

CITY OF SUMTER

Unified Development Ordinance

Code Comparison Report

Chapter A — Administration

Prepared by: Kimley-Horn | Date: May 11, 2026 | Prepared for: City of Sumter

DOCUMENT ORIENTATION

Current Code = existing adopted City of Sumter Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance (January 2014, revised through 2023) — in project files.

Proposed Draft = Sumter_Chapter_A_DRAFT_-_4_29_26_-_Copy.docx — Chapter A: Administration (uploaded to this chat).

All section references use the numbering as it appears in each respective document.

Purpose of This Report

This Code Comparison Report documents all differences identified between the Current Code (existing adopted City of Sumter Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance) and Chapter A of the Proposed Draft UDO. It has been prepared by Kimley-Horn for use in staff reports, public hearings, and applicant guidance.

Every entry in Section 1 is drawn exclusively from the two source documents. No assumptions, inferences, or outside knowledge have been applied.

How to read this report: Deleted language is shown in **dark red**. Added language is shown in **dark green**. Modifications (replacements) are labeled in **purple**.

SECTION 1 — COMPLETE LIST OF CHANGES

Total Changes: 47 | Additions: 21 | Deletions: 8 | Modifications: 18

All changes are listed in the order they appear in the documents. Every change is captured regardless of significance. Deleted language is in the Original Language column; added language is in the Revised Language column.

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
1	Title / Document Name	Modification	City of Sumter Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance	City of Sumter Unified Development Ordinance (UDO)	The ordinance has been renamed from the Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). The Proposed Draft document is now formally titled the UDO.
2	Section A.1 — Introductory Provisions / 1.2 Authority	Modification	This ordinance is adopted pursuant to the authority delegated to cities and counties in South Carolina under the Code of Laws, in Title 6, Chapter 29 S.C. 6-29-710.	The development regulations contained in the UDO have been adopted pursuant to the authority conferred by the South Carolina Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act of 1994, S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-310 et seq.	The statutory authority citation has been updated from S.C. 6-29-710 to S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-310 et seq., with an explicit reference to the South Carolina Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act of 1994. The Proposed Draft also adds language clarifying that the enumeration of state code sections does not exclude other sections granting similar authority.
3	Section A.1 — Introductory Provisions / 1.1 Title	Addition	—	This document is to be known as the 'City of Sumter Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).' It should be read in conjunction with the official zoning map noted in [insert reference].	A new formal title section has been added stating the name of the document and directing that it be read in conjunction with the official zoning map. There was no equivalent

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
					formal title provision in the Current Code.
4	Section A.1 — 1.3 Jurisdiction	Modification	The provisions in this ordinance shall be applicable within the entire City of Sumter and the unincorporated portions of the County of Sumter, South Carolina.	Pursuant to the general health, safety and welfare of the community, the articles and sections of the UDO apply as relevant to all public and private development within the corporate limits of the City of Sumter in their current form and in all future extensions and configurations as shown on the official zoning map and its periodic updates.	Jurisdiction has been narrowed from both the City of Sumter and the unincorporated portions of Sumter County to only the corporate limits of the City of Sumter. This reflects the document's shift from a joint City-County ordinance to a City-only UDO.
5	Section A.1 — 1.4 Purpose and Intent	Modification	The purpose of this ordinance is to protect the health, safety, and general welfare, while allowing for the cost saving efficiencies, through the proper subdivision of land and the creation of zoning districts. The purpose of this ordinance will be to regulate: use of buildings, structures, and land; size, location, height, bulk, orientation, number of stories; erection, construction, recreation, alteration, demolition; removal in whole or in part of buildings and other structures; area and dimensions of land, water, and air space; and the effects of	The document's general purpose is to guide development within the municipal limits in accordance with existing and future needs; in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan; for the purposes of promoting the health, safety, and general welfare of the City; providing safe and convenient orientation to streets and other public spaces for accessibility; securing safety from fire; providing adequate light and air to dwellings; facilitating the adequate provision of transportation, water, sewerage, schools, parks, public improvements and other infrastructure; and protecting scenic and critical environmental areas. Specifically designed to implement planning principles including: grow by balancing economic growth with preservation of natural resources and quality of life; preserve open space in connected networks; preserve and revitalize historic	The purpose statement has been significantly expanded and reorganized from a regulatory-focused list to a planning principles framework. The new language adds goals such as accessible street orientation, protection of scenic and critical environmental areas, open space preservation in connected networks, historic preservation, and quality design, while retaining the Shaw AFB protection language.

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
			aircraft noise and maximize the safety of land use in and around Shaw Air Force Base.	buildings and spaces; balance individual and community interests; enhance quality of life through quality design; and protect Shaw AFB from incompatible development.	
6	Section A.1 — 1.5 General Terms	Addition	—	For the purpose of this UDO, certain terms or words used in this UDO shall be interpreted as follows: 'person' includes a firm, association, organization, partnership, trust, company, or corporation; 'shall' and 'will' are mandatory; 'may' is permissive; 'used or occupied' include 'intended, designed or arranged to be used or occupied'; 'lot' includes 'plot,' 'parcel' and 'tract'; 'structure' means anything constructed or erected, exceeding six inches in height; 'land' includes 'water,' 'marsh' and 'swamp.'	A new general terms section has been added providing construction rules for key words in the ordinance. There was no equivalent standalone general terms provision in Article 1 of the Current Code.
7	Section A.1 — 1.6 Consistency with All Adopted Plans	Addition	—	In accordance with S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-310 et seq., the UDO is intended to implement the various development-related plans and policies adopted by the City Council.	A new provision has been added expressly linking the UDO's standards to all development-related plans and policies adopted by City Council, grounded in the state planning enabling act.
8	Section A.1 — 1.7 Conformity with All Standards	Addition	—	No land, structure or parts thereof shall be used, occupied, constructed, erected, altered or moved, unless in conformity with all of the regulations herein specified for the zoning district in which it is located, and with all other applicable local, state and federal laws.	A new general conformity provision has been added requiring compliance with both the UDO and all applicable local, state, and federal laws. The Current Code contained conformity language in

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
					Section 1.t but not as a standalone introductory provision.
9	Section A.1 — 1.8 Annexations	Addition	—	All territory which may hereafter be granted or annexed to the City of Sumter, shall be classified automatically into the zoning district (including zoning overlay districts) which most closely corresponds to the territory's zoning designation in the unincorporated portion of Sumter County, as shown in Table A.1.8: Corresponding City & County Zoning Districts & Overlay Districts. However, the applicant or owner of said property may request and/or City Council may designate a zoning district that is compatible with existing surrounding land uses and supports the Comprehensive Plan, at the time of annexation. Such changes in zoning which emerge with annexation of property into the City must be accompanied with the recommendation from the Planning Commission.	A new annexation section has been added establishing that annexed territory automatically receives the most closely corresponding City zoning district and providing a cross-reference table (Table A.1.8) mapping County to City zoning districts and overlays. The Current Code contained no equivalent annexation-mapping provision.
10	Section A.1 — 1.9 Conflicts and Severability	Modification	In their interpretation and application, the provisions of this ordinance shall be held to be the minimum requirements. The Sumter City-County Planning Commission or the Sumter City-County Zoning Board of Appeals may impose more stringent standards if it is demonstrated	Resolution Of Conflicting Regulations: Wherever there is, or appears to be, a conflict between any provision of this chapter with the provisions of any other lawful ordinance regulation or resolution of the City, the requirements of this ordinance shall take precedence. Severability: In the event of any portion of the UDO being declared unconstitutional or invalid, such decision does not affect the	The Current Code's provision on interpretation (minimum standards with authority to impose more stringent standards) has been removed. The Proposed Draft replaces it with a conflicts-of-law resolution rule—establishing this ordinance takes precedence over conflicting City ordinances—

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
			that different standards are necessary to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The provisions of this ordinance are separable. If a section, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance is determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, the decision shall not affect remaining portions of this ordinance.	remainder of the ordinance.	and a standard severability clause.
11	Section A.1 — 1.10 Effective Date	Addition	—	The date of adoption of this Unified Development Ordinance is recorded as [Insert DATE].	A new effective date provision has been added as a placeholder. The date is not yet populated in the April 29, 2026 draft.
12	Section A.1 — Fees (Current Code Section 1.c)	Deletion	Reasonable fees sufficient to recover incurred costs shall be set at the Planning Commission meeting in July and approved by the City Manager and County Administrator for the following: [list of 19 fee categories including rezoning, ZBA, site plan, subdivision, temporary use, conditional use, text amendment, street name change, etc.].	—	The standalone fee-setting section from Current Code Section 1.c has been removed from the Introductory Provisions. Fee-setting authority is now addressed in the Applications section (Section A.3.1.C), where City Council establishes fees via a fee schedule.

