

Council Members

District 1: Terry Graham
District 2: Charlene McGriff
District 3: Billy Mosteller, Secretary
District 4: Jose Luis
District 5: Steve Harper, Chair
District 6: "Vacant"
District 7: Brian Carnes, Vice Chair

**County Administrator**

Dennis E. Marstall

County Attorney

Ginny L. Merck-Dupont

Clerk to Council

Sherrie Simpson

**October 14, 2024
6:00 PM**

LANCASTER COUNTY COUNCIL
COUNTY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, COUNTY ADMINISTRATION
BUILDING, 101 NORTH MAIN STREET, LANCASTER, SC 29720

MINUTES

Council Members Present: Brian Carnes, Terry Graham, Steve Harper, Jose Luis, Charlene McGriff, and Billy Mosteller.

Vacant: District 6 Seat

Lancaster County Board of Voter Registration and Elections Members Present: Norman Anderson, Brian Greene, Tom Page, Tyler Reeves, Darrell Reid, and Ronnie Wall.

Staff Members/Others Present: Dennis Marstall, County Administrator; Ginny Merck-Dupont, County Attorney; Sherrie Simpson, Clerk to Council; Stephany Snowden, Deputy County Administrator; Sabrena Harris, Chief Financial Officer; Jamie Privuznak, Budget Director; Allison Hardin, Development Services Director; April Williams, Planning Director; Jeff Catoe, Public Works Director; Clay Catoe, Emergency Medical Services Director; the press; various elected officials; various Department Heads; various employees; and citizens.

A quorum of Lancaster County Council and the Lancaster County Board of Voter Registration and Elections were 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 power point presentation utilized during the meeting is attached to the written minutes in the Clerk to Council's office.

Call to Order Regular Meeting - Chairman Steve Harper

Chairman Steve Harper called the regular meeting of County Council to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

Welcome and Recognition - Chairman Steve Harper

Chairman Steve Harper welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Pledge of Allegiance and Invocation - Council Member Billy Mosteller

Billy Mosteller led the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag and delivered the Invocation.

Joint Meeting with the Board of Voter Registration and Elections of Lancaster County

a. Call to Order of Board of Voter Registration and Elections of Lancaster County - Chair Ronnie Wall

Ronnie Wall, Chairman of the Board of Voter Registration and Elections of Lancaster County, called the meeting to order at approximately 6:03 p.m. Mr. Wall introduced the members of the Board, and explained the purpose of the joint meeting.

b. Public Hearing to Receive Public Comment on Proposed Transportation Sales Tax Referendum Questions - Chair Ronnie Wall, Board of Voter Registration and Elections of Lancaster County

Ronnie Wall opened the Public Hearing to receive public comment on the Proposed Transportation Sales Tax Referendum Questions at approximately 6:06 p.m. He noted that no one signed up to speak at the Public Hearing. There were approximately 98 citizens, including staff members, in attendance during the Public Hearing for this Ordinance. Chair Wall gave anyone in attendance a chance to come up and speak even though they did not sign up. The following speakers came forward to make comments regarding the Proposed Transportation Sales Tax Referendum Questions:

1. Wade Tenbenschel, Lancaster, SC, spoke and questioned if the proposed tax was in addition to the Pennies for Progress project, or if this was a separate tax.
2. Peter Miller, Lancaster, SC, spoke and stated that citizens would be volunteering to pay additional taxes if this Transportation Sales Tax Referendum passed.

Ronnie Wall closed the Public Hearing at approximately 6:09 p.m.

c. Adjournment of Board of Voter Registration and Elections of Lancaster County Portion of Meeting - Chair Ronnie Wall

Ronnie Wall adjourned the Board of Voter Registration and Elections of Lancaster County portion of the Council meeting at approximately 6:09 p.m.

Approval of the Council Agenda

After the conclusion of the Joint Meeting with the Board of Voter Registration and Elections, the regular Council meeting resumed. Brian Carnes moved to approve the agenda. Seconded by Charlene McGriff. The motion to approve the regular meeting agenda Passed by a vote of 6-0.

Citizens Comments

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

1. Beatrice Adams, Indian Land, SC, spoke regarding grievances related to the Estates at Covington development in the Indian Land area of the County.
2. Gordon Johnston, Charlotte, NC, noted that he was representing Century Communities Southeast, LLC and explained that he was available for questions during the 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1932.
3. Jean Doyle, Lancaster, SC, gave praise to Mary Ann Hudson, the County's Voter

Registration Director, for the Poll Manager Training sessions.

The following citizens submitted electronic, written comments for Citizen Comments, of which Council received physical copies at their seats and which were acknowledged during the meeting by Sherrie Simpson, Clerk to Council.

1. Anna Mullis, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule A to the written minutes.
2. Jared Callis, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding his opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of his comments is attached as Schedule B to the written minutes.
3. Laura Lawless, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule C to the written minutes.
4. Shannon Miller, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule D to the written minutes.
5. Gerald Brasington, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding his opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of his comments is attached as Schedule E to the written minutes.
6. Laura Lothers, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule F to the written minutes.
7. Wilson Brasington, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding his opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of his comments is attached as Schedule G to the written minutes.
8. Jacqueline Walters, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule H to the written minutes.
9. Teresa Whitacre-Lytle, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule I to the written minutes.
10. April Martinez, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule J to the written minutes.
11. Renee Watts, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule K to the written minutes.
12. David and Rachel Wallace, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding their opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of their comments is attached as Schedule L to the written minutes.
13. Airen Ayers, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule M to the written minutes.
14. Grace Carnes, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule N to the written minutes.
15. Jane Hawkins, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule O to the written minutes.
16. Samantha Frank, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule P to the written minutes.
17. Tommy Hawkins, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding his opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of his comments is attached as Schedule Q to the written minutes.
18. Gwen Bird, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule R to the written minutes.
19. Megan Jamieson, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule S to the written minutes.
20. Carmen McKoy, Lancaster, SC, wrote in regarding her opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929. A copy of her comments is attached as Schedule T to the written minutes.
21. Beatrice Adams, Indian Land, SC, submitted an electronic, written comment, but attended the Council meeting in person, and spoke during Citizen Comments. A copy of

her comments is attached as Schedule U to the written minutes.

Consent Agenda

Billy Mosteller moved to approve Consent Agenda Item **7a.** and **7b.** [which are the same as Item **a.** and **b.** listed below]. Seconded by Charlene McGriff. The motion to approve the Consent Agenda Passed by a vote of 6-0.

- a. Approval of Minutes from the September 11, 2024, County Council Committee of the Whole Meeting**
- b. Approval of Minutes from the September 23, 2024, County Council Regular Meeting**

Non-Consent Agenda

- a. Resolution 1284-R2024**

Resolution Title: A Resolution To Adopt And Implement The Lancaster County, South Carolina Investment Policy As Required By Article V, Division 3, Subdivision VII, Section 2-223 Of The Lancaster County Code Of Ordinances. - Sabrena Harris / Carrie Helms

Billy Mosteller moved to approve Resolution 1284-R2024. Seconded by Brian Carnes.

