

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED
NOV 05 2018
SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

Honorable J.C Nicholson, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2018-000332

Stephen G. Brock,Appellant

v.

Town of Mt. PleasantRespondent

REPLY OF APPELLANT

Stephen G. Brock
Appellant, *pro se*
34 Hopetown Road
Mt. Pleasant, SC,
29464
843-478-3021

November 2, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....ii

ARGUMENTSiii

CONCLUSION11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Board of Educ. v. Salt Lake County, 659 P.2d 1030, 1030 (Utah 1983).

Springville Cit. for a Btr. Comm. v. Springville 979 P.2d 332 (Utah 1999)

Loehr v. Ventura County Community College Dist. (1983) 147 Cal.App.3d 1071, 1083 [195 Cal.Rptr. 576]

Bassei v. United States, 632 F 3d, 1145 (9th Cir. 2011)

Fiskin v. HiAcre, Inc., 462 Pa. 309,341,A.2d 95 (1975);

Business License Opposition Comm. v. Sumter Co., 311 S.C. 24, S.E. 2d 24 (S.C. 1992

I'On v. Town of Mt. Pleasant 526 S.E.2d, 716 (S.C. 2000)

Brown v. County of Charleston 303 S.C. 245, 399 S.E.2d 784 (Ct. App.1990)

Bethea v. Floyd 177 S.C. 521 (1935)

Lovelle v. Thornton 106 S.E.2d 531(S.C.1959)

(Lathem v. City of Greenville 256 S.C. 586, 183 S.E.2d 455 (1971)

Ordinances

Chapter 155 - Land Development Regulations - Mt. Pleasant Code Of Ordinances

Chapter 156 - Zoning Code – Mt. Pleasant Code of Ordinances

Chapter 39 - Rules of Order – Mt. Pleasant Code of Ordinances

Statutes

South Carolina Local Government Planning Enabling Act of 1994,

Other

Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised; Chapter IV, §8

ARGUMENTS

- 1. RESPONDENT MISCHARACTERIZES THE FACTS OF THE CASE**
- 2. RESPONDENT MISCHARACTERIZES SPECIAL MEETINGS AND
APPLICATION OF RULES OF ORDER**
- 3. RESPONDENT MISCHARACTERIZES THE PROCESS FOR INITIATION OF
ORDINANCE AND APPLICABLE RULES OF ORDER**

RESPONDENT MISCHARACTERIZES THE FACTS OF THE CASE

Respondent's Initial Brief minimizes, ignores and misstates facts, and legal issues to support the contention that in the creation of dozens of amendments to the Zoning Code and Land Development Regulations of the Town of Mt. Pleasant, Respondent "touched all the bases". Additionally, Respondent proposes that its rules of order were consistently followed. Respondent's positions on several issues are in such contrast to the facts that they stand as evidence of questions of material fact for a jury.

Respondent's Initial Brief ends with the specific claim that the amendments at issue were "properly enacted" and that there were "no defects in the process...". At the same time, Respondent would lay an anchor to windward with the claim that if there are defects, they are forgiven under the Doctrine of Substantial Compliance (Respondent's Brief Pages 5&9.) Substantial compliance involving "directory" provisions of a statute is distinguished from mandatory (statutory) provisions. Both cases relied on in Respondent's Brief (page 9) support Appellant's argument rather than its own, to wit, that while "directory" language may be subject to a finding of substantial compliance, statutory language is not:

The provisions of the statute with reference to the time of filing are directory rather than mandatory (emphasis added)...We should not, because of a merely technical failure to comply with a directory provision of the statute, deny the candidate the fruits of victory. (Lovelle v. Thornton 106 S.E.2d 531(S.C.1959)

Nonobservance of mere directory provisions, slight irregularities, immaterial variances...will be disregarded where there is substantial compliance with the requirements. (Lathem v. City of Greenville 256 S.C. 586, 183 S.E.2d 455 (1971) citing 14 E. McQuillan, Law of Municipal Corporations, Sec. 38-175 (1970 rev. vol.)

The district court's use of the substantial compliance doctrine in the face of ordinances that are expressly mandatory was erroneous. While substantial compliance with matters

In which a municipality has discretion may indeed suffice, it does not when the municipality itself has legislatively removed any such discretion. The fundamental consideration in interpreting legislation, whether at the state or local level, is legislative intent. (Board of Educ. v. Salt Lake County, 659 P.2d 1030, 1030 (Utah 1983).

