



Richland County Council

PROPERTY DISTRIBUTION MANAGEMENT AD HOC COMMITTEE

NOVEMBER 27, 2018 – 12:00 PM

4th Floor Conference Room

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

Yvonne McBride	Calvin “Chip” Jackson	Dalhi Myers
District Three	District Nine	District Ten

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 5, 2018 [PAGES 2-9]**
4. **Department of Juvenile Justice – Staff Recommendation of O’Neil Court for a new location [ACTION] [PAGES 10-12]**
5. **COMET Request for a temporary bus stop on the Dillard’s property at Columbia Place Mall [ACTION] [PAGES 13-14]**
6. **Report on the possible use of the Brookfield Drive property [PAGES 15-17]**
7. **Update on the real property purchase/divestiture policy as requested by Councilman Malinowski**
8. **Letter requesting County to purchase property at 215 Monticello Road [ACTION] [PAGES 18-19]**
9. **Adjournment**

The Honorable Dalhi Myers

Special Accommodations and Interpreter Services Citizens may be present during any of the County’s meetings. If requested, the agenda and backup materials will be made available in alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), as amended and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Any person who requires a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in the public meeting may request such modification, accommodation, aid or service by contacting the Clerk of Council’s office either in person at 2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC, by telephone at (803) 576-2068, or TDD at 803-576-2045 no later than 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.



Richland County Council
Property Distribution Management Ad Hoc Committee
November 5, 2018 – 11:30 AM
Administration Conference Room
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Dalhi Myers, Chair; Yvonne McBride, and Calvin Jackson

OTHERS PRESENT: Jim Manning, Paul Livingston, Greg Pearce, Michelle Onley, Stacey Hamm, Michael Niermeier, Sandra Yudice, Brandon Madden, Edward Gomeau, and Katharine Thibaudeau

1. **Call to Order** – Ms. Myers called the meeting to order at approximately 11:30 AM
2. **Approval of Minutes**
 - a. October 15, 2018 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve the minutes as corrected. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **Adoption of Agenda** – Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to adopt the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Myers welcomed Mr. Gomeau to his first meeting of the committee.

4. **Department of Juvenile Justice – Report on the Staff Recommendation for new location on the O’Neil Court property** – Dr. Yudice stated the remaining employees from DJJ are at the courthouse. They have a deadline of December 31st to vacate that facility. The staff recommendation is to rehabilitate the O’Neil Court property to house the DJJ operations.

Mr. Niermeier stated the longer term solution they have found is the rehabilitation of the O’Neil Court property. However, in the short-term that rehabilitation cannot occur by the December 31st deadline. The staff recommendation is to use one of the available facility, which, more than likely, can be rehabilitated for use by the end of December. He has not had a chance to discuss anything with DJJ on this. Operational Services looked into the use of a certain amount of square footage in the Health Department Building and directly across the street at All Medical. Although DJJ has looked at the All Medical and did not find it completely acceptable, it would be a compromise in the short-term to use that for some of their staff that comes and goes. The building is in decent shape compared to O’Neil Court property. The only other option would be the Haverty’s, but he thinks that would cost a little bit more.

Ms. McBride inquired, of the 2 options, which does DJJ prefer.

Mr. Niermeier stated he has not had the discussion.

Property Distribution Management Ad Hoc Committee
November 5, 2018

Ms. Monique McDaniels, Senior Strategist for DJJ, stated they would prefer the O'Neil Court property, opposed to separating their operations, which is one of the hindrances, and stopped them from coming to 2000 Hampton in the beginning. She inquired if they could negotiate something where they could stay where they are until the O'Neil property is completed, or is it absolutely that we have to vacate the courthouse.

Mr. Niermeier stated he was going on the correspondence from the Clerk of Court had stated. If there is something different, he is not aware of it.

The personnel from DJJ stated they have not received any correspondence from the Clerk of Court regarding the December 31st date.

Ms. Myers stated there is back and forth correspondence between DJJ, by way of Freddie Pough, and the Clerk of Court. She inquired if they were aware of that correspondence.

They responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated the letter from Mr. Pough indicates you are aware of the Clerk of Court's letter, and the need to vacate.

The need is for part of the staff to vacate. They have done some improvements to the courthouse where they still have approximately 14 staff at the courthouse. They had removed half of the staff to one of the older, unused portions of a campus. It was their understanding those staff would be able to stay in the courthouse indefinitely. They were not given a timeframe for which those staff needed to be removed from the courthouse. They understood that was a permanent situation that they could keep staff in the courthouse.

