CITY OF DARLINGTON
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
HELD IN THE OLD COUNCIL CHAMBERS
400 PEARL STREET, DARLINGTON, SC 29532

JUNE 23, 2026 - 6:00 PM

Present: Mayor Boyd, Councilpersons Shelia Baccus, Angela McRavin, John Milling, John Segars, Elaine Reed, and Bryant Gardner. Also present were Interim City Manager Ronnie Ward, Gloria Pridgen, Hunter Thomas, Steve Abbott, Sean Odom, Anna DeWitt, Street & Superintendent Calvin Holloman, Sam Evans, Alex Gainey, Clarence Chapman, Gloria Hines, Ernestine Lyde, Police Chief Jimmy Davis, Fire Chief Pat Cavanaugh, W&S Superintendent Michael Morris, Kimberly Vinson, CPA, Attorneys Ron Scott and Joseph Dickey, Officer Joyce Everett and other citizens.

Mr. Stephen Drew with the News & Press was present at the meeting.

Invocation & Pledge

Mayor Boyd did the invocation which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Old Business

Discussion of 2026-2027 Budget

Councilwoman McRavin wanted to know if department heads were present at the meeting in the event, they had questions and they were. Councilwoman McRavin asked the reason there was a significant decrease in the revenues from last year. CPA Kimberly Vinson asked if she was talking about actual and projected or proposed budget and she said the proposed 2026-2027 budget. Kimberly said there were several line items that we don't have any control over and don't know what's coming in. She said one of them being the FILOT and the budget number you see is based off a schedule we got from the County, so I don't feel comfortable budgeting more than what I know the County says that we're going to get. She said we're receiving more than that and if they want to adjust the budget to reflect more coming in, that is up to you all, but I'm only going to put in the number that I know the County is giving us saying this is what you all can expect. Kimberly said line item 4080 Insurance Tax Collection from MASC fluctuates. She said what you don't see our income dropped over $15,000 a couple of years ago. That is tax that the insurance companies pay to the state on insurance premiums and it gets dispersed by the municipal association and then they disperse it to us. Kimberly said we don't know what we're going to get, and I don't want to over budget that and we do not get it. Kimberly went over several line items and explained why she

budgeted conservatively. Councilwoman McRavin asked about line item 4003 – Fire District and why it was reduced to almost half the amount. Kimberly said because there was a distribution of money that should have been distributed in previous years that we got this year. Councilwoman Reed asked about the salaries in the police department, the audited amount vs the 2026-2027 proposed amount. Councilwoman Reed said, "That wouldn't even pay for one salary. She said we're in such a situation and why is this not being considered because if this is what it was and we don't have enough officers on the street as it is now, some adjustments have to be made. Councilman Gardner said, "My understanding is the officer salaries for the other positions are budgeted in there. In years past we used it overtime. Kimberly said we are breaking out the overtime now, but in 2024-2025 the overtime was not broken out. Councilwoman Reed wanted to know how many officers this figure was based on. Mr. Ward said I think it was based on six vacancies. Kimberly said it might include more vacancies from when she initially did the report. She said it includes everybody when she started the salaries budget plus six vacancies. Kimberly said one thing it does not include is the SRO vacancy that we have but she also did not include that in the SRO revenue. She said the budget for the revenue is for four officers, but we can have five and since we only have four officers right now, I only budgeted revenue and expense for four officers and if we get the fifth officer, it's going to be covered in the revenue that we'll get. Councilwoman Reed asked, "The amount that I'm looking at includes salary increases and four or five officers." Kimberly says yes, six additional officers. Mayor Boyd asked, 2024-25 there was no overtime projected in that. Kimberly said the overtime wasn't broken out back then; we started breaking out the overtime starting this year. Mayor Boyd said the salaries for that year were $1,707,000 which included the overtime. In 2026-27 you are projecting $1,714,160 with an additional $62,000 almost $63,000 in overtime so that's almost $1.8 million. He said that is a good increase. Mayor Boyd asked Chief Davis if there was anything else that he needed such as more assistance. Chief Davis said he has not had the privilege to see what you were looking at, but I am sure that Mr. Ward has looked over it and has given us everything that he can. Chief Davis said he would say officers and vehicles would be a top priority. Councilwoman Baccus asked why the fire department salaries were reduced. Kimberly said it's based off what people are making right now and I don't recall if there were any vacancies in the fire department. Chief Cavanaugh said he has two vacancies. Councilwoman McRavin said she noticed that as well. She said there's been discussion in the past about potentially expanding our fire district, so she asked Chief Cavanaugh to enlighten her and give her a little understanding of that. Chief Cavanaugh said, "I will reiterate what Chief Davis said. He said Mr. Ward has the numbers, and he hasn't gotten back with us with the final numbers. He said the problem with us is I can't decrease staff because we are held to a minimum with our ISO rating. Councilwoman Baccus asked, so none of the department heads has had an opportunity to look at the budget. Mr. Ward said, "They presented figures, but then I took those figures and got with Kimberly, and we put what we could put on the budget with the income that we have coming in. Councilwoman Baccus said the fire department overtime decreased to about half and she asked Chief Cavanaugh if that would work. Chief

