

**MINUTES  
CITY OF GOOSE CREEK  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 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 6:31 p.m.

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

Absent: none

Staff Present: Sarah Hanson

Chairman Wall introduced the new members; Gary Berenyi, Jeanette Fowler, and Joshua Johnson to the Planning Commission.

**II. Approval of Agenda**

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

*Discussion:* There was none.

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

**III. Review of Minutes from May 3, 2016**

*Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Smith seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

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

**IV. Public Hearing – Proposed Ordinance Amendment; Appendix D - Zoning Districts**

Chairman Wall opened the public hearing, outlined the two new zoning districts for Commercial Industrial (CI) and General Industrial (GI), and opened the floor to Staff to present the proposed ordinance amendment. Ms. Hanson stated the Commission recently discussed and suggested a recommendation to City Council to add two new zoning classifications for the zoning ordinance. Staff outlined the language and uses by right as recommended to Council, and noted they had been approved for first reading. Ms. Hanson stated language had been added to appendix D to encompass the two new zoning classifications that were previously approved.

Staff described the two new zoning classifications that are currently in the process of being added. Staff outlined the research process for the development standards, such as setbacks, minimum land area, maximum density, etc. Ms. Hanson noted the importance of keeping and preserving the character of the City of Goose Creek while continuing to be competitive with other municipalities to attract commercial development. Staff stated the recommendation includes development standards for the two new zoning classifications and outlined the specifics of each. Ms. Hanson also outlined the types of land use buffers that would be required between incompatible spaces per the proposed revised ordinance.

Chairman Wall opened the floor to the public that wished to speak in favor of the issue. There was none. Chairman Wall inquired if anyone from the public that wished to speak against the issue. There was none. Chairman Wall inquired if Staff had a recommendation. Ms. Hanson stated Staff feels it is a needed addition, and recommends the Commission approve of the recommendation for Council. Chairman Wall closed the public hearing.

Mr. Berenyi inquired to Staff in regards to the buffer to clarify the widths and density. Staff clarified the specifics of the buffer requirements.

- Motion:* Mr. Smith made a motion to accept the modifications to Appendix D-Zoning Districts as submitted by City Staff. Mr. Washington seconded.
- Discussion:* There was none.
- Vote:* All voted in favor. (7-0)

## **V. Public Hearing – Proposed Ordinance Amendment: Section 151.085 Land Use Buffer**

Chairman Wall opened the public hearing, and requested Staff present the proposed ordinance amendment for Section 151.085, Land Use Buffer. Ms. Hanson explained the purpose and requirements of the design of the land use buffer for uses between incompatible properties in order to create a landscaped distance between the properties. She also described that it would depend on the difference in intensity of the land use for the width and density of the buffer. Staff described the deeper buffers to have less density of landscaping, with narrower buffer requirements to be more heavily planted. She described the buffer requirements to require canopy trees, understory trees, and shrubs to create layers for the area, providing a better screening. Staff stated the new zoning classifications were taken into consideration for the proposed amended buffer requirements along with additional language giving detailed specifics for buffer criteria. Ms. Hanson mentioned that Buffer V had been added, and Buffer IV had been modified in order to make it consistent for Commercial Industrial use. Staff noted changes were included in the ordinance language, and also included in the chart.

Chairman Wall opened the floor to the public to speak for the issue. There was none. Chairman Wall inquired if anyone from the public wished to speak against the issue. There was none. Chairman Wall inquired if Staff had a recommendation. Ms. Hanson stated Staff feels the additions to the buffer ordinance are necessary with the new zoning classifications, and recommends the Commission approve of the recommendation for Council. Staff mentioned Buffer III had language added outlining the Zoning Administrator to have the authority to amend the requirements for a specific site. Chairman Wall closed the public hearing.

Mr. Smith inquired about the responsibility of maintaining the buffers. Staff stated this is required so the buffer will remain living and maintained, and plantings replaced if necessary. There was discussion about reduction buffers, easements and other types of development restrictions that may hinder a buffer on certain properties. Staff stated that provisions would be covered by the Zoning Administrator. That was discussion about day lighting trees within an established buffer, along with details of the buffer V requirements.