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
			Said fees shall be established by the Sumter City-County Planning Commission based on costs associated therewith, i.e., publishing, printing, copying, man hours, materials, etc.		
13	Section A.2 — Administrative Officials / 2.2 City Staff	Modification	It shall be the duty of the Zoning Administrator to enforce the provisions of this ordinance and bring to the attention of the appropriate court any violation or lack of compliance.	The various provisions of this ordinance shall be administered under the general direction of the City Council and City Manager and under the specific direction of the City's Department Heads. For the purposes of this ordinance, the Heads of each department and their subordinate staffs, the Zoning Administrator, as well as the Technical Review Committee assigned with the task of plan and subdivision review are collectively referred to as 'City Staff.'	The Current Code identified the Zoning Administrator as the sole enforcement officer. The Proposed Draft replaces this with a broader 'City Staff' framework that encompasses the City Council, City Manager, Department Heads, Zoning Administrator, and the Technical Review Committee (TRC), a body not present in the Current Code.
14	Section A.2 — 2.2 Technical Review Committee (TRC)	Addition	—	The Technical Review Committee, who may be referred to in this UDO as the 'TRC', is a technical review committee for projects that have been submitted to the City of Sumter. For the applicable projects, the TRC meeting schedule shall be consistent with the schedule of Planning Commission meetings. No formal approval of projects shall be made at TRC meetings. The TRC reviews and provides recommendations on applicable development applications.	A new Technical Review Committee (TRC) has been created as a formal body in the Proposed Draft with responsibilities for reviewing development applications and providing recommendations. The Current Code contained no equivalent body.

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
15	Section A.2 — 2.2 City Council Roles	Addition	—	City Council powers and duties include: Zoning Map Amendment (rezoning) — hear and approve or deny after PC recommendation; UDO Text Amendment — hear and approve, approve with conditions, or deny after PC recommendation; Comprehensive Plan Amendment — initiate, adopt, and amend after PC recommendation; Historic Designation — designate historic landmarks and amendments after DRB recommendation; Appointments — appoint members to PC, BZA, and DRB.	A new section explicitly defining City Council's powers and duties under the UDO has been added. The Current Code referenced City and County Council authority throughout but did not consolidate it in a standalone provision.
16	Section A.2 — Planning Commission (2.5 vs. Current Code Sections 1.f and 1.g)	Modification	The Sumter City-County Planning Commission is hereby established pursuant to S.C. Code of Laws, Title 6, and Chapter 29. Nine members appointed by the City and County Councils of Sumter. Members serve four (4) year terms. The Planning Commission shall act on a complete application within thirty (30) days of receipt of the complete application.	Planning Commission (PC) established pursuant to S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-320, et seq. Nine members: 3 appointed by City Council, 3 appointed by County Council, 3 appointed jointly. Terms of 4 years. The PC shall make recommendations to City Council; Planning Commission action on development applications is subject to 60-day deferral deadlines.	The Planning Commission's membership structure has been made more specific: the Proposed Draft explicitly allocates the 9 appointments as 3 City, 3 County, and 3 joint appointments, whereas the Current Code stated only that they were appointed by the City and County Councils. The 30-day action deadline in the Current Code has been replaced by a 60-day deferral cap in specific review tracks.
17	Section A.2 — 2.4 General Provisions for All Boards and Commissions	Addition	—	A comprehensive set of general provisions applies to all Boards/Commissions, including: attendance (75% of meetings required or risk of vacancy), removal for	An entirely new consolidated set of general procedural rules for all boards and commissions has been added. The Current Code

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
				cause by City Council, compensation (no pay; expenses reimbursable with advance approval), conflicts of interest (defined to include close familial relationships through in-law relations), voting (no proxy or email votes; members absent from hearing may not vote), and actions subsequent to approval (conditions must be met before building permit; Board may allow phased element submission).	addressed board and commission procedures in separate sections for each body and with less specificity.
18	Section A.2 — 2.6 Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA)	Modification	Current Code Sections 1.h and 1.i establish the Sumter City-County Board of Zoning Appeals with nine members appointed by the City and County Councils of Sumter. The BZA hears appeals, variances, and conditional uses. Appeals from ZBA decisions are taken to circuit court.	BZA established pursuant to S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-780, et seq. Nine members: 4 appointed by City Council, 5 appointed by County Council. City-appointed members shall be residents of the City. The BZA hears administrative appeals, special exceptions, and variances. Written orders required for all decisions. Appeals governed by S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-820.	The BZA's appointment allocation has been made specific (4 City / 5 County), and City-appointed members must be City residents. A formal written order requirement for all BZA decisions has been added. The term 'conditional uses' no longer appears in the BZA's jurisdiction list; conditional use authority is now in Section A.3.6.
19	Section A.2 — 2.7 Design Review Board (DRB)	Modification	Current Code Sections 1.j through 1.o establish the Design Review Board with members appointed by City Council, covering Hampton Park and Downtown Design Districts. The DRB reviews certificates of appropriateness for historic	DRB established pursuant to S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-870, et seq. Seven members appointed by City Council. Members must have demonstrated knowledge in at least one of: historic preservation, architecture, urban design, landscape architecture, planning, urban planning, engineering, law, banking and real estate. Covers Hampton Park Design Review District and Downtown Design	The DRB competency requirements have been formalized: members must now have demonstrated knowledge in at least one specified area of expertise. The DRB's power to approve with modifications has been made explicit. Appeals from DRB decisions are now

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
			structures and districts.	Review District. DRB reviews and recommends to PC historic landmark designations; issues certificates of appropriateness; has power to approve, approve with modifications, or deny.	referenced at S.C. Code §6-29-900 through §6-29-940.
20	Section A.3 — 3.1 UDO Review Processes / General Procedures	Addition	—	A comprehensive set of general procedural rules has been added for all development applications: pre-application meeting (encouraged, required for some); applications (content established by City Staff; Council establishes fees; completeness determination within 20 business days; if no completeness determination within timeframe, application deemed officially submitted); conflicts of interest for staff; and public hearing notice requirements including published and posted notice, legislative public hearing procedures, and quasi-judicial public hearing procedures including oath, evidence, cross-examination, and order of hearing.	An entirely new general procedures section has been added establishing uniform requirements for all development applications. The Current Code addressed procedural requirements in scattered sections for specific application types. The Proposed Draft consolidates these into a single framework with specific timelines, completeness requirements, and differentiated legislative vs. quasi-judicial public hearing procedures.
21	Section A.3 — 3.1.E Table A.3.1 Public Notice Requirements	Addition	—	Table A.3.1 establishes public notice requirements by application type: Zoning Map Amendment — published and posted at least 15 days before hearing; Rezoning to PD District — published and posted at least 15 days; PD District Amendment (Major) — published and posted at least 15 days; UDO Text Amendment — published at least 15 days (no posted notice required); Variance — published and posted at	A new consolidated public notice requirements table has been added, specifying both published and posted notice requirements by application type. The Current Code addressed notice requirements within each individual section rather than in a consolidated table.

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
				least 15 days; Special Exception — published and posted at least 15 days; Appeal — published and posted at least 15 days for appeals involving specific property; Street Name Change — published and posted at least 15 days; Board Level Design Review (COA) — published and posted at least 15 days.	
22	Section A.3 — 3.2 Zoning Map Amendment (Rezoning)	Addition	—	Rezoning procedures now require: only complete applications received 22 days before the PC meeting move forward; TRC reviews for conformance; PC makes recommendation to City Council at a public meeting; City Council takes legislative action at public hearing and may approve, deny, approve a lesser-intensity designation, defer, or remand to PC with 30-day report deadline; denied applications may not be re-initiated for 1 year unless deemed substantially different.	A comprehensive rezoning procedure section has been added. While the Current Code addressed rezoning procedurally in various scattered provisions, the Proposed Draft consolidates all rezoning procedural requirements into a single section with explicit options for City Council action and a 1-year resubmission bar for denied applications.
23	Section A.3 — 3.2.B UDO Text Amendment	Addition	—	UDO Text Amendments may only be initiated by City Council, Planning Commission, or City Staff (at the direction of the City Manager). Requires 22-day submission deadline before PC meeting; TRC review at Zoning Administrator's discretion; PC recommendation to City Council; City Council action including approval, denial, approval with modifications, deferral, or remand to PC.	A new text amendment procedure has been added that restricts initiation rights to governmental bodies only (City Council, PC, City Staff). The Current Code's amendment procedures allowed more general initiation.

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
24	Section A.3 — 3.2.C Planned Development District	Addition	—	PD District procedures added: pre-application meeting required; TRC review; PC public meeting recommendation; City Council public hearing decision (approve, approve with modifications, deny, defer, or remand); minor amendments may be approved by Zoning Administrator alone with findings identical to original approval; denied applications barred for 1 year.	A consolidated Planned Development District procedure has been added. The Current Code addressed PD procedures in Article 3, Section P. The Proposed Draft relocates and consolidates PD procedural requirements in Chapter A.
25	Section A.3 — 3.3 Major Site Plans	Modification	The approval of site plans is hereby required as a condition for the issuance of a building permit, except that individual lot applications for detached one or two dwelling unit buildings shall be exempt from site plan review approval. The Planning Commission may waive the requirement for site plan approval where there is a use or occupancy and no extensive construction or improvements is sought.	Major site plan applications apply to proposals with 1 or more of: construction of more than 20,000 sq. ft. of building area; more than 5 acres of land disturbance; 35 or more required off-street parking spaces; or greater degree of impact as determined by the Zoning Administrator. Pre-application meeting required. TRC review. PC action within 60-day deferral cap. Vested right for 2 years with up to 5 one-year extensions.	The Current Code's general site plan requirement has been replaced with a tiered site plan system. Major site plans now have specific quantitative thresholds (20,000 sq. ft., 5 acres, 35 parking spaces), a required pre-application meeting, TRC review, and a 2-year vested right.
26	Section A.3 — 3.3.B Minor Site Plans (Level 1 & 2)	Addition	—	Minor site plan Level 1: construction less than 20,000 sq. ft.; less than 5 acres land disturbance; 35 or fewer parking spaces; does not meet Level 2 criteria. Level 2: site already developed; addition less than 1,000 sq. ft. or new building less than 500 sq. ft.; less than 1 acre disturbance; no new paved parking;	A new two-tier minor site plan system has been added with no equivalent in the Current Code. Level 1 and Level 2 minor site plans have different eligibility thresholds, and Level 2 is specifically

