
**CITY OF COLUMBIA
PLANNING COMMISSION**



November 2, 2015

Regular Session 5:15 P.M.

Eau Claire Print Building, 3907 Ensor Avenue, Columbia, SC 29203

In attendance: Richard Cohn, Gene Dinkins, Jr., April James, Joshua McDuffie, Brian Stern, Dale Stigamier, Craig Waites

Absent: Kendora Foster, John Taylor

Staff: John Fellows, Brian Cook

I CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Meeting called to order at 5:18 PM by Chairperson Rick Cohn. Mr. Cohn explained the purpose and process of the Planning Commission and explained the rules of order for the Planning Commission.

Roll call and quorum established. John Fellows, Planning Administrator, noted a recommendation for a change to the agenda. All items stand as published, however staff recommends that item #11 be deferred to the December meeting and moved forward on the agenda for action.

Motion by Mr. McDuffie to defer item #11 to the December meeting. *Motion seconded by Mr. Dinkins, Jr.*

Motion to defer approved 7-0.

Mr. Fellows proceeded with review of the Consent Agenda.

II CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of Minutes

1. Approve **September 14, 2015 Minutes**.

**Annexation, Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment,
& Zoning Map Amendment**

2. **1750 Andrews Road**, TMS#13701-01-17; request recommendation concerning application to annex, assign land use classification Urban Core Residential Small Lot - 1 (UCR-1) and zone the property RG-1 (General Residential District -1). The property is currently classified as Mixed Residential (High Density) and zoned RM-MD (Mixed Residential-Medium Density) in Richland County.
3. **3807 Capers Avenue**, TMS#13805-07-17; request recommendation concerning application to annex, assign land use classification UCR-1 (Urban Core Residential – Small Lot), and zone the property RS-3 (Single Family Residential). The property is currently classified as Mixed Residential and zoned RS-HD (Residential, Single-Family, High Density) in Richland County.
4. **7316, 7320, 7324, and 7340 Garners Ferry Road**, TMS#16409-01-01; request recommendation concerning application to annex, assign land use classification AC-2 (Community Action Corridor), and zone the property C-3 (General Commercial District). The property is currently classified as Neighborhood (Medium Density) and zoned GC (General Commercial) in Richland County.

Site Plan Review

5. **10.21 acres, west side of Clif Kinder Boulevard**, TMS#19100-06-20; request site plan approval for the construction of a single-family residential subdivision. The property is zoned PUD-LS (Large Scale Planned Development).
6. **5350 Randall Avenue**, TMS#11705-03-01; request site plan approval for the construct an 8-unit apartment building and one community building. The property is zoned RG-2 (Multi-Family Residential).

Motion by Mr. Stigamier to approve the Consent Agenda items as presented. Motion seconded by Mr. Sterne.

Motion approved 7-0.

III REGULAR AGENDA

Site Plan Review

7. **Belmont Drive**, TMS#13907-03-31, -32, and -34, 13907-01-09(p); request site plan approval for the extension of Belmont Drive. The properties are zoned RS-1 (Single-Family Residential), RG-1 (General Residential), within the –FP (Floodplain Overlay).

Johnathan Chambers, Land Development Administrator, presented on the proposal which entails the extension of Belmont Drive to develop a 34-lot single-family residential subdivision on 28.7 acres primarily located within Forest Acres. The site plan illustrates that the extension of Belmont Drive will be privately maintained and gated in accordance with all applicable codes.

The request is being presented to the Planning Commission because the extension of Belmont Drive classifies as a major subdivision and is in conformance with Section 17-464 of the City of Columbia Zoning Ordinance. The Commission review is only for the portion of the property located in the City of Columbia, and is technical in nature. The project has received sketch plan approval by Forest Acres by staff on July 30, 2015.

The site plan generally meets staff comments. Roads are to be constructed to meet all City street requirements. With the land development perspective, lots 15, 16 and 17 if constructed should not span the municipal boundary and cannot be located within the jurisdiction. Land disturbance permitting is to be provided by Richland County and/or Forest Acres for the entire project, and City land disturbance requirements are to be met in the portion of the property located within the City.

