the recommended zoning was B-3, General Commercial District. The properties are north and adjacent to the previous items properties just outside the City limits east of the municipal boundaries. There is one small parcel that is zoned R-4 and the recommended zoning would clean up that property and zone all the

others. The properties are also outside of the overlay district. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation showing images of the properties and the adjacent properties. All properties were posted and public notices posted in the Newspaper and public buildings as required per the Florence County Ordinances.

There were questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission, Mr. Brashear stated that the property North of Day Street was vacant property and the cemetery is located within the right hand corner of the properties.

There was discussion of the Commission regarding the commercial zoning of the properties seemingly within a residential area, although the properties are very close to the hospital and downtown area of the City of Florence.

Mr. Brashear explained that the properties were advertised to be zoned from unzoned or rezoned from unzoned, the advertisement did not state what the zoning of the property would be. He additionally stated that as such staff hoped that property owners would contact the Planning office to discuss the zonings of their properties so that if need be a different solution could be determined. Staff has not heard any responses from the letters that were sent to the property owners. The Planning Commission's determinations regarding zoning map amendments is a recommendation so that gives the Commission the privilege to make a different recommendation than what is being presented by staff and ultimately County Council makes the final determination regarding zoning map amendments utilizing the recommendations of staff and the Planning Commission. The advertisement does not state what the properties are being recommended zoned for; just that the unzoned or zoned properties are being zoned or rezoned to a district zoning. The Planning Commission has the privilege to change the zoning recommendation, as long as the recommendation complies with the Comprehensive Plan and that the recommended zoned district fits within the Variable Development District One (VD1) land use designation.

There was discussion of the recommended zoning that would protect the neighborhood as it was mentioned that the neighborhood is one of the oldest within Florence County.

Mr. Brashear requested to make a request of the Planning Commission to defer the item and send it back to staff for further review of the recommended zoning designation. If the Commission was not necessarily satisfied with the recommendation deferring the item would give staff additional time to explore the property sizes, widths and likes to ensure they meet the minimal standards of residential district that Florence County has. Staff does not want to apply a zoning to the area that leaves the properties non-conforming. His recommendation would be to defer the item and reconsider the last item also, as they are all in the same general location of the County.

Before the Commission made a decision regarding deferring the items, the Chairman and Commission stated that they would like to hear any public opinions regarding the requested zoning map amendment and the recommended zoning.

Cheryl Floyd opened the forum for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

Ms. Lillian Lawson 1406 and 1427 E. Evans Street, Florence, SC, was present in the meeting and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. She stated that the people in the neighborhood are seniors and they can't get out and do the work they desire to do to their homes due to their limited incomes. She contacted Planning and Building once the signs were placed on the property. She also received her property letter, however; she never spoke with anyone. She came to the meeting tonight to know and see what was being recommended for their properties. She desired to know and understand what was going on. She doesn't want to be a hindrance to the zoning projects but she also does not want to be taken advantage of.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd tried to explain to Ms. Lawson the zoning study and what the County's initiative is in zoning properties throughout the County. She explained to Ms. Lawson that their homes would remain residential properties but the County was recommending a zoning designation for the properties which allowed flexibility in the use of the residential properties. She wanted her to know that she had the option to visit with the Planning Staff to discuss the study and her properties in particular so that she could understand the zoning and how it affected her properties and that the Commission was interested in their communities input and comments regarding the recommended zoning. The Commission explained to her that their properties are presently unzoned and anything could possibly end up beside them. There are many different classifications of zoning that possible could be applied to the properties and the Planning Staff could explain those zonings to her. If the properties are zoned commercial they could still remain residential properties and could be replaced if damaged or destroyed within a reasonable period of time.

Mr. Brashear also added that as the residential properties are allowed outright within a B-3 zoning designation, the home could be replaced if damaged or destroyed at any time. The nonconformity clause in this case would not apply as residential single family homes are allowed outright in a B-3 zoning district designation.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if any additional public in attendance at the meeting had any questions or concerns that they desired to ask regarding the requested zoning map amendments.

Ms. Wilhelmina Lowery, 1437 E. Evans Street, Florence, was present in the meeting and requested to ask questions. If the zoning of the property changed would that not also change the tax information for the property.

In response to the inquiry Mr. Brashear stated that the zoning change would not affect the tax status if the use of the property did not change. If the property stayed single family residential the tax

status would remain the same, as single family residential.

Mr. Ron Williamson was present in the meeting and stated that he was speaking for his aunt, Ms. Lillian Grant, 1433 E. Evans Street, Florence, whose property was included in the PC item. He stated that it appeared that her property was being rezoned for commercial property and that was her concern. He wanted to make sure that her property was not being taken from her for commercial use and that she could live there the remainder of her life. Also, if something happened to her property, that she could replace it, that it could be rebuilt or replaced. He wanted to understand why the property was being zoned or rezoned in the first place.

