



## Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum

8-13-25

The Anderson County LUDO project is an effort to prepare a new unified development ordinance for unincorporated Anderson County as well as updates to the Land Use Element and Community Facility Element of the County's Comprehensive Plan. The project seeks to clarify and improve the development regulations while also establishing clearer policy guidance for land use regulation in the County.

Task 1, Project Initiation, of the LUDO project includes a series of thirteen interviews with stakeholders about their views on what is working or not working with the County's current regulations and development review process, as well as discussion about how to better address the growth challenges facing the County. This document summarizes the input collected through interviews with the County Council and County-identified stakeholders listed in the table below. Interviews were conducted in-person and virtually over several days from April through June 2025.

This report summarizes the comments provided. The information collected during the interviews is not attributed to any one individual. Thoughts and ideas are paraphrased, grouped by topic, and consolidated in cases where multiple people expressed the same or similar sentiments. The input is not prioritized or listed in any particular order.

Interviewees were encouraged to share their thoughts freely, but were asked the following three questions:

- What aspects of the County's current regulations are problematic?
- What parts of the County's current application review process are in need of improvement?
- What parts of the County's current regulations or review process should not be changed?

The table below identifies the 22 County-identified project stakeholders interviewed.

STAKEHOLDER		AFFILIATION
Terry Jackson Jr.	President	Lake Hartwell Owner's Association
Tom Dobbins	Farmer	Assoc. Dean Clemson University
Thompson Smith		Farm Bureau
David Phillips		Realtor
Aimee Gray		Starr, Iva area
Charlene Spelts	Community Activist	Piedmont area
Kris Yon	Community Activist	
Wess Grant		Anderson School District 5
Eddie Kinsey	Realtor	Anderson Realty
Kenny Jeffcoat	Realtor	Anderson Realty
Wesley White	Engineer	Ridgewater Engineering & Surveying
Allie Martinsen	Land Policy Manager	Upstate Forever
Michael Dey	Dir. of Governmental Affairs	Western Upstate Assoc. of Realtors
Dr. Barry Knocks	Professor	Clemson University





## Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum

8-13-25

STAKEHOLDER		AFFILIATION
Omar Rash		Anderson University
Charles Dickerson		Anderson University
Brett Hawthorne	Inventory Manager	NVR Ryan Homes
Todd Harper	Acquisition Manager	Four Star Homes
Tricia Chassen	Entitlements Director	Four Star Homes
Cameron Brogdan	Land Acquisition	DR Horton
Finn Loftus	Acquisition Manager	Eastwood Homes
Chip Morrison	Land Acquisition	Four Star Homes

In addition to interviews with the 22 stakeholders listed above, the consulting team also conducted interviews with the following seven County Council Members:

- Glenn Davis
- Greg Elgin
- Jimmy Davis
- Cindy Wilson
- Brett Sanders
- Chris Sullivan, Vice Chairman
- Tommy Dunn, Chairman

The following pages provide a summary of the input collected from the Council members and stakeholders listed in the table above. Individual responses have been summarized into six topic areas. Similar thoughts or ideas are consolidated for the sake of brevity. These comments are summarized from the opinions of stakeholders and may or may not properly characterize current requirements or represent broad community sentiment. This information is used by the consulting team to identify trends and areas of focus for more discussion as the LUDO project progresses.

Prior to the listing of individual interviewee comments, there are a series of general observations about the project, drawn from the input collected thus far.





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

8-13-25

### **GENERAL OBSERVATIONS BASED ON INPUT RECEIVED**

The following are some preliminary observations about Anderson County and the LUDO project based on the input received and the consulting teams basic understanding of conditions in Anderson County. These observations are likely to evolve and become more refined as the project progresses.

