

SUMTER CITY - COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting

October 22, 2014

ATTENDANCE	A regular meeting of the Sumter City – County Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, October 22, 2014 in the City Council Chambers located on the Fourth Floor of the Sumter Opera House. Seven board members: Mr. David Durham, Mr. Burke Watson, Mr. Jim McCain, Mr. Todd Champion; Mr. Doc Dunlap; Mr. Dennis Bolen – and the secretary were present. Ms. Sandra McBride and Ms. Bertha Willis were absent. The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Mr. David Durham.
MINUTES	Mr. John Acken made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 24, 2014, meeting as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jim McCain and carried a unanimous vote.
NEW BUSINESS	<p><u>OA-14-09, Temporary Real Estate Signs (City)</u></p> <p>Mr. Doc Dunlap recused himself from discussion on this request due to being one of the applicants.</p> <p>Mr. George McGregor presented this request to amend Article 8, Section 8.h.8 Temporary Signs to better define real estate signs, contractors signs, subdivision project signs and commercial project signs in the City of Sumter Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance. Mr. McGregor stated the types of signs being focused on are the more temporary real estate signs in developing subdivisions – signs announcing the project with project name, some of the homebuilders, price of the lots. What is seen at a number of subdivisions is an exponential growth in the number of these types of signs. He stated that in the current ordinance only one 32 sq. ft. sign is permitted per street frontage. The developers have asked for help in either allowing more square footage or allowing additional signs. He added that once you get to the interior of the subdivision you see a lot of other types of signs – directional signs for the sales center or announcing the model home. Mr. McGregor stated staff received some draft options of signs they would like to be allowed. This would be about seven signs per home builder. He stated staff is recommending some minor changes that include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Commercial Project Signs</u>. One sign per project only (not one sign per contractor) at 32 sq. ft. and 10 ft. tall. This doubles the current allowable sq. ft.• <u>Residential Subdivisions Under Construction</u>. One sign per street frontage 64 sq. ft. and ten feet tall. This doubles the current allowable sq. ft. This does NOT allow one sign per home builder, but expects the doubled sign area be used for sharing• <u>Individual Residential Lots Under Construction</u>. One sign per contractor 6 sq. ft. Here we find it acceptable to permit 1 sign per contractor as the signs are much more temporary and are generally internal to the subdivision and NOT on primary corridors.

- Real Estate Signs. No major change except by adding the specific language adopted in the County Ordinance which is more specific than existing City language.

Mr. McGregor stated in summary, particularly for the residential developer, staff is proposing to keep the one sign but double the square footage.

Mr. David Durham asked if staff had received any feedback from Mr. Dunlap or the developers.

Mr. McGregor stated staff received the sign package and several emails from Mr. Tobias suggesting the one 34 sq. ft. sign may be okay if they had the ability to put multiple users on it.

Mr. Burke Watson asked for clarification on whether a house under construction in a subdivision signs would be allowed to post individual subcontractor signs.

Mr. McGregor stated staff is proposing to allow each individual subcontractor to have one sign six (6) sq. ft. sign during construction.

Mr. Todd Champion asked if one sign would be allowed on each street frontage.

Mr. McGregor stated one 64 sq. ft. sign would be allowed on each street frontage.

With no further discussion, Mr. Jim McCain made a motion to recommend approval for this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dennis Bolen and carried a unanimous vote.

OA-14-10 and OA-14-11, Cell Tower Height (City/County)

Ms. Donna McCullum presented this request to amend Article 5, Section 5.b.4.a.1 and Article 5, Section 5.b.4.g.2 regulating cell tower height in residentially zoned districts in order to delete the maximum 100 foot tower height in the City and County Zoning and Development Standards Ordinances. Ms. McCullum stated this request is asking to delete the 100 foot maximum tower height in residentially zoned areas. She stated this request was initiated because the applicant – Farmer’s Telephone – wishes to install a communications tower on the Country Club property, which is zoned Residential-15. Under the current regulations, cellular towers in all residential districts have a maximum at 100 ft. in height with no ability for the Board of Appeals to grant a height variance. With changes in how people use cellular telephones and hand-held devices, there has been an increased demand for cellular network capacity in and around residential areas. As part of meeting this demand and to limit the number of towers needed, Farmers Telephone and other wireless providers seek to build taller towers that cover a larger distance. As such, generally a tower needs to be taller than 100 feet to provide the desired coverage, particularly in high user areas such as residentially zoned neighborhoods. Ms. McCullum stated the current ordinance states that all towers and antennas placed in residential areas are special exceptions and must be approved by the Zoning Board Of Appeals and cannot be approved at staff level. She stated that the special exception criteria now has dimensional requirements that include: tower height; the necessity for the tower to be placed in a residential area and that the area cannot be adequately served by

a communication tower placed in a non-residential district for valid technical reasons. She stated that staff feels there are sufficient regulations for reviewing and criteria for determining the appropriate height for a communications tower without restricting to 100 feet and recommends approval to delete the 100 foot maximum height and handle the maximum height through the Zoning Board of Appeals review.

Mr. George McGregor stated today there is an absolute ceiling on tower height in residential districts, meaning you can't go through a process to ask to go higher. Staff thinks there are probably conditions in some locations where it may make sense to go above 100 feet, and recommends changing the ordinance and let the special exception review process determine the appropriate height.

