

Committee Members

District 1: Stuart Graham
District 4: Jose Luis
District 5: Steve Harper, Chair
Citizen: Maggie Norris
Citizen: Darrell Walters
PC Chair: Shelly Richards
PC Vice-Chair: Judianna Tinklenberg
Development Serv. Dir.: Allison Hardin
Zoning Director: Shannon Catoe
Ex-Officio: James Mulvaney



Interim County Administrator
Steve Willis

County Attorney
Ginny L. Merck-Dupont

Clerk to Council
Sherrie Simpson

**December 11, 2025
6:00 PM**

LANCASTER COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNTY COUNCIL AD-HOC UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) COMMITTEE
COUNTY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, COUNTY ADMINISTRATION
BUILDING, 101 NORTH MAIN STREET, LANCASTER, SC 29720

MINUTES

Committee Members Present: Stuart Graham, Steve Harper, Darrell Walters, Shelly Richards, Judianna Tinklenberg, Allison Hardin, Shannon Catoe, James Mulvaney.

Committee Members Absent: Jose Luis, Maggie Norris.

Staff Members/Others Present: Steve Willis, Interim County Administrator; Lauren Hill, Deputy Clerk to Council; Stephany Snowden, Deputy County Administrator; Jeff Catoe, Public Works Director; Dr. Kirsten Willis, Planner.

A quorum of the County Council Ad-Hoc Development Agreement Committee was present for the meeting. The following press were notified of the meeting by e-mail in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act: *The Lancaster News*, *Kershaw News Era*, *The Rock Hill Herald*, Cable News 2, Channel 9 and the local government channel. The agenda was posted in the lobby of the County Administration Building and also on the County website the required length of time.

Call to Order Ad-Hoc UDO Committee Meeting - Committee Chair Steve Harper

Committee Chair Steve Harper called the Ad-Hoc UDO Committee meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

Darrell Walters moved to approve the agenda. Seconded by Shelly Richards. There was no discussion from the Committee. The motion Passed by a vote of 8-0; Absent: Maggie Norris, Jose Luis.

Citizens Comments

The following citizens signed up for and spoke during the Citizen Comments:

1. Jeff Catoe, Lancaster County Public Works Director, spoke regarding the acceptance of

roads and the need for developers to submit camera storm drain systems prior to final plat approval.

Discussion and Action Items

a. Approval of Minutes from the December 3, 2025, County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee Meeting

Judianna Tinklenberg moved to approve the minutes from the December 3, 2025, County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee meeting. Seconded by Stuart Graham. There was no discussion. The motion Passed by a vote of 8-0; Absent: Maggie Norris, Jose Luis.

b. Stormwater Regulations in the MS4 Area - Allison Hardin, Development Services Director

Allison Hardin briefly reviewed the history of the MS4 program in Lancaster County and the reason behind the program. Ms. Hardin explained that the recent review of the program conducted by the South Carolina Department of Environmental Services recommended that the stormwater regulations be removed from the County's Unified Development Ordinance ("UDO") and be moved to the general codes, but staff was recommending the design and floodplain regulations remain in the UDO.

c. Discussions Regarding Planned Development Districts (PDD's) Replacing the Mixed-Use (MX) District, Minor and Major Subdivision Regulations, Housing Types, and Previous Proposals - Committee Chair Steve Harper / Allison Hardin, Development Services Director

Allison Hardin explained how Planned Development Districts (PDDs) and Mixed-Use Districts (MX) are reviewed and their differences, highlighting that PDDs allow for more flexibility, but require Planning Commission and County Council approval. Ms. Hardin reviewed the pros and cons of replacing MX Districts with PDDs, and Shannon Catoe explained that the County would be able to hold developers more accountable in PDDs with the plans that are submitted and approved since any changes would require Planning Commission and Council approval. The Committee members discussed legacy districts, potentially converting vacant MX lots/parcels to PDDs, the need to set standards and expectations of developers rather than allowing developers to start "from scratch" with their plans, and open space requirements.

Due to Maggie Norris and Jose Luis being absent from the meeting, the discussion regarding Minor and Major Subdivision Regulations was tabled until the next County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee meeting, which was scheduled for Thursday, December 18, 2025.

