Anderson County Planning Commission

Vacant, At Large
Scott Junkins, Vice-Chair, District #1
Brad Burdette, District #2
Steven Gilreath, District #3
Michael Burns, At Large
Mark Ligon, District #4
David Cothran, District #5
Jane Jones, District #6
Dan Harvell, Chair, District #7

Agenda
August 11, 2026
Regularly Scheduled Meeting
6:00 PM

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Invocation
3. Pledge of Allegiance
4. Approval of Agenda
5. Approval of Minutes – May 12 and June 09, 2026, Minutes
6. Introduction of Anderson County Planning Commission Member, Council District 4, Mark Ligon.
7. Public Hearings:
    A. Variance Request: To allow existing parcel to be subdivided into 4 lots under the minimum lot size requirement. Located at Guest Circle. / TMS 178-00-01-002 **(Council District 2)**.
        1. Staff Presentation
        2. Developer Presentation
        3. Public Hearing – Citizen Comments
    B. Rezoning Request: Applicant is requesting to go back to R-20 from I-2. Located at Dixon Road. / TMS 95-00-03-006 **(Council District 5)**.
        1. Staff Presentation
        2. Developer Presentation
        3. Public Hearing – Citizen Comments
    C. Land Use: Verizon In-Line Amplifier Facility. Located at Highway 29 North. / TMS 219-00-06-036 **(Council District 7)**.
        1. Staff Presentation
        2. Developer Presentation
        3. Public Hearing – Citizen Comments
8. New Business:
    A. Single-Family Subdivision (Conservation): Burress Farm. Located at Norris Road and Hard Hillhouse Drive. / TMS 99-00-05-014, -017, -024, -053, 99-00-06-001, and 99-00-10-001 **(Council District 3 & 5)**
        1. Staff Presentation
        2. Developer Presentation
        3. Public Hearing – Citizen Comments
    B. Single-Family Subdivision: Camden Crest. Located at Spearman Road. / TMS 193-00-08-004 **(Council District 4)**.
        1. Staff Presentation
        2. Developer Presentation
        3. Public Hearing – Citizen Comments

See Back…

Anderson County Planning Commission

Vacant, At Large
Scott Junkins, Vice-Chair, District #1
Brad Burdette, District #2
Steven Gilreath, District #3
Michael Burns, At Large
Mark Ligon, District #4
David Cothran, District #5
Jane Jones, District #6
Dan Harvell, Chair, District #7

9. Old Business:
    A. Land Use: Anderson Mill Apartments. Located at Highway 29 South and Highway 28 Bypass. / TMS 125-07-03-004 **(Council District 2)**.
        1. Staff Presentation
        2. Developer Presentation
        3. Public Hearing – Citizen Comments
    B. Variance Request: To allow three additional driveways for lots to be subdivided off Nautical Way due to SCDOT pending request. Located at 121 Nautical Way. / TMS 27-00-01-006 **(Council District 4)**.
        1. Staff Presentation
        2. Developer Presentation
        3. Public Hearing – Citizen Comments
    C. Variance Request: To allow existing parcel to be subdivided under 1 acre requirement to place a mobile home. This is .10 tenth of an acre under the minimum requirement. Located at 8801 Highway 24. / TMS 7-01-02-006 **(Council District 4)**.
        1. Staff Presentation
        2. Developer Presentation
        3. Public Hearing – Citizen Comments
10. Public Comments, non-agenda items – 3 minutes limit per speaker
11. Adjournment

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

COUNTY OF ANDERSON)

ANDERSON COUNTY

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

MAY 12, 2026

PRESENT:
WESLEY GRANT, CHAIRMAN
SCOTT JUNKINS
BRAD BURDETTE
STEVEN GILREATH
WILL MOORE
DAVID COTHRAN
JANE JONES
DAN HARVELL
MICHAEL BURNS

ALSO PRESENT:
ALESIA HUNTER
TIM CARTEE
BRITTANY MCABEE
QUANESHIA HAMMOND

WESLEY GRANT: Good evening. I'd like to welcome you to the May 12 Anderson County Planning Commission meeting. We're glad you're here with us. We'd like to call the meeting to order. If you're able to stand, please join me for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance led by Mr. Harvell.

DAN HARVELL: Let us pray.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE BY DAN HARVELL

WESLEY GRANT: Next, we have our agenda for approval. Commissioners, I presume you saw where we're removing item 8B, the Waters Run subdivision. We need to entertain a motion to amend that.

WILLIAM MOORE: Motion, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: We got a motion by Mr. Moore.

DAVID COTHRAN: Second.

WESLEY GRANT: We got a second by Mr. Cothran. All those in favor. Thank you. It's unanimous.

So for those in the crowd, if any of you are here for item 8B, Waters Run subdivision, in case you didn't see it on the, on the doorway, it has been removed from tonight's agenda.

Do we have a motion to approve the minutes that you guys had the opportunity to see online from June, July, August and March?

We got a motion by Mr. Burdette. We have a second?

WILLIAM MOORE: I'll second that.

WESLEY GRANT: We got a second by Mr. Moore. All those in favor. It’s unanimous. Thank you.

That moves us into public hearings. Item A is related to Palmetto Place Apartments located at Highway 28 Bypass, tax map number 12408010150 and 029, County Council District Two. I'll turn it over to staff for their presentation.

ALESIA HUNTER: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As mentioned, this is a large scale project. It's called Palmetto, Palmetto Place Apartments. It’s a multi family development. It will consist of 126 units. Property owner of record is Epstein Living Trust and Ms. Julie Baker, authorized representative. They are here this evening as TWG Development, LLC and Tenant Development. Again, is multi family dwellings.

Location is Highway 28 Bypass and Flowe Road.

The details of the development consist of, again, 126 units. Also a breakdown of the units. There will be 32 one bedroom units, 50 two bedroom units, and 44 three bedroom units. Also will include a clubhouse. It's 2920 square feet. Also, they do intend to include several amenities, a dedicated clubhouse, a putting green, children's playground, a dog park, community garden and outdoor gas grills and open space areas.

In addition, this is -- they are going to use a preference for veterans. They have added a component in there for leasing -- a leasing strategy to offer veterans, both men and women who have served the country and made the ultimate sacrifice, for quality and stable housing in honor and support for their long term care for quality of life for the residents.

Required parking: Parking is based upon the dwelling units. 236 parking spaces are included. 14 ADA parking spaces provided. The surrounding land uses is outdoor shed and commercial areas there. Total site area is 9.74 acres.

County Council District Two. Property is unzoned. Here's your tax map for your reference.

Extension of existing development: It's not -- existing access roads is Highway 28 Bypass and Flowe Road. And there are no variances requested.

Traffic impact analysis: Proposed development is located on 29 Bypass. This is a state maintained road, for your reference, SC 040028, and then Flowe Road, C-9-320, which is considered a minor local road. The traffic impact analysis was conducted by Roger Dyar, P.E., Dyar Engineering.

A traffic study has been submitted and DOT has summarized its findings for your review.

And then also, I'll go ahead and turn it over to Anderson County Roads and Bridges so they can discuss their findings.

BRITTANY MCABEE: Thank you. So we did receive this traffic impact study later than we would have liked to. So during the course of the review, it was discovered that there was some missing information from the original traffic impact study. So we are -- we have received the next iteration of that traffic impact study that should have that information that we were looking for. To kind of give you an idea of how that will play out is we do still have to issue an encroachment permit for this project if you guys approve it tonight. We will, of course, make sure we have an approvable traffic study

before issuing that encroachment permit.

Any improvements on Highway 28 from what I saw from the traffic impact study is highly unlikely. DOT approved the traffic impact study as is, and they were concerned about Highway 28, mainly because that is their road. I doubt, with the additional information that I requested, I will find something that will contradict what DOT has already stated.

The biggest concern is Flowe Road. Flowe Road is a minor local so we have an ADT cap, or an annual -- or average daily traffic cap. Flowe Road may or may not need to be upgraded along their side only. Again, we can hold them to that in the encroachment permit process. That was the only kind of iffy whether they would have to improve Flowe Road. I can't say whether they will or not. But again, even if you approve this tonight, we will hold them -- if they are required to improve Flowe Road, we will hold them on the encroachment permit.

So if you have any more questions, I'd be happy to answer.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

ALESIA HUNTER: Staff assessment: This comes out of Chapter 24. If the commission does approve the large scale project, there are a number of permits that has to be secured before commencement of land disturbance. And South Carolina Department of Environmental Control does have to issue a National Pollutant Discharge permit. Also our county stormwater erosion control. City of Anderson, in your packet, you will see they will be the sewer and water provider. And course they have to have approval from them. SCDOT encroachment permitting as well. Fire, water -- water authority. Airport heights. There's a number of items listed for your review that they do have to continue on if the project is approved to move forward.

Of course, always they have to do a detailed site plan, grading permit and building permitting as well.

Here is a layout of the Palmetto Place, what the apartment -- multi family development will look like. You can see all the green space, open space areas there and the clubhouse and the units there. Here's another site layout where you can see the two access points, Flowe Road and Highway 28 Bypass.

This is the floor plan of what the units will look like inside the, inside the buildings. This is some different floor plans.

Here are some renderings of some of the projects

that TWD has worked on. I believe these here are recently constructed in Greenville County. Here's some inside photos of the units. Here is an aerial photo of the subject property. There you can see where the surrounding land uses are in conjunction to where this property is located. Here is the land use sign that's required to be posted for your review.

That concludes your staff report, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you, Ms. Hunter. Do we have representation from the developer side that would like to present? Yeah, if you'll just please state your name and address, please, and we'll give you an opportunity to speak.

JACKSON TAYLOR: My name is Jackson Taylor, representing TWG Development, located at 1301 East Washington Street in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Did a great job, I think -- or the staff, I think, did a great job. I'm just kind of hitting on a lot of the high level benchmarks of this project, given the use -- you know, the unit count, amenities. I really like the fact that we're doing a veterans preference on this one, especially with just even driving around and being involved in the state, how committed this state and community is to supporting our veterans, supporting our troops. I think that's something that meshes really well, I think, with the long term vision and kind of a lot of the priorities of not just the county, but the state at whole -- at large, and this community as well.

One thing I want to hit on, particularly with the traffic study. I know we have Roger Dyar here tonight, our traffic engineer. We've kind of had a back and forth with Roads and Bridges trying to get the final -- their kind of final approval on everything. And they've been great, you know, super responsive, and we've had a number of conversations with them over the last couple of weeks, just trying to get everything resolved.

My understanding is that this was based kind of on just a scope of work related to the average daily counts on that Flowe Road, which are pretty minimal compared to the county standards of 500 average, average daily trips, or something like that. I think we found between 320 and 330 when we revised the counts, but I know it's still being reviewed.

So any questions that you all have that you want to direct to Brittany or Roger, I think they can speak to that as well. If you have any technical specific questions -- again, state findings were

that, essentially, if we are to build our project, it's not going to substantially impact any current congestion or traffic on those main corridors, particularly 28 and Dobbins Bridge and then 28 and 29 Highway, I think are the two big ones, but they found no material future expected impact from our project being built versus not being built. I think it's a great location for it. You know, the future land use plan has it as kind of a mixed use commercial/ residential area. So I think it fits that pretty well.

I'm trying to remember the source off the top of my head that -- I was looking at this the other day -- that it's showing that Anderson County needs -- or Anderson City particularly, but especially the county, as well, needs, I think, 1600 housing units by 2031 just to even support the current population, not accounting for any future growth that's coming with or without our project. So I think that's worth noting as well.

I think -- one other thing that I think is worth considering, outside of the fact that we're not -- just to be totally clear, we're not asking for, as I think Alesia has alluded to this already, we're not asking for approvals for permits or anything like that. You know, we're still far out from breaking ground, probably in July or August 2027 if I had to guess. But all we're really looking for tonight is approval to move forward with just the use and the density that we're requesting, to be able to move forward with our project.

But I think beyond that, given that this land is, in my opinion, a very prime commercial area, an area that is booming, I think if our project is not the one to be developed there, there will likely be something developed in its place, probably in the next three to five years. There very likely could be a commercial project that would generate, you know, probably four or five times the traffic that we will. So I think that's just at least something to consider.

But that’s really all I have unless you all have questions directly for me, or you want to direct to Roger, feel free.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you. We may call you back.

JACKSON TAYLOR: Thanks.

DAN HARVELL: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

WESLEY GRANT: Okay.

DAN HARVELL: Yes, sir. Has this -- has the deed shifted to this property already, or you are just the engineering design build firm?

JACKSON TAYLOR: So we are currently in a purchase option contract, under contract until, I believe, June of 2027, currently. So we are not the current property record -- or current property owner of record, but we have a -- an executed contract to close on the land by June 2027.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Thank you, sir.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you. We'll open it up to the public hearing. We had one person sign up to speak on this particular project, Lillie McGee. Okay. Ms. McGee, if you will please state your name and address, please. And we allow each person three minutes to speak.

LILLIE MCGEE: My name is Lillie McGee, and I'm in Ward Five Council.

And my problem with -- in our neighborhood, where we're talking about the Planning Committee for the apartments on 28 and Flowe Road, what I would like to know, would that make the property of our community go down, which is on Hillcrest Circle. And we do have one apartment on the right hand side of Hillcrest Circle, and that made the value of our property to go down. So what I'm interested in, would that be -- that if they do the apartment, would that bring the value of our community down for tax purposes.

And most everybody in our neighborhood on Hillcrest Circle is elder peoples. So we had one apartment is on the -- around the circle on the left hand side. And we had a lot of crime rate, and we had a lot of breaking in to our home. So my concern, if they do the apartment on 28 and Flowe and Flowe going to comes out into Burdine, and we have the school, is the Miller's Academy Southwood. And we have a lot of problems getting in and out our neighborhood when the school's in in the morning and in the afternoon.

So that's my concern. And I just wanted to know, how would -- would that affect our neighborhood, or not, about putting apartment? And I wanted to know, is it going to be apartment, or is it going to be condos there? Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you, ma'am. And I will say, Ms. McGee, this is not an opportunity for us to answer questions, per se. We

just like hearing the feedback. Did want you to know that.

Commissioners, anybody have any questions for the developer, or just ---

STEVEN GILREATH: I'd like to ask the developer based on hers, and it's -- I don't guess it matters, but it might help price range. What is the target price range?

JACKSON TAYLOR: Let me pull this up real quick. I had this written down. So right now -- and again, obviously this is subject to change based on, you know, population growth, market changes, just our preliminary kind of general market analysis, not anything formal has been ordered or done yet. That's coming very, very soon. But right now, we're currently estimating one bedrooms to go for roughly about 900 a month. Two beds are going to be about 1100. And three beds are going to be about 1250 a month, currently.

STEVEN GILREATH: 1450 a month?

JACKSON TAYLOR: 1250.

STEVEN GILREATH: 1250?

JACKSON TAYLOR: Yeah.

STEVEN GILREATH: So that's at average, or a little above, I would -- for Anderson County.

JACKSON TAYLOR: Yeah, that's just based on kind of general comps around the area that we've dug into. But again, we'll order a formal market study to confirm that in the coming months.

STEVEN GILREATH: Thank you.

DAN HARVELL: Is that to say that this development is intended to be a rental?

JACKSON TAYLOR: Correct.

DAN HARVELL: Not -- no units purchased as condos or the like?

JACKSON TAYLOR: No. This will be all rental units.

DAN HARVELL: All right. Thank you.

MICHAEL BURNS: Is it intended to be gated?

JACKSON TAYLOR: I don't know if there's anything currently on our site plan that shows that. I know we'll have more detailed civil work done with landscaping and whatnot coming down the road, but that's something we can definitely include, if that's something that the county would like to see.

MICHAEL BURNS: And then what, what is the previous use?

JACKSON TAYLOR: I believe the current use right now is it's being used as like shed storage, I think is my understanding, where they have sheds either for sale or just sitting on the site. The majority of the parcel that we have under contract right now is -- remains vacant. But I think the front -- just the frontage off 28 is currently shed storage.

MICHAEL BURNS: Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: If there's no other questions, we'll entertain a motion on the project.

JANE JONES: I've got a question.

WESLEY GRANT: Okay. I'm sorry.

JANE JONES: It doesn't say (mic not on) covers this project. Which fire station would cover this project?

JACKSON TAYLOR: I'm not exactly sure off the top of my head. Sorry, I can't answer that for you. But I know our utilities are covered by Electric City, so Anderson city, given that it's in pretty close proximity to city, to city limits, but I can look into that.

JANE JONES: He said it's Homeland Park. Our county fire people are volunteers, and so it makes a difference. But I'm concerned -- it showed in here that units will be three stories high?

JACKSON TAYLOR: Correct.

JANE JONES: And not knowing which fire station was covering you, I couldn't go to them and ask this question, but we need to know that they're equipped to handle a fire for three stories. And this came up -- I live in the Powdersville section, and there was some motels out on 85 and that stopped construction of some of those things because they couldn't handle the fires. I think it's important for us to know if, if they can cover you. And at this point, I guess we don't know.

JACKSON TAYLOR: We can't say for certain, but what I can tell you is that we've done over 130 plus of these projects. We've done projects in South Carolina. We've done projects all over the country, and areas, in my opinion, that are far more rural than Anderson, and far, I would say, less equipped, from just a public service standpoint,

to handle a three story walk-up building. And to my knowledge, we haven't had any issues with the fire department being able to, to service the ---

JANE JONES: Well, you have to have a truck that will accommodate ladders like that, to go that high, that's what I was told.

JACKSON TAYLOR: Okay.

JANE JONES: And whether they've got the equipment or not, we don't know. But that's a concern that I have.

JACKSON TAYLOR: Okay.

JANE JONES: And I know this project is in School District Five, but I don't know which particular schools it feeds into. I didn't know if we had anybody here that was from the School District Five to say anything about ---

WESLEY GRANT: It's in the Westside cluster. So it'd be Robert Anderson Middle School, Westside High.

JANE JONES: But we don't know, you know, what -- how they feel about growth in that school system, that particular school. We just don't have that information.

WESLEY GRANT: I think in the packets, Ms. Jones, it just shows the capacity.

JANE JONES: I know what the packet has. You know, we're not qualified to analyze that. I didn't even know which school it was. It doesn't tell us in here which particular schools. So you can't really go by that.

DAN HARVELL: So Mr. Chairman, that would be Robert Anderson Middle School, Westside High School, and I'm assuming Homeland Park Elementary; correct?

WESLEY GRANT: Homeland Park serves K through three, and Varennes serves grades -- I'm sorry, K through two, and Varennes serves grades three through five. So depending on the age of the child.

JANE JONES: Then we've got the middle school and the high school.

WESLEY GRANT: Any other questions for the developer? If not, we'll entertain a motion on the project so we can keep things moving.

JANE JONES: I'll make a motion that the project be denied based on my concerns about the fire coverage. And we don't have any information as far as school capacity. And I just don't, I don't feel comfortable about it.

WESLEY GRANT: So we've got

a motion by Ms. Jones to deny. Do we have a second?

DAN HARVELL: Second.

WESLEY GRANT: We got a second by Mr. Harvell. Any discussion?

DAN HARVELL: Just for the sake of information here, I'm looking at some of these school capacity figures from the district itself. It says, according to what I read here, and and Mr. Grant, you might can correct me on this if I'm wrong. But it says, that the current enrollment, Homeland Park, Homeland Park is at 107%. And let's see. And Varennes, Varenness, now they're better because they look like they're at 63%. And then Robert Anderson, which I don't see here. Robert Anderson is at 101% at this current time. That's just for a matter of information for the board.

WESLEY GRANT: Any other discussion? All those in favor of the denial, please raise your hand. All those opposed to the denial, please raise your hand. And the project is approved. Thank you.