Application of the substantial compliance doctrine where the ordinances at issue are explicitly mandatory contravenes the unmistakable intent of those ordinances. (Springville Cit. for a Btr. Comm. v. Springville 979 P.2d 332 (Utah 1999)

The doctrine of substantial compliance... "cannot cure total omission of an essential element from the claim or remedy...". (Loehr v. Ventura County Community College Dist. (1983) 147 Cal.App.3d 1071, 1083 [195 Cal.Rptr. 576] (Loehr).

The doctrine of substantial compliance can have no application in the context of a clear statutory prerequisite that is known to the party seeking to apply the doctrine. (Bassei v. United States, 632 F 3d, 1145 (9th Cir. 2011)

Perfect compliance and substantial compliance are competing claims. Moreover, a claim to substantial compliance is *defacto* recognition by Respondent of the existence of the "scintilla of evidence" necessary to defeat summary judgment on a mandatory requirement.

As defined in the Mt. Pleasant Code of Ordinances (§156.006)(D), "The term SHALL is always mandatory, and the word MAY is "permissive". (emphasis is contained in the original) Throughout the ordinance-driven process of amendment (Section (156.031(C-F) Zoning Code) as detailed in Appellant's Initial Brief, the word "shall" accompanies every step of that process beginning with submission to the Planning Commission and culminating in its report and recommendation and action by Town Council (§156.031C-F). The corresponding statute (Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act – (§6-29-760)(A) mirrors the ordinance providing that the Planning Commission "shall have a time prescribed in the ordinance... within which to submit its report and recommendation". Criteria for amendment are presented by the Ordinance providing that the Commission "shall" consider those criteria in preparing its report and recommendation.

The result of the mandatory process of amendment is avoidance of “haphazard or thoughtless decisions” as expressed by our Supreme Court (*I’On v. Town of Mt. Pleasant* 526 S.E. 2d, 716 S.C. 2000 commenting on the Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act). Thoughtful zoning and land development serves the interests of the citizens of any jurisdiction with the tangential value of protecting the Town from legal challenges while creating historical record useful for deciding future zoning law. Four of the seven mandatory steps in the Town’s Zoning Code amendment process that lead directly to the mandatory report and recommendation were ignored. The only steps accomplished by Town Council were notice and submission to the Planning Commission for public hearing. (Order p3). As the minutes of the Planning Commission August 24, 2016, affirm, Commission failed to do its job and Town Council failed to require the lawful process for amendment. Remand was available as a remedy to secure the report and recommendation required by law.

Despite the clear language of the Zoning Ordinance regarding the Recommendation, Respondent expended considerable space (pages 5-7) to inveigh against the perils of a “written” Recommendation from the Planning Commission. The exercise served only to raise the question whether Respondent knows the lawful process of amendment.

As briefly as possible for correction, from Appellant’s experience on the Commission witnessing and personally formulating reports and recommendations, the findings of the Commission are expected to be incorporated into the motion for approval or disapproval. Published minutes of the meeting provide additional material for Town Council from discussion among members of the Commission and comments from the public.

On the subject of amendment of the Land Use Regulations, Respondent notes that the statute does not require any action by the Planning Commission on the Land Development

Regulations; however, Respondent failed to mention that approval by the Planning Commission is required by the Land Development Regulations. (§155.087) A public hearing is not required of the Commission for amendment of the Land Development Regulations, however, the amendments were inserted in the public hearing for the Zoning Code amendments without notice. The notice for the August 24, 2016, Planning Commission's special meeting and public hearing specifically excluded the Regulations from the Commission public hearing. Unnoticed for the public hearing before the Commission and not voted on as a separate issue, those amendments are of questionable standing and further reflective of the haphazard approach to zoning and land use by Respondent.

Respondent claims that it was "not the intention of the amendments" to take away powers of the Planning Commission. Intent is irrelevant in light of the fact that what were once public processes before the Commission - presentation and approval of preliminary and final plats - are now secreted within the Planning Department with no public exposure. Authority was taken from the Planning Commission; power was taken from the citizens of Mount Pleasant who no longer will even know when plans are submitted, much less what the Plans propose. Respondent's tepid affirmation that "public participation is good" supports Appellant's position, however, the Town's stated belief is contradicted by its actions on this and other matters of the amendments.

