

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
July 2, 2012

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

[Members Present: Olin Westbrook, Kathleen McDaniel, David Tuttle, Patrick Palmer, Stephen Gilchrist, Howard Van Dine, Wallace Brown, Sr. Absent: Heather Cairns, Deas Manning]

Called to order: 1:00 pm

CHAIRMAN PALMER: We'll call the July meeting of the Richland County Planning Commission to order. Please allow me to read this into the Record. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act a copy of the Agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration building. And we didn't have Minutes from our last month's meeting so we cannot approve those. Do we have road name approvals?

MR. TUTTLE: I don't think there are any.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: It's part of our Agenda but not on, not part of our package.

MS. LINDER: It doesn't appear we have any road names for this month.

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. We'll move on to Case No. 12-24 MA.

MS. LINDER: And just for the Record, you are deferring the Minutes then till next month, is that correct?

CHAIRMAN PALMER: Well, we don't have them.

MS. LINDER: Since we don't have them you're deferring the approval until next month.

MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we defer the approval of the Minutes from last meeting to next month.

MR. BROWN: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: All those in favor of the motion please say aye?

2 *[Approved: Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Van Dine, Brown; Absent:*
3 *Cairns, Manning]*

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay, Case No. 12-24 MA.

5 **CASE 12-24 MA:**

6 MR. LEGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good afternoon everyone. The Applicant
7 in this case is Mr. Martin Fridy representing Grands Investment Company. The property
8 is located on Two Notch Road and Fore Avenue. It's currently zoned MH, which is our
9 Mobile Home District and M-1, which is our Light Industrial District. The Applicant is
10 requesting a GC, General Commercial District. The current zoning classifications are
11 the original zoning districts from September 1977. We had two previous requests on this
12 site; one in 2005 and one in 2010, both of which were withdrawn so there was no action
13 at that, on those two cases. In the area we've got a mixture of uses. To the north we've
14 got some NC, GC, and MH zoning, some of which is undeveloped and occupied by
15 some residences. To the south we've got M-1, Light Industrial District zoning which is
16 the Husqvarna Construction product site which is kind of a light industrial facility. To the
17 east we've got RS-MD and MH, and in this case both are residential in nature. To the
18 west M-1 and GC where we have some commercial properties and Sandhills shopping
19 center. Our Comprehensive Plan recommends priority investment in this case where
20 commercial uses should be located on arterial roads, at traffic junctions or where
21 existing commercial is located. Certainly there is commercial and office use in the area,
22 however, this property does also have frontage on Fore Avenue, which is really a
23 residential service street not designed for general commercial use. For that reason and

1 for the reason that the zoning would encroach in a residential area, we found that this
2 application was not in compliance with our Comprehensive Plan. The property currently
3 has kind of an abandoned, vacant parking lot along the frontage of Two Notch Road.
4 There are also five residential structures on the residentially zoned properties along
5 Fore Avenue. Primarily and for that reason Staff felt like this property should remained
6 zoned as is. We felt like the zoning district should follow Aubrey Street, which would be
7 parallel to Two Notch Road and not encroach further east into the residential area.
8 Rezoning commercial further down Fore Avenue might would be detrimental to the
9 nature of this subdivision, and for those reasons our Staff recommended denial of the
10 rezoning request at this time. If you have questions I'll be glad to try and answer them.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff?

12 MS. MCDANIEL: Well, I understand – I have one question, Mr. Chairman, I
13 understand that the applications were withdrawn in 2006 and 2010, but it looks like in
14 2010 the Applicant, the Staff recommendation was for approval. What was the
15 difference then?

16 MR. LEGER: The way it's been explained to me was just the change in Staff and
17 change in the opinion of, of how we felt like that property should develop. Other than
18 that, I'm not sure. That is true, but in 2010 we were using the same Comprehensive
19 Plan so [inaudible] answer that.

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, any other questions for Staff? David Brandies?
21 And if we call your name if you could come up and take the podium and give us your
22 name and address, we'd appreciate it.