Chairman Chery Floyd restated that if the recommendation for the property were approved that the residential property could be replaced and that Ms. Grant could also remain in her property. The properties are being recommended for zoning or rezoning as part of a study for Florence County to have all properties zoned in an effort to protect the uses of the properties and the neighborhoods within the County.

There were questions and discussion as to what happens or what would happen to the properties that are presently vacant lots if the recommended zoning of B-3, General Commercial is approved for recommendation.

In response to the questions and discussion Mr. Brashear stated that nothing would happen they would still be vacant lots with a B-3, General Commercial zoning designation. It would have no bearing on the taxes for the properties as zoning has to do with the uses of the property.

There was further discussion and questions pertaining to the types of commercial business uses that could potentially be in a B-3 zoning designation, i.e. vape stores, beverage stores, small retail, etc. Presently, the properties are unzoned and some manufactured homes at least up to two could be placed on the lots which could affect the property values within the area also. Staff looked at the area and tried to find a zoning that was most advantages to the area now and in the future and was not looking to harm any public by way of their recommendation.

There was no further comments, questions or discussions and Commissioner Doris Lockhart made a motion that the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-58 be deferred until next month** to allow additional time for the community and staff to get together, so that the community could fully understand the implications of the commercial and residential zoning designations / Second – Commissioner Allie Brooks / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to defer the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-58 until next month**. (Commissioner Gregory Miller rescued himself from voting on the requested zoning map amendment as he indicated that he owned property within the proposed zoning area).

Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson made a motion to reconsider zoning map amendment **PC#2026-57** / Second – Commissioner John Martin / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to reconsider zoning map amendment **PC#2026-57**. (Commissioner Gregory Miller rescued himself from voting on the requested reconsideration of zoning map amendment PC#2026-57.)

Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson made a motion that the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-57 be deferred until next month** / Second Commissioner John Martin / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to defer the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-57 until next month**. (Commissioner Gregory Miller rescued himself from voting on the requested zoning map amendment PC#2026-57.)

The Commission requested staff and the community to meet to discuss the recommending zonings of the properties. Staff requested that the public in attendance ensure that they signed in and provide a good telephone number to which staff could reach them regarding the recommending zoning of their properties.

Sketch Plan:

PC#2026-52 Sketch Plan Requested By HP Freedom, LLC, For Freedom Park, Located Off Of Freedom Boulevard, Florence, SC, As Shown On Florence County Tax Map Number 00209, Block 01, Parcel 061.

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <https://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear, Director, Florence County Planning and Building presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the proposed project site was located off of Freedom Boulevard in County Council Districts Five (5) and Six (6). The owner of record for the approximately fifty-one acre (51 acre) property is HP Freedom, LLC. Water and sewer are available to the project site by the City of Florence. The property is in an AE flood zone and the surrounding land uses and zonings by the project site on three sides are residential, vacant and unzoned with one side also adjacent to the City of Florence zoning district. The applicant desires to subdivide the property into one hundred and fourteen (114) rental lots to support a manufactured home park. The item was deferred from the May Planning Commission meeting. The subject project site is located off of Freedom Boulevard southeast of the City of Florence. The vicinity of the subject property is unzoned beside the neighboring City of Florence zoning district. To the left of the subject property is a subdivision being developed within the City of Florence zoning. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation providing images of the property and the adjacent properties. The project is presented before the Planning Commission as a development project plan of five acres (5 acres) or more. The projected development plan does not require paved roads, but graveled roads with sidewalks, street trees and the likes. The proposed project met all the development standards except the fire code required a secondary means of ingress and egress where there are fifty (50) units or more. Mr. Brashear explained the controlled access points that were previously built out onto Freedom Boulevard to control the traffic coming onto the road. Those previously built out access points caused some issues with the development of the subject project as the fire department required another access point. The fire department has agreed that if the developer could get an emergency access to the site then the project could be permissible. An email was received by staff this afternoon and a copy placed on the dais for each Commission member from Jane Dodge that states that South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT), specifically, David Johnson, is granting an access waiver for a conditional secondary access point for emergency vehicles only at the Freedom Park sketch plan subject project site. The SCDOT additionally provided some conditions that the

developer must comply with regarding the conditional secondary access and those conditions are listed in the email. (A copy of the email is attached to the minutes and maintained at the Florence County Planning and Building Department.). Staff was unsure if SCDOT would grant the request for secondary access and the email shows that it has been granted and the development sketch plan project for Freedom Park is presented for the Commission's approval.

There were questions and comments from the Commission.

