

PLANNING COMMISSION
Monday, November 14, 2016
Clemson City Hall Council Chambers
6:00 P.M.

MINUTES

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

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

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 6:02 pm by Mr. Peters.
2. **Public Session:** No one from the public chose to speak. Public session was closed.
3. **Adoption of Minutes: September 12, 2016.** Mr. McGuire motioned to accept the minutes. Mr. Carson seconded the motion. Unanimously approved by a show of hands.

4. Advisory/Action Items

- a. **2016-R-12:** Proposed Amendment to Article III. Residential Districts, Residential Developments to clarify standards for duplexes

Mr. Steadman reminded the Commission that this matter had been previously discussed. He stated that when the Residential Districts standards were revised that changes were made to clarify how to deal with townhomes. The same language was supposed to be applied to duplexes and it was inadvertently left off. It is to clarify the language on spacing, heights, and setbacks for multiple duplexes on a single lot or on individual lots.

Discussion followed by the Commission clarifying the language.

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

Mr. Carson moved to accept the clarification 2016-R-12 as written. Ms. Andreason seconded. The motion was approved unanimously by a show of hands.

- b. **2016-R-15:** Proposed Amendment to Table 19-404 to allow for plazas in CP-1

Mr. Steadman reminded the Commission that they had discussed this proposal before. When the Commission modified the minimum and maximum front setbacks in CP1 it was suggested that we have an allowance for plazas in front of CP1 buildings. The language being presented will do that. It states the maximum front setback for all CP-1 properties shall be 15 feet, unless a public plaza is provided. Any such plaza shall have a minimum depth of 25 feet deep and a maximum depth of 50 feet, front a public street or sidewalk, be accessible to the general public, be a minimum of 25 feet wide with a maximum width of 50 percent of the building frontage, and ensure that all sides of the building abutting the plaza have retail, office, or service uses with a minimum depth of 35 feet.

Discussion followed by the Commission clarifying the proposal.

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

Mr. McGuire moved to accept the proposed amendment to the setback. Ms. Green seconded. The motion was approved unanimously by a show of hands.

c. **2016-S-01:** Final Plat approval of Sunset Arbor Subdivision and street naming

Mr. Steadman reviewed the final plat approval of Sunset Arbor Subdivision and street naming. His understanding is that the Commission approved the subdivision with three caveats. The first was they maintain a 40' buffer against all neighbors. This has been accomplished. The second was that they meet with the neighbors to come up with an acceptable plan for screening the detention pond. That has been done with staff's recommendation to have the Commission defer to staff for the final placement and species selection of the plants. The third issue was for the developer to agree to an easement to accommodate the Green Crescent Trail should that become necessary. The developer has agreed to that verbally (and in the Minutes) and a letter from the developer has been submitted prior to the meeting today. Also, the Commission needs to approve the proposed name of the street which is Ember Woods Lane. This name is unique and non-competing with any existing street names in Clemson.

Discussion followed by the Commission and Mr. Steadman about the Green Crescent Trail Easement.

Brad Harper representing Great Southern Homes, 101 Great Riding Rd, Clemson, SC 29631 felt it would be best to have the easement on the deed prior to the sale to prevent any misinterpretation from the sales agent.

Mr. Peters had concerns from the last meeting dealing with storm water runoff with lots 1 & 2, Sedgefield.

Mr. Harper stated they had met with the adjacent property owners. Upon reviewing the situation and agreed that once the development is built it would change the water flow to one spot where it could be controlled, therefore, eliminating any issues with runoff. Regardless, any storm water solutions would have to be approved by the City's Storm Water Manager.

Mr. McGuire asked about what was decided about the hammer head, cul-de-sac and fire safety dealing with the end of the road?

Mr. Harper stated that they briefly talked about the pros and cons of using a cul-de-sac or a hammer head from the stand point of use of space and safety. The Fire Marshal is comfortable with the hammerhead as they can back the truck up and back it out. From the use of space stand point the hammer head works better with the way the lots lay out, you get square shapes on them verses with a cul-de-sac you get pie shaped lots which gets weird when setting a house on it.

Mr. McGuire asked if an agreement was reached dealing with a landscape plan for screening of the detention pond.

Mr. Harper said they agreed to do something to screen it and were still trying to determine how to define exactly what that is. They realize any solution will require DHEC approving the plan and

the City Storm Water Department approving the plan as far as vegetation that is planted. Picking a vegetative option that provides the screening they want but also provides for the integrity of the dam structure over time as vegetation grows and becomes mature are parts of the decisions which remain in flux. The applicant stated that they are going to put something that screens the pond but still works within the constraints. A large oak tree might be nice short term but long term they may have to cut it down because it could cause the dam to leak.

Mr. Newton recused himself from voting on action item 2016-S-01 due to a potential conflict of interest and he stated he did not vote on it last time.

Ms. Green expressed her concerns about the easement for the Green Crescent Trail, she would not be in favor of such an easement going through her property and could not support this.

Mr. Steadman explained that the verbiage of the letter included two things; first, the Green Crescent Trail is not funded and second, we are not sure which side of the road the Trail will be for this section of Berkeley. But he feels there was wisdom in the Planning Commission anticipating some version of this happening and it would be nice to go ahead and have this easement in place if that time ever comes.

Discussion follow by the Commission about the pros and cons of the easements. It was pointed out that this was voluntary on the part of the applicant and that anyone purchasing a parcel which has an easement will be doing so with full awareness of the easement. Nothing will be imposed on anyone.

