

**MINUTES  
TOWN OF FORT MILL  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
June 21, 2022  
112 Confederate Street  
6:00 PM**

Present: James Traynor, Dan Stout, Sarah Curtis, Hynek Lettang, Mark Kerr, Matthew Lucarelli, Planning Director Penelope Karagounis, Planner II Zach Driggers, Sean Coldren (CES Group Engineers), David Buist (Vulcan Property Group); Sidney and Tracy Bletcher (Residents), Mark Manning (Resident), Elias Garcia (GSG Holdings LLC) and Phil and Sherry Hunkler (Resident/Applicant).

Absent: Jason Therrell

Chairman James Traynor called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:00 pm on Tuesday, June 21, 2022. Chairman Traynor gave opportunity to the Planning Commission to review and comment on the May 17, 2022 meeting minutes. Chairman Traynor stated a minor edit on page 3, paragraph 3 of the meeting minutes to be corrected. Commissioner Stout made a motion to approve the minutes with minor edit and Commissioner Kerr seconded the motion. The minutes for May 17,2022 were approved with minor edit by a vote of 6-0.

**NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

**1. Annexation Request: Elias Garcia (GSG Holdings LLC)**

Penelope Karagounis, Planning Director, presented the staff report for the ordinance annexing York County Tax Map Number(s) 706-00-00-009 and 706-00-00-008 located on Banks Roads, containing approximately +/- 0.17 acre. GSG Holdings LLC would like to annex these parcels to combine with the property they own in the Town to HC, Highway Commercial. He is proposing a daycare center and would like these two small parcels to be combined with existing parcel.

Commissioner Lucarelli mentioned to correct the date of when the TIA was completed for the Daycare TIA. It needs to read September 17, 2022 and not 202.

Chairman Traynor noted the Daycare would need to go through the commercial appearance review with their site plan to the Planning Commission. Mr. Garcia understood the next process for the commercial appearance review.

Mr. Lettang made a motion to recommend approval of the annexation request to HC, Highway Commercial and Mrs. Curtis seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

**2. Commercial Appearance Review: The Vault at Fort Mill**

Penelope Karagounis, Planning Director, presented the staff report and provided a brief

overview of the request, the purpose of which was to grant commercial appearance review approval for The Vault at Fort Mill.

David Buist, the applicant, presented samples to the commissioners. Ms. Curtis pointed out not seeing the materials noted for the mini-warehouse storage buildings. Mr. Traynor asked if there were renderings available that showed the material of the storage buildings. David Buist directed attention to the two front retail buildings and rear flex office building. Mr. Buist stated that the storage buildings would have the same brick elevation. Ms. Curtis commented that it appeared to be all stucco. Mr. Traynor and Mrs. Curtis both stated they would like to see a variation of brick and stucco.

Mr. Lettang asked Mr. Buist about the color of the storage building doors. Mr. Buist replied that the color of the doors of the storage building were undetermined at the time; Mr. Buist noted the door could potentially be orange.

Mr. Stout asked if there were architectural standards for the proposed Elizabeth development to have commonality, to which Mr. Buist replied that there were not per the development agreement. Mr. Buist noted that the same plans were submitted to Lennar.

Discussion occurred related to roadway design and improvements. Ms. Karagounis summarized those requirements and limitations.

Mr. Lucarelli expressed his approval of the two front retail flex buildings. Mr. Lucarelli pointed out the design of the project appeared to be scaled back further into the site comparative to the architecture of two front buildings. Mr. Lucarelli noted the lack of design variation and commented not having enough information to approve the appearance review. Mr. Lucarelli suggested the applicant provide more detailed renderings for the back project buildings.

Discussion occurred about the use and the size of the buildings. Mr. Lucarelli again noted not having enough information from the renderings. Ms. Curtis commented that the renderings of the storage buildings were unclear. Mr. Buist acknowledged. Mr. Traynor conveyed the same remarks.

Discussion occurred about the project layout, lack of variation of the building materials, and building design. Planning Director Karagounis added that the Planning Commissioners could defer to another meeting date to gain more information.

Mr. Lucarelli responded wanting to see the same architecture design of the front two buildings reflected on the buildings at the back of the project. Discussion occurred about deferring the commercial appearance review to a later meeting date.

Mr. Kerr made a motion to defer the commercial appearance review to allow the applicant more time to make modifications to the plan to address comments for improved building materials. Mrs. Curtis seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

### **3. Subdivision Plat: Philip Hunkler**

Senior Planner Alex Moore provided a brief overview of the request, the purpose of which was to review and consider granting approval of a final plat. The request was submitted by the applicant, Philip Hunkler, of 206 Ballard Court in Fort Mill.

