

The Town of Summerville Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes
July 19, 2021

This meeting of the Town of Summerville Planning Commission was held in Town Council Chambers and was attended by Commission Members, Jim Reaves, Chairman; Charlie Stoudenmire; Tom Hart; Kevin Carroll; and Betty Profit. Elaine Segelken and Jonathan Lee were unable to attend. Staff in attendance included Jessi Shuler, Director of Planning; Tim Macholl, Zoning Administrator; Bonnie Miley, Assistant Town Engineer; and Becca Zimmerman, Planner II. The public was invited to attend in person, or they viewed the meeting via live-stream.

Jim Reaves, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

Approval of Minutes:

The Chairman asked if there were any edits or additions to the minutes from the meeting on June 21, 2021. Hearing none, the minutes were accepted as distributed.

Public Hearings:

The first public hearing opened at 4:01 PM and was for the petition by Michael Lawrence Knotts and Laura McCurry Knotts to annex Dorchester Co. TMS# 136-07-01-002, located at 100 W. Butternut Road and totaling approximately 0.85 acres. Currently zoned CN, Neighborhood Commercial in Dorchester County and will be zoned G-B, General Business, upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council District 1). Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if anyone wished to speak on the item. A gentleman that lives in the area questioned the benefit of annexation into the Town and why it would be done if it created more doughnut holes. Mr. Reaves explained that the property had to be contiguous in order to request annexation, so no doughnut holes would be created and the property was already adjacent to property in the Town limits across both streets. He went on to explain that he could not speak to the applicant's specific reasons for requesting annexation, but that there were a number of reasons that could be considered, particularly the delivery of services that the Town provides. Mr. Reaves asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak on this petition. Robby Robbins stated that he represented the Moons who had the property under contract and currently operated an internet-based golf cart business on the premises. He noted that the applicants had had no cooperation from the County and pleasant dealings with the Town, in addition to wanting Town services. Mr. Robbins also noted that the applicants agreed with staff's recommendation of a zoning of N-B, Neighborhood Business, rather than the initial request of General Business, and that they would like to formally change their request to N-B. Mr. Hart confirmed that the N-B zoning would limit the types of business uses in the future and would fit in better with the neighborhood. Mr. Robbins reiterated that the golf cart sales were internet-based, the carts were then delivered, and the applicants had already built a nice fence to help screen any carts that may be on-site. Hearing no further public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:07 PM.

The second public hearing opened at 4:08 PM and was for the petition by the Rosemary Family Limited Partnership to annex Berkeley County TMS#'s 221-00-00-005, -200, -201, -202, and 220-00-02-019 (approximately 100.23 acres total), currently zoned PD-OP/IP Planned Development District – Office or Industrial Park in Berkeley County and will be zoned G-B General Business upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council District 2). Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if the petitioner was here. Chris Campeau stated that he was representing the applicant if the Commissioners had any questions on this agenda item or the next one. Mr. Reaves asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak on this petition. Hearing no further public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:10 PM.

The third public hearing opened at 4:10 PM and was for a request to rezone TMS#s 130-00-00-008 and 130-00-00-050, located on N. Maple St., approximately 20.91 acres, and owned by CVEA Summerville I. LLC from N-MX, Neighborhood Mixed-Use to G-B, General Business. (Council District 1). Mr. Reaves introduced the item. Mr. Reaves asked if there was anyone who would like to speak about this petition. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:10 PM.

The fourth public hearing opened at 4:11 PM and was for proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 1 – Purpose and Applicability, Section 1.5 – Scope of Authority, and Section 1.9 – Transitional Provisions. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked Ms. Shuler to explain the proposed amendments. Ms. Shuler stated that these amendments and those in the remaining public hearings were all initiated and given first reading by Council at a Special Meeting on June 30th. Mr. Reaves asked if there was any public comment, hearing none, this public hearing was closed at 4:13 PM.

The fifth public hearing opened at 4:14 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 2 – Districts, Section 2.3 – General Lot and Building Provisions, Section 2.5 – Mixed-Use District Standards, Section 2.7 – Conventional District Standards, and Section 2.10 – Planned Development Districts. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:14 PM.

