

PICKENS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

of

May 9, 2022

6:30pm

PICKENS COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING Main Conference Room

NOTICE OF MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING: Pursuant to Section 30-4-80 of the S.C. Code of Laws, annual notice of this Commission's meetings was provided by January 1, 2022 via the Pickens County Website and posted next to the Offices of the County Planning Department. In addition, the agenda for this meeting was posted outside the meeting place (Pickens County Administration Building Bulletin Board) and was emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice. Notice for the public hearings was published in the *Pickens County Courier*, posted on the properties subject of public hearing(s), and emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice pursuant to Section 1205(d)(1) of the Pickens County Unified Development Standards Ordinance.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bobby Ballentine, Chairman
Gary Stancell, Vice Chairman
Phil Smith
Bobbie Langley
Jon Humphrey
David Cox

STAFF PRESENT:

Les Hendricks, County Attorney
Ray Holliday, County Planner
Allison Fowler, Community & Tourism Development Director

Welcome and Call to Order

Mr. Ballentine, the Presiding Official, called the meeting to order at 6:32pm.

Mr. Ballentine asked those in attendance to join in a moment of silence and for the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Ballentine asked for the members of the Commission to introduce themselves.

Motion to add Executive Session to the Agenda

Mr. Ballentine stated that he has been informed by the County Attorney that he needs to address the commission in executive session for a legal briefing regarding a land use suspension issued in 2016 against MRR Pickens, LLC. This needs to be done prior to the County Council meeting next Monday, May 16, 2022. If we want to address this tonight, then we will need to have a 2/3 vote of the Commission to do so and find that exigent circumstances exist. The exigent circumstance is that the Commission does not have a meeting scheduled until after the County Council meeting in which they need to hear from us before addressing the topic.

Mr. Ballentine asked for a motion. Ms. Langley motioned to add Executive Session to the agenda, Mr. Cox seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Ballentine stated that Executive Session will be added that to the end of the official agenda after the Public Hearings.

1 **Approval of Minutes**

2
3 Mr. Ballentine called for corrections or for a motion regarding the minutes of the April 11, 2022 meeting.

4
5 Mr. Stancell made a motion to approve the April 11 minutes. Mr. Humphrey provided a second. The motion passed
6 unanimously (6-0).

7
8 Mr. Ballentine called for corrections or for a motion regarding the minutes of the April 18, 2022 meeting. Mr.
9 Humphrey made a motion to approve the minutes once the spelling of his name was corrected on page 4, line 11 and
10 line 13. Mr. Stancell seconded the motion. The motion, with the noted changes, passed unanimously (6-0).

11
12 **Public Comments**

13
14 There were no public comments provided.

15
16 **Public Hearings**

17
18 Mr. Ballentine opened the public hearing portion of the meeting and called for the first case being heard. Mr.
19 Ballentine stated that since the first three cases are all the same owner, they may be presented at the same time, but
20 the Commission would vote on them separately.

21
22 Mr. Ballentine explained that the Commission will hear from the presenters and once they are done and have a
23 chance to ask questions, anyone opposed may speak on the project. The presenters will have a chance for rebuttal.

- 24
25 1. LU-22-0006 Land Use Review for a 15 site RV Park and Campground
26 on approximately 12 acres of a larger 183 acre tract The subject
27 property is located on Fruit Mountain Road, Easley. The applicant is
28 Carolina Preserve Group, LLC. The property owners of record are
29 Chrome Real Estate LLC and Victoria Anthony. TMS# 5009-16-93-2137,
30 5009-20-91-2303
31
32 2. SD-22-0002 Subdivision Land Use for 40 lots of a larger 78 lot, single-
33 family residential development located on Fruit Mountain Road, Easley.
34 The proposed development is located on approximately 102.71 acres
35 of a larger 183 acre development. The applicant is Carolina Preserve
36 Group, LLC. The property owners of record are Chrome Real Estate
37 LLC and Victoria Anthony. TMS# 5009-16-93-2137, 5009-20-91-2303
38
39 3. SD-22-0003 Subdivision Land Use for 38 lots of a larger 78 lot, single-
40 family residential development located on Fruit Mountain Road, Easley.
41 The proposed development is located on approximately 55.14 acres of
42 a larger 183 acre development. The applicant is Carolina Preserve
43 Group, LLC. The property owner of record is Victoria Anthony. TMS#
44 5009-16-93-2137
45

