

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
19 January 2021 6:30 PM
CENTRAL TOWN HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1067 WEST MAIN STREET, CENTRAL, SC 29630

MINUTES

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
 - a. Justin Rakey, Daniel Bare, Carissa Hood-Pope, Tripp Brooks (Present); Ted Balk (Call-in)
 - b. Staff, Council: Curt Edsall, Philip Mishoe, Mac Martin, Lynn Chapman (Present); Paige Bowers (Call-in)
3. Rules of order for Public Comments - Justin Rakey. 5 minutes total time per speaker allotted. Responses from Commission or Council Present may be provided as part of allotted time.
4. Public Comments and Responses
 - a. Maureen Lesley-There are many questions regarding timeliness of notification and what feels to be a rushed process. She feels the mayor, council, commission want to see the development happen and are doing what it takes to push the project through.
 - i. She does not trust the developer and does not believe they are reputable.
 - ii. She feels the need for more transparency.
 - iii. Responses from commission, council included mandatory review within 60 days, synchronization of review with planned council meetings and notification requirements. The builders application was submitted 3 days prior to a scheduled meeting.
 - b. Rachelle Buckner-She has first hand experience with the developer and does not like craftsmanship or feel they are trustworthy.
 - i. She believes a more proactive PR campaign would generate citizen trust in the process.
 - ii. Wants to understand “Why is this a good thing” and “how is the developer held in check”.
 - iii. Believes we should be looking down the road to how things can be done more transparently and feels that the process is happening too quickly
 - iv. General response from commission and council members regarding timeliness requirements and legal requirements for announcements in paper, website etc.
 - c. Janie Collins- States that developer has not been held accountable to ordinances, specifically regarding trees.
 - i. Responses from Curt and council, mayor explaining tree ordinance and offset/ credit.
 - ii. She believes the tree program should ensure that trees are planted at the site of the development
5. Standing items:
 - a. Approval of minutes of previous meeting - One item noted that minutes are labelled as “Agenda”. With this exception, motion offered to adopt. Motion seconded. Unanimously approved.

- b. General updates from Paige regarding town operations. None.
 - c. General updates from Curt regarding Main Street Program and other active projects in the town. None.
6. Old business:
- a. 2nd Reading on Main Street District proposal. This will need to be posted; requirement for posting not well understood for overlay. No opposition from council but needs to meet requirements
 - b. Mission & Vision Statements for Commission.
 - c. Review of Current Comprehensive Master Plan. Potential avenues for outside support. Justin has been in touch with Chair of Planning Dept at Clemson. Council is supportive of grad student for work for a 1 yr period starting in August. Some preparatory items include converting the existing Comp Plan to digital. Several avenues to gather citizen input were discussed. Online surveys; sandwich boards on Main St; use of data collected from Main St. program surveys. Use of extra line on water bill. Hang tags on garbage cans. Mail-in flyers.
 - d. Lawton Rd Project - Recent council meeting voted to approve annexation.
 - i. Discussed summary of public concerns - ecological, creeks, stormwater, erosion, traffic
 - ii. Preliminary site plan included option for higher density in exchange for added green space.
 - iii. Reviewed "cluster zone" ordinances from other municipalities. Provide flexibility on lot size, interior setbacks, exterior buffers.
 - iv. Discussion of requirements to include in zoning proposal & potential benefits - home prices may be reduced, less utility to run, less impermeable area, less road sqft. Concerns around replenishment of vegetation into natural areas with vegetation of same size. Need to designate an area not to be disturbed by construction. There is not enforcement mechanism within the proposal - specifically on maintenance of natural space after development. Concern regarding setbacks and proximity of homes/ density. Concern regarding future usage - sheds, additions, etc may need to be addressed as the density will be tighter than R12 would normally be. May be future concerns regarding added impermeable surface. Proposal needs discussion.
7. Next Meeting - 16 Feb
8. Adjourn