

A public hearing of the Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, December 7, 2021, at 6 p.m. in City Council Chambers, 155 Johnston Street, Rock Hill SC.

MEMBERS PRESENT Duane Christopher, Shelly Goodner, Nathan Mallard, Keith Martens

MEMBERS ABSENT Randy Graham, Gladys Robinson, Justin Smith

STAFF PRESENT Dennis Fields, Eric Hawkins, Shana Marshburn, Leah Youngblood

In the absence of Chair Randy Graham, Vice-Chair Duane Christopher presided over the meeting.

1. Approval of minutes of the November 9, 2021, meeting.

Commissioner Mallard made a motion to approve the minutes from the November 9, 2021, meeting. Commissioner Goodner seconded, and the motion passed by a vote of 4-0 (Graham, Robinson, and Smith absent).

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

2. Hold public hearing and consider a recommendation to City Council on petition T-2021-06 by Rock Hill City Council regarding a proposed six-month moratorium on single-family detached and attached development except in certain cases.

Leah Youngblood, Planning & Development Director, presented the staff report.

Mr. Mallard asked why the moratorium is necessary if City Council will have the ability to review sketch plans. Mrs. Youngblood stated that the moratorium gives Council the ability to determine if a proposal can move forward now or not. They may want to have some proposals wait until the development and design standards are revisited.

Mr. Mallard asked if the idea is to increase the standards for larger Master Plans. Mrs. Youngblood stated that staff is going to look at all of it, both Master Plans and things under standard zoning districts.

Mr. Christopher asked if sketches will be reviewed in a public meeting. Mrs. Youngblood stated that they will. Mr. Christopher asked if plans will then come to the Planning Commission. Mrs. Youngblood stated that they will. Mr. Martens asked if Council is the gatekeeper during the moratorium. Mrs. Youngblood stated that is correct.

Mr. Christopher stated that the term sketch plan means different things to different people. It sounds like the concerns are more about what the houses look like more so than the layout of the development. Mrs. Youngblood stated that buffers, grades, amenities, and lot sizes, along with other things, are things that City Council wants to review. The layout will determine if a proposal can move forward. Mr. Mallard asked if developments will go through the same process as usual after Council reviews the sketch. Mrs. Youngblood stated that is correct and noted that we have a sketch plan

checklist to give some guidance and that a sketch is a more of a conceptual level plan.

Mr. Christopher asked if six months is the right amount of time. Mrs. Youngblood stated that six months is the usual starting point for a moratorium and that it can be ended sooner if needed. We need enough time to develop standards but don't want to make it too long in an effort to minimize impact on the development community.

Mr. Christopher asked if anyone in attendance wanted to speak on this item and there were no comments.

Mr. Martens stated that it makes sense to take a break to look at the standards due to how fast we're growing.

Mrs. Goodner stated that she likes that there is still an opportunity for things to be reviewed.

Mr. Mallard stated that some things in the ordinance seem counter-intuitive and noted that it says affordable housing is important and also that the design standards need to be increased.

Mrs. Goodner made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed moratorium. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martens and passed by a vote of 4-0 (Graham, Robinson, and Smith absent).

3. Hold public hearing and consider a recommendation to City Council on petition M-2021-50 by Dreamkey Partners (Sammy Jackson) to rezone approximately 12 acres of property located at 513 & 542 Rauch Street and adjacent right-of-way from Wilhurst Village Master Planned Residential (MP-R) to Wilhurst Master Planned Residential (MP-R). Tax parcels 598-19-01-023 & -025

Dennis Fields, Planner III, presented the staff report.

Mr. Martens asked, regarding the foundation requirement, what is the effect of an 8" raised foundation versus an 18" raised foundation on the appearance of the building. Mr. Fields stated that the 18" requirement gives the house a better appearance and more of a presence than a slab-on-grade house. An 8" raised foundation would essentially be two stairs lower than our normal standard. This standard applies to all types of residential development in the City.

Mr. Martens stated that he thought we had waived that requirement for some other developments. Mr. Fields stated that a waiver can be granted for developments serving the elderly and disabled. In this case, the development isn't completely geared towards the elderly or disabled but the applicant has noted that they may have elderly or disabled residents who qualify for the affordable housing and they are requesting the deviation to better accommodate them.

