

Committee Members

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

**Interim County Administrator**

Steve Willis

County Attorney

Ginny L. Merck-Dupont

Clerk to Council

Sherrie Simpson

**February 19, 2026
6:00 PM**

LANCASTER COUNTY COUNCIL

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

MINUTES

Committee Members Present: Stuart Graham, Jose Luis, Steve Harper, Maggie Norris (*who arrived late to the meeting at approximately 6:19 p.m.*), Darrell Walters, Shelly Richards, Judianna Tinklenberg, Allison Hardin, Shannon Catoe, James Mulvaney.

Staff Members/Others Present: Sherrie Simpson, Clerk to Council; Stephany Snowden, Deputy County Administrator; April Williams, Planning Director; Jeff Catoe, Public Works Director; Mike Magette, Fire Marshal; consultant Kelly Cousino from White and Smith, various Department Heads; and various employees.

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

Call to Order County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee Meeting - Committee Chair Steve Harper

Committee Chair Steve Harper called the County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

Jose Luis moved to approve the agenda. Seconded by Shelly Richards. The motion to approve the agenda Passed by unanimous vote.

Citizens Comments

The following citizens signed up for and spoke during the Citizen Comments: None.

The following citizens submitted electronic, written comments for Citizen Comments: None.

Discussion and Action Items

a. Approval of Minutes from the February 11, 2026, County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee Meeting

Jose Luis moved to approve the minutes from the February 11, 2026, County Council Ad-Hoc UDO Committee meeting. Seconded by Stuart Graham. There was no discussion from the Committee. The motion to approve the minutes Passed by unanimous vote.

b. Decision Points - Allison Hardin

Allison Hardin provided the Committee with a handout entitled, "Restrictions Affecting Missing Middle Implementation," and that handout is attached to the minutes as Schedule A.

The Committee discussed roads, which was a continuation of the discussion from the last meeting. Jeff Catoe agreed that an 8:2:2 paving for roads provided a better product for citizens. He explained that the County should require that roads be completely built out before releasing the final plat. He also noted that he would like to add a requirement for developers to have to submit video footage of storm drain systems to the County so that County staff could verify what has actually been done and that it is correct.

c. Discussion of Subdivisions - Allison Hardin

The Committee then proceeded to discuss the questions on page 10 of 77 of the agenda packet. For question 1: *Should all residential subdivisions be held to the same standard based on their zoning district? Or is there an interest in higher standards for the Panhandle?* The Committee determined that there should be more relaxed requirements for minor subdivisions in AR, RR, and RN, but for LDR and above, all residential subdivisions should be treated the same.

For question 2: *What will be the final vision of Conservation subdivisions? What zones will be allowed this option?* The Committee determined that the LDR and RN zoning districts could use Conservation subdivisions. The Committee discussed where to have higher density subdivisions, density incentives for developers, how to preserve the rural nature of the County, minimum lot size in both LDR and RN, the use of development agreements and whether to limit their use, the use of planned development districts (PDD's), and how sewer might affect lot size. After discussions, the Committee determined that the following minimum lot sizes would be used in the following zoning districts: 1/2 acre for LDR (density from 1.5 per acre to 2 acres) and 3/4 of acre for RN (density from 1 per acre to 1.5 per acre), if they are using conservation in the subdivisions. They also determined that the LDR zoning would require the use of public water and sewer and that there would be no sewer requirements in the RN zoning district.

For question 3: *What information will be required for a subdivision application? Should a tree survey be required for the buffer areas?* The Committee determined that any subdivision that has buffers should be required to have a tree survey so that the County would be encouraging developers to use natural buffers and not clear-cut land.

For question 4: *Is there still a consensus that any commercial subdivisions will go through the*

full review with Planning Commission? The Committee determined that the answer to the question was yes and there was no other discussion on the topic.

For question 5: *Is there an interest in requiring a small percentage of every large subdivision proposal (100 + lots) be set aside for starter homes?* The Committee determined that the answer to the question was no because that issue would be driven by the market.

And for question 6: *Should lot size be determined by housing type instead of a static minimum in each zone?* The Committee discussed the use of design standards, how to encourage revitalization / redevelopment / re-growth, using a width standard in revitalization, and designating districts for revitalization. No consensus was reached by the Committee.

The Committee also discussed using permit discounts for owner-occupied houses, but not rentals, in order to encourage revitalization, zoning for data centers, instituting another rural zoning district in the County, changing the sign notices for "by right" subdivisions to say that an information meeting would be held and not a public hearing (with which the Committee agreed), and that site design variances for subdivisions should be handled through text amendments and not by the Planning Commission.

The Committee determined the following future meeting dates: (1) 2-26-2026 at 6:00 p.m. to review Administration and Definitions; and (2) 3-4-2026 at 6:00 p.m. as a catch-all, last meeting.

Adjournment

Jose Luis moved to adjourn the County Council Ad-Hoc UDO Committee meeting. Seconded by Shelly Richards. The motion to adjourn this meeting Passed by unanimous vote. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Sherrie Simpson

Sherrie Simpson
Clerk to Council

Approved by the Committee on February 26, 2026

Schedule A

Restrictions Affecting Missing Middle Implemer

Subdivision	One house per lot?	# of people per lot?	R/Vs	Age-restricted?
Avondale	One house per lot	Not more than 3 unrelated	Prohibited	Not stated
Bent Creek	One house per lot	Two or more related with kids	Prohibited	Not stated
Carolina Reserve	One house per lot	No more than the # of bedrooms	Not clear	Not stated
Caroline Acres	No multi family	None	Prohibited	Not stated
Covington North	One house per lot	"Reasonable"	Not clear	Yes
Covington South	One house per lot	"Reasonable"	Not clear	Yes
Legacy Park	One house per lot	None	Prohibited	Not stated
Overlook at Barber Rock	One house per lot	None	Prohibited	Not stated
Preserve at Barber Rock	One house per lot	None	Prohibited	Not stated
Reid Pointe	One house per lot	None	Prohibited	Not stated
Wilson Creek	Not explicit	Not more than 3 unrelated	Prohibited	

Random sampling of CCR documents of established neighborhoods