



**Forest Acres Planning Commission
Minutes
May 1, 2018 6:00 P.M.
Forest Acres Council Chambers
5205 N. Trenholm Rd.**

1. Call to order - determination of a quorum.

Joe Gentry, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:07 P.M. and a quorum was determined by the presence of Ralph Bailey, Ellis Creel, Jack Cantey, Will Dillard, Stephen Powell, and Joe Gentry. Pendleton Grove was absent.

2. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: April 17, 2018

On a motion by Jack Cantey, seconded by Ellis Creel, the April 17, 2018 minutes were approved unanimously without change.

3. New Business

1. Continued Discussion of update to Forest Acres Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Gentry opened turning the floor over to City Administrator, Shaun Greenwood.

Mr. Greenwood began by noting that he had been doing research on how our Comprehensive Plan and Land Use map compare to those of other municipalities. He noted examples from comparable cities, emphasizing that there are 3 “levels” of Future Land Use maps. The first, like the City of Forest Acres’, is very broad with overarching categories (residential, commercial, etc.) not specific zones (e.g., C-1, R-1, etc.). Other cities get more specific with their categories but are still not at the level of specific zones. Typically, these categories are associated with a table in the Comprehensive Plan that spells out what uses are permitted in each zone (indicate of which uses are preferable, allowable, and not allowed). Other maps get even more specific and come close to having the level of detail of a zoning map. Mr. Greenwood noted that the decision about which type of map to use would have been made much earlier in the planning process for the city.

Mr. Greenwood answered a question from an earlier meeting: *Does State Law mandate that all zoning decisions “must” be in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan?* He noted that there is currently no test case in South Carolina that answers that question. Right now, it depends on what the Comprehensive Plan itself says about how to use the map. Mr. Greenwood recommends that such language be inserted into the new Comprehensive Plan asserting that the map is intended to be a guide based on information available at the time of the Plan’s development and is not intended to be mandatory.

Mr. Greenwood noted that the current Land Use Map's broadness means that "commercial" would encompass high density commercial or retail, but that future rezoning decisions could limit a parcel to low intensity commercial (i.e., all degrees of commercial density are possible on the Future Land Use map but would not necessarily be allowed on the zoning map). Similarly, "residential" is broad enough on the Future Land Use map to encompass single family residential all the way up to high density apartment housing.

Mr. Creel asked for clarification regarding text that could be added to the plan to note that the map is a guide, not a mandate. Mr. Greenwood confirmed that and gave an example from the City of Cayce. He noted that such clarifying language would be staff's recommendation to the Committee.

Mr. Gentry guided discussion to the Future Land Use map and particularly Mr. Dillard's proposal. Mr. Dillard went back through the proposal for the benefit of those who weren't at previous meetings. Mr. Dillard clarified (and Mr. Gentry concurred) that the lot on the corner of Coker and Trenholm was not changed on this map, despite current litigation on this lot, because the Committee had already ruled on this. Mr. Dillard noted his tendency at this point to default to leaving parcels with their current actual zoning on this revised Future Land Use map.

Mr. Creel noted his concern with defaulting to current zoning, given current development activity, particularly along Forest Drive. He wants the map to acknowledge what he sees as trends toward commercial.

Mr. Dillard countered that there are a number of residential parcels on Forest Drive that 10 years ago showed as commercial on the Future Land Use map, but that are still residential with no anticipated change. He noted that with the proposed "guide" language discussed above, the City could consider specific rezoning requests for such parcels.

Mr. Cantey discussed his own experience with a rezoning next to his house where a residential parcel on Forest Drive became low-density commercial with very little discernable effect for him. He noted his understanding of traffic concerns, but that most of that is out of the Committee's hands. He also noted that with the current pace of change (e.g., with ride sharing) traffic may in time become less of an issue. He noted his conviction that Forest Dr. is different than Trenholm Rd. and that the two must be looked at separately. Mr. Cantey further noted the importance of making distinctions in zoning decisions (high intensity v. low intensity) within broad categories in the Future Land Use map (e.g., commercial and residential).

Mr. Greenwood noted that the entire Comprehensive Plan will be up for review and replacement in roughly 2020, so changes in the style of land use map could be updated at that point (i.e., to include narrower categories and a table that shows specific uses). He reiterated that the Comprehensive Plan narrative should correspond to the Future Land Use map and should guide decisions, based on current trends. Mr. Cantey emphasized that Forest Acres is somewhat unusual because we don't really have a downtown or a city center. Several residents in the audience noted that they were not happy with the current trends and want to see the map show zoning as it is now. Mr. Dillard noted his satisfaction with the current format of the Future Land Use map, given the city's relatively small size and complexity. He also reiterated his conviction that any change in zoning should have a very good, well documented reason for the rezoning.

