



MEMBERS OF LANCASTER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

JASON CAVALIER, DISTRICT 1
T. YOKIMA CURETON, DISTRICT 2
LYNETTE HINSON, DISTRICT 3
VICE-CHAIR JUDIANNA TINKLENBERG, DISTRICT 4
CHAIR-MICHELLE RICHARDS, DISTRICT 5
SHEILA HINSON, DISTRICT 6
FRANCES LIU, DISTRICT 7
SECRETARY: MARA MATA

MINUTES
Lancaster County Planning Commission
September 16, 2025, 6:00 p.m.

Chairman Richards called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

1. Roll Call: Quorum is present (6 Commissioners)

Commissioners Present:

Jason Cavalier, Dist. 1	Judianna Tinklenberg, Dist. 4
T. Yokima Cureton, District 2	Michelle Richards, Dist. 5
Lynette Hinson, District 3	Sheila Hinson, Dist. 6
	Frances Liu, Dist. 7

Absent: Frances Liu

Staff Present:

Allison Hardin, Development Services Dir.	
April Williams, Planning Director	Corey Barnes, Planner
Matthew Blaszyk, Planner	Kirsten Willis, Planner
Jennifer Bryan, Planning Technician	Admin. Assistant: Mara Mata

The following press were notified of the meeting by email in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act: The Lancaster News, Kershaw News Era, The Rock Hill Herald, The Fort Mill Times, Cable News 2, Channel 9, and the local Government Channel. The agenda was also posted in the lobby of the County Administration Building for the required length of time and was published on the County website.

THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS. IT IS NOT A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT.

2. PRAYER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.....Michelle Richards

3. APPROVE AGENDA

Chairman Richards called for a motion to approve the Agenda.

Motion by J. Cavalier; Second by L. Hinson

Motion to AMEND by J. Tinklenberg to remove items RZ-2024-1663 Meritage Homes and item RZ-2025-1292 MPV Activity Road from the agenda at the applicants' request.

Called vote: 6:0. Motion to Amend approved unanimously.

Motion to Approve as Amended by J. Cavalier; Second by Y Cureton.

Called Vote: 6:0. Motion approved unanimously

April Williams stated at the applicants' requests that the items in the amendment have been taken off the agenda for September 16th.

4. APPROVE MINUTES

a. July 15, 2025, 2025 Regular Minutes

Minutes were deferred for amendment. No amendments were submitted as of publication of the agenda.

Chairman Richards called for a motion to approve July 15, 2025, Regular Minutes as written.

Commissioner Tinklenberg made a statement regarding the July 15th minutes. Please see attachments for statement, which will be added to the amended July 15th minutes.

Commissioner Cureton stated she has made a similar comment.

Motion to Amend by J. Tinklenberg per written amendment(s) provided by J. Tinklenberg; Second by L Hinson.

Called vote: 4:1. **Motion approved.**

S. Hinson abstained, J. Cavalier opposed.

b. August 19, 2025, Regular Minutes

Chairman Richards called for a motion to approve August 19, 2025, Minutes as written. Motion to Approve by J. Cavalier; 2nd by J. Tinklenberg.

Chairman Richards would like a statement corrected from the August 19th minutes, on page 29. It states that Bethel Boat Road was resurfaced in 2013, but it was resurfaced in 2017.

Called vote: 6:0. **Motion approved as amended by Chairman Richards unanimously.**

c. September 4, 2025, Workshop Minutes

Chairman Richards called for a motion to approve September 4, 2025, Workshop Minutes as written. Motion to Approve by J. Cavalier; 2nd by J. Tinklenberg.

Called vote: 4:0. **Motion approved unanimously.**

Y. Cureton and S. Hinson abstained.

d. August 7, 2025, Workshop Minutes (Amended)

Chairman Richards called for a motion to approve August 7, 2025, Workshop Minutes as Amended. Motion to Approve by Y. Cureton; 2nd by J. Tinklenberg.

Commissioner Cureton agreed she would provide her written amendment for the August 7th Minutes.

Commissioner Cavalier asked for clarifications on the two amendments.

Chairman Richards discussed the amendment by Commissioner L. Hinson, and the amendment Commissioner Cureton would be sending in later.

Commissioner Cureton stated her statement would be a clarification.

Commissioner L. Hinson made a comment about her amendment. Commissioner Cavalier asked if it would be a second amendment. Commissioner L. Hinson replied no, and she was stating for the record, “that’s why I had that...it was incorrectly...umm...recorded.”

Commissioner L. Hinson’s recorded statement was regarding an amendment to correct inaccurate information in the August 7th minutes. The changes were:

Prior to the start of the meeting: The meeting minutes opened with a statement by Director Hardin, however, the meeting could not be started as according to the County Attorney, there was no chair due to there being no election held in July. An election for the Temporary Chair needed to be held to get elections on the agenda for the next meeting.

Commissioner Hinson nominated Commissioner Cavalier, Commissioner Liu seconded. Commissioner Cavalier gave background information as to why he is qualified to be chair.

Commissioner Tinklenberg nominated Commissioner Cureton, Commissioner L. Hinson seconded. Commissioner Cureton gave background information as to why she qualified to be chair, she also explained she ran for mayor and state senate and has heard what the issues in Lancaster County are.

Vote for Commissioner Cavalier: 6 (including Commissioner Cureton)

Vote for Commissioner Cureton: 1

Called vote: 6:0. **Motion approved unanimously.**

5. CITIZEN'S COMMENTS [see Sign-In sheet attached]

Chairman Richards opened the floor to comments from the public.

Chairman Richards summarized a comment by Geoff Larson, please see the email comment attached.

Chairman Richards summarized a comment by Cody Hinton, please see the email comment attached.

Jeannine Clifton (Indian Land) spoke regarding Barberville Rd/Fort Mill highway. She is discontented with how she believes they are circumventing the process and standards.

6. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

a. DA-2021-0528 Arbor Meadows (aka DA-2025-1506)

Application by AM Group Landholdings LLC for a Development Agreement for Arbor Meadows development (SD-2021-0528) at TM 0087-00-105.00, a single-family residential development of 92 lots on 47.47 acres.

Staff Presentation: April Williams, Planning Director, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: Approval

Questions to staff:

Commissioner Tinklenberg and April Williams discussed Section 4.01C, regarding the funds for public safety and impact fees.

Chairman Richards asked for clarification on what UDO is being used for this DA, and April Williams stated the UDO that is current would apply to this DA.

Chairman Richards asked why section 4.04A states the county council would accept roads, April Williams said this writing is in the code as when the county needs to take a road, they can with a super majority.

Comment from applicant(s):

Chaplin Spencer (Rock Hill) spoke on behalf of his client, Michael Coulston. He stated the property is already zoned MDR, and the cluster development was already approved with the DA a few years ago, but now the DA has expired.

Questions from Commissioners:

Commissioner Cureton and Chaplin Spencer discussed the updated TIA that is required.

Commissioner Tinklenberg and Chaplin Spencer discussed future Impact fees.

Commissioner L. Hinson asked whether the anticipated TIA would take into consideration the new developments that were nearby. Chaplin Spencer replied that all TIA's follow guidelines and requirements regarding proximity, and those include future approved developments. April Williams explained the process for TIA reviews.

Commissioner Cureton wanted clarification if the county worked with the city. April Williams replied that the county either has the data or can retrieve the data from the city when needed.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets)

Michael Dido (Lancaster) asks where he could get more information and where the access road would be, as there is a powerline there. Chaplin Spencer replied that the two access points are off Pineview Rd, and adjacent to powerline, not underneath.

Chairman Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item DA-2021-0528

Motion to approve by J. Cavalier with the planning staff's recommended conditions; 2nd by J. Tinklenberg.

Discussion:
None.

