Minutes
Regular Meeting of the Florence County Planning Commission
Tuesday, September 22, 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 6:02 p.m.

II. Attendance:

Commissioners Present:	Cheryl Floyd, Chairman Dwight Johnson, Vice-Chairman Doris Lockhart Jeffrey Tanner John Martin Christopher Mishoe Gregory Miller Mandy Simpson
Commissioners Absent:	Allie Brooks
Staff Present:	J. Shawn Brashear, Planning Director Ethan Brown, Deputy Director Holly Smith, Senior Planner Stephen White, IT Dept, A/V Support Lisa Becoat, Secretary
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 Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson provided the invocation for the meeting.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the meeting, welcomed and thanked the Public in attendance and online for their attendance at the Meeting. She additionally informed the public to pick up a copy of the agenda and

meeting procedures if they had not already done so. She provided information regarding the meeting procedures and the time allotted for the public to speak when they approached the podium.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd requested a review of the Planning Commission meeting minutes from August 25, 2026.

III. Review and Motion of Minutes:

- **Meeting of August 25, 2026**

Motion to approve minutes – Commissioner Doris Lockhart made a motion to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of August 25, 2026 / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / Unanimously approved 8 to 0 the minutes of the August 25, 2026, Planning Commission meeting.

IV. Public Hearing:

Prior to presentation of the items for the public hearing Chairman, Cheryl Floyd, requested that the agenda items be modified so that the **Sketch Plan PC#2026-92** could be presented first.

Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson made a motion that **PC#2026-92** be moved to the first item for presentation on the agenda / Second - Commissioner John Martin / Unanimously approved 8 to 0 to move **PC#2026-92 to the first item on the meeting agenda for September 22, 2026**.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd informed the Commission and public that she had a vested right in **PC#2026-92** and as such she was recusing herself from the review of the agenda item as her personal property is immediately adjacent and abuts the property being presented for sketch plan approval. (The original signed recusal is filed and maintained at the Florence County Planning and Building Department.)

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear stated that staff additionally desired to request an amendment to the zoning map amendment agenda item **PC#2026-89**. They requested to strike seventeen (17) of the tax map numbers: 90161-02-016, 90161-02-026, 90161-02-029, 90161-02-030, 90161-02-031, 90161-02-032, 90161-02-033, 90161-02-034, 90161-02-035, 90161-02-036, 90161-02-037, 90161-02-038, 90161-02-039, 90161-02-040, 90161-02-041, 90161-02-042, & 90161-02-043, to have the opportunity to go back and analyze the properties a little more to ensure the recommended zoning was appropriate.

Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson made a motion that the seventeen (17) tax map numbers mentioned be removed from consideration of agenda item **PC#2026-89 /** Second - Commissioner Christopher Mishoe / Unanimously approved 8 to 0 to **remove Tax Map Numbers: 90161-02-016, 90161-02-026, 90161-02-029, 90161-02-030, 90161-02-031, 90161-02-032, 90161-02-033, 90161-02-034, 90161-02-035, 90161-02-036, 90161-02-037, 90161-02-038, 90161-02-039, 90161-02-040, 90161-02-041, 90161-02-042, & 90161-02-043 from consideration of agenda item PC#2026-89**.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd removed herself and exited the Planning Commission Meeting Room. Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson assumed duties as Chairman and opened the public hearing.

Sketch Plan

PC#2026-92 Sketch Plan Approval Requested By Micah Jones And Nationwide Land Group For Palmetto Cove, Located At 2503 Raymond Lane, Florence, SC As Shown On Florence County Tax Map Number 00209, Block 01, Parcel 015.

(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 38.64 acre project was referred to as Raymond Lane as the property was split by Raymond Lane off of Arthur Road. All of the acreage would not be considered for development due to part of the acreage being in an AE flood zone. However, the proposed development does not take place in the AE flood zone area. Confirmation has been received from the City of Florence indicating that water and sewer are available to the proposed site. The surrounding land uses are the City of Florence and the adjacent Arthur Road properties are pending zoning if not already approved for residential zoning by County Council. The applicant and developer desire to subdivide the property into eighty-five (85) residential lots.

Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation showing aerials and images of the property and the adjacent properties. The requested sketch plan is phased into three (3) phases and has gone through the technical review process. All comments regarding the requested sketch plan have been satisfied except for obtaining approval from the City of Florence, which would allow for a second means of access into the subdivision of Carriage Place. As that subdivision and road are within the City of Florence, the approval for access must be approved by them. The Fire Code requires that once a development has fifty (50) lots or more, a second means of emergency ingress/egress is required and presently there is none, as Arthur Road is a dead end road. The requested sketch plan includes street trees, sidewalks and the likes but the second means of egress is not there so the technical requirements have not been met in that regard. The developer, however, has communicated to staff in an email that they desire to move forward with the review of the requested sketch plan contingent upon the City of Florence granting the right-of-way and/or easement whichever is deemed appropriate for the emergency ingress/egress into the subdivision of Carriage Place.

There were questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission Mr. Brashear stated that the property is currently unzoned.

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

There were additional questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to additional questions and discussion from the Commission Mr. Brashear stated that the emergency ingress/egress would not be required to be paved, but it could be gated. The requirement is that the surface be improved to withstand the tolerance required by the fire department to be able to get their apparatus in and out. It basically looks like a maintained lane and it could have a gate with a lock-box which the fire department and all emergency services would have a key to access. He further mentioned that the City Planning Commission reviewed the emergency ingress/egress request and it was denied.

There were further questions and discussion from the Commission regarding the approval of the sketch plan and the contingency. That if the sketch plan were approved the developer could request that the City of Florence reconsider their request for emergency easement access. If the requested sketch plan were denied then the request is denied. Staff did not attend the City of Florence Planning Commission meeting and did not know why the emergency easement request was denied. There is no traffic study required for the requested sketch plan.

Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson inquired of the Commission if there were any additional questions or discussion from the Commission.

There were no additional questions, comments or discussion from the Commission and Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson opened the forum for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested sketch plan.

Mr. Jared Corbell, 7472 Waterside Loop Rd., Denver, NC, the applicant, was present and spoke in favor of the requested sketch plan. The requested subdivision sketch plan is eighty-five (85) lots, with all technical requirements met. They went before the City of Florence approximately two weeks ago for their emergency ingress/egress access request, which was denied, because the City did not know what was going on the parcel. It is their request to get the sketch plan approved which will allow them to go back to the City of Florence with their request for emergency access. They have met with the adjacent property owners and the homeowners association of the subdivision where the emergency access will connect. The subdivision is okay with limiting the connection to emergency access only, rather than the full-use access desired by the Arthur Road property owners. Their goal is to meet code and that is to provide a secondary emergency ingress/egress. The applicant does have deeded easement access to the right of way and are proposing the emergency access onto their property only. They are not proposing any easement on public right-of-way. They are requesting an encroachment permit from the City of Florence only. Their plan is to gate the access with a knox box per conversations with the Fire Marshall.

There were questions and discussions from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission Mr. Corbell stated that the property on the Carriage Place side of the subdivision is a deeded right-of way. The subdivision's eighty-five (85) homes will be single-family detached homes.

Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson inquired of anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested sketch plan.

Mr. Charles McPherson, 2403 Arthur Road, Florence, SC, was present and spoke in opposition to the requested sketch plan. He stated that before the road was Arthur Road it served as his private driveway which consisted of a quarter-mile of mud trenches. He noted that when the Country Manor development was built, developers cut down into the road, causing the low ground to displace water directly onto Arthur Road and into the ditch. He argued that the developer cannot change this dynamic, rather, the road will continue to flood at least four times a year unless Florence County redesigns the entire draining system.

Mr. McPherson emphasized that the flooding posed a significant risk for emergency access. While it may not cause an issue most of the time, a crises could occur if a fire truck or ambulance was forced to turn around, drive back down, and unlock a gate during a medical emergency. He noted that residents have photos and video evidence of the flooding on Arthur Road.

He further stated that according to the Institute of Traffic Engineers, the addition of eighty-five (85) homes would increase traffic on Arthur by eight hundred and twenty (820) trips per day. Arthur Road is a twenty-five foot (25') wide dead end country road that cannot sustain an additional eight hundred and twenty (820) daily trips. He expressed concern that construction from the new subdivision would destroy the road, forcing Florence County to pay for repairs. If the developer cannot secure ingress/egress, the traffic and existing flooding issues would reduce Arthur Road to potholes, as it was not designed for the volume of use. Eventually, the County would be forced to overhaul the road's drainage system.