Mr. Jonathan Teseniar was present to speak on behalf of this request.

With no further discussion, Mr. Doc Dunlap made a motion to recommend approval for this request as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jim McCain and carried a unanimous vote.

SD-14-02, Wesmark Commercial Subdivision (City)

Ms. Helen Roodman presented this request for preliminary plat approval to develop a 4-lot commercial subdivision on property located on the north side of Wesmark Blvd. between the City of Sumter Water Treatment Plant and Palmetto Orthopedic Sports Medicine. Ms. Roodman stated the applicant proposes to develop a four lot commercial subdivision on a +/- 6.77 acre tract. She stated the property is heavily wooded today and the front portion of the property is jurisdictional wetlands and will remain undisturbed. The development will be accessed from an internal road that connects to the established encroachment being used by the orthopedic office located at 595 W. Wesmark Blvd. Because this property is for future commercial development, each individual parcel will go through major or minor site plan review as appropriate. At that time, each parcel development plan will be evaluated for full compliance with the City of Sumter – Zoning & Development Standards Ordinance to include: landscaping, buffering & tree protection, site access, stormwater management, and public safety. She stated there is an existing sidewalk network on W. Wesmark Blvd. at the entrance to the subdivision site. Sidewalks are a requirement on at least one side of the street based on the current development proposal and street profile in the City. Installation of the sidewalk will be at time of road construction. The submitted plans make accommodation for sidewalks. The submitted plans make stormwater accommodations for the management of roadway run-off as well as stormwater connections for lots #1 and #2. Lots #3 and #4 are planned to provide individual stormwater management upon development of each lot. Ms. Roodman stated the proposed plan was reviewed by the Fire Inspector, Robbie Rickard. She stated no secondary access point is required. Because this is a commercial subdivision and all future users have yet to be identified, the Fire Inspector has indicated that hydrant placement will be reviewed on a per-lot basis as it is unknown whether future buildings will be required to have fire suppression systems. The requirements for fire sprinklers within a building significantly alter hydrant placement. Based on this, Mr. Rickard has requested that sufficient water capacity be provided to the subdivision but the hydrant placement be evaluated at time of major/minor site plan review for a given lot. Ms. Roodman stated that because of the importance of this corridor, and the likelihood that development at this site will eventually result in the need for

	<p>road improvements on Wesmark Blvd, Planning Staff has worked with representatives of SCDOT and the Applicant to identify a trigger point for when a Traffic Impact Study will be required. She stated the following clause has been added to their plans and will go on the final plat so that future buyers are aware of the requirement:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“As per Article 7, Section 7.d.10 of the City of Sumter – Zoning & Development Standards Ordinance, a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) shall be required when the combined floor area of each developed parcel in conjunction with the proposed development meets 29,000 sq. ft. of medical office space and/or the combined uses meet or exceed 100 peak hour trips. If/when this threshold is met or passed, a TIS shall be commissioned and conducted to determine the feasibility of a separate left-turn lane on Wesmark Blvd.”</i></p> <p>The cost of conducting said TIS shall fall to the developer at time the threshold is met. In addition to establishing a timeline for execution of a TIS, Staff and SCDOT have concerns related to the geometry of the encroachment on W. Wesmark and the connection to the existing orthopedic office. Staff and SCDOT foresee a time when, for safety reasons, access to the existing site at 595 W. Wesmark Blvd. will need to be moved further north along the proposed access road for safety. This issue has been brought to the applicant’s attention.</p> <p>With no further discussion, Mr. Jim McCain made a motion to approve this request as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dennis Bolen and carried a unanimous vote.</p> <p><u>SV-14-09, West Ave. (County)</u></p> <p>Ms. Claudia Rainey presented this request for a variance from Article 8.e.14, Section f, depth of residential lots shall not be more than 2 ½ times their width to subdivide +/- 11.40 acre tract from a larger +/- 62.50 acre parcel located on West Ave. South. Ms. Rainey stated the property in question is a +/- 62.50 acre parcel located off of West Ave. South, near Pinewood, in Sumter County. There are two residential parcels that were previously cut out of this larger tract along West Ave. South. The proposed parcels require variances for the width to depth ratio. She stated the intent of the lot width to depth language is to prevent creation of flag lots and other non-conforming parcels. The only flag lot being created here cannot be helped because it is partially behind an existing lot, all the other parcels to be created have adequate road frontage and the railroad to the rear constricts any other type of subdivision. Ms. Rainey added that this division meets the intent of the ordinance and Staff recommends approval of this request.</p> <p>Mr. Joey Smoak was present to speak on behalf of this request.</p> <p>With no further discussion, Mr. Burke Watson made a motion to approve this request as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jim McCain and carried a unanimous vote.</p>
DIRECTOR’S REPORT	NONE

ADJOURNMENT	With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:45 p.m. by acclamation. The next scheduled meeting is October 22 2014.
	Respectfully submitted, <i>Wanda F. Scott</i> Wanda F. Scott, Planning Secretary

Sumter City-County Planning Commission

Meeting Date: 10-22-14

NAME (Please Print)	Which request are you here for?
JAY STUTZ	SHAW AFB REP.