

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
2 MARCH 2021 6:30 PM
CENTRAL TOWN HALL – CONFERENCE ROOM
1067 WEST MAIN STREET, CENTRAL, SC 29630

MINUTES

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call - Carissa Hood-Pope, Tripp Brooks, Curt Curz-Edsall (present); Justin Rakey, Daniel Bare, Ted Balk, Paige Bowers (Zoom)
3. Public Comments and Response- 5minutes per person. 30 minutes maximum.
 - a. Rachele Beckner - Conducted traffic count on Johnson Rd for one week 14-21 Feb 2021. 8274 trips total; ~1400 trips per day. ~600 trips on Saturday. Concerns with the traffic count.
 - i. Members shared concerns with traffic counts as well, specifically around school drop off and pick up times.
 - ii. Requested traffic study data and contact information from Ms. Beckner so that members could follow up.
 - b. David Garrett - How do private citizens apply for a traffic study?
 - c. Marshall Collins - expressed confusion regarding the ordinance draft - what are the min lot size requirements? Do they refer to the table?
 - i. What covenants will the subdivision have?
 - ii. What are the maintenance requirements for the HOA - specifically at Hidden Valley?
 - iii. There is supposed to be another layer of asphalt at Hidden Valley - who does this (the Toen or the developer?) This should be at the close of the project.
 - iv. Responses - there are no min lot sizes, the table is used for a maximum density calculation. The members are not aware of the HOA at Hidden Valley, however the project is not complete and it's likely the builder is still responsible for maintenance items; covenants for the subdivision are not part of the ordinance, other than maintenance of the Natural Area; the topcoat of the asphalt does come at the close of the project; the developer is required to hold a bond for a period of time for repairs needed after close of the project; the developer will need permission to apply the final layer of asphalt from the building official.
 - d. Thomas Goldman - Have we thought about building a bridge instead of a tunnel at Pepper Street?
 - i. The military plans ahead; it does not feel that the Planning Commission is planning ahead.
 - ii. How long has the proposal been on the table and how long has the (Lawton Rd) bridge been out?
 - iii. General discussion regarding the removal of the bridge at Lawton rd. (~2008) and the timing of the proposal to annex this parcel (~Nov 2020)
 - e. Janie Collins - there should be concern with drainage since there is a natural creek on the site
 - i. She feels that issues and citizen concerns have been misrepresented.

- ii. She is concerned with the lack of a minimum lot size.
 - iii. She does not feel that the green spaces will be cared for under this provision.
 - iv. She does not feel that town houses or other non single-family homes should be allowed.
 - v. General responses regarding the tradeoff of density for preservation of natural space.
 - f. Maureen Lesley - Why are we doing this? Why do we need to accommodate the builder?
- 4. Discussion / Proposal for Natural Space Residential District (this has been called cluster zoning)
 - a. Discussion of minimum setbacks. Several proposals and tradeoffs submitted. 5ft min setback with a 15ft min distance between structures seems OK.
 - b. Who owns and maintains the buffer? Is 50 ft too big? Will any proposed buffer size be reduced at Council review?
 - c. Should there be front setbacks? There is a requirement to have off-street parking - if this is in front then it would be a setback.
 - d. Buffer yard ownership could be in one of the manners specified for ownership of the Natural Area. Not necessary to be the same one, but must follow the same guidelines.
- 5. Adjourn

Next Meeting 16 March 2021