

# SUMTER CITY - COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

## Minutes of the Meeting

May 25, 2022

<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	<p>A regular meeting of the Sumter City – County Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, May 25, 2022, in the City Council Chambers located on the Fourth Floor of the Sumter Opera House. Six board members: Mr. Chris Sumpter, Mr. James Munford, Mr. Jim Price, Mr. Keith Ivey, Mr. Michael Walker, and Ms. Kim Harvin – were present. Mr. Jim Crawley, Mr. Jason Ross and Mr. Gary Brown were absent.</p> <p>Staff members present were Ms. Helen Roodman, Mr. Jeff Derwort and Ms. Kellie Chapman.</p> <p>The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Mr. Jim Price.</p>
<b>MINUTES</b>	<p>Mr. Chris Sumpter made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 27, 2022, meeting as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Keith Ivey and carried a unanimous vote.</p>
<b>NEW BUSINESS</b>	<p><b><u>MSP-22-14, 1416 N. Main St. (County)</u></b> was presented by Mr. Jeff Derwort. The Board reviewed the request for Major Site Plan Approval for a 425,000 sq. ft. Photovoltaic Energy Collection System (Solar Farm).</p> <p>Mr. Derwort added the facility will include an array of individual ground mounted solar energy collection panels, a security fence, and access driveway, stormwater retention ponds, and an inverter/transformer assembly.</p> <p>Mr. Derwort stated, staff recommends approval subject to the stated Conditions of Approval outlined in Exhibit 1.</p> <p>After some discussion, Mr. Chris Sumpter made a motion to approve subject to staff's recommendations and proposed conditions of approval outlined in Exhibit 1, as well as the site and landscaping plans titled "<i>Runnymede Solar, LLC Major Site Plan</i>". Prepared by Booth &amp; Associates, LLC, dated April 25, 2022. The motion was seconded by Mr. Michael Walker and carried a five (Sumpter, Walker, Price, Munford, Ivey) in favor and one (Harvin) in opposition. The motion carried.</p> <p><b><u>OA-22-08, Residential Front Setback Requirements in the R-9, R-6, GR, RMF, and Commercial Districts (City)</u></b> was presented by Mr. Jeff Derwort. The Board reviewed the request to amend Article 3, Section 3.b.5.; Article 3, Exhibit 3-1; Article 3, Exhibit 3-2; Article 3, Exhibit 3-3; and Article 3, Exhibit</p>

3-6 to increase front setback requirements for various development types to 35 ft.

Mr. Derwort stated the proposed amendment is applicable to all development types in the R-9 zoning district, the R-6 zoning district, and the GR zoning district. In the RMF district, it is applicable to all development types except for suburban multi-family apartments and urban multi-family apartments. In the commercial zoning districts, it is applicable to all residential development types except for suburban multi-family apartments and urban multi-family apartments.

Mr. Derwort mentioned the goal of this proposed change is to address ongoing parking challenges present in many, primarily newer, residential neighborhoods throughout the city. Prior to 2014, the minimum front setback requirements within the above stated zoning districts were set at 35 ft. However, those front setback minimums were reduced in 2014 (reference OA-14-05 & OA-14-08) to give flexibility to developers in site design and to allow for compatible infill development in the historic city core.

Mr. Derwort added if the amendment is approved, it would be applicable to any new lot created via the minor or major subdivision approval process in the applicable zoning districts and to any existing lot of record located outside of an existing major subdivision scheme approved by the Planning Commission in the applicable zoning districts. Any existing development that does not conform to this proposed change is considered non-conforming and is subject to the requirements of Article 6: Nonconforming Zoning Uses and Sites of the Ordinance. Existing Planned Developments would not be impacted by this change.

Major subdivision developments that are currently under construction and have received general development plan or preliminary plat approval by the Planning Commission using the front setbacks applicable at the time of approval are considered vested under *Article 7, Section 7.d.5* and *Article 7, Section 7.f.c.* of the Ordinance. Thus, development would be permitted to be constructed under the front setback requirements in place at the time of approval. Vested rights are considered to be in place regarding this proposed change for major subdivision approvals because setback information and typical lot layout exhibits are taken into account when the development (as a whole) is approved by the Planning Commission.

Minor subdivision approvals since 2014, in most cases, are not considered to carry the same vested rights for front setbacks as compared to major subdivision approvals due to either 1) the approved plats not containing setback information similar to a major approval or 2) any vesting period has expired due to lack of development.

After some discussion, Ms. Kim Harvin made a motion to recommend approval to amend Article 3, Section 3.b.5.; Article 3, Exhibit 3-1; Article 3, Exhibit 3-2; Article 3, Exhibit 3-3; and Article 3, Exhibit 3-6 to increase front setback requirements for various development types to 35 ft. The motion was

	seconded by Mr. Keith Ivey and carried a unanimous vote.
<b>OLD BUSINESS</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>DIRECTOR'S REPORT</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:40 p.m. by acclamation.  The next scheduled meeting is June 22, 2022
	Respectfully submitted, <i>Kellie K. Chapman</i> Kellie K. Chapman, Board Secretary