Called vote: 5:1. **Motion is approved.** J. Cavalier opposed.
The item will go to County Council for consideration, and the applicant will be notified of time and place.

b. RZ-2024-1281 Whitehall Phase 2

Application by Coulston Development and Pinnacle Homes USA LLC to rezone 60.02 acres off Flat Creek Road (TM 0080-00-061.00) from Rural Neighborhood to Medium Density Residential, with the intention of developing Whitehall Phase 2 residential subdivision. Concurrent with Comprehensive Plan Amendment application CP-2024-1281

Commissioner L. Hinson recuses herself.

Staff Presentation: Kirsten Willis, Planner, presented the applications consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: Approval of MDR rezoning request and neighborhood future land use designation for the comp plan to allow developer to develop but restrict industrial use that growth area would allow.

Questions to staff:
Chairman Richards and Kirsten Willis discussed what staff is recommending.

Commissioner Cureton asked where the Traffic data came from. Kirsten Willis replied SCDOT.

Commissioner Cureton asked if the cumulative effects of White Hall and the adjacent development justify mitigation at Potter Rd. Kirsten Willis stated that a TIA could possibly be required, but that would be more for the preliminary stage, and currently only the rezoning and comp plan are being reviewed.

Commissioner Cureton and April Williams discussed what our UDO requires of developments. April Williams also clarified that the applicants request is for growth neighborhood, and to proceed with the Planning department's recommendation of neighborhood, the applicant would have to be willing.

Commissioner Cavalier asked April Williams to restate what the Planning Commission would need to do to proceed with the Planning department's recommendation. April Williams stated that the applicant has requested a Comp Plan amendment to change the rural designation to growth area. The Planning department has determined that Neighborhood is more suitable, however, since the applicant has requested growth area, they would need to approve the change first.

Commissioner Tinklenberg stated that a change for buffers is being addressed in the new UDO.

Comment from applicant(s):

Andy Bright (Matthews) is an engineer on this project. He stated that the developer agrees with the Planning department's recommendation for neighborhood. The TIA's preliminary study is done, and the developer will be adding in a left-hand turn, which is under review. In coordination with public works and the property owners that would be affected, there will also be a sewer main extension.

Questions from Commissioners:

None.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets)

Peggy Matte (Lancaster) also sent an email comment. She shared her concerns about the density and the lack of EMS/911 services available for the area.

Andy Bright clarified that the developers DUA is going to be 1.65 dwelling units per acre and are only proposing 98 units that will be 70ft in width, so it will be more spread out and less dense.

Commissioner Cavalier and Andy Bright discussed the sewer extension the developer would be adding.

Chairman Richards inquired if Phase 1 has county water and sewer. Andy Bright stated that he believed so.

J. Cavalier motions to table item RZ-2024-1281 until CP-2024-1281 is voted on.

Called vote: 5:0 **Motion to table is approved unanimously.**

Chairman Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item RZ-2024-1281 Motion to approve by J. Cavalier with Planning Departments recommendation; 2nd by Y. Cureton.

Discussion:

None.

Called vote: 4:1. **Motion is approved as amended.** Y. Cureton opposed.

The item will go to County Council for consideration, and applicant will be notified of time and date.

c. CP-2024-1281 Whitehall Phase 2

Application by Coulston Development and Pinnacle Homes USA LLC for a Comprehensive Plan/Future Land Use Amendment for 60.02 acres off Flat Creek Road (TM 0080-00-061.00), to change the Future Land Use designation from Rural to Growth Area. Concurrent with rezoning application **RZ-2024-1281**.

Staff Presentation: Kirsten Willis, Planner, presented the applications consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: See above under RZ-2024-1281

Questions to staff:

None.

Comment from applicant(s):

None.

Questions from Commissioners:

None.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets)

Peggy Matte (Lancaster) reiterated her comment from earlier.

Chairman Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **CP-2024-1281** Motion to approve by J. Cavalier with Planning Department's recommendation; 2nd by J. Tinklenberg.

Discussion:

Commissioner Cureton and April Williams discussed the role of Planning Commission to County Council.

Called vote: 4:1. **Motion is approved.** Y. Cureton opposed.

The item will go to County Council for consideration, and applicant will be notified of time and date.

J. Cavalier motioned to bring agenda item 6b. to the floor; 2nd by S. Richards.

Called vote: 5:0. **Motion is approved unanimously.**

Commissioner L. Hinson returned to her seat.

d. RZ-2024-1663 Meritage Homes

Application by Tim Sheehy for Meritage Homes of the Carolinas to rezone approximately 355 acres located between Charlotte Highway and Activity Drive (TM# 0044-00-0006.00) from Rural Residential (RR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) District, to allow development of a single-family residential development

APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED DEFERRAL TO NOVEMBER 18, 2025.

e. RZ-2025-1292 MPV Activity Rd

Application by Mike Bilodeau/ MPV Properties for 521Lancaster LLC to rezone approximately 48.339 acres located at Charlotte Highway near Lewis McAteer Rd. (TM# 0044-00-004.00 and p/o 0044-00-006.00) from Rural Residential (RR) to General Business (GB) District, to allow development as a commercial property

APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED DEFERRAL TO NOVEMBER 18, 2025.

f. CP-2025-2062 Kershaw Land Use Addendum

Addendum to the County Comprehensive Plan, updating Future Land Use Plan for the Town of Kershaw.

Staff Presentation: Kirsten Willis, Planner, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: Approval with an amendment to include language dedicating the right of way for the Carolina Thread Trail.

Questions/Comments from Commissioners:

None.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets)

Milton Hood signed up but was not present when called.

Chairman Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **CP-2025-2062**
Motion to approve by Y. Cureton with amendment for language; 2nd by L. Hinson.

Discussion:

None.

Called vote: 6:0. **Motion is approved unanimously.**

The item will go to County Council for consideration, and applicant will be notified of time and date.

g. Kershaw Annexation: 275 W. Second Street

Application by Danny Lee Terry II to annex a property of approximately 1.2 acres located at 275 W. Second St (TM 0114-00-052.00) into the Town of Kershaw.

Staff Presentation: Jennifer Bryan, Planning Technician, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: Approval.

Comment from applicant(s):

None.

Questions from Commissioners:

None.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets)

None.

Chairman Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **Kershaw Annexation**. Motion to approve by J. Tinklenberg; 2nd by Y. Cureton.

Discussion:

None.

Called vote: 6:0. **Motion is approved unanimously.**

The item will go to Kershaw Council for consideration, and applicant will be notified of time and date.

7. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL

a. SD-2024-1442 Shadow Moss

Application by Prestige Development & Site Works LLC and Michael McCarter for a Preliminary Plat for 52.235 acres located off Hilldale Drive (TM-0080-00-033.00) to develop a 98-lot single family residential community

Staff Presentation: Matthew Blaszyk, Planner, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: Approval.

Questions to staff:

Commissioner L. Hinson inquired about whether the TIA included the traffic from the White Hall Phase 2 development and the 325 homes that will be directly behind the A.R. Rucker Middle School. Matthew Blaszyk replied that he would have to check with the county engineer and consultant.

Commissioner L. Hinson shared her concern about the traffic in that area, especially going into A.R Rucker school district as it is extremely dangerous.

Chairman Richards and Commissioner L. Hinson discussed what area Commissioner L. Hinson was referring to.

Comment from applicant(s):

Luke Woodburn (Indian Land) states Matthew Blaszyk did a great job summarizing the project and he is here for questions.

Questions from Commissioners:

Commissioner L. Hinson and Luke Woodburn discussed her concern for the 98-home development having only two exits and entrances. Luke Woodburn clarified that there is one wide primary entrance/exit, and the other is emergency access, as code would not allow two entrances near each other due to width.

