

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
Zoning Director: Shannon Catoe
Ex-Officio: James Mulvaney



Interim County Administrator
Steve Willis

County Attorney
Ginny L. Merck-Dupont

Clerk to Council
Sherrie Simpson

May 20, 2026
12:00 PM

LANCASTER COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNTY COUNCIL AD-HOC UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) COMMITTEE
ADMINISTRATION CONFERENCE ROOM, 2ND FLOOR OF THE COUNTY
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 101 NORTH MAIN STREET, LANCASTER, SC 29720

MINUTES

Committee Members Present: Stuart Graham, Jose Luis, Steve Harper, Maggie Norris, Shelly Richards, Judianna Tinklenberg, Shannon Catoe, James Mulvaney.

Committee Members Absent: Darrell Walters.

Staff Members/Others Present: Ginny Merck-Dupont, County Attorney; Lauren Hill, Deputy Clerk to Council; Dr. Kirsten Willis, Planner; Kelly Cousino and Sean Scoopmire, White Smith Cousino (Consultants).

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

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

Chairman Steve Harper called the Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee meeting to order at approximately 12:00 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

Stuart Graham moved to approve the agenda. Seconded by Judianna Tinklenberg. There was no discussion from the Committee. The motion Passed by a vote of 7-0; Absent: Jose Luis, Darrell Walters.

Jose Luis arrived at the meeting at approximately 12:04 p.m., after the approval of the agenda.

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 26, 2026, County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee Meeting

Jose Luis stated that there were some edits that he wanted made to the minutes, and made a motion to postpone the approval of the February 26, 2026, minutes until the next County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee meeting. Seconded by Judianna Tinklenberg. The motion Passed by a vote of 8-0; Absent: Darrell Walters.

b. Approval of Minutes from the May 6, 2026, County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee Meeting

Jose Luis stated that there were some edits that he wanted made to the minutes, and made a motion to postpone the approval of the May 6, 2026, minutes until the next County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee meeting. Seconded by Maggie Norris. The motion Passed by a vote of 8-0; Absent: Darrell Walters.

c. Review of Ad-Hoc UDO Committee Summary Points - *Interim Planning Director Shannon Catoe*

See the next agenda item for discussion.

d. Consultant Assistance and Next Steps

The consultants introduced testing scenarios, and the Committee agreed that they wanted to see graphic-based scenarios, and also requested a commercial scenario that shows building locations and illustrates access points, connectivity, buffers, and other key site features.

The Committee members and consultants reviewed the decision points that were attached to the agenda packet.

- Decision Point #4 - The Committee discussed the inclusion of purpose statements. Jose Luis stated that he was against purpose statements, but if they were to be included, a statement needed to be included that clearly defined the interpretation process involving the applicant, staff members, and County Council, and also clearly outlines the County Attorney's role for advising Boards and Commissions. The Committee agreed to remove purpose statements.
- Decision Point #19 - The Committee discussed the need for the UDO to be easier to navigate and more user-friendly for a regular citizen to understand. The Committee also discussed the desire to include more graphics and hyperlinks.
- Decision Point #58 - The Committee agreed to define minor modifications and that all other modifications would be considered major and require Planning Commission review for preliminary plats.
- Decision Point # 60 - The Committee discussed Conditional Use Permits and Special Exception Permits, as well as uses permitted by right. The Committee agreed to replace

"Conditional Use" with "Permitted with Review" and add a statement clarifying that any use not listed was prohibited.

- Decision Point #26 - The Committee discussed sewer availability and requested Low Density Residential (LDR) scenario testing comparing septic and sewer-served developments to evaluate potential lot size adjustments.
- Decision Point #27 - The Committee agreed to create two MFR Districts (one with apartments, and one without), and add density requirements. Ginny Merck-Dupont stated that a property of 25 acres or more would require a Development Agreement (DA).
- Decision Point #28 - The Committee discussed Planned Development District (PDD) eligibility requirements, which included the 25-acre minimum, 80/20 mix of uses, two dwelling types, commercial components, and overlay compliance. The Committee also agreed that UDO interpretations would be based on the UDO in effect at the time of the request rather than prior versions.

The Committee took a break from the meeting at approximately 1:55 p.m., and returned at approximately 2:06 p.m.

- Decision Point #31 - The consultants explained that data centers were not included in the current UDO, but was defined in the draft due to increased conversations surrounding data centers. The Committee agreed that Lancaster County was not ready for data centers, so it was to be taken off the table. It was also noted that uses not listed are prohibited (which would include data centers).
- Decision Point #6 & 35 - The Committee agreed to adjust the "Type A" buffer to 15 feet.
- Decision Point #36 - The Committee discussed how staff determines parking requirements, how to enforce maintenance, and the use of graphics in the UDO.
- Decision Point #7 - The Committee discussed the purpose of screening for drive thru's, and agreed that an update should be made to include walls or hedges/plantings as screening.
- Decision Point #9 - The Committee agreed to remove the proposed deferred parking plan.
- Decision Point # 41 & 42 - The Committee discussed off-street parking, and asked to see a testing scenario. The consultants and staff discussed developing parking standards for residential dwellings based on either bedroom count or square footage.
- Decision Point # 46 - The Committee discussed different options to manage bonds, and potentially include phasing.
- Decision Point # 48 - The Committee discussed right of way acquisitions, entry and exits, and turn lanes. Staff was requested to do additional research on South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) requirements.
- Decision Point # 18 & 50 - The Committee agreed to keep Stormwater regulations together in the UDO, and also agreed to add more enforcement provisions (i.e. stop work orders).
- Decision Point #52 - The Committee discussed Development Agreements and agreed that Development Agreements would not be required.
- Decision Point #55 - The Committee discussed subdividing family properties and easements. The Committee agreed that the family exemption would be excluded.
- Decision Point #70 - The Committee directed staff to review Signs (Chapter 7) and Building Design (Chapter 8) and coordinate with the consultants on their findings.

The Committee and consultants discussed the timeline to adopt the UDO. The consultants stated that they would provide scenarios by the end of June, as well as a revised draft, and the goal was to have the new UDO adopted by County Council by the end of September 2026 or October 2026.

e. Committee Comments

The Committee set their next meeting for Tuesday, June 30, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.

f. Staff Comments

Ginny Merck-Dupont stated that she would research the requirements for public involvement, including any required public input meetings, related to the adoption of the UDO.

Adjournment

Jose Luis moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Shelly Richards. The motion Passed by a vote of 8-0; Absent: Darrell Walters.

There being no further business to discuss, the County Council Ad-Hoc Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Committee meeting adjourned at approximately 4:42 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lauren Hill

Lauren Hill
Deputy Clerk to Council

Approved by the Committee on June 30, 2026