



MEMBERS OF LANCASTER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

CHARLES DEESE, DISTRICT 3, CHAIRMAN
JAMES BARNETT, DISTRICT 5, VICE-CHAIRMAN
YOKIMA CURETON, DISTRICT 2
JUDIANNA TINKLENBERG, DISTRICT 4
SHEILA HINSON, DISTRICT 6
ALAN PATTERSON, DISTRICT 1
BEN LEVINE, DISTRICT 7
CLERK: JENNIFER BRYAN

**MINUTES OF THE LANCASTER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORKSHOP MEETING**

**December 7, 2023 5:00 P.M.
MINUTES**

Chairman Deese called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call:

Members Present:

Jim Barnett	Charles Deese	Sheila Hinson
Ben Levine	Yokima Cureton	Alan Patterson
Judianna Tinklenberg		

Absent:

Others Present:

Allison Hardin, Development Services Dir.	Clerk: Jennifer Bryan
Matthew Blaszyk, Planner;	

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.

2. New Business

a. CP-2023-1464 Greybridge MacMillan

Application by Lancaster County on behalf of Brian Cillian/Greybridge MacMillan LLC and LEH SC MacMillan LLC to change FLU map/Comprehensive Plan designation of 7.286 acres at 1662 MacMillan Park Drive (TM# 0007-00-008.05) from Employment Center to Neighborhood Mixed-Use allow rezoning from Light Industrial (LI) to Institutional (INS) District in order to convert existing structure to a K-12 private school facility.

Staff Presentation: Allison Hardin

Discussion: Greybridge MacMillan Flu Map amendment

- The applicant will also have to have Covenants and Restrictions removed with agreement of 51% of landowners in Business Park.
- Having a school located at this site may limit further development in the park, as many industrial uses have distancing requirements from schools.
- Concern about east-west trucking and high volume commercial traffic on Hwy 160.
- The ADM facility fire in Kershaw this weekend highlights the inherent dangers of industrial uses.

b. SD-2022-2205 The Sands, Kershaw

Application by Earl Coulston/Coulston Enterprises, for a Preliminary Plat for 38.02 acres located at the southeast corner of Fork Hill Road and Little Dude Avenue in Kershaw (TM #0141-00-024.00) for a single-family residential development of 74 lots.

Staff Presentation: Allison Hardin

Discussion:

- Not all issues raised by review comments have been resolved. SCDOT separation of entrances still not resolved, and water/sewer easements have not been worked out.
- SCDOT comments affect the Fork Hill Road proposed secondary (emergency) ingress/egress
- The stub-out to the south does not have access to function as ingress/egress. It will have a T (3 point turn) rather than a circular turnaraound for emergency vehicles.
- UDO prohibits individual homes having direct access to Little Dude Road.

c. SD-2023-0325 Jasmine Hills

Application by Mohamed Altwaairgi/Rass Investments LLC for a Preliminary Plat for 34.14 acres straddling Pettus Road northwest of the intersection with Barberville Road (TM# 0003-00-058.00) for a subdivision of 75 single-family lots.

Staff Presentation: Matthew Blaszyk

Discussion:

- TIA has not yet been reviewed. Review will not be finished before 12/19/2023 meeting
- Landscaping plan is incomplete
- Water lines outside ROW needs revision
- Sewer upgrades needed

d. SD-2023-0765: Cane Mill /Coulston Enterprises

Application by Andy Coulston on behalf of Coulston Enterprises for a Preliminary Plat for 11.758 acres located at Sienna Lane off Cane Mill Road (TM 0087-00-088.00) for a subdivision of 17 single-family lots.

Staff Presentation: Matthew Blaszyk

Discussion:

- SCDOT standards for separation of entrances not met.
- BMP drainage areas being counted towards open space- must correct.

e. SD-2023-1409: Pinnacle at Sunset Pointe (Edgewater)

Application by True Homes for a Preliminary Plat for 9.14 acres at the intersection of Bethel Boat Landing Road and Spinnaker Way (TM 0104-00-022.01) for 19 single-family lots. This area is part of the Edgewater community.

Staff Presentation: Allison Hardin

[See attached memo with current review comments (full comments not yet complete)]

Discussion:

Outstanding comments from 911 addressing and fire marshall must be resolved
No pump station has been built yet to serve this section

f. NRN-2023-2146 Elite Avenue

Application by Gopalakrishna Kesineni to name a private road extending from Lenger's Way behind QT and KFC in Indian Land.

Staff Presentation: Jennifer Bryan, Clerk

Discussion:

Sandra has reviewed, no objections.

