



City of Clemson

PLANNING & CODES ADMINISTRATION

365 College Avenue • Clemson, SC 29631 • (864) 653-2050 • Fax (864) 653-2057 • www.cityofclemson.org

CLEMSON PLANNING COMMISSION Monday, August 13, 2007 City Hall – Council Chambers – 6:30 P.M.

MINUTES

Members present: Spencer Bryan, Vice-chair, Harold Cheatham, John Peters, Julie Craig, Elaine Richardson, Bob Smith, and Del Kimbler.

Members absent: None

Staff present: Sharon Richardson, Director of Planning and Codes Administration; Bob Vecchio, Zoning and Codes Administrator; and Pat Collins, Recording Secretary.

1. Call to Order: Meeting was called to order by Spencer Bryan at 6:45 p.m.

Mr. Bryant reviewed the agenda. He welcomed Del Kimbler who will fill the unexpired term of David Hamilton.

2. Public Session:

Mr. Bryant asked if there were any comments from the public. There were none.

3. Adoption of minutes:

Spencer Bryan asked if there was a motion to adopt the minutes from the July 9, 2007 meeting.

Harold Cheatham made a motion to approve the minutes from July 9, 2007. Julie Craig seconded the motion with two corrections. The vote was unanimous.

4. Election of Officers:

Julie Craig made a motion to nominate Harold Cheatham to chair the remaining term of Chairman. John Peters seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

5. Advisory Action

a. R-07-14 Rezoning request for the .308-acre property at 542 College Avenue from CP-1 to CP-2. The property is within AR Overlay District #2. Applicant: J. Girard. Owners: J. and E. Woodruff.

Staff Report: Sharon Richardson presented the proposed rezoning request. She stated that the current zoning CP-1 limits the amount of retail space. Applicant would like to combine all these parcels and construct a Walgreens Drug store. There are three acres total. Staff recommended the Commission consider the following issues:

1. Adherence to the Comprehensive Plan Generalized Future Land Use recommendation.
2. Need for additional CP-2 property
3. Effect on adjacent properties
4. Changes in the area since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Richardson stated the subject property is located at the point where College Ave begins to descend. She stated since under both the existing and proposed zoning scenarios the same Architectural Review Overlay District Standards would supersede the Zoning Ordinance Development Standards, the major difference in the two districts would be mainly in the range of allowed uses. She stated that the bufferyard requirements would be identical in both districts as they are based on general use categories and the existing adjacent uses. A significant difference between the two districts would be the maximum 3,000-square foot cap for convenience retail uses in the CP-1 (existing) district that does not exist in the CP-2 (proposed) district. The proposed zoning change could potentially allow a larger than 3,000 square foot retail use to be located on the subject property. However, the width of the property (70 ft) and its relatively small area of .308 acres as well as the architectural review standards would be the limiting factors that would lessen potential impacts on College Ave.

Mr. Peters asked if the property would remain in the upper College Ave district with more specific standards but would have to meet all standards.

Bob Vecchio stated the Architectural District is a zoning district and when there is a split zoned district the ordinance states that the more restrictive standards apply to the entire property.

Applicant Comments: Jim Girard, Principal, M & M Development Company, 11235 West Point Drive, Knoxville, Tennessee, thanked the Commission for hearing this request. He stated has had a town meeting and presented the proposal to the Board of Architectural Review. He has made modifications to the plans and feels the groups are probably in agreement with the plan. He stated the applicant is purchasing the three parcels on the corner of College Ave and Tiger Blvd to construct a Walgreen's Drug Store. He stated he has considered the logical pattern for the driveway access.

Spencer Bryan asked if this piece of property will be held to the more restrictive guidelines. The answer is yes. He asked the applicant to tell the commission about the proposed building.

Mr. Girard presented the proposed plans and stated he has presented 30 pictures to the town hall meeting and the participants have selected this proposed style specifically to fit within this area.

Mr. Peters asked if there would be a drive thru. Mr. Girard stated yes and they would be closing all curb cuts but two. The plans will meet the requirements for the street scape.

Bob Smith stated the landscaping rendering appears to show Leland cypress only half way down the property line.

Mr. Girard stated the landscape architect has prepared the plan and will submit to the Planning and Codes department. This is only a conceptual design.

Mr. Smith said he was reacting to what the applicant has submitted.

Mr. Cheatham stated it is not a requirement that the applicant submit the landscape design to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Richardson reviewed the responsibility of the Planning Commission. Mr. Smith stated he has every right to ask any question he feels appropriate and Ms. Richardson does not have the right to tell him different.

Mr. Cheatham stated the landscape design is beyond Mr. Smith's jurisdiction in this setting. He stated the question before the Commission is to review the rezoning of the property. He stated the applicant is being gracious in sharing these plans, however, the Commission cannot make a decision as to how many cypress trees are proposed.

Mr. Smith stated he would like to make sure the request is appropriate and does see the distinction as to his role as a Planning Commissioner.