The sixth public hearing opened at 4:14 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 3 – Use Provisions, Section 3.3 – Table of Permitted Uses, Section 3.4 – Conditional Use Provisions, Section 3.5 – Accessory Uses and Structures, and Section 3.6 – Temporary Uses. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:14 PM.

The seventh public hearing opened at 4:15 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 4 – Site and Building Design Guidelines, Section 4.2 – Design Guidelines, Section 4.3 – Residential Building Design Guidelines, Section 4.4 – Mixed-Use Building Design Guidelines, Section 4.5 – Suburban Commercial Building Design Guidelines, and Section 4.6 – Industrial Building Design Guidelines, and 4.7 – Civic / Institutional Building Design Guidelines. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:15 PM.

The eighth public hearing opened at 4:16 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 5 – Subdivision and Infrastructure Standards, Section 5.2 – Applicability and Administration, Section 5.3 – Required Improvements and Coordination for All Development, Section 5.4 – Land Suitability, Section 5.6 – Street Classification and Design, Section 5.7 – Street Construction Standards, Section 5.8 – Access and Connectivity, Section 5.9 – Traffic Impact Analysis, Section 5.10 – Easements and Dedications, and Section 5.11 – Surveying, Inspections and Warranties. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:17 PM.

The ninth public hearing opened at 4:17 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 6 – Parks and Open Space, Section 6.2 – Dedication and Conservation Requirements, Section 6.3 – Payment in Lieu of Dedication and Conservation Credit for Parks and Greenway Connections, Section 6.4 – Park Standards, Section 6.5 – Open Space Standards, and Section 6.6 – Ownership and Maintenance. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:17 PM.

The tenth public hearing opened at 4:18 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 7 – Parking and Driveways, Section 7.1 – Purpose and Intent, Section 7.2 – Applicability, Section 7.3 – Vehicle Parking Location, Section 7.4 – Required Parking, Section 7.5 – Bicycle Parking Standards, Section 7.6 – Parking Lot Design Standards, and Section 7.7 – Driveways and Off-Street Parking Access. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:18 PM.

The eleventh public hearing opened at 4:18 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 8 – Tree Preservation, Landscaping and Screening, Section 8.2 –

Applicability, Section 8.3 – Tree Protection, Section 8.5 – Parking Area Landscaping, Section 8.6 – Screening/Buffers, Section 8.7 – Installation and Maintenance Standards, and Section 8.8 – Administration. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Peter Wallace of 427 W. Carolina Ave. stated that he was also a member of the Town’s Tree Protection Board (TPB), which had some serious concerns about these proposed amendments. He noted that the TPB authored a letter detailing their concerns to the Planning Commission and Council, so he wouldn’t go into detail, but he did want to stress that one of their greatest concerns is that the changes haven’t been discussed with the TPB or with staff. In addition, the changes don’t address reality and appear to be an attempt to make it easier for tree removal without consequences. Mr. Hart confirmed that the Commissioners had received the letter from the TPB, and encouraged the members to provide further comments to Council as they had a chance to review the proposed amendments in further detail. Faye Campbell of 107 Newcastle Ct., another member of the TPB, stressed that Summerville should be proud to have the oldest tree ordinance in the state, and she finds it offensive for it to be altered without contacting and seeking input from the TPB. Hearing no further public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:25 PM.

The twelfth public hearing opened at 4:25 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 9 – Lighting, Section 9.2 – Applicability, and Section 9.3 – Design Standards. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:25 PM.

The thirteenth public hearing opened at 4:26 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 10 – Signs, Section 10.3 – Residential Signs, Section 10.4 – Mixed-Use, Commercial, and Industrial Signage, Section 10.5 – Changeable Copy Signs, Section 10.6 – Sign Illumination, Section 10.7 – Temporary Signs, Section 10.8 – Signs That Do Not Require a Permit, Section 10.9 – Prohibited Signs, and Section 10.10 – Administration Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:26 PM.

The fourteenth public hearing opened at 4:27 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 12 – Nonconformities, Section 12.3 – General Provisions and Procedures, Section 12.4 – Nonconforming Uses, Section 12.5 – Nonconforming Structures, Section 12.6 – Nonconforming Uses, and Section 12.9 – Nonconforming Sites. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:17 PM.

