



GREENVILLE COUNTY COUNCIL

Committee of the Whole

Minutes

June 1, 2021

5:01 p.m.

County Square – Conference Room D

Council Members

Mr. Willis Meadows, *Chairman, District 19*
Mr. Dan Tripp, *Vice Chairman, District 28*
Mrs. Xanthene Norris, *Chairman Pro Tem, District 23*
Mr. Joe Dill, *District 17*
Mr. Mike Barnes, *District 18*
Mr. Stephen Shaw, *District 20*
Mr. Chris Harrison, *District 21*
Mr. Stan Tzouvelekas, *District 22*
Mrs. Liz Seman, *District 24*
Mr. Ennis Fant, Sr., *District 25*
Mr. Lynn Ballard, *District 26*
Mr. Butch Kirven, *District 27*

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, notice of the meeting date, time, place and agenda was posted online and on the bulletin board at County Square and made available to the newspapers, radio stations, television stations and concerned citizens.

Council Members Absent

None

Staff Present

Joe Kernell, *County Administrator*

Mark Tollison, *County Attorney*

Regina McCaskill, *Clerk to Council*

Jessica Stone, *Deputy Clerk to Council*

Others Present

Call to Order

Chairman Willis Meadows

Invocation

Councilor Xanthene Norris

Item (3) Approval of Minutes

Action: Councilor Kirven moved to approve the minutes of the May 18, 2021, Committee of the Whole meeting.

Motion carried unanimously.

Item (4) Human Relations Commission / Interviews and Appointments

The following individuals appeared before the Committee of the Whole and gave their personal presentations:

- Tabatha **Crawford** - District 25
- Meagan **Ingersoll** - District 26
- Tobe **Sizemore** - District 19
- Keyisha **Smith** - District 25
- Ronald **Smith, Sr.** - District 22

By ballot vote, Tabatha **Crawford**, Meagan **Ingersoll**, Tobe **Sizemore**, Keyisha **Smith** and Ronald **Smith, Sr.** were elected to fill five (5) vacancies on the Human Relations Commission.

Item (5) Land Development Regulations Amendment / Repeal Article 3.1

Chairman Meadows stated the item in question had been discussed by Council Members in many different venues; however, a solution had not been reached. The motion to repeal Article 3.1 was returned to the Committee of the Whole from full Council in an effort to find a replacement. Mr. Meadows stated that while it affected the entire County, some Council districts were affected more than others. Council Districts 17 and 26 were affected the most, followed by Districts 18 and 20. Article 3.1 affected District 25 to a small degree.

Chairman Meadows appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to study the issue; he asked Councilor Ballard to serve as Chairman. Other Committee Members would include Joe Dill, Mike Barnes and Steve Shaw. Those Council Members knew what was best for their districts, as well as the residents. Mr. Meadows requested the Committee bring the item back to Council, with a solution, as soon as possible. The remaining Members of Council should support the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations.

Councilor Kirven requested to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee as a significant portion of District 27 was affected by Article 3.1.

Chairman Meadows agreed and indicated that Mr. Kirven would also serve on the Ad Hoc Committee.

Councilor Harrison stated he had worked on a possible solution to Article 3.1 with several other Council Members. He had met with staff the previous week and a viable option was "ready to go." It could be presented to the Planning and Development Committee on June 14, barring comments from the proposed Ad Hoc Committee.

Chairman Meadows stated that Councilor Harrison, along with *Upstate Forever* and other groups, had done quite a bit of work on Article 3.1. Some of the groups had a vested interest in the issue, whether it be a personal or professional interest. The Ad Hoc Committee would look at the recommendations of all interested groups, along with the recommendations of staff.

Councilor Seman stated Council, as a whole, had to live with what happened to Article 3.1. While it may affect some districts more than others, it was not just the responsibility of the Ad Hoc Committee. Ms. Seman stated she appreciated the work that Mr. Harrison, and others, had done in regards to the issue. All the groups that had worked on Article 3.1 continued to give good input; their interests were complimentary, not competitive, and she would like to see their continued support, as well as support from the citizens of Greenville County. She hoped the Ad Hoc Committee could come up with a viable solution to be presented to the Planning and Development Committee on June 14.

Chairman Meadows requested the Ad Hoc Committee present its recommendations to the Committee of the Whole in order to give all Council Members an opportunity to participate.

Action:

Councilor Barnes moved to forward the ordinance to repeal Article 3.1 of the Greenville County Land Development Regulations to the Council floor.

Councilor Dill stated that Mr. Barnes' motion was not germane to the topic currently on the floor. The item on the floor was to set up an Ad Hoc Committee to study Article 3.1. He stated all the recommendations that had been compiled, by all interested groups and staff, would be considered at the next Planning and Development Committee meeting, scheduled for June 14. The establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to study the issue had been previously suggested; however, Mr. Meadows was not in favor of it. Mr. Dill stated he had no problem with the proposed committee but he did not want to "throw a monkey wrench" in what had already been compiled by others, including Council Members and staff. Mr. Dill asked if the item would be put on the floor by the Ad Hoc Committee. He stated it would be considered by the Planning and Development Committee, per Council Rules.