46 Mr. Jim Anthony presented the project for Carolina Preserve Group, LLC. Mr. Anthony explained that the property is
47 a very unusual piece of land that had a lot of four-wheeler use. The plan for the project was to solve the erosion
48 problem and so they did a forestry plan. Mr. Anthony explained that Carolina Preserve Group, LLC has a successful
49 low-density development in Marietta called Riverstead. This project is planned after that project with trails, gardens
50 and green areas. Mr. Anthony stated that they do not plan to do an RV park, however, they do plan to have a low
51 impact plan with one or two small cottages. They see the project as an opportunity to create an icon development for
52 Pickens County. Mr. Anthony stated that they are working on the full business plan.

53
54 Mr. Smith asked what is a green area.

55
56 Mr. Anthony explained it as a green space.
57

1 Ms. Langley asked if it would be a dedicated greenspace to never be developed. Ms. Langley asked if the common
2 areas would be dedicated to never be developed.

3
4 Mr. Anthony explained they would never be developed in to homesites but would be developed for amenities.

5
6 Mr. Stancell asked what the plan is for the campground.

7
8 Mr. Anthony responded with 1,500 square feet as max, 1 or 2 bedrooms, rustic looking.

9
10 Ms. Langley requested confirmation on the 180 day limit on occupancy. Ms. Langley asked if the cottages would be
11 pre-fabricated or site built.

12
13 Mr. Anthony confirmed there would not be any stays beyond 180 days and that the cottages would be site built.

14
15 Mr. Ballentine asked how the roads will be developed, with curb and gutter.

16
17 Mr. Anthony stated that there would be 90' lots with curb and gutter.

18
19 Mr. Stancell had a question about the sewer. Is that common?

20
21 Mr. Anthony stated that they plan to go through DHEC and get a permit to pump to another area.

22
23 Ms. Langley asked if the project was being designed as a green development.

24
25 Mr. Anthony stated that the number of homesites average about 2 acres, but he is not familiar with the requirement to
26 be green. Mr. Anthony stated they will have a HOA in place.

27
28 Mr. Smith asked if they plan to have someone on site managing the property, specifically the campground and
29 cabins.

30
31 Mr. Anthony stated that whether they live on site or not, yes someone will be managing the property. He went on to
32 say they have considered corporate outings in the future.

33
34 Mr. Smith asked what is the plan for the additional acreage at the top of the mountain.

35
36 Mr. Anthony stated that a corporate experience space is in the works.

37
38 Mr. Smith asked if they plan to have just one access road to both sides. Are there plans for a second access.

39
40 Mr. Anthony responded no, there will be one access directly across Fruit Mountain that will be gated.

41
42 Mr. Ballentine asked for any additional questions.

43
44 Mr. Ballentine asked what range the square footage of houses will be.

45
46 Mr. Roy Costner answered that they will be closer to 400SF on average, more like the Riverstead development.

47
48 Mr. Timothy Bunch asked how the infrastructure will be handled. He stated he lives on Fruit Mountain Road and can
49 barely handle the traffic that is on it now.

50
51 Mr. Anthony stated that if there is a traffic study required they would do it. He further stated that 100 cars a days is
52 probably an exaggeration.

53
54 Mr. Bunch stated that 2 cars per house could add more than 100 cars.

55
56 Mr. Duane Bradshaw asked if the project included a sewage system. He stated he lives right by Fruit Mountain
57 Road.