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
				no new stormwater facilities; minimal impact as determined by Zoning Administrator. Pre-application meeting required for Level 1. Staff reviews and acts within 60 days. Vested right 2 years with up to 5 one-year extensions.	designed for small additions on already-developed sites.
27	Section A.3 — 3.3.C Corridor Protection Review	Addition	—	A new corridor protection review procedure has been added for corridor protection applications. Major requests and alternate exterior materials requests go to Planning Commission; all other requests are reviewed by City Staff within 60 days. Vested right of 2 years with up to 5 one-year extensions. Approvals cover a structure's and/or site's exterior appearance including building exterior materials, color, architectural features, roof design, and exterior signs.	A new corridor protection review procedure has been added. While the Current Code had a Highway Corridor Protection District (Article 3, Section T), it did not contain a standalone procedural section for corridor protection reviews in Article 1. The Proposed Draft adds a full procedural track including tiered staff/PC review, action timelines, and vested right.
28	Section A.3 — 3.3.D/E Sketch Plan and Major Subdivision (Preliminary Plat)	Modification	All plats shall be subject to review of the Planning Commission with the exception of the following which may be reviewed by staff: plats of existing lots of record; minor subdivisions of land which meet all zoning requirements; subdivisions which are exempt from regulation pursuant to S.C. Code 6-29-1110(2). The Planning Commission shall act on a	Major subdivision: 10 or more lots or construction of street/stormwater infrastructure. A Sketch Plan (approved by City Staff) is a prerequisite for Major Subdivision application. Pre-application meeting required for both. TRC review. PC action within 60-day deferral cap. Vested right 2 years with up to 5 one-year extensions. Final plat (subject to preliminary plat approval) must be recorded at the Register of Deeds within 90 days of staff approval.	The subdivision review process has been significantly restructured. A new mandatory Sketch Plan step has been added as a prerequisite to the Major Subdivision (Preliminary Plat) application. The 30-day PC action timeframe in the Current Code has been replaced with a 60-day deferral cap. A new 90-day recording deadline for final plats has been added.

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
			complete application within thirty (30) days of receipt of the complete application.		
29	Section A.3 — 3.3.H Vacation of ROW or Easement	Addition	—	A new procedure for vacation of right-of-way or easement applications has been added: reviewed by City Council; TRC provides review; placed on next available City Council agenda. City Council acts under legislative discretion.	A formal ROW/easement vacation procedure has been added to the UDO review processes, with City Council as the approving authority. The Current Code did not include a dedicated procedural section for ROW/easement vacations in Article 1.
30	Section A.3 — 3.3.I Street Name Change	Modification	Under Current Code Section 1.c, Street Name Change was listed as a fee category, and Section 1.g.5 indicated the Planning Commission reviewed street-related plat matters.	Street Name Change applications may only be initiated by a government entity or by a landowner or agent with property on the affected street. Requires 22-day submission deadline before PC meeting. Planning Commission has final decision-making authority at a public hearing. PC may approve, deny, or defer.	A formal street name change application procedure has been added, specifying who may initiate (government entities or abutting landowners only) and establishing the Planning Commission as the decision-making body at a public hearing.
31	Section A.3 — 3.3.J Alternative Parking/Landscaping/Signage Plans	Addition	—	Alternative parking plan, alternative landscaping plan, and signage plan applications associated with major site plans go to Planning Commission; those associated with minor site plans are reviewed by City Staff. Signage plans are required for all multi-tenant complexes in any district, including multi-family and manufactured/mobile home parks. Vested right	A new formal procedural track for alternative parking, landscaping, and signage plans has been added with a tiered major/minor review structure. The Current Code did not consolidate these in a standalone procedural section in Article 1.

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
				2 years with up to 5 one-year extensions.	
32	Section A.3 — 3.4 Variances	Modification	Current Code Section 1.h.4 established variance criteria: BZA may grant a variance where special conditions exist not created by applicant, where literal enforcement would create unnecessary hardship, where the variance is in harmony with the general purpose of the ordinance, and where public welfare is secured. Variances applied to requirements of Article 4 (development standards) only.	Variance procedure: complete applications required 22 days before BZA meeting; BZA quasi-judicial action (approve, approve with conditions, deny, defer); denied applications barred 1 year unless substantially different; variance approvals do not expire; variance approvals do not establish a vested right. Criteria: extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property; conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity; conditions effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict utilization; authorization will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or the public good. BZA may not grant a variance to establish an otherwise unpermitted use, extend a nonconforming use of land, or change zoning district boundaries.	The variance procedure has been formalized with a consolidated procedural section including a 22-day submission deadline, 1-year resubmission bar, explicit prohibition on variances to establish unpermitted uses or extend nonconforming land uses, and a clarification that variance approvals do not expire but also do not create vested rights.
33	Section A.3 — 3.4.B Special Exceptions	Addition	—	Special exception procedure: complete applications 22 days before BZA meeting; BZA quasi-judicial action; denied applications barred 1 year; special exception approvals expire if action is not taken within 6 months of BZA approval; special exception approvals do not establish a vested right.	A formal special exception procedure has been consolidated into the review processes chapter. The 6-month action requirement before expiration and the clarification that special exceptions do not create vested rights are explicit provisions.
34	Section A.3 — 3.5 Design Review (Certificates of Appropriateness)	Modification	Current Code Sections 1.m through 1.o address	COA procedure: board level requires 22 days before DRB meeting; administrative level	The Certificate of Appropriateness procedures have been consolidated

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
			<p>Certificates of Appropriateness. The ZA may issue a general COA for certain alterations. DRB may postpone demolition permits up to 120 days with an additional 120 days if an alternative to demolition is possible.</p>	<p>reviewed by City Staff within 60 days (may refer to DRB). DRB quasi-judicial action. Demolition postponement: up to 120 days with additional 120 days if alternative to demolition can be achieved. General COA categories include: paint colors consistent with historic color palette; awnings in Downtown Core District; minor exterior architectural elements; business signage subject to font requirements (serif, sans serif, or script only; mimicry and playful fonts must go to DRB); fencing consistent with guidelines. COA approvals expire if action not taken within 6 months.</p>	<p>with a 6-month expiration rule added. The General COA signage category now includes a specific font restriction: only serif, sans serif, or script fonts may receive administrative approval; mimicry and playful fonts must be reviewed by the DRB.</p>
35	Section A.3 — 3.6 Conditional Use	Modification	<p>Under Current Code, conditional uses were reviewed under Section 5 (Conditional Uses) with the Zoning Administrator determining compliance and referring certain matters to the BZA. The Current Code listed conditional uses separately in each zoning district.</p>	<p>Conditional Use Approval: City staff reviews complete applications within 60 days; may refer to BZA per Section B.9.10. Conditional Use Approval confers right to establish proposed use subject to submitted plans and conditions and all other required approvals. Conditional use approvals expire if action not taken within 6 months; conditional use approvals do not establish vested rights.</p>	<p>The conditional use review process has been consolidated into the procedural chapter. The 6-month expiration rule and the explicit non-vested-rights status are new. The referral pathway to the BZA via Section B.9.10 has been retained.</p>
36	Section A.3 — 3.6 New Permit Types Added	Addition	—	<p>New permit types added without equivalent in Current Code: Temporary Use Permit (staff action within 60 days; expires per Section B.14.2); Special Event Permits (staff action per established process); Land Disturbance Permits (staff action; all site,</p>	<p>Five new permit types have been formally added to the UDO review framework: temporary use permits, special event permits, land disturbance permits, zoning verification letters, and UDO</p>

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
				landscaping, tree protection, and stormwater approvals must be in place first); Zoning Verification Letters (Zoning Administrator within 60 days); UDO Interpretations (Zoning Administrator within 60 days).	interpretations. The Current Code addressed temporary uses and conditional uses but did not have formal tracks for special events, land disturbance, zoning verification, or UDO interpretations.
37	Section A.4 — 4.1 Compliance Required	Modification	Violations of the provisions of the ordinance shall be deemed a misdemeanor, punishable as provided by law and with each day such violation continues constituting a separate offense. Failure to remove a prohibited sign under section 8.h.7 within the time period requested by the Zoning Administrator or his designee shall constitute an additional offense. The Zoning Administrator shall have recourse to such remedies in law and equity as may be necessary to ensure compliance.	Compliance with all procedures and standards of the UDO, and all terms and conditions of permits and development approvals, is required by all persons owning, developing, managing, using, or occupying land, structures, or signs in the City. Violations run with the land where the violation occurred and shall not be voided by sale or transfer. Specific violations include: developing without permits; excavating/grading without permits; removing trees without permits (with a rebuttable presumption provision if owner cuts property and seeks development permit within 2 years); reducing development standards below minimums; increasing intensity or density except per UDO standards.	The compliance section has been significantly expanded. The Proposed Draft adds that violations run with the land and are not voided by sale or transfer. A new tree removal provision creates a rebuttable presumption that a cut was done in anticipation of development if a development permit is sought within 2 years of the cut. Specific categories of violations have been enumerated.
38	Section A.4 — 4.2 Enforcement	Modification	It shall be the duty of the Zoning Administrator to enforce the provisions of this ordinance and bring to the attention of the	City Staff responsible for enforcement. Any person may file a complaint with City Staff. City Staff may enter land or inspect structures during normal business hours upon presentation of proper credentials. Notice of	The enforcement provisions have been substantially expanded. The Proposed Draft adds a formal notice of violation procedure, a municipal

