

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 18, 2021 @ 5:30 PM
City Hall Council Chambers

Board Members Present: Dr. Phillip Stone, Reed Cunningham, Lekesa Whitner, Mike Epps, Warwick Spencer, Jared Wilson, and Jemar Brown. None were absent. City Staff present: Martin Livingston, Community Development Director; Tia Keitt, Planner II; and Julie Roland Admin. Assistant.

Roll Call

Dr. Stone said I am the Chair, and I'm calling this meeting to order of the Commission, and will preside over these proceedings this Thursday, November 18, 2021. Please note the notice of this meeting was posted and provided to the media 24 hours in advance as required by the Freedom of Information Act.

Let the record reflect that all seven Members of the Commission are present; therefore, we have a quorum and can proceed with business before the body. Dr. Stone asked all the Planning Commissioners to identify themselves for the recording.

So the first item will be the approval of this evening's Agenda for November 18, 2021.

Mr. Wilson moved approval of the Agenda for the November 18, 2021 meeting and was seconded by Mr. Cunningham. The motion was approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

Disposition of the Minutes of the October 21, 2021 Meeting

Mr. Spencer moved approval of the October 21, 2021 Meeting; and he was seconded by Ms. Whitner. The motion was approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

Old Business: None.

New Business:

RZC-21-011-00008 – The Planning Commission has received a rezoning request regarding the property located at 293 South Converse Street (TMS# 7-12-15-248.00); from R-6, General Residential District to LOD, Limited Office District, to allow for the property to be consistent with neighboring properties.

Jerry and Annie Kerns, Owners.

Mr. Livingston said Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, we have before us is a request for rezoning of the property

Mr. Livingston...: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commissioners. We have a request for rezoning of the property located at 293 South Converse Street, rezoning from R-6, General Residential District to LOD, Limited Office District. The applicants are Jerry and Annie Kerns of 293 South Converse Street. The project site is an approximately 13,937 square-foot lot with a single family residential structure located at 293 South Converse Street.

The site is situated between Henry Place of Wheeler Court, both cul-de-sacs. The current residents, who are the property owners, confirm that their home is located between two existing LOD, Limited Office District zoned properties. The property owners would like to match the zoning designation of the adjacent properties in order to be consistent and maximize the potential use of the site. The proposed zoning request will allow for consistency and flow of the LOD designation of three contiguous properties along South Converse Street. Under the LOD zoning, property owners can remain in their homes.

Per Section 201 of the Zoning Ordinance, the LOD districts are established to provide for office uses, including offices which have contact with the general public, but which do not conduct sales at merchandising premises. It is intended that this district will ensure compatibility with residential districts and serve as a transition to commercial districts.

Required Findings

Historically, the City of Spartanburg has required the zoning applicants to meet certain criteria and Planning Commission must take the following findings as reasonable conformance in order to recommend a zoning change.

Staff offers the following analysis relating to each of these required findings:

Analysis of Required Findings

The Zoning Ordinance enables Council to change the Zoning Ordinance or Map following public notice and hearing. The Planning Commission reviews and recommends action on proposed zoning changes at its regularly scheduled meetings. The following comments are based on established criteria:

1) Consistency (or lack thereof) with the Comprehensive Plan -There is consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, which is dated 2004. The Comprehensive Plan defines this area as the Central Planning District which is to be included in the Core Activity Area Land use classification. The Core Activity Area Land is the designation for the city's Central Business District. The area is intended for a wide variety of land uses that will create a vital, quality, well-rounded atmosphere for downtown, which is designed to maintain a mix of land use patterns promoting a well-rounded activity center with commercial, professional office, civic, and residential activities.

2) Compatibility with the present zoning and conforming uses of nearby property and with the character of the neighborhood – The present characteristics of the surrounding properties include residential directly to the south, GID, General Institutional District to the north, and abutting properties zoned as LOD-Limited Office District. Currently, the parking lot of a staffing business is the immediate western view from the porch and windows of 293 South Converse Street. The proposed rezoning of the site from R-6 to LOD will be compatible with the surrounding area and will match with conforming uses of nearby properties. Therefore rezoning will not impact the neighborhood character.

