

**MINUTES  
CITY OF GOOSE CREEK  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2019, 6:30 P.M.  
GOOSE CREEK MUNICIPAL CENTER  
519 N. GOOSE CREEK BLVD.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER – CHAIRMAN JOSH JOHNSON**

**Action:** Chairman Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.  
**Present:** Gary Berenyi; Heather Byrd; Paul Connerty; Judie Edwards; Josh Johnson; Jeffrey Smith and John Starzyk  
**Absent:** None  
**Staff Present:** Planning Director Mark Brodeur; Planning Technician Brenda Moneer  
**Council Present:** Councilmember McSwain

**II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Motion:** A motion was made to accept the agenda as presented. **Moved by** Commissioner Smith; **Seconded by** Commissioner Byrd.  
**Discussion:** There was none.  
**Vote:** All voted in favor. The motion carried (7-0).

**III. REVIEW OF MINUTES - OCTOBER 1, 2019**

Chairman Johnson stated there were two(2) typographical errors in the October 1, 2019 minutes.

**Motion:** A motion was made to approve the October 1, 2019 minutes with corrections. **Moved by** Commissioner Edwards; **Seconded by** Commissioner Smith.  
**Discussion:** There was none.  
**Vote:** All voted in favor. The motion carried (7-0).

**IV. PUBLIC HEARING – REZONING REQUEST FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT PARCEL IDENTIFIED AS TMS# 235-14-04-007; REQUEST TO REZONE FROM RESIDENTIAL MEDIUM DENSITY (R2) TO RESIDENTIAL HIGH DENSITY (R3).**

Chairman Johnson opened the public hearing. Mr. Brodeur presented staff report. He stated the application is from D.R. Horton, Inc. They are requesting a rezoning of a property located on the east side of Nello Drive. The Subject 18.13-acre property is currently zoned R2. The rezone proposal is to rezone the property to R3. The subject property is identified as TMS# 235-14-04-007. It is surrounded by residential properties and vacant parcels. The rezone proposal is accompanied by a development plan for sixteen (16) two story buildings containing a total of seventy-eight (78) residential units. The subject site is constrained by large expanses of freshwater wetlands. To develop the property in a site sensitive way, relative to those wetlands,

the applicant is proposing attached dwelling units in two (2) to five (5) units each on their own small parcels. This is commonly referred to as cluster development. Cluster development is a useful development tool when significant natural features exist on the property. Currently the City of Goose Creek's Zoning Map contains very little if any R3 zoned property. For the applicant to build these attached units the project proposal must receive a recommendation from the Planning Commission and a zone change amendment before City Council. It also must appear before the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) under the auspices of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) before moving forward. The proposed multi-family development will need to meet fourteen (14) distinct conditions as part of the approval by the ZBA.

The applicant was present but did not speak at this time.

Chairman Johnson inquired if the public wished to speak in favor of the rezoning. No one spoke in favor. He inquired if the public would like to speak in opposition to the rezoning. Six (6) members from the audience spoke.

Mr. Eric Mead of Nello Drive opposed the rezoning due to the proposed zoning being uncharacteristic for the area. He also opposed due to the disruption of wildlife, traffic, drainage, increase crime, and decrease in property values.

Mr. Joseph Hernandez of Water Oak Drive opposed due to traffic, decrease property values and increase in crime.

Mr. Jake Taylor of Gianna Lane is opposed due to the extra traffic this will bring.

Ms. Uticia Rosda of Amy Drive opposed due to extra traffic, increased crime, and displacement of wildlife.

Ms. Ana Dallas of Elrod Drive opposed due to drainage, traffic and concerned with schools as she stated they are already full.

Mr. Phillip Obie II of Thurgood Road opposed due to the curve being dangerous to where this development is being proposed. He also opposed due to drainage issues and speeding.

Chairman Johnson opened discussion between the Commission and applicant. Mr. David Williams with Thomas and Hutton Engineering stated the property has been looked at a couple of times in the past for single family residential. He stated he understood the concerns for wildlife and believes a cluster development would be a better situation for wildlife. Concerning traffic, a traffic study will be done. He stated in this case, we are providing two connections to the existing roads. Regarding drainage concerns, a pipe drainage system will be installed. Mr. Williams stated we are required by the state to reduce drainage and it must flow off the site. He stated he can not speak to property value and crime concerns. Mr. Williams stated sidewalks and street trees will be installed in the development.

Chairman Johnson inquired if the applicant has any idea as to the amount of traffic that is generated by this size of development. The applicant stated about 760 trips in a day. Mr. Johnson clarified for the public the requirements for drainage for this type of development. The applicant stated drainage should always be better after development. Mr. Johnson inquired if the applicant

would prepare a site distance exhibit that would show that the curve has enough visibility to the intersection that is being proposed as this is a public concern. The applicant stated that can be prepared. Mr. Johnson inquired what the property potentially would be developed into if the zoning request remained R2. The applicant stated it would be single family and we will be entitled to thirty (30) to thirty-two (32) homes to his knowledge.

