

PICKENS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

of

April 10, 2023

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 January 1, 2023 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.

1 **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

2 Gary Stancell, Chair
3 David Cox, Vice Chairman
4 Bobby Ballentine
5 Clay Counts
6 Mike Watson

7
8 **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

9 Phil Smith
10 Jon Humphrey

11
12 **STAFF PRESENT:**

13 Todd Steadman, Planner
14 Trad Julian, Planning Supervisor

15
16 ***Welcome and Call to Order***

17
18 Mr. Stancell, the Presiding Official, called the meeting to order and asked those in attendance to join in a moment of
19 silence and then asked everyone to recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

20
21 Mr. Stancell then asked for the members of the Commission to introduce themselves.

22
23 ***Approval of Minutes***

24
25 Mr. Stancell called for approval of the minutes of the December 12, 2022 meeting.

26
27 Mr. Counts made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Cox seconded.

28
29 Mr. Stancell called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously (5-0).

30

31

32 ***Public Comments***

33

34 Chairman Stancell asked if there was anyone present who wished to make a public comment regarding an item not on
35 the agenda. There were no public comments provided.

1
2 **Public Hearings**
3
4

5 Mr. Stancell then opened the public hearing portion of the meeting and called for the first case to be heard.
6

7 **LU-23-0013:** Land Use Review for the creation of a small animal processing facility to process animals sold
8 under the Six Mile Farms label. The subject property is located at 213 Smith Memorial Highway. The applicant
9 is Harold Crane. The property owner of record is Harold Crane. TMS# 4058-18-21-9597
10

11 Mr. Stancell asked the applicant, Harold Crane, to speak on the matter.
12

13 Mr. Crane stated that this was going to be a small scale operation, closed to the public, for his animals only, and only
14 in operation about two days a week. He stated that about 30% of the proposed building would be for the processing
15 and the balance for storage. This building would be sited on a 2-acre tract he would carve out of a larger 20-acre
16 tract. He stated that his motivation was two-fold: to reduce costs due to his driving 86-miles each way for processing
17 a hog and 66-miles each way to process a cow and that reservations for those services are almost a year in
18 advance. His plan is to process about 6 head (combined cattle and hog) per month. He also pointed out that this
19 would give him better quality control. There would be no employees. He stated that the property has been in pasture
20 for many generations and was primarily an agricultural use.
21

22 Mr. Stancell then asked if there was anyone there to speak in favor of the project.
23

24 Fae Kelly – Spoke in favor. She is a neighbor.
25

26 Elizabeth Brown – A customer spoke in favor.
27

28 Marie Crane – Spoke in favor.
29

30 Mr. Stancell then asked if there was anyone there to speak in opposition to the project.
31

32 Wayne Evans – Afraid it will be Pandora's box. No guarantee of what will happen in the future. It does not meet the
33 character of the area and is within ½-mile of a church. He also presented the Commission with a signed petition and
34 letters submitted in opposition to the project.
35

36 David O'nan – Concerned about runoff to the pond and that it doesn't meet the UDSO.
37

38 Jimmy Goss – Worried about smells.
39

40 Doris Wilson – Concerned that DHEC will not be able to inspect.
41

42 Kevin Sexton – Lives down the street. Curious about why they can get a variance for this but builders can't get a
43 variance.
44

45 Monica Fowler – Lives close by. Concerned that it was not properly noticed
46

47 Todd Steadman pointed out that the project followed all normal and legal procedures and that an ad ran in the
48 Courier, it was posted on the website, and a sign was posted in the yard.
49

50 Kris Childress – Lives nearby. Concerned about what happens if Mr. Crane stops running the operation.
51

52 Doris Von Kaenel – Lives nearby. Concerned that Mr. Crane did not have experience operating a facility like this and
53 that a metal building was not in keeping with the neighborhood.
54

55 Tom Von Kaenel – Concerned about why the property was being rezoned.
56

1 Todd Steadman pointed out that there is no zoning in Pickens County and the proposed use is an allowed use with
2 conditions.
3
4 Calvin McMahan – A neighbor. If we could guarantee that it would only operate two days a week he'd be ok with it
5 but he is concerned about the smell.
6
7 Gary Stancell asked if anyone else wished to speak on the matter. No one spoke up so he closed the public input
8 session.
9
10 Mr. Cox clarified that a variance was being requested.
11
12 Me. Watson was concerned that a meat inspector will actually be there to inspect. And he was concerned about
13 introducing this use as this is a neighborhood.
14
15 Mr. Counts asked what the distance would be from the middle of the property to the nearest residential use.
16
17 Mr. Crane said it was probably 600 feet.
18
19 Mr. Watson made a motion to deny the project.
20
21 Mr. Counts made a second.
22
23 Mr. Stancell called for discussion.
24
25 Mr. Cox said we still had to deal with the 1000' issue. Said it was hard to find a place in Pickens that was 1000' from
26 a residential use. He went on to say he was concerned about the impact this would have on property values.
27
28 Mr. Counts said he does like to support and eat locally grown products.
29
30 Mr. Watson reiterated that the good of the neighborhood outweighed the benefits to one person.
31
32 Mr. Ballentine asked if the motion stated why we were denying it.
33
34 Mr. Steadman re-read the motion.
35
36 Mr. Stancell called to stop the discussion.
37
38 Mr. Watson made a motion to amend the earlier motion.
39
40 Mr. Cox seconded.
41
42 Mr. Watson amended the motion to deny the project due to its not meeting the UDSO.
43
44 Mr. Counts seconded.
45
46 Mr. Stancell called for discussion. He went on to say that he did not oppose the project.
47
48 Mr. Ballentine clarified that we were still discussing the amendment.
49
50 Mr. Stancell called for a vote on the amendment. It passed 4-1. He then called for discussion on the amended
51 motion.
52
53 Hearing none Mr. Cox called to end discussion.
54
55 Mr. Stancell called for the vote.
56

1 The motion to deny passed 3-2 with Mr. Ballentine and Mr. Stancell dissenting.

2
3 The Chair then addressed the issue of the Public Hearing on the proposed changes to the UDSO and asked if there
4 were any members of the public wishing to speak on that matter. No one spoke.

5
6 Mr. Stancell suggested that since it was late the Commission wait until the April 24th workshop to address the
7 ordinance changes.

8
9 **New Business:** Trad Julian presented the Commission with a letter outlining the County's position on a
10 condition of approval made by the Commission regarding requiring the County to upgrade the roadway at
11 the project on Laurel Ridge Drive (SD-21-0014).

12
13 ***Commissioners and Staff Discussion***

14
15 Mr. Steadman reminded the Commission that they will have a workshop on the UDSO changes at 6:00 on April 24th
16 and that it will be held in the Emergency Operation Center.

17
18 Mr. Steadman also asked the Commission to reserve May 22 for a joint workshop with Council to discuss growth
19 issues.

20
21 ***Adjourn***

22
23 There being no additional matters to be taken up by the Commission, Mr. Stancell made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Cox
24 seconded. Mr. Stancell called for discussion. Hearing none he called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously (5-0).

25
26 The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 pm.

27
28
29 Submitted by:

30
31
32
33 _____
34 Secretary Date

35
36
37 Approved by:
38
39
40
41 _____
42 Chairman Date