Ms. McDaniels stated the December 31st date is very new to them, as far as, saying that all of the DJJ operations needs to be out of the courthouse.

Ms. Myers stated the letter from Mr. Pough requests that his entire staff ultimately be united in one area. Let's assume that is true, we have a letter before us from DJJ that says, "ultimately we all want to be in the same place" and that is different from what you are saying with the request for an indefinite space at the courthouse. Mr. Pough is saying that, while we would have some temporary home there, we ultimately want our whole staff in the same place.

Ms. McDaniels stated, when the Clerk of Court asked us to vacate part of our operations out of the courthouse, we requested the County find a space for them. Ultimately, we want all of our employees together. However, the December 31st, that Mr. Niermeier just spoke of, saying that we have to vacate the rest of our staff out of the courthouse is new information. If the County can accommodate all of the staff being in one location, that is what they are requesting. She stated they have already moved part of their staff, upon the Clerk of Court's request, so they thought that would be a temporary fix until the County would be able to assist them with finding space to relocate those individuals, with the hope that everyone could be located together.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, her question should have been, excluding O'Neil Court, there were 2 other options. The other options are what she was concerned about. In defense of the Clerk of Court since she is not here, and she has been involved in some of the conversations, she thinks we are hearing one side and not the other side of what actually took place. The Clerk of Court should have probably should have been at this meeting. The question we were dealing with, that was at hand, was which of the 2 options. The

Property Distribution Management Ad Hoc Committee
November 5, 2018

-2-

one across the street...and what was the other one?

Mr. Niermeier stated the only other building we have available, that is suitable, would be Haverty's.

Ms. McBride thought there were 2...

Mr. Niermeier stated there is space within 2000 Hampton, and the additional space would be across the street in the former All Medical property. He stated we do not have enough space in one, but between the 2 we have enough space.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, they would need both buildings. She was thinking there were 2, and you had an option between one or the other.

Mr. C. Jackson stated this is a little frustrating. He stated we had this conversation prior to the October 15th meeting, and it was a major discussion. We knew then that the December deadline was approaching, so to hear this morning that we have not had a conversation with the people affected by a deadline that is less 60 days away is disturbing. And, to also hear that the space we talked about, at that meeting, is probably not going to be available, and even the space that is being suggested, the phrase was used "we hope it can be made available", as the clock ticks. He stated we should not be trying to hash this out in this committee meeting. This is not the place for this to be resolved. This needs to be resolved between Mr. Niermeier and the appropriate DJJ staff, and come back with a recommendation. If that means you have to meet this afternoon, tonight, etc. Whatever it takes to resolve it, but he does not think it is appropriate, or fair, to Ms. McDaniels, and others, to be negotiating in here with you about where is the best space, and where they can go. He apologized, if that sounds a little harsh. He does not mean for it to be, but he does not think that we should be having this discussion today when we had this conversation almost a month ago, and we sound like we are no further along today than we were prior to the October 15th meeting.

Ms. Myers stated she would like to add that, despite the fact the staff has given us a briefing document, and a recommendation, she would be extremely uncomfortable voting on any space, on DJJ's behalf, that no one from their team has visited, and has come back and said is appropriate. She stated she does not know their needs. She does not know if this is the forum for us to be hashing out DJJ's space needs.

Ms. McBride stated she concurs with both of her colleagues, with the understanding that this has been going on for a number of years. This just did not happen overnight. We need to meet with DJJ, the Clerk of Court, if necessary, to determine the next steps. She stated, at this point, she could not vote one way or the other on it.

Ms. Myers suggested entertaining a motion to put some timelines around giving staff some room to negotiate and discuss with DJJ their needs, and give a deadline to come back, so we can meet the needs that have been identified by the Clerk of Court, as well as, DJJ. That we not summarily displace DJJ.

Mr. Niermeier stated, based on what Ms. McDaniels just said, it was new information to him that they are actually allowed to stay in the courthouse.

Ms. Myers stated that is beside the point. The issue is they have to be at the table for a discussion of their space. Whether they are going to stay at the court, or leave the court altogether, the discussion has to start with them.

Ms. McBride stated they do not have the final decision because you have to involve the Clerk of Court. She inquired as to when the former All Medical can be completed because they need to have a place, so we need

to, at least, have some timeframes from when the other buildings can be completed.

Ms. Myers stated all of that conversation begins with them talking about what space might be appropriate. If we decided the All Medical building could be ready tomorrow, but they say that building is not suitable for their needs, it does not matter.

