



MEMBERS OF LANCASTER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

CHARLES DEESE, DISTRICT 3, CHAIRMAN
JAMES BARNETT, DISTRICT 4, VICE-CHAIRMAN
TAMECCA NEELY, DISTRICT 2
, DISTRICT 5
SHEILA HINSON, DISTRICT 6
ALAN PATTERSON, DISTRICT 1
BEN LEVINE, DISTRICT 7
CLERK: JENNIFER BRYAN

MINUTES
Lancaster County Planning Commission
October 18, 2022 6:00 p.m.

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

1. **ROLL CALL:** Quorum is present (Five* Commissioners)

Commissioners Present:

Tamecca Neely	Ben Levine*	James Barnett
Sheila Hinson	Charles Keith Deese	

Absent: Alan Patterson *[see attached letter to Commissioners]*

No appointment has yet been made to fill District 5 seat.

Staff Present:

Rox Burhans, Development Services Director	
Ashley Davis, Senior Planner	
Matthew Blaszyk, Planner	Clerk: Jennifer Bryan

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.

2. **APPROVE AGENDA**

Chairman Deese called for a motion to approve the Agenda.

Motion to Approve by James Barnett; 2nd by Tamecca Neely.

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

**** Commissioner Ben Levine arrived after approval of minutes.***

3. CITIZENS' COMMENTS [see Sign-In sheet attached]

[3 General Comments received after publication of Agenda, see attachment]

Chairman Deese opened the floor to general comments from the public.

Donna Hagins (Lancaster SC); Present on behalf of owners on two projects, Shiloh Woods (Items 5a and 5b) and Alcott Village (Item 5f). The Harper family acquired the land in the early 2000s, has always intended to develop as residential subdivisions. She shares a 1,600-foot boundary with the Alcott Village project. Family also developed Hunters Ridge which adjoins Alcott Village. Available to answer questions from Commissioners.

4. APPROVE MINUTES

a. September 1, 2022 Workshop Minutes

Deferred to 11/15/2022 for lack of quorum.

b. September 20, 2022 Regular Minutes

Deferred to 11/15/2022 for lack of quorum.

c. October 6, 2022 Workshop Minutes

Chairman Deese called for a motion to approve October 6, 2022 Workshop Minutes as written. Motion to Approve by James Barnet; 2nd by Sheila Hinson.

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

*** *Commissioner Ben Levine arrived after approval of minutes.***

5. PUBLIC ITEMS

a. SD-2022-0733 Century Communities aka Shiloh Woods

Application by Century Communities for a Preliminary Plat for four parcels totaling approximately 169.86 acres located at and adjacent to 500 and 516 W. Shiloh Unity Road (TM#s 0049-00-004.130049-00-004.16, 0049-00-005.01 and 0049-00-005.02) to allow development of a 398-lot Cluster Subdivision.

Staff Presentation: Ashley Davis, Senior Planner, presented the applications consistent with the staff report (Items 5a and 5b conjoined). Previous public hearing was held on 9/20/2022 [see minutes attached to 10/18/2022 agenda]. TIA information now submitted and reviewed, and Rezoning has completed two readings with Council and third reading will be on Monday 10/28/2022. TIA memo was received after agenda publication, emailed to Commissioners. *[See attached TIA memo for Shiloh Woods]*

Staff Recommendations: Approval with Conditions:

- TRC/Evolve comments resolved within 60 days of this meeting;
- TIA comments resolved within 90 days of this meeting;
- County Council Approval of Rezoning.

Questions to staff:

Ben Levine asked if changes required due to TIA comments would change the Preliminary Plat. **Davis** responded that significant changes e.g. more than 10-20 feet shift of ingress/egress would require applicant to submit a new Preliminary Plat for approval by Commission.

Comment from applicant(s):

Rob Reddick (Charlotte NC) McAdams Engineering:
Century Communities representative is also here. No additional presentation; the most significant aspects of the TIA comments involve ingress/egress, and applicant has been working with SCDOT to resolve them. The locations have been approved by SCDOT; what remains is to gain necessary easements from adjacent properties to establish correct turn radii. Applicants available for questions from Commissioners.

Questions from Commissioners: None.

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

Rob Reddick (applicant, see above) signed in. No additional comments.

Chairman Deese closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **SD-2022-0733**
Motion to approve, subject to stated staff conditions, by Sheila Hinson; 2nd by Tamecca Neely.

- TRC/Evolve comments resolved within 60 days of this meeting;
- TIA comments resolved within 90 days of this meeting;
- County Council Approval of Rezoning.

Discussion:

Ben Levine asked that in the future, such proposals would not be brought to Planning Commission until the rezoning stage has been heard and approved by Council.

Chairman Deese concurred that this would not happen in the future.

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

Planning Commission makes final decision on Preliminary Plats.

b. DA-2022-0733 Century Communities aka Shiloh Woods

Application by Century Communities for a development agreement for four parcels totaling approximately 169.86 acres located at Williamson Farm Road, and at 500 and 516 W. Shiloh Unity Road (TM#s 0049-00-004.13, 0049-00-004.16, 0049-00-005.01 and 0049-00-005.02) to allow development of a 398-lot Cluster Subdivision.

Staff Presentation: Ashley Davis, Senior Planner, presented the applications consistent with the staff report. (Items 5a and 5b conjoined).

Staff Recommendations: Approval with stated conditions:

- TRC comments resolved within 60 days
- TIA comments resolved within 90 days;
- County Council Approval of Rezoning

Questions to staff:

A. Davis noted that TIA is associated with Development Agreement, and the updated TIA response/revisions are unlikely to be ready before the DA's first reading before Council.

Comment from applicant(s): No additional.

Questions from Commissioners: No additional.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets) None signed in.

Chairman Deese closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **DA-2022-0733** Motion to approve, with stated staff conditions, by **Ben Levine**; 2nd by **James Barnett**.

Discussion:

Ben Levine: asks if at all possible, draft Development Agreements in the future would include stipulations that future potential impact fees must apply. He does not support this development agreement.

Called vote:

B. Levine: Against

T. Neely: For

S. Hinson: For

J. Barnett: For

C. Deese: For

Vote: 4:1. **Motion is approved.**

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

c. RZ-2022-0735 CLREF III Acquisitions LLC aka Nisbet

Application by CLREF III Acquisitions LLC to rezone 5 parcels totaling approximately 780.40 acres located at and adjacent to 8275 Van Wyck Road (TM#: 0022-00-002.00, 0022-00-002.02, 0022-00-002.03, 0022-00-003.00, 0022-00-03.01) from Rural Neighborhood (RN) to medium Density Residential (MDR) to allow development of a 1,019-lot single-family residential cluster subdivision.

Staff Presentation: Ashley Davis, Senior Planner, presented the applications consistent with the staff report. (Items 5c and 5d conjoined). Please note that the attached proposed plat is only for information, and is not binding, as the plan cannot be submitted until the rezoning is secured. 150 acres are covered by existing Conservation Easement, and must remain unbuilt.

Staff Recommendations: Denial of both rezoning and development agreement, based on required traffic mitigation/improvements, as well as incompatibility with Future Land Use (Rural Living) and character of surrounding neighborhood, including Van Wyck's new Comprehensive Plan.

Comment from applicant(s):

Mike Scisciani (Wake Forest NC) Landeavor representative

[see attached slideshow presentation for Nisbet Property]

Landeavor is an award-winning private Master Plan company. Developed Millbridge in Charlotte. Every project is unique. Cluster Development was chosen to preserve natural features; other design elements and amenities preserve the historic features of the site. The plan does include public access trails and kayak launch site. The design includes a community farm with neighborhood farmer's market on weekends. Current zoning does not require curb and gutter development, nor does it have minimum required open space. Development under current zoning would be more detrimental to historic and natural features, with a larger footprint than the design proposed under rezoning. Smaller lot sizes and houses are more affordable. The proposed plan has more than 50% open space (462 acres), far in excess of the 25% required under Cluster Overlay. Plan calls for 1.3 du/a, much less than the allowed 2.5 du/a under Cluster Overlay, and only slightly more than allowed under current zoning (1.0). They specialize in highly amenitized communities, and are eager to work with the county to develop public playing fields. This property will be developed, this plan is the best way to preserve the features the community wants.

Questions from Commissioners: none

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

72 Citizens' Comment emails and letters were submitted to the Clerk in advance of the meeting. [See attached copies, and Summary by Clerk]

Paul Schulz (resident of Treetops) Vice-President of Treetops HOA Board of Directors:

Residents are aware that the area will be developed, but they oppose this plan.

- Not in keeping with farm conservation easements around it;
- The high density and number of homes is not in keeping with community;
- Will have a negative effect on home values;
- Lack of supporting infrastructure especially roads;
- Worsens traffic conditions, adding 2,000+ autos to surrounding roads;
- Worsens condition of Van Wyck road, both from traffic and construction vehicles;
- Will overburden utilities, especially electrical service;
- Inadequate emergency services;
- The Treetops EMS station has never been funded by the County;

Requests that Commission and Council do not approve the rezoning request.

Lyn Reese (Treetops resident): Presenting petition with 649 signatures of residents of Van Wyck and Indian Land. Petition was generated in just 6 days.

Reasons for opposition are:

- Lack of infrastructure;
- Too high density of homes;
- Threat to property values;
- Not in keeping with farm conservation easements.

Rosa Sansbury (resident of Van Wyck): Concerns in agreement of Town of Van Wyck letter. Especially concerned with Steele Hill Road, which will be used by construction. The road is in bad condition and already experiences heavy traffic to 521. There is already significant heavy-truck traffic to industrial site on the road, including hazardous waste. Turning left (north) onto 521 is already hazardous and will only become more difficult as existing projects at Griffin Road and Vantage Apartments are built out. Ten years ago, Steel Hill Road was voted 2nd worst road in Lancaster County. The County repaved the road but used substandard tarmac material which has quickly deteriorated. Please consider these conditions in your vote.

Steve Patton (resident of Treetops): concurs with other comments, and is concerned with how residents will get in and out of their neighborhood.

Emily Nisbet (Hendersonville NC) part owner of Nisbet property: 5th generation of Nisbet property owners. Have worked for years to preserve the heritage of the property. Landeavor has committed to preserving over 50% of the land, as well as historic sites and other features on site. The family wants a development that will preserve their family's heritage and conserve the beautiful features of the site.

Stewart Graham (Lancaster SC): representing The Ivey Place, working farm and event venue founded by his parents. Serves thousands of people a year; concerned about the high density of the proposed development next to a farm and an event venue. This is not the right location for the proposed subdivision.

Roy Sansbury (Van Wyck): Lancaster County recently invested in a study to create the Small Area Plan (Panhandle) and SAP Extension. An important finding was that there not be a continuation of the overdevelopment taking place in Indian Land coming farther south into the County. The traffic study indicates a future need for a light at Steel Hill road, which is in contradiction to the SP call for fewer traffic stops going south. Another inconsistency is the Rural Living designation in the County's Comprehensive Plan, which directly contradicts what the proposed plan shows.

Rebuttal by Applicants:

Many of the issues presented are problems whether or not this proposal is approved. Treetops (MDR Cluster) and Light Industrial sites are nearby, so the proposal is not inconsistent with the neighborhood. The developer will be working with LCW&SD to upgrade water and sewer service. The surrounding easements should not restrict the Nisbet family's ability to develop the rest of their property.

Chairman Deese closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **RZ-2022-0735** Motion to approve (in the interest of an affirmative motion) by **Ben Levine**; 2nd by **James Barnett**.

Discussion:

Ben Levine: He does not support the proposal. The area has a very rural feel, which would not be enhanced by such dense development; other developments in the area have created buffers making them invisible from the road. Also, there is no benefit to having a development agreement since impact fees would apply in either case.

Tamecca Neely: She does not support, given the lack of consistency with Future Land Use, Van Wyck's Comprehensive Plan, and the limitations on infrastructure in the area and effects on school district.

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

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

d. DA-2022-0735 CLREF III Acquisitions LLC aka Nisbet

Development Agreement by CLREF III Acquisitions LLC for 5 parcels totaling approximately 780.40 acres located at and adjacent to 8275 Van Wyck Road (TM#: 0022-00-002.00, 0022-00-002.02, 0022-00-002.03, 0022-00-003.00, 0022-00-03.01) for a 1,019-lot single-family residential cluster subdivision.

Staff Presentation: Ashley Davis, Senior Planner, presented the applications consistent with the staff report. (Items 5c and 5d conjoined). Reminder to audience that Planning Commission is a recommending body, County Council has the final decision on both the rezoning and the development agreement.

Staff Recommendations: Denial, due to stated concerns (see previous item).

Comment from applicant(s):

Chaplain Spencer (Rock Hill) attorney: available for questions.

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

[See attachments under previous item 5c: Nisbet Rezoning]

Jimmy White [yields time]

Robert Yoder (Van Wyck): lives adjacent to subject property. He opposes the development. Family owns Oakdale Farm, a working farm. Has a 4,000-foot border with Nisbet Property. There is only a 25-foot setback along their property line, which would mean they would be looking at 400-500 houses in their backyard. Asks that the County require a 300-foot buffer and an 8-foot chain link fence on the property line. We hunt and fish on our land and safety is a concern, we would lose the use of over 125 acres of their property for hunting. Traffic has increased 300-400% on Van Wyck Road since Sun City and TreeTops were developed. The roads and schools cannot stand the increase of cars and students. Conservation Easements should not be considered part of the open space requirement for the development.

Cricket Harper [signed by mistake, speaking to Alcott Village item]

Linda Pelletier (Van Wyck): 20-year resident of Van Wyck in opposition to the Nisbet Development. She is also representing the Town of Van Wyck as a member of their Planning Commission. Reasons for opposition:

The plan is not compatible with definition of Rural Living by Van Wyck and by County standards;

- The density far exceeds that of the adjacent Town;
- The proposal encroaches on valuable agricultural properties, and community landmark The Ivey Place;
- Current infrastructure and all-volunteer fire department cannot support influx of cars and people, will result in injuries and fatalities
- Planning is not about tax value or profits, it is about preserving values, quality of life, and green space.

Please consider the County's own research for recent area plans, and recent feedback from Comprehensive Plan Forums, and deny the proposal.

Nancy Graham [yields time]

Genie Graham [yields time]

Chairman Deese closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **DA-2022-0735 Motion to deny** by **James Barnett**; 2nd by **Sheila Hinson**.

Discussion: no additional.

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

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

[Chairman Deese called a recess at 7:20 PM. Meeting Resumed at 7:26 PM.]

e. RZ-2022-1357 D.R. Horton aka Asbury Lane

Application by D.R. Horton to rezone 7 parcels totaling approximately 95.85 acres (TMs 0007-00-022.00, 0007-00-022.01, 0007-00-022.02, 0007-00-022.03, 0007-00-022.04, 0007-00-022.05, 0007-00-023.06) located west of the intersection of Possum Hollow Road and Old Bailes Road from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Medium Density Residential, with the intent to develop a 196-unit single-family lot subdivision.

Staff Presentation: Matthew Blaszyk, Planner, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: Approval on basis of findings, with caveat that Council and Indian Land residents have recently indicated opposition to further development in the area.

Questions to staff:

Staff provided clarification that a TIA was not required for this submission since lack of Cluster Overlay designation required no Development Agreement; data from prior TIA was provided for reference purposes only. County and SCDOT did not complete comments/review of the prior TIA.

Comment from applicant(s):

Andrew Grant (Charlotte NC) BGE Engineering:

[see attached slideshow presentation Asbury/D.R. Horton]

While some nearby neighborhoods have larger lots, several including northern Bridgemill phase and Fox Ridge have similarly sized lots. Most recent sketch plan shows a reduction of lots to 170, yielding a density of 1.78 du/a. The plan includes amenity areas and trails. Applicants have submitted TIA revision today addressing prior comments by SCDOT and staff.

Questions from Commissioners:

Ben Levine: Have you discussed with staff a way to stipulate e.g. Development Agreement that Cluster Subdivision will not be requested in future revisions of this project? **Grant** responded that the client has no intention of pursuing CSO. **Dan Ballou** (attorney) applicant has had conversations with staff and county attorney regarding development agreement, but after CSO was denied last year, has developed a new plan and does not want to go through redesign and resubmission to Commission and Council that would be required for CSO. Would be open to creating a development agreement if Council desires and can commit to not using CSO.

B. Levine asked staff if there was any way to address his concern that CSO would re-emerge in future design revisions, he would like assurance that it could not be changed to CSO later. How could this concern or recommendation be conveyed to Council?

R. Burhans responded that such concerns or recommendations could be included in staff's report to Council on Planning Commission referred items.

J. Barnett concurred with MR. Levine that without a development agreement, there were a lot of "what ifs."

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

[One email comment was received in advance of the meeting, see copy attached]

Andrew Grant (applicant/developer): no further comment.

Troy Korski (applicant/developer) no additional comments

Conrad Trapp: not present.

Dan Ballou (attorney for developer): no additional comments.

Chairman Deese closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **RZ-2022-1357** Discussion ensued regarding the form of the motion, whether to phrase as condition or recommendation.

Motion to approve, with recommendation to Council that the property be developed by-right and not as Cluster Subdivision, by **Ben Levine**; 2nd by **James Barnett**.

Discussion: no additional comments or discussion

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

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

f. SD-2022-1135 McIlwain Holdings LLC aka Alcott Village

Application by McIlwain Holdings LLC for a Preliminary Plat for 51.28 acres (TM# 0102-00-120.00) located on the east side of McIlwain Road between Hunters Ridge Road and Suttle Road, for a 99-lot single-family subdivision.

Staff Presentation: Ashley Davis, Senior Planner, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: Conditional Approval, pending resolution of TIA comments within 60 days. There are no significant unresolved TRC comments.

Questions to staff:

Ben Levine requested that TRC comments be included in future staff reports, even if minor.

Comment from applicant(s):

Chris Wood (York SC) Civil Engineer:

SCDOT has approved the TIA. Lancaster County Water & Sewer will serve the property, with upgrades to adjacent pump and lift stations.

Questions from Commissioners: no additional.

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

Arthur “Cricket” Harper (resident): Owns land adjacent to the subject property. He hunts on his land, asks that the developer ensure some type of permanent barrier to prevent injuries; is also concerned about the traffic impact on that road.

Ron Capitini: not present.

Chris Harper (McIlwain Road resident): Concerned about the number of houses and increased traffic, foresees safety issues. Would like a larger easement next to adjacent properties. He has a pond on his property, and is concerned about safety especially if children trespass. Would prefer a smaller development/fewer homes.

Chairman Deese closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **SD-2022-1135** Motion to approve, with stated staff conditions (resolution of TIA comments within 60 days) by **Ben Levine**; 2nd by **James Barnett**.

Discussion:

Ben Levine asked for clarification about the zoning of the property: already zoned MDR, the plan was by-right density under ordinance and no rezoning or Cluster Overlay was requested.

Tamecca Neely stated that recent comments by School District indicated that this development would not adversely affect the schools in the surrounding area. Nonetheless, she would like Council to explore expanding school impact fees to other parts of the County south of Highway 5 as they have done in Indian Land.

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

Planning Commission makes final decision on Preliminary Plats.

6. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Overview of Next Month's Agenda: One single-parcel rezoning submitted for November calendar. Two others have had discussions with staff but have not submitted documents.
- b. Other
 - Clerk will send email regarding an upcoming CE event via Zoom that the County can host if there is sufficient interest.
 - The last Comprehensive plan Key Topic Forum will be held Thursday, October 27, 2022 at CrossRidge, on the topic of Transportation.

7. ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn by James Barnett; 2nd by Sheila Hinson. Motion approved by unanimous consent. Meeting adjourned at **8:16 p.m.**

ATTACHMENT:
LETTER FROM
COMMISSIONER PATTERSON

Alan Patterson
Lancaster County Planning Commission
District 1

Dear Fellow Commissioners,

Unfortunately, I must be out of town Tuesday and will miss our monthly meeting. I am very disappointed because I believe what we do is important and that our voice to our county council is heard.

There are four agenda items that I want to share my thoughts on in my absence.

First, SD-2022-0733 Century Communities aka Shiloh Woods. This project is not ready for our agenda, much less approval. There are TRC items to resolve, as well as numerous TIA items to resolve. I am not comfortable approving a preliminary plat with so many items outstanding. This project has not been rezoned yet so I think that it was presented to us too soon and incomplete. I believe the applicant should withdraw and resubmit when complete. I believe that this developer's struggles to date reflect its ability to follow through and complete a quality project. Lastly, I believe that the entrance configuration is problematic for current and future homeowners.

Second, DA-2022-0733 Century Communities aka Shiloh Woods. In article 4, no impact fees are assessed in this project. I am sure there is a simple explanation but I believe that new development should pay their share of the impact of development, no matter where it is in the county.

Third, RZ-2022-0735 CLREF III Acquisitions aka Nisbet. This project is inconsistent with the rural nature of the area as well as the desire of our town of Van Wyck neighbors to maintain a rural lifestyle. I spoke to the Chief of the Van Wyck fire station and he emphatically told me that his station is not prepared nor will it be prepared to protect another 1,019 homes. The Fire Protection District money is not enough yet to build the facilities needed to cover the district with higher density. He also informed me that in the years that he sat on the county fire commission he never saw any plans or plats of any kind to provide input as to whether local first responders could protect a development.

The plan also uses approximately 150 acres of public conservation land to meet its open space requirement. This should not be allowed.

It seems clear to me that County Council wants to slow development.

Ditto for Development agreement.

Fourth, RZ-2022-1357 D.R. Horton aka Asbury Lane. There are 15 "items of interest" concerning the applicant's TIA report. It is incomprehensible to me that adding 283 additional single family residents does not need any Traffic mitigation measures as noted on page 373 of our packet. Old Bailes and Possum Holler roads are already stressed. We cannot add additional homes without better traffic management.

Thank you for hearing me out and thank you for your commitment to Lancaster County.

Sincerely,
Alan Patterson
District One Planning Commissioner

ATTACHMENT: SIGN -IN SHEETS



PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Item 3: CITIZEN'S COMMENTS

General Comments or comments on matters not on tonight's agenda.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, October 18, 2022

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

PLEASE PRINT

1.	Donna Hagins
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	



PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Item 5b: DA-2022-0733 Century Communities aka Shiloh Woods

Application by Century Communities for a development agreement for four parcels totaling approximately 169.86 acres located at Williamson Farm Road, and at 500 and 516 W. Shiloh Unity Road (TM#s 0049-00-004.13, 0049-00-004.16, 0049-00-005.01 and 0049-00-005.02) to allow development of a 398-lot Cluster Subdivision.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, October 18, 2022

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

PLEASE PRINT

1.
2.
3.
4.



PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Item 5a: SD-2022-0733 Century Communities aka Shiloh Woods

Application by Century Communities for a Preliminary Plat for four parcels totaling approximately 169.86 acres located at and adjacent to 500 and 516 W. Shiloh Unity Road (TM#s 0049-00-004.130049-00-004.16, 0049-00-005.01 and 0049-00-005.02) to allow development of a 398-lot Cluster Subdivision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Rob Reddick", is written over the signature line.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, October 18, 2022

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

PLEASE PRINT

1.	Rob Reddick
2.	
3.	
4.	



PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Item 5c: RZ-2022-0735 CLREF III Acquisitions LLC aka Nisbet

Application by CLREF III Acquisitions LLC to rezone 5 parcels totaling approximately 780.40 acres located at and adjacent to 8275 Van Wyck Road (TM#: 0022-00-002.00, 0022-00-002.02, 0022-00-002.03, 0022-00-003.00, 0022-00-03.01) from Rural Neighborhood (RN) to medium Density Residential (MDR) to allow development of a 1,019-lot single-family residential cluster subdivision.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, October 18, 2022

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

PLEASE PRINT

✓ 1.	PAUL SCHULZ
✓ 2.	Lyn Reese
✓ 3.	Paul Tessione Rosa Sansbury
✓ 4.	Steve Patton

✓ 5. Emmy Nisbet

✓ 6. Stuart Graham

✓ 7. Roy Sandberg

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.



PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Item 5d: DA-2022-0735 CLREF III Acquisitions LLC aka Nisbet

Development Agreement by CLREF III Acquisitions LLC for 5 parcels totaling approximately 780.40 acres located at and adjacent to 8275 Van Wyck Road (TM#: 0022-00-002.00, 0022-00-002.02, 0022-00-002.03, 0022-00-003.00, 0022-00-03.01) for a 1,019-lot single-family residential cluster subdivision.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, October 18, 2022

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

PLEASE PRINT

✓ 1.	Jimmy White
✓ 2.	Bob Yoder
✓ 3.	John E (Erin) Hays McLellan Holding
✓ 4.	Linda Pelletier

✓ 5.

Nancy Graham

✓ 6.

Genie Graham

7.

~~Susan Helgott~~

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "D. R. Horton", is located to the left of the main title.

PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Item 5e: RZ-2022-1357 D.R. Horton aka Asbury Lane

Application by D.R. Horton to rezone 7 parcels totaling approximately 95.85 acres (TMs 0007-00-022.00, 0007-00-022.01, 0007-00-022.02, 0007-00-022.03, 0007-00-022.04, 0007-00-022.05, 0007-00-023.06) located west of the intersection of Possum Hollow Road and Old Bailes Road from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Medium Density Residential, with the intent to develop a 196-unit single-family lot subdivision.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, October 18, 2022

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

PLEASE PRINT

✓ 1.	ANDREW GRANT, BGE
✓ 2.	Troy Karski, DR Horton
3.	CONRAD TRAPP *

✓ 4. Dan Ballou

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.



PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Item 5f: SD-2022-1135 McIlwain Holdings LLC aka Alcott Village

Application by McIlwain Holdings LLC for a Preliminary Plat for 51.28 acres (TM# 0102-00-120.00) located on the east side of McIlwain Road between Hunters Ridge Road and Suttle Road, for a 99-lot single-family subdivision.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Tuesday, October 18, 2022

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

PLEASE PRINT

1.	RON CAPITANI	X	not an meeting
2.	Chris Harper		
3.	CRICKET HARPER		
4.			

ATTACHMENT:

Item 3: Citizens' Comments

3 Emails and Summary

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

for October 18, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting

Item 3: General Citizens' Comments

General Comments or comments on matters not on tonight's agenda.

- Gloria & Walt Hein
- Elaine Molnar (1 of 2)
- C & G Bonacorsi

General concerns:

- Infrastructure overload
- Traffic/road overcrowding
- School overcrowding

Specific concerns:

- Hwy 521/Van Wyck Road intersection
- Entrance/exit to apartment complex near intersection
- New Indy "stench" and location in residential area

From: [Gloria Hein](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Growth in Indian Land, SC
Date: Thursday, October 13, 2022 10:56:59 AM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender gloriahein7@gmail.com

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

My husband and I are residents of Carolina Lakes. Terry Graham is our council representative. He does an excellent job of keeping us abreast of what is happening in our area. We are concerned about the tremendous amount of development in this area; especially of apartment and multi-plex units.. We do not feel the infrastructure in this area can accommodate a higher population in the schools. Also of particular concern are the overcrowding of the roads as well as the provision of utilities .We ask that you would not approve further development until the infrastructure can be upgraded.

Thank you.

Gloria and Walt Hein
gloriahein7@gmail.com

MOLNAR I

From: [Elaine Molnar](#)
To: [Dennis E. Marstall](#); [Sherrie Simpson](#); [Jennifer Bryan](#); [rburhans@lanaster.net](#); [Terry Graham](#); [cmcgriff@comporium.net](#); [Billy Mosteller](#); [lhoney@comporium.net](#); [Steve Harper](#); [Allen Blackmon](#); [Brian Carnes](#)
Cc: [Elaine Molnar](#)
Subject: Concerned Tree Tops Community Resident
Date: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 11:42:57 AM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender emolnar@carolina.rr.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

As a resident of Indian Land, I am inquiring about the logic behind the planning of residential growth in this area without adequate infrastructure and schools to support this growth. When does the planning commission meet with the transportation commission to share the feasibility of road expansion to accommodate planned growth? Are the member of the planning commission aware of the traffic congestion in this area? Are the planning commission decisions based on common sense or increased revenue?

Case in point: What are the plans to manage the traffic on the corner of Hwy. 521 and Van Wyck Road upon completion of the approved apartment complex? How are the apartment residents going to enter/exit this complex?

Response requested.

Are the political leaders of Lancaster aware of the Indian Land residents' concerns about the "stench in the air" and its impact on their health? It appears the political leaders' concern revolves around revenue rather than the health and well being of the citizens. Is New Indy Containerboard in a residential area logical? Let's be proactive in our decisions.

Commentary:

Being unaware of problems is not a viable excuse. "Oops!" is not part of planning.

From: [Cathy](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Please stop the madness!
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 10:55:58 AM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender bonacorsicathy@gmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

My husband and I moved here from Florida 3 years ago to get away from the craziness , overcrowding, all the out of control building. We are shocked at how out of control the building of community after community along 521 is! It is actually worse than Florida had become. It is like you guys are tax drunk and that is all you are thinking about. NO THOUGHT FOR ALL THE CONGESTION YOU HAVE CAUSED!!! Shame on you for such horrible planning! Just tax \$. That's all you are thinking of. Shame shame on you!

Cathy and Gary Bonacorsi

Sent from my iPad

ATTACHMENT:

Item 5a & 5b Shiloh Woods:

TIA COMMENTS MEMO

1. Overview of Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report

Ramey Kemp submitted a traffic impact analysis report for single family housing development that will access West Shiloh Unity Road just west of US 521. J. Andrew Eagle is the Engineer on Record (EOR) for producing the detailed traffic study. Four intersections were analyzed for impacts – US 521 at West Shiloh Unity Road/Shiloh Unity Road, US 521 at University Drive/Old Charlotte Road, University Drive at Hubbard Drive, and University Drive at W. Shiloh Unity Road. Also, two access point locations were reviewed on West Shiloh Unity Road for the development that are located offset north and south of Havenwood Drive. The overall report contained existing, no-build, and build traffic volumes for all study locations and good breakdown of volumes and distribution among all study locations. The analysis period for build out +1 year was not included but for the build out year only. Primary concerns are the driveway offsets on West Shiloh Road with Havenwood Drive, the strip of land for southern access being wide enough to accommodate a full access drive, and mitigation needs. Report needs some adjustments to get a true understanding of issues at the study locations.

2. Items of Interest in the TIA Report

The TIA document was redlined with marks highlighting interest items below (pages noted below reflect pdf pages and not report pages):

- Page 2 – Lancaster County is in South Carolina and not North Carolina
- Page 3 – Build out year is 2029 and the analysis for No-Build and Build was for 2029 and not 2030 for Build +1 year. Volumes needed to grow for an additional year per Lancaster UDO.
- Page 4 – For trip generation used peak hour adjacent street traffic and not peak hour traffic which tends to be a little more trips.
- Page 5 – Recommending left turn lane by Lancaster Landing but report says no additional improvements were reviewed – would not recommend additional lanes on same approach at an All-Way stop control due to right of way movement issues.
- Page 6 – Statement says that improvements are needed but not associated with Shiloh Woods even though volumes are attributed to this location at US 521 at University Drive/Old Charlotte Road.
- Page 6 – Recommends R-Cut (Restricted Crossing U-Turn intersection) for US 521 at University Drive/Old Charlotte Road – but did not perform an analysis for a signal and/or additional turn lanes. Issues with R-Cut would be driveway restrictions upstream and downstream on US 521 and placement of U-turns in driveway areas would need to be verified.
- Page 7 – Recommended Lane configuration shows separate right turn lanes on University Drive EB and WB at Hubbard Drive and these lanes are not present. Also shows additional turn lanes for the NB and SB approach of Hubbard Drive at University Drive and would not recommend due to All-Way stop control.
- Page 11 – Did not perform analysis for Build year + 1 year for 2030.
- Page 15 – Southern access shows radii encroachment onto adjoining properties and not a 5' offset as required by SCDOT.

Traffic Impact Analysis Review – Lancaster County – Shiloh Woods Technical Memorandum

- Page 15 – The report does not mention, or site plan show dimensions of the proposed access points from a reference point.
- Page 19 – Analysis for 2029 build out year and not 2030 for Build + 1 year.
- Page 20 – 3.3 statement says no roadway improvements are expected but the report shows improvements by Lancaster Landing adding turn lanes on Hubbard Drive.
- Page 24 – used adjacent peak hour traffic and not peak hour traffic which gives more trips during the peak hour
- Page 34 – State that queuing is from University EB at US 521 is affecting University EB at Hubbard. Did not see verification or drawing reference showing the distance between the two intersections and queuing.
- Page 35 – WB approach drops to LOS D where Shiloh traffic added.
- Page 36 – US 521 at University/Old Charlotte states that additional lanes was considered but was it tested to determine improvements? Signal also could be considered at a skewed intersection if warranted.
- Page 37 – Recommended R-Cut mitigation for US 521 at University/Old Charlotte but would like to see additional mitigation tested due to impacts by this development.
- Page 66 – SCDOT Synchro defaults – use calculated PHF from counts in Synchro and not .9.
- Page 75 – Appears that the SCDOT signal plan was not used in the modeling of the signal at US 521 at Shiloh Unity Road. Should use base plan for all scenarios for comparisons and optimized for mitigation. Left turn phase green is too low and would not represent actual timings in the field.
- Page 98 – University at Hubbard shows that additional turn lanes were modeled in Synchro for EB/WB University where there should be just one lane approaches.
- Page 116 – Should use SCDOT turn lane graphs located in the Road Design Manual P 9.5-8 for lefts.
- Page 117 - Should use SCDOT turn lane graphs located in the Road Design Manual P 9.5-2 for rights.

3. Checklist Comments

Attached is a TIA checklist that reviews all submitted information for proper TIA submittal. The analysis period did reflect UDO 6.8.2 D for analysis year after development which would be 2030 (Build plus 1 year). The TIA did not review driveway sight distance (usually covered under site plan permitting). Did not verify signalization at US 521 at University/Old Charlotte. Modeled 2 approach lane on University at Hubbard where there is one lane.

4. Recommendations

- 1. Verify sight distance for all access points.**
- 2. Update Trip generation and Growth for increased trip distribution.**
- 3. Update modeling for All-Way stop control at University Drive and Hubbard Drive to understand the need for additional mitigation where queue lengths are excessive. Shiloh Woods is adding traffic increasing the queue lengths and delays. Model needs to show one lane approaches on University Drive. Statement on queues from the EB approach on University Drive at US 521 affecting the Hubbard intersection - if no effect from these queues, then what happens to the intersection in a model? Would not add additional turn lanes on Hubbard Drive at an All-Way stop control so model Build scenario without these turn lanes.**
- 4. Use a base signal plan to model US 521 at W. Shiloh Unity and Shiloh Unity Road for all scenarios for reference point to determine impacts. Then mitigate timings as an option. Good to use SCDOT signal plan as a base.**
- 5. Need to see the effect of a signal and additional lanes at US 521 at University Drive/Old Charlotte Road instead of the recommended R-Cut.**
- 6. Verify spacing locations of the two access point locations offset from Havenwood Drive and verify turn lane needs for both using SCDOT graphs found in the Road Design Manual.**

ATTACHMENT:

Item 5c and 5d:

Nisbet Property

TIA COMMENTS MEMO

1. Overview of Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report

Kimley Horn submitted a traffic impact analysis report for single family housing development that will access Van Wyck Road south of Tree Tops subdivision. Amy Massey is the Engineer on Record (EOR) for producing the detailed traffic study. Seven intersections were analyzed for impacts – US 521 at Van Wyck Road/Faith Presbyterian Driveway, US 521 at Steel Hill Road, US 521 at W. Rebound Road/E. Rebound Road, Rock Hill Highway (SC 5) at Steel Hill Road, Rock Hill Road (SC 5) at Rebound Road/Riverside Road, Van Wyck Road at W. Rebound Road, Van Wyck Road at Steel Hill Road. Also, five access point locations were reviewed on Van Wyck Road for the development on the east and west side of the road. The overall report contained a good breakdown of volumes and distribution among all study locations. The analysis period for build out included the proposed year of 2031 plus one year for a 2032 modeling period. There were some unacceptable levels of services for certain movements at intersections and the report showed mitigation for all mentioned in the report.

2. Items of Interest in the TIA Report

The TIA document was redlined with marks highlighting interest items below (pages noted below reflect pdf pages and not report pages):

- Page 5– US 521 at Van Wyck Road recommends auxiliary lane on US 521 northbound to improve LOS at the intersection to allow additional movement for US 521 to take away green time from this movement to add time to the predicated heavy left turn from Van Wyck Road.
- Page 6 – Van Wyck Road at Steel Hill Road – suggest All -Way Stop Control – would recommend performing warrant analysis and install prior to development build out. Might be justified based on sight distance issues.
- Page 25 – US 521 at Van Wyck Road – construction of 300' SB left turn lane on US 521 – might consider extending to the additional lane on US 521 that tapers about 1200' north of this intersection to accommodate the heavy right turn movement and prevent a merging taper and a deceleration taper.
- Page 29 – US 521 at Steel Hill – Steel Hill and Niven would need to eventually line up on US 521 for future improvements especially for a traffic signal.
- Page 34 – Van Wyck Road at Steel Hill Road – Verify All-Way Stop Warrants and install – might be based on sight distance issues.
- Page 35 – Van Wyck Road at Access 1/Ivy Place – Verify Sight distance and would mirror construction of left turn lane into Ivy Place for safety and consistency in roadway geometry.
- Page 36 – Van Wyck Road at Access 2 & 3 - verify sight distance.
- Page 37 – Van Wyck Road at Access 4 – verify sight distance (could be issues with horizontal curve on Van Wyck Road); consider extending left turn bay up to Access 2 left turn lane (three lane section) to prevent hourglass effect on Van Wyck Road where there will be a short tangent section on Van Wyck Road between the two tapers.
- Page 38 – Van Wyck Road at Access 5 – verify sight distance

3. Checklist Comments

Attached is a TIA checklist that reviews all submitted information for proper TIA submittal. The analysis period did reflect UDO 6.8.2 D for analysis year after development which would be 2032 (Build plus 1 year). The TIA did not review driveway sight distance (usually covered under site plan permitting).

