

**City of Camden
Planning Commission
November 21, 2023**

Minutes

The City of Camden Planning Commission met for a regular meeting on November 21, 2023 at 6:15 PM. Commission members present were Mr. Johnny Deal, Chair; Mr. Mark Chickering, Ms. Connie Davis Rouse, Mr. Travis Hall, Mr. Mark Mohr, Mr. Greg Youngmans and Mr. Shawn Putnam, Secretary. Also attending were City Manager Jon Rorie and approximately 120 members of the public. Commission member Mr. Charles Wood was absent.

Mr. Deal called the meeting to order and entertained a motion to approve the meeting agenda. Mr. Chickering made a motion to accept the minutes and Mr. Hall seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Deal entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the September 19 meeting. Mr. Youngmans made a motion to accept the minutes and Mr. Hall seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Consideration of a request to annex property at 1128 Chesnut Street and 1130 Chesnut with an interim zoning of MPD; rezone property at 2200 Carter Street from R-15 to MPD; rezone property at 1886 Greene Street Extension from R-10 to MPD

Mr. Rorie and Mr. Putnam gave a presentation that provided information on the proposed development. The proposed development is comprised of four parcels: 1128 Chesnut Street, 1130 Chesnut Street, 2200 Carter Street, 1886 Greene Street Extension. These parcels combined are approximately 310.88 acres. The developer requested to convert the property into a residential development using the Master Planned District (MPD) zoning classification. The proposal calls for a total of 795 lots, which includes 140 townhomes and 655 single-family homes. Based on the total acreage of the site, this will result in a density of 2.56 units/acre.

The development would be built in five phases as follows: Phase 1 (134 lots), Phase 2 (201 lots), Phase 3 (192 lots), Phase 4 (131 lots), and Phase 5 (124 lots). The developer expects a 7-10 year period for total build out of the project. Lots for the single-family homes will range from approximately 7,000 square feet to 12,420 square feet. The development includes approximately 111.59 acres of open space, which includes approximately 37.58 acres of wetlands. This is approximately 35% of the total area of the site.

A traffic impact analysis was conducted for the development by a professional engineering firm. Traffic to and from the site will use a proposed extension of Chesnut Street; a proposed access on Battleship Road approximately 2900 feet south of Carter Street aligned with Five Bridge Road (S-198); a proposed access on Carter Street about 2650 feet north of Chesnut Street; and a

proposed access on Carter Street approximately 2650 feet north of Chesnut Street aligned with Access 2. The analysis determined that a right-turn lane would be required on Battleship Road at Access 1, a dedicated left turn signal would be required at the intersection of Battleship Road and Dekalb Street, and an additional right only turn lane would be required on the southbound side of Battleship Road at the intersection with Dekalb Street. At the end of the presentation, Mr. Rorie stated that the staff recommendation was to not annex the property until a development agreement for the development is completed.

Following the staff presentation, Mr. Deal entertained a motion to open the public hearing. Mr. Hall made a motion to open the public hearing, and Mr. Younghans seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Kip Elser stated that training centers across the country are in decline, and now that the center is closed, developing the property is the next best option.

Ms. Lisa Moore expressed concerns about traffic generated by the development and additional crime. She also stated concerns about the number of homes proposed and would prefer fewer homes in the area. She stated she was opposed to the annexation and development.

Ms. Kristy Ayers stated she lives on Carter Street near the training center and that she believed Carter Street could not handle the traffic from the development. She stated she was opposed to the annexation and development.

Mr. Sidney Locke expressed opposition to the annexation and development and said he felt the project did not make financial sense for the city.

Ms. Anna Locke expressed appreciation for work done on the city's comprehensive plan. She stated she was glad staff recommended pausing the annexation process.

Mr. Arch Kingsley stated he is a horse trainer and that the facility should be preserved as an equine training facility. He expressed opposition to the annexation and development.

Mr. Charles Gary stated he thought it was a good idea to annex the property to reduce the size of the donut hole made in the city limits by the property.

Mr. Rob Brown stated he has experience in the construction industry. He explained he was glad that the MPD would provide a clear description of what would be allowed and not allowed.

Mr. Jim Melton stated he believed the development is too large and that he opposed the annexation and development.