The flood plain manager has also reviewed the request and required that manholes be required to be floodplain requirements.

There are many emails that have been distributed to the Commission, and will now be stated for the record.

- An email of opposition from Ms. Deborah Drotor of 3406 Brookwood Court; as well as an email from Ms. Drotor regarding the flood plain delineation.
- An email of opposition from Ms. Christy Elwell of 3905 Trenholm Road.
- An email of opposition from Ms. Lisa Fouche of 44 Mahalo Lane
- An email of opposition from Mary Jane and Patrick Scott.

Mitch McGuirt, H&M Realty, provided background on the property of which the majority is in Forest Acres. The request is for an extension to Belmont to allow another access into the subdivision, which will encompass the three lots at the end of Belmont which are in the City of Columbia. The community will be gated to reduce incoming and exiting traffic flow. Regarding the flooding potential, which is a

concern, the site plan has been reviewed by Forest Acres, and no zoning variances have been requested or changes within the existing code. Existing code within the City of Columbia will be followed. Mike Brickle, H&M Realty, spoke with regard to the buffer requirements which are enforced through Richland County with the City of Forest Acres, and will be met per their code and enforcement. Water retention and the flood control methodology will be completed on final engineering and presented to both the municipality, the county, and any DHEC jurisdiction requirements. The applicants are aware that any necessary obligations will be met.

Mr. Dinkins, Jr. stated for clarification that that Planning Commission's purview for the request is only for the portion of the property within the City. Any flooding issues or buffer issues, while very important, is not the issue the Commission is charged with for recommendation today.

Mr. Chambers concurred with Mr. Dinkins.

Deborah Drotor, neighboring resident, spoke in opposition of the request. Ms. Drotor voiced concerns with the older version of the flood plain map used and brought an updated flood plain map and video showing the area after the historic flooding of the surrounding area stating flooding is routine for the area.

Mr. Waites stated he is sensitive to Belmont as his parents and sister sustained flooding damage. However, the Commission is asked to evaluation and to make a recommendation based on the planning and the road itself; not engineering. Ultimately whether or not the road can/or cannot be built should be determined by the city engineers taking all information into account.

Mr. Chambers stated that is correct with their review, and the flood plain manager has reviewed the proposal. All of his concerns were that the manholes meet floodplain requirements.

Toby Ward, Columbia attorney, spoke on behalf of Lisa Fouche who is a neighboring landowner in the Tanglewood subdivision. If the Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposal, Mr. Ward felt two conditions should apply: strict enforcement of each and every condition as recommended by staff; and strict review by staff of the June 2015 Ordinances, Section 21-171 and following sections.

Mr. Chambers stated that plans have been reviewed and looked at by City Engineering. If the Planning Commission were to approve the request, the applicant will be required to submit additional plans prior to permitting. The project will not present to City Council in that it is a site plan review and technical in nature.

Motion by Mr. Dinkins, Jr. to approve the request for site plan approval for the extension of Belmont Drive. *Motion seconded by Mr. Stern.*

Mr. Dinkins, Jr. added that Commission members are sensitive to all of the neighborhood concerns however the city flood plain coordinator and engineer staff approved the matter. In his opinion, it is out of the Commission's jurisdiction. **Approval is subject to staff comments.**

Motion approved 6-1 with Mr. McDuffie in opposition.