23 **TESTIMONY OF DAVID BRANDIES:**

1 MR. BRANDIES: My name is David Brandies, I'm with Genesis Consulting
2 Group, I'm representing the Applicant, Martin Fridy. My address is 1330 Lady Street,
3 Columbia, South Carolina 29201. I wanted to hand out a couple of handouts, just some
4 items that we've been working with the community on. We've met with Staff a number
5 of times on this project and it is true that Staff has recommended denial and I think
6 we've worked with Staff and with the community on some elements of that approval and
7 I wanted to kind of go through them just for a few minutes if I could. Let me take you
8 through the exhibits. What you're looking at here is the, sort of a blown out view and
9 you can see our proposed development drawn at the corner of Fore and Two Notch. As
10 you can see the commercial along Two Notch does encroach even further than what
11 we're showing as an encroachment. You can see the Target shopping Center and
12 Husqvarna backed up to Woodlands Glen, then you can see the super-imposed of the
13 development that we're talking about going down Fore. The encroachment for the
14 Target commercial development is about 1,000', we're talking about a little bit less
15 encroachment. What we're talking about really is the rezoning of fundamentally six MH
16 lots. Our proposed commercial use is applicable on, which is now the M-1 zoning, I
17 know that's a zoning that's trying to get taken out eventually, but also we have a general
18 commercial already zoned that way on the property. We decided that it was appropriate
19 to take all of the zoning to GC rather than leave a portion of the property as M-1, but I
20 want to point out that all the uses we're talking about could be put into the M-1, it could
21 be put into the GC. So we somewhat dispute what the Staff is saying in that we've
22 already encroached into this neighborhood. This is not a new encroachment, you can
23 see where the M-1 encroaches into this, and all the uses we're contemplating, again,

1 can be put on this property. Really what we're talking about is taking those six MH lots,
2 which are now all abandoned housing, and converting them over to the use that we
3 think is more consistent. Just to give you a sense for the drawn out – you can see the,
4 a little more pulled out and you can see the different zoning uses overlay. We're as far
5 back as Husqvarna is and you can see the General Commercial on the corner.
6 Everything on the other side of Fore and Aubrey is all either Neighborhood Commercial
7 or General Commercial. There's actually a church a little bit down Fore Avenue just past
8 us, so there are non-residential uses on Fore, but that's, you know, what we're talking
9 about is an element, it already encroaches into the neighborhood. When we first started
10 working with Staff and community, this was the site plan we were looking at and we
11 heard a couple of things. At this point we had not heard the Staff's comments about not
12 wanting to push past Aubrey, so one of the things we're taking a look at is changing
13 that. If you flip to the next slide, what we've done here is we've stopped all access past
14 Aubrey so there's no trucks, no commercial access would go past Aubrey. This is the
15 end of the General Commercial that's already existing, and consistent with what Staff
16 was saying, not want to push past Aubrey. This area is listed as a priority investment
17 area. One of the things I would disagree on is that the Comp Plan does call for this
18 property to be redeveloped. As you know if you look at the Land Use Plan it's a very big
19 blow out of what a priority area is, that circle that shows the priority area goes deep into
20 the neighborhood. Part of that is it's just hard to go parcel by parcel, so this particular
21 node is listed as a priority investment area and we'd say that this entire property fits
22 within that priority investment. That includes concentrated growth, a mix of residential
23 and a mix of commercial and civic uses. So priority investment expects you to mix these

1 uses and that's really where we are and we think we're consistent with the Comp Plan.
2 Note that in 2010, the Staff approved, the Comp Plan was in place at that time, so it was
3 approved with the Comp Plan. The second thing that the Staff has said is the residential
4 service street, and we understand that. Fore is not built for tractor trailers and
5 commercial. What we would have to do is improve Fore Avenue from Two Notch down
6 to Aubrey. That would be a requirement with DOT, it's nothing that this Body has to
7 force us to do, but certainly we'd have to do that for DOT to allow us to have that
8 access. So we feel like in revising of the site plan we've addressed the two comments
9 that really compelled the Staff to list it as non-compliant. We've also worked with the
10 community, we've had a community meeting, there's some representatives from the
11 community here to talk about that. We're committed to working with them as we
12 continue. Lastly I want to point out that all of the commercial is pointed towards Two
13 Notch, an important element, there's a right in, right out on Two Notch Road, which we
14 think is very, very important. And we're going to screen everything from Audrey down
15 heavily with landscaping so that the community doesn't look at a commercial, they look
16 at heavy landscaping. With that I'll answer any questions that you might have.

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Any questions from the Commissioners?
18 Thank you. Harold Branham?