Ms. McBride stated we need a timeframe, in terms of the 2000 Hampton street building, and a timeframe for them to get together to talk and make a decision because we do not have that much time left.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to direct staff to get with DJJ and come back with a recommendation by November 9th, with regards to an agreed upon location or relocation of DJJ offices. The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **Update on the Richland Library request to use the Old Antique Mall Parking Lot** – Dr. Yudice stated the County received a proposal from the Library to use the parking lot of the Old Antique Mall, as overflow parking for their events, or for employee parking. She stated we have not made a decision on what to do with that property.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he is puzzled. If they need parking, and we own the space, what decision is there we need to make, except let them use the space.

Dr. Yudice responded for the County to enter into an MOU with Library for the use of the space for employee parking, or overflow parking during event. The Library would assume maintenance of the property.

Ms. Myers stated, in the briefing document, staff suggested there are maintenance and safety issues with the property. She inquired if the property is useable without improvements.

Dr. Yudice stated the Library will have to stripe the property. The County will likely have to tear down the building because it is not useable. It is her understanding, there is asbestos in the building.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, can the Library use the parking lot without us doing anything to the site.

Dr. Yudice responded, more than likely.

Ms. Myers stated they can use the parking lot without us doing anything to the site. And, the Library is happy to do whatever upgrading and maintenance to the parking lot that needs to be done.

Dr. Yudice responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated, in letting them use it, do we run into an issue for when we decide that we have demo the building. She stated we can easily draft an agreement that covers that possibility, and states they can use it “at our pleasure.”

Ms. McBride stated her concern was to spell it out that this is just a temporary parking solution for them.

Mr. C. Jackson stated at the snail’s pace that we move, with regards to getting rid of property, approving actions on property and building, the Library does not have to worry about it anytime in the near future.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride to direct Mr. Smith to draft an MOU, with the Library, to

authorize them to be able to use the parking space, and include in the MOU all of the necessary restrictions, requirements and notices that, if in fact we have to require them to vacate it, we would do that in the appropriate manner.

Ms. Myers made a friendly amendment that whatever liability arises from it, the Library is clear that is their responsibility, and it is exclusively for the use for that purpose.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **Report on the possible use of the Brookfield Drive property for a new Dentsville Magistrate facility** – Dr. Yudice stated this is the property that School District II wants to donate to the County. The staff's recommendation is to accept the donation of the property for the Dentsville Magistrate facility.

Ms. McBride stated one recommendation is for us to accept the property. Another recommendation is to use the property for the Dentsville Magistrate, so there are 2 separate issues we are dealing with. She stated she would be willing to divide those 2 issues.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to accept the property from School District II.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the recommendation is simply to accept the recommendation, or does it include using it for the Dentsville Magistrate's Office.

Mr. Madden stated the thought behind staff's recommendation is if we are going to accept it, to have a use for it. If there was not a use, then the recommendation would be not to accept the property.

Ms. McBride stated she asked to divide the question because she does not think a decision has been made regarding the magistrate offices, so she would hate to vote to use the property for the magistrate's office when we have other magistrate offices we are looking at.

Ms. Myers inquired, if we did not use the property for the Dentsville Magistrate Office, would staff recommend that we not accept the property at all.

Dr. Yudice responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, only if we are going to use it for this purpose, would you say we should accept it.

Dr. Yudice stated staff has not found any other use for the property, at this time, other than the magistrate office.

Mr. Manning inquired if there was no reference to the property, and possible use, in the County's Master Plan for Greater Woodfield and Decker.

Mr. Niermeier stated he has not looked that far.

Dr. Yudice stated, not that she knows of.

Mr. Manning stated they may want to consider that. He does not know that for a fact, but something is ringing a bell in the 85-page master plan, that there may be some talk about uses within the County's approved master plan for that property.

Property Distribution Management Ad Hoc Committee
November 5, 2018

Mr. Livingston stated he remembers, at the last meeting, that he stressed the importance of meeting with the Chief Magistrate and talking about the use of this property before we move forward. He does not think it is fair to the Chief Magistrate to make this decision, about the use of this property, without any direct feedback from him. If there is a vote to say we are not going to accept this property because we do not want to use it for a magistrate office, it is not fair to the Chief Magistrate. That is why he suggested, at the last meeting, that we have that conversation first.

