

MINUTES

Monday, June 13, 2016
Planning Commission Meeting
Council Chambers-Glennon Center Lower Level
7:00 p.m.

<p>1. Call to Order</p>	<p>Jerry Church, Chair, called the meeting to order.</p> <p>Present: Kathy Masters, Jerry Church, Chris Leonard, Arnold Mann, Stephen Handel, Vincent DesRosiers, and Susan Britt (staff)</p> <p>Absent: Doug Burns, David O’Neal (Council Liaison)</p>
<p>2. Approval of Minutes</p> <p>a. May 9, 2016</p> <p>b. May 16, 2016</p>	<p><u>MOTION</u></p> <p>Stephen Handel motioned to approve the minutes as presented.</p> <p>Kathy Masters seconded.</p> <p>VOTE: Ayes, Unanimous</p>
<p>3. New Business</p> <p>a. Consider Approval of Final Plat for Cameron Creek Phase 7</p>	<p>Susan Britt presented the Subdivision Summary and reviewed the Final Plat checklist (Attached to the minutes and official record). Based on the Technical Team Review, Staff recommends approval of the final plat contingent upon approval of the Letter of Credit and Performance, Labor, and Materials Surety Agreement by the City Attorney and City Council. Marty Davis from MI Homes was in attendance and available for questions from the Commission.</p> <p>Mr. Leonard asked about the sequence of the phasing and how many more phases were expected. Mr. Davis stated there was a total of nine phases. Phases 1-4 have been previously approved. This particular phase was out of sequence due the need to develop the utility infrastructure in this area prior to the Phases 5-6.</p> <p>Mr. DesRosiers asked about the trail location and the timing of development. Mr. Davis stated that the trails would be the final stage of development due to the need to limit disturbance along the creek system. Also the trail will continue off site to connect to the current City trail system and will be constructed by MI Homes.</p> <p><u>MOTION</u></p> <p>Arnold Mann motioned to give conditional approval contingent upon approval of the Letter of Credit and</p>

b. Consider Recommendation for Adoption of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

Performance, Labor, and materials surety Agreement by the City Attorney and City Council. Stephen Handel seconded.

VOTE: Ayes, Unanimous

Susan Britt introduced Kara Drane, Senior Planner with the Catawba Regional Council of Governments. Ms. Drane then provided an overview of the CIP and the process.

Mr. DesRosiers acknowledged the process of generating the forecast appeared disciplined but stated that the manner in which the data was presented did not expose or in any way identify the potential for tax increases over time. Mr. DesRosiers polled all the Planning Commission members regarding if they had any idea or impressions based upon the CIP, as to the effect on taxes over time. The universal response from all Planning Commission members was that no one was able to understand any potential tax implications based upon the CIP. Mr DesRosiers then suggested that the proposed CIP be modified to show a cash flow analysis (Projected Revenue versus Expected Expense) as an appendix. He stated that as written, the Resolution would be perceived that the Planning Commission perceived the CIP as being tax neutral, he was concerned the adoption of a Resolution recommending adoption of the CIP to Council would place an expectation on future councils to increase taxes to fulfill the Capital needs. Ms. Drane explained the process thus far and that all department heads had been very involved. Also, the CIP is a program and not a capital budget. It only includes the needs derived to meet the goals outlined in the 10-year Comprehensive Plan. If the revenue did not exist for the proposed budget year, then the subsequent councils could decide not to fund the program. Mr. DesRosiers stated that he need more time to digest the CIP information.

MOTION

Mr. DesRosiers made a motion to defer adoption of the resolution until next month to include an amendment estimating cash flow analysis (Projected Revenue versus Expected Expense) as an appendix. The motion died for lack of a second.

MOTION

Kathy Masters motioned to adopt the Resolution recommending adoption of the CIP by Council

	<p>Arnold Mann seconded.</p> <p>VOTE: Ayes, (Leonard, Church, Mann, Masters, Handel Nays, (DesRosiers)</p>
<p>4. Old Business</p> <p>a. Consider Approval of revised Sketch/Master Plan for Cadence PDD (TMS #'s 6440000045, 6440000047, 6440000048, 6440000049, 6440000050, 6440000051, 6440000052, and 6440000053)</p>	<p>Bob Wiggins from Mattamy Homes and Matt Mandle and Matt Levesque from ESP Associates presented the revised PDD Sketch/Master Plans based on input received from the Commission and from the comments at the public hearing on May 16. Discussion then ensued with the Commission.</p> <p>Mr. Mann asked about the Dam Road connection. Mr. Wiggins stated that a draft TIA had been submitted to the City and to SCDOT. Final decision regarding location would be after the engineering work had been completed.</p> <p>Mr. Handel asked about the elimination of the townhome product. Mr. Wiggins stated that after a more detailed market analysis he thought that the single family detached product would be successful marketed to “empty-nesters”.</p> <p>Mr. Handel then asked about the price points. Mr. Wiggins stated that it would be in the mid 300’s.</p> <p>Mr. DesRosiers asked about the future trail connection to Gold Hill Middle and Elementary Schools. Mr. Wiggins stated that the trail crossing would be developed by the City.</p> <p>Ms. Masters then asked about planting in the buffers. Mr. Wiggins stated that Mattamy intended to save as many trees as possible but also do a combination of plantings and screening. Ms. Masters also stated that she had issues with a 50’ wide lot and a 40’ wide home product. She thought that the houses would be too close together with a 5’ setback. She asked about the possibility to increase the lot widths to 55’. Mr. Wiggins stated that his market analysis indicated that this is the product that is selling. Buyers did not want to have large lots. All exterior maintenance would be the responsibility of the HOA and that this would cause an increased financial burden on the HOA. Both Ms. Masters and Mr. Handel stated that they could not support the 50’ lot width with the 5’ side setback.</p> <p><u>MOTION</u></p>

<p>b. Review suggestions for clarification of sign regulations</p>	<p>Chris Leonard motioned to approve the revised Sketch/Master Plan for Cadence PDD. Mr. DesRosiers seconded</p> <p>VOTE: Ayes, (Leonard, Church, Mann, DesRosiers Nays, (Masters, Handel)</p> <p>MOTION APPROVED</p> <p>Due to the time this item will be carried over. Discussion involved the potential for a future workshop to be scheduled at 6:30 pm prior to a regular meeting.</p>
<p>5. Public Comments</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>6. Council Liaison Comments</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>7. Commissioner’s Comments</p>	<p>Mr. Leonard said that since there had been much discussion on 50’ lots in a PDD that perhaps the basic standards could be revised to set minimum for lots sizes. The Commission agreed to consider setting some new minimum standards.</p>
<p>8. Chairman’s Comments</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>9. Staff Comments</p>	<p>Ms. Britt presented a minor subadvisor plan for the Windhaven PDD to subdivide out the parcels for the park, the school and the water tower site for deed transfers. The Commission was OK with the plan.</p>
<p>10.Adjournment</p>	<p><u>MOTION</u> Kathy Masters motioned to adjourn. Stephen Handel seconded.</p> <p>VOTES: AYES Unanimous</p>