

**MINUTES
TOWN OF FORT MILL
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
December 16, 2015
112 Confederate Street
7:00 PM**

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

Absent: Chris Wolfe

Guests: Darryl Trull

Chairman Traynor called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and welcomed everyone in attendance.

Chairman Traynor stated that he had a conflict of interest for Information/Discussion Item #1 and would be recusing himself from discussion of that item.

Mr. Hudgins made a motion to approve the minutes from the November 24, 2015, meeting, with a second by Mr. Garver. The minutes were approved by a vote of 6-0.

Planning Director Cronin stated that he had heard from Mr. Wolfe, who would be unable to attend due to scheduling conflicts.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- 1. Annexation Request: 1544 Sam Smith Road:** Planning Director Cronin provided a brief overview of the request, the purpose of which was to consider an annexation request submitted by Darryl Trull for a 4.48 acre tract located at 1544 Sam Smith Road. The applicant requested a zoning designation of LI Limited Industrial. Planning Director Cronin stated that the future land use map in the town's comprehensive plan identified the parcel as medium-density residential, but noted that the property was bordered on two sides by LI zoned property. An auto repair business on the opposite side of Sam Smith Road is zoned BD-III in the county, but contained a use that would be consistent with the town's LI zoning district. Given the property's size and proximity to I-77, it was staff's opinion that the highest and best use for the property was likely LI.

Mr. Hudgins questioned how close the property was to neighboring residential uses. Assistant Planner pulled up a map on the screen and showed one residential parcel on the opposite side of Sam Smith Road, and another residence bordering the property on the north. The applicant, Darryl Trull, stated that he had an option to purchase the neighboring residence at a later date. Mr. McMullen asked the applicant what he intended to develop on the property. Mr. Trull stated that he hasn't settled on a specific use, but was considering either auto repair or personal storage units.

Mr. Garver made a motion to recommend in favor of the annexation with a zoning designation of LI. Mr. Petty seconded the motion. Chairman Traynor called for a vote on the motion:

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>
Traynor	McMullen
Hudgins	Lettang
Garver	
Petty	

The motion passed by a vote of 4-2.

- 2. 2016 Meeting Dates:** Planning Director Cronin made a request on behalf of town staff that the Planning Commission consider changing its standing meeting date from the fourth Tuesday of each month to the third Tuesday of each month. The primary purpose of this change is to allow sufficient time between the Planning Commission meeting date and the first council meeting of the following month to provide 15 days' notice of an upcoming public hearing. Currently, most public hearings must be scheduled for council's second evening meeting following the Planning Commission meeting, which is typically 7-8 weeks out. By moving the Planning Commission's meeting date up one week, all public hearings can be advertised for council's next evening meeting, which will reduce the normal turnaround time for most annexations, rezonings and text amendments by 2-4 weeks.

Mr. Garver made a motion to move the Planning Commission's standing meeting date from the fourth Tuesday of each month to the third Tuesday of each month. Mr. McMullen seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

- 1. Preliminary Commercial Appearance Review: QuikTrip:** Chairman Traynor stated that he had a conflict of interest on this item, and would recuse himself from discussion. Chairman Traynor left the meeting at 7:21 pm.

Assistant Planner Pettit provided a brief overview of the request, the purpose of which was to provide a preliminary review of the proposed QuikTrip at the corner of Highway 160 and Springfield Parkway.

Assistant Planner Pettit, following the topics as listed in the staff report, began the discussion by noting the proposed building meets applicable setback requirements but potentially did not meet the 20' minimum height requirement of the COD-N overlay district. The Planning Commission discussed the definition of "Height of building, minimum" from the town's zoning ordinance and determined that the building's current minimum height was 16'. Planning Commission members noted the proposed building and associated gas canopy would need to meet the 20' requirement as determined by the "Height of building, minimum" definition. .

Assistant Planner Pettit provided an overview of the building placement and orientation requirements of the COD-N overlay district. Several members of the Planning Commission noted a discontent with the site design as submitted. Assistant Planner Pettit pulled up pictures of several existing QuikTrip locations noting generally what the site would look like as proposed and what other possibilities could look like, including a site that includes a “faux” entrance along the building’s rear. A discussion occurred, noting that the “faux” front along the building’s rear along with enhanced landscaping, pathways, and signage surrounding the project’s perimeter, could make up for the non-preferred site layout and could meet the intent of the district, which is to provide a pedestrian scale atmosphere. Mr. McMullen additionally noted that since the private drive behind the building would be well travelled, an additional strip of plantings between the drive and the building would provide further enhancement.