- The County already has a wide array of zoning-like provisions (from Chapter 24 of the County Code of Ordinances) in place throughout the County (there are standards for parking, landscaping, signs, stormwater, setbacks, lot access, and numerous use standards that already apply county-wide). The LUDO project anticipates changes to both the zoning provisions in Chapter 48 as well as changes to the land use regulations in Chapter 24 – the project will have impacts on all lands in the unincorporated County.
- The County has two different contexts – suburban areas facing intense growth pressure and rural areas without significant growth pressure. In suburban contexts, the development rules need to help manage the pace of growth and ensure infrastructure capacity is maintained. In rural areas development rules need to protect open space and agricultural character, and ensure compatibility between existing and new land uses. Both zoning and land use provisions need to be better calibrated to these different contexts.
- The County has had great success with economic development efforts to attract new industries. In many cases, these new industrial facilities locate in areas where land prices are the most affordable. As a result, a new need for additional housing arises, often in areas proximate to where the jobs are created. This is one of the main engines driving growth and where it is located, and the role of the County's economic development efforts must be factored into the thinking about if, where, and how the County will grow in the future.
- Economic development initiatives are driving infrastructure extension. Extension of infrastructure increases land costs. Land costs are an important part of the calculus when proposing new residential development, and when land costs rise as a percentage of total development costs, the typical result is smaller lots and less expensive materials as developers work to maintain profitability. If development is not profitable, it will not take place. If it does not take place, there are not enough homes to house employees needed by new industry.
- There are strong desires to maintain and protect the County's established community character, including its agricultural heritage. Many residents express concern about a loss of community character and environmental degradation that could potentially be occurring as a result of new development. Irrespective of the desire to control the rate, timing, or location of new growth, there is a strong community sentiment to improve development quality generally.

Input collected from individual County Council members and project stakeholders are organized into six sections and are listed on the following pages.





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

8-13-25

### **INPUT SUMMARY**

Council member and stakeholder input statements are summarized into the following six categories:

- A. Community Character
- B. Zoning, Generally
- C. Challenges and Concerns Over Growth
- D. Goals for Improved Development Standards
- E. Goals for Improved Development Review Processes
- F. Suggestions for Participation in the LUDO Process

Comments are not attributed to any particular individual, and are in no particular order or priority. Statements are numbered for ease of reference. Readers are reminded that these are individual opinions, and are not asserted as facts.

### **A. COMMUNITY CHARACTER**

1. There are really 2 Anderson Counties: 1 is rural and 1 is suburban.
2. Shirley's Store, Creightonville, Ebenezer, Rock Springs are all in the midst of getting signatures for a zoning vote and people in these areas have indicated they do not want "dense housing" (where dense housing means big houses on little lots)
3. There is a lot of old farmland in Anderson County, thus there is a lot of land that is relatively easy to develop
4. There is a desire to maintain rural character along the Highway 29 Corridor
5. Honey Creek is a great example of a "good" subdivision – built in the 1980's, larger lots, brick homes, well-maintained, deeper setbacks
6. Agricultural production is important in Anderson County
7. District 4 (Powdersville) has had tremendous growth, and remains very fast-growing – significant amount of tract residential
8. Many in Anderson County have concerns about new "tract-home" developments; Some feel there are vocal "newcomers" who are changing everything
9. The City of Anderson has an aggressive annexation stance (such as has been seen in the area of the east-west connector)
10. There is distrust between residents and the county government as well as distrust between existing residents and new developers
11. There is a concern about a loss of community character as new large subdivision tracts are developed





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

8-13-25

### **A. COMMUNITY CHARACTER - continued**

12. There is a desire to preserve rural land and focus growth around the I-95 corridor. The County's location makes it a desirable spot for distribution centers
13. Neighboring jurisdictions (like Greenville County) are "closing the doors to growth" while Anderson's door is still open, leading to out-of-town tract developers coming into Anderson County and building tract homes – this can lower property values over the long term, particularly in cases of economic downturns when developments are partially finished or when people become "upside down" on mortgage owed to house value
14. There are 5 school districts in Anderson County, and each one approaches growth and development differently. For example the district centered on Powdersville does not wish to see any additional new development
15. School District #5 is the largest school district in the County and is based primarily in the City of Anderson. Enrollment is expected to decline in the next 5 years, then rise slightly after that, with a total of 1% increase over the next 10 years – fairly stable
16. While there are 2 high schools and 2 middle schools at or near capacity (in District 5) they are not in panic mode right now (4 of the 5 elementary schools are under-utilized)
17. In 2006-2007 the County issued 1,500 building permits for new residential starts – more so than any year since (they average around 1,300 new residential building permits per year now)
18. In the late 1990's the lot sales price accounted for about 12% of the total finished house cost; by 2025 the lot sales price is around 25% of the finished house cost (sweet spot is around 15%)
19. Greenville County is "slamming the door" on new growth and development (such as taking steps to end cluster development and exploring character/design standards for houses), and this is one of the main causes for increased growth pressure in Anderson County
20. Anderson County is promoting economic development projects in rural areas, and housing has a tendency to follow – economic development efforts are driving sprawl and contributing to housing affordability issues
21. Interestingly, the places that want growth don't have the infrastructure to accommodate it and the places that have the infrastructure don't want the growth
22. The average home price in Anderson County has gone from \$239,000 to \$407,000 over the last 5 years and the average Anderson County earner can not afford a \$407,000 home
23. 1 acre lots are required if there is no water or sewer service available, but lot sizes can be reduced downwards to 10,000 sf with water and sewer service. 1 acre lots are too big given land prices