Commissioner Byrd inquired if pad parking would be included. The applicant stated their would-be individual garages with driveways. Commissioner Byrd inquired as to why guardrails have not been installed if speeding and curves have been an issue. Mr. Brodeur stated if this project proceeded to the ZBA the applicant has indicated that they would do a traffic study. It would be his recommendation that they look at any other mitigating devices to slow traffic and improve the site distance at that intersection. He stated it would be up to a traffic and transportation engineer. Commissioner Edwards inquired about on street parking. The applicant stated they will be required to meet the parking requirement of the ordinance. Commissioner Berenyi stated the property is restricted by wetlands and wetlands buffers. He stated only fifty (50) percent of the property can be developed due to this and it makes logical sense to increase the density. Commissioner Edwards inquired as to the location of the two (2) entrances. The applicant stated Amy Drive and Farm Quarters Drive.

Chairman Johnson closed the public hearing and inquired if the Commission would like to act.

- Motion:** A motion was made to approve the rezoning request for the property 235-14-04-007 from R2 to R3 with the recommendation to the ZBA to require a traffic study for speed and sight distance. **Moved by** Commissioner Smith; **Seconded by** Commissioner Byrd.
- Discussion:** Commissioner Berenyi stated he would like to request that there be a limit of 78 homes.
- Amended Motion:** A motion was made to approve the rezoning request for the property 235-14-04-007 from R2 to R3 with the recommendation to the ZBA to require a traffic study for speed and sight distance and to limit the number of homes to 78. **Moved by** Commissioner Smith; **Seconded by** Commissioner Byrd.
- Vote:** Commissioner Connerty; Commissioner Byrd, Commissioner Edwards, Commissioner Smith and Commissioner Berenyi voted in favor. Commissioner Johnson and Commissioner Starzyk opposed. The motion carried (5-2).

## V. DISCUSSION – ORDINANCE LANGUAGE AND REQUIREMENTS FOR MURALS

Mr. Brodeur presented a draft ordinance to the Commission for murals. He stated specific ways that murals can be beneficial is that they create a public art scene; placemaking and economic development. He stated if you create a great place, people want to live, work and socialize there. Murals add a creative esthetic to the environment which energizes neglected and sometime blighted neighborhoods. They also enhance districts where new developments are taking place by creating a sense of destination. The Planning Commission is being asked to review this draft before it is set for public hearing in December. He stated that City Council believes that the Cultural Arts Commission should be the body responsible for murals.

Commissioner Berenyi believes incorporating murals in the community is a good idea. Commissioner Edwards stated she likes the idea of including history but there are some points of history she believes should not be included in a mural. Mr. Brodeur stated this is an opportunity to define what we want to see on murals. Chairman Johnson inquired as to why the Cultural Arts Commission come up with the topic that would be acceptable and inquired if it needed to be codified in the ordinance or can the ordinance reference a guideline. Mr. Brodeur stated it can reference a companion document and he can also relay to the Cultural Arts Commission that they are the deciding body. Commissioner Edwards stated when murals were added to a City she previously lived in, it eliminated graffiti. Discussion regarding the preservation and maintenance of murals ensued. It was stated it would be the building owner's responsibility to ensure it is maintained. He stated the building owner owns the art, but the artist retains the ability to modify and update the art. Commissioner Byrd stated there needs to be parameters set if the building has a change of ownership. Mr. Brodeur stated the mural runs with the property not the owner. Discussion about murals protruding six inches ensued. It was stated that will be researched. Commissioner Byrd inquired if there were any incentives for business owners to incorporate murals. Mr. Brodeur stated no. The Commission agreed that the Cultural Arts Commission should be responsible for murals. Chairman Johnson suggested having the ARB approve the location of the mural and the Cultural Arts Commission approve the design. Mr. Brodeur stated he will think about this.

## **VI. END OF YEAR BUSINESS**

### **a) Election of Chairman**

**Motion:** A motion was made to Nominate Mr. Josh Johnson for Chairman. **Moved by** Commissioner Connerty; **Seconded by** Commissioner Edwards.

**Discussion:** There was none.

**Vote:** All voted in favor. The motion carried (7-0).

### **b) Election of Vice Chairman**

**Motion:** A motion was made to nominate Mr. Jeff Smith for Vice Chair. **Moved by** Commissioner Connerty; **Seconded by** Commissioner Berenyi.

**Discussion:** There was none.

**Vote:** All voted in favor. The motion carried (7-0).

**Motion:** A motion was made to close nominations. **Moved by** Commissioner Edwards; **Seconded by** Commissioner Connerty.

**Discussion:** There was none.

**Vote:** All voted in favor. The motion carried (7-0).

### **c) Commission Member Terms**

Mrs. Moneer stated next year Commissioner Byrd, Commissioner Smith and Chairman Johnson will make their determination.

**d) 2020 Calendar Approval**

It was stated that January 2nd should be Tuesday not Wednesday on the 2020 Calendar.

- Motion:** A motion was made to accept the calendar with corrections. **Moved by** Commissioner Berenyi; **Seconded by** Commissioner Connerty.  
**Discussion:** There was none.  
**Vote:** All voted in favor. The motion carried (7-0).

**VII. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION**

Commissioner Edwards inquired as to when they will be starting the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Brodeur stated early 2020.

**VIII. COMMENTS FROM STAFF**

Mrs. Moneer stated on December 5, 2019, there will be an end of year Boards and Commission's party.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Smith made a motion to adjourn, Commissioner Berenyi seconded. All voted in favor (7-0). The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:06pm.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Josh Johnson, Chairman

Date: \_\_\_\_\_