Steve Harper explained that housing was unattainable, and the Committee discussed potential tax or redevelopment credits, designating areas for attainable housing where infrastructure already exists, the need for the County and City of Lancaster to work together for attainable housing, the alternative demolition program, and the potential to incentivize developers/builders who bring attainable housing to the County.

Allison Hardin provided a handout that included a chart comparison of Rural Residential, Rural Neighborhood, and Low Density Residential. A copy of the handout is attached as Schedule A to the minutes. Ms. Hardin also reviewed a handout that included a chart that broke down

various zoning districts and included information regarding building types, lot area, lot width, front setbacks, set (corner and interior) setbacks, rear setbacks, impervious surface (maximum per lot), and height and density maximums. A copy of the handout is attached as Schedule B to the minutes. The Committee discussed easements, lot sizes, septic requirements, conservation/clustering, sidewalks, rolled curbs, stand-up curb and gutters, streetscape requirements, right of ways, and incentives from developers. Allison Hardin also provided a handout highlighting the Carolina Heelsplitter habitat and land use connection. A copy of the handout is attached as Schedule C to the minutes. Ms. Hardin explained the history of the Carolina Heelsplitter program and the potential of the County creating its own bank for credits. Steve Harper stated that the topic should be revisited after legal review, and that he would want something in writing from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the enforcement of the bank.

d. Review of Chapter 2 of the Draft Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) - Committee Chair Steve Harper

Allison Hardin explained that staff needed a consensus from the Committee regarding smaller lot sizes, and Stuart Graham expressed his concerns about smaller lots and the effects they have on density. The Committee members also discussed setback requirements and accessory structures. See agenda item **4c.** for the Committee's discussion regarding zoning districts and their requirements.

Adjournment

Darrell Walters moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Steve Harper. There being no further business to discuss, the County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee meeting adjourned at approximately 7:44 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lauren Hill

Lauren Hill
Deputy Clerk to Council

Approved by the Committee on December 18, 2025

Schedule A

COMPARISON – Rural Residential, Rural Neighborhood, Low Density Residential

Feature	Rural Residential	Rural Neighborhood	Low-Density Residential
Intent / Purpose	Large-lot residential Preserve rural character / open space	Protect residential character in rural areas Promote rural living / low density housing	Transitional between rural and suburban development Maintain residential character
Density	1 unit/acre	1 unit/acre	1.5 units/acre
Permitted Housing Types	Site-Built Single-Family Dwellings Manufactured Homes Accessory dwellings Residential/family home care	Site-Built Single-Family Dwellings Accessory dwellings Residential/family home care	Site-Built Single-Family Dwellings Accessory dwellings Residential/family home care
Other Uses	Broader Agricultural Uses Rural Accessory Uses	Broader Agricultural Uses Rural Accessory Uses	Limited Agricultural Uses Limited Civic Uses
Compatibility Goal	Protect Farmland Allow flexible rural housing	Maintain neighborhood character in rural areas Ensure compatibility with LDR areas	Protect established neighborhoods Deter uses that negatively impact residential quality

Is there a big overall difference between current RN and LDR when looking at a subdivision?

- Density: 1 unit/acre vs. 1.5 units/acre
- Lot Size: 1 acre vs. 29,040sq. ft (0.67 acre)
- Lot Width: 130' vs. 90' with water/sewer or 130' w/ septic
- Open Space: None vs. 10% open space & 5% park space
- Development Character: Strictly Rural vs. Suburban transition including amenities, sidewalks, shared spaces etc.
- Mobile homes are not allowed in RN or LDR; they are allowed in RR.
- Rural Neighborhood subdivisions tend to look rural; LDR subdivisions tend to look more suburban.