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

Mr. McGuire motioned to accept 2016-S-1 as presented with the requirement that prior to final approval the easement for the Green Crescent Trail must be in place and with the request that if the neighbors and developers cannot agree upon a solution for screening storm water installations that the matter be brought back to the Commission. Mr. Mixon seconded. Mr. Carson, Mr. Peters, Mr. McGuire and Ms. Andreasen were in favor of the motion. Ms. Green opposed the motion. Mr. Newton recused himself. Motion passed.

- d. **2016-R-13:** Proposed amendment to Section 19-402 and 19-405 to allow the sale of motor scooters in CP-2

Mr. Steadman reported that some merchants have asked if they could sell scooters in Clemson. Ironically, the only place that allows them to be sold is CP3. Clemson has no CP3. So, we propose to allow the sale of scooters as a conditional use in CP2. The proposed language will effectively limit this to scooter and moped sales only as all merchandise has to be indoors.

Commission members expressed concerns as follows but not limited to:

- Is this just limited to scooters or would ATV's and boats be included?
- Were any of these requests brought before the BZA?
- Did someone specifically ask for this?
- Would this allow anyone to sell mopeds in CP2?
- Are the majority of the CP2 in an AR overlay district?
- Does the Commission have final authority, and would it go to a Public Hearing?
- Safety concerns with mopeds, scooters and traffic.

- We haven't heard enough from applicants or the public. There is also CP2, could they not ask for rezoning to be CP3.
- Would help in reducing traffic?

Mr. Steadman responded to the concerns expressed by Commission. Yes you could have ATVs, or motorcycles, but they could not be on the sidewalks or out in front. The likelihood of anything other than scooters is slim. The BZA could have not have granted a variance, it would have to be in the code first and right now we don't allow it. There is currently no land zoned CP3. We would have a definition for it if someone petitioned to be rezoned. Several people have inquired about scooter sales in Clemson and have been denied. When we got the last one, we decide to look into it. This is the language we came up with. Anyone could sell mopeds as long as they were in CP-2 and as long as it was inside. All CP2 is in an AR overlay district. If you make this recommendation it would go to a Public Hearing then on through City Council. Mr. Steadman recommends that the Commission include the safety concerns as part of the motion. While the Commission thinks this is a fair and good idea from a zoning standpoint, it raises questions in regards to safety with scooters. The Commission would like to see the City research measures that can be taken to create a safer environment for people riding scooters. Some campuses require you to be licensed and insured to park scooters on campus, even though the state does not have any regulations specific to scooters/mopeds.

Public Comment:

Don Collins, 112 Allee Street, Clemson suggested that you have this to cover two wheel verses four wheel motorized vehicles as you go forward.

Mr. Newton moved to approve Action item 2016-R-13 as written. Ms. Green seconded. Mr. Newton, Mr. Carson, Mr. Peters, and Ms. Green were all in favor. Ms. Andreasen, Mr. McGuire and Mr. Mixon were opposed. Motion passed.

5. Discussion Items:

- a. Planning Commission Concept introduction and Review of a proposed PD for the Catholic Church Property.

Mr. Steadman informed the Commission that The Catholic Church has been working towards developing a PD for their combined properties bordered by Sloan, Edgewood, and Wigington. The Catholic Church will be sharing with you their general concept for the project including the proposed phasing. The third phase would only occur if they acquire additional property.

The residential component of the PD will be contained in one of the houses on Wigington Street and will be home to various students affiliated with the church. The other houses will remain and be used as office space, counseling, and teaching. The small stone chapel will also remain.

Father Dan McLellan, 207 Edgewood Ave, Clemson, SC pastor of Saint Andrews stated that the Catholic parish has had its place of worship at the corner of Sloan and Edgewood since 1935. He said that the parish was about 550 households and does not foresee any appreciable growth in the years to come. Even right now they kind of have outgrown their current worship space on Sundays, which is 285 seats. They are looking to increase that with a new church with roughly 500 seats and a hall that would accommodate about 300 people. They want to stay in downtown Clemson.

Commission members expressed concerns as follows but not limited to:

- Will people be living in these homes?
- Are some homes being used as Sunday school rooms?
- Limited parking, concerns with parking lots creating noise and light issues being next door to residential homes.
- Would you entertain leasing some parking to city when the church is not using them?
- Will this disrupt the lives of the residents?

Father Dan McLellan, responded to the Commissions concerns:

- The clergy will reside on site, plus the interns are provided rooms at no cost but they have to qualify as an intern.
- Yes, some of the homes are being used as Sunday school rooms.
- There is limited parking at this time, if new parking lot is approved the church would be open to allow parking Monday through Friday 6 am to 12 pm.
- Does not believe this will disrupt the lives of the residence. This is not introducing a new activity. We are trying to accommodate with some minimal growth.

Lisa Lanni 32 Ashley Ave, Greenville, SC 29607 and Lynn Solesbee, 19 Washington Pk, #100, Greenville SC 29601 both representing Blue Water Civil Design, responded to Commissions questions and concerns.

There was discussion regarding the buffering/screening between adjacent properties and the applicant was asked to consider alternatives to fencing.

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

b. Determine who would like to reapply to the Commission and who is rotating off.

Mr. Carson is rotating off. The normal service for Mr. Peters and Mr. McGuire is up, they will have to apply for one of the three vacancies.

Mr. Carson motioned to adjourn the meeting, Ms. Green seconded. Meeting adjourned unanimously by a show of hands.

6. Adjourn: Meeting was adjourned at 8:12 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.**