



Chester County Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

February 28th, 2025

ADMINISTRATIVE

1. Attendance

- a. Commission: Chairman Shawn Hough, Vice-Chairman Azzie Lee Hill, Commissioner Nancy Walley, Commissioner Israel Bunting Sr., Commissioner Trent Smith, Commissioner Todd Love.
- b. Staff: Jeremy Ward.

2. Approval of Agenda

- a. Motion: made by Commissioner Love, seconded by Commissioner Walley.
- b. Vote: 6-0 to approve.

3. Approval of Minutes from 2/25/2025 Meeting

- a. Motion: made by Commissioner Walley, seconded by Commissioner Smith.
- b. Vote: 4-0 to approve.

NEW BUSINESS

4. CCTA25-01: Chester County requests to change Chapter 2 § 2-101 of the Zoning Ordinances to read: “A planned development ~~may be predominately residential or predominately commercial or industrial~~ **must include a proportionate mix of residential and commercial or industrial use** and may be proposed for any area. **A planned development district must contain more than one type or density of residential unit.”**

- a. Applicant Comment: Mr. Ward explained that this change would enable the county to require that subdivisions comply with subdivision standards, such as minimum lot size, for each residential zoning district that it falls into or is rezoned into. This is a change from the previous definition, of which Chester County was well within its rights to define it as either predominately residential or commercial. This change will put us in more compatibility with surrounding counties, as well as how the state defines planned developments. This is not

targeting any PD that is currently underway. This will make the process more streamlined, and change the intent of the PD district to provide an innovative, creative town center that has shopping and a mix of residential houses to help support the shopping opportunities.

- b. Public Comment: Chris Robusto (572 Sutton Rd. in Fort Mill) stated that they were okay with the language proposed, but also wanted to add in civic uses, such as school donation sites, as well as parks or emergency management service facilities or land given to the county. He stated that all subdivisions in the past five years have been PD plans, while the only subdivision has been approved as a PDD plan has been Lando. He stated his opinion that the language proposed here would only impact PDD plans/Lando, and then stated that the Lando plans would provide civic sites. He stated his experience with donating sites with the Baxter Village project in Fort Mill.
 - i. Questions:
 - 1. Chairman Hough asked if a developer would build out the retail space for a PD. Mr. Robusto responded that the current PDD plans for Lando allowed the ability to build 100,000 sq. ft. of commercial space; that he would not be the builder of the commercial, just the residential and road network, but the school site for Lando would be a donation as well as the EMS/fire station.
 - 2. Chairman Hough asked if there would be any guarantee that the retail would be built. Mr. Robusto stated that, in their willingness to cooperate with the county, they would be put conditions on a certain number of units built until the commercial was built or school site donated or fire site donated.
 - 3. Chairman Hough clarified that he was not talking about Lando particularly, but in general, was concerned about retail not being finished. Mr. Robusto further explained how the conditions of development timeline could be worked out. Chairman Hough stated that he did not want to create a loophole where no retail was every built, and cited several Charlotte-area examples of mixed-use development. Mr. Robusto then stated that there was a reverter clause that could be put in.
 - 4. Mr. Ward stated that the five minutes of speaking time was up. Mr. Hough and Mr. Robusto wrapped up their conversation.
- c. Staff Report: Already presented in the Applicant Comment.
 - i. Questions:
 - 1. Commissioner Love asked about commercial land within the plan review process and the distinction between planned development districts versus planned development sites. Mr. Ward explained the uniqueness of a planned development district, with a lack of set

rules and that it is not confined to a particular part of the county but is a zoning classification assigned to individual projects. Mr. Ward explained that there is no separate PDD district, but that the extra “D” on the end of “PDD” stands for “district.” Lando Village is currently zoned “PD”, just as with every other Planned Development in the county. These changes are in no way targeted at one particular project.

2. Commissioner Love asked where the county could come in and require a certain amount of each use. Mr. Ward explained that the ordinances currently allow the county to require land to be sold for civic purposes, and that is the case in the new subdivision codes as well. He discussed further the reasons for the changes.
3. Commissioner Bunting further clarified that the county could consider such projects on a case-by-case basis, and Mr. Ward confirmed that.
4. Commissioner Walley asked about parks. Mr. Ward explained that parks would be allowed, and in the proposed code for both subdivisions and planned developments, parks would be required.
5. Chairman Hough asked about future oversight for PD’s moving forward. Mr. Ward confirmed that any application for a PD rezoning would continue to come before the Planning Commission.
6. Chairman Hough reiterated that his comments were not addressed at Mr. Robusto or his particular project, but asked if it would be possible to set a limit on when retail has to be built for PDs. Mr. Ward confirmed that could be possible and could be added into the new subdivision codes, but not tonight.
7. Chairman Hough asked if it would be possible for PDs for developers to partner with another developer. Mr. Ward responded that it would be possible.
8. Chairman Hough asked if the Planning Commission would have the latitude to deal with the differences in site topography and location as far as site uses. Mr. Ward stated that they would always retain the latitude to approve or deny any application for rezoning, based on the interests of the county and the Comprehensive Plan.
9. Commissioner Walley asked about the old school building in the Lando project, and how PD’s work if there is a historic structure on them. Mr. Ward reiterated that this was not about any particular project, but that he believed the county could require sites, such as historic sites, within a PD be sold to the county, but that specific question with historic sites had not come up before the county

within a PD in recent memory. There was some discussion about this fact.