Table 2.5.2-1: Rural Districts Dimensional Standards											
Zoning District	Building Type	Lot Dimensions (min)			Setbacks (min) ⁴			Impervious Surface (max per lot)	Height (max)	Density (max)	Proposed Change; Current UDO:
		Lot Area	Lot Width	Front	Side (Corner)	Side (Interior)	Rear				
AR	Principal Residential Buildings ¹	1.0 ac	130 ft	40 ft	20 ft	20 ft	25 ft	30%	35 ft	1 du/ac	35%
	Principal Non-Residential Buildings	21,780 sf	100 ft	40 ft	40 ft	15 ft or 35 ft ²	25 ft or 35 ft ²	30%	60 ft	n/a	new regulation
	Accessory Structures (600 sf or less)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Same as front setback for principal structure	5 ft	5 ft	30%	35 ft	n/a	1. No AS in front yards; 2. 35%
	Accessory Structures (more than 600 sf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Same as front setback for principal structure	Same as principal structure	Same as principal structure	30%	35 ft	n/a	35%
RR	Principal Residential Buildings ¹	1.0 ac	130 ft	40 ft	20 ft	20 ft	25 ft	40%	35 ft	1 du/ac	50%
	Principal Non-Residential Buildings ¹	21,780 sf	100 ft	40 ft	40 ft	15 ft or 35 ft ²	25 ft or 35 ft ²	40%	60 ft	n/a	new regulation

Schedule B

Table 2.5.2-1: Rural Districts Dimensional Standards											
Zoning District	Building Type	Lot Dimensions (min)			Setbacks (min) ⁴			Impervious Surface (max per lot)	Height (max)	Density (max)	Proposed Change; Current UDO:
		Lot Area	Lot Width	Front	Side (Corner)	Side (Interior)	Rear				
RR	Accessory Structures (600 sf or less)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Same as front setback for principal structure	5 ft	5 ft	40%	25 ft	n/a	1. No AS in front yards; 2. 50%; 3. 35ft
	Accessory Structures (more than 600 sf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Same as front setback for principal structure	Same as principal structure	Same as principal structure	40%	25 ft	n/a	1. 35%; 2. 35 ft
	Principal Residential Buildings	1.0 ac	130 ft	40 ft	20 ft	20 ft	25 ft	40%	35 ft	1 du/ac	35%
RN	Principal Non-Residential Buildings ¹	21,780 sf	100 ft	40 ft	40 ft	15 ft or 35 ft ²	25 ft or 35 ft ²	40%	60 ft	n/a	new regulation
	Accessory Structures (600 sf or less)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Same as front setback for principal structure	5 ft	5 ft	40%	25 ft	n/a	1. No AS in front yards; 2. 50%; 3. 35ft

Table 2.5.2-1: Rural Districts Dimensional Standards											
Zoning District	Building Type	Lot Dimensions (min)			Setbacks (min) ⁴			Impervious Surface (max per lot)	Height (max)	Density (max)	Proposed Change; Current UDO:
		Lot Area	Lot Width	Front	Side (Corner)	Side (Interior)	Rear				
RN	Accessory Structures (more than 600 sf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Same as front setback for principal structure	Same as principal structure	Same as principal structure	40%	25 ft	n/a	1. 50%; 2. 35 ft

Key: min = minimum required | max = maximum allowed | ft = feet | sf = square feet | du/ac = dwelling units per acre

¹ Chapter 3: *Use Regulations* includes additional standards that apply to manufactured homes and manufactured home parks.

² The greater setback applies when the lot line is adjacent to a lot in containing a detached single-family dwelling. The lesser setback applies when the lot line is adjacent to any other use.

³ For any nonresidential building or structure located immediately adjacent to a single-family residential use or district, the setback distance shall be determined as follows: the developer shall provide internal side and rear setbacks equal to or greater than the height of the building. At no time shall the setback be less than indicated in this table.

4. Lancaster County Water and Sewer District's Elevated Water Tanks must conform to the setback for the zoning district with a minimum 25 foot setback in all zoning districts.

Table 2.5.2-2: Residential Districts Dimensional Standards										
Zoning District	Building Type	Lot Dimensions (min)		Setbacks (min) ⁵			Impervious Surface (max Per Lot)	Height (max)	Density (max)	Proposed Change; Current UDO:
		Lot Area	Lot Width	Front	Side (Corner)	Side (Interior)				
LDR	Detached Single-Family Dwellings	29,040 sf	90 ft	40 ft	20 ft	20 ft	50%	35 ft	1.5 du/ac	1. 130ft for septic; 2. 55%
	Non-Residential Structures	1 ac	100 ft	40 ft	40 ft	15 ft or 35 ft ¹	50%	35 ft	n/a	new regulation