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
			appropriate court any violation or lack of compliance.	Violation procedure: written notice with address/TMS number, nature of violation, date to remedy, and penalty warning; if no one present, notice may be posted on residence/building; notice by email or mail also permitted. Failure to correct: Uniform Municipal Ordinance Summons issued; City may lawfully enter and abate at owner's expense if severe health/welfare/safety conditions exist. Costs assessed as a lien. Repeat violations: warning notice not required.	summons process, authority for City Staff to enter and abate violations at owner's expense in severe cases with costs assessed as a lien, and a repeat violation provision eliminating the warning notice requirement for repeat offenders.
39	Section A.4 — 4.3 Remedies and Penalties	Modification	Violations of the provisions of the ordinance shall be deemed a misdemeanor, punishable as provided by law and with each day such violation continues constituting a separate offense.	Any person violating the UDO shall be guilty of a misdemeanor punishable as provided in the City of Sumter Code of Ordinances, Chapter 1, Section 1-7. Each continuing day is a separate offense. Additional remedies: stop orders; permit revocation (for failure to comply with permits, false representation, or permit issued in error); civil remedies (injunction, mandamus) by City; private civil relief (adjacent/neighborhood landowner may seek injunction); all remedies cumulative.	The remedies and penalties section has been significantly expanded with stop orders, permit revocation authority, civil remedies, and private civil relief provisions. The misdemeanor penalty has been cross-referenced to the City Code of Ordinances, Chapter 1, Section 1-7. All remedies are stated to be cumulative.
40	Section A.5 — Definitions	Addition	—	A comprehensive definitions section (Section A.5) has been added as Chapter A. The definitions include new and expanded terms such as: Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU); Artisan Food and Beverage Manufacturing; Ash Garden; Breweries and Micro-Breweries; Cottage Court	A comprehensive standalone definitions section (Section A.5) has been added to Chapter A. The Current Code contained definitions in Article 10 at the end of the document. The Proposed Draft

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
				Residential Development; Crosswalk Visibility; Distillery and Micro-Distillery; Driving Range; Extended Stays; Flex Facility; Group Home (with Fair Housing Act and S.C. Code §6-29-770 references); Heavy and Light Industrial Uses; Infill Development; Low Impact Development (LID); Open Space; Quasi-Judicial Action; Residential use types (Single-Family Detached, Single-Family Attached, Duplex/Triplex/Quadplex, Townhome, Multi-Family); Tree categories (Canopy, Understory, Significant, Historic); Vehicle Use Area (VUA); and many others.	moves and expands definitions significantly, including many new terms not present in the Current Code.
41	Current Code Sections 1.h through 1.i — BZA Rules of Procedure	Deletion	Detailed BZA rules of procedure including: officers (chair and vice-chair); meetings (regular and special); agenda; quorum; voting; public input; records; review procedures (appeals, variances, exceptions); specific standards for variance criteria; continuation of nonconforming structures; specific standards for conditional uses.	—	The Current Code's detailed BZA-specific rules of procedure (Sections 1.h and 1.i) have been removed as standalone provisions and replaced by the general board/commission provisions in Section A.2.4 and the individual review procedure sections in Section A.3.
42	Current Code Section 1.j through 1.o — DRB Rules of Procedure (standalone)	Deletion	Detailed DRB rules of procedure including: establishment; Hampton Park Design Review;	—	The Current Code's detailed standalone DRB procedural sections (1.j through 1.o) have been removed

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
			Downtown Design Review; Swan Lake Overlay District; Certificates of Appropriateness procedures; DRB rules of procedure; DRB application requirements.		and consolidated into Section A.2.7 (DRB) and Section A.3.5 (Design Review Procedures).
43	Current Code Section 1.p — Administrative Officer and Responsibilities	Deletion	Section 1.p.1 through 1.p.3 addressed the Zoning Administrator's specific administrative responsibilities including issuance of building permits, certificates of zoning compliance, and inspection duties.	—	The standalone Zoning Administrator duties section has been removed and its content distributed into Section A.2.2 (City Staff) and Section A.4 (Enforcement).
44	Current Code Section 1.q through 1.r — Building Permits	Deletion	Section 1.q and 1.r addressed land clearance, grading, building and sign permit requirements, and the application process for building permits including site plan requirements and engineer sign-offs.	—	The standalone building permit requirement sections have been removed from the administrative chapter. Building permit requirements are now addressed through the site plan and subdivision review procedures in Section A.3.3.
45	Current Code Section 1.s — Certificates of Zoning Compliance	Deletion	Zoning compliance is shown by the completion of the Planning Section of the Building and/or Sign Permit.	—	The standalone certificates of zoning compliance section has been removed from Article 1. Certificate of Zoning Compliance is defined in Section A.5 of the Proposed Draft.

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
46	Current Code Section 1.t — Construction and Use to Be as Shown	Deletion	Building permits or certificate of zoning compliance issued on the basis of plans and applications approved by the Zoning Administrator authorize only the use, arrangement, and construction set forth in such approved plans and applications. No building, other structure, or land shall be used or converted to any other use until a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued by the Zoning Administrator and the Building Official.	—	The standalone construction-and-use provision has been removed from Article 1. Its substance is captured in the Compliance Required provision at Section A.4.1 and in the individual approval sections.
47	Current Code Section 1.u — Amendment Authorization and Procedure	Deletion	The Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance may be amended from time to time by the Sumter City or County Councils, but no amendment shall become effective unless it shall have been first submitted to the Sumter City-County Planning Commission for review within thirty (30) days. Initiation of Amendment: proposed changes may be initiated by Sumter City Council, Sumter County Council, the Planning	—	The Current Code's standalone amendment authorization section has been removed. Its procedural content has been replaced by the Zoning Map Amendment and UDO Text Amendment procedures in Section A.3.2, which significantly restrict text amendment initiation rights to governmental bodies only.

#	Section / Article	Type of Change	Original Language (Current Code — Deleted)	Revised Language (Proposed Draft — Added)	Summary of Change
			Commission, the Zoning Board of Appeals, and individual property owners.		

SECTION 2 — SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

24 changes have been identified as substantively significant. These changes meaningfully alter the intent, scope, standards, or requirements of the ordinance.

The number in each entry heading below corresponds to the row number in Section 1.

1. Amendment #1 — Title / Document Name

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: The renaming from 'Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance' to 'Unified Development Ordinance (UDO)' reflects a structural shift from a single-topic document to a consolidated regulatory framework. This affects how the document is cited in applications, permits, appeals, and legal proceedings. All references in forms, staff reports, and notices will need to be updated to reflect the new title.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** City of Sumter Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance.
Added: City of Sumter Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

2. Amendment #2 — Section A.1 — Introductory Provisions / 1.2 Authority

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: The statutory authority citation is foundational. Updating from S.C. 6-29-710 (which does not exist as a standalone citation) to the formally recognized S.C. Code §6-29-310 et seq. provides more legally precise grounding for the UDO. The addition of explanatory language—that other applicable state law sections are not excluded—may affect how legal challenges to the UDO's authority are evaluated.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** This ordinance is adopted pursuant to the authority delegated to cities and counties in South Carolina under the Code of Laws, in Title 6, Chapter 29 S.C. 6-29-710..

Added: The development regulations contained in the UDO have been adopted pursuant to the authority conferred by the South Carolina Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act of 1994, S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-310 et seq..

4. Amendment #4 — Section A.1 — 1.3 Jurisdiction

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: This is a fundamental jurisdictional change. The Current Code applied jointly to the City of Sumter and the unincorporated County. The Proposed Draft applies only within the City's corporate limits, as extended by annexation. Property owners and applicants in the unincorporated county will no longer be subject to this ordinance and must rely on the County's separate regulations. City staff should no longer reference this document for decisions on unincorporated county parcels.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** The provisions in this ordinance shall be applicable within the entire City of Sumter and the unincorporated portions of the County of Sumter, South Carolina.. **Added:** Pursuant to the general health, safety and welfare of the community, the articles and sections of the UDO apply as relevant to all public and private development within the corporate limits of the City of Sumter in their current form and in all future extensions and configurations as shown on the official zoning map and its periodic updates..

