

PETTUS POND – PRELIMINARY PLAT
Response to County Comments Issued March 9, 2023

COUNTY ENGINEER – STEPHEN BLACKWELDER

1. Acknowledged
2. The name of the TIA will be updated to Pettus Pond upon issuance of comments related to the TIA. Any improvements outlined as a result of the TIA and agreed upon will be a requirement of the project.
3. It is understood that LCWSD will not approve this project for construction, nor review construction drawings until downstream sewer improvements by others have been installed, tested, certified and placed into operation. LCWSD is aware that we are seeking Preliminary Plat approval for Pettus Pond and that we will not seek construction drawing approval until downstream sewer improvements are in place.
4. We acknowledge that any impacts to jurisdictional streams and/or wetland will require a permit through the US Army Corps of Engineers and/or SCDHEC.
 - a. We are aware that we will have to obtain a Nationwide Permit for road, lot, stormwater and utility impacts to the jurisdictional wetlands and streams
5. We have removed the storm outfall into the BMP as on PP-6 as that appears to have errantly been shown

E911 ADDRESS – SANDRA BURTON

No response required

FIRE MARSHAL – JOHN MAGETTE

1. Per email correspondence with Fire Marshal the week of 3/20/23, a second access will not be required subject to following conditions:
 - If only single access is provided, interior roads will be widened to 26' in paved width
 - Fire hydrants will be provided on both sides of road (LCWSD has under consideration and will work out specifications for such type of fire service within a community
 - These conditions will not be applicable if Patterson Preserve is developed simultaneously with this project and interconnection can be made (Fire Marshal has acknowledged that interconnection proposed would satisfy 2nd access requirement)
2. Fire hydrant locations have been adjusted and fire hydrants added to ensure that all homes will be within 500' of a fire hydrant, as an apparatus would lay a hose. Final adjustments may be required with actual engineered plan review and detailed exhibits can be provided at that time.
3. Radius information for edge of pavement and R/W have been added to the cul-de-sacs.

LC WATER & SEWER DISTRICT – ERIN EVANS

Acknowledged and no response required.

PLANNING – ASHLEY DAVIS

General

1. Acknowledged and it is anticipated by LCWSD and the Suncrest Development that the downstream sewer will be operational on or about June 1, 2023.
2. We acknowledge that Patterson Preserve has been notified that their vested right has expired and will not be renewed by Lancaster County and this project is prepared to make connection to Suncrest directly as easements are in place and this development is an adjoining property (no easements needed aside from easement already in place on Suncrest property).
3. We acknowledge the comment but express deep concern that such a statement is a declaration of a moratorium on any residential development without proper notice and ordinances to substantiate the comment, especially since this is not a rezoning or conditional zoning permit



Lancaster County
Planning Department
P. O. Box 1809
Lancaster, SC 29721
803.285.6005
planning@lancastercountysc.net

March 09, 2023

Brandon Pridemore
R. Joe Harris & Associates, Inc.
127 Ben Casey Drive
Fort Mill, SC 29708

Project Number	20212450
Project Name	Pettus Pond
Location	10822 Pettus Farm Road
Stage	Preliminary Plat
Parcel(s)	0003-00-051.00
Status	Not Approved

Dear: Brandon Pridemore

We have completed our review of the plan identified above. The comments listed on the attached report must be addressed and revised plans submitted with a response letter.

If the attached comments require changes to the plans, please submit the requisite number of sets, along with a pdf of the plan set on a CD, to the Lancaster County Planning Department.

Once revised plans are received, they will be submitted to staff for review.

Please be aware that plans will not be routed for review without a response letter

Sincerely,

Plan Review Comments

County Engineer - Stephen Blackwelder - 8035482406
sblackwelder@lancastersc.net

Not Approved

Review Comments:

General Comments:

1. More detailed comments can be provided once the construction documents are developed. The preliminary nature of this plan does not provide adequate detail to formally comment, but the following are items of note from the information given and a visit to the site to determine existing conditions.
2. The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) provided is under review. Any improvements agreed upon as a result of the final TIA will need to be included in the civil plan set. For clarity please change the name on the TIA documents to Pettus Pond instead of Pettus Farm.
3. Per Lancaster County Water and Sewer District policy- this subdivision cannot be approved for construction until downstream sewer infrastructure is in place and the notice of capability and capacity from the LCWSD is obtained.
4. Any impacts to wetlands and/or stream crossings will need to be permitted through the US Army Corp of Engineers. This can be a lengthy process.
 - a. There are streets, residential lots, and BMP measures all impacting wetlands and streams.
5. On Sheet PP-6- storm drainage- there is a storm water pipe going into a BMP pond but we don't see any upstream storm water pipe system.

E911 Address - Sandra Burton - (803) 416-9325
sburton@lanc911.com

Approved

Review Comments:

The following road names are on hold for the Pettus Pond subdivision:

Gumbranch St
Roseberry Ct
Whisnant Way
Cottonwood St
Mazzetti Way
Goldenrod Ct
Avens Dr

Also, Hay Field Ter is also approved, as it will adjoin with Hay Field Ter in Patterson Preserve.

Fire Marshal - John Magette - 8032838888
jmagette@lancastersc.net

Not Approved

Review Comments:

1. This development will need to have 2 accesses or comply with the provisions of section 503.1.2.1 of the South Carolina Fire Code.
2. 500 foot distances for fire hydrants will need to be shown as an apparatus would lay hose, not a 500 ft radius.
3. Show radius for cul-de-sacs.

