

**MINUTES
CITY OF GOOSE CREEK
PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 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 6:32 p.m.

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

Absent: Jeffrey Smith

Staff Present: Kara Browder, Brenda Moneer

II. Approval of Agenda

Motion: Mr. Johnson made a motion to accept the Agenda, and strike the review of the minutes. Mr. Berenyi seconded.

Discussion: There was none.

Vote: All voted in favor.

III. Discussion – Zoning Classifications – Restricted Commercial

Chairman Wall opened the discussion to Staff. Ms. Browder stated the purpose for the discussion of the additional zoning classification was brought about because there are a few areas within the City that do not provide a transitional zoning from General Commercial (GC) to residential areas. She suggested creating a zoning classification such as a more restricted office use, and presented a listing of current properties that are Restricted Commercial (RC) throughout the City. She also presented the Commission with Appendix “B” and suggested going through the current (RC) permitted uses to determine what the Commission feels would be an appropriate use for the new zoning classification, or create an office district to allow office type uses only. Chairman Wall inquired if Staff had found any type of existing dialysis business as office use, expressing concern for the 24-hour service. He added that an office district would be consist of nine to five type office hours, and reduce traffic flow. Staff agreed to check into dialysis clinics, and the hours of operation. There was a lengthy detailed discussion regarding the zoning, and what types of uses would be appropriate for this type of district, if the Commission felt they wanted to delete (RC) or add an additional district. Mr. Berenyi suggested adding the language of the limited hours of operation to the definition. Mr. Connerty offered he found that the hours were typically nine to five. Ms. Browder added that Appendix “D” could also include any parameters for lot criteria. A member of the audience stated they felt this would help the property owner if they had a zoning that would offer a less intense use. Mr. Berenyi commented that a letter of opinion from the Zoning Administrator is helpful in certain situations for a specific use within a particular zoning. Chairman Wall suggested breaking down the class by giving it a name, and then determining what

uses would be permitted within the Appendix "B"-Table of Land Uses. He invited the Commission to suggest a name. Mr. Washington inquired if the (RC) would be replaced by this new classification. There was mention that Staff had stated previously that the parcels would be a non-conforming use. Chairman Wall inquired to Staff if the (RC) classification should be kept. Ms. Browder stated that the (RC) classification would remain, and this would be adding an additional classification to the zoning districts. She outlined the existing parcels within the City boundaries that are currently zoned (RC). She suggested keeping the (RC) and add an office district. There was discussion regarding various titles to give the zoning classification, and what the uses would consist of, along with the criteria to be included within Appendix "D". The Commission reviewed the table of land uses, Appendix "B", and determined what would be permitted, and outlined the language for the definition of the Business Professional Office District (BPOD). The Commission tasked Staff with a polished proposal to keep (RC) and come up with language and definition for the zoning classification (BPOD) for the next upcoming meeting, along with review of Appendix "B".

IV. Discussion – Land Uses; specifically tattooing, ordinance regulations and guidelines

Chairman Wall opened the discussion to Staff. Ms. Browder mentioned this request came about by an individual that wished to have a tattoo facility in the City. She added that currently the zoning ordinance does not have a zoning for tattoo facilities, and a need to add it to the zoning ordinance. Staff presented language to the commission to propose the addition to the current ordinance under adult uses. There was some discussion about DHEC certifications, and state requirements. There was also discussion regarding distance from residential, schools, and churches. She mentioned that this discussion had started prior to her position with the City, and that it is under the City ordinance under health and sanitation. Ms. Browder mentioned that it would need to be added to a zoning classification to allow the use within the City.

There was discussion about including the tattoo parlors within the adult uses as they are also not under any specific zoning classification. The Commission discussed that the Council should address the issue under the City ordinance before they could add it within the zoning ordinance. There was also discussion about the need, market for this type of business. Mr. Connerty suggested that maybe this item should not go under the adult uses section of the zoning ordinance. There was discussion about the use not being an industrial type use, and it being more common than in the past. There was discussion about making it a conditional use within the commercial industrial zoning district. Mr. Berenyi stated that the location should not be restricted by the zoning district. The Commission agreed that the conditional use guideline would fall under General Commercial (GC) zoning classification, and be used in relationship to the distance. Ms. Browder requested how many feet to incorporate into the language. There was some discussion pertaining to various locations, and churches and schools within proximity, and the currently requirement of distance for a bar. There was a brief discussion about the regulations of ECIG. The Commission requested Staff bring back a proposal with the locations being restricted within a limited distance to schools, churches, establishments that sell alcohol and residential uses under General Commercial with a conditional use.

Mr. Berenyi inquired about the adult uses portion of the ordinance. Staff suggested since the Commission decided to not include the tattoo parlor under adult uses, she would come back with

some suggestions to propose to the Commission. There was discussion that the ordinance for the City code would need to be amended first. There was discussion about the definitions of adult uses, and the non-existence within Appendix "B". Staff requested additional time to come up with additional information to add to the language of the ordinance.

V. Discussion – Development of Storage Facilities

Chairman Wall inquired to the Commission if anyone had read the article in the paper. There was discussion about located facilities in certain zoning classifications, and what type of facility; i.e. enclosed or open doors on exterior. Ms. Browder stated the requirements for mini-warehouses where storage units are fully enclosed within a single building structure, and access to all units from a common entrance into the building in the General Commercial, Commercial Industrial and the Light Industrial zoning districts. She outlined where the City permits warehouses, mini-warehouses with units having access from the exterior of the unit in the Commercial Industrial and the General Industrial zoning districts. Staff presented the storage facility request from the previous five years. She outlined some criteria currently used within other municipalities. She suggested some criteria that could help designate the development of such facilities.

Ms. Fowler stated concerns for the area being inundated with storage facilities, in comparison with other areas within the tri-county area. She added that height may be of concern, if lot size restriction is a factor. Mr. Berenyi stated that development could be restricted with a height restriction, and that the market will adjust accordingly. He added that this should be the function of the Architectural Review Board to control the aesthetics of the exterior building. He outlined various criteria that could help with this. Chairman Wall stated that it previously was suggested that these facilities go into light industrial from the previous City Planner. Staff stated yes. Mr. Berenyi expressed disagreement to force a specific zoning, and keep it with the Architectural Review Board, with larger buffers.

There was discussion about concerns for too many storage facilities, and lack of restaurants developing within the City of Goose Creek. There was discussion regarding the determination of buffers with zoning and adjacent zoning. Ms. Browder stated that exteriors currently are much more aesthetically pleasing than those from years past. Chairman Wall stated concerns for existing facilities that are not kept up and maintained, and requested input from City Council in the form of a letter to the Commission. There was