Cavanaugh said if he can get the two spots filled, he should be okay. Council continued to discuss the fire department salaries. Kimberly said she will need to look at the salary list and see if there are people that left the city. She said the number of personnel in the fire department was the same as what was in previous budget years so if there has been a change or if there's something missing, maybe we didn't budget for them in previous years. She said she will have to go back and look at it. Councilwoman McRavin said I just want to make sure the fire chief gets what he needs for his department because they are indeed vital. I don't know if there's anywhere or any place where we can start putting some funds aside for a fire station because they are in dire need of a fire station. Councilwoman McRavin said, I didn't see anything in the budget for capital expenses, but for cars for police…. for fire and their needs, where are we addressing their needs? Kimberly said what's in here…. We didn't do any rate increases in this budget and what we have is pretty much your bare minimum to operate. She said I have $8,000 in the general fund that has not been allocated anywhere and it's based primarily on what we have been spending. I went through each individual account line and figured out what our contracts are and what that is costing us every month and every year so that's where these budget numbers come from. She said with your current revenue, there is no room for that unless we start cutting expenses elsewhere and most of them, we can't cut. Mr. Ward said, when I started out with the budget and went through the revenues and then the expenses, I am putting in the things that we would like to have. I was about one and a half million dollars over what we had money to pay for. Mr. Ward said we have to sit down and take what we've got and make that work and the rest of the stuff we've got to figure out how we're going to either finance it or get grants, etc. to take care of what …. But we did not figure on not having employees in the positions that they would need to be. He said we want to account for all of them with hopefully at least a 5% increase. Kimberly said after this year we have $124,000 in debt freed up. Our last debt payment on one of our bonds is this year, so once we get through that that will free up $124,000 that can go towards something like that next year. Councilwoman McRavin asked about revenue line item – 4200 (rent) & 4220 (rent – downtown retail) because if the downtown properties are technically not ours are we still going to be collecting rent for that? Councilman Gardner asked if we should be discussing this in open session. Councilwoman McRavin said it's on the budget so we can ask questions about the budget. She said for the SRO's did we get all of the amount that's listed here. Kimberly said they actually agree to more. They agreed to five officers at a certain rate, but we currently only have four, so this budget is for four officers, but also the personnel budget is only putting for SRO officers so if we get the fifth officer that will increase our expense, but then it will also increase our revenue. Councilwoman McRavin said, "the issue that we had some months ago is they weren't paying enough to cover and we were still having to foot part of the bill and that's why we previously asked if there could be some negotiations between them about making certain we're getting reimbursed the appropriate amount because we were losing on that deal. I'm inquiring to make certain that we are recouping as much as we need to, to cover the cost of these officers. Mr. Ward said that the County and Hartsville are also involved in that negotiation. Councilwoman

