

**MINUTES  
CITY OF GOOSE CREEK  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2017, 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 6:37 p.m.

Present: Gary Berenyi, Paul Connerty, Josh Johnson, Jeffrey Smith, Allen Wall, Barry Washington

Absent: Jeanette Fowler

Staff Present: Sarah Hanson, Kara Browder

**II. Approval of Agenda**

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

*Discussion:* There was none.

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

**III. Review of Minutes from January 3, 2017**

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

*Discussion:* There was none.

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

**IV. Street Name Approval – Liberty Village-Phase 5, Daniels Creek Circle, Chaste Tree Drive, Sumac Drive.**

Chairman Wall opened the floor to Staff. Ms. Hanson cited the Commission with the addressing of the suggested street names for Liberty Village, Phase V, Street Name Approval. Staff mentioned the names may have gone before the Commission previously, however Staff was not able to find any specific information to support that. There was discussion about the size of the development to include approximately 120 lots, to be developed under the Development Agreement that was redone a year ago December.

The Commission agreed to table the discussion until the end of the meeting to provide Staff an opportunity to locate the development plat.

Chairman wall noted for the record there was no public present for the Public Hearing.

## **V. Public Hearing – Zoning Ordinance §151.082 Design Standards: Prohibiting Barbed Wire Fencing**

Chairman Wall opened the public hearing and the floor to Staff. Ms. Hanson addressed the Commission with concerns regarding the use of barbed wire. Staff stated the language, suggesting a list of what types of fencing could be used, limiting fencing to traditional fencing materials, and prohibiting barbed or laser wire for residential fencing. Ms. Hanson stated the use of barbed wire for commercial properties was discussed, and it was determined that if it was used, it would be on the inside of the fence, and not be visible from the exterior side. Staff also mentioned, for those properties that do not currently conform, there would be a 6-month period once the ordinance was approved by Council to conform to the amended ordinance. Staff presented the language to the Commission. Chairman Wall inquired if anyone wished to speak for the issue. There were no comments. Chairman Wall inquired if anyone wished to speak against the issue. There were no comments. Chairman Wall inquired if Staff wished to summarize. Ms. Hanson stated in listening to the concerns from Citizens and Council, Staff wished to recommend the request go to City Council.

Chairman Wall inquired if the Commission had any comments. Mr. Johnson inquired if an opaque fence included having a chain link with the slats weaving in and out of the chain link for commercial properties. Staff stated that the ordinance currently requires that if it is a chain link fence that it be the black chain link fencing, and that type of fencing would be considered opaque requiring approval from the ARB. There was discussion about the location of the barbed wire for commercial, and not being able to see it, along with the use being prohibited from residential. The Commission detailed the language of the proposed ordinance, and discussed existing commercial properties containing barbed wire. There was discussion about some municipalities not permitting the use of barbed wire entirely.

Chairman Wall closed the public hearing.

*Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion to recommend the ordinance amendment with the addition of “his/hers” to the fourth sentence as discussed, and strike the last sentence, and add it to the second sentence: “and may not be constructed of damaged or unsafe materials”. Mr. Smith seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

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

*Motion:* Mr. Smith made a motion that after the changes as discussed are made, to present §151.082 Design Standards (C) other yard provisions for fences, poles to recommend to City Council. Mr. Washington seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

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

## **VI. Public Hearing – Zoning Ordinance §151.108 Accessory Structures: Requiring Dumpsters, Construction Dumpsters to be Permitted in Residential Zones**

Chairman Wall opened the public hearing, and asked Staff to open the discussion. Ms. Hanson stated this was prompted by the Administration of the City because there is not any language

within the ordinance that specifically addresses construction dumpsters. Staff stated that per last month's discussion, that a dumpster would be approved with a building permit, with approval for 30 days, at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator, and with additional fees paid they could extend for another 30 days. She also stated it was suggested, due to the comings and goings of these dumpsters, that the dumpster be removed off site for 30 days, and then could come back if there is a valid building permit.

Chairman Wall inquired if anyone wished to speak for or against. There were no comments.

Chairman Wall closed the public hearing.

Chairman Wall inquired with the Commission for comments. Mr. Smith inquired about the specifics of use with the use of a dumpster. Ms. Hanson stated that may need to be spelled out with the use being for construction vs. an accessory structure. Chairman Wall inquired if language should be added to cover that specifically. Staff stated concern if language is added, that it would need to be less than 30 days if it is a non-construction use. There was discussion regarding adding language to regulate a timeframe for a non-construction use.

*Motion:* Mr. Smith made a motion to recommend the ordinance amendment with the addition of section (I) Non-Construction Use dumpsters may remain on site for 15 days, and, at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator, with the appropriate permit, with additional fees, may be extended for another fifteen (15) day period. Upon the expiration of the permit the dumpster shall be removed from the property. Mr. Berenyi seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

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

*Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion for approval of zoning ordinance 151.108 Accessory Structures, requiring permit for construction and non-construction dumpsters in residential zones. Mr. Smith seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

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

## **VII. Public Hearing – Zoning Ordinance §151.084 – Signage, Reducing the Maximum Allowable Height for Freestanding Signs and prohibiting Vehicles from being used as Signage.**

*Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion to move item VIII on the agenda up and item VII down. Mr. Berenyi seconded.

