

**MINUTES  
CITY OF GOOSE CREEK  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2016, 6:30 P.M.  
GOOSE CREEK MUNICIPAL CENTER  
519 N. GOOSE CREEK BLVD.**

**I. Call to Order – Chairman Allen Wall**

Chairman Wall called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Present: Gary Berenyi, Paul Connerty, Jeanette Fowler, Joshua Johnson, Allen Wall, Barry Washington

Absent: Jeffrey Smith

Staff Present: Sarah Hanson

**II. Approval of Agenda**

*Motion:* Mr. Joshua Johnson made a motion to accept the Agenda as posted. Mr. Connerty seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

*Vote:* All voted in favor. (6-0)

**III. Review of Minutes from June 7, 2016**

*Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion to accept the minutes as written with the addition of punctuation at the top of page 2. Ms. Fowler seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

*Vote:* All voted in favor. (6-0)

**IV. Public Hearing – Rezoning Request for property identified as: TMS#244-00-00-065; Request to Rezone from Planned Development for Mobile Home (PD-MH) to General Commercial (GC)**

Chairman Wall opened the public hearing for the rezoning of the property. Chairman Wall opened the floor to Staff to present the rezoning request. Ms. Hanson presented the rezoning request for the property identified as TMS#244-00-00-065. She noted the property location at the corner of Henry Brown Boulevard and Liberty Hall Road, adjacent to the Birch Hollow Mobile home community, and immediately adjacent to the Long Leaf subdivision. She added it is located directly across the street from the Brickhope community which is under current development. Ms. Hanson stated the applicant is the owner of the property, and has been the owner for quite some time. Staff described the property as 40.01 acres and is presently zoned Planned Development-Mobile Home (PD-MH). Ms. Hanson added the owner is no longer wishing to develop the property for mobile home use. She stated the owner has applied to request to rezone

to a General Commercial classification, and presented the uses by right to the Commission. Staff requested the Commission keep in mind that should this property be rezoned General Commercial and that any of the uses by right could be used for this property. Staff stated that another use, though not by right for General Commercial use, is multi-family. Ms. Hanson noted the City zoning ordinance requires that a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) be approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) within a General Commercial zoning classification. She added that if this property is rezoned to a General Commercial classification, and a prospective developer wished to develop multi-family, then they would still be required to get approval from the ZBA for a CUP. Staff mentioned the ZBA would have to determine if multi-family was a compatible use for this piece of property. Ms. Hanson presented the Commission with the uses by right, and CUP requirements. Staff noted the uses along Liberty Hall Road are very inconsistent. She added a portion of the parcels along Liberty Hall Road that are within the City limits, and the majority of the properties that are not. Staff stated there are development plans to widen the roads along Liberty Hall Road and Henry Brown Boulevard.

Ms. Hanson introduced Mr. Gordon Darby, the property owner, and Mr. Mike Ferrara, representative for Mr. Darby, to the Commission to present their comments. Mr. Ferrara explained the original intent of the property was to include a high density, single wide trailer community. He stated that as time has progressed, demand for a mobile home community has declined. Mr. Ferrara stated if the request to change the zoning classification was approved it would provide a better fit for the community.

Chairman Wall opened the floor to the public to speak for the issue. A resident inquired as to the impact the development would have on the residents of Birch Hollow, and if there would be any changes to Birch Hollow. Mr. Ferrara stated he hoped it would bring further amenities and housing opportunities for those interested. Mr. Darby stated he understood the two projects to be separate. Another Birch Hollow resident inquired if the zoning classification was required to be a different zoning for residential or commercial use, such as a gas station. Mr. Ferrara stated that the zoning is specific to the use. The resident expressed concerns for a 3 story condo development at the entrance to Birch Hollow. Mr. Ferrara stated that was not the plan at this time. There was some discussion in regards to the concerns of neighboring properties, and the access road to Birch Hollow. Ms. Hanson noted that the zoning for the Birch Hollow community would remain the same, and the entrance would stay the same. Staff stated the difference the Birch Hollow residents would see, would be rimmed in a landscaped buffer along with fencing regulations and requirements that have been added to the ordinance language. She also mentioned that the determination for access to the property would be taken into consideration at the time a plan was submitted for development, and determined by SCDOT and/or Berkeley County Roads and Bridges. Chairman Wall asked the format return to the routine of the public hearing in order to give an opportunity to hear from those that would like to speak for the issue at this time, stating there would be an opportunity for questions later. He inquired if anyone else would like to speak for the issue. There was none.

Chairman Wall inquired if anyone from the public that wished to speak against the issue. A resident from Brickhope Greens stated concerns for the current volume of traffic, and how this development would impact traffic. A resident of sixteen years from Birch Hollow stated the current traffic congestion is an issue, and therefore opposes the request to change the zoning classification. Chairman Wall inquired if there were any further comments against the issue. Mr.

Darby commented that the development could stay mobile homes, or another type of development which would still create additional traffic. Mr. Ferrara stated concerns for the traffic as well, and the development would create a positive impact for the community. A resident stated concern for the future development, and the opportunity to say what would be considered an approved use for that parcel. There was a resident with concerns for drainage at Brickhope, along with the impact of this development. There was discussion in regards to the wetlands, and also widening Liberty Hall Road.