3) Suitability of the property affected by the amendment for uses permitted by the district that would be made applicable by the proposed amendment -The property is currently the primary residence of the applicant. Per Section 301 to 303, District Use Regulations, page 35, residential uses are permitted in the LOD zoning district. Therefore the current use of the property is suitable for uses permitted by the rezoning request.

4) Marketability of the property affected by the amendment for uses permitted by the district applicable to the property at the time of the proposed amendment - The marketability of the property and therefore, the Central Planning Division, would likely increase with the zoning change. Rezoning from R-6 to LOD allows three contiguous properties to have the same zoning. Staff does not anticipate the rezoning to have a negative impact on the marketability of the property.

5) Availability of sewer, water and storm water facilities generally suitable and adequate for the proposed use - Both water, and sanitary sewer services currently exist at this site.-

Staff's Analysis & Recommendation

According to Section I, Adoption and Interpretation of the City of Spartanburg Zoning Ordinance, Section 105, Purpose, "The purpose of the zoning ordinance is to implement the land use element of the comprehensive plan for those purposes set forth in S.C. Code § 6-29-710." This S.C. Code section states that the "Zoning Ordinance must be for the general purposes of guiding development in accordance with existing and future needs and promoting the public health, safety, morals, convenience, order, appearance, prosperity, and general welfare" of properties inside the City Limits.

One of the reasons for the Comprehensive Plan and City Zoning Ordinance is to have zoning classifications that allow for certain uses in conjunction with adjacent properties that may be considered "less intense" uses. For this reason, the purpose is to protect the less intense uses from adverse impacts on their property with regard, but not limited to, noise and/or light pollution, traffic congestion, and any other adverse impact that a higher intense use could cause on a surrounding less intense use.

Based on the above analysis and findings, staff recommends the proposed property be rezoned from R-6 General Residential District to LOD - Limited Office District. Considering the adjacent properties are already zoned LOD, rezoning 293 South Converse allows for consistency and minimizing future planning issues that could arise.

Written Public Comments

Notices were sent to the property owners within a 400 foot radius of subject properties. 27 Notices were sent regular mail and 3 sent through certified mail. A community meeting was held on Wednesday, November 10, 2021, at 5:30 PM at the City Council Chambers to discuss the rezoning request, review comments, and address concerns. The Planning Commission Meeting – Thursday, November 18th – 5:30 PM.

Future Process

Under State law, if the Planning Commission recommends approval of this application, staff will schedule the matter for another public hearing and First Reading of Ordinance by City Council on Monday, December 13 – 5:30 PM. If the matter receives First Reading Approval, it will then go before the City Council for a Second/Final Reading Monday, January 10, 2022 – 5:30 PM. The public hearings will be publicly noticed.

If the Planning Commission recommends against the application, the negative recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. In this case, a public hearing before City Council will be conducted only if the applicant submits a written request within a two-week period following the Planning Commission's action.

On Thursday, November 18th, at 5:30 PM, the Planning Commission may act to support or oppose the application, with or without changes to the proposal. The Commission can also continue the matter if additional information, testimony, or dialogue is deemed necessary. The staff report was prepared by Tia Keitt, Planner II, and you have the attachments.

Mr. Livingston went through the PowerPoint presentation as follows: Again, this is the process. The informational meeting was conducted on November 10th. We have the Planning Commission meeting tonight, First Reading on December 13th, Second and Final reading on January 10th. On December 13, we'll also have a public hearing on this matter.

These are the five criteria that staff reviews. This is the current property. This is 293, surrounded by LOD, Limited Office District, nonprofit organizations, staffing agencies, and then this is GID, which is a Unitarian Church location. Then only two properties are zoned R-6, surrounded by LOD and LC. This is the future land use map that shows this area to be primarily residential, and so you can see that that has changed over time. It has become mostly LOD.