*Motion:* Mr. Smith made a motion to accept the proposed ordinance amendment for Section 151.085 Land Use Buffer as presented by the City. Mr. Johnson seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

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

I. **Public Hearing – Rezoning Request for properties identified as:**

**TMS#234-07-05-029;** Request to Rezone from Light Industrial (LI) to General Industrial (GI)

**TMS#234-07-05-042;** Request to Rezone from Light Industrial (LI) to General Industrial (GI)

**TMS#234-07-05-031;** Request to Rezone from Light Industrial (LI) to General Industrial (GI)

**TMS#234-07-05-044;** Request to Rezone from Conservation Open Space (CO) to General Industrial (GI)

**TMS#234-07-05-030;** Request to Rezone from Conservation Open Space (CO) to General Industrial (GI)

Chairman Wall opened the public hearing for the rezoning of the properties. Chairman Wall opened the floor to Staff to present the rezoning request. Ms. Hanson presented the properties identified as TMS#'s; 234-07-05-029, 234-07-05-042, 234-07-05-031, 234-07-05-044, 234-07-05-030, all which are owned by J.W. Aluminum. Staff explained that when the owner had approached the City, in regards to their intentions for the property, the zoning was not in place to support it. Staff noted it was at that time it was realized that the zoning classifications would need to be added for this project, and also to create zoning classifications that would allow other types of businesses to develop within the City boundaries as new industry comes into the area. Ms. Hanson described the current zonings of the properties. She also mentioned that as a property is annexed into the City it is zoned Conservation Open Space as per the ordinance, and it is typical not to zone it until the owner decides the use for development of the property. Ms. Hanson stated J.W. Aluminum needed to request the rezoning in order to proceed with the proposed development. Staff stated one thing to consider is what the best and highest use for this property is, as if the facility that is there now should go dark, this General Industrial zoning would stay in place.

Staff introduced Mr. Stan Brant to present the plans and state the reason for the request on behalf of J.W. Aluminum. Mr. Brant, Chief Operating Officer of J.W. Aluminum, presented the intentions of their projected project. Chairman Wall inquired with Mr. Brant to elaborate on the expansion of the project. Mr. Brant stated the intention for the expansion would be adding a building for the melting and casting operations. Mr. Brant stated the proposed addition consists of an approximate 185,000 square foot expansion that would replace the existing process inside the

existing building. Mr. Brant added with the addition of the state of the art technology and equipment they would be able to meet all emissions requirements and create a much cleaner operating facility. Mr. Brant stated these advantages would allow them to have one of the most, if not the most, competitive positions in the industry.

Chairman Wall opened the floor to the public to speak for the issue. There was none. Chairman Wall inquired if anyone from the public that wished to speak against the issue. Mr. Robert Matthews stated concerns on behalf of the neighborhood adjacent to the plant about the material deliveries, emissions, noise, and size of the existing facility and proposed expansion. Chairman Wall inquired if there was anyone else that wanted to speak against the issue. Mr. Robert Sass stated concerns for the noise, and emissions from the existing plant. Chairman Wall inquired if there was anyone else that wanted to speak against the issue. There was inquiry in regards to if the new technology would create more noise or less noise. Chairman Wall inquired if there were any further comments against the issue. There was none.

Chairman Wall inquired if Staff had a recommendation for the Commission. Ms. Hanson stated Staff recommends the properties requested for the rezoning as submitted be approved, subject to City Council's final approval of the second reading of the General Industrial zoning classification.