Additionally, Mr. McPherson noted that he attended the City of Florence Planning Commission meeting where the developer's encroachment request was denied because the property was not yet zoned. He stated that the City required the property to be zoned before they would rehear the request.

Mr. Ken Jones, 2101 Kent Wood Drive, Florence, SC, Carriage Place subdivision, was present and spoke in opposition to the requested sketch plan. He expressed concerns regarding having a main road right next to his home and into Carriage Place; as he stated the streets are small and narrow. He was okay and supportive of having an emergency-only access.

Mr. J. D. Newland, 2709 Arthur Road, Florence, SC, was present and stated that he was neither for nor against the requested sketch plan. His concerns were with the safety and efficacy of the requested sketch plan. The residents of Arthur Road have safety concerns with having only an emergency ingress/egress as a secondary access point. During inclement weather Arthur Road sometimes becomes blocked with flooding issues. To his knowledge Florence County recently implemented a new development standard requiring subdivisions to have two points of traffic ingress/egress. The residents of Arthur Road would desire that this requested subdivision adhere to that same standard rather than utilizing one main entrance and an emergency only access point. They feel this would improve safety, better distribute the increased traffic load on Arthur Road, and ease ingress and egress onto Claussen Road.

There were questions and discussions from the Commission regarding the flooding of Arthur Road and if the residents have made their County Councilmen and or public works aware of the ongoing issues. They also

discussed the location of where the flooding happened on the road in relation to the requested sketch plan subdivision.

There were questions and discussions from the Commission for the developer regarding the flooding of the road and the impact it could have for his requested subdivision.

In response to the questions and discussion, Mr. Corbell mentioned that he had been in discussion with the residents of Arthur Road regarding the flooding. However, their proposed development is isolated from the area where the flooding takes place. Adjacent to their property is an eight foot (8') deep ditch, and all of their stormwater management will be directed to the rear of their property. The stormwater issues the residents are currently having do not reach the limits of the developer's property; therefore, the project will have zero influence on the current problems the residents are having. Everything will be captured within their property limits, piped through the stormwater facility, detained, and released.

The developer additionally stated that they would be happy to look at the road issue during the design process to provide suggestions and assistance if possible, without rebuilding the entire Arthur Road. They understand why the residents desire another main road access point in case of flooding, noting that the issue would have to be taken up with the City of Florence and its Engineering Department to see what they would allow. Furthermore, they acknowledge that flooding on Arthur Road could delay access or block the entry of the residents in their proposed subdivision.

Mr. Corbell stated that they were responsible for two main issues: first obtaining the ingress/egress emergency access from the City for their proposed subdivision; second, asking the County to review and approve their requested sketch plan based on the fact that it meets technical requirements, contingent upon their encroachment permit being granted by the City of Florence. Mr. Corbell additionally stated that, at this time, they were not proposing any improvements to Arthur Road at their cost.

Once their requested sketch plan with contingencies is approved, they will have to complete engineered plans for the development, which must be approved by the County. Once they enter full engineering with calculations and the likes that is when City and County Engineering departments will review the entire stormwater management process. As part of that phase, they could review the topography of Arthur Road and see what happens when the road floods and determine if there is an opportunity for their proposed site to help. As was mentioned the flooding has been happening for decades, appearing to be a County issue that they would be willing to assist with if possible. Their primary responsibility is to ensure no flooding, or runoff from their proposed site affects Arthur Road or the development. They have no idea what the cost would be and they are not in a position to redesign Arthur Road but would be willing to look at the issues affecting Arthur Road during the design process.

There were questions and discussion from the Commission for Staff.

In response to questions and discussion, Mr. Brashear stated that for an emergency access to be converted into a full access road; it would have to be developed to specific standards. It could no longer remain a graveled path, instead, it would need to be an improved street approved by both the City and the County. He

further noted that County approval was primary since the road would sit on the County side of the easement. The County and City would also have to agree on the standards for both the road and its access point.

Staff was unsure of who would have the authority to open the emergency access road for general use if Arthur Road became impassable due to flooding. If the sketch plan were approved and the City approved the encroachment easement for emergency access, the site must be developed according to the sketch plan that was presented to the Commission. After the subdivision is developed, the final plats are stamped, and while the property remains unzoned, the lots could be reconfigured slightly, as long as they meet the unzoned standards. Mr. Brashear provided some samples of lot reconfiguration, such as merging lots into one or transferring acreage from one lot to another.

With the property being unzoned many different uses could be placed on the site. The County previously evaluated potentially re-zoning property in the area approximately thirteen years ago, but the area is not currently being considered for re-zoning. However, individuals can submit requests to zone or rezone their individual properties at any time. The requested sketch plan does meet all technical requirements with the exception of the emergency ingress/egress encroachment approval from the City of Florence.

Following further comments and discussion from the Commission, Commissioner John Martin, made a motion that the requested sketch plan **PC#2026-92** be denied as currently presented.

There was not a second to the motion.

Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson requested further comments, discussion or an alternative motion.

Commissioner Jeffrey Tanner made a motion that the requested sketch plan **PC#2026-92** be approved as presented contingent upon the City of Florence approving the encroachment request for emergency ingress/egress through the Carriage Place subdivision / Second – Commissioner Christopher Mishoe / The Commission voted 6 to 1 to approve as presented the **requested sketch plan PC#2026-92 contingent upon the City of Florence approval of the encroachment request for the emergency ingress/egress through the Carriage Place subdivision.** (Commissioner John Martin voted in opposition to the approval of the requested sketch plan **PC#2026-92**.)

Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson requested a brief recess to reset the dais.

The Commission recessed at 6:50 p.m., and reconvened at 6:55 p.m., September 22, 2026.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd re-entered the meeting room, assumed her position on the dais, and called the meeting back to order moving forward with the review of PC#2026-79.

Map Amendments:

PC#2026-79 A Comprehensive Plan And Zoning Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Future Land Use And Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Four Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Variable

Development District 1 To Suburban District And The Zoning Designation 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 Properties Included In This Amendment That Lay 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 Road's Edge, Or Curb, And Extend Landwards. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90160-01-032 And 90160-01-033.

(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 of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the subject properties were located along the gateway and within the overlay district. Staff recommends changing the land use and zoning map designations for the two properties from Variable Development District 1 to Suburban District, and from Unzoned to R-2, Single-Family Residential District. The properties are East of Florence along Highway 76. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation showing images of the properties noting that the properties were within five hundred feet (500') of Palmetto Street and are therefore captured within the overlay district. Proper notification was completed, including notices sent to property owners, properties posted and public notices displayed at applicable locations in accordance with Florence County Ordinances.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission regarding the requested comprehensive plan and zoning map amendment, PC#2026-79.

In response to questions and discussion, Mr. Brashear stated that staff had received no inquiries.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments. No one from the public was in attendance to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Commissioner Gregory Miller, made a motion to approve as presented the requested comprehensive plan and zoning map amendment **PC#2026-79** / Second – Commissioner John Martin / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to approve as presented the requested comprehensive plan and zoning map amendment **PC#2026-79 for Suburban Development District and R-2, Single-Family Residential District, zoning designation**.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd reminded the public that the approval of the comprehensive plan and zoning map amendment requests were a recommendation. The item would now move forward to County Council for Introduction and first reading at their regular meeting on October 15, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. in the Council Chambers.

PC#2026-80 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Four Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90128-01-001, 90128-01-002, 90128-01-015, 90128-01-017, 90128-04-013, 90128-04-014, 90128-04-015, 90128-04-016.

(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 of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the subject properties were under consideration in County Council District Seven (7). The subject properties are currently unzoned and part of the Highway 76 corridor project but not in the overlay. Staff recommends changing the zoning of the properties to B-3, General Commercial District. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation showing images of the posted properties and the adjacent properties just east of the City of Florence. The properties are adjacent to the railroad tracks with some vacant land and businesses in the area.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission regarding the requested zoning map amendment, PC#2026-80.

In response to questions and discussion, Mr. 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.)

Following additional questions and discussion from the Commission, Mr. Brashear clarified that the proposed change in zoning would not affect the use of Mr. Gootman's property, as it would be grandfathered in as legally nonconforming.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

Mr. Robert Gootman, 1650 Day Street, Florence, SC, was present and spoke regarding the requested zoning map amendment. Mr. Gootman noted that he was deaf and had been assisted during the meeting by an adjacent gentlemen who helped him follow the discussion. He stated that he owns three of the parcels, which have historically been utilized for heavy industrial purposes and expressed his desire for them to remain designated as such. He noted that while he currently uses the site to store his equipment, the active business is precious metal refining.