1
2 Mr. Anthony stated that the septic is all regulated by DHEC and they would meet all their specifications.
3

4 Mr. Ballentine confirmed that it will be septic based on the plan and be DHEC regulated.
5

6 Mr. Ballentine asked for any questions from commissioners. He stated the commission would vote on one item at a
7 time.
8

9 Ms. Langley confirmed that it is a total of 78 houses and 15 cabins.
10

11 Mr. Ballentine closed the public hearing at 6:55pm.
12

13 Mr. Smith made a motion to approve LU-22-006 as presented. Mr. Cox seconded. Mr. Ballentine asked for any
14 discussion.
15

16 Ms. Langley stated she is concerned about relief on individual meters. She is afraid to set a new standard, as it is
17 not a home and not a cabin.
18

19 Mr. Ballentine stated to look at it separately from the concept of a permanent structure.
20

21 Mr. Ballentine asked if there was any other discussion.
22

23 Mr. Cox clarified that over 100 lots requires a road study. Is this considered to be over 100 lots.
24

25 Ms. Langley said it's only 78 lots.
26

27 Mr. Holliday stated that a traffic study is not required for this project.
28

29 Ms. Langley asked if lots 74-78 are coming out directly onto Fruit Mountain Road.
30

31 Mr. Anthony confirmed access directly off of Fruit Mountain Road.
32

33 Mr. Holliday clarified 178 daily trips estimated for this project, as stated in the project application.
34

35 Mr. Ballentine asked for any other discussion.
36

37 Mr. Ballentine asked for a vote on the motion to approved as presented. The motion passed unanimously (6-0).
38

39 Mr. Ballentine asked for a motion on application SD-22-0002.
40

41 Mr. Stancell made a motion to approve SD-22-0002 as presented. Ms. Langley seconded. Mr. Ballentine asked for
42 any discussion.
43

44 Mr. Smith clarified that lots 74-78 are in this project.
45

46 Mr. Costner confirmed that this part of the project is on the west side of the road, left hand side on the map, so yes, it
47 includes lots 74-78.
48

49 Mr. Ballentine asked if all in favor. The motion passed unanimously (6-0).
50

51 SD-22-0003

52 Mr. Ballentine clarified that SD-22-0003 is on the east side of the road.
53

54 Mr. Ballentine asked for a motion.
55

56 Mr. Cox made a motion to approve SD-22-0003 as presented. Mr. Stancell seconded.
57

1 Mr. Ballentine asked for any discussion or questions.

2
3 Mr. Ballentine asked if all in favor. The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

4
5 Mr. Ballentine called for the next item in the public hearing.

- 6
7 **4. SD-22-0005 Subdivision Land Use for a 10 lot, single-family residential**
8 **development located on Archery Club Road and Six Mile Highway,**
9 **Central. The proposed development is located on approximately 10**
10 **acres of a larger 51.21 acre tract. The applicant is AC9, LLC. The**
11 **property owner of record is Sarah Chastain. TMS# 4057-00-05-6251**
12

13 Mr. Ballentine asked for the presenter on the case to step forward.

14
15 Mr. Daniel Youngblood appeared to present the item before the Planning Commission. Mr. Youngblood explained
16 that they are cutting an approximately 50 acre tract into 10 or better lots. He stated that the project meets all the
17 county specs and there will be septic lots. He stated that none of the parcels are under contract yet, but there are a
18 few restrictions the owner placed on the property – all lots must be 1 acre or greater. The project will receive public
19 water from the Town of Six Mile.

20
21 Mr. Smith asked if the driveways would be per each lot or be common.

22
23 Mr. Youngblood stated they are not sure what DOT will require, but it will likely be a shared driveway per two houses.

24
25 Mr. Ballentine stated that the Commission can specify that it has to be shared, make it a condition.

26
27 Mr. Youngblood stated that in case there is an issue, end lots might need to be single drives.

28
29 Mr. Stancell stated that on the map back toward Six Mile there's a triangle shaped lot, with a space between it and
30 the next lot.

