

**City of Camden  
Planning Commission  
July 17, 2012**

**Minutes**

The City of Camden Planning Commission met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, July 17, 2012 at 6:00 PM at City Hall. Commission members present were Mr. Jim Burns, Vice Chairman; Ms. Joanna Craig, Mr. Johnny Deal, Mr. Brandon Moore, Mr. Charles Wood, Mr. Byron Johnson and Mr. Shawn Putnam, Secretary. Commission member Mr. Bill Ligon was absent. Also present were Ms. Cheryl Matheny, Mr. Martin Cahn, Chronicle-Independent; Mr. Mike White, Mr. Henry Walker, Mr. Harold Pickrel, and Ms. Liz Gilland.

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Bill Ligon, Mr. Burns called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

**Recommendation for annexation and interim zoning – 1.08 acres parcel located at 2209 West Dekalb Street**

Mr. Putnam provided a map showing the property proposed for annexation. He indicated that this lot is where the proposed Chick-fil-a restaurant would be built. Mr. Putnam noted that all of the surrounding properties in this area are zoned General Development (GD).

Mr. Deal moved to open the public hearing, and Mr. Wood seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. No one spoke during the hearing. Mr. Wood moved to close the public hearing and Mr. Deal seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Deal made a motion to recommend to City Council to annex the property with an interim zoning classification of General Development (GD). Mr. Wood seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

**Extension Request for Beechwood PDD**

Mr. Putnam referenced a letter provided to Commission members from Mr. Ed Royall requesting a one year extension to the approved PDD for the Beechwood development. He said this would be the third of five one-year extensions allowed by the ordinance.

Mr. Deal made a motion to approve the request for a one year extension to the approved PDD for the Beechwood development. Mr. Moore seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

## **Revised Preliminary Plat – Bridlewood Farms Subdivision**

Mr. Putnam provided a copy of the revised preliminary plat for the Bridlewood Farms subdivision. He explained the plat, which is construction plans for the infrastructure, had to be revised because the sketch plan was revised to change the number of lots from 17 to 41, which necessitated changes to the infrastructure. Mr. Putnam noted that on the preliminary plat the cul-de-sac on the north side of the property in the sketch plan was removed, which reduced the number of lots to 36. The development was divided into three phases, with the first phase consisting of fifteen lots centered near the primary entrance and the other two phases on either side of phase one. For the first phase, water, sewer and electric connections already exist for some of the lots. The plan by the developer is to install the additional service connections and then ask for a final plat for phase one to be approved so they can begin to sell lots. Mr. Putnam referred to comments provided from the Review Committee, which stated in addition to the additional service connections, the developer must conduct bacteria tests for the water lines, flush the fire hydrants, and submit a revised sediment and erosion control plan prior to any building permits being issued for phases two and three.

Mr. Burns asked about a possible additional entrance. Mr. Putnam noted that the second entrance was proposed to be installed in phase three. Mr. Moore asked if phase one would include the main entrance and Mr. Putnam responded yes it would. Mr. Burns asked if a turning lane was required. Mr. Putnam indicated that City Council did not include that requirement in approving the sketch plan. Mr. Deal asked if they were approving the entire plat, and Mr. Johnson asked if the plat was modified would they have to approve it. Mr. Putnam indicated major changes would need to be approved by the Commission, but minor changes could be approved by staff. Mr. Burns asked about the condition of the pond on the property. Mr. Putnam stated it was lower than normal but is in decent condition.

Mr. Moore made a motion to approve the preliminary plat as presented. Mr. Deal seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

## **Presentation on Zoning Ordinance Update**

Ms. Matheny reviewed comments on design standards from the previous meeting and indicated they were working on those edits. The purpose of this meeting is to review landscaping and buffer requirements. She reviewed discussions from the previous discussion on landscaping and buffers at the February meeting.

Ms. Matheny noted that the City Arborist would be approving landscape plans and that a pre-submission meeting would be required to ensure a smooth approval process. Ms. Gilland will produce a list of preferred trees and shrubs that developers can use to choose the types of plant materials. Standards will be included to ensure plants and trees have a better chance to be healthy and survive by requiring installation and maintenance requirements. Existing healthy trees will be required to be retained unless approved for removal by the City Arborist. Healthy existing plants and trees can be counted towards landscaping and buffer requirements.

Ms. Matheny discussed requirements for buffers. Buffers must include trees and a combination of perennials, annual flowers, grass, and mulch. Additional plantings may not be required in areas with existing significant forested areas. Buffers will not be required in the B1 zone to encourage mixed-use developments.

Ms. Matheny explained the buffer table provided to Commission members. Buffers between single family residential and multi-family residential of more than eight units would be twenty feet wide. A thirty-foot buffer would be required between non-residential and light industrial uses and residential uses, and a forty-foot buffer would be required between manufactured home parks and heavy industrial uses and all other uses.

Ms. Matheny discussed requirements for street buffers. They would not be required for multi-family with less than 5 units. Streets buffers must be a minimum of five feet wide but must average seven feet wide, and must be ten feet wide for manufactured home parks and heavy industrial uses. These widths provide adequate space for trees to grow and provide flexibility in design. A minimum of 30% of the buffer area must be planted in shrubs, perennials, live ground cover, turf grass and mulch. Ms. Matheny then explained the chart for a planting schedule. Large maturing trees would not be required. A medium maturing tree would be required at the rate of .04 per linear foot, which equates to two trees per fifty linear feet. A small maturing tree would be required at the rate of .06 per linear foot, which equates to three trees per fifty linear feet.

Ms. Matheny discussed requirements for property buffers. Buffers would not be required for multi-family of less than five units if no subdivision of land is required and the structure mimics the appearance of a single family structure, and a minimum of 40% of the buffer area must be planted in shrubs, perennials, live ground cover, turf grass and mulch. Trees would be required in the buffer at the rate of one large maturing per 200 square feet, one medium maturing tree per 150 square feet, and one small maturing tree per 100 square feet.

Ms. Matheny discussed landscaping requirements for parking lots. The requirements would apply to lots with ten or more spaces or expansions of ten or more spaces. The area between trees and shrubs must be filled with a combination of perennials, flowers, grasses, and mulch. The landscaped area must be ten percent of total paved lot, and the buffer area may provide up to fifty percent of the requirements. All trees must be large maturing trees unless otherwise approved by the City Arborist. Planted areas must include one large maturing tree and five shrubs. Parking lots must be designed to include low impact techniques for handling stormwater. Mr. Johnson asked if there was a certain area needed to ensure healthy trees and to ensure roots do not tear up paved surfaces. Ms. Matheny noted that currently landscaped islands are required to be ten by nineteen feet, but it would be preferred to require landscape islands be a minimum of two hundred square feet in area. Ms. Craig asked if a large tree meant large when planted or large when grown. Ms. Gilland said it meant the tree would be large once mature.

Mr. Johnson noted that the buffer table showed that no buffer was required between a quadraplex and a single family home. He indicated that a buffer would be needed based on his experience. Ms. Matheny suggested adding a column to differentiate single family residential and duplexes and not requires a buffer for those uses. Commission members stated they would review the requirements and provide comments before the next meeting.

There being no further business, Ms. Craig made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Deal seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.

---

Shawn Putnam  
Secretary

---

Bill Ligon  
Chairman