Next on the agenda is Item 6B, rezoning request, I-2 to C-2, located at 4634 Liberty Highway, tax map number 1190017007, County Council District Four. I'll turn it over to staff for their presentation.

ALESIA HUNTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As mentioned, this is a rezoning request for property located in the Five Forks zoning area. Applicant is Ann Miles. Current owner of the properties is Ms. Miles, as well.

This is in the Five Forks precinct, Council District Four. Tax map for your reference here for your viewing. And this property is a little over a half an acre, .59 acres. They're requesting -- the zoning history: this was owned I-2 back in 1999 and this is the ordinance number and it was officially adopted in July 20 of 1999. That was the initial zoning of the property. Current zoning is I-2 Industrial Park District. And they requested rezoning is C-2, which is Highway Commercial District.

Here is what the Highway Commercial District regulates. This district is established to provide for development of major thoroughfares for commercial and land uses, which, in turns, help oriented customers from traveling by motor automobile. Establishment in this district to provide services for the traveling public. This is what the intentions of the district is. Existing land use is commercial use. Surrounding zoning, north, east,

south and west is C-2 and I-2 zoning. Current land use map, it's located in the Five Forks area. And that use map indicates commercial and industrial use. The future land use, land use map calls for industrial use. Evaluation of the rezoning is they requested it so that they can better, better be able to use the property so that it's compatible with the other commercial uses that are adjacent to the, to the parcel. The parcel is inadequate in size to use for industrial uses.

Public Outreach: Staff, we certify that existing parcel was required for public notification. This was done on April 26, as follows. We also sent out 159 postcards to property owners within 2000 feet of the subject property. The rezoning notification sign was posted on the subject property as well. Of course, we did -- we always have to advertise, and it was published in The Independent Mail.

Staff assessment: the Planning Commission meeting during which you all were -- will evaluate the application, and you will report your consideration and recommendation to County Council at their next available meeting.

Here is the plat of the property for your reference. You can see it's an older plat, and you can see when it first was platted out. It was -- it's a very old plat for your reference there.

Here is the zoning map where you can see the little small area there marked in red. You can see on the adjacent properties there, it is adjacent to already commercial uses, which is C-2 and that's the reason for the request to rezone that property.

Here is the existing land use map here. This is the new map from our comprehensive plan. And I'm sorry, that was future land use map. I can't see that. I don't know if that's future? Existing land use map and a future land use map. And these are from our new Comprehensive Plan, 2026 Plan.

Here's the rezoning sign for your reference.

This concludes your staff report, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you, Ms. Hunter. Do we have representation from the developer side here tonight? I guess -- or any representation from ...

ALESIA HUNTER: She's the property owner.

WESLEY GRANT: Okay. That works.

ANN MILES: I own it with my mother. When we purchased the building in

1997, we were under the impression that it was, in fact, commercial property. And the first thing I did was put in a beauty salon, and then I had a retail business, and then after I closed that, it was a beauty salon again, and then it was a dog grooming business. And then we come to find out all this time that we are not in compliance. I had no idea that we were not commercial.

So we use the building for income, and nobody wants to lease it, because there isn't anything that they can legally do. In the past, like I said, we weren't compliant and had no idea. I'm just grateful that nobody got closed down. But that's our reason.

The Buc-ee's bought the property next door and all of that got zoned commercial. So it's such a tiny little thing. And we've already talked to the next door neighbors. Everybody's fine with it.

WESLEY GRANT: Okay. Thank you. No one signed up to speak on the project. So do we have any questions, Commissioners?

MICHAEL BURNS: I've just got a clarification. One part of the packet, it says it's .6 acres, and one part it says it's .06 acres.

ALESIA HUNTER: Are you looking at the survey, or are you looking at the report?

MICHAEL BURNS: Report says actually .59 acres?

ALESIA HUNTER: Yes.

MICHAEL BURNS: The applicant, the owner information says total acreage, .06.

ALESIA HUNTER: Yes. The setbacks are deducted from that and right of way. So it's .59.

MICHAEL BURNS: I guess my question is, I'm not -- I'm asking whether it's six tenths of an acre, or is it six hundredths of an acre? 10th?

WESLEY GRANT: All right. Mr. Burns, did you get your answer?

Okay. Any other comments? Hearing none, we'll entertain a motion on the project.

DAN HARVELL: I'll make a motion, Mr. Chairman, to approve.

WESLEY GRANT: We got a motion by Mr. Harvell to approve.

WILLIAM MOORE: I'll second Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: Got a second

by Mr. Moore. Any discussion? All those in favor to approve. It's unanimous. Thank you.

Next on the agenda is Item 6C. It's a variance request to eliminate left turning lane at Covered Bridge subdivision located at Shackleburg Road, tax map number 1440003001, County Council District Four.

I'll turn it over to staff for their presentation.

STEVEN GILREATH: Mr. Chairman, I need to recuse myself.

WESLEY GRANT: Okay. Let it be noted Mr. Gilreath is recusing himself from this particular item. Ms. Hunter, turn it over to you.

ALESIA HUNTER: Yes, sir, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As mentioned, this is the Summit at Covered Bridge. This is a residential subdivision. It was originally approved by the Planning Commission back in April of 2025. Applicant is James Curtis Jones, Creek Development, LLC. Owner of property is Covered Bridge at Jones Creek, LLC, Shackleburg Road, County Council District is Four. And this is the tax map for your reference. Number of acres is 200 plus or minus. Current zoning is R-A and R-20. Again, the the land use is residential that's proposed. The surrounding zoning districts are R-A2, R-12, R-15 and PD, which is planned development.

Again, the applicant is requesting a variance to eliminate the left turn lane due to the inability to obtain the adequate right of way from the adjacent property owner. He has included documentation of -- for the variance and statement and email denying the developer’s request to secure the property, and they also mentioned that they are not interested in selling the property.

This comes out of Chapter 24, findings of facts out of our TIS, our traffic study, intensity standards number F. It states the following: if additional right of way, not under the control of the developer, is required to implement roadway improvements, developer shall make reasonable efforts to secure and obtain that right of way. If they are unable to, the developer is required to make a written request from the -- to the Planning Commission. This is what the reason for the variance is for.

Here is some information regarding the traffic study for your review. Here is the actual layout where they're requesting the variance. So here's the

parcels that are zoned. This is the R-12 or R-A in the planned development. And this is a zoning, zoning map for your viewing. Here's the actual variance request signage that was posted.

This concludes your staff report, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you, Ms. Hunter.

Do we have representation here on the developer's side?

WESLEY WHITE: Thank you, Commissioners. Wesley White with Ridgewater Engineering, 211 Society Street in Anderson, on behalf of the developer.

As staff mentioned, this was approved by you guys, eight oh vote, in April of last year. At that time, the traffic impact study did request -- require a turn lane. So over the last year, we've been working with the county staff on the design. This includes the left turn lane, as mentioned. We tried to request property -- all the property control that would be affected by this is controlled by the Jones Creek HOA, homeowner association. They made it clear in the email that they had no wishes to -- for this turn lane and no wishes to give up property to accommodate it. So that puts us back here with you guys.

During the last year, we've also been working with staff to address some of the concerns where the traffic was going in and out. So we've relocated some CBU locations, which has helped distribute that, that traffic a little bit better. And so as you can see from the report, we're down to 305 turns, which the threshold is 300. So we're just barely over that threshold.

Additionally, the traffic consultant made the following note, and I just want to make sure that that everybody caught it. It says both Covered Bridge Parkway and the new access road will be expected to operate at a level of service of A, which is the highest level possible, for all movements in the 24 hour total of left turning vehicles. That's only five vehicles over the Anderson County guidelines threshold for the left turn lanes.

It is anticipated that the new development traffic would operate favorably without mitigation. So that's their way of saying that -- and if you look through the report, the level of service of A is maintained with or without the turn lane.

So that's the, the main thing I wanted to point out. I'll be happy to answer any questions if y'all

have any. Appreciate it.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you. We may call you back.

We had a few people signed up to speak as we move into the public hearing part. First on our list is Ms. Candy Kern.

CANDY KERN: Mr. Chairman, my name is Candy Kern. I live on Shackleburg Road, 1812 Shackleburg Road, right across from Covered Bridge.

That traffic impact study that was referenced, the count was done 18 months ago. The traffic study itself was done 14 months ago. And where they're proposing that they put this turn lane is across from the Blanton's (phonics) property, which is at the corner of Shackleburg Road and Scotts Bridge Road.

Since then, there has been a lot of development in our area. And tonight, on your agenda tonight, you are looking at not only this property, but a property a half mile away at Thompson Road and Shackleburg Road, where there's going to be over 50 homes. And another property a half a mile away towards Martin Road where there's going to be another 69 homes.

And unfortunately, that doesn't include the mega development that's going up at the corner of Thompson Road and Dalrymple Road, which is right around the corner from Tuscany. This does not include development which has happened in this area in the past 18 months.

We already have dangerous conditions on this road. I grew up in this area. I grew up in Mr. Harvell's district, about two miles away, over on the bridge on Hampton Road, and the road that comes out right there.

Our dentist, actually, who was an orthodontist that owned this property previously had a deadly wreck on the corner on one of the three 90 degree turns when I was kid, Dr. Croxton, and the passenger in his car was killed. We still have three 90 degree blind turns on that road. This also doesn't include the property that's being developed that's right across from 1930 Shackleburg Road, my neighbor, the Windsors. I don't even know how many houses are going up there, but there's a bunch more going up there.

And with all this development, on top of those three dangerous curves, we have water issues. We have stormwater issues. They have to close the bridge on our road every time we have over an inch of

rain. A couple years ago, we lost a truck down the Brook, Brook something Meadows, Brookstone Meadows. The truck went into the water, and they had to do an under water rescue on that man. That same time, that same storm, we lost the bridge on Shackleburg Road, up by Shackleburg farms. We lost a bridge on Martin Road. And we continue to have these stormwater issues. And at the time, we continued this development with no improvement to our road, no amelioration of our water conditions. Somebody is going to go off that road and into my neighbor, Ms. Spivey's pond.

TIM CARTEE: Time, Mr. Chairman.

CANDY KERN: And the other ---

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you. That's time.

CANDY KERN: Okay.

WESLEY GRANT: We're trying to be respectful of everybody else's time as well. Thank you. Points taken.

Next we have on our list Ms. ---

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you. Ms. Carol Mercer.

CAROL MERCER: Good evening. My name is Carol Mercer, District Four.

I would like to see you guys deny this variance. I would like to see the developer make further adjustments to comply to the 300 rather than the county adjust to the developer. So please deny this variance and let them reduce the lots a couple more. Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

Next we have -- last we have Beverly ... I'm sorry. Okay. Yes, thank you.

BEVERLY ZEABART: I'm Beverly Zeabart. I live at 1981 Shackleburg Road. Can you hear me?

WESLEY GRANT: I can. Thank you.

BEVERLY ZEABART: Okay. My complaint is the fact that he has 130 homes that are going in with only one exit that can come out over that bridge that he has to put in to get around the flooding. The entire complex where he's at, where he's adding the new houses, it's all surrounded by a flood zone, okay? You can look it up on the tax maps.

With that said, all the 130 homes are going to be coming out one exit, okay? And it's my understanding that if you have over 101 homes, you have to have two exits. That would have to be, probably on to Shackleburg Road. And he's only got one, in my opinion. And I think that -- I thought that was the one we were discussing today, but I was wrong.

So my concern is that these people are going to get trapped into their subdivision because of flooding or because of a fire or something like that, and then the fire trucks are going to have to get into there. And the entrance to that place is a circle, and it's going to be hard for the fire trucks to maneuver through there.

With that said, I have a sign in my front yard, which is on Shackleburg Road. It says stuff about two axle trucks and so many tons of weight because of the Shackleburg bridge that always floods during the rain. I see so many semi trucks going through there, and farm equipment, construction equipment, being hauled over that bridge, which I'm pretty sure is all illegal. Okay?

So now, when you talk about these people moving into this subdivision that is in a flood zone, going over a bridge, I would like to have that sign moved a little bit back somewhere, so that they would see it and they would have a place to turn around in, because once it -- once they see the sign, it's too late to turn around and you're going through those curves with your heavy duty equipment.

Along with that, my issue is the whole flooding thing. I just don't want to get a whole bunch of people stuck back there with all that water, having them trapped into their subdivision because they can't get across that flood zone coming out, which would be every time Shackleburg bridge floods, they're going to flood too, probably.

And then one other thing is, because there's so much area in there that is ---

TIM CARTEE: Time, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you. Points taken. Thank you.

That concludes those that were speaking, Commissioners. Do we have any questions of anyone?

MICHAEL BURNS: Was the widening proposed on one side of the road?

WESLEY WHITE: That's correct.

MICHAEL BURNS: All on the subdivision side?
WESLEY WHITE: Uh-huh (Affirmative). And even with the symmetrical widening on both sides, it would still require right of way from them, so we ---
MICHAEL BURNS: Would there be any possibility of doing it on the other side?
WESLEY WHITE: Asymmetrical? The other side?
MICHAEL BURNS: Correct.
WESLEY WHITE: No. It would still require the HOA approval on this side. And if you don't mind if I could correct one statement. So, and Ms. McAbee can, can maybe address it as well. But the traffic study ordinance that the county requires, requires the traffic study to address future growth. So the future growth has been taken into account. I know that traffic studies are done in a certain point in time, but they are required to update background data for subdivisions that have already been approved. So that's, you know, the traffic study that was done.
DAN HARVELL: While you're here, Mr. White. Of this entire property, how much of that would you say lies within a flood plain?
WESLEY WHITE: Of the 200 acres, probably 75 to 80 of it.
DAN HARVELL: 75 or 80. So the anticipated build-out would be on how many acres?
WESLEY WHITE: I think we're around 100.
DAN HARVELL: 100.
WESLEY WHITE: And some of the concerns they've been addressed -- those have already been addressed with staff through the review process. First, the bridge height, the bridge size, the road alignments, fire code, that's already been addressed as part of the design.
DAN HARVELL: All right. Thank you, sir.
MICHAEL BURNS: I'm just trying to recall, isn't this the property that was already zoned to be developed back in 2009, 2010, somewhere?
WESLEY WHITE: You're correct. It was, and it's been taxed as such since then, and that's one of the big issues. It's always been laid out with the single access across there.

And trust me, Roads and Bridges has done a significant job of making sure that crossing is adequate.

WESLEY GRANT: Any other comments or questions?

MICHAEL BURNS: Again, would it be possible to shift the widening to the other entrance?

WESLEY WHITE: To the other side you mean?

MICHAEL BURNS: Yes -- well, no, no, I'm saying, isn't there two access points?

WESLEY WHITE: Right. Per the -- for the traffic study, it's required to be at that first entrance.

MICHAEL BURNS: Okay.

WESLEY WHITE: Due to the majority of the traffic coming from Scotts Bridge Road.

WESLEY GRANT: Any other comments?

JANE JONES: I just want to clarify something. If we voted yes to this, then we would be voting to eliminate the left hand turn lane, correct.

NO VERBAL RESPONSE

WESLEY GRANT: Okay. Commissioners, assuming there's no more comments, we'll entertain a motion.

SCOTT JUNKINS: I make a motion to approve.

WESLEY GRANT: We got a motion to approve by Junkins.

WILLIAM MOORE: I'll second, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: We got a second by Mr. Moore. Any discussion? All those in favor to approve, please raise your hand. All those opposed. And Mr. Harvell, Ms. Jones and Mr. Burns. Thank you.

DAN HARVELL: This is the one that Mr. Gilreath was ---

WESLEY GRANT: Recusing himself from.

DAN HARVELL: Okay.

WESLEY GRANT: So that gives us -- what was it? One, two, three. So it's approved. Thank you.

And let it be known for the record, Mr. Gilreath

has joined us again.

Next on our agenda is item 7A, single family subdivision, Clearbrook, located at Lawrence Road, tax map number 1510005002, County Council District Two. And I'll turn it over to staff for their presentation.

TIM CARTEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This development, 242 property owners within the 2000 feet of the proposed development were notified via postcard. And again, this is Clearbrook. It's a single family development. The applicant is BFCI Partners, LLC. Survey engineer of record is Ridgewater. And the property owner has sold this property to another applicant. And just wanted to have that for the record.

This location access is off Lawrence Road. And again, it's in Council District Two. Surrounding land use is residential and it's vacant. This area is unzoned. The tax map is there for your reference. 24.08 acres and 69 lots. No variance is requested. And does not require a traffic impact study.

Here's the lot layout for the proposed development. Here's the aerial showing the proposed property. Here's the sign for notification to the public.

This project has met the requirements of Chapter 24. This is your staff report, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you, sir. Do we have a developer here? Okay. Mr. White is coming forward.

WESLEY WHITE: Thank you, Commissioners. Wesley White with Ridgewater Engineering, 211 Society Street here in Anderson.

With me are the developers, Mr. Barreto and Felt (phonics). The existing property owners did provide a letter. I don't know if that was passed out or not.

WESLEY GRANT: I don’t have it.

WESLEY WHITE: Okay. I'm going to ask Mr. Cartee if he would pass this out to you guys. In that they just highlight the process of how they came about this property and how they ended up choosing these developers they felt were best suited to develop it the way they intended to use it. So just wanted to provide that for the record.

What we're presenting here is a 69 lot subdivision on approximately 24 acres, 2.87 lots per acre density, with an average lot size around 5800 square feet. So it's a little above the 5000 square

foot minimum.

The proposed layout sets aside over 50% of the property. The requirement right now is 25%. So we're double what's actually required to be set aside.

Again, all the utility letters have been provided. Sewer is available on the south side of the property. Again, as mentioned, no traffic impact study was required, but based on traffic counts, we don't anticipate any issue. Fire access did provide some comments. Talked to them about that. These roads will all be designed to county standards, with adequate turnarounds and cul-de-sacs and radiuses at the intersections, adequate width to bypass those.

This, as mentioned previously, this project does fall under the new mass grading ordinance, so we're looking forward to designing it as such. The developers see no issue with that. They've talked to prospective builders who are excited to comply with that. So you won't see a mass clearing of the trees on 16 acres.

Infrastructure, stormwater controls in and roads in, and then they'll systematically go through and build the lots. So I think that's something you'll see that Council passed starting to actually have an effect, and this will be one of the first.

Happy answer any questions or any concerns anybody has. Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

JANE JONES: What did you say the lot size is?

WESLEY WHITE: The average lot size is 5800 square feet.

JANE JONES: 5800?

WESLEY WHITE: 5800, 5,800 square feet.

JANE JONES: And that's within the new ordinance?

WESLEY WHITE: It's in the ordinance that was in place at the time the project was submitted. Yes, ma'am.

DAN HARVELL: And that ordinance has been changed to what square footage since that went into effect?

WESLEY WHITE: Currently it's been suspended. But it was 7250, 7,250, and then they suspended it.

DAN HARVELL: This is just an ancillary question, Mr. Chairman, if I might ask it as a point of information.

And this will be a question for the staff. Are we, are we before -- the projects that are coming before us, are we before the moratorium, the filing before the moratorium or after at this point?

TIM CARTEE: We're after the moratorium. The moratorium ended on January 7 of this year.

DAN HARVELL: All right. Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you, Mr. White. We did not have anyone sign up to speak in public hearing. So Commissioners, we'll turn it over to you guys if you have any questions, comments or now is the time to entertain a motion.

JANE JONES: I would just like to make the point in reference to school capacity. In our packet, here tonight, there are 435 houses proposed in School District Five. That number is not in our material, but I added them up, and that's the total number. I just thought we ought to keep that in mind. Somebody should. I don't know which school this project feeds into.

