

PICKENS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

of

August 10, 2020

6:30pm

PICKENS COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING Main Conference Room

NOTICE OF MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING: Pursuant to Section 30-4-80 of the S.C. Code of Laws, annual notice of this Commission's meetings was provided by January 1, 2020 via the Pickens County Website and posted next to the Offices of the County Planning Department. In addition, the agenda for this meeting was posted outside the meeting place (Pickens County Administration Building Bulletin Board) and was emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice. Notice for the public hearings was published in the *Pickens County Courier*, posted on the properties subject of public hearing(s), and emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice pursuant to Section 1205(d)(1) of the Pickens County Unified Development Standards Ordinance.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill Cato, Chairman
Michael Watson
Bob Young
Philip Smith

STAFF PRESENT:

Ray Holliday, County Planner
Chris Brink, Community Development Director

Welcome and Call to Order

Mr. Cato, the Presiding Official, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Mr. Cato asked those in attendance to join in a moment of silence and for the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Cato called for a motion regarding the minutes of the July 13, 2020 meeting. Mr. Smith motioned to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Watson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments

No one signed up to speak.

Public Hearings

Mr. Brink reviewed the social distancing and access process for the public hearing.

Mr. Cato reviewed the public hearing procedures that will be followed.

Mr. Cato opened the public hearing portion of the meeting and called for the first case to be heard.

- 1. LU-20-0005 Allan Fortner of Land Planning Associates, Inc is requesting Land Use approval for a Commercial Center generating greater than 1,000 Average Daily Vehicle Trips (Large Scale Project). The subject tract is located on SC 183 (Walhalla Highway) and Old Keowee Church Road, Six Mile. The property owner of record is Century Landscaping, LLC (Jarrett Jernigan). TMS#s 4049-00-66-9058, 4049-00-66-8815**

Mr. Allan Fortner appeared before the commission and gave a very brief overview of the updated Century Plaza project; that this initially came before the commission in 2018 and was approved with conditions; that the project has been redesigned somewhat due to concerns over access; that, just as before, the project will contain space for a small neighborhood market or grocery store; a fine dining restaurant, some space for several retail shops, and a stand-alone office for a financial advisor who has already committed to the site.

Mr. Fortner explained the redesign of the project entrances that were made based on discussions with SCDOT and that the traffic study from 2018/2019 indicated a need for a re-design as well.

Mr. Cato asked if anyone wanted to speak in favor of the request.

Being none present, Mr. Cato asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition to the request.

Several citizens were present at the meeting just to gather information about traffic and impact on the community.

There being no additional comments, Mr. Cato asked if any Commissioners had any questions.

Mr. Watson indicated his approval of the new design; that it was better presented than before.

Mr. Cato read the recommended staff conditions that were attached to the staff report.

There being no additional discussion or questions, Mr. Cato closed the public hearing and opened the floor for a motion.

Mr. Watson motioned that the project be approved with the staff recommended conditions. Those conditions being:

- 1. Prior to the submittal of any application/plans for permits for the project (stormwater and development permit), the developer must submit to Planning staff, a REVISED Traffic Impact Analysis for the proposed project. This TIA must be performed by a licensed engineer proficient in traffic engineer/planning and conducted according to the guidelines established for such analysis by the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE). At a minimum, this analysis must look at and fully study the intersection of SC 183 and SC 133, the intersection of Old Keowee Church Road and SC 183, and the proposed project entrances from and onto SC 183.*
- 2. In concert and concurrence with both SCDOT and the County Engineer, the project developer must coordinate with the County Engineer and SCDOT to secure the proper permits prior to the issuance of any development permit for the project. Any required improvements must be made and installed prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Site Completion.*
- 3. Approval is based on the conceptual plans submitted with the Land Use Application and reviewed by the Planning Commission. Any substantial changes to what has been reviewed by this Commission must be sent back for review as a change in conditions of this land use permit action.*

Mr. Terry Cannon, nearby resident, asked a question related to traffic and the need for improvements at the SC 133 and SC 183 intersection or medians and a traffic light at SC 183 and Old Keowee Church Road.