Respondent would place the burden of Appellant to prove that the Planning Commission did not consider the criteria for amendments to the Zoning Code. The minutes of the August 24, 2016, Planning Commission meeting contain no mention of any criteria considered, nor the mandatory report based on consideration of the criteria for amendment and the recommendation itself. Quite simply, Respondent offers no evidence of completion of the mandatory process of amendment.

RESPONDENT MISCHARACTERIZES SPECIAL MEETINGS AND APPLICATION OF RULES OF ORDER

Respondent's analysis of Appellant's position on special meetings and related reference to special meetings in Robert's Rules of Order (RRO) is inaccurate. Respondent misperceives the instruction of RRO on special meetings. As defined by RRO, "a meeting is a single official gathering of members for a length of time from which there is no cessation the proceedings".... (RRO Newly Revised 11th Edition, Chapter IV, §8) . A session is a meeting or series of connected meetings devoted to a single order business, program, agenda, or announced purpose"...(id at page 82, line 6) Regardless of which might be involved, Roberts is clear, "The reason for special meetings is to deal with matters they may arise between regular meetings and that require action by the society before the next regular meeting...".

Public bodies routinely adopt RRO, often with little subsequent interest. That does not excuse any public body from abiding by those procedures relevant to its activities not barred by state law. In this case, a 3PM Special Meeting of the Mt. Pleasant Planning Commission, with a Public Hearing on its agenda, convened on August 24, 2016. On that same date, two hours later followed the regular monthly meeting of the Commission at 5PM. Given the purpose of a special meeting, the meeting was clearly a violation of its published Rules of Order. No credible rationale has been offered for the scheduling.

As to the explanations of why 3 o'clock public hearing might be just as appropriate as a hearing 5 o'clock - the regularly scheduled time of planning commission meetings - Respondent suggests various hypothetical conditions, including convenience for local developers and land planning companies who might find 3 PM a more convenient time. Common sense answers the question whether 5pm is more convenient for the public at large than 3pm. Among those who could not

attend would teachers and mothers of school-age children. Disregarded in the rationalization of 3pm convenience are those who work at an hourly wage. Respondent offers that “public participation is good,” and “should be encouraged”, but Respondent goes on to find that public participation is “only one factor to take into consideration”. It is, in fact, the preeminent consideration for a “**public**” (emphasis added) hearing. Evidence of the value of public participation by Respondent Town of Mt. Pleasant is well-expressed by this case.

**RESPONDENT MISCHARACTERIZES THE PROCESS FOR INITIATION OF
ORDINANCE AND APPLICABLE RULES OF ORDER**

On the matter of the origin of the amendments, Respondent offers that even if there is some evidence that the ordinance was initiated by the Planning and Development Committee, that committee is comprised of four members of Council who have the authority to introduce ordinances. There is no question that any member of Council may introduce any matter to Council as explained in Appellant’s Initial Brief. That fact has nothing to do with this case. Introduction of an any matter has a process in Town Council’s Rules of Order and does not suggest that a committee (without a quorum) can perform any action reserved for Town Council.

Respondent further finds that there is no case law to support overturning an ordinance based on who proposed the ordinance. There is case law for overturning an ordinance adopted illegally.

...non-compliance with directory language creates a “voidable” transaction, noncompliance with mandatory provisions renders the transaction “*void ab initio*” (Fiskin v. HiAcres, Inc., 462 Pa. 309,341,A.2d 95 (1975);

In a South Carolina Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), a vote on a business license ordinance was overturned when it was not approved in an open meeting. (Business License Opposition Comm. v. Sumter Co., 311 S.C. 24, S.E. 2d 24 (S.C. 1992). It is difficult to see any


substantial difference in the FOIA case and this one. In both cases, ordinances were created outside lawful process.

As for the presumption that agenda item being presumed to have been placed on the agenda by someone with authority, it is unclear whose presumption this might be, but “someone with authority” is not always someone acting lawfully. Further, the premise that an approving vote at a noticed meeting can overcome failed, lawful processes leading to that vote is not an admirable standard for government at any level.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the lower court’s order should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stephen G. Brock', written over a horizontal line.

