

**City of Camden  
Planning Commission  
July 21, 2015**

**Minutes**

The City of Camden Planning Commission met for a regular meeting on July 21, 2015 at 6:00 PM in the Council Chambers at City Hall. Commission members present were Mr. Bill Ligon, Chairman; Mr. Brandon Moore, Ms. Peggy Ogburn, Mr. Charles Wood, Mr. Johnny Deal, Ms. Joanna Craig and Mr. Shawn Putnam, Secretary. Mr. C.D. Rhodes also attended. Commission member Mr. Byron Johnson was absent.

Mr. Ligon called the meeting to order and entertained a motion to accept the minutes from the June 16, 2015 meeting. Mr. Wood made a motion to accept the minutes and Ms. Ogburn seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

**Recommendation for final zoning – 16 Chestnut Ferry Road, 33 Chestnut Ferry Road and 200 Lynwood Street**

Ms. Ogburn moved to open the public hearing and Mr. Wood seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. No one spoke during the hearing. Mr. Wood moved to close the public hearing and Ms. Ogburn seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Putnam noted that City Council approved the interim zoning classification for these properties as R-6. He recommended the final zoning classification also be R-6.

Ms. Ogburn made a motion to recommend to City Council to give the properties at 16 Chestnut Ferry Road, 33 Chestnut Ferry Road and 200 Lynwood Street a final zoning classification of R-6. Mr. Wood seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

**Discussion of potential zoning ordinance revisions**

Mr. Putnam stated that staff was presenting some potential revisions to the sign requirements in the zoning ordinance based on a review of a recent US Supreme Court decision. He then introduced Mr. Rhodes, an attorney for the city, to review the case and the potential revisions. Mr. Rhodes gave a summary of the case, which involved a community that was sued over a provision of its sign regulations. The US Supreme Court ruled that the regulations violated the free speech portion of the first amendment to the Constitution because they regulated the signs based on their content. Based on this ruling, Mr. Rhodes stated that there were a few areas of the sign requirements that should be changed to avoid similar conflicts. After some discussion, the Commission concurred on the following changes:

- Revised the definition of “temporary signs” from “Any sign that is used for 30 days or less and is not permanently mounted” to “Any sign or banner constructed of cloth,

canvas, light fabric, cardboard or any other paper-based material, corrugated plastic, unfinished or untreated wood, wallboard or other light materials, with or without frames, which is not permanently secured, and is intended to be displayed for a limited period of time only.” This new definition is more specific about the materials a temporary sign could be made from and removes the specific time period since it is not appropriate to have the time period in the definition.

- Delete requirements on political signs because the requirements are considered “content-based” according to the court ruling, and therefore not allowed.
- Delete 157.112(D): Neon signs, except for “Open” or “Closed” signs that do not exceed two square feet in area. This is regulating the sign type based on its content. Add the following section to requirements for building signs: “Illuminated neon signs located within four feet of a window and that are plainly visible from any public street shall not exceed a maximum sign area of two square feet and no more than two illuminated neon signs may be displayed per street frontage. No illuminated neon sign may be displayed outside of a building.”
- Change the time period a temporary sign is allowed from 30 to 60 days. This helps address the concern about not being able to regulate when political signs are allowed.
- Revise 157.111(E) under exempt signs to state that real estate signs can be up to 32 square feet in area in commercial zoning districts and 6 square feet in residential districts.

Mr. Putnam stated that there were other revisions for the Commission to consider not related to the court case. In the table of uses, the entries for “animal shelters and pens, domestic” and “bathhouses and cabanas” needed to be changed from permitted uses to conditional uses. They have conditional use requirements associated with them but were accidentally not marked as conditional uses. Also under the entry for “Full and limited service restaurants” the table should be edited to show these are allowed in the CMU zoning district. This was an error in the table when it was converted from the SIC system to the NAICS system. Mr. Putnam also stated that in the sign regulations it requires a permit for sidewalk signs but that this was not intended. These are signs placed on the sidewalk in front of a business and can only be there while the business is open. The request is to change the ordinance to allow these signs without a permit. This Commission concurred with these changes.

Mr. Putnam also indicated there were two items in the table of uses that Ms. Ogburn had requested to discuss as a result of the public hearing on the rezoning of the former Pine Tree Hill school property. Mr. Putnam noted that many of the residents that spoke during the hearing were concerned that duplexes were allowed in the OI zoning district, which is the district the property was rezoned to. Some residents were concerned the city would sell the property to a developer that would put a duplex development covering the entire property. Several commission members stated they did not feel there was a problem with duplexes being allowed. Mr. Putnam noted that the maximum residential density in the OI zoning district is 5 units per acre. After some discussion the Commission decided that it should not be changed since there may be areas zoned OI where a duplex would be appropriate.

Mr. Putnam also indicated that Ms. Ogburn had some concerns about the types of utility related uses that were allowed in the OI zoning district. Ms. Ogburn stated that she was concerned about utility poles and lines being stored on the property and creating the appearance of an industrial type area. Mr. Ligon and Ms. Craig indicated that these were utility uses that are needed to provide the services to business and residences. Ms. Ogburn stated that she agreed and did not have any changes to request.

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

---

Bill Ligon  
Chairman