

**MAULDIN PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
June 24, 2025 6:00 P.M.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jonathan Paulsen, Randy Eskridge, Kevin Greene, Chauncelynn Locklear, Lyon Bixler, Raj Reddy, Dan Chism

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

CITY STAFF PRESENT: David Dyrhaug

CALL TO ORDER/OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Paulsen called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. Mr. Dyrhaug held roll call.

READING OF MINUTES

Mr. Chism moved to accept the minutes for the May 27, 2025, Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Greene seconded the motion.

The motion to accept the minutes for the May 27, 2025, Planning Commission meeting passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.

OLD BUSINESS

No old business was discussed.

NEW BUSINESS

Docket #: PC-2025-05-TA

Request: Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance regarding the O-D zoning district

Mr. Dyrhaug introduced a text amendment to the zoning ordinance regarding the O-D zoning district.

To kick off the public hearing for this text amendment, Mr. Dyrhaug read into the record a petition received by the City that has been signed by 72 residents of the Meadowood community. The petition states, “We, the undersigned/attach respectfully oppose the proposed amendment/changes to Office District O-D. We do not want any changes to what was created to protect the residents of Mauldin Residents. Our opposition is based on the following list of concerns but not limited to the following: (1) preservation of neighborhood character and aesthetic and history, (2) increased traffic congestion, detriment to health and safety, (3) property value depreciation to our homes and to the negative impact on our way of living, (4) increased environmental concerns that will definitely negatively impact all residents, and (5) we do not any changes to what was created to protect the residents of Mauldin. There is no need to amend/change the Office District zoning in order to squeeze businesses into a neighborhood of residents. Office District was created to protect the residents and this amendment will erase that protection and the entire mission and purpose of protecting Mauldin neighborhood of citizens unjustly. This petition is inclusive to our existing petition and is meant to enforce our opposition to amending Office District O-D.”

Mr. Dyrhaug also a pre-submitted statement from Michael Yanover, a resident at 105 Meadowood Drive. He expressed opposition to the ordinance. He commented on the disruption that allowing new types of businesses could cause, as well as the negative impact that this ordinance could potentially have on their community.

Mr. Paulsen opened the floor to public comments. The following citizens provided public comment during the hearing:

Opposition

- Michael Yanover, a resident at 105 Meadowood Drive, expressed **opposition** to the ordinance. He commented on the disruption that allowing new types of businesses could cause as well as the negative impact that this ordinance could potentially have on their community.
- Ulunda Shell, a resident at 103 Meadowood Drive, spoke in **opposition** to the ordinance. She cited concerns about business entrances on Meadowood Drive and traffic safety.
- Lamorris Greggs Wiggins, the heir to 112 Lawnfield Street, spoke in **opposition** to the ordinance. She also cited concerns about traffic safety and the traffic patterns a new business would introduce.
- Ruby Coleman, a resident at 126 Woodgreen Drive, spoke in **opposition** to the ordinance. She asked why the community needs a swim school and she asked who gave permission for the current business to have a driveway on Meadowood Drive.
- Jocelyn Nix, a resident at 113 Woodgreen Drive, spoke in **opposition** to the ordinance. She cited concerns about allowing this business in their neighborhood. She also commented that there are already opportunities to receive swim lessons in the City.
- Samuel Neely, a resident at 127 Woodgreen Drive, spoke in **opposition** to the ordinance. He cited concerns that minds have already been made up on this issue and that the concerns of the community are not being listened to.
- James Kennedy, a resident at 123 Meadowood Drive, spoke in **opposition** to the ordinance. He commented that their neighborhood is destined to be historical one day. He cited concerns about the community being disturbed as a result of this ordinance. He cited concerns about impacts on aesthetics and traffic.
- Denise Clark, a resident at 108 Woodgreen Drive, spoke in **opposition** to the ordinance. She cited concern about the effect this ordinance would have on the health, safety, and welfare of their community. She cited concerns about the detriment this could bring to their community, especially allowing a swim school by their neighborhood.
- Henry Choice, a resident at 113 Lawnfield Street, spoke in **opposition** to the ordinance. He cited concerns that this ordinance would in effect remove protections from their neighborhood including safety and peace.

Support

- Hannah Durham, with Seamon Whiteside, read a statement on behalf of the business identified as Swim Lessons with Mary. She spoke in **support** of the ordinance. She commented on the process the business owner has undertaken trying to bring her business to this community and the attacks and rejection the business owner has been met with.

No other public comments were offered.

Hearing no other public comments, Mr. Paulsen closed the floor to public comments.

Mr. Dyrhaug provided the staff report and recommendation.

Mr. Greene asked some questions about the current building height regulations in the O-D zoning district and if it could be revised to a more restrictive standard.

Mr. Eskridge asked if this text amendment, if approved by City Council, would allow indoor recreation in the O-D zoning district. Mr. Dyrhaug indicated that it would.

Mr. Chism asked various questions to which Mr. Dyrhaug responded. These included questions about: (1) the previous rezoning proposal reviewed in April, (2) the current businesses on properties zoned O-D, (3) the current building height standard in the O-D zoning district, (4) the maximum building size added in the proposed ordinance, (5) building design standards the O-D zoning district is subject to, (6) the effectiveness of the proposed screening/landscaping standards, (7) the abbreviations used in the allowed land use table, (8) the type of instructional/training operations allowed, and (9) the proposed standards for driveways.

Ms. Locklear asked about what, if any, communication has occurred with SCDOT about the location of the driveway for the business proposed at Meadowood Drive. Mr. Dyrhaug and Mr. Chism commented about this process.

Mr. Greene expressed support for modifying the O-D zoning district while also expressing concern that we are trying to make something happen that people are not comfortable with. He commented that the timing seems wrong considering the anticipation that the City may adopt a new comprehensive plan by the end of the year.

Mr. Paulsen asked if the O-D zoning district is the least common district. Mr. Dyrhaug indicated that it is.

Mr. Bixler asked questions about the uses currently allowed and proposed to be allowed in the O-D zoning district. Mr. Dyrhaug responded to these questions.

Mr. Reddy asked about how indoor recreational instruction is currently categorized in the zoning ordinance. Mr. Dyrhaug responded to this question.

Mr. Chism made a motion to recommend denial of the text amendment citing concern about the timing of the ordinance in light of the City's anticipation of adopting a new comprehensive plan by the end of the year.

Ms. Locklear seconded the motion.

The motion to recommend denial of the text amendment passed by a vote of 5-2 with Mr. Paulsen and Mr. Bixler in dissent.

OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was discussed.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Locklear moved to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Eskridge seconded the motion.

The motion to adjourn this meeting passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.

The Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.