Chairman Wall closed the public hearing. He opened the floor to the Commission for questions or comments. There was discussion if this would generate additional jobs to the area. Mr. Brant stated this is currently not about creating additional jobs, and is an integral part of sustaining and continuing to secure the current jobs of the approximately 380 people currently employed at this site. Mr. Smith inquired if the plant was located prior to the development of the subdivision, and asked that the question be addressed if there would be more or less noise posed earlier. Mr. Brant stated the older technology is noisy. He also stated from an environmental standpoint, with the newest technology, the addition of pollution mitigation to eliminate smoke from the system will reduce the emissions by 40%. Mr. Brant added that the noise currently generated is from the scrap yard. He outlined the location of the site of the current storage of materials which is adjacent to Walker Lane. Mr. Brant mentioned with the new proposal, the use of this area will be reduced in size and will move slightly to the interior of the property, away from Walker Lane not impinging on the back property line. Mr. Brant added that they would be happy to incorporate other noise mitigation barriers as necessary. There was discussion in regards to the concrete area, storm drain, and dust control currently in place. Mr. Johnson inquired with Mr. Brant if the parcels requested to be rezoned, that are less than five acres, would be combined in order to meet the ordinance criteria. Mr. Brant stated they are viewing the development as one contiguous parcel and are working in conjunction with City Staff on any new buffer requirements. He also mentioned some of the building design had been altered in order to avoid encroaching upon the new buffers, locating it further away. Mr. Johnson inquired if there are plans to annex the current site of the existing facility into the City of Goose Creek. Mr. Brant stated they currently were focusing on the rezoning requests as proposed. There was discussion about the new facility being tied to the existing structure. Chairman Wall inquired to Staff if the proposed property meets the five acre requirement. Staff stated it does not meet the requirement unless they abandon property lines, and that would need to be requested by the property owner. Ms. Hanson stated zoning the properties the same would be required in order to be consistent with the zoning ordinance. There was discussion about the size of the property, abandoning the property lines to meet the

ordinance criteria, the land use buffers, landscaping and setback requirements. There was also discussion about the current zoning of the surrounding properties.

Chairman Wall inquired, on behalf of a concerned citizen, about access off of Walker and the noise. Mr. Brant discussed the current barrier and the proposed barrier would be a much more elaborate structure if necessary. He mentioned the barrier design is currently under development, and added that the new location would be centrally located on the interior portion of the property. Mr. Brant stated they are currently working with SCDOT for the entrances in order to get the traffic off of Walker Lane. Mr. Brant stated the main entrance would be relocated on Thurgood Road, off of Old Mt. Holly Road, at the back of the property for the majority of the truck traffic. There was discussion about locating the access from Walker Lane to Thurgood Road, to reduce some of the traffic congestion from the trucks that currently park on Old Mt. Holly Road.

Chairman Wall inquired if the Commission had any further comments or questions. There was a comment about the road accessing all the way through the property, and how the new building would create a noise barrier. Mr. Brant inquired where the concerned property owners lived. The owner's pointed out the locations of their property on the map. Chairman Wall inquired with Mr. Brant where the access would be off of Thurgood Road. Mr. Brant pointed out the proposed Thurgood Road entrance location off of Old Mt. Holly Road to be located adjacent from the property designated as TMS#234-08-00-029 and 234-08-00-028. Mr. Brant invited the public to come to the site to visit and express concerns. Mr. Brant stated the company was founded within Goose Creek and they want to continue as a member of the community that supports 380 jobs. Mr. Connerty mentioned anyone who was unable to address their concerns could do so at the upcoming City Council meeting, as the public hearing had been closed, and he suggested the Commission move forward.

*Motion:* Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the request to rezone the properties identified as: TMS#234-07-05-029, from Light Industrial (LI) to General Industrial (GI); TMS#234-07-05-042, from Light Industrial (LI) to General Industrial (GI); TMS#234-07-05-031, from Light Industrial (LI) to General Industrial (GI); TMS#234-07-05-044, from Conservation Open Space (CO) to General Industrial (GI); TMS#234-07-05-030, from Conservation Open Space (CO) to General Industrial (GI). Mr. Connerty seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

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

## **VI. Public Hearing – Proposed Ordinance Amendment; Omit all Sections included in overlay district.**

Chairman Wall outlined the original intent for the overlay district ordinance and the reason to omit it at this time. Chairman Wall opened the public hearing, and opened the floor to Staff to present the proposed ordinance amendment. Ms. Hanson presented a reference of the overlay ordinance to the Commission members. She explained portions of the overlay district ordinance have been deleted over a period of time and blended into the general zoning ordinance. Staff recommended deleting the remaining portion of the overlay ordinance language in its entirety from the zoning ordinance. Ms. Hanson noted some of the downtown overlay ordinance language

may be beneficial to reincorporate back into the general zoning ordinance in the future. Chairman Wall inquired about the last page being a stand alone. Staff stated that §151.999 is the enforcement paragraph at the end of the general zoning ordinance, is not a part of the overlay ordinance language, and so it will remain the last paragraph of the City zoning ordinance.

