



MEMBERS OF LANCASTER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

JASON CAVALIER, DISTRICT 1
T. YOKIMA CURETON, DISTRICT 2
LYNETTE HINSON, DISTRICT 3
JUDIANNA TINKLENBERG, DISTRICT 4
MICHELLE RICHARDS, DISTRICT 5
SHEILA HINSON, DISTRICT 6
FRANCES LIU, DISTRICT 7
SECRETARY: VACANT

MINUTES
Lancaster County Planning Commission
August 19, 2025, 6:00 p.m.

Interim Chairman Cavalier called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call: Quorum is present (7 Commissioners)

Commissioners Present:

Jason Cavalier, Dist. 1	Judianna Tinklenberg, Dist. 4
T. Yokima Cureton, District 2	Michelle Richards, Dist. 5
Lynette Hinson, District 3	Sheila Hinson, Dist. 6
	Frances Liu, Dist. 7

Absent: _____

Staff Present:

April Williams, Planning Director	Corey Barnes, Planner
Matthew Blaszyk, Planner	Kirsten Willis, Planner
Jennifer Bryan, Planning Technician	Admin. Assistant: Mara Mata

The following press were notified of the meeting by email in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act: The Lancaster News, Kershaw News Era, The Rock Hill Herald, The Fort Mill Times, Cable News 2, Channel 9, and the local Government Channel. The agenda was also posted in the lobby of the County Administration Building for the required length of time, and was published on the County website.

Prayer and Pledge of AllegianceJason Cavalier

THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS. IT IS NOT A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT.

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2025-2026 TERM

Interim Chair yields to Planning Director April Williams to moderate the election of Chair and Vice Chair.

a. Moderator calls for nominations for the office of **Chair:**

S. Hinson nominates JASON CAVALIER; Second by F. Liu.

J. Tinklenberg nominates MICHELLE RICHARDS; Second by Y. Cureton

Moderator asks nominees if they are willing to serve if elected.

Jason Cavalier is willing.

Michelle Richards is willing.

Commissioners chose to elect by a show of hands.

Those in favor of JASON CAVALIER as Chair: S. Hinson, F. Liu, J. Cavalier (3)
Those in favor of MICHELLE RICHARDS as Chair: J. Tinklenberg, L. Hinson, Y. Cureton, M. Richards. (4).

MICHELLE RICHARDS is elected as Chair by a simple majority

b. Moderator calls for nominations for the office of Vice-Chair
S. Hinson nominates JASON CAVALIER; Second by F. Liu.
Y. Cureton nominates JUDIANNA TINKLENBERG; Second by L. Hinson

Moderator asks nominees if they are willing to serve if elected.
JASON CAVALIER is willing. JUDIANNA TINKLENBERG is willing.

Commissioners chose to elect by a show of hands.

Those in favor of JASON CAVALIER as Vice-Chair: S. Hinson, F. Liu, J. Cavalier (3)
Those in favor of JUDIANNA TINKLENBERG as Vice-Chair: J. Tinklenberg, L. Hinson, Y. Cureton, M. Richards. (4).

JUDIANNA TINKLENBERG is elected as Vice-Chair by a simple majority

Moderator yields to the new Chair.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

Chairman Richards called for a motion to approve the agenda.
Motion to Approve by J. Tinklenberg; 2nd by Y. Cureton.
Called vote: 7:0. Motion approved unanimously.

4. RULES OF PROCEDURE

Draft of Rules of Procedure under consideration.
Discussion regarding holding elections in January, or in July.
Motion to Approve in the entirety, as written by J. Tinklenberg. Second by Y. Cureton.
Called vote: 7:0. Motion approved unanimously.

5. APPROVE MINUTES

a. June 17, 2025 Amended Minutes

Chairman Richards called for a motion to approve minutes as amended by Commissioner Cureton. Commissioner Tinklenberg asked that the minutes be amended, but withdrew the request as intended for other minutes.
Motion to Approve June 17, 2025 by Y. Cureton; 2nd by F. Liu.
Called vote: 7:0. **Motion approved unanimously.**

b. July 15, 2025 Regular Minutes

Chairman Richards called for a motion to approve July 15, 2025 Regular Minutes as written. Commissioner Tinklenberg asked that the minutes be amended as she felt they were inaccurate. Commissioner Tinklenberg was asked to provide amended text for approval by the Commission. Motion to table the July 15, 2025 minutes until September 16, 2025 by J. Tinklenberg; 2nd by Y. Cureton

Called vote: 7:0. **Motion to table to September meeting approved unanimously.**

c. August 7, 2025 Workshop Minutes

Chairman Richards called for a motion to approve August 7, 2025 Workshop Minutes as written. Motion to Approve by Y. Cureton; 2nd by J. Tinklenberg.

