City of Camden Planning Commission April 16, 2024

Minutes

The City of Camden Planning Commission met for a regular meeting on April 16, 2024 at 6:15 PM. Commission members present were Mr. Johnny Deal, Chair; Mr. Mark Chickering, Mr. Hall, Mr. Mark Mohr, Mr. Jay Hudson; and Mr. Shawn Putnam, Secretary.

Mr. Deal called the meeting to order and entertained a motion to approve the meeting agenda. Mr. Mohr made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Chickering seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Putnam explained that the minutes from the March meeting were not ready because the audio recording system in the room failed to save the recording of the March meeting.

Consideration of a request for a minor subdivision at 302 Shannon Lane

Mr. Putnam stated the request is to subdivide the parcel at 302 Shannon Lane into two lots. The proposed complies with the zoning ordinance. He explained the Land Development Regulations require that any subdivision in the National Register District be approved by the Planning Commission. The proposal was reviewed by the Chair of the Historic Landmarks Commission and no objections were raised.

Mr. Deal entertained a motion to approve the subdivision as presented. Mr. Chickering made the motion, and Mr. Hudson seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

Consideration of a sketch plan for a major subdivision at 1946 Rowe Street

Mr. Putnam introduced Mr. Josh Rabon to give an overview of the proposed subdivision. The property is on the north side of McRae Road, primarily off of Rowe Street. The subdivision is proposed as a cluster subdivision, which allows lot sizes to be reduced by up to 50% in exchange for additional open space. It includes 185 lots for single-family detached homes.

Mr. Putnam presented the staff report for the proposal. He indicated that staff and Mr. Rabon were working to cost share upgrades needed to a sewer lift station to accommodate the subdivision. The City would provide electric and sewer utilities, and water would be provided by Cassatt Water Company. He noted that the normal requirement for open space for a subdivision it 10%, and this development has 25% open space. Mr. Putnam stated staff recommends approval of the sketch plan as presented with the following required to be submitted with the preliminary plat: traffic impact analysis and documentation from Cassatt Water that they can provide sufficient water to serve six-inch water lines.

Following discussion, Mr. Mohr made a motion to approve the sketch plan as presented with the following required to be submitted with the preliminary plat: traffic impact analysis and documentation from Cassatt Water that they can provide sufficient water to serve six-inch water lines. Mr. Chickering seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

Consideration of amendments to the Land Development Regulations regarding requirements for utilities, sidewalks and traffic impacts

Mr. Putnam reviewed the discussion from the March meeting on the amendments. Based on concerns raised about water and sewer feasibility studies being required to be conducted by developers, all references to water and sewer feasibility studies were deleted from the ordinance. All other changes were the same.

Following discussion, Mr. Mohr made a motion to recommend City Council approve the amendments to the Land Development Regulations. Mr. Hall seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

Consideration of amendments to the Zoning Ordinance

- 157.025 157.029 (Zoning districts)
- 157.093 157.097 (Design standards)
- 157.136 157.141 (Landscaping, buffers, open space and tree conservation)

Mr. Putnam states that staff was proposing two new zoning districts. The first was a Parks and Recreation zoning district. He noted all of the parks in the City are zoned R-15, and that many communities have this type of zoning for their parks. The second was a new zoning district for property owned by Historic Camden. The property is currently zoned R-15, and this is causing conflicts with plans for the property by the Historic Camden Foundation. He reviewed a list of proposed uses and discussed them with the Commission. Following discussion the Commission asked for several revisions to the allowed uses for the Historic Camden zoning.

Mr. Putnam reviewed the revised design standards for non-residential developments. The intent of the following amendments is to make the section on design standards easier to use, and to reduce the number of overlay districts. The current section on design standards is in a table format, and based on feedback we have determined it is not very user friendly. This revision will replace the existing section with a new section that is in narrative format. The new section on design standards includes the following:

- Restate requirements for all commercial development. These requirements are very similar to the existing requirements. Additional requirements were added on building articulation and exterior materials.
- Restate requirements for the Commercial Overlay District. These requirements are mostly the same as the existing requirements, with additional graphics for clarification.

Combine Downtown Core Overlay District and Corridor Overlay District into a
 Downtown overlay district. The requirements for these two overlay districts were 99%
 the same, so it makes sense to combine them. A section in the requirements details
 specific requirements for the area that was identified as the Downtown Core area. The
 overlay district is also expanded to include some sections of Rutledge Street and Market
 Street.

Following discussion, the Commission requested Mr. Putnam specify which requirements were new in the design standards.

Mr. Putnam described the following proposed amendments to the section on landscaping, buffers, open space and tree conservation requirements.

- Change "Urban Forester" to "Zoning Administrator" throughout section
- Add new section on landscape requirements for residential uses. This new section
 defines landscape requirements for single-family units and multi-family developments.
 For single-family dwelling units it requires a tree in the front yard and back yard, and
 some shrubs along the front. There are also requirements to require a tree and some
 shrubs for the side of a house that is on a corner lot. The requirements for multi-family
 developments are written in a broad way to allow for flexibility in the landscape design.
- Revise requirements for streets buffers. This includes two revisions to the requirements.
 - First is to remove the requirements that streets buffers must be 6-8 feet in width and state that the buffer must be within 20 feet of the front property line. This will allow for more flexibility in the location and design of the buffer area. It is especially helpful in areas where utilities are installed.
 - The other revision is a new requirement to require a street buffer for major subdivisions. The requirement states the buffer must be at least 30 feet wide for single-family developments and 50 feet for multi-family developments to provide separation between the homes and the street. It includes a requirement that existing wooded areas must be supplemented with additional trees if it does not provide an adequate screen.
- Revise section on property buffers. These revisions replace the existing table with a new table to identify the width of buffers between different uses. The current table provides several areas where no buffer is required. In the new tables, only single-family detached homes or duplexes on infill lots or in existing subdivision would not require a buffer. The revisions also include increasing the required number of large maturing trees from 1.5 every 100 feet to 2 every 100 feet. It also includes a statement that for single-family developments the buffer must not be located on any platted lots and must be maintained by a homeowners association.
- Add a requirement for the parking lot standards to require a continuous row of evergreen shrubs along roadways and shared access drives that are not already protected by a land use buffer.

Following discussion the Commission concurred with the proposed amendments for landscaping, buffers, open space and tree conservation requirements.

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

Shawn Putnam

Secretary