Table 2.5.2-1: Rural Districts Dimensional Standards											
Zoning District	Building Type	Lot Dimensions (min)			Setbacks (min) ⁴			Impervious Surface (max per lot)	Height (max)	Density (max)	Proposed Change;
		Lot Area	Lot Width	Front	Side (Corner)	Side (Interior)	Rear				Current UDO:
LDR	Accessory Structures (600 sf or less)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Same as front setback for principal structure	5 ft	5 ft	50%	25 ft	n/a	1. 55%; 2. 35 ft
	Accessory Structures (more than 600 sf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Same as front setback for principal structure	Same as principal structure	Same as principal structure	50%	25 ft	n/a	1. 55%; 2. 35 ft
	Detached Single-Family Dwellings	10,000 sf	70 ft	35 ft	15 ft	10 ft	25 ft	50%	35 ft	2.5 du/ac	1. 130 ft for septic; 2. 30 ft; 3. 55%
MDR	Non-Residential Structures	21,780 sf	100 ft	35 ft	35 ft	15 ft or 35 ft ¹	25 ft or 35 ft ¹	50%	35 ft	n/a	new regulation
	Accessory Structures (600 sf or less)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Shall not be located between the street and the wall line of the principal structure	5 ft	5 ft	50%	25 ft	n/a	1. 55%; 2. 35 ft

Table 2.5.2-1: Rural Districts Dimensional Standards

Zoning District	Building Type	Lot Dimensions (min)			Setbacks (min) ⁴			Impervious Surface (max per lot)	Height (max)	Density (max)	Proposed Change; Current UDO:
		Lot Area	Lot Width	Front	Side (Corner)	Side (Interior)	Rear				
MDR	Accessory Structures (more than 600 sf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Shall not be located between the street and the wall line of the principal structure	Same as principal structure	Same as principal structure	50%	25 ft	n/a	1. 55%; 2. 35 ft

Key: min = minimum required | max = maximum allowed | ac = acres | sf = square feet | ft = feet | du/ac = dwelling units per acre | n/a = not applicable

¹ The greater setback applies when the lot line is adjacent to a lot in containing a detached single-family dwelling. The lesser setback applies when the lot line is adjacent to any other use.

² The lesser setback applies when the townhouse is alley-served, and parking is accommodated to the rear of the building. The greater setback applies when the townhouse is not alley-served, and parking is accommodated at the front of the building.

³ The minimum setback between individual townhouse dwelling units is 0 ft. The minimum setback between an end townhouse unit and its side lot line is 10 ft.

⁴ The greater setback applies when the townhouse is alley-served, and parking is accommodated to the rear of the building. The lesser setback applies when the townhouse is not alley-served, and parking is accommodated at the front of the building.

4. Lancaster County Water and Sewer District's Elevated Water Tanks must conform to the setback for the zoning district with a minimum 25 foot setback in all zoning districts.

Carolina Heelsplitter Habitat - Land Use Connection

Limiting Factors	Identified Concerns	Land Use Causes
Water Quality	Point Source Discharges • Sewage Effluent (Ammonia and Copper in Water) Non-Point Source Discharges • Sediment (Including Bank Erosion) • Fertilizer • Other Pollutants	Location of Sewage Treatment Plant Discharges Content of Sewage Effluent Removal of Natural Buffers Changes in Land Use, Including Conversion from Native Deciduous to Managed Pine Increased Impervious Surface Area Inadequate Stormwater Controls
Water Quantity	Variations in Flow • Water Velocity Increases • Erosion • Low Water Levels Limit Host Fish Mobility and Oxygen Levels in Water • High Water Levels Increase Discharge of Sediment, etc.	Removal of Natural Buffers Changes in Land Use, Including Conversion from Native Deciduous to Managed Pine Increased Impervious Surface Area Inadequate Stormwater Controls
Mobility of Host Fish	Road crossings and other blockages do not allow host fish to move throughout the stream section.	Design of Road Crossings (Culverts) Impoundments of Water (Dams)

Source: Carolina Heelsplitter (*Lasmigona decorata*) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation 2019, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Available at: https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/five_year_review/doc6112.pdf).

Schedule C