

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
March 2, 2023**

[\(3\) Planning Commission - YouTube](#)

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andy Nef
Jeff Bolingbroke
Julie Farr
Manya Stolrow
David Gossner
David Park
Sean Wilkinson

EXCUSED

Dean Stokes
Chad Kotter

STAFF PRESENT

Amy Mabey, City Administrator
Brandon Bell, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Dana Shuler, City Engineer

VISITORS

None noted

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Brooke Smith, MMC

MINUTES APPROVED:

Approved August 3, 2023

Commission Chair, Andy Nef, called the meeting to order at 6 pm

OPENING PRAYER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTREST

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM, and all attendees were welcomed. Attendees were encouraged to ask questions if they needed clarification during the meeting. The meeting began with the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance and an opening prayer led by Commissioner Wilkinson. The prayer expressed gratitude for the freedoms enjoyed in the country, acknowledged the beauty of the area, and requested manageable spring runoff to prevent flooding. There was also a mention of helping those in need and being good neighbors and citizens.

The attendees were reminded to declare any conflicts of interest regarding the agenda items. However, no conflicts of interest were declared.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:

Wildcat Minor Subdivision (Planning & Zoning Administrator, Brandon Bell)

The administrative item discussed was the Wildcat Minor subdivision in the Planning and Zoning administration. Brandon Bell was assigned to review the items related to this subdivision. The reason behind this subdivision was the applicant's desire to expand their current lot in accordance with a recent code amendment that allowed for the extension of storage facilities in the area. To ensure compliance with the ordinance and legal requirements, a minor subdivision was deemed necessary. The minor subdivision criteria were met, as it consisted of one lot, combining three or four parcels. The location of the subdivision was also in accordance with the requirement of being on an existing dedicated public driveway.

The applicant had already fulfilled the necessary improvements and obtained a deferral from the Planning Commission. The expansion of the facility complied with the limitations on the total storage

unit area and distance from the property boundary. The expansion area was more than 250 feet away from the adjacent road. The acreage of the subdivision fell below the maximum allowed 10 acres. However, there were minor issues regarding the water line and the buildings on the site.

The water line, originally intended for culinary water services, would now serve as a fire service line due to the combination of properties. The city recommended removing the easement and transferring ownership to the property owner. Additionally, the applicant was advised to demolish certain existing structures before construction or issuance of a new building permit, ensuring compliance with the upcoming site plan. This condition aimed to guarantee that the subdivision would be used for its intended purpose.

Other recommended conditions of approval included marking the combined parcels on the plat, securing demolition permits, addressing red-line comments from the city engineer, and finalizing the application. The Planning Commission raised questions and sought clarifications on various aspects, such as the property boundaries, demolition timing, waterline access, and water retention. Staff and the applicant provided satisfactory explanations, ensuring that the project would proceed according to the proposed plan.

MOTION

A motion to close the public hearing related to agenda item two, which was seconded and unanimously agreed upon.

MOTION

However, it was later corrected that the public hearing needed to be opened before proceeding further. Commissioner Farr expressed appreciation for the thorough research conducted by Mr. Feld. Once the public hearing was officially opened, attendees were invited to voice their questions, thoughts, or concerns about the presented project.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

One member of the public inquired about the petitioner's willingness to collaborate with other property owners, and the response indicated a general willingness to cooperate.

MOTION

After no further comments were received from the public, a motion was made and seconded to close the public hearing.

DISCUSSION

The discussion then shifted to the possibility of making a motion related to the project. Clarifications were sought regarding the recommended conditions, including the demolition of old buildings in the construction zone and the finalization of the application. Questions were raised about the city's ability to withhold the building permit until the old buildings were torn down. The possibility of delaying the subdivision plat until the demolition was completed was discussed to ensure the city had control over the process. Concerns were raised about potential delays and financial implications for the petitioner.

The time frame for the demolition process was also deliberated, with suggestions that it could occur simultaneously with other project steps.

Commissioner Wilkinson expressed support for allowing demolition before site plan approval based on previous experience with subdivisions, while Commissioner Nef agreed and expressed confidence in the administrative staff's presented plan. Participants were then requested to make a motion, and Commissioner Farr sought clarification regarding the restriction on storage units and their history. An explanation was given about the city council's rezoning efforts and the limitations on storage unit locations. Concerns raised by Brandon Bell were discussed, focusing on the potential issue of having two different uses on the same property.

The city's authority and legal standing were questioned, and it was clarified that the requirements should align with the existing code. Concerns were raised about losing control and potential non-compliance if the demolition was not completed. Brandon emphasized the need to ensure progress toward meeting the site plan and avoiding a situation where the property deviated from the approved plan. The process steps, including subdivision approval, site plan submission, and building permits, were clarified.