In response to the questions and comments from the Commission, Mr. Brashear stated that the Fire Department and all other parties responsible for reviewing sketch plans had reviewed the requested development project and were aware that the developer was awaiting approval of the secondary access point for their proposed project. Mr. Brasher explained that other developments have also had to request and include access points for emergency use only into neighboring developments but ideally they would rather just have secondary access points. Typically, you would not even know that an emergency ingress and egress existed unless you were familiar with the project or if a gate is covering the access. There was discussion of the types of lock boxes and accesses that the fire department has to access emergency ingress and egress points. The emergency access is an improved graveled surface that must meet the requirements for weighted fire vehicles and apparatus' to drive on the surface of it and once it is tested and approved then the developer allows the grass to overtake it. There was additional discussion of the spacing of the SCDOT previously controlled access points along Freedom Boulevard. The Fire Department has signed off on the approval of the conditional emergency secondary access point. Staff has received no inquiries, communications or comments regarding the requested development sketch plan.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the forum for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested development sketch plan for Freedom Park.

Mr. Robert Weaver, Engineer for the project was present in the meeting and spoke in favor of the requested development sketch plan for Freedom Park. He stated that the secondary access approval took approximately two months to obtain and the developer had to work exceptionally hard to obtain the approval. The developer appreciated the Commission patience in deferring the project. The sketch plan has not changed and they shall comply with all requirements of the Fire Department and SCDOT to ensure compliance for the secondary emergency access. The developer has and will also widen the entry access to the development from fifty feet (50') wide to one hundred plus (100+) feet wide.

There were no additional questions, comments or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there was anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested development sketch plan for Freedom Park.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested development sketch plan for Freedom Park.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Commissioner Jeffrey Tanner made a motion that the requested development sketch plan **PC #2026-52** be approved as presented / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson. / The Commission voted 8 to 1 to approve the requested development sketch plan **PC#2026-52**. (Commissioner John Martin was opposed to the requested development sketch plan PC#2026-52 for Freedom Park.)

Prior to the presentation of the requested final plat, Mr. Brashear informed the Commission that the applicant had contacted staff prior to the meeting and requested that item number **PC#2026-59** **be deferred until next meeting.**

Final Plat:

PC#2026-59

Sketch Plan Requested By Teddy Dowling, For Middlecoff Brownstones, Located Off Of Middlecoff Lane, Florence, SC, As Shown On Florence County Tax Map Number 23807, Block 01, Parcel 029, And 034.

There were no questions, comments and or discussion and Commissioner Allie Brooks made a motion that the request **final plat PC#2026-59** be deferred until the next meeting / Second – Commissioner Glynn Willis / The Commission voted 9 to 0 to defer item number **PC#2026-59 until the next meeting.**

Text Amendments:

PC#2026-60

Request For Text Amendments To The Florence County Code Of Ordinances, CHAPTER 30, ZONING ORDINANCE, ARTICLE II. - ZONING DISTRICT REGULATIONS, DIVISION 8. – TOWNHOUSE AND MIXED-USE DISTRICTS, Sec. 30-80.5 – Dimensional Standards. (c) Lot Characteristics.

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <https://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear, Director, Florence County Planning and Building presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He directed their attention to page eighty-eight (88) of their staff report and stated the requested changes to be updated to the listed zoned districts for the minimum requirements for sidewalk widths and public and private roads within those particular zoned districts. The requirements for ten foot (10') sidewalks was a recommendation from the consultant a few years back concerning the gateway but staff considers it quite excessive. Staff hopes that the gateway transforms into something beautiful with time but feels that it can be accomplished with a six foot (6') sidewalk requirement vice a ten foot (10') road in front of the buildings. Staff is also recommending a change for private roads with sidewalks to be reduced from six feet (6') to five feet (5'). Typically, sidewalks are four feet (4'), so this is still a substantial sidewalk compared to everything else the County has and staff is recommending these proposed

reduced changes to this section of the zoning ordinance. He also mentioned a scrivener's error in the italicized notes under the table for the Overlay District indicating a width of eight feet (8') which should say five feet (5'). Staff will ensure the correction is made when sending the marked up ordinance for review and approval to County Council.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of the Commission if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

There were no questions, comments or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the forum for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested text amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested text amendment.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested text amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested text amendment.

There were no further questions, comments, or discussion and Commissioner Glynn Willis made a motion that the requested text amendment **PC#2026-60** be approved as presented / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / The Commission voted 9 to 0 to approve as presented the requested text amendment **PC#2026-60**.

PC#2026-61

Request For Text Amendments To The Florence County Code Of Ordinances, CHAPTER 30, ZONING ORDINANCE, ARTICLE VII. - GENERAL AND ANCILLARY REGULATIONS, Sec. 30-249. – Nonconformities. (b)(1).