The Commission asked Staff questions regarding other zoning designations, and their permitted uses, specifically whether the current industrial operations would be permitted within a CMU, Commercial Mixed Use District.

In response to questions and discussion, Mr. Brashear stated that a precious metal refining business is not permitted within a CMU zoning district. He noted that without a clear understanding of the previous

specific use and operations, staff would likely classify precious metal refining as heavy industrial, which requires a B-6 zoning designation. While warehousing and storage are permitted under a B-3, precious metals might fall under B-5, staff would have to verify the exact classification. Mr. Gootman clarified that the previous business on the site was a tire retreading plant which is classified as heavy industrial.

The Commission discussed removing the three parcels from the agenda item to allow Mr. Gootman an opportunity to meet with staff and review the zoning options. However, Mr. Brashear noted that the property owner does not possess enough acreage to qualify for a different zoning designation on their own, as doing so would constitute spot zoning. Per the Florence County Ordinances, a property owner must have five (5) acres or more to request a different zoning designation within the proposed area. When staff looked at the proposed area which has B-3 and CMU zonings, with the vacant properties and residential properties being allowed in those zonings, they chose the B-3 zoning designation. If the B-3 zoning designation is approved, the property would be grandfathered in, allowing it to continue under its pre-existing nonconformity and could be rebuilt if damaged or destroyed. Furthermore, if the property is sold, the buyers would also be permitted to continue the current use.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd informed Mr. Gootman and the public that if the zoning designation were changed to B-3, the current operations could continue. Furthermore, even if the property were sold, a new owner would be permitted to maintain the existing use. Chairman Cheryl Floyd clarified that the Planning Commission was a recommending body to County Council. She added that the Commission could not recommend an Industrial zoning designation, which is what Mr. Gootman's current use is, because the parcels did not meet the five (5) acre minimum requirement, and would result in spot zoning.

Mr. Brashear clarified that if the property were rezoned, the Planning Commission, acting as the recommending body, would forward the zoning request to the County Council for final approval. Once approved the property's zoning would be considered grandfathered in, and under the current standards, if the facility were damaged or destroyed, the owner would have eighteen (18) months to obtain a permit to rebuild it. Additionally, the status goes with the land, so if the property were sold, the new owners retain the right to rebuild.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition of 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 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-80** / Second – Commissioner Gregory Miller / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-80 for a B-3, General Commercial District, zoning designation.**

PC#2026-81 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Property In Group Four 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 Lay 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 Road's Edge, Or Curb, And Extend Landwards. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Property As It Is Reflected On The Tax Map As: 90128-04-006.

(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 of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the unzoned subject property was in the gateway along Highway 76 in County Council District Seven (7). Staff has not received any public inquiries regarding the zoning map amendment. The subject property is currently unzoned and part of the Highway 76 corridor project but not in the overlay. Staff recommends changing the zoning of the property to R-3, Single-Family Residential District. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation showing images of the posted property and the adjacent properties just Northeast of the City of Florence. The property is a strip of land adjacent to some residential and CMU uses which would allow some commercial uses. It has drainage easements and various physical constraints on the parcel of land. The property is directly above one of the oldest historic cemeteries within the City of Florence. Proper notification was completed, including notices sent to the property owner, property posted and public notices displayed at applicable locations in accordance with Florence County Ordinances.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission regarding the requested zoning map amendment, PC#2026-81.

Hearing none, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments. No one from the public was in attendance to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment..

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Commissioner Gregory Miller made a motion to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-81** / Second – Commissioner John Martin / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-81 for an R-3, Single-Family Residential District, zoning designation**.

PC#2026-82 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Four Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90128-01-011, 90128-01-012, 90128-02-010, 90128-02-011, 90128-02-012, 90128-02-017, 90137-01-002, 90137-02-001, 90137-02-002, 90137-02-003, 90137-02-010,

90137-03-007, 90137-03-008, 90137-03-009, 90137-03-010, 90137-03-011, 90137-03-013, 90137-03-014, 90137-03-015, 90137-03-019, 90137-03-021.

(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 of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the unzoned properties were a part of the Highway 76 corridor project but not in the overlay district, in County Council District Seven (7).

Mr. 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 posted and adjacent properties. He stated that the properties were East of the City of Florence along Highway 76 and Day Street. Staff was recommending an R-3, Single Family Residential District zoning designation. The properties consist of single family homes and some manufactured homes, which are allowed and would be grandfathered in. If the manufactured homes were damaged or destroyed, they would be allowed to be replaced. Proper notification was completed, including notices sent to the property owners, properties posted and public notices displayed at applicable locations in accordance with Florence County Ordinances.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission regarding the requested zoning map amendment, PC#2026-82.

Hearing none, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments. No one from the public was in attendance to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Commissioner Mandy Simpson made a motion to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-82** / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-82 for an R-3, Single-Family Residential District, zoning designation**.

PC#2026-83 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Four 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 Properties Included In This Amendment That Lay 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 Road's Edge, Or Curb, And Extend Landwards. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90128-02-003, 90128-03-015, 90128-04-012, 90137-01-001.

(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 of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the unzoned properties were a part of the Highway 76 corridor project in the overlay district, in County Council District Seven (7); and, that staff's recommended zoning was RU-1, Rural Community District zoning designation. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation showing images of the posted and adjacent properties. He stated that the properties were East of the City of Florence along Highway 76. The properties are adjoining properties to the RU-1's that were previously zoned. Proper notification was completed, including notices sent to the property owners, properties posted and public notices displayed at applicable locations in accordance with Florence County Ordinances.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission regarding the requested zoning map amendment, PC#2026-83.

In response to questions and discussion, Mr. Brashear stated that staff had received no inquiries.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments. No one from the public was in attendance to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson made a motion to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-83** / Second – Commissioner John Martin / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-83 for an RU-1, Rural Community District, zoning designation.**

PC#2026-84 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Four Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90128-01-004, 90128-01-005, 90128-01-014, 90128-02-001, 90128-02-002, 90128-03-009, 90128-03-013.

(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 of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the unzoned properties were a part of the Highway 76 corridor project, in County Council District Seven (7) and that staff's recommended zoning was RU-1, Rural Community District zoning designation. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation, showing images of the posted and adjacent properties. He stated that the properties were East of the City of Florence along Highway 76. The properties are contiguous with the RU-1's previously designated zoning districts. The properties consist of some manufactured homes and single family residential homes. Proper notification was completed, including notices sent to the property owners, properties posted and public notices displayed at

applicable locations in accordance with Florence County Ordinances. Staff did not receive any public inquiries regarding the requested zoning map amendment.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission regarding the requested zoning map amendment, PC#2026-84.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments. No one from the public was in attendance to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Commissioner Gregory Miller made a motion to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-84** / Second – Commissioner John Martin / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-84 for an RU-1, Rural Community District, zoning designation.**

PC#2026-85 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Four 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 Properties Included In This Amendment That Lay 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 Road's Edge, Or Curb, And Extend Landwards. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90156-02-014, 90156-02-015, 90156-03-004, 90156-03-005.

(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 of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the unzoned properties were a part of the Highway 76 corridor project in the overlay district, in County Council District Seven (7), east of the City of Florence along Highway 76. Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation showing images of the posted and adjacent properties surrounded by B-3 and CMU zoning designations. He stated that staff's recommendation for the properties was an R-2, Single Family Residential District, zoning designation contiguous with zoning to the south of the parcels, consisting of medium to larger sized residential lots. Proper notification was completed, including notices sent to the property owners, properties posted and public notices displayed at applicable locations in accordance with Florence County Ordinances.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission regarding the requested zoning map amendment, PC#2026-85.

In response to questions and discussion, Mr. Brashear stated that staff had received no inquiries.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments. No one from the public was in attendance to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Commissioner John Martin made a motion to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-85** / Second – Commissioner Christopher Mishoe / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-85 for an R-2, Single-Family Residential District, zoning designation.**

PC#2026-86 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Four Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90156-02-001, 90156-02-002, 90156-02-003, 90156-02-004, 90156-02-005, 90156-02-006, 90156-02-007, 90156-02-008, 90156-02-009, 90156-02-010, 90156-02-011, 90156-02-012, 90156-02-013, 90156-02-020, 90156-02-021, 90156-02-022, 90156-02-023, 90156-02-024, 90156-02-025, 90156-02-026, 90156-03-001, 90156-03-002, 90156-03-003, 90156-04-001, 90156-04-002, 90156-04-003, 90156-04-004, 90156-04-005, 90156-04-006, 90156-04-007, 90156-04-008, 90156-04-009, 90156-04-010, 90156-04-011, 90156-04-012, 90156-04-013, 90156-04-014, 90156-04-015, 90156-04-016, 90156-04-017, 90156-04-018, 90156-04-019, 90156-04-020.

