SUMTER CITY - COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes
October 28, 2026

ATTENDANCE	Sumter City – County Planning Commission meeting was held on Wednesday, October 28, 2026, in the City Council Chambers located on the First Floor James E. Clyburn Intermodal Transportation Center Santee Wateree Regional Transit Authority (RTA) Building Meeting Room, 129 South Harvin St., Sumter, South Carolina. Six board members: Mr. James Munford, Mr. Jim Price, Mr. Gary Brown, Mr. Michael Walker, Mr. Jim Crawley and Mr. Keith Ivey – were present. Mr. Chris Sumpter, Ms. Kim Harvin, and Mr. John T. Rivers IV were absent. Staff members present were Ms. Helen Roodman, Mr. Kyle Kelly, Mr. Jeff Derwort, Ms. Carmen Lowery, and Ms. Kellie Chapman. The meeting was called to order at 3:18 p.m. by Mr. James Munford.
MINUTES	Mr. Gary Brown made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of September 23, 2026, as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jim Crawley and carried a unanimous vote.
NEW BUSINESS	**SV-26-03, 6320 Jasper Dr. (County)** was presented by Ms. Carmen Lowery. The Board reviewed the request for approval of 2nd Cousin to 2nd Cousin relationship for a lifetime family conveyance to subdivide a +/- 1.0-acre lot from a larger +/- 2.79-acre tract. Ms. Lowery stated the parent tract is located on Jasper Dr., which is a private road. Ms. Lowery added the proposed division does not have sufficient frontage on a public road, the property may only be subdivided via the lifetime family conveyance exemption outlined in Article 10 of the Sumter County Zoning & Development Standards Ordinance. Ms. Lowery mentioned the lifetime family conveyance exemption only applies to 1st generation family members. However, the Planning Commission body can review and approve alternate family relationships. After some discussion, Mr. Jim Price made a motion to recommend approval of 2nd Cousin to 2nd Cousin relationship for a lifetime family conveyance to subdivide a +/- 1.0-acre lot from a larger +/- 2.79-acre tract. The motion was seconded by Mr. Michael Walker and carried a unanimous vote.

RZ-26-07, 3239 Broad St. (County) was presented by Mr. Kyle Kelly. The Board reviewed the request to rezone 2 parcels totaling +/- 6.2-acres from a combination of General Commercial (GC), Planned Development (PD) and Residential-15 (R-15) to General Commercial (GC).

Mr. Kelly stated the applicant is requesting rezoning to facilitate future development of the property tentatively involving a hotel project.

Mr. Kelly mentioned current zoning is partially connected to a 1995 Planned Unit Development (PUD) (PD-95-01), that rezoned +/- 1.93-acres of TMS #186-03-01-003 to accommodate a hotel construction project.

Current interpretation of SC Code Section 6-29-740 by the South Carolina State Supreme Court in Sinkler v. County of Charleston (2010) requires planned development zoning to incorporate mixed-use elements and innovative site planning rather than serve as a way to avoid application of general land development regulations.

Mr. Kelly added the Comprehensive Plan places the property in the Suburban Development Planning Area influenced by the Priority Commercial Corridor Planning Area.

General Commercial zoning would be in line with the policies for Priority Commercial Corridor areas, as such designations typically apply to areas along arterial roadways.

The rear parcel of the request is located within the broader Suburban Development area where the goal is to scrutinize and manage existing development patterns and to identify appropriate locations for new commercial and industrial development. Existing land uses close to the subject property consists of single-family residential houses in an established residential subdivision.

After some discussion, Mr. Jim Crawley made a motion to recommend approval of the request to rezone 2 parcels totaling +/- 6.2-acres from a combination of General Commercial (GC), Planned Development (PD) and Residential-15 (R-15) to General Commercial (GC). The motion was seconded by Mr. Jim Brown and carried a unanimous vote.

RZ-26-09, 2820 Trufield Dr. (County) was presented by Ms. Carmen Lowery. The Board reviewed the request to rezone +/- 6.19-acres of land from Medium Lot Single-Family Residential (R-9) to Agricultural Conservation (AC).

Ms. Lowery stated the intent of the AC district is to protect and preserve areas of the county which are presently rural or agricultural in character and use and are uniquely suited to agricultural use.