Called vote: 7:0. **Motion approved unanimously.**

6. CITIZEN'S COMMENTS [see Sign-In sheet attached]

Chairman Richards opened the floor to comments from the public.

1. **Jeannine Clifton** (Olive Terrace, IL) speaking in opposition to the commercial development at 9901 Barberville Road aka "Barberville Commercial."
2. **Sam Beegle** (Millrace Ln, IL) Speaking in opposition to the County's mishandling of growth in Indian Land, which is moving south into the rest of the County.

Chairman closed the floor to Citizens Comments.

7. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

a. TA-2025-1306 MUSC/Lowes

Application by Keith Corp./MUSC Health and MDI Management LLC/Lowes Foods for amendments to Unified Development Ordinance Sec. 10.3 Definitions and Sec.

7.4.5 Signage Standards. Continued from 7/15/2025 Planning Commission meeting.

Staff Presentation: Kirsten Willis, Planner, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: refinement of language removing hospitals from the text intended for Large-scale Grocery stores, and vice-versa.

Comment from applicant(s):

David Kopenay (Lowe's): the signage area request is comparable to competitor's signage in Lancaster and in other jurisdictions.

Sam Walker (MUSC): supports the amended language that clarifies the application of the requested signage requirements.

Questions/Comments from Commissioners:

L. Hinson: supports the MUSC request, but wants further discussion about the allowance requested for Large Scale Grocery stores.

L. Tinklenberg concurs. Asks how many grocery stores meet the definition currently.

K. Willis: Only two other stores currently meet the definition.

F. Liu: Does not see a need for such a large sign area for a grocery store, but agrees that current allowance may be too small.

Kopenay: The requested 250 sq. feet is smaller than many existing grocery signs.

J. Cavalier: Is there other signage for the property?

Kopenay: We are working on obtaining permission for a single pylon sign at the roadfront.

J. Tinklenberg: When we change the text we're setting [precedent for] the future. We want to preserve the aesthetic. It makes me nervous to change this.

S. Richards: 250 [square feet] is too big, the existing allowance is too small. 150 or 175 [square feet] would be better.

Chair Richards opens public hearing.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets): None signed in.

Chair Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item TA-2025-1306.

Motion to exclude grocery store signage by F. Liu; 2nd by Y. Cureton.

Discussion regarding protocol for splitting the issue.

Original Motion withdrawn by F. Liu.

Motion to split the issue (Hospitals and Large Scale Grocery) by F. Liu; second by Y. Cureton.

Called Vote: 6:1 in favor of splitting the issue; S. Hinson dissented.

Motion to Approve signage request for hospitals, with language amended by staff by Y. Cureton; second by L. Hinson.

Called vote: 7:0 **Motion is approved unanimously.**

Motion to approve Grocery signage allowance of 200 square feet by S. Richards;

Request by F. Liu to amend to "200 square feet total signage."

So amended by S. Richards; second by Y. Cureton.

Called vote: 7:0. **Motion approved unanimously.**

Application will move to County Council on August 25, 2025, with the recommendation

- Approval of hospital signage request, with language as amended by staff.
- Approval of a reduced signage allowance of 200 square feet for Large Scale Grocery, with language as amended by staff.
- Approval of both new definitions (medical facility and large scale grocery)

b. RZ-2025-1613 Fenchel

Application by Roxanne Fenchel to rezone a 0.5-acre parcel (TM # 0069M-0E-013.00) located adjacent to 454 Fox Lane from Low Density Residential District (LDR) to Medium Density Residential District (MDR) in order to conjoin with adjacent MDR lot

Staff Presentation: Corey Barnes, Planner, presented the applications consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: Approval

Comment from applicant(s):

Roxanne Fenchel (owner/applicant): Owns several lots in the neighborhood. She would like to conjoin this portion to her existing residential lot, and market remainder of properties.