Stephen G. Brock
Appellant, *pro se*
34 Hopetown Road
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
843-478-3021
SteveBrock7@gmail.com

November 3, 2018

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

NOV 05 2018

SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

Honorable J.C Nicholson, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2018-000332

Stephen G. Brock,Appellant

v.


Town of Mt. PleasantRespondent

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on the 3d day of November, 2018, a true and correct copy of APPELLANT’S REPLY was deposited in the U.S. Mail addressed to Respondent’s attorneys of record as shown below:

Timothy A. Domin, Esq.
Clawson and Staubes
Seven Farms Drive
Charleston, SC

Julia P. Copeland. Esq.
Town of Mt. Pleasant
100 Ann Edwards Lane
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464



Stephen G. Brock
34 Hopetown Road
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
(843) 478-3021
SteveBrock7@gmail.com

November 3, 2018
Mt. Pleasant, SC

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL



1007



29211

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
PME 1-Day
MOUNT PLEASANT, SC
29464
NOV 03, 18
AMOUNT
\$24.70
R2305H128963-17

**PRIORITY
★ MAIL ★
EXPRESS™**
OUR FASTEST SERVICE IN THE U.S.

WHEN USED INTERNATIONALLY,
A CUSTOMS DECLARATION
LABEL MAY BE REQUIRED.



EP13F July 2013 OD: 12.5 x 9.5



E2267813850US

ATIONAL USE



**PRIORITY
★ MAIL ★
EXPRESS™**

CUSTOMER USE ONLY

FROM: (PLEASE PRINT) **STEPHEN BROOK** PHONE **843-474-3021**
34 HOPETOWN RD
MT. PLEASANT, SC
29464

PAYMENT BY ACCOUNT (If applicable)

DELIVERY OPTIONS (Customer Use Only)

SIGNATURE REQUIRED Note: The mailer must check the "Signature Required" box if the mailer: 1) Requires the addressee's signature; OR 2) Purchases additional insurance; OR 3) Purchases COD service; OR 4) Purchases Return Receipt service. If the box is not checked, the Postal Service will leave the item in the addressee's mail receptacle or other secure location without attempting to obtain the addressee's signature on delivery.

Delivery Options

No Saturday Delivery (delivered next business day)
 Sunday/Holiday Delivery Required (additional fee, where available)
 10:30 AM Delivery Required (additional fee, where available)
 *Refer to USPS.com® or local Post Office™ for availability.

TO: (PLEASE PRINT) **SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS** PHONE **803-734-1890**
PO 2304 1100
COLUMBIA, SC

ZIP + 4® (U.S. ADDRESSES ONLY) **29211**

RECEIVED
NOV 05 2018
SC Court of Appeals

■ For pickup or USPS Tracking™, visit USPS.com or call 800-222-1811.
 ■ \$100.00 Insurance Included.

ORIGIN (POSTAL SERVICE USE ONLY)

1-Day 2-Day Military DPO

PO ZIP Code 29464	Scheduled Delivery Date (MM/DD/YYYY) 11-5-18	Postage \$24.70
Date Accepted (MM/DD/YYYY) 11-3-18	Scheduled Delivery Time <input type="checkbox"/> 10:30 AM <input type="checkbox"/> 3:00 PM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 NOON	Insurance Fee \$
Time Accepted 11:53	<input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	Return Receipt Fee \$
Special Handling/Fragile \$	Sunday/Holiday Premium Fee \$	Live Animal Transportation Fee \$
Weight lbs. 3.0	Acceptance Employee Initials VE	Total Postage & Fees \$24.70

DELIVERY (POSTAL SERVICE USE ONLY)

Delivery Attempt (MM/DD/YYYY) Time Employee Signature
11/5 **6:32** **[Signature]**

Delivery Attempt (MM/DD/YYYY) Time Employee Signature
11/5 **6:32** **[Signature]**

LABEL 11-B, OCTOBER 2016 PSN 7690-02-000-9996 3-ADDRESSEE COPY

This packaging is the property of the U.S. Postal Service® and is provided solely for use in sending Priority Mail Express™ shipments. Misuse may be a violation of federal law. This packaging is not for resale. EP13F © U.S. Postal Service; July 2013. All rights reserved.