Commissioner L. Hinson inquired how residents would access the emergency access. Luke Woodburn stated that they would be using a radio read that would open as emergency services pulled up.

Chairman Richards asked the applicant if both fire and EMS would have access to the radio read. Luke Woodburn replied yes.

Commissioner Cavalier and Luke Woodburn discussed the developer's permits with Army Core Engineers.

April Williams added that radio read is very similar to a remote for a garage door, and police, fire, EMS will have access to that emergency road. Commissioner L. Hinson clarified that her question was how the residents would have access to that road.

April Williams stated that our UDO only requires one entrance for developments under 99 homes, and so they could not force this access to be available for the residents.

Commissioner Cureton and Luke Woodburn discussed the turn lanes and bike access.

Chairman Richards and Luke Woodburn discussed a turn lane for the emergency access.

Allison Hardin, Development Services Director, clarified that while the UDO only requires one access for subdivisions under 99 homes, the fire code changed in 2021 to require a subdivision with more than 50 lots to have two entrances, unless there is a separation issue. As with this case, the entrances would not have met with the minimum space for separation; a wider entrance was required along with emergency access. In addition, fire hydrants will be required on both sides of the entrance in case one is blocked by an accident.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets)

Jerry Witherspoon (Lancaster) shared his concerns about the number of homes proposed, as it would lead to more accidents and traffic.

Steve McRae (Charlotte) represents Richard McCarter, the owner of this property. He thanked the commissioners for their help. He stated that they are finally at the end of the process and require the approval of the Planning Commission. This is use as a matter of right.

Sandra Sikorski (Lancaster) shared her concerns about lack of emergency services, traffic, and the loss of the rural aspect of her neighborhood.

Toronica Johnson (Lancaster) also sent an email comment. She shared her concern of more noise, possibility of more crime, and more traffic. Also, the emergency access will be built by her driveway, and she is concerned it will affect her way of life.

Chairman Richards summarized a comment by Teri Hinson, please see the email comment attached.

L. Woodburn stated that he would speak with anyone who would like to talk to him after the meeting and could hand out his card.

Chairman Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **SD-2024-1442** Motion to approve by J. Cavalier; 2nd by Y. Cureton.

Discussion:

Commissioner Cureton commented that she would have liked the developer to have spoken with the community prior to this voting opportunity.

Called vote: 4:2. **Motion is approved.** L. Hinson and Y. Cureton opposed.
Planning Commission makes the final decision on approval of Preliminary Plats.

8. NON-HEARING ITEMS

a. **NRN-2025-1834 Quiet Rail Court**

Application by Autobahn Homes Inc to name a private driveway adjacent to 1110 Lancashire Drive (TM 0002J-0A-031.00) pursuant to Sec. 6.11.4.G of the Unified Development Ordinance. The proposed name of the private drive is Quiet Rail Court

Staff Presentation: Jennifer Bryan, Planning Technician, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendation: Approval.

Questions to Staff:

None.

No public hearing is required.

Chairman Richards called for a motion on item **NRN-2024-2548**.

Motion to approve by Y. Cureton; 2nd by L. Hinson.

Discussion:

None.

Called vote: 6:0. **Motion is approved unanimously.** The Planning Commission has final approval of new road names and road name changes.

9. **OTHER**

a. Amendment to Rules of Procedure

J. Cavalier motions to table agenda item 9a. until the October Workshop meeting; 2nd by J. Tinklenberg.

Called vote: 6:0 **Motion to table is approved unanimously.**

b. UDO Update

Allison Hardin discussed the UDO update and timeline with the Planning Commissioners.

10. **ADJOURN**

Motion to adjourn by Y. Cureton; 2nd by J. Tinklenberg. Motion approved by unanimous consent. Meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

ATTACHMENT:

Statement by Commissioner Judianna Tinklenberg

For attachment to 7-15-2025 Minutes

Tuesday, September 16, 2025

July meeting documentation-by Judianna Tinklenberg

Full Context to July meeting

Thank you Madam Chair. I have something to say about our July meeting that has not been publicly addressed and is important. Please allow me to complete this without interruption.

I listened to our recording of the July meeting again, and while the minutes are conclusive to the most part, they are by no means a full representation of that meeting. For these reasons I felt that I needed to substantiate the context. I have said it before sitting up here and I will say it again, 'to be unclear is to be unkind'. I will take it a step further to also say that I think everyone that sits around me on this commission knows that I will search for the truth in all we do. It is easy to take one part of a whole and run with it, but it misses the context. Context is defined as the circumstances that form the setting for an event, statement, or idea, and in terms of which it can fully be understood. These minutes leave out all of the context. I recently heard a fitting quote that unfortunately rings loud as I prepared this statement, it reads 'text without context is only a con.' A con, per definition, is to persuade to do or believe something by use of deception or tricking. So in this case I would hope that staff would want all context included for full transparency and accountability so there is no question in the details of these July minutes. I will always be fully transparent and not leave out the context that is often proven to be the most important part of the whole and often times is the hardest to say out loud. Accountability is uncomfortable, but it is admirable.

I motioned last month to amend these minutes because it lacked any context. The irony is staff included footnotes to the meeting minutes, but not to provide clarity, to point fingers. If they want to be technical with footnotes, lets get technical and include all of the detailed context. The details are that the County attorney did find that we should have had our election in July. I was merely trying to keep us as a commission legal and make sure we had a legitimate meeting that evening. The fact is we should have had the election and voted on officers to run that meeting, unfortunately for reasons I don't know the staff removed the election from our agenda without proper communication, nor did our prior chair, communicate this change with his fellow commissioners. I believe we should not have to worry about staff meddling in our administrative duties as a commission, so no we were not checking our agenda a week

before to see if the election was included or not. We discussed the election previously in our June public meeting so it should have been on the agenda. The removal of the election suggests some form of outside control and conspiring to mislead us. In that moment when I asked during the meeting to hold the elections staff, nor our previous chair, lead us into doing the right and legal thing. Thus the entire meeting was in error and it ultimately lead to more confusion moving forward with our commission elections. It is important we get things right, simply because it is the right and noble thing to do.

Doing what is right, leads me to my last part. I mentioned that I was uncomfortable in that July meeting because I knew we were being forced to carry on when it was not right or legal and the County attorney even later found this to be accurate. Instead, I was mocked by staff responding to me in a condescending way trying to make me look incompetent and incorrect for stating I was uncomfortable. I will always be uncomfortable doing something that I know is wrong. This will not be tolerated. Let the record indicate that they were incorrect and completely out of line and unprofessional. The July meeting was in error and thankfully for staff everything that evening was deferred and no major decisions were made.

Since then, staff has had 2 months to publicly take accountability and responsibility and has not done so, so let this memo and the full context be the record. I do not need a public apology, knowing that I was merely trying to do what is right and the law on my side gives me the peace I need. However, it would have gone far in making positive amends and gaining trust again among the staff and commission. I wish to move forward with the expectation of mutual respect and professional conduct as we are only trying to do what is best for all of Lancaster County and as a reminder we are all volunteers on this commission and unpaid. It is always my goal to keep this commission fully transparent in all our affairs, with full context of our meetings being documented. Thank you for listening and giving me the opportunity for correct representation of the meeting and what transpired within our commission, lets move on.

Footnotes:

In response to the footnotes on July meeting minutes, myself, nor multiple other people, could locate the past years July meeting videos. Obviously staff who posts these videos can quickly navigate the links. At least 2 of the past years July videos are voice only and in different folders. It has since been requested by myself that the videos/voice recordings be grouped per Commission and Board so all Planning Commission videos/recordings are together under one tab.