Sabrena Harris and Carrie Helms reviewed the investment policy via the County's PowerPoint presentation. They reviewed the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) best practices, the policy's objectives, the roles and responsibilities of County staff, types of suitable and authorized investments, investment threshold criteria examples, internal control processes, reporting requirements, and deposit protection objectives. Council and staff discussed whether having investment policies would help with the County's ratings, that Council should receive quarterly reports regarding investments, and how the competitive bid process would work related to the financial institutions used for investments.

There was no further discussion from Council. Resolution 1284-R2024 Passed by a vote of 6-0.

- b. 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1930**

Ordinance Title: An Ordinance To Amend Ordinance No. 2024-1910, Relating To The Appropriation Of Funds And The Approval Of A Detailed Budget For Lancaster County For The Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2024, And Ending June 30, 2025 (FY 2024-2025), To Further Provide For Revenues And Expenditures During The Fiscal Year; And To Provide For Matters Related Thereto. - Passed 6-0 at the September 23, 2024, County Council Meeting. - Sabrena Harris

Charlene McGriff moved to approve the 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1930. Seconded by Brian Carnes.

Sabrena Harris explained the two budget amendments within Ordinance 2024-1930. Ms. Harris explained that the Ordinance reflected the motion that was made by Council at the 1st Reading regarding the Voter Registration and Fleet Maintenance facility upfit appropriation of

\$950,000 with a proposal that any disbursements other than \$75,000 for architectural fees would be reviewed and approved by Council. Ms. Harris noted no other changes to the Ordinance. Council and staff discussed the percentage of monies that would go to the Olde English District.

There was no other discussion from Council. The 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1930 Passed by a vote of 6-0.

c. 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1932

Ordinance Title: An Ordinance To Amend A Development Agreement With Century Communities Southeast, LLC, In Accordance With Unified Development Ordinance Section 9.2.18.C.16.C And Section 5.02 Of Ordinance 2023-1854, To Extend The Effective Date Of The Agreement To December 31, 2025. - Passed 4-1-1 at the September 23, 2024, County Council Meeting (Terry Graham Opposed and Steve Harper Abstained). - Dennis Marstall

Steve Harper recused himself from the discussion and vote regarding the 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1932, and stepped out of Council Chambers at approximately 6:32 p.m. A copy of Mr. Harper's Statement of Recusal is attached as Schedule V to the written minutes. Brian Carnes took over as Chair of the meeting for the 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1932.

Billy Mosteller moved to approve the 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1932. Seconded by Charlene McGriff.

Terry Graham explained his opposition regarding the extension of the Development Agreement. Several Council members expressed their interest in the extension since the Developer had been diligently working towards obtaining the required documents in order to meet the December 31, 2024, deadline. Jose Luis noted that he was in favor of the extension, but that it would be the only extension that he would approve, so the Developer needed to adhere to the timeline they proposed to Council.

There was no further discussion from Council. The 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1932 Passed by a vote of 4-1-1; Ayes: Carnes, Mosteller, McGriff, Luis; Nays: Graham; Abstained: Harper.

At approximately 6:35 p.m., Steve Harper reentered Council Chambers, rejoined Council at the dais, and resumed his duties as Chair of the meeting.

d. 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1934

Ordinance Title: An Ordinance To Approve A Temporary Construction And Permanent Easement Grant To Lancaster County Water And Sewer District Upon Real Property Owned By Lancaster County And Located In The Regional Park Off Norman Forest Road Bearing Tax Parcel Number 0044-00-024.01 And To Authorize County Officials To Take Such Actions As Are Necessary To Effectuate The Grant Of The Easements And To Effectuate The Purposes Of This Ordinance. - Passed 4-2 at the September 23, 2024, County Council Meeting (Terry Graham and Jose Luis Opposed). - Dennis Marstall / Ginny Merck Dupont

Charlene McGriff moved to approve the 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1934. Seconded by Billy Mosteller.

Dennis Marstall explained the purpose of the easement, and noted no changes since the 1st Reading of the Ordinance. Council and staff discussed who would benefit from the easement, if there was a chance that the County Regional Park civil plans would need to change in order to accommodate the easement, and if the County would receive any compensation for granting the easement. Jose Luis requested that the agreement allow for flexibility for the County if areas of the easement needed to be utilized for the County Regional Park. Council expressed interest in granting the easement to the Lancaster County Water and Sewer District if they waive the tap fees. Steve Harper requested that a representative of Lancaster County Water and Sewer District attend the 3rd Reading of the Ordinance.

There was no further discussion from Council. The 2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1934 Passed 4-2; Ayes: Carnes, Harper, Mosteller, McGriff; Nays: Graham, Luis.

e. Public Hearing and 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1929

Ordinance Title: An Ordinance To Amend The Unified Development Ordinance ("UDO") Chapters 2 And 5 To Amend Regulations Relating To Backyard Pens/Coops - Planning Department Case Number: TA-2024-1451. The Planning Commission recommended approval by a vote of 5-2. - Allison Hardin

Allison Hardin reviewed the proposed text amendment via the County's PowerPoint presentation, and noted that the text amendment was brought forward by a resident after he received a violation regarding the number of small animals he had on his property. Several Council members stated that the proposed amendments were overreaching.

Steve Harper opened the Public Hearing for Ordinance 2024-1929 at approximately 6:44 p.m. He noted that 21 people signed up to speak at the Public Hearing for the Ordinance. There were approximately 97 citizens, including staff members, in attendance during the Public Hearing for this Ordinance. The following speakers came forward to make comments or sent in written comments regarding the Ordinance: 2024-1929.

1. Bobby Richards, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929.
2. Adrian Kroger, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that tax dollars should be used towards Emergency Medical Services (EMS), the Fire Service, and teachers instead of being used to monitor chickens.
3. Herman Heath, Kershaw, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that he received a ticket from the Town of Kershaw for having chickens in the town limits.
4. Lisa Pickens, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that citizens needed liberty, freedom, and food security.
5. John Ellis, Heath Springs, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that everyone needed to worry about their own property instead of their neighbor.
6. Kristi Zimmerman, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that the Ordinance had too many restrictions and questioned how regulations would be enforced.
7. Josh Pangle, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and requested that Medium Density Residential (MDR) District be removed from the Ordinance's restrictions.
8. Peter Miller, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that the Ordinance was too heavy-handed.
9. Jay Wallace, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated

that there should not be any restrictions or regulations on raising farm animals on your property.

10. Randall Reynolds, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that County resources should be focused on infrastructure, specifically on sidewalk considerations.
11. Dan Lesho, chose not to speak during this Public Hearing.
12. Crystal Keller, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that her family moved to Lancaster County because of low regulations and the opportunity to make decisions about their own property.
13. John Hornacky, Lancaster, SC, chose not to speak during this Public Hearing.
14. Jeff Monnig, Lancaster, SC, thanked Councilman Luis and Councilman Graham for their time and attention on Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that the County added too many restrictions to the proposed Ordinance.
15. Jenny Paquette, Lancaster, SC, requested that Low Density Residential (LDR) District and Medium Density Residential (MDR) District be removed from the rules and regulation standards of the Ordinance, and also read the letter she submitted to Councilman Billy Mosteller regarding the proposed Ordinance.
16. Isabella Mackey, Lancaster, SC, chose not to speak during this Public Hearing.
17. Brandy Shati-Rhoney, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that the proposal was too far reaching and strict and citizens needed freedom on their own property.
18. Randy Sandoli, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that he wanted to see the County move in a positive direction and increase citizens' freedoms.
19. Jared Callis, Indian Land, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and stated that he appreciated the increase in the number of small animals allowed on a property.
20. Wade Tenbensel, Lancaster, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and questioned why the County had regulations regarding small animals to begin with, and stated that the County needed to protect the freedoms of the citizens.
21. Jeremy Murphy, Kershaw, SC, spoke in opposition of Ordinance 2024-1929 and requested that residential districts be removed from the proposed Ordinance.