31
32 Mr. Youngblood responded that it will be part of the larger remaining tract that won't be built. It allows access to the
33 lot in case it can be used at a later date.

34
35 Mr. Smith asked about the gravel road that goes to the north of the property – is that part of the land.

36
37 Mr. Youngblood stated that it is an easement, but it is part of the parcel.

38
39 Mr. Smith confirmed that by conventional house, they mean not modular.

40
41 Mr. Youngblood replied correct.

42
43 Mr. Ballentine asked if there are any other questions.

44
45 Mr. Holliday stated that there are several people signed up in opposition.

46
47 Mr. Dana Simmons stated that he wanted to know more about the property and the intent. He asked if the 40 acres
48 in the back is a planned development.

49
50 Mr. Youngblood stated there is not plan to develop those acres at this time. He cannot guarantee it but it's not a plan
51 at this time.

52
53 Mr. Simmons asked if the easement to the Ross's property would stay the same.

54
55 Mr. Youngblood responded that yes, it will stay the same as a gravel road.

56
57 Mr. Simmons asked if they are developing the property for Sarah.

1
2 Mr. Youngblood stated that they are purchasing and developing it.

3
4 Ms. Langley asked what size houses are you planning to develop.

5
6 Mr. Youngblood responded that he was unsure, but probably 2,500 square feet or better.

7
8 Mr. Brandon Ross, 3481 Six Mile Highway stated that he owns the easement and it's the only access to his property.

9
10 Mr. Ross asked if they are planning to subdivide the remaining 40 acres. He asked the Commission if they are only
11 asking for 10 acres, does this give them permission to develop the other 40.

12
13 Mr. Ballentine responded that they would have to come back to Planning Commission for approval before any future
14 development.

15
16 Mr. Ballentine stated that if the easement is in your deed that's it forever.

17
18 Mr. Ross asked if his easement be able to give access to the future lots.

19
20 Mr. Holliday stated that as the property was further subdivided, it would be up to Mr. Ross to decide the maintenance.

21
22 Ms. Langley asked if Mr. Ross could gate it off.

23
24 Mr. Holliday responded that if Mr. Ross is the only property owner, he can gate it off.

25
26 Mr. Hendricks advised that Mr. Ross needs a legal opinion on the easement before making any decisions.

27
28 Mr. Youngblood stated that in going through all of the deeds, it looks like Mr. Ross is one of three property owners
29 that have been granted use of the easement. If we were going to use that access to build a subdivision, we'd have to
30 turn it in to an actual road. We would need to meet county specs and create a road. As far as accessing the back,
31 we would have the right to cross it, but we have no plans of putting more development in the back.

32
33 Mr. Ronnie Collins 3466-3400 Six Mile Highway – stated that a lot of the concerns brought up have been addressed.
34 He asked if this is approved, how much could they do later. Is the Commission giving future approval.

35
36 Mr. Ballentine stated it's only for the 10 lots.

37
38 Mr. Collins stated he had some other questions in regards to 2008-2009 time, rates changed and we had several
39 housing developments left vacant or unattended. Is there a plan in place so we know this will get completed, so it's
40 not half done, vacant lots across the street.

41
42 Mr. Youngblood responded that no infrastructure would be done. Once the builder buys the lot, our hope is that it will
43 be finished but they cannot make any guarantees.

44
45 Mr. Collins stated that assuming all are on the main road, all are 1 acre lots with single-family homes. We would be
46 worried about 10 houses that can drop our land value. Mr. Collins asked is there a way to have a minimum square
47 footage so we knew it would be at least that or greater.

48
49 Mr. Youngblood stated there is no minimum square footage on the deed.

50
51 Mr. Josh Arnett of 3482 Six Mile Highway stated that there is not a lot of specificity in the entrance. He asked are
52 they coming in from Archery Club Road.

53
54 Mr. Ballentine responded that all enter on Six Mile Highway and will have a shared driveway for every two houses.

