

The McClellanville Planning Commission met on the above noted date and time in person. Notice of the meeting was published in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act. Planning Commission members present were Ginny Prevost (Chair), Oliver Thames, Dan Fifis and Mary Duke. Zoning Administrator Kathryn Basha, Town Administrator Michelle McClellan and Town Planner Eddie Bernard were also present.

Chair Prevost then introduced the first item which was a subdivision of 5.7 acres into 5 lots. Mr. Bernard read through the staff report. It was mentioned that an updated plan (provided by the applicant the day of the meeting) showed existing topography which surface drainage toward Graham Farm is possible with natural grades heading that way for 2/3 of the site. Commission members sought confirmation that all lots were accessed from Graham Farm Road, which was confirmed, and that a lack of a turn around was a concern. Chair Prevost asked if anyone from the public had any comments. The owner of the property and the applicant, Alan Tavel, began speaking about the driveway and described not having a cul-de-sac turn around but rather a hammerhead style turn around that would extend roughly 30' in one direction and 10'-20' in the other at the end of the ingress/egress easement. A utility easement would extend roughly down the northern lot 3 line to the adjacent property to the east. Chair Prevost asked for a motion concerning the turnaround item. Ms. Duke made a motion to approve the application pending approval of the fire department to accept the proposal of the discussed turn around, which was seconded by Mr. Thames. Ms. Prevost asked for a motion for the remainder of the preliminary plan. Mr. Fifis made a motion to approve the preliminary plan submitted with the staff recommended conditions which was seconded by Ms. Duke and the motion carried an "aye" vote by all commission members.

Chair Prevost introduced the next item which was a request for Commission review of the size of accessory structures allowed on lots prior to establishment of a principal use. Council had asked the Commission to consider amending the size of accessory structures that may be permitted prior to a principal structure. Ms. Basha mentioned that prior to last September you could not put any accessory structure on a property ahead of the principal structure. Recent revisions were put in place to allow for a 120 square foot structure ahead of the principal structure, which aligned with the building code in that they do not need to meet flood zone r and other permitting requirements. Some recent inquires have asked for 1,000 square feet. The accessory dwelling unit is limited to 800 square feet. The Commission mentioned the example of an accessory structure near the post office. Ms. Basha clarified that the structure they were referencing is currently the principal structure on that property but was built to not exceed the maximum accessory dwelling unit size should a larger house/principal structure was ever to be built. Ms. Basha explained that the current 120 square foot requirement was consistent with the 2021 changes in the floodplain management ordinance and the fact that up to that size would not have to meet flood regulations or require a building permit. She continued that some people wanted to be able to have sheds to store maintenance equipment or boat supplies on otherwise vacant properties. Commissioners mentioned some ideas such as tying the size to impervious surface percentage or having different sizes depending on whether the property was in or outside of the historic district. The Commission decided to table the discussion to have Ms. Basha provide some additional options.

Chair Prevost introduced the next item which was looking at Home Occupations and screening of storage or equipment. Ms. Basha explained that a condition of home occupations is that they should have no exterior evidence that a business is there other than a small sign and should not increase traffic. There is debate on whether the current language conditioning “no exterior evidence” is sufficient to dictate screening of a yard where equipment and/or materials are stored. Council did not feel that the current language was clear enough concerning how to handle this. Ms. Basha recommended adding clarification that any outdoor storage or equipment associated with a home occupation be shown on the sketch plan accompanying a permit application and be required to be screened, as well as amending the section for uses that require screening to include home occupations. The Commission was agreeable to having Ms. Basha draft these items as recommended.

Ms. Prevost mentioned that the next meeting would be a joint meeting with Planning Commission and Town Council on April 4<sup>th</sup>.

There being no further business, Ms. Prevost asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Fifis motioned to adjourn and was seconded by Mr. Thames. The motion carried an “aye” unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted



Eddie Bernard, RLA  
Planner

APPROVED: April 25, 2022