Baccus asked about the Williamson Park contract for $16,000 and questioned why we are buying tools for Williamson Park. Kimberly said the $16,000 is the money they city gives them to operate. She said the rest of that is not necessarily for Williamson Park, but for anything park related. Council discussed the park and recreation budget and questioned some of the line items listed in the parks department. Mayor Boyd said I think what she's asking is in Williamson Park we give them $16,000 and it should be a period after that and we shouldn't be buying anything for that park. Council discussed what should be charged to recreation and what should be charged to parks. Kimberly said you can get rid of 725 altogether if all you want to go there is Williamson Park. She said it sounds like that whole department needs to disappear and roll everything including the $16,000 into recreation and call it Parks & Recreation. Councilwoman Baccus said, if we are going to allocate money for one park, we should be allocating money for all parks. Councilwoman Baccus said, if we are going to give $16,000 a year to Williamson Park, we should be giving to B.A. Gary, we should be giving to the park at Bowen Manor for each park to be able to grow and add something to that park every year instead of dumping $16,000 every year into one park and not consider the other parks". Councilman Gardner said, just to be clear we probably spent $1 million to $1,5000,000 ….Councilwoman said, that's not true. Councilman Gardner said I've got $375,000 at Hampton Street Park, the cost of the land and the swing sets; we spent over $400,000 for upgrades to the pool. We spent over $400,000 on the basketball courts, and all the things at Carroway plus the playground equipment, money spent at Bowen Manor and the splash pad. He said we've spent hundreds of thousands of dollars that we've allocated for every one of those parks, and they are maintained through our parks and recreation department. He went on to say they have a board and Williamson Park needs to be maintained from an ecological standpoint. We've got to keep the trails up and we've got to keep the boardwalks up. Got into a discussion about the parks. Mr. Ward said we give Williamson Park that $16,000 to do what they need to do to maintain it. He said the park itself has a board that maintains and contributions from citizens that take care of most of things that go on down there. He said we will take a look at all of that and if it's confusing, we will try to fix it so that it won't be confusing. I don't know. Councilwoman McRavin said on page 7 under community promotions PDRTA is listed there. She said last year we were supposed to give them $18,000 but for some reason they were only allocated the same $15,000 that they had been receiving for the last three years. That is not enough for them to operate the bus at its current status. We took a bus tour a couple of months ago. We live in a city where more of our residents live at or below the poverty level. She said 80% of the people who utilize PDRTA that is their only means of transportation. We are currently running that bus. The operating hours are less than they need to be. They only operate from 7 to 4 because we have not been providing the funding for them to operate longer than that. Fuel costs have increased but we're not increasing their funding. We might not have enough to fund them the $30,000 that they requested because technically our citizens need that bus to run until 7 PM. This budget that we are proposing to give to them is not enough, so we need to find at least $7000 in order for them to continue to operate the bus with the schedule

that they currently have. Councilwoman Baccus asked about the "beautification" line item. Kimberly said this is something you all discussed a couple of years ago. She said the department that it's in was a council decision. Kimberly said one line item is what the city spends on beautification and the other line item is what council gives the board to spend on beautification. Council discussed what the two different beautification line items were for. Hunter said when he started working here one of the line items is for what street and sanitation might need to help beautify entrance signs and whatever requests council may have and then the $8,000 for the beautification board itself. Councilwoman Baccus asked why do we have signs falling down if the beautification board is supposed to be replacing the signs. Hunter asked Councilwoman Baccus what signs she is talking about and she said the one that says, "Welcome to Darlington." He asked Councilwoman Baccus if she means the entrance signs coming into Darlington and she said, "yes." Hunter said from what he understands that is supposed to be street and sanitation. I told them council went through an extensive discussion about this same thing a couple of years ago. Councilwoman Baccus asked Kendrick if he was aware that there's $8,000 available for you to use in the community budget. Kendrick said he was not aware of that and Councilwoman Baccus said so now you know there's $8,000 for you to use. Mayor Boyd said that's not correct. $8,000 is allocated for the board to ask for funds. Kimberly said it's $8,000 for the board and $6,000 for the city. Councilwoman Baccus told Kendrick, so you've got $6,000 that you can use to fix signs. (Council still discussing signs) Kimberly asked, do we need to consider changing the names of these accounts. Councilwoman Baccus asked why is it under community promotions. Kimberly said let's fix the name and then it can be moved. It was decided Beautification – entrance signs & Beautification – Board recommendations. Councilwoman Reed said that it started out that we were trying to find money for PDRTA. Mayor Boyd went back to revenue line item 4000 – property taxes and she explained that the first two months of the fiscal year goes back into the previous year. She said there will be adjustments like that for this year as well. Councilwoman McRavin asked questions about a couple of line items in the municipal court budget. Mayor Boyd asked about the revenue line item 4300 for franchise agreements. Kimberly said this is based on what the electric and cable company submits to us and we don't know what that is going to be in advance. Councilwoman McRavin asked about the revenue line item for the recreation department. Councilwoman McRavin said she's just looking for $7,000. She said the county gives them $300,000 and I'm trying to figure out where's all this money is going. Mayor Boyd asked about revenue line item 4010 – building permits. Kimberly said maybe we need to talk with building and codes to see if there will be potential growth to increase the permit fees. Line item 4015 – court fines, Kimberly said the court reports run a month behind, so she won't know until she starts moving everything around to the correct account for the audit. Councilwoman Baccus asked about temporary staff line item. Kimberly said she doesn't know what was going on last year for the temporary staff to be so high. She said we pay more to have somebody in as a temp then to have them on payroll. She said if we are fully staffed, we shouldn't need the temporary staff at all.