Zoning Map Amendment

8. **Canalside: 1511 Williams Street, 600 Canalside Street, N/S Canalside Street (multiple parcels), 610 Depot Street, 1625 Williams Street, 463 MacDougall Street, 485 MacDougall Street, N/S Irwin Park Circle, E/S Irwin Park Circle, 361 Taylor Street, 638 Taylor Street, 535 Depot Street, 645 Canalside Street, TMS#09005-03-01, -02, -03 to -06, -15, -18, -07, -08, -09, -10, -11, -12, -13, -14, -16, -17; request major amendment to (Canalside) a PUD-C/DD**

Planned Unit Development-Commercial/Design Development Overlay District). **1511 Huger Street, 419 Hampton Street, 4 Science Alley, 21 Science Alley, 9 Science Alley, 1504 Williams Street, 401 Hampton Street, 1510 Williams Street, 1512 Williams Street, and 1516 Williams Street, S/S Huger Street**, TMS# 09009-14-11, -14, -15, -22, -23, -24, -25, -26, -27, -28, -31; request recommendation to rezone from C-1/DD (Office and Institutional District/Design Development Overlay District) to PUD-C/DD (Planned Unit Development-Commercial/Design Development Overlay District).

The major amendment takes into consideration all of the Planned Unit Development (PUD). The revised Canalside PUD revised document reflecting all of the changes has been provided to Commission members.

Ryan Hyler, Land Holdings Two LLC, presented on behalf of the Beech Company on the Canalside amendment. The main component is to bring in the group of eleven parcels to build a climate-controlled state of the art storage facility. It is felt this will be a great amenity and much needed for the City as urbanization continues to grow. The parcel is an odd site with very little frontage on Huger Street. It is one-way on three sides with up to seven lanes of traffic. Meetings have been held with DOT, and access/exit to the site will only be allowed on Williams Street.

Storage use is allowed in the Vista and will be in keeping with the area. Materials to be used include hard stucco, exterior glass, and brick. This will be a very attractive building that will be highly visible as one crosses the bridge. Meetings have been held with many neighboring property owners and the surrounding area who are in support of the project.

Mr. Hyler provided copies of the design and street framework to Commission members. The facility will front up to the street both on Williams and Hampton Streets. There will be 550 units, and the height of the building will not exceed 50'. To the applicant's knowledge, the area has always been C-1 zoning. It is not in the West Gervais historic district.

Dale Marshall, representing the Congaree Vista Guild, spoke in opposition of the request as it is felt the use is not consistent with the Canalside PUD, or appropriate for the gateway site into the Vista. There are other sites in the Vista that would be more appropriate for this use. They feel that if approved, it will preclude the site for future development that would be appropriate and would block the riverfront site. The Congaree Vista Guild Board is opposed to request.

Toby Ward, represented Mike Kelly, who is also opposed to the project on the same grounds. Mr. Ward voiced legal concerns with regard to non-compliance of Section 17-134 of the Ordinance.

Brian Cook, Zoning Administrator, responded that Section 17-134 is the section for criteria in place for rezoning of property. 17-134.1 states rezoning would be permitted. The adjacent parcel is zoned PUD. Section 17-305 discusses a PUD and major changes. This changing of the boundary of the PUD follows the same criteria as establishing a new PUD, therefore the entire PUD is being amended, not just the strict rezoning of 1.68 acres currently zoned C-1. Section 17-304 which states less than 2/3 vote of the Planning Commission is required is limited to principle uses and uses allowed in a PUD. The request deals with specific permitted uses. Staff feels confident the PUD can stand on its own merits and have no concerns moving forward.

Mary Langston, resident of the Vista, spoke in opposition to the request voicing the same concerns as Mr. Marshall.

Steve Hinson, resident, voiced opposition as he feels it is not the best use for the property.

Gordan Langston, resident, voiced opposition to the request as he felt it is not appropriate.

Elizabeth Trenbeck whose mother lives in the area, voiced opposition to the area as she feels it is inappropriate for the area.

Bart Walrath, resident and member of Vista Development was opposed to the request and in agreement with comments made.

Dan DeElbert, attorney, works with Mr. Tomlin and Mr. Hyler. Meetings have been held with City staff numerous times, as well as with the surrounding area. This specific zoning change was recommended by City staff. Tax requirements will be met at the full rate. Beech Company met with Canalside several months ago as they are neighboring landowners. They appreciate the connection to this site, consider it an amenity, and feel it is a strong use for a neighboring piece of land. With regard to parking concerns, the site is oddly shaped. Storage does not require a lot of parking, and though there may be 550 units, there may be 30 cars daily using the facility; parking will be very minimal.