Assistant Planner Pettit stated the building material requirements of the COD-N overlay district and questioned whether the Planning Commission had any issues with the building materials as submitted. The Planning Commission applauded QuikTrip for their high quality of building materials and architectural features of their typical design, and members only reiterated their preferences as noted during the building placement and orientation discussions.

Assistant Planner Pettit provided an overview of the landscape requirements of the COD-N overlay district and questioned the Planning Commission’s resident landscape architect as to whether the trees as proposed were similar to those allowed by the approved species list in the town’s Code of Ordinances. Mr. McMullen noted that the canopy trees were rather small, but could be appropriate. Mr. Hudgins asked whether businesses in the future could simply remove trees that were originally required by the Planning Commission and/or the landscape requirements of the ordinance. Assistant Planner Pettit noted that the trees would be a condition of the approval and that staff could require replanting in the event that plantings were removed. Planning Commission members then reiterated previous discussions, noting that the applicant’s use of enhanced landscaping, pathways, and signage beyond what is minimally required could make up for the building’s orientation and placement and create the desired pedestrian atmosphere.

Assistant Planner Pettit noted the lighting requirements of the COD-N overlay district, additionally noting that the discussions of a standard across the entire overlay district would be necessary soon as multiple projects along the corridor have been announced. Planning Director Cronin stated that staff would work with a sub-committee of Planning Commission members to come up with standards for the overlay district during the month of January. The Planning Commission noted their agreement with the plan to move forward on creating standards for the district.

Assistant Planner Pettit provided the requirements of the COD-N as related to pedestrian pathways. Mr. Petty questioned why the sidewalk as shown ended short of the property line going up Springfield Parkway and Assistant Planner Pettit noted that the applicant would be required to extend the sidewalk the full length of the property line and stub out

to the neighboring property. A discussion took place regarding the required 8' minimum planting strip between the edge of pavement and the pedestrian pathway. Mr. Hudgins noted that the purpose of the 8' planting strip goes back to one of the intents of the district, which to create a safe pedestrian realm, and that the sidewalk should meet the requirement as no one would want to walk right beside Tom Hall or Springfield Parkway. Assistant Planner Pettit noted that the design as submitted did not show internal pathways meeting the requirements of the COD-N overlay district, and that the sub-committee in January should additionally finalize a design for internal pathways in the district.

Assistant Planner Pettit noted the final potential site issues as listed in the staff report related to driveways and bicycle parking. Mr. Petty questioned whether the driveway off Springfield Parkway met the 400' separation requirement, to which Assistant Planner Pettit noted that it appeared to be close and that staff would provide a comment to request further information on whether or not the design meets the requirement. Assistant Planner Pettit noted the lack of bicycle parking as required by code and that a comment would be made to the applicant requesting the addition of at least 2 spaces.

There being no further discussion, staff noted that the comments as provided would be sent to the applicant for further revisions prior the formal submittal package.

- 2. UDO Advisory Committee Meeting Dates:** Planning Director Cronin reminded members that the next UDO Advisory Committee meetings have been scheduled for January 5th and 6th at 6:30 PM in the Spratt Building. Draft articles have been forwarded to members for review. The consultant requested that members return any comments on the draft articles before the end of the year.

There being no further business, Vice Chairman Hudgins wished everyone a Merry Christmas, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Cronin
Planning Director

RECUSAL STATEMENT

Member Name: JAMES TRAYNOR

Meeting Date: December 16, 2015

Agenda Item: Section ^{ITEMS FOR} INFO/DISCUSSION Number: 1

Topic: COMMERCIAL APP-ARMCC REVIEW - QUICK TRIP

The Ethics Act, SC Code §8-13-700, provides that no public official may knowingly use his office to obtain an economic interest for himself, a family member of his immediate family, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated. No public official may make, participate in making, or influence a governmental decision in which he or any such person or business has an economic interest. Failure to recuse oneself from an issue in which there is or may be conflict of interest is the sole responsibility of the council member (1991 Op. Atty. Gen. No. 91-37.) A written statement describing the matter requiring action and the nature of the potential conflict of interest is required.

Justification to Recuse:

Professionally employed by or under contract with principal

Owns or has vested interest in principal or property

Other: I AM AN OFFICER OF AN AFFILIATED

COMPANY OF LAND OWNER THAT HAS SITE AT IS
INQUIRING ABOUT.

Date: 12/15/2015 J Traynor
Member

Approved by Parliamentarian: [Signature]