



Planning Commission Minutes

August 3, 2021

A public hearing of the Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, August 3, 2021, at 6 p.m. in City Council Chambers, 155 Johnston Street, Rock Hill SC.

MEMBERS PRESENT Randy Graham, Duane Christopher, Gladys Robinson, Shelly Goodner, Nathan Mallard, Keith Martens

MEMBERS ABSENT Justin Smith

STAFF PRESENT Dennis Fields, Shana Marshburn, Eric Hawkins, Leah Youngblood, Janice E Miller

Chair Graham informed attendees that case M-2021-25 had been deferred until the Commission's September 7th public hearing.

1. Approval of minutes of the July 6, 2021, meeting.

Vice-Chair Christopher made a motion to approve the minutes from the July 6, 2021, meeting. Commissioner Robinson seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6-0 (Smith absent).

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

2. Hold public hearing and consider a recommendation to City Council on petition M-2021-22 by Woda Cooper Companies (Denis Blackburne) to rezone approximately 18.39 acres at 1055 Finley Road from Neighborhood Commercial (NC) to Multi-Family Residential (MFR) and Office and Institutional (OI). Tax parcel 597-04-01-166.

Dennis Fields, Planner III, presented the staff report, part of which included a revised site plan that had not been included in the staff report sent to the Commissioners.

Chair Graham asked the number of lots approved for the Finley Road/York Road subdivision. Shana Marshburn, Planner II, responded that 100 lots had been approved.

The applicant's representative, Denis Blackburne, 50 Meeting Street Suite D, Savannah GA, provided a brief history of the Woda Cooper Company and an overview of this particular project, noting specifically that the company was involved in all aspects including development, construction, and long term management. He stated there would be 36 one-bedroom units, 120 two-bedroom units, and 60 three-bedroom units, all geared towards the 50-70% of the area median income level. He added they did not see this as an overlap of the adjacent York Road development project, and that the anticipated timeline was to begin construction in 2022 with a 2023 completion date.

Vice Chair Christopher asked if they had done studies to see if there was a need for this type of development. Mr. Blackburne replied they believed there was, that there had not been many multi-family developments within the past couple of years, adding that his company provided quality developments of a high value for occupants.

Commissioner Robinson asked for a definition of median income. Mr. Blackburne

stated these were published income limits based on the income range of the citizens of a particular area. Commissioner Robinson asked the income range for this area. Mr. Blackburne stated that for an individual, the 50% range was \$29,500 and the 70% figure was \$41,300, adding that for a family of four the low-income range at 60% was determined to be \$50,520.

Vice Chair Christopher noted that if this figure was higher, they would not qualify for these apartments. Mr. Blackburne stated this was correct.

Vice Chair Christopher asked if there was a particular market in this area for this product. Mr. Blackburne stated there was, that this was very affordable for the area.

Vice Chair Christopher asked if there had been a discussion with staff that this project may be seen as creating too many units within this area, further asking if other areas of the City had been considered. Mr. Blackburne stated this was a great location near commercial activity and a variety of uses, adding it was not adjacent to single-family residential homes.

Vice Chair Christopher asked how much time had been spent to get the project to this stage. Mr. Blackburne stated six months.

No one from the audience spoke on this item.

Vice Chair Christopher asked staff if the project met the City's architectural standards. Mr. Fields stated they had submitted some conceptual elevations but the project had not been reviewed to that detail yet, adding they would be required to meet all of the City's multi-family design standards.

Vice Chair Christopher asked if this project would require management to live at the site. Mr. Fields stated that they do not have to have someone live there, but that they would have office stand and would have to meet other regulations for security systems, lighting, and working with the police department.

Vice Chair Christopher asked if the applicants had requested any deviation from the standards. Mr. Fields replied they had not.

Commissioner Goodner asked if the concentration of units in the area was related to the number of units at Mallard Pointe and Eden Terrace. Mr. Fields stated that a housing study done during the multi-family moratorium presented the concept of not having a high concentration of units within a specific area, adding that is where the 225 general limitation came from.

Commissioner Mallard asked if the Multi-Family Residential (MFR) zoning was the essentially the updated version of Multi-Family Residential-15 (MF-15) zoning. Mr. Fields stated this was correct.

Commissioner Goodner asked if a traffic study would be required. Mr. Fields stated it would as the number of units and trip generation figures were met to require this, adding that the project, including the TIA findings, would come back to the Planning Commission during major site plan approval.

