

**Minutes**  
**Florence County Planning Commission Meeting**  
**Tuesday, October 25, 2011 at 6:30 p.m.**  
**City-County Complex, Council Chambers, Room 803**  
**180 N. Irby St., Florence, South Carolina 29501**

**The Florence County Planning Department staff posted the agenda for the meeting on the information boards at the main entrance and the back entrance of the City-County Complex and on the information board in the lobby of the Planning and Building Inspection Department building.**

The agenda was also mailed to the media.

**I. Call to Order:**

Chairman Peter Knoller called the meeting to order at 6:29 p.m. and declared a quorum of members present.

**II. Attendance:**

**Commissioners Present:** Peter M. Knoller, Chairman  
Bill Lockhart, Vice-Chairman  
Linda Borgman  
David Hobbs  
Roger Kirby  
Jody Lane  
Doris Lockhart  
Virginia Talbert

**Commissioners Absent:** Cecil Cunha  
Ted Greene  
King Lowery

**Staff Present:** Jonathan B. Graham, III, Planning Director  
Pearlie D. McDaniel, Development and Zoning Services Officer  
Angela C. Thomas, Secretary

**Public Attendance:** See sign-in sheet on file with the Florence County Planning Department.

Chairman Knoller explained to those present the procedures for the Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

### **III. Review and Motion of Minutes:**

- **Meeting of August 23, 2011**

Comm. Lane made a motion to approve the minutes.

Vice-Chairman B. Lockhart seconded the motion.

The vote carried unanimously to approve the minutes.

### **IV. Public Hearings:**

#### **Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment:**

**PC#2011-17 Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment to change the Land Use Map designation for property in Florence County located at 900 E. Julip Lane, Florence shown on Tax Map No. 1812, Block 1, Parcel 1 from Public Facilities to Residential Preservation.**

Mr. Jonathan Graham presented the staff report to the Commission. Staff recommends approval of the request.

(Copy available at the Florence County Planning Department)

Chairman Knoller asked is there anyone present that would like to speak in favor of this request?

There was no response.

Chairman Knoller asked is there anyone present that would like to speak in opposition to this request?

Neil Grantham came forward to speak; he asked is this going to affect this property for future use of what it is currently?

Chairman Knoller responded as it's a private piece of property, we couldn't possibly tell you that; we are only correcting an error; we cannot guarantee anything.

Mr. Grantham asked R-2 allows it to be a ballpark correct?

Chairman Knoller responded yes.

Comm. Lane responded, Chairman, I think maybe what he was asking is the clarification of the zoning; R-2 is what everything currently is; it's not going into a multi-family zoning or a business district but as long as it maintains private ownership it doesn't really matter what the zoning is as long as they don't try to develop it.

Chairman Knoller responded the R-2 will stay; we are trying to get residential preservation which means it preserves the area but we cannot guarantee anything about ballparks.

Comm. Talbert asked who owns the property?

Mr. Graham responded the ruritan group; it's a civic organization; their current intent is to keep this as a ballpark.

Mr. Grantham responded the reason for the question is, it has to stay as a ballpark because it's in the Grantham Estate; the ruritan has ownership of it; that ownership reverts back to the Grantham Estate if it changes as a ballpark.

Vice-Chairman B. Lockhart made a motion to approve the request.

Comm. Lane seconded the motion.

The vote carried unanimously.

**Text Amendment:**

**PC#2011-18 Text amendment request for Section 30-311. – Definitions for Dwelling, residential designed manufactured home of the Florence County Code of Ordinances.**

Mr. Jonathan Graham presented the staff report to the Commission. Staff recommends approval of the request.

(Copy available at the Florence County Planning Department)

Comm. Kirby asked how are wind zones rated on the shingle roofs; are they based on the actual wind zone loads that we are using in the county?

Mr. Graham responded yes; they're required to meet the South Carolina Building Code.

Vice-Chairman B. Lockhart asked how did they come up with that 2:3 pitch?

Mr. Graham responded it was the highest level pitch that we could get and have the home transportable; we discovered in the SC DOT regulations that 13' 6" is the height limit; it makes it very difficult to transport these homes with that height limit; some of the changes that I mentioned that we discovered are that some of the side walls of manufactured homes are now 8 feet; earlier they were lower, so that allowed a steeper roof pitch which may be where the 3:12 roof pitch came from ten years ago.

Vice-Chairman B. Lockhart asked I know as a designer we don't usually put shingles on a roof that's under 3:12; is it code that they can put shingles on a pitch that's less than 3:12?

Mr. Graham responded these are assembled in a factory, the manufacturers of the shingles have the recommendations of how to do that installation given the different circumstances; it is applied in the factories and it meets the codes.

Chairman Knoller asked who's going to be the spokesman?

Mr. Allen Hutto came forward and spoke in favor of this request; his comments were as follows:

- I'm the general counsel for the manufactured housing institute for South Carolina; we represent the industry in the state.
- The current ordinance for R-3 and R-5 requires the 3:12 pitch; our builders don't make a 3:12 pitch; they make a slightly lower pitch than that and we have a higher pitched roof; many builders offer a 5:12 or greater roof pitch but it's a lot more expensive; because of that 3:12 requirement we've had some buyers who have had to special order a house to be built to meet this 3:12 requirement.
- We don't build a 3:12 due to shipping restrictions; DOT says that anything over 13'6" is an oversize, overweight load that you have to have a special permit for and you have to follow special routes which makes shipping more expensive as well as special construction.
- The 5:12 roofs and the higher pitched roofs of that nature are hinged roofs; they actually fold down during transport to avoid shipping problems; it is more expensive to build a hinged roof and more complicated to set up; you have to have jacks to raise the roof up.
- The higher side walls are limiting the roof pitch; our customers have wanted higher ceilings over the past few years so we've moved 8' and 9' side walls and that just reduces the available roof pitch.
- This 3:12 requirement is requiring people to pay extra for a house that is basically indistinguishable from a manufactured home with a standard roof pitch.
- It is costing people about \$1,500 to \$2,000 to special order these 3:12 roofs.