5. Amendment #5 — Section A.1 — 1.4 Purpose and Intent

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: The purpose statement is used by courts and boards to interpret the ordinance. The shift from a regulatory checklist to a broader planning principles framework expands the grounds on which the Planning Commission and BZA may evaluate applications. The new language—including quality of life through quality design, open space in connected networks, and historic preservation—may provide additional basis to impose or evaluate design conditions on applications.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** The purpose of this ordinance is to protect the health, safety, and general welfare, while allowing for the cost saving efficiencies, through the proper subdivision of land and the creation of zoning districts. The purpose of this ordinance will be to regulate: use of buildings, structures, and land; size, location, height, bulk, orientation, number of stories; erection, construction, recreation, alteration, demolition; removal in whole or in part of buildings and other structures; area and dimensions of land, water, and air space; and the effects of aircraft noise and maximize the safety of land use in and around Shaw Air Force Base.. **Added:** The document's general purpose is to guide development within the municipal limits in accordance with existing and future needs; in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan; for the purposes of promoting the health, safety, and general welfare of the City; providing safe and convenient orientation to streets and other public spaces for accessibility; securing safety from fire; providing adequate light and air to dwellings; facilitating the adequate provision of transportation, water, sewerage, schools, parks, public improvements and other infrastructure; and protecting scenic and critical environmental areas. Specifically designed to implement planning principles including: grow by balancing economic growth with preservation of natural resources and quality of life; preserve open space in connected networks; preserve and revitalize historic buildings and spaces; balance individual and community interests; enhance quality of life through quality design; and protect Shaw AFB from incompatible development..

9. Amendment #9 — Section A.1 — 1.8 Annexations

Type: Addition

Why It Is Significant: This is an entirely new regulatory provision with no equivalent in the Current Code. It establishes a default automatic zoning assignment for all future annexations based on a specific correspondence table (Table A.1.8), which maps County districts to City districts. This creates a clear, predictable framework for applicants and staff on how annexed property will be zoned initially, while preserving the option for City Council to designate a different district consistent with surrounding uses and the Comprehensive Plan.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** —. **Added:** All territory which may hereafter be granted or annexed to the City of Sumter, shall be classified automatically into the zoning district (including zoning overlay districts) which most closely corresponds to the territory's zoning designation in the unincorporated portion of Sumter County, as shown in Table A.1.8: Corresponding City & County Zoning Districts & Overlay Districts. However, the applicant or owner of said property may request and/or City Council may designate a zoning district that is compatible with existing surrounding land uses and supports the Comprehensive Plan, at the time of annexation. Such changes in zoning which emerge with annexation of property into the City must be accompanied with the recommendation from the Planning Commission..

10. Amendment #10 — Section A.1 — 1.9 Conflicts and Severability

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: The Current Code's 'minimum requirements' language gave the Planning Commission and BZA express authority to impose more stringent standards than those written in the ordinance when health, safety, and welfare justified it. This provision has been removed in the Proposed Draft. Applicants and boards should be aware that this express grant of authority to impose heightened standards is no longer present in Section A.1, though it may be addressed elsewhere in the UDO. The new conflicts-of-law rule—establishing the UDO's precedence over conflicting City ordinances—is also new.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** In their interpretation and application, the provisions of this ordinance shall be held to be the minimum requirements. The Sumter City-County Planning Commission or the Sumter City-County Zoning Board of Appeals may impose more stringent standards if it is demonstrated that different standards are necessary to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The provisions of this ordinance are separable. If a section, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance is determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, the decision shall not affect remaining portions of this ordinance.. **Added:** Resolution Of Conflicting Regulations: Wherever there is, or appears to be, a conflict between any provision of this chapter with the provisions of any other lawful ordinance regulation or resolution of the City, the requirements of this ordinance shall take

precedence. Severability: In the event of any portion of the UDO being declared unconstitutional or invalid, such decision does not affect the remainder of the ordinance..

12. Amendment #12 — Section A.1 — Fees (Current Code Section 1.c)

Type: **Deletion**

Why It Is Significant: The Current Code vested fee-setting authority in the Planning Commission with approval by the City Manager and County Administrator. The Proposed Draft transfers fee-setting authority to City Council, which will establish and maintain fees via an adopted fee schedule. This is a material shift in which body has authority to set application fees. Additionally, the specific list of 19 fee categories has been removed from the text; the Proposed Draft relies instead on a City Council-maintained fee schedule not included in the UDO.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** Reasonable fees sufficient to recover incurred costs shall be set at the Planning Commission meeting in July and approved by the City Manager and County Administrator for the following: [list of 19 fee categories including rezoning, ZBA, site plan, subdivision, temporary use, conditional use, text amendment, street name change, etc.]. Said fees shall be established by the Sumter City-County Planning Commission based on costs associated therewith, i.e., publishing, printing, copying, man hours, materials, etc.. **Added:** —.

13. Amendment #13 — Section A.2 — Administrative Officials / 2.2 City Staff

Type: **Modification**

Why It Is Significant: The Current Code placed enforcement and administrative responsibility squarely on the Zoning Administrator. The Proposed Draft distributes that responsibility across 'City Staff' broadly, which includes a new Technical Review Committee (TRC). This creates a new intermediate layer of technical review not present in the Current Code. Applicants submitting site plans, subdivision plats, and other development applications will now interact with the TRC as well as the Zoning Administrator and Planning Commission.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** It shall be the duty of the Zoning Administrator to enforce the provisions of this ordinance and bring to the attention of the appropriate court any violation or lack of compliance.. **Added:** The various provisions of this ordinance shall be administered under the general direction of the City Council and City Manager and under the specific direction of the City's Department Heads. For the purposes of this ordinance, the Heads of each department and their subordinate staffs, the Zoning Administrator, as well as the Technical Review Committee assigned with the task of plan and subdivision review are collectively referred to as 'City Staff.'

14. Amendment #14 — Section A.2 — 2.2 Technical Review Committee (TRC)

Type: **Addition**

Why It Is Significant: The TRC is an entirely new institutional body with no equivalent in the Current Code. Its meeting schedule is tied to Planning Commission meetings, and it is empowered to review and comment on development applications including zoning map amendments, major site plans, corridor protection reviews, and subdivision plats. Applicants will now need to submit materials for TRC review as part of multiple application tracks. TRC review comments may result in required revisions before applications are placed before the Planning Commission.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** —. **Added:** The Technical Review Committee, who may be referred to in this UDO as the 'TRC', is a technical review committee for projects that have been submitted to the City of Sumter. For the applicable projects, the TRC meeting schedule shall be consistent with the schedule of Planning Commission meetings. No formal approval of projects shall be made at TRC meetings. The TRC reviews and provides recommendations on applicable development applications..

16. Amendment #16 — Section A.2 — Planning Commission (2.5 vs. Current Code Sections 1.f and 1.g)

Type: **Modification**

Why It Is Significant: The explicit allocation of 3 City / 3 County / 3 joint appointments is a new structural specification not present in the Current Code, which only stated the City and County

Councils made appointments. This may affect how vacancies are filled and how the Commission's balance between City and County is maintained. The change from a general 30-day action requirement to a 60-day deferral cap in specific review procedures also affects scheduling and applicant timelines.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** The Sumter City-County Planning Commission is hereby established pursuant to S.C. Code of Laws, Title 6, and Chapter 29. Nine members appointed by the City and County Councils of Sumter. Members serve four (4) year terms. The Planning Commission shall act on a complete application within thirty (30) days of receipt of the complete application.. **Added:** Planning Commission (PC) established pursuant to S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-320, et seq. Nine members: 3 appointed by City Council, 3 appointed by County Council, 3 appointed jointly. Terms of 4 years. The PC shall make recommendations to City Council; Planning Commission action on development applications is subject to 60-day deferral deadlines..

17. Amendment #17 — Section A.2 — 2.4 General Provisions for All Boards and Commissions

Type: Addition

Why It Is Significant: The Proposed Draft establishes a uniform set of standards governing all boards and commissions, including a 75% attendance requirement (with vacancy consequences), a specific conflict-of-interest definition including familial relationships through step and in-law relations, and a prohibition on proxy and email voting. These standards are materially more specific than the Current Code's procedures. The attendance threshold, in particular, creates a new accountability mechanism with vacancy consequences if not met.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** —. **Added:** A comprehensive set of general provisions applies to all Boards/Commissions, including: attendance (75% of meetings required or risk of vacancy), removal for cause by City Council, compensation (no pay; expenses reimbursable with advance approval), conflicts of interest (defined to include close familial relationships through in-law relations), voting (no proxy or email votes; members absent from hearing may not vote), and actions subsequent to approval (conditions must be met before building permit; Board may allow phased element submission)..

18. Amendment #18 — Section A.2 — 2.6 Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA)

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: The specific appointment allocation (4 City / 5 County, with City members required to be City residents) is a new structural requirement not in the Current Code. The written order requirement—mandating separately stated findings of fact and conclusions of law—is also new and creates a more court-like procedural standard for BZA decisions. This may affect how parties prepare for BZA hearings and how decisions are appealed.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** Current Code Sections 1.h and 1.i establish the Sumter City-County Board of Zoning Appeals with nine members appointed by the City and County Councils of Sumter. The BZA hears appeals, variances, and conditional uses. Appeals from ZBA decisions are taken to circuit court.. **Added:** BZA established pursuant to S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-780, et seq. Nine members: 4 appointed by City Council, 5 appointed by County Council. City-appointed members shall be residents of the City. The BZA hears administrative appeals, special exceptions, and variances. Written orders required for all decisions. Appeals governed by S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-820..