19 **TESTIMONY OF HAROLD BRANHAM:**

20 MR. BRANHAM: My name is Harold Branham, I reside at 312 Burmaster Drive in
21 Royal Pines Estate and I'm here to ask you to vote favorably on this issue that Mr.
22 Brandies has presented today. We met last Thursday night with the homeowners, we
23 had probably 35 or 40 people present. We had some that were for it, some that were

1 against it, but as for me and my wife, Rachel, we would like to see it approve. It would
2 improve the looks of our community when you come in on Fore Avenue and I don't think
3 it would affect anything as far as traffic on Fore Avenue that would affect our
4 neighborhood.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Anything else, Mr. Branham? Thank you.
6 That's all we have signed up to speak. Any thoughts from the Commission?

7 MR. VAN DINE: Let me ask one quick question if I could. Ownership of the six
8 mobile home lots, who owns that?

9 MR. BRANDIES: Those parcels are currently owned by the property owner and
10 they would be blended into this property. They're all abandoned and no one lives in
11 those homes.

12 MR. VAN DINE: Okay, thank you.

13 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we send Case No.
14 12-24 MA forward to Council with a recommendation for approval. And I guess because
15 I'm going against Staff's recommendation, we need a justification for that?

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Correct.

17 MR. TUTTLE: And I guess my justification is gonna be that I think that the
18 Comprehensive Plan, although well intended, sometimes it's too broad and clearly if
19 there's not an opportunity for commercial expansion here along Two Notch Road in a
20 priority investment zoning I don't know where one would be.

21 MR. GILCHRIST: Mr. Chairman, I second that.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We have a motion and a second.

1 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add to that that it seems to me that the
2 arbitrary dividing line at the back of the mobile home lots is too narrow whereas the road
3 would make a much more appropriate division at that edge to delineate between
4 residential and this particular use. But I also point out that the front half of all of this is
5 either commercial already or neighborhood commercial already and as a result it
6 doesn't seem to me that you would be having any more encroachment on this
7 neighborhood than you would be having by adding this particular project to it. And
8 especially with the buffers that are being provided and the other things that are listed,
9 which is much greater than would be normally put forth in a development of this kind, I
10 think this would appropriately be an area that should be approved.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I, also I couldn't agree more. I like the way that the
12 developer has gone to the community, had the previous meetings, and not only that but
13 has listened to the community and has done everything they can above and beyond as
14 far as the screening, the entrances, so forth and so on, to try to, to put a sensible
15 development in this area, in an area that we would like to steer commercial activity
16 towards. So having said that we have a motion and a second to send this case forward
17 to Council with a recommendation of approval. All those in favor please signify by
18 raising your hand.

19 *[Approved: Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Van Dine, Brown; Absent:*
20 *Cairns, Manning]*

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: There's none opposed. As you know we're a
22 recommending Body to County Council, they'll have the final say on this issue. Their
23 meeting will be the 31st of this month in these same chambers at 7:00.

1 MR. BRANDIES: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thanks. First Text Amendment.

3 **TEXT AMENDMENT #1:**

4 MR. PRICE: Commission, if you remember, I think we went through this for a few
5 months earlier this year of somehow allowing group homes for more than nine
6 individuals in the rural community. And what happened was it actually turned into also
7 allowing them in some of the other zoning designations, and when it got to Council it
8 was defeated. This was recently brought back up by Council, one Councilmember, and
9 the main changes to what you originally approved to go forward to County Council was
10 that this would be limited to the Rural District only, because there were some concerns
11 previously that some of the other zonings, they didn't want to allow this use in other
12 zoning designations, especially more of your suburban areas. And the, probably the
13 main change is that it will, each lot will be required to be at least five acres. So those
14 are the two changes, but other than that this is pretty much the same ordinance that you
15 approved previously.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Helen Spearman? And if you
17 would, again, give us your name and address for the Record.

18 **TESTIMONY OF HELEN SPEARMAN:**

19 MR. SPEARMAN: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Helen Spearman,
20 171 Sweetwater Drive, Hopkins, South Carolina, and I'm asking that, I'm in favor of the
21 group homes, they are very well needed because they stay in the rural area. So we
22 found out that group homes with residents in the rural area have been very effective, so
23 I'm asking if you would vote favorably for group homes. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you. Ms. Bernice Scott?