Questions from Commissioners: no questions.

Chair Richards opened the public hearing.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets): None signed in.

Chair Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item RZ-2025-1613 . Motion to approve by Y. Cureton ; Second by L. Hinson.

Discussion: no further questions of comments.

Called vote: 7:0. **Motion is approved unanimously.**

The item will go to County Council for consideration, and applicant will be notified of time and date.

c. Kershaw Annexation: 439 Kershaw Country Club Rd

Application by Justin & Ashley Lee to annex a property of approximately 1.2 acres located at 439 Kershaw Country Club Road (TM 0156P-0K-002.00) into the Town of Kershaw

Staff Presentation: Jennifer Bryan, Planning Technician, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: Approval

Comment from applicant(s): not present.

Questions from Commissioners: no further questions

Chair Richards opened public hearing.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets): None signed in

Chair Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **Kershaw Annexation**. Motion to approve by L. Hinson; 2nd by Y. Cureton.

Discussion: no further discussion

Called vote: 7:0. **Motion is approved unanimously.**

The item will go to Kershaw Town Council for final consideration, and applicant will be notified of time and date.

Chair called a recess at 7:24 PM

Reconvened after recess at 7:30 PM

d. MXU-2023-1492 Stock Lane RMX

Application by SRAM1 LLC and R. Joe Harris Associates for a Mixed-Use Master Plan Preliminary Plat for two parcels totaling approximately 54.28 acres located off Stock Lane (TM#s 0006-00-070.00 & 0006-00-069.00) for a Residential Mixed Use (RMX) neighborhood of 96 Townhomes and 144 Garden Apartments

Staff Presentation: April Williams, Planning Director, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: Denial based on TRC comments.

Questions to staff:

F. Liu: Why is staff recommending denial?

A. Williams: TRC review has several unresolved matters.

F. Liu: What are the comments?

A. Williams: reads comments from TRC Report in agenda packet.

All reviewing departments have outstanding comments and concerns.

J. Tinklenberg: SCDOT did not have comments?

A. Williams: SCDOT reviewed the TIA. Per SCDOT and the ICE Consultant, the TIA was not approved.

Applicants' comments:

Brandon Pridemore (R Joe Harris).

- The findings of fact are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The GB parcel is not being developed, only being used as Right of Way for the ingress. There is a second point of egress to the west; that easement has not been deeded.
- Regarding integration with transportation plans: the TIA has been vetted by SCDOT but will not be "approved" until Civil Construction stage.
- Other TRC comments are minor and are easily resolved; we will address them during Civil Construction phase.
- We are asking for by-right development under RMX zoning, not asking for rezoning. RMX allows 12 dwelling units per acre; we are asking for considerably less.

Questions from Commissioners:

F. Liu: When was the TIA performed?

Pridemore: In March of this year.
J. Tinklenberg: Is the road public or private?
Pridemore: It will be private.
J. Tinklenberg: Will connectivity be allowed to GB parcels?
Pridemore: No development is planned for those parcels at this time.
L. Hinson: Is the project by-right, or does it require approval?
Pridemore: MX projects require a little more review for certain conditions, allowing some flexibility.
J. Tinklenberg: through TIA approvals for already approved developments, we are in deficit, so we are cautious.
S. Richards: The Barberville intersection [for example]
Pridemore: Traffic control changes will be required.

Chair Richards opened public hearing.
Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets)

1. **Cheryl Hanhart-Beck** (IL). See handout on services data and impact: Opposes this development as burdensome on already strained services, focusing on Emergency services.
2. **Barbara Scannell** (IL). See handouts on services/impacts.: Opposes this development as burdensome on already strained services, focusing on Fire stations and Ambulance calls.
3. **Kevin Gribbon** (Bethpage, IL) Opposes this development as burdensome on already strained services, focusing on Sheriff's Department and Fire safety calls.
4. **Suzy Proescher** (Hartwell Ln, IL): Opposes this development as burdensome on already strained road system, focusing on traffic and road conditions.
5. **Angela Davis** (IL) Opposes this development as burdensome on already strained services, focusing on school overcrowding in Indian Land.