Commissioner Martens asked the allowed uses under the current zoning. Mr. Fields stated a number of uses were allowed in the NC district but unlike other commercial districts, NC limited the hours of operation. He added that the site was zoned commercially to specifically to allow for the existing cell tower in the 1990's and was surrounded by school, church, cemetery, and mobile home park uses, but did not see the site as being suitable for commercial single-family residential uses.

Vice Chair Christopher asked the affect of the development on the adjacent school. Mr. Fields replied that the school had been decommissioned by the school district and may be repurposed in another form, but that the bus parking would remain.

Vice Chair Christopher made the motion to recommend to City Council approval of rezoning the property from Neighborhood Commercial (NC) to Multi-Family Residential (MFR) and Office and Institutional (OI) as requested. Commissioner Goodner seconded.

Chair Graham expressed concerns over the density, noting specifically that there was a need for this type of housing and that the project presented was a good one, but that he questioned the timing given that the total number of units now planned for all the properties combined were at about 537. He added that the traffic was not currently difficult but not knowing the timing of the other multi-family projects in the area, this could become an issue.

Commissioner Robinson commented that there was a serious need for affordable housing, but that she agreed traffic will be an issue.

Commissioner Goodner stated she agreed with both, adding that while there was a need for this type of housing, it might not be ideal at the time when it came back to the Commission during the major site plan phase depending upon the timing of the other projects.

Chair Graham asked how many affordable housing development projects had been approved within the recent past. Mr. Fields stated he did not know the exact number, but pointed out that a few of applications that the Planning Commission had recently seen were not approved by City Council.

Commissioner Mallard commented he did not think traffic around Mallard Pointe was bad, especially turning left at 5 p.m., and believed that area had greater density than what was being proposed in this area. He noted this particular project appeared to include a dead-end road that would not create a cut through opportunity.

Vice Chair Christopher asked the timelines for the other projects in this area. Mr. Fields stated one of the properties had completed the rezoning process and staff had reviewed a sketch plan for this, noting the Commission would be reviewing the major site plan in the near future. He added the developers of the other site on Heckle were still going through the process of financing, architectural renderings, and traffic study so it may come to the Commission sometime in the late winter or early spring.

Vice Chair Christopher asked the number of units for that project. Mr. Fields stated there were approximately 156 proposed for one site and 80 for another, but that staff did not believe there would be more than 40 due to the infrastructure and topography issues on the second site.

Chair Graham observed that, depending upon how the vote went, there may be a need to reevaluate the number of units currently allowed for an area.

Commissioner Martens asked how long the restriction of the number of units had been in place. Planning & Development Director Leah Youngblood stated it had been in place since 2016 but that they had not received many applications since that time.

Chair Graham called for a vote, and the motion carried by a vote of 5-1 with Vice Chair Christopher and Commissioners Robinson, Goodner, Mallard, and Martens voting in favor and Chair Graham voting in opposition (Smith absent).

- 3. Hold public hearing and consider a recommendation to City Council on petition M-2021-24 by June Engineering Consultants Inc. (Jimmy Dunn) to rezone approximately 0.42 acres at 1110 Burton Street from Residential Conservation District II (RC-II) in York County to Office and Institutional (OI). The subject property is proposed to be annexed into the City of Rock Hill, Tax parcel 634-00-00-110.**

Dennis Fields, Planner III, presented the staff report.

Mr. Keane McLaughlin, ESP Associates, 3475 Lakemont Boulevard, Fort Mill, representing the applicant, stated the addition of this property allowed for better circulation on the site and kept it from being placed in the floodplain area. He added there were still some environmental concerns but these were being dealt with.

Vice Chair Christopher asked if mitigation had been necessary. Mr. McLaughlin stated there were Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) reports on the site and that clean-up was necessary although he didn't yet have a timeline for that work.

Vice Chair Christopher asked if stream crossing permits would be necessary. Mr. McLaughlin stated they would not.

Commissioner Mallard made the motion to recommend to City Council approval of Office and Institutional (OI) zoning as presented by staff. Commissioner Robinson seconded, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0 (Smith absent).