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

---

8-13-25

### **B. ZONING, GENERALLY**

1. Zoning has two roles to play, depending on the local context: in developing or suburban areas, zoning can help manage growth. In rural or undeveloped areas, zoning can protect open space and protect existing development from new incompatible growth
2. There is a desire for more ethics in local government
3. There was a recent good experience with establishing zoning (Double Springs) – the main problem with establishing zoning is that many people don't understand it and there is a lot of confusion or misinformation
4. If land has water and sewer, it really also needs zoning. The addition of water can cause land prices to increase from \$5,000/acre to \$25,000 per acre – that has impacts on development
5. Recent annexation to the City of Anderson can in part be explained by the lack of zoning around the City in unincorporated areas – people want to rezone, but the County can not or will not allow change. The City allows people to request any zoning, and that is an enticement
6. The County's current process for getting zoning in place (via the precinct referendum process) is too difficult – particularly the 15% of signatures required to start the process while some people think zoning is socialism, there should be an easier way for communities who want zoning to have it
7. Some like the approach used in Greenville where new zoning can be established without first requiring a referendum
8. One reason why the County uses the referendum process was that in past times, the County would apply zoning without sufficient public knowledge and there is a trust issue
9. Residents in rural areas want protection but do not necessarily want zoning
10. Some farmers are distrustful of zoning – why would they want to limit development if in doing so they limit their potential income from sales of land?
11. Zoning can protect land from incompatible development and creates a process to do development outside of the courts
12. The County's land development regulations (Chapter 24) are minimum standards to protect health and safety but do not control uses. One needs zoning to control uses and to deal with density. Zoning can also address the scale of impacts from uses [NOTE: Ch 24 does contain use-specific standards and minimum lot sizes do control density]
13. Some feel that zoning density limits drive up housing costs and higher densities allow the creation of more affordable homes





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

---

8-13-25

### **B. ZONING, GENERALLY - continued**

14. Some note that higher by-right residential densities in target locations may lead to fewer applications for high density development and more lower density development applications outside of target areas
15. Zoning is not necessarily about shutting down development it just about making sure we get the type of growth we want. Comp Plan is to guide us where we want to be.
16. Is there a way to tailor zoning to different contexts, some rules in some places, more rules in other places where needed?
17. There is little-to-no support for the kinds of rules typically associated with homeowner associations in Anderson County
18. Many County residents have concerns about perceived incompatible uses locating near their land or neighborhood, and thus understand how zoning can protect them from undesirable uses





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

---

8-13-25

### **C. CHALLENGES AND CONCERNS OVER GROWTH**

1. Water quality is a problem – there is an excessive amount of grading and mass grading, as well as an abuse of grading rules
2. School districts and County Council district boundaries are not the same. This can make governance more difficult
3. The County needs better zoning districts and more informed citizens
4. Seems like many or most developers are not from the Anderson County area - promises are made to surrounding residents about new development, but seldom kept. Residents hear how new positive change is coming to their area, but the positive change never happens
5. One area wanted deeper front setbacks for new surrounding development, but the request was not approved by the County
6. There is a lot of unplanned growth throughout the State
7. Tax structure is also a problem – new growth does not pay for itself
8. We need to do a better job managing growth
9. Getting to the fields with your tractor is becoming impossible in some parts of the County (can only move tractors during dark to avoid traffic)
10. Tract home developments are taking away existing farmland
11. The County needs to slow the rate of growth down
12. Residents want amenities and the benefits from growth (like more shopping choices) but don't want the actual increase in residential development
13. There is a need for workforce housing and a need to help address aging population
14. Growth is uncontrolled from Anderson City
15. Some note that the tax bill for land in City is less than what is charged in the County despite getting more services in the City
16. Some believe the two-year Council member term duration is not helpful for long-range growth planning
17. Some note that establishment of new development was easier in 2015 than 2025







## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

8-13-25

### **C. CHALLENGES AND CONCERNS OVER GROWTH - continued**

18. Some note that housing in Anderson County is getting more expensive, and any standards that increase minimum lot size requirements will likely increase housing costs and do little to help alleviate supply shortages
19. Some note that new industrial development is getting approved, but new residential subdivisions are frequently denied. This is not sustainable as industry needs workers, who need a place to live. In addition, industry is getting tax incentives. Perhaps it is time to ask new industry to help contribute to housing shortage, roadway impacts, costs of growth
20. Some feel the 2016 Land Use Plan was “watered down” and not an effective tool for guiding County actions
21. Farm land in the County is disappearing – farmers can get upwards of \$80,000 per acre for land – suggest the County do a better job encouraging farmland preservation, conservation easements, programs that allow agriculture to continue while farmers can capture a percentage of the land’s value notes that Greenville County funds preservation
22. It seems like Anderson County has been really overwhelmed by growth and development over the last 2-3 years – like its reached a tipping point. The traffic is a big problem, and someone needs to take a step back and think about how to do better planning in the County
23. Some note that the County Staff follows direction of Council, and silence means de-facto support
24. The County is promoting industrial development, and housing is needed to support these efforts
25. Some say the County does not appear to be pro-business
26. 1<sup>st</sup>-time homebuyers want small lots (due to housing costs) but existing residents are an impediment to the kind of housing needed by 1<sup>st</sup>-time home buyers
27. People don’t want “ugly” houses, but aesthetic regulations drive up housing costs
28. Higher land costs can yield lower materials budgets as developers seek to maintain profit margins in the face of land cost increases
29. The SC HBA and realtors are expected to be a source of opposition to new development regulations – there are many large, out-of-town companies who are seeking to develop in Anderson County
30. The County is akin to the “wild, wild west” in terms of regulatory control
31. Some have a desire to gently increase allowable densities in some areas to better support the need to manage growth. Need to communicate the goals and potential outcomes of “missing middle” housing





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

8-13-25

### **D. GOALS FOR IMPROVED DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

1. There is support for incentives and the notion that they may be better than mandates
2. There is a desire to upgrade landscaping and buffer requirements in both zoned and un-zoned areas
3. There is a desire for greater durability and more quality in exterior building materials, especially single-family homes
4. Lots of concern about stream pollution and mass grading
5. There is a desire more open space and more trails – there is insufficient funding for new trails
6. There are problems and concerns with short term rentals – we need to be careful and only prepare rules that the County is capable of enforcing
7. People are concerned about “ugly plastic” houses that are quickly built but that could potentially fall down after the developers have left
8. Quality development is lacking (note: what does “quality” mean?)
9. Traffic and road capacity always come up as concerns from residents, but the County never seems to be able to address these problems – residents want to know what the County is doing
10. There does not seem to be a way to effectively plan for or manage school capacity (Act 388 on school impact fees was shot down by the Legislature)
11. Infrastructure (sewer, electric power, road capacity, bridges) is often a limiting factor; water is abundant, but not unlimited
12. First responders are a problem – some bridges can not support a fire truck; depends upon volunteer firefighters
13. Water runoff is a problem
14. Some in the community want more open space and larger lots
15. Slab on grade houses have been a disaster – cracked foundations, negative appearance. “Tract housing” has become a term that describes neighborhoods of perceived low quality homes with slab foundations, inexpensive materials, and uniform appearance located in areas that used to have rolling hills that are now flattened into building pads on small lots
16. Tract homes have excessive grading and lack sufficient parking on driveways (due to small lot sizes)
17. Mobile homes are a problem in the County – they are hard to sell, hard to title, don’t hold their value, and can negatively impact land values of surroundings – as such the County should require permanent foundations and generally reduce the number of mobile homes