Ms. Lowery mentioned the applicant has indicated that long-term plans for the property include agricultural and residential uses. Additionally, the applicant

desires to place a manufactured/mobile home on the property.

Ms. Lowery added the current R-9 zoning designation does not permit the placement of manufactured/mobile homes.

Ms. Lowery mentioned the property is adjacent to the Gingko Hills residential subdivision to the east and south of the property, and undeveloped land to the north and west. The property is an undeveloped tract that is part of the Hatfield Estates Subdivision.

The property has direct frontage onto Trufield Dr., a county-owned and maintained dirt, local roadway.

Ms. Lowery added the Sumter 2040 Comprehensive Plan shows that the property is in the Military Protection Planning Area.

The Military Protection Planning Area is intended to protect Shaw AFB from encroachment of incompatible land uses and reduce the accident and noise potential to citizens in areas adjacent to these two critical military installations. Protection of the Shaw A.F.B. mission is the community's primary goal in this area.

Key policies include supporting development of a type that significantly limits the concentration of people, and supporting low-density residential uses of one acre or more. The requested district aligns with these policies.

Mr. Scott Byrd was present to speak on behalf of the request.

After some discussion, Mr. Gary Brown made a motion to recommend approval of the request to rezone +/- 6.19-acres of land from Medium Lot Single-Family Residential (R-9) to Agricultural Conservation (AC). The motion was seconded by Mr. Michael Walker and carried a unanimous vote.

RZ-26-10, 3910 & 3920 Camden Hwy. (County) was presented by Mr. Kyle Kelly. The Board reviewed the request to rezone 3 parcels totaling +/- 9.01-acres of land from a combination of Limited Commercial (LC) and Residential-9 (R-9) to Light Industrial-Warehouse (LI-W).

Mr. Kelly added the property is the location of a former cotton oil mill and contains multiple structures pertaining to this business and any other later businesses on the property, as applicable.

Mr. Kelly mentioned the applicant has indicated that long-term plans for the property include a workshop and parking area for a local trucking company. The current LC/R-9 zoning designation does not permit the establishment of this business type on the property.

Mr. Kelly stated the Dalzell Water District of South Carolina owns a 0.08-acre parcel inside TMS#189-00-02-005 that serves as well site for the water utility. As a minor support facility for a public or public service company, the Dalzell

Water District's property is subject only to the site criteria outlined in Article 3.w.1 of the Ordinance.

TMS# 189-00-02-036 is included in the rezoning request to ensure that, if the rezoning is successful, that there is note a separate 0.08-acre free-standing zoning district.

Mr. Kelly mentioned key characteristic of the site is that it lies within Accident Potential Zone 2 Northeast (APZ-ZNE) and the Shaw Noise Attenuation overlay.

The APZ strictly limits the pattern of development. Uses in the APZ are only compatible if they do not result in a large concentration of people.

The applicant is requesting rezoning to allow for LI-W use of the property for a commercial trucking company.

This use is not permitted in the R-9 district. The use is permitted in the LI-w district, subject to the concentration of people restrictions found in Article 3, Exhibit 7 (Airfield Compatibility District (ACD) Use Regulations).

Mr. Kelly added the Sumter 2040 Comprehensive Plan places the subject site in the Military Protection Planning Area.

Specific Military Protection Planning Area policies relevant to this request include the following:

- The County supports commercial, agricultural, and industrial development in this area of a type which significantly limits the concentration of people.
- Existing residential zoning districts which are in clear conflict with these policies will be reviewed for potential rezoning implementation.

Sumter 2040 Comprehensive Plan policies support this request.

Mr. Thomas Edmunds was present to speak on behalf of the request.

After some discussion, Mr. Michael Walker made a motion to recommend approval of the request to rezone 3 parcels totaling +/- 9.01-acres of land from a combination of Limited Commercial (LC) and Residential-9 (R-9) to Light Industrial-Warehouse (LI-W). The motion was seconded by Mr. Keith Ivey and carried a unanimous vote.

RZ-26-11, 1210 N. Lafayette Dr. (City) was presented by Mr. Jeff Derwort. The Board reviewed the request to rezone +/- 0.26-acres of land from General Commercial (GC) to General Residential (GR).