Chairman Meadows stated the item had already been considered by the Planning and Development Committee and the findings reported out to Council.

Councilor Dill stated Article 3.1 itself was considered by the Planning and Development Committee, not a revision to Article 3.1.

Point of Order

Vice-Chairman Tripp stated the formation of the Ad Hoc Committee was not included on the agenda and he questioned if it was in order to be discussed.

Chairman Meadows stated he was under the impression that the appointment of an Ad Hoc Committee did not have to be an agenda item to be in order.

Mr. Tollison stated under Council Rules, the Chairman of County Council could announce an Ad Hoc Committee during the Committee of the Whole or during a regular Council meeting. The announcement did not have to be an agenda item. Mr. Tollison stated Chairman Meadows could determine if it was germane to the item.

Councilor Kirven stated Councilor Barnes' motion was to simply repeal Article 3.1., which was included on the agenda. The Ad Hoc Committee was a separate issue. Mr. Kirven stated a lot of work had been done regarding Article 3.1; nothing was final until approved by Council. That work was ready to be presented and considered by Council. Mr. Kirven stated to repeal Article 3.1 at that time was "nonsense", when a potentially viable substitute was almost at hand for consideration. There was no rush to repeal; it should be done simultaneously with the implementation of a substitute. Mr. Kirven stated he was not in favor of the motion presented by Councilor Barnes.

Councilor Tzouvelekas stated it did not appear that Chairman Meadows had indicated the information gathered regarding Article 3.1 would not be discussed by the Ad Hoc Committee. Mr. Tzouvelekas asked where the committee's recommendations would be sent.

Chairman Meadows stated the committee's recommendations could be sent to the Planning and Development Committee. From there, they could be sent to the Committee of the Whole or to Council.

Councilor Kirven stated the motion on the floor was to repeal Article 3.1.

Chairman Meadows confirmed Mr. Kirven's statement and added that the reason for the proposed repeal was due to the fact that Article 3.1 was used as a veto by "both sides", those who were in favor of building and those who were not. The point of repealing Article 3.1 was to "level the playing field" speed up the process of finding a replacement for it. Mr. Ballard was very capable of acting as Chairman of the committee; he knew the process as 7,000 acres were zoned in District 26. Chairman Meadows stated all the work that had been done on the issue would be pulled together and an alternative to Article 3.1 would be presented to Council.

Councilor Seman suggested the Ad Hoc Committee meet the week of June 7 and present its recommendations to the Planning and Development Committee on June 14. The item could then be presented to either the Committee of the Whole or County Council on June 15.

Councilor Harrison stated he had no problem with the Ad Hoc Committee; however, he was frustrated as there had been no direction given to those that had worked on the item. Starting over with a new committee negated all the work that had already been done. He had no unzoned areas in his district and had been involved in rezoning when he was on the Planning Commission. He had no vested interest in it; he was simply doing it for the good of Greenville County.

Chairman Meadows encouraged Mr. Harrison to provide the work he had done to the Ad Hoc Committee. He stated there had been very little communication from Mr. Harrison, and others, to Council regarding the work he had done on Article 3.1. Mr. Meadows stated the Ad Hoc Committee would not negate the work that others had done; it would simply pull everything together.

Vice-Chairman Tripp stated he had supported the repeal effort; however, he now questioned why it was necessary to repeal Article 3.1, given the fact that the Ad Hoc Committee would be working on a possible alternative.

Chairman Meadows stated the repeal was necessary in order to prevent groups from using Article 3.1 as a veto. A lot of groundwork had already been done and the Ad Hoc Committee would simply compile all of the information. If Council voted to repeal Article 3.1 during the evening's meeting, the item would then have to be presented to full Council, which would take at least three (3) weeks. Hopefully, the Ad Hoc Committee would have something in place by that time.

Vice-Chairman Tripp stated he was concerned, given what happened at the last Council meeting. They were moving into "uncharted territory" in terms of how they acted together as a Council. He took Mr. Meadows' move to appoint the Ad Hoc Committee as a "masterful Machiavellian swipe" at both Councilor Dill and Councilor Harrison, as they were not part of his "coalition." Because Council was so divided, it could be two or three months before the issue was settled. The County would be operating under no guidance. Mr. Tripp stated it would be better to hold off repealing Article 3.1 until a replacement was ready.

Action: Vice-Chairman Tripp moved to hold the repeal of Article 3.1 until a suitable alternative was in place.

Motion to hold carried by a roll vote of seven (Dill, Shaw, Harrison, Seman, Ballard, Kirven and Tripp) in favor and five (Barnes, Meadows, Tzouvelekas, Norris and Fant) in opposition.

Item (6) **Adjournment**

Action: Councilor Seman moved to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

Regina G. McCaskill
Clerk to Council