20. Amendment #20 — Section A.3 — 3.1 UDO Review Processes / General Procedures

Type: Addition

Why It Is Significant: This is a comprehensive new procedural framework with no single equivalent in the Current Code. The 20-business-day completeness review timeline, the deemed-submitted rule if staff fails to act, the specific quasi-judicial procedural requirements (oath, cross-examination, evidentiary standards, 120-day action deadline), and the differentiated legislative vs. quasi-judicial framework are all new provisions. These affect how applicants prepare materials, how public hearings are conducted, and the legal defensibility of board decisions.

Change Summary: **Deleted: —. Added:** A comprehensive set of general procedural rules has been added for all development applications: pre-application meeting (encouraged, required for some); applications (content established by City Staff; Council establishes fees; completeness determination within 20 business days; if no completeness determination within timeframe, application deemed officially submitted); conflicts of interest for staff; and public hearing notice requirements including published and posted notice, legislative public hearing procedures, and quasi-judicial public hearing procedures including oath, evidence, cross-examination, and order of hearing..

23. Amendment #23 — Section A.3 — 3.2.B UDO Text Amendment

Type: Addition

Why It Is Significant: The Proposed Draft limits who may initiate a UDO text amendment to City Council, Planning Commission, or City Staff acting under the City Manager's direction. Property owners and private parties may no longer initiate text amendments directly, unlike in the Current Code where the amendment process was more broadly available. This concentrates regulatory change authority in governmental bodies.

Change Summary: **Deleted: —. Added:** UDO Text Amendments may only be initiated by City Council, Planning Commission, or City Staff (at the direction of the City Manager). Requires 22-day submission deadline before PC meeting; TRC review at Zoning Administrator's discretion; PC recommendation to City Council; City Council action including approval, denial, approval with modifications, deferral, or remand to PC..

25. Amendment #25 — Section A.3 — 3.3 Major Site Plans

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: The introduction of quantitative thresholds for major site plans (20,000 sq. ft., 5 acres, 35 parking spaces) is a new, measurable standard replacing the Current Code's general site plan requirement. The 2-year vested right provision is entirely new. Applicants whose projects fall below these thresholds will now use a minor site plan process, which has different review bodies and timelines. The pre-application meeting requirement is also new for major site plans.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** The approval of site plans is hereby required as a condition for the issuance of a building permit, except that individual lot applications for detached one or two dwelling unit buildings shall be exempt from site plan review approval. The Planning Commission may waive the requirement for site plan approval where there is a use or occupancy and no extensive construction or improvements is sought.. **Added:** Major site plan applications apply to proposals with 1 or more of: construction of more than 20,000 sq. ft. of building area; more than 5 acres of land disturbance; 35 or more required off-street parking spaces; or greater degree of impact as determined by the Zoning Administrator. Pre-application meeting required. TRC review. PC action within 60-day deferral cap. Vested right for 2 years with up to 5 one-year extensions..

26. Amendment #26 — Section A.3 — 3.3.B Minor Site Plans (Level 1 & 2)

Type: Addition

Why It Is Significant: The two-tier minor site plan system is an entirely new framework. Most routine commercial and multi-family projects under 20,000 sq. ft. will now fall into the Level 1 track, which is reviewed by City Staff rather than the Planning Commission. Level 2 is a streamlined track for minor additions on existing developed sites. The move from Planning Commission to City Staff review for these projects represents a significant decentralization of approval authority.

Change Summary: **Deleted: —. Added:** Minor site plan Level 1: construction less than 20,000 sq. ft.; less than 5 acres land disturbance; 35 or fewer parking spaces; does not meet Level 2 criteria. Level 2: site already developed; addition less than 1,000 sq. ft. or new building less than 500 sq. ft.; less than 1 acre disturbance; no new paved parking; no new stormwater facilities; minimal impact as determined by Zoning Administrator. Pre-application meeting required for Level 1. Staff reviews and acts within 60 days. Vested right 2 years with up to 5 one-year extensions..

28. Amendment #28 — Section A.3 — 3.3.D/E Sketch Plan and Major Subdivision (Preliminary Plat)

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: The mandatory Sketch Plan step is a new intermediate review milestone that applicants for major subdivisions (10+ lots) must complete before submitting a formal Preliminary Plat application. This adds a stage to the development review process that will require additional staff resources and applicant preparation. The 90-day recording deadline for final plats is also new—failure to record within 90 days voids the staff approval.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** All plats shall be subject to review of the Planning Commission with the exception of the following which may be reviewed by staff: plats of existing lots of record; minor subdivisions of land which meet all zoning requirements; subdivisions which are exempt from regulation pursuant to S.C. Code 6-29-1110(2). The Planning Commission shall act on a complete application within thirty (30) days of receipt of the complete application.. **Added:** Major subdivision: 10 or more lots or construction of street/stormwater infrastructure. A Sketch Plan (approved by City Staff) is a prerequisite for Major Subdivision application. Pre-application meeting required for both. TRC review. PC action within 60-day deferral cap. Vested right 2 years with up to 5 one-year extensions. Final plat (subject to preliminary plat approval) must be recorded at the Register of Deeds within 90 days of staff approval..

32. Amendment #32 — Section A.3 — 3.4 Variances

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: The explicit prohibition on using a variance to establish an otherwise unpermitted use, extend a nonconforming use of land, or change zoning district boundaries is a new, codified limitation. The clarification that variance approvals do not expire (unlike special exceptions) but also do not create vested rights is a new distinction with practical implications for property transactions and future development planning.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** Current Code Section 1.h.4 established variance criteria: BZA may grant a variance where special conditions exist not created by applicant, where literal enforcement would create unnecessary hardship, where the variance is in harmony with the general purpose of the ordinance, and where public welfare is secured. Variances applied to requirements of Article 4 (development standards) only.. **Added:** Variance procedure: complete applications required 22 days before BZA meeting; BZA quasi-judicial action (approve, approve with conditions, deny, defer); denied applications barred 1 year unless substantially different; variance approvals do not expire; variance approvals do not establish a vested right. Criteria: extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property; conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity; conditions effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict utilization; authorization will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or the public good. BZA may not grant a variance to establish an otherwise unpermitted use, extend a nonconforming use of land, or change zoning district boundaries..

34. Amendment #34 — Section A.3 — 3.5 Design Review (Certificates of Appropriateness)

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: The addition of a font classification restriction to the General COA signage category is a new, specific design standard. Signs using mimicry or playful fonts (e.g., Comic Sans) in design review districts will require full DRB review rather than administrative approval. This affects businesses in the Hampton Park and Downtown Design Review Districts. The 6-month expiration rule for COA approvals is also new and requires applicants to act promptly after receiving approval.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** Current Code Sections 1.m through 1.o address Certificates of Appropriateness. The ZA may issue a general COA for certain alterations. DRB may postpone demolition permits up to 120 days with an additional 120 days if an alternative to demolition is possible.. **Added:** COA procedure: board level requires 22 days before DRB meeting; administrative level reviewed by City Staff within 60 days (may refer to DRB). DRB quasi-judicial action. Demolition postponement: up to 120 days with additional 120 days if alternative to demolition can be achieved. General COA categories include: paint colors consistent with historic color palette; awnings in Downtown Core District; minor exterior architectural elements; business signage subject to font

requirements (serif, sans serif, or script only; mimicry and playful fonts must go to DRB); fencing consistent with guidelines. COA approvals expire if action not taken within 6 months..

36. Amendment #36 — Section A.3 — 3.6 New Permit Types Added

Type: Addition

Why It Is Significant: The formalization of land disturbance permits, zoning verification letters, and UDO interpretations as distinct permit types with defined timelines (60 days) is new. In particular, the UDO interpretation process—requiring the Zoning Administrator to issue a written interpretation within 60 days—creates a formal mechanism for applicants and property owners to obtain written guidance on UDO provisions. This may be significant for property transactions and development planning.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** —. **Added:** New permit types added without equivalent in Current Code: Temporary Use Permit (staff action within 60 days; expires per Section B.14.2); Special Event Permits (staff action per established process); Land Disturbance Permits (staff action; all site, landscaping, tree protection, and stormwater approvals must be in place first); Zoning Verification Letters (Zoning Administrator within 60 days); UDO Interpretations (Zoning Administrator within 60 days)..

37. Amendment #37 — Section A.4 — 4.1 Compliance Required

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: Two provisions are materially new. First, the statement that violations run with the land and are not voided by sale or transfer means a purchaser of property with an existing UDO violation takes on that violation. This is significant for title examination and property transactions. Second, the tree removal rebuttable presumption—if an owner clears property and seeks a development permit within 2 years—creates a new evidentiary burden that may affect forestry and pre-development site preparation practices.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** Violations of the provisions of the ordinance shall be deemed a misdemeanor, punishable as provided by law and with each day such violation continues constituting a separate offense. Failure to remove a prohibited sign under section 8.h.7 within the time period requested by the Zoning Administrator or his designee shall constitute an additional offense. The Zoning Administrator shall have recourse to such remedies in law and equity as may be necessary to ensure compliance.. **Added:** Compliance with all procedures and standards of the UDO, and all terms and conditions of permits and development approvals, is required by all persons owning, developing, managing, using, or occupying land, structures, or signs in the City. Violations run with the land where the violation occurred and shall not be voided by sale or transfer. Specific violations include: developing without permits; excavating/grading without permits; removing trees without permits (with a rebuttable presumption provision if owner cuts property and seeks development permit within 2 years); reducing development standards below minimums; increasing intensity or density except per UDO standards..