Dr. Stone: Would you hold onto that slide really quickly. I have a question while you're on that. That's the future land use map. I can see what colors... The orange is medium-density residential. What is that blue.

Mr. Livingston...: The blue.

Dr. Stone: Blue-gray that's over to the left of all of those orange properties.

Mr. Livingston: I think that's Institutional. I can look it up.

Dr. Stone: Oh, that makes sense, because that's Church Street. That's institutional. That makes sense. It wasn't on the table, that's why I asked. Thank you.

Mr. Livingston: Sure. Here's the site. As you can see, most have the original character. Photographs of the existing property. The LOD to the left and LOD to the right. This is LOD, as well. Unitarian Universalist Church, GID, General Institutional District.

Dr. Stone: GID.

Mr. Livingston: This is mostly LOD to the rear.

Mr. Livingston explained the street view showing they're mostly residential, and based on the findings, staff recommends rezoning from R-6 to LOD. I'll answer any questions the Commissioners may have.

Planning Commission Questions:

Dr. Stone: The property directly behind it is still brown, so that's R-6, correct.

Mr. Livingston: Yes, that's still zoned residential, and it's currently still being used as a residential.

Dr. Stone: Okay. And I think, the property next door on the right, it's zoned LOD, but I believe that's a residence, as well.

Mr. Livingston: Yes. It's zoned LOD, but it's also a residence.

Dr. Stone: Okay. I'm sorry, I went ahead and jumped the gun. Does anyone else have questions for Mr. Livingston.

Dr. Stone: Nobody seems to be jumping into questions. Is the applicant here to say anything.

Mr. Livingston: No, the applicant is not present.

Mr. Cunningham: I assume that this property that is behind the property in question will eventually be swept into the same classification as this one has requested, rather than being the only property in that business section to remain residential. Is that typically what happens.

Mr. Livingston: It can get rezoned two ways. First, the property owners can petition it to be rezoned either GID or LOD and we can go through that process. The second method for doing so is with a comprehensive plan update and rezoning our properties throughout the entire city.

Mr. Cunningham: So it seems like we have these islands of... And this is how we get them.

Mr. Livingston...: Yes.

Dr. Stone: Any other questions. All right. Let's see. I guess if there aren't any other questions and the applicant isn't here, I guess I need to open a public hearing to hear any public comment on the matter. I will open a public hearing, and if anyone and in the audience wishes to speak, please come up and say your name and your address.

Kenneth Myers Sr. I live at 299 South Converse Street, and I'm here tonight to voice my concerns about the property to my right, which is 293, being rezoned, because there's been a history for the last two years with that property. I was not able to cut my bushes, so I had to pay a landscaper. I couldn't have any verbal resolution without any kind of conflict. I had verbal threats against me. I had stalking of my wife. I put up a fence for security and safety, and that created more problems. I had to put cameras on the front door. I've had numerous complaints. Called the police for threats to my life.

My concern is, part of the reason I put up a fence for security, because early in the morning, there's a lot of traffic blowing horns, slamming doors, dropping kids off, appearing to be a childcare type business. My concern is on the zoning. I think their intent possibly would be to increase their business. I don't think that's good for my property value. I don't, not at all. We have our property up kept. Everybody in that section is neighborly.

Nobody has any complaints. Everybody resolves things in a civil manner, and I've been going through two years of complaints against myself and my wife at City Council meetings, and I just have concerns about what would happen in the future if you can't resolve anything at this level, and the attitude. I'm thinking that they're going to increase their business, and so I just want to protect my residence and the value of my house and lot as we're moving forward. That's what I wanted to share.

Dr. Stone: Sir, are you saying there's currently a business being run to the property that we're looking at rezoning.

Mr. Myers said yes, it's my opinion. It's my opinion, early in the morning, you have cars driving up to them, and from my experience, that's a childcare business. Everybody has the right to do what they want to do with their property, but I'm a neighbor and it's causing hardship to me, and I spent almost \$8,000 trying to resolve neighbor conflict, but I can't get a resolution, and they can't get a resolution of City Council, as well, so I don't see any... Going forward, I don't think it'll get any better, so I just wanted to share that.

