

**MINUTES
TOWN OF FORT MILL
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
June 6, 2016
112 Confederate Street
7:00 PM**

Present: James Traynor, Hynek Lettang, Tom Adams, Ben Hudgins, Chris Wolfe, Tom Petty, Jay McMullen, Planning Director Joe Cronin, Assistant Planner Chris Pettit

Absent: None

Guests: Louis Roman (Historic Review Board)

Chairman Traynor called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm.

Chairman Traynor stated that the UDO Advisory Committee had not yet completed its 6:00 pm meeting, and requested a motion to recess the Planning Commission meeting so that the UDO Advisory Committee may complete its meeting.

Mr. Hudgins made a motion to recess the Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Petty seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-0, and the meeting was recessed at 7:05 pm.

Mr. Lettang arrived at 7:06 pm.

Mr. Adams made a motion to reconvene the Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Wolfe seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0, and the meeting was reconvened at 8:01 pm.

Mr. Hudgins made a motion to approve the minutes from the June 1, 2016, special called meeting, with a second by Mr. McMullen. The minutes were approved by a vote of 7-0.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

1. **Unified Development Ordinance (UDO)**: Planning Director Cronin presented the draft ordinance adopting the new UDO for the Town of Fort Mill, and briefly summarized the amendments recommended by the UDO Advisory Committee. Mr. Adams made a motion to recommend in favor of adopting the third draft of the UDO, with the following amendments:

ARTICLE III: Residential Zoning Districts

○ **Dimensional Requirements in Residential Zoning Districts**

- **AMENDMENT**: The Planning Commission recommended amending Table 3-3 to incorporate the following revisions recommended by staff.

		R-25	R-15	R-7
Lot Width	Min. Feet	100	80	40 <u>50</u>
	Avg. Feet	125 <u>120</u>	100 <u>90</u>	50 <u>60</u>

- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended amending Table 3-3 to incorporate the following revisions recommended by staff.

	R-25	R-15	R-7
Max. Density (Units/Gross Acre)	1.7 <u>1.4</u>	2.9 <u>2.3</u>	5.0 <u>4.0</u>

- **Impervious Surface Coverage**

- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended reevaluating the maximum impervious surface coverage percentages for the R-25, R-15 and R-7 districts, as shown in Table 3-3, and either increasing these percentages as appropriate, or removing certain accessory uses (and sizes) from the surface coverage calculations.

- **Residential Floor Area Minimums in RT-8 and RM-15 Districts**

- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended removing floor area minimums for the RT-8 and RM-15 districts, as shown in Table 3-3.

- **Minimum Open Space in Residential Zoning Districts**

- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended amending Table 3-3 to include the following open space requirements: R-25, R-15 and R-7 (20%); RT-8 (25%) and RM-15 (30%). At least 50% of the required open space shall be “usable open space.” The definition of “usable” may be substantially similar to that used Table 6-3 for Mixed Use zoned projects.
- **POLICY DECISION:** There was not a consensus as to whether perimeter and streetscape buffers should count toward the minimum open space requirements. The Planning Commission recommended that this should be a policy decision of Town Council. If council elects to make this change, then the UDO may be amended accordingly.

ARTICLE IV: Commercial Zoning Districts

- **Downtown Core (DC) District**

- **POLICY DECISION:** There was not a consensus as to whether to restrict offices from street level store fronts in the DC district. The Planning Commission recommended that this should be a policy decision of Town

Council. If council elects to make this change, then the UDO may be amended accordingly.

- **POLICY DECISION:** There was not a consensus as to whether to restrict the concentration of similar uses (particularly office-related uses) in the DC district. The Planning Commission recommended that this should be a policy decision of Town Council. If council elects to make this change, then the UDO may be amended accordingly.
- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended amending the footnote in Table 4-2 to require that all commercial uses in the DC district which are located at street level after the effective date of the new UDO should be open to the public at least 32 hours per week, with business hours clearly posted at each entrance.
- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended amending Table 4-2 to allow co-working facilities in the LC, DC and GC districts.

ARTICLE V: Industrial Zoning Districts

- **Light Industrial (LI) District**

- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended amending Table 5-2 to include vehicle towing, wrecker and storage uses as a conditional use in the LI district. Article VIII (Conditional Uses) should also be amended to specify the conditions associated with such uses.