Maria Walrath, resident, voiced opposition and agreed with comments of opposition made.

Mr. Waites said he hears the concerns regarding this use in the Vista area. With the increased population and approved projects in the city, it is truly becoming an urban city. There will be a need for these types of services for people who will not want to drive outside of the City for storage needs which must be provided somewhere. Issues regarding access limit the develop ability of the property. This use may not be compatible with existing uses, but he feels sure the use will be welcomed and needed in the Vista.

Mr. Cohn feels the facility is very attractive and will be much needed services in the area, commending everyone for all the opinions made.

Mr. Dinkins, Jr. said C-1 is not an intense zoning for this type of parcel in such an urban area. He questioned the current land use classification asking if future zoning maps would put a more intense zoning on this parcel in the future.

Mr. Fellow responded that C-1 is a very low density, limited/collection of uses in that district. C-1 is typically used adjacent to residential areas. The zoning map shows a scattered of various zoning districts in the area. In terms of rewrite and mapping, many areas in the downtown area will be reviewed. As this is an area in the -DD, it will need to be reviewed by the D/DRC for site plan and architecture.

Motion by Mr. Waites to approve the request for recommendation to rezone the parcel from C-1/DD to PUD-C/DD. Motion seconded by both Ms. James and Mr. Stigamier.

Motion approved 7-0.

9. **801, 805, 809, 813, 817 Sunset Drive**, TMS#09112-13-14, -15, -16, -17, -18; request recommendation to rezone from PUD (Planned Unit Development) to RG-1 (General Residential District).

Mr. Fellows stated that information regarding the original PUD and proposed project are included in staff packets. Staff recommends denial of the request.

Tory Johnson represented the proposed owners of the project. The comp plan was not available with regard to this request for a small multi-family development. With the Comp Plan now in place and the area designated as UCR-2, the proposed use will not be allowed. Mr. Johnson would like to research small multi-family development in area, and see what can be allowed in the current designation.

Mr. Cook stated this was a specific PUD that stated the existing buildings, which are now removed, would need to be used. A lower density may be appropriate in another zoning category and staff can work with the applicant regarding different uses.

Discussion was held with regard to hearing the request as presented, what types of structures would be allowed for specific zoning, or whether the applicant wished to defer the request to discuss other options.

Mr. Johnson requested his request be withdrawn to discuss alternative options with staff.

Mr. McDuffie left the meeting at 6:30 PM for another meeting.

Text Amendment

10. Recommendation to City Council to **Amend §17-404 (e) (4) (Prohibited Signs)** to define how the spacing requirement is measured for the conversion of an outdoor advertising sign to changeable copy adjacent to an interstate highway.

Brian Cook, Zoning Administrator, presented on the text amendment recommendation to define how spacing requirements are measured from residential zoning districts. This request is for billboards along the interstate to convert changeable copy from static to digital. Signage must be 300' from a neighborhood district. This is measured from zoning district boundary line as opposed to property line; therefore the 300' would be measured from the billboard to the residential zoning boundary - center of the interstate. The recommendation is to permit the 300' measurement to extend to the parcel lines instead of the interstate center line.

This will not allow for more signage, but would allow for the conversion of static to digital.

**Motion by Mr. Stigamier to approve request. Motion seconded by Ms. James.
Motion approved 6-0.**

11. Recommendation to City Council to **Amend § 17-55 (Definitions)** to redefine the Public Dormitory definition to allow cooking/eating within.

III OTHER BUSINESS

12. **Public Life / Public Space Project – Informational Update**

Mr. Fellows provided an update on the Public Life / Public Spaces Project. Locations for the project were discussed, volunteers are needed, and there will be pop-up stations in various areas for interaction.

13. Adjourn

There being no further business, move to adjourn by Mr. Waites. Meeting adjourned at 6:37 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Wolfe
Sr. Admin. Secretary
Planning and Development Services Department
City of Columbia