

Lancaster County Planning Department

101 N. Main St., Ste. 108

P.O. Box 1809

Lancaster, South Carolina 29721-1809

Telephone (803) 285-6005

Fax (803) 285-6007

Memo

To: Lancaster County Planning Commission
From: Penelope G. Karagounis, Planning Director
Date: May 19, 2014
Re: Highway Corridor Overlay District Proposal

Message:

On April 14, 2014, County Council approved first reading for the Highway Corridor Overlay District text amendment (TA-014-006) by a vote of 5-2. County Council's discussion was about the following:

- Industrial Street Frontage and Setbacks
- 25% Open Space requirement to high
- Zoning Administrator's ability to increase buffers (maximums should be given)
- Mast Arms- Is SCDOT/Lancaster County also required to comply?
- 8 foot Multi-Use Path –there will be gaps in construction
- Drive access for individual property owners
- Tree Survey Requirements.

Then on Wednesday, April 23, 2014, ColeJenest and Stone (Brian Jenest and Marshall Giles) and I had a meeting with Keith Tunnell, Lancaster County Economic Development Corporation. Mr. Tunnell invited Mr. Joshua Langen, Economic Development Corporation; Mr. Mike Bilodeau, Merrifield Partners; and Mr. Hart, Springs Corporation. Mr. Ron Pappas from the Lancaster County Planning Commission attended too. He was notified to attend the meeting by Mr. Larry McCullough. At this meeting, the Consultants and I listened to the gentlemen and Marshall Giles took notes of the meeting. The following were comments from the group:

- Overlay width – 1,000 feet too large
- Increase curb cut separation
- Building vernacular is an issue for larger office and industrial
- Private/Public street to be clearly defined
- 8 ‘ Multi-Use path –There will be gaps in construction, concerned with transition to existing sidewalks, concerned with use and maintenance costs of asphalt.
- Vested Rights
- Connectivity – concerned with shared parking access, in favor of shared drive access where “practicable”
- Curb cut distances for internal streets
- Confirm trigger for TIA
- Concerned with setbacks for larger office and industrial
- Mast-Arm cost
- Open space requirement to high, would be ok with impervious/previous language
- Tree preservation should be removed
- Overall text was to general
- Text should be clarified for difference uses (i.e. industrial, mixed use, commercial, retail, office, etc.)

At the County Council meeting on Monday, April 28, 2014, I was not in attendance due to attend a National Planning Conference in Atlanta. Kathy Johnson, Planner I and Marshall Giles from ColeJenest and Stone attended the 2nd reading for the Highway Corridor Overlay District Text Amendment. **Brian Carnes made a motion that Council give second reading approval to Ordinance No. 2014-1271 the Highway Corridor Overlay District Ordinance and that Council refer the ordinance back to the Planning Commission to review and make recommendations at the commission’s May 20, 2014 meeting on suggested changes to the ordinance and that Council place the ordinance on its agenda for third reading consideration at the June 9, 2014 meeting. Seconded by Jack Estridge. Passed 7-0.**

Marshall Giles and Kathy Johnson compiled their notes from the April 28, 2014 (see attachment) and ColeJenest and Stone went back to the draft table. We agreed that it

would be wise to have a Special Work Session with the Planning Commission on Thursday, May 15, 2014. The new revision was handed out at the May 15, 2014 Special Work Session. Any comments or corrections to the draft from that work session will be resubmitted on Tuesday, May 20, 2014 at the Planning Commission Meeting. We will have copies of the final draft that the Planning Commission will vote on at the meeting on May 20th. We will provide copies for the audience and also place it on the Planning Department website under agendas.

Based on the revisions to the Highway Corridor Overlay District text amendment, the Lancaster County Planning Department makes a recommendation to approve the revised text.

Notes from County Council Meeting on 04/28/2014 Regarding Highway Corridor Overlay District

Motion was made and seconded for second reading of this text amendment, and to send it back to the Planning Commission for their 05/20/2014 meeting and then it is to come back to County Council for third reading on 06/09/2014 (Motion passed 7-0)

Comments from Council Members on HCOD:

Harper: He has problem with industrial districts being included in this text amendment; thought it would have had a negative effect on Keer America had it been in place earlier, thinks industry needs to clear cut when they are constructing facilities; doesn't want building vernacular to apply to industry; wants I-1 & I-2 to be exempt from HCOD (pg 7 of agenda)

(pg 11, #4) wants a maximum to be set, not leave to discretion of zoning officer to increase

How do these regulations affect existing zoning? Marshall responded that if they have a vested right, they are grandfathered

(pg 8) Multiuse path- clarify that it goes from property line to property line; how it will connect to adjacent properties. No steps at connections.

McGriff: wants supplementary document with illustrations and pictures (discussed problem with Municode not allowing that very well- they are ok with a separate document that has illustrations and pictures)

Bundy: In favor of HCOD but doesn't want it to be a burden that discourages development, especially for the small business owner; If only large (nationalized) businesses come to IL, the area could lose its character; wants Council to give specific suggestions when it is sent back to PC. Agrees that IL needs the overlay district; would like for us to address potential impact on small businesses. Noted that he had other comments, but did not bring them with him.

(pg 14) Signalized intersections- who would pay for mast arms if the amount of traffic dictates the installation of another intersection in the area? Probably Lancaster County? He would like this to be addressed so that at least citizens would be aware of that possibility

Landscaped medians- who would maintain? Properties on both sides of the highway?

Concerned about irrigation- can LCWSD support this additional load?

Suggested we go with smaller trees than the 2.5' caliper- due to expense, suggests smaller trees and allow them to grow

Honeycutt: Discussion about sidewalks and multi use paths- if meandering, make sure adjacent parcels connect to the path; likes the idea of sidewalks connecting residential and commercial areas. Requested clarity in the section on sidewalks.

Concerned about deputies not being able to see behind buildings if they are brought up to the setback line with parking in the rear, may need to see if there is any research that indicates whether or not this has been a problem in areas where New Urbanist designs have been used

Concerned about landscaping blocking signs for businesses, Marshall said this was not allowed in the text amendment

Lighting standards: Which of our new businesses (look at new QT) are in compliance now with these standards for the intensity of 20 foot candles? They would like to be able to see what this will look like

Pg 18- Chain link fences not permitted- how will that affect recreation facilities? Can they be exempted?

Pg 10- Who will pay for TIA? Marshall responded developer is responsible for paying

Asked about uninterrupted parking areas and parking landscape requirements. Marshall noted the reference to parking landscape requirements.

Asked about language in sign section. Specifically, asked about the clearance requirement under a canopy or awning sign.

Estridge: Will sidewalks be asphalt or concrete? Who will maintain sidewalks and multi-use path? He questioned about on-street parking but Marshall explained that it was designated parking spots (e.g. parallel parking); he is concerned with safety issues behind buildings that sit on the setback line & would like to minimize buildings built that way

Carnes: Typo on pg 17, item 1, last sentence. He also wants the text amendment to state that buildings that sit on the setback line would have their entrance on the rear so folks would not have to walk around; ~~he is concerned with safety issues behind buildings that sit on the setback line & would like to minimize buildings built that way~~