Ms. Myers stated she was going to suggest that staff consult the master plan and we look at whether the property is generally useful for the County, and not in the context of any magistrate office. She thinks that is the question this committee is saying. Can we use it for something that, perhaps may include a magistrate's office, but aside from that is there a use for it that can be made, and is there a good reason to accept the donation? She thinks what we are asking is, the overarching question, can you tell us if there is a general use, outside of a magistrate facility, for this property.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he was going to follow-up with a comment, that Mr. Manning made, if in fact, there is a question that there may be some possible identified use, we should research that first, before we take any action.

Mr. C. Jackson made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. McBride, to instruct the staff to explore potential uses for the property, generally, in harmony with the Master Plan. The vote in favor was unanimous.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

***The committee went into Executive Session at approximately 12:06 PM
and came out at approximately 12:20 PM.***

7. **Update on Paso Fino Property divestiture** – Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to accept staff's recommendation and sell the property as is. The vote in favor was unanimous.

8. **Report on Potential Northwest Recycling Center Property** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to accept staff's recommendation not to purchase the Northwest Recycling Center property. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Pearce stated he was thinking forward to the Council meeting, when this item comes up, about the recycling center. He inquired if the Planning Department offered any suggestion as to...this is going to be a problem, if we have to find a site that is heavy industrial for a recycling center. Mr. Malinowski is probably going to want to know, if we are not recommending to buy that, then where are we going to go.

Mr. Madden stated Planning did not offer an alternative site.

Mr. Pearce inquired if we have a plan, as to what we do. Do we just go back to the drawing board?

Mr. Madden stated it is a part of our Capital Improvement Project. In that process, they will identify sites that they could have potentially have a center. There are other sites available, Planning just would not recommend one. The hurdle that will have to be jumped over is finding one that can be zoned industrial. It is use of a recycling center that makes it challenging. He stated he knows they can find a property. It is just having a property that the Solid Waste fund can support purchasing and one we can fund through our CIP.

Property Distribution Management Ad Hoc Committee
November 5, 2018

-6-

Mr. Pearce stated he would suggest, respectfully, that when you make your motion to decline this that you offer some guidance as to where to proceed in the future, not only with finding property, but meeting with the Planning Commission, and getting their okay before bringing it back. It seems to him; an awful lot of time was spent, only to find out we could not do what we wanted to do. It could have been avoided if someone had thought about that a long time ago.

Ms. McBride inquired about how urgent it is for us to have a recycling center in that area, at this time.

Mr. Madden stated it was a part of Solid Waste's long-term plan to expand. Right now we just have the one in the Lower Richland area, so they wanted to eventually have a 2nd site, as the County continues to grow in the Northwest portion of the County.

Ms. McBride stated it is a part of a long-term, so it is not so much of an urgent need right now.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, however, he would say that Solid Waste also has, in their plan, the creation of a site in the Northeast. There is a temporary recycling spot on Clemson Road at the Clemson Research Center. Specific plans, or discussions, were being had with regards to doing the same thing in the Northeast. He stated, his point is, that we really think about this more holistically Countywide because once you resolve the Northwest issue, the next one immediately arising is the Northeast issue. He stated it might not be necessarily urgent, but there are things, in the near future that Planning and/or Solid Waste had on their drawing board.

Ms. McBride stated she was thinking staff would have ample time to investigate and look at other properties. She knows, within the overall plan, there are a lot of things that are set that are long-term, and she does not know the overall priorities for different areas.

Ms. Myers stated, in harmony with what Mr. Pearce, Mr. C. Jackson and Ms. McBride are saying, she would note that some of the issues that have arisen here today, for the third time, is that sometimes we silo ourselves off too much. One group is busy doing something, and there is not enough input from the other groups, so that when we come up with what is a solution/plan, the stakeholders may or may not be able to support it because of the method that we used to get to the plan. She thinks what we are pointing out is the need for a more holistic way of approaching it.

Dr. Yudice stated that will be addressed in the Capital Improvement Program.

9. **Inquiry from party interested in purchase of Sears and/or Dillard's property** – Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to instruct the Interim Administrator to send a letter to the prospective buyers that we are not interested in selling, at this time. Also, include in the letter, to offer them guidance or recommendation on considering other property in Columbia Place Mall that may be available, if they have not investigated it. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. C. Jackson thanked Ms. Myers and Ms. McBride for validating the importance of the committee. He stated he is sure there were skeptics, when this committee was first formed, that may have wondered whether or not there was a need to do this, or whether this was a backdoor effort to try to reestablish Renaissance. It has been clear from today's agenda, and the last agenda, that the items we are talking about are critical issues that have not been handled in a formal committee meeting. As a result of that, we are faced with some major decisions, and deadlines, that are rapidly approaching us. Without this committee, he is not sure what we would be doing about them. He stated the other Council members that are here today have offered some value input to help us be able to do what is necessary to resolve some of these issues and get them off the table.