Mr. Fortner explained that the updated traffic study that was underway would look at any needed improvements in those locations; that SCDOT could require such improvements be made if any were indicated in the study.

Mr. Young seconded the motion to approve.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Cato called for the next public hearing.

**2. SDV-20-0002 Deborah Quick requesting a subdivision variance of the Pickens County development standards regarding minimum lot size and division of property off a private residential access. The subject tract is located on Knob Hill Road, Pickens. The property owner of record is Deborah Quick.
TMS# 4191-17-11-4369**

Ms. Deborah Quick, applicant and property owner, appeared before the Commission, along with her prospective new owner and explained the need for the submitted variance; that they are wanting to subdivide her property so that she can sell the smaller piece for either a camper or small manufactured home.

The adjacent property owner and son of potential new owner, Daniel McCollum also spoke on the request for the variance.

Mr. Watson asked about drainage and culverts at the end of Knob Hill Road.

Ms. Quick stated that the culverts are not on her property.

Mr. Watson asked about the potential of combining the smaller tract proposed, that doesn't meet the minimum size requirements, to property owned by Mr. McCollum.

Discussion continued regarding this question and its viability.

Mr. Brink informed the Commission that, yes, this could be done, but the variance issue will still need to be addressed since the issue would just be transferred to another property; that the issue of two homes on a parcel of less than an acre will still exist.

Mr. Cato read and explained the requirements for Knob Hill Road as mentioned and outlined in the staff report.

Discussion continued amongst members of the Commission, public, applicant, and staff regarding easement requirements, required road widths, building locations, and lot size.

There being no further discussion or questions, Mr. Cato closed the public hearing and called for a motion.

Mr. Watson made the motion to deny the variance request due to the fact that the request does not meet the minimum requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Young seconded the motion.

The motion to deny passed with three in favor (Watson, Young, Cato, and one against Smith).

Mr. Brink clarified exactly what the applicant was requesting; that the nature of a variance is that it does not meet the minimum requirements of the ordinance; that denying a variance request just because the request does not meet the minimum requirements of the ordinance is not a valid reason to deny such a request.

Mr. Smith offered a new motion; that the request be approved with a condition. That condition being:

1. No site built or stick built home is permitted or allowed on the smaller tract.

Mr. Cato provided a second. The motion to approve with the stated condition passed unanimously.

Mr. Cato called for the next public hearing.

3. **SDV-20-0003 Daniel Kingsbury and Tony Gaylor requesting a subdivision variance of the Pickens County development standards regarding division of property off a private residential access. The subject tract is located on Amberway Road, Easley. The property owner of record is Jerry Richardson. TMS#s 5049-10-25-7716, 5049-10-26-5345**

Mr. Kingsbury, applicant and potential property owner, appeared before the Commission and stated that he and Mr. Gaylor were wanting to purchase property from Mr. Richardson; that there exists one business on the property and that he would like to operate his outdoor event/inflatable business on the property in the rear of the shop building; that the property meets all the size requirements it's just located on a private road that doesn't meet standards.

Mr. Cato and Mr. Watson asked about access to lot D-1 and Lot D-2.

Mr. Kingsbury gave an explanation regarding access; that a small drive currently exists alongside of the existing shop building that is wide enough for an 18 wheeler to fit through there; that Duke Energy has given them permission to have that drive through the power line ROW.

Mr. Smith asked for clarification on the nature of the request.

Mr. Brink explained that Amberway Road is private and does not have a verifiable easement width; that the road actually is located within the ROW of the Norfolk Southern Rail Road; that since the easement cannot be verified and that a new lot was being created on this easement, a variance and consideration by the Planning Commission was in order.

Mr. Cato called for additional discussion or for anyone that wished to speak in favor or in opposition of the request.