- 4. Hold public hearing and consider a recommendation to City Council on petition M-2021-25 by Eastwood Homes (Mike Kemp) to rezone approximately 24 acres at 404 Rawlinson Road and adjacent right-of-way from Residential Development District I (RD-I) in York County and Office and Institutional (OI) to Single-Family Attached (SF-A). The subject property is proposed to be annexed into the City of Rock Hill. Tax parcel 541-00-00-079.**

Chair Graham noted this item had been deferred by the applicant until the Commission's September 7th meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

- 5. Consideration of a request by Barge Design Solutions (Robert Cox) for Major Site Plan approval for The Park at Wilkerson independent living facility. (Plan #20211038)**

Shana Marshburn, Planner II, presented the staff report, noting that the vinyl-coated chain link fencing indicated on the plan provided in the staff report had been changed to be a solid opaque fence. She provided the Commissioners with an email from a neighboring property owner concerned about the use of Wilkerson as the main access for the site, adding that the main entry and fire truck access were required to be off Wilkerson Road rather than Cel-River.

Chair Graham asked who mandated the access points. Ms. Marshburn stated the City required this in order to limit the number of access points along Cel-River Road. Mr. Fields added that City Council expressed concern of having access off Cel-River Road and requested the entrance for this project be located off Wilkerson.

Commissioner Robinson asked if the final plan would show the buildings having elevators. Ms. Marshburn stated she was not certain, but that the buildings would have

to have them if required by building code.

Mr. Keith Bauer, 72 Old Stonemill Road, Marietta GA, applicant's representative, stated the buildings would have elevators and would meet all the City's required standards.

Mr. Phillip Still, 1661 Manhassat Court, Dunwoody GA, property owner of 842 Wilkerson Road, asked if there was a sidewalk along Wilkerson would there also be curb and gutter. Mr. Fields stated the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) would require this, not the City.

Mr. Still asked how the fire lane would be accessed off Wilkerson. Ms. Marshburn stated there would be a pathway behind the building constructed to handle the weight of a fire truck but would be grassy to appear to be a lawn. Mr. Fields added that fire trucks would be able to access the site by driving over the curb.

Mr. Still asked where the main entrance for the fire truck would be located. Mr. Fields stated one would be access from the main driveway access and the other would be at the curb as mentioned. He added staff was working to try and have the access for fire truck use only be located off Cel-River Road.

Mr. Still indicated that Ms. Anne Blake, an adjacent neighbor, would be most affected and voiced concern over the buffers. He noted that he could develop his property as an industrial use and that he wanted to make certain there was adequate buffer for the residential and industrial uses to co-exist.

Ms. Anne Blake, 818 Wilkerson Road, stated her biggest concern was that the entrance be located off Cel-River Road rather than Wilkerson due to the high amount of traffic already using Wilkerson, adding that this size of a development should have its access be located off a higher traffic road. Chair Graham reiterated that City Council and staff required the entrance to be located off Wilkerson Road. Ms. Blake stated she had spoken with SCDOT and that they thought it could be located off Cel-River Road instead.

Chair Graham asked the frontage along Cel-River Road. Mr. Fields stated it was a little over 700 feet.

Vice Chair Christopher asked the ages for the project. Mr. Fields stated it was 55 and over. Vice Chair Christopher observed that many people living at the site would be walking and not driving.

Chair Graham asked the number of single-family residences between this and the Murdock property located further along Cel-River to the Eden Terrace intersection. Mr. Fields stated approximately six.

Chair Graham expressed concern over the distance between curb cuts since it was usually between 300 and 350 feet, stating he did not see why there was an issue having the access off Cel-River Road.

Mr. Bauer explained they did not want people to have to make a left turn onto or off of a four-lane road, adding that the developer had not picked Wilkerson as the main access point. Planning & Zoning Manager Eric Hawkins stated the intent was for projects such as this to have access points off secondary roads rather than primary roads to lessen traffic issues.

Chair Graham stated the character of Wilkerson Road was primarily residential. Mr. Hawkins stated this was correct, and that there was commercial at the other end of

Wilkerson, adding that the level of traffic for this use was not seen to be an overwhelming amount and that Wilkerson had the potential to handle the amount of traffic coming from this use.

Chair Graham stated he would vote in opposition if the use was more commercial. Mr. Hawkins noted that if there had not been a way to access Wilkerson, access would have been from Cel-River Road.

Vice Chair Christopher made the motion to approve the Major Site Plan as submitted, subject to staff comments, commenting that the buffer screening probably would not be much of an issue. Commissioner Martens seconded, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0 (Smith absent).

6. Consideration of sponsorship of a design overlay district and its associated development standards.

Planning & Development Director Leah Youngblood presented the staff report.

Chair Graham reiterated that this was a request for sponsorship and that the details would be reviewed by the Commission at the next meeting.

Vice Chair Christopher asked if there was a lot of the proposed overlay district located in the county. Ms. Youngblood indicated the areas where the City limits were on the map provided.