DAN HARVELL: Do you have an idea, Mr. Chairman, which school zone this would be?

WESLEY WHITE: It's the same one. Sorry, if I may?

DAN HARVELL: Sure.

WESLEY WHITE: It's the same one, Westside ---

DAN HARVELL: The Westside zone. Well, that being the case, I will -- point of information. I will state this. According to the data that we have from the school district, if that's Robert Anderson Middle School, it's at 101%. If it's Westside, they're at 96%. Homeland Park is at 107%. And Varennes is the one in good shape at 63% currently. That's just for information.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

JANE JONES: The information we have from the fire marshal just says that he would like for all subdivisions to have hydrants and have wide enough streets for the trucks. But I don't know if we don't have any information on whether that will be the case with this subdivision. It's just ---

TIM CARTEE: Yeah, the minimum, the minimum standard for this subdivision is a 50 foot right of way, and it'll have a 20 foot pavement section on this. And every 1000 feet, there

will be a fire hydrant.
JANE JONES: Okay. Thank you.
WESLEY GRANT: Any other comments. We'll entertain a motion.
MICHAEL BURNS: I make a motion to approve.
WESLEY GRANT: We got a motion to approve by Mr. Burns. We have a second?
SCOTT JUNKINS: Second.
WESLEY GRANT: Second by Mr. Junkins. Any discussion? All those in favor to approve? Opposed? Will, Mr. Moore, how do you vote? Okay. So it is approved. Thank you.

Next on the agenda is Item 7B, single family subdivision, Indigo Trail, located at Thompson Road, tax map number 1440007002 and 003, and 005, County Council District Four. And I'll turn it over to staff for their presentation.

TIM CARTEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 186 property owners within 2000 feet of the proposed development was notified via postcard. And again, this is in the -- Indigo Trail. Single family development. The applicant is Wesley White. Engineer of record is Ridgewater. And access is on Thompson Road. It's in Council District Four, School District Five.

Surrounding land use is residential, and I-85 backs up to this property. It's zoned R-20. Tax map number is there for your reference. It's 39.83 acres with 53 lots. No variance is requested.

And I will turn this over to the traffic impact analysis from Roads and Bridges.

WESLEY GRANT: Okay. Thank you.
BRITTANY MCABEE: This development only has 53 lots and does not meet the threshold for a traffic impact study. We did ask them to do counts on Thompson, but that was outside of the scope of the Planning Commission.
WESLEY GRANT: Okay.
TIM CARTEE: Here is the layout of the proposed development. This is the R-20 zoning. This is your proposed subdivision sign for the public.

This concludes your staff report.

WESLEY GRANT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. White, are you coming forward? Okay. Thank you.
WESLEY WHITE: Wesley

White, with Ridgewater Engineering, 211 Society Street. The developer with me is Phillip Day.

What we've got is a project that's in a R-20 zoning, so we're doing it as a buy right zoning, meaning that we're not asking for any variances. We're following the guidelines of the R-20 zoning as they're laid out, and as they allow.

The 53 lots on, on 40 acres is roughly 1.3 lots per acre density. We have the option to do smaller, 15,000 square foot lots with lot averaging. We chose not to do that. We've kept these all at a minimum of 20,000 square foot across the entire subdivision.

For reference, Tuscany is what we'll be coming out across from. They have 105 lots, and those are all at R-15, so we'll be bigger than those lots as a comparison. To give you an idea of how the density will lay out. All utility letters have been provided. Again, the fire access, he mentioned the roads and water with hydrants within 1000 feet. That'll all be addressed as part of the design. And that's pretty standard, that our access be met on all of those. Current county standards allow that.

As I mentioned on the previous one, this one also falls under the mass grading ordinance, so the developer's excited to work through that, do the infrastructure, get that out of the way. And then as lots -- the builder comes in and develops lots as -- on a case by case basis, instead of doing the mass grading, which the county is trying to discourage. So excited about utilizing that.

Just to address some concerns on the traffic. When Tuscany was constructed, you know, 15 years ago I believe, the county required them to improve from Shackleburg down to Tuscany. It has a turn lane out onto Tuscany. So that improvement was made years ago. We've evaluated that, because the road was never reclassified, so it's still currently classified as a minor local road, which is 500 trips per day. It's our -- with our -- with what's there now it's at around 840 per our traffic study. We'll add another 593, just say 600, so that will push it to a collector level, which option that we have to present with them to reclassify it? We have no issue with that, getting the road up to county standards, to reclassify it as such. And of course, that'll all be at the developer's expense.

So, happy to answer any questions that come up. Appreciate it.

JANE JONES: Will these houses be on sewer or septic tank?

WESLEY WHITE: These will be on septic.

JANE JONES: I saw the letter that said they had limited access.

What is the fire station that covers this?

WESLEY WHITE: I'm not sure.

JANE JONES: I don't know where it is. Which one? Hopewell. I couldn’t hear you.

STEVEN GILREATH: If it's moved to a collector road, would it be improved just in front of the property or to the nearest intersection? How does ---

WESLEY WHITE: It would be improved on our side of the road. And depending on the -- what the county wants, it would most likely be from Shackleburg down to our entrance.

WESLEY GRANT: Okay. We may call you back.

We are moving to public hearing now. We have six people signed up. We'll start with Ms. Candy Kern.

CANDY KERN: Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

I want to make clear, I'm not opposed to development in our neighborhood. What I'm opposed to is that our street is dangerous, and more development that we have without correcting those dangerous conditions at that point is going to create liability for the county.

And my point in being here tonight was to make sure the county knows that they are on actual and constructive knowledge of how dangerous that road is. And so under the Tort Claims Act, Section 15-78-60, that strips the county of its immunity under the Tort Claims Act.

So when that accident occurs because of the water or because of the bridge falling down, because when you have the construction, like my neighbor said, those heavy trucks are going across this bridge. We watched it when they were doing the sewer improvement. We watched it. We called it in. Nothing happened.

On top of that, Thompson Road is not even wide enough for two cars to pass. You have to pull off the road on Thompson Road at a turn where there's a big oak tree, and you can't get off the road there because of the oak tree. And these problems are just the problems in our neighborhood that are not being addressed. And as the people who are doing the

planning and approving these things, you all need to address them.

Hopewell is the fire station. Hopewell is an all volunteer fire station. Our other closest fire station is the one down on Highway 81, Piercetown. And I grew up, like I said, on the other side of the Highway and Piercetown was our fire station there from the time I was a kid.

So we've got dangerous conditions. We have flooding conditions. We have development going on that's stripping our land down to just raw land, which is contributing to more water problems. And that's what I'm here to talk to y'all about tonight, is to make sure you understand that we're facing these dangerous conditions and the county's not doing anything to help us.

That bridge, that Shackleburg Road bridge, was put on the capital improvement list back in 2004 when I moved into that house on Shackleburg Road in 2003. And it's still never been improved. And we've had two bridges fall around us. We've had a third one that's washed somebody away. And that bridge on Shackleburg is going to fail.

And I'm hoping that you guys will make a point, if you're going to continue to approve these subdivisions, that we have some safety put in place for our road. Thank you.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

Next, we have Kathryn -- I'm having trouble with reading the last name. I'm sorry. Okay.

KATHRYN DUBEN: My name is Kathryn Duben, I live at 1036 Tuscany Drive, Anderson, South Carolina 29621.

To the Anderson County Planning Commission, once again, my name is Kathryn Duben, and I am speaking tonight, not only as a resident of Tuscany, but as someone representing many homeowners and families in our surrounding community who are deeply concerned about the proposed Indigo Trail subdivision on Thompson Road. We understand that growth is inevitable and we are not opposed to responsible development. However, we strongly oppose this proposal in its current form because too many important questions remain unanswered and too many potential impacts on existing residents have not been adequately addressed.

After reviewing the meeting packet and speaking with neighbors throughout our community, there are several recurring concerns that continue to surface.

First and foremost is traffic and infrastructure. Thompson Road already struggles with increasing traffic volume, particularly during peak morning and evening hours. Residents are extremely concerned about the additional burden the large subdivision will place on roads that are already insufficient for current demand. There has been no clear traffic study presented to residents showing how this development will affect congestion, emergency response times, school transportation, or overall public safety.

We're also concerned about the lack of detailed information regarding the homes themselves. The packet references single family homes, but provides little clarity regarding the builder, anticipated square footage, price points, architectural style, density or long term compatibility with the surrounding area. These details matter because they directly impact the character of our community and the property values of existing homeowners who have invested their lives and savings into this area.

Another major concern is environmental impact and land preservation. Residents are worried about excessive clearing of trees and natural buffers, especially near Interstate 85 and surrounding properties. Many homeowners chose this area because of its quieter, rural suburban feel and natural landscape. Removing those buffers could dramatically change both the appearance and quality of life for nearby residents. There are also unanswered questions regarding utilities and infrastructure location. Major overhead power and communication lines currently cross portions of this property near Shackleburg Road. Residents deserve transparency regarding whether relocation is planned, where those lines would go, and how such changes may affect neighboring communities.

Additionally, many residents feel this proposal is moving forward without sufficient long term planning for schools, drainage, stormwater management, emergency services and overall County infrastructure.

Growth without proper planning, places strain on existing residents who are already seeing increased pressure on roads, services and community resources.

Most importantly, I want the Commission to understand that this -- this opposition is not coming from a place of hostility. It is coming from people who generally love where they live.

TIM CARTEE: Time, Mr.

Chairman.

KATHRYN DUBEN: All right. Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you. Your points taken?

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Jimmy Smith.

JIMMY SMITH: Mr. Chairman, my name is Jimmy Smith. I live at 1036 Tuscany. I'm the HOA president of the Tuscany Community near the proposed Indigo Trail development on Thompson Road.

Over the last couple weeks, I've received a large amount of communication from the residents. They've sent it via email, phone calls, we've met in the neighborhood and so forth. And it regards this proposal. A lot of homeowners have asked me to make sure their concerns were voiced tonight.

One thing I want to make clear from the beginning is the people aren't against the growth, but in our neighborhood, we have a lot of growth. We have this proposed subdivision going across the neighborhood. We have a mega one right down the road. And yet you say a traffic study is not needed. Well, I beg to differ. I drive that road every day.

Once again, the biggest concern I continue to hear is traffic. Thompson Road is already beginning to be increasingly congested, and many residents are worried about what happens when a subdivision of this size is added to the area that already struggles during peak traffic hours.

Well, people are concerned about safety, school traffic, emergency vehicle access, and whether the surrounding road system can realistically handle the added strain. And then, once again, those added communities that we're going to add that's going to add to that strain once more.

Another issue residents keep bringing up is the amount of unknowns surrounding this project. The public packet provided basic information about lot sizes, the fact that it's a single family subdivision, but many important details seem unclear. Residents are asking, who's the builder, what types of homes are planned, what will the density look like once it's built out? How will this development fit into the character of the existing area?

People are also very concerned about preserving the natural landscape around the property, trees, buffer, drainage, runoff, overall environmental impact matter to nearby homeowners. I can tell you

that we live right beside I-10 (verbatim). I can hear the traffic faintly at night. Once you remove those trees, I'm going to hear it every day. I did not move there to hear traffic from I-10 every day. That that is not what I moved there for. And I can assure you that 100 other people that live in that neighborhood did not move there to hear traffic from I-10 every day.

In addition to the visual buffer, residents are also worried about increased interstate noise, which I just talked about. And another major concern residents continue expressing is a potential impact on surrounding property values. Many families have been heavily invested in their homes and choose this area because of the character, the spacing and the overall feel of the community. Residents are worried about if this development is not carefully planned and properly integrated into the surrounding community, it can negatively affect our values on our homes.

I also think it's important to recognize the broader issue here. Residents are seeing subdivision after subdivision proposed through this area. Once again, this is the second subdivision within half a mile of my house. And if you look at the ones that are spoken for -- before tonight, they're all within a mile, two miles of our houses. This is going to, once again, tax those roads that we're not thinking about. But schools, roads, traffic flow, utilities, emergency services, all need to be part of these conversations.

TIM CARTEE: Time, Mr. Chairman.

JIMMY SMITH: Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you, sir.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Ted Ferguson.

TED FERGUSON: Thank you. This won't take long.

I've had some concerns about this new subdivision, Indigo. One of the concerns that I have is noise or remediation. Is there any plan for that? Because when they cut those trees down, it's going to be really loud. Right now, it's loud enough even with the trees there, but when they take those trees out and put in houses, it's going to be rough. And that -- I think that has to be addressed.

Another thing that concerns me is the entrance

location. There's only one spot on Thompson Road where a good entrance could come, and that's right in front of our entrance. And if they put that entrance right in front of ours, it's going to be a disaster.

The next thing is, who is going to be responsible for taking care of Thompson Road? I know Thompson Road pretty well. I travel it almost once every other day. But that road is narrow enough that two cars can't really pass each other unless they almost hit the ditch. And it's got a blind corner.

Now, with the new subdivision going on over on Dalrymple, that's going to crush that road. And with -- now, with this subdivision, it's going to be even worse. Something's got to be done with that road.

So that's my concerns. Entrance location, the road condition, which is, which is really bad, and noise remediation. I plan to get noise measurements, decibel levels as a map, and then we can compare that after its done.

Who does the noise remediation? Is that the county? Or is that the developer?

That's all.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: John Duncan.

JOHN DUNCAN: Thank you for the time to address you. I'm John Duncan. I live at 1033 Tuscany.

I have the same concerns that have already been voiced over and over. If you're not familiar with Thompson Road, it's really not a road. It's not passable by two cars. Full of potholes. It's a disaster. We've heard over and over Shackleburg's issues. Shackleburg is a mess. We're talking about 350 new homes we've been talking about and the numbers have been thrown out here, but what's on Dalrymple, you know, 130 here, 50 there. You've got Mattison Woods coming up. We've got the same kind of concerns Mattison Woods has. We have a very nice property value where we are. Everything's got to be brick and stone. We don't know what's going to go up across the road. The noise level. Even if you say you're going to build very expensive homes there, when you take somebody to look at it, no one wants to live that close to the interstate, so the homes they build are going to be dropping in value just to try to sell the things, because nobody wants to live that close to the interstate.

There's been no discussion about what kind of sound barrier would we put up. Who's going to pay

for the sound barrier? What happens when the sound barrier starts falling apart? We've got a lot of concerns. We really like the quality of life we have in Tuscany. We moved there and plan to live there, you know, the rest -- I'm 63. We plan to live there the rest of our lives.

A subdivision with cheap houses across the street that continually go down in value because of the interstate noise is going to hurt our property value. And we had people campaigning in the neighborhood just the other day, and everybody was telling people campaigning, we're going to move if that subdivision comes in there. So property values are going to go to pot really quick.

We opposed any kind of thing going up there that's going to create interstate noise. Especially, we don't know what kind of homes are going to be built there. We've got, you know, we've got million dollar homes in our neighborhood. You're going to build a 250,000, we don't know. So we have a lot of concerns that have not been addressed yet. We ask you to please oppose this.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Last we have Kyle Whitfield.

KYLE WHITFIELD: Good evening, members of the Planning Commission. My name is Dr. Kyle Whitfield, and I reside at 1044 Tuscany, near the proposed development.

I'll also be speaking on another measure here later tonight. I'm principal at Wren High School. Soon be Assistant Superintendent of Anderson School District One in July. And so I'm here to respectfully ask the commission to vote no. I'll echo some of the concerns.

I think the first is lack of transparency. I think it's been noted, you know, Tuscany, we pride ourself in our neighborhood. We pride ourself in, you know, taking care of our houses and the investments we've made in our houses. And I think, you know, this measure -- it's pretty common sense. I think this is a vote no, just due to lack of transparency.

I think it's a common sense vote no with the proximity to I-85. You're more than welcome to hang out with me tonight and listen to I-85 from my house. I'll be happy to have you over. But you know, when these trees are gone, I think, you know, that is a huge concern. I would prefer not to move. I can

understand with the other neighbors proposing moving because of the noise, it's a huge factor.

I think Thompson Road is a no-brainer as well. If you've not -- I know you guys have a tough job approving, and different neighborhoods, but if you've not driven Thompson Road, I encourage you to do it. Everything they've said is truthful.

You know, I think from -- as a school safety person myself, you know, I worry about busses traversing that road. I worry about our neighbors traversing that road when we had hurricane Helene and other issues. I mean, it is a dangerous road. I think Shackleburg is becoming more dangerous as well. I think continually adding homes in this area is irresponsible. I think there needs to be more thoughtfulness on the number of homes we continue to put in this area. And later on, I'll talk about the strain on Anderson School District One. I can only imagine Anderson Five, this situation, with continuing to put homes in this area as well.

So once again, I'm just here to respectfully ask you guys to vote no on this measure. I think it's a common sense no. And I appreciate your support in this endeavor. Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: That concludes the public hearing portion, Commissioners. So if we have any questions or things that you might still be questioning for the developer or staff, now's the time to ask that.

DAN HARVELL: Mr. Chairman, I have a general question about the interstate noise. As we travel up and down the interstates, and it was more prevalent in Georgia and North Carolina, but now it's becoming prevalent here, that we're seeing those concrete and steel noise barriers that are going up, obviously shielding neighborhoods.

Was there any, any possible situation that that was going to be the case here to shield this new -- to shield this development and the other surrounding from the noise from the interstate.

WESLEY GRANT: I think I'll defer that to the staff or developer.

TIM CARTEE: Not that we're aware of. You may ask the engineer of record if they have any intentions of doing that. We don't have any ordinance that would require that. But you may ask.

DAN HARVELL: And I would ask, I would ask Ms. McAbee with the traffic department, is -- are you familiar with who actually pays for those for the most part?

PHILLIP DAY: Mr. Harvell, my name is Phillip Day. I'm the developer, and I'd be pleased to answer that for you if you ---

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Sure.

PHILLIP DAY: The fact of the matter is, when it comes -- if -- I'm going to direct the Planning Commission's attention to the matter that was brought before you several months ago on Nunnally Road. We had exactly the same question that was raised at that time. There was an engineering firm that was retained to study the question of whether the property on Nunnally Road, which just like this, backed up to the interstate, whether or not the development there that took place was going to affect the sound levels of the, of the other neighborhood. And in fact, they determined that it would not, and it would actually make it better because, because ---

WESLEY GRANT: Please.

PHILLIP DAY: --- the buffer area under the county's new ordinance maintains most of the trees in the area. The houses that are additionally added to that area create additional sound barriers. And so they actually went out and did a study in the adjoining neighborhood to determine what happened to the sound levels. And the professional engineers that came in here and presented that to you showed you that that is just not true.

So that particular thing is -- has been answered. And with all due respect, they're the only professional engineers that have studied that question.

The other thing is, I must also say that I, I am -- have absolutely no desire to be anything other than absolutely clear about what's going to be built there. And that'll be houses that are at least $750,000 in value.

WESLEY GRANT: Mr. Day, if you could address the Commission, that would be helpful.

PHILLIP DAY: I'm trying to answer those questions.

WESLEY GRANT: I understand, but if you could just present to us.

PHILLIP DAY: I apologize.

But those, those will be the houses that will be built there. These are half acre lots. These are not going to be small houses. These are going to be very nice houses that are going to be at least as valuable as those in the neighborhood around it.

And so I think that in terms of it hurting anybody's property values that's just not true.

The other thing I would just say is this, when the people in Tuscany bought their houses, somebody there developed it. And at the time that they developed it, I am absolutely certain that there were people in the surrounding neighborhood that said, Man, we don't want Tuscany there, because it's going to ruin our way of life.

WESLEY GRANT: Mr. Day, it would be helpful if you would just focus on us.