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

8-13-25

### **D. GOALS FOR IMPROVED DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS - continued**

18. Impact fees (like a \$500/house fee for purpose of school capacity) won't solve the problem of managing growth, they will just make housing more expensive, and there are problems with affordable housing
19. There is a desire for protecting prime farmland
20. There is a desire for maintaining the tree canopy
21. There is a desire about managing stormwater runoff
22. There is a desire about limiting mass grading
23. There is a desire for open space preservation
24. There is a desire to avoid nuisance flooding
25. There is some support for conservation subdivisions, but not many local examples (even though they are permitted), and this requires low base densities, available sewer, and permit small lots – visibility of the development from surroundings is a concern
26. One suggestion is a set of incentives or other inducements for affordable housing. The County should not that if supply is limited and demand is strong, home prices will remain high, and it is necessary to have inventory in order to have variable pricing
27. The current conservation subdivision provisions are the worst thing the County has ever done and it has been a failure
28. There should be Incentives for quality development; open space should be quality, not leftovers, and the County should proactively identify places or land conditions that should be preserved as open space
29. Some suggest the County consider a land banking or transfer of development rights program where rural areas can be senders and suburban areas can be receivers
30. There is a desire for mixed-use walkable communities that include provisions for pedestrians and bicycles
31. The roads from Anderson to Greenville are not up to standards- narrow, over capacity
32. Some support impact fees or so-called systems charges (for sewer connection) and incentives for preferred forms of development
33. The Conservation ordinance has given developers another option, but needs to be re-reviewed because the current wording is unclear





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

8-13-25

### **D. GOALS FOR IMPROVED DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS - continued**

34. The County's road ordinances have not changed in 25 years; private and public roadway standards are the same and there are not a lot of design options. Suggest adding more options for private drives. Suggest reviewing G
35. The County's stormwater regulations need to be revised
36. The current ordinance allows lot size averaging in any residential district, but the zoning provisions have differing lot size thresholds for lots on septic
37. Short-term rentals are not well managed (especially in areas around the lake). Most County residents do not like these uses as tenants are not well screened, and such uses should be licensed and taxed by the County. There is a maximum STR density (separation requirement), which is a good thing and STR rules are applied in non-zoned areas
38. Question about if an STR is sold, can the STR be continued by the new owner? What happens if it is too close to another existing STR?
39. Concerns about recreational vehicle lots/parks, especially in lakefront areas. These are a disaster and there are far too many new applications. There are no standards, these uses are unsightly, there is too much clearing and grading, and the vehicles are too close to one another
40. Many of the recent residential subdivisions developed in the County are of a poor quality. They are too dense. The homes have inexpensive exterior materials, and the quality of the work is substandard
41. There is support for the recent riparian buffer ordinance as buffers are important, and are needed to protect drinking water and recreation water quality. The County needs more robust silt fencing standards applied throughout the County (not just in buffers)
42. The County's regulations are ill-prepared to address stormwater concerns from higher density development – downstream flooding and localized sedimentation problems are occurring
43. Roads are too narrow for the kind of development being proposed – the county should raise its standards and ensure the development community pays the costs for the necessary road improvements – the approach must spread the roadway costs evenly across all developers not just the first guy or the last guy to develop
44. Stormwater ordinances are creating a need for excessive grading – this is so because the standards are requiring too much centralized retention
45. While Anderson County does maintain roads, the SCDOT is responsible for many of the roads in the County, and more attention should be paid to what kinds of things the County can do to help ensure better capacity on an SCDOT roadway – for example, can the County or developer contribute funds to SCDOT for roadway improvement? Can the County secure easements for roadway widening of SCDOT roads? Can the County condemn land for use as part of a SCDOT roadway?





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

8-13-25

### **E. GOALS FOR IMPROVED DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESSES**

1. The rules should include new and better bonding for large tract developments to ensure the final development meets expectations and that all promises can be kept
2. The Planning Commission is making decisions without sufficient factually-based information; this is causing an image problem for zoning and lots of legal challenge. It is also giving the County a bad reputation and inhibiting desirable commercial development
3. Zoning is a "mixed-bag" the free market can take care of many things, but perhaps not all. The problem is that interface with development rules (like the Planning Commission) doesn't go well- they turn everything down and often wind up in court
4. Lots of problems with traffic but in some cases development applications have been turned down by the Planning Commission for no legitimate reason. This situation is leading to increased annexation and lawsuits. The lack of due process and equal protection can give County residents a distorted view of things. County staff could play a greater role in consideration and approval of certain kinds of development to help address this problem
5. There is a perception that there is no coordination between Anderson City and the County. Generally speaking, the County feels like they share and talk but the City doesn't feel there is communication
6. There are numerous special service districts → water, fire that overlap one another and are hard to coordinate between
7. Questions about how/when are you "vested" in the development project
8. Suggest adding pre-application meetings to the process like Lexington County
9. It would be helpful to have an expedited procedure for certain kinds of development that are preferred or that exceed all minimum standards
10. It is somewhat unclear how stormwater fees are being spent
11. Lately, the County has done a lot of piecemeal ordinance amendments – not ideal
12. The current Summary Plat process (up to 4 1-acre lots) is going backwards. It used to be that 7 lots could be created without PC review
13. There is support for more staff decision-making – The Oconee County control free district allows on-line application submittal and staff review for most forms of development. Planning Commission review only required if someone is seeking a variance from the requirements.
14. The County needs a performance guarantee system that relies on collection of funds for escrow deposit rather than letter of credit