Mr. Hutto at this time presented a power point presentation to illustrate what homes with a 3:12 roof pitch and homes with a lesser roof pitch look like.

Mr. Hutto continued, what we would ask you to do is consider the proposal to reduce it to a 2:3 and a 6' overhang; this is actually complicating the appraisal procedure; an appraiser is not going to give you any added value for the \$1,500 or \$2,000 that you are spending on this.

Comm. Kirby asked are there any other counties in the state of South Carolina that you are dealing with this same requirement issue?

Mr. Hutto responded I think there are a couple that do have this requirement; the only time I have ever run into this problem is with Florence and I think it is because Florence has been going out and measuring these roofs; I think there are a couple of other counties but it has never come up before.

Comm. Borgman asked concerning the width, is there a particular purpose as to why it is going from 20 to 25?

Mr. Hutto responded we were trying to strike a good balance since this is a transitional area and the larger homes are probably going to fit in a transitional area better than some of the smaller homes.

Comm. Hobbs asked I'm interested to know why we even had a number there to start with; is it a support issue?

Mr. Hutto responded I think it's just an appearance issue.

Comm. Hobbs asked when we talked about this before, it's obvious to me that somebody put down a number because they were building them that size at that particular time and it has been changed, so why do we even have a number that we have to keep up with?

Vice-Chairman B. Lockhart responded seems like the only number that we would have to keep up with is the height.

Comm. Hobbs responded whatever concerns DOT and the state of South Carolina is the only number I would be interested in preserving.

Mr. Graham responded in Planning we have transition zones so an R-1 is your higher end, larger lots, larger homes, more expensive and you move your way down from there; R-3 and R-5 are transition zones where you are moving into the area where you could eventually end up with all mobile homes with no restrictions; I believe the intent was that they were trying to ease that transition; where the 3:12 comes from is a throw-back to the stick built to say this is in that genre but we are moving away from that; historically we did have a committee of 27 people that looked into this issue over ten years ago and they came up with that formula; where we are today, the design has changed and the quality and the whole industry has moved upward and forward; these homes have really advanced in there technology and their presentation; working with the association, planning staff feels we've reached an agreement where we are still maintaining that transitional nature.

Comm. Borgman asked was there ever a time when a manufactured home had a flat roof like a mobile home?

Mr. Graham responded historically, a long time ago they were almost flat.

Chairman Knoller asked is there anyone else that would like to speak.

There was no response.

Chairman Knoller asked is there anyone that would like to speak against this proposal.

There was no response.

Comm. Lane responded I think the roof pitch issue is more of a cosmetic issue; as long as the manufacturers of the products and the engineers say that it's going to work; I think that's more of an architectural review committee issue of a neighborhood and of a community than an ordinance that we need to be deciding on; as far as the height issue, I don't think we need to be involved in that either; South Carolina has things in place to handle that; manufacturers know how to handle it; I would like to see us eliminate the whole part of that out of our ordinance dealing with the roof pitches and height requirements so it doesn't come back up.

Comm. Lane made a motion to approve the request but asked that staff revisit this ordinance and totally eliminate this section.

Comm. D. Lockhart seconded the motion.

The vote carried unanimously.

**V. Requests for Plat/Plan Approval:**

**PC#2011-19 Request for Summary Plat Approval with a waiver of Section 28.6-85 by Diane Haigler on behalf of David Johnson for property located off of Meadow Prong Rd., Effingham shown on Florence County Tax Map No. 107, Block 1, Parcel 33.**

Chairman Knoller stated this request has been withdrawn by the applicant.

**VI. Other Business:**

None

**VII. Director's Report:**

Mr. Graham's comments were as follows:

- **Summary Plats & Building Report**

We have included the summary plat report as well as the building report in your packet.

- **Continuing Education - Advanced Issues in Land Use Planning and Zoning**

Every year it is a requirement for the Planning Commission to achieve three hours of continuing education; we have scheduled a continuing education session for November 17<sup>th</sup> from 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.; it will be held at our office in the first floor conference room.

Chairman Knoller asked what happens if anyone of these members does not participate for these three hours?

Mr. Graham responded the state monitors this and they do audits; if they did an audit and found out that you have not complied, I believe it is their prerogative to have you removed from the board.

Comm. Borgman asked but you had mentioned you could do it on your own?

Mr. Graham responded if you do it on your own you would need to provide us with a certification that you had done it; whatever class you attended would have to be certified; provide us with a ticket and we will forward that to the administrator's office for the state.

### **VIII. Adjournment:**

Chairman Knoller declared the meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Angela C. Thomas  
Secretary

Approved by:

---

Jonathan B. Graham, III  
Planning Director

Approved by:

---

Peter M. Knoller  
Chairman, Florence County Planning Commission

\*These minutes reflect only actions taken and do not represent a true verbatim transcript of the meeting.