



# PENDLETON

S O U T H C A R O L I N A

---

History, Hospitality & Happenings!

Town of Pendleton  
Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting  
December 11, 2025  
Pendleton Town Hall, 6 pm

## Minutes:

### 1. Call to Order:

Chairman Perkins called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm

### 2. Approval of prior meeting minutes:

Mr. McCuen motioned to approve the previous meeting minutes. Mr. Holland seconded the motion. All voting members voted in favor at 6:00 pm.

### 3. Public Comments.

Chairman Perkins opened this portion of the meeting at 6:04 pm.

Alex Symborksi, 1200 Cherry Street Extension

Stated that the previous meeting did not follow the town's agenda. Requested that the Town follow the published agenda.

Tom Garrison, 201 Martin Lane

Expressed concerns over the watershed and the effect the development could have on the surrounding area.

Chairman Perkins reminded the public in attendance that the public comment is for general comments and not specific to the subject of the public hearing

Carol Fleming 204 East Queen Street

Asked the planning commission to consider the decisions made by the commission. There has been an increase in traffic due to development, and the historical structures of Pendleton have been affected by ongoing development. The quality of life has been impacted by the growth.

Danny Lee Ford II, Bishop Branch Road.

A blue-green algae bloom has killed many of the cattle he owns. Asked the board to examine the impact of the blue-green algae boom on the surrounding area

Alex Symborski speaks on behalf of his wife, Linda Symborski. 1200 Cherry Street Extension

Stated that we did not have a response from Town Staff regarding the meeting. Stated he would share a ruling from the Assistant Attorney General later.

Sarah Bond, 521 East Main Street

Spoke about the planning commission academy that comes to towns and areas to help locals understand the language and jargon of the planning commission. Thanked the board for their time

Chairman Perkins asked if there was anyone else to speak for the general category

No response, chairperson moved to the public hearing. Read off the property's location and TMS number.

#### **4. Public Hearings:**

- a. Hold a public hearing to receive public input on a request for approval of Preliminary Plat Subdivision for a Planned Unit Development (PDMU) located off Cherry Street Extension having TMS#62-00-08-009 and 63-00-01-007.

Chairman Perkins opened the Public Hearing portion of the meeting at 6:15 pm, where Town Staff read their report to the commission.

Chairman Perkins asked Mr. Matthewson, the developer, to come forward.

Mr. Mathewson introduced Mrs. Morris, one of the property owners. Mr. Mathewson stated that the Morris's have prepared a letter addressed to the town of Pendleton planning commission. He read the letter on her behalf. The letter gave an overview of their ownership of the property and stated that the town staff's inability to provide information regarding the development has caused them to suffer sufficient hardship financially and health-wise.

Mr. Matthewson stated he was in town for the April meeting to hear from the planning commission and members of the public regarding their plan for the property. Stated they attempted to address concerns they've heard through the meetings. The commission denied the original plan to add the commercial component, citing its belief that a senior living facility would better suit this property. Mr. Matthewson stated that they planned to go to the Town Council with the negative recommendation, stating they decided to instead move to go back before the planning commission again with the added Senior Living facility. He said that with the change, it was now a by-right application. He had a letter from town staff in 2016 that stated they could have a density of 10 units per acre; however, their new plan contained 2.3 units per acre. Stated his lawyer, Rivers Stillwell, was here, along with Hussey Gay Bay, the engineering firm they have hired for the plan.

Chairman Perkins asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Holland asked the developer about the watershed's effects.

Mr. Matthewson stated that they submit construction plans to different layers of government and ultimately need approval from DHEC, and that there are multiple steps throughout the process to ensure all requirements are met.

The representative from Hussey Gay Bell stated that as engineers, they have an obligation to ensure all requirements are met.

Mr. Holland asked about the runoff increase resulting from the street.

The representative from Hussey Gay Bell stated that the detention ponds would help ensure that water is released at a consistent rate. They typically try to reduce the rate at which it flows from the site.

Mr. Holland asked if it was typical for it to be reduced.

The representative from Hussey Gay Bell said yes, it was typical due to the 100-year requirements of stormfall required by the county and other agencies.

Ms. Dawson asked if Hussey Gay Bell has worked with Center Park Group for other projects.

They said yes.

Ms. Dawson asked whether they were aware of any flooding from their other projects.

The representative from Hussey Gay Bell stated that they had not received reports of flooding at their other developments. Stated that any downstream impacts have not been known to them.

Ms. Dawson asked about the requirements of ingress and egress on their preliminary plat.

Mr. Matthewson stated that one of the lines pointed out was intended to indicate the development's phasing. They need a DOT permit before beginning construction, and he explained the traffic study requirement. Stated they were not at the point for DOT approval but would need to be in the future if the project was approved.

Ms. Dawson asked if they had been to the site location to see the traffic around the property.

Mr. Matthewson stated they have not been. The engineers needed to know how many homes would be approved before they would do a traffic study

The representative from Hussey Gay Bell stated the circulation plan was shown from the two access points on the preliminary plan. The roads were laid out to show how traffic will circulate.