Mr. Derwort mentioned the purpose of the GC district is to support a diverse mix of office, medical, retail, service, and compatible commercial uses that

	serve both the residents and visitors of Sumter. This district is intended to facilitate the development of businesses such as retail stores, restaurants, and serves providers that meet community needs. Further, the uses permitted within the GC district are intended to promote employment opportunities and economic vitality while minimizing land use conflicts, particularly between commercial and residential areas. The purpose of the requested GR district is to accommodate higher density residential development and a variety of housing types on small lots. This district is primarily intended to support the provision of housing in older, established areas of the City. It is not intended to support new large acreage residential tract development. Mr. Derwort added approval of this request does not bind the applicant to establish any future use identified as part of the rezoning process. Rather, the applicant could establish uses allowed in the requested zoning district, as indicated by the use table found at Chapter B.8, Table B.8.1 of the City of Sumter Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), in accordance with the use review process indicated and all applicable UDO requirements. Mr. Derwort stated the Sumter 2040 Comprehensive Plan shows that the property is influenced by the Priority Commercial Corridor Priority Investment Planning Area and the Downtown Planning Area. Areas designated as Priority Commercial Corridor Planning Areas focus on existing corridors through the city. As a matter of policy, the 2040 plan is supportive of neighborhood retail, employment and other commercial uses should be directed to major intersections and arterials corridors such as Lafayette Dr. The Downtown Planning Area represents the historic core of the City. The primary goal of the Downtown Planning Area is to achieve a city center which promotes and encourages a design focused flexible urban core that is dominated by retail, office/institutional, and residential uses. New commercial development and/or redevelopment is supported in these area. Mr. Ernest Gainey was present to speak on behalf of the request. After some discussion, Mr. Jim Price made a motion to recommend approval of the request to rezone a +/- 0.26-acres of land from General Commercial (GC) to General Residential (GR). The motion was seconded by Mr. Keith Ivey and carried a three (Price, Ivey, Walker) in favor and two (Crawley, Brown) in opposition. The motion carried. **OA-26-02, Conservation Subdivisions (County)** was presented by Ms. Helen Roodman. The Board reviewed the request to amend Article 3, 4, and 10 of the Sumter County Zoning & Development Standards Ordinance in order to established conservation subdivision development standards in the Agricultural Conservation (AC) district.

	Ms. Roodman stated County Council is seeking to implement strategies that preserve rural and agricultural land while allowing residential development that preserves open space and promotes more compact development. Ms. Roodman mentioned current development standards in the Agricultural Conservation (AC) zoning district permits residential subdivision development at 1 unit per acre – result in subdivision development with no open space the fundamental change to rural character of an area. Ms. Roodman added when developing a conservation subdivision design framework there are a few key items to address: 1. Define what constitutes a conservation subdivision. 2. Establish the minimum tract size necessary to develop a conservation subdivision. 3. Establish the minimum conservation area set-aside within a development and confirm how that area is measured. 4. Make the open space protection permanent and enforceable. Ms. Roodman mentioned a conservation subdivision is a residential subdivision in which dwelling units are clustered on a portion of the tract and the balance of the tract – the conservation area – is permanently protected from development. This is an alternative to conventional lot-by-lot subdivision of rural land. A conservation approach does not reduce the number of dwellings that could be developed on an open tract of property – the density entitlement granted by the base zoning district is maintained; however, the homes are simply on a smaller development footprint so that open land remains. From an infrastructure development standpoint, a conservation subdivision is no different than a conventional subdivision and requires a developer to provide the same level of new infrastructure to support any proposed development; however, costs are often lower due to a reduction in the amount of infrastructure required for the smaller development footprint. The true impact comes from how conservation design affects the pattern of development – where the lots go and what is left open – rather than the amount of development the property may support. Ms. Roodman added preservation of rural and agricultural lands through open space preservation. The core of the proposal is a floor on protected land. Not less than 50 percent of the developable area of the tract must be designated conservation area and permanently protected. Open space preservation accomplishes several things at once for rural AC landscape: • Keeps land in agricultural and forestry use. The conservation area may remain in agricultural, horticulture, silviculture, pasture, and equestrian use under a management plan and applicable best management practices. Conserved land is not idle land; it is land that stays in production. • Protects the resources that matter most. Primary conservation areas –

jurisdictional wetlands, open water, the FEMA 100-year floodplain and floodway, slopes of 25 percent or greater, and riparian buffers – are placed in the conservation area to the maximum extent practicable. Secondary conservation areas – prime farmland and hydric soils, working forests, scenic viewsheds from public roads, cemeteries, and known or suspected historic and archaeological resources – archaeological resources – are identified through a required site analysis map and protected as well.