Commissioner Martens asked if the overlay district would apply to those areas located outside of the City limits. Ms. Youngblood stated these would only apply as property were annexed into the City limits.

Commissioner Martens expressed concern that it appeared the impetus was to have nice looking areas located off I-77 but that most of this was not even in the City. Ms. Youngblood stated the overlay concept had evolved over a long period of time, noting that the City's I-77 area did not include recently approved projects, but did include all the areas from the future land use plan.

Chair Graham commented that he thought the same as Commissioner Martens, adding that it made sense around the Panthers development area.

Commissioner Martens commented that this may need to apply to the entire city.

Chair Graham asked for clarification that this was not directly related to the Panthers project. Ms. Youngblood stated it was not, that there were projects that had an interest in how the overlay district would be handled, such as the Mattamy Homes Sturgis Road project. She further noted there were discussions to applying these standards citywide.

Commissioner Martens observed some of the proposals were warranted in order to make area aesthetically pleasing but disagreed over the color schemes, adding he had heard some express concerns over the scope and real purpose of the overlay district.

Vice Chair Christopher stated this might need to apply to the whole City. He asked if this was in York County Councilwoman Christi Cox' district. Ms. Youngblood stated a lot of the area was located in Councilwoman Cox' district.

Chair Graham reiterated his previous comments about the Commission meeting with the City Council on a regular basis in order to make certain both entities were on the same page.

Commissioner Mallard commented the overlay would create additional costs for developers, noting that there could be as much as an added \$2000 for an upgraded garage door depending upon what was required. He added he believed this may be an overreach that will block the development of entry level homes. Ms. Youngblood stated there was potential for this to not be applied citywide.

Commissioner Mallard stated a master plan would allow for vinyl siding in order to cut costs. Ms. Youngblood noted that infill development projects allowed for the developer to either meet the current standards or be consistent with the prevailing architecture of the area, that this allowed for affordable housing projects to develop without being excluded.

Vice Chair Christopher made the motion to sponsor the design overlay district and associated development standards as presented by staff. Commissioner Robinson seconded, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0 (Smith absent).

7. Other Business.

Staff member Dennis Fields, Planner III, reminded the Commissioners that continuing education information had been sent to them by email.

8. Adjourn.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

Review of: Major Site Plan
Status: Conditional
Project: The Park at Wilkerson
Plan #20211083

Review Comments

Inspections: Conditional

1. Details consisting of but not limited to Fire apparatus access, Fire hydrant and Fire Department Connection type and location, accessibility, Knox Box location, first floor elevation relative to the rim elevation of the next upstream manhole in the public sewer, Grease interceptor type and location or other wastewater system pretreatment requirements, retaining wall locations/structures, basic building code compliance items that surface prior to building plan submission etc. will be reviewed at the Civil Plan review phase.

Zoning: Conditional

1. Because the building is proposed to have more than 25 residential units, major site plan approval by the Planning Commission will be required. This item has been placed on the Tuesday, August 3rd agenda. The meeting will take place at 6:00 pm within City Council Chambers at City Hall, located at 155 Johnston St. Rock Hill, SC 29730.
2. The 6-foot vinyl coated chain link fencing along the Jerry L. Gillespie property will need to be revised to be solid fencing, matching the fencing provided along with the 40-foot buffer along the southern portion of the site.

Infrastructure-Roadway: Conditional

1. As you develop the plans for the Civil Stage, the following items are pertinent:
For Civil Plan approval, please refer to the Sketch Plan notes.
2. For purposes of the Major Site Plan review. The following should be included on the plans:
 - a. Indication of existing driveways adjacent opposite the parcel with dimensions of offset.

Infrastructure-Water & Sewer: Conditional

1. Review of the Water/Sewer Infrastructure will occur with Civil plans.

Infrastructure-Stormwater: Approved

Infrastructure-Landscaping: Conditional

1. A number of landscape adjustments are to be expected with the first civil review largely related to the buffering, as well as, the illustrated existing trees immediately behind curb/gutter, proposed utility line conflicts and understory exposure from adjacent lots.

Please have the landscape design professional coordinate with the LA in Pln/Dev.