Councilwoman Baccus said, I keep hearing that the water department is short of employees. Kimberly said your payroll is as if we're fully staffed even if we are short, she said there are vacancies in that salary number. Councilwoman Baccus said, I'm fine with not having the temps. My problem is do we have enough staff to cover it. Michael Morris said last year we asked for four but two were approved. Michael said he has six employees and three temps. Councilwoman Baccus said I'm asking this question because when I get a water bill that says we read your meter for 16 days and then I get a water bill that says we read your meter for 45 days. I'm questioning whether you are reading the meter or not? And that's why I'm asking the question as to whether we have enough people that go out and read meters because a lot of those meters have to be manually read. She said it has been said, and I heard Michael say that he had to take everybody with him to go fix a leak or a sewer problem, so if everybody is out in the street fixing a water or sewer problem then the meters are not being read. Michael said every meter that's not read off the satellite, we manually read that meter. But 45 days, the only ones we can find without knowing the actual account number that would be like a new service, and they have to be on the system 15 days before it actually starts billing. Mayor Boyd said he asked Charlotte about that and there's no accounts read that way they are all read 29, 30, or 31 days whatever is in the month unless it is where you 45 days you've got 15 days and then that's your very first bill. Councilwoman Baccus asked Michael do you have enough employees at nine employees, so what do you need? Michael said at least two or three more. Mayor Boyd asked Kimberly if she budgeted for this and she said she can't pull it up right then, but she would look at it. Councilwoman McRavin asked about line item 273 in the planning department. Kimberly said we historically budgeted around $15,000 but if the circumstances have changed as to how that being done …. Councilwoman McRavin said, I'm trying to find where I can trim some money. Mr. Ward said if council wants to pay more for that item, then simply bring it up and vote on it and we'll find it if that's what you all want to do. Mr. Ward said we will be here all-night hunting for $7,000. Councilwoman McRavin said, "Well we need to discuss that then because we talked last year and it was supposed to be over $18,000 … we voted to give them over $18,000 but they didn't get that. They only got the amount that they had been receiving the previous three years. So, at this point we need to discuss whether or not we are trying to make certain our citizens can access their doctors' appointments and be able to support our businesses by supporting the PDRTA to keep those buses running. And I would propose that we give them at least $22,500 so that they can continue the bus route at least the way it is if we are not able to find the $30,000 that they need to include to increase the hours to 7:00 PM." Mayor Boyd said he found $5,000 that was in the Carnegie Library line item. Kimberly said it's not in the current budget because Mr. Ward told her to take it out. Kimberly will put the $5,000 back in the budget. Councilwoman Reed said I would like for us to agree that we want to increase PDRTA and like our city manager has said then we can find the money. Mr. Ward said we will fix it. Councilwoman Baccus asked Michael Morris how many more meters does he need to replace and he said about 1,900. He said we have 3,300 meters that we have been doing along and along. Kimberly said we

