



**CITY OF COLUMBIA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**February 1, 2021**  
**Regular Session 5:15 P.M.**  
**Virtual meeting using video conferencing technology**  
**Columbia, SC**

---

---

**HARRIS COHN • ANNA DAVIS • JAMES FROST II • MASON HARPE • LATRELL HARTS •  
APRIL JAMES • ISA MANDELL • FORD TUPPER**

**In attendance:** Harris Cohn, Anna Davis, James Frost II, Mason Harpe, LaTrell Harts, April James, Isa Mandell, Ford Tupper

**Absent:** none

**Staff:** Rachel Bailey, Johnathan Chambers, Leigh DeForth, Andrew Livengood, Shane Shaughnessy, and Lucinda Statler

**I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Chairman Frost called the meeting to order at 5:15pm. Lucinda Statler, Planning Administrator, reviewed ways for the public to participate in the virtual meeting. Ms. Statler called roll; a quorum was established. Chairman Frost reviewed the meeting format and ways to communicate during the virtual meeting.

**II. CONSENT AGENDA**

**Approval of Minutes**

1. Approve **January 4, 2021 Minutes**

**Site Plan Review**

2. **SPLAN-2021-0001: 316 North Beltline Boulevard, TMS# 13810-04-01;** request site plan approval for the construction of an educational building (Midlands Technical College). The property is zoned C-3 (General Commercial).
3. **SPLAN-2021-0002: 7451 Garners Ferry Road, TMS# 16312-01-01, -08, and -09;** request approval for a group development sign (Caliber Collision). The properties are zoned C-3 (General Commercial).

Ms. Statler proceeded with review of the consent agenda; she noted that staff member Leigh DeForth was present at the January meeting, so that the minutes should be amended accordingly. Chairman Frost asked if any members of the Planning Commission or public wished to have an item removed from the consent agenda. He reviewed ways for the public to provide comment on agenda items. Some technical difficulties regarding the provision of public comment through the phone portal occurred, resulting in an extended pause while these were resolved. Once these difficulties were resolved, Mr. Livengood was able to confirm that no individuals on the line wished to provide comments regarding the consent agenda, and no further emails had been received. There being no public comment or requests from the Commission, Chairman Frost asked for a motion. Vice-Chair James made a motion to approve the consent agenda subject to all conditions contained in the case summaries and with the addition of Ms. DeForth to the minutes, and Dr. Mandell seconded the motion. The motion was carried by unanimous vote (8-0).

### III. REGULAR AGENDA

#### Reconsideration

4. Reconsideration of **ANNEX-2020-0027: 1307 Mason Road, TMS# 11813-01-02** in order to incorporate input of members of the public unable to comment during the January 4, 2021 meeting of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Statler introduced the case, and indicated that this agenda item was to reconsider the annexation case considered at last month's Planning Commission. She indicated that due to some issues with the public input platform last month, staff was asking that the Planning Commission move to reconsider the case so that those wishing to provide public comment could do so during this meeting. Vice-Chair James made a motion to reconsider, and Ms. Harts seconded the motion. The motion was carried by unanimous vote (8-0).

#### Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment & Zoning Map Amendment for Pending Annexation

5. **ANNEX-2020-0027: 1307 Mason Road, TMS# 11813-01-02**; Request recommendation to assign land use classification of Urban Edge Multi-Family (UEMF) and assign zoning of General Residential District (RG-2) for a pending annexation. The property is currently classified as Mixed Residential (High Density); a portion is within a Community Activity Center Node and zoned RU by Richland County.

Ms. Statler introduced the case, and indicated that Mr. Livengood, Annexation Coordinator, was available for any questions. Mr. Frost asked for any questions from the Planning Commission members or the public, and reviewed ways the public could provide comment.

Mr. Livengood patched through Mr. Charles Gary, who indicated he was not in support of the proposed zoning of RG-2, though he was in favor of the annexation.

Ms. Statler read an email from Harold Murray, a resident of the Greenview Community, who indicated his opposition to the proposed zoning for the property.

Ms. Harts asked if a separate zoning district could be considered by the Commission during the meeting. Ms. Statler indicated that the applicant had requested the zoning of RG-2, so that was what was under consideration during the evening's meeting. Ms. Statler confirmed that a site plan review would still be required before the Planning Commission, separate of the annexation with land use and zoning assignment. She reviewed the process for site plan review for the public at the request of Dr. Mandell. She clarified that site plan review would not require posting of the property (unlike with a rezoning). She confirmed that individuals wishing to receive emails regarding land use board and commission agendas could email the [coboardmeeting@columbiasc.gov](mailto:coboardmeeting@columbiasc.gov) email to ask to be added to that email distribution list.

Ms. Davis asked about the comments regarding prior planning efforts and density. Ms. DeForth noted that the subject property was not subject to the Villages of North Main Master Plan, as it was not in the City at the time of planning. She reviewed the recommendations of the Walkable 29203 Pedestrian Master Plan, which did provide recommendations which included the subject property specific to providing for pedestrian walkability. Ms. Bailey reviewed the density allowed by the RG-2 zoning district, and noted that a separate application was in process for consideration by the Board of Zoning Appeals, meaning that public notice would be provided for that meeting, and that meeting would offer an additional opportunity for public input, specific to the site plan.

Ms. Statler patched in Mr. James Starnes, President of the Norris 21 Terrace Neighborhood Association. He indicated that the neighborhood had been brought into the process relatively late, but had subsequently

received a wealth of information from Mr. Anthony Lawrence, architect for the project. He expressed a number of concerns on behalf of the neighborhood association, including potential property management issues, traffic, and flooding in the immediate area.