The fifteenth public hearing opened at 4:28 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 13 – Administration and Procedures, Section 13.2 – Administrative Officials and Agencies, Section 13.3 – Boards and Commissions, Section 13.5 – Application Requirements, Section 13.7 – Administrative Permits, Section 13.8 – Design Review, Section 13.9 – Land Development and Subdivision, Section 13.10 – Adjustments and Appeals, and Section 13.11 – Amendments and Other Legislative Actions Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:28 PM.

The sixteenth public hearing opened at 4:28 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 14 – Violations and Enforcements, and Section 14.2 – Enforcement. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:28 PM.

The seventeenth public hearing opened at 4:29 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 3 – Use Provisions, Section 3.3 – Table of Permitted Uses and Subsection 3.6.1 – Permitted Temporary Uses, Item G – Mobile food/retail vending. Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing no public comment, this public hearing was closed at 4:29 PM.

Old Business

There were no items under Old Business.

New Business

The first item under New Business was New Street Names. Ms. Shuler stated that they had three street names for consideration in Phase 3A of the Limehouse Village development: Red Bluff St., Slater Lake Ln., and Upper Trestles Ave. Mr. Carroll made a motion to approve all three names, and Mr. Stoudenmire made the second. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Shuler then noted that they had nine names for consideration in the Sheep Island PUD development: Attadale Road, Broadstone Drive, Great Glen Way, Lilac Grove Way, Midmills Lane, Riverside Gardens Drive, Ruthven Drive, Terrace View Drive, and Whitebridge Road. Mr. Hart made a motion to approve all nine names, and Mr. Carroll made the second. The motion passed unanimously.

The second item under New Business was the petition by Michael Lawrence Knotts and Laura McCurry Knotts to annex Dorchester Co. TMS# 136-07-01-002, located at 100 W. Butternut Road and totaling approximately 0.85 acres. Currently zoned CN, Neighborhood Commercial in Dorchester County and will be zoned G-B, General Business, upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council District 1). Mr. Carroll made a motion to accept with Ms. Profit making the second. Mr. Hart then made a motion to amend the motion to recommend acceptance of the annexation petition with a zoning of N-B, Neighborhood Business. Ms. Profit made the second. Mr. Reaves called for the question for the amendment, which passed unanimously. The question was then called on the original motion as amended, and the motion carried unanimously.

The third item under New Business was the petition by the Rosemary Family Limited Partnership to annex Berkeley County TMS#'s 221-00-00-005, -200, -201, -202, and 220-00-02-019 (approximately 100.23 acres total), currently zoned PD-OP/IP Planned Development District – Office or Industrial Park in Berkeley County and will be zoned G-B General Business upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council District 2). Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend acceptance of the annexation petition with the requested zoning, and Mr. Carroll made the second. Following no discussion, the question was called and the motion carried unanimously.

The fourth item under New Business was the request to rezone TMS#s 130-00-00-008 and 130-00-00-050, located on N. Maple St., approximately 20.91 acres, and owned by CVEA Summerville I, LLC from N-MX, Neighborhood Mixed-Use to G-B, General Business. (Council District 1). Mr. Carroll made a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning with Mr. Stoudenmire making the second. Following no discussion, the question was called and the motion carried unanimously.

The fifth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 1 – Purpose and Applicability, Section 1.5 – Scope of Authority, and Section 1.9 – Transitional Provisions. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Mr. Hart explained that he felt it was clear that Council had spent a lot of time and effort on these amendments to the UDO, and out of deference to their work, he was going to generally defer to their recommendations on all of these amendments, although he may have specific comments on certain ones. Mr. Carroll noted that he takes the opposite opinion of Mr. Hart. He explained that the role of the UDO is to give the Town rules that they can enforce because you hope that you are going to get a good developer, but a lot of time you don't, and the more restrictions you have, it's easier to take care of things. Mr. Carroll also detailed that the proposed amendments included some strange things that could possibly use some proofreading from someone who is used to dealing with zoning ordinances and also a reduction in some things that you could do. He stated that there may be some minor changes that are needed, but overall he does not agree with these changes. Mr. Hart informed the Commission that his specific comment on this chapter is that he would not remove the scope of authority. Mr. Reaves agreed and added that in this chapter and in others the proposed amendments delete or change things that should remain either because they were original or are needed to remain in line with state law requirements. He also informed the Commission and the public in attendance that these amendments were

a document that belonged to Council since they had already received first reading, so the Commission could bless them if they so choose, provide comments if they choose not to, but they could not suggest amendments at this point. Mr. Hart asked for clarification that the Commission's previous comments would be included, and Ms. Shuler confirmed that they would be in the minutes. Mr. Hart then affirmed his motion for approval with reservations. The question was called and the motion carried 4-1 with Mr. Carroll the lone vote in opposition.