Steve Harper closed the Public Hearing at approximately 7:38 p.m.

Jose Luis moved to approve the 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1929. Seconded by Charlene McGriff.

Jose Luis made a motion to amend the current Ordinance to delete everything in it and replace it with a clarification so that section 5.10.4 is only applicable to Modular Home (MH) District and Professional Business (PB) District. Seconded by Brian Carnes.

Council and staff discussed removing the entire 5.10.4 section from the Ordinance since the section would only apply to two zoning districts in the County.

Jose Luis withdrew his motion to amend, and Brian Carnes removed his second.

Jose Luis made a motion to remove 5.10.4 from the Ordinance. Seconded by Brian Carnes. The amendment Passed by a vote of 6-0.

The 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1929 Passed, as amended, by a vote of 6-0. Steve Harper noted that the item would be placed on the Consent Agenda at the next regular Council meeting.

Council took a break from the meeting at approximately 7:40 p.m. and Steve Harper called the meeting back to order at approximately 7:52 p.m.

f. Public Hearing and 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1935

Ordinance Title: An Ordinance To Amend The Unified Development Ordinance ("UDO") Chapter 6 Section 6.11.3 To Include A New Road Name Extension Option. - Planning Department Case Number: TA-2024-1896. The Planning Commission recommended approval and staff also recommended approval of the text amendment. - Allison Hardin

Allison Hardin reviewed the proposed Ordinance via the County's PowerPoint presentation and noted that the request was to add "LNDG" suffix so that Emergency Services can distinguish landings from streets leading to them. Ms. Hardin stated that the County's Planning and E-911 Addressing departments had both reviewed the text amendments and recommended their approval.

Steve Harper opened the Public Hearing for Ordinance 2024-1935 at approximately 7:54 p.m. He noted that no one signed up to speak at the Public Hearing for the Ordinance. There were approximately 11 citizens, including staff members, in attendance during the Public Hearing for this Ordinance. The following speakers came forward to make comments or sent in written comments regarding the Ordinance: None. Steve Harper closed the Public Hearing at approximately 7:54 p.m.

Brian Carnes moved to approve the 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1935. Seconded by Jose Luis.

There was no discussion from Council. The 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1935 Passed by a vote of 6-0. Steve Harper noted that the item would be placed on the Consent Agenda at the next regular Council meeting.

g. Public Hearing and 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1936

Ordinance Title: An Ordinance To Amend The Official Zoning Map Of Lancaster County To Rezone Approximately 1.0 Acres (TM# 0102D-0A-010.00), Which Is Located At 2488 Cane Mill Rd, From Neighborhood Business (NB) District To Medium Density Residential (MDR) District For The Purpose Of Building Houses - Planning Department Case Number: RZ-2024-1611. The Planning Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote and staff also recommended approval of the rezoning request. - Allison Hardin

Allison Hardin reviewed the rezoning request via the County's PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Hardin highlighted that the rezoning request was compatible with the Future Land Use Category of a "Growth Area" and addressed Goal GL.4 of the County's 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Steve Harper opened the Public Hearing for Ordinance 2024-1936 at approximately 7:57 p.m. He noted that no one signed up to speak at the Public Hearing for the Ordinance. There were approximately 11 citizens, including staff members, in attendance during the Public Hearing for

this Ordinance. The following speakers came forward to make comments or sent in written comments regarding the Ordinance: None. Steve Harper closed the Public Hearing at approximately 7:57 p.m.

Charlene McGriff moved to approve the 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1936. Seconded by Billy Mosteller.

There was no discussion from Council. The 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1936 Passed by a vote of 6-0. Steve Harper noted that the item would be placed on the Consent Agenda at the next regular Council meeting.

h. Public Hearing and 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1937

Ordinance Title: An Ordinance To Amend The Official Zoning Map Of Lancaster County To Rezone Two Parcels: One Being Located At 8123 Charlotte Hwy (TM# 0013-00-079.00) And Zoned Neighborhood Business (NB); And One Being Located At 137 Dogwood Trail Ln (TM# 0013-00-076.00) And Zoned Medium Density Residential (MDR); Both Proposed To Be Rezoned To Regional Business (RB) District For The Purpose Of Combining Lots Under Unified Ownership And Operation. - Planning Department Case Number: RZ-2024-1693. The Planning Commission recommended approval by a vote of 5-2 and the Planning staff also recommended approval of the rezoning request. - Allison Hardin

Allison Hardin reviewed the rezoning request via the County's PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Hardin explained the applicant's intentions behind the rezoning request and noted that the proposal was consistent with the County's 2040 Comprehensive Plan designation of Core Mixed Use. Council and staff discussed the different access points for the properties and the concerns of residents on Dogwood Trail Lane.

Steve Harper opened the Public Hearing for Ordinance 2024-1937 at approximately 8:05 p.m. He noted that one person signed up to speak at the Public Hearing for the Ordinance. There were approximately 11 citizens, including staff members, in attendance during the Public Hearing for this Ordinance. The following speakers came forward to make comments or sent in written comments regarding the Ordinance:

1. Scott Michaud, Lancaster, SC, stated that he was the property owner of 8123 Charlotte Highway and explained his intentions for 137 Dogwood Trail Lane and stated that he planned to install a privacy fence that would cut off access to the property from Dogwood Trail Lane.

Steve Harper closed the Public Hearing at approximately 8:06 p.m.

Charlene McGriff moved to approve the 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1937. Seconded by Billy Mosteller.

Terry Graham voiced his concerns about the applicant cutting off access to 137 Dogwood Trail Lane since the County could not add that as a stipulation of the rezoning. Scott Michaud passed out pictures of the property to Council. The pictures are attached as Schedule W to the written minutes. Council, staff and the applicant discussed several topics which included deed restrictions, access on Dogwood Trail Lane, and how the property would be addressed, once

combined. Steve Harper explained that 137 Dogwood Trail Lane was a dilapidated property, so the applicant would clean it up.

There was no further discussion from Council. The 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1937 Passed by a vote of 6-0. Steve Harper noted that the item would be placed on the Non-Consent Agenda at the next regular Council meeting.