PHILLIP DAY: And I would just say this. I would just say this. If somebody wants to preserve that as a park or as a buffer area, they need to go buy it. They need to go buy it.

And as it relates to safety on the road, I hope everybody heard that when, that when we were asked to do what, what needs to be done to improve that road, we are in agreement with doing that. I don't hear anybody else stepping up to the plate, whether it's the county or the other neighbors, to do the improvements to that road that need to be done. We are the only ones that are willing to do that. We are willing to put our money where our mouth is and take care of that.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

PHILLIP DAY: We are ready to do what we are allowed to do under the traffic study.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you, Mr. Day. I appreciate your comments.

Any questions from the Commissioners.

DAN HARVELL: Well, Mr. Day, now let's clarify this, if we might. You're saying that you, as a development company, will take care of improvements on that road.

PHILLIP DAY: We are -- there are certain improvements that are, that are going to be made on our side of the road, and we are perfectly willing to do that. I don't have any control over other people's property, and I can't take care of that. But, but what we are asked to do by the traffic study -- and by the way, we have supplied traffic count numbers to the county, even though we're not required to. We are, we are

perfectly willing to do that. Yes, sir.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. But you're not, you're not talking about any pavement or anything like that. You're just talking about what's, what's on your side of the road, correct?

PHILLIP DAY: If there's any road widening that needs to be done, absolutely, we'll be the ones to do it.

JANE JONES: Which road is that? Which road are you talking about?

PHILLIP DAY: Thompson Road.

JANE JONES: Okay.

PHILLIP DAY: We don't have all (inaudible - turned toward audience). We don't have that. All we have is the land that we are, that we are purchasing. And we are willing to do what needs to be done with ours. I would ask, you know, the other neighbors, if they're willing to do -- to widen the road on their side? So it's a county road, and it's the county's responsibility to take care of the infrastructure for the county and to accommodate growth. It's not my obligation to come in and fix the entire county's problems on roads that aren't even connected to us. But what we are required to do, we will absolutely do.

STEVEN GILREATH: And y'all -- it does take you to the intersection of Shackleburg. Did I understand that right?

PHILLIP DAY: That's correct.

WESLEY GRANT: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioners, if everybody's had their questions answered, we'll entertain a motion on the project.

WILLIAM MOORE: I've got one last question. So when did those folks vote for the, for the zoning in that area? Do you remember? Was that in 2007?

WESLEY GRANT: Maybe defer to Ms. Hunter here.

ALESIA HUNTER: I don't know the exact date, but zoning in that whole area started in '99 up to the present. So it would have been in between somewhere after '99 to 2000, somewhere along in there.

WILLIAM MOORE: Thank you, ma'am.

WESLEY GRANT: And it's

been taxed accordingly since that time.
We'll entertain a motion, if we're all clear.
JANE JONES: I'll make the motion to deny the project. My reasons are, of course, the infrastructure, even inside of the subdivision. I can't vote for a subdivision that's this congested and this dense. There's one way in and one way out, and there's no way you could handle an emergency -- or I fear that you couldn't handle emergency vehicles in there, this is -- this type of subdivision where you can't get out the backside. And if one car is parked in -- on one of these roads, you can't get through.
And the other reason, of course, has to do with the schools. We've got the information on that overcrowding. And all this discussion we've had about the roads, I'm sure the developer will take care of what he just said, but the traffic issues can't be all solved by that.
But my motion is to deny the project.
WESLEY GRANT: We got a motion to deny by Ms. Jones. Do we have a second?
DAN HARVELL: Second, Mr. Chairman.
WESLEY GRANT: We got a second by Mr. Harvell. Any discussion? All those in favor to deny please raise your hand. All those opposed to the denial. Project's approved.
APPLAUSE
WESLEY GRANT: Next on our agenda is item 8A, single family subdivision, Mattison Woods, located at Shackleburg Road.
STEVEN GILREATH: Mr. Chairman, I need to recuse myself.
WESLEY GRANT: Okay. Let it be known for the record, Mr. Gilreath is recusing himself.
Give those guys time to clear out.
Okay. We'll move to item 8A. We'll let it be known for the record, Mr. Gilreath recused himself.
It's a single family subdivision, Mattison Woods, located at Shackleburg Road, tax map number 1430002004, County Council District Four.
I'll turn it over to staff for presentation.
TIM CARTEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Previous Planning Commission meeting on April 14, 2026, the vote was a tie for this subdivision. That's the reason why it came back.
210 property owners within 2000 feet were notified via postcard. Again, this is Mattison

Woods, single family development. Applicant is Jamie Turner with Ridgewater. And surveyor and engineer of record is Ridgewater. Location and access to Shackleburg Road. It's in Council District Four.

And surrounding land use is residential and vacant. This area is unzoned. Tax map parcel is there for your reference. It's 77.82 acres, 69 lots. No variance is requested. And a traffic impact study is not required.

This is your layout for the proposed development. And the reason why I say traffic impact study is not required, it has to reach 70 lots for it to activate a traffic impact study, per county ordinance.

WESLEY GRANT: Please. Please.

TIM CARTEE: This is your proposed layout. This is your aerial of the proposed development. And this is your sign notifying the public.

This project has met the requirements of Chapter 24. This is your staff report, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you. Mr. White, you are coming forward, it seems.

WESLEY WHITE: Thank you, Commissioners and staff. Wesley White with Ridgewater Engineering, 211 Society Street. Also have the developer, Mr. Cease (phonics) present as well.

Just as a refresher from last month's meeting, for anyone who wasn't able to attend, what we're presenting is a 69 lot subdivision on 78 acres. So that's a density of .9 lots per acre. These are large, 25,000 square foot minimum lot sizes. So that's the minimum. Some of them are larger than that. This is in line with the typical lot size from Innisbrook, which is across the street, as well as much larger than the quarter acre lots that make up Brookstone and Jones Creek subdivision.

So our intent here is -- there was sewer across the street in Innisbrook. We've communicated with county and our preference to not do sewer, which would allow for over 200 lots. So we've definitely made the decision to keep this as a low density development. No traffic impact study was required, as mentioned. However, there have been some recent studies in the area. There's currently only about 330 trips per day on that portion of Shackleburg, so a large portion of the traffic is not in that area.

The fire access, as mentioned before, all these

roads are designed to county standards which allow for adequate fire department access. There's cul de sac turnarounds with (inaudible) lots at the end of them, per county requirements. 22 foot wide face curb to face curb with a 50 foot right of way. Again, with these being larger lots, we see very little on-street parking. Parking will be in driveways for these lots, which will, you know, large high end homes.

Again, the mass grading ordinance is in place for this one as well. That will eliminate the -- what you (inaudible) we'll go in and clear the roads and then the (inaudible) lots. They'll build them out. So there will be, you know, the county's implemented the mass grading ordinance. So mass grading, so a lot of the trees that you see will remain. Also, there's significant buffers, 100 foot, 50 foot in others, as well as a large portion of floodplain on the back. It'll also have buffers. So a lot of the area is being protected through those buffers and the stormwater requirements that the county has.

It kind of caught us off guard last month when the school district provided the letter the day of. Didn't give us an opportunity to really address their concerns, and so I wanted to do that today.

Couple of things. These are large lots, high end houses, and it's typically that those have less of a direct impact on the local schools. So even so, you're not looking at more than about (inaudible) students generated, once this project is actually built out entirely, based on industry standards.

Additionally, the only option currently available for developers is to build houses which generate the tax revenue that the school district (inaudible). Currently, there's not a mechanism in place for a developer to do anything. Wanted to make sure that's on the record.

Also did a little bit of research. So the South Carolina Department of Education has an active student head count that they keep track of twice a year, and every year. When you research that '21 to '22, all the way up to '23, '24 school years, it grew about 200, 300 to 350 students. It peaked in '23, '24 and since been dropping. Not sure what that is, but it does go against a little bit of the concern that all this development is driving the school population up. Their own data and data from the Department of Education does not show that right now, any concerns with the school district. Although

they're outside our control, I just wanted to point that out. (Inaudible) and I'm not sure why.

But anyway, we would appreciate your approval. And happy to answer any questions.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you. We may call you back.

WESLEY WHITE: Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: We had quite a few to sign up. We'll start with Ms. Candy Kern.

CANDY KERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment about this, because in the scheme of things, okay, our side of Shackleburg Road is on this side of Scotts Bridge Road. Where this development is, is on the other side towards Highway 81. They're fortunate in that their bridge fell. It got replaced. The bridge on Martin Road fell. It got replaced. Martin Road connects to the TTI facility, so it's been improved. However, I believe they will still be in the Piercetown Fire District, which Piercetown is the one that serviced my house when I was growing up on Paulan Road, which comes out at Hampton Road. Which, by the way, for school purposes I think y'all just approved 1000 homes around Anderson Lake. Where are they going to go to school? Because I went to Wren and I believe they're in the Wren district.

So you know, those are concerns that continue to come up, at least on that side of Shackleburg Road, the road has been improved a little bit, and the roads that feed it have been improved a little bit. But it's still a windy, twisty country road. It's not as windy, twisty as our part, but it's still windy, twisty.

And I want to make a comment about the engineers who say that the sound barrier gets better with subdivisions. I've lived on Shackleburg Road for 23 years. This is my neighbor, Susan Spivey. Her dad built the Brookstone Meadows golf course with earth moving equipment. She's lived there all her life. I started hearing a train. I thought I was going crazy. I asked my former county councilman, do we have a train around here? The train is over on Highway 178, and it services the two industries over there. I can hear a train. People hit the speed bumps, the drunk bumps, on Highway 85 my dogs go crazy. I have three German shepherds, and they hear everything, and they go crazy. I live over two miles from the interstate, but we hear it. And there's a whole Brookstone Meadows golf course community over

there that if -- you know, I'm not an engineer. I'm a retired lawyer. I don't know anything about what that study was, but it's not logical to me. I'm sorry. It's just not logical to me. That we take out stuff, we take out trees, we put in buildings, and somehow sound reduces. Because, I'll tell you, after living in this community since I was seven years old, and I turned 58 earlier this month, that's not been my experience. Not been my experience when I grew up on Paulan Road, and not been my experience for the 23 years I've lived on Shackleburg Road.

Y'all, we've got to do something with this stuff, and I'm here tonight, like I said, we don't oppose development. But our road is dangerous. People are going to die, and y'all are going to be responsible. Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Next we have George Venturella.

GEORGE VENTURELLA: Good evening. George Venturella, Hidden Falls. And I'm the vice chairman of the HOA in Hidden Falls.

I don't know what your qualifications are to judge 30 students going to a school, but I -- so I wouldn't take that gentleman -- he's an engineer, not a prognosticator of who's going to attend what school.

On page 237 of your handout tonight, you have a letter from Bill Rutledge of Anderson County stating that 20 foot frontage lots or flag lots and cul de sacs cause driveway problems. Be aware of that when you approve something.

My second problem I have with this development, on page 245 you have a letter from Dr. Seth Young, the superintendent of School District One, and he states, any students that live there in this subdivision that's proposed would go to Spearman, Wren Middle and Wren High School. That means they would -- until they address capacity concerns, these students will -- he doesn't say maybe, doesn't say possibly -- page 245 -- he says they will be forced to add portables, especially at the elementary school, will have additional enrollment.

So if you vote to approve this, you're saying to the parents of these students, your kid is going to be put in a portable classroom. And I want to praise Mr. Harvell at the last meeting, because he voted no, because he said, I'm not going to put a student in a classroom that's not made of brick and mortar. And

so don't do that tonight. Choose the safety of these children.

If you don't think it's possible, drive down the interstate where you have it named after a young student, Mr. Hall from Townville. We remember what happened there. So remember when you vote, you guys are tasked to vote what is prudent, what is smart and what is in the best interest of the citizens here in Anderson County. Not of a developer, but what's best for us.

So please don't vote for this right now. Let us get the school capacity under control. Our kids are our future, and let's be smart when we do that. Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Next, we have Gary. I can't say the last name. I'm sorry.

GARY SEE: My name is Gary See. I live at Hidden Falls subdivision, as well. Thank you for the time, Chairman.

A couple of items that I'd like to consider. Are the current schools in the area able to handle the additional students and existing buildings and structures and if not how long will it take to construct a new building to support the increase in student population? No trailers should be used due to safety concerns.

Currently, there's another 300 plus subdivision that's currently being built on Liberty Highway. And can those schools currently handle that? And only about 50 of those houses have been built so far. Does the county have money to upgrade the existing roads that would be used leading to the subdivision? Currently Shackleburg Road needs totally repaved due to the existing conditions. Estimate is anywhere between 600,000 to a million per mile based on a Google search. Will the developer foot the cost of all road improvements needed for the roads leading to the development, or the county? Should the county be on the hook for this when tax raised per year will not cover the road costs? Does the county have the budget already with the extra money needed for services like ambulance, fire, extra sheriff support? The fire department is a volunteer department, and no additional money was allocated to them when the additional tax was being brought up for the approval a few years ago.

Due to the proximity of lots proposed, this becomes a huge fire risk for other houses that would

be in the -- eyesore to the existing communities and leave no green space for children and wildlife in the area; would negatively impact the county as a whole. Do we really want Anderson County to look like the Northeast? The people that are trying to escape from all over are moving here because of our natural beauty. Should we not try to maintain it for the next generation to come?

What green space is required to be maintained so children can have a place to grow up, as we did in the youth? Look inside the city, even in the older neighborhoods, and look at the house density compared to what they are proposing, and ask, is this what we want our community to become? Should all trees that are on the property be allowed to be stripped clear, or is there a requirement to maintain some current tree growth to preserve the beauty of the natural area in our county?

It would be proposed that the county, as a minimum, have 30 feet -- 35 feet be left from any structure to the property line or any side of the house, left or right of the house, for any subdivision or house going forward. This would mean a subdivision or property, you would have a minimum of 70 feet between structures.

I would ask everybody to have the courage ---

TIM CARTEE: Time, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you, sir. Point taken.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Next we have Mike -- I'm sorry -- Jocelyn Jones.

JOCELYN JONES: Good evening. It is me again, and I will be here every time.

You've heard all of my neighbors express everything about the road safety, about our schools. I had a whole speech prepared for my three minutes, but I am so angry right now and practically almost in tears, because I have sat here and watched you guys approve two subdivisions on or near Shackleburg Road that's going to directly affect the neighbors.

I was ran off of the road, and my car is currently in the shop right now, of the undercarriage, because an 18 wheeler with a big, wide load came down Shackleburg Road and basically pushed me off the side of the road.

There is not enough infrastructure, preparedness, funding or anything for any more

subdivisions. And my God, Wren -- the Wren school district is being destroyed by all of these subdivisions that you're approving.

I respectfully urge that you deny, pause, defer until the commission has carefully considered a comprehensive traffic study. I don't care if it's 50 houses or 69 or 70, there needs to be a traffic study.

Funding for these upgrades and these costs should not be put on the taxpayers. We are already being taxed enough. And if I'm not mistaken, I don't think our schools are getting very much tax money.

I also ask the commission to consider these questions. I'm so sorry. I'm sorry. I can't go on. I can't go on. But please consider the citizens that are in this area. District Four, my God, has so many -- I counted 11 subdivisions in all of -- in all of District four; 11 new subdivisions. I purposely drove every road of District Four, and counted subdivisions being built. And you guys just approved two more.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Next we have Mike Wood.

MIKE WOOD: Mike Wood. I live on Prestwick Drive and in Innisbrook subdivision, right across the street from where Mattison Woods is going to be developed.

My basic concern tonight is, is the infrastructure of the whole neighborhood, as this lady has spoken to three times already. We're in a flood zone. Most of the, most of the area around us is referred to as Jones Creek. If you know anything about Jones Creek, it's one of the largest creeks in Anderson County. It runs from one end to the other. And adjacent creeks from that run into Lake Hartwell, into that creek.

I live in -- at the end of the street. RYOBI built two one-million square foot buildings in my backyard in 2015 which included 400 acres. It caused a severe erosion problem. Two of my neighbors back there and myself have been flooded at least three times in the last five years.

Ms. Kern spoke about the two cars that was washed into the creek. There's actually, out of Jones Creek into our neighborhood, there's probably -- there's actually five roads that lead out that you can get out of the area. On the morning of October 7, 2021 two cars were washed into the creeks. Martin Road was washed out. The new bridge on Shackleburg

was used and closed down as a rescue operation to rescue the driver who went out when Martin Road washed away. There was another driver washed down the road -- washed down the creek in Brookstone hanging to a tree who had to be rescued. My daughter in law was trying to get my grandchild to my house to keep him because she works at the hospital and is required to be at her job, no matter what. So a fire truck was behind her. They wouldn't even let her turn around.

Those are things I'm talking about. Four of those bridges get flooded every time we get at least five inches of rain. Four of those bridges will not allow you to leave by way of Scotts Bridge Road, by way of Thompson Road, by way of Shackleburg Road, all the way up to Martin Road. There's only one way out. Go down Timms Mill all the way to Sentell and back out to the highway. We're talking about thousands of people have already been in this neighborhood because of -- the lady said 11 subdivisions in this area. There's going to be a catastrophe one day, if we continue to get the rain that we're getting and it's going to be bad because people are not going to be able to leave their homes.

Basically, that's what I'm speaking about tonight. The roads are in shambles. These roads are rural roads, what the old farmers used to call pig trails. Thompson Road is a pig trail. Shackleburg Road is a windy road.

TIM CARTEE: Time, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you, sir.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: David Searight.

DAVID SEARIGHT: My name is Dr. David Searight.

WESLEY GRANT: Oh, I'm sorry.

DAVID SEARIGHT: I live at 115 Prestwick Drive.

I'm here to echo similar concerns to my neighbors. Of course, I have major concerns with road conditions, similar to my neighbor, Jocelyn, who was actually run off of the road by a large truck. Both myself and my wife have almost been run off the road in the last two weeks, two separate occasions, by large trucks who don't have enough room dodging potholes on Shackleburg, which is nearly impossible

at this point, and the debris that's left when they go to fill these holes lasts about a month, and now you have debris and a pot hole to dodge.

My wife and I moved to this area because of the school district. I mean, that's what drew us to the area. We both work for AnMed. We both have careers serving this community. And the fact that this development risks our son's education and his opportunities while we've given so much to serve this community is profoundly upsetting to me. We're talking about potential people moving to our area and possibly prioritizing them over people who are currently here, who are the community trying to serve the community.

So I think we need to check our priorities when we're talking about this, and make sure that we're focused on the people who are already here and part of this community. That's all I have. Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Next we have Joseph Oppermann.

JOSEPH OPPERMANN: Thank you all. I'm here to speak for my family, the Mattison family, in favor of Mattison Woods.

The owners of this land have been my uncle, John Mattison, my mother, Mary Mattison Oppermann and my Aunt Sarah Mattison Forrester. They are the sixth generation of our family to own this land.

The first member of our family to own the land was Dr. John L. Hopkins of Creightonville, who bought the first piece of it in 1863. Dr. Hopkins was born in 1788, the year South Carolina ratified the Constitution. When his son, young John Hopkins, came home from the war where he served in the 22nd South Carolina regiment, he bought a neighboring parcel. And these parcels together became the family's farm.

Young John's daughter, Sarah Tallulah, married another veteran of that war, Pickens Mattison, and together, they purchased or inherited much of the Hopkins farm. Their son Monroe Mattison succeeded them in owning this land. Monroe Mattison later served this county as a road commissioner and as school superintendent for the Lebanon community. He married the girl next door, Ms. Inez Walker and they, along with their son, Cecil, helped to found Pope Drive Baptist Church here in Anderson.

