

**MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
OCTOBER 19, 2009
CONFERENCE ROOM D
5:04 PM**

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, notice of the meeting, date, time and place of the agenda was posted on the bulleting board at the entrance of the Council Office and mailed to the newspapers, radio stations, television stations and concerned citizens.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jim Burns
Liz Seman
Joe Baldwin
Sid Cates
Fred Payne

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

None

STAFF PRESENT:

Dean Campbell
Keith Drummond
Paula Gucker
Judy James
Skip Limbaker
Mellone Long
Tom Meeks
John Owings

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman, Jim Burns

INVOCATION:

Councilor, Dr. Sid Cates

Approval of the Minutes:

Councilor Liz Seman made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of September 14, 2009, as submitted. The motion carried.

Request to Waive the Plan Review and Permit Fees for the Ronald McDonald House

Paula Gucker, Assistant County Administrator for Public Works, addressed the committee concerning a request to waive the plan review and permit fees for the Ronald McDonald House. Mrs. Gucker explained that that the request to waive the fees, in the amount of \$5,994, came from Councilor Meadows and Councilor Dill through the County Administrators Office. Mrs. Gucker responded to questions from the Committee members and stated that approval of this request would open the door for other non profit and charity organizations, and she reminded the committee members that permit fees fund the building inspectors salary. Mrs. Gucker stated that in the past we had waived permit fees for a specific number of homes for Habitat for Humanity; however, this had not been done in a number of years.

Following a brief discussion, Councilor Fred Payne made a motion to forward to full Council with no recommendation. The motion carried.

Zoning Dockets

See attached report from Skip Limbaker, Planning Department.

Comprehensive Plan Update

Mellone Long, Assistant County Administrator, Planning Department, explained that this was on the PWRPD agenda as an update, that no action was being requested. Ms. Long stated that the Comprehensive Plan would be on the November 2nd PWRPD agenda with a request for action and would be included on the Council agenda on Nov. 17th for a public hearing and second reading.

Todd Usher, Chairman, Greenville County Planning Commission, stated that he was there to answer any questions that the Committee might have. Mr. Usher stated that since the joint meeting with Council, the Commission met and recommended a couple of minor changes. The first was to move the glossary to the back of the document. Second was to add a disclaimer on the strategy section to be clear that these are ideas, they are not set in stone. Mr. Usher explained that the Commission felt it was important to include the strategy in the plan because they came directly from the citizens' committee meetings. Third were map changes to show the interstates more bold. Fourth, in the southern region the RLU1 (1 unit in 10 acres) was changed to all be RLU2 (1 unit in 3 acres). The last recommended change was in step 5, Chapter 6, monitor progress; the Planning Commission felt strongly that on an annual basis the Comp Plan should be reviewed, ideally in a joint meeting with council to discuss the progress from the prior year and strategies for the year to come.

Chairman Jim Burns stated that this was received as information, asked if there were any questions and stated that this will be on the next PWRPD agenda for a motion. Chairman Burns requested that all members of council receive a CD/DVD with the Comprehensive Plan; he would prefer that this be included as an attachment on the PWRPD agenda.

For Informational Purposes: Sidewalks Update

Received as information – no motion was made.

Requests and Motions

Councilor Baldwin inquired about nuisance abatement and stated that he had concerns about houses that are foreclosed and the county does nothing about it because they cannot recoup the money. Councilor Baldwin asked if it were possible to create an ordinance that would be similar to the recent ordinance so that it could be handled as a tax lien so it could be included on the tax bill.

Dean Campbell stated that this was a problem that the county has been dealing with foreclosures and bankruptcies that had been consuming a large portion of their time, especially dealing with developments that have gone bankrupt. Mr. Campbell stated that with the committee's directive, they would explore various avenues and report back to PWPD.

Councilor, Dr. Sid Cates asked about the surety bonds that were required for developments and asked if the development went bankrupt, did the surety bonds go bankrupt as well. Mr. Campbell responded that they did not, surety bonds or letters of credits were required but they were for the roads and did not address some of the issues that they were seeing now.

Paula Gucker stated that what they had seen were developments that were started in the past and are coming to fruition now, since the passage of the new stormwater ordinance the county has a way for site remediation if this type problem continued. The bigger issue is taking a look at different options, improving what we are doing, and better ways of tracking; this is a big issue that staff is working on.

Mr. Burns requested that staff report back to the Committee after they explore options; let them know if action is needed by council and if so, what that action would be.

Adjournment

Councilor Fred Payne made a motion to adjourn at 6:14 PM. The motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,

Judy C. James,
Administrative Coordinator

ZONING DOCKETS FROM OCTOBER 19, 2009 PWPDP MEETING

Docket Number	Applicant	CC DIST.	STAFF REC.	GCPC REC.	PWPDP REC.	COUNCIL ACTION
CZ-2009-40	Unique Builders, Inc. for Abington Park, LLC South Batesville Road R-12 to R-M6	21	D	D	D	
Public Comments	<p>Some of the general comments made by Speakers at the Public Hearing on September 14, 2009 were:</p> <p><u>Speakers For</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Discussed the history of the site including the approved preliminary subdivision of 10 lots and a possible 4 lot subdivision (2) Discussed the vandalism of the structure on site (3) Discussed proposed townhomes on site (4) Addressed traffic concerns (5) Met with home owners associations (6) Willing to meet and create private agreements such as deed restrictions to include minimum square footage, materials, and issues requested by others <p><u>Speakers Against</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Multifamily zoning is not consistent with surrounding zoning (2) Rezoning the site would add additional units and increase traffic (3) Concerns about school children walking and additional traffic (4) Rezoned the site 2 years ago because it met R-12 standards and those findings should remain (5) Current zoning is in compliance with the area (6) It is the applicant's responsibility to prove the request is appropriate (7) Stated that schools are at capacity (8) Concerns over what happened to proposed subdivisions on site and why the estate lot sign is still posted 					<p>Petition/Letter For – Approx. 5 stood</p> <p>Against – Approx. 45 stood Approx. 300 names on petition</p>
Staff Report	<p>Staff is of the opinion the existing zoning and land use pattern that has developed in the area is appropriate for this location. As previously stated, R-12, Single-Family Residential, zoning was approved by County Council in 2007. The following is an excerpt from the 2007 request:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Staff is of the opinion that the requested R-12, Single-Family Residential, is compatible with the existing R-12 zoning and single-family residential land uses surrounding the subject site. Rezoning this site would complete the R-12 zoning designation in this area of South Batesville Road and would not introduce uses or lot sizes incompatible with the existing land uses or zoning classification.</p> <p>Staff remains of this opinion stated above. The R-12, Single-Family Residential, district and the R-M6, Multifamily Residential, district both permit residential uses with the exception that the R-M6, Multifamily Residential, district permits multifamily residences such as duplexes, condominiums, and apartments which are not located in the immediate vicinity of the site. Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the request.</p>					