- Holds the conservation area together. The conserved land is configured in the fewest practicable number of contiguous parcels, connected to conservation or undeveloped land on adjoining tracts wherever feasible, and cannot include isolated fragments smaller than 0.5-acre or narrower than 50 feet, except for trail, greenway, and riparian connectors.
- Protects the agricultural interface. Where a tract adjoins land in bona fide agricultural or forestry use, a buffer of not less than 100 feet separates residential lots from the shared boundary, and the plat and every deed carry a right-to-farm notice. Agricultural operations conducted in accordance with generally accepted practices are expressly protected.
- Reduces long-term public obligation. Shorter road, water, and sewer networks reduce both developer cost and the County's long-term maintenance exposure, and reduced impervious surface lowers post-development runoff volume and downstream flood risk.

Ms. Roodman mentioned preservation of rural and agricultural lands through compact development. Compact development is what makes the set-aside possible. Rather than spreading lots across the entire tract, the ordinance requires a four-step design process, documented at sketch plan:

1. Identify conservation land. Delineate all primary conservation areas, then all secondary conservation areas, using the site analysis map.
2. Locate house sites. Site dwellings on the remaining land, taking advantage of views of and access to the conservation area.
3. Align streets and trails. Lay out the minimum street network needed to serve the house sites, with pedestrian connections to the conservation area.
4. Draw lot lines. Lot lines are the last element drawn.

Because the lots are drawn last, the conservation area drives the plan instead of being whatever land is left over. Compacting the developed portion of the tract:

- Preserves the landowner's economic use of the land. Based on density is derived from the density factor of the AC district applied to the net developed area, with constrained land credited at 25 percent.
- Allows lot smaller than the AC district minimum, down to a floor of 0.40-acre – and only under this ordinance, and only under this ordinance, and only where the 50 percent set-aside is satisfied.
- Caps impervious coverage at 45 percent per lot and encourages low-

impact stormwater practices, including bioretention, vegetated swales, and preservation of natural drainageway.

- Minimizes street width and length, encourages open swales over curb and gutter, limits cul-de-sac length to 1,000 feet absent a waiver, required two points of external access for subdivisions over 30 lots, permits shared driveaways serving up to four lots, and requires all utilities to be placed underground.

Ms. Roodman added density and design standards mean little if the open space can later be developed. Protection is therefore structured to last:

- A perpetual conservation easement, in a form approved by the County Attorney, is recorded with the final plat and runs with the land under the South Carolina Conservation Easement Acto of 1991.
- The easement is held by a Qualified Holder – a qualified land trust, the County, a municipality, the State, or an authorized special purpose district. Sumter County is named a third-party beneficiary with independent standing to enforce, whether or not it is the Holder.
- The easement may not be amended, released, or extinguished in a way that reduces the protected area, absent the Holder's written consent, approval of County Council after a public hearing, and an order of a court of competent jurisdiction on a finding that the conservation purpose has become impossible or impracticable.
- In no event may the conservation area be reduced below the minimum set-aside. The set-aside, the 0.40-acre lot floor, the perpetuity of the easement, and the maximum density are not waivable or variable by anybody.
- Where a homeowners' association owns or maintains the conservation area, mandatory membership, enforceable assessments, a reserve, and County or Holder maintenance-and-lien backup rights are required. The applicant must post financial assurance equal to two year of the management plan budget, and the Holder must inspect annually and file a monitoring report with the Zoning Administrator.
- If a Holder ceases to exist or fails to enforce, the easement does not lapse; the County may enforce directly and required conveyance to a substitute Qualified Holder.

Ms. Roodman mentioned staff recommends a minimum tract size of 20 acres in the AC district in order to develop a conservation subdivision. A conservation subdivision requires, at a minimum, a conservation area of at least 50 percent of the developable area, a functioning street and utility network, and a protection instruments that must be drafted, recorded, and monitored. Below roughly 20 acres, a clustered layout generally cannot produce a conservation area of meaningful size or shape, and the traction and monitoring costs of the easement fall disproportionately on a small number of lots. The threshold also keeps the option from being triggered on small parent tracts where a conventional development plan is the practical approach.