Moore showed a vicinity map on the meeting room monitor illustrating the location, zoning, and general location of the proposed final plat. This indicated that the property to be subdivided consisted of approximately 7.1 acres of an overall 25.21-acre tract. The property is zoned R-15, One-Family Residential District. The property is currently unimproved. The applicant intends to purchase the 7.1 acres from the current owner, Springland, Inc.

Senior Planner Moore then went into the specifics of the final plat request. This consisted of the proposed creation of three lots from the 7.1-acre area. The R-15 zoning district standards indicate that the minimum lot size is 15,000 square feet. The proposed final plat as submitted indicated that the proposed lot sizes consisted of Lot 1 at 1.081 acres, Lot 2 at 1.074 acres, and Lot 3 at 4.953 acres.

Moore then indicated that only two of the lots would be buildable. This would include Lot 1 and Lot 2. This would be due to the presence of a large amount of flood plain, along with utility easements, on Lot 3. He stated that the town engineer had provided a willingness to serve letter for water and sewer for Lots 1 and 2 only.

Senior Planner Moore stated that planning staff recommended approval for this proposed final plat as submitted. He then asked planning commission members if they had any questions on the proposed final plat.

Chairman Traynor asked if there was a town pump station which existed on this property. Moore stated that the town pump station was accessed by a service road and easement. The access to this pump station would not encroach onto the proposed Lot 2 and would remain fully on the Springland property.

Planning Commissioner Mark Kerr noted that to get access to build on Lot 2, one would have to construct a lengthy driveway due to the elevation change of the lot. Thus, this would result in a new home on Lot 2 “looking into” the adjacent neighbors. Mr. Kerr asked if there had been any consideration of how best to deal with this condition within this project.

The applicant, Philip Hunkler responded to this question and stated that some grading would be necessary to create an adequate building area on lot 2. Mr. Hunkler indicated that the result would be a flat area for construction of an aesthetically pleasing home on lot 2 which would compliment the neighborhood.

Chairman Traynor then asked about what would become of the area between the railroad right-of-way and the existing homes on the northwest side of Ballard Court. Senior Planner Moore stated that this area would be part of the proposed lot 3. Mr. Hunkler also added that Springs did not wish to retain this portion of the property and thus it was part of the overall sale. He did note that in the future he might offer portions of this property to the adjacent property owners.

Planning Commissioner Dan Stout then asked Mr. Hunkler if he would be doing anything with lot 3. Mr. Hunkler responded that he did not intend to do anything with this lot due to the flood plain and existing utility easements on this portion of the property.

Mr. Mark Manning of 215 Ballard Court was present at the meeting and asked about the side setback requirement. Senior Planner Moore stated that the side setback requirement of ten feet was shown correctly on the final plat.

Mr. Manning then asked about a portion of the proposed lot 2 which indicated a waterway traversing the northern tip of the property. Mr. Manning stated the final plat did not show this waterway and wondered if there should be some consideration of this on the final plat.

Senior Planner Moore stated that the map that Mr. Manning was referring to was the vicinity map and did indeed indicate the waterway, or floodplain area, to be part of the proposed lot 2. However, the plat of the property now indicated that this area would not be part of the proposed lot 2.

Mr. Manning then posed a question about the staking for lot 2 which he believed did include a portion of the creek. Mr. Hunkler addressed this question and noted that these were not permanent stakes and did not reflect the lot as currently configured on the proposed final plat. Rather, the stakes in question were from an earlier survey which did indeed include the floodplain area. Since then, the lot had been truncated to exclude the creek and the floodplain. Mr. Manning then asked about the force main line in existence would be taken into consideration with the creation of lot 2. Mr. Hunkler stated that the force main in fact was located beneath the gravel access road to the pump station with an easement located on either side of the force main and that it would not be built upon.

Planning Commissioner Kerr then asked Mr. Hunkler if he had asked the various neighbors about how they felt about having a new home constructed next to them. Mr. Hunkler responded that he had spoken to the neighbors and that they all seem to be amenable to the construction of new homes on lots 1 and 2. He noted that they seem to understand that he and his wife are currently residents of the neighborhood and will construct something that is nice and not be a detriment or an eyesore.

There being no other questions or comments, Chairman Traynor entertained a motion. Planning Commissioner Lucarelli made a motion to approve the final subdivision plat as submitted. Planning Commissioner Stout seconded the motion. Then, by a vote of 6-0 the motion carried.

#### **4. Information/Discussion**

Planning Director Karagounis reported on the subdivision name change for Vista South (MXU, Pleasant/Vista development) to Meadows at Wilson Farm subdivision. The Pleasant/Vista MXU development will use the "Wilson Farm" branding for the overall development.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:02pm.