Concerns about the delay and financial impact of starting the demolition process before being ready for the site plan were brought up. The timing of the demolition and whether it should be a requirement during the subdivision approval were further discussed. Commissioner Wilkinson shared his opinion that the demolition should be required before the site plan approval, considering the proposed changes to the new site. However, concerns were raised about being too restrictive and potentially burdening the petitioner.

During a meeting, the commission discussed that there may be some aspects that need to be demolished before progressing to the next step. They express their support for removing the requirements to demolish before the site plan or recording the subdivision. They acknowledge that this issue might be addressed in the following steps of the process.

MOTION

The speaker then requests a motion from the Commission. A motion was made, stating that they recommend approval of the Wildcat storage minor subdivision with the proposed conditions set by the staff.

CONDITIONS OF THE MOTION

One of the conditions they mention is the removal or demolition of additional buildings on the current storage unit property *before* recording the subdivision plat.

After making the motion, the speaker asks if there is a second to support the motion. Another member of the Commission seconds the motion.

DISCUSSION

The floor was then opened for discussion regarding the motion. The speaker clarifies that they are approving the proposal as it is stated in the written packet.

They further explain their reasoning, stating that they are okay with what the staff is proposing because the site plan and the subdivision process can run concurrently. They mention that the site plan is scheduled to be on the agenda for the next month and is likely to be approved if it meets all requirements. Thus, they do not see any need for a delay in recording the subdivision. They believe that once the site plan is approved, the subdivision can be recorded simultaneously, and there would not be any significant time difference. They also suggest that a condition can be added during the site plan approval process, ensuring that the demolition takes place before a building permit is issued.

VOTE

The chair of the Commission asks for any other comments or discussions related to the motion. After hearing no further input, the chair calls for a vote. All in favor of the motion say "aye," and the motion is approved unanimously.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MARCH 2, 2023 PACKET

"Staff recommends approval of the Wildcat Storage Subdivision, subject to the following recommended conditions of approval:

- *The easement on the plat for the existing culinary water line, being converted to fire flow use only, be removed, and the site owner to take possession of the water line.*
- *The applicant and/ or City be required to complete and execute any other adjustments to the plat, and/or legal instruments necessary for the applicant to take ownership of the water line, (as it is becoming a private fire service line), prior to or at the time of recording of the subdivision plat.*
- *Staff also recommends that City Staff have the option of executing a release of easement document to be filed with the County to release any claims to the easement.*
- *The applicant demolish the existing buildings on site, that conflict with what is approved on the upcoming proposed site plan, (if approved), prior to recording of the subdivision plat. Recording of the subdivision plat should be considered subject to these buildings being demolished, as the applicant is vesting additional rights for additional storage units, with the recording of the subdivision; the City has an interest in ensuring that purpose is accomplished. Demolition permits need to be secured for the demolition of existing buildings and structures.*
- *Any redline comments currently spelled out by City Engineer on Plat (included as an Exhibit to this document).*
- *Show the former property lines that on the plat, that are included within the extents of the current subdivision, in light grey, with parcel numbers, while indicating that they are being superceded by the current plat.*
- *The above recommended conditions of approval be reviewed for completion by members of the Development Review Committee.*
- *Other adjustments needed to plat necessary to record."*

Admiral Beverage Site Plan (Planning & Zoning Administrator, Brandon Bell)

The Planning Commission meeting began with the next agenda item being introduced, which was the Admiral Beverage Site Plan. The Planning and Zoning administrator, Brandon Bell, presented the topic. He explained that the site in question was an existing facility with a large bottling operation. The focus of the discussion was a small expansion proposed for one of the buildings. The city engineer confirmed that the necessary right of way was already available, eliminating the need for a subdivision or additional property. No changes were planned for the impervious surface on-site, significantly limiting

the scope of the Planning Commission's review. The main aspects to consider were parking and setbacks.

Based on the city staff's assessment, they recommended approving the proposed site plan in accordance with the city's zoning and building code regulations. The staff suggested a minor variation on the building's footprint within the setback requirements, without expanding the impervious area or reducing parking spaces. The applicant's proposed expansion was located 4.39 feet from the east property line and 954 feet from the north property line, complying with the setback requirements.

Additionally, the applicant stated that the parking capacity was based on a ratio of one parking stall for every two employees on-site during the highest shift. They estimated having approximately 85 employees during the busiest period and provided documentation showing they had 66 parking spaces, exceeding the required ratio. The applicant's communication was appreciated, and the details of the parking arrangement were confirmed.