4. Recommendations

1. **Verify sight distance for all access points.**
2. **Mitigation for US 521 at Van Wyck Road needs to be looked at for whether negating the additional lane on NB US 521 due to tapers or extend to Jim Wilson Road as a right turn lane drop instead of tapering where numerous driveways are located. This improvement is used to allow more green time for the predicted heavy left turn movement off Van Wyck Road.**
3. **Conduct All-Way Stop Control analysis for Van Wyck Road at Steel Hill Road and implement.**
4. **Consider left turn lane for Ivy Place since the recommendation for left turn lane for Access 1 across from it. This will eliminate confusion for motorist meeting offset trying to make left turns at the same time – safety issue.**
5. **Consider extending the left turn lanes between Access 2 and 4 to eliminate tapers and hourglass effect (create 3-lane section between the access points on Van Wyck Road).**
6. **Need to verify partnership with Catawba COG over improvements at SC 5 and Steel Hill Road and at SC 5 and Riverside/Rebound Road.**

ATTACHMENT:

Items 5c & 5d: Nisbet Property
72 Emails/Letters & Summary

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

for October 18, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting

Item 5c: RZ-2022-0735 CLREF III Acquisitions LLC aka Nisbet

Item 5d: DA-2022-0735 CLREF III Acquisitions LLC aka Nisbet

71 Emails and letters were submitted; 3 prior to publication and 68 after publication of agenda. **All were statements in opposition to the Nisbet proposal.**

Of highest concern were the topics of traffic congestion on Van Wyck Road and its nearby intersections; infrastructure concerns, in particular road conditions/width, water & sewer service, and Duke Energy service; school overcrowding; capacity and response time for emergency & safety services; and the negative impact on the rural character of the area.

Attached to Agenda:

Russ Knutson (1p.)

Dawn Eckholm (1p.)

Linda Pelletier (2 pp.)

Received after Agenda publication:

Town of Van Wyck

Desiree Accetturo
Allan & Betty Ahner
Robert Arnold
Cheryl Badorrek
Devon Bagley
Maria Baker (2 pp)
Joan Baron
David Bates
N.S. Bentley
Valerie Brassell
Heather Breedlove
Susan Brown
Gregory Chase (2 pp)
Stephanie Conklin
Courtney Crowell
Ann Marie Dudek
Jean Fritchley
Deb Fulcoly
Megan Gaissert
Sylvia Gilland (2 pp.)
James Gore
Marie- Helene Grabman
Cathy Grady
Elizabeth Greenan
Madelyn Greenspan
Jen Kocsak
Larry Kopyta
Anthony Koszalinski
S. & R. Livingston
Patricia Loggia
C & P Maida
Clare McConaughay
Thomas McKnight
Elaine Molnar (2 of 2) (3pp)
Margaret Norris

Patricia Oglesby
Kay Ostram
Judy Overhulz
Steve Patton
Melissa Pelletrino
Fred Peltz
Allison Peterson
Sharon Peterson
Diane Ramsay
Mike Reddy
Ann Richardson
Brenda Sadler
Dan Sadvary (2 pp.)
Dan Saffer (2 pp)
Paul Schulz (2 pp)
Sandy Sharer
John Sheehan
Donna Sigman
Sharon Summers
Tylee Tracer-Anderson
Diane Tracey
Glenn Trutner (2 pp.)
Jen Tsonas
Betsy Ulibarri (2 pp.) (1 of 2)
Betsy Ulibarri (2 of 2)
Ronald Ulibarri (3 pp.)
Gail Vance
Richard Vaughan
Matthew Walgren
Anne White
Jimmy White (2 pp)
Beverly Williams
Carol Yow

Summary of comments/issues raised:

- 51 Traffic (Van Wyck Road)
- 49 Infrastructure/water & sewer/ road condition
- 14 Conservation/Preservation/ Green spaces
- 3 No Sidewalks on major thoroughfares
- 20 Noise & safety on roads
- 18 Too many developments already
- 25 Violates Quality of life/community character/Future Land Use
- 22 School overcrowding
- 2 Lack of school buses/children must walk
- 5 Pollution/Littering
- 7 Density too high
- 16 Safety/Emergency Services response
- 10 Violates farm and/or conservation easements
- 6 Violates Van Wyck density regulations (1 du/acre)
- 3 Lack of involvement of Town of Van Wyck in Planning process
- 1 Berms and sound buffers needed
- 5 Improvements needed at nearby intersections
- 5 New turn lanes needed
- 5 Developer should pay for all improvements and maintenance
- 6 Corporate Credentials of CLREF III Acquisitions, Landeavor and Nisbet Properties LLC (Nisbet Applicants)
- 5 Pollution from sewer pump station
- 10 Duke energy insufficient service
- 3 Preserving Historic properties / Native American sites
- 8 Negative impact on the Ivey Place
- 4 Negative impact on home values
- 1 Stormwater runoff
- 1 Danger to cyclists on Van Wyck Road
- 2 Lack of stores and restaurants
- 1 Traffic signals not synchronized
- 1 Quality and aesthetics of proposed development
- 1 Didn't see signs posted

Other matters:

- 2 Oppose Billboards on Hwy 521
- 20 Traffic from Vantage Apartments
- 1 Limit truck traffic through Town of Van Wyck



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 11, 2022, 10:59AM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion: Proposed 1,000 home development on Van Wyck RD.

Meeting Date: November 10, 2022 10:51 AM


Full Name
First Name: Russ
Last Name: Knutson

Phone Number 2628535568

Email rknutson1954@gmail.com

Address: 1939 Tranquility Blvd., Lancaster, SC 29720

Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item: I am opposed to this development, Van Wyck RD cannot handle the traffic from 1,000 homes.



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 10, 2022, 10:14PM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion: Nisbit concept plan

Meeting Date: October 18, 2022 06:00 PM

Full Name
First Name: Dawn
Last Name: Eckholm

Phone Number 7049755114

Email mrs_eck2001@hotmail.com

Address: 3254 Oliver Stanley trail Tree Tops Lancaster, SC 29720

Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item: Oppose this development due to infrastructure and not keeping with the farm easements. Van Wyck cannot handle the extra traffic. Van Wyck fire department cannot handle the extra population.

From: [Linda Pelletier](#)
To: [Terry Graham](#); [cmcgriff@comporium.net](#); [Billy Mosteller](#); [lhoney@comporium.net](#); [Steve Harper](#); [Allen Blackmon](#); [Brian Carnes](#); [Rox Burhans](#); [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Cc: [Maggie Norris](#); [sean.corcoran](#)
Subject: Nisbet Property development
Date: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 1:54:28 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender lindampelletier@gmail.com

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

To Whom It May Concern,

Van Wyck is a special oasis in which to live, and we work very hard together to keep that from changing. Allowing a development of the proposed size and density would irrevocably change the fabric of our small community, and not for the better.

- The developer should be required to abide by Van Wyck density regulations of one house per acre and/or conservation development standards to keep the area in harmony with the community surrounding it. Due to its proximity and effect on the town of Van Wyck, the Town should be intimately involved with the planning and construction standards.
- Berms and other permanent sound buffers should be installed between the development and the surrounding farms, particularly The Ivy Place, which is an important regional event venue and historical property.
- The development will necessitate the construction of sidewalks on our major arteries for the safe passage of our citizens who walk through. The developer should install the sidewalks on Steele Hill from Van Wyck Rd. to Old Hickory Rd.
- Road improvements or alterations should be made concurrent with the construction of the development, due to the obvious impending danger involved for everyone and the time required to build them.
 - Stoplight at 521 and Steele Hill Rd.
 - Stoplight at Steele Hill Rd and Hwy. 5.
 - Stoplight or, at the very least, 4-way stop at Steele Hill and Van Wyck Rd.
 - Turn lanes for the development on Van Wyck Rd.
 - Truck traffic should somehow be limited through town. These are our homes and children play in their yards. A constant barrage of construction trucks is noisy and dangerous for our residents, both young and old.
- ALL construction traffic should be REQUIRED to access the development

from Hwy. 521, using Van Wyck Rd.

- Final approval for this development, once adapted to the area, should be contingent upon the developer accepting the financial burden of any and all road alterations, berms, sidewalks, and stoplights - in short, any changes to our town that would be required to maintain our standard of living and lifestyle.

Thank you for your attention and time. I implore you to not rezone this property, nor approve this development in its current form, but require *at the very least* that the plans be adapted to fit in a rural neighborhood setting.


Linda M. Pelletier

5085 Old Hickory Road, Van Wyck, SC

--

"It is easier to build strong children than to repair broken men." Frederick Douglass

"There can be no keener revelation of a society's soul than the way in which it treats its children." Nelson Mandela



THE TOWN OF

VAN WYCK

October 14, 2022

VIA EMAIL

To:

The Lancaster County Planning Commission and Lancaster County Council
planning@lancastersc.net; rburhans@lancastersc.net; tgraham@lancastersc.net; cmcgriff@comporium.net;
bmosteller@lancastersc.net; lhoney@comporium.net; steveharper@lancastersc.net; ablackmon@lancastersc.net;
briancarnes@lancastersc.net; JBryan@lancastersc.net

cc: planning@townofvanwyck.net; town.council@townofvanwyck.net

Re: Comments from the Town of Van Wyck, South Carolina regarding:

[RZ-2022-0735 CLREFIII Acquisitions aka Nisbet](#)

Application by CLREF III Acquisitions LLC to rezone 5 parcels totaling approximately 780.40 acres located at and adjacent to 8275 Van Wyck Road (TM#: 0022-00-002.00, 0022-00-002.02, 0022-00-002.03, 0022-00-003.00, 0022-00-03.01) from Rural Neighborhood (RN) to medium Density Residential (MDR) to allow development of a 1,019-lot single-family residential cluster subdivision.

[DA-2022-0735 CLREFIII Acquisitions aka Nisbet](#)

Development Agreement by CLREF III Acquisitions LLC for 5 parcels totaling approximately 780.40 acres located at and adjacent to 8275 Van Wyck Road (TM#: 0022-00-002.00, 0022-00-002.02, 0022-00-002.03, 0022-00-003.00, 0022-00-03.01) for a 1,019-lot single-family residential cluster subdivision.

Greetings:

Members of the Van Wyck Town Council and Planning Commission, after review of the proposed application and after receiving feedback from town residents, respectfully request the Lancaster County Planning Commission decline to advance the application. Thank you for receiving and incorporating the following comments into your deliberations on the above proposed rezoning application and development agreement.

The Proposed Subdivision does not meet the Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan concept for Rural Living

The property for this proposed subdivision is currently zoned Rural Neighborhood (RN) which is coordinated with the zoning for the Town of Van Wyck, (just adjacent to the property) and is an area of the county that promotes rural living. These are the pictures from the current Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan showing Rural Living. The Future Land Use Map in the Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan identifies this area as Rural Living. The proposed subdivision does not meet this concept.

Rural Living



The Town of Van Wyck would request that the county keep RN zoning in areas that surround the town to provide rural living to county residents.

The Proposed Subdivision proposes a housing density far exceeding the conservation concepts adopted by the Town of Van Wyck

The parcels in question notably lie immediately outside and adjacent to the Town limits. The Town's adopted Comprehensive Plan includes concepts of extensive open space, conservation of natural resources and overall rural characteristics. The proposed development contemplates more than 1000 units in a cluster subdivision. The resulting housing density will undoubtedly negatively impact the surrounding area and ultimately be an unwelcome and incongruous addition to the area.

The Proposed Subdivision encroaches on nearby agricultural property and landmarks in the community such as The Ivy Place.

This will have a direct impact on the agricultural economic opportunities outlined in the Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan. Panhandle residents indicated in the latest Comprehensive Plan survey, preserved open land makes for a desirable place to live, "a great neighborhood." MDR zoning is not in keeping with this concept.

The county leaders are also making a statement when they continue the preservation of environmental resources such as significant vegetation, forest stands, wetlands, waterways, and wildlife. The parcel is bordered to the north by property held in a conservation easement and to the south by agricultural lands. MDR zoning is incompatible with these uses.

Infrastructure Impacts are not adequately addressed in the proposal

As a natural result of adding 1019 homes, the already significant cut-through traffic on Van Wyck and Steele Hill Roads is expected to increase dramatically. Van Wyck Road is a two-lane road, and the proposed plan does not appear to add acceleration or deceleration lanes to exit or enter the development. Five new entrances are proposed on Van Wyck Road for this subdivision. The current speed limit on VW Road is 50 mph and much of the traffic using the road far exceeds this already excessive speed. The traffic study neglected to address the traffic controls needed to improve rather than exacerbate the safety problems in the area.

A two-lane collector road is not suitable to manage current planned traffic plus proposed traffic. In addition to increased residential traffic there will be temporary construction traffic and longer-term school bus traffic. This will cause additional roads around the area, such as Steele Hill Road, another two-lane collector road, to handle additional unplanned traffic. The Van Wyck/Steele Hill and Steele Hill/Old Hickory intersections are already burdened by significant commuter and cut-through traffic connecting to Rock Hill and I77 via Hwy 5 as well as traffic accessing Indian Land High School. As noted above these intersections do not have adequate traffic controls to address the current traffic volumes. The additional vehicles coming from a 1000+ home subdivision will require real and immediate improvements to these intersections. The residents of Van Wyck are clear that improvements to the intersections and pedestrian infrastructure will need to be provided in conjunction with any development rather than accepting the inevitable casualties while waiting for the SCDOT warrants to accrue. Factoring in the Maddison Apartments development currently under construction, access at the intersection of Van Wyck Road and US 521 will be likewise burdened.

The Southern Panhandle Small Area Plan

Again, we reference the top issues raised by the respondents from the Panhandle in the recent Comprehensive Plan survey that transportation—road widening, and additional lanes are an issue.

We also want to point out that area citizens in the Panhandle and the Town of Van Wyck participated in the South Panhandle Small Area Plan. The focus of this plan was as follows:

The Southern Panhandle Small Area Plan seeks to preserve the rural lifestyle and values of residents by ensuring developments conserve the natural landscape, cultivate employment centers, and create efficient infrastructure through enhanced connectivity, safety, and mobility.

The Common Themes from the public participation:

- Maintain rural community
- Protect local heritage
- Ensure Growth is Well-Planned
- Prevent Loss of Tree Canopy
- Protect Andrew Jackson State Park
- Plan for Transportation enhancements
- Provide for Sewer enhancements as needed
- Be a natural retreat destination

This development is not in sync with these themes outlined in the Southern Panhandle Small Area Plan.

Charlotte Road Van Wyck Fire Department is staffed by volunteers

Last, please note that the Charlotte Road Van Wyck Fire Department is staffed solely by local volunteers. An additional 1000+ homes will be a significant burden on the that resource and one that it is currently unprepared to address. The department frequently attends vehicle accidents along SC Hwy 5 and US 521 arising largely from a lack of adequate traffic controls at those intersections. As noted above, the increased traffic burdens stand to exceed the already limited capacity of this service. The addition of fire protection for the increased housing will also stretch this service beyond its capabilities. No additional subdivisions should be considered until this service is provided with adequate resources to handle the increased burden.

For the foregoing reasons, we recommend the applications for rezoning and development agreement for this cluster sub-division not be approved by the Lancaster County Planning Commission and County Council.

Respectfully,

The Town Council and Planning Commission of the
Town of Van Wyck, South Carolina

From: [Desiree Accetturo](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#); [Jennifer Bryan](#); [Sherrie Simpson](#)
Subject: Vote no on Nisbet Property
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 6:51:25 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender travelbug115@gmail.com

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

The council spent about 25 minutes a month ago discussing how over crowded the area is becoming. There is a lack of planning for growth for the area.

Please vote no for rezoning. Heed your own advice. Come up with a solid long term plan for growth for roads, schools (ask the school board again for their input), more police, appropriate fire protection, etc.

People move here thinking there is a plan. Residents are taken aback when they realize it's just a day to day vote.

Please, stop the madness. Vote no!

Oct 13, 2022

1652 Tranquility Blvd

Lancaster, SC 29720

Gentlemen:

Let this letter serve as notification as to our opposition to the planned community to be erected south of the Tree Tops Community on Van Wyck Rd.

Tree Tops Community is comprised of 796 Homes with two gated entries to Van Wyck Road, Additionally, Del Webb Sun City with 3000 homes +/- also exits to Van Wyck Road and Route 521.

We understand application to the board has been recently requested as to constructing a mixed use development comprising of some 1000 units.

As residents we have already experienced an increase in traffic on Van Wyck Road. With the yet unfinished apartment complex at the intersection of Van Wyck Road and Route 521 of some 350 units we have yet to feel the impact of that expansion. Currently Van Wyck Road which is a 2 Lane thoroughfare serves as an alternate route to Charlotte by routing traffic to SC 5. With the current influx of business to the Queen City we as residents have experienced this traffic increase first hand.

Additionally, Polte Construction is scheduled to construct 240 homes off Griffin Rd which will also impact traffic volume and my understanding is an additional 600 homes is also scheduled along State Road S-29-308 which will highly impact Route 521 Traffic where we anticipate Van Wyck Road to be an alternate route to Charlotte.

The explosion of housing in the Indianland Area has been enormous over the last four years. It is reminiscent of Long Island NY in the 1980's which resulted in traffic congestion beyond belief because home construction was approved without consideration of the existing infrastructure. We implore you to consider these impacts as to impact on air quality, noise and living quality of life.

We respectfully request special oversight be implemented when reviewing the request and planning of this new community, its impact on congestion and its impact on our schools and general quality of life,

Thank You

Regards:

Allan & Betty Ahner



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 13, 2022, 02:11PM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion:	Land development on Van Wyck near Tree Tops and Ivy Place
Meeting Date:	October 18, 2022 06:00 PM
Full Name	First Name: Robert Last Name: Arnold
Phone Number	951-217-4953
Email	boblinrnld@yahoo.com
Address:	5074 Samoa Ridge Dr. Lancaster SC 29720
Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item:	My wife and I (and neighbors) are very concerned about a large development that will be built next to our community. We selected Tree Tops to live in a country atmosphere. Now these huge development will be right next to us causing noise and traffic congestion. It's bad enough a huge apartment complex is being built right at Van Wyck and 521. Traffic will be out of control at that intersection. There are so many large parcels of land they could use, why build so close to Tree Tops and Ivy place. Please do not let this destroy our neighborhoods. Sincerely Bob and Linda Arnold

From: [Cheryl Badorrek](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Stop ruining the area with these ugly developments.
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 6:54:17 AM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender cbadorrek@gmail.com

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

You have no infrastructure to support the blight of developments that you have allowed in the Lancaster county.

Cheryl Badorrek

From: [Ashley Davis](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: FW: In opposition
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 3:08:00 PM
Attachments: [LCLogo_c716c29e-f766-46c0-a18c-7d20f2fc6ebd.png](#)



Ashley Davis, Senior Planner
Planning

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

P: (803) 285-6005 F: (877) 636-7963
ADavis@lanastersc.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: DBB <devonbeaty@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 2:50 PM
To: Ashley Davis <ADavis@lanastersc.net>
Subject: In opposition



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender
devonbeaty@yahoo.com

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

Dear Ms. Davis,

I would like to express my concern and opposition regarding the rezoning request by CLREF III Acquisitions LLC from RN to MDR zoning at 8275 Van Wyke Rd. This request seems to be at stark odds with the identity of the area and unique value that this area adds to Lancaster County. This is not a good fit, and I wanted to express my opinion.

Thank you for your time,

Devon Beaty Bagley

From: bakermj1@aol.com
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Cc: bakermj1@aol.com
Subject: Planning Commission: RZ-2022-0735 CLREFIII Acquisitions aka Nisbet
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2022 4:47:55 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender bakermj1@aol.com

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

Ms. Bryan,

Please read the following at the Planning Commission Meeting on October 18.