10. Chairman Hough asked about projects that were currently in phases of development, such as Stanton. Mr. Ward responded that these zoning ordinances changes would not impact any development underway that currently had a development agreement with the county, such as Stanton.

11. At the request of Chairman Hough, Mr. Robusto stepped back to the podium. Commissioner Love asked about the reason for the request in the change in verbiage. Mr. Robusto explained that if they had more options to choose from, it helped underwrite the deal from the beginning. They did not want the county to be able to demand that land be donated or sold or forced, when the developer has already underwritten the deal and is way into it. They wanted an option that it has to be two of the items, for instance, and not have Council tell them after the Planning Commission that they wanted to do something else. There was more discussion on this point. Mr. Ward informed the Planning Commission about the current rules: after submission of a sketch plan for PD, the county has one month to respond with any requirement for the sale of any civic uses. Chairman Hough asked if this was enough time, and Mr. Ward said that that could be changed in the upcoming subdivision ordinance review.

- d. Discussion: Chairman Hough restated the agenda item, and stated that because the County Council would soon be reviewing this and could better speak with regards to the civic uses, they should be the ones to consider Mr. Robusto's request about civic donation sites.
- e. Motion: made by Chairman Hough, seconded by Commissioner Love, to approve the text as written.
- f. Vote: 6-0 to recommend approval.

5. CCTA25-02: Chester County requests to change Chapter 4 § 4-129 of the Zoning Ordinances to read: "Planned Development Districts ~~may permit~~ shall consist of a mixture of different types of housing with compatible commercial uses, shopping centers, office parks, and other mixed-use development."

- a. Comment: Mr. Ward explained the purpose behind this change.
- b. Discussion: None.
- c. Motion: made by Commissioner Love, seconded by Commissioner Bunting, to approve the text as written.
- d. Vote: 6-0 to recommend approval.

6. CCTA25-03: Chester County requests to change Chapter 4 § 4-110 of the Zoning Ordinances to add: **“Utility Capacity: The planned number of units in a subdivision using public water and sewer shall not exceed the guaranteed allotment for those utilities. Should the water and sewer guarantee expire before the development construction begins, the zoning shall revert to the previous zoning.”**
- a. Comment: Mr. Ward explained that this was the same language that the Planning Commission and County Council had previously added to the PD zoning district.
 - i. Questions:
 - 1. Commissioner Love about what this would apply to. Mr. Ward clarified that this would generally not refer to individual builders, which were proposed to be generally exempted from subdivision ordinances. There was further discussion on this point.
 - b. Discussion: none.
 - c. Motion: made by Commissioner Love, seconded by Commissioner Smith, to approve the text as written.
 - d. Vote: 6-0 to recommend approval.
7. CCTA25-04: Chester County requests to change Chapter 4 § 4-112 of the Zoning Ordinances to add: **“Utility Capacity: The planned number of units in a subdivision using public water and sewer shall not exceed the guaranteed allotment for those utilities. Should the water and sewer guarantee expire before the development construction begins, the zoning shall revert to the previous zoning.”**
- a. Comment: none.
 - b. Discussion: none.
 - c. Motion: made by Vice-Chairman Hill, seconded by Commissioner Smith, to approve the text as written.
 - d. Vote: 6-0 to recommend approval.
8. CCTA25-05: Chester County requests to change Chapter 4 § 4-114 of the Zoning Ordinances to add: **“Utility Capacity: The planned number of units in a subdivision using public water and sewer shall not exceed the guaranteed allotment for those utilities. Should the water and sewer guarantee expire before the development construction begins, the zoning shall revert to the previous zoning.”**
- a. Comment: none.
 - b. Discussion: none.
 - c. Motion: made by Vice-Chairman Hill, seconded by Commissioner Love, to approve the text as written.
 - d. Vote: 6-0 to recommend approval.

9. CCTA25-06: Chester County requests to change Chapter 4 § 4-116 of the Zoning Ordinances to add: **“Utility Capacity: The planned number of units in a subdivision using public water and sewer shall not exceed the guaranteed allotment for those utilities. Should the water and sewer guarantee expire before the development construction begins, the zoning shall revert to the previous zoning.”**

- a. Comment: none.
- b. Discussion: There was discussion among the commissioners regarding the exact location of the easement and the usage of the site.
- c. Motion: made by Commissioner Bunting, seconded by Commissioner Smith, to approve the text as written.
- d. Vote: 6-0 to recommend approval.

10. Adjourn

- a. Comment: Mr. Ward stated that they had the first draft of the proposed new subdivision ordinances at their seats, and the Commission would be reviewing them at the upcoming workshop on March 10th.
- b. Motion: made by Chairman Hough, seconded by Commissioner Walley.
- c. Vote: 6-0 to approve.