Discussion and Action Items

Status of Items Tabled, Recommitted, Deferred or Held

- a. **HOLD UNTIL NOVEMBER 12, 2024, MEETING -**
2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1917
Ordinance Title: An Ordinance To Amend The Official Zoning Map Of Lancaster County To Rezone Approximately 26.94 Acres (TM# 0081-00-045.01), Which Is Located Adjacent To 2491 Hwy 9 Bypass, From Neighborhood Business (NB) District To Medium Density Residential (MDR) District - Planning Department Case Number: RZ-2024-0623. The Planning Commission recommended approval by unanimous vote and the Planning staff also recommended approval of the rezoning request. Passed 6-0 at the July 15, 2024, County Council Meeting. At the August 26, 2024, Council Meeting, the 2nd Reading was Postponed until the November 12, 2024, County Council Meeting - Allison Hardin
- b. **HOLD / REFERRED BACK TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION -**
1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1912
Ordinance Title: An Ordinance To Amend The Official Zoning Map Of Lancaster County To Rezone Approximately 3.63 Acres (TM# 0008-00-069.07) Located Along Lodge Rd, From Low Density Residential (LDR) District To General Business (GB) District - Planning Department Case Number: RZ-2024-0259. The Planning Commission recommended denial by a unanimous vote; however, the Planning staff supports the rezoning request. Referred back to the Planning Commission by a vote of 6-0 at the August 12, 2024 County Council Meeting. - Allison Hardin

There was no discussion regarding the status of any tabled, recommitted, deferred or held items.

Executive Session

a. Two Items:

- 1. Receipt of legal advice subject to the attorney-client privilege regarding a potential contractual matter relating to an Economic Development Project: Keer America Corporation.**
- 2. Receipt of legal advice subject to the attorney-client privilege regarding potential contractual matters relating to County Fire Districts.**

Steve Harper stated that he needed a motion to go into Executive Session for the receipt of legal advice subject to the attorney-client privilege regarding a potential contractual matter relating to an Economic Development project, Keer America Corporation and the receipt of legal advice subject to the attorney-client privilege regarding potential contractual matters relating to County Fire Districts and to invite Economic Development staff into Executive Session to discuss the first matter. Brian Carnes stated that he so moved. Seconded by Jose

Luis. The motion to go into Executive Session Passed by a vote of 6-0. At approximately 8:18 p.m., Council went into Executive Session.

Items Requiring a Vote Following Executive Session

Council came out of Executive Session and Steve Harper called the Council meeting back to order at approximately 9:02 p.m. Charlene McGriff moved to come out of Executive Session. Seconded by Brian Carnes. The motion to come out of Executive Session Passed by a vote of 6-0.

Upon returning to open session, Ginny Merck-Dupont stated that Council met in Executive Session for the receipt of legal advice subject to the attorney-client privilege regarding a potential contractual matter relating to an Economic Development Project: Keer America Corporation, and for the receipt of legal advice subject to the attorney-client privilege regarding potential contractual matters relating to County Fire Districts. She stated the during Executive Session, no motions were made, and no votes were taken.

Adjournment

Jose Luis moved to adjourn the Council meeting. Seconded by Terry Graham. The motion to adjourn Passed by a vote of 6-0.

There being no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of Council adjourned at approximately 9:03 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lauren Hill

Lauren Hill
Deputy Clerk to Council

Approved by Council on October 28, 2024

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "B Mosteller", written over a horizontal line.

Billy Mosteller, Secretary

Sherrie Simpson

From: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2024 8:44 AM
To: Allison Hardin; Sherrie Simpson
Subject: FW: Ordinance to amend regulations relating to Pens/Coops

Citizens Comment for Ord 2024-1929 Backyard Pens & Coops

Schedule A



Jennifer Bryan, *Planning Technician*
Planning

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

P:(803) 285-6005
jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov

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

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

From: Anna Mullis <stana883@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2024 9:10 PM
To: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov>
Subject: Ordinance to amend regulations relating to Pens/Coops

 **The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender stana883@gmail.com**

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

—IT Helpdesk, lanastercountysc.supportsystem.com

I am writing in response to the Ordinance to amend the regulations relating to Backyard Pens/Coops. This ordinance would be detrimental to the 4H organization in Lancaster County. Children and youth in 4H care for and show their beloved animals. 4H is a youth development program that focuses on the four H's: head, heart, hands and health. Head: the ability to think, plan and reason. Heart: the ability to care for others, accept citizenship responsibilities and develop positive attitudes. Hands: the ability to be useful, helpful and skillful. Health: the ability to practice healthy living, enjoy life and use leisure time productively. It would be a disgrace to disrupt the 4H program in Lancaster County. Thank you for your time.

Sherrie Simpson

Schedule B

From: Jared Callis <jaredcallis@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2024 10:13 AM
To: Sherrie Simpson
Cc: Allison Hardin; April M. Williams; Jennifer Bryan
Subject: Re: Text Amendment UDO-TA-2024-1451

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

Sherrie, thank you.

I would like to revise my comments in light of Allison's clarifications and clean it up a bit. Here's what I'd like to submit:

***Begin Comment**

My name is Jared Callis, I live and own property on Laurel Hill Road in Indian Land, SC. Here are my concerns with the new small animal ordinance language, and recommendations for changes, in order of their appearance:

Section 5.10.4.1 "...Slaughter of small animals is prohibited on residential lots and may result in criminal charges"

- Concern #1 - The definition of "slaughter" is unclear in this context. It's my understanding through conversation with Planning staff that the intent is not to prohibit dispatching small animals for personal consumption or good and proper management of the animals. I'm told it is intended to relegate (commercial?) slaughter and processing to agricultural zoned properties. As written, this line is ambiguous and could in the future be misapplied to homeowners in good standing who are doing only what is necessary for good health and management.

- Recommendation - provide clearer definition or distinction of the word 'slaughter' to the intent of allowing dispatching for personal consumption and proper management of the animals, and prohibit the commercial slaughter of animals.

Section 5.10.4.2.2 "... This section specifically excludes fighting fowl or aggressive animals"

- Concern #1 - see my section on roosters below. I agree a rooster should not be raised as fighting fowl, but they can be loosely lumped in with "aggressive" or "fighting fowl".

- Recommendation - assuming amendment is made to allow roosters under certain conditions, amend this section to exclude roosters compliant with section 5.10.4.3 for clarity.

Section 5.10.4.3 "No roosters shall be allowed on residential lots. Any chicks determined to be roosters must be removed from the property within ten (10) days of gender determination".

- Concern #1 - This blanket prohibition of roosters is too broad and disregards their importance. Roosters are a helpful and natural part of the protection of the laying hens against predators, and the sustainable continuation of the flock. Roosters warn the flocks of predators nearby and overhead, and physically defend them at the cost of their lives. A rooster can protect our flocks if a predator defeats the defenses we try to set up. Mature, fully functional roosters are needed for new chicks. We cannot sustainably maintain a flock long term without at least one rooster. Hen health and attitudes often do better with certain ratios of roosters around.

- Concern #2 - Not all locations affected by this blanket ban are equal. If the concern is noise, some of the lots and locations would be able to handle a rooster without noise becoming a nuisance. Rooster noise is understandably a nuisance before dawn, though I have more disruptive owls that live in the trees. And did you know that roosters may not crow until they are 6-12 months old? If noise is a concern, there's a lot more than 10 days from identification by feathers before they become a noise nuisance. Furthermore, crowing can be mitigated without full prohibition.

- Recommendation - amend this section to allow minimal roosters for sustainable and healthy flocks, but revise language to address the specific situations the County is concerned about, such as noise or aggressiveness that good flock managers can meet by enclosure, distance to property lines etc.

Section 5.10.4.6.3.1 "For Chickens: A structural minimum of at least four (4) square feet of floor space per animal..."