55
56 Mr. Arnett stated he was under the impression that Mr. Youngblood would be building and not selling to builders. He
57 stated that gives leeway to builders.

1
2 Mr. Youngblood responded that they would meet all county specs with only 1000 square foot homes but they have no
3 intentions of that for the financials to work.

4
5 Mr. Smith asked what other specificity would they like to see.

6
7 Mr. Arnett responded they'd like to see specific ground rules on minimum square footage size.

8
9 Mr. Ballentine asked if there was any rebuttal from your end Mr. Youngblood.

10
11 Mr. Youngblood stated they can't make any guarantees that those things don't happen.

12
13 Mr. Cox asked if they're going to sell the land to a builder.

14
15 Mr. Youngblood responded correct.

16
17 Mr. Smith asked have you considered punching through a property on Six Mile Highway, coming behind with a
18 common shared driveway, it would save money on culverts.

19
20 Mr. Youngblood stated it would have to become a public road per county standards.

21
22 Mr. Smith responded I take that back, that won't work.

23
24 Mr. Ballentine asked if there were any other questions.

25
26 Mr. Ballentine closed the public hearing at 7:25pm and asked for a motion from the Commission.

27
28 Mr. Smith made a motion to approve with following conditions:

- 29 • At a minimum 5 shared driveways coming off Six Mile Highway.
- 30 • Square footage minimum of 2,500.
- 31 • Construction style be consistent architectural model and type.

32
33 Mr. Ballentine responded we will want to define consistent.

34
35 Mr. Ballentine asked for a second.

36
37 Mr. Humphrey seconded.

38
39 Mr. Ballentine asked for any discussion.

40
41 Mr. Humphrey stated that because there is a right of way between lot 9 and 10, it would be difficult to put in 5 shared
42 driveways. He wondered if maybe it should be a minimum of 4 since there cannot be more than 3 lots in a shared
43 driveway anyway.

44
45 Mr. Ballentine responded that a minimum of 4 driveways would be 6 cuts.

46
47 Mr. Smith requested to amend the motion to a minimum of 4 shared driveways.

48
49 Mr. Cox requested clarification on whether the builder have to buy two lots in order to build on either side.

50
51 Mr. Holliday stated that a shared driveway has a 20' easement that must be indicated on the plat.

52
53 Mr. Humphrey commented that the first builder puts in the easement and the second builder would have to agree.

54
55 Mr. Holliday responded as to how it happens he can't say.

56
57 Mr. Cox stated that the builder buying one lot would have to ensure a right of way.

1
2 Mr. Youngblood responded that they anticipate one buyer and are not concerned with that issue.

3
4 Mr. Ballentine requested a second. Mr. Cox seconded.

5
6 Mr. Ballentine asked for a vote on the amendment of the motion for the first condition, minimum of 4 shared drives.
7 All in favor, amended motion passed unanimously (6-0).

8
9 Mr. Cox asked for clarification if the basis of 2500 square feet is based on comments from the community. Mr. Cox
10 wondered if that is consistent for how the Commission does business.

11
12 Mr. Stancell stated if the landowner wants to do it, fine, but he is against the Commission going down that road.

13
14 Mr. Cox said the Commission doesn't want to set that precedent.

15
16 Ms. Langley stated the Commission should look at that for every item and need to consider the precedent.

17
18 Mr. Cox stated the Commission shouldn't be in the business of dictating home size.

19
20 Mr. Ballentine stated the Commission must come to a consensus and amend the motion for the second condition.

21
22 Ms. Langley requested the guarantee that it's only single family homes.

23
24 Mr. Ballentine said the Commission can amend it to say that but the builder stated in letter of intent that he is doing
25 single family homes.

26
27 Mr. Smith stated that the second condition was a minimum of 2,500 square feet. He is prepared to remove that
28 condition.

29
30 Mr. Ballentine stated Mr. Smith will need to withdraw the first motion and make a substitute motion.

31
32 Mr. Smith requested to remove the original motion.