Please consider my opinion and the opinions of many of my neighbors while deliberating on the proposed new development on Van Wyck Rd. The proposal is for a new development of over 1000 homes adjacent to the TreeTops Community and the Ivy Place Farms. The infrastructure in the area CANNOT handle the additional load a community of this size will add to an already overstressed area.

As it stands today, the traffic on Van Wyck is more than a rural road should handle. When the Pulte homes and the Madison Apartments are completed, the road will be overtaxed. Yet another neighborhood will produce complete gridlock. The fire and EMS services are also inadequate for this additional growth. Additionally, if we were to have an evacuation emergency, we would not be able to quickly leave the area. Also, Duke Energy is already struggling to provide consistent power to part of the TreeTops community. Another 1000+ homes at this time would overtax their capacity. I understand the community will have a higher density of homes than currently exists in this area. This will likely negatively impact property values and our quality of life! These are all considerations the planning commission needs to think about! We need to place a moratorium on all new development until such time that we have begun to execute a comprehensive plan for handling both the existing and any upcoming neighborhoods.

As of this email communication, over 480 Tree Tops neighbors have already signed a petition AGAINST this new development.

Regards,

Maria Baker

5083 Samoa Ridge Dr

Lancaster SC 29720

803-372-3309

bakermj1@aol.com

From: [Joan Baron](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Development - Van Wyke
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 11:38:02 AM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender joanbaron@carolina.rr.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

Please, please reconsider development effecting Van Wyke community, especially the school area.

Joan Baron

From: [David Bates](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Stop High Density Development on Van Wyck Road
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2022 1:31:32 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender isaiah61.dcb@gmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

I am writing as a concerned citizen living off of Van Wyck Road. There is a proposed new development just to the south of my neighborhood wanting to add approximately 1000 homes and a new sewage pumping station. The development is characterized as a high density neighborhood. I think this is absolutely the wrong thing to do at this time as the current infrastructure would not support adding another thousand homes on this Part of Van Wyck Road. The road structure does not support the amount of new traffic including the multi family apartments that were just recently built at the start of this road. Additionally the connection to 521 from Van Wyck does not support the amount of traffic using the current stop light and number of lanes at this intersection. There is also a concern with the electric utilities on VanWyk Road as there have been a number of incidents in the past couple of years where we have lost power for a significant amount of time. Instead of developing a new high density neighborhood at this stage I would propose that a multi level infrastructure study be conducted to develop the infrastructure if this neighborhood moves forward. Until the infrastructure is expanded no further development should take place.

Concerned,
David Bates
7083 Hot Springs Road
Lancaster, SC 29720

From: nsbentley5@gmail.com
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Nesbit Proposed Development
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2022 6:21:28 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender nsbentley5@gmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

No, absolutely no to adding more congestion to an already busy VanWyck Road. 250 homes have been approved for Griffen road plus 300 apts. at the corner of VanWyck - that will add over 1000 cars daily to that road. It is not built to handle anymore traffic as there are considerable backups getting on 521 from VanWyck. This proposed development will add potentially 2000 more cars to that. Add 3000 cars to a narrow (zero shoulders) country road and you're inviting disaster.

School is already overburdened and education quality in SC is already abysmal - now you would be adding another >100 kids per grade (assuming 1 child per unit which you know will be way more than that).

Fire district - will be in VanWyck fire district which is totally volunteer- they do not have personnel nor equipment to add more stress to their system.

Healthcare is already sub-par in Indian Land with the closest ambulance coming from Lancaster and the closest hospital in Pineville.

No rhyme nor reason to the development of Indian Land which would suggest greed and money is driving development more than citizen concern.

Please protect green space as there are zero parks in Indian Land and no developer requirement to have x amount of green space.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [VALERIE BRASSELL](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Rezoning Nisbet
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 12:42:41 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender vib0301@msn.com

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

This rezoning does not need to happen. Traffic is ridiculous now; there is not enough decent shopping stores or restaurants; school traffic is crazy -- we do not even go out before 9:30 AM or after 3:00 PM adding 1100 homes will just add to the craziness. Can the schools even handle additional students? EMS will be overwhelmed adding 1100 homes. The roads cannot handle the traffic now. Why not do open space and parks?
We moved here 10 years ago because of the openness which is now gone. Seriously have thought about moving because of all the development.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [H Breedlove](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Nesbit property NO!
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 11:51:19 AM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender hcbreedlove@gmail.com

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

Please DO NOT build any houses on this property. Keep it open space for wildlife for the protection of the Catawba River not to mention the schools.

I work for ILHS and we DO NOT have anywhere to put any more children or cards

We have to care more about where we live and the quality of life we have over developing every square inch of ground just for the money. Money is not everything. We need a lot more stuff for our residents rather than just adding more residents. Please STOP approving everything every developer wants and consider those of us that already live here and those of us that were born in these parts and didn't move here from across the country.

Thank you

Heather Breedlove.

From: [Susan B. Brown](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Proposed development
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 1:53:43 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender susanbrown0704@gmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

I am writing in regards to the proposed housing development on Van Wyck Road. I object to this project.

I am concerned about the negative effects on this area especially for safety and environmental impact. Can the Van Wyck fire station protect this additional growth? Van Wyck Road is already over burdened with traffic and speeding vehicles. The intersection with 521 needs to be reconfigured as it no longer serves the current traffic flow effectively, let alone an additional flow of construction vehicles followed by the potential additional thousand plus vehicles per day.

Is the positioning of the proposed plan such that it is considerate of its neighbors in proximity of the sewage waste area?

I do not believe this project is a good fit for this area.

Respectfully,

Susan B. Brown

1676 Tranquility Blvd

Lancaster SC 29720

Sent from my iPad



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 17, 2022, 08:08AM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion: Van Wyck Rezoning Proposal

Meeting Date: October 18, 2022 08:07 AM

Full Name
First Name: Gregory
Last Name: Chase

Phone Number 7049989664

Email gchase@carolina.rr.com

Address: 7089 Hot Springs Rd. Lancaster SC 29720

Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item: Ms. Bryan, My wife and I are residents of the Tree Tops community located off of Van Wyck Road and immediately contiguous to the proposed high density 1,000 homes development in Indian land. We were long-term residents of Charlotte, and as a businessperson and a former member of the Charlotte media, I did many projects with Charlotte and Mecklenburg County leaders. My wife and I are asking you to consider both the short and long-term impacts of allowing a community of the size being proposed to be built near Van Wyck Road. Of significant concern are the impacts this level of new single-family homes will have on the infrastructure of the area where Tree Tops is located. Van Wyck is a two-lane road. Between the entrance to Tree Tops and Charlotte Highway (521) there is already the Sun City development, a new 250 home development being built, and a large apartment complex being added. There are no turning lanes from Southbound 521 onto Van Wyck and no turning lanes from Van Wyck onto 521. Current traffic backs back up from the Van Wyck onto 521, and this is before the new housing and apartment developments are built out. Older residents of Sun City and Tree Tops have only one road to get to 521. Not only does this high volume traffic and poor intersection design negatively impact the quality of life for these more elderly residents (and taxpayers), but it also creates the opportunities for more vehicular accidents as well preventing emergency vehicles from reaching residents of these two 55+ plus communities in a timely manner. Zoning decisions also impact the look and feel of an area, as well as the tax base. This proposed high density lower price point homes is inconsistent with the lifestyle visions of the Sun City and Tree Tops communities. As county leaders, we would think the last thing you would wish to do is drive the existing values of

homes down (and thus erode the tax base), and trap several thousands of older county residents in their homes because they are unable to safely drive to stores and doctor appointments. Finally, please consider whether the home builder will have the financial resources and experience to build such a large development and whether they have any successful business track record in Lancaster County or South Carolina. In a financial environment where most national builders are cutting back and mortgage rates are rising, is it wise to embark on such a large community undertaking? Do you really want to deal with the crime and strain on county resources hundreds of homes that cannot be sold but only rented will cause? Please do not approve this request to rezone this area. Respectfully, Greg & Ellen Chase 7089 Hot Springs road Lancaster, S

From: [Stephanie Conklin](#)
To: [Dennis E. Marstall](#); [Sherrie Simpson](#); [Jennifer Bryan](#); [Rox Burhans](#); [Terry Graham](#); [cmcgriff@comporium.net](#); [Billy Mosteller](#); [lhoney@comporium.net](#); [Steve Harper](#); [Allen Blackmon](#); [Brian Carnes](#)
Subject: Oct 18 meeting
Date: Thursday, October 13, 2022 7:11:39 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender sconklin0809@gmail.com

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

We are longtime residents of the Indian Land and totally oppose the proposed new developments and zone changes. Real estate progress needs to be slowed until the schools, utilities, and roads have caught up to the insane growth we are now experiencing.

Not opposing progress but it needs to slow down until our infrastructure can handle the growth. PLEASE PLEASE stop rezoning parcels and subdivision approvals until we are able to absorb.

Stephanie Conklin
Tree Tops Resident

From: [Courtney Crowell](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#); [Planning Mailbox](#)
Cc: mjjg70@yahoo.com
Subject: Rezoning
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 3:00:29 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender mkcc1@hotmail.com

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

Please, for the love of God, stop approving more residential zones, complexes and neighborhoods for Indian Land. We have lived here for 18 years and I hate what Indian Land has become. The building must stop. The planning committee must be honest about their unfettered and ill thought out approvals (Calvin Hall and Harrisburg Road is the perfect example). Van Wyck seems to be next.

Please just stop!

With sincerity~

Courtney Crowell
BridgeHampton neighborhood

From: [Ann Marie Dudek](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Proposed development on Van Wyck Rd
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2022 8:15:03 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender adudek1951@gmail.com

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

This email is to inform you that I am opposed to the development of over 1000 homes on Van Wyck Road. Van Wyck cannot handle the traffic and pollution that over 2000 additional cars will create. You have over 2,500 senior citizens living in two different developments on Van Wyck who's lives will be put in danger if you approve this development.

From: [Jean Fritchley](#)
To: [Dennis E. Marstall](#); [Sherrie Simpson](#); [Jennifer Bryan](#); rburhans@lancastersc.net; [Terry Graham](#); cmcgriff@comporium.net; [Billy Mosteller](#); lhoney@comporium.net; [Steve Harper](#); [Allen Blackmon](#)
Cc: [Gmail](#)
Subject: Open Letter to the Lancaster SC County Council
Date: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 8:03:26 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender jaf21.jf@gmail.com

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

To All,

I have recently learned of a proposal for a 1000+ home subdivision on the Nisbet property on Van Wyck Road up for vote on October 18.

With the already expanding developments, developments currently finishing, just starting construction, (521 at Shelley Mullis) or more importantly, approved that have not even broken ground, estimated to add 5000+, we simply do not have the infrastructure or school systems to support this growth.

What is your plan to help with the current traffic delays we already have before adding current construction? I sit at my intersection of Collins Road and 521 through 3 lights just to get onto 521 at times.

The Indian Land School is considering making people who live within 1.5 miles of the school walk, as they don't have enough buses. That is my entire community. Are you ready to address the issues that will cause? Not to mention injuries, or worse, with children/families crossing 521?

I implore you to stop all approvals and focus on a plan that will allow current residents the vision they had when moving to Indian Land. Focus on developing on a plan to support expansion within this town.

Thank you

Jean Fritchley

Indian Land

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Deb Personal GMail](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Housing development in VanWyck
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 9:57:18 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender debfulcoly@gmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

I honestly don't think we need any more subdivisions in VanWyck or Indian Land as we seem incapable of providing the needed infrastructure and it really ruins the "feel" that many love.

Thanks for your consideration.

Deb Fulcoly
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Hotmail](#)
To: [Dennis E. Marstall](#); [Sherrie Simpson](#); [Jennifer Bryan](#); [Rox Burhans](#); [Terry Graham](#); [cmcgriff@comporium.net](#); [Billy Mosteller](#); [lhoney@comporium.net](#); [Steve Harper](#); [Allen Blackmon](#); [Brian Carnes](#)
Subject: Development Proposals
Date: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 8:48:34 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender megangaissert@hotmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

Open Letter to the Lancaster SC County Council

To All,

I have recently learned of a proposal for a 1000+ home subdivision on the Nisbet property on Van Wyck Road up for vote on October 18.

With the already expanding developments, developments currently finishing, just starting construction, (521 at Shelley Mullis) or more importantly, approved that have not even broken ground, estimated to add 5000+, we simply do not have the infrastructure or school systems to support this growth.

I sit at my intersection of Collins Road and 521 through 4 or 5 lights just to get onto 521 for work in the morning. Many of us have learned to cut through the Publix parking lot because once we get on 521, we sit for several more lights. It takes me almost 20 minutes to turn from Collin's onto 521 to Dobys Bridge.

I volunteer with the Indian Land Action Council to pick up garbage once a month and I see a woman out there constantly. More homes, means more garbage along our roads and we lose our wonderful clean rural feel.

I grew up on a cattle ranch in Montana and was relocated to the Charlotte area for work two years ago. I fell in love with how much it felt like home and everyone seemed to know one another. I've already noticed a huge difference in the last two years.

I recognize growth is inevitable but I urge you to please limit the speed which it's occurring until we can support the increase in people, children in schools and traffic. Please focus on a plan that will allow current residents the vision they had when moving to Indian Land. Focus on developing on a plan to support expansion within this town. Please immediately stop approving new developments.

Further, do not allow for any large billboards along 521. Keep Lancaster County beautiful.

Thank you
Megan GAISSERT
1181 Castle Rd

From: sylviagilland81@gmail.com
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Nisbet property off Van Wyck proposed 1,000 development
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2022 4:33:11 PM
Importance: High



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender sylviagilland81@gmail.com

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

I wish to express my deep concerns for the rezoning to medium density for this proposed development. I live in Tree Tops for the past four years. Several developments are already approved or in process off Van Wyck that effect the infrastructure of this area. The 300 apartments under construction and the planned housing development off 521 that will have larger lots and larger houses.

The current request for rezoning is an irresponsible use of this land. I understand the Nisbet family wants to sell this property and after retiring from a Charlotte development company after 25 years, I understand that development can be done responsibly.

After reading the proposed development agreement, it is skewed in the developers best interest, not Lancaster County and current residents. The tax revenue from this will NOT outweigh the cost to the county and current residents.

- There is nothing in the agreement that states the proposed community will be planned as an over 55 community. This will place a huge burden on schools and the proposed one time fee will not cover future needs.
- With the high density layout, the smaller lots will generate a need for smaller, less expensive houses that are not in keeping with the area
- Almost all of the area is to be developed not considering ecological impacts to habitat and nature in this area nor to the water run off in close proximity to the Catawba River.
- The agreement addresses water and sewer needs at a bare minimum, please consider the stated fee and look long term at the burden this will place on county obligations to supply this need.
- No where is the electrical needs addressed. My understanding is York Power cannot supply and Duke Energy currently cannot either. Tree Tops has Duke Energy and you are probably aware of all the issues we have had with unstable power due to poor planning. Many of us

have whole house generators because Duke cannot currently give us stable power.

- Although there is to be a traffic study, you do not need to be an engineer to know that there will 100% be a negative impact on Van Wyck Road as it was never designed to carry this type of construction nor development.
- The road will be destroyed with many one- lane closures creating traffic backups. With few alternatives of access to 521, quality of life and fire/life safety will be effected.
- The current Van Wyck volunteer fire department will not be able to handle an addition 1,000 homes so how will this be planned for and changed??
- Police services?

I urge you to **not** allow this rezoning to take place based on this development proposal. If/when the land is developed, it should be done with parks, walkways, open areas to preserve wildlife and the eco system, larger lots that will in turn promote larger houses in keeping with the current area. Require developer to do extensive planning for installation of infrastructure and develop a temporary roadway access that will keep construction traffic off Van Wyck. Time restrictions should be placed such that development would need to be completed in a timely manner, not the current eight years and fines should be in place to ensure compliance.

To allow this to continue based on current proposal is a travesty and one that will only harm Lancaster County and its residents in the area.

Thank you

Sylvia Gilland

3053 Oliver Stanley Tr Lancaster, SC 29720

704.201.2942

Sylviagilland81@gmail.com

From: [jrgore](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Nesbit proposed community
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 9:04:51 AM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender jrgore@comporium.net

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

We do not need another community on Van Wyck destroying the rural feel of our community as well as the fact that Van Wyck road can not certainly handle the increased traffic. There is enough undeveloped land on 521 south of Van Wyck they can use for their community.

James Gore

Sent from my Galaxy

From: [Marie-Helene Grabman](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Van Wyck development
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 12:30:09 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender scissorcutter@yahoo.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

Dear planning committee,

PLEASE do not allow any more development along VanWyck road UNTIL proper inner structure and a wider roadway is put in place. The Nesbit company can put their development farther south along Hwy. 521 if there is a need for it at all.

MH Grabman

www.scissorcutter.com

scissorcutter@yahoo.com

From: chankgrady@aol.com
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Nisbet Project comment
Date: Thursday, October 13, 2022 5:03:42 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender chankgrady@aol.com

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

Jennifer,

Thank you for your help with navigating the issue submitting an online comment for the Nisbet Project at Tuesday's Planning Commission meeting. I appreciate all the additional information you gave me about Growth Management. I was still unable to submit my comment online so, here is my comment:

I oppose the 1000+ housing development on Van Wyck Rd. It will have a negative impact on our infrastructure (roads, emergency services, electric power supply, schools, etc) which seems to be ignored by the Lancaster Planning Commission on a regular basis. Preservation of green space needs to be improved in the Indian Land section of Lancaster Country - there is too much high density construction without planning and foresight for future needs. Please start preserving green space and improving infrastructure, for example the widening of Van Wyck Rd., before anymore high density construction.

Cathy Grady
3251 Oliver Stanley Trail, Lancaster SC 29720
704-578-6592
chankgrady@aol.com



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 13, 2022, 05:54PM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion:	CLREF III Acquisitions applied to rezone five land parcels at and near 8275 Van Wyck Road for a combined 780 acres.
Meeting Date:	October 18, 2022 05:47 PM
Full Name	First Name: Elizabeth Last Name: Greenan
Phone Number	7329771880
Email	egreenan@gmail.com
Address:	3265 Oliver Stanley Trail Lancaster, SC. 29720
Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item:	Please do not approve the application to rezone the Nesbit property. With the addition of the apartment complex at the intersection of 521 and Van Wyck Rd., this development would impact the infrastructure even further. The infrastructure to support this additional development is not in place, and this would have an impact on the community and affect quality of life. Thank you.

From: [Madelyn Greenspan](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Rezoning on VanWyck near Treetop
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2022 5:00:15 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender maddrugs1@icloud.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

I am a resident of Tree Top. I recently saw that the zoning commission wants to put another community close to ours near the ivy place. Yhis is a terrible idea and certainly not in the best interest of Tree Top residents. Firstly it would destroy the rural atmosphere of our community and secondly Van Wyck is a 2 lane road and could not handle additional traffic. Beides the traffic from our community there will be another community thatvis being built right behind us. That along with the Sun City residents along with the homes being built right near the traffic light at Van Wyck and. 521 already causes traffic to back up . Instead of trying to rezone this area which cannot support it. Why not use all the vacant land gOUNG south on 521 which is all vacant.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Larry Kopyta](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Fwd: Comments on October 18th Planning Commission Rezoning Development Agreement DA-2022-0735
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 1:25:38 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender lrkopyta@gmail.com

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

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Larry Kopyta <lrkopyta@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Oct 18, 2022 at 12:29 PM
Subject: Comments on October 18th Planning Commission Rezoning Development Agreement DA-2022-0735
To: <jbryan@lancastercsc.org>

Dear Ms Bryan,

I attempted to submit my comments through the County website but was unsuccessful. Therefore, I have included my comments below. I spoke to someone in your office and apparently the email address listed in the agenda in Novus is incorrect and she gave me this email.