- Concern #1 - This is too much space for the coop. In my observation, I have a coop that meets the 4 square foot rule, but the chickens typically huddle together, barely taking up 1 square foot per chicken. The chickens seem to prefer tight spaces in their coop to sleep/roost/nest. It's outside they like to roam. I understand Planning Staff did online research and found wildly varying results and chose something in the middle, but in my experience it's still too much to be considered a County Ordinance-mandated "minimum". The result of the higher minimum will be oversized coops that will be more visually apparent to neighbors, and wasted space and money, to no real benefit to the chickens.

- Recommendation - reduce the required square footage listed to what the Planning Staff found in the Merck Veterinary Manual: 2 sf/ea.

Section 5.10.4.7 ".... detection of 35ppm or more within ten (10) feet of the pen/coop/shelter/run shall be considered a nuisance to public health and be grounds for removing the permit to keep...."

- Concern #1 - "within ten feet of the pen/coop..." is my issue here. Manure smells, and this line is written such that an inspector could get inside the coop/cage and under the litter to obtain a high reading

they're looking for. A gauge buried in the manure counts as "within ten feet of the coop". This does not account for the fact that outside the pen/coop/area, there may be no smell at all.

- Recommendation - change the wording "*within ten feet of the pen/coop/shelter/run*" to "*within ten (10) feet of a neighboring property*" to be more consistent with mitigating the "public" nuisance.

Section 5.10.4.8 "Proposals for keeping small animals must be submitted to the Lancaster County Planning/Zoning department and will be reviewed on an individual basis...."

- Concern #1 - This pre-approval process is unnecessary and requires more work and time of the County staff. The Ordinance states what can and cannot be done already. If a homeowner follows the policy, they are compliant. If not, then a complaint arises and the County has means to issue violations. The Ordinance itself acts as the permission granted/denial mechanism, so this pre-approval process is not necessary.

- Recommendation - Omit this paragraph entirely.

Thanks for the chance to voice.

Blessings,

Jared Callis

***End Comment**

On Fri, Oct 11, 2024 at 8:53 AM Sherrie Simpson <ssimpson@lancastercountysc.gov> wrote:

Mr. Callis:

Do you want me to consider this as a Citizen Comment for the 10-14-2024 Council meeting? If I do that, Council members will receive a copy of your email, and it will also be attached to the written minutes for the meeting and will become a part of the public record. Also, I will acknowledge that you wrote in regarding the text amendment but will not give any details about your comments.

Sherrie

Sherrie Simpson

From: Laura Lawless <lauralawless@comporium.net>
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2024 2:43 PM
To: Sherrie Simpson
Subject: Comments about Lancaster County Back Yard Chickens/Coops Ordinance



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

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

—IT Helpdesk, lancastersc.supportsystem.com

To Whom it May Concern:

I live in the city limits, and one of the drawbacks to living here is that we can't have chickens; therefore, I am writing to state that I strongly oppose any ordinance that restricts, in any way, county residents to freely own backyard chickens or other small farm animals. This will adversely affect small farmers and people who rely on chickens for food, especially in this time of high inflation and food scarcity. To even suggest pushing this ordinance through shows your complete lack of empathy and concern for people whose livelihoods depend on them and those who supplement already meager food supplies with chicken eggs.

Please reconsider this nonsensical ordinance and throw it out.

Sincerely,

Laura Lawless

714 Canterbury Drive

Lancaster, SC 29720

Schedule C

Sherrie Simpson

From: Shannon Miller <sewichers@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2024 9:43 PM
To: Sherrie Simpson
Subject: Keep Chickens in Lancaster!

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

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

Hello County Council,

I am a resident of Lancaster county and a friend of backyard chickens and I am writing you to vote NO on modifying the current regulations for chicken ownership in the county.

Lancaster county is a rural county and seeing backyard chickens is a part of life. Many of our friends and neighbors keep chickens not only for the healthy eggs but also to give their children an opportunity to care for an animals and learn about it. Some of these children attend Lancaster County 4H and have greatly benefitted from the experience, with many winning scholarships and prize money at the state fair for their hard work.

The proposed amendments are heavy handed and draconian. It will hurt small farmers and families and deprive residents of a healthy and affordable food source, especially in this difficult economy. It also goes against the history of our great state, which prides itself on self sufficiency and a disdain for government overreach. The state that gave us the Swamp Fox and Andrew Jackson should not be leading the way in barging into the personal lives of law abiding citizens with needless, punitive overreach.

As a citizen and a voter, I remind the council their job is to act in the best interest of the PEOPLE and ask that they vote against these changes to backyard chicken keeping.

Thank you,
Shannon Miller

Schedule D

Sherrie Simpson

From: Gerald Brasington <gwbrasington@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2024 8:51 AM
To: Sherrie Simpson
Subject: Backyard chicken ordinance



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

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

—IT Helpdesk, lancastersc.supportsystem.com

I am writing to voice my opposition to any ordinance or regulations that would restricts in any way a person being able to raise chickens in their backyard. This is an important source of food for many people in the county. Backyard chickens are a great source of organic meat and eggs. Regulations against backyard chickens would greatly hamper many families ability to cost effectively obtain such quality food. In this time of increasing inflation, supply chain disruptions and food insecurity it would be a disservice to your rural constituents to pass such a regulation making it more difficult for citizens to provide quality food for their families. Please reconsider these regulations and do the right thing. Strike down these regulations.

Sincerely
Gerald Wayne Brasington

Sent from my iPhone

Schedule E

Sherrie Simpson

From: Laura Lothers <lauralothers@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2024 4:57 PM
To: Sherrie Simpson
Subject: comments re: small animal regulation 5.10.4



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

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

—IT Helpdesk, lancastersc.supportsystem.com

I wanted to register our objection to increasing oversight of small animal ownership and requiring permits and applications for ownership of ducks, chickens, rabbits, etc. It is an unnecessary and inappropriate use of our local governments time and energy to be policing the size and location of our chicken coops when much more urgent issues need to be addressed.

Laura Lothers
Lancaster Co resident

Schedule F

Sherrie Simpson

From: Buddy Brasington <brasingtons1@comporium.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2024 4:34 PM
To: Sherrie Simpson
Subject: Chicken ordinance



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender
brasingtons1@comporium.net

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

—IT Helpdesk, lancastersc.supportsystem.com

Hello,

I oppose any ordinance that restricts, in any way, the right of county residents to freely own backyard chickens. This will be a detriment to small farmers and people who grow chickens for food. Having the ability to provide our own food is especially important in these uncertain times. To even suggest pushing this ordinance shows your complete lack of empathy to your core constituency.

Furthermore, it also shows you are catering the wants of the new arrivals that are moving into the panhandle area and not being empathic with majority of the county. If this goes through it will be time to vote out all of the current council and vote in representatives more in tune with the people.

Please do not consider or pass this ordinance.

Sincerely,
Wilson Brasington
~~Kendlewood Drive~~
Lancaster SC 29720

Schedule G

Sherrie Simpson

Schedule H

From: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lancastercountysc.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 9:05 AM
To: Jacqueline Walters
Cc: Sherrie Simpson; Allison Hardin
Subject: RE: Lancaster county ordinance re: small animals

This text amendment request initiated by a citizen is being heard by County Council tonight (Monday October 14, 2024) at 6:00 PM. I will forward this comment to Sherrie Simpson, Clerk to Council.

The proposed text does not ban chickens or other small animals in any zoning district in Lancaster County.