ARTICLE VI: Mixed Use Districts

- **Commercial Floor Area Ratios (FAR)**

- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended amending Table 6-3 to include a minimum land area (%) for NMU, CMU and TOMU, as well as including a minimum floor area ratio within each district. The land area and floor area ratios could then be used in combination to determine the minimum and maximum amount of non-residential development for all proposed mixed use projects.
- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended amending footnote number 3 under Table 6-3 to explicitly state that structured parking decks would not be included in the calculation for maximum FAR.

ARTICLE XI: Landscaping, Buffering & Tree Preservation

- **Buffer Zones**

- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended that Table 11-2 should be amended to require a minimum 20' buffer (Buffer C) in the R-25, R-15 and R-7 district when abutting neighboring property which is also zoned R-25, R-15 and R-7. This requirement would only apply to new subdivision projects, and not existing lots of record.
- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended including language that in instances where a new project abuts property that is not located in the town limits, the Planning Director may evaluate the neighboring county zoning designation, and apply a buffer pursuant to Table 11-2 using the town zoning district that most closely reflects the neighboring county zoning designation. If an adequate comparison cannot be made, then a minimum buffer of 20' (Buffer C) shall apply.
- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended including language in Section 11-2 that in instances where a new project abuts property that has been designated as "historic" (using the same definition used in the recently revised "Special Tax Assessment for Rehabilitated Historic Properties") then a minimum buffer of 30' (Buffer B) or 50' (Buffer A) should be applied along any shared property lines.
- **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended amending the buffer illustrations under Table 11-2a to show buffer plantings (drawn to scale) distributed throughout the buffer area, and not concentrated along the property line.
- **Landscaping Requirements**
 - **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended adding a section or subsection within Article XI to require minimum landscaping requirements around buildings and foundations.

ARTICLE XIII: Building Design & Materials

- **Commercial Building Design & Materials**
 - **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended amending Table 13-3a to remove vinyl siding from the list of permitted elevation materials on the front façade of commercial, office and institutional buildings.

ARTICLE XV: Stormwater Management & Sedimentation Control

- **Stormwater Requirements**
 - **AMENDMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended amending Article XV of the UDO to remove the existing stormwater language, and to instead

provide a reference to the stormwater requirements outlined in Chapter 16 (Environment), Article III (Stormwater Management and Sediment Control) of the Code of Ordinances.

GENERAL COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Anne Springs Close Greenway Zoning**
 - **POLICY DECISION:** The Planning Commission recommended that staff and the consultant continue having conversation with Greenway staff and identify the best way to address the Greenway's needs. The Planning Commission recommended that this should be a policy decision of Town Council. If council elects to make this change, then the UDO may be amended accordingly.

- **Cell Towers & Antennas**
 - **POLICY DECISION:** The Planning Commission recommended that staff and the consultant continue having conversation with local providers to determine the best way to address the best way to meet the growing need for cellular and data service. The Planning Commission recommended that this should be a policy decision of Town Council. If council elects to make this change, then the UDO may be amended accordingly.

Mr. McMullen seconded Mr. Adams motion. Chairman Traynor asked if there was any additional discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7-0.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

1. **Pending Annexation Request: CMHA Project:** Planning Director Cronin stated that the town has received an annexation request for a significant commercial project at the intersection of SC 160/Tom Hall Street and the Fort Mill Southern Bypass. Additional details will be provided when the request is formally presented during the June 21st Planning Commission meeting.

2. **Huntington Place Annexation Update:** Planning Director Cronin stated that he heard from the county's Voter Registration and Election Director earlier in the day. The annexation petition for Huntington Place is scheduled to be certified on June 7th during the York County Board of Voter Registration and Elections meeting. Council will be asked to adopt a resolution on June 13th certifying the petition, and requesting that the county hold a special election on the question of annexation. The Planning Commission will provide a zoning recommendation on June 21st.

3. **Fort Mill Southern Bypass Update:** Planning Director Cronin informed members of the commission that the York County E-911/Addressing Office had inquired about the possible renaming of Fort Mill Parkway once the final leg of the southern bypass is open to traffic.

The county was requesting that the bypass be renamed as “South Springfield Parkway.” The general consensus among Planning Commission members was in favor of retaining “Fort Mill Parkway” and against renaming the southern bypass as “South Springfield Parkway;” however, the commission would be open to considering other names that had a historic tie to the southern portion of Fort Mill. Planning Director Cronin reminded commission members that since the bypass runs through both town and county jurisdiction, it will be important for everyone to be on the same page.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Cronin
Planning Director