Ms. Richardson stated she would have to point out that the applicant does not have to show any of his landscaping plans to the Commission.

Del Kimbler stated that the Commission's decision is not to deal with the development of this property.

Mr. Cheatham ruled Mr. Smith out of order. He stated Mr. Smith is free to go to the Board of Architectural Review or Board of Zoning Appeals and state any concerns he may have.

Mr. Smith asked if the applicant would explain the best configuration for this parcel and will the proposed plans accommodate the delivery trucks? Mr. Girard explained the traffic flow and stated it would accommodate the delivery trucks.

Mr. Smith asked if it is reasonable that most of the traffic would flow as it is proposed. Mr. Girard stated there is only one way to circulate with the exception of the parking spaces.

Mr. Smith asked if there was any striping for ingress and egress for pedestrians. Mr. Girard stated there are plans to be pedestrian friendly. There will be two accesses from College Avenue.

Mr. Smith asked if this will have any impact on the retaining wall.

Ms. Craig stated the applicant is going from CP-1 to CP-2 the only major difference is the restrictions.

Mr. Peters asked with this rezoning is this the actual size of most of the Walgreen stores. Mr. Girard stated no, this one has been reduced from 15,000 to 12,000 square feet.

Mr. Kimbler stated the key issue is the increase of the zoning district or size of the building. Under the assumption that the three properties would be combined how would this affect any future development if this project does not go forward?

Ms. Richardson stated if the Commission has misgivings about the possible uses in CP-2 this property is in an Architectural Overlay District which requires any new development be reviewed by the Board of Architectural Review plus the other standards within the zoning ordinance would regulate the size of the building to suit the site.

Mr. Peters made a motion to approve the request. Ms. Craig seconded the motion.

Public Comments:

James Woodruff, 219 Mt View Lane, the owner of the existing Laundromat on the property stated he feels that his building is not the prettiest in town and that the Walgreens would make a great improvement at this site.

Clark Wickliffe representing Campus Camera on the site stated he feels this is a reasonable request. The Walgreens would be a good addition to Clemson and provide a good service.

Dr. Bill Dukes stated he has practiced medicine for 43 years in this town and his sons own the BP station on this site. He feels it is very nice that Mr. Girard has given the community the opportunity to help design the building.

The commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the request.

b. R-07-04 Rezoning request for the proposed 5.56-acre Stone Ledge single-family residential planned development located off Highway 93. Applicants P. Zugg and M. Hill.

Staff Comments: Ms. Richardson presented the request for a planned development for the zero-lot-line homes. She stated at one of the previous meetings there was a discussion about the amount of open space and the placement of a couple of homes. The applicant has taken this into consideration and has made the central area an open space. The plan has gone from 22 homes to 19 homes and the applicant has gone to a

more traditional sewer system. The only outstanding issue that remains with this proposal is the storm water. The City Engineer has approved this option and given the size of the area available for the pond and the anticipated size of the pond needed to meet retention requirements.

Applicant Comments: Paul Zugg, Z & H, LLC stated the underground detention that was originally proposed is cost prohibitive. They will have to have an easement and have talked to adjacent property owner Mr. Steadman and will obtain one.

Mr. Smith asked if Mr. Zugg could give a brief overview of the storm water plan.

Mr. Zugg stated there will be a catch basin along the street however a lot will be sheet flow.

Mr. Cheatham asked if there were any plans to change the style of the homes since the applicants will have to cut back on the number of homes being built.

Mr. Zugg stated all plans will stay the same. The homes will be 1,800 to 2,300 square feet. They will stay under the \$200,000 range.

Mr. Smith asked if there were any concerns from the neighbors. Mr. Zugg stated the only conversation he has had was with an owner who wanted to sell their property to him.

Mr. Peters asked when the projected start date was. Answer right away.

Mr. Smith stated the plans call for a stone wall, will this be where the sign will be located and what type of lighting will be used.

Mr. Zugg stated they will go with the City standards.

Elaine Richardson stated that since this project will be elevated will it have an impact on the surrounding properties? Answer, the lights are located within the housing development on the proposed public right of way and will not impact the surrounding properties.

Mr. Bryan asked about the sidewalk detail. Mr. Zugg showed Mr. Bryan the detail on the plans.

Mr. Smith asked if the applicant envisions a homeowner's association. Answer yes.

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the request Mr. Kimbler seconded the motion with the addition of the recommended final retention pond section detail.

The commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the request with the addition of the recommended final retention pond section detail.

6. Reports and Discussion: Ms. Richardson passed out a draft of the proposed Architectural Standards for district three. She will be scheduling a work shop in conjunction with the BAR prior to when the Commission will have to vote on this. She stated the City is proposing adding more of Tiger Blvd and Anderson Blvd to the commercial corridor. She discussed the proposed standards.

7. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Collins, Recording Secretary

Note: The proceedings of this meeting have been recorded on audiotape.