

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
JANUARY 17TH, 2023 6:30 PM
CENTRAL TOWN HALL – CONFERENCE ROOM
1067 WEST MAIN STREET, CENTRAL, SC 29630

Minutes

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call – Justin Rakey, Tripp Brooks, Erin Ash, David Vaughn, Edith Williams, Daniel Bare, Lauren Queen, Paige Bowers (Council Advisor), Jennifer Vissage (Zoning Admin)
3. Approval of Minutes from November 15th, 2023
 - a. No minutes available at this time, postponed to next meeting.
4. New Business:
 - a. Election of Officers – after a brief discussion and nominations, the following officers were approved for 2023:
 - i. **Chairman – Tripp Brooks**
 - ii. **Vice Chairman – Daniel Bare**
 - iii. **Secretary – Justin Rakey**
 - b. Rezoning Request 2023-01-01 NW Side Gaines Street (Tax Map Number 4065-10-26-9476) – **See 4c.**
 - c. Rezoning Request 2023-01-02 Gaines Street (Tax Map Number 4065-10-36-2565)
 - i. Items 4B and 4C were considered by the commission, together. Staff report presented by Zoning Administrator. Applicant stated that he did not have specific plans for the property yet but felt that in the future it could support overflow parking if a business were developed at the Roller Mill property or serve as a retention pond as needed. Felt that neighborhood commercial served his interests and his neighbor’s interests well at this time. The Zoning administrator identified the two parcels on the northwest side of the intersection of Maw Bridge Road and Madden Bridge Road as the two in question. During discussion, request was made by Daniel Bare that should it become a parking lot, greenspace be prioritized and not just a parking lot as he feels there are too many asphalt lots right now. Further discussion was had regarding the need for protected greenspace and how the commission can and should influence that. **Motion to rezone to Neighborhood Commercial for both 4b and 4c was made, seconded, discussed and approved unanimously by the commission.**
 - d. Rezoning Request 2023-01-03 Gaines Street (Tax Map Number 4065-10-36-1419)
 - i. Staff report presented by the Zoning Administrator. Applicant spoke briefly about her desire to move forward and that so far, their demand is growing. During discussion, Justin Rakey asked if the parking lot would be transitioned to asphalt and if there was a mechanism to ensure it would be completed at some point in the future. The answer from the applicant was yes and Councilwoman Bowers and the Zoning Administrator further stated that the Town would work with the applicant to ensure it gets done in a timely manner without putting

undue pressure on her as she opens the business. Lauren Queen stated that she thought it was important that the parking lots would be kept up in the future and the tire bumpers are still organized and pleasing to the eyes. She also mentioned a desire for character elements of the town like brick to be considered in future design and projects. Daniel Bare reiterated the desire for greenspace to be considered as well as the topography of the lot with regard to runoff. **Motion to rezone to Neighborhood Commercial for 4d was made, seconded, discussed and approved unanimously by the commission.**

e. University Zone Text Amendment

- i. Chairman recognized the Zoning Administrator who then recognized Justin Rakey. Justin explained the timeline of the development of the University Zone and stated that when Eagle Creek planning was underway it was discovered that the UZ's applicability was never amended to only be applicable to land owner by the University. He stated that emails were reviewed from around 2018 and there had been a request to have this added to an agenda around 2018 but it was missed due to other projects and forgotten about. He went to state that after recent discussions with representatives from SWU, he had concerns with moving forward with the amendment as proposed at this time. He did not want to cause undue hardship on the University but did feel that further dialogue needed to occur because the premise still needs to be addressed. He would recommend a motion to postpone the question until such discussion can be had. The Chair recognized Scott Drury from SWU who stated that the text amendment could have a significant impact on SWU's routine business dealings and he is present to oppose the amendment. He provided several examples such as their most recent resident hall and the method they used for financing the project as well as hampering the ability to buy, sell, or receive gifts in real estate and that if such a restriction had been included in the original UZ text, SWU would have opposed it then, too. Ken Whitener explained that Eagle Creek has been a project in the making for some 50 years and it is finally beginning to come to fruition. Went on to discuss that SWU and the Town of Central sought bonds, defended challenges to the bonds, and ultimately secured the bonds to lay the infrastructure to support that project. Stated that the relationship between SWU and the Town is important to the University, and they would ask that the commission postpone the amendment as proposed. Chairman Brooks went on to state that he would certainly be open to more discussion on the topic to ensure that the commission is fulfilling its duty to protect the neighbors of SWU but that there are several ways to handle this. Several options were discussed including tabling or postponing and whether a motion to rescind the approval of the amendments was necessary. Councilwoman Bowers clarified that while the commission had previously approved the amendment, she had not yet presented it to Council and would look to this decision for next steps regarding that topic. **Ultimately, a motion to postpone amendments to the University Zone Text (item 4e) was made, seconded, and approved unanimously by the commission.** Furthermore, it was recommended that a work session be scheduled in the spring to allow all interested parties adequate time to prepare as well as to share the full history of the University Zone for all interested commission members.

- f. RM8/RM16 Setback Requirements Text Amendment
 - i. Staff report presented by the Zoning Administrator. She elaborated that there is a potential project for which she was reviewing the setbacks for duplex residences and noticed that Central’s didn’t seem to be in the state she would expect. Stated that there is strong demand for duplex residences and that several towns she advises are making similar adjustments to ensure the zoning restrictions for such residences make sense compared to other residential zoning requirements. Discussion was held regarding the setback between adjacent duplexes and how that impacts emergency access. Ms. Vissage stated that she spoke to three different fire officials and all three said 5 – 10 feet seems acceptable. Mr. Vaugh asked how setback is affected when differently zoned properties are adjacent to one another, but then clarified if these new restrictions were adopted and two adjacent lots held duplexes, the setback between the two total would be 10 feet and not 5, but only if they were on separate lots. The chairman agreed and further stated that requiring duplexes to each be on their own lot would likely be difficult or burdensome for rental companies to manage or would drive down adoption. He went on to state that he doesn’t have significant concerns at this time. Upon further clarification of which tables were being considered, it was clarified that the table on the lower half of the second page of tables, titled “Proposed Changes to Setbacks for Duplexes and Single Family Homes in RM8 and RM16” was the table under consideration. The question was further clarified that the commission is not considering a specific piece of property right now but just a change to the zoning text. **Motion to approve the changes contained in the below table was made, seconded, discussed and approved unanimously by the commission.**

Proposed Changes to Setbacks for Duplexes and Single Family in RM-8 and RM-16

Minimum Lot Square Footage	Multi Family – 40,000 square feet Single Family – 6,000 square feet Duplexes – 4,500 square feet per lot
Minimum Lot Width	Multi Family – 100 feet Single- Family – 60 feet Duplexes – 50 feet
Front Setback	Multi Family – 40 feet Single Family – 15 feet Duplexes – 15 feet
Side Setback	Multi Family – 20 feet Single Family – 10 feet Duplexes – 5 feet
Rear Setback	Multi Family – 40 feet Single Family – 15 feet Duplexes- 15 feet
Height	Multi Family- 35 feet Single Family – 35 feet Duplexes – 35 feet
Distance Between Buildings	Duplexes – 5 feet

- 5. Wrap-Up Items:
 - a. Next Meeting – Tuesday, February 21st, 2023

- i. Suggest scheduling a work session prior to the meeting to complete updates to the Sign Ordinance
- ii. Suggest adding Neighborhood Commercial parking requirements to the agenda
- iii. Suggest adding review of the Comprehensive Plan with a focus on locations identified as or target for multifamily housing