Mr. Cunningham asked if the landowner is listed as Jerry and Annie Kerns. Are they also the people operating this business.

Mr. Myers said yes, at 293.

Mr. Cunningham asked if they live in this home.

Mr. Myers said yes.

Mr. Cunningham asked that they not only own it, but they live in it.

Mr. Myers said yes.

Mr. Cunningham said and run potentially a business now.

Mr. Myers said yes.

Reed Cunningham: Okay. So it's the Kerns you're dealing with.

Mr. Myers said yes, it is.

Mr. Cunningham said thank you.

Mr. Myers said I had my house appraised a couple of months ago. I took a survey a year ago, paid \$500, and I questioned them to look at the survey. They denied it, and then they misrepresented. They have a survey, and they've a survey for years. I just can't get any resolution, and so I don't see, moving forward, that it's going to get any better, that's why I'm speaking for my home, my residence, so I'm not losing any property value in this neighborhood and trying to build a neighborhood. I found the Neighborhood Association. We want more home ownership, and I think like it is now, we should recruit people. That's just my opinion about the rezoning. Any questions for me. All right. Thank you very much.

Dr. Stone: Thank you.

Mr. Epps asked So Martin, under the current LOD, someone could operate a business and live in the residence, as well.

Mr. Livingston said yes. Under the current zoning ordinance, you can live and operate any business in that location. Thank you.

Dr. Stone asked In LOD.

Mr. Livingston said LOD.

Mr. Epps said Thank you, sir.

Dr. Stone said I was trying to find in R-6 if you can actually operate a daycare center. I know there's some flexibility there, but can you operate a childcare center in a residential.

Mr. Livingston said as far as I know, you can, yes.

Dr. Stone: That's right.

Mr. Cunningham: So R-6; is the business for operations of a childcare center in R-6 is within the law.

Mr. Livingston said yes. I believe under the zoning rules, you are allowed to operate a childcare center in an R-6 zone. It's a General Residential zone. You are limited to a certain number of children.

Mr. Cunningham: Oh, okay.

Mr. Brown asked outside of the Kerns wanting the property to be consistent with the neighboring properties, did she give a reason of why she wanted to make this change.

Mr. Livingston said that was the primary reason. The majority of the properties surrounding hers was R-6. When we met with her, she asked about changing the zoning because the zoning surrounding her was not compatible with her zoning, so they want it to be compatible.

Ms. Whitner asked are there any other businesses operating on Converse Street right now under LOD that you're aware of, Martin.

Mr. Livingston said yes. There's a staffing agency right down here, right here, and then these are mostly businesses and institutions here.

Ms. Whitner referenced a slide on the screen and said we've got this business here.

Mr. Epps said Okay, so that's a church. It was a church.

Dr. Stone said the teal color is the church.

Ms. Whitner said so that's the business.

Mr. Epps said that's the business here. So here's our only outlier, and this is business. This is business. This is a home.

Ms. Whitner said as Martin was saying, they can still operate a daycare even under R-6.

Mr. Epps said it doesn't matter, yeah, changing the zoning is not going to make a difference.

Mr. Livingston said under LOD, daycare centers, and adult daycare centers are eligible under LOD as well. That's a permitted use.

Mr. Epps: Okay.

Dr. Stone: Yeah. I've got the table open for all of the various uses under LOD. Everything from assisted living to community center, daycare, kindergarten. And there's no size restriction.

Mr. Livingston said yes, there might be size restrictions based on the size of the property. It will have to go through a process. Similar to the building permit, we'll have to review occupancy. They'll need a certificate of occupancy to run a daycare. They'll need to go through the city's building permits process and the planning process if it changes the uses from single family residential to another use, and a business license will be required if a business is run from the property.

Mr. Brown said he had one more question; and he asked Mr. Myers if the change is made, will this bring resolve to you and your neighbor outside of the fact that you don't want the change made, but will this settle any type of conflict that's being had. Do you think this will settle the conflict.