(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 of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the unzoned properties were east of the City of Florence in County Council District Seven (7). Mr. Brashear continued with the presentation showing zoning images and aerials of the forty-three (43) properties, and stated that staff's recommendation was for an R-2, Single Family Residential District zoning designation. He continued with the presentation showing images of the posted properties and adjacent properties. Proper notification was completed, including notices sent to the property owners, properties posted and public notices displayed at applicable locations in accordance with Florence County Ordinances.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission regarding the requested zoning map amendment, PC#2026-86.

In response to questions and discussion, Mr. 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.)

Following additional questions and discussion from the Commission, Mr. Brashear clarified that there did appear to be some single-wide manufactured homes within the proposed zoning area.

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

Mr. Robert Gainey, 305 S. Court Avenue, Florence, SC, was present and spoke in favor of the requested zoning map amendment. He noted that there are existing manufactured homes on South Court Avenue and on S. McCurdy Road within the proposed zoning area.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd stated that the existing manufactured homes in the area would be considered pre-existing nonconformities and allowed in the recommending zoning district. If the properties were damaged or destroyed they could be replaced under the proposed zoning classification.

Mr. Brashear clarified that recent developments in state law now preempted local ordinances regarding legally nonconforming grandfathered manufactured homes. While Florence County's local ordinance currently allows a property owner eighteen (18) months to obtain a permit to replace a nonconforming manufactured home without restriction of its age, state law removes this time limit entirely. Under state law, a pre-existing manufactured home can be replaced regardless of the zoning district or how much time has passed since it was damaged or destroyed, provided the replacement home is five (5) years old or less.

Mr. Gainey stated that his purpose for attending the meeting was to understand the reasons behind the proposed property rezoning and the specific classifications being considered, noting that he was unfamiliar with how zoning protections worked. He shared that community rumors suggested the properties might be rezoned as light industrial, or that the change was intended to raise taxes. On behalf of his community, he requested clear information to share with his neighbors regarding the zoning changes and whether any infrastructure improvements are planned for their neighborhood. Additionally, Mr. Gainey highlighted urgent infrastructure concerns where a fire hydrant at the corner of McCurdy Road had been out of service for more than five (5) years despite outreach to their County Councilman on numerous occasions. He further stated that the local water lines were in poor condition, and subsequent street excavations for repairs had been left unpatched. He also desired to know what other zonings could be applied to their neighborhood.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd stated that the rezoning was intended to protect the property and its owners. As an example, she cited a neighborhood of older homes where a resident began operating an industrial business in their backyard. The operation included hammering and nailing throughout the night behind a six-foot privacy fence, with materials stacked higher than the fence line. Although neighbors complained that the business was incompatible with their neighborhood, the property was unzoned, leaving the county with no restrictions to enforce.

She further expressed hope that the property owners would welcome zoning regulations to establish enforceable restrictions rather than relying solely on informal neighborhood rules. She clarified that zoning changes had no impact on raising property taxes. While the Commission could not provide a response to all of Mr. Gainey's questions, she advised residents to direct their specific concerns to their County Councilman for further action and responses. Chairman Cheryl Floyd explained and reaffirmed that the neighborhood is a residential neighborhood and that staff's primary objective was to preserve and protect its residential integrity.

Mr. Brashear further stated that the primary purpose of zoning was to protect the neighborhood's integrity and preserve its residential character. Without zoning, a wide variety of incompatible uses would be permitted, leaving staff with no recourse. However, established residential zoned districts prevent situations where a neighboring property owner could turn their garage into a body shop and operate it in their front yard with parked vehicles across their lawn. While some neighborhoods rely on active Homeowners Associations (HOA's) for protection, they must hire their own attorneys to enforce their covenants. If there is zoning in the area then the County takes responsibility of enforcing their zoning ordinances.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for any additional questions or comments from anyone who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who had additional questions or 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 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-86** / Second – Commissioner John Martin / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-86 for an R-2, Single-Family Residential District, zoning designation**.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd noted that the gallery was still very full and several members of the public had not yet spoken and she inquired from the public which agenda item they were there to address. The majority of the audience indicated they were present for the item regarding property within the Forest Lake subdivision.

Staff requested a brief recess.

The Commission recessed at 7:36 p.m. and reconvened at 7:41 p.m., September 22, 2026.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd reconvened the meeting and requested a motion to amend the agenda to move items PC#2026-90 and PC#2026-91 up for immediate review within the agenda items.

Commissioner John Martin made a motion that the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-90** be moved up to the next item for review within the agenda / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson and Commissioner Gregory Miller.

Commissioner John Martin made a motion that the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-91** be moved up to the next item under PC#2026-90 for review within the agenda / Second -Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson. The Commission voted 8 to 0 to amend the agenda and move items **PC#2026-90** and **PC#2026-91 up for immediate review within the agenda items.**

PC#2026-90 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Four Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 00101-01-011 And 07607-01-003.

(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 of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He noted that staff had received numerous inquiries on the item and some would be redundant as they reflected comments for PC#2026-90 and PC#2026-91.

Mr. 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 his presentation indicating that the unzoned subject properties were located in County Council Districts Four (4) and Nine (9). Staff's recommendation for the two properties was R-1, Single-Family Residential District zoning designation. The subject corridor properties are west of the City of Florence along Highway 76 within Forest Lake with a small sliver of land extending into the Forest Lake Pointe Subdivision near the access point. Mr. Brashear presented images and aerials of the subject site and the adjacent properties, noting that Forest Lake subdivision extends out and under Highway 76. Staff ensured that the postings of the subject properties were placed in conspicuous places to clearly identify the areas designated for zoning. Proper notification was completed, including notices sent to the property owners, properties posted and public notices displayed at applicable locations in accordance with Florence County Ordinances.

Mr. Brashear stated that he was requested to attend a meeting last Friday evening with Council Counsel at a local church where the majority of the members in the meeting were in attendance discussing the zonings of PC#2026-90 and PC#2026-91.

Mr. Brashear proposed a question of "Why would staff propose a zoning district for a body of water." He explained that the subject property is a legal parcel of land that touches Highway 76. For the past few years staff has been studying and zoning properties along Highway 76 and must determine what is the most practical and best use of every parcel of land, including bodies of water, regardless of whether development is anticipated.

Staff reviewed the surrounding parcels, which consist of larger lots and homes that conform most closely to an R-1, single-family zoning designation. Mr. Brashear emphasized for the edification of the Commission and the public that R-1 is Florence County's most restrictive residential zoning district. He noted that Florence County does not have open space or conservation districts and explained that even where such districts existed in other jurisdictions, they only restrict rather than prohibit development. He stated that he was not trying to be contrary but wanted to provide clear factual context regarding the zoning districts as that information was mentioned in emails that were requested to be forwarded to each member of the

Commission. (A copy of the two emails requested to be forwarded to the Commission members is maintained and held and the Florence County Planning and Building Department.)

Mr. Brashear presented a scenario involving a damaged lake dam requiring $10 million dollars in repairs. Because the lake is private property, homeowners would be responsible for raising the funds, which could potentially involve selling some acreage of the property to finance the repairs.

Comparing R-1 to a rural district designation, Mr. Brashear noted that rural districts speak about land preservation, but they still allow various business and developmental uses. While state wildlife regulations might impose restrictions, county regulations do not prevent development on rural zoned parcels. Mr. Brashear further explained that property owners can request zoning changes to match contiguous parcels in their zoning area. As part of the counties zoning efforts along Highway 76, the properties must be zoned and the most practical zoning choice is R-1, it matches the adjacent area of single family large lots and restricts uses strictly to single family residential homes.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission regarding the requested zoning map amendment, PC#2026-90.