Keith MacVean, Moore & Van Allen (applicant's representative), presented information about the applicant's development experience and anticipated rents for the units. He noted that the buildings will use masonry and hardi-plank siding materials. He stated that he doesn't think that adding brick beyond 30% adds to the quality of the buildings. The proposed design helps achieve affordable rents for people at or below 60% of Area Median Income. He noted that they are working with the architect to achieve a building design that will look similar to an 18" raised foundation. The development will also have to meet ADA accessibility requirements and the applicant doesn't want to add ramps. He stated that they will continue to work

on the design to see how close they can get and noted that the buildings will have quality materials and appearance.

Mr. Christopher asked what the cost difference is between 30% brick and 50% brick. The applicant stated that he doesn't know the exact number.

Mr. Martens asked if the townhomes will be sold. The applicant stated no, they will be rental units.

Mrs. Goodner asked if there will be a management office on site. Mr. MacVean stated yes, they will have staff on site.

Mr. Martens asked to see the pictures of the units they have built in Charlotte and asked if they had less than 30% brick or less than 18" raised foundations. The applicant stated that the site in Charlotte was much larger and it was easier to spread the costs over the number of units. Mr. Martens asked if the proposed development would look somewhat like that. The applicant stated that they will use the same design features, architectural shingles, etc.

Mrs. Goodner stated that the drawings presented for this proposal don't reflect the same look as the pictures of the development in Charlotte and asked if it will change prior to construction. The applicant noted that this is just a starting point and the drawings don't do it justice.

Latasha Brown-Baird, 222 Roddey Street, stated that if the plan is approved, she would like to see the final architectural plans. She asked what the projected start and completion dates are. The applicant responded that they will be happy to share the final architectural plans when they are available and noted that the tax credit process will take some time. It will be 18-20 months before construction starts and then construction will take approximately 18 months.

Mr. Christopher asked if the extra 20% brick could be incorporated since the timing of construction is that far off. The applicant stated that they don't want to compromise quality and also don't want to increase cost. They are not sure what the cost of the additional brick will be a couple years in the future.

Mrs. Goodner asked if the development will come back to the Planning Commission for review. Mr. Fields stated that it will have to come back for major site plan review.

Mr. Martens asked if we are reviewing all details of the architecture now. Mr. Fields stated that the renderings are conceptual but the Terms & Conditions states any deviations from the normal standards that they're asking for. The development is still subject to all standards that they're not asking for relief from.

Mr. Martens stated that he doesn't have a problem with the requested deviations and noted that he is a proponent of accessibility.

Mr. Christopher stated that he doesn't see a reason for a reduction of brick and noted that the cost shouldn't be that significant relative to the full development costs.

Mr. Mallard made a motion to recommend approval of the application with the requested deviations. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Goodner and passed by a vote of 3-1 (Christopher opposed, Graham, Robinson, and Smith absent).

4. Hold public hearing and consider a recommendation to City Council on petition M-2021-51 by Nelson Property Group to rezone approximately 1.56 acres at 1670

& 1678 W. Main Street, one unaddressed parcel, and adjacent right-of-way from Residential Development District II (RD-II) in York County and General Commercial (GC) to Neighborhood Commercial (NC). The unaddressed parcel is proposed to be annexed into the City of Rock Hill. Tax parcels 595-00-00-066, 595-02-02-015 & -016.

Shana Marshburn, Planner II, presented the staff report.

The applicant, Terano Nelson of 5437 Gatsby Circle, was available for questions.

Mr. Christopher asked if brick is required for this development. Ms. Marshburn stated that it needs to be consistent with other houses in the area and that some amount of brick does need to be provided, given the presence of brick on homes in the immediate vicinity. Mr. Nelson added that he would not be opposed to the provision of brick.

Mr. Mallard stated that this is a great idea and a great use of the residential infill regulations.

Mr. Christopher asked if anyone in attendance wanted to speak on this item and there were no comments.

Mr. Mallard made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed Neighborhood Commercial zoning. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Goodner and passed by a vote of 4-0 (Graham, Robinson, and Smith absent).

5. Hold public hearing and consider a recommendation to City Council on petition M-2021-56 by Rise Partners (Greg Wilson) to rezone approximately 39.1 acres at 4939 and 5005 Old York Road and adjacent right-of-way from Limited Commercial (LC) to Master Planned Residential (MP-R). Tax parcels 542-07-01-003 & -021.

Dennis Fields, Planner III, presented the staff report, noting that six additional e-mails have been handed out with public comments on the proposal, four in support and two in opposition. These e-mails were received after the agenda packet was sent out.

Mr. Martens asked, regarding traffic on Celanese Road, if staff assumes that all residents will go out Celanese to I-77. Mr. Fields responded no but there will be some that do.