Before proceeding with questions for the staff, the issue of coordination with the fire marshal was raised. There had been a previous concern about a pallet warehouse created outside during the last expansion of the building. The fire marshal's approval for the new building's location in the southeast corner was sought. It was confirmed that the fire marshal had been made aware of the project and any potential concerns.

The applicant was then invited to come forward. Questions were invited from the Planning Commission members at that time. It was clarified that the proposed addition was for manufacturing purposes, with a small office space included. No further questions were asked by the commission, and a positive comment was made about the applicant's ability to accommodate two employees per parking stall, considering the reduced car usage nowadays.

The need for a public hearing was questioned, but it was determined that it was not required based on the information provided.

MOTION

A motion was made to approve the agenda item, specifically the Admiral Beverage site plan with the recommendations that staff made during the meeting.

A motion was seconded, and a vote was taken, resulting in unanimous approval.

The Planning Commission expressed their appreciation to the applicant for being an engaged community member and expressed excitement for the progress on the site plan. The meeting concluded with a note to work closely with the city staff on the next steps of the project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MARCH 2, 2023 PACKET

"City staff recommends approval of the proposed site plan in accordance with the city's zoning and building code regulations, with the following conditions of approval:

- *Allowing minor variation of building footprint within setback/while still meeting setback requirements, and without expanding current impervious area or reducing parking stalls."*

LEGISLATIVE ITEMS

Zoning Text Amendment Regarding Accessory Buildings in the A-5 Zone

The Legislative Item began with a request to recommend a zoning text amendment regarding accessory buildings in the A5 zone. Amy Mabey was assigned to present the item. The audience was informed that administrative matters were handled by the commission, while legislative matters required a recommendation to be made to the city council, which would then take action based on the commission's recommendation. The item being discussed was a cleanup proposal related to accessory structures in the Agricultural Residential zone.

Amy explained that currently, only agricultural accessory structures were allowed in the zone, while others were not permitted. The proposed amendment aimed to rectify this inconsistency and allow for the existence of non-agricultural accessory structures. Amy mentioned that these structures would still need to go through the regular building permit process, and there were certain size limitations specified in the code. The proposal also included applying the same setbacks required for agricultural buildings, which was in line with previous practice.

During the discussion, the commission raised questions about the proposal, particularly regarding the areas that deviated from the standard agricultural regulations. Amy clarified that previous surface limitations would still apply, ensuring that there were restrictions on the number of structures that could be built. An attachment in the packet provided additional information on the proposal. No other changes were proposed aside from the amendment under discussion.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

The commission then proceeded to open a public hearing on the matter, allowing members of the public to share their thoughts on the proposed changes to accessory buildings in the A5 zone. No comments were made.

MOTION

Afterward, a motion was made to close the public hearing, which was seconded and approved by the commission.

MOTION

Following the closure of the hearing, a motion was requested to recommend the zoning text amendment. A first motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved by the commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MARCH 2, 2023 PACKET

"The General Plan addresses the sensitive nature of the A-5 zone and ensures consideration of this upon development. Sensitive land requirements would remain applicable if accessory structures were allowable within the zone, and as such, staff recommends approval as this modification is compliant with the General Plan."

REMARKS FROM COMMISSIONER AND/OR STAFF

Moving on to the next agenda item, remarks were given by commission staff. They mentioned that there was no additional scheduled meeting for the current month but confirmed that the next meeting would be in April. There was a discussion about the meeting date, and it was mentioned that the first Thursday of April might need to be rescheduled due to potential availability and attendance

issues. The alternative date of April 13th was proposed, but it was decided to send a Doodle poll to the commission members to determine the most suitable date.

The commission was reminded to inform staff as soon as possible if they were unable to attend a meeting, as it would be important to ensure a quorum. This way, necessary arrangements could be made promptly.

They also mentioned the upcoming APA conference in Myrtle Beach, where expenses like hotel and travel are partially covered. The meeting participants expressed enthusiasm for the conference as it provides an opportunity to earn training hours.

Afterward, the staff was asked if there were any other items to discuss. Commission members mentioned their efforts to support a charity organization called "Power of Plate" and their involvement in community service projects. They highlighted the active participation of the city's youth in council activities and announced an upcoming event where seniors would present their experiences as council members. The council also discussed a project involving storm drain clearance and encouraged community participation. They mentioned safety precautions and the specific date and time for the project. The meeting concluded with updates on a funding application that received positive feedback, and the need to match the funding amount. Finally, they briefly discussed building height restrictions and the possibility of researching measures implemented by other cities.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

*Amendment: On August 3, 2023, during the Approval of Minutes section, Commissioner Wilkinson mentioned he was excused midway through this meeting. This note is to reflect that change.