In response to questions and discussion, Mr. Brashear noted that if Florence County were to create a zoning designation that allowed nothing to occur but the lake or was unique to the lake, it would be considered a taking. All state or federal wildlife managements would supersede local zoning ordinances. He further explained that the building code allowed for structures within wetlands and the likes and provided the requirements to do so; but would be superseded if protected by state or federal wildlife management. Reviewing aerials of the parcels beyond the bridge, Mr. Brashear stated that the zonings were R-1 and City of Florence zoning. The adjacent zonings on both sides of Forest Lake subdivision and Forest Lake Pointe are presently unzoned which potentially could allow for any uses per Florence County Zoning regulations, i.e. manufactured homes, chop shops and the likes. Although both of the neighborhoods have homeowners associations and restrictive covenants, there are no County regulations that would restrict most uses in either of the neighborhoods. As staff is recommending zoning of the lake, they are proposing zoning the lake with the most restrictive zoning Florence County presently has.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

Mr. Frank McIntyre, 3341 Lakeshore Drive, Florence, SC, was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. He noted that one of the words that he had not heard in the meeting was sanctuary, and emphasized that the lake was a state designated sanctuary. Mr. McIntyre stated that property owners were only notified of the requested zoning map amendment by letter on August 10, 2026, so their research had been fast tracked for presentation to the Commission. He recalled that during a subsequent drop in meeting, residents were shown an aerial map outlining the proposed parcel zonings.

Mr. McIntyre highlighted that Forest Lake had over six hundred (600) residents and the middle swamp was dammed around 1963 or 1964. He explained that Ed Young and Jessie Wiggins started Ebenezer Community Watershed Conservation District, which was legitimized and acknowledged by the state. That

is where the conservation concept came from and why the property owners of Forest Lake are against the zoning change. The Florence County government adopted the Land Conservation Vision which provided insight into what Highway 76 would like in the next fifty (50) years.

There were questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission, Mr. McIntyre stated that they had met with the Planning Staff to review alternative zoning options for the parcels. He noted that a portion of the lake lies within the City of Florence boundaries. Mr. McIntyre raised a personal objection to defining the lake as a parcel or land, emphasizing that it was a body of water. He argued that while zoning is intended to protect land, conservation measures are meant for environmentally sensitive areas which is how Forest Lake has functioned for the past sixty years. He stated that the preferred zoning designation would be an open space zoning, which would recognize the lake as a wildlife sanctuary and acknowledge it as a federally regulated dam that creates Forest Lake. Mr. McIntyre emphasized that the lake is completely undevelopable and concluded that the distinction between land, parcels, and buildings must be addressed. He requested that the lake not receive a standard zoning designation.

Mr. Nick Foong, 3125 Lakeshore Drive, Florence, SC, was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. He stated that as a member of the Forest Lake Homeowners Association Board of Directors, the Board understands and agrees that unzoned parcels require zoning. However, on behalf of the Board, he requested that the Commission consider creating an open area conservation style zoning classification in the spirit of contiguous improvement. He noted that the City of Florence, Horry County, and Richland County already utilize such classifications to protect and preserve their open land areas. He requested that Florence County consider establishing this zoning classification during its current efforts to zone unzoned properties and apply it to Forest Lake first.

Mr. Foong reiterated that Forest Lake is a designated state wildlife sanctuary noting that the area features, protected nesting bald eagles, ospreys and migratory cormorants. The Board's research into wildlife sanctuaries found that there is a state required mandate of a one hundred yard (100 yard) buffer zone intended for protection. He expressed belief that this buffer would impact several parcels to be discussed later in the meeting, including one parcel that touches the lakeside wetlands which is being recommended for B-3 zoning. The residents are concerned as to what B-3 zoning allows, specifically the potential for stormwater runoff, oils, contaminants and drainages from a business that could harm the lake and wildlife sanctuary. They would also like it noted on published Florence County documents or records used in the future that the lake is a state wildlife sanctuary.

There were questions and discussion from the Commission for staff.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission, Mr. Brashear stated that Planning Commission and staff had the authority to create a zoning and submit it to County Council for review and recommendation. It would take time as staff would have to research the zoning with the present Comprehensive Plan, then put said recommendation together for the Planning Commission's agenda, and then send them to County Council for three readings for approval. The process could be approximately

four (4) to five (5) months. In conservation districts, some areas are open to the public, however, Forest Lake is a private lake limited to due paying members of Forest Lake.

Mr. Brashear further explained that Planning and Building would issue permits for parcels based on what the zoning would allow. However, if Forest Lake is a sanctuary area then the private owners would have to obtain the necessary permits that would override what the zoning would allow. That is one area of protection. Even if the property were unzoned the private owners would have to go to the respective government agencies to obtain the requirements of what would be allowed.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for any additional questions or comments from anyone who desired to speak in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

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

There were further questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion, Mr. Brashear stated that citizens of Forest Lake were requesting a zoning that did not exist within Florence Counties zoning ordinance. The City of Florence does have an open space development district that does allow restricted development.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Commissioner Doris Lockhart made a motion to defer **PC#2026-90**, to allow staff time to research and recommend a zoning that would fit the open space or conservation district and present it for review and recommendation. / Second – Commissioner Jeffrey Tanner / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to **defer PC#2026-90**, **to allow staff time to research and recommend a zoning that would fit open space or conservation district and present it for review and recommendation**.

PC#2026-91 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Four Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 00076-01-017, 00076-01-018, 00076-01-019, 00076-01-052, 00076-01-100.

(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 of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He noted that the unzoned properties are located on the west side of the City of Florence along the Highway 76 corridor, and staff was recommending a B-3 zoning for the parcels. He continued with the presentation showing images and site aerials of the subject properties and adjacent properties. All required notifications were completed, including notices sent to the property owners, properties posted and public notices displayed at applicable locations in accordance with Florence County Ordinances.

Mr. 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.)

There were questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission, Mr. Brashear stated while the City and County zonings differ, a City CG district is similar to the County's B-3 zoning district. The properties current uses are residential. Mr. Brashear noted that a B-3 zoning district is similar to the R-1 and is the most intense commercial district within Florence County; it allows for multi-family housing, single family housing, convenience stores, retail stores and restaurants.

B-2 commercial districts are less intense and do not allow multi-family housing, but they do permit retail uses, convenience stores and single family housing. B-1 is Florence County's most restrictive business district, allowing only professional services and business offices. While strip malls are permitted in B-1, standard retail stores are not. If a strip building were constructed under a B-1 designation, it would be limited to professional offices, such as real estate or attorney's offices.

Staff's only contact regarding the proposed zoning was a telephone call from a woman claiming to be the daughter and granddaughter of the owners of two of the properties. She expressed support for the recommended B-3 zoning designation. While the Bateman's are the original developers of the area and still own two of the properties, staff was unsure if they owned all of the parcels in question. No members of the Bateman family were present in the meeting.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

Ms. Nancy Ullerich, 1842 Osprey Drive, Florence, SC was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. She stated that she is on the Board of Directors for the Homeowners Association (HOA) for the Forest Lake Pointe Subdivision. She stated that the Bateman properties are owned by members of the Bateman family, except for one which has been sold. Many of the family members are older, and the HOA was not able to reach them. The properties are at the edge of their neighborhood, across from Bateman Drive, and also next to the front entrance of their neighborhood. Their neighborhood was formed around 1990, and residents recently learned that their properties are unzoned. She stated that her husband is the president of the HOA and that he would read a letter that he prepared for the Commission. (She requested and passed out a copy of the letter to each Commission member. A copy of the letter is maintained at the Florence County Planning and Building Department.)

There were questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission, Ms. Ullerich stated that the Bateman's properties are not a part of their HOA.

Mr. Robert Ullerich 1842 Osprey Drive, Florence, SC was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. He stated that he had a prepared statement to read to the Commission. The statement read as follows: "My name is Bob Ullerich, and I am the president of the Forest Lake Pointe Homeowners Association. I am here to represent our neighborhood with respect to the rezoning of five residential properties on W. Palmetto Street near the entrance to our neighborhood, as described in map amendment PC#2026-91.

Forest Lake Pointe is one of the most desirable neighborhoods in Florence County due to our beautiful front entrance, quiet streets, access to the lake, and a family-friendly neighborhood. This is supported by the fact that home values here are more than twice the average of Florence County single family homes.

The lots affected by the B-3 rezoning are located between W. Palmetto Street and Bateman Drive, the border of our subdivision, with one adjacent to our front entrance at Osprey Drive.

B-3 zoning would permit businesses such as beer, wine and liquor stores; gasoline stations; truck stops; flea markets; transportation warehouses; auto repair shops; and car washes. The proximity of a B-3 Commercial zone will lower property values in our neighborhood, due to increased noise, light, water pollution and crime risk. Some studies suggest that property values could decrease as much as 16%.

This would warrant a reduction in assessed values, potentially costing the county tens of thousands of dollars.

Even more important is the potential contamination from polluted water runoff into Forest Lake from having a B-3 zone just 23 paces from a wildlife sanctuary. Increased water pollution will adversely affect the habitat of wildlife, including protected species of birds such as bald eagles and osprey.

