

PLANNING COMMISSION
Monday, April 11, 2016
Clemson City Hall Council Chambers
6:00 P.M.

MINUTES

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

Staff present: Sharon Richardson, Director of Planning and Codes; 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:** No one from the public chose to speak. Public session was closed.
3. **Adoption of Minutes: February 8, 2016.** Mr. Carson moved that the minutes from the February 8, 2016 meeting be approved. Ms. Green seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously by show of hands.
4. **Advisory/Action Items**
 - a. **2016-R-01:** Request by Earle & Rice Investment, LLC to consider a proposed major amendment to the Issaqueena Trail Planned Development to add storage and apparel retail uses to the land use allowances for Parcel “A” and modify the parking to comply with Article VII, Off-Street Parking.

Ms. Richardson reported that this Major Amendment to the Issaqueena Trail Planned Development (CC-2002-020) would amend the allowed uses in Section A, as well as, establish parking and landscaping standards for new uses. The regulating language for the Issaqueena Trail Planned Development has been modified to reflect the requested changes made by the applicants.

Discussion by the Planning Commission followed in reference to the proposed major amendment to allow storage and apparel retail uses to the land use allowance for parcel A.

Public Comment: Open

Mr. Jack Davis, 202 Wescott Drive, first question before Lowes, retail shops were a part of the P.D. plan for Lowes. Why did we have to go back? Second question, every retail shop has a storage facility/area. May I have your definition of a storage facility?

Ms. Richardson reported that in this case the storage facility they want to build would be for their adjacent building on a different lot, which is where they have the production facility for Tiger Town Graphics.

Mr. Davis asked if this storage is associated with that shop.

Ms. Richardson responded that it was associated with the production facility in the building that is already there.

The other issue is when the Lowes P.D. was adopted it only effected certain sections of the underlined P.D.

Mr. Davis is concerned once zoned storage and they move out, could it be turned into self-storage.

Ms. Richardson responded that self-storage is in another category.

Mr. Davis, ask to pay attention to the location of the handicap parking.

Ms. Richardson stated that was actually a requirement of the ADA Disability Act and that would be a requirement by our Code Officials.

Public Comment: Closed

Mr. McGuire motioned to approve this change, Mr. Carson seconded his motion. Motion was approved unanimously by a show of hands.

- b. 2016-R-02:** Proposed Text Amendment to the City of Clemson Zoning Ordinance to Remove the Allowance for Increase to Dwelling Occupancy for Patio and Zero-Lot Developments with On-site Management and to Require Landscaping/Bufferyards for Shared Parking for Same in the RM-1 & RM-2 Districts.

Ms. Richardson reported this text amendment will no longer allow one-person occupancy bonus for projects with on-site management. It would require shared parking areas to be treated like parking for multi-family complexes along with requiring bufferyards/landscaping in a similar manner.

Discussion by the Planning Commission followed in reference to removing the allowance for increase dwelling occupancy for Patio and Zero-Lot-Line Developments with On-site Management.

Public Comment: Open

Mr. Tal Slan, 408 College Avenue, In reference to reducing occupancy, was curious are other developers would lose this based on the City being disappointed with the results with doing it in a handful of cases. It hasn't been too long since it was changed, right?

Ms. Richardson stated the occupancy is two. There is an occupancy bonus if on-site management was on site. If that management goes away bonus goes away.

Mr. Slan, so that provision is not changing?

Ms. Richardson answered, so the two is what it is now, the proposal is to take away the bonus.

Discussion by the Planning Commission followed about the density and occupancy in the different zones. Some of the Planning Commission members disagree with it because of the economics of it and could cause development problems later with Single Family Developments.

Linda Dove, 146 Folgers Street, she served on the housing committee, one of the issues was lack of Single Family Homes so if this is a methodology to improve that, I would support that. Young professional, retirees are not interested in living in a community possible with students that have a different life style than them. This could be a good thing.

Discussion followed, Mr. Newton recommended discussing this some more.

Tal Slan, 408 College Avenue, expressed concerns about dealing with restrictions imposed by the city such as but not limited to dealing with occupancy change and development and these more restrictions placed on property, the more difficult it is for that person to sell, develop their property, possibly damaging their values.

Ms. Richardson clarified, we are not taking out the use. What we are proposing is taking out the occupancy bonus for having on-site management.

Mr. Newton said Planning Commission really needed to examine those areas on the zoning map to see where they are because maybe some of those parcels need to be zoned something different.

Ms. Richardson recommended tabling this Text Amendment and during the workshop meeting being set-up discuss how some of the sections that were changed a year ago are working.

Mr. Newton motioned to table this item on the agenda, Mr. Green seconded the motion.

Mr. Newton amended his motioned to table this till the next Planning Commission meeting, but in the meantime the staff will research the topic and set up a workshop to review RM1 and RM2 Zoning districts, Ms. Andereasen seconded the motion. Motion was approved unanimously by a show of hands.

- c. **2016-R-03:** Proposed Text Amendment to the City of Clemson Zoning Ordinance to Clarify Standards for Private Recreational Facilities Serving a Neighborhood or Residential Complex.

Ms. Richardson reported that this amendment clarifies the language requiring common amenity areas to be subdivided from the overall track. This amendment seeks to remove the requirement for projects where the land is commonly owned, either as a condominium complex or an apartment complex. In either case, the subdivision of the amenities onto a separate lot serves on logical purpose.