Applicant rebuttal: no comment

Chair Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **MXU-2023-1492**. Motion to approve by Y. Cureton ; 2nd by J. Tinklenberg.

Discussion:
Motion made in the interest of a vote in the affirmative

J. Tinklenberg: Agrees with the concerns raised by citizens about infrastructure.
Y. Cureton: Concurs with Commissioner Tinklenberg and citizens. She is concerned by the overwhelming impact of development.
F. Liu: Is concerned about the disproportionate impact on children and the elderly. Asks staff for accident data on Hwy 521 and Hwy 160 for future development items.

Called vote: 0:7. **Motion is denied unanimously.**

The item will go to County Council for consideration, and applicant will be notified of time and date.

Chair Richards reopens **Item 2 Elections** to address **Item 2c, Appointment of Secretary.**

- a. Chair Michelle Richards calls for appointment of a designated staff member as **Secretary.**

Mara Mata is appointed as Secretary; Jennifer Bryan will support during training of the new Secretary.

- e. **DA-2021-0528** (a/k/a DA-2025-1506) **Arbor Meadows**

Application by AM Group Landholdings LLC for a Development Agreement for Arbor Meadows development (SD-2021-0528) at TM 0087-00-105.00, a single-family residential development of 92 lots on 47.47 acres.

Staff Presentation: April Williams, Planning Director, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendations: ---

There was an error in the upload of documents in the agenda package.

Motion to continue to September 16, 2025 by Y. Cureton; second by J. Tinklenberg.

Chair Richards opened the public hearing.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets). Two signed in; the citizens were called out of order.

2. **David Hinson** (Pineview Drive): Opposed to this development creating 94 homes in a small area. There is already a new development planned less than 2 miles away [Forestar development near Airport Crossroads]. Schools can't support the growth; it will also strain water & sewer systems. The road [Pineview Drive] can't sustain the extra traffic.

1. **Thomas Filyaw** (Pineview Drive): Opposes the development. The primary entrance will be right in front of his house. Absolutely opposed to building this many houses in a small neighborhood.

Chair Richards closed Public hearing and called for a vote on the motion to continue item **DA-2021-0528 (a/k/a DA-2025-1506).**

Called vote: 7:0. **Item is continued to September 16, 2025.**

8. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION

a. SD-2024-1350 Riverside Single Family a/k/a Riverside Manor

Application by Coulston Development on behalf of owners B & C Land Farming LLC for a Preliminary Plat for 251.42 acres at and surrounding 4602 Riverside Road (TM 0028-00-038.00) for a single-family residential development of 133 lots (a/k/a Riverside Single-Family)

Staff Presentation: Matthew Blaszyk, Planner, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendation: Approval as all TRC comments have been resolved.

Questions to Staff:

Y. Cureton: What is the distance from the nearest intersections? Are there a lot of places to turn off?

M. Blaszyk: There are a few roads within a couple of miles radius

J. Tinklenberg: I'm glad to see the cul-de-sac [to resolve the block length issue]. Is there any information on amenities?

M. Blaszyk: No, amenities have not been determined.

Comments from Applicant:

Andy Coulston (Developer): The plan calls for one-acre lots with public water [and septic systems]. We want to help the area grow. We have addressed the TRC comments. We will have a clubhouse, but we are not dictating or restricting the home designs.

Claire Folk (Engineer): We have worked with staff to comply with all requirements of the UDO. SCDOT did not make requirements; our TIA took into consideration the planned changes to the Highway 5 intersection.

Comments/Questions by Commissioners:

J. Tinklenberg: Knowing the lack of infrastructure, I don't want to exacerbate the situation south of [Hwy] 5. Would you add turn lanes?

A. Coulston: We will do whatever SCDOT requires.

L. Hinson: There is farmland nearby, is any of it growing soybean?

A. Coulston: Some soybean and some corn; 120 acres is undeveloped

L. Hinson: Is there an existing structure?

A. Coulston: There is a house and some sort of radio tower.

L. Hinson: How close are you to Riverchase?

A. Coulston: about a mile away.

S. Richards: The SCDOT approval surprises me. The road is narrow, with bad lines of sight and blind curves.

Coulston: The design meets the sight distance requirements for SCDOT.