Ms. Diane Dubose stated that she felt the development does not fit in Camden and that if it was approved people would think Camden is anti-horse. She expressed concern that the increase in traffic would hinder transportation of injured animal in the area to receive care. She stated she

was opposed to the annexation and development.

Mr. Ted Brunson said he had concerns about financial issues with the city, concerns about preserving trees, and that the project was too large for the city. He stated he was opposed to the annexation and development.

Ms. Lisa Brook Smets said she was concerned about additional traffic, particularly the increase in traffic that has occurred on Red Fox Road. She stated she was opposed to the annexation and development.

Ms. Molly Bridges said she was concerned about gentrification and the character of the development. She preferred the property be put in a conservation easement or use the RE zoning district. She stated she was opposed to the annexation and development.

Ms. Linda Franklin Moore said she was concerned about additional traffic and that the development would cause an increase in taxes. She stated she did not believe the city had adequate sewer capacity to handle the project. She stated she was opposed to the annexation and development.

Mr. Scott Burris stated he was opposed to the annexation and development and provided a signed petition on the opposition.

Ms. Harriett Burns expressed concern about the impact on the school system and asked the proposal be paused until that could be addressed.

Mr. William Tetterton stated he was opposed to the annexation and development. He referenced conversations from a town hall meeting held earlier in the year.

Mr. Mike Burkett said he had concerns about capacity of utilities and the impact on schools. He asked if in the future proposals could be made available in advance of the meeting. He stated he was opposed to the annexation and development.

Mr. Allen Cobb said he did not believe the city could afford the improvements needed for the development. He stated he was opposed to the annexation and development.

Mr. Matt Semple said he thought there is too much growth in the area and was opposed to the annexation.

Mr. Paul Wood stated he did not like the layout of the proposal and asked that it be redesigned to not include any cul-de-sacs.

Ms. Jamie Stokes stated she was opposed to the annexation and development.

Mr. James Fix stated he felt the development would push horse people out of the Camden area.

He stated he was opposed to the annexation and development.

Ms. Sharon Huffstelter stated she believed the proposed housing is too expensive for the area. She stated she was opposed to the annexation and development.

Ms. Felicia Elliott expressed concerns about the size of the development and the traffic impacts to the surrounding area. She stated she was opposed to the annexation and development.

Mr. Deal entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Mohr made a motion to close the public hearing, and Mr. Hall seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Following discussion, Mr. Chickering made a motion to recommend that City Council not recommend that City Council annex the property until such time that a formal Development Agreement is available that memorializes development terms, including development timing and phasing, the payment of certain development charges and fees, the design and conveyance of certain development infrastructure (including planned public infrastructure), design standards, and vesting of certain rights for the property prior to annexation and subsequent zoning. Mr. Younghans seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Based on the outcome of the item #4, the Commission agreed to defer consideration of agenda item #5 to a future meeting.

Consideration of a request to modify the preliminary plat for a major subdivision (Wylie Street Townhomes)

Mr. Putnam explained the developer requested approval of a revised preliminary plat. The soil conditions on the west side of the property are not conducive for development, so the layout was revised to push the developed area east. The revised plans reduced the total number of dwelling units from 39 to 30 by removing some units, relocating others, changing the end of the dead end street on the west side of the property to a hammerhead style end, and relocated the dumpster location to the end of the cul-de-sac street. Mr. Putnam stated the revised layout complies with the development regulations.

Following discussion, Mr. Younghans made a motion to approve the revised preliminary plat for the Wylie Street townhomes. Mr. Hall seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

Consideration of amendments to the Land Development Regulations regarding requirements for sidewalks

Mr. Putnam explained that staff was proposing changes to the regulations on sidewalks to address two issues. The first is to have more specific requirements on the construction of sidewalks. The second is to change the requirements to make sidewalks optional, but if they are installed they must be maintained by a homeowners association. The change is needed because the city feels it should be not paying to maintain sidewalks for a specific neighborhood when

only the residents of the neighborhood are using them. The city is already having difficulty in maintaining the existing sidewalks, so accepting more sidewalks is not desirable.

Several Commission expressed concerns about removing the requirement to install sidewalks. Following discussion, the Commission requested staff consider requiring sidewalks but having a homeowners association maintain them.

There being no further business, Mr. Hall made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Chickering seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.

Shawn Putnam
Secretary

Johnny Deal
Chair