3. Other:

a. Discussion: Comp Plan Comments

[see handout, Sample of UDO Comments matrix for reference]

Commissioners will submit comments before Christmas.

b. Discussion: Continuing Education

- Clerk will create a bound volume of information for onboarding new Commissioners
 - Staff will look for more tailored training events this spring.
- c. Ben Levine: Commissioner Levine announced that due to new professional opportunities, he will be resigning before his term ends in June. This month or January will be his last meeting.

4. Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at **6:15 PM**

Sandra Burton/ 911 Addressing:

As stating in my review of the Sketch plans, due to Bethel Boat Landing not being a continuous road with the new "T" intersection, the section going down to Sunset Pointe will need to be renamed. This may need to be taken before the Planning Commission. Please submit road names for consideration to addresser@lanc911.com. No one has contacted me regarding this matter. This will need to be done before any plans are approved.

Fire Marshall:

1. Plan does not show fire hydrants on both sides of the street.

Engineering/Stormwater:

General Comments:

1. The preliminary nature of this plan set does not provide adequate detail to formally comment, but the following are items of note from the information given. More specific comments will be provided during the civil review cycle.
2. This project is in the SC DHEC jurisdiction and not the MS4 for Lancaster County.
3. Sewer
 - a. The sewer for this phase is to go to a pump station that has not been built yet.
 - b. When will the pump station and associated access and infrastructure be built?
 - c. Is the sewer infrastructure downstream of this pump station in place?
 - d. If not, when will it be operational?
 - e. We will not approve civil plans that allows disturbance of land where there is no willingness and capability for water and sewer for the proposed parcels.
4. There are approximately 1400 lots platted and 600 bond lots which have not been built upon. We are not in favor of disturbing more land until those lots are stabilized and in use.
5. In our opinion, this lot should be set aside for future use as a town center/municipal area. It is in an ideal location to be used for that rather than having 19 houses surrounded by major roadways. This is not our call, but we believe future community planning is needed for the wellness of future residence in this area.
6. We are curious as to where the outfall barrel for the proposes BMP pond will be directed. Will it go into the Sunset Point stormwater system? Or somewhere else? Has his amount of flow been accounted for downstream? All of this can be evaluated further at civil plan review.

School District:

"Approved" no additional comments.

SECTION	EDITS/COMMENTS
General	The County previously indicated it was dissatisfied with the current use list and asked for a new one to be prepared or carried over from another WS project. It appears the proposed use list is our current list with specific changes. This would have been a good item for WS to call the County about prior to crafting Ch-3 to make sure we were okay with this alternative approach.
General	Some uses specifically requested seem to be missing (Outdoor RV and Boat Storage). Do you all have a use table from any previous projects that you feel is well-rounded? Our existing use table and associated definitions are relatively specific without being comprehensive which leads to somewhat regular interpretations which if possible would be helpful to avoid.
General	With the conversion of the CU process into a staff-level approval (which is fine), we have now enabled many sensitive uses to be permitted at a staff level. We were hoping for more use of the SE process in preparing the chart. There are also new districts accomodating new uses (such as town homes, mf, etc.) that are now enabled with staff level approvals, which will not be received well.
General	We need to have a placeholder for the future approval types that will require a rezoning (PDD, Flex, etc) and certain uses will need to go through this process only versus being allowed via CU or SE. Concerned Council may not want to delegate that to the BZA or others for properties with existing zoning to support those uses.
General	Quite a few of the use spcific standards make refrence to districts that may not exist moving forward. We will just need to keep our eye on this as our districts become more solidified. A problem in the current UDO is inconsistancy from chapter to chapter so we want to make sure that does not roll in to the new UDO.
General	What happened to the HDR district in chapter 2? Is MF replacing it? With the direction from Council on fixing of the MX Districts, we will need to re-evauate some of the Ch-2 and 3 content as the districts are formed.
General	I would prefer one use table over how this is broken into sections but that may just be personal prefrence.
3.1.2	This language seems redundant – it should be up front in Chapter 1. Doesn't the whole Code apply to the entire County? If not, have a general provision in Ch. 1 and then a carve out in the limited sections where it doesn't.
3.2.2.E	I agree - don't put definitions in text. These are "lay" descriptions of the categories. In reality, are these descriptions even necessary? They are an organizational function that, if well-conceived, should be self-explanatory.
3.2.3. D & E	I agree - don't put definitions in text. These are "lay" descriptions of the categories. In reality, are these descriptions even necessary? They are an organizational function that, if well-conceived, should be self-explanatory.
3.2.4.D.	Agree with consultant – the language of D. 2 is unnecessary and covered by the general language of D. 1.
3.2.5.1	Remove Ag and Crop from RUB, LI, and HI
3.2.5.1	Make non-swine animal production facility a SE in AR. This use includes turkey/chicken houses