

**City of Camden
Planning Commission
July 9, 2012**

Minutes

The City of Camden Planning Commission met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, July 9, 2012 at 6:00 PM at City Hall. Commission members present were Mr. Bill Ligon, Chairman; Mr. Jim Burns, Ms. Joanna Craig, Mr. Johnny Deal and Mr. Shawn Putnam, Secretary. Commission members Mr. Brandon Moore, Mr. Charles Wood and Mr. Byron Johnson were absent. Also present was Ms. Cheryl Matheny, Ms. Carol Rhea and Ms. Peggy Ogburn.

Mr. Ligon called the meeting to order and entertained a motion to accept the minutes from the June 19, 2012 and June 26, 2012 meetings. Ms. Craig moved to accept the minutes, and Mr. Deal seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

Presentation on Zoning Ordinance Update

Ms. Rhea referred to the table of design standards and opened the discussion on changes Commission members wanted to make. Mr. Burns asked if some of the standards could be written more clearly. For example, the standard requiring a coordinated plan for multiple awnings appears to state a plan is required even if they are not used. Ms. Rhea and Ms. Matheny said they could revised the wording to make it clearer.

Ms. Craig asked if the symbols in the table could be changed so that it was clearer on which part of a standard was required. Ms. Rhea said she would move the symbols so they were listed at the top of each row.

Mr. Burns noted that in the section on facades, windows and roofs there was a reference to the symbol U for standards in the underlying district. Ms. Rhea stated she would delete that because standards in the underlying districts were not being referenced.

Ms. Craig referenced the standard stating openings had to be square and vertical in proportion and asked if that meant opening could not be any shape other than square. Ms. Rhea explained that this standard was from the Smartcode and thought it meant that openings do not have to be square but should be as tall as it is wide or taller than it is wide. Ms. Rhea agreed to reword the statement to be clearer.

Mr. Ligon referenced the standards under section F relating to the current overlay districts and asked if we could reference architectural styles or some other reference instead of referring to specific buildings. Ms. Matheny asked about using a phrase such as "in aesthetic harmony with surrounding or nearby historic properties." Ms. Craig stated that it could refer to the historic district. Mr. Putnam said that could cause confusion between whether to apply the zoning

design standards or the historic design standards. After a lengthy discussion Commission members agreed to have Ms. Rhea reword the standard to reference nearby historic buildings. Mr. Putnam agreed to provide Ms. Rhea the sections of streets where the standard would apply.

Ms. Rhea mentioned that the standard on page 6 under item (A)(6) would be moved to the section on paving.

Mr. Putnam asked for an explanation of standard 3 on page 8 relating to parking. Ms. Rhea stated that on a large lot, outparcels at the street could be used to shield the parking lot for the larger building from the street. Mr. Ligon said this was a similar situation to how the Walmart property is developed. Ms. Rhea said she would rewrite the section to make it easier to understand.

Mr. Putnam noted that on page 8, item 4 relating to accessing parking through rear alleys, there were no districts marked as required. After a lengthy discussion the Commission agreed to require this standard in the B1 and B3 districts.

Mr. Putnam referenced item 6 on page 8 and asked what is meant by a "zoning lot." Ms. Rhea said this was the same as a development site, which could include multiple lots. She said she would change the wording on this item.

Mr. Burns noted that all of the sections on pages 9-15 did not have intent statements. Ms. Rhea said they were in a previous version and would be added back in.

Mr. Ligon referenced item (C)(1) on page 9 relating to driveways being paved and asked if residential areas should be exempt from this requirement. Ms. Rhea suggested that this should not apply to single family or duplexes but should apply to other multifamily units. Mr. Burns suggested the statement in item 1 regarding pervious paving could be used in the intent statement for this section. The Commission also agreed that parking areas for employees and customers at industrial sites should be paved.

Mr. Ligon asked if the city could require utilities to be placed underground. Commission members agreed that utility connections for new non-residential services should be underground. Mr. Putnam said he would ask if the public works department already requires this or not.

Ms. Rhea stated that on the recommendation of Mr. Putnam the design standards for streets, sidewalks, trails and pedestrian pathways should be include in the land development regulations instead of the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Putnam offered the following suggestions:

- Page 2, item 8: this standard relates to commercial buildings and should not be required in any residential district

- Page 3, item 1: change the term “cementitious” to “fiber cement”
- Page 4, items 11, 13, 14: require the standard in the B3 district
- Page 4, item 12: delete the sentence in parenthesis relating to industrial buildings
- Page 5, item 16: delete the sentence in parenthesis relating to industrial buildings
- Page 6, items 1-3: do not require in the EQ district
- Page 6, item 1: change OI to I1
- Page 6, item 4: require this standard in B3 district
- Page 6, item 9: only require the standard in the PDD district because private streets are only allowed in that district
- Page 7, item 1: delete the sentence in parenthesis relating to industrial buildings
- Page 8, items 7 and 8: require the standard in the B3 district
- Page 9, item (C)(3): require the standard in B2 but not OI
- Page 10, item (D)(3): require the standard in the OI and GD districts
- Page 11, item 9: combine with item (A)(9) on page 8 and add requiring it in the OI and GD districts
- Page 12, item 2: require in OI, B2 and GD districts

Ms. Matheny stated that at the next meeting requirements for landscaping and buffers would be discussed. There being no further business, Ms. Craig made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Burns seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.

Shawn Putnam
Secretary

Bill Ligon
Chairman