PENDLETON
SOUTH CAROLINA
History, Hospitality & Happenings!

Town of Pendleton
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
July 16, 2026
Pendleton Town Hall, 6 pm

MINUTES:

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Holland at 6 pm.

2. **Approval of prior meeting minutes:** Approval of the Minutes from May 14th and June 11th, 2026.
   - Staff was directed to fix several spelling and grammar errors from both meetings.
   - Motion to approve the minutes as amended by Richard Baldwin, seconded by Steve Moloney. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. **Public Comments**.
   - Alex Symborksi, 1200 Cherry Street Extension, speaking for his wife, Linda Symborksi
     - See the attached statement. Read aloud by Mr. Symborksi.
   - Alex Symborksi, 1200 Cherry Street Extension
     - See the attached statement. Read aloud by Mr. Symborksi.

4. **Work Session:** Work Session to discuss items from Resolution 03-2026. No motions were made.
   - **a.** Chairman Holland asked Ms. Vance to introduce the work session on items from resolution 03-2026.
     - i. Ms. Vance went through the resolution to match the current zoning ordinance sections.
     - ii. Staff will need to confirm if this is one total ordinance with the zoning amendments, or a separate ordinance for each section individually.
     - iii. Item A- adding Anderson County Stream/ Riparian buffers. Ms. Vance explained what the Larger Common Plan means for development.
       1. Chairman Holland stated this will help with larger properties located off Waters of the State (WoS), and any future annexations that are located on WoS as well.

iv. Item B- Historic Overlay District- Will work on the discussion of the map first in a future meeting.
v. Item C- Public Tree Ordinance, Section 6-2 in the current ordinance.
    1. This is the ordinance from the UDO draft.
    2. Mr. Baldwin stated it needed to be changed from City to Town because Pendleton is not a city.
    3. Add Tree Maintenance definition.
    4. Greenville city's tree ordinance was read out, and decided that it would be a good inspiration for amending the size requirements
        a. 24-inch dbh or greater in a buffer zone or 40 inches or greater anywhere else on the property.
        b. The commission stated this sounded more reasonable and like the language of the City of Greenville's document.
    5. Some Pinus trees, such as eastern white, longleaf, and loblolly pines, should be protected as heritage trees.
    6. Change wording to refer to the South Carolina invasive species list developed by Clemson University instead of the zoning administrator.
    7. Canopy Tree, Canopy Tree, Overstory Tree, Historic Tree-Create a definition for these terms.
    8. Amend 2-2 definitions of the zoning ordinance to add definitions for the tree ordinance.
    9. Town Council will need to amend the fee schedule to include information for the tree ordinance.
    10. Change the table to 1 for tree replacement.
    11. Developments have an 8inch requirement for them to mitigate at 100 percent. For homeowners, anything over 24 inches must be mitigated at 100 percent.
    12. Change the table to match the current zoning districts.
    13. The tree ordinance will be reworked with the suggestions made by the planning commission, and they will receive a new draft of it.
vi. Sidewalks Requirements and Connectivity
    1. Add sidewalk requirements for both sides of the road for new development.
vii. Generalized Design Standards
    1. A merger of the Town's current design standards and the Village Hills overlay.
    2. It will need to have an applicability section.
    3. Large parking lots need to be defined somewhere.
    4. Add size and type of tree appropriate for the space

5. Add architectural character/elements must be similar in design to other buildings on the property/ similar materials, color/ façade.

viii. Lighting

1. The lighting measurement needs to be in lumens.
2. Fix the missing statement in the efficiency section.

5. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Holland at 8:12 pm.

Chairman: Carl Holland Date: 8-13-26

I would like to present some data presented in the 2026 Anderson County Comprehensive Plan and some statistics from the US Censes.

We have all heard that the population in South Carolinas is the fastest growing in the nation.

Anderson County's median age has changed significantly in the past 20 years.
In 1990, it was 35.1
In 2020, it increased to 40.5
Additionally of note, Anderson County's median age group is higher than both the state of South Carolina at the Nation.

Anderson County's population for the 45 and older age group shows
In 1990 was 35%
In 2022, it increased to 44.9%.