Ms. Roodman added the proposed ordinance language requires that not less

than 50 percent of the developable area of each tract be set aside as conservation area. Net developable area is defined as the gross tract area less constrained land – wetlands, open water, floodplain and floodway, slopes of 25 percent or greater, existing easements and rights-of-way, and land already under conservation easement. Constrained land is protected in addition to 50 percent of developable area, because primary conservation areas must be placed in the conservation area to the maximum extent practicable. Constrained land cannot be counted as if it were developable land to satisfy the set-aside.

Once street rights-of-way are removed from the balance of land available for lots, there is effectively 34-acres available for lot development. Because the overall lot yield is a maximum of 85 units based on base density, 34-acres ÷ units results in an average lot area of 0.40-acre.

Ms. Roodman added conservation subdivisions are intended to integrate seamlessly into rural landscapes, minimizing their visual impact to existing viewsheds of an area. As such, specific buffering standards should be applied to developments to mitigate the impact of a development on existing adjacent uses.

The following landscape buffering requirements are established as part of the proposed ordinance language.

- A landscaped or naturally vegetated buffer of not less than 50 feet in depth along all exterior boundaries:
- 75 feet along any existing public road (which may remain open where the frontage is open field, to preserve the agricultural view, subject to Zoning Administrator approval);
- 100 feet where the tract adjoins bona fide agricultural or forestry use; and
- A riparian buffer preventing any structure, impervious surface, or land distrurbance within 30 feet of the top of bank of any perennial or intermittent stream, other than approved crossings, trails, and restoration.

After some discussion, Mr. Michael Walker made a motion to recommend approval of the request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jim Crawlery and carried a unanimous vote.

OA-26-02, Conservation Subdivisions (County) was presented by Mr. Jeff Derwort. The Board reviewed the request to amend Article Articles 3.n.5.a of the Sumter County Zoning & Development Standards Ordinance in order to change minimum required lot width in the Agricultural Conservation (AC) District from 60 ft. to 150 ft.

Mr. Derwort mentioned the request is the result of County Council Land Use Subcommittee discussions regarding residential development impacts within the rural areas of the County. This amendment request, if approved, will

	increase the minimum lot width in the Agricultural Conservation (AC) district from 60 ft. to 150 ft. Mr. Derwort added under current AC district requirements, new lots must have at least 60 ft. of lot width throughout the entirety of the lot. This requirement, in conjunction with the district 1-acre minimum lot size, has the potential to yield narrow and deep lots. Mr. Derwort stated current AC district lot width requirements have been in effect since July 14, 2015, the effective date of a previous Ordinance Amendment (OA-15-05) that eliminated lot-width-to-depth ratio requirements for the AC district. Mr. Derwort added prior to this, new residential lots in the AC district were required to have a depth of no less than 1 and no more than 2.5 times the width of the lot. This standard led to a de-facto minimum lot width requirement of 132 ft. and de-facto lot depth requirement of 330 ft. to get to the required 1-acre minimum lot size. Mr. Derwort mentioned lot width is measured at the required front building line) i.e., front setback line) pursuant to the "lot width" definition in Article 10 of the Zoning Ordinance. The following is applicable for lots in the AC district under this proposal: • Lots must have at least 60 ft. of frontage on a public road. (existing) • Lots have must have at least 150 ft of width at the front building line (proposed) • Lots shall have no less than 60 ft. of lot width throughout the parcel. (existing) This proposed ordinance amendment will not impact previously approved major or minor subdivision approvals that are subject to vested rights protections under the Zoning Ordinance and state law. After some discussion, Mr. Jim Crawley made a motion to recommend approval of the request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Keith Ivey and carried a unanimous vote.
OLD BUSINESS	**NONE**
OTHER BUSINESS	**NONE**
DIRECTOR'S REPORT	NONE

ADJOURNMENT	With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:20 p.m. by acclamation. The next meeting scheduled is November 19, 2026.
	Respectfully submitted, *Kellie Chapman* Kellie Chapman, Board Secretary