LC Water & Sewer District - Erin Evans - 8032856919
eevans@lcwasd.org

No Review Done

Review Comments:

LCWSD is a separate entity from the County. We have our own submittal requirements. Please check our website, www.lcwasd.org, under the Developers tab for our policies and procedures.

The developer must submit 2 sets of hard copy water and sewer plans directly to LCWSD, adhering to the LCWSD Water & Wastewater Extension Policy.

Review Comments:

General:

- Downstream sewer infrastructure is not currently operational.
- Once downstream infrastructure is completed (timeline unknown) LCWSD has indicated that this project is possibly working in conjunction with the Patterson Preserve to extend sewer to both sites. It should be noted that at this time the Patterson Preserve project which is nearing the expiration of its vesting.
- Lancaster County School District is recommending denial pursuant to overcrowding in the schools serving this area.
- The latest update to the SC Fire Code requires 2 points of ingress/ egress for projects including more than 50 lots. SC Fire Code supersedes Lancaster County's UDO therefore this project may not be approved in its current configuration.

Pending Ordinance Issues:

- Requires 12,000 minimum lot size
- Requires a front setback of 40' for garages
- Requires open space or a road to break up sections which have more than 10 lots consecutively.

Planning:

- Remove stormwater BMPs from Open Space Calculation
- Add Density information
- Provide connectivity index
- As currently depicted lot 53 is not viable with wetlands in the buildable lot area
- Park space should be clearly depicted. It appears this plan intends for a pond to be considered a significant portion of their park space. Park space is intended to be useable open space. While the walking trail and green space around the pond may be counted towards open space I do not believe the pond itself should be counted.
- Stub road should be depicted and built to property line
- Keep in mind no easements may encroach into the buildable area of lots. Easements shall be located outside of individual lots. When being located on individual lots is necessary, easements must be centered along property lines and may not decrease the buildable area of a given lot.
- TIA states that a turn lane on to Pettus is needed yet is not listed as a planned improvement. We will add this comment to the TIA as well but should this project move forward a turn lane onto Pettus from Barberville will likely be required.

LC School District - Bryan Vaughn - (803) 286-6972**Not Approved****Review Comments:**

We oppose due to current overcrowding in the Indian Land schools.

SCDOT - David Gamble - (803) 385-4280**Conditional****Review Comments:**

The final draft of the TIA should be sent directly to Allison Love at the District 4 SCDOT office in Chester for an official review.

This review is a general access location review only and does not include required driveway widths, radius returns, pavement design or any other details.

A full review for compliance with the SCDOT ARMS manual will be conducted when the SCDOT permit is applied for.

Impact Fee - Chanda Kirkland - 803-416-9390**Approved****Review Comments:**

This project is located in the Pleasant Valley Fire District and Indian Land School, the following impact fees apply:

The Service Impact fee for each housing unit is \$1,929.00. The Indian Land School impact fee for each housing unit is \$8,899.00.

Fees will be collected at the time of building permit issuance. Should you wish to arrange prepayment that can be coordinated after you receive final plat approval. Impact fees increase July 1 of every year.

If you have any questions or would like further information on the Impact fees you can contact me.

4. We have addressed fire code access comment with Fire Marshal – see Fire Marshal comment section. It should be noted that the SC Fire Code does not “require” a second access for developments with more than 50 lots, but rather provides discretion should Fire Marshal determine that a second access is necessary given certain conditions unless otherwise required by the approved UDO.

Pending Ordinance Issues

This should not be an issue as County Council voted down the proposed UDO Amendments impacting the MDR Zoning District on March 27, 2023.

Planning

1. We have removed BMP locations + additional 25% of shown BMP areas from the open space calculations (4.00 acres reserved for BMP surface and berm areas) and proposed open space is estimated at 38% of the gross site acreage (23.26 acres – only 12.25 acres required).
2. Density information has been added to sheet PP-1 and proposed density is 1.62 DUA.
3. Connectivity index has been added to sheet PP-1 and connectivity ratio is 1.33 and meets the min. required 1.3 ratio.
4. The wetland shown within Lot 33 will be permitted through the US Army Corps of Engineers and Nationwide #29 Permit will be obtained for the impact to this wetland and other wetland/stream locations.
5. Park spaces have been outlined with bold dashed line and it is our belief that park space should only have to equal 5% of the min. required 20% open space, which would correlate to the clarification that Planning Staff was seeking in the MDR UDO Amendments and offer following observations:
 - Park space has not been enforced nor specified on preliminary plats since the adoption of the current UDO
 - The UDO provides no guidance or reference to its incorporation into a development nor defines what a “park space” is required to be
 - It is our belief that existing, naturalized ponds are qualified open spaces and providing access to and around such a feature can be considered part of the park space (hence, many City & County Parks incorporate ponds as a feature of their public spaces)
6. Stub road to adjoining property has been depicted, but construction to the property line will be limited by topographic and geographic issues and has been noted as such.
7. The buildability of all lots has been accounted for an buildable width, when easements pass between lots, has not been diminished (additional width has been added where easements would otherwise diminish buildable width).
8. The conditions of the current TIA that is under review by Lancaster County, has been added to sheet PP-1. As acknowledged under Engineering Comments, development will construct all traffic improvements agreed upon resulting from review and approval of the TIA.

LC SCHOOL DISTRICT – BRYAN VAUGHN

Please see response to Planning General Comment #3.

SCDOT – DAVID GAMBLE

Acknowledged and no response required.

IMPACT FEE – CHANDA KIRKLAND

Acknowledged and no response required.