L. Hinson: There is a lot of speeding [on that road]. We would like a turn lane. People need to be safe.

Chair Richards opened the floor to public comment.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets)

1. **Ken Katz** (Riverchase) See email comments submitted. Opposed to development as burdensome to roads and other infrastructure
2. **Barbara Scannell:** See handouts [applicable to all development items on agenda] Opposed to development as burdensome to all services and infrastructure.
3. **Cheryl Hanhart-Beck:** See handout [applicable to all items on the agenda.] Opposed to development as burdensome to all services and infrastructure.
4. **Kevin Gribbon:** Opposes this development. Concurs with what has been stated by others. Reduce the number of units in this development.
5. **Suzy Proescher:** Opposed to this development. Please note the traffic data for Hwy 5, more than 18,900 vehicles in 2022-2023, and increase of 2200 over the previous year. Please consider public health and safety.
6. **Angela Davis:** Opposes this development. Indian Land is over capacity in all infrastructure. We want to be a voice for the people.
7. **David Basri** (Riverchase): It is unreasonable not to have turn lanes; the second entrance is on the crest of a hill. Secondly, the lots butt up to Riverside Road with little to no buffer. There needs to be berms or a landscaping buffer.

Rebuttal by Earl Coulston (Coulston Development):

People are just against any kind of growth. There are trees screening the road [at the Riverside property]. You don't build hospitals and schools until there are people. For the roads, we will abide by the County regulations. We are trying to develop the south side [or Hwy 5]. We are not asking for rezoning, just what the zoning already allows.

Chair Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **SD-2024-1350**. Motion to DENY by S. Hinson; Second by J. Cavalier.

Discussion:

F. Liu: These are multi-million dollar homes, why are we discussing whether we need turn lanes? We should require this.

Y. Cureton: We need buffers. I love the idea of [the applicant] contributing to a fire station.

F. Liu: Wilson Creek is an example of poor buffering.

J. Cavalier: this is an isolated area with low fire coverage, this is a safety issue.

Earl Coulston: I'm willing to put a turn lane at the main entrance, and some landscape buffering. The second entrance is smaller [and doesn't need a turn lane.]

S. Hinson: When staff recommends approval it is because the regulations are met. Developers need to give more.

F. Liu: One turn lane is not enough. Call the question.

Chair Richards calls for a vote on the Motion to DENY.

To the question , Do you vote to deny the application for a Preliminary Plat?

Y. Cureton: Yes F. Liu: Yes L. Hinson: No J. Cavalier: Yes
S. Hinson: Yes J. Tinklenberg Yes S. Richards: No

Vote 5:2. The motion to DENY carries; **the application is denied.**

Planning Commission makes final decisions on Preliminary Plats.

Chair Richards calls a recess at 9:24 PM

Meeting reconvened at 9:32 PM

b. SD-2024-1745 Silverton a/k/a Silver Run

Application by Broadstreet Homes Inc and Jerry Griffin Jr for a Preliminary Plat for 25.25 acres located off Silver Run Road (TM 0006-00-034.00) to develop a 44-lot single family residential community a/k/a Silver Run a/k/a Silverton.
Deferred from prior Planning Commission agendas

Staff Presentation: Matthew Blaszyk, Planner, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendation: Approval as all TRC comments have been resolved.

Questions/ comments to Staff:

J. Cavalier: The steep grade will cause significant challenges for runoff and construction during the Civil approval phase.

Comments from Applicant: See slide deck presentation

Brian Iagnemma, Broadstreet Homes : The feedback received at the March hearing informed out revision. We are going beyond what is required by the UDO. Two community meetings were held; we spoke to the Sheriff's department about concerns raised we took 5 months to work on the revision. As a Lancaster County employer we are committed to this project, and we listened to what the county wants. We are for responsible development:

- The value of the proposed homes is \$800,000- \$1,000,000
- The entrance has been realigned to Rise Lane intersection

- The park space has been relocated
- Grading has been adjusted to modify the topography and privacy concerns
- We have taken into consideration the impact on public services;
- We are addressing the impact on traffic and the problem of vehicles cutting through Rosemont.