2 **TESTIMONY OF BERNICE SCOTT:**

3 MS. SCOTT: Good afternoon. Mr. Chairman and Members, I would like us to
4 have this favor of because I know Ms. Spearman, known her all of my life, and the way
5 she took care of her mother and the community, we really need more of these out in the
6 rural area because of the space. And as you know when the state closed down a lot of
7 the facilities they had, our people are looking for more facilities such as this. She's very
8 caring, she got great staff, the staff is come in by the state, so I'm asking you to please
9 approve this because there's no where else for people to go. And we know the rural
10 area's not like the suburban area or whatever, so we asking please vote favorably.
11 Some County Council has said that they would because of the need and they
12 understand the whole picture.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Thank you.

14 MS. SCOTT: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That's all we've got signed up to speak.

16 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for Staff. The five acre minimum,
17 what, what's the justification for that? Where did that number come from?

18 MR. PRICE: There was some concerns that you would still find a lot of rural
19 property along suburban areas, but typically you may not find a five acre tract of rural.
20 They're what we would deem to be a single-family district, sort of residential district.

21 MR. TUTTLE: And I understand the quantity, just I, I think it's such a good thing
22 and a good purpose I hate to, if somebody only had two or three acres and wanted to

1 have a group home for the benefit of the community for them to not be able to do that
2 without acquiring other land. I understand what they're trying to do, but.

3 MR. PRICE: Well, one of the things we do as a staff is that we've kind of been
4 through this before, if this were to occur and let's say we had a number of applicants
5 come in they couldn't reach that five acre threshold, we would probably look to bring this
6 back to the Planning Commission at least to, you know, say we've had a number of
7 applications just couldn't meet it and there seems to be a need, but the five acres can't
8 be met.

9 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, one question. Has anybody from the community
10 that discussed with you had any objections, questions or [inaudible]?

11 MR. PRICE: We, we have not received any phone calls [inaudible] phone calls or
12 no one has contacted this department in objection or in favor.

13 MR. BROWN: But as far as you know there's no objection from the community.

14 MR. PRICE: Not that I'm aware of, no, sir.

15 MR. BROWN: Okay, thank you.

16 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, couple quick questions. There's a reference to
17 any road line. Is road line a defined term? Are we talking about center line, are we
18 talking about the edge of the right-of-way, are we talking about – I'm talking specifically
19 in E, subsection E.

20 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir, I see what you're referring to. I don't believe that we have
21 referenced road line. No, sir, and we, we could probably strike road line and just keep it
22 at property line, because I think what was, what's being said is the same thing, but I
23 think for clarity we need just to keep it at property line, that would suffice.

1 MR. VAN DINE: And that would take care of the front –

2 MR. PRICE: Yes, sir –

3 MR. VAN DINE: - portion that would –

4 MR. PRICE: - because when we measure the setback it's always from the
5 property line, so.

6 MR. VAN DINE: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I would proposed that, with a couple of
7 modifications that we send this forward with a recommendation of approval. The
8 modifications that I would like to see is to decrease the minimum lot size from five to
9 four acres, and to eliminate the reference to the road line and leave it as the property
10 line.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Would you, would you want to see a, anything less than
12 four acres be a special exception so that the community can go into the Board of Zoning
13 Appeals, have a public hearing and if it's accepted, if it's not, it'd at least give the ability
14 to do that, or just lock it down at four?

15 MR. VAN DINE: Well, I don't have a problem with, with the special exception but
16 I'm not sure, does a special exception apply under this or would it have to be a different
17 section that would have to be –

18 MR. PRICE: It would have to be a different section.

19 MR. VAN DINE: so I think as far as this is concerned we can, we ought to take it
20 up as it is. We can certainly make a secondary motion that this particular, if the property
21 size is less than four acres that it could be subject to a special exception.

22 MR. PRICE: And I think the only issue with that is we need to, to identify some
23 additional standards that would all be in one place.

1 MR. VAN DINE: Sure. Well, I think for the purpose of what we're doing here if
2 we limit it to the four now but with instructions for Staff to go back and to look at the
3 special exception requirements and bring back something to us regarding that, I think
4 that would be appropriate.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What I'm concerned about is a little bit of what Mr.
6 Tuttle's talking about, and I understand Mr. Price's, doesn't actually hear of people
7 perhaps, but some people actually look at the Code to see if they can do something and
8 they wouldn't come down with an application knowing they couldn't get it anyhow. Now,
9 some people don't look at it, they just come down and ask for stuff, but you know, some
10 people do look at the Code and say, hey look we can't do a group home on this site so
11 we're not even gonna bring down an application, of which the county would never hear
12 about the complaint or, or the turn down application, so I would just like to see, you
13 know, I understand what the, the thought process behind it but I also know there's
14 gonna be exceptions to that rule and to give the ability for an exception to be granted if
15 one's needed, so.