need to see if we can find a grant for that. Councilwoman Baccus asked Michael how many meters does he have sitting on the shelf and he said he got a shipment of twenty on yesterday. She asked why is there no money in the budget for meter replacement? Michael said we do them along and along and if you buy 1,900 meters and sit them on a shelf that battery life starts. He said they replaced two hundred meters in the past month and a half. Councilwoman Baccus asked how many meters do they have to read manually every month? Michael said they dropped from 330 down to the high 100's. Kimberly said rolled money over from line item 258 in the water department budget and combined that with line items 256 & 257. Councilwoman Baccus asked how much does the meters cost. Michael said $287 for the meter and $170 for the transmitter and satellite cap. Councilman Gardner said we have an allocation request for about $2 million dollars and we may want to reach out to his office. He said we have assurances from congressman Frye and senator Chaplin. We might want to reach out to Senator Graham and the community too. Councilman Milling said we changed our water and sewer rates for outside city customers that we supply to, and he asked Kimberly if she figured any increase in the revenue into the water and sewer based on that. Kimberly said she didn't so she will need to go back and calculate that. Councilman Gardner said PDRTA said that they were going to pave our maintenance building and put an electric gate there, whenever we started allowing them to park there. He said they have not done it, so we need to reach out to them and ask them when they plan on doing that.

New Business

Discussion on zoning the Evans Property by Dixie Cup and Possible Vote for First Reading.
Mayor Boyd provided a drawing of the property for everybody. He said some people have questioned whether they should go through zoning or whether it should go through planning first. He said he was told if everybody were OK with this this could be voted on as first reading tonight and then at that point go through planning and then a public hearing and second reading. He said the property they are discussing is if you go by Dixie Federal Credit Union and cross over the tracks to the backside of the Dixie Cup Plant, Mr. Evans owns that property, and he has gone through codes and provided this to them and they have approved his plan as long as it is rezoned. Mayor Boyd said it's currently zoned as general commercial and to be able to put sixteen duplexes on there, it would need to be rezoned as R-6. Councilwoman McRavin said we just got this when we got here. I'm all for development, but I don't know what all of this other stuff around it looks like. It needs to be cross-referenced with our master plan our comprehensive plan and make certain that what we're doing here …. I'm looking at this plan, but I don't know what all of the other things surrounding it are. I need an opportunity to really look to see how they are zoned and what this is going to look like for our city long-term. It's great to look at it at the moment, but we're talking about a piece of property that sits in the midst of something that has the zone for industry. What are our long-term goals? Are we going to end up defeating or shooting ourselves in the foot for potentially bringing in some industry down the road because we rezoned something and it's not going to fit that. I personally

would like to take an opportunity to actually be able to view it a little more closely so that we can actually see what this means for the city. Oftentimes we end up making some decisions… we don't look long-term. What is this going to look like 20 to 30 years from now based on our master plan and based on our comprehensive plan. All of that needs to be taken into consideration. I would like to take a moment and ask that we table this until the next meeting so that we can have an opportunity to cross reference it with these things to make certain that the decision that we are making is the right decision for everyone involved. Mayor Boyd said, to get the ball rolling for him, it can be done tonight and then it can be shot down later by the planning commission, or by ourselves or by the council. He said you are familiar with the area because I was just with you the other day, he said to the left of that property is Dixie Federal Credit Union to the right of that property is an event hall and to the back of it is Diamond Hill plywood, and to the front of it is Georgia Pacific that's being torn down. Councilwoman McRavin said, I'm all for development. I'm not trying to shoot down development. I'm asking that we be strategic in all of this. I am requesting an opportunity to actually view it because we just got this you called me and talked about it, but I didn't have anything to look at. I'm asking for a moment for us all to be able to look at this and study it so that we're making certain that what we're doing is actually in alignment with our master plan that we are not going to hinder future growth of our city by making any changes on an impulse vote here because that is what I feel like this is almost we haven't had an opportunity to really review or study anything. I want a four million … four hundred million, but if you do a $400 million investment but we don't do the right investment we could end up with something that's not going to work for our city 10 years from now. She said a temporary delay doesn't mean an ultimate no it means an opportunity just to review it and make certain we're doing the right thing. Councilwoman Baccus said, based on the ordinance, this should've gone to planning before it ever came to council for a first reading. She said ever since I've been on council anything that needed to go to planning went to planning first, I don't understand what the purpose of rushing our first reading actually this should have come up at a council meeting instead of in this meeting because this meeting was initially set for the budget. There's no purpose in rushing to have a first reading instead of letting it go to planning because I want to hear what planning got to say. I want to know what planning opinion is on this before we do anything instead of the one-on-one conversations that you are having with people outside of council and then coming back and putting something on an agenda. And I agree with Nikki that we haven't heard anything about this. We haven't seen anything. We haven't looked at it based on our master plan. The one-on-one conversations is not council. Mayor Boyd asked Attorney Ron Scott, you told me when I addressed you about this that it didn't have to go through planning first and that the first reading was an opportunity for us to discuss this and then if they want to do a first reading, which is why I put it on there. Discussion first, and if they would like to do first reading, so the contractor is ready to roll with a piece of property that desolate over there …. We can do the first reading and then at that point, then they would go to the planning commission, and they can decide for it or against it. At that point it can come back to council and during that time you've got probably close