Property Distribution Management Ad Hoc Committee
November 5, 2018

-7-

Dr. Yudice stated, from the previous committee agenda, there are some items that were not reported out at the last Council meeting.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Ms. Myers stated it has been, at least for her, a sad and happy occasion, to note, when people go off hunting for really smart people, to run counties, they do their sourcing in Richland County. She congratulated Mr. Madden and Ms. Hegler no their future endeavors.

10. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:29 PM



Memorandum

07 November 2018
CP 01-06

From: Michael A. Niermeier, Capital Projects Manager
To: Dr. Sandra Yudice, Assistance Administrator

CC: Mr. Edward Geumeo, Interim County Administrator
Ms. Jeanette McBride, Richland County Clerk of Court
Mr. Freddie Pough, Director, South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice
Ms. Katherine Pierson, Juvenile and Family Relations, South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice
Ms. Monique McDaniels, Senior Strategist, South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice
Mr. Randy Pruitt, Director, Operational Services
Hon. Tomothy Edmond, Chief Magistrate, Richland County Summary Court

Subject: Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) Space Needs Meeting, November 7, 2018

This memorandum serves as a record of decisions made during the subject meeting among Richland County, Clerk of Court, and Department of Juvenile Justice. The purpose of the meeting was to clarify information and develop an acceptable plan for relocation of DJJ from the Richland County Court House. A staff recommendation will be presented to County Council for action.

The following decisions and actions were agreed upon.

1. DJJ favors using the County's 144 Oneil Court property as a long term solution to address their space needs.
2. The Clerk of Court has agreed to allow DJJ personnel to remain in the Courthouse no later than March 31, 2019, to allow the County to up fit the Oneil Court property and for DJJ to begin procurement actions for relocating their server and network.
3. County Staff will submit a recommendation for property use to the Property Distribution Management Ad Hoc Committee asking permission to up-fit the Oneil Court property for use by DJJ. This request will include a cost estimate.

Please let me know if there are further questions.

Michael A. Niermeier
Capital Projects Program Manager

Recommendations- DJJ Space Needs

- Issue: DJJ will lose all of its space in the Court House in December 2018. Richland County is responsible to provide an adequate facility for DJJ.
- Discussion: Richland County has property available for immediate reconfiguration and use to meeting the space needs of the DJJ personnel.
- Recommendation: Utilize the County Property located at 144 O'Neil Court for DJJ offices.

Department of Juvenile Justice

- In July 2017, DJJ had and estimated 6,278 usable square feet in the Judicial Center
- The 144 O'Neal Court property provides 7,865 sf plus parking on .735 acres





TO: Michael Niermeier, Capital Projects Manager

FROM: Samuel L. Scheib, director of planning and development

CC: John Andoh, executive director/CEO


DATE: November 21, 2018

SUBJECT: Temporary Columbia Place Mall Connection Protection Zone


As discussed in meetings, phone calls, and email exchanges, The COMET has for many years served the Columbia Place Mall using a substandard and ADA non-compliant stop that is heavily used as the agency has not had a means to improve the stop in the past. Since 2014 The COMET has attempted to outfit several of the bus stops within the mall property with shelters and other related amenities. Unfortunately, these efforts have proven unsuccessful. Before now, neither the City of Columbia, Richland County, nor the South Carolina Department of Transportation owned any right-of-way within the mall property or an adjacent parcel. As such, The COMET has been compelled to negotiate easement agreements with private property owners. To date, none of the property owners approached have agreed to grant the CMRTA permission for the construction and operation of a transit amenity.

You have expressed interest in improving the Columbia Place Mall for transit as part of Richland County's acquisition and reuse of the mall for multiple county administration functions. County Council's need for deliberation, however, is here at odds with The COMET's pressing needs to use the site for operations, allowing multiple routes to converge for transfers. We would like to propose an interim solution that would be impermanent—allowing the county to study the entire property appropriately—but still a functional near-term solution for The COMET.

The photo on the following page shows the area in front of the former Dillard's department store. Using only paint and removable bollards, The COMET could mark the pavement next to parking island #5 (labeled as "Bus loading zone") and make a safe place for passengers to transfer between buses. The vehicles would travel through the parking lot according to the white arrow ("Path of travel"). There would be no shelters in place and this would be considered by both parties a temporary arrangement put in place for the comfort and efficient travel of our passengers. The COMET could put this in place within weeks of the approval by Richland County.