We would prefer the properties be rezoned R-1, but we recognize that there is going to be commercial zoning adjacent to W. Palmetto St. We are proposing a solution that we believe meets the needs of the county while keeping our neighborhood intact. We suggest dividing the zoning on the lots in question, such that at least 125 feet currently adjacent to Bateman Drive is zoned R-1, with the property adjacent to W. Palmetto St., zoned as B-1 rather than B-3. This suggestion was proposed to us by Gary Finklea, a local attorney who lives in our neighborhood.

The types of businesses permitted in B-1 zones pose significantly less disruption to our neighborhood and the Lake habitat in terms of noise, light, security, and water pollution. For this reason, we recommend B-1 zoning for these parcels if a split as described above is not feasible.

In conclusion, decrease in property values, combined with an increase in traffic, noise, crime, and water pollution of a wildlife sanctuary can be minimized by zoning said properties as suggested."

Ms. Tammy Smith, 1830 Nighthawk Drive, Florence, SC, was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. She stated that while residents understand development is part of a growing community, they ask that the safety and quality of life of existing families be given serious consideration. A primary concern is traffic safety. The entrance to Forest Lake Pointe has a blind spot near

the crest of both Osprey and Bateman Drives, creating limited visibility for drivers. Adding commercial traffic, unfamiliar drivers and potentially larger delivery vehicles could make an already hazardous area more dangerous. Their neighborhood streets are used daily by residents walking their dogs, children riding bicycles, families walking, neighbors riding golf carts and people enjoying the outdoors. She emphasized that these are residential streets not commercial throughfares and outside drivers may not anticipate pedestrians or pets in the roadway.

Residents are especially concerned about Osprey Drive or Bateman Drive being used to access the rear of future businesses. Allowing employees, customers, visitors, deliveries or service vehicles access through these streets could turn quiet residential roads into commercial access routes, creating additional traffic and safety hazards. She urged the Commission to consider the cumulative impact of additional businesses along Palmetto Street, including increased turning movements, congestion, traffic backups and potential conflicts at their neighborhood entrance. Furthermore, B-3 zoning raises concerns regarding the types of businesses that could eventually operate next to their homes, specifically future uses that bring excessive traffic, late night activities, frequent deliveries, noise or other impacts incompatible with a family friendly neighborhood.

Ms. Smith concluded by stating their concern is not simply about development; but about responsible development that protects Florence County residents. They respectfully request that before B-3 zoning is approved, a comprehensive traffic and safety assessment be conducted with particular attention to the blind spot at their subdivision entrance, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and commercial traffic circulation. They also ask that any approval include enforceable restrictions prohibiting routine commercial access through Forest Lake Pointe, including Osprey and Bateman Drives, alongside appropriate protections to preserve their residential character. She urged the Commission not to make a zoning decision without fully evaluating how it could affect the safety of the families who call Forest Lake Pointe home.

Ms. Jessica Brewton, 1900 Osprey Drive, Florence, SC was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. She requested that Florence County limit the zoning on the proposed parcels to R-1, or B-1 if they must be zoned commercial. Ms. Brewton noted that while residents understand the need for zoning and recognize that B-3 zoning may be appropriate for many properties along Highway 76, the parcels in front of their subdivision are unique and should be evaluated differently because of their location.

Forest Lake is one of only four recognized lakes in Florence County and its location along the commercial corridor of Highway 76 requires particular consideration. While residents would prefer the properties be zoned R-1, a B-1 designation would also be acceptable; it allows commercial development but at a lower intensity providing a better transition between Highway 76 and the homes and lake immediately behind the properties.

More intensive commercial development could mean larger buildings, expanded parking areas, increased impervious surfaces, stormwater runoff, heightened traffic, lighting, signage, noise, pollution, trespassing, and potential crime for their neighborhood. Good planning does not mean that every property along Highway 76 must receive the same level of commercial zoning. Instead, it means recognizing when a particular location requires a different approach. The County has been successful at zoning many B-3

properties along the corridor, but it should acknowledge that while those commercial spaces are plentiful, the county's lakes and wetland areas are limited and should be protected.

Ms. Brewton asked if Florence County could make an exception for this small area of the corridor to signal to local residents and travelers that the community values its beautiful lakes, wildlife, and neighborhood areas. Her request is simple, recognize the unique and sensitive location of the proposed parcels and zone them R-1. If not R-1 then limit the properties to a B-1 rather than a B-2 or B-3 zoning designation. This will allow reasonable development while providing greater protection for a location that warrants greater consideration. The County has the opportunity now to make that distinction before a development makes it that much harder to reverse.

Mr. Oliver Brewton, 1900 Osprey Drive, Florence, SC was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. He read through his prepared remarks and stated that he would avoid repeating previous points. He noted for the Commission that one of the parcels was distinctively different as it was directly uphill from the wetland, separated only by an adjacent road. He reiterated that they had already discussed the wetlands, the wildlife sanctuary and the ospreys. He agreed that B-1 would be appropriate for the properties except for the first one beside the wetland; he would request that it be R-1, as he would prefer that all the properties to be R-1. He conceded that an R-1 designation might be difficult to defend in court, but argued that the land's unique proximity to the lake provided a justifiable defense. Additionally, if R-1 was not feasible he requested a B-1 designation over B-2 or B-3 to minimize impervious surface coverage. Mr. Brewton, in closing reiterated public safety concerns and stated that introducing industrial uses would negatively alter their neighborhood's character.

Ms. Stacy Foster, 2001 Chickadee Court, Florence, SC was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. She stated that given the location of her residence, she would look directly at the dumpsters of businesses along the Highway 76 corridor from her driveway if they were zoned into any of the commercial districts. She noted that residents would be forced to drive past dumpsters or the backs of businesses daily. She added that the access roads next to the current residential properties would probably remain, meaning traffic would likely access the businesses via Bateman Drive and pull out through their neighborhoods. Ms. Foster stated that the current residents on Chickadee Court would be the most affected by the zoning change, looking daily at dumpsters and the backs of liquor stores and motels. Finally, she stated that when residents attempt to sell their homes, prospective buyers would have to drive past the backs of those establishments, destroying their property values. She requested that the properties be zoned R-1 to protect their neighborhood and property values.

Mr. Josh Harris, 1805 Nighthawk Drive, Florence, SC was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. He stated that he lives in Forest Lake Pointe and, since he did not get the opportunity to call in, he wanted the Commission to know that he opposes the B-3 zoning designation. He noted that he would prefer R-1 zoning or if R-1 is not possible, a B-1 zoning designation instead.

Mr. Kevin Russell, 1975 Tanager Drive, Florence, SC was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. He stated that the land sits at a high elevation overlooking the lake. He noted that although no one is currently planning it, the site would be a perfect location for a two story restaurant overlooking the lake and their homes. He argued that a buyer would likely purchase the approximately two

and one half acre (2 ½ acre) property to build a nice restaurant with an elevating dining area. It would turn their neighborhood into a highly trafficked walking area for strangers, which is not currently the case. He reminded the Commission that they consist of Florence County citizens who own homes and property that they hope to turn over to their children. He concluded that if the area is zoned commercial he would lose $100,000 of his home's equity, costing his children their future inheritance just so people could visit a restaurant overlooking the lake by his home.

There was discussion and questions from the Commission.

In response to the discussion and questions, Mr. Brashear noted that, to the credit of the residents at the previous meeting, almost unanimously they requested that their neighborhood of Forest Lake Pointe be zoned R-1. He stated that staff would be looking into this request in the future, as the residents now understand the necessity of zoning.

He further stated that if the Commission wished to change the zoning recommendation from the staff's original proposal, a list of allowable uses within the B-1, B-2, and B-3 designations had been provided on the dais for each member. The Commission reviewed the uses during the public meeting paying close attention to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) numbers that classify the business uses. (A copy of the document is maintained at the Florence County Planning and Building Department.)

Mr. Brashear noted that it is difficult to split zone properties. When staff does split zone a property, there are recordable plats that go along with that property to show definitively where the zoning designation lines are. The property owners would have to make such requests, as staff cannot record a plat on their behalf. In reference to the County access road beside the one property and off of Osprey Road, a business wishing to utilize that access road must submit an encroachment request for approval by the Florence County Public Works Department.

There was further discussion from the Commission stating that they could recommend an R-1 zoning designation for the properties; and, if the Bateman family desired to change the zoning they could submit a request to have their property rezoned or split zoned.

