

**MINUTES
CITY OF GOOSE CREEK
PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, MAY 3, 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: Paul Connerty, Jeffrey Smith, Allen Wall, Barry Washington
Absent: none
Staff Present: Sarah Hanson, Brenda Moneer

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. (4-0)

III. Review of Minutes from April 5, 2016

Motion: Mr. Washington made a motion to accept the minutes with the addition of language, under Staff Comments to the inquiry for DOT access, to include the words “right turn lane” at Mt. Holly and Hwy. 52. Mr. Connerty seconded.
Discussion: There was none.
Vote: All voted in favor. (4-0)

IV. Discussion – Appendix D – Zoning Districts

Chairman Wall stated the modifications for the zoning districts, and opened the floor to Staff. Ms. Hanson stated due to recently adding the zoning classifications, for both Commercial Industrial as well as General Industrial, it is necessary to determine the site requirements for both classifications. Staff presented the proposed site requirements, specifically noting the individual requirements for the Commercial Industrial and the General Industrial classifications. Ms. Hanson also mentioned when determining the criteria of requirements, the vision of Goose Creek is taken into consideration, as well as creating site requirements desirable for Businesses to incorporate within the City Boundaries.

Staff described Commercial Industrial (CI) as a zoning classification to be designated or reserved for commercial uses that may require a larger land area than a simple commercial use. She added the use to be a more intense commercial use, while taking into consideration that the setbacks

may need to be back farther from the street, with deeper setbacks at the rear of the property. Chairman Wall inquired as to why the setback had to be larger. Staff noted the front setback would need to be greater because the structure might not be as aesthetically pleasing as some of the other types of commercial buildings. She added that there may need to be additional landscaping at the front of the property, or a more natural area kept in the front of the business, to allow more vegetation and landscaping up front to provide a visual buffer. Ms. Hanson stated that many of the parcels located within the City boundaries have deep easements along the front of the general commercial properties, sometimes as a right of way, and in other instances it may be part of a right of way and partial utility easements. She also stated that this may limit businesses as to what may be planted in these particular areas, allowing businesses to keep the natural vegetation at the front of their properties and still have ample room to build the structure that they are planning to build. Staff gave examples of the benefits of keeping the natural vegetation, or the addition of landscaping to allow screening from the street view. There was a brief discussion about the height guidelines for the different types of zoning classification. Staff noted the only changes to these two types of zoning classifications were the front and rear setbacks to screen the more intense use from the neighboring properties.

Ms. Hanson described the specifics of the General Industrial (GI) land requirements, including making it viable for businesses, while protecting the surrounding properties. Staff stated the minimum property size for a General Industrial property zoning classification would be five acres. She detailed the minimum widths and depths as the same as Light Industrial (LI) to provide a consistent uniformity of setbacks, buffers and landscaping. She also mentioned the front setback was the same as Light Industrial (LI), at 50' with the sides at 20', totaling 40' and 40' at the rear. Staff added the side setback would be 30' rather than 20' if the parcel was on a corner. Ms. Hanson noted the maximum height to be a five story structure instead of four, with a maximum overall height of 70'. She noted the lot coverage would be 50% instead of the 40% used for the General Commercial, noting it is the same as Light Industrial. There was a discussion about adding the variable for height with all of the setbacks, to include adding 2' to the setbacks for every story above the second story. There was discussion about setbacks requirements for other local municipalities, and Staff noted that annotation #5 setback requirement is subject to meeting the land use buffer requirement.

V. Discussion – Section 151.085 Land Use Buffer

Chairman Wall opened the discussion to Staff, and suggested a motion for all discussions be included with the City Council's approval of General Industrial. Ms. Hanson stated these items would require a public hearing with the changes of the zoning ordinance. Staff stated research showed the majority of other municipalities are using the same requirements. Ms. Hanson mentioned that this insures that the development requirements; 1) meet the Comprehensive Plan, 2) meet the vision the City has for Goose Creek, 3) for developers to develop within the City from a competitive standpoint. Staff described different types of buffer requirements when various types of property lines abut, and stated a new type of buffer was added to the Land Use Buffer requirements, and is designated as Buffer 5. Ms. Hanson suggested adding a structural element to the buffer 5 requirement, such as a fence.