Chairman Wall opened the floor to the public to speak for the issue. There was none. Chairman Wall inquired if anyone from the public that wished to speak against the issue. There was none. Chairman Wall inquired if Staff had a recommendation. Ms. Hanson stated Staff recommends deleting the remaining portion of the zoning ordinance overlay district language in its entirety from the zoning ordinance, and recommends the Commission approve the recommendation to City Council. Chairman Wall closed the public hearing.

There was discussion in regards to different types of overlay districts, and the existing portions of the current language within the overlay district that is irrelevant.

- Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion to accept the proposed ordinance amendment to omit all sections included in the overlay ordinance as submitted by Staff. Mr. Washington seconded.
- Discussion:* Mr. Connerty asked to clarify if the sections to be deleted are §151.230 through §151.239. Staff confirmed the sections to delete would consist of: §151.230, §151.231, §151.232, §151.233, §151.235, §151.236, and §151.237.
- Vote:* All voted in favor. (7-0)

## **VII. Street Naming Approval – Waters at St. James**

Chairman Wall invited Staff to brief the Commission on the proposed names. Ms. Hanson stated that the developer had requested street names for the Waters at St. James Apartments Community. Staff outlined the process for street naming, and presented the list of names requested from the developer to the Commission, noting approval is the decision of the Planning Commission. Ms. Hanson described the development to be located off of St. James Avenue, to the left of Cobblestone Village, south of 17A. Staff noted that the apartment buildings sit on the main loop of the development, and pointed out the front parcels are planned for future commercial development. Staff recommended addressing all buildings with the same street name, and mentioned the developer's request is to address the two inner parking lots to include family names of the original property owners. There was some discussion in regards to the different streets and the names as requested, along with some discussion that the service road would eventually be a public road and all roads within this community would remain private. Chairman Wall inquired as to which streets were being requested. Staff stated that the developer is requesting Emma Meredith Circle, Baxter Brown Way, Waters Creek Way, and Waters Way. There was discussion in regards to naming the service road Baxter Brown Way, the main access road off of St. James Avenue to be named Waters Creek Way, the entrance to the Waters at St. James community to be Waters Way, and the main loop within the development to be named Emma Meredith Circle. Chairman Wall stated the middle portion would not be named since it would only consist of parking. Staff stated fire safety is also taken into consideration when addressing.

*Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion to accept the proposed street names as discussed. Mr. Smith seconded.  
*Discussion:* There was none.  
*Vote:* All voted in favor. (7-0)

### **VIII. Comments from the Commission**

Mr. Connerty thanked the Mayor and the City Administrator for the benefits given to the Boards and Commission members to the community center and golf course in appreciation for their voluntary service.

Chairman Wall welcomed the new Commission members to the Planning Commission. He introduced Gary Berenyi, Jeanette Fowler, and Joshua Johnson and requested each new member give a brief explanation as to why they were interested in being on the Commission. Mr. Berenyi stated he was interested in helping make a difference. Ms. Fowler stated she has always been interested in the happenings of the City and wanted to get involved in the process. Mr. Johnson explained he was looking forward to the opportunity to serve the City.

Chairman Wall explained there would not be a meeting in July, as it was tentatively scheduled, and suggested the new members read the zoning ordinance. Chairman Wall inquired about the change to the minutes. Ms. Hanson stated the word "structure" would be added to the portion of the ordinance amendment describing the five story height requirement within the description of the General Industrial (GI) zoning classification height requirement.

*Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion to amend the minutes as presented by Staff. Ms. Fowler seconded.  
*Discussion:* There was none.  
*Vote:* All voted in favor. (7-0)

### **IX. Comments from Staff**

Ms. Hanson welcomed the new members to the Commission, and thanked those that currently serve on the Planning Commission. She outlined the agenda for the upcoming City Council meeting.

### **X. Adjournment**

Mr. Smith made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Washington seconded. All voted in favor (7-0). The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:52 p.m.

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

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