Jennifer Bryan, Planning Technician
Planning

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

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

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

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

From: Jacqueline Walters <Jacque_Walters@outlook.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2024 4:19 PM
To: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lancastercountysc.gov>
Subject: Lancaster county ordinance re: small animals

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

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

To whom it concerns,

I know I'm not alone when I say that small home farms and Homestead are important to every community. They're particularly important to areas in Lancaster county where families and children are being raised learning to take care of animals, responsibility, self resilience, and self reliance. Farming, whether it is larger scale or smaller scale for an individual family is hard and already cost a lot.

This is not something that the government needs to have its hand in or control over. It is Part of what used to be considered the great American dream and part of the backbone of our society. Farmers growing good quality foods for their families and friends and local markets. Whether it's rabbits, chickens or some other small animal, it should not be anyone else's responsibility or authority to determine how many of what kind a family can have.

I know lots of people in this community that would be affected by this proposed ordinance. Some families just have a couple chickens and some have a whole Homestead. It should be within our individual decisions and rights on the property that we own to determine if we want to be able to be more self-reliant, know where our food comes from and support our families in a healthy way.

Well, I don't know the origin of this Someone thought it necessary, think about how it's going to affect the family that wants a couple chickens for eggs, the kid that wants to grow chicks up into chickens, the teenager that inspires to be a farmer, the hard-working citizen that just wants to put a little bit of food on his plate from the backyard. Let these people see and know what is supposed to be the freedoms we have in America.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Jacque Walters MSL RT (R), (CT)

Sherrie Simpson

From: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 9:07 AM
To: Teresa Whitacre
Cc: Sherrie Simpson; Allison Hardin
Subject: RE: Lancaster county ordinance on small animals

This text amendment request initiated by a citizen is being heard by County Council tonight (Monday October 14, 2024) at 6:00 PM. I will forward this comment to Sherrie Simpson, Clerk to Council.

The proposed text does not ban chickens or other small animals in any zoning district in Lancaster County.



Jennifer Bryan, Planning Technician
Planning

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

P:(803) 285-6005
jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov

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

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

From: Teresa Whitacre <teresawhitacre24@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2024 5:42 PM
To: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov>
Subject: Lancaster county ordinance on small animals



The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender
teresawhitacre24@gmail.com

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

Good morning

I am a property owner in the county of Lancaster. I must voice my opposition to the proposed ordinance regarding control of small animals.

Schedule I

As a professional quality engineer I understand full well about risk, liability, conformance to requirements and other related necessities especially in government organizations. That being said I must vehemently and wholeheartedly oppose this motion for an ordinance

Firstly, how only one person can convince the county to do this is unacceptable. If said gentleman has an issue with his community then it should be addressed there

Secondly, why in a free country do we need to ask permission to do something on property that we own and pay taxes on (legal activities of course). The last I checked im a well educated adult not a kindergarten student. I don't need to ask permission to do something legally on my own property

Thirdly, no matter what the ordinance there still are trespassing laws. No one in south Carolina can enter your property without permission. I just went through this with the state government. There was a complaint about a leaking fire hydrant across the street. I was turned on to the state for standing water from this. The state government approached me about in a letter seeking entry permission. If the state has to seek entry how does the county think it doesn't?

Fourth, if any runs, coops, etc require being measured, will there be calibrated measurement tools being used? Even tape measures are able to calibrated.

Making it a criminal offense to slaughter an animal on your own property- where was that when my neighbors dogs were poisoned? What happens if, for example, I have two chickens and a predator such a fox attacks the chicken? Am I to let it suffer rather than end it's misery for fear of retribution? Am I supposed to have my safety questioned with a predatory animal since the new law would not permit actions that may terminate the predator?

In these challenging times should we not be teaching and rewarding self sufficiency? Meaning of I have chickens and eggs I can feed myself and my family thus keeping us off the need for government support.

I implore you and the county council to revisit this matter with a common sense approach not one on a whim of one person. While it may be true the loudest voice in the room wins, many voices make more noise.

It is my intention to do my best to attend the meeting. But I am sending you this message on case I cannot

Please feel free to reach out to me any questions you may have

Teresa Whitacre-lytle

~~Fickling drive~~

Sherrie Simpson

From: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lanca
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 9:08 A
To: april martinez
Cc: Sherrie Simpson; Allison Hardin
Subject: RE: New Animal Ordinance Bill 10

Schedule J

This text amendment request initiated by a citizen is being heard by County Council tonight (Monday October 14, 2024) at 6:00 PM. I will forward this comment to Sherrie Simpson, Clerk to Council.

The proposed text does not ban chickens or other small animals in any zoning district in Lancaster County.



Jennifer Bryan, Planning Technician
Planning

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

P:(803) 285-6005
jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov

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

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

From: april martinez <greenappleaprilapple@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2024 7:26 PM
To: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov>
Subject: New Animal Ordinance Bill 10/14



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

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

I'm very opposed to passing of this bill. We have had chickens, sheeps, goats etc throughout the years and we love having animals. This bill will hurt alot of people, who depend on eggs and chickens and other animals for food. Some families compete in 4H and have to keep their animals at there home. Please don't pass this bill in the county of Lancaster. VOTING NO AND I'm VERY AGAINST THE PASSING OF THIS BILL.

Sherrie Simpson

From: Renee Watts <naenaewatts1960@gr
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 11:30 AM
To: Sherrie Simpson
Subject: Small animal regulations

Schedule K



The System finds this email suspicious! The sender of this email Renee Watts is similar by name to your contact 'Renee Watts', this might be an impersonation attempt. | [Know this sender?](#)

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

My name is Renee Watts and I live beside but not in the town of Kershaw. I was writing about the new regulations concerning small animals. I know next to nothing about chickens but I do believe homeowners should have the right to keep them as they wish. What I would like to speak about is rabbits. I have had rabbits as pets and/or for breeding for over 50 years. I currently have 20 which I have to keep in my home (we have a dedicated room) because of Coyotes, stray dogs, and stray people (homeless people who stay in my area because they work at the mine, most are not bad people, they just need some help). I think those 3 problems should be a higher priority than someone keeping small animals. Now back to the rabbits, I raise very expensive plush and regular Holland lops. Rabbits can be very sensitive, a stranger messing with their pen and area can cause a pregnant doe to abort her babies, a new mother to stop nursing or even possibly kill her babies plus the rabbit could just die from a heart attack. There are also many diseases that can be passed with only a small contact. For these reasons, everyone I know that has a rabbitry they are closed to everyone except their caregivers. To give one example, say the inspector checked one pen where the rabbit unknowingly had a disease, then came and touched my pen or rabbit (the rabbit can pick it up from the wires or the person their self). My rabbit gets it and passes it to the entire herd, all my rabbits die and I'm out around 10,000 dollars plus the heartache because I love my pets (all of them) like they are family. Another case would be if my doe were to die from stress with say 6 kits that would be valued at around 3,000 dollars. All rabbits do not get this stressed but a lot of them do so why take a chance. I lost my beautiful Topper who was a beautiful 4 lb, tortie, Holland lop buck who was only 2 years old and very healthy when I had a stroke in June and we had strangers come into the house (not in his room) so now no one is allowed in at all.