VI. Discussion – Section 151.235 Parking Requirements

Chairman Wall mentioned the packet had included the deletion of items. Staff proposed these items are deleted from the overlay district, and portions are kept and blended into other areas of the zoning ordinance. Ms. Hanson proposed deleting the section 151.235 (D) in its entirety, since it is relative strictly to the overlay district. She added the original vision was created with parking lots that would not be privately owned, and added that nothing had changed with parking lots in regards to private vs. public since the ordinance was created.

- Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion to bring the items as per the Agenda IV- Appendix D, V-Land Use Buffer, and VI-Parking Requirements as modified to add to the upcoming Planning Commission Agenda for a public hearing. Mr. Washington seconded.
- Discussion:* There was none.
- Vote:* All voted in favor. (4-0)

VII. Street Naming Approval – Comet Creek Lane

Chairman Wall invited Staff to brief the Commission on the proposed name. Ms. Hanson stated that the developer had requested to name the interior street for the Comet Creek Apartments: Comet Creek Lane, for the 256 unit apartment complex located within Cobblestone off of St. James Avenue, just south of Carnes Crossroads. She added it will be a luxury gated apartment community. Chairman Wall inquired if this is located directly off of St. James Avenue. Staff noted it would be off of Village Stone Circle that is located directly off of St. James Avenue.

- Motion:* Mr. Washington made a motion to accept the proposed street named Comet Creek Lane. Mr. Connerty seconded.
- Discussion:* There was none.
- Vote:* All voted in favor. (4-0)

VIII. Street Naming Approval – Levis Song Court

Chairman Wall invited Staff to brief the Commission on the proposed name. Ms. Hanson stated this would be for a street within the next phase of the Liberty Village sub-division off of Montague Plantation Road. Staff noted the developer, Ryland Homes, is requesting Levis Song Court. She added that they had asked Berkeley County to come up with a name they could use, using Levis. Chairman Wall inquired the length of the street. Ms. Hanson stated it is a cul-de-sac. There was a brief discussion about the reason for choosing Levis Song Court.

- Motion:* Mr. Smith made a motion to accept the proposed street named Levis Song Court for the Liberty Village development. Mr. Connerty seconded.
- Discussion:* There was discussion about the current stage of development within Liberty Village.
- Vote:* All voted in favor. (4-0)

IX. Comments from the Commission

Chairman Wall inquired about the recent resignation of Mr. Darrell Williams, leaving a current total of only four members. There was a brief discussion in regards to the Council's interview process for open positions on the Boards and Commissions. Mr. Smith inquired if the forum is closed, or if current commission members are able to attend. Staff noted members could attend; however, there would not be any input to the Council's decision. She stated that after all interviews were conducted they would vote that same evening to elect members to positions accordingly. She noted currently there are three positions open on the Planning Commission and one position on the Architectural Review Board.

Chairman Wall nominated Barry Washington to assume the position of Vice Chair with the recent resignation of the former Vice Chair, Mr. Williams. Mr. Connerty seconded the nomination. Mr. Washington accepted the nomination.

X. Comments from Staff

Ms. Hanson stated that the next meeting would be June 7th, and inquired with the Commission to insure a quorum, and also to advertise for the public hearing. She also mentioned there would be a rezoning request. She inquired if the Commission could verify if that date would work for everyone. All members agreed that June 7th was workable.

Chairman Wall inquired about the ingress and egress of the Sunoco at the corner of Red Bank Road. Staff noted that the developer had a traffic study, and had worked in conjunction with SCDOT to get an extra turn lane. There was discussion about the Red Bank Road access that fronts Caliber collision.

Mr. Smith inquired if there would be dedications for the new fire stations. Staff noted there recently was a ceremony for the firemen at station #3, along with 12 new firemen, as well as three new captains. She stated as soon as some last items were complete, there would be a dedication along with a ribbon cutting ceremony. Ms. Hanson mentioned the timeframe for the headquarters was uncertain at this time.

XI. Adjournment

Mr. Smith made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Washington seconded. All voted in favor. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:25 p.m.

Allen Wall, Chairman

Date: _____