See slide deck for contributions offered by developer:

- Realigned entrance for improved access and traffic flow.
- Relocated the park area for safer community use.
- Adjusted grading and addressed drainage concerns.
- Implemented a 10' buffer consistent w/ Rosemont Community.
- Enhancing home values with anticipated pricing exceeding \$900k.
- Committing \$500k+ to offset school and public service impacts.
- Investing \$250k+ in unexpected offsite pump station improvements.
- Investing over \$300k to upgrade a 2.5" water line to an 8" main.
- Committed to assisting Rosemont with their traffic hazard concerns.

Comments/Questions by Commissioners:

J. Cavalier: Thank you for the fantastic presentation. I will never be a fan if that steep hill, but I think you have gone above and beyond in addressing our concerns and those of the community.

Iagnemma: We are willing to make them conditions of approval.'

F. Liu: It was a powerful presentation. I don't agree with the metric yielding just 16 students from 44 Homes. I also don't think the contribution toward policing speed in Rosemont will go very far.

Iagnemma: We can contribute, but we cannot carry it all in assisting Rosemont.

J. Tinklenberg: This is the most prepared presentation I think we have seen. However, I also question the metric of 16 students. The topography is questionable. We have a responsibility to the public.

S. Richards: I don't like that hill. What effect will that slope have on fire trucks?

Iagnemma: We contacted the Fire Marshall, they saw no issue.

Commissioner Sheila Hinson departed at 10:48 PM

Chair opens the floor to public comment.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets)

1. **Bryan Griffin** (Email comment submitted, see attached.)

2. **Angela Davis:** Appreciates the developer's efforts, but the stated costs are borne by the homebuyers. Still opposed to this development.

3. **Kellen Threatt**: Speaking on behalf of landowners Mr. & Mrs. Griffin. This is an excellent plan and it meets the requirements. It is by-right and not a rezoning request.

4. **Barbara Scannell**: Opposed to this development. Appreciates the applicant's efforts, but the enrollment numbers she provided are more current. Plan does not address the traffic cut-through problem; there are no turn lanes.

5. **Cheryl Hanhart-Beck** (not present)

6. **Kevin Gribbon**: (not present)

7. **Suzy Proescher** (declined to speak)

8. **Robert Burke** (Rosemont) reading Bryan Griffin's comments. Opposed to this development. Mr. Burke manages the speed signs in Rosemont. This development will make the problem worse by 10%.

9. **Jill Randolph**: Works for a water pump manufacturer and for Riverkeepers. The largest environmental threat is flash floods due to increase in impervious surfaces.

10. **Rod Alvaredo** (Indian Land): Opposed to this development.

11. **John Venus** (Rosemont) : Opposed to this development

12. **Mark Taylor** (Rosemont): Opposed : concerned about the status and practices of the developer, Broadstreet Homes.

13. **Kirk Reed** (Rosemont) Opposed. It is an excellent proposal, but concerns remain.

14. **Brian Detremont** (Rosemont) Opposed. Please deny this application.

15. **Jim & Karen Maskas** (Bretagne subdivision): Supports this development. Broadstreet has made generous offers to assist with infrastructure concerns.

16. **Justin Anderson** (Vixen Ln): Opposed. His property backs up to the boundary; he has spent \$100K on his backyard and this will destroy his privacy. The reality is much different from what is being portrayed.

17. **David Havlik**: This is a small infill development. He supports it. Please approve the application.

18. **Chris Reed** (Silver Mine Rd) Supports this development. Growth is inevitable. This is the best that can be done. It is a benefit to the community and the county.

Rebuttal by developer:

Brian Iagnemma: Most of the statements made are inaccurate;

- They are willing to make all proposals offered conditions for approval;
- A community meeting was held but only 4 people showed up; the [Rosemont] HOA was informed, and it was posted on Facebook and the Nextdoor app;
- They have gone above and beyond the by-right requirements.
- There are stormwater ordinances that we have to meet. We are protecting streams on our site per Army Corps of Engineers requirements.
- The impact of 44 homes to schools and infrastructure is negligible.

Chair Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item

SD-2024-1745. Motion to approve with stated commitments by developer; Second by L. Hinson.

Discussion:

Y. Cureton: are there plans to develop the neighboring property where the stub-out is?

A. Williams: The stub out is required by the UDO. It is not an indication that there are plans for development; it is a design requirement in case the property is ever developed by someone else in the future.