Chairman Wall closed the public hearing.

Chairman Wall inquired if Staff had a recommendation for the Commission. Ms. Hanson inquired with Chairman Wall if she could address some of the questions for the Commission in order to clarify some of the confusion. Chairman Wall agreed. Staff noted the property is 40.1 acres, and a survey showing 20 acres of wetlands. She noted, in regards to concerns of visibility, the wetlands tend to run along the perimeter of the property, both along Liberty Hall Road and Henry Brown Boulevard. Ms. Hanson added that development would be limited because of the location, and the amount of wetlands on the property. Staff added that any redevelopment on this property will be required to have their own new storm water design, with the Engineers of Berkeley County. Ms. Hanson also clarified that when a property in a specific zoning classification has a use by right, the developer has the right to develop the property as the use permits. She gave examples of different commercial business's that could develop under the General Commercial (GC) classification, and noted there would be no additional requirements for approval of the use. Staff did mention that the developer would be required to come back for additional approval if they wanted to develop it for multi-family use. Ms. Hanson stated Staff recommends the approval of this recommendation, noting that the property owners can be required or considered to have to hold onto a property forever, and traffic engineers state that single family residential or a mobile home community creates the highest volume of traffic. Staff asked the Commission to consider; the uses by right, the owner having the right to develop the property, the size and location of the property, along with the City's vision for development, and the comprehensive plan, along with the best and highest use of this property. Staff stated approval of the request to have this property rezoned to General Commercial (GC), and approved to send the recommendation to City Council.

Chairman Wall opened the floor to the Commission for questions or comments. Ms. Fowler inquired if the developer had a timeframe in mind, in regards to before or after the road is widened. Mr. Ferrara stated there was not a timeline at this time. Chairman Wall inquired with Mr. Darby if his plans were to sell the property with the intent for it to be used as a commercial property, and not develop it. Mr. Darby stated yes. Mr. Ferrara added that Mr. Darby has a right to; however, at this time that is not the primary objective. There was an inquiry if Mr. Darby had been approached for the development of the property. Mr. Darby stated he had been. Chairman Wall inquired to Staff to clarify if the wetlands were on the outer perimeter. Staff stated they were. There was discussion in regards to the buffer, location of the wetlands, and size of available land to develop. Chairman Wall inquired if Mr. Darby had anything he would like to add to the comments. Mr. Darby stated he felt all the bases had been covered. Chairman Wall inquired if the Commission had any further questions.

- Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion to approve the request to rezone the property identified as: TMS#244-00-00-065, from Planned Development for Mobile Home (PD-MH) to General Commercial (GC). Mr. Washington seconded.
- Discussion:* Mr. Berenyi noted development needs the support of the residence in the area.
- Vote:* All voted in favor. (6-0) the motion carried.

Chairman Wall thanked everyone for their input. Chairman Wall inquired when it would be on the City Council Agenda. Staff stated it would be on the second Tuesday in September.

Chairman Wall requested to continue with the meeting.

## **V. Discussion - Miscellaneous**

Chairman Wall opened the floor to Staff. Ms. Hanson noted she would prepare additional materials and put information together regarding the recent land use buffer ordinance for the commission. Staff stated that the commission would be tasked with reviewing the City's sign ordinance in the future, due to a recent question that had come up regarding a specific regulation within the current sign ordinance. Ms. Hanson noted it would involve electronic digital signs, and what the Commission feels is appropriate for development within the City and how to regulate it. There was a brief discussion about the content, restrictions, and current allowed uses. Ms. Hanson explained the Commission would have an opportunity to review and give feedback on how and if they would like to see these types of signs used. There was some discussion on the aesthetics and how the ordinance language can regulate the electronic digital signage and use.

## **VI. Comments from the Commission**

Chairman Wall opened for comments from the Commission. Chairman Wall inquired about the development of Waffle House on Red Bank Road, and if they determined whether or not they would be installing a fence. Ms. Hanson stated they were going to start and the permit had been picked up. She also stated there would be a fence and it would be tree lined between the waffle house and the residential community behind it. There was some discussion in regards to the entry access point approval with SCDOT.

Chairman Wall inquired about training. Staff mentioned a possible one night training at some point in October for veteran members, and training that would be required for new members. Mr. Berenyi suggested residents approach the podium to state comments or concerns. Chairman Wall inquired about the language that was deleted within the overlay district that would be added at a future date. Ms. Hanson stated that would be addressed at the time that section of the general ordinance is reviewed. There was some discussion about if there is a defined used for residential development over commercial development.

**VII. Comments from Staff**

Ms. Hanson mentioned the official retirement of Mr. Dennis Harmon, formerly the City Administrator; and stated that Mr. Jake Broom, formerly the Assistant City Administrator, has now assumed the position of City Administrator.

**VIII. Adjournment**

Mr. Washington made a motion to adjourn, and Ms. Fowler seconded. All voted in favor (6-0). The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:50 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Allen Wall, Chairman

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