Thank you!

My cell number is 412-580-1328 if you have any questions

My name is Larry Kopyta. My family and I are currently residents of the Walnut Creek community. Walnut Creek is located in Indian Land near the intersection of Highways 521 and 75 (Waxhaw Highway). Our community currently consists of approximately 2000 homes. We are opposed to the rezoning request due to its negative impacts on our quality of life in the Indian Land area for the following reasons:

- 1. Traffic congestion and road safety on 521 in Indian Land are currently unacceptable and will only get worse with the recent approval of multifamily housing and single-family homes north of Sun City. The addition of several thousand vehicles from this proposed development will make the situation exponentially worse.*
- 2. Currently, Indian Land High School student teacher ratio is reportedly 18:1 and Van Wyck Elementary ratio is 15:1, which will undoubtedly increase significantly given the aforementioned approval of developments along 521, plus additional households from this proposed development feeding into the school systems. Additionally, the lack of adequate bus transportation is also an issue that will only worsen as well.*
- 3. The proposed development will negatively impact the rural nature in the area surrounding this development as well as existing infrastructure in the area.*

Thank you to the Planning Commission for the opportunity to provide comments on this important issue. We trust that you will make the right decision.

From: Jen K
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#); [Allen Blackmon](#); [Billy Mosteller](#); [Brian Carnes](#); cmcgriff@comporium.net; [Dennis E. Marstall](#); lhoney@comporium.net; [Rox Burhans](#); [Sherrie Simpson](#); [Steve Harper](#); [Terry Graham](#)
Subject: Concerned resident
Date: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 9:26:51 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender jennifer.kocsak@gmail.com

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

To All,

I have recently learned of a proposal for a 1000+ home subdivision on the Nisbet property on Van Wyck Road up for vote on October 18.

With the already expanding developments, developments currently finishing, just starting construction, (521 at Shelley Mullis) or more importantly, approved that have not even broken ground, estimated to add 5000+, we simply do not have the infrastructure or school systems to support this growth.

What is your plan to help with the current traffic delays we already have before adding current construction? I sit at my intersection of Collins Road and 521 through 3 lights just to get onto 521 at times.

The Indian Land School is considering making people who live within 1.5 miles of the school walk, as they don't have enough buses; my entire neighborhood would be impacted by this. There are no sidewalks that currently connect my neighborhood to the schools for walking - and no safe way to cross 521. This will undoubtedly cause strain to working families and more traffic on the roadway to contend with. How do you plan to address these issues?

I implore you to stop all approvals and focus on a plan that will allow current residents the vision they had when moving to Indian Land. We need to slow down with approving countless subdivisions and focus on adding more green space, recreation areas, proper roads/infrastructure and allocating land for schools that we will most definitely need sooner rather than later.

Thank you for your consideration.
Jen



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 17, 2022, 11:58AM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion: 1019 home development on Van Wycke Rd

Meeting Date: October 18, 2022 11:46 AM

Full Name
First Name: anthony
Last Name: koszalinski

Phone Number 614-579-2933

Email art.koszalinskli@yahoo.com

Address: 3176 Oliver Stanley trail Lancaster, SC 29720

Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item: I am opposed to proposed housing development along Van Wycke Rd. For the following reasons: 1. Nisbet community is not needed. There are a number of developments in the area that are still building homes. 2. The zoning application was signed by a shell corporation called CLREF. The agent for CLREF is Corporation Services Co. which helps shell companies avoid paying taxes. 3. Nisbet properties operates primarily in the building services sector. Has one employee and generated \$33,401.00 in annual revenues? Nesbit does not have the business history or experience to complete a community of this size. 4. The new community is not in keeping with current farm/conservation easements which surround it. 5. There is a complete lack of infrastructure to support additional homes. 6. There already exists a lack of traffic control at the Van Wycke/521 interchange. 7. The Nesbit project, will have a negative effect on home values to the current communities. Thank You for your time and attention to this matter.

From: [Gratus Atnc](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Disapprove Nesbit Development on Van Wyck Rd
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 9:18:23 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender gratusatnc@gmail.com

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

Please disapprove Nesbit development.

Comments:

- The new community, as drafted, is not in keeping with the current farm/conservation easements which surround it.
- There is a lack of proper infrastructure to support the additional 1,000+ homes which will bring over 2,000 additional automobiles to Van Wyck Road and surrounding support roads.
- There is already a lack of proper traffic control at the overtaxed Van Wyck/521 intersection. This new development would add to the traffic issues on top of the currently approved 200+ new homes yet to be built on Griffin Road and the large apartment complex at the intersection of Van Wyck and 521. A traffic study should be completed after the Griffin Road development and apartments are in place to determine what traffic improvements are needed before adding 2,000 more automobiles to this intersection.
- The Nesbit development is requesting far too many homes within the community, which is not in keeping with the surrounding communities. The higher density of homes will have a negative effect on home values to the current communities in the area.
- The Town of Van Wyck strongly opposes the new development as it is not in keeping with the aesthetic of the township or surrounding area.

Concerned citizens at TreeTops,
Shawna and Ron Livingston

From: jloggia2007@comporium.net
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Nesbit development
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 5:15:28 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender jloggia2007@comporium.net

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

This should be denied as the traffic now is horrendous getting from Van Wyck Rd to 521.
Send down south to Lancaster..

Patricia Loggia from Indian Land SC

Sent from my Galaxy Tab® A

From: [Cathy Maida](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Proposal to Rezone Property South of Tree Tops
Date: Saturday, October 15, 2022 9:35:23 AM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender catret08@gmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.
—IT Helpdesk, [support.lancastercountysc.net](mailto:support@lancastercountysc.net)

Subject: Proposal to Rezone property south of Tree Tops

We are submitting our statement of opposition to the proposal to build 1,019 single family homes south of our Tree Tops community on both sides of Van Wyck Road. The two large existing communities, Sun City Carolina Lakes (over 3,000 homes), Tree Tops (around 800 homes) and the other communities that are being built north of Tree Tops, will cause wear and tear to the road, increase road congestion and possibly lead to more accidents due to the curves and hills on the road. It's bad enough that the traffic on 521 is a nightmare, please don't take away our country back road.

Another concern is the extra burden on our mostly volunteer first responders that often respond to calls in Tree Tops and Sun City Carolina Lakes.

Catherine and Peter Maida
5030 Redwood Grove Trail
Lancaster, SC 29720

Sent from my iPad

From: [Clare McConaughay](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Cc: [Terry Graham](#); [Brian Carnes](#)
Subject: Rezoning on agenda
Date: Saturday, October 15, 2022 1:38:41 PM

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.
—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net<<http://192.168.1.5>>

Chairman Deese and Commissioners ,

I am writing to voice my opposition to higher density rezonings in Indian Land, particularly the property on Van Wyck Road , on the October 18th agenda .

Traffic : As a Sun City resident , we are already seeing traffic cutting through our subdivision to avoid the traffic delays at the traffic lights on 521 , especially for the 521/north bound Van Wyck intersection . With the apartments being built by that intersection , it will bring additional hundreds of cars to that area . We can't have thousands more !

Greenscape : Van Wyck Road's natural beauty and the town of Van Wyck's village character are such a breath of fresh air that need to be preserved in our county . To come off 521 and drive that road and see strawberry farms, cotton fields, and land trust forests is such a treat, I swear my blood pressure drops. Please vote to maintain our little area of serenity .

Thank you for all you do .

Clare McConaughay
49080 Gladiolus Street
Indian Land SC 29707

Sent from my iPhone



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 15, 2022, 09:22AM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion: Rezoning along Van Wyck Road

Meeting Date: October 18, 2022 06:00 PM

Full Name
First Name: Thomas
Last Name: McKnight

Phone Number 7657300573

Email tlmnrn614@gmail.com

Address: 5062 Samoa Ridge Drive Lancaster SC 29720

Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item: Under the current conditions of Van Wyck Road, it can not handle the traffic of the construction and the traffic of a 1,000 new homes. The Commission needs to vote no on rezoning along Van Wyck Road.

From: [Elaine Molnar](#)
To: [Zoning](#); [Scott Edgar](#); [Barry Faile](#); [Jeffery Catoe](#); [Rox Burhans](#); [Hal Hiott](#); [Lisa Robinson](#); [Darren Player](#); [Jamie Gilbert](#); [Dennis E. Marstall](#); [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Cc: [Elaine Molnar](#)
Subject: November 18th Lancaster County Planning Commission Meeting - Lack of Transparency
Date: Thursday, October 13, 2022 3:10:59 PM

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.
—IT Helpdesk, support@lanastercountysc.net

With regard to the rapid growth in land development. Please read comments below department names and respond to my concerns of lack of transparency and lack of recognizing the consequences of rapid land development.

Shannon Catoe: When do you intend to announce to the general public the November 18th Lancaster County Planning Commission Meeting? It is not on the Lancaster County Website. Fortunately, there are proactive citizens living in Indian Land that care about the well-being of the citizens and think about the consequences of quick decisions. It takes more than houses to build a strong community.

Before adding more traffic to the area, think. Have you interacted with the transportation department? Are you aware of the congestion on Highway 521? Have any traffic surveys been implemented or planned?

Jeff Catoe: Specifically, what are your proactive plans to ensure the existing residents in Indian Land will not have interruptions in services due to rapid building? Are the utility companies ready to handle the growth?

Edgar Scott: Were you included in land development discussion? Explain your proactive actions.

Barry Faile: Are plans in place to reduce the strain on the police with the rapid residential growth in Indian Land?

Rox Burhans: What is your department's job description? Is your department independent or does it involve the teamwork of other departments?

Lisa Robinson: Is your department ready for the rapid growth in Indian Land?

Veronica Thompson: Explain the benefits and drawbacks of this growth.

Jamie Gilbert: Explain the benefits and drawbacks of rapid growth.

Hal Hiott: Have you been included in the land development plans in Indian Land? Have public parks & recreation been included?

- Comments to the proposed rezoning of Tax Parcel Nos. 0022-00-002.00, 0022-00-002.02, 0022-00-002.03, 0022-00-003.00 and 0022-00-003.01, owned by Nisbet

Properties LLC.

- The Nisbet community is not needed. There are a number of developments in the area that are still building homes and adding another community to the mix will only complicate completion of the Nisbet community as well as these other communities. Area communities where potential home owners can buy right now are: Millbridge, Walnut Creek, Riverchase Estates, the large Lennar project near Lancaster (not yet named), the 200+ home development going in on Griffin Road next to Tree Tops (not yet named), the new development along Waxhaw Highway near the SC/NC border (not yet named). It does not make sense to add another large community at this time.
- ... the validity of the companies involved in the rezoning request. The Zoning Amendment Application was signed by a representative of CLREF III Acquisitions LLC, 10006 N. Dale Mabry Highway, Suite 201, Tampa, FL 33618, though the Draft Development Agreement shows this company as incorporated in Delaware. A search of Delaware corporation records shows the address of the company as 251 Little Falls Drive, Wilmington, DE 16908, phone number 302-636-5401, with the agent for the company listed as Corporation Service Company. Corporation Service Company helps shell companies avoid paying proper state taxes. Do we really want a company like this doing business in our backyard?
- A Google search for CLREF gives a Tampa address and shows a company by the name of Landeavor, not CLREF III Acquisitions LLC. Landeavor has an office in Tampa at this exact address and also has an office in Waxhaw, so why the secrecy by hiding the actual owners with a Delaware/Florida LLC? I believe CLREF III Acquisitions LLC is a bogus company because they have no website, no internet presence whatsoever, other than 'acquisition' in their name and no business description anywhere. Other than the fact that Delaware incorporated them in 1997, there is zero information about who owns this company, what they do, or reviews to determine a legitimate business history.
- Nisbet Properties LLC, was established as a South Carolina company back in 1998. According to Bizzfile.com, the business is described as: **Nisbet Properties is located in Lancaster, South Carolina. This organization primarily operates in the Building Maintenance Services, nec business / industry within the Business Services sector. This organization has been operating for approximately 24 years. Nisbet Properties is estimated to generate \$33,401 in annual revenues, and employs approximately 1 people at this single location.** Nisbet Properties does not have the business history or experience to start and complete a community of this scale, and not should they be allowed to try.
- Lancaster County is reviewing a rezoning application for a shell acquisition company, CLREF III Acquisitions LLC, which calls into question the transparency of the land acquisition. The secrecy of Landeavor hiding behind CLREF III Acquisitions LLC should be reviewed before consideration is given to the rezoning request.
- ... impossible to believe that Nisbet Properties LLC can demonstrate a history of

successful home building, construction management, and community development sufficient for approval of the rezoning application. Nisbet Properties LLC completely lacks the business experience and business history to demonstrate they are willing and able to follow Lancaster and South Carolina building requirements and codes, or the ability to build a quality home, or are capable of providing proper warranties to potential home owners. Who in their right mind would pay hundreds of thousands of dollars for a home built by an unknown company, with zero business experience and history?

- Planning Commission should not approve the rezoning application based on the following reasons:
 - The new community, as drafted, is not in keeping with the current farm/conservation easements which surround it.
 - There is a lack of proper infrastructure to support the additional 1,000+ homes which will bring over 2,000 additional automobiles to Van Wyck Road and surrounding support roads.
 - There is already a lack of proper traffic control at the overtaxed Van Wyck/521 intersection. This new development would add to the traffic issues on top of the currently approved 200+ new homes yet to be built on Griffin road and the large apartment complex at the intersection of Van Wyck and 521. A traffic study should be completed after the Griffin Road development and apartments are in place to determine what traffic improvements are needed before adding 2,000 more automobiles to this intersection.
 - The Nesbit development is requesting far too many homes within the community, which is not in keeping with the surrounding communities. The higher density of homes will have a negative effect on home values to the current communities in the area.
 - The Town of Van Wyck strongly opposes the new development as it is not in keeping with the aesthetic of the township or surrounding area.

Lancaster County Planning Commission, the Nesbit Properties LLC has no business attempting to build such a large development due to their lack of business experience...period. Their lack of experience will no doubt bring many more problems and issues to Lancaster County than it solves. Furthermore, Lancaster County and the surrounding area has experienced a huge increase in the number of apartments and houses over the last few years, and I believe it is time to slow growth in northern Lancaster County until the Lancaster 2040 Comprehensive Plan is fully developed and put into place.

October 9, 2022

Margaret Norris
1243 Mooreland Wood Drive
Lancaster SC 29720

Lancaster County Planning Commission and Town Council
c/o Lancaster Planning Department

Re: Rezoning Application RZ-2002-0735, CLREF III Acquisitions LLC to rezone 5 parcels approx. 780 acres

As a resident who lives just off Van Wyck Road and uses this road daily, *I am not in favor of this rezoning.*


The density of the proposed subdivision does not compliment properties in the area and the neighboring Town of Van Wyck. These properties are zoned RN, Rural Neighborhood with Agricultural designations.

I am also concerned about the impact on a local community treasure, The Ivey Place.

I participated in the Small Area Plan community sessions and the Lancaster County 2024 Comprehensive Plan sessions, and I heard repeatedly the need for areas in the county to maintain their rural character. In addition, retention of the tree canopy, historical structures and areas that support wildlife and wetlands are important in making a community special and a wonderful place to live.

The proposed subdivision with its density will also have an adverse impact on the infrastructure –most notable roads. Van Wyck Road is a two-lane feeder road that continues to see pressure from developments such as Tree Tops or Sun City and shortly from the Maddison Apartments. I have seen the proposed plan and 5 ingress and egress lanes along Van Wyck Road will cause major headaches for residents and school bus traffic.

I would ask that you listen to residents and the community feedback and reject this rezoning request.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "MB Norris". The letters are cursive and somewhat stylized.

Margaret (Maggie) Norris

From: [Patricia Oglesby](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Nisbet Property on Van Wyck Road
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 4:20:26 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender poglesby@comporium.net

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

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed change in zoning for the Nisbet Property on Van Wyck Road. I understand this land is to be sold to a developer who intends to put in a densely populated development on the property and change the use of the existing house and lodge which are listed on the national register of Historic Places.

I feel that a development of this size and scope will be detrimental to the fragile natural environment of the property and to the existing community of Van Wyck. Over 1200 houses have been proposed for this area and that is much more than the zoning of the town of Van Wyck would allow (One house per acre). The traffic that this kind of construction and eventual population of this area would put more strain on Van Wyck Road and the Twelve Mile Creek Bridge on VW Road than should be allowed at all.

A development of this size and scope would also damage historical burial sites of the Catawba Indian tribe. The Catawba's have used the clay from this land and used portions of the land as a sacred burial ground for at least 100 years.

I realize that at some point this land will be sold and developed but I sincerely ask that the council not allow this large a development be allowed on this property.

Thank you,

Patricia M. Oglesby

PO Box 8

1069 West Rebound Rd

Van Wyck, SC

803-517-0775

From: [kay ostram](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Stop building
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 10:31:02 AM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender kay_bobostram@hotmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

Do NOT ok the building on Van Wyke Road. We are getting way over built in Indian Land. The roads and schools can not handle all of this. Use some common sense. It is not all about tax money. Build down in Lancaster.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Judy Overhultz](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Nesbit Plan
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 1:29:49 PM

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

Please include my comments in the ones to be read at the hearing. I could not get it to go through under the comment section.

My name is Judy Overhultz and I am a resident of the TreeTops and want to voice my opposition to the rezoning of the Nesbit Property.

Most of the residents in my neighborhood moved here because of the rural setting. Since moving here, the developing has become such that we are becoming a “bedroom community to Charlotte”. That is not a good thing. I understand that smart development must go on, but this plan does not fit the zoning of the land to the south of TreeTops. Please consider the following:

1. Lack of infrastructure
2. Van Wyck Rd is already a narrow, poorly maintained rd. The traffic studies that were done did not take into account all the apartments being built at the 521 intersection and the addition homes being built to the north of us on Griffin Rd. And VanWyck.
3. Construction traffic alone would tear VanWyck up
4. Indian Land Fire Dept is served by volunteers several living in my neighborhood. Lennar has donated land for an EMT station across from one of our entrances, yet unfunded by the County.
5. Duke Energy would be serving this development and they cannot serve Ph 2 of our neighborhood. Many are having whole house generators installed because of the many blackouts.
6. Storm water runoff is a major concern.
7. Van Wyck Road used to be a haven for cyclists. Not now
8. The Location of a pump station closest to TreeTops is a MAJOR concern.

Thank you for all you do for our county.

Respectfully submitted,
Judy Overhultz

From: [Steve Patton](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Van Wyck rd
Date: Thursday, October 13, 2022 2:04:02 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender hbfoxhunter@yahoo.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

I live in Treetops and I'm not understanding how you can let another development company build over 1000 more homes in this area. How do you expect this extremely small road to handle the traffic. The developers should be responsible for making the infrastructure work with the new building that is going on. If we had to evacuate in an emergency the road as is cannot handle the traffic. As it is we can barely get out of our neighborhood in the morning and afternoons due to traffic and when we are able to get out we sit at the stop light at Charlotte Hwy. for 3 or 4 lights. I don't know if the city or county has a traffic engineer but if they do that person needs to get up to speed with the growth in our city. Van Wyck rd is way to small to handle the existing traffic much less hundreds of more cars. Is there a traffic study being done? Or is it a free for all to get the tax money? I would like to see the traffic impact report on this and other projects

Sent from my iPad

From: [melissa.pelletrino](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Rezoning
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 2:20:15 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender melissa.pelletrino@gmail.com

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

Please do not rezone the property on Nesbet property. There is a lack of infrastructure to develop 1100 more homes in the area. We need more roads to support the growth first.