F. Liu: Appreciates the attempts to resolve issues, but the problems remain.

J. Cavalier: They have addressed all concerns. I would be embarrassed if, after answering all our concerns and going beyond what the UDO requires, we voted no when it was given.

F. Liu: I still have reservations.

J. Tinklenberg: Concurs with Commissioner Liu.

J. Cavalier: It takes more than one developer to solve these problems.

L. Hinson: The original plan was mortifying; but they have responded to everything we asked for. They're giving back to the community.

Called vote: 4:2. **Motion is approved.** Commissioners Liu and Tinklenberg dissent. Planning Commission makes final decisions on Preliminary Plats.

Chair Richards called recess at 11:17 PM

Meeting reconvened at 11:23 PM

c. SD-2023-0677 Edgewater Phase 9

Application by True Homes LLC and B&C Landholdings LLC for a Preliminary Plat for 30.26 acres (p/o TM # 0106-00-003.02 and 0106-00-003.00) for a neighborhood of 155 townhome lots. (Phase 9 of Edgewater development)

Staff Presentation: Matthew Blaszyk, Planner, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendation: Approval, as TRC comments are resolved.

Questions to Staff:

S. Richards: In the future, traffic notes should indicate that the traffic count station is 5.9 miles by driving distance, as opposed to “crow flies”

Comments from Applicant:

Joel Madden (True Homes): We worked with staff to resolve all the TRC comments. I am here to answer any questions.

Comments/Questions by Commissioners:

S. Richards: Do you have an update on the Catawba Ridge Road extension?

Madden: Construction has begun, we are waiting on permits for the wetland area but have begun the full depth reclamation elsewhere for pavement. Realignment portion is waiting on Duke Power approval, which is forthcoming.

S. Richards: And the big bridge?

Madden: That is part of Contender’s portion, but we are coordinating with them.

S. Richards: I see single car garages and 1 driveway parking spot. Is there any on street parking?

Madden: There are a few spots; it is also close to the old clubhouse and the new restaurant, which can take some overflow.

S. Richards: What about the eroded areas per the County report?

Madden: We have contracted with a Geotech engineer to address filling and compacting, and we are studying as we go along to assure compliance.

S. Richards: Have you done an updated traffic study on Bethel Boat Landing Road? There’s over 1,000 homes, maybe 2200cars plus school buses and other traffic. It was resurfaced in 2013 and is already significantly damaged.

Madden: The structure of the road would require I think 10” reclamation – we are open to discussing that in the spirit of cooperation.

L. Hinson: The 155 townhomes- how many bedrooms per unit?

Madden: At least 2 bedrooms, some will have 3 – the designs are optional.

L. Hinson: I’m concerned about parking and overflow.

Madden: We can look at road parking

J. Tinklenberg: Will you agree to add some parallel parking spots? It's problematic.

Madden: There are some pockets that could be added.

Chair Richards opened the floor to public comments.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets) None signed in.

Chair Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item

SD-2023-0677. Motion to approve by Y. Cureton; Second by J. Cavalier .

Discussion:

J. Tinklenberg moved to amend the motion with the addition of "adding parallel parking where possible." Second by L. Hinson.

Called vote on amendment: 6:0 in favor. The amendment is approved.

Called vote on motion as amended: 6:0. **Motion is approved unanimously.**

Planning Commission makes final decisions on Preliminary Plats.

d. SD-2025-0771 Howard Properties a/k/a McClaren

Application by Howard Properties of Waxhaw I and Howard Properties of Waxhaw IV for a Preliminary Plat for approximately 48.7 acres located at Henry Harris Road (TM# 0010-00-010.09 and 0010-00-010.00), to develop a single-family residential neighborhood of 32 homes.

Staff Presentation: Kirsten Willis, Planner.

Comments from Applicant: Brandon Pridemore on behalf of Shea homes: Requests 60 day deferral to October 21, 2025 meeting. Developer would like time to revise and work with neighbors.

Comments/Questions by Commissioners:

J. Tinklenberg: Thank you for asking for feedback. Shea offers quality products. I am concerned with traffic safety on Henry Harris Road, and would prefer to see turn lanes, and sidewalks for schoolchildren.

Pridemore: Do you mean deceleration lanes, or left turn lanes?

J. Tinklenberg: the more the better, but I leave that to your discretion. I would like to see what you offer to offset the burden that is being created.

