

**City of Camden
Planning Commission
October 21, 2014**

Minutes

The City of Camden Planning Commission met for a regular meeting on October 21, 2014 at 6:00 PM in the Large Conference Room at City Hall. Commission members present were Mr. Johnny Deal, Vice-Chairman; Mr. Brandon Moore, Ms. Peggy Ogburn, Ms. Joanna Craig, Mr. Charles Wood and Mr. Shawn Putnam, Secretary. Commission members Mr. Bill Ligon and Mr. Byron Johnson were absent. Also present was Ms. Liz Gilland.

Mr. Deal called the meeting to order and entertained a motion to accept the minutes from the September 16, 2014 meeting. Ms. Ogburn moved to accept the minutes and Mr. Moore seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

Zoning Ordinance Update

Mr. Putnam indicated that there were three sections of the ordinance to be reviewed during the meeting. The first section covers requirements for landscaping, buffers, open space, and tree protection. The Commission then engaged in a discussion of the following changes to the requirements.

❖ General

- Enforcement of this section done primarily by Urban Forester instead of Zoning Administrator
- Add references to Chapter 100 of city code on trees to incorporate approved list of trees and shrubs and planting installation standards
- Identified minimum size for new trees
- Added prohibition on clear cutting residential property without approval
- Added requirement to mandate irrigation for landscaping except single family residential
- Added more specific requirements on maintenance of landscaping

❖ Buffers

- Buffers divided into two categories: street buffers and property buffers.
- Removed specific buffer types A-D with required buffer widths. Instead of identifying specific size trees and spacing, the section identifies area requirements for different size trees and requires 40% of buffer area to be planted with plantings other than trees.
- Parking lot landscaping requirements revised to require islands in lots are at least 200 square feet instead of specifying 10 feet by 19 feet to provide flexibility in design. Added requirement for large maturing trees unless overhead utility lines are present.

❖ Screening

- Added specifications for berms.

❖ Open Space

- Ordinance now requires 20% of land area to be open space in multi-family developments containing 20 or more units and manufactured home parks with more than 9 units. Also requires 10% of area to be open space in single family residential developments with 20 or more units.
- Allows for open space to be publicly or privately owned.
- Differentiates between regular open space and environmental open space, which includes wetlands and floodplains.

❖ Tree Conservation

- Deletes tree protection area and applies requirements citywide
- Requires permit to remove a significant tree (defined as a tree with a DBH between 8 – 25 inches).
- Prohibits removal of significant trees prior to any land disturbance and before obtaining a grading, land disturbance or building permit.
- Adds specific requirements for tree removal and requires tree replacement standards (15 large mature trees for each acre cleared) on tree plantations.
- Adds requirement that all new single family residential lots contain a minimum of 4 trees (similar to current 157.090(C)(4)).
- Adds requirements for protection of significant trees during construction (fencing, spacing, etc.)
- Creates a tree fund that developers can be approved to pay into if replacement trees cannot be planted due to extraordinary circumstances
- Adds requirements for forestry activity in accordance with state law.

Ms. Gilland noted that the size requirements for new trees were in caliper in inches, and that she recommending adding standards for container grown trees in the event that a specific type of tree was only available in containers based on the time of year.

Mr. Putnam stated that the requirement to prohibit clear cutting without approval on residential lots was added because the current tree protection requirements were instituted primarily due to residential lots being clear cut. Approval will only be given if a tree replacement plan is approved, and the plan must include a minimum of four trees, of which one must be a large maturing tree and one must be in the front yard.

Mr. Putnam stated that where large maturing trees are required, there is an exception for smaller trees if overhead utility lines or street lights are present.

Mr. Putnam noted that in the buffer requirements that they were not required in the B-1 zoning district. Ms. Ogburn asked how that would have applied in the last rezoning request where there was a single family residential home next to a business. Mr. Putnam indicated he would look into revising that requirement to ensure some type of buffer was required.

The commission reviewed the requirements on tree conservation and how they would be applied to single family residential lots. After some discussion the commission decided that

owners of single family homes should not be required to receive a permit in order to remove a significant tree from their property. However the requirement in the general section stating that single family residential lots cannot be clear cut would still apply.

Mr. Putnam stated the definition of a significant tree was being changed from six inches in diameter to a range of eight to twenty-five inches. Ms. Gilland explained that trees larger than twenty-five inches in diameter are more susceptible to damage, disease and stress which makes them more likely to fail and possibly cause damage to people or property.

Mr. Putnam reviewed the new requirement that no significant trees shall be removed prior to a land disturbance or building permit being issued. Any significant trees that were approved to be removed would be required to be replaced. It also requires that all significant trees on the property be indicated on the site plan. The requirement includes language to recommend a preliminary review of the site plan by the urban forester. After some discussion the commission agreed that a preliminary review of the site plan by the urban forester should be required rather than recommended.

Mr. Putnam explained that the current ordinance requires residential lots in the tree protection area have four trees planted, and the new ordinance maintains this requirement but applies it city wide. This requirement would apply to new houses.

The commission discussed a new section that would establish a tree fund that a developer could pay into if they could not comply with the planting requirements in the ordinance. Ms. Gilland explained that a developer would need to justify a valid reason why the plantings could not be installed before taking this option. Mr. Putnam stated this would be more effective than having a developer go through the variance process because they could not fit a tree on their property. The money in the tree fund would be used to plant trees in the city.

Mr. Putnam and Ms. Gilland explained the new requirements on tree protection zones. Significant trees that would be retained must be protected by fencing or some type of barrier to prevent any entry into the protection area. This is to protect the root system of the tree to ensure it survives the construction process.

The commission reviewed a new section on tree pruning. Ms. Gilland recommended deleting this section since it is duplicates requirements in the section on tree maintenance. The Commission agreed to delete this section.

Mr. Putnam reviewed the following changes to the next section of the ordinance on performance standards.

❖ Light and Glare

- Added exemptions for government entities
- Added height requirements for lights
- Included light requirements for manufactured home parks

❖ Manufacturing Standards

- Incorporates most standards previously listed in conditional use section (current 157.043)
- Revises noise requirements to simplify allowed decibel levels and add standards for noise testing
- Adds requirements for radiation hazard standards, electromagnetic radiation and interference standards, and liquid and solid waste standards.

After some discussion of the requirements the commission agreed on the section.

Mr. Putnam reviewed the following changes to the next section of the ordinance on development agreements.

- ❖ Adds more detail to what is required in the content of a development agreement (use of buildings and land, dimensional standards, design standards, use conditions, performance standards, and phasing plan). Requires more specific requirements for onsite and offsite improvements.
- ❖ Requires restrictive covenants to be submitted with the development agreement, if applicable.
- ❖ Adds requirement that agreement is void if not recorded within 14 days of approval.

Mr. Putnam noted these were not substantial changes but just clarified existing requirements based on state law. After some discussion of the requirements the commission agreed on the section.

There being no further business, Ms. Craig made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Moore seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.

Shawn Putnam
Secretary

Johnny Deal
Vice-Chairman