to two months before all of that finally goes through. To keep the contractor from going elsewhere to spend their money when they are ready to spend their money here to develop a piece of property that's sitting there. Mr. Scott said that is correct. in fact, if it is to be a city council-initiated proposal to rezone this property, I felt it's probably more appropriate for there to be a first reading so that you are giving the planning commission something to formally consider with a recommendation. But it is up to this body to decide whether to give.... I do think if it is going to be a city council-initiated rezoning versus a property owner requesting rezoning this would be the appropriate method to do this. Councilwoman McRavin said so that means whoever the property owner is should have been the person to do that. Councilwoman Reed said the contractor have a conversation with council as well as you mayor would sometimes eliminate a lot of this. She said as other contractors have done in the past they come before us with these different plans. She said we do need to have a little bit more conversation rather than with you and then you bring it to us. Councilman Gardner read Section 10-1 which is authority under the city's municipal code. He then read Section 10-2 Section 1. Mr. Ward said I have seen the property, and you all have to. He said this would be a grand improvement to what's there now. The developer is here and he wants to put some duplexes on this property and provide housing. He said what we're doing is helping him progress with this as soon as he can and make something there that would benefit all of us and help him at the same time. Mr. Ward said this process will allow it to start and you all will have ample time to review it and listen to the planning commission and let them go through it. If they come back and say, "no, this is not a good idea, then it's off the track, but there is no need for us not to go through this process as recommended by the attorney to get him started because we've got to change it. He can't do what he wants to do at General Commercial. He needs R-6 to do what he needs to do, so we need to get that process in motion so that this can be done. We don't want to miss out on an opportunity for growth and development in an area that right now is under demolition. Mr. Ward said for everybody's sake I think we would be doing good to allow this process to go as it is. Councilwoman Reed said, "I want you all to understand that we appreciate all that you do for the city. Understand that for this Council to begin to work harmoniously these are the things that we're putting out here now. Nothing to stop the growth of this. As you pointed out, on the front and sides there are still commercial buildings there and different ones have voiced that. She said this is all we want to do in this atmosphere, let all of the questions, all of that come out ...and one of the things is because this has been in motion now even from our last council meeting, some of it should have been introduced to us. That's all I'm saying because obviously there's been a lot of discussion going on about it and we just want to be a part of ... that's all it is and we might could even move it forward faster than what you're proposing if we are involved from the jump street." Councilman Gardner said historically when you look from the railroad tracks and look into the alphabet streets you see Dixie Cup, but in a couple of months that's not going to be the case anymore. He said this is going to have the esthetic appeasement of all the other properties surrounding it. Councilman Bryant said I think it's well worth moving it forward so the planning commission can take a look at it and dive into it with the