Decker/ Brookfield:



- Richland School District Two owns a 19 acre undeveloped tract of land directly across Brookfield Road from the high school. The District has contemplated using this land for additional playing fields / for the school, but such fields could potentially be made available to area residents as well through a joint-use agreement with the Recreation Commission. – page 17




- Area schools, in conjunction with the Recreation Council if necessary, could publicize, program, and make more accessible the use of school facilities for area residents. For example, at Richland Northeast High School, one of the main points of access to the campus playing fields

from the Woodfield Park neighborhood is typically locked. Having a pedestrian accessible entrance might facilitate more casual use of the school's facilities. – page 17

- Portion of the parcel is a priority need for side walk – page 34
- Pedestrian/bike connector/path is suggested to go through the property – page 34
- Promoting active community uses, such as parks and greenways, in the undeveloped, natural areas of the corridor will help to provide positive activity that will deter criminal activity in these locations that are currently hidden and unobserved. – page 47
- As noted in the previous section and in the community survey, crime and safety are priority issues for the study area -- both the reality of crime as well as the perception of crime. Area residents who completed the Community Survey indicated that "Safety" was the most critical factor in the success of the revitalization of the Decker Boulevard area. – page 47

<http://www.richlandcountysc.gov/Portals/0/Departments/Planning/NeighborhoodPlanning/MasterPlans/Decker.pdf>

Trenholm/ Newcastle:



- The plan is from 2009
- Focuses on missed-use development for living and retail as well as neighborhood parks

<http://www.richlandcountysc.gov/Portals/0/Departments/Planning/NeighborhoodPlanning/MasterPlans/Trenholm.pdf>

Comprehensive Plan:

- Does not directly state anything about the parcel or the area around Brookfield Road

http://www.richlandcountysc.gov/Portals/0/Departments/Planning/ADOPTED_RC_2015CompPlan.pdf



MEMORANDUM

November 21, 2018

From: Katharine Thibaudeau
To: Michael Niermeier, Capital Projects Program Manager
Subject: 215 Monticello Road Sale Inquiry

A request was received from Starkes Realty, LLC to sell a parcel of land located at 215 Monticello Road. This memo serves to evaluate the utility of the land for County purposes. As such, the Richland County Comprehensive Plan, the Richland County Neighborhood Plans, and the Sustainable Energy plan were all examined to determine the if the proposed parcel of land would aid Richland County in fulfilling these plans.

Parcel R06600-03-09 is a 1.88 acre RU (Rural District) parcel located in Council District 2. 215 Monticello Road has been mapped as a future neighborhood (low density) area and closely borders an area planned as rural (large lot), according to the Future Land Use and Priority Investment Area map of Richland County in the Richland County Comprehensive Plan. This area has not been zoned as a community, neighborhood, or rural activity center, nor is it zoned as a priority investment area. There is no other mention of this area or a specific mention of the parcel in the comprehensive plan.

After a search of the Richland County neighborhood plans, 215 Monticello Road does not fall within the boundaries of any of the current neighborhood plans. In addition, The Sustainable Energy Plan for the Midland Region does not indicate a use for the property on Monticello Road. As such, it is concluded parcel R06600-03-09 is not essential to fulfilling any current projects for Richland County.

Recommendation: The staff recommends declining the invitation to purchase the property and to authorize staff to respond to the sellers agent appropriately.

Doris Starkes

1817 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29201

Office: 803.758.2882/Cell: 803.587.2335 Email: doris@starkesrealty.com



November 8, 2018

Richland County Government
ATTN: Capital Projects
2020 Hampton Street, 4th Floor
Columbia, SC 29202

RE: Proposal for Sale: 1.88 acres
215 Monticello Road
Columbia, SC 29203
TMS R06600-03-09

Dear Richland County Government,

My name is Doris Starkes, Agent, Starkes Realty LLC. I have an out of state client who owns a parcel of land as referenced above and wishes to sell.

It is my understanding that this parcel is located near a public golf course. Since the parcel is located near a public golf course, I am sending this proposal to Richland County to ascertain the County's interest and possible sale.

Please advise on the County's interest in purchasing referenced property. If the county is interested, please provide the proper paperwork required to consummate the sale.

I look forward to hearing from you with a positive response. Thank you for your time and effort on this matter.

Sincerely,

Doris Starkes, Agent