Greg Wilson (applicant), Eddie Moore (McAdams- designer), Nick Burns (Impact Design- traffic engineer) addressed the Commission. Mr. Wilson provided information about Rise Partners and their development experience. He then presented information about what could be developed under the existing zoning, specifically a big box retailer near the houses. The proposed mixed-use development will create less traffic than a big box development. Mr. Moore noted that the developer met with neighbors first to get their input and changes have been made to the plan based on neighbors' comments. Changes include the commitment that no vinyl siding will be used, the addition of sidewalk along Miller Pond Road, moving the townhomes toward Old York Road, moving the open space, and increasing the buffer. The layout is arranged with the more intense uses oriented to Old York Road. A collector street paralleling Old York Road is included to increase connectivity and provide people with another way out of the development and the surrounding neighborhoods. Beyond the collector road, the development transitions to townhomes and then to detached lots similar to Summerwood. The density of the residential area is about 3.5 units/acre and the overall density is 2.9 units/acre. The proposal exceeds open space and tree

save requirements. Mr. Moore then presented the differences between this proposal and a big-box development, noting that a big-box would have up to 215,000 square feet of commercial versus the proposed 25,000 square feet. The proposal has more open space, less impervious coverage, and a collector street. The types of commercial that are proposed include fast-casual restaurants, limited office financial institutions, and limited medical office. The proposal checks off the boxes of the comprehensive plan's recommendations, except for the amount of residential proposed. Mr. Burns stated that the proposed development would result in decreased traffic compared to what could be built under the existing zoning. The proposal would generate approximately 4,800 trips per day versus 13,000 trips per day for a big-box development. The proposal would reduce the AM peak traffic volume by 36% and the PM peak traffic volume by 57% versus a big-box development. This would result in a 30% reduction in delay time at the Miller Pond/Old York Road intersection in the AM and an 18% reduction in the PM.

Mr. Christopher stated that no signal at the intersection of Road B and Old York Road. Mr. Burns stated that is correct. Mr. Christopher asked if Road B is too close to Miller Pond Road to be signalized. Mr. Burns stated that it is too close and that adding another signal would affect progression along Old York. The collector road is intended to get people to a signal, either at Miller Pond Road or a future signalized intersection to the west of the development.

Billy Nguyen, 701 Creekbridge Drive in Miller Pond stated that his family recently moved to this area because they wanted more space. He was frustrated about more housing being added where he moved from in Steele Creek and more classroom trailers being added at the schools. He is concerned about cut-through traffic and traffic in general. He noted that he hasn't heard any consideration of the aggregate impact of this development and the proposed development of the 67 acres at the end of Miller Pond Rd. Mr. Christopher asked Mr. Nguyen if he is mainly concerned with traffic. Mr. Nguyen stated that he is also concerned about high density housing and that it is not consistent with Miller Pond.

Marty Sheek- 755 Creekbridge Drive in Miller Pond stated that he was never invited to a meeting with the developer. He stated that there was an agreement when Miller Pond was annexed that everything would have to be built like our development. He stated concerns about cut-through traffic and traffic back-up. He stated that this is not what was promised by the City when Miller Pond was annexed. He is concerned about how this will affect his property value and stated that he hasn't heard anything about how much the proposal would increase traffic versus not building anything.

Edgar Vasquez, 700 Creekbridge Drive in Miller Pond stated that he was not invited to the neighborhood meeting. He is concerned that the City made many promises when Miller Pond was annexed. This will negatively affect the property value of existing development. He noted that traffic has increased tremendously and because Miller Pond Road is the only way in and out, it backs up.

Rhonda Preston, 316 Nantucket Way and Amanda Miller, 250 Mallard Head Drive in Summerwood spoke in support of the proposal and noted that there will either be a big-box development or this master plan. This will have less traffic than a big-box development and they would rather have this than a big box development. For our community, our home values and appearance/aesthetics, would rather have houses behind us than loading docks. They stated that they appreciate the applicant adding

their ideas into the plan.

Chris Lynn, 1310 Yellowwood Court in Miller Pond stated that Miller Pond Road is only road in and out of the neighborhood. He stated that the applicant is following the regulations but not being a good neighbor. They should have come down to the end of the road and asked us to join the meetings. Wal-Mart made a lot of promises and they haven't upheld any of it. He noted that his commute to the hospital has gone from 5 minutes to 10 minutes in the last 22 years and asked the Commission to consider the neighbors.