ATTACHMENT:

**Recusal by Commissioner Lynette Hinson for
Item 6b Whitehall Rezoning and
6c Whitehall Comprehensive Plan Amendment**



Lancaster County, South Carolina

Post Office Box 1149 Lancaster, South Carolina 29721-1149

STATEMENT OF RECUSAL

In accordance with State Code § 8-13-700(b), I hereby abstain from all votes, deliberations, and other action on the following matter(s):

RZ - 2024-1281

CP - 2024-1281

SECTION 8-13-700. Use of official position or office for financial gain; disclosure of potential conflict of interest.

(B) No public official, public member, or public employee may make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use his office, membership, or employment to influence a governmental decision in which he, a member of his immediate family, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated has an economic interest. A public official, public member, or public employee who, in the discharge of his official responsibilities, is required to take an action or make a decision which affects an economic interest of himself, a member of his immediate family, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated shall:

- (1) prepare a written statement describing the matter requiring action or decisions and the nature of his potential conflict of interest with respect to the action or decision;
- (2) if the public official is a member of the General Assembly, he shall deliver a copy of the statement to the presiding officer of the appropriate house. The presiding officer shall have the statement printed in the appropriate journal and require that the member of the General Assembly be excused from votes, deliberations, and other action on the matter on which a potential conflict exists;
- (3) if he is a public employee, he shall furnish a copy of the statement to his superior, if any, who shall assign the matter to another employee who does not have a potential conflict of interest. If he has no immediate superior, he shall take the action prescribed by the State Ethics Commission;
- (4) if he is a public official, other than a member of the General Assembly, he shall furnish a copy of the statement to the presiding officer of the governing body of any agency, commission, board, or of any county, municipality, or a political subdivision thereof, on which he serves, who shall cause the statement to be printed in the minutes and require that the member be excused from any votes, deliberations, and other actions on the matter on which the potential conflict of interest exists and shall cause the disqualification and the reasons for it to be noted in the minutes;
- (5) if he is a public member, he shall furnish a copy to the presiding officer of any agency, commission, board, or of any county, municipality, or a political subdivision thereof, on which he serves, who shall cause the statement to be printed in the minutes and shall require that the member be excused from any votes, deliberations, and other actions on the matter on which the potential conflict of interest exists and shall cause such disqualification and the reasons for it to be noted in the minutes.

Reason(s) for Disqualification: _____

My property connects to the property
to be developed

Name: Lynette W. Hinson Date: 9-16-2025

Planning Commission Member

Lynette W. Hinson

ATTACHMENT: EMAIL COMMENTS SUBMITTED

Item 5: General Comments

- **Geoff Larson email**
- **Cody Hinton Email**

Item 6b/6c Whitehall rezoning and Comprehensive Plan Amendment

- **Peggy Matte Email and copies of prior comments**

Item 7a Shadow Moss Subdivision

- **Teri Hinson Email**
- **Toronca Johnson Email**

Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Sep 16, 2025, 03:57PM EDT

5) General Comments

Agenda Item for Discussion:	Barberville Commercial, 9901 Barberville Rd
Meeting Date:	September 16, 2025 06:00 PM
Full Name	First Name: Geoff Last Name: Larson
Phone Number	9164252279
Email	geoff.larson@gmail.com
Address:	2010 Oliver Terrace, Indian Land
Please check which meeting this comment is for:	Planning Commission Meeting
Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item:	Hello Members of the Planning Commission, My name is Geoff Larson, and I live at 2010 Oliver Terrace in Indian Land. I'm submitting comments today regarding the ongoing struggle we are having with the development at 9901 Barberville Rd, near Highway 160. Please note that this not a project in front of you at the moment. But it was previously, and it will be again. You denied it in 2024 as a Major Subdivision, and they have proceeded anyway by calling it two "unrelated" Minor Subdivisions. This impropriety is currently under review. But one way or another, either soon or as a future phase of the same project, it will trigger Major Subdivision review. When that day comes, I implore you to deeply consider the following subversive and unethical actions this applicant has taken, and aggressively hold anything they do to the highest possible standards and interpretation of governing regulations, so that they are held accountable for those actions. The applicant is the Moody Group, and you should remain aware of their history with this project: 1. Plan Denied. You unanimously denied the Moody Group's plan last year, and they refused to revise or incorporate ANY feedback from you or public comment into their design in any meaningful way. 2. No Communication. You told the Moody Group to take down our contact info and meet with us because it was "in their best interest in the eyes of the Planning Commission" to make any effort whatsoever at communication – but we never heard from them again. 3. Violates Regulations. The Moody Group and their engineering firm seemingly can't be bothered to read the UDO, even after numerous issues were brought to their attention. Their plan was so riddled with violations, that they couldn't even bring it back to you for another vote. And as I mentioned, they made zero changes in response to feedback. 4. Careless. They were so careless in their design and application submittal,

that they labeled my back yard down the block as their daycare's playground. And although circumstantial, we find it quite a coincidence that our neighborhood's LCWSD water main blew out the same week that they began moving dirt this summer.

5. Fraudulent. The Moody Group may be engaged in a conspiracy to commit fraud, and should be investigated immediately. The following is a Statement of Facts:

a. Concealing Parcels. Their Construction Drawing Package and Minor Sub Plat don't even have the same number of parcels. This is because they are actually subdividing again, but since that would trigger Major Subdivision, they used the "real" plans to obtain Stormwater and Grading permits for the entire Common Plan, but did so without applying for an additional subdivide while lying that the additional split doesn't exist to continue the pretext that they are a Minor Subdivision.

i. I called this out to staff, and staff's response has amounted to, "Oops, that's just a typo." Given the scale of the project and the gravity of whether there is or is not an additional split, it is reasonable to suspect that multiple parties may be engaged in a conspiracy to circumvent your review.

b. False Statements. Their application and site plan were submitted for a daycare use on Parcel 1. Just a daycare. However, the building is actually a three-tenant retail use structure. It is openly advertised on their website and social media as such, and they have multiple signed pre-lease tenants.

i. This is significant because a retail or general commercial use would require larger setbacks, a Type C buffer, and year-round opaque screening from all adjacent residential zoning. Instead, they plan to plop a playground down just 17ft from the cul-de-sac right-of-way on our side of the property line. Following UDO requirements could mean requiring recombination and fewer leasable buildings, so they lied on the application to backdoor their way in hoping no one like you would be able to hold them accountable.

c. Destruction of Trees. The UDO clearly requires for all development in the Highway Corridor Overlay, both the preservation of trees in all setbacks and buffers, as well as the creative design around large trees everywhere. By engaging in fraudulent and misleading tactics, they have been able to rip out every last old growth tree on the entire property without anyone holding them accountable.

i. This is significant because it has caused irreparable harm to all surrounding properties in blatant violation of the UDO.

ii. They made no legitimate case for tree removal, and have done so entirely because they wanted to move the dirt under them so they didn't have to pay for fill. Again, they made zero attempt to modify plans in response to your feedback or that of others.

When this project comes to you, in one form or another, remember how the Moody Group has misled you, and what they have done. Also consider whether they are running the same con at their 9-acre project across from Bridgemill.

Thank you for your valuable time!