Mr. Bailey asked about the status of the intersection of Pinestraw and Two Notch. Mr. Greenwood noted that the city continues to monitor the property; the owner was mandated to clean it up and has done so. There is no known proposal for the site. Mr. Bailey noted that his opinion is that whatever happens there will be driven by what the City of Columbia and Richland County do in adjacent areas.

Committee members began discussing specific areas and parcels as they appear on the Future Land Use map (using Mr. Dillard's proposal as a guide), as follows:

- Mr. Cantey asked about areas on Two Notch Rd. that are commercially zoned currently. He noted that parcels behind these commercial parcels are residential and by the logic that we've been using should stay that way (since we don't "turn corners" with Commercial). Mr. Greenwood noted that the current commercial lots on Two Notch are not really deep enough for true commercial uses, so adding parcels gives depth to possible businesses facing Two Notch. Mr. Cantey compared Two Notch and the depth issue with the fears of commercial spread that residents around Trenholm have expressed. Mr. Greenwood noted that different types of commercial would have different depth needs and he sees a difference in commercial intensity for potential redevelopment on Two Notch compared to Trenholm.
- Mr. Gentry noted that he would recommend turning the lots on Trenholm from Coker to Chicora back to residential on the Future Land Use map.
- Mr. Cantey moved on to discuss Beltline, particularly areas that have been fairly recently redeveloped as residential but showed as commercial on the prior Future Land Use map. The Committee generally agreed that these should go back to residential on the new Future Land Use map.
- In the Harrison/Bagnal area, Mr. Dillard noted that he indicated in his proposal that all of these would match current zoning.
- The same goes for areas along Sunnyside Drive, near Forest Drive, according to Mr. Dillard. Mr. Gentry noted his conviction that the first lot that is currently zoned residential on Sunnyside (across from Miyo's) should stay commercial on the Future Land Use map, to line up better with the transition from commercial to residential on the opposite side of Sunnyside. Mr. Dillard noted that he didn't have a strong opinion either way.
- Dalloz and Forest – Mr. Dillard reiterated his conviction that parcels in this area should stay as they are currently zoned. After discussion about commercial development along Forest Drive, Mr. Greenwood noted that "turning the corner with commercial development" (a concept referred to in a recent council rezoning decision) implies that there's no ingress/egress on a main thoroughfare (e.g., Forest Drive) so ingress/egress would have to be on a side street (e.g., Brentwood), not simply that an existing residential parcel is rezoned commercial next to a neighborhood.
- Forest Drive at Madison & Falcon and Forest Drive at Brentwood – Mr. Dillard discussed the existing zoning in this area, which is reflected in his proposal, but also noted that the area at Forest and Brentwood shows as PDD on his map (because a proposed PDD had been recommended by Planning Commission for that area when he made the map, but was subsequently turned down by City Council) and that this

is a good topic of debate. Residents expressed their concerns with this staying PDD on the Future Land Use map given the recent denial of a PDD proposal. The general consensus on the Commission was to leave it as PDD, with Mr. Cantey and Mr. Bailey noting that they wouldn't include the last lot in the series on Brentwood as PDD, leaving it residential because of the location of the PDD line across Brentwood (i.e., the rear property line behind the bank and gym buildings).

- Forest Drive at Greenhill and Atascadero and Forest Drive at Idalia- the general consensus was to denote these properties on the Future Land Use map as Mr. Dillard's proposal suggests (largely residential) given recent residential development and property purchases as residential parcels. Mr. Dillard noted that, regarding this entire area of Forest Drive, any significant commercial redevelopment would have to "involve a creative combination of lots" or PDD designation; in either case, the issue would have to go through the process of rezoning (Administration review, Planning Commission recommendation, and Council approval). Mr. Cantey did express his reservation about leaving *all* of this area residential, particularly the parcel next to the Atrium PDD, but the general consensus was to accept Mr. Dillard's proposal and reflect current zoning on the Future Land Use map revision.
- The Commission reached consensus on areas along Decker Blvd., accepting Mr. Dillard's proposal.

Mr. Gentry noted his desire to memorialize all of the changes discussed at this meeting in the minutes, for clarity. Mr. Cantey asked whether, at the next meeting, they would have a revised map up for vote. Mr. Greenwood noted that staff would make that available at the next meeting.

Ms. Reynolds, Coker St. resident, expressed her appreciation to the Planning Commission for their hard work throughout the process.

4. Adjourn

Mr. Cantey made a motion to adjourn; Mr. Bailey seconded. Mr. Gentry declared the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Andy Smith, Asst. City Administrator/Finance Director
(Administrative support of Planning Commission)