16 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman?

17 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Yes, sir?

18 MR. BROWN: What would be the impact of Mr. Tuttle's recommendation of the
19 exception, what impact would that have on the applicant?

20 CHAIRMAN PALMER: I think the four or five acres would, from what I'm hearing
21 would work currently, but you know, I think what we're looking at is a possibility of some
22 issues down the road or some exceptions to that rule –

23 MR. BROWN: I understand that.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: - yeah, I think the four or five would possibly work.

2 MR. BROWN: Could we ask the applicant that question?

3 MR. VAN DINE: We don't have an applicant.

4 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We don't have an applicant but we have somebody that's
5 looking at it.

6 MR. BROWN: The person that's looking at it.

7 CHAIRMAN PALMER: But you're fine with the five acres for what you're looking
8 to do.

9 MR. PRICE: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay.

11 MR. BROWN: Ms. Spearman.

12 MR. TUTTLE: I think from a procedural standpoint if we send it back with four
13 acres and Council doesn't like four acres, they'll just strike through and put it at five and
14 pass it.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

16 MR. BROWN: But the four or five, Ms. Spearman, that would be fine?

17 [Inaudible]

18 MR. BROWN: I didn't hear her.

19 MR. TUTTLE: She said she has 11 acres.

20 MR. BROWN: Okay, thank you. I second Mr. Tuttle's [sic] motion.

21 MR. TUTTLE: That's Mr. Van Dine's motion.

22 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Mr. Van Dine's motion.

23 MR. BROWN: Yes, please excuse me.

1 [Inaudible discussion – laughter]

2 MR. VAN DINE: I'm not gonna comment. [laughter]

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright, so we've got a motion and a second to send this
4 forward to Council with a recommendation of approval, subject to the change of
5 30(A)(b) from five acres to four acres, and the removal of the words road line from
6 38(E). All those in favor please signify by raising your hand.

7 *[Approved: Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Van Dine, Brown; Absent:*
8 *Cairns, Manning]*

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: There's none opposed. Would somebody like to make a
10 motion that we put on our Agenda for next, as it pertains to this, that we bring back
11 something with special exceptions?

12 MR. VAN DINE: Mr. Chairman, if it requires a motion, I think it only requires a
13 request but to the extent it requires a motion, I'd like to see the Staff bring us back some
14 appropriate language which would allow for the, what we have just approved as far as
15 the groups homes to be applicable to the special exception if the property is less than
16 four acres.

17 MR. PRICE: Or five as Council –

18 MR. VAN DINE: Or five if Council decides that they would rather have five.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

20 MR. BROWN: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: What's our procedure for that, for getting something on
22 our Agenda? Doesn't it need a motion and a vote?

1 MS. LINDER: That would be an appropriate way to do it, yes. Otherwise, it's
2 usually Staff initiated.

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right, okay.

4 MR. TUTTLE: And we have a motion and a second.

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: So we have a motion and a second. All those in favor of
6 the motion please say aye.

7 *[Approved: Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Van Dine, Brown; Absent:*
8 *Cairns, Manning]*

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Next Text Amendment?

10 **TEXT AMENDMENT #2:**

11 MR. PRICE: Yes, I actually have one of the planners that's gonna come and
12 speak on this but.

13 MR. WILLIAMSON: Carroll Williamson, Land Development Planner for the
14 county. For this text amendment we were trying to reduce or take out the sketch plan
15 review as a requirement for minor subdivision. I think that was just one extra step that
16 was unnecessary for most applicants for a minor subdivision and it keeps it more in
17 keeping with administrative subdivisions or lot splits. That was the purpose of taking out
18 the sketch plan review requirement.

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any questions for Staff? Any motions?

20 MR. TUTTLE: Sure, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to send forward, and again they're not
21 named so I don't know what to call this, the second text amendment on our Agenda
22 today forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

23 MR. VAN DINE: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Any other discussion? All those in favor of the motion
2 please say aye?

3 *[Approved: Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Van Dine, Brown; Absent:*
4 *Cairns, Manning]*

5 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Next text amendment.