38. Amendment #38 — Section A.4 — 4.2 Enforcement

Type: Modification

Why It Is Significant: Several new enforcement tools are materially significant. The authority for City Staff to enter and abate a violation at owner's expense, with costs assessed as a lien on the property, is a new remedy not present in the Current Code. The elimination of the warning notice requirement for repeat violations is also new. Together, these provisions give City Staff broader and stronger enforcement authority than the Current Code provided.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** It shall be the duty of the Zoning Administrator to enforce the provisions of this ordinance and bring to the attention of the appropriate court any violation or lack of compliance.. **Added:** City Staff responsible for enforcement. Any person may file a complaint with City Staff. City Staff may enter land or inspect structures during normal business hours upon presentation of proper credentials. Notice of Violation procedure: written notice with address/TMS number, nature of violation, date to remedy, and penalty warning; if no one present, notice may be posted on residence/building; notice by email or mail also permitted. Failure to correct: Uniform Municipal Ordinance Summons issued; City may lawfully enter and abate at owner's expense if

severe health/welfare/safety conditions exist. Costs assessed as a lien. Repeat violations: warning notice not required..

39. Amendment #39 — Section A.4 — 4.3 Remedies and Penalties

Type: **Modification**

Why It Is Significant: The addition of permit revocation authority, civil remedies including injunction and mandamus, and private civil relief for neighboring landowners substantially expands the enforcement toolkit beyond the Current Code's single misdemeanor provision. Permit revocation—including for permits procured by false representation or issued in error—is a new remedy with direct consequences for project development timelines. The private civil relief provision creates a new avenue for neighbors to seek court orders without waiting for City action.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** Violations of the provisions of the ordinance shall be deemed a misdemeanor, punishable as provided by law and with each day such violation continues constituting a separate offense.. **Added:** Any person violating the UDO shall be guilty of a misdemeanor punishable as provided in the City of Sumter Code of Ordinances, Chapter 1, Section 1-7. Each continuing day is a separate offense. Additional remedies: stop orders; permit revocation (for failure to comply with permits, false representation, or permit issued in error); civil remedies (injunction, mandamus) by City; private civil relief (adjacent/neighboring landowner may seek injunction); all remedies cumulative..

40. Amendment #40 — Section A.5 — Definitions

Type: **Addition**

Why It Is Significant: Moving definitions from Article 10 (end of code) to Section A.5 (beginning of the UDO) makes the definitions section the first reference point for interpretation of all subsequent chapters. Many new definitions have been added that will govern eligibility and standards throughout the UDO, including: Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) — new use type; Cottage Court Residential Development — new development type; Group Home with specific Fair Housing Act and state law references — new regulatory clarity; Tree classifications (Significant = 10–29 inches DBH; Historic = 30+ inches DBH) — new measurement standards; Quasi-Judicial Action — new procedural definition. Applicants, staff, and boards should familiarize themselves with the expanded definitions before applying standards in other chapters.

Change Summary: **Deleted:** —. **Added:** A comprehensive definitions section (Section A.5) has been added as Chapter A. The definitions include new and expanded terms such as: Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU); Artisan Food and Beverage Manufacturing; Ash Garden; Breweries and Micro-Breweries; Cottage Court Residential Development; Crosswalk Visibility; Distillery and Micro-Distillery; Driving Range; Extended Stays; Flex Facility; Group Home (with Fair Housing Act and S.C. Code §6-29-770 references); Heavy and Light Industrial Uses; Infill Development; Low Impact Development (LID); Open Space; Quasi-Judicial Action; Residential use types (Single-Family Detached, Single-Family Attached, Duplex/Triplex/Quadplex, Townhome, Multi-Family); Tree categories (Canopy, Understory, Significant, Historic); Vehicle Use Area (VUA); and many others..

SECTION 3 — INSTRUCTION MANUAL

This section explains the Proposed Draft to someone familiar with the Current Code. It is organized by topic rather than section number. All content is drawn exclusively from the two source documents.

TOPIC: Document Title, Jurisdiction, and Governing Authority

What it was (Current Code)

Under the Current Code (January 2014, revised through 2023), the document was titled the 'City of Sumter Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance' (ZDSO). It applied jointly within the City of Sumter and the unincorporated portions of Sumter County. Authority was cited to S.C. 6-29-710. The City and County Councils of Sumter shared governing authority, and the joint City-County Planning Commission administered the document. See Current Code Sections 1.a and 1.b.

What it is now (Proposed Draft)

The Proposed Draft is titled the 'City of Sumter Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).' Jurisdiction is limited to the corporate limits of the City of Sumter, with future extensions as shown on the official zoning map. Authority is cited to the South Carolina Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act of 1994, S.C. Code 1976, §6-29-310 et seq. City Council and City Staff govern administration. See Section A.1.1 (Title), Section A.1.2 (Authority), and Section A.1.3 (Jurisdiction).

What changed and why it matters

This is a foundational transformation: from a joint City-County document to a City-only UDO. Property owners and applicants in the unincorporated county are no longer subject to this document. All prior joint references (Sumter City-County Planning Commission, City Manager and County Administrator fee approvals) now refer only to City bodies. Staff and applicants should verify whether projects are within the City's corporate limits before applying this document. Annexed properties are governed by the new annexation section (Section A.1.8).

Where to look

- Section A.1.1 — Title
- Section A.1.2 — Authority
- Section A.1.3 — Jurisdiction
- Section A.1.8 — Annexations and Table A.1.8

TOPIC: Fee Setting Authority

What it was (Current Code)

Under Current Code Section 1.c, fees were set at the Planning Commission meeting in July and approved by the City Manager and County Administrator. A specific list of 19 fee categories was enumerated in the code itself. The Planning Commission base the fees on costs including publishing, printing, copying, man hours, and materials.

What it is now (Proposed Draft)

Under the Proposed Draft, City Council establishes application fees, which are identified in the City's adopted fee schedule. City Council may amend and update fees as necessary. No formal action or approval shall be given until all required application fees are paid in full. There is no enumerated list of fee categories in the UDO text. See Section A.3.1.C (Applications).

What changed and why it matters

Fee-setting authority has shifted from the Planning Commission (with City Manager and County Administrator approval) to City Council via a separate fee schedule. The specific list of 19 fee categories has been removed from the UDO. Applicants should consult the City's separately adopted

fee schedule — which is not part of the UDO — for current fee information. Staff should not cite the old UDO fee list for fee determinations.

Where to look

- Section A.3.1.C — Applications (fee provisions)

TOPIC: Site Plan Review Process

What it was (Current Code)

Under the Current Code (Section 1.f.5), the approval of site plans was required as a condition of building permit issuance, with an exception for individual lots with detached 1- or 2-unit dwellings. The Planning Commission could waive site plan review where no extensive construction was sought. All site plans were reviewed by the Planning Commission or staff. There was no tiered major/minor site plan system.

What it is now (Proposed Draft)

The Proposed Draft establishes a three-tier site plan system. Major Site Plans (Section A.3.3.A): more than 20,000 sq. ft. of building area, or more than 5 acres of land disturbance, or 35+ required parking spaces, or greater impact as determined by Zoning Administrator — reviewed by Planning Commission with a pre-application meeting and TRC review required; 2-year vested right. Level 1 Minor Site Plans (Section A.3.3.B): below major thresholds — reviewed by City Staff within 60 days; 2-year vested right. Level 2 Minor Site Plans (Section A.3.3.B): small additions on existing developed sites (addition under 1,000 sq. ft. or new building under 500 sq. ft., less than 1 acre disturbance, no new paved parking, no new stormwater) — reviewed by City Staff; 2-year vested right.

What changed and why it matters

Most routine smaller commercial and multi-family projects will now be reviewed by City Staff rather than the Planning Commission. Only projects meeting the major site plan thresholds require Planning Commission approval. This represents a significant decentralization of approval authority for smaller projects. The 2-year vested right is entirely new and provides applicants a defined window to commence construction. Applicants should determine their tier before submitting.

Where to look

- Section A.3.3.A — Major Site Plans
- Section A.3.3.B — Minor Site Plans (Level 1 & 2)
- Table A.3.3 — Summary of UDO Development Review Procedures

TOPIC: Subdivision Review Process

What it was (Current Code)

Under the Current Code (Section 1.g.5.b), all plats were subject to Planning Commission review except: plats of existing lots of record; minor subdivisions meeting all zoning requirements; and exempt subdivisions per S.C. Code 6-29-1110(2). The Planning Commission was required to act on a complete application within 30 days. There was no Sketch Plan requirement.

What it is now (Proposed Draft)

Major Subdivisions are defined as those involving 10 or more lots or construction of street or stormwater infrastructure (Section A.3.3.E). A Sketch Plan (reviewed by City Staff, Section A.3.3.D) is a mandatory prerequisite before a Major Subdivision (Preliminary Plat) application is considered complete. Final Plats (whether or not subject to Preliminary Plat approval) must be recorded at the Sumter County Register of Deeds within 90 days of City Staff approval or the approval expires (Sections A.3.3.F and A.3.3.G). PC may defer but must decide within 60 days.

What changed and why it matters

The mandatory Sketch Plan step adds a new stage to the subdivision review process for major subdivisions. Applicants for large subdivisions must obtain Sketch Plan approval before their Preliminary Plat application is considered complete. The 90-day recording deadline for final plats is entirely new — missing this deadline voids staff approval and requires re-application. The 60-day deferral cap replaces the Current Code's 30-day action requirement.