If you were to walk this land today, you'll see big piles of rocks all throughout it. Those are the rocks Cecil, my granddaddy, dug out of the land

during the depression to keep it arable. Cecil's children are the sixth generation of us, John, Mary and Sarah. They have carefully chosen this developer, Mr. Cease, among the many who were interested, because they know him and they trust him to do right by their family, their land and their neighbors.

Mattison Woods will be above specs, have large lots, ample green space and add significant value to the local tax base. As descendants of a local school superintendent who served during the depression in this county, we're proud of that, and we're proud to be part of a project done right.

John, Mary and Sarah want to act now, because there are now 20 descendants of Cecil Mattison who passed at the age of 69. They're 80, 75, and 72. Six of us in the seventh generation, my generation, are all in South Carolina, and five of us are in Anderson. Ten of us are in the eighth generation, a majority in this county, all in South Carolina. And in the last year, the first of the ninth generation was born.

The Mattisons want to act now so their descendants can benefit from the over 160 years of labor and care that have gone into this land. They also want to act now to prevent the risk of future conflict, which can happen with land as the generations pass.

Our family humbly and respectfully asks you to approve the careful and thoughtful choices of John, Mary and Sarah Mattison, Cecil’s children.

TIM CARTEE: Time, Mr. Chairman.

JOSEPH OPPERMANN: And we thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

JOSEPH OPPERMANN: Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Next, we have Kyle Whitfield.

KYLE WHITFIELD: Good evening again. Kyle Whitfield, 1044 Tuscany Drive.

I’m speaking tonight for this measure as current principal at Wren High School and soon to be Assistant Superintendent of Administration for Anderson School District One.

So Anderson School District One is one of the top performing schools in South Carolina, serving nearly 1100 -- 11,000 students across 15 schools. Protecting that standard of excellence must remain a priority.

According to information provided to the district, more than 1900 residential lots have already been approved in Anderson County this year alone and over 85%, I quote, 85% of those lots are located within Anderson One alone.

Using growth estimates commonly referenced by developers themselves, those approvals could result in more than 500 additional students entering our schools. Several schools in Anderson One are already at or near capacity, and some are currently relying on portable classrooms to accommodate growth.

The Wren feeder system alone, which I can attest, in particular, is expected to face additional strain if growth continues at this fast pace. Rapid growth also impacts class sizes, teacher recruitment, student support services, transportation and the district's ability to maintain a quality education that our community expects.

Anderson One has been proactive in planning responsibly for growth, including funding a new elementary, Oak Hill, using local option sales tax money without asking taxpayers for a bond referendum.

The district has repeatedly asked for a comprehensive, responsible growth plan developed in partnership with the school district before additional large scale developments are approved. We welcome responsible growth, but growth without adequate planning and infrastructure places unnecessary strain on our schools, our teachers, and ultimately, our parents.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to carefully consider the long term impact of this development, along with further development on Anderson School District One before moving forward with approval. And I ask you to vote no.

And I would also, and this is not in my notes, but I'd also welcome the opportunity to sit with you guys and discuss the challenges that we have in Anderson One. I remember coming a couple years ago when we tried to pass an impact fee on homes, which would benefit our school district. We get zero dollars from new development. Property taxes don't go to schools at all. That’s 100% true, I promise. The homestead exemption, we get zero property money. And Wess can attest to that. And so, you know, every new house that goes -- that is built, we get nothing off of that. We have to put those students in our school with no additional funding for capital needs.

And so if we were funded -- just real quickly,

if we were funded based on Act 388 -- I encourage you to look at Act 388.

TIM CARTEE: Time, Mr. Chairman.

KYLE WHITFIELD: Thank you.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Three more. We have Douglas Stuart.

DOUGLAS STUART: Good evening. My name is Douglas Stuart. I have a shop at 515 Walker Road. It's adjacent to Mattison Woods. I do grading and clearing for a job. That's what I do. The terrain of where they're proposing to put Mattison Woods has 100 foot elevation change from that of where it touches Dr. Walker's down to the Six & Twenty Creek.

The only way you're going to be able to get these lots in there, you're going to have to clear all the trees off and then go in there and grade for each home. And no matter what you can possibly do, you're never going to avoid all of the silt and run off down to that Six & Twenty Creek. What's down right there is a big swamp. What's in the swamp? A bunch of ducks. We got mallards, wood ducks, all kinds. Wood Ducks, very -- it's one of the very few aquatic animals that build their nests in trees. After we cut down all those trees and all that silk goes down into that creek, there goes our ducks.

What makes Anderson great? It's definitely not all these big old developments that keep getting passed over and over. There's going to be nothing left before too long. That property butts up next to some of the biggest farms that we have left. Walker Century Farms is right there beside it. That's one of our biggest attractions. We have a venue there. We have a store. That's what a lot of people come to see, and that's big entertainment for everybody, and it's nice to see.

What's not going to be nice to see is this development right beside it. And I could go on and on about the roads. Everybody said plenty about the roads. We have tons of problems. Bridges washing out, they're narrow, they're winding. But you've heard it over and over again. It's the same old problem. Thank y'all.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Next, we have -- I'm really having difficulty with this. A-W-

D? Address is 1060 Farmer or Firmer. Have I said enough to figure out who I'm trying to call out? Thank you.

ANDY CROFT: I have a lot of weak points. Handwriting is one of them. But my name is Andy Croft. I live at 1060 Furman Gambrell Road, and I've been there for 40 years. Pay taxes in both District Four and District One, I guess.

Wren, fine school. We've heard a lot today about -- tonight, about why not to build this? Why would you build it? Who benefits? If there's a shortage of housing in Anderson County, then I'm a blind man. So why would you build it? Why would you vote for this with all of the negatives that you've heard?

I rode my block today, which takes me down Walker Road, and that bridge is about to collapse. I sold property to rebuild that bridge 12 years ago. Not one thing has been done. It's a hazard.

I went down Dalrymple Road, same bridges. Okay. I got up the Thompson Road and on the, on the right is this monstrous development. Okay. Roads won't support what we have now. Schools won't support. So why would you vote for it? There's safety concerns. There's more -- you could fill half this room up with what you've heard tonight. So why would you vote for it?

Number one, on the other side is money. Got quality of life, schools, road, medical, safety, fire protection. The other side is money. The developer is going to make money. The developer is not going to live here. And probably none of his employees will. The contractors are going to make money. The real estate agents are going to make money. Why would you vote for it? It is unbridled growth. That area, in 40 years that I've been here, has accepted TTI on our roads. We've accepted the golf course. We've accepted Innisbrook. We accept Tuscany. And there was no outcry.

TIM CARTEE: Time, Mr. Chairman.

ANDY CROFT: We're not a bad group.

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you, sir. Last we have Phil Clark.

PHIL CLARK: Good evening. My name is Phil Clark, and I grew up on a small farm. And the gentleman talked about this lot being farmed. I don't know if you guys looked at the picture. It looks like a forest to me. I couldn't

drive a plow down it.

But beside that, I think you guys need to pump the brakes really hard. School District can't handle it. Infrastructure can't handle it. I'd like to ask the good doctor how the medical field is -- you know, we talk about the infrastructure. What about medical, dental? You know, you guys just approved two, you know, new developments, plus how many in the past; can they handle it?

And you know, out of state developers. What -- South Carolina doesn't have any land developers that you got to go to Indiana, Texas. That's ridiculous. I think you guys need to, like, really pump the brakes and think hard about this.

And I wouldn't want my kid in a school portable. And some of you members feel fine just sticking them in there. So I really encourage you guys to vote no and really think about the speed at which this area is developing. My house backs up to Shackleburg Road. And I've got to tell you, I love those motorcycles that don't have mufflers on it, or the ATVs that are cruising. And you know, it's just -- and golf carts are now legal on the road.

One day I was leaving, around the curve at Shackleburg, I got a 53 foot semi coming at me. The tractor is in his lane, and the axle of the trailer is right in my path. So Jocelyn getting run off the road, it is -- it does happen.

So you guys really need to think hard about this, and please vote no.

APPLAUSE

WESLEY GRANT: Thank you.

That concludes the public hearing portion. Commissioners, do you have questions that you need clarified from anybody?

DAN HARVELL: Mr. Chairman, I don't have questions, but after the motion's made, I do have some observations to share.

WESLEY GRANT: Okay. Hearing none, we'll entertain a motion on the project.

JANE JONES: I make the motion to deny the project. I think the reasons have been clearly stated. The schools are overcrowded. And please, remember, all those children don't go to elementary school. It's not just a roof over their head. They've got to have labs, gym, locker rooms, a lot of things go into school overcrowding.

Public safety. We've talked about the inability of Shackleburg Road to handle any more traffic. And

cutting down the trees. I just think there are too many reasons that we need to deny this project.

WESLEY GRANT: We've got a denial by Ms. Jones. Do we have a second?

DAVID COTHRAN: Second.

WESLEY GRANT: We have a second by Mr. Cothran. Any discussion?

DAN HARVELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just a couple of observations on my part.

I've been involved in government, county and state level, especially, for decades. I remember back in the early to mid 2000s when there was a lot of contention concerning sewer lines and where they were and where they weren't and the condition of the lines that were where they were. And because of that, the Shackleburg Road area became a huge concern. I was personally down there on Shackleburg Road numerous times when it was flooding out. And I'm telling you, the Jones Creek aquifer, that is one really active creek in Anderson County.

What we've heard about the bridges, you know, we -- the county is obviously saying we don't have the funds to fix these things, and yet, we just continue to do what causes more traffic and more traffic and more traffic.

For that reason, I'm voting no on this because -- or I'm voting to deny on this just because of not only the safety hazard that exists on Shackleburg, but also the environmental impact, because this is a very, this is a very environmentally intense area. A lot of wildlife, and I think that certainly needs to be considered.

And even though I sound like a broken record, and I say it every time when it comes to School District One, I will absolutely not vote to put kids in portables in today's society. The dangers that we face if they're not behind, if they're not behind brick and mortar, you will not have my vote.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: Any other comments? All those in -- I guess we'll vote. All those in favor to deny, please raise your hand. All those opposed to the denial, please raise your hand. And the project is approved. Thank you.

Item nine is public comments. We do not have anyone signed up for public comments.

Let it be known for the record, Mr. Gilreath has joined us again.

With that being said, I think that's all the business we had to attend to tonight, and we'll

entertain a motion to adjourn.

WILLIAM MOORE: Make a motion, Mr. Chairman.

WESLEY GRANT: Got a motion by Mr. Moore.

STEVEN GILREATH: Second.

WESLEY GRANT: Second by Mr. Gilreath. All those in favor, stand up.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:17 P.M.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

COUNTY OF ANDERSON)

ANDERSON COUNTY

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JUNE 9, 2026

PRESENT:
DAN HARVELL, VICE CHAIR
SCOTT JUNKINS
BRAD BURDETTE
STEVEN GILREATH
WILL MOORE
DAVID COTHRAN
JANE JONES

ALSO PRESENT:
ALESIA HUNTER
TIM CARTEE
HENRY YOUMANS
JOAN HOLLIDAY
MATT HOGAN - LIVE FEED

DAN HARVELL: Okay. We want to thank everybody for being here tonight. Before we gavel in, Mr. Moore, Commissioner Moore, has something he'd like to say.

WILLIAM MOORE: Yeah, at this time I would like to welcome Mr. Henry back with his health and -- health concerns. And we appreciate you and glad to have you back.

DAN HARVELL: I'm sure that's sentiments from all of us, Mr. Henry.

The June 9 meeting of the Anderson County Planning Commission for 2026 will be called to order. We will now stand for the, for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance done by Commissioner Gilreath.

STEVEN GILREATH: Let us pray.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE BY STEVEN GILREATH

DAN HARVELL: Thank you.

At this time I will call for a motion to approve the agenda as printed. I will state that I do have two things that I'd like to discuss before we get into the meeting itself. But other than that, I will consider those a point of privilege, and we will have a vote now for the approval of the agenda. Do I hear a motion?

STEVEN GILREATH: I'll make a motion to approve.

DAN HARVELL: We have a motion from Mr. Gilreath. Do we hear a second? We have a second from Mr. Cothran. Any discussion? All those in favor. And so ordered.

We have before us a copy of the April 14, 2026 minutes. Do I hear a motion to approve those as printed?

JANE JONES: Motion to approve.

DAN HARVELL: We hear a motion from Ms. Jones. Do I hear a second? We have a second from Mr. Junkins. Any discussion? All those in favor, please raise your hand.

Okay. Before we get started, I'd like to make mention of something. I guess due to the mail service, some of us commissioners have had a difficult time having our packets arrive in a timely manner. I know at least three of us only received our packets yesterday. That is absolutely not time for us to go over and study. And a lot of us like to go out and look at the properties physically, and it doesn't allow -- certainly doesn't allow time for that.

Now I realize that we do have advanced, advanced digital copies that are sent to us about a week ahead,

but the fact that the mail is doing what it's doing now, I think that I'm going to entertain a motion, and we can have discussion on this if you want to afterwards, but here is the motion that I would like a second on, so that we can discuss.

And it reads like this. I move in the form of a resolution that the Anderson County Development Department meet with the Public Works Committee of County Council to discuss resetting the deadlines of applications in relation to the date of the monthly Planning Commission meetings to allow a minimum time of two weeks in hand of the packets provided to Commission members. And I put that in the form of a motion. Do I hear a second?

STEVEN GILREATH: I'll second.

DAN HARVELL: We have a second. Now, any discussion from anyone?

WILLIAM MOORE: Yes, sir. I agree with you, Mr. Chairman. It is tough to get that information just a day or two before, and if you're not aware of those projects or don't look online, I mean, you don't have time to really evaluate the packet. So I'll just make that point.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Moore. Anyone else? Okay. If not, I'll ask for a vote on this. Those in favor of the motion as stated, will you raise your hand? And it is unanimous. Thank you.

Now, secondly, I just have a couple of questions for staff. There has been a lot of talk and concern, especially on social media, and some of us Planning Commissioners have been asked questions about the development on Rogers Road. I'm going to ask for clarification. Did we, as a Planning Commission, turn that project down three times?

TIM CARTEE: That project for single family was turned down twice. So they came back with doing a commercial development for townhomes under the requirements at staff level.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. So we did not take a third vote on that.

TIM CARTEE: It didn't require the Planning Commission to vote on a townhome development. That's under the requirements for staff level. It was denied for single family residential for 30 lots, but those were turned down twice. And so they went under the commercial, and they were allowed to do that on a commercial.

DAN HARVELL: Why, why -- I don't understand that. I don't understand that

classification as commercial, because this is a residential project.

TIM CARTEE: It falls under the -- it's under the large scale. It doesn't meet the requirements for large scale, because the parking is under 100, so that qualifies that as -- it's a rental type unit and this development that falls under the commercial and has always been that way.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. So is this, is this something that we have routinely had happen with residential units?

TIM CARTEE: Correct. We have them all over the county.

JANE JONES: So if you have less than 100 parking places, we don't vote on it?

TIM CARTEE: That's correct. When it comes to townhome commercial development.

JANE JONES: Because we do frequently vote on townhomes?

TIM CARTEE: Same way with an apartment complex; if it's less than 100 it would not come to the Planning Commission.

DAN HARVELL: That's a big ---

TIM CARTEE: And it’s been that way since 2003.

STEVEN GILREATH: How many units do that -- do those town homes go in as?

TIM CARTEE: I believe on that one there may be 47 or 48, maybe.

DAN HARVELL: Forty-eight is what I heard.

TIM CARTEE: That I recall; correct.

DAN HARVELL: Yeah, okay. The new ordinance concerning townhomes, does that affect this?

TIM CARTEE: It does not, because it was already -- the application was approved ---

DAN HARVELL: Yes, I, I realize that, so that went in under the grandfather ---

TIM CARTEE: In the future, I believe the limit is 32; I believe. So that goes at staff level, and it would not come to the Planning Commission, as well.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Well, we've had so much public opinion on this, I just wanted to clear that up here for everybody. We want to be as transparent as we can about everything, and I just thought it was worthwhile doing that.

All right. We'll move on into the agenda now. Item 6-A is Center Rock Precinct, rezoning referendum. This is County Council District Five. We'll now have the presentation from the staff.

ALESIA HUNTER: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As mentioned, this is a Center Rock precinct district, County Council District Five. This is for precinct zoning in the zoning areas there. Back in March, some individuals gained a petition, and we got all the certified signatures with the election office, which qualified for it to be on the ballot. We've had our first reading with Council.

Of course, this is a public hearing tonight. We have had a series of meetings for the property owners to come in and review the map and look at it to make certain that they are comfortable with what we have mapped in terms of properties being residential agricultural, single family, any industrial sites, as well as commercial sites, and so far we've had a map that everybody in that Council district is satisfied with. We did not have anybody object to the, to the maps that we have formulated. This is the public hearing tonight to -- with the Planning Commission to address this one more time.

If this is approved, we'll have one more reading, and that'll be after the referendum. The referendum is scheduled for August 11. So if it passes, we'll have the third reading with County Council. If it doesn't pass, then we don't move forward with the ordinance in the zoning -- official zoning map.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Thank you.

ALESIA HUNTER: Yes, sir.

DAN HARVELL: All right. We have two people signed up to speak to this. The first one is Jeanne Naus -- Nourse.

INAUDIBLE COMMENT FROM AUDIENCE

DAN HARVELL: You'll pass. Okay. The second one is Brian Crowther. Brian. Okay. Come to the microphone, and if you will, please state your name and address.

BRIAN CROWTHER: My name is Brian Crowther. I live at 102 Plum Leaf Lane here in Anderson. Again, first time being in one of these

things.
I appreciate what you guys do. It's a hard job; easy job some days, difficult some others. You guys are trying to discern what is best for Anderson County as a whole, but also trying to weigh out the local residents, how that may impact them in different areas of the county. I live over in this area.
For me, this development, I think it's 2.65 houses that's being proposed; is that not correct, per acre?
DAN HARVELL: Well, this is concerning the zoning.
BRIAN CROWTHER: The zoning? Okay.
DAN HARVELL: This is the zoning, yes.
BRIAN CROWTHER: Thinking about the other part of it.
DAN HARVELL: Were you thinking about -- what address is the ---
BRIAN CROWTHER: The Waters ---
DAN HARVELL: That, that's later on.
BRIAN CROWTHER: Later on? I apologize.
DAN HARVELL: That's all right. It's your first time. We understand.
All right. So that, that clears out that. I suppose we need to take a vote on this to move it to Council?
ALESIA HUNTER: Yes, sir.
DAN HARVELL: Okay. All right. At this time I'll entertain a motion to accept the presentation that has been given to us concerning the Center Rock zoning referendum. Do I hear a motion? We have a motion from Mr. Cothran. Do I have a second?
WILLIAM MOORE: Second.
DAN HARVELL: Second from Mr. Moore. Any discussion?
JANE JONES: All we're voting on here is just the map; right?
DAN HARVELL: Correct.
ALESIA HUNTER: That's, that's correct. Just the map.
INAUDIBLE COMMENT
ALESIA HUNTER: Yes.
DAN HARVELL: So this is, this is actually a resolution type vote going to

approve what we've sent to County Council to go forward.

JANE JONES: Because they have not voted on the ---

ALESIA HUNTER: Yes, they, they've had one reading on it. It's -- it works -- the Council does it first, first reading.

DAN HARVELL: All right. Okay. Any other discussion? Call for the vote. Those in favor. And unanimous. Thank you.

All right. Next is a variance request to subdivide existing parcel into two lots less than one acre minimum lot size requirement, located at 204 Leslie Lane, tax map number 42-02-02-001. This resides in County Council District Four.

And staff.