Ms. Dawson states that the ingress/egress road shown on Lebanon Road leads through the current apartment complex to Westinghouse Road.

Mr. Mathewson discussed that the easement in place at the VTAC apartment complex is intended for the development.

Mr. McCuen stated there was concern about the amount of ingress and egress at Lebanon Road and the traffic volume that will be added. Wanted the developer to walk him through the traffic study process. Who pays for widening the road.

Mr. Poulson of Town Staff stated that once they conduct a traffic study, the costs are borne by the developer.

Mr. McCuen asked who pays for the traffic light if it is required.

Mr. Matthewson, if required, we will consider options if they are too expensive or not.

Mr. Holland asked about what happens to ingress and egress if only one phase or the other is built.

Mr. Poulson of Town Staff explained that developments with 50 or more units are required to install a second point of ingress and egress.

Mr. Matthewson stated they raised good points and that, when the apartments currently there were built years ago, a wider road should have been built, and he wished they had an alternate point of access. The wetland and topography make it physically impossible to create an alternate point of access.

Ms. Jones questioned the developers' by-right statement. Expressed concern over the claims of the developer regarding what was approved.

Mr. Root, the Towns attorney, explained that through the process from 2005 to 2010 that has led to this information. Understood there was a question of the legitimate claims of the developer. Stated they needed to make the best decision possible given our current requirements and ordinances.

Mr. Rivers Stillwell, the developer's lawyer, came up to speak. Stated the preliminary plat is supposed to go to the staff instead of the commission. He said the original PD is already half built to the easement, which is a clue of what was approved. It is a third of the approved density. Stated they were mixing and matching pieces to see what was approved. The public's input and concerns did not need to affect their decision. He said the property has a vested right in what has been approved. Stated denial leads to the courthouse.

Chairman Perkins asked the public to refrain from comments.

Mr. Root said it may need to be resolved in court.

Mr. Matthewson said that over the past year, no one has questioned the previously approved density. The plan was a good plan, and he did not want to send it to court. He was informed by the Town's staff that a relatively low-density single-family detached subdivision would be best received. Property has rights, and sellers need to sell the property. We're not going away until someone finally tells them there is no development here.

Carter Massingale Lawyer of Villages of Pendleton LLC

Since staff cannot locate the requirements for the development, this is not a by-right plan. Should not accept plat until town can confirm what those requirements are. Concerns over number of parking spaces and traffic. It would make sense to do a traffic study first. Understands the road in the area are already heavily trafficked. No contact with school district to accommodate new home, no natural resources inventory, there are no stormwater plans. Questioned if they would be rental or sold to owner properties. Outlined any evidence standard for the planning commission when going to the court.

Carey Fleming 204 East Queen Street

Consider protecting the historic assets of the town by blocking all commercial traffic. Asked the board to do something proactive about influx of traffic from development.

David Alverson 122 Woodhaven Drive,

He expressed concerns over the curve off Cherry Street near Woodhaven Drive. Density and traffic are a problem. Morton Farms and Village Hills are going to increase traffic on the farm area off Cherry Street. Town Creek is an established wildlife corridor.

Alex Symborski 1200 Cherry Street Extension

Presented a slideshow of the gardens of Pendleton. The complaint is not to the developer or the property owner, but to the town's diligence. Discussed the 2004 letter of the density. Discussed the letter of density approval from November to January of 2004-2005. Stated the annexation does not extend to where its indicated. Showed 2009 parcel inclusion. My.Symberski asked staff what the excuse for incorrect information. Showed the current state of affairs of the property. Stated the property is zoned as AF even though its shown as PDMU. Discussed what was not lost. Showed several slides showing annexation and zoning history. Showed the area around the PUD and outlined their uses and owners.

Skip Still 106 Challedon Way Pendleton

Representing Jim and Betty Jackson, two other area residents who are very vocal about the development. Wildlife is important to the area, and the people of Pendleton care about wildlife. If you can't find the documents, then they don't exist. Presented slides on the watershed and flooding. Mr. Jackson, his neighbor, has been a long-time resident and has concerns about all the new developments that will increase traffic on Cherry Street.

Discussed the foot traffic on Cherry Street and the concerns of people walking on the road. Infrastructure concerns with the added development. The pictures he presented showed a field near the area covered in water. He showed an image from 2014 of a property near Town Creek that was flooded by excess rain. Asked the commission to deny the request and to hire a good lawyer.

Joy Beck 1006 Challedon Way

Expressed concerns over the Morton Farms sidewalk and people walking on Cherry Street. Suggested subdividing the property and to consider the best use.

Laura McGuerry 236 Buchanan Circle

Questioned the traffic study being done after approval. Concerned about floodplain and watershed. Had concerns about all the other developments and their traffic impact on Cherry Street. Suggested building the infrastructure out first before adding to the current problems.