Where to look

- Section A.3.3.D — Sketch Plan — Major Subdivision
- Section A.3.3.E — Major Subdivision (Preliminary Plat)
- Section A.3.3.F — Final Plat (Not Subject to Preliminary Plat Approval)
- Section A.3.3.G — Final Plat (Subject to Preliminary Plat Approval)
- Table A.3.3 — Summary of UDO Development Review Procedures

TOPIC: Boards and Commissions — Membership and Procedures

What it was (Current Code)

Under the Current Code, the Planning Commission had nine members appointed by the City and County Councils. The BZA had nine members. The DRB had members appointed by City Council. Board-specific rules were set out in individual sections (1.f through 1.o). No minimum attendance threshold was specified. There were no general provisions applying to all boards simultaneously.

What it is now (Proposed Draft)

Section A.2.4 establishes general provisions for all Boards and Commissions: 4-year terms; 75% attendance requirement (failure to attend triggers vacancy consideration); removal for cause by City Council; no compensation (expenses reimbursable with advance approval); conflicts of interest defined including close familial relationships; no proxy or email voting. Planning Commission: 3 City / 3 County / 3 joint appointments (Section A.2.5). BZA: 4 City / 5 County appointments; City members must be City residents; written orders with findings of fact and conclusions of law required (Section A.2.6). DRB: 7 members appointed by City Council; demonstrated knowledge required in at least one specified area (Section A.2.7).

What changed and why it matters

The 75% attendance requirement with vacancy consequences is a new accountability provision. City Council appointees to the BZA must now be City residents — a new eligibility requirement. BZA written orders with separately stated findings of fact and conclusions of law are a new procedural standard that will affect how BZA decisions are drafted and how they are evaluated on appeal. The DRB's competency requirements are also new.

Where to look

- Section A.2.4 — General Provisions for All Boards and Commissions
- Section A.2.5 — Planning Commission (PC)
- Section A.2.6 — Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA)
- Section A.2.7 — Design Review Board (DRB)

TOPIC: Variances and Special Exceptions

What it was (Current Code)

Under the Current Code (Section 1.h.4), the BZA could grant variances for special conditions not created by the applicant where literal enforcement caused unnecessary hardship, the variance was in harmony with the ordinance, and public welfare was secured. Conditional uses were also heard by the BZA. The Current Code did not separately define special exception procedures in a standalone procedural section.

What it is now (Proposed Draft)

Variances (Section A.3.4.A): 22-day submission deadline; BZA quasi-judicial action; denied applications barred 1 year; variance approvals do not expire and do not create vested rights; BZA may not grant variances to establish unpermitted uses, extend nonconforming land uses, or change zoning boundaries. Special Exceptions (Section A.3.4.B): same 22-day submission deadline; BZA quasi-judicial; 6-month expiration after approval if no action taken; do not create vested rights.

What changed and why it matters

The prohibition on using a variance to establish an otherwise unpermitted use is now explicitly codified. Variance approvals now have explicitly no expiration and no vested right — they run with the property condition addressed, not with a specific development project. Special exception approvals, by contrast, expire in 6 months and do not create vested rights. Applicants should distinguish carefully between the two types and plan timelines accordingly.

Where to look

- Section A.3.4.A — Variances
- Section A.3.4.B — Special Exceptions
- Table A.3.4 — Summary of Appeal & Relief Review Procedures

TOPIC: Enforcement, Violations, and Penalties**What it was (Current Code)**

Under Current Code Section 1.d, enforcement was the duty of the Zoning Administrator. Violations were misdemeanors, each day a separate offense. Failure to remove a prohibited sign constituted an additional offense. The Zoning Administrator had recourse to remedies in law and equity.

What it is now (Proposed Draft)

City Staff responsible for enforcement (Section A.4.2). Any person may file a complaint. Notice of Violation procedure with specific content requirements (address, nature of violation, remedy date, penalty warning). Failure to correct triggers Uniform Municipal Ordinance Summons. City may abate at owner's expense with costs as a lien on property in cases of severe health/safety/welfare conditions. Repeat violations: no warning required. Violations run with the land; not voided by sale or transfer. Tree removal with subsequent development permit application within 2 years creates rebuttable presumption of pre-development clearing. Additional remedies: stop orders; permit revocation; civil remedies (injunction/mandamus); private civil relief for neighboring landowners (Section A.4.3).

What changed and why it matters

Multiple new enforcement tools have been added. The most significant for property transactions is that violations run with the land and are not voided by sale. Buyers of property with existing UDO violations inherit those violations. The tree removal rebuttable presumption affects pre-development site preparation. Permit revocation — including for permits procured by false representation — is a new remedy. Private civil relief for neighboring landowners is a new avenue for neighbors to seek court orders.

Where to look

- Section A.4.1 — Compliance Required
- Section A.4.2 — Enforcement
- Section A.4.3 — Remedies and Penalties

TOPIC: Definitions**What it was (Current Code)**

Under the Current Code, definitions were located in Article 10 at the end of the document. The definitions were generally shorter and less comprehensive than the Proposed Draft.

What it is now (Proposed Draft)

Definitions are now located in Section A.5 at the beginning of the UDO (Chapter A). The definitions section has been significantly expanded with many new terms including: Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU); Artisan Food and Beverage Manufacturing; Ash Garden; Breweries and Micro-Breweries; Cottage Court Residential Development; Crosswalk Visibility; Distillery and Micro-Distillery; Driving Range; Extended Stays; Flex Facility; Group Home (with specific Fair Housing Act and S.C. Code §6-29-770 cross-references); Infill Development; Low Impact Development (LID); Open Space; Quasi-Judicial Action; Tree classifications (Canopy Tree, Understory Tree, Significant Tree [10–29 inches DBH], Historic Tree [30+ inches DBH]); Transient Accommodations; Vehicle Use Area (VUA); and many others.

What changed and why it matters

Relocating definitions to Chapter A means they govern interpretation of all subsequent chapters. New definitions — particularly ADU, Cottage Court Residential Development, Infill Development, tree size classifications, and Group Home with Fair Housing Act references — will directly affect development eligibility, tree protection requirements, and use permissions throughout the UDO. Staff and applicants should consult Section A.5 definitions before applying standards in other chapters.

Where to look

- Section A.5 — Definitions (comprehensive listing beginning with 'Abandonment' through 'Zoo')

Quick Reference — Most Common Questions

Questions a staff member or applicant would most likely ask, with Proposed Draft section answers.

Question	Where to Find It (Proposed Draft)
What is this document called?	Section A.1.1 — The City of Sumter Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Previously called the Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance.
Does this UDO apply to unincorporated Sumter County?	Section A.1.3 — No. The Proposed Draft applies only within the corporate limits of the City of Sumter and future annexations. Unincorporated county properties are not covered.
How does newly annexed property get zoned?	Section A.1.8 and Table A.1.8 — Annexed territory is automatically classified into the most closely corresponding City zoning district per the correspondence table, unless City Council designates a different compatible district with a PC recommendation.
Who sets application fees?	Section A.3.1.C — City Council, via a separately adopted fee schedule. Fees are no longer set by the Planning Commission or listed in the UDO text.
What is the threshold between major and minor site plans?	Section A.3.3.A/B — Major: more than 20,000 sq. ft., more than 5 acres disturbance, or 35+ parking spaces. Level 1 Minor: below those thresholds. Level 2 Minor: small additions under 1,000 sq. ft. on existing developed sites with minimal impact.
Who reviews and approves a major site plan?	Section A.3.3.A — Planning Commission, after TRC review. Pre-application meeting required. 2-year vested right upon approval.

Question	Where to Find It (Proposed Draft)
Who reviews and approves a minor site plan?	Section A.3.3.B — City Staff (Zoning Administrator), within 60 days. Pre-application meeting required for Level 1. 2-year vested right upon approval.
Is a Sketch Plan required for subdivisions?	Section A.3.3.D — Yes, for major subdivisions (10+ lots or street/stormwater construction). Sketch Plan must be approved by City Staff before the Preliminary Plat application is considered complete.
How long does a final plat approval remain valid?	Section A.3.3.F and A.3.3.G — Final plat approval expires if the plat is not recorded at the Sumter County Register of Deeds within 90 days of City Staff approval.
Do variance approvals expire?	Section A.3.4.A — No. Variance approvals do not expire. However, they also do not create a vested right for a specific development project.
Do special exception approvals expire?	Section A.3.4.B — Yes. Special exception approvals expire if action is not taken within 6 months of BZA approval.
Can a variance be used to allow an otherwise prohibited use?	Section A.3.4.A — No. The BZA may not grant a variance that would establish a use not otherwise permitted in a zoning district.
Do UDO violations transfer with a property sale?	Section A.4.1 — Yes. Violations run with the land and are not voided by sale or transfer.
Where are definitions located?	Section A.5 — Definitions are at the beginning of the UDO in Chapter A (not at the end as in the Current Code's Article 10).
What are the new tree classifications?	Section A.5 — Canopy Tree: mature height over 40 ft. Understory Tree: 15–40 ft. at maturity. Significant Tree: 10–29 inches DBH. Historic Tree: 30+ inches DBH.

— END OF CODE COMPARISON REPORT —

Prepared for City of Sumter | Kimley-Horn | Chapter A | Draft May 11, 2026