There being non, Mr. Cato closed the public hearing and called for a motion.

Mr. Young motioned that the request be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion to approve the variance request passed unanimously.

Mr. Cato called for the final public hearing.

- 4. SD-20-0003 Subdivision Land Use and associated Subdivision Variance request for a 22 lot single-family residential development with unpaved/gravel streets. The subject tracts are located on Old Keowee Church Road. Six Mile. The applicant and property owner of record is RSL Buildings, LLC (Mark Clayton). TMS#s 4049-00-59-1085, 4049-00-58-5751, 4049-00-58-6074, 4049-00-59-5232, 4049-00-57-8898, 4049-00-59-3692, 4049-00-59-8238**

Mr. Mark Clayton, applicant and Mr. Pete Frogget appeared before the Commission and provided a detailed overview of the proposed project; that they were proposing a "NetZero" green development with passive solar homes; that the community will have organic farms scattered through the development; that their 1st such community is located in Greer; that they have conducted some initial land clearing and are currently working on detailed site plans.

Mr. Clayton explained that the 1st phase of the development on the initial 31 acres will have 23 homes; that there are mountain views from the initial phase; that they have an option to purchase an additional 36 acres that will have access onto SC 133.

Mr. Cato asked why 23 homes proposed when the application and notice had 22.

Mr. Clayton explained that his civil engineer was able to re-design the concept to add additional home sites to the project.

Mr. Cato explained that they were bound to what was being applied for and advertised; that anything beyond that would require an additional application and hearing process.

Mr. Clayton stated that they would stick with what was initially proposed in the application.

Members of the Commission and the applicant discussed access and lot location.

Mr. Clayton provided some information regarding anticipated cost of homes in the project, being in line with what is being realized in his Greer project.

Mr. Clayton asked the Commission to consider gravel roads within the development as well, similar to how the development was done in Greer; that gravel roads were considered green and would allow for more water collection rather than runoff; that they were trying to minimize all runoff and in fact capture a lot of water in detention ponds for irrigation.

Initialed by questions from Mr. Watson, the Commission and applicant discussed the gravel road proposal and maintenance of the road and various alternatives to construction type and profile needed to accommodate traffic and construction equipment.

Mr. Smith asked about home sales in the Greer community.

Mr. Clayton stated that all the homes in that project have been sold.

Mr. Smith asked about complaints from residents in the Greer project related to the gravel streets.

Mr. Clayton stated that no one has complained about the streets; that they were approved by the city, that even though the streets are gravel, each home has a concrete driveway.

Discussion continued relative to the gravel streets and the construction requirements for private vs public streets and the recommendation from Public works and Engineering that the proposed gravel streets not be approved or allowed.

Mr. Watson asked if the development would be gated.

Mr. Clayton stated that they would not make that call initially; that that decision would be left up to the community once it is better established.

Mr. Watson asked additional questions relative to the topography of the property, specifically where the road would be located and how would gravel hold up in the steepest areas and that perhaps other construction should be considered in this area such as pavers or asphalt meeting county requirements.

Mr. Brink offered that perhaps there were too many questions and not enough detail regarding the gravel street request and that Public Works and Engineering really needs to weigh-in relative to their recommendation; that planning staff also recommends the same but the Commission needs to hear directly from their staff; that perhaps tabling the approval/action for another month would allow some additional questions to be answered and for Public Works staff to attend the next meeting.

Mr. Cato and members of the Commission agreed.

There being no one else wanting to speak either in favor or in opposition of the request and there being no additional discussion, Mr. Cato closed the public hearing portion of the meeting and motioned that action on the request be tabled until the September 14th meeting.

Mr. Smith seconded the motion to table. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioners and Staff Discussion

There was no additional Commission or staff discussion.

Adjourn


There being no additional matters to be taken up by the Commission, Mr. Smith motioned that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Mr. Watson. The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 pm.

Submitted by:


Secretary

9/14/2020
Date

Approved by:


Chairman

9/19/2020
Date