Signed
A concerned citizen

From: [Fred Peltz](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Development in Fort Mill
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 3:06:55 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender peltzf@gmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

We do not need more development, and more density in Van Wyck or upper Fort Mill before the infrastructure and first responders are in place.

Thank you for listening.

Fred Peltz



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 17, 2022, 05:12PM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion: Van Wyck Road development

Meeting Date: October 18, 2022 05:06 PM

Full Name
First Name: Allison
Last Name: Peterson

Phone Number 7047240150

Email apeterson72311@gmail.com

Address: 1140 Mooreland wood drive Lancaster sc 29720 (van Wyck)

Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item: This type of volume of development would not be consistent in any way with the rural culture of this area. The high density is too much, and not desired by the community. The schools and infrastructure are not meant to sustain this level of development. The beautiful views on van Wyck road would not be the same, and the additional traffic would change the ways current residents would travel daily. We greatly oppose this development. Thank you for your consideration in blocking the development of this scale/density.

From: [Sharon Peterson](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Proposed building project near Tree Tops
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 6:00:43 AM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender mustangsal3@yahoo.com

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

PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE do not allow further development in this area of Indian Land!!! Traffic is already a nightmare on Van Wyck Road where it accesses 521. When the new apartments are occupied, I dread thinking what kind of impossible traffic situation we'll all be dealing with!! I hope and pray that someone will have the wisdom to just say NO!!

It is totally unfeasible to allow further development in this area. As a fairly new resident of Tree Tops, I feel thankful that I don't have a job to report to daily. The poor people who do are in an extremely dire situation with the narrow 2 lane road that is presently Van Wyck.

Please show the people of Lancaster County that county officials are looking out for our best interests, and do not allow further building in this area. Our infrastructure cannot support it!!

Sincerely.

Sharon Peterson
Tree Tops resident

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [diane ramsay](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Zoning on VanWyke
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2022 10:36:57 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender dramsay48@gmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

I live in Tree tops now for four years. The traffic situation on this road is becoming a hazard.

Planning commission has allowed developers to build with no regard to our infrastructure.

1. Apartments on corner of 521 and Van Wyke causing problems and when the apartments are finished, it will even worse
2. Developments on every intersection with 2 lane roads causing hazardous driving.
3. Poor planning causing drivers heavy traffic from SC line to VanWyke Rd
4. Lights are not even synchronized to allow smooth flow of vehicles.

Please consider the residents safety instead of tax dollars. Our property is at stake and the serenity of this beautiful area will be ruined.

Thank you

Best Regards
Diane Ramsay
ProStead Realty
Dramsay48@gmail.com
704-576-1100

Sent from my iPad

From: [Mike Reddy](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Nesbit planned community
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 5:48:45 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender michael0118reddy@gmail.com

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

I'm writing to let you know of my opposition to the proposed Nesbit development off of Van Wyck Rd in Lancaster county. There is clearly no infrastructure to support this development. Between the communities of Sin City, Treetops and the new apartment development on the corner of Van Wyck and 521, the 2 lane road is already saturated. There is plenty of land south of Van Wyck Rd heading to Lancaster that is ripe for development. There must be rural land, places that still remain open in this area. I urge you to vote down this new development.

From: [ANN B RICHARDSON](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Van Wyck proposed development
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 9:40:15 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender annrrg@bellsouth.net

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

PLEASE slow the rampant development in the Panhandle until roads and infrastructure catch up. Traffic is already so bad we are considering relocating. No one will want to live in a constant traffic jam.

Ann Richardson and David Bower, Sun City Carolina Lakes

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Brenda Sadler](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Proposed subdivision off of Van Wyck
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2022 7:01:10 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender sadler.brenda@gmail.com

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

As a resident of Tree Tops, I have great concerns over the proposed subdivision slated to be built adjacent to our community. The Van Wyck traffic already overwhelms the existing road, with no plans for expansion on the books. In addition, Duke Power currently struggles to provide consistent service to current customers in this area, including our home. The infrastructure of this area simply cannot handle additional expansion without implementing improvements in advance of expansion.

We ask that you deny the proposed neighborhood until appropriate infrastructure changes have been approved and implemented.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brenda Sadler
1905 Tranquility Boulevard
Lancaster, SC 29720

From: [Dan Sadvary](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Fwd: Van Wyck rezoning...Vote NO!!!!!!!, on Oct. 18 **everyone bcc'd: please ADD your emails to this e-address:Jbryan@lancastersc.net
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 12:37:12 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender dansadvary@yahoo.com

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

Note email below

Dan

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Dan Sadvary <dansadvary@yahoo.com>
Date: October 17, 2022 at 12:33:28 PM EDT
To: Jbryan@lancastersc.net
Subject: Van Wyck rezoning...Vote NO!!!!!!!, on Oct. 18 **everyone bcc'd: please ADD your emails to this e-address:Jbryan@lancastersc.net

Given the soon to be opened new Apartments (ugh!) on Van Wyck, near 521, the traffic congestion will go from BAD to WORSE If there is new housing across from Ivy Farm.

Will this Developer PAY for widening Van Wyck to 4 lanes ,with extra turn lanes at 521??

-Vote NO on Rezoning, across from IVY Farm.-

Lancaster County is “killing the Goose” (aka , Indian Land) that has laid the Golden eggs

(Big tax revenue) for the past several years, Without adding to infrastructure-especially to

significantly ADDING Road capacity and better traffic flow.

(All County Council, Admin. Should have to experience current major traffic congestion here..often during times other than just rush hour!)

There really NEEDS to be a Moratorium on All New Housing in Indian Land, until new

infrastructure, traffic planning is in place and operational.....

This gridlock will most likely have a severe negative impact , eventually, on property

Values here...which will be Bad for All of Us..

-Plus, what's the latest on Developer Impact Fee??? Fort Mill has had this for

many years, taking in millions of dollars \$\$ for infrastructure....

Vote NO on Oct. 18

Thank You for your thoughtful consideration

****URGENT..**I encourage everyone cc'd on this email to ADD your comments with your own email: the meeting is tomorrow, Oct.

18....Jbryan@lancastersc.net

We here in Indian Land..the poor, underrepresented red haired step child of Lancaster

County need our rights, property values protected!!....and forward to your friends!

Dan Sadvary
1078 Mesa Verde Drive, IL

Sent from my iPad

From: [Dan Saffer](#)
To: [Dennis E. Marstall](#); [Sherrie Simpson](#); [Jennifer Bryan](#); [Rox Burhans](#); [Terry Graham](#); [cmcgriff@comporium.net](#); [Billy Mosteller](#); [lhoney@comporium.net](#); [Steve Harper](#); [Allen Blackmon](#); [Brian Carnes](#)
Subject: RZ-2022-0735 Nisbet Property and Digital Billboards on 521
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 10:20:34 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender daniel.j.saffer@gmail.com

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

Good evening all,

Hope that this email finds you well.

I am writing to urge against the planned rezoning of the Nisbet Property and the proposed digital billboards along 521.

Regarding the Nisbet Property, the last thing the Panhandle needs is another high density residential neighborhood. I strongly urge Planning Commission and County Council to deny the rezoning application.

1. There is a lack of appropriate infrastructure along Van Wyck road to support the high density housing and traffic that will come with it.
2. While not under the direct jurisdiction of the County Council the school system is under strain without a clear direction on future capacity expansions. This impacts all of us in Lancaster County.
3. The lot sizes are far too small and replicate much of the housing that already exists in Walnut Creek. There is a demand for property with larger lots and nicer homes, with the higher valuations (and associated tax revenues) this seems like something reasonable citizens would support.
4. No one that lives in the Panhandle is asking for this, the quality of the developments being built need additional scrutiny as aesthetics and appearance of new structures both residential and commercial developments continues to decline.

While realizing progress/development is inevitable I encourage the following to be considered in future proposals.

1. Large lot (1.0 acre plus) requirements for a percentage of any new development to reduce density and strain on the community.
2. Material requirements for housing finishes (e.g. Brick) to improve quality in the Panhandle and protect/elevate property values.
3. Age restricted portions of developments to reduce strain on schools
4. While Impact Fees are nice, broker deal with developers for additional school sites.

Lastly regarding the digital billboards, this is something no one wants. While I do not have all the details, something doesn't smell right here. The eyesore on 521 is not worth the 10 acres in Buford that would be given as a quid pro quo. That this is even being considered is the government at its worst and shameful. If the land is that important to Buford community, put the billboards out there. The fact that this proposal is being considered is utterly ridiculous.

Thank you for your time and attention to these matters, continuing to stuff the Panhandle with cluster development and other eyesores doesn't benefit anyone that lives here. For those of you in districts south of Highway 5, ask yourself if these are things you would want in your backyard.

Happy to discuss further if helpful.

Best regards,
Dan Saffer
1326 W Rebound Rd



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 17, 2022, 06:55AM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion: Nisbet Properties Rezoning - I would like to be added to the agenda to speak

Meeting Date: October 18, 2022 06:00 PM

Full Name
First Name: Paul
Last Name: Schulz

Phone Number 704-231-5773

Email prschulz1910@gmail.com

Address: 2060 Acadia Falls Ln, Lancaster, SC 29720

Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item: Residents in Tree Tops and the Tree Tops HOA Board of Directors realize that there will be growth in our area because it is a wonderful place to live. However, on behalf of the residents in Tree Tops, the Tree Tops HOA Board of Directors opposes the Nisbet properties development as written for the following reasons: • The new community, as drafted, is not in keeping with the current farm/conservation easements which surround it. • The Nisbet Properties development is requesting far too many homes within the community, which is not in keeping with the surrounding communities. The higher density of homes will have a negative effect on home values in the current communities within the area. • There is a lack of proper infrastructure to support the additional 1,000+ homes which will likely bring over 2,000 additional automobiles to Van Wyck Road and surrounding support roads. • There is already a lack of proper traffic control at the overtaxed Van Wyck/521 intersection. This new development would add to the traffic issues on top of the currently approved 281 new homes yet to be built on Griffin Road and the large apartment complex at the intersection of Van Wyck and 521. A traffic study should be completed after the Griffin Road development and apartments are in place to determine what traffic improvements are needed before adding 2,000 more automobiles to this intersection. • The construction of 1,000+ homes will have a negative impact on the already deteriorating condition of Van Wyck Road even before heavy usage and additional damage by construction vehicles. • This development may put too much of a burden on this area's utilities. As an example, many Tree Tops residents serviced by Duke Energy are installing whole house

generators because of the lack of Duke's Infrastructure and unreliable service. • The current level of emergency services may not be adequate for the population density being proposed. There are concerns about whether or not the current fire stations can effectively serve this area with the addition of the Nisbet community along with what is already under development. In addition, the county has previously acknowledged the need for another EMT station. Lennar Corporation, the developer of Tree Tops, donated land for this purpose. However, there has been no funding approved to develop the EMT station. The Tree Tops BOD and the concerned residents of our community are asking the Planning Commission not to approve the rezoning variance application.

From: [Sandy Sharer](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#); [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: "NO" to Nesbit project
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 9:09:49 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender sandysharerscc@gmail.com

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

Please vote NO on the Nesbit project. Review this project in a couple of years when other construction projects have been completed. Please wait and see what the impact of currently approved projects will have on Hwy 521 and Van Wyke Road.

Thank you.

Sandy Sharer
Mobile: 612-281-3868

From: [John Sheehan](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Nesbit Project on Van Wyck
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2022 11:36:38 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender john.sheehan49@icloud.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

Hi, this is John Sheehan at 5034 Big Bend Dr, Lancaster, SC. I object to the zoning variance for the Nesbit development on Van Wyck.

Why? The two lane Van Wyck is narrow and getting close to repair. We need a solid plan to upgrade capacity on that road before any more big developments are added.

Please decline the request for variance.

Thanks.

John Sheehan

Sent from my iPhone

From: stuff4donna@comporium.net
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: rezoning of Nesbit property, Van Wyck Rd
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 12:38:52 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender stuff4donna@comporium.net

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

Dear Council members:

I am writing to urge you NOT to rezone the Nesbit property for the proposed large housing development.

Van Wyck Road is already inundated with traffic from other large developments – Sun City, Tree Tops, Riverchase – the new apartments under construction up by 521 will only make it more so.

It is dangerous and downright irresponsible to continue to allow development, especially the scale of this one, to proceed and not shore up the infrastructure to support it. You cannot add another 2000 cars to a 2 lane road and expect it to be OK (not to mention the heavy destruction/construction equipment, construction materials supply vehicles, thousands of people trekking out to view the homes, moving trucks, etc. Does anyone ever actually consider this??) . You cannot add hundreds of children to a school system with no plan or concern as to how it will affect the schools and millions of dollars for MORE schools. There is more to consider than the tax income it will bring to the county.

I lived in Fort Mill for 19 years and watched them make one irresponsible decision after another resulting in traffic nightmares, the need for one school after another to be built, etc. – please learn from their mistakes. (Evidence of your doing so is not apparent in the willy-nilly over-developing of the panhandle; for goodness sakes – do better! Please do not be swooned by the tax income to the county resulting in negative impacts to those having to actually PAY the taxes!)

I sincerely trust you will deny this request.

Donna Sigman

From: [SHARON SUMMERS](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Proposed Nesbit Development
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 10:12:15 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender ssdubld17@gmail.com

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

Gentlemen:

Enough please - stop all this building of more housing! We can hardly get down 521 now. The infrastructure cannot support any more. Just because there is land, does not mean it needs to be built on.

The number of nice restaurants can be counted on one hand so please concentrate your efforts on bringing us something besides car repair shops, fast food and mattress stores!

Indian Land had character, but it's being ruined and greed is the cause. Please re-think all that additional housing and let Indian Land be special while there's still time.

Sharon Summers

From: [Tylee Tracer-Anderson](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Rezoning in Van Wyck
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 2:00:32 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender tyleetracer@gmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.
—IT Helpdesk, [support.lancastercountysc.net](mailto:support@lancastercountysc.net)

I would like for you to relay this message to the Commissioners, my stance on rezoning the Nisbet Property on Van Wyck Road. I absolutely do NOT want this to happen. This area is a safe haven for so much wildlife, and a beautiful untouched part of the county with amazing views and a way to get out of the bustle of Indian Land and Lancaster. Please do not let this be rezoned for 1000's more housing developments and preserve the land. I am currently a resident of Lancaster County and want to keep this part of the county beautiful and natural.

From: [Diane Tracey](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#); [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Proposed development on Van Wyck Road by Nesbit
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 11:22:21 AM

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

Hi all. Yes another email about the proposed 1019 homes and sewer treatment plant to be built on Van Wyck. We are not naive to think that we can stop development. BUT you need to upgrade the infrastructure to make sure you have not created another major problem. This is a 2 lane road that floods in certain areas when it rains. We are talking about adding a minimum of 500 cars, up to 1000+ per day to the already existing traffic. And more from the huge development being built less than 3 miles up the road at Van Wyck and 521. Do you seriously think this small road can handle that much traffic without any improvements such as widening and turning lanes?? Common sense needs to prevail. And then throw in a sewer treatment plant. This area already gets bombarded with the New Indy smell and pollution. Maybe that is why the planning board feels it's OK to put the sewer treatment plant there. The smells will blend in. Sensible modifications need to be made to this plan or it should be scrapped.

Thank you.

Diane Tracey

Tree Tops

Lancaster, SC

Ironical that I live in a development that likely had opposition to it being built too. At least Lennar repaved Van Wyck, A although it should have been widened at that time. But you missed that chance. Missed it again with the development at 521 and Van Wyck. Here's another chance to fix those errors.


From: Glenn Trutner
To: Rex Burhans; Terry Granam; cmoniff@comporium.net; Billy Mosteller; lboney@comporium.net; Steve Harper; Allen Blackmon; Bran James; Dennis E. Marstall; Sherrie Simpson; Jennifer Bryan
Cc: Pat Trutner
Subject: Nisbet Property Rezoning
Date: Saturday, October 15, 2022 4:29:40 PM
Attachments: IMG_5163.png
PastedGraphic-4.jpg

The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender gtrutner@icloud.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites
—IT Helpdesk, support@lancastercountysc.net

To: Lancaster County Planning Board

We have noticed a rezoning request has been made for one of the “Nisbet” properties on both sides of Van Wyck Road in Lancaster, as follows:



As presently described, we oppose this rezoning for the following reasons:

- 1) The **sewer pumpstation** is positioned so as to MAXIMIZE the impact of any resulting air pollution on the TreeTops Community
- 2) **Van Wyck Road** is far too narrow to adequately handle the traffic resulting from over 1,000 new homes
- 3) **Duke Energy**, if they are expected to supply electrical services to any or all of the proposed community, is already overstretched in this area and the additional load would have a disastrous impact on their already shaky reliability
- 4) The **proposed density** continues a recent trend towards high density communities, which out of character for the surrounding area, and approval would only serve as a bad precedent as the remaining Nisbet and other properties come on the market.

These objections are described in more detail below.

Sewer Pumpstation

Such devices are in fact DESIGNED to enable releases of toxic fumes as as part of their normal operation, unless additional pollution control technologies are employed

(https://static1.squarespace.com/static/534128c3e4b063017f7a6d31/54f7b9f6e4b0a53decd97641426045430944/ATOdourControlForPumpStations.pdf?fbclid=IwAR2Xdgl8rx06iz_0bfVp0mj2oRsmV5JvI2R3a6O4hluOrhoHfR040M5yKvg). We inquired with LCWSD as to what would be required here. The response received from their operations manager was not encouraging:

"For pump stations we typically try to use buffers/site location and best management practices to keep local odors as low as possible."

The proposed location of the pumpstation certainly does that for the NEW community, since winds typically blow through there in a north/northeasterly direction, but it puts TreeTops squarely in line for the toxic releases. We continue to endure similar pollution from the New-Indy paper mill, which is about 4 miles away in York County and still awaiting final resolution by DHEC/EPA/courts. We certainly don't need additional toxins being released right on our doorstep.

We have unfortunately learned far more than we wanted to about the effect of such toxins, particularly hydrogen sulfide (H2S) which is the principle release from sewer pumpstations, and can send you LOTS of information if you want it. This article provides quick review of the health effects of even very low exposures to H2S: <https://ohsonline.com/articles/2007/10/human-health-effects-from-exposure-to-low-level-concentrations-of-hydrogen-sulfide.aspx>

Van Wyck Road

Van Wyck is NOT a major thoroughfare, and is more like a country road. The speed limit is too high for the existing traffic, which is already a bit more than it should be, and we have observed a number of near-miss accidents at the entrance to Sun City as well as to TreeTops. It is the ONLY route to and from 521. There are already 2 development projects underway which will strain this road past its limits:

- a) the apartment complexes on the Indian Land side of Van Wyck, well under way, which will only connect to Van Wyck
- b) the imminent "Griffen Road" development just north of TreeTops, which also will directly and indirectly connect only to Van Wyck

While the Nisbet owners certainly have the right to sell their property to developers, we think there are alternative uses for this land which will have far less of an impact on the Van Wyck traffic situation; see below under "proposed density".

