

- Copy -

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MAY 17 2022 6:30 PM
CENTRAL TOWN HALL – CONFERENCE ROOM
1067 WEST MAIN STREET, CENTRAL, SC 29630

MINUTES

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Roll Call – Present: Justin Rakey, Tripp Brooks, Daniel Bare
 - a. Council Member Present: Paige Bowers
 - b. Advisors Present: Jennifer Vissage
- 3. Approve Minutes:
 - a. Minutes approved
- 4. Old Business:
- 5. New Business:
 - a. Preliminary Plat Review of Spring Grove Development
 - i. Motion offered, seconded and approved unanimously to change the order of agenda items 5a (Preliminary Plat Review) with 5b (Spring Grove Development Variance Request). Group transitioned to discussion of item 5b and returned to 5a for further discussion.
 - ii. After discussing 5b, the group returned to 5a. A motion for conditional approval of the Preliminary Plat Review was offered, seconded, and approved unanimously provided that the following conditions are met:
 - 1. The two ends of Sweetgrass St be modified to be cul-de-sacs
 - 2. Setback along perimeter of property be re-labeled to display as a buffer on the plan
 - 3. The historic red oak on the property be identified on the ^{plan} ~~plan for a~~ *plus* ~~further consideration~~ *a significant natural feature.*
- b. Spring Grove Development Variance Request for turning lane requirement of the LDR's
 - i. Motion offered, seconded and approved unanimously to offer the opportunity for public comments.
 - 1. Greg Chapman: Asked why the developer should be asking the county for the variance.
 - 2. Doug Johnson: Asks whether the overgrown edges of the road should be better taken care of and if they were would it negate the need for a variance.
 - 3. William Ritzman: Mentioned the quality of the asphalt roads in the area, especially the edges. Also asked who will be responsible for the upkeep of the roads.

JR

4. Janie Collins: Also asked about road ownership, specifically whether the developer has talked to the county to make sure they do or do not need a turn lane. She also asked if the town could claim eminent domain for a sidewalk. She further requested the developer act in a safe manner for pedestrian traffic.
5. Unknown: A question was asked regarding ownership of the road.
 - ii. Motion was offered to approve the variance as requested to not require the turning lane dictated by the LDR's. Motion seconded and approved unanimously.
 - c. Temporary Sign Discussion: Brief discussion was held with no actions taken on this topic.

6. Meeting adjourned