Mr. Harold Murray sent a subsequent email, which Ms. Statler read into the record. His email discussed concerns regarding traffic safety and potential flooding.

Mr. Tupper asked staff if a traffic study would be required with a site plan review. Mr. Chambers indicated that the applicant had made application for the next Planning Commission meeting, and he believed a traffic impact study was submitted along with the application. Ms. Harts asked if a prior application had been made for this property. Ms. Bailey confirmed that an application to annex the subject property, in addition to adjacent property, had been reviewed by the Planning Commission a while back, however she believed that application had not moved forward to City Council due to changes on the applicant's end.

There being no further public comment, Chairman Frost asked for a motion. Vice-Chair James made a motion to recommend approval of the future land use and zoning for the pending annexation. Mr. Cohn seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a vote of five to three (AYE: Cohn, Harpe, James, Tupper, Frost; NAY: Davis, Harts, Mandell).

#### Site Plan Review

- SPLAT-2021-0001: North and South Side 400 Block of Calway Alley, 417 thru 425 Henderson Street, 1603 thru 1615 Rice Street, two vacant lots on the South Side 1600 Block of Rice Street, 312 thru 328 Pickens Street, a vacant lot within the 1600 Block of Catawba Street, and a portion of the Phelps Street, TMS#11307-18-05 and -06, 11307-12-09, 11307-13-03 thru -07, 11307-13-21 thru 25, 11307-13-26 thru -31, 11307-13-14 thru -17, 11307-19-01, 11307-19-06 thru 19, 11307-21-01(p);** request site plan approval for the construction of a 35-lot cluster housing development (Wheeler Hill Phase 2). The properties are zoned RG-2 (General Residential).

Ms. Statler introduced the case, and Mr. Chambers noted that the application was for a cluster development, which allowed for a variation in lot sizes, and that the site plan included a proposed extension of Phelps Street. He indicated that several public comments had been received in advance of the meeting regarding the extension of Phelps Street, and had been forwarded to Commission members for review. Mr. Chambers confirmed that a two-page letter from the Wheeler Hill Neighborhood Association had been received by the Commission.

Mr. David Tuttle, applicant, provided a summary of the application for the Commission. Chairman Frost asked if Phelps Street had originally been platted to run all the way through. He indicated the reconfiguration of lots along Pickens Street, which originally fronted along Pickens Street in the original PUD, were now proposed to face the proposed extension of Phelps. Dr. Mandell asked the applicant to elaborate about his comments regarding working with the Saint James AME Church, and asked if the University of South Carolina (U of SC) planned to work with the Church, given the Church's and the neighborhood's history with the U of SC. Mr. Tuttle indicated that there had been discussions, and understood that the University was working with the Pastor and a member of the neighborhood regarding the potential of reserving the lots adjacent to the Church from sale for several months in hopes that the Church would be able to raise the funds to purchase those lots, but he could not speak to any agreements between the two parties, aside from to indicate that there was no written agreement in place at this time between the developer and the Church.

There being no further questions for the applicant, Ms. Statler and Mr. Livengood worked to patch individuals through in order to provide public comment.

Mr. Livengood connected State Senator Dick Harpootlian, who indicated that the neighborhood had been in favor of the rezoning of the property from a PUD to the current zoning, but that this rezoning did not contemplate the extension of Phelps Street. Dr. Mandell reiterated her concerns regarding the history of the Wheeler Hill neighborhood, and the treatment of the neighborhood by U of SC. Extensive discussion between the applicant and Sen. Harpootlian occurred. Mr. Chambers clarified that the plan staff initially received for site plan review showed the gating of a road closure and gate. He clarified that a public road could not be gated. Mr. Tuttle indicated that the proposed hammerhead did not meet City code. Ms. Bailey clarified for the Commission and public that the plan submitted as an exhibit to the rezoning application was conceptual, and the consideration of a rezoning was not binding as it related to a conceptual site plan. Mr. Tupper asked if the discussion of Phelps could be considered by the Board of Zoning Appeals. There was discussion of whether a deferral would result in a March review by the Planning Commission, or an April review. Staff clarified that if a revised site plan was submitted with enough time for staff technical review, it could possibly be re-heard in March.

Ms. Statler patched Mr. Jim Daniel, President of the Wheeler Hill Neighborhood Association, through to provide public comment. He voiced his concerns on behalf of the neighborhood and referenced the email comments he provided. Ms. Statler reiterated that the rezoning process does not include review or approval of a specific site plan, and that site plan review was a separate technical review process related to the requirements of City ordinances. There was some further discussion regarding next steps.

Chairman Frost asked the Commission if there were any questions for the applicant. There being none, he asked for a motion. Vice-Chair James made a motion to defer site plan review to a subsequent meeting. Ms. Harts seconded the motion. The motion was carried by unanimous vote (8-0).

#### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

Introduction of new Planning Commission appointee, Raquel Thomas.

Ms. Statler introduced Ms. Thomas, a newly appointed Commission member, and she and Planning Commission members welcomed Ms. Thomas to the Commission. Ms. Thomas indicated she looked forward to serving.

#### **V. ADJOURN**

There being no further business, Ms. Harts made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Vice-Chair James. The meeting was adjourned by unanimous vote (8-0) at 6:47pm.

**Respectfully submitted,  
Planning & Development Services Department**