Agenda Item for Discussion:	
Meeting Date:	September 16, 2025 06:00 PM
Full Name	First Name: Cody Last Name: Hinton
Phone Number	5033208386
Email	codyhinton2002@yahoo.com
Address:	4627 Kingswood Dr Indian Land, SC 29707
Please check which meeting this comment is for:	Planning Commission Meeting
Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item:	I would like to voice my concerns about the development at 9831 & 9901 Barberville Road / Fort Mill Highway, Fort Mill, SC 29707. Aside from the, what appear to be, shady and unclear building plans, the majority of the trees have been cut down right up to the property line and it appears the land is being graded. There are also piles of rocks and tree roots being cleaned up by their crews. Even though they've removed all of the trees that could be used as a natural buffer/shield between us, it's their land, they can do what they want with it. My main concerns are with what they have or haven't done to make sure what they are doing is safe after they are done clearing the land. They have removed a very large number of mature trees and their root systems. Part of our neighborhood is below the land being cleared with only a relatively small retaining wall between us and them. Since part of our neighborhood is below the land being cleared and water runs downhill, has a survey been done to ensure the soil and the retaining wall can handle a large amount of rain and can our drains and sewers handle the water runoff from their property? From the neighborhood property, very large boulders on their property can be seen sticking out of the embankment that separates our two properties. How big are these boulders? My next door neighbor (whose property abuts the embankment separating our neighborhood and the land being developed) literally had to change the shape of their in-ground pool because they found a rock that was too large to move or break apart with heavy machinery. So we know some of the boulders are large, but we don't know just how large. Can/Will the integrity of the embankment be maintained if/when these

boulders are to be removed? Have any geological surveys been done to see if removal can be done safely? What if those boulders are so huge, they cross into our neighborhoods property underground? If they need to blast those boulders, will the, likely, tremors felt by our homes be damaging? What will be done by the Moody Group to ensure there will be no damage to persons or property?

I believe all of these questions and concerns to be pretty basic and reasonable, but since the Moody Group hasn't been forthcoming with any information to us or to the county, nobody seems to have answers to any questions.

Thank you

From: [Kirsten Willis](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: FW: Zoning meeting tonight Fwd: FOLLOW-UP Re: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023 Council Chambers 2nd Floor
Date: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 12:29:45 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[lanccologo_db3e5d40-7215-4742-ba85-9e0e33ad59e2.png](#)
[Pinnacle emails.pdf](#)

Jennifer –

I'm guessing this is a citizen comment? I guess she was looking up people to email and chose me from the website.



Kirsten Willis, Planner

Planning

Lancaster County Government
P.O. Box 1809
Lancaster, SC 29720

P:(803) 285-6005
kwillis@lancastercountysc.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain private, restricted and/or legally privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Lancaster County. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. Lancaster County accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

NOTICE: All email correspondence to and from this address may be subject to public disclosure under the SC Freedom of Information Act.

From: Peggy Matte <peggymatte@comporium.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 11:47 AM
To: Kirsten Willis <kwillis@lancastercountysc.gov>
Subject: Zoning meeting tonight Fwd: FOLLOW-UP Re: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023 Council Chambers 2nd Floor

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.
—IT Helpdesk, lancastersc.supportsystem.com

Good morning. Please refer to the string of emails below and all the way down to my original email on the last application by Pinnacle Homes on this 60 acre parcel adjacent to White Hall. Nothing has changed since they withdrew the application after my last protest. They clearly knew from the beginning this was rural residential zoning when they purchased the property - 1 house per acre. Now, once again, they seek to build 2.5 homes per acre. This is still not acceptable. I was assured by Planning and Zoning that they had no intention of making Lancaster another Indian Land. And yet it is obviously not the case

already on the north side of town.

I plan to try to attend tonight, however, I am sight impaired and don't drive at night. Nonetheless, I will be there at 6 in hopes that the meeting won't last past dark.

It is the responsibility of Planning and Zoning, as well as County Council, to protect the rights of its existing residents. We already know from White Hall the low quality housing these developers will build. We know from experience what a financial bust that development was for years, with high crime rates, including violent crimes. This is not what the good residents of this county want.

Please deny the rezoning application of Coulston Development and Pinnacle Homes USA LLC. BTW, Coulston is inactive on its registration in NC, although not yet revoked. This would certainly indicate their attention to detail.

Yours truly,
Peggy Matte
1268 Bailey Rd
803-804-8964

From: "Peggy Matte" <peggymatte@comporium.net>

To: "ssimpson" <SSimpson@lancastersc.net>

Cc: "ablackmon" <ablackmon@lancastersc.net>

Sent: Monday, July 22, 2024 9:45:52 AM

Subject: Re: FOLLOW-UP Re: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023 Council Chambers 2nd Floor

Good morning! I hope all is well for you and you are staying cool in all this intense heat we are having this summer. Remember our correspondence about the 60 acres behind 1268 Bailey Road that the owners were attempting to rezone to 2.5 houses per acre? Just because they withdrew does not mean I don't intend to check in on them. Ha! In fact, my friend who lives on the other side of that acreage where they and/or their other affiliated partners are also buying up all the property with the intent to put in massive subdivisions (which I believe also got voted down, or they withdrew) - the story from my friend is they are mysteriously repaving all the streets in Whitehall and in addition on her side were cutting trees. Since I know that the streets in Whitehall such that I have seen were not really in need of repaving in light of the fact that the county rarely repaves anything until there is no other choice available. So I ask - what is the story here? Are they proceeding without approval? It would not be the first such event in Lancaster County.

Thanks for any info you have available.

Sincerely,
Peggy Matte
1268 Bailey Rd
Lancaster, SC 29720

From: "ssimpson" <SSimpson@lancastersc.net>
To: "Peggy Matte" <peggymatte@comporium.net>
Cc: "Matthew Blaszyk" <mblaszyk@lancastersc.net>, "ablackmon" <ABlackmon@lancastersc.net>, "bmosteller" <BMosteller@lancastersc.net>, "Brian Carnes" <briancarnes@lancastersc.net>, "Charlene McGriff" <faynettef@yahoo.com>, cmcgriff@comporium.net, "Jose Luis" <jluis@lancastersc.net>, "Steve Harper" <steveharper@lancastersc.net>, "Terry Graham" <ivyplaceevents@gmail.com>, "tgraham" <TGraham@lancastersc.net>
Sent: Friday, March 22, 2024 2:49:25 PM
Subject: RE: FOLLOW-UP Re: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023 Council Chambers 2nd Floor

Ms. Matte:

Thank you for reaching out to Lancaster County. I wanted to inform you that the Development Services Director, Allison Hardin, has reported that the rezoning on South Potter Road (Application by Mark Boyce with Wellspring Carolina Investments to rezone approximately 53 acres on South Potter Road and heard at the 3-19-2024 Planning Commission meeting) has been withdrawn by the property owner, which means that this item will not move forward to Council. If the applicant wishes to bring the rezoning back up at a future date, they will have to restart the process.

I hope that this information answers all of your questions. I am copying Mr. Blaszyk on this email because if you have any other specific questions, those will need to be answered by the Planning Department.

With kind regards,

Sherrie Simpson



Sherrie Simpson, Clerk to Council
County Council

Lancaster County Government
PO Box 1809
101 N Main St
Lancaster, SC 29720

P: (803) 416-9307 F: (877) 241-5430
SSimpson@lancastersc.net

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain private, restricted and/or legally privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Lancaster

County. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. Lancaster County accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

NOTICE: All email correspondence to and from this address may be subject to public disclosure under the SC Freedom of Information Act.

From: Peggy Matte <peggymatte@comporium.net>

Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2024 3:59 PM

To: Sherrie Simpson <ssimpson@lancastersc.net>

Cc: Matthew Blaszyk <mblaszyk@lancastersc.net>

Subject: FOLLOW-UP Re: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023 Council Chambers 2nd Floor

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.
—IT Helpdesk, lancastersc.supportsystem.com

Hi, Sherrie. Remember this from the Thanksgiving holiday? I learned there was a zoning meeting last night where they are trying to do this from Potter Road instead. I need to know if this includes the 60 acres behind me and what is the status that they plan to build at least 900 homes 2-1/2 per acre (instead of the long-time rural residential 1 home per acre), just like this previous zoning they were seeking behind our property. I know of not one single resident looking to buy a home because of prices and interest rates that have been driven through realtor.com to artificially inflate what is the real truth. Also, I know that the meeting last night is tied to Pinnacle as well, so different road, same people under various names. It is quite easy to form LLCs in NC and SC to confuse non-legal people from understanding it is the same face, just a different day. Why do we need 900 houses there? Who is moving here so rapidly that we need to overrun the long-term residents of this community and county so that a few can get rich at our expense.