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

## **VIII. Discussion – Appendix B – Restricted Commercial Approved Uses**

Chairman Wall opened the floor to Staff. Ms. Hanson addressed the Commission stating the Restricted Commercial zoning classifications has some approved uses by right that are creating concern for land use. She outlined the intent of Restricted Commercial zoning classification as per

the current ordinance. She also mentioned some of the permitted uses by right that may be too intense of a use as stated in the land use table, located right next to a residential zoning.

Chairman Wall invited the gentlemen in the public to speak. Mr. Randy Bates, with the Edge of Folly spoke in favor of a zoning classification to provide a professional business office district. Mr. Bates presented some language to the Commission to provide support of a new district as per other municipalities. There was discussion regarding medical offices, and where they would fall in the land use table. Staff deferred to the Commission as to what they felt appropriate for an office setting with established daytime hours vs. later or 24 hours, such as a dialysis clinic. Ms. Hanson stated an applicant is required to wait twelve (12) months to request the same rezoning, and is not required to wait if they request a different zoning classification for rezoning.

Mr. Bates stated this type of zoning would create a great neighboring transitional zone by a residential neighborhood. There was discussion about requiring the zoning classification to outline specifications to create quiet business district regulations and design criteria. Staff outlined the buffer requirements as per the ordinance.

Chairman Wall inquired if the Commission wished to bring the discussion back at the next meeting. Mr. Johnson inquired how many parcels currently have the restricted commercial zoning classification. Staff stated approximately nine, and would be able to remain the same from a use standpoint, if they do not go thirty (30) continuous days without operating a business, within the establishment, on a consistent basis.

The Commission requested a study from Staff regarding how many parcels are currently zoned Restricted Commercial and what the current use is. Staff stated they could provide that information for the Commission. Chairman Wall stated concerns for certain offices with lengthy office hours. There was a brief discussion regarding the level of activity, and the access for the property by Colonial Heights, and creating another zoning classification or renaming the existing restricted commercial zoning classification.

Chairman Wall thanked Mr. Bates for his input, and information.

## **VII. Public Hearing - Zoning Ordinance §151.084 - Signage, Reducing the Maximum Allowable Height for Freestanding Signs and Prohibiting Vehicles from being used as Signage.**

Chairman Wall opened the public hearing, and requested Staff summarize. Ms. Hanson stated this was also requested by the Administration for the City, as it is something that has been an issue for some time with no supporting language that regulates it. Staff stated that upon research of other municipalities, it was discovered that the same language was being used to regulate vehicles used as signage for advertising. Staff presented the examples to the Commission. Ms. Hanson stated the language as provided addressed the location and restrictions of other municipalities currently being used, where the sign is not the primary use of the vehicle.

Chairman Wall inquired if this is combined within the same public hearing as the ten foot sign. Staff stated yes.

Chairman Wall inquired if there was any further discussion on the mobile signs, and asked Staff if there was a size that would not be permissible. Ms. Hanson stated that the purpose of the last sentence is to not prohibit identification signs painted on affixed to vehicles or trailers. Mr. Berenyi inquired about the vehicles with “for sale” signage, and added a side note of the Councils concerns of impact for businesses, and supported the regulation as proposed. Chairman Wall inquired if there was any other discussion on this subject, and requested the conversation begin for the sign height regulation for freestanding signage, and then the Commission could vote on both.

Chairman Wall stated that the proposed ordinance would reduce the freestanding sign height to ten (10) feet from the current requirement of twenty (20) feet. He asked Staff to elaborate. Staff confirmed the this would change the height restriction to ten (10) feet, and in the discussion from last month added the language that it must be of a monument type design. Ms. Hanson stated the rest of the language would remain the same as it is currently. There was some discussion about current applications, and the vision for the future of the City of Goose Creek. She stated those current applicants were willing to work within the pending legislation, and provide the sign submittal based on those requirements. There was some discussion about the cost comparison of diverse types of signage.

Chairman Wall noted there was no public present, and closed the public hearing.

*Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion to approve the §151.084 Sign Regulations (I) (8) as presented. Mr. Berenyi seconded.  
*Discussion:* There was none.  
*Vote:* All voted in favor. (6-0)

#### **IV. Street Name Approval – Liberty Village-Phase 5, Daniels Creek Circle, Chaste Tree Drive, Sumac Drive.**

Staff presented a plat to the Commission showing the proposed layout of Phase 5 of Liberty Village.

*Motion:* Mr. Connerty made a motion to approve the naming of the streets for Liberty Village, Phase 5 as proposed. Mr. Smith seconded.  
*Discussion:* Chairman Wall inquired if the names were approved through the County. Staff confirmed they were.  
*Vote:* All voted in favor. (6-0)

#### **IX. Comments from the Commission**

There was discussion about current development within the City boundaries. Chairman Wall thanked Sarah for her time and wished her well.

**X. Comments from Staff**

Ms. Hanson thanked the Commission for all their cooperation and challenging work, and future efforts to keep Goose Creek’s vision for Development. Ms. Browder stated she is looking forward to working with the City and the Commission.

**XI. Adjournment**

Mr. Johnson made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Connerty seconded. All voted in favor. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

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

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