A significant statistic to note is the 60 year old or older population.
In 2010, that group was 20.6% of our population and
In 2022, it increased to 26.1%
Again, this population growth is higher than the rest of the State of South Carolina or the Nation

The 2026 Anderson County Comprehensive Plan also shows that our central challenge over the next 20 years will be accommodating an aging population. Anderson County's aging population can be attributed to several factors but, primarily the county's popularity as a retirement destination... AARP has named Anderson County as one of the best places to live and retire.

This certainly will include the need for accessible single-story homes, smaller units with lower maintenance needs, proximity to transit, health care, and daily amenities, all within a quiet and safe environment.

It seems that the Town of Pendleton already accommodates these needs. There is a significant opportunity now, in a new market, for independent living and senior lifestyle housing in the Town of Pendleton. We would be remiss if we passed up a great opportunity, by overlooking this age group.

Linda Lyubovski 7/16/24

Outlook

PPC meeting July 16, 2026

From Alex Symborski <asymborski@gmail.com>
Date Thu 7/16/2026 6:01 PM
To Alex Symborski <asymborski@gmail.com>; Owen Rines <owenr@townofpendleton.org>

CPG Lawsuit
1 Mediation outcome ? Don't know.
2 Court case is closed, off the docket, clerk wouldn't accept my petition to join.
3 The Mayor says decision will go to the Town Council for approval.
4 There will be a public hearing. I think.
5 Rumor is density is reduced a little, but CPG gets commercial instead of senior living.
6 Town had little to work with since it never gave CPG any reasons for denial.
7 So the Planning Commission had both of their votes reversed.
8 The "Lost" Original zoning documents were located before the court case settled.
9 Don't know what happened after that.
10 State code says a rehearing can occur if the Town and CPG had a mutual mistaken understanding of facts. - - Google it

I am, and you should be. angry that we got short changed.- -
The original valid zoning of Ordinance 10-02. had:
A) 14.4 acres of comprehensive senior living including a 60 bed full nursing care home,
B) And a 20 unit apartment style senior assisted living facility with 24 hour staff
C) And 25 cottage units with arrangements and structure provisions for handicapped INDEPENDENT living
D) Full electronic connectivity to request immediate emergency assistance.
E) Probably optional meal service by request.
F) Commitment to build the living / healthcare first..
G 19 separate documents, signatures as expected, confirm Ordinance and site plan.
H) There are 13 engineering size drawings with a) building layout, b) density quoted at 2.0 and 6.25 units per acre, c) commitment for single level structures, d) dual ingress egress, e) utility, water and sewer plans, f) 40 foot buffers, g) commitment for tree preservation, h) landscaping and parking layouts, i) housing styles and floor plans, j) an extra wide 24 foot roadway, and k) a scaled fire engine navigation layout, These supporting meeting notes show that Apex Homes had already contacted a prospective health facility management company and had changed their site plan in response to that firm's recommendation.

CPG does not have the qualifications to pursue such a senior living aspect and should have been removed from consideration when their first request for major change was denied.

I remember citizens and commission members asking for independent living but the Town Planner had other information.

I also recall Chuck McKuen inquiring about rezoning. If true zoning requirements had been known, would CPG have initially proposed a rezoning?.

I recall Jill Gemill's question and being told the issues raised by the Symborskis were not for current discussion.

Perhaps we might have found zoning documents if we had looked in the 2010 era records instead of the 2005 era records

The appearance is troubling. The effective lowering of zoning requirements is reminiscent of the Pendleton Station fiascoes of groundbreaking before legal annexation and the later multi multi bedroom floor plans purportedly for large single family use. So we've found legitimate zoning but no one says it matters, I guess that's in keeping with Pendleton and its Pendleton Station Tradition .

alex

Alex P Symborski (PE Em)

The Heritage asymborski@gmail.com

1200 Cherry Street Extension 864.933,7166

Pendleton, SC 29670

THE WILL TO DO, THE SOUL TO DARE [1] SO SELDOM NOW FOUND ANYWHERE [2]

1) Sir Walter Scott 2) some other guy