Also what do you mean by small animals, I saw chickens, ducks, and rabbits listed. What about turkeys, quail, pheasants parakeets, cockatiels, small parrots such as parrotlets, love birds, etc, large parrots such as African greys, macaws, and cockatoos, Guinea pigs, rats, gerbils, hamsters, ferrets, hedgehogs, chinchillas, sugar gliders,

Mini goats, mini pigs, mini donkeys, mini horses, mini cows, and all types of reptiles.

All of these are small animals kept as pets. Most of these are kept in houses or buildings but a lot of people like to have outdoor pens and cages for them too.

To speak on the rabbits again, their cage requirements vary greatly according to the breed (a Netherland dwarf can be around 2 pounds to a Flemish giant which can top 50 pounds, with the average being 20), size of the individual rabbit, activity level and how much time it will spend in that cage or pen. They do not need to be cramped in a cage too small or be in one that is too big because that can make them feel

insecure as they are prey animals, so a lot of times the cage size is determined by that individual rabbit, it is not a one size fits all.

To give another example, I raise Holland lops. They are usually 2 to 4 pounds but I do have 1 or 2 a little heavier. My cages are 24 X 30 X 24 with half wire mesh and half platform bottoms with a few being a little bigger. My rabbits do have a lot of free roam time in their room so my cages can be smaller, as I said a lot depends on the breed and the characterizts of that individual rabbit.

If you have any questions, please give me a call. I am always happy to share my little bit of knowledge of rabbits. I would have loved to attend the meeting but I am recovering from a stoke

Thank you.

Sherrie Simpson

From: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 2:10 PM
To: David & Rachel Wallace
Cc: Sherrie Simpson; Allison Hardin
Subject: RE: Ordinance 2024-1929

I have forwarded your comments to the Clerk of Council for distribution to the Council members for tonight's meeting.



Jennifer Bryan, Planning Technician
Planning

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

P:(803) 285-6005
jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov

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

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

From: David & Rachel Wallace <mormoney@comporium.net>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 2:07 PM
To: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov>
Subject: Ordinance 2024-1929

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

Hi, Jennifer --

I was given your email to contact as part of the County Council Meeting on Monday, October 14, 2024. I will not be able to attend but wanted to express my feelings about this revision of the above mentioned ordinance.

I reviewed what the ordinance was and what is now being proposed and I DO NOT agree with the new revisions. Why are they now being more restrictive to have small animals? I feel it is more government overreach.

I am asking the County Council to vote NO on this amendment.

Thanks,

Schedule L

Rachel

Rachel Wallace

2066 Mountain Laurel Road

Lancaster, SC 29720

Home - (803) 285-3193

Cell - (803) 287-3687



Virus-free www.avast.com



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 14, 2024, 03:13PM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion:	Public Hearing and 1st Reading of Ordinance 2024-1929
Meeting Date:	October 14, 2024 06:00 PM
Full Name	First Name: Airen Last Name: Ayres
Phone Number	239-895-6364
Email	ayresoc@yahoo.com
Address:	1882 New Cut Church Rd. Lancaster, SC 29720
Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item:	I own 8 acres of property in the Buford area. I have 7 hens and one rooster. They are kept in a large hoop house well inside my property boundary. I enjoy raising my own chickens and knowing I have fresh eggs from healthy animals. Every 2 years or so I will incubate and hatch a few new chickens, and I believe it should be my right to dispatch any new roosters on my own property, as having too many is bad for the flock. I haven't received any complaints from my neighbors about keeping these chickens. I sincerely hope the council will consider the many residents who are in rural areas in the county like me when considering this new ordinance. Being able to own property and be free is what makes this county so great, and it is my hope that I will continue to be allowed to raise a few healthy, happy chickens for a long time to come.

Schedule M

Sherrie Simpson

From: Grace Carnes <gracecarnes1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 3:18 PM
To: Sherrie Simpson
Subject: Proposal on animals and pens and coops

 The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender
gracecarnes1@gmail.com

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

I am very much opposed to government interference with my right to have animals on my own property without having to pay Lancaster County to do so. It is none of your business. This has been kept pretty quiet so citizens would not be able to oppose but we can take legal action after the fact if you do this and we can definitely vote all of you out for not doing what is wanted by your constituents. The very nerve of trying to do something like this in a farming community.

Grace Carnes

Schedule N

Sherrie Simpson

From: Jane Hawkins <mjkhawkins@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 3:21 PM
To: Sherrie Simpson
Subject: TA-2024-1451 Backyard Pens/Coops.....VOTE NO!



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

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

October 14, 2024

To: Lancasater County Council

PLEASE VOTE "NO" ON TA-2024-1451.

Lancaster County residents take pride in the way our homes, Property and animals are taken care of. The rural country way of life is what drew us to Southern Lancaster County. This is a normal way of life for most rural communities in South Carolina. Please do not put unnecessary regulations on our lifestyle. Please appreciate the country atmosphere

we in Lancaster County love. We want to keep or property clean, neat and with an appealing country environment. We treat our animals with the upmost care. This is government overreach!

It is totally unnecessary to waste time and resources on this subject. We have so many other topics that need attention like upgrading our roads, again like paving our roads, bringing jobs into the county, and the safety of Lancaster County residents.

PLEASE VOTE " NO" ON TA-2024-1451!

Thank you for letting me express my opinion.

Kind Regards,
Jane Hawkins
~~2147 New Hope Road~~
Heath Springs, SC 29058

Schedule O



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 14, 2024, 03:37PM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion:	Hearing and First Reading 2024-1929
Meeting Date:	October 14, 2024 03:37 PM
Full Name	First Name: Samantha Last Name: Frank
Phone Number	7047749036
Email	samanthafrank92@gmail.com
Address:	3363 Atlas Lane
Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item:	My chickens bring so much joy to our home and I don't understand why this is even a topic of discussion? My home, my yard, my chickens are my business. Sadly this is yet again, another way our government is grossly overreaching. My 8 hens and one miniature rooster cause zero harm and I have never received a complaint from any of my neighbors in the time that I have owned chickens. I truly hope this ridiculous agenda doesn't pass. Please allow my family and I to continue to have the freedom of providing for ourselves in a natural healthy way. Please stop allowing the government to control areas of our lives that should be our choice and our freedom to decide and control. Thank you for your time. God bless you Vote for Trump

Schedule P

Sherrie Simpson

From: Pa Hawk <pahawk60@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 3:45 PM
To: Sherrie Simpson
Subject: NO on TA-2024-1451

 The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender
pahawk60@gmail.com

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

With the US economy on the verge of collapse, you have nothing better to do than attempt to take away citizens' ability to feed their families and fertilize their gardens. I realize that you do not control the US economy, but do you really feel that adding to rural families' woes is necessary? Do you also plan to raise taxes to hire compliance officers to measure chicken coops? Surely you do not expect to add to the burden of the local police officers to enforce your fantasies. Lancaster County is mostly rural with a rural mindset. Stop with the Karen mentality and do something useful, like repairing the roads or recruiting business to increase employment opportunities for young people.