Utilities-Electric: Conditional

1. Coordinate the electric utility design and installation with Patrick Hall @ (803) 329-5523, patrick.hall@cityofrockhill.com
2. Civil Construction Drawings must show conduit crossings for power and communication lines. The conduit must be schedule 40 PVC Gray Pipe. The conduits must extend beyond the road ROW & into the electrical easement and include conduit sizes, quantities, & depths. Coordinate with the City's assigned project engineer and Comporium's Engineering Department at 803 326

6129. A note must be placed on the plans indicating that the developer will provide and install the conduit crossings.

3. Need to show location parking lot lights, meters locations with the electric route shown to ensure we don't have any conflicts. In addition, the route will need to call-out the easement (20') as shown for our primary electrical route.

Marshburn, Shana

From: Hawkins, Eric
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 11:00 AM
To: Marshburn, Shana
Subject: FW: Celriver/Wilkerson Road Senior Living Facility

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

FYI...

Eric Hawkins, AICP

Planning & Zoning Manager
Planning & Development
City of Rock Hill
P.O. Box 11706
155 Johnston Street (29730)
Rock Hill, South Carolina 29731-1706
o: 803-329-8763

Eric.Hawkins@cityofrockhill.com

www.cityofrockhill.com

From: Anne Blake <ablake@comporium.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 1, 2021 7:06 PM
To: kbauer@laureldg.com
Cc: Hawkins, Eric <Eric.Hawkins@cityofrockhill.com>; philipwstill@gmail.com
Subject: Celriver/Wilkerson Road Senior Living Facility

CAUTION: This message was sent from outside of the City of Rock Hill. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe. Please report all suspicious emails to Tech Tools as an attachment

Hi Keith,

It appears you may be going before Planning Commission to present your Major Site Plan which I have tried to study but unsure how well I am reading it. Riverwalk has been adding residences at a tremendous rate so I think you are right about these individuals wanting to have parents close by and that would be successful for your proposed endeavor.. I have listened to your previous presentations and we have had some conversations about your senior living facility. There are some very tall trees across the back of my property and on your recently purchased property which could provide a natural setting for your occupants to view as well as provide the same for me instead of looking at the four story building. I can't tell from your site plan if you plan to try and keep most of them especially those between my property and the back of your building in this location but I would appreciate it if you could. We have discussed having the 6 ft. solid vinyl fence installed from Wilkerson Road to Celriver Road but of course your buildings will be a lot taller than that. It will provide some privacy and prevent any people possibly walking through shrubbery or other plantings onto my property. You

said you would prefer to put a chain link fence and I did give that consideration but it would not provide enough privacy & hopefully the solid fence will help a little bit blocking some noise. Eric Hawkins said he previously forwarded to you some questions I had with his answers on the city requirements back in March, 2021. Per that memo & previous conversations with you, I understood you planned to install the 6 ft. pvc/vinyl solid fencing from Wilkerson Road to Celriver Road but from the site plan, it doesn't seem to be that way.

As the residents of Wilkerson have discussed, it is very hard to understand why the entrance to this very large building is planned to be on Wilkerson. There were seven resident addresses on Celriver with drive ways on each and only one driveway on Wilkerson and as your building is very large and visible from Celriver, it seems a very nicely crafted sign showing the name of your building and a beautiful entrance would be excellent advertising and good landscaping for this well traveled road. I have also noticed the My Ride bus goes down Celriver and could provide some of your residents who may have had to give up driving a way to travel around Rock Hill for shopping, etc. Another problem I have mentioned before is access to emergency vehicles. Direct entrance from Celriver would be a lot more convenient than having to turn on Corporate Boulevard and then turn on Wilkerson before turning directly onto your property. The other day I was on my way home and a tractor trailer was on Wilkerson getting ready to turn onto Corporate and I realized a fire truck would not have had enough room to turn onto Wilkerson. The tractor trailer could not turn right onto Corporate with the fire truck there. I guess the tractor trailer could have turned to left on Corporate Boulevard even if that was not the way he was going to get out of the way but all that is taking precious time away from an emergency. An ambulance could maybe turn beside a big truck but that is still taking extra time to turn on Corporate and then on Wilkerson, which is a much smaller road than Celriver. I know you are aware your Wilkerson Road entrance is directly across from a noisy lumber yard from early morning and some activity all night. A thick tree buffer could be more helpful than open entrance. Celriver has neat landscaping but the lumber company does not..

I also notice that your water line ends close to the end of your building closest to Wilkerson. If you could extend it to Wilkerson and have a fire hydrant placed on our road, that could be a benefit to fire departments for your property as well as to residences on Wilkerson as there is presently no hydrant on Wilkerson.

Since my property is so close to your proposed building, I am interested in knowing if you will have around the clock security or someone on duty who can be reached 24/7.

Anne Blake