33
34 Mr. Ballentine asked if there is a second to remove the motion. Mr. Stancell seconded. Mr. Ballentine asked all in
35 favor. Motion passed unanimously (6-0).

36
37 Mr. Ballentine asked for a substitute motion.

38
39 Mr. Smith made a motion with one condition to allow a minimum of 4 shared driveways on Six Mile Highway. Mr.
40 Stancell seconded. Mr. Ballentine asked if all in favor. The motion to approve with the stated condition passed
41 unanimously (6-0).

- 42
43 **5. SDV-22-0003 Kent Unruh requesting a subdivision variance from the**
44 **Pickens County development standards regarding the minimum lot**
45 **size of a parcel when served by septic and public water; to create two**
46 **tracts with less than 0.50 acres. The property is located at 203 Old**
47 **Easley Pickens Highway. The property owner of record is Kent and**
48 **Susan Unruh. TMS# 5009-06-49-9331**
49

50 Mr. Ballentine asked for the presenter on the case to step forward.

51
52 Mr. Kent Unruh, property owner, presented the case. He states that he and his wife purchased a property that is
53 94/100 of an acre. The property has a mobile home and a single family house. He stated their desire is to split the
54 property directly in half and all utilities are separate. Mr. Unruh stated they wish to put in a new driveway for the
55 mobile home off Old Easley Pickens Highway. Mr. Unruh stated that each property would come out at 47/50 of an
56 acre.
57

1 Mr. Ballentine asked for any questions.

2
3 Mr. Holliday stated that no one else signed up to speak.

4
5 Mr. Stancell confirmed that they have separate utilities.

6
7 Mr. Unruh responded that yes, dividing for septic would keep them separate.

8
9 Mr. Ballentine closed the public hearing closed at 7:42pm.

10
11 Ms. Langley made a motion to approve SDV-22-003 as presented. Mr. Cox seconded. There was no additional
12 discussion. The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

13
14
15 **6. SDV-22-0004 Jack Pollard requesting a subdivision variance from the**
16 **Pickens County development standards regarding the division of**
17 **property when located on a Private Residential Access. The property**
18 **is located Covenant Acres Lane, Liberty. The property owner of record**
19 **is Jack Pollard. TMS# 4095-02-69-3559**
20

21 Mr. Ballentine stated the request and asked for the presenter to step forward.

22
23 Mr. Jack Pollard, property owner, stated that he is granting his granddaughter and husband a lot on their property to
24 place a manufactured home. Mr. Pollard stated the placement is across the street on our private dead end gravel
25 road.

26
27 Mr. Ballentine asked where does that road end, he noticed survey markers on the property.

28
29 Mr. Smith asked where specifically on the plot are they putting the home.

30
31 Mr. Pollard responded that Clayton Homes is handling everything.

32
33 Mr. Smith asked if Mr. Pollard could show the Commission where on the map the house will be.

34
35 Mr. Pollard approached the Commission to point out the location on the map.

36
37 Mr. Ballentine asked if DHEC specified the location.

38
39 Mr. Pollard stated that it had to be a specific septic tank for that spot.

40
41 Mr. Ballentine stated that they could actually straighten out the road to give them a little more land on the property.

42
43 Mr. Ballentine asked who decides how to maintain the road.

44
45 Mr. Pollard responded we all do and we take up gravel money every month.

46
47 Ms. Langley asked if there is a road maintenance agreement.

48
49 Mr. Pollard stated there is no written agreement, it's all been verbal. He further stated that he has no plans to sell and
50 each year some areas get more priority on the road. They put the gravel where it's needed and haven't had a
51 problem in 20 years, it's all family. Mr. Pollard further stated he understands the need to put something in writing, but
52 just never thought about it. It's not but \$20 per family per month, so it's not a great deal of money. It's all been
53 working well so far.

54
55 Mr. Ballentine asked for any questions from the commission.

56
57 Mr. Ballentine closed the public hearing at 7:49pm.

1
2 Mr. Ballentine asked if there is a motion on the table.