6 **TEXT AMENDMENT #3:**

7 MS. HEGLER: This is a text amendment to our Land Development Code so as to
8 foster more environmentally sensitive site development. This is the result of the
9 development roundtable's work over the last several years. Commissioners just
10 attended a work session with the roundtable, had a few questions, some clarity. I think
11 those questions were attempted to be answered. We're here for any others.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to send the third text
13 amendment on our Agenda forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

14 MR. GILCHRIST: Second, Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: If you would just for a moment, what came out of our
16 meeting was the change to perhaps one, one part of that which was under the parking
17 requirements.

18 MR. TUTTLE: Correct. Ms. Hegler, do you have the appropriate –

19 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Here it is.

20 MR. TUTTLE: - she was working on the actual wording.

21 MR. HEGLER: And that's correct as well, Mr. Tuttle.

22 MR. TUTTLE: Okay, so send it forward to Council with the following amendment,
23 then page 10, double asterisk section, delete "as a reinforced turf area" and then it

1 would read “. . . of pervious material capable of supporting traffic flow.” And then also in
2 the chart then you strike –

3 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Take out the word maximum and put – I’m sorry, add the
4 word pervious.

5 MS. HEGLER: Impervious.

6 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Impervious to that as a maximum.

7 MR. TUTTLE: Maximum pervious area.

8 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Right.

9 MR. TUTTLE: Right, impervious, excuse me.

10 MS. HEGLER: And under the asterisk there was the deletion of the 30%
11 additional.

12 MR. TUTTLE: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN PALMER: That’s correct. Take out the words “by an additional 30%”
14 and the words “as a reinforced turf area” substitute what Mr. Tuttle said. Got it?

15 MS. HEGLER: I’ve got it.

16 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. We have a motion. Did we get a second?

17 MR. GILCHRIST: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: We got a second. All those in favor please say aye.

19 *[Approved: Westbrook, McDaniel, Tuttle, Palmer, Gilchrist, Van Dine, Brown; Absent:*
20 *Cairns, Manning]*

21 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Alright. Other Business, borrow pits.

22 MS. HEGLER: That’s Geo. You had asked, in our last meeting we had
23 discussed the minimum required for borrow pit. Geo [inaudible]?

1 MR. PRICE: Yeah, there was a lot of discussion. I think when we were looking at
2 the, the requirements for a borrow pit, of course, one of the things that we did look at
3 was the acreage and of course that was, that probably would have been more of the
4 simpler amendment to what we have currently in our Code. Staff has been discussing
5 with the actual applicants about the additional criteria that's in our Code now and
6 because they deferred it from this meeting we're gonna take the opportunity to meet
7 with them over the next couple of months since we don't come until September, to
8 actually go over that criteria a little bit more.

9 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. So that was the borrow pit update?

10 MR. PRICE: That was the borrow pit, yes.

11 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Okay. Alright. Well, any questions on borrow pits? Alright,
12 we look forward to hearing back. We got the Council Report in our package for just
13 informational purposes. Anything else?

14 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah, I have one thing I wanted to ask Staff if we could take a
15 look at. Something came up last week and evidently there's no minimum standard as it
16 relates to a land disturbance permit and the review, i.e., a 3,000 acre project had the
17 same review cycle, etc. as something on a 10th of an acre as related to adding an
18 additional structure to an existing use, etc. And in the conversation with Staff, Staff
19 thought it might be a good idea if we took a look at that and maybe come up with
20 something that might be a minimum standard; if it's less than this maybe it goes down a
21 different path potentially. I don't know the ins and outs of that but certainly would look
22 for some professional guidance there to see if there's a way to do something that's a

1 little more streamlined and easier for folks going forward. Anybody know what I'm
2 talking about?

3 MS. HEGLER: I do.

4 MR. VAN DINE: Why don't you tell me what you're talking about.

5 MR. TUTTLE: Well, there was a particular case where one of the golf courses in
6 town wanted to add a restroom at their facility, 12 x 12 restroom on an existing facility
7 and tied to any adjacent properties, etc., etc. And the, the typical path for that would've
8 been a 21 day review cycle along with everything else. You know, I don't know where
9 the threshold should be and how that change might look, but it is something we could
10 look at and maybe look at recommendations.

11 MS. HEGLER: I think our site additions process is what you're asking us to
12 review for maybe a minimum threshold.

13 MR. TUTTLE: Yeah.

14 MS HEGLER: Okay. We'll report back.

15 CHAIRMAN PALMER: Anything else? Do we have a motion to adjourn?

16 MR. VAN DINE: So moved.

17 MR. BROWN: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN PALMER: See y'all in September.

19

20

[Meeting adjourned at 1:36 pm]