The sixth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 2 – Districts, Section 2.3 – General Lot and Building Provisions, Section 2.5 – Mixed-Use District Standards, Section 2.7 – Conventional District Standards, and Section 2.10 – Planned Development Districts. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Following no discussion, the question was called and the motion carried 4-1 with Mr. Carroll the lone vote in opposition.

The seventh item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 3 – Use Provisions, Section 3.3 – Table of Permitted Uses, Section 3.4 – Conditional Use Provisions, Section 3.5 – Accessory Uses and Structures, and Section 3.6 – Temporary Uses. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Following no discussion, the question was called and the motion carried 4-1 with Mr. Carroll the lone vote in opposition.

The eighth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 4 – Site and Building Design Guidelines, Section 4.2 – Design Guidelines, Section 4.3 – Residential Building Design Guidelines, Section 4.4 – Mixed-Use Building Design Guidelines, Section 4.5 – Suburban Commercial Building Design Guidelines, and Section 4.6 – Industrial Building Design Guidelines, and 4.7 – Civic / Institutional Building Design Guidelines. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Following no discussion, the question was called and the motion carried 4-1 with Mr. Carroll the lone vote in opposition.

The ninth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 5 – Subdivision and Infrastructure Standards, Section 5.2 – Applicability and Administration, Section 5.3 – Required Improvements and Coordination for All Development, Section 5.4 – Land Suitability, Section 5.6 – Street Classification and Design, Section 5.7 – Street Construction Standards, Section 5.8 – Access and Connectivity, Section 5.9 – Traffic Impact Analysis, Section 5.10 – Easements and Dedications, and Section 5.11 – Surveying, Inspections and Warranties. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Following no discussion, the question was called and the motion carried 4-1 with Mr. Carroll the lone vote in opposition.

The tenth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 6 – Parks and Open Space, Section 6.2 – Dedication and Conservation Requirements, Section 6.3 – Payment in Lieu of Dedication and Conservation Credit for Parks and Greenway Connections, Section 6.4 – Park Standards, Section 6.5 – Open Space Standards, and Section 6.6 – Ownership and Maintenance. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Following no discussion, the question was called and the motion carried 4-1 with Mr. Carroll the lone vote in opposition.

The eleventh item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 7 – Parking and Driveways, Section 7.1 – Purpose and Intent, Section 7.2 – Applicability, Section 7.3 – Vehicle Parking Location, Section 7.4 – Required Parking, Section 7.5 – Bicycle Parking Standards, Section 7.6 – Parking Lot Design Standards, and Section 7.7 – Driveways and Off-Street Parking Access. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. In Section 7.1 Purpose and Intent, Mr. Carroll stressed that the word "may" can't be used in a document like this. He also noted that the deletions in that section are all impacts that you would want to avoid. He further emphasized his disagreement in reducing the size of bike paths and/or bike parking spaces. Following no

further discussion, the question was called and the motion carried 3-2 with Mr. Carroll and Mr. Stoudenmire voting in opposition.

The twelfth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 8 – Tree Preservation, Landscaping and Screening, Section 8.2 – Applicability, Section 8.3 – Tree Protection, Section 8.5 – Parking Area Landscaping, Section 8.6 – Screening/Buffers, Section 8.7 – Installation and Maintenance Standards, and Section 8.8 – Administration. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Mr. Hart expressed his concern that the deletion of all of the mitigation alternatives is too strict, and he recommended Council confer with the Tree Protection Board and work with them to come up with any changes that would be mutually agreeable to both. Mr. Stoudenmire agreed with the Tree Protection Board's concerns and also brought up his concern with the pruning and cutting of trees by the electrical company, noting that it needed to be monitored closer. Following no further discussion, the question was called and the motion failed 0-5, with all voting in opposition.

The thirteenth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 9 – Lighting, Section 9.2 – Applicability, and Section 9.3 – Design Standards. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Following no discussion, the question was called and the motion carried 4-1 with Mr. Carroll the lone vote in opposition.