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

8-13-25

### **E. GOALS FOR IMPROVED DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESSES - continued**

15. The Anderson County ordinance needs to include an appeal path for Planning Commission decisions rather than mediation/litigation. The current procedure for large project review by Planning Commission needs to be revised.
16. Some note that there is inadequate transparency in the ordinance amendment process – there is no real tracking system and even though there are three readings, there is no draft text to review until the third reading – this needs to be changed
17. There is too much arbitrary decision making by the Planning Commission – some applications get approved, or not, based on arbitrary factors. There is insufficient justification for Planning Commission decisions
18. The County's handling of new development applications where proposed uses don't cross the threshold for a TIA is insufficient. The roads are too narrow and bridge capacities are routinely ignored
19. Chapter 24 3.35 Sec. 3(d) gives the Planning Commission too much freedom to approve or deny new development proposals. Some on the Planning Commission feel it is their job to represent their constituency rather than applying the development rules
20. There is interest in making the Planning Commission more effective and revising the development regulations in service of that goal
21. Many comment that there are rules and standards in place today, but that it doesn't matter because development proposals that comply with the rules still get shot down – one statement asserted that 90% of the applications have staff recommendations of approval, but the Planning Commission ignores the staff recommendations
22. The County needs a more objective development review process with clearer standards
23. County staff is great, and pre-application conferences are helpful but they appear frustrated by the situation- some claim that it appears as though Staff is getting "gun-shy" about making recommendations of approval
24. The County has experimented with more flexible provisions, like IZODs, PDs, and conservation subdivisions, but it is unclear if these are helping
25. The process for establishing zoning in an un-zoned area is daunting for residents
26. There are questions of fairness regarding off-site roadway improvement requirements from TIA, and how far away is still fair?





## **Anderson County Land Use and Development Ordinance Project LUDO Stakeholder Interviews Summary Memorandum**

8-13-25

### **F. SUGGESTIONS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE LUDO PROCESS**

1. It is very hard to get information out to the public – people don't always go to project webpages – we need to make it easy for people to get information and share their thoughts
2. Caution during potential rollout of new zoning – don't want to create a "rush" or a "run" on new applications as people seek to circumvent what they perceive as new more restrictive rules
3. Need to explain the relationship between the plan (policy guidance) and the zoning (how the plan is implemented)
4. The webpage should include videos to help explain things. There should also be a place for interested persons to sign up to receive project updates
5. Be sure to clarify for residents that the survey (associated with the comprehensive plan) is not being used to infer results from those who did not take the survey – that responses and responders are self-selected – we are not inferring political will
6. To be fair, it seems that the only people who attend Planning Commission meetings have loud voices and speak out against development – seldom is there audience support for new development
7. Support for more training and education of appointed County officials, and a desire more administrative decision-making by County staff
8. Make sure that people understand that the comprehensive plan and that zoning rules can change
9. Try to avoid piecemeal changes in zoning rules, and inform people about the ripple effects of such changes
10. Suggestions for face-to-face meeting with residents, small group discussions, stories in newspaper or posting signs, meeting with church congregations, providing more than a week's notice, using social media. Have meetings where participants can ask questions
11. The community will ask "what is zoning going to do for us?" How will it make my life easier? How will it improve my property value? We should be able to answer these questions.
12. The development community wants to be able to provide input on the LUDO project
13. There is a desire to better understand what the County's wishes and goals for the future are
14. There is support and a desire for having a more logical format to the development regulations

END OF INPUT