Michael Atkins, 700 Pinewood Drive

Longtime resident of Pendleton and stated concerns of flooding from Town Creek. Suggested to subdivide the properties to solve density issues. Too much development in the area too soon. Expressed traffic concerns and the impact of the development on the Town as a whole.

Danny Ford 2<sup>nd</sup> Bishop Branch Road

Presented the Anderson County Stream overview of the development and expressed concerns that the amount of flooding that could result due to the stream. Concerns over the lack of work done on Cherry Street. Surface water concerns on the healthy and safety of animals.

Sharon Jones 108 Blueberry Lane

Concerned about the amount of traffic and the inability to safely exercise while walking on the roads in the area.

Linda Symborski 1200 Cherry Extension

Has kept an extensive record of all the information for this development since 2005. Stated that the annexation and zoning of the parcels is incorrect. The density letter from 2016 is baseless; there are no supporting documents to suggest 10 units per acre. It should be disregarded and considered heresy. There is no guarantee that the second ingress and egress point off Lebanon Road will be built. We need to plan to protect our future. In 2009, the property was approved for assisted/senior living. Suggested, the developer should consider an adult/independent senior living community. Many of the neighbors in the area are seniors living in single-family homes or on farms who would like to keep it that way but understand they have a right to develop the property. They say, please develop in a way that complements the current community. Stated that the property is very steep. Another development in the area has runoff issues and stated retention ponds will not solve the potential runoff issue. Developers should pay for traffic lights and studies.

Thanked the commission and developer and said she hoped we could work something out together.

Richard Baldwin 201 Hillandale Road

He respects landowners' rights to do as they wish on their property. The most concerning thing to him was the legal aspect of development; he questioned the 2016 letter. Assumed the county has never approved a final plat for the development. Concerns for the precedent that may be set in the future. Suggested building 25 or 30 homes with 1-acre or more lots. Asked for the commission to go to an executive session with their attorney. Questioned the Supreme Court ruling from the 2016 letter. Recommended that the commission take no action, table a decision, or have an executive session to find out more information.

Motion made for a 5-minute recess.

Recess ends.

Mark Matthewson

Valid concerns, they care about stormwater and the environment, but they reminded that there are processes they must follow. They'll do a traffic study and review the information. It is unreasonable to rezone the property. He has proof of the zoning and approved density, you can't ignore property rights its unamerican.

Robbie Morris, Owner of the properties in question

Bought it as an investment. Nothing has changed in the 6 years he has been here. Suffered financial devastation due to ownership of the property. Asked for the commission's help and guidance.

Rivers Stillwell

Thanked the commission for its patience. Reminded the commission they're not asking for what's appropriate. He knows property rights and the Constitution. The concerns are about the owner's property rights need to be taken into account. Said that the Constitution protects property rights from the public's opinion. Stormwater and other concerns were presented and discussed in 2005. He is not threatening to sue. Said they are trying to compromise by cutting the previously approved density.

Mr. Alex Symborski

He agrees with what was said. The town is complicit with the development. Said the solution will come from the town coffers.

With no further public comments, Chairman Perkins closed the public hearing at 8:10 pm.

**5. New Business / Action Item:**

- a. The Consideration of approving the Preliminary Plat and Subdivision of property currently zoned as a Planned Unit Development Mixed Use (PDMU) located off Cherry Street Extension, having TMS#62-00-08-009 and 63-00-01-007.

Chairman Perkins opened the action item at 8:12 pm. Stated it was the commissions opportunity for statements, questions, and concerns.

Ms. Jones

She was not here in 2005. Concerned about the precedent they will set by approving it without knowing what was approved. Question whether or not the commission can make the decision if it's by right or not. We don't have that information, she would like to see if it exists. Her interest is the people of the town. Wants to get the decision right and cannot agree to it in its current state.

Mr. Holland made a motion to enter an executive session to ask the town's attorney questions.

Mr. Root asked to amend the agenda to enter the executive session to receive legal advice pending the plat review.

Mr. McCuen asked whether we could consider the complex situation in executive session.

Chairman Perkins asked if it was a motion.

Mr. Holland seconded the motion.

The commission entered executive session, where no decisions or motions were made.

Return from executive session.

Mr. McCuen

Thanked everyone for their time. The commission states that it takes everyone's opinion and situations very seriously. Everything they do is best for the town, and they are tough decisions. Thanked the town for letting him serve. Made a motion to deny the plan as submitted

Ms. Dawon seconded the motion

All members voted to deny the request.

Chairman Perkins

Stated it was his last meeting, and Pendleton was a special place, and it was an honor to serve. Thanked the staff and the town.

Mr. Poulson thanked the Chairman and Mr. McCuen for all they've done for the town.

**6. Updates:**

No updates were given

**7. Adjournment:**

With no further business, Mr. McCuen made a motion to adjourn, which Ms. Jones seconded. All members voted in favor of. Meeting adjourned.

Chairman: *Curt Holland* Date: *3-12-26*