Duke Energy

If Duke will be supplying energy to some or all of this new development, they are NOT equipped to do so at the present time. We have been informed by Duke that this may take YEARS to fix, since this area is at the end of their power lines (power only comes in from one direction). They tried to get permission to cross over with York at the Sun City substation, but apparently met with regulatory issues. Still unresolved. For more information, please contact:

Takisha Waller
(803) 737-5267
twaller@ors.sc.gov

Proposed Density

The new community is expected to have about 1,100 houses on 780 acres, or 0.71 acres/house. For comparison:

- a) TreeTops has 799 houses on 613 acres, or 0.77 acres/house
- b) Ivy Place is a nonresidential "rural commercial" property of 701 acres
- c) Mooreland Wood has (I believe) 14 lots on 206 acres, or 14.7 acres/house
- d) The prospective "Carolina Ventures/Griffin Road" development has 281 lots on 155 acres, or 0.55 acres/house (this rezoning was approved against the unanimous recommendations of the Planning Commission - you were right!)

So this area has a mix of higher density and lower density communities - such a mix is healthy to maintain, and we've already got a couple of high-density projects on the way (could not find any specifics on the in-progress apartment complex). The proposed development could be situated as a low-density residential, or perhaps even an "agrimmunity", instead of the present proposal.

Sincerely,

Pat & Glenn Trutner
3079 Oliver Stanley Trail (TreeTops Community)
Lancaster, SC 29720

From: [Jen Tsonas](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Comments on proposed Nisbet Development
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 12:00:37 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender jentsonas2@gmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

As a four year resident of Tree Tops I would like to weigh in on the proposed 1000 home development being considered for Van Wyck.

We understand the explosion of population in this area and the run to make the money. That is of course the way of the world. That being said I would think that the first concern should be not the tax revenue but the impact on the local community and surrounding towns.

Van Wyck is a two lane road that is already congested and about to get even more so with the upcoming complexes at the intersection of 521 and Van Wyck. How in the world will this road accommodate 1000 + more cars? What about the infrastructure? Gas, electric, water? We already experience frequent blackouts due to the heavy load on the Duke Energy grid. Cell service is poor. Are the schools prepared to accommodate the influx of students? Speaking of schools the county is already experiencing a huge shortage of teachers. What will the effect of this influx have on class size?

We realize that the rural feel we “bought in to” was bound to change but do it responsibly. Limit how much can be built and within specific time frames that will allow the infrastructure to grow equivalent to the construction rate.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jen Tsonas
5101 Samoa Ridge Dr. - Tree Tops
Indian Land, SC

B-ULIBARRI (1)

From: [BY Ulibarri](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Opposition to Nesbit Property Rezoning
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 4:56:03 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender dareana@hotmail.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

Firstly, I'd like to say that I didn't see any signs prominently displayed announcing the rezoning of the property as we've seen for other properties in the past. I suspect you would have received more comments had there been signs posted and kept visible from the road. I feel like we've been blindsided by this rezoning request announcement.

I oppose the rezoning of this large tract of land to accommodate approx. 1100 homes, especially high-density homes for the following reasons:

- It will probably impact the electrical power of this area. As it is right now, homes powered by Duke suffer numerous outages a year. I know that neighbors are having to purchase generators to keep the power going when these outages occur.
- It will negatively impact the traffic on Van Wyck Rd which only has 2 lanes. Can we even trust the traffic study? We are already bracing for the added traffic that will be added to Van Wyck with the building of a large apartment complex at the corner of Van Wyck and 521. In addition, there are another 250+ homes going in off Griffin Road (east of Tree Tops).
- There would need to be 4 lanes of traffic to accommodate existing traffic; the current homes/apartments currently being built; and the steady stream of construction vehicles and school buses. The new apartments/homes are not inhabited yet, and already there is already a backup at Van Wyck/521. We do not have alternative routes accessible to us to avoid traffic, especially in case of an emergency. I cannot even imagine how long it will take ambulances to get thru this area when the traffic is backed up if this project is approved.
- Unless it will be developed into a 55+ community, this many homes will place a huge burden on the already crowded schools.
- We may be further impacted by the New Indy chemical dispersions when all the 700+ acres of beautiful trees are leveled.
- Also, is the builder going to let the people purchasing these homes know of the present

situation with New Indy, which appears to have no end in sight? People in our neighborhood are still having physical effects such as headaches, asthmatic symptoms, etc.

- I'm not familiar with the developer. Are they capable of planning and carrying thru this huge project? Are they somehow vetted?
- I don't think the one-time fee will cover future costs.

Please **DO NOT APPROVE** this rezoning request, as it will have a **negative** effect on the quality of life of all the surrounding residents. If this land is developed, it should be done in a manner in keeping with the surrounding area, not high-density homes. It should preserve the existing trees as much as possible, have middle to low-density homes, and avoid causing harm to the Catawba river. It should also provide expanding the Van Wyck road to accommodate all the added traffic.

Thank You,

Betsy Ulibarri

Tree Tops Resident

B. Ulibarri (2)

From: [BY Ulibarri](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Subject: Additional comment regarding opposition to Nesbit Property rezoning
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 5:23:37 PM

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

This is in addition to the reasons I oppose the rezoning as stated in the previous email I sent just a while ago. This project will not only affect the immediate area, but also the area in general. There are thousands of new homes already approved to be built and we haven't even seen what the impact of those will be on the local traffic. The road already backs up at the intersection of Van Wyck Rd and 521. Having all these cars backing up will provoke drivers to start driving thru Sun City Carolina Lakes community to avoid the bottleneck at 521/Van Wyck. Also, there are already many accidents on 521, and the exit from Sun City onto Van Wyck is dangerous. There have been MANY near collisions.

Thank you again,
Betsy Ulibarri
2972 Arches Bluff Circle
Tree Tops Resident



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 12, 2022, 02:29PM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion: Rezoning of Tax Parcel Nos. 0022-00-002.00, 0022-00-002.02, 0022-00-002.03, 0022-00-003.00 and 0022-00-003.01, owned by Nisbet Properties LLC

Meeting Date: October 18, 2022 02:27 PM

Full Name
First Name: Ronald
Last Name: Ulibarri

Phone Number 5402705097

Email ronulibarri@outlook.com

Address: 2972 Arches Bluff Cir. Lancaster, SC 29720

**Citizen Comment - Regarding
Agenda Item:**

• The Nisbet community is not needed. There are a number of developments in the area that are still building homes and adding another community to the mix will only complicate completion of the Nisbet community as well as these other communities. Area communities where potential home owners can buy right now are: Millbridge, Walnut Creek, Riverchase Estates, the large Lennar project near Lancaster (not yet named), the 200+ home development going in on Griffin Road next to Tree Tops (not yet named), the new development along Waxhaw Highway near the SC/NC border (not yet named). It does not make sense to add another large community at this time. • I question the validity of the companies involved in the rezoning request. The Zoning Amendment Application was signed by a representative of CLREF III Acquisitions LLC, 10006 N. Dale Mabry Highway, Suite 201, Tampa, FL 33618, though the Draft Development Agreement shows this company as incorporated in Delaware. A search of Delaware corporation records shows the address of the company as 251 Little Falls Drive, Wilmington, DE 16908, phone number 302-636-5401, with the agent for the company listed as Corporation Service Company. Corporation Service Company helps shell companies avoid paying proper state taxes. Do we really want a company like this doing business in our backyard? • A Google search for CLREF gives a Tampa address and shows a company by the name of Landeavor, not CLREF III Acquisitions LLC. Landeavor has an office in Tampa at this exact address and also has an office in Waxhaw, so why the secrecy by hiding the actual owners with a Delaware/Florida LLC? I believe CLREF III Acquisitions LLC is bogus company because they have no website, no

internet presence whatsoever, other than 'acquisition' in their name and no business description anywhere. Other than the fact that Delaware incorporated them in 1997, there is zero information about who owns this company, what they do, or reviews to determine a legitimate business history.

- Nisbet Properties LLC, was established as a South Carolina company back in 1998. According to Bizzfile.com, the business is described as: Nisbet Properties is located in Lancaster, South Carolina. This organization primarily operates in the Building Maintenance Services, nec business / industry within the Business Services sector. This organization has been operating for approximately 24 years. Nisbet Properties is estimated to generate \$33,401 in annual revenues, and employs approximately 1 people at this single location. Nisbet Properties does not have the business history or experience to start and complete a community of this scale, not should they be allowed to try.
- Lancaster County is reviewing a rezoning application for a shell acquisition company, CLREF III Acquisitions LLC, which calls into question the transparency of the land acquisition. The secrecy of Landeavor hiding behind CLREF III Acquisitions LLC should be reviewed before consideration is given to the rezoning request.
- I find it impossible to believe that Nisbet Properties LLC can demonstrate a history of successful home building, construction management, and community development sufficient for approval of the rezoning application. Nisbet Properties LLC completely lacks the business experience and business history to demonstrate they are willing and able to follow Lancaster and South Carolina building requirements and codes, or the ability to build a quality home, or are capable of providing proper warranties to potential home owners. Who in their right mind would pay hundreds of thousands of dollars for a home built by an unknown company, with zero business experience and history?
- I also ask that the Planning Commission not approve the rezoning application based on the following reasons:
 - o The new community, as drafted, is not in keeping with the current farm/conservation easements which surround it.
 - o There is a lack of proper infrastructure to support the additional 1,000+ homes which will bring over 2,000 additional automobiles to Van Wyck Road and surrounding support roads.
 - o There is already a lack of proper traffic control at the overtaxed Van Wyck/521 intersection. This new development would add to the traffic issues on top of the currently approved 200+ new homes yet to be built on Griffin road and the large apartment complex at the intersection of Van Wyck and 521. A traffic study should be completed after the Griffin Road development and apartments are in place to determine what traffic

improvements are needed before adding 2,000 more automobiles to this intersection. o The Nesbit development is requesting far too many homes within the community, which is not in keeping with the surrounding communities. The higher density of home will have a negative effect on home values to the current communities in the area. o The Town of Van Wyck strongly opposes the new develop as it is not in keeping with the aesthetic of the township or surrounding area. Lancaster County Planning Commission, I submit that Nesbit Properties LLC has no business attempting to build such a large development due to their lack of business experience...period. Their lack of experience will no doubt bring many more problems and issues to Lancaster County than it solves. Furthermore, Lancaster County and the surrounding area has experienced a huge increase in the number of apartments and houses over the last few years, and I believe it is time to slow growth in northern Lancaster County until the Lancaster 2040 Comprehensive Plan is fully developed and put into place.



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 15, 2022, 02:43PM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion: Nisbet development

Meeting Date: October 18, 2022 02:40 PM

Full Name
First Name: Gail
Last Name: Vance

Phone Number 9102842764

Email gailcvance@gmail.com

Address: 1589 Tranquility Blvd

Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item: Please do not approve the Nisbet concept for Van Wyke Rd near Tree Tops. The infrastructure will not support the additional population density.



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 16, 2022, 09:37PM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion: #5 c & d Acquisitions aka Nisbet Property

Meeting Date: October 18, 2022 09:30 PM

Full Name
First Name: Richard
Last Name: Vaughan

Phone Number 8032851076

Email wwvaughan@comporium.net

Address: 7350 Van Wyck Road

Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item: I was born and raised in Van Wyck. My wife, Linda, and I worked tirelessly on the committee to incorporate Van Wyck. After incorporation was approved, I was elected and served as a member to the Town Council. Linda was appointed as Town Municipal Clerk and Treasurer. One of the main reasons we fought so hard for incorporation was to keep the out-of-control development out of Van Wyck as is seen in the unincorporated area of Indian Land. Two words-"Indian Lands"-the late local historians, Louise and Lindsay Pettus, wrote that a majority of the property north of 12-mile creek was inhabited by the Catawba Indians. I heard over the years that the Nisbet property has numerous graves scattered throughout its boundaries. This location has three of the oldest homes in Lancaster County-Oakdale (Yoder property), Ivy Place and the Oliver Nisbet home. This is not an area that can or should accommodate a cluster development of 1,000+ homes. Roads, schools, infrastructure cannot support this type of development. Among the most crucial concern is the Van Wyck Fire District consist of a small volunteer fire and rescue department. It does not fit in the Van Wyck Comprehensive Plan. This development borders protected land and will threaten a family-owned farm and wedding venue. Please deny the cluster development rezoning request.

From: [Matthew Walgren](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Van Wyck Rezoning Vote
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 1:53:36 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender mattwalgren@yahoo.com

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

To whom it may concern,

As a resident of the Bridgemill neighborhood in Indian Land, I am concerned about the proposed plans to rezone additional land for a large residential community on Van Wyck. While I am pro growth for the area and appreciate the amenities and conveniences that such growth has offered us, I would like to make sure that the pros and cons be thoughtfully considered with respect to appropriate impact fees paid by developers, as well as infrastructure concerns related to roads, traffic and schools be properly addressed. Please take careful consideration with the direction of our community.

Best regards,

Matthew and Kristy Walgren
2017 Donaldson Street
Indian Land SC 29707

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: Anne WHITE <ahfwhite@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 10:48 AM
To: Ashley Davis <ADavis@lancastersc.net>
Subject: Opposing Rezoning Petition - 8275 Van Wyke Road

 The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender
ahfwhite@bellsouth.net

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

Dear Ashley,

I am opposed to the rezoning of the Oliver Nisbet property at 8275 Van Wick Rd by petitioner CLREF III Acquisitions LLC. My husband's family has owned and lived on the adjacent Ivy Place property for many generations and has worked hard to preserve the land. I do not agree with the development plans of the property and request that this rezoning petition to the Planning Commission and to County Council NOT be recommended for approval.

Over past decades the Nisbet family has donated 1,025 acres of Conservation Easements to the Catawba Valley Land Trust (KVLT) protecting 3.7 miles of Catawba River frontage and nearly one mile of Van Wyck Road frontage. The subject property is nearly surrounded by

Conservation Easements held in perpetuity by KVLT. The proposed cluster housing development is much too dense and will impede the good work done by KVLT for water and land conservation in the immediate vicinity.

In addition to being a family home, the Ivy Place is a thriving multi-faceted business offering a wedding and events venue, fresh produce, cut flowers, and berry picking to promote AgriTourism in the area. The location is special for Lancaster County and the proposed development of adjacent densely packed homes will diminish its uniqueness, threaten the protected wildlife, and further erode the rural nature of the area.

I believe the rezoning petition should be opposed and instead the land should be permanently protected through KVLT for a more environmentally sound purpose such as a County Park with access to the Catawba River.

Sincerely,

Anne White
Charlotte, NC

From: [Matthew Blaszyk](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: FW: Rezoning Petition - 8275 Van Wyck Rd
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 11:12:30 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[LCLogo_c716c29e-f766-46c0-a18c-7d20f2fc6ebd.png](#)



Matthew Blaszyk, Planner
Planning
Lancaster County Government
P.O. Box 1809
Lancaster, SC 29720
P: (803) 285-6005 F: (877) 636-7963
mblaszyk@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: Jimmy White <JWhite@nisbetoil.com>
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 6:12 PM
To: Matthew Blaszyk <mblaszyk@lancastersc.net>
Subject: Rezoning Petition - 8275 Van Wyck Rd

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

Dear Mr. Blaszyk,

Am writing to oppose the Rezoning petition by CLREF III Acquisitions LLC from RN to MDR zoning at the above address.

MDR zoning is far too intense a use for this beautiful, historic property, and the proposed plan will hurt the thriving Agritourism business at The Ivy Place.

Our family has been in the Van Wyck area since the 1700s and I am an owner of the Ivey Place LLC property adjacent to the Oliver Nisbet properties. I served on the Board of Katawba Valley Land Trust for 29 years and our

extended family has donated over 1,000 acres of Conservation Easements to KVLTL.

The Nisbet families have permanently protected 3.7 miles of Catawba River frontage.

We also protected almost 1 mile of Van Wyck Rd frontage- on both sides of 'VW' Road.

We believe in land conservation, and we believe in keeping Van Wyck unique, different, and beautiful.

The subject property is nearly surrounded by Conservation Easements and I think this should be reason enough to disallow this plan.

This high density development is not compatible with the surrounding rural farms and Agritourism uses.

The plan puts cluster development right next to The Ivy Place Strawberry patch and events business, creating conflicts between the two incompatible land uses.

Please consider these facts and recommend 'against' this plan.

With Kind Regards,

Jimmy White

President

Nisbet Oil Co

Rhodes and Beal Oil Co

www.nisbetoil.com

704-332-7755



Celebrating 95 years in business in 2022

From: [Beverly Williams](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: Nesbit Property
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 7:42:15 PM

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

I am opposed to the newly proposed development of 1100 homes on the Nesbit property.

There is too much traffic on Van Wyck road now. I live very near the 521/Van Wyck road intersection.

Thank you for your Consideration.

Beverly Williams
131 Arrowhead Dr, Lancaster, SC 29720

8033220464

From: [Carol Yow](#)
To: [Planning Mailbox](#)
Cc: [Tom Yow](#)
Subject: Planned community for Van Wyck Road adjacent to TreeTops
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2022 6:11:39 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender yowcarol@yahoo.com

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL E-MAIL — Use caution when clicking on links as they could open malicious websites.

—IT Helpdesk, support.lancastercountysc.net

As two year residents of TreeTops, we have noticed the amount of traffic from our community of 797 homes, to 521 Highway. With the apartment complexes already being built at the entrance of 521/Van Wyck, the amount of traffic will increase even more PLUS residents of Carolina Lakes....and regular traffic from 5 that intersects Van Wyck, that also use this road. Now to add the traffic of 1019 more homes, the traffic on Van Wyck road will be unimaginable. Now consider the sewer pump station to be situated near our home, along with the already odor from New Indy. When is “enough” enough? Please consider the residents to be affected along with the natural beauty of the area which will also be definitely harmed. With your eyes open, thank you for your consideration.
Tom and Carol Yow

Sent from my iPad

ATTACHMENT:

Items 5c & 5d: Nisbet Property
Petition from Residents

STOP Development on Van Wyck Rd.

To: Tree Tops Residents & Sun City

Nisbet Properties, LLC wants to build 1,000 high density homes and a sewer pump station on Van Wyck Rd. between Ivy Farms and the south side of Tree Tops. This development would have a major impact on Tree Tops residents with increased traffic and 5+ years of heavy construction equipment, noise and dust. It is already anticipated that the apartments on Van Wyck and the new homes to be built on Griffen Rd will have a negative impact on the area. An additional 1,000 homes will significantly increase existing infrastructure issues in the area. In an effort to express Tree Tops residents' opinion on this issue, we ask that you sign this petition AGAINST the Nisbet Properties, LLC development. PLEASE DO SO NO LATER THAN MIDNIGHT OCTOBER 17, 2022.

Why is this important?