Anne Bland, 1325 Yellowwood Court in Miller Pond stated that she is disappointed that Miller Pond wasn't notified of the neighborhood meeting. 300' is not sufficient in this case. There is only one road to get in and out of our neighborhood. Everyone on that road should be notified. This comes across as sneaky and deceitful and the City has failed us. Not opposed to development of this land- that is a foregone conclusion. Too many townhomes and too few streets are proposed. There are over sixty acres for sale at the end of Miller Pond Road that will be developed. There needs to be a larger plan for the area. The people in support are in fear of the current zoning but those aren't the only two options.

Mr. Burns (applicant's traffic engineer) stated that the road improvements recommended by in the TIA meet the thresholds & guidelines of the City and the State. He noted that final approval has not been given by SCDOT and that their comments will be addressed and incorporated when they are received.

Mr. Christopher asked if the applicant is accounting for additional 75 homes to be developed at the end of Miller Pond. Mr. Burns stated that the study accounts for all of the existing traffic plus traffic from the proposed development.

Mr. Christopher asked if there is another exit onto Old York Road for Miller Pond residents. Mr. Burns stated that it is possible to go through the Wal-Mart development to another signal.

Mr. Mallard asked if the road through Wal-Mart will become part of the public collector road. Mr. Fields stated that it will not since it is already developed. The proposed road in this development will be the first part of the collector road and it is planned to extend to Adnah Church Road eventually. As properties develop along Old York Road, there will be additional connection points and there may be additional signals at some point. The purpose of the collector road is to alleviate traffic on Old York Road by providing additional connections rather than requiring everyone to go out to Old York Road.

Mr. Martens asked if there is a proposed development at end of Miller Pond Rd. Mr. Fields stated that it is not in the City and it would have to be annexed and rezoned prior to development. Staff has advised the people who have inquired about it that it would need to be single-family development similar to what's around it.

Mr. Martens stated that something will be developed on this land and this looks like a good plan. Anything that goes there will add traffic to the area.

Mr. Wilson (applicant) stated that the Master Plan locks in everything and ensures that we do what we say.

Mr. Christopher asked if the moratorium affects this proposal. Mr. Fields stated that the Master Plan will be reviewed by City Council.

Mr. Martens asked if off-street parking is required for every unit. Mr. Fields stated that all townhomes and detached houses are required to have two parking spaces on the lot in addition to the garage. There will also be on-street parking for guests.

Mr. Christopher stated that he thinks this is a well-planned development. He noted that traffic will continue to increase because there are limited roads in this area of town and it will be several years before the site is fully developed.

Mr. Mallard made a motion to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martens.

Mr. Mallard stated that the proposal would be better than a big-box development.

Mrs. Goodner acknowledged the traffic issues in this area and noted that this would have less impact than what could be built by-right.

The motion passed by a vote of 4-0 (Graham, Robinson, and Smith absent).

6. Hold public hearing and consider a recommendation to City Council on petition M-2021-57 by Sandeep Gupta to rezone approximately 2.5 acres at 1106 Ebinport Road and adjacent right-of-way from General Commercial (GC) to Single-Family Attached (SF-A). Tax parcel 632-01-01-001.

Dennis Fields, Planner III, presented the staff report, noting that he received a call from a resident of the area who supports the proposal because it is a dumping ground now and he would like to see it cleaned up.

Mr. Martens asked if the site is viable for commercial development. Mr. Fields stated that it is far off Cherry Road and sites that aren't up closer to Cherry Road have struggled. Ebinport Road is more of a collector street to get people to and from the neighborhoods.

John Gast, applicant's representative, noted that it is not a good site for commercial. The proposed townhomes would be a good transition from commercial to residential and would be a benefit to the community. He noted that there is space at the back of the property for stormwater retention.

Mrs. Goodner made a motion to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mallard and passed by a vote of 4-0 (Graham, Robinson, and Smith absent).

NEW BUSINESS

7. Consideration of a request by Edge Express Car Wash related to driveway locations on Cross Point Drive in the High Point Crossing Planned Development.

Dennis Fields, Planner III, presented the staff report.

Mr. Mallard made a motion to approve the request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Goodner and passed by a vote of 4-0 (Graham, Robinson, and Smith absent).

8. Other Business.

a. Consider Moving January Meeting Date.

Mrs. Goodner made a motion to move the January meeting to Jan. 11. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mallard and passed by a vote of 4-0 (Graham, Robinson, and Smith absent).

9. Adjourn.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.