Could you please give me the relevant background on this matter and answer if the 60 acres which were previously withdrawn are in this new plan, basically the same plan, different day? I don't want to write the county council until I know what is going on, so that I can do my own research.

I have copied Mr. Blaszyk so that he understands that no one living in this area wants Whitehall enlarged. It has been a thorn in this community since it was built.

Thank you for your prompt response.

Peggy Matte
1268 Bailey Road

From: "ssimpson" <ssimpson@lancastersc.net>

To: "Peggy Matte" <peggymatte@comporium.net>, "Matthew Blaszyk" <mblaszyk@lancastersc.net>

Cc: "tgraham" <tgraham@lancastersc.net>, "Charlene McGriff" <cmcgriff@lancastersc.net>, "bmosteller" <bmosteller@lancastersc.net>, "Jose Luis" <jluiss@lancastersc.net>, "Steve Harper" <steveharper@lancastersc.net>, "ablackmon" <ablackmon@lancastersc.net>, "Brian Carnes" <briancarnes@lancastersc.net>

Sent: Monday, December 11, 2023 9:13:22 AM

Subject: RE: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023 Council Chambers 2nd Floor

Ms. Matte:

The applicant has withdrawn this rezoning request, which is why it is not appearing on the agenda. He withdrew his request on 11-30-2023. Mr. Blaszyk can hopefully answer any questions that you may have about next steps for the applicant.

With kind regards,

Sherrie Simpson



Sherrie Simpson, Clerk to Council
County Council

Lancaster County Government
PO Box 1809
101 N Main St
Lancaster, SC 29720

P: (803) 416-9307 F: (877) 241-5430
SSimpson@lancastersc.net

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain private, restricted and/or legally privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Lancaster County. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. Lancaster County accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

NOTICE: All email correspondence to and from this address may be subject to public disclosure under the SC Freedom of Information Act.

From: Peggy Matte <peggymatte@comporium.net>

Sent: Sunday, December 10, 2023 4:58 PM

To: Matthew Blaszyk <mblaszyk@lancastersc.net>

Cc: Terry Graham <TGraham@lancastersc.net>; Charlene McGriff <cmcgriff@lancastersc.net>; Billy Mosteller <BMosteller@lancastersc.net>; Jose Luis <jluiss@lancastersc.net>; Steve Harper <steveharper@lancastersc.net>; Allen Blackmon <ABlackmon@lancastersc.net>; Brian Carnes <briancarnes@lancastersc.net>; Sherrie Simpson <SSimpson@lancastersc.net>

Subject: Re: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023 Council Chambers 2nd Floor

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.
—IT Helpdesk, lancastersc.supportsystem.com

The purpose of this email is to remind county council members of the previous emails to mblaszyk@lancastersc.net, copying the County Council on Planning Commission item RZ-2023-1814/County Council Ordinance 2023-1886, which was heard by the Planning Commission (Bailey Road and Flat Creek Road Intersection, (TM#0080-00-061.00)). The Commission voted to recommend denial to County Council. Unfortunately, we cannot attend the County Council meeting scheduled tomorrow, December 11, 2023. Therefore, please read the email string below, and accept this as a reassertion of our previous stance on this matter. Please accept the recommendation of the Planning Commission and deny the request by Pinnacle Homes USA, LLC, and their affiliated entities and partners, to rezone the 60 acres adjacent to Whitehall Subdivision and also adjacent to the rurally zoned properties in the 1200/1300 blocks of Bailey Road, from the current rural residential 1 house per acre to medium density residential.

Although we reviewed the agenda for the meeting, we could not identify any of the agenda items as this matter, however, we were told by Ms. Simpson that it was coming up on the 11th.

We thank you for your consideration in this important matter.

Thank you.
Sergio and Peggy Matte

From: "Peggy Matte" <peggymatte@comporium.net>
To: "mblaszyk" <mblaszyk@lancastersc.net>
Cc: "tgraham" <tgraham@lancastersc.net>, "cmcgriff" <cmcgriff@lancastersc.net>, "bmosteller" <bmosteller@lancastersc.net>, "jluis" <jluis@lancastersc.net>, "steveharper" <steveharper@lancastersc.net>, "ablackmon" <ablackmon@lancastersc.net>, "briancarnes" <briancarnes@lancastersc.net>
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2023 12:53:15 PM
Subject: Re: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023 Council Chambers 2nd Floor

The purpose of this email is to thank you for voting to adjourn and reconvene this matter until probably after the first of the year. We learned of that result this morning. We hope you will continue to work with this rural community in finding a fair solution for the owners of the subject property that is not detrimental to the community. As we all know, since at least inception, Whitehall has historically been in financial trouble, and crime ridden, although since the recession it seems to not have as bad a reputation as in the past. Although there was a preponderance of foreclosures during the recession, it seems to have brought in more financially sound owners. However, we do not encourage any solution making an already historically failed subdivision into the new template for Lancaster. We know that change is coming, but please let that change be to support of the very special family community that Lancaster has been for many generations.

Thank you again.

Sergio and Peggy Matte

From: "Peggy Matte" <peggymatte@comporium.net>
To: "mblaszyk" <mblaszyk@lancastersc.net>
Cc: "tgraham" <tgraham@lancastersc.net>, "cmcgriff" <cmcgriff@lancastersc.net>, "bmosteller" <bmosteller@lancastersc.net>, "jluis" <jluis@lancastersc.net>, "steveharper" <steveharper@lancastersc.net>, "ablackmon" <ablackmon@lancastersc.net>, "briancarnes" <briancarnes@lancastersc.net>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 5:35:16 PM
Subject: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023 Council Chambers 2nd Floor

The purpose of this email is to advise you of how disappointed (and angry) we, as well as many residents in the Bailey Road area are, that the rezoning hearing for property located at the Southeast corner of Bailey Road and Flat Creek Road intersection (TM#0080-00-061.00) (hereinafter, has conveniently for the developer been scheduled for 2 days before the major Thanksgiving Holiday, assuring that most residents in the area will be traveling or otherwise occupied with their family holiday and not attend the meeting. We respectfully request that this agenda item be recontinued to another date, preferably after the Christmas holiday, when the residents may appear to contest the rezoning and assert and protect their citizen's rights the rezoning of this rural residential zoned neighborhood. Most of the residents purchased in this area for a reason - the rural zoning! Now Pinnacle Homes USA, LLC is seeking to rezone to medium density residential to build 115 homes on the 60 acres at question - that is 2.5 homes per acre - instead of the 1 home per acre in effect.

The current principals of Pinnacle have been aware for decades of the zoning on this property. The principals of Pinnacle are principals, business partners, friends, subsidiaries and/or affiliates of one another as well as all previous owners, since at least 2003. Benjamin Russell, David Cuthbertson, and Wesley Hinson, as well as others, have been partnered in multiple real estate and/or banking transactions for decades. They have been associated in one manner or another with Whitehall Subdivision adjacent to this 60 acres for decades. They are not unsavvy buyers. Although the county records show that Pinnacle purchased the property recently for \$1.060 million on the last owner transfer, this is, in fact, Mr. Russell selling the property from himself to himself, one assumes to increase prices on land in the area, and one also assumes to obtain financing for the purchase to use as seed money for the development of the land. Every owner of the land since 2003 has been associated with one or the other of the aforementioned business partners, individually or through their affiliated or subsidiary companies.

It is the hope of the existing residents that Lancaster County Government, including the Planning and Zoning, the County Council and others, will do the right thing. Continue this matter until after the end of the Christmas and New Year Holidays, and thereafter vote in favor of community residents. If Mr. Russell wants to build one home per acre, so be it, it is not up to the community to contest that. But his attempt

to change the quality of this zoning to something undesirable to the present residents is not acceptable. To schedule this important agenda item two days before a major federal holiday so no one is likely to show up is even more unacceptable.