In response to the discussion, Mr. Brashear stated that the Bateman family could request to have their property rezoned. However, in order to avoid spot zoning, it would take several of the properties to get to the five acre (5 acre) threshold for split zoning to have the frontage of the properties commercial and the rear residential. The property owner could also annex their property into the City of Florence and request a zoning that is contiguous with the City Zoning across the street from the parcels.

Mr. Brashear further noted that some properties do not touch the corridor of Highway 76 and therefore are not recommended for zoning at this time. However, second tier neighborhoods adjacent to Highway 76 will be presented and recommended for zoning as part of the county's ongoing initiative to zone all properties within Florence County. Residents of Forest Lake Pointe have already expressed to staff their desire for an R-1 zoning designation for their second tier neighborhood.

Mr. Brashear reiterated that staff's only communication regarding the Bateman family properties was a phone call from an individual stating they were the daughter and granddaughter of the family, expressing support for a B-3 zoning designation. Because staff understands most members of the Bateman family are elderly and possibly residing in nursing facilities, staff would need to locate the properties legal representatives for a formal discussion before meeting with the family directly.

Staff recommended a B-3 zoning designation because the properties are situated along the major four-lane corridor of Highway 76 through Florence, SC. From a planning perspective, this designation aligns with the City of Florence's business zoning directly across the street, which is equivalent to B-3. Additionally, the properties are located just one mile from Interstate 95. The immediate danger right now is that the properties are not zoned at all, they are completely unzoned, so it is critical that zoning be applied to the properties.

Mr. Brashear stated that the publicly advertised and posted information for the four parcels indicated that the zoning map amendment was requested to change the property from unzoned. Staff's recommendation is for a B-3 zoning designation, which the Commission can change and move forward with a different zoning recommendation, if they desire.

There were no further questions, comments or discussion and Commissioner Gregory Miller made a motion that the requested map amendment **PC#2026-91 be approved for an R-1 Single Family Residential zoning designation and if the Bateman family desired they could request a zoning change.** (This would allow the Bateman family to annex their property into the City if they desired but with no representation the Commission made a recommendation for an R-1 zoning designation) / Second – Commissioner John Martin and Commissioner Christopher Mishoe / The Commission voted 7 to 1 to approve the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-91 for an R-1 Single Family Residential zoning designation**. (Chairman Cheryl Floyd was opposed to the requested recommendation for an R-1, single family residential zoning designation.)

PC#2026-87 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Property In Group Four Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Property As It Is Reflected On The Tax Map As: 90160-01-030.

(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. Ethan Brown, Deputy Director of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He noted that the unzoned property was a part of the Highway 76 corridor project and was located in County Council District Six (6). He continued with the presentation showing aerials and zonings of the properties and adjacent properties. He noted that staff's recommendation for the parcel was B-3 and to the west of the property it was contiguous with a B-3 zoning and east of the property is zoned CMU. He further stated that the property was directly behind the Food Lion on Highway 76 and to the south would be McCurdy Road and on the other side would be the Circle K in that area. The property is not directly on Highway 76, but a second tiered property by the corridor

project where it starts to transition from commercial to residential properties. Staff did not receive any inquiries regarding the requested zoning map amendment and the property was properly posted per Florence County Ordinances.

There were questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission, Mr. Brown stated that the acreage of the parcel was not listed on the staff report but it was a rather large parcel.

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

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

Ms. Laquita White, 222 Penshurst Drive, Florence, SC was present and requested to ask a question. She inquired exactly where the subject vacant parcel was behind the Food Lion as she was not aware of any open areas of land within the property area that was zoned B-3.

In response to questions from the public, Chairman Cheryl Floyd stated that the subject parcel was being recommended for zoning to B-3 and the location of the vacant parcel was before McCurdy Manor; on McCurdy Road directly behind the Food Lion grocery store and adjacent shops on Highway 76 on the east side of the City of Florence.

Hearing no further discussion or questions, Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any additional questions or speakers in opposition to or in favor of the requested zoning map amendment.

Hearing none, Chairman Cheryl Floyd closed the public hearing and requested a motion, discussion, comments or questions from the Commission.

Hearing no further questions, comments or discussion, Commissioner John Martin made a motion to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-87 /** Second - Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-87 for a B-3, General Commercial District zoning designation.**

PC#2026-88 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Four Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90160-01-001, 90160-01-002, 90160-01-003, 90160-01-004, 90160-01-005, 90160-01-006, 90160-01-007, 90160-01-008, 90160-01-009, 90160-01-010, 90160-01-011, 90160-01-012, 90160-01-013, 90160-01-014, 90160-01-015, 90160-01-016, 90160-01-017, 90160-01-018, 90160-01-019, 90160-01-020, 90160-01-027, 90160-01-028, 90160-01-031, 90160-02-001, 90160-02-002, 90160-02-004, 90160-02-005, 90160-02-006, 90160-02-007, 90160-02-008, 90160-02-009, 90160-02-010, 90160-02-011, 90160-02-012, 90160-02-013, 90160-02-014,

90160-03-001, 90160-03-002, 90160-03-003, 90160-03-004, 90160-03-005, 90160-03-006, 90160-03-007, 90160-03-008, 90160-03-009, 90160-03-010, 90160-03-011, 90160-03-012, 90160-03-013, 90160-03-014, 90160-03-015, 90160-03-016, 90160-03-017, 90160-03-018, 90160-03-019, 90160-03-020, 90160-03-021, 90160-03-022, 90160-03-023, 90160-03-024, 90160-03-025, 90160-03-026, 90160-03-027, 90160-03-028, 90160-03-031.

(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. Ethan Brown, Deputy Director of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He noted that the unzoned properties were on the east side of the Highway 76 corridor project and were located in County Council District Six (6). He noted that staff was recommending an R-2 single family residential zoning designation for the subject properties. He continued with the presentation showing aerials and zonings of the posted and adjacent parcels. He explained that the zonings fronting the second tier parcels on Highway 76 were B-3 and CMU. He noted that the parcels were smaller single family lots which fit the R-2 zoning designation.

Mr. Brown 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.)

There were questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission, Mr. Brown noted that the parcels which appeared not to be included with the subject properties were addressed earlier and were part of the overlay district of the corridor project study and were recommended for an R-2 zoning designation within the overlay district.

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

Ms. Patsy Drayton, 3300 Woodburn Drive, Florence, SC, was present and spoke in favor of the requested zoning map amendment. She noted that she supports the zoning of R-2 single family residential for the subject properties.

Ms. Jane Shaw, 3313 Woodburn Drive, Florence, SC, was present and spoke in favor of the requested zoning map amendment. She stated she has lived at her residence since 1963 and she would like for it to remain single family residential property.

Hearing no further discussion or questions, Chairman Cheryl Floyd opened the floor for public comments from anyone in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment.

Ms. Laquita White, 222 Penshurst Drive, Florence, SC, was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. She stated that she was unsure if her specific parcel was included in the subject properties but noted her membership in the community. Ms. White explained that several affected property owners were present earlier but had to leave due to medical issues and the late hour, which she attributed to changes in the meeting agenda order. While she was not certain if those individuals had submitted inquiries for or against the requested zoning map amendment; she emphasized that the scheduling adjustments forced multiple community members to leave before the item was called.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd apologized for the changes to the agenda and expressed her displeasure that the length of the meeting caused some citizens to leave before they had the opportunity to make public comments, if they had desired to do so.

Hearing no further questions, comments or discussion Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson made a motion to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-88** / Second - Commissioner John Martin / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to approve as presented the requested zoning map amendment **PC#2026-88 for an R-2, Single Family Residential zoning designation**.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd noted that the recommended zoning map amendment would appear before County Council on October 15, 2026 at 9:00 a.m.

PC#2026-89 Map Amendment Requested By Florence County To Change The Zoning Designation For The Properties In Group Four Of The Highway 76 Corridor Project From Unzoned. This Amendment Shall Apply To The Following Properties As They Are Reflected On The Tax Maps As: 90160-03-032, 90160-03-033, 90160-03-034, 90160-03-035, 90160-03-036, 90160-03-037, 90160-03-038, 90160-03-039, 90160-03-040, 90160-03-041, 90160-03-042, 90160-03-043, 90160-03-044, 90161-01-003, 90161-01-004, 90161-01-005, 90161-01-006, 90161-01-007, 90161-01-008, 90161-01-009, 90161-01-010, 90161-01-011, 90161-01-012, 90161-01-013, 90161-02-001, 90161-02-002, 90161-02-003, 90161-02-004, 90161-02-005, 90161-02-006, 90161-02-007, 90161-02-008, ~~90161-02-016~~, 90161-02-017, 90161-02-018, 90161-02-019, 90161-02-020, 90161-02-021, 90161-02-022, 90161-02-023, 90161-02-024, 90161-02-025, ~~90161-02-026~~, ~~90161-02-029~~, ~~90161-02-030~~, ~~90161-02-031~~, ~~90161-02-032~~, ~~90161-02-033~~, ~~90161-02-034~~, ~~90161-02-035~~, ~~90161-02-036~~, ~~90161-02-037~~, ~~90161-02-038~~, ~~90161-02-039~~, ~~90161-02-040~~, ~~90161-02-041~~, ~~90161-02-042~~, ~~90161-02-043~~.