TIM CARTEE: Okay. Mr. Chairman, instead of repeating my report, thank you for doing that for me.

It's 1.67 acres, and it's currently unzoned, and it's a residential single family golf course area. And the requested variance is to allow for subdivision into two 25,000 square foot lots for construction for single family residential homes. Property is surrounded by the Boscobel golf course and single family residential lots. No additional land is available to be able to construct one acre minimum lots. Surrounding properties are already single family residential lots at a similar lot size at the proposed 25,000 square foot lots.

Finding of facts: Anderson County Ordinance 2024-31 section 24-338, Exhibit A(3), the division of a tract of land into four or less lots at a minimum of one acre during any three year period, where each lot fronts an existing county or state road, a minor subdivision of land into four or less lots with road frontage shall be allowed, along with a 20 foot private drive, as shown on the exhibit. It is the responsibility of the subdivider to obtain any encroachment permits or permits for -- from the appropriate state or county department or agency for any driveway entrances.

If there's been a division of these parcels in the previous three years out of the parcel on which the proposed division of four or less lots is proposed, whether to individual or to corporate entities, the proposed division by summary plat shall not be allowed.

Here it shows the layout of the proposed lots to be split. And this is the area of the tax map parcel.

And there's the sign posted for the variance request to the public.

And this concludes your staff report.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cartee. We have no one signed up to speak for or against this. So at this time, let's see, do we need a, yeah, developer -- I'm sorry, developer presentation. Mr. White.

WESLEY WHITE: Thank you, Commissioners. Wesley White with Bridgewater Engineering. Also, our representatives are here from Boscobel who owns the property, if y'all have any questions for them.

But yeah, they've owned this property for a while. It's an internal part of the Boscobel Golf Course. And their goal is to situate two single-family homes here, 25,000 square foot was the minimum up to about a year and a half ago when Council changed it to one acre. It can still go to you guys with the request when it's less than an acre. That allows them to do two houses.

Lot sizes, as staff mentioned, are similar to the surrounding area, so it's not going to really create a non-conforming issue with the surrounding houses. There's, like I said, also -- this is landlocked property. The total of 1.6 acres is landlocked. There is a third parcel on there, so just to make sure there's no confusion, that's a non-conforming lot, and it'll be used for parking area and overflow parking by the -- during -- for the golf course itself.

But happy to answer any questions, and the guys are here if you have any questions directly related to what they need.

DAN HARVELL: I will ask you, the non-conforming lot, you say that will be used for parking by the two people that would be ---

WESLEY WHITE: No, it's to be used by the golf course itself.

DAN HARVELL: By the golf course?

WESLEY WHITE: Correct. So it's leftover property that's already being used for overflow parking, and so that's why it's being cut out. It'll be separate. The other two are single family.

DAN HARVELL: Anyone want to address the developer or the engineer of the project?

STEVEN GILREATH: Why wouldn't he go ahead and, if he's not going to do anything with

it, why wouldn't you make one an acre and one -- a variance like that, Mr. White?

WESLEY WHITE: You talking about the -- well, the non-conforming .5 acres already has parking on it, and for liability reasons, we didn't want that to be part of the residential homes themselves. And you would still be left with one non-conforming lot that we would still have to come for a variance on.

STEVEN GILREATH: And there's, there's no -- you couldn't build on -- we're not, we're not approving three lots?

WESLEY WHITE: No. You're ---

STEVEN GILREATH: Five years from now, could we go back and put a house on that?

WESLEY WHITE: They would have to come back to you guys to request a variance for that, because the minimum is 25,000 square foot for a septic tank in Anderson County. So they would have -- and this is the non-conforming lot. It'll have -- it has a note on the plat going forward, not to be used for residential.

DAN HARVELL: Any other questions of Mr. White? All right. Thank you.

WESLEY WHITE: Thank you. Appreciate it.

DAN HARVELL: All right. As I said before -- got the cart before the horse. We have no one signed up to address this, so I'll call for a motion to approve or deny this from the, from the board.

WILLIAM MOORE: Mr. Chairman, it is my district, and I understand the problems they're faced with over at the golf course. I've spent a lot, a lot of time there as a kid learning to play golf. And you know, the new homes that have been built in there, upgraded, it is the owner of the course, so you know, I just feel like it is conducive with the surrounding homes, and therefore I make a motion to approve.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. We have a motion to approve from Mr. Moore. Do I hear a second?

DAVID COTHRAN: Second.

DAN HARVELL: We have a second from Mr. Cothran. Time for discussion. Anyone?

STEVEN GILREATH: I have a question for the county. So are we setting a

precedence? If we approve this, is it ---
TIM CARTEE: The Planning Commission has approved previous ones in the past for less than one acre.
DAN HARVELL: This is coming under the new ordinance, correct?
TIM CARTEE: Correct.
DAN HARVELL: Okay. So when we approved before, what, what ramifications were we -- or what were we doing then concerning, concerning lot size compared to this?
TIM CARTEE: Well, we've had two that was approved by the Planning Commission to where it had got changed over when they were in the process of changing the lot sizes, and they'd already purchased the property. So they were looking to get the maximum out of all the lots on these properties. And they fell under the one acre minimum, and so they came to the Planning Commission, and y'all agreed to approve.
DAN HARVELL: And those would have been about what date? It would have predated the new ordinance, right?
TIM CARTEE: Well, no, not the, not the one acre. No, it was during that, but it was just shortly after that when these two came.
DAN HARVELL: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else?
JANE JONES: Well, I just think we need to -- this ordinance is new, I understand that, but I think we need to go ahead and enforce it, and not -- we can't continue to make exceptions now that the ordinance is in place.
DAN HARVELL: I know we've been faced with this before, but I'm being told, I think, by the staff that, you know, if you do this, you're setting a precedent for, for things down the road, and also setting a preference for someone who wants to go to court and overturn our decisions.
So that does weigh on my, that does weigh on my vote personally.
Anyone else have anything to say? All right. I'll call for the vote. The vote is to approve this. Those that are in favor of approval, please raise your hand. Okay. That would be Mr. Cothran, Mr. Moore, Mr. Burdette, and Mr. Junkins. Those not in favor, please raise your hand. And that would be Ms. Jones, Mr. Harvell, and Mr. Gilreath. It passes.
All right. Next on the agenda is 6-C, variance request to subdivide existing parcel into two lots,

less than one acre minimum size requirement, located at 248 Mahaffey Road, tax map number 246-00-03-003. And this is in County Council District Seven.

Staff.

HENRY YOUMANS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The applicant is Roger Nix for Juanita King. The address and Council district and taxpayer number are there for your reference. This is currently zoned R-A, which is residential agricultural, and that is the land use.

The applicant is requesting that the one acre minimum required by ordinance be waived to subdivide and sell the remaining parcel while maintaining the homestead for the seller.

Under finding of facts: Chapter 48, Anderson County Code of Ordinances, under Section 5.2 R-A, residential agricultural district; 5:2.3 lot size, or lot area, the minimum lot area should be one acre.

Ms. King is no longer able to maintain the two acres of the property that she owns, and desires to sell a portion due to her age and health status. She entered into a contract to sell the portion of the parcel in April of -- April 10, 2026. It was subsequently discovered that the two acres was originally measured incorrectly from the center of the road of both Mahaffey and Mill Street Extension. The R-A zoning ordinance requires that the property consists only of one acre, but one net acre. The net acre requirement is causing a hardship for Ms. King's desire to -- and ability to sell the portion of her land due to the one acre net requirement. There will be not enough acreage to sell both the lot and maintain her homestead. The lot is slightly undersized and deducted from the right of way setbacks. It would make it difficult for the use of the property. There are no adverse effects of the adjacent properties if the variance is granted.

If this variance is approved, the applicant is required to obtain a survey to subdivide the parcel, leaving the remainder of the parcel to the homestead of the seller. Once the survey has been completed and approved by Development Standards, the sale can be completed, and the new parcel containing .96 acres can be recorded in the Register of Deeds.

This is a proposed layout of the subdividing of the parcel showing the homestead on the left and the new lot of record on the right. It is R-A zoned, as shown by this zoning map.

And this is the sign that was posted for the variance. This concludes the staff report.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Thank you. All right. We have one person signed up to talk, and that's Roger Nix, who has identified himself as the applicant. Mr. Nix.

ROGER NIX Yes. Thank you.

So, this particular property, as you had heard, was -- is owned by Mr. and Ms. King. They purchased the property with two acres, and that does include the right of way from the center line of both Mahaffey Road and Mill Street Extension. Their desire is to sell a portion of it.

Based on the zoning requirement, it doesn't have to be that -- according to the way they want to operate it, they don't need to maintain their own net acre unless that's required. If the new divided part of it needs to be in that acre, that's completely fine. They just didn't know what amount they could sell based on the requirement of the zoning ordinance. And so that's why they would seek a variance to find out what they could sell if they needed to maintain their existing property at an acre, and then sell what was left, or if they could, you know, maintain less than one acre of their personal property, and then have the new portion be granted at greater than an acre, or a net acre, whatever it needed to be. So that's where that came from.

And I'll answer any questions anybody has as far as that goes.

JANE JONES: What is the actual size of her property? Measured, measured correctly; not from the center of the road.

ROGER NIX: Well, as I have been able to determine, it's approximately 1.75 net acres, is what I've been able to approximately identify in the measurements that I've been able to take. We did contact the surveyor to go out and identify this for us. His suggestion was that we come before you guys first, find out if we could get an approval, and then he would draw the survey in accordance with what you guys determined.

STEVEN GILREATH: I would assume she's been paying taxes to the center line, right?

ROGER NIX: She has, yes. Everything that she's been paying, and/or her tax value assessments, have been based on the full two acres, which would include center line of the property. Or center line of the road. Pardon me.

DAN HARVELL: Anyone else?

Okay. So she is conducive to moving where the line would be to make that a one acre net?

ROGER NIX: Correct. She has no desire to necessarily keep an acre. In fact, she -- her initial desire was to keep whatever the minimum was going to be, because of the maintenance challenges that she has with regard to the property itself. And so the more she could sell, probably the better for her. But at the time that we began to enter into this, we thought it might need to be an acre, and then we discovered about the net acreage requirement, and that caused us -- me to appear before you guys.

DAN HARVELL: Well, that was, that was quite thoughtful of you to do it this way. I'm not sure everybody would.

ROGER NIX: Well, we want to make sure we're doing all the right things for all parties.

DAN HARVELL: So, if she's okay, if she's okay with moving her property line so that it makes that one net acre, then that seems the solution, right?

ROGER NIX: It would to us as well, because she's already set up -- her septic is established, everything is done there at the property. Has been for many, many years.

So if -- that's why we were saying, if the requirement was that the new parcel that would be designated, if it was granted, be a net acre, that's perfectly fine with her. It could be drawn and surveyed in any number of ways based on the way that the property is laid out. And there's a number of ways that that could be configured per the surveyor, unless you guys have specific recommendations on that.

DAN HARVELL: So my question for staff would be, is this actual -- do we actually need to do this?

HENRY YOUMANS: Yes.

DAN HARVELL: We have to do this?

HENRY YOUMANS: If the proposed lot, if she makes whatever changes to make that acre, her homestead would be less than one acre.

DAN HARVELL: Yes.

HENRY YOUMANS: So either way would have to be either for the new lot or her existing lot to be approved.

STEVEN GILREATH: But if we leave it as is, she's paying taxes to the center line

of the road.
HENRY YOUMANS: Right, which is ---
STEVEN GILREATH: If we leave it as is, it works for both of them.
HENRY YOUMANS: Well, normally the front setback is the issue, because it is from the road right of way. And wherever that right of way ends, you add the additional setback. And most people do measure it from the center line of the road, and in most cases that's incorrect.
So it depends on the jurisdiction of whoever owns the road, if it's DOT or the county. Based on that, then wherever that right of way ends, then the additional setback would occur for the setback from the right of way.
STEVEN GILREATH: With that putting her house less than an acre, if they move the lot line, does that affect her selling her house at any point?
HENRY YOUMANS: Well, at any point, if she moves to make the new parcel one acre, of course her homestead would be less than that. And if you approve the variance, then the variance goes with the, with the property.
STEVEN GILREATH: So she would be able to sell her property?
HENRY YOUMANS: Correct.
WILLIAM MOORE: Also, one other point I'd like to make, Mr. Chairman, the -- all the utilities are -- is it going to work out for both parties and nothing's going to cross property lines, is that correct?
ROGER NIX: That is correct, because everything that we've seen, because the new property would come in and include both the corner from Mahaffey Road, as well as Mill Street Extension. So, there'll be a number of ways that you could draw that without having to come across her property.
And with regard to any potential impact for her being able to resell down the road, there are -- prior to the zoning ordinance being in place to have a net acre, there are quite a few parcels out there at half acre, or even in that range between a half and one acre. So, there's a lot of sales that have happened over there already that have not included a full acre.
So, I don't think it would impact at all.
DAN HARVELL: Okay. This is the first time that I recall that we've had

somebody giving up their own property in order to make something work. This was -- this is different.

ROGER NIX: Sure.

DAN HARVELL: This is different. Any other questions? All right. I'll -- thank you, sir.

ROGER NIX: Yes, sir.

DAN HARVELL: I'll call for the vote. Do I have a motion to approve or deny this? Calling for a motion to approve or deny.

DAVID COTHRAN: Motion to approve.

DAN HARVELL: Okay, we have a motion to approve from Mr. Cothran. Do I hear a second?

STEVEN GILREATH: Second.

DAN HARVELL: We have a second from Mr. Gilreath. Any discussion amongst the commissioners?

STEVEN GILREATH: I would just like to add that it is basically an acre from center line. So they've been, they've been paying taxes on this for multiple years, I would imagine. So...

DAN HARVELL: Okay.

STEVEN GILREATH: That's my reasoning.

DAN HARVELL: All right. Okay. Anyone else? Okay. Call for the vote. Those in favor of approval, please raise your hand. And that would be Ms. Jones, Mr. Cothran, Mr. Moore, Harvell. Oh, it's unanimous. Okay. Unanimous vote.

ROGER NIX: Thank you.

DAN HARVELL: All right. Moving on to item 7-A, single family subdivision, Providence Farms, located at Hidden Acres Road, TMS 116-00-02-008, in County Council District Four. Staff.

TIM CARTEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 179 property owners within 2000 feet of the proposed development were notified via postcard. And again, this is Providence Farms, single family, and the applicant is Lucas Anthony. Jamie McCutcheon is the engineer.

And the location access is near Hidden Acres Road. It's Council District Four. Surrounding land use is residential. It's unzoned. Tax map is there for viewing. Acreage is 60.55 acres and 35 lots proposed. No variance is requested. And the traffic impact analysis is not required for these lots.

Here is the proposed layout of this development.

And it also has a kiosk for the mail and a parking lot for all these lots. Here's a color photo of this. Here's the aerial view.

And there's the proposed sign for the public. The project has met the requirements of Chapter 24. This is your staff report.

DAN HARVELL: Mr. Cartee, could you go back to that aerial photo one more time, the overlay? The one before that. And then forward to the next one. Okay. Thank you.

All right. Do we have an engineer/developer here to speak to this?

LUCAS ANTHONY: Thank you. I'm Lucas Anthony. I live at 210 Longview Carolina in Easley, South Carolina. I'm the developer.

Like Mr. Cartee said, it's a 168 acre development. We are basically planning a low density community. So one -- 1.5 or one and a half acre average home sites.

You know, this didn't -- just a little bit of background, so everybody kind of understands how this happened. This didn't start with a land deal. It started with a phone call from a friend, Donald Snow. He works at -- or does Providence Farms markets. And so we went to high school together. Long story short, he had a cattle lease on this property and contacted me because I did a low impact development in Pickens County. It's a farm agricultural community, has its own garden, mentorship. It's really designed to get people farming and living, you know, the way everybody in Anderson already does, kind of an agricultural basic lifestyle.

And so, you know, Providence Farms is not your typical subdivision. It's what I call an authentic living community. There's not really a word for it, but it's -- if you look at the way we used to live, you know, close community with like-minded values and beliefs, like-minded people. We have a, you know, really the concept is to not come in and change the culture of Anderson, but to make people value farms. That's how you'll save them.

Everybody -- we met with the community, we met with adjoining property owners. This was scheduled to be 190 homes. It was under contract with NBR. I guess I shouldn't have said that. It was under contract with a relatively large tract builder. Got approvals for gas, water, etcetera. They were just marching down the line, and, like, I say, my friend Donald called me with his cattle lease and said, hey, they're getting ready to end my lease and do 190 homes

on this farmland. Is there a way you can help?
And so that's really why I'm here. I've been impressed with everybody in the community asking questions, concerned about their property, concerned about the property values, the impact. I'm just grateful to be able to be here to say my side, to kind of present what we're doing, and welcome to answer any questions.
But the goal is to create a low-density development that will add to Anderson County and not take away. Thank y'all.
DAN HARVELL: All right. Thank you.
Anybody have any questions while he's up here?
STEVEN GILREATH: If this is phase one, how many are you anticipating in the next two?
LUCAS ANTHONY: Maximum of 80 home sites on 190 acres. Or 168 acres. I'm sorry.
STEVEN GILREATH: Maximum of ---
LUCAS ANTHONY: 80 home sites. Still a 1.5 acre average, no more. No less, I should say.
WILLIAM MOORE: Mr. Anthony, what's your target market price? Do you have an idea?
LUCAS ANTHONY: Yeah, so there'll be three different categories of product. Everything we do is custom homes, so there's nothing that's kind of standard. But we'll, we'll have what I call a cottage product, probably be in the 500 range, 500,000. And then farm house estates, probably in the five to eight range. And then there'll be estate homes, probably a million plus.
There'll be a farm, a garden, community center, gathering spaces. It's really designed to get people outdoors living together. It's more of a generational community. There's a farm -- I mean, a lake on the property. I plan on getting kids out, teaching them how to fish, teach them how of skin of fish. Like nobody knows how to clean fish anymore. I mean, I've frog gigged the pond on this property. We're going to do 100 foot buffers on the rivers.
I was a biology major. My goal is to figure out how to protect land and still have people live on it. I value trees. I felt like -- I was in the development meeting that Anderson County had with the new land development ordinance. I've developed land in Pickens, Greenville, Buncombe County, Oconee County. First time in Anderson. I'll be

straightforward, you guys do a phenomenal job. Everybody here might not believe it, but as an independent party, Anderson's the most buttoned-up county I've ever been a part of on development.

Yeah, like I say, I'm not getting paid by anybody here. It's the truth. And they're in the process of trying to make things harder for developers to mass grade. I don't do any mass grading. Won't be any mass grading on this. And they're in the process of moving that way. Y'all have got a long way to go. Y'all are doing great, though.

And anyway, I'll just end it there.

DAN HARVELL: Well, before you sit down, I will ask you, how about the trees? How do you treat the trees that are existing?

LUCAS ANTHONY: Yeah, so if you look, most of the land that we're developing is in pastures. And so there are trees around the peripheral. You know, I've got a Google map download of the lots and roads, and am actively walking around and shifting. The only issue, a little bit with me, is I like to put my roads with contours and have a little more curvature. That's a little bit resistance in Roads and Bridges towards having curvatures in roads and following contours, primarily because straight roads are traditionally known as being safer.

But there is some evidence that shows that slightly curvier roads do slow traffic down and can have less impact on the actual land. But that's -- I'm a mountain road building guy. My dad did a lot of development in Pickens and Greenville, and I grew up kind of putting roads through the mountains and around, you know, making sure your water is pitching to ditch lines and things like that.

DAN HARVELL: So, no, no intention of on-street parking?

LUCAS ANTHONY: No.

DAN HARVELL: None at all?

