

**MINUTES  
TOWN OF FORT MILL  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
May 18, 2021  
112 Confederate Street  
6:30 PM**

**Live Viewing Online: Request Access by emailing before 5:00 pm on Tuesday, May 18, 2021 to  
Penelope G. Karagounis, Planning Director at [pkaragounis@fortmillsc.gov](mailto:pkaragounis@fortmillsc.gov)  
Public Access by Phone: Dial (toll free) 1-866-899-4679 and use access code 861-752-589**

Present: James Traynor, Dan Stout, Andy Agrawal, Hynek Lettang, Chris Wolfe, Ben Hudgins, Matthew Lucarelli, Planning Director Penelope Karagounis, Planner II Nick Cauthen, Mark McAuley, Kevin Harney, Al Bronner, Tony Zook, Justin Henry, Cait Shaw, Walter McNeil, Sam Kleto, Tom Arcoria, Mark Murray, Ken Pagano, Justin Bice, Nick Fitzgerald, Shawn Mottern,

Absent: N/A

Chairman James Traynor called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:30 pm on Tuesday, May 18, 2021. Chairman Traynor gave opportunity to the Planning Commission to review and comment on the April 20, 2021 meeting minutes. Chairman Traynor mentioned to add “meeting minutes” after the March 16, 2021 sentence. Then the third to last sentence in the first paragraph to delete “to” and add “the” and then delete “delivers” and add “contains”. Commissioner Lucarelli made a motion to approve the minutes as edited and amended by the chairman and Commissioner Agrawal seconded the motion. The minutes for April 20, 2021 were approved with conditions by a vote of 7-0.

**NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

- 1. Commercial Appearance Review – Tenet Healthcare:** Mr. Cauthen provided a brief overview of the request, the purpose of which was to review and consider granting commercial appearance review approval for a proposed medical office building. The Planning Department recommended approval of the request, contingent upon staff being able to approve minor adjustments.

Mr. Stout noted the original size and placement of the medical office building was slightly different in size and location. The applicant stated the building had been rotated to get more parking directly adjacent to the building.

Mr. Wolfe asked if there would be treatment areas in the M.O.B. or if it would just be support staff offices. The applicant stated there will be administrative offices, a physician’s lounge, and possibly labs, but no treatment areas.

Mr. Hudgins noted concerns regarding the straight rooflines and the industrial look of the

building. The applicant stated the building had the same aesthetic and materials as the Hospital and it is very simple with an emphasis on the entry corner.

Mr. Lucarelli said he agreed with Mr. Hudgins and would like to see windows along the large brick mass where the stairwell was located. The applicant responded that it was important to keep the building “quiet” from Wellness Way as to not attract people particularly in times of emergency.

Mr. Stout asked if there was a covered walkway proposed between the M.O.B. and Hospital. The applicant said the buildings are located approximately 30 ft. apart and discussions are still being had whether the connection will be covered or not.

After no further questions or comments Chairman Traynor stated he liked the look of the building and asked for a motion.

Mr. Lettang made a motion to grant commercial appearance review approval with the condition for staff to have the ability to approve minor modifications to the site plan and elevations if needed. Mr. Wolfe seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-1. (Mr. Hudgins against).

- 2. Commercial Appearance Review – SC Hondros and Associates:** Mr. Cauthen provided a brief overview of the request, the purpose of which was to review and consider granting commercial appearance review approval for a landscape supply company. The Planning Department did not recommend in favor of the request, due to the amount of metal paneling particularly along the south and west elevations. Staff noted a previous approval was granted back in September of 2020 but the building had substantially changed since that initial rendering.

Mr. Traynor briefly discussed the historical context of the Commission’s prohibition against significant metal siding and how the P.C. decided years ago that a tremendous amount of metal does not hold up very well and can easily become an eye sore for the community. It was also noted the buildings in the immediate area significantly pre-date the Planning Commission’s current standards.

Mr. Wolfe agreed and stated the Commission has stayed consistent with the prohibition of significant metal regardless of the use type, including churches.

The Commission also stated they strive to work with applicants as much as possible to come to an agreement that is acceptable to all sides.

Mr. Lucarelli stated it was a very good use for the subject property, but many other similar buildings had been turned down by the Commission.

The applicant described the materials in detail including details regarding the manufacturer of the metal paneling.

Mr. Lettang reiterated that metal panels to this extent are not acceptable. Mr. Hudgins stated this standard had been in place for many years.

The applicant stated that the prohibition of metal paneling is not codified in the ordinance.

Chairman Traynor said a commercial appearance review board is both subjective and objective and everything could not possibly be included in the ordinance. The Board has a very long track record of consistency over the years.

Mr. Lucarelli asked about the price difference between the proposed corrugated metal paneling and architectural metal paneling. The applicant stated there was a significant price difference.

The applicant asked for a deferral. After no further questions or comments Chairman Traynor asked for a motion.

Mr. Wolfe made a motion to defer the commercial appearance review request to allow the applicant more time to work with staff regarding improved building materials. Mr. Lettang seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

- 3. Commercial Appearance Review – Justin Bice:** Mr. Cauthen provided a brief overview of the request, the purpose of which was to review and consider granting commercial appearance review approval for a general retail commercial building. The Planning Department recommended approval of the request, contingent upon staff being able to approve minor adjustments.

Mr. Wolfe noted concern over a residential road serving the project. The applicant and staff noted that SCDOT approved the location, and it was reviewed by the Town's traffic consultant.

Mr. Agrawal asked about the proposed tenants. The applicant stated he was not sure at this time, but it could be similar to Steele Street Station. Staff noted that a restaurant would not be allowed without updated parking counts and TIA ramifications.

Mr. Wolfe stated the fabric awnings on the rear of the building are a concern due to durability issues. The owner said he would be agreeable to change them to metal assuming it is not a dramatic cost increase.

Mr. Wolfe said he wanted to ensure the AC mechanical units are covered appropriately along with any janitorial equipment behind the building in view of the residential area. The owner said he would make sure that was not an issue.

After no further questions or comments Chairman Traynor asked for a motion.

Mr. Wolfe made a motion to grant commercial appearance review approval with the condition for the fabric awnings to be replaced with metal, storage for any cleaning supplies to be hidden from the outside, and for staff to have the ability to approve minor modifications to the site plan and elevations if needed. Mr. Hudgins seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:06 pm.