developer. He said if you have reservations that you're worried about …if you're worried about maybe if somebody didn't call, maybe you can reach out and have conversations with the developer over the next couple of months while it's getting through planning commission and figure out what issues you may have and let's solve those, but to hold it up just because you weren't called first, I think we just need to move forward with it. Mayor Boyd said just to set the record straight Mr. Evans has been working on this property with the Codes Department for a while. My issue of being involved with it as the mayor and your issues as councilmembers should be that we're here to develop anything that we can in the city. Mayor Boyd said he approached me last week as I called you and told you, so this has not been brewing for years, weeks or months. It was approved by the Codes Department if it could be changed for the zoning, so I called Mr. Scott to make sure. He said he also called William Jackson and asked if this needed to go through zoning and he said no, that council can do it. He said he called Mr. Scott to make sure, and he said he could do an ordinance on it. He said you sit at council up here and you dig and plead and beg to try to find money but then when someone does come to town and is going to do it, you throw up hesitation toward it instead of trying to do the right process. The right process is to look at this and then take it to the planning commission. **Councilman Milling said in order to end the discussion one way or another I am going to make a motion to approve First Reading on Ordinance 2026-06 an Ordinance of the City of Darlington South Carolina approving to rezone 1.142229 acres located at the corner of A Avenue and Second Street, in the City of Darlington, Darlington County TMS #165-03-02-037, from General Commercial use to High Density Residential; and other matters related thereto. Councilman Segars seconded the motion.** Mr. Scott said I just want to make a point of clarification process wise. State law has a very specific process for approval of …or changing the zoning maps. This is only the first step; there will be a public hearing, discussion before the planning commission and all the concerns that I've heard from council tonight can be a part of that process. You will not lose any of those evaluation points that you've raised tonight by taking that vote. This is just a procedure." **Councilpersons Gardner, McRavin, Reed, Baccus and Mayor Boyd voted in favor of the motion.** Councilwoman Baccus said, "And I would like to say let's see if you have this same energy when it's another contractor on the other side of town. **Councilman Milling made a motion to approve First Reading on Ordinance 2026-07 an ordinance of the City of Darlington, South Carolina, approving to rezone 0.785893 acres located at the corner of A Avenue and Third Street in the City of Darlington TMS #165–03–02–031 from General Commercial use to High Density Residential and other matters related thereto. Councilman Gardner seconded the motion. Councilpersons McRavin, Reed, Segars, Baccus and Mayor Boyd voted in favor of the motion.**

Councilwoman McRavin asked if this does go to planning and they decide that the zoning should be different from R-6 are we still able to make that change. Councilman Gardner said anytime the board brings something to our attention it's always a suggestion and we can go with it or we can make our own. Councilwoman McRavin said this is nothing against development. I said that to begin with. I've made these comments before that when we come into a council meeting, and we have paperwork in front of us that we've never seen before it's a little difficult for us to make an educated vote and decision when I haven't had opportunity to review it. She said I had no idea who the developer was. Councilwoman Reed told Mr. Evans she appreciates so much what he is doing for the city and would like for him to expand it to Ward 2.

Executive Session

a. Discussion and receipt of legal advice regarding contractual arrangements to purchase real property SC code 30–40-70(a)(2)
b. Discussion and receipt of legal advice regarding contractual arrangements to sell real property on Exchange Street SC code 30–40-70(a)(2)
c. Discussion and receipt of legal advice regarding contract contractual arrangements to update the cities' comprehensive plan SC code 30–40-70(a)(2)
d. Discussion of employment matters regarding hiring of city manager S.C. code 30–40–70(a)(1)

Possible votes on matters resulting from executive session.

Councilman Gardner made a motion to go into executive session at 7:40 PM. Councilman Segars seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

5-minute break

Back In Session

Councilman Milling made a motion to end executive session at 8:35 PM. Councilman Gardner seconded the motion. All approved the motion.

Councilwoman McRavin made a motion that we adopt a plan as discussed to continue our city manager search. Councilman Gardner seconded the motion. All approved the motion.

Reminders

Monday, June 29, 2026, at 6:00 PM public hearing/special city council meeting

On Friday, July 3, 2026, July 4 holiday city offices will be closed.

Tuesday, July 7, 2026, next regular city council meeting

Adjournment

Councilwoman McRavin made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:36 PM. Councilman Milling seconded the motion. Councilpersons Gardner, Reed, Baccus, Segars and Mayor Boyd voted in favor of adjourning the meeting.

_____ Mayor

ATTEST: _____

Clerk and Treasurer