LUCAS ANTHONY: None. These are all private roads. So we'll, we'll own and maintain them. Build them and maintain them, I guess.

DAN HARVELL: Anyone else?

JANE JONES: While you’re talking about roads, there’s a letter here in our packet that has to do with the sight distance on the driveways. I'm not going -- can you explain some of that, reiterate on it?

LUCAS ANTHONY: Yes, ma'am. I mean, the -- our roads will meet sight distance based on the DOT’s requirements, right there on ---

JANE JONES: I'm concerned by the highway people about that.
LUCAS ANTHONY: Oh, that was on the second phase. Like if we did the second development on the second half, like the -- what we're submitting today is 35 homes.
JANE JONES: It's going by the letter, it doesn't specify that.
LUCAS ANTHONY: Yeah, the -- well, originally we were going to do the whole development as one submittal, and the second half of the property was fed off a county road, Jerry Dalrymple, and the county told us they didn't want us to use it because it wasn't safe.
And so we decided to wait on the second tract until we really figure out a better access. We don't want it to be unsafe, but we'd also like to help the county out and fix their issue with Jerry Dalrymple. It would be the ideal scenario.
JANE JONES: I don't have anything either from the fire station that would serve this project. Have you contacted them to see if ---
LUCAS ANTHONY: I don't know if we did or not. Yeah, I'm not sure if we've contacted the fire department.
JANE JONES: It's kind of important.
LUCAS ANTHONY: I understand.
JANE JONES: These houses are real close together. You've got to have access.
LUCAS ANTHONY: Understood. And they're no more close together than the ones across the street. So they're one and a half acre versus one acre.
DAN HARVELL: Anyone else?
JANE JONES: This, this project is in, I guess, School District, the Anderson School District Five?
LUCAS ANTHONY: Yeah, D's district. We spoke with him. Or Four. I'm sorry.
JANE JONES: Oh, Four. Okay, that's what I was trying to clarify. Wasn't in here.
DAN HARVELL: Okay. So, when you do the build-out in the second phase, you, you -- now, you mentioned that that might come out on Dalrymple, or you had wanted it to, or the staff advised against that?
LUCAS ANTHONY: Yeah, they advised against it based on the sight distance.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. So there's nowhere on that section of road where that would work, because of sight distance, correct?

LUCAS ANTHONY: Correct, yeah. Basically, Jerry Dalrymple, the existing county road doesn't have enough sight distance to be considered safe.

DAN HARVELL: All right. Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. Thank you. We may call you back, sir.

LUCAS ANTHONY: Absolutely. Thank y'all.

DAN HARVELL: All right. First person signed up to speak is Kelly Decker.

KELLY DECKER: My first time here, so... All right. My name is Kelly Decker. I live at 2045 Five Forks.

So I'm a couple miles down the road from this development. And I will tell you that when it first came about, I was strongly against this. But since then I have had many conversations with the developer and with Providence Farms, and we truly believe as a community that this would be the best option for us.

We do not want 200 tract homes coming to that road. One, it doesn't have the infrastructure. If you've been on Five Forks Road, it doesn't have the infrastructure for 200 tract homes. We like the idea of this. It -- he is, he's preserving a lot of the land. And we like the idea of the community. It will be a gated community, and it will have a lot of the values that we carry.

And so, for us, we believe that this is the direction that Anderson should go in when it is considering developments. Done some research on his past ones. If y'all want to look it up, Riverstead, great development. And you can see a lot of where this community is headed.

And so we're asking you, I'm asking you, to please vote for this, because otherwise it's going to get sold to a big developer.

So appreciate your time tonight.

DAN HARVELL: All right. Thank you. Next is Don Hall.

DON HALL: Don Hall, 141 Bluff Point Trail.

My family and I moved here in '94. I bought my land on Timms Mill in 2000. We built in 2011. When we first moved here, Shackleburg, Dalrymple, Midway, all those roads, cows, land, crops, few horses, open land, eye candy.

Now it seems like every month or so there's a new bulldozer somewhere. People are moving here, there's nothing we can do about that. It seems like our options would be to hold on to our land, but the problem with that is in looking around, a good many of us are getting older. We're going to have financial needs. We're going to need money, things like that. So, there's pressure to sell. And if not, then our heirs even more pressure to sell. They move away, all that kind of stuff. And so development is coming.

I ride down the roads now, they're full. I see people I don't know. I used to know almost everybody, but the land is going to develop, and it seems like the option would be, one, for all of us landowners to buy up the land; two, play the lottery, do that, but like my son said, Dad, you have to play to win the lottery. But that. Refuse to sell, but then our heirs might. And then the other option would be use this land for tract homes, lots of smaller homes, or a development like he's described that fits in more with the character of our community. We call it Timms Mill Community. I know it's Piercetown, but a lot of us call it Timms Mill Community. But to fit in better, less traffic, better way of living.

And then these gentlemen have committed -- we had a meeting on Timms Mill with them Friday night. They came and presented. It seems like they really want to do this in such a way that would fit in with the character of the kind of places we want to live.

So thank you for the opportunity to speak.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you. Next is Kevin Hardy.

KEVIN HARDY: Kevin Hardy. I live at 2035 Five Forks Road. I'm just going to reiterate what we just heard from Mr. Hall and Ms. Decker.

Like Mr. Hall just said, we met last Friday night as a community. We did Facebook and called people, sent texts, and everything to the community around us to get everybody involved, so that we could get feedback to see what everyone in the area wanted to do.

And the general consensus, I believe was, let's vote for this thing, because we don't want 200 homes coming in our area. And initially I was against it. But then when we met with Lucas two times, and he was kind enough to come to Ms. Decker's house and discuss it with us, along with Mr. Snow, and then he came last Friday night and gave us a presentation, so we'd all know what we're looking at.

And I welcome that housing group to come in. Thank you.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you. Next is Bernice Whitney.

BERNICE WHITNEY: Yes, I'm Bernice Whitney, and I'm at 1212 Five Forks Road.

And I came here to speak out against this whole development, but just hearing what I heard this evening, it does sound interesting. I don't want to see multiple homes go in. These are going to be on larger lots.

But I do think we need to address the issue of the roads. This particular Five Forks Road is frequently used by bicyclers and others, and it is narrow, and we have a lot of heavy equipment on that road these days. So, I think that needs to be a big consideration.

Roads need to be addressed. And so rather than getting into my other points, I will leave it at that.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you. Allison Hester, Hampton? Allison? Anyone in here named Allison? There you go. It may be Hunter, I don't know.

ALLISON HORTON: I live at 800 Shackleburg Road.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Name?

ALLISON HORTON: Allison Horton, H O R T O N.

DAN HARVELL: Horton. Okay.

ALLISON HORTON: Horton. Yes, thank you.

DAN HARVELL: It could have been that too.

ALLISON HORTON: It could have. Put my hands in my pockets. Doug and I live at 800 Shackleburg Road. And Shackleburg Road Farms was a living nightmare to live through when the bridges were out and people were trying to get those huge trucks down Smith Road onto Shackleburg and turn up by Martin Owens. We took tractors many a time to help those poor people get those large trucks moved towards Shackleburg Farm Road. Those houses are packed in there, and it's an ugly sight.

I couldn't talk a lot of the people into buying the 44 acres because I knew what was coming, and it's a lot of traffic.

So, what Donald and Colleen Snow and Lucas are presenting is extremely acceptable. They are preserving the land. They're preserving the

community. They are not shoving houses where they can reach out and shake hands. It is something I do welcome in our community. It's something I hope y'all will consider to approve.

DAN HARVELL: All right. Thank you, ma'am. Next is James Blanding.

JAMES BLANDING: Good evening. My name is James Blending. I live at 1552 Five Forks Road. Less than a mile away from where this development wants to build these homes.

I have a real concern about the infrastructure, as most people have already said, and I've been living there for 40 years. Now, I know this -- I know all that property over there pretty good. I want to know, what are you going to do as far as infrastructure, cars getting in and out on Five Fox Road.

Because I know there's no access on the backside, because that's all that swamp. There's no access on the other side from where the Martins was. So where's all this traffic going to go? When I-85 back up you have tractor trailers and all of these cars detouring coming up Five Forks Road. The roads are already tore up because of all these big trucks.

I am totally against this many houses coming in. And you guys say you have not been out there to see the site yet. When you come up Five Forks Road, you'll see what I'm saying. I don't have $500,000. I don't have the kind of money that these kind of houses coming in to buy, so that means that's going to push me out. I'm going to end up having to sell or do something. But I'm going to try to hold on as long as I can.

So I mean, I understand you can't stop people from moving to our area. And I, too, am a lover of the land; I'm a hunter, I'm a fisher. I love that. Don't cut the trees down. We done cut down enough. But is there any other alternative here? That's just -- I yield.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Blanding. Next is Charles Blanding.

CHARLES BLANDING: Hello, I'm Charles Blanding. I live at 1201 Five Forks Road.

And many of you, if you was watching the news here just recently, there was a young man that got killed, 17 -- 16 year old kid that just got killed. That happened two mailboxes from my mailbox.

So Five Forks Road is dangerous. There's a lot of traffic on Five Forks Road. And as my brother mentioned, when traffic gets backed up on the other side of 85 or 81, traffic gets off on 8, and it comes

right through my neighborhood. It's too much. That road can't handle all that traffic, you know.

So it's -- concerns, safety concerns, that's my concern. Thank you.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you. Next is Robbie Dunaway. I think, maybe.

ROBBIE DUNAWAY: Before I get started, is it possible for me to ask a couple of questions based on some of the stuff I've heard, from the developer, or -- because some of it is not clear to me.

DAN HARVELL: Ask them to us, and then we may relay them. Okay?

ROBBIE DUNAWAY: So what are you approving here tonight? What I saw was for 22 houses, or whatever, and we're talking about a subdivision that's 80 houses. So, what are you being asked to approve tonight? 80 houses or 22 houses?

JANE JONES: 35 houses.

ROBBIE DUNAWAY: So, what happens to the rest of it? How does it -- does it have to come again, or does it get approved in total? How does that work?

STEVEN GILREATH: I asked that question. It was ---

TIM CARTEE: Mr. Chairman, what's being proposed in that is 35 lots to the Planning Commission. He's showing a future phase. If he decides to do the future phase, he would have to come back to the Planning Commission for -- to ask permission from y'all to approve his next phase in there. But right now he's only asking for 35 lots.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cartee.

ROBBIE DUNAWAY: But this is a bigger project than what you're being asked to approve today.

Also, I've heard that the average lot size is one and a half acres, which sounds really good when you say that. That's average, right? But they're not all an acre and a half. Some of them are -- they're all greater than an acre, but they're not all an acre and a half. That's just the average. I want to make that point.

Another point that I want to make is what I understand is these houses are going to be a minimum of 1200 square feet. The prices that he's given is pretty steep for a 1200 square foot house.

Also, what Mr. Luke -- Mr. Anthony has said paints a very good -- pretty picture, right? But how

do we hold him to that? How do you hold him to that? What are you approving? Are you approving all of these restrictions that he's saying? Or you're just approving him to have 22 lots in the subdivision?

So it's one thing to say something, it's a whole nother thing to do something, right? So that's a concern that I have, is, is how do you do that?

And then, of course, the issues with the roads that some of the other folks -- and I also want to make it very clear that, you know, some people have gotten up here and said they represent the community. Well, they don't represent the community. They certainly don't represent me. Okay? And I don't think -- there's other people here that they don't represent either. So that was, that was kind of out of context.

But my name is Robbie Dunaway, and I live at 1519 Five Forks Road. I've owned my property for 36 years, and this proposed subdivision borders my property. So I live, I live right next to it.

Let me first thank you for putting a sign up on the side of the road, and for the home mailing. That's the way it should work. It happened 17 -- the sign went up 17 days ago, so everybody here has been made aware of this in 17 days. And I will give Mr. Anthony very good credit for getting people together and kind of rallying the troops and telling them this is what we're going to do. And like I said, it sounds, it sounds really good.

But what you hear people coming up here saying is pick your poison. Do you want 200 houses or do you want 80 houses?

HENRY YOUMANS: Time.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you, sir. Next is Dusty Woods.

DUSTY WOODS: Good evening. I'm Dusty Woods. 1808 Dalrymple Road. I live right in the pie where all the green grass is. So the front of my house faces Pearman Drive and the back is on Dalrymple. So if anybody wants to talk about traffic, I look at it at both sides. Most everybody here has one road. I've got two. I know what traffic is out there. The times of the day I'm out there, my -- I do work from there, everything, and what's very interesting is the times a day traffic hits. It's construction people with their trailers on Pearman cutting through. It's when the plants let out, whether it's coming off of 178 or TCI, or any of those. It's not the neighbors coming up and going down the road throughout the day.

My understanding, when it comes down to a person owning a piece of property, as I'm a financial planner, when I ask somebody, what are your heirs going to do with your land? Well, they're going to sell it. And you know what, here's what's interesting. If somebody came to any of us and said, for our acre or our six acres or 168 acres, let's take six. Somebody walks up and says, I want to give you $5 million for that. You're going to walk away, and you're going to go and do what you want. Here's what the cool thing is about this whole thing. If we all take the time to understand the rules of when you own a piece of property, it's yours. You guys dictate how it can be zoned. If it's zoned the way it is, you guys have to fall within your parameters.

My understanding of this entire project is it is a lesser of two evils, as the gentleman said that just spoke. If we want to, you know, help him finish his thought, because he's got great thoughts. But also my thought is, do I want 200 or even one day way down the road, 80 in a gated community that I don't have to worry about all the different things that go on. It's a set, exact planned program. The gentleman has a history. He has other properties that he can show of what he's done.

And my thought living where I do for the last 10 years, very, very proud of where I live. I love taking care of it. Everybody knows me and my ponytail when they drive by, because they're going to see me in my yard. Having something like this versus the other when I drive by Five Forks to go any direction, I have a suspicion I'm not going to see a clean piece of land like when I came to town tonight that I saw on the right, that's completely clear cut.

So I am in -- very much in favor of this. And if anyone else in my community, my close-knit neighbors, I can speak for them tonight. They are also in favor of this particular project.

Thank you for your time.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you, Ms. Woods. Next is Barbara Smith.

BARBARA SMITH: I'm Barbara Smith. I live at 5100 Olden Porter Road. My husband Lewis and I purchased our 105 acres in 1976. We've been a part of the community for 50 years.

When we first moved out to the Five Forks area, it was rural, it was farm. And as the older generation died off, the heirs would divide the land and sell. This property that we're talking about tonight is going to be sold, hands down. The owner

has made that extremely clear.

When I look at what has been done in and around Anderson County, and there's one close to us at the end of Dalrymple Road at 85, that land has been destroyed. There is not a tree left standing on it. It's mass grading, it's mass erosion. It's horrendous.

I was at the meeting Friday night. Lucas presented a good plan, a good program. Yes, I would like to see the land stay intact, but it's going to happen. He is the lesser of two evils. He is very sure in preserving the trees. I'm a horticulturist by trade. I had a good talk with him about land preservation, preserving the trees, different things that he's got. To me, that is much better than letting a tract home builder come in, build substandard houses, and put 200 plus houses into this property. That would be a travesty.

So if this is what has got to be done, I do propose that Mr. Luke -- that Mr. Anthony be given permission to proceed. Thank you.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you, ma'am. Last is Angela Dodson.

ANGELA DODSON: Hi. Good afternoon. Thanks for putting this together. And again, first time, just like everyone else, kind of nervous up here.

My name is Angela Dotson. I live with my husband at 151 Hidden Acres Road. I know there's a lot of people here very affected by this development, and I hate to say it, but I'm the one that's affected the absolute most.

If you pull up your map, we're directly behind the first phase. There's almost no trees on our property, so for us, we are literally going to be staring at the back of people's houses.

Moved from high density to rural area to stay rural. When we first heard there was a development going in, tears in my eyes. Lucas came out, spoke to us personally with the neighbors that are in that little tiny square that this development is actually going around, and changed my mind.

Lucas is a really upstanding person that's going to keep the land the way that it is. He's going to have the buffers between the houses, which again we're affected the absolute most. If you look at the land they're buying, our house is right in the middle of two and a half acres, and we're surrounded by the trees that aren't ours. He's actually going to keep the trees around us, so we actually keep our little

bit of privacy and keep our little bit of rural.
I understand everyone's concerns, and the roads are definitely -- the infrastructure is absolutely not ready for any houses, but it's going to happen. And 85 is much better than 200. The first phase, again, I'm going to -- we're going to be affected the absolute most. We're in a corner, and it's -- keeping with the land is what I want to hear. You go by these developments that have absolutely just taken every single tree out. I would hate to honestly be in those houses after everything settles, to be honest. And I come from high density. This low density, keeping with the structures of the land, I believe is absolutely the best thing that we can do in that area. I really would hate to see a Midway on Five Forks. And that's what he's preventing. He didn't have to. There was already -- that was already going in. He's coming in to save it. He's coming in to preserve it. He's coming in with the values that I know our family has. I hated to see my cows go. They just had little baby calves. I hated to see that happen. I used to go out there and watch them all the time. But this is reality, and reality is something's going in.
Please approve this.
DAN HARVELL: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
That concludes citizens' comments. Does anyone on the board have any further questions of the developer?
JANE JONES: I'd like to ask if you've had any conversation with any of the roads people about any hopes of improvements. I know how this -- I know the deal with roads.
LUCAS ANTHONY: Are you talking about the state roads, or ---
JANE JONES: Whatever the road is out there.
LUCAS ANTHONY: Five Forks Road?
JANE JONES: Yeah.
LUCAS ANTHONY: You know, it's a state-maintained road. I mean, I have had success in actually getting state-maintained roads fixed, but it's really congressman work. I mean, I can ---
JANE JONES: I know all of the, the problem you have. I just didn't know if you had had any conversation with anybody, if they had -- if you were working toward ---
LUCAS ANTHONY: I'll be

straightforward. I won't pull any favors until I see if it's needed. In other words ---

JANE JONES: I know what you're saying.

LUCAS ANTHONY: But yes, everybody here has expressed -- you know, I went out to Five Forks Road, and looked at the traffic. I agree, there's probably periods of time where it's busy. But I didn't feel like it was overwhelmed with traffic when I was -- in the times that I've been there. And so, but I'm not -- you know, I'm not saying that there's not a traffic issue with the roads.

JANE JONES: I was just asking if you had been in any conversation about the ---

LUCAS ANTHONY: No, ma'am, I haven't talked to anybody else about improving the roads.

STEVEN GILREATH: And Mr. Chairman?

DAN HARVELL: Yes.

STEVEN GILREATH: So, with the safety issue, I know DOT will make sure, but the sight distance out of that driveway, you, you have that?

LUCAS ANTHONY: Yes, sir.

STEVEN GILREATH: Okay.

DAN HARVELL: I heard a couple talk about heavy equipment and trucks that might have -- might be diverting off of 85. Ms. McAbee is not here tonight, is she? No. ... with the traffic department. Is that a regular, is that a regular occurrence?

INAUDIBLE COMMENT FROM AUDIENCE

DAN HARVELL: The question is about -- I heard traffic being diverted off of 85 coming -- making a detour. I mean, is that 18 wheelers? Are they coming from factories or anything?

MULTIPLE INAUDIBLE COMMENTS FROM AUDIENCE

DAN HARVELL: Only when it's completely shut down. Okay. All right. I just wanted to make sure that wasn't a common occurrence. Okay, all right. Thank you. That was my question.

JANE JONES: There's no plan for any turning lane in your ---

LUCAS ANTHONY: No, ma'am. One thing I would like to say, the community asked me Friday what they could do to preserve farmland? And it's been just echoing in my head. I've been racking my brain, thinking about what can

Anderson do to protect their farmland?