We respectfully request that this agenda item be reconvened at a later time and date. We also respectfully copy each member of the Lancaster County Council to make known the wishes of the residents of this county and to ask for their support in at the minimum delaying this agenda item until a later and more convenient date for the residents. We do not desire to become the next Indian Land.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

--

Sergio and Peggy Matte
Cell: 803-804-8964
Voice Mail: 704-469-6319

--

Peggy Matte
Cell: 803-804-8964
Voice Mail: 704-469-6319

--

Peggy Matte
Cell: 803-804-8964
Voice Mail: 704-469-6319

--

Peggy Matte
Cell: 803-804-8964
Voice Mail: 704-469-6319

--

Peggy Matte
Cell: 803-804-8964
Voice Mail: 704-469-6319

--

Peggy Matte
Cell: 803-804-8964
Voice Mail: 704-469-6319

Zimbra**peggymatte@comporium.net**

Re: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023 Council Chambers 2nd Floor

From : Peggy Matte
<peggymatte@comporium.net>

Mon, Nov 27, 2023 12:53 PM

Subject : Re: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning
Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats
monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023
Council Chambers 2nd Floor

To : mblaszyk <mblaszyk@lancastersc.net>

Cc : tgraham <tgraham@lancastersc.net>,
cmcgriff <cmcgriff@lancastersc.net>,
bmosteller <bmosteller@lancastersc.net>,
jluis <jluis@lancastersc.net>, steveharper
<steveharper@lancastersc.net>,
ablackmon <ablackmon@lancastersc.net>,
briancarnes
<briancarnes@lancastersc.net>

The purpose of this email is to thank you for voting to adjourn and reconvene this matter until probably after the first of the year. We learned of that result this morning. We hope you will continue to work with this rural community in finding a fair solution for the owners of the subject property that is not detrimental to the community. As we all know, since at least inception, Whitehall has historically been in financial trouble, and crime ridden, although since the recession it seems to not have as bad a reputation as in the past. Although there was a preponderance of foreclosures during the recession, it seems to have brought in more financially sound owners. However, we do not encourage any solution making an already historically failed subdivision into the new template for Lancaster. We know that change is coming, but please let that change be to support of the very special family community that Lancaster has been for many generations.

Thank you again.
Sergio and Peggy Matte

From: "Peggy Matte" <peggymatte@comporium.net>

To: "mblaszyk" <mblaszyk@lancastersc.net>

Cc: "tgraham" <tgraham@lancastersc.net>, "cmcgriff" <cmcgriff@lancastersc.net>,
"bmosteller" <bmosteller@lancastersc.net>, "jluis" <jluis@lancastersc.net>, "steveharper"
<steveharper@lancastersc.net>, "ablackmon" <ablackmon@lancastersc.net>, "briancarnes"
<briancarnes@lancastersc.net>

Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 5:35:16 PM

Subject: URGENT: 6:00 pm: Planning Commission - Regular Meeting Repeats monthly on 3rd Tuesday, until 12-19-2023 Council Chambers 2nd Floor

The purpose of this email is to advise you of how disappointed (and angry) we, as well as many residents in the Bailey Road area are, that the rezoning hearing for property located at the Southeast corner of Bailey Road and Flat Creek Road intersection (TM#0080-00-061.00) (hereinafter, has conveniently for the developer been scheduled for 2 days before the major Thanksgiving Holiday, assuring that most residents in the area will be traveling or otherwise occupied with their family holiday and not attend the meeting. We respectfully request that this agenda item be reconvened to another date, preferably after the Christmas holiday, when the residents may appear to contest the rezoning and assert and protect their citizen's rights the rezoning of this rural residential zoned neighborhood. Most of the residents purchased in this area for a reason - the rural zoning! Now Pinnacle Homes USA, LLC is seeking to rezone to medium density residential to build 115 homes on the 60 acres at question - that is 2.5 homes per acre - instead of the 1 home per acre in effect.

The current principals of Pinnacle have been aware for decades of the zoning on this property. The principals of Pinnacle are principals, business partners, friends, subsidiaries and/or affiliates of one another as well as all previous owners, since at least 2003. Benjamin Russell, David Cuthbertson, and Wesley Hinson, as well as others, have been partnered in multiple real estate and/or banking transactions for decades. They have been associated in one manner or another with Whitehall Subdivision adjacent to this 60 acres for decades. They are not unsavvy buyers. Although the county records show that Pinnacle purchased the property recently for \$1.060 million on the last owner transfer, this is, in fact, Mr. Russell selling the property from himself to himself, one assumes to increase prices on land in the area, and one also assumes to obtain financing for the purchase to use as seed money for the development of the land. Every owner of the land since 2003 has been associated with one or the other of the aforementioned business partners, individually or through their affiliated or subsidiary companies.

It is the hope of the existing residents that Lancaster County Government, including the Planning and Zoning, the County Council and others, will do the right thing. Continue this matter until after the end of the Christmas and New Year Holidays, and thereafter vote in favor of community residents. If Mr. Russell wants to build one home per acre, so be it, it is not up to the community to contest that. But his attempt to change the quality of this zoning to something undesirable to the present residents is not acceptable. To schedule this important agenda item two days before a major federal holiday so no one is likely to show up is even more unacceptable.

We respectfully request that this agenda item be reconvened at a later time and date. We also respectfully copy each member of the Lancaster County Council to make known the wishes of the residents of this county and to ask for their support in at the minimum delaying this agenda item until a later and more convenient date for the residents. We do not desire to become the next Indian Land.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

--

Sergio and Peggy Matte

Cell: 803-804-8964

Voice Mail: 704-469-6319

--

Peggy Matte
Cell: 803-804-8964
Voice Mail: 704-469-6319

From: [Teri Hinson](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: PRESTIGE DEV & SITE WORKS, MICHAEL McCARTER
Date: Tuesday, March 18, 2025 11:35:05 AM

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.
—IT Helpdesk, lancastersc.supportsystem.com<<https://lancastersc.supportsystem.com>>

52.35 acres, subdivision 100 lot single family homes

Points of concern:

1. This land is/was a gully that was used as a dumping ground when a stretch of Hwy 903 was widened from 2 lane to 4 in the 1970s. How can it possibly support these homes. We've already been taken advantage of by the previous owner building rental houses, no berm, right on the road, no set back. (Ellis Homes). This land has changed owners several times over the past 10 years or so. How is it any different now? The land wasn't suitable for a subdivision then and it's not now.
2. Entrance/exit in front of my property 846 Hilldale Dr. This will impact my family's entering/exiting my driveway and property.
3. Runoff into Hannah's Creek.
4. Traffic-currently have major issues with tractor trailer trucks, tanker trucks, logging trucks(to and from Jacks), Lancaster County trash trucks using this mile stretch of Hilldale as a short cut. I've contacted the state about this and have basically been ignored.
5. Bridge over Hannah's Creek-I'm already concerned about the heavy vehicles crossing it, there's no weight limit posted. State and county should be aware of this since Hilldale was resurfaced several years ago.
6. 100 homes, maybe 2 cars per family-how can this road handle the additional traffic?
7. Speeding-Hilldale is already a free for all. Speed limit is 35, the majority of traffic that comes through is treating it like a mini bypass.
8. Noise

Sent from my iPad

July 11 ,2025

Lancaster Planning Commission
Lancaster Administration Building
101 North Main Street
Lancaster SC 29720

Reference: Preliminary Plat SD-2024-1442
Shadow Moss Subdivision – Hilldale Drive Lancaster

I, Toronca D. Neely Johnson of 775 Hilldale Drive, request that you **deny the approval** of the new 98/100 lot single family residential subdivision (Shadow Moss) on Hilldale Drive once again. This is our third time around, first in 2002 with 130 homes and in 2006 with 130 homes. Now we are here with 100 homes. Note: This plan has two “future connections” so this is not the end which is even more concerning.