(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. Ethan Brown, Deputy Director of Florence County Planning and Building, presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He noted that the unzoned properties were a part of the same neighborhood of parcels previously discussed on the east side of the Highway 76 corridor project and were located in County Council District Six (6). He noted that the properties were further into the residential portion of the secondary properties of the Highway 76 corridor project study. The parcels were split into two different item numbers because of the number of parcels listed and staff was recommending the same

zoning designation of R-2 single family residential for the subject properties as recommended for the previous parcels to the North of the subject parcels. He continued with the presentation showing aerials and zonings of the posted and adjacent parcels. He explained that the parcels that were removed from the item were for the properties that were along the Handy Lane Road and that staff wanted to revisit those property's zonings to recommend a more appropriate zoning.

Mr. Brown 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.)

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.

Mr. Keith White, 222 Penshurst Drive, Florence, SC was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. Mr. White noted that due to the large numbers of citizens in the meeting, many of his neighbors were unable to remain long enough to comment on the agenda item, which he characterized as a disservice to the community. He stated that residents desire for their community to remain unzoned, noting that the neighborhood has remained unchanged since he purchased his property thirteen (13) years ago.

Mr. White questioned the County's rationale for zoning the area, arguing that their residential neighborhood is not close enough to Highway 76 to have any impact on the corridor. He further distinguished their neighborhood from the Forest Lake community, describing their properties as rural border tracts where residents engage in outdoor and agricultural activities. He concluded by stating that placing restrictions on their properties was a disservice to the property owners, changing the conditions under which they originally purchased their land, and that the neighbors he had spoken with are unanimously opposed to the requested zoning map amendment changes.

There were questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to the questions and discussion, Mr. White stated that he does not wish to have the properties zoned single family residential and prefers they remain unzoned as they are not seeking any changes to the current zoning designation. Mr. White additionally stated that several long time neighborhood residents had to leave the meeting after the agenda order was amended, missing their opportunity to voice their concerns and opinions regarding the requested zoning change. It would be a disservice to the residents for the Commission to render a recommendation without the residents having had the opportunity to express their opinions and concerns.

Ms. Laquita White, 222 Penshurst Drive, Florence, SC was present and spoke in opposition to the requested zoning map amendment. She stated that she lives in the neighborhood where the county is requesting zoning and she requested that the Board maintain the community's unzoned zoning status. Leaving their properties unzoned protects them more than a residential classification would. She understood the concerns with the properties being unzoned, but the neighborhood is already established. Fundamental property rights naturally default to the landowner as they are now. The classification allows many property owners throughout the subdivision to utilize their land with the flexibility of long term uses. There are a lot of homeowners who are doing a lot of things within their neighborhoods, and most of them desire it to remain unzoned. But by meeting basic county wide standards the property owners do what is required to adhere to all county regulations.

The greatest risk of the zoning change is the uncertainty. It is what they do not know about the regulatory shifts that truly affect them as homeowners. In planning and development most property owners don't know they have a problem until a problem exist. It also goes both ways because a property owner could also have a neighbor who does not care for them or just doesn't like them and then you have issues with that change. A problem does not exist until it actively manifests and disrupts someone's life. Locking their neighborhood into a new untested classification of residential zoning creates a wave of uncertainty for the long term residents who rely on their land for practical everyday uses, they could find themselves caught in situations. There are a lot of older homeowners in the community that the zoning change could affect. By imposing a rigid residential zoning classification on their parcels will strip away their current protections and shift total control of their properties away from them. Even if the current uses are grandfathered in, it will still limit the property owners ability to upgrade their structures, sell their homes without complex legal disclosures or to pass their properties down to family members without several issues.

There were questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission, Mr. Brashear stated that only single family dwellings are allowed within an R-2 zoning designation and the number designates the lot size of the property, minimum eighty feet (80') wide and six thousand square feet (6,000 sq ft). If a property owner presently has a business out of their residence, and has a certificate a zoning compliance for that business, then it would be legally nonconforming and would be grandfathered in. If the structure were damaged or destroyed and a permit to rebuild was not obtained within eighteen months (18 mos) then officially the property would revert solely to the R-2 zoning designation. If someone were running an auto body shop and had a certificate of zoning compliance and applicable licensing, then they could continue running their auto body shop. Additionally, if they could sell it and someone purchased it, they could continue running their auto body shop, but if it ceased to operate for eighteen months (18 mos), then that is when the legally nonconforming status goes away.

There were questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission, Ms. White stated that residents do not want illegal businesses operating within their neighborhood. She noted that under the current unzoned status, property owners could have businesses and utilize their properties as they desire. She noted that if a person were in school and wanted to start a telehealth business in their home, she was not sure if they could have

that type of home based business if the property were zoned R-2, but presently, being unzoned, it is allowed. Ms. White additionally requested that if the properties could not remain unzoned, that the Commission grant property owners additional time to review and research what zoning classification is best for their entire community.

There were questions and discussion from the Commission regarding the critical role of zoning in safeguarding established residential neighborhoods. To illustrate the risks of remaining unzoned, members cited the potential for incompatible commercial uses, such as a 24-hour pool hall, to open adjacent to residential homes. The Commission emphasized that zoning regulations protect existing property values and family environments by proactively managing future development, whereas a lack of zoning exposes neighborhoods to unpredictable and disruptive land uses.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission, Mr. Brashear stated that per zoning standards in a residential district you cannot operate a business. Within the zoning code requirements it does allow home occupations, meaning the work takes place solely inside the dwelling, you cannot have outside signage, advertisement or outside storage. The occupation must take place within the home. There are some caveats, such as deed restrictions, which if presented to staff, then staff could not issue a certificate of zoning compliance to allow the home occupation. It is not like a person working from home, but someone running a business from their home, that is a home occupation and it is allowed in the zoning code in a residential district but has restrictions which do not allow a sign to advertise the business and the likes.

There were questions and discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and discussion from the Commission, Mr. White stated that the Forest Lake residents had the attention of the meeting, they even provided a round of applause. The members of his community also showed up, but due to the amended changes of the agenda, they had to leave. Additionally, the last item that was voted on is within their neighborhood and some of those neighbors are also against the requested zoning changes. The Commission, however, has already approved it and provided a recommendation for R-2 zoning.

The Commission again apologized for the length of the meeting and Commissioner Doris Lockhart made a motion to **defer until the next meeting the request map amendment PC#2026-89** / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to **defer PC#2026-89 until the next planning commission meeting**.

After further discussion and comments Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson made a motion for the Commission to reconsider PC#2026-88 / Second - Commissioner John Martin / The Commission voted 6 to 2 to reconsider **PC#2026-88**. (Chairman Cheryl Floyd and Commissioner Jeffrey Tanner were opposed to the reconsideration of PC#2026-88 as some public residents did remain in the meeting and expressed their concerns regarding the zoning.)

Commissioner John Martin made a motion that **PC#2026-88 be deferred until the next meeting** / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson and Commissioner Christopher Mishoe / The Commission

voted 7 to 1 to **defer PC#2026-88 until the next planning commission meeting**. (Commissioner Jeffrey Tanner was opposed to the deferral of PC#2026-88 until the next meeting.)

The Public Hearing portion of the meeting was closed.

V. Director's Report:

Mr. Ethan Brown presented the summary plat and building activity report and they were also attached and presented for the Commission's review.

He additionally stated that although the email reminder had been forwarded he wanted to remind the Commission of the Planning & Land Use Training for Counties that would be on October 2nd, 2026.

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

VI. Adjournment:

There were no further questions, comments and or discussion and Commissioner Christopher Mishoe made a motion that the Planning Commission meeting be adjourned / Second – Commissioner Gregory Miller / The Commission voted 8 to 0 to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

_____

Lisa M. Becoat
Secretary

Approved by:

_____

J. Shawn Brashear
Director, Planning and Building

_____

Ethan Brown
Deputy Director, Planning and Building

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