Mr. Myers said I seriously doubt it. I've been trying for two years.

Mr. Brown said thank you.

Dr. Stone: Just for the record, let me say, does anyone else wish to speak in the public hearing. Seeing no one else the public hearing portion was closed and we will move into Board Deliberation.

Dr. Stone said to Mr. Brown's point, it's in the packet that the property owner says, "To the best of my knowledge and understanding, our home at 293 South Converse Street is located between all the commercial property. Our property is deemed residential, but since all the other property is commercial and our property is in the middle of commercial property, then we would like for our property to be deemed commercial." That is the property owner's justification for their request. As I frequently say, rezoning is a discretionary act of City Council, so you're not entitled to a rezoning. I think they are entitled to consideration, and so that would be where I would start us.

Mr. Cunningham said technically, the lot behind this property in question is zoned R-6.

Dr. Stone said technically, that is absolutely correct.

Mr. Cunningham said so that's not totally factual.

Dr. Stone said that is not totally factual. I also think that calling all of that commercial property isn't... I think LOD is supposed to be kind of a hedge zone anyway, because you can still live in LOD, as we see, since Mr. Myers lives in an LOD house, and apparently, so would the owners of this property. It looks like they'd likely continue to live there. The fact that they're not here for us to ask any questions does trouble me.

Mr. Spencer asked may we still ask questions of Mr. Livingston. Is that all right.

Dr. Stone: We can certainly ask questions of Mr. Livingston.

Mr. Spencer said under the analysis of paragraph one, consistency or lack thereof with the comprehensive plan, the future land use map that's included in the presentation reflects the comprehensive plan, and that has this area identified as medium-density residential, right.

Mr. Livingston said that's correct.

Mr. Cunningham asked so the land use map used is the new one, so to speak.

Mr. Livingston said could you repeat that.

Mr. Cunningham said the property use map that you used in this presentation is-the newer version, not the one from '04.

Mr. Livingston said this is the one from '04.

Mr. Cunningham: From '04.

Mr. Livingston said right. So because of all the changes, it no longer really applies, because the majority of that medium-density residential has been converted to LOD and residential.

Mr. Cunningham: So the new comprehensive plan will have a future land use map.

Mr. Livingston said yes, we hope. It will be very different from what we have now.

Mr. Cunningham: Okay. Do you have any thoughts or understanding as to where this section of the city might be going from a planning standpoint.

Mr. Livingston said I don't, not from a planning standpoint. That would be useful for this deliberation. We have to still use the 2004 on any existing documents because the comprehensive plan that's in process right now has not been adopted by the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Mr. Cunningham: Right. Understand.

Mr. Spencer asked would it be fair to say then, Mr. Livingston, that while the proposed use is consistent with current uses and current zoning, it is inconsistent with the 2004 comprehensive plan and the land use map. So it may not reflect reality, but it is not consistent.

Dr. Stone said and this is the problem, that this property seems to be, right now, kind of on that bleeding edge, because everything... I walked by there Monday before last to take a look at it, and everything sort of from this point on, going southeast on South Converse Street, still looks to be residential to me. It's certainly zoned that way. But then as you head towards closer to downtown, yeah, it's more limited office. We're kind of on that what seems to be kind of teetering on the knife's edge of which should it be, which is where we always get the fun questions.

Mr. Cunningham said but I mean, the reality of the situation is this daycare operation, is it can be run either in R-6 or it can be run in LOD. He said so he did not see any basis for the rezone.

Mr. Livingston said yes.

Dr. Stone: I basically find myself in agreement with that position.

Mr. Spencer said I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, would Mr. Cunningham mind repeating himself. I was distracted momentarily.

Mr. Cunningham said I mean, notwithstanding that the owner can request a rezone, the fact that what appears to be a daycare center operation which is being run now on this property zoned R-6 can also be run in LOD. If I understand correctly, it can be run in R-6 or LOD, so I fail to see the reason for the request for rezoning. If we had a buyer for this property who wanted to put a different type of business there that required LOD, and I don't know from memory the exclusions between R-6 and LOD, then I would see much more of a basis for consideration of the change.

Mr. Spencer said so Mr. Livingston, then, is it fair to say that the current use is consistent with the current zoning if based on what we heard from the neighbor.

Mr. Livingston said I do not know for a fact that the property is being used as a daycare. I do not know that, and I do not have any evidence.

Mr. Spencer asked if it is, that would not violate its current zoning designation. It wouldn't, as far as you know.

Mr. Livingston said as far as I know; no.

Mr. Spencer asked is it possible that the requested zoning change would allow them to... If it is being used in part as a daycare, or a daycare business is being operated there, that a more intensive daycare operation could be going on there under an LOD designation versus an R-6.

Mr. Livingston said it would have to meet the City's Building and Zoning Requirements. If it was rezoned to LOD, it would have to meet those requirements.

Mr. Cunningham said well, the absence of the applicant is significant, I think, to those questions.

Ms. Whitner asked Martin, does the LOD, with them changing the zoning, does that help with external features or something. I'm trying to figure out... I really wish the applicant was here to answer. Does it change the outside, with the siding or anything. I mean, I'm just trying to figure out what would be the reason to rezone.

Mr. Livingston said just consistency with the surrounding zoning.

Dr. Stone said and in a way, we're only talking about consistency with one side, with their left side, because the right side, though it is zoned LOD, it's actually more a residence.

Mr. Spencer asked Mr. Livingston, just along the same lines as the original question I had. To be clear with regard to the analysis of the required findings, paragraph number one, the proposed use is not consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Livingston said it is not consistent with the comprehensive plan. It's consistent with the surrounding other uses.

Mr. Spencer said so it doesn't meet criteria number one, but it does meet criteria number two. It's compatible with the present zoning, which is, for the right, LOD, and to the left, LOD, but behind, not, and conforming uses of nearby properties.

Mr. Livingston said right.

Mr. Spencer said it would conform with two of these requirements.

Mr. Livingston said so it meets four of the five requirements.

Mr. Spencer asked if I recall correctly from conversations that we've had in earlier testimony in other meetings, those are the two most important ones, one and two.

Mr. Livingston said that is correct.

Mr. Spencer said so we sort of have a split decision.

Dr. Stone said I will say, though nobody ever likes doing this, I will say it is certainly in order if someone wants to move to carry this over to a future meeting so that it gives the opportunity of the petitioner to speak and explain their justifications for why they want to do it.

Mr. Cunningham: Is that a motion.

Dr. Stone said I was just putting that out there, that if somebody wanted to make that motion, it would be an option. I would say, and the City Attorney's not here, but Mr. Livingston would probably say this, an outright rejection prohibits them from making the request again for a period of time. Is that correct.

Mr. Livingston said I believe one year.

Dr. Stone said I believe it is one year. I do want everyone to be mindful that a rejection has some consequences, as does approval.

Mr. Spencer moved that we carry this matter over to a future meeting, and would ask that Mr. Livingston and the planning staff speak with the applicant and see if the applicant can be encouraged to attend that future meeting so that we may explore it in more depth. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cunningham. The motion was approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

Mr. Wilson asked, just for the sake of it, when they come back, can we pull the business license records to see if they have one in hand to operate daycare centers. Just answer that question, with or without the applicant.

Mr. Livingston said Sure.

Mr. Wilson said Thank you.

Mr. Cunningham asked was he correct in that at the public information meeting, the applicant did show up.

Mr. Livingston said yes, they did show up for the informational meeting.

Mr. Cunningham: So you met with them.

Mr. Livingston...: Yes. I was present.

Dr. Stone: I imagine you've met with them more than once, at this point.

Mr. Livingston: Yes.

Site and Landscape Plans Approved since the October 21, 2021 Meeting:

- The Hub Development – 578 N. Church St.
- McDonald's Redo – 106 Garner Rd.

City Council Updates Since the last Planning Commission Meeting on October 21, 2021:

- 10-25-21 Second Reading Approval re 1631 John B White Sr Blvd., TMS#6-21-13-056.00 from Zone R-15 to B-1; Owner James V. Smith.
- 10-25-21 Public Hearing and First Reading re 577 N. Church St., TMS#7-12-01-249.00 from R-8/B-3 to B-3; Owner: CBC Investments, LLC (**Applicant pulled from Agenda prior to meeting**).
- 11-8-2021 Public Hearing & First Reading re 1097 Union St., TMS#7-17-05-106.00, from I-1 to B-3, Lat Purser & Assoc. (**Applicant pulled from Agenda prior to meeting**).

Staff Announcements:

Mr. Livingston said Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, there were several Commissioners that asked the question about the difference between Euclidean and form-based zoning. I sent you an email today that provides some information on what the differences are, as well as some other resources that may be available to you. You can review those documents, if you believe that it would be helpful to have Craig Lewis, the City's Design Consultant come and talk about the differences, or if it would be helpful when we're through going through the zoning ordinance to have TPUDC be present to talk about the difference between has a zoning process. We can certainly have that.

The City has a mixed zoning process. We have form-based zoning and traditional, also known as Euclidean zoning, throughout the city. The form-based zoning is located downtown and in the north side, and then the Euclidean traditional zoning is throughout the rest of the city, but we've provided you with some information on that, so you can read up on that. If you have any questions, we'll try to attempt to answer those questions. We'll also provide additional resources for them, as well.

I think there was a request to have the City Attorney attend the next meeting. We'll ask him to attend the next meeting to talk about Planning Commissioners' liability and responsibilities. I think that was it. It was a recent request.

Dr. Stone said I have started working my way through the draft Comprehensive Plan. I haven't finished it, but I do think that certainly, as we do our work to approve the Comprehensive Plan and send it to City Council, I think we want all the information we can get, and it may be even more important to talk to Craig Lewis about form-based versus Euclidean zoning at the point where we start doing serious delving into the zoning ordinance. At some point, I think that would be helpful. Any other questions for staff.

Mrs. Roland said I'm proud to say that everybody on this Board has completed their Continued Ed Training or received their required New Board Orientation for the new members. Thank you very much.

Dr. Stone: Any other... I will take one moment. Some of you, Mr. Wilson knows this, because he used to sit in this chair, but the chair of the planning commission gets to serve on the Spartanburg Area Transportation Study Policy Committee.

Mr. Wilson: It's a privilege and a joy.

Dr. Stone: A privilege and a joy. I started attending those this summer. I went to one last week. I get to kind of hear about community transportation policy and what's coming, road building project-wise, and so I do know that there is a downtown traffic study coming. Mr. Livingston can probably say if the City is paying for that. I think the City's paying, or is SPATS paying for that.

Mr. Livingston said the Downtown Transportation Study is funded by the City of Spartanburg, as well as SPATS, the Spartanburg Area Transportation Committee.

Dr. Stone said Study.

Mr. Livingston said yes.


Dr. Stone asked basically, have you all gone out for RFP for that yet.

Mr. Livingston said we have. We actually have an informational meeting on Tuesday, and the, quote, the actual proposals or qualifications are due on December 7th.

Dr. Stone: So we'll have that coming, and partly to deal with the requests that several people have made, including some Council Members, about truck traffic on Pine Street, which SCDOT has so far been unwilling to do a whole lot on, and I say that even though I have a good friend who's a Deputy Secretary there. SPATS is asking the consultant to look at that, as well. Look at the truck.

Just so that everybody, if you all hear about that in the community, know that there's more people looking at it, and I have no idea what solutions are even possible. That's why you have consultants. Just since I'm, in some ways, a liaison between this body and that body, I felt like it was fair for me to tell you all what had happened at one of those, and I'll try to do that on a quarterly basis.

There being no further business; the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 PM.


Dr. Phillip Stone, Chair

Minutes edited by Julie Roland