When I purchased my house on Hilldale Drive over 30 years ago, it was selected because of the following:

- 1) Off a main street so not much traffic
- 2) Quiet area
- 3) There are not a lot of houses around me

Perfect place right!

The building of this subdivision in my back door will eliminate all the reasons I purchased in this location.

I understand we may need more housing; I see a number of new subdivisions are being built in the Lancaster area. However, how can we continue to build more houses but not have other adequate essentials in place such as Fire Stations, Police Service and EMS Service staffing and equipment to provide necessary services for these additional residents. As well as funding to maintain roads.

Additional Reasons for denial:

- 98/100 single family homes will bring more than 200 additional cars onto Hilldale Drive.
- Overpopulating Hilldale Drive and concerns for safety with no sidewalks and disability capabilities.
- Hilldale Drive is currently used by many to get from Hwy 903 area to the Hwy 9 area.
- One way in and out will cause even more congestion in the upper area of Hilldale Drive resulting in potential for accidents and fatality without a light.
- Additional noise and disturbance of our current peace and quietness in this area. Creating a pocket for crime to manifest without proper surveillance.
- Hilldale Drive, Emerald Estates/Emma Circle, Diamond Circle, Sunshine to Foster Heights and Foster Heights all together only have 104 houses.
- We now have more elderly residents in our current surrounding community and on Hilldale Drive this will cause more disturbance and traffic for them. I’m getting close to this as well.

Thank you for your understanding and casting a **denial vote** for this new “Shadow Moss” subdivision on Hilldale Drive. Would you want this in your area or to disturb your peaceful living after all these years.

ATTACHMENT:
Sign-In Sheets

SIGN IN ONLY IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK



MB2
9/16/25

**PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing Sign In Sheet**

Item 5: CITIZEN'S COMMENTS

General Comments or comments on matters

NOT ON TONIGHT'S AGENDA.

For comments on specific agenda items under discussion, please sign in on the appropriate sheet.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, September 16, 2025

Citizens are allowed 3 minutes per person to speak. Everyone speaking before The Commission will be required to do so in a civil manner. The Commission will not tolerate personal attacks on individual Commissioners, County Staff or any person or group. Racial slurs will not be permitted. The Commission's number one priority is to conduct business for the citizens of this county.

PLEASE PRINT

1. Email Comment: Cody Hinton Re: 9831 & 9901 Barberville Rd/Fort Mill Hwy
2. Email Comment: Geoff Larson re: Barberville Commercial
3. Jeannine Clifton : re 9831 & 9901 Barberville Road/FM Hwy
4.

read

read

✓

SIGN IN ONLY IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK



MBZ
9/16/25

**PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing Sign In Sheet**

Item 6a: DA-2021-0528 Arbor Meadows (aka DA-2025-1506)

Application by AM Group Landholdings LLC for a Development Agreement for Arbor Meadows development (SD-2021-0528) at TM 0087-00-105.00, a single-family residential development of 92 lots on 47.47 acres

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, September 16, 2025

Citizens are allowed 3 minutes per person to speak. Everyone speaking before the Commission will be required to do so in a civil manner. The Commission will not tolerate personal attacks on individual Commissioners, County Staff or any person or group. Racial slurs will not be permitted. The Commission's number one priority is to conduct business for the citizens of this county.

PLEASE PRINT

1.	Chaplin Spencer X
2.	MICHAEL DIDO
3.	
4.	

✓

SIGN IN ONLY IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK



YMBL
9/16/25

PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Item 6b: RZ-2024-1281 Whitehall Phase 2

Application by Coulston Development and Pinnacle Homes USA LLC to rezone 60.02 acres off Flat Creek Road (TM 0080-00-061.00) from Rural Neighborhood to Medium Density Residential, with the intention of developing Whitehall Phase 2 residential subdivision. Concurrent with Comprehensive Plan Amendment application CP-2024-1281

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, September 16, 2025

Citizens are allowed 3 minutes per person to speak. Everyone speaking before the Commission will be required to do so in a civil manner. The Commission will not tolerate personal attacks on individual Commissioners, County Staff or any person or group. Racial slurs will not be permitted. The Commission's number one priority is to conduct business for the citizens of this county.

PLEASE PRINT

1. Peggy Matte : Email Comment here
2.
3.
4.

✓

SIGN IN ONLY IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK



MRB
9/16/25

**PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing Sign In Sheet**

Item 6c: CP-2024-1281 Whitehall Phase 2.

Application by Coulston Development and Pinnacle Homes USA LLC for a Comprehensive Plan/Future Land Use Amendment for 60.02 acres off Flat Creek Road (TM 0080-00-061.00), to change the Future Land Use designation from Rural to Growth Area. Concurrent with rezoning application RZ-2024-1281.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, September 16, 2025

Citizens are allowed 3 minutes per person to speak. Everyone speaking before the Commission will be required to do so in a civil manner. The Commission will not tolerate personal attacks on individual Commissioners, County Staff or any person or group. Racial slurs will not be permitted. The Commission's number one priority is to conduct business for the citizens of this county.

PLEASE PRINT

1. (see Peggy Matte: email comment)
2.
3.
4.

SIGN IN ONLY IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK



UAB
9/16/25

**PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing Sign In Sheet**

Item 6f: CP-2025-2062 Kershaw Land Use Addendum

Addendum to the County Comprehensive Plan, updating Future Land Use Plan for the Town of Kershaw.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, September 16, 2025

Citizens are allowed 3 minutes per person to speak. Everyone speaking before the Commission will be required to do so in a civil manner. The Commission will not tolerate personal attacks on individual Commissioners, County Staff or any person or group. Racial slurs will not be permitted. The Commission's number one priority is to conduct business for the citizens of this county.

PLEASE PRINT

1.	MILTON L. HOOD S.R.
2.	
3.	
4.	

no

SIGN IN ONLY IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK



YMR
9/16/25

**PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing Sign In Sheet**

Item 6g: Kershaw Annexation: 275 W. Second Street

Application by Danny Lee Terry II to annex a property of approximately 1.2 acres located at 275 W. Second St (TM 0114-00-052.00) into the Town of Kershaw.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, September 16, 2025

Citizens are allowed 3 minutes per person to speak. Everyone speaking before the Commission will be required to do so in a civil manner. The Commission will not tolerate personal attacks on individual Commissioners, County Staff or any person or group. Racial slurs will not be permitted. The Commission's number one priority is to conduct business for the citizens of this county.

PLEASE PRINT

1.
2.
3.
4.

SIGN IN ONLY IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK



PLANNING COMMISSION
Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

YMB
9/16/25

Item 7a: SD-2024-1442 Shadow Moss

Application by Prestige Development & Site Works LLC and Michael McCarter for a Preliminary Plat for 52.235 acres located off Hilldale Drive (TM-0080-00-033.00) to develop a 98-lot single family residential community.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, September 16, 2025

Citizens are allowed 3 minutes per person to speak. Everyone speaking before the Commission will be required to do so in a civil manner. The Commission will not tolerate personal attacks on individual Commissioners, County Staff or any person or group. Racial slurs will not be permitted. The Commission's number one priority is to conduct business for the citizens of this county.

PLEASE PRINT

1.	TORONCA NEELY: Email Comment TORONCA Johnson	✓
2.	TERI HINSON: Email Comment	
3.	Jerry Witherspoon	✓
4.	Steve McKay Steph	✓

SIGN IN ONLY IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK

5.	Sandra Sikorski	✓
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		