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <https://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear, Director, Florence County Planning and Building presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that staff had made no changes in the regulation or the enforcement of the ordinance but wanted to add the wording “or building” to the change of nonconforming use subtitle section of the ordinance. In the continuation section of sub paragraph (a) of section 30-249, the words, nonconforming uses, buildings or structures is listed there but was erroneously omitted in the change of nonconforming use under the modification subparagraph (1). Staff desires to clarify that the information applies to both buildings and structures under this section of the ordinance. By adding that information in the subtitle, it alleviates any confusion that staff and or public may have when reading through this section of the ordinance.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of the Commission if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

There were no questions, comments or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the forum for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested text amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested text amendment.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested text amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested text amendment.

There were no further questions, comments, or discussion and Commissioner Allie Brooks made a motion that the requested text amendment **PC#2026-61** be approved as presented / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / The Commission voted 9 to 0 to approve as presented the requested text amendment **PC#2026-61**.

PC#2026-62

Request For Text Amendments To The Florence County Code Of Ordinances, CHAPTER 30, ZONING ORDINANCE, ARTICLE II. - ZONING DISTRICT REGULATIONS, DIVISION 7. – CORRIDOR OVERLAY DISTRICT, Sec. 30-79.3 – Building and structure design. (d) Access.

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <https://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear, Director, Florence County Planning and Building presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the intent of the text amendment was to clarify information within the ordinance pertaining to requirements for businesses within the Overlay District; to maintain the appearance of a primary entrance along the front façade of the business or structure when the functional primary entrance is located on the side or rear of the building. Permanent signage must also be installed at that front entrance to identify that it is a nonfunctional entrance. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation directing the Commissioners to page ninety-nine (99) of the staff report for the requested text amendment and read the requested changes to subsection (d) of Section 30-79.3. “Where front of the building parking is not provided, intended, or developed, the primary building entrance may be located on the side or rear of the structure. However, all buildings fronting the corridor roadway shall maintain an appearance of a primary entrance along the front façade. Any nonfunctional or decorative entrance from the corridor roadway must include permanent signage clearly stating, “Non-operable Entrance.” Mr. Brasher further explained the subtle changes that are taking place within the corridor and the importance of having the primary entrance on the front of the buildings but in cases where it is located on the side or rear of a building, it is important to note for emergencies and the likes where the actual entrance to the building is located. He provided an example of subtle changes that are taking place within the corridor and suggested that the Commission go by and see the new beauty salon that will be opening up in the old credit union building at 1937 E. Palmetto Street, Florence. He stated that it is taking shape beautifully. Additionally, Regent Homes, a manufactured home dealership, a few

doors down from there wanted to put in a new office. Because of the regulated corridor and overlay district the office could not be a mobile home or manufactured home, but could be a modular home. Basically, the building can be replaced but it must now comply with the corridor and overlay district zoning regulations. So, they obtained a modular building, turned it perpendicular to the roadway and the very front of the building serves as an entrance and is very nice looking. So, the hard work, long nights of review which the Commission put in reviewing the zoning regulations for the corridor and overlay gateway district has not gone to waste. Subtle changes are taking place within the gateway corridor and overlay of the districts. Staff believes that the ordinance intended for businesses to have the option of having the primary entrance located in a separate area to meet the requirements of the overlay and gateway corridor regulations. The recommended text amendment will clearly clarify and state that the main or primary entrance can be somewhere other than the front of the building but the front must appear to be the frontage of the building.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of the Commission if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

There were no questions, comments or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the forum for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested text amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested text amendment.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired of anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested text amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested text amendment.

There were no further questions, comments, or discussion and Commissioner Allie Brooks made a motion that the requested text amendment **PC#2026-62** be approved as presented / Second – Commissioner Glynn Willis / The Commission voted 9 to 0 to approve as presented the requested text amendment **PC#2026-62**.

The Public Hearing portion of the meeting was closed.

V. Director's Report:

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear presented the summary plat and building reports and they were also attached and presented for the Commission's review.

- **Summary Plat Report for (May 2026)**
- **Building Report for (May 2026)**

Mr. Brasher further stated that he had known and worked professionally along with Commissioner Glynn Willis since 1996 and it has been his pleasure over the years to have worked with such a fine constituent. He has done his community well. God Bless you in all your future endeavors.

VI. Adjournment:

There were no further questions, comments and or discussion and Chairman Cheryl Floyd made a motion that the Planning Commission meeting be adjourned / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / The Commission voted 9 to 0 to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Lisa M. Becoat
Secretary

Approved by:

J. Shawn Brashear
Director, Planning and Building

*These minutes reflect only actions taken and do not represent a true verbatim transcript of the meeting.