3
4 Mr. Cox made a motion to approve SDV-22-0004 as presented. Mr. Stancell seconded.

5
6 Mr. Ballentine asked for discussion.

7
8 Mr. Smith asked the Commission to look at page 4 of 5, item numbers 6 and 7.

9
10 Mr. Smith stated that the current motion isn't asking them to do that and number 7 (Plat Certification) has to go in the
11 motion.

12
13 Mr. Holliday stated that the county prefers the surveyor place that on the plat before approval or staff can include a
14 sticker with the notation before recording.

15
16 Mr. Ballentine asked if anyone wants to amend it or change it.

17
18 Ms. Langley made an amendment that items 6 and 7 be included.

19
20 Mr. Ballentine stated there was no second, so the amendment dies.

21
22 Mr. Ballentine stated there are no other questions and asked if all in favor. The motion to approve SDV-22-0004
23 passed 5-1.

24
25 ***Executive Session***

26 Mr. Stancell made a motion to enter Executive Session. Mr. Smith seconded. All approved.

27
28 The Commission entered Executive Session at 7:53pm.

29
30 Mr. Ballentine called the meeting back to order at 8:23pm.

31
32 Mr. Ballentine asked for a motion to approve Resolution 2022-03.

33
34 Mr. Cox made a motion to approve Resolution 2022-03. Mr. Stancell seconded.

35
36 Mr. Ballentine asked for any discussion. The motion to approve Resolution 2022-03 passed unanimously (6-0).

37
38 Any staff discussion? Elections at next meeting in June. Do it before we go into session.

39 Motion to adjourn. Smith motion. Langley second. 8:27pm.

40
41 ***Commissioners and Staff Discussion***

42
43 Mr. Ballentine asked if there was any staff discussion.

44
45 Mr. Ballentine reminded the Commission and staff that elections of officers will take place at the June meeting before
46 going in to session.

47
48 ***Adjourn***

49
50 There being no additional matters to be taken up by the Commission, Mr. Smith motioned that the meeting be
51 adjourned. Ms. Langley seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 8:27pm.

Submitted by:

Amita
Secretary

7/19/22
Date

Approved by:

C. Cory Stumm
Chairman

June 13 2022
Date

RESOLUTION 2022-003

A RESOLUTION OF THE PICKENS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDING THAT THE COUNTY ATTORNEY SEND A LETTER LIFTING THE SUSPENSION OF THE LAND USE PERMIT HELD BY MRR PICKENS, LLC CONTINGENT UPON PICKENS COUNTY COUNCIL ENTERING INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH MRR PICKENS, LLC FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, TERMS OF OPERATION AND SALE OF THE PROPOSED LANDFILL LOCATED IN PICKENS COUNTY

WHEREAS, this Pickens County Planning Commission (the "Commission") issued a letter to MRR Pickens, LLC on January 11, 2016 suspending the land use permit previously issued by this commission;

WHEREAS, subsequent to suspension of the land use permit MRR Pickens, LLC and the County of Pickens and several, present or former, individual members of the Commission have engaged in protracted litigation;

WHEREAS, the Commission is informed and believes that the parties after extensive negotiation are nearing a resolution to their differences such that the litigation would be resolved;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Pickens County Planning Commission that the Pickens County Attorney is directed, contingent upon approval by the Pickens County Council of a settlement agreement between the parties, to issue a letter lifting the suspension of the land use permit of MRR Pickens, LLC.

PICKENS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

BY: Robert Ballentine Robert Ballentine, Chairman, District 1
BY: Gary Stancell Gary Stancell, Vice Chairman, District 3
BY: Bobbie Langley Bobbie Langley, District 2
BY: Philip E. Smith Philip Smith, District 4
BY: Jon Humphrey Jon Humphrey, District 5
BY: David Cox David Cox, District 6

THIS 9th DAY OF MAY, 2022

ATTEST: Ray Holliday
Ray Holliday, County Planner