1. Lack of appropriate infrastructure
2. Too high density homes
3. Impact on quality of life
4. Threat to property values
5. Not keeping with farm/conservation easements that surround the proposed developments

Signed by 643 people:

Name	Zip code
Jean Doyle	29720
Ronald Ulibarri	29720
Jennifer Tsonas	29720
Harvey Bobb	29720
Jackie Baker	29720
Sharon Summers	29707
Diane Myers	29720
Barbara Buckridge	29707
Janet B. Plyler	29720
donna meng	29720
William D Plyler	29720
Tom Yow	29720
Richard Engels	29720-0297
Sandra Downs	29720
Janice Newlon	29707
Ronald Walkotten	28720

Name	Zip code
Jacquie Rudgers	29720
Richard Rudgers	29720
Samantha Stoddard	29720
Daniel Downs	29720
Ellen Dale	29720
Richard Dale	29720
Rita Ciarla	29720
Carolyn Tutino	29720
Barbara Smutney	29707
Carol Yow	29720
Lisa Mion	29720
Roy Vaughan	29720
Lisa Shasky	29720
Ken C	29720
Carol Schmitt	29720
Dawn Larkin	29720
Gus St. Angelo	29720
Stephanie Conklin	29720
Fred Davidson	29720
irene St Angelo	29720
JoAnne Anzano	29707
Jo Miller	29720
Paula Crawford	29720
Janice Hopper	29720
Larry Hopper	29720
angelina carreras	29720
Jim Guill	29720
Mary Taylor Hundley	29720
Susanne Hyman	29729
Alfred Woods	29720
Michael Satran	29720

Name	Zip code
Ronald Peskin	29720
Marcia L Fitzsimmons	29720
Carol Saari	29720
Cindy Carroll	29720
Mary Ann Sullivan	29720
Linda Gates	29720
Robert Arnold	29720
Steve Patton	29720
Ann Marie Dudek	29720
Sharon Smith	29720
Otis Darko	29720-0376
Elaine Stumpf	29720
Shelly Heckert	29720
Lurene Ulrich	29720
Maria Berkebile	29720
audrey schmidt	29720
Bonnie Lins	29720
Julie Sloop	29720
JIM DOTT	29720
Dana Baker	29720
Janice Sawitoski	29720
Dea Ruff	29720
Barbara Weber	29720
Doretha Hawkins	29720
Denise Becker	29720
Donna Anderson	29720
William Lins	29720
Karen Arnold	29707
Ron and Roberta Crone	29720
Scott Karpman	29720
ROSLYN REESE	29720

Name	Zip code
Deborah DeAbate	28173
Daniel Arnold	29707
Susan Dupuis	29720
Carolee Burkey	29720
Eleanor Magette	29720
Timothy Grimes	29720
Jan Parsons	29720
Liz Peffley	29707
Christine Wilson	29720
Irene Linner	29720
Mary Spangler-Boone	29720
Nancy Samson	39730
Barb Owensby	29720
Mary Ann Murano	29720
Sandra Driscoll	29720
Judy Overhultz	29720
Jack Driscoll	29720
Cheryl Powell	29720
Susan Ruck	29720
Kim Cousar	29720
Catherine Maida	29720
William Adams	29720
Chuck Howard	29720
Ellen Hitti	29720-0084
Dorothy Bernard	29720
Cynthia Laine	29720
Phil Chamberlain	29720
Ingrid Cesarski	29720
Mark Fermaglich	29720
John Laine	29720
Steve Cesarski	29720
Dale Fermaglich	29720

Name	Zip code
Dawn Eckholm	29720
Denise Capraro	29720
Laura Raleigh	29720
Ann Dyckman	29720
Michael Jenkins	29720
Frank Portagallo	29720
Pamela Guill	29720
Gertrude Rozas	29729
Dana Overby	29720
Ken Owensby	29720
Darcie McKay	29720
Jeffrey Schwartz	29720
Andrew Smith	29720
Walter Fulton	29720
Laura Douglas	29720
Sylvia Gilland	29720
William Kolceski	29720
Barbara Robertson	29720
Marilyn Girard	29720
Robert Fuller	29720
KENNETH IBERG	29720
Anne Mattice	29707
Carolyn Mundy	29720
Kenneth Gahr	29707
David Mundy	29720
Nancy Bentley	29720
Abby Bobb	29720
Deborah Grimes	29720
Michael Reddy	29720
Glenn Trutner	29720
Elizabeth Greenan	27920

Name	Zip code
Debra Crawford	29720
Clinton Brooks	29720
Charles Ryan	29720
Penelope De Picciotto	29720
Keith Petersen	29720
Judy Ottenstroer	29720
Mary VanWagenen	29720
Sylvia Hutchings	29720-0284
Dave Ohs	29720
Jayne Peterson	29720
Stephan Sam	29720
Eileen McG	29720
Timothy REESE	29720
Robert Lusk	29720
John Magette	29720
Linda DiApice	29720
Marlene Petersen	29720
Michael Saracino	29720
Soher Conti	29720
Janet Ostinelli	29720
Darlene Pelc	29720
Diane Turner	29720
Michael Pelc	29720
Kay Merrick	29720
Tom Greenan	29720
Diane Johnston	29720
Debra Robles	29720
Vincent Rizzo	29720
Shelley Pawlyk	29720
Beverly Sinople	29720
Carolyn McCrorey	29720

Name	Zip code
Mary Buckowsky	29720
Larry Buckowsky	29720
Sylvia Burch	29720
Natasha Thomas	29707
Maura Anne Lynch	297200091
Lydia Ledesma	29720
Pauline Mancuso	29729-0103
Sandi Harris	29729
Karen K.	29720
Joyce Woodlief	29720
Diane Tracey	29720
jerry matheny	29720
Joy Smith	29720
Lynn Costanzo	29720
Linda Meyers	29720
Michael Costanzo	29720
mary caterina	29720
Bill Meyers	29720
Donna Peterman	29720
Gene Hetzel	29720
Warren Heiser	29720
Robin Hensel	29707
Trudy Matheny	29720
Linda Heiser	29720
Clifford Houtz	29720
Catherine Foran	29720
Margaret Meyer	29720
Susan Stephenson	29720
John Linner	29720
Roseann Everett	29720
Michele Wisniewski	29720

Name	Zip code
Evelyn Dapra	29720
William Kasper	29720
Daniele Chavanton	29720
Jan Pugh	29720
Debra Orlando	29720
Barbara Vargochik	29720
Janine Smith	29720
Albert Peterson	29720
Darlene Slarb	29720
Mike Sloop	29720
Kirstan Marion	29708
Pamela Shultz	29720
Barbara Jenkins	29720
Ronald Patton	29720
Peggy Patton	29720
Gail Yannello	29720
Cynthia Mills	29720
David Koyle	29720
Regina Ryan	29720
Dwight Mills	29720
Maria Saracino	29720
Deborah Santoro	29720
John Crabtree	29720
Steven Hyman	29720
Julie Hesselgrave	29720
Frank Folly	29720
Donna Fulton	29720
Patricia Lowe	29720
Arlene Peskin	29720
Linda Privette	29720
Gary Nordling	29720

Name	Zip code
Donna McLean	29720
Chris Griffin	29720
Marsha Paitzel	29720
Cynthia Scudder	29720
Birginia Dziomba	29720
John King	29720
Virginia Dziomba	29720
Linda Mabry	29720
Susan Helfgott	29720
Diane Ramsay	29720
Mark McIsin	29720
Barbara Winkler	29720
Judith Bryant	29720
Robert Schexnayder Jr	29720
Shantel Schexnayder	29720
Barbara Minkoff	29720
Kathleen Moran	28173
Tessa Walker	29720
Dennis Berkebile	29720
Sharon Peterson	29720-0095
Sandy Leiviska	29720
Patricia B	29720
Dwayne Ruff	29720
Mark Johnston	29720
Anthony Koszalinski	29720
Loraine Koszalinski	29720
Laura Renegar	29720
William Hennessy	29720
Vickie Jarvis	29720
Jeffrey Dupuis	29720

Name	Zip code
Lisa Byrne	29720
Thomas Sledzianowski	29720
Gonda Lewis	29720
Cathy Grady	29720
Kathleen McPherson	29720
Carolyne Dowd	29720
AUDREY TAORMINA	29720
Patricia Satran	29720
Mary Dubisky	29720
Rebecca Ryan	29720
Kim Carter	29720
Catherine Lombardi	29720
Laura Hage	29720
Kenny Sette	39723
Fred Peltz	29707
Steve Martin	31324
Stephanie Nance	29707
Susan Brown	29720
Marv Hage	29720
Richard Giesler	29720
Alicja Pellegrino	29720
Lisa Bird	29720
Jen griffin	29720
Joan Macklin	29720
Lee Condit	29720
Jan Tescione	29720
Dianne Petrino	29720
Karen McLain	29720
Theresa Tufano	29720
Donna Gahr	29720

Name	Zip code
Karen LaVeglia	29720
Thomas Zielke	29720
Kathy Womack	29720
Petra Chittenden	29720
Janet Bershers	29707
Lynda O'Connor	29720
Kathleen Newbold	29720
Joanne Benhardt	29720
Jerry Sulhan	29720
Julie Rizzo	29720
Elizabeth Johnson	29720
Gary Johnson	29720
Jackie Milbrod	29720
Anne Willuweit	29720
Marcia Brooks	29720
Michael Tutino	29720
Elisa Wolfe	29720
Cheryl Fry	29720
Rosalind Milton	29720
Madelyn Greenspan	29720
Charles Allen	29720
Helene Schilian	29720
Joseph Giocondi	29720
Andrea Bezuk	29720
Richard Hamilton	29720
Daniel Jordan	29720
Shawn Fiola	29707
Warren Chase	29720
Cathy Barth	29720
Alfred Licastrino	29720
Thomas Barth	29720
David Mobley	29720

Name	Zip code
Janice Hennessy	29720
frank nostro	29720-0247
Kathleen Folly	29720
Russ Knutson	29720
Susan & Jim Lugaresi	29720
Don Brown	29720
Nina Baran	29720
Judy Van Der Linden	29720
Pamela Giocondi	29720
Maureen Drogus	29720
Annmarie Bingham	29720
Ronald Lowell	29720
Melissa Appel	29720
Deborah Foster	29720
Joann Kaiser	29720
Michael Dowd	29720
Patricia Sinclair	29707
Michele West	29720
Robert & Kay Ostram	29707
Nelson Payne	29720
Gail Casazza	29720
Helen Drahos	29720
Ken Stolfo	29720
Gail Adams-Beers	29720
Sue Peverelle	29720
Michael Grady	29720
John Peverelle	29720-0376
Ruth Bailey	29720
Richard Shoaf	29720
Kathy Shoaf	29720

Name	Zip code
Gail Vadeboncoeur	29720
Janette Schwartz	29720
Paul Vadeboncoeur	29720
Margaret Marshall	29720
Riccaldó sandra	29707
Sandra Sosby	29720
Marion Paolo	29720
Dolores Smith	29720
Reed Baker	29720
Antonio Paolo	29720
Albert Fry	29720
Dan West	29720
Jeanne Love	29720
Barbara Myers	29720
Linda Stolfo	29720
Edward Meyer	29720
Mary Jo Rini	29720
John Sosby	29720
Susan Phillips	29720
Janet Bohne	29720
John Nunziato	29720
Mary Doody	29707
Joe Minotti	29720
Mark Newbold	29720
Mary Sharon Minotti	29720
Patricia Devery	29720
Sandra Wiley	29720
Jane Larsen	29720
Judi Gross	29720
Cheryl Jordan	29720
Vincent Orsini	29707

Name	Zip code
Chris Bohlmann	29707
Anne McAlvey	29707
Kathy Nealon	29707
Jennifer Wilcox	29720
Carol Reddy	29720
Williette King	29720-0284
Monica Martinez Patton	29720
Penelope DePicciotto	29720
Joe Dimino	29720
Sandy Ameele	29720
Bill Nicholson	29720
Jackie Rangel	29720-0248
Darlene Crossett	29720
Terri Adams	29720
Laura Largent	29707
Bob Wainwright	29720
Desnna Carletti	29720
Jackie Graceffa	29720
Mary Jarrells	29720
Jerry Smith	29720
Carol Peterson	29720
Mary Dott	29720
KATHERINE BESKID	29720
Mary Smith	29720
Gary Ameele	29720
Claudia W.	29707
Catherine Krauer	29707
John Looney	29720
Danny Zidaroff	29720
Reeda Zidaroff	29720
Donna Kelly	29720

Name	Zip code
Kathy Holton	29720
Rose Weinheimer	29720
Gregory Wellman	29720
Thomas Bailey	29720
Richard Nichols	29720
William Gordon	29720
Melissa Greenspan	29720
Sharon Cousar	29720
Diane Feldman	29720
joe o'grady	29270
Doreen Jewitt	29720
Mark Mikeal	29720
Robert Brink	29720
James Wolfe	29720
Robert Beers	29720
David Bates	29720
Bonnie Lundquist	29720
JoAnn Carroll	29729
Brenda Sadler	29720
Jim Carroll	29720
Bethany Bates	29720
Jerry Friedrich	06804
Thomas McKnight	39720
bernard gross	29720
Evan Freeman	29707
Marlene Karpman	29720
Eric Myers	29720
Rita Schulz	29720
Ronald Brookshire	29720
James MacIver	29720
Linda MacIver	29720

Name	Zip code
Manny Schmaizl	29720
Chris Zackin	29720
Ilona Sudimack	29720
Richard Carlucci	29720
Chip Thompson	29720
Sally Wagner	29720
Clinton Alston	29720-0284
David Fedderly	29720
Michael Carmean	29720-0290
Cathy Eaton	29720
Misuk Carmean	29720
Rich Pokrin	29720
Dottie Pokrin	29720
PJ Bednar	29720
Patricia Rebel	29720-0087
Kathleen Sharp	29720
Larry Koper	29720
Elizabeth Dandrea	29720
Gilbert Smith	29720
Mary Walkotten	38720
Linda Lutzvitch	29720
Danny D	29720
Danielle Barr	29720
Sandra Daniello	29720
Nancy King	29720
Alison Ward	29720
Sidney Lowe	29720
Marnie Ohs	29720
Deborah Allman- Smith	29720
Michael Smith	29720
Robert Myers	29720

Name	Zip code
Rene Chamberlain	29720
Michael Stevens	29720
Marsha Giesler	29720
Jeanette Ryan	29720
Elaine Craig	29720
Jim Ward	29720
Debra Kaufhold	29720
Michael Tschantz	29720
Karen Koyle	29720
Tina-Marie Mott	29720
Robert Baker	29720
Madelyn Denice	29720
Mavis Gauruder	29720
William Gauruder	29720
Barbara Smith	29720
Jo Ann Davis	29720
Steve Bower	29720
Myrna Boyet	29720
Tom Hodges	29720
Andrew Allen	29720
Deborah Loudon	29720
Henry Loudon	29720-0147
Linda Allen	29720
Ron Forfar	29720
Holly Hierl	29720
Dennis Young	29720
Heather Breedlove	29720
James Lynch	29720
Andrea Helms	29720
Daniel Sadvary	29707
Dana Getz	29707

Name	Zip code
Jean McMullen	29707
Tylee Tracer-Anderson	29720
David Boothe	29720
Lauren Kandel	29707
Megan Gaissert	29707
Anthony Gionta	29720
Pam Wlitsie	29720
Susan Murray	29707
Emily Lawrence	29707
Nancy O'Grady	29720
Jessica Fitzgibbon	29715
Marie Kolceski	29720
Michaela Noojin	29707
Todd Harding	29720
Joseph Dudek	29720
Patricia Sims	29707
Sarah Freland	29707
Tenicia Washington	29707
Michael Palleschi	29707
Priscilla Taite	29707
Carl Simsic	29707
Barb Lamb	29707
Leslie Connors	29720
Paula Walter	29707
Stephen Griffith	29720
varney Lisa	29720
Kate Harris	29708
Debby Wunsch	29707
Libby Sweatt-Lambert	29744
Kelsey Mickelson	29720
Madison Mace	29720

Name	Zip code
Betsy Ulibarri	29720
Lilach Man	29707
Virginia Cornish	29707
Nicole F Ferrie	29720
Erin Kersey	29720
Michael Connors	29720
Julianna Kersey	29720
Michael Gilson	29720
Janet Desjardins	29707
Holly Holton	29720
Suzan Gilson	29720
Michael Conklin	44139
Ruby McDonald	29707
Anna Gilson Gilson	29720
Erik Peterson	29720
Susan Detwiler	29720
Joseph Marano	29720
Lillian Marano	29720
Lorrie Ayers	29720
Sharon Vincent	29707
Allison Peterson	29720
Ashley Smith	29707
Amanda Siemietkowski	29720
Christine Rittereiser	29720
David Siemietkowski	29720
CHRISTINE DORAN	29707-3522
Glenn Rittereiser	29720
Dianna C	29707
John Meadows	29720
Alanna Guardino	29707

Name	Zip code
Nicole Saffer	29720
Johanna De Beus	29720
Christina Curlee	29707
Linda Vaughan	29744
Srinivasa Basavaraju	29707
Natalie Hoag	29707
Erika Ruckert	29707
Kyle Price	29707
Tammy Brock	29707
Desiree Accetturo	29707
Ted Finkelstein	29707
Therese Crisafulli	08850
Mary Sue Testerman	29707
David Siemietkowski	29720
Dennis Stephenson	29720
Michael Schultz	29707
Kristin Wood	29720
Karen Castle	29707
Caity Cardano	29707
Christi Walsh	29720
Dana Rusalem	29707
Nancy Morales	29707
Gabby Shuler	29704
Magda Gill	29707
Stephen Rape	29720
Irene Marsh	29720
Roberta Boik	29720-0248
Shawna Livingston	29720
Ron Livingston	29720
Sandy Sharer	29707

Name	Zip code
Lynn Borelli	29707
Patricia Oglesby	29744
Erica Smith	29744
Mel Thor	29707
Valerie Brassell	29707
Frank Brassell	29707
Judith Bixen	29720
Edgar Carpenter	29720
Lauren Takes	29707
Rosalind Santini	29707
Rebecca Mikkelsen	29720
Debra Whitlock	29720
James Whitlock	29720
Bonnie Hamil	29707
Susan K	29607
Kellie Cannon	29707
Tracy McLaughlin	29707
Neil Berg	29707
Ashley Lang	29707
Kelly Remus	29707
Jon Branham	29707
Sandra Pelletier	29720
Thomas Pelletier	29720
Elizabeth Venditti	29707
Hubbard Margaret	29707
Christopher venditti	29707
Tommy Wilson	29720
Michelle Daley	29707
Jennifer McCalmont	29720
Barbara Flood	29707

Name	Zip code
Shannon St.John	29720
Kimmie E Kiefer	29720
Lloyd Kiefer	29720
Lori C	29707
Margaret Yoder	29744
Steven Gregory	29706
Dennis Crawford	29720
Kathy Storm	29720
Donna Heinlein	29720
Max L	29707
Bethany Hailey	29707

ATTACHMENT:

Item 5e: Asbury Lane
Email comment

From: [Virginia Cornish](#)
To: [Jennifer Bryan](#)
Subject: NO TO REZONING on ASBURY RD/NO MORE HOUSES ON VAN WYCK RD
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 4:19:03 PM



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender virginia.cornish@yahoo.com

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

PLEASE DO NOT REZONE the plot of land on Asbury Rd!! This request was recently voted down by the Planning Commission in an effort to keep the area zoned for Light Industrial. Why is this being reconsidered??

NO MORE HOUSES/APTS along Van Wyck Rd or anywhere else in Indian Land!! The SCHOOLS CANNOT handle the increased population, the ROADS CANNOT handle more people!!

PLEASE do not allow these items to pass the Planning Commission. Vote IN FAVOR of current residents of Indian Land!!

Sincerely,

David & Virginia Cornish