Tommy Hawkins

Schedule Q



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 14, 2024, 03:45PM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion:	Chickens in neighborhoods
Meeting Date:	October 14, 2024 03:32 PM
Full Name	First Name: Gwen Last Name: Byrd
Phone Number	8033202170
Email	gwenbrd55@gmail.com
Address:	284 Arrowood Ave. Kershaw sc 29067
Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item:	I am speaking for my parents John & Mozelle Byrd & myself. My parents live near a chicken coop. We have never been bothered by noise or smell or any other concern. The only thing we know about these chicken are they produce great safe eggs. Our neighbor shares with us often. These are great neighbors & they should have the right to raise chickens like some people raise dogs & cats. This yard for chickens is a heck of a lot cleaner & safer than the yard beside my parents. It is full of trash & garbage, poison oak, bugs & who knows what. They have been told to clean up about 5 or 6 months ago & it's gotten worse. SO would we rather have chickens YES YES YES. There is nothing wrong with chickens. Teaches kids to work together & be responsible, allows people to share and have you seen the price of eggs lately. PLEASE LET THE CHICKENS STAY.

Schedule R

Sherrie Simpson

From: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lanastercc
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 3:56 PM
To: Megan Jamieson; Planning Mailbox
Cc: Sherrie Simpson; Allison Hardin
Subject: RE: Ordinance Regarding Backyard

Schedule S

I will forward your comment to the Clerk to Council.

Since the applicant's request for text amendment specifically includes LDR zoning, that zoning district must be addressed by the staff report. Council has the authority to include, exclude, amend, or reject any or all of the request and the staff's recommendations.

If you are unable to attend tonight's Council meeting, it will be livestreamed at the County's Youtube channel at: <https://www.youtube.com/@LancasterCoSCGov/streams>



Jennifer Bryan, Planning Technician
Planning

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

P:(803) 285-6005
jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov

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

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

From: Megan Jamieson <mjamieson1012@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 3:48 PM
To: Jennifer Bryan <jbryan@lanastercountysc.gov>; Planning Mailbox <planning@lanastercountysc.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Ordinance Regarding Backyard Pens/Coops

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

I do ask that at the very least, remove LDR from this ordinance. If his zoning was just drug into the conversation because the applicant is upset.

How many children's education would be affected? Look at the amount of LDR areas there are and how many agricultural families are in them.

Thank you.

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

From: **Megan Jamieson** <mjamieson1012@gmail.com>

Date: Sunday, October 13, 2024

Subject: Ordinance Regarding Backyard Pens/Coops

To: jbryan@lancastercountysc.gov

I hope this email finds you well!

I am a Lancaster county, SC resident who is rather concerned regarding the new rules & regulations on backyard pens and coops.

My family has owned chickens for over 15 years and they bring great joy to us all, especially my children. Our two girls participate in 4H Poultry Showmanship and the American Bantam association. They raise chickens, incubate their eggs, grow them out to then show them in 4H and professionally. In our county, with a lot of new growth in the area many children who want to participate in the 4H poultry project are not able due to housing, neighborhoods, so we help those kids out by housing a chicken for them.

With the potential of this new ordinance our small farm, county children, and on a state/national level would be detrimental.

Our girls have learned through raising and showing their chickens so much. Below I will list the skills they have acquired from having their chickens: anatomy, public speaking, how to overcome obstacles, responsibility of having

animals, the cycle of the animal from egg to death, life cycle, breeding program, diseases, npip, state regulations, national regulations, how to carry themselves, my children used to be extremely shy but with their chicken in hand they can talk to anyone, and honestly so many more life skills.

Taking the educational value of having chickens in a child's yard away from our county's children is disheartening. With costs of land we are not all able to afford housing in agricultural zones. At least lifting this ordinance from the LDR and MDR. These zones are at least far apart enough where chickens shouldn't be a bother. Our state is very much a farm friendly area where we nurture the life of a farmer, either big or small.

It is a responsibility of a chicken owner with a flock to be npip tested by the state and avian influenza tested. This helps keep poultry, livestock, and the health of people in order. Why could the county not just double check the farms are at least being state tested?

Our youth are the only promise of tomorrow, please do not let an ordinance get in the way of teaching them solid life skills.

I would be happy to discuss this further with any and all council members.

Thank you for the time,
Megan Jamieson

Sherrie Simpson

From: Carmen McKoy <cmckoy78@yahoo.c
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 3:58 PM
To: Sherrie Simpson
Subject: Fw: 2024-1929

Schedule T

 The System couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender cmckoy78@yahoo.com

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

Lancaster county council,

Regarding Ordinance 2024-1929 I would ask you unanimously vote NO.

Council, please remember who your constituents are. Lancaster County is mostly rural!

My family moved to Kershaw almost 20 years ago to get AWAY from this kind of nonsense. The country lifestyle is what was so appealing about this area. I love being out in the country and being able to have fresh air, plenty of land, trees, chickens, and goats. As I stated before, the MAJORITY of Lancaster County is RURAL! Chickens are a way of life here, it does not matter if they are in the back, side, or front yard as long as they are in MY yard.

Lancaster County should not try to dictate where it's citizens can keep small animals, how much space I have them in, or what my coop looks like. What business does Lancaster County have telling its citizens whether or not we can use chicken waste in a compost pile? This ordinance says it may not be stored. Many gardeners regularly use chicken waste for their garden.

Another absurd piece of this ordinance is that it would be illegal to dispatch of your own animal on your own property. Yet if I have a rooster I have 10 days to get rid of it? I do not believe the shelter takes roosters.

What do we do with them? What about sick animals? Do we now take every sick chicken to the vet?

I also take issue with not allowing the sale of eggs. As terrible as our economy is right now why would you attempt to prevent a family from making ends meet? Many people have a side gig of selling their eggs. It is ridiculous to restrict that.

This whole ordinance comes across as extremely tone deaf. This is terrible example of government overreach. Lancaster County has much more pressing matters to attend to than whether the residents have chickens! I pray the Lancaster County Council will see what an absurd proposal this ordinance is and vote no this evening.

Thank you for your time.

Kind regards,

Carmen McKoy

Kershaw



Citizen Comment

Lancaster County

Submitted On:

Oct 14, 2024, 02:31PM EDT

Agenda Item for Discussion:	Our Community(Estates at Covington) needs the Council Help with grievances
Meeting Date:	October 14, 2024 02:16 PM
Full Name	First Name: Beatrice Last Name: Adams
Phone Number	6316641856
Email	bea11adams@gmail.com
Address:	7133 Sumters Camp Trail Indian Land SC 29707
Citizen Comment - Regarding Agenda Item:	1. Waste Water Management (Retention Ponds) throughout community needs to be drained and bushes removed 2. Common Areas in community in need of proper grading 3. Unfulfilled community contractual agreement 4. We are trying to get the Civil Plat for our community to compare what has been done to what was promised to be do. 5. We have drains in some of our home owners backyards, making it unsafe for kids to play in the own backyard. 6. We have security issues with break ins cars and stolen cars. We have had LCPD come into community about 7 or eight times in the past months. 7. What can we do to obtain permit for gated front entrance 8. How can we hold Developer accounted for issues that should have been resolved before turning over to community.

Schedule U

Schedule V



Lancaster County, South Carolina

Post Office Box 1809 Lancaster, South Carolina 29721-1809

STATEMENT OF RECUSAL

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

2nd Reading of Ordinance 2024-1932

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

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

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

Reason(s) for Disqualification: _____

Vested interest in property

Name: _____

, County Council Member

Date: _____

10/15/2024 ✓



Schedule W