Mr. McGuire motioned to pass this Text Amendment, Mr. Carson seconded. Motion was unanimously by a show of hands.

- d. **2016-R-04:** Proposed Text Amendment to the City of Clemson Zoning Ordinance to Allow 65' Height for Hotels in the CM, Commercial-Mixed-use District as a Conditional Use.

Ms. Richardson was instructed by the Commissioners to prepare this proposed text amendment. Ms. Richardson prepared a draft to allow hotels only be constructed to a height of 65' in the CM District due to the same conditions as currently apply to the same use in the CP-2 District. Ms. Richardson described the Table 19-405. Which are the Standards for Conditional Uses and Special Exceptions in Non-residential Districts.

Discussion of the pros and cons of the text amendment to allow 65' height in the CM District followed by the Planning Commission.

Public Session:

Patricia Finley, Foy Creek, Clemson SC is concerned that a 65' building will destroy the residential section over on Shore Crest Dr. A 2-3 story area through there that has restaurants and shops. She stated it would be much nicer to walk out of a restaurant over to the park or to a shop. It would be much more conducive to that area.

Mr. Newton humbly disagreed that 15' would not make that much of a difference.

Ms. Finley has a question about the Step Down, that there is supposed to be a single step down in the zoning?

Ms. Richardson ask for clarification on what was meant by step down.

Ms. Finley clarified Step Down Zoning, if you had a residential house next to that commercial building.

Ms. Richardson replied there would be a buffer requirement that has been place for 30 years.

Ms. Finley is also concerned about the density, traffic downtown. Having the 65' height on Keowee Trail will add more traffic.

Mr. Newton explains there is not enough demand for Single Family Housing.

Jody Hunter, 268 Riggs Drive, as being a residence of Clemson I am trying to realize what a 65' hotel coming to Clemson would do for him. He stated a restaurant could go on the first floor of any hotel and it could stay with in the current 40' building height. If we want more restaurants we can find plenty other places to build them.

Bob McHilley, 140 Folger Street, Clemson. He believes your duty of an agency is to support the citizens of Clemson and not the university. As he understands it the hotels are only full 8 days a year for the home games. The area is coded for 40' height and leave it at a 40' height.

Ensley Coldwell, 111 Cochran Road, Clemson. If someone came in and built at the 65' limit, would it be possible to add in that they would have to provide some sort of restaurant that would benefit the community full time? If they don't want to put in a restaurant or something to benefit the community then they have to build at 40'.

Ms. Richardson stated the language could say a restaurant and hotel. Zoning can't say it is going to be a particular type of restaurant. But yes it could say a hotel in inclusive of a restaurant.

Jack Davis 202 Wescott Drive, Clemson. Has a concern, you are giving one developer a priority and the other property owners do not have the opportunity to increase the revenues. Until you get more than one employer in Clemson it is going to be the same thing over and over again.

Linda Dove 146 Folgers St, Clemson, Keowee Trail is a special area, we have another special area that is included in this also, across from the campus. There seems to be no guarantee if you change it to 65' now, what guarantee is there that there will be a great hotel with a roof top garden. It could be just a cheap hotel, the best bang for their buck. Keowee Trail is a very special area, one of our last areas to develop mythology for people to come to Clemson. Why don't we develop master plan for this area? Make a P.D. out of it and presents it and it is a great design for making Clemson a great destination. She hopes the Planning Commission support not just making a blanket change and say yes you can make 65' hotels.

Ms. Richardson suggested to table this item. Before you take action go back and determine what would be the standards, what kind of hotels and restaurants are we talking about. Then make this space specific condition for the CP2 rather than just piggybacking what we have for the CP2 District.

Katie Hillie, 140 Folger Street. She is not opposed to growth. The university should not drive every single thing we do.

Patricia Finley, Foy Creek, expressed concern about the simplification of the 65' height limit at the City Council meeting. Feels it was more intense that was indicated.

Michael Todd, 266 Riggs Drive, as being a student his comment is to look at it as what is best for the community. He recommended implementing some type of application system for someone who is wanting to build a 65' hotel would have to apply and show it would benefit the community.

Mark Cato, 9 Poplar Drive, I am a local, he is in favor of the 65'. People are renting their house because the hotels are booked.

Ms. Richardson suggested postponing so that it can be discussed during the work session.

Mr. Newton motioned to postpone or table and add to the next work session to discuss further details of what this would entail, Ms. Green seconded. Motion was unanimously approved by a show of hands.

Public Comment: Closed

5. Discussion Items:

- a. Discuss text amendment to the City Zoning Ordinance regarding timelines for Planning Commission consideration of text amendments after a denial by City Council.
- b. Set a date for a work session on proposed amendments to the City Zoning Ordinance.
- c. Discuss the AR district applications to Frontage Road.

Ms. Richardson requested a work session date for the Monday, April 25, at 5:30, with light meal.

Ms. Richardson stated the city's attorney felt there was some ambiguity in the language of the zoning ordinance dealing with the amendment process. Staff would like the commission to authorize staff to prepare a draft amendment to clarify this section of code.

The Commission agreed to proceed with amendment.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Ms. Andereasen moved to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Carson seconded the motion. All was in favor.

6. Adjourn: Meeting adjourned at 7:52 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.**