F. Liu: To be clear, feedback doesn't assure approval.

J. Cavalier: We can't design the site for you; but Henry Harris is a difficult road.

Y. Cureton: Please hold community meetings.

Chair Richards opened the floor to public comment.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets)

1. **Peter Manfre:** Email comment submitted
2. **Jimmy Hood:** Email comment submitted
3. **Alice Lee:** (see email) Opposes the development; concerned about drainage on Henry Harris Rod. There is already considerable runoff.
4. **John Gray** (Hood Rd) See email comment: Opposed to development due to concerns about drainage and traffic, as well as property tax inflation
5. **Rebecca Brown:** Opposed. There is a horse cemetery on the property for victims of a 2018 barn fire, which is very meaningful to the community. She is also concerned about infrastructure, especially roads and traffic as well as the difficulty of septic systems in unsuitable ground.
6. **Laura Hickman:** Opposed. Existing traffic congestion and strain on community resources will only get worse. Current plans call for an entrance on her driveway: it is a private driveway and she will not grant access.
7. **Jimmy Hood** (Henry Harris Rd) There is already severe runoff drainage onto hos property. A swale is needed to protect neighboring properties and divert water to detention ponds. There is a blind curve and hills on the approach on Henry Harris Road.
8. **Linda Woodall** (Ravenwood): Opposed. She is a 45 year resident. There are already multiple 15-20 foot ditches and they do not sufficiently manage runoff.
9. Megan Jamieson (see email attachment) Not present.
10. Paula Nguyen (see email attachment) Not present.
11. **Randy Wilson:** (IL) 65 year resident. He is leasing adjacent property for cattle. Concerned about runoff contaminating the existing stock ponds, and the spring on his property. Concerned about where the power line easement will be located.
12. Barbara Scannell (not present)
13. Kevin Gribbon (not present)
14. Suzy Proescher (not present)
15. Angie Davis (not present)
16. John Bryant (not present)
17. **Diane Powell** (Henry Harris Rd) Lives across Henry Harris from the development. Concerned about flooding, her garage already floods when it rains; also speeding on Henry Harris is out of control.

18. **Thomas Byrum:** Opposed. Water is a serious problem; the development is at the top of the hill. Where is the absorption capacity? Wants conservation of green space, and also concerned about traffic problems increasing.

Chair Richards closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item **SD-2025-0771**. Motion to defer 60 days by Y. Cureton; Second by J. Cavalier.

Discussion: No additional discussion

Called vote: 6:0. **Motion is approved unanimously.**

Planning Commission makes final decisions on Preliminary Plats.

Commissioner Jason Cavalier departed at 12:20 AM

9. NON-HEARING ITEMS

a. **NRN-2025-1616 Stonebrook Drive**

Application by Dianna Broughton for a new road name for a private drive off Palomino Road at TM 0123-00-043.03, pursuant to Sec. 6.11.4.G of the Unified Development Ordinance. The proposed name of the private drive is Stonebrook Drive.

Staff Presentation: Jennifer Bryan, Planning Technician, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Staff Recommendation: Approval

Questions to Staff:

F. Liu: Why Stonebrook?

(Applicant in audience responded that there was a stream on the property)

No public hearing is required.

Chair Richards called for a motion on item **NRN-2025-1616**.

Motion to approve by Y. Cureton; Second by J. Tinklenberg..

Called vote: 5:0. **Motion is approved unanimously.**

The Planning Commission has final approval of new road names and road name changes.

10. OTHER

a. Review of Next Month's Agenda

SD-2024-1442 Shadow Moss

RZ-2024-1663 Meritage (MDR)

RZ-2025-1292 MPV (GB)

RZ/CP Whitehall 2

RZ/CP Covepoint

RZ-2024-2259 Dooley Tract/

The Haven

Kershaw Comp Plan Amendment
(Land Use Addendum)

NRN 2025-1834 Quiet Rail Ct

b. Administrative Matters

Community Meetings: The Haven (August 20)

Y. Cureton asked staff for an update about impact fees. April Williams noted Council was preparing a resolution which was forthcoming.

F. Liu asked about Continuing Education opportunities. Staff will address via email.

11. ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn by Y. Cureton; Motion approved by unanimous consent. Meeting adjourned at 12:36 AM.