And I think the answer is to make people care about it, make the youth care about farms. And how do you do that? You expose them to it, teach them how to farm, make them part of the harvest, get their hands dirty.

The reason that -- 10 years from now, it doesn't matter who's sitting up here, 10 years from now, the people that are growing up and voting are going to be changing the laws. So you can, you can pass anything you want, approve anything, deny anything. If kids don't start caring about farming, there will be no farming. That's the facts.

So, the way to do it is to create communities where kids are exposed to it and want to be a part of it.

I really appreciate the opportunity to do it.

DAN HARVELL: Well, while you're still here, one other question. Would you, would you, as a developer, be willing to covenant any of that vacant space that's already there for phase two for substantial amount of green space?

LUCAS ANTHONY: So I plan on having at least 25% open space, which I think is in keeping with a new proposed development ordinance, with the LSTOs, I believe.

DAN HARVELL: Tim?

TIM CARTEE: I believe that is correct on that.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. All right. Anyone else? Jane?

JANE JONES: Just for the record, I'd like -- because since we've had a problem with seeing our packets, I'd just like to point out that the School District Four says they have classroom seats to accommodate.

LUCAS ANTHONY: So it's Five, I think, right? Four, gosh. Sorry. Yeah, I spoke with Dee Christopher. He actually said they have an attrition problem at the school right now.

JANE JONES: I'm just reading from Dee’s letter.

LUCAS ANTHONY: Well, I mean, he mentioned that he was looking forward to having more students, you know, the types of students in the communities that we have, are their parents actually participate in the schools, raise money for schools. It's a different, you know, concept.

Anyway, he's looking forward to it. He's very supportive.

DAN HARVELL: Anyone else? All right. Thank you.

Okay, hearing nothing else, I'll entertain a motion to approve or deny this development.

WILLIAM MOORE: Mr. Chairman, it is my district, and he's done a good job. Good example. Followed the ordinances. And he's -- his community pretty much has his back.

And I'm going to make a motion to approve this.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Motion from Mr. Moore. Do I hear a second?

STEVEN GILREATH: Second.

DAN HARVELL: I have a second with Mr. Gilreath. Any discussion amongst the board?

I will say this is somewhat of a departure from what we're used to here. Normally, we do not have neighbor -- the neighborhood coming in support of something -- of more houses. So this is somewhat of an anomaly compared to what we usually hear.

So, with that, I will call for the vote. All those in favor, please raise your hand. All right. We have Ms. Jones, Mr. Cothran, Mr. Moore, Harvell, and it's unanimous. Thank you.

All right. Next on the agenda is 8-A, old business, single family subdivision, Waters Run, located at Dobbins Bridge Road, tax map number 71-04-07-001. This is in County Council District Five.

And we'll, we'll give a minute for the chamber to clear.

Okay. I think things are quiet enough. Staff.

TIM CARTEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 194 property owners within 2000 feet of the proposed development were notified via postcard. This development was before the Planning Commission back in September 10 of 2024. It was denied.

And this is Waters Run, single family. This is a Conservation Development. Applicant is Freeland and Associates, and the engineer is the same. Dobbins Bridge Road is the access and location for this project. It's in Council District Five.

Surrounding land use is residential, vacant, and there's a school approximately across the street. And this area is unzoned. Tax map number is there for your reference. Number of acres is 69.82. 187 lots are proposed. No variance is requested. And you can see the traffic impact study that's in your packet. Here is the proposed layout for this development. This is the aerial.

This is the proposed subdivision sign posted for

the public. This project has met the requirements of Chapter 24. This concludes your staff report.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you, Mr. Cartee. At this time, we'll ask the developer and/or engineer to come forward and address us.

KEVIN TUMBLIN: Good evening, Kevin Tumblin, Freeland and Associates, 323 West Stone Avenue in Greenville.

Just got a couple of points I want to make, and then I'll be happy to answer any questions.

First off, we have 42% of the site in open space, so almost 30 acres. I think 25% is required. We've got 42%. We're in good shape with sewer and water. And we had a traffic impact study. We're good there. We've got two accesses.

I would like to mention also that I believe originally this property was approved as a future phase of the mobile home park that it's adjacent to. And I think it had somewhere around 250 mobile homes. So we're obviously not doing that. And the big point I'd like to make is that because of the two new ordinances, the tree ordinance and the mass grading ordinance, we of course won't be mass grading. These houses will be on crawl spaces. The proposed roads will just go along the existing grades, and we'll be saving all the trees outside of the road and outside of the house footprint. We'll be saving all those trees and replanting additional trees.

So, with that, just happy to answer any questions.

DAN HARVELL: Anyone on the board have any questions?

JANE JONES: What school district is this? One or Five?

WILLIAM MOORE: Five.

DAN HARVELL: This is Five.

JANE JONES: Is there anything that you can tell us about access to this subdivision? It's so large. I mean, as far as turning lanes, anything?

KEVIN TUMBLIN: We've got, you know, two proposed access, two roads. And we had a traffic impact study, and they actually did not recommend any improvements to the existing road.

DAN HARVELL: Anyone else? Okay. Thank you, sir. We may call you back.

At this time we have several people signed up to speak, and the first is Joyce Miller.

JOYCE MILLER: My name is Joyce Miller. I live at 152 Calm Cove. It's in

District Five.

This proposed high-density subdivision -- I really wish we were talking about a low-density subdivision -- is a tremendous safety issue for Dobbins Bridge Road. There's no shoulders on Dobbins Bridge Road. When school lets out by McLees, that road that's on a rise, there's no shoulders, and the parents are really blocking that lane to wait for their children. So, if you're coming home from town, you can't see around them, and there's -- it's on a rise. You can't see cars coming at you. And that's right where one of the entrances to the subdivision is going to be.

And I don't know what those traffic people looked at when they said they thought that would be okay, because I can't even imagine it getting worse.

That's really all I have to say; that it will cause extremely hazardous conditions, in my opinion. And I hope that you will consider safety. And I think that should go without saying, but I'm saying it.

So, thank you very much.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you. Next is Elizabeth Hanson.

ELIZABETH HANSON: My name is Elizabeth Hanson. I live at 2729 Providence Church Road, which is in District Five.

I, like Joyce, am in opposition to this project. I take Dobbins Bridge anytime I go into town. It's a rough, bumpy road, not been maintained. You know, the county continually is asking for more money to maintain the roads. As Joyce said, that road has no shoulders, it has no turn lanes. The average American household has 1.83 cars per household, so if we want to just round it up to two, that's 374 more cars coming in and out of that area.

Dobbins Bridge is not the only two lane road around there. Pretty much anything to get over to a major road is two lane. So if you've got two people going to work in the morning and coming home, that's another 800 cars on the road. It's a rural area, so it's not like you couldn't walk anywhere. It to me is a very dangerous prospect, and the road would have to be widened. Something would have to be done, or you're going to have just major traffic jams.

I don't know how those people would be getting out of that subdivision onto Dobbins Bridge with no turn lanes, and it just being a two-lane road.

So, I share Ms. Miller's concerns, and I would urge you to send this back for more development. And I also question that traffic impact study.

So, thank you for your time and your consideration.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you, Ms. Hanson. Next is Cheryl Snyder.

CHERYL SNYDER: Good evening. I'm Cheryl Snyder, 105 Chapel Wood Drive in Anderson.

I too travel on Dobbins Bridge Road all the time. That's just the main access from all of that area in the western Anderson area. And it's just -- when the school is in -- right now, it's not bad when the kids aren't there. But when that's going on, there's, there's all kinds of traffic that backs up right in that area. And that's a lot, a lot of lots.

If we had a proposal of low density, like we just heard in the previous one, I think we would all entertain that. But this high density, I mean, that's a lot of people. And in a very restricted area, the options for getting to and from are just negligible; they're just not there.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you. Next is Will Anderson.

WILL ANDERSON: Good evening. My name is Will Anderson. Live at 474 McClure Road.

We just ask for common sense growth. This is -- nothing about this development makes any sense. You put this many houses with two entrances right in front of an elementary school. I farm in the community. We have lots of large equipment.

The two main roads that feed the school and this development will be New Hope Road and Dobbins Bridge Road, and I have several large semi trucks, and you need to wear a football helmet when you’re driving one of them down the road. One is a county road and one is a state road. The roads are that rough. There's no shoulders.

And putting this many houses in front of an elementary school makes no common sense. We know development is coming, we can't stop it. We just ask you, please use some common sense about it.

Thank you.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you, sir. Eric Miller.

ERIC MILLER: My name is Eric Miller. I live at 2505 East North Avenue in Linley Park.

But I have purchased a property at 5005 Dobbins Bridge Road. It is a large warehouse. I'm turning it into an aircraft restoration place/museum. I am putting a lot of money into this, restoring the building, restoring the property, getting everything

nice over there.

My concern is property values. Now, if I'm going to do so much work on this place, and we're going to have basically tract houses that aren't worth anything, hundreds of them put in just a quarter mile away, the traffic is going to be just crazy. The amount of houses is crazy. Anytime you go down -- try to drive down Whitehall in that area, if you're coming off a side street now, it takes you almost 10 minutes just to get into White Hall, because of the traffic coming up and down there. And that's where all these people are going to be going. To get out of that area you have to go down Whitehall.

Dobbins Bridge Road, you have tractors all day long, going up and down. You've got the school there. It's just crazy. They're going to go in and just scrape off every piece of grass on the property and put up houses that aren't worth anything. It's going to -- just going to be horrible for that area.

The property values, it's not going to increase it, it's going to make it worse. Most of the people in that area are all farmers. They don't want to see all these people coming into the town and the area be destroyed.

What we need is something like what you just approved; a small low-impact development, not one of these high impact ones.

So, and also, what I would like to request from the commission is to postpone a vote on this property or this development until the new zoning map is approved, because we don't know if they're going to be going to get, you know, get grandfathered in and be doing something that the new zoning is not going to allow. So, if you would please postpone the vote, that would be great. Thank you.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you. Next is Brian Shanahan.

BRIAN SHANAHAN: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Brian Shanahan. I'm at 3008 Cobbs Way in Anderson. I'm in District One.

I'm not in this district, but I just want to get up here and tell you what I've seen tract builders do where I live, and right around where we live, it's just devastating to think the density of the housing is ridiculous.

What I saw tonight looked like the future, like if we literally could get all these developers on the same page, we would probably have very cordial meetings, and you'd have unanimous votes, I believe in my heart.

But when you see this up here, this just goes back to the past. And I think the future of Anderson deserves better. The people, when you explain it to them, and you, and you do it in a way that has less impact and creates more community, because what I see around me right now is these high-density houses go in; the very first thing that goes up is a fence. And a fence, you think that makes a good neighbor? I don't think so.

So I feel like that gentleman that was here before, that represents the future of Anderson. These folks back here from Greenville represent the past.

Let's go in the future the right way. Thank you.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you, sir. Next is John Glenn.

JOHN GLENN: My name's John Glenn, 442 Galloping Ghost Road, Anderson.

This is my property. And you know, I've heard everybody, and I would love to do the development before, but there are only so many people in Anderson County that can afford a million dollar house. So I think this is a great alternative, because this is not the tract home that we've seen. This is actually probably the neighborhood of the future for Anderson County. It meets the mass grading. It meets the tree ordinance. We aren't going in and, and you know, taking all the topsoil off. Hopefully we don't have fences and all the things.

And on top of that, I'm not leaving the area. I'm just as affected as everybody else around. I'm still going to be across the street. I'm still going to be farming across the street. And you know, it's just -- I think it's a good opportunity for people in the community to move here, find out what Anderson's about.

You know, it's not the million dollar house, but it's not the slab home that we've been accustomed to approving in Anderson County.

So, you know, I've, I've talked with these developers, and I've stressed my concerns about the way we have built in Anderson, and I think that this is a viable neighborhood with over 40% open space. Pond. Of course, it does look really high density compared to the one that was here just before, but it's not as dense as the 245 trailers that were approved to go on this.

You know, like I say, I mean, the roads are the roads, the schools are the schools that I can't really affect apparently the bad drivers we have in Anderson County. But I do think that this is a good

neighborhood that needs to go in this area to help Anderson County.

So, if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you, Mr. Glenn. Gene -- pardon?

INAUDIBLE COMMENT FROM AUDIENCE

DAN HARVELL: Nourse. Okay.

JEANNE NOURSE: My name is Jeanne Nourse. I'm at 1315 Old Webb Road. So I cross right past where Dobbins Bridge is, and the four way stop, thankfully, that we have right there at the Villager. The high density that's presented is absolutely not in keeping with what we need in Anderson County. There's plenty of housing. The traffic, I agree, and the numbers are correct, as far as the amount of homes, cars, the traffic that will be there at the school.

I've got a friend who lives in Moncks Corner and Goose Creek, in that area, and it's miserable. The houses are so close, you barely can fit a suburban in the, in the driveway. So all the other vehicles have to park on the road, then you can't get cars past. There's no room for trees, for growth, for kids. It's extremely unsafe.

So, the amount of traffic that's coming up from Georgia, coming up 187, which is a great gateway, brings more to Anderson County. Competing traffic with the homes is -- it's going to be far too dense for what we can do in that small area. So the other impact I'm concerned about is the amount of density of population versus our proximity to Lake Hartwell. We're already having increased algae bloom, and it's a real concern.

So, with that said, I think it's too high a density. I opt for the Lucas plan, if we want to -- can call it that. And I do agree with putting off the vote until the zoning is approved, instead of grandfathering in. And having concerns about undermining future decisions if this one goes through.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you, ma'am. That concludes the citizens' comments. Any comments from the board before I entertain ---

INAUDIBLE COMMENT

DAN HARVELL: Oh, yeah, that's right, that's right, that's right, that's right. I'm glad you stood up. Thank you. Sorry.

BRIAN CROWTHER: Again, Brian Crowther, 102 Plum Leaf Lane. Been at that address

since 2002. Had kids grow up in McLees, Robert Anderson. I can echo the traffic issues right there at the school at dismissal time. They'll back all the way up to Country Meadows sometimes at dismissal, and it's, it's dangerous. It's a two-lane road, you can't go around it, you've got to wait.

You know, 2.6 houses, Mr. Commissioner, you mentioned the safety concern for fire. You got 2.6 houses on an acre. You talking about being close together. If there's a fire, your neighbor's house is affected.

I have concerns about the infrastructure; I have concerns about the traffic, the safety. You know, living there since 2002 -- been an Anderson resident my entire life, but I agree, you know, if we were talking about 70 houses on this 70 acres, I don't know how much opposition you would have. You talk about 100 and -- well, 187 on the 68, 69 acres, that's a lot of houses.

So, I just, you know, I have concerns. And again, I know you guys have a tough job. You have to make decisions based off of Anderson County, and you're trying to discern what's best for the residents in those communities, in those areas. And I appreciate that. And I just want to, you know, I want to express my opposition. Appreciate it.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Thank you, sir.

All right. That does conclude the citizen comments. Any comments or anything from the board at this time?

JANE JONES: In our packet we have a notice about a previous denial of this project, and I was looking at the concerns in that decision making. And I was just wanting to know how -- what's changed since then? The concerns then, the reason for the denial was density, traffic concerns, proximity to the school, and only one outlet. And it seems to me that all these conditions still exist.

Just bringing that up.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. Anyone else? Mr. Moore.

WILLIAM MOORE: No, sir. But you know, there hasn't been any changes made, so I mean, I think that's important as well. At some point, we've got to work with the community to make it work for everybody around the table, or it's not going to work. So, make that point.

DAN HARVELL: Thank you. Anyone else?

All right. Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion to approve or deny this project.

DAVID COTHRAN: Mr. Chairman?

DAN HARVELL: Mr. Cothran.

DAVID COTHRAN: I'll make a motion to deny this. With -- there is, of course, the addition of the outlet. But I think we can go with the same previous concerns, the non-compatibility, traffic levels, density, safety, convenience, prosperity of the current residents in the area, infrastructure, etcetera.

WILLIAM MOORE: And I'll second that, Mr. Chairman. Save you a step.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. We have a motion by Mr. Cothran and second by Mr. Moore to deny. Any discussion? Hearing none, I'll call for the vote. Those in favor of denial, please raise your hand. And we have Ms. -- we have unanimous, unanimous denial.

All right. At this time we'll move on to number nine on the agenda, public comments, non-agenda items.

WILLIAM MOORE: What was the numbers on that denial?

DAN HARVELL: Unanimous.

WILLIAM MOORE: Okay.

DAN HARVELL: We have Ellis Johnson that would like to speak.

ELLIS JOHNSON: Ellis Johnson, 102 Allen Court. I'm the president of the Homeowners Association for Teakwood Plantation off of Highway 81/87.

It's come to our attention that a nearby neighbor has asked for a variance to rules for Anderson County. I'm only here to ask the question, who can I talk to to find out details on that? Several attempts have been made to the commission by email and phone, and we've not been responding to. I know someone has talked to Mr. Cartee, and maybe that's the place we go. I'm looking for who can I talk to to find out details on this.

ALESIA HUNTER: Mr. Chairman.

DAN HARVELL: Yes.

ALESIA HUNTER: He submitted a Freedom of Information Act request that has been sent over to the attorney's office for processing.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. So I haven't, I haven't -- I've seen nothing on this. So we've not seen anything on this yet.

ALESIA HUNTER: It's not until July. We haven't even -- we haven't finished

processing it. But we did go ahead and send the application to the attorney's office.
ELLIS JOHNSON: And that's fine. I just would like to find out what, what do you know so far? In other words, what variance to what rule?
ALESIA HUNTER: Yes. That's on the application.
JANE JONES: We don't know anything about it.
ELLIS JOHNSON: Where is that information? It exists somewhere now.
STEVEN GILREATH: You've applied for a Freedom of Information Act to get that information to you. So it'll take -- he'll have it before the July meeting?
ALESIA HUNTER: Yes, sir.
DAN HARVELL: Okay. So I'll defer to our attorney on this. Sir, can you ...
INAUDIBLE COMMENT
ELLIS JOHNSON: An application was made. Is there a copy of the application that is viewable that I could see? The application for variance.
INAUDIBLE COMMENT
ELLIS JOHNSON: That’s something that's not available now?
INAUDIBLE COMMENT
ELLIS JOHNSON: The application was made to the commission.
WILLIAM MOORE: The office is on River Street.
INAUDIBLE COMMENT
DAN HARVELL: But just, just to clarify here. Okay, so if I were to go into the office and I wanted to see somebody's application, that's not something I could do, right?
ALESIA HUNTER: If you're requesting specific copies of documents, you do have to file a FOIA. If it was the application -- the packet that we're just hearing tonight, that information is available on the website. You're not required to do that. But he's asking for something specific that we haven't even processed and completed the reports, because it's next month's meeting.
DAN HARVELL: Okay. So that's an application that will come through next month?
ALESIA HUNTER: Yes, sir.
DAN HARVELL: For sure,

right?
ALESIA HUNTER: Yes, sir.
DAN HARVELL: Yeah, okay. All right.
ELLIS JOHNSON: So the county attorney will release that under FOIA. However, I'm only asking what -- a variance to what? Give me a number of a document or a rule.
INAUDIBLE COMMENT
ELLIS JOHNSON: No. That's all right.
DAN HARVELL: Okay. All right. There is no other, no other business on the agenda. Do I hear a motion to adjourn?
WILLIAM MOORE: Motion.
DAN HARVELL: Motion from Mr. Moore. Second?
DAVID COTHRAN: Second.
DAN HARVELL: Mr. Cothran. All those in favor.

MEETING ENDED AT 7:49 P.M.