

**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Monday, August 8, 2016**  
**Clemson City Hall Council Chambers**  
**6:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**Members present:** Robert Mixon, Eric Newton, Chad Carson, John Peters, Fran McGuire, Mary Beth Green and Ruth Andreasen

**Staff present:** Todd Steadman, Planner; and Kelly Winchester, Recording Secretary

**1. Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm by Mr. Peters.

**2. Public Session:**

Commission questioned the by-laws for public session.

Mr. Steadman clarified the public session portion of the by-laws stating that the public is allowed to speak on non-agenda items during the public session at the beginning of the meeting and then the public is allowed to speak on specific agenda items as those items are addressed by the Commission.

No one from the public chose to speak. Public session was closed.

**3. Adoption of Minutes: July 11, 2016.** Mr. McGuire moved to accept the minutes with changes. Ms. Green second. All in favor by a show of hands.

**4. Advisory/Action Items**

**a. 2016-R-09:** Revision of maximum front set CP-1 District.

Mr. Steadman informed the Commission that the original maximum and minimum front set-back in CP-1 is 8' which he felt was too restrictive. The revision would allow 15' maximum set-backs.

Discussion followed by the Commission on different property locations to which this would apply.

Mr. Carson asked how similar this would be to plazas in front of commercial mixed-use developments and asked if there was a negative to having CP-1 set up in a similar manner.

Mr. Steadman stated that the proposal in front of Commission did not have that particular requirement. This does not require a plaza but you could do landscaping instead. Mr. Steadman did not think it would be negative to have a provision for an increased setback when a plaza is provided and said he would bring some proposed language to the Planning Commission.

Discussion followed.

Public Comment: Open and closed no one chose to speak.

Mr. Mixon motioned to accept as is with correction of set-back. Mr. Newton seconded. The motion passed unanimously with a show of hands.

The Commission requested Mr. Steadman propose language for how the setback in CP-1 can be increased if a plaza is added.

Mr. Steadman made a request to the Commission to move item 2016-S-05 ahead of item 2016-R-10 due to the possible of length of time of discussion regarding the reduction of parking requirement for mixed-use and multi-family projects.

The Commission agreed to move to 2016-S-05 next.

**c. 2016-S-05:** Approval of proposed site plan and architecture for a Waffle House to be located on the commercial parcel of Aspen Heights at 663 Old Greenville Highway.

Mr. Steadman informed the Commission that the proposal meets code, and was not in conflict with anything in the PD ordinance but protocol mandates that the Commission must approve. He mentioned that in the absence of detail in a PD ordinance he typically looks at the AR District Standards for guidelines and in this case the project met the district standards with the exception of the colors. District standards would only allow a maximum of 25% of the façade be a bright primary color.

The Commission expressed concerns about the following issues.

- Concern was expressed regarding the house that is adjacent to the parcel.
- Concern was expressed on the boldness of the colors.
- It was suggested that for future development that the architectural standards be the same on either side of the road.
- Handicap parking spaces.
- Adequate space for the entrance.
- If existing trees died, would they be replaced?

Mr. Randy Fick, Waffle House, Norcross, GA, stated the cornice around the building is larger than usual and was designed that way to hide the roof top equipment. The yellow band is a trademark of the Waffle House. The fascia is Waffle House's standard color.

Ms. Andreasen asked Mr. Fick to take the plans back to corporate and rework them. She objected to the boldness of the colors being used on the building and signage. Also, she had concerns with the exterior materials that were being used. Several other commissioners expressed concern about the brightness of the colors.

Mr. Fick asked to work with the staff on getting it approved and the colors.

Public Comment:

Ms. Katie Healy, 140 Folgers St, Clemson – Stated that yellow and red are both primary colors, black is not a primary color so by adding a strip of black would make the difference.

Mr. Carson motioned to approve this request with an amendment to delegate to the Planning staff the authority to work with the applicant so this property meets the same standard as the architectural standards of that district. Mr. Newton seconded the motion. Motion passed six to one (Mr. McGuire opposed).

**b. 2016-R-10:** Reduction of parking requirement for mixed-use and multi-family projects within -1 mile of Clemson.

Mr. Steadman presented the proposal to reduce vehicular circulation within City limits by having the ability to reduce the amount of parking required for projects within walking or biking distance of campus. He proceeded to discuss criteria that would need to be met in order to get a .5 space per bedroom parking ratio.

Mr. Steadman reported that the City was expecting a 600 bedroom complex, located behind Lowe's to be submitted. He went on to say there has been no increase in traffic tickets or illegal neighborhood parking since Campus View has been occupied. He made some corrections to comments made prior to the meeting saying there are 1984 bedrooms under construction, not 2300; there have been 600 bedrooms submitted for review this month not 1500.

Mr. Steadman spoke with Upstate Forever, CAT, two of the leading traffic engineering analysis organizations in the country, The American Planning Association, and they all agree that what has been proposed is the best way to reduce traffic, promote transit, and create a healthier community by walking and reducing drunk driving.

Mr. Steadman presented 3 choices to the Commission:

1. Take no action, leave it as is, 1 parking space per bedroom.
2. Reduce to .67 with or without conditions.
3. Reduce to .5 or to give an option to reduce to .5.

Public Comment:

Ms. Katherine Schwensen recommended by email that the city be cautious about changing this ratio at this time. She feels that the city should wait to see the affect of the development that is already in the works. Her concerns are that traffic and parking problems caused by the current development could result in loss of downtown businesses due to people avoiding the area due to traffic issues. Ms. Schwensen stated she did not support a reduction in the parking ratio at this time.

Mr. Jody Hunter, 268 Riggs Dr, Clemson requested that the Planning Commission maintain the current parking regulations of one parking space per bedroom.

Ms. Katie Healy, 140 Folgers St, Clemson reiterated when you come to campus you come by car which means you have to have a place for that car to park. Campus View is not affecting anything, but now we are adding more complexes so you will no longer have those old statistics to go by because we are adding more students. She asked who was benefiting to less parking and what was the rationale behind this?

Discussion followed by Commission to help Ms. Healy understand. Discussion continued between the Commission of the pro and cons of reducing the parking ratio.

Ms. Healy asked if this could wait to see what the impact to traffic and parking would be once the units that are under construction are occupied, then we could look back see what needed to be changed.

Mr. Steadman explained it could take 3 years to see the true impact and felt it would be best to be proactive now rather than be reactive in 3 years. The Commission continued to discuss pros and cons of reducing parking and examined some examples of walkable and public transit oriented municipalities.

Mr. Carson stated that the suggested changes to parking were in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Newton motioned to approve the language as written by the staff (the language in red in the Planning Commission staff notes dated August 8, 2016) with the amendment to subsection F saying that \$10,000 per space could be applied to CAT and/or other transit related operations. Mr. Carson seconded the motion. Motion passed by a show of hands, 6 to 1 (Mr. Mixon opposed).

Mr. McGuire motioned for staff to develop a plan for the Commission to consider for a local resident neighborhood parking permit program. Mr. Carson seconded. The motion passed unanimously by a show of hands.

**5. Discussion Items:**

- a. August 22 workshop
- b. Duplex district standards
- c. Possible R-8 District

**6. Adjourn:** Meeting was adjourned at 9:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Winchester, Recording Secretary

*Note: The proceedings of this meeting have been recorded on digital media*

**\* These minutes are in draft format and subject to change until approval by the Planning Commission.**