The fourteenth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 10 – Signs, Section 10.3 – Residential Signs, Section 10.4 – Mixed-Use, Commercial, and Industrial Signage, Section 10.5 – Changeable Copy Signs, Section 10.6 – Sign Illumination, Section 10.7 – Temporary Signs, Section 10.8 – Signs That Do Not Require a Permit, Section 10.9 – Prohibited Signs, and Section 10.10 – Administration. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Mr. Carroll stated that when it comes to signs you want the Town to look nice, and he believed that taking any restrictions out would be unacceptable. Mr. Hart added that the regulations only applied to new businesses, not existing signs, so he agrees with the stricter standards that are already in place. Following the discussion, the question was called and the motion failed 0-5, with all voting in opposition.

The fifteenth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 12 – Nonconformities, Section 12.3 – General Provisions and Procedures, Section 12.4 – Nonconforming Uses, Section 12.5 – Nonconforming Structures, Section 12.6 – Nonconforming Uses, and Section 12.9 – Nonconforming Sites. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Mr. Hart explained that he sees these changes as a way to make these requirements softer and more applicable to Summerville, and he believes that the intent of these changes is to give more flexibility to the Town in regulating uses, and therefore, the staff would have more flexibility in how buildings are built and whether they conform or not. Mr. Carroll disagreed citing the removal of the landscaping section. Mr. Hart asked Ms. Shuler if the staff had any say in landscaping coming into conformance prior to the UDO. Ms. Shuler noted that they did in certain situations, such as a change in use from residential to commercial or if the property value was increased by 50% or more. Following the discussion, the question was called and the motion carried 4-1 with Mr. Carroll the lone vote in opposition.

The sixteenth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 13 – Administration and Procedures, Section 13.2 – Administrative Officials and Agencies, Section 13.3 – Boards and Commissions, Section 13.5 – Application Requirements, Section 13.7 – Administrative Permits, Section 13.8 – Design Review, Section 13.9 – Land Development and Subdivision, Section 13.10 – Adjustments and Appeals, and Section 13.11 – Amendments and Other Legislative Actions. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Mr. Hart brought up the changes to Section 13.3.2.C, which deleted numbers 3, 5, and 6 from the Planning Commission's review. He did not argue with removing them from the Planning Commission's purview, but stressed that if that was done, some other commission, board, etc. needed to review them. Mr. Carroll noted that there needed to be consistency between the use of "days," "calendar days," and "business days." He was

also concerned about the deletion of the advertising requirements in certain sections. Mr. Reaves noted that the removal of annexations from the Planning Commission's purview is a concern because that was added to their purview years ago due to a lawsuit following an annexation. Since annexations involve a change in zoning, Council changed the ordinance at that time to have them go through the Planning Commission. Mr. Reaves emphasized that Council needed to reexamine that change and some of the others as well. Following the discussion, the question was called and the motion failed 0-5, with all voting in opposition.

The seventeenth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 14 – Violations and Enforcements, and Section 14.2 – Enforcement. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Mr. Carroll again noted a concern about the intended definition of the word "days." Mr. Hart argued that there are legal standards for interpretation, so no specification is needed. Following no further discussion, the question was called and the motion failed 2-3 with Mr. Carroll, Ms. Profit, and Mr. Stoudenmire voting in opposition.

The eighteenth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 3 – Use Provisions, Section 3.3 – Table of Permitted Uses and Subsection 3.6.1 – Permitted Temporary Uses, Item G – Mobile food/retail vending. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval with Mr. Carroll making the second. Mr. Hart explained that he believes that this is a good example of where the UDO is a good document in general, but when it was applied specifically it had problems, and this is one of those problems. He noted that these amendments allow food trucks to be regulated but also utilized. Following the discussion, the question was called and the motion carried 4-1 with Mr. Carroll the lone vote in opposition.

Miscellaneous:

Ms. Shuler stated that she had no items under Miscellaneous.

Adjourn:

With no further business for the Commission, Mr. Carroll made a motion to adjourn with Mr. Hart making the second. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 5:04 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,



Jessi Shuler, AICP
Director of Planning

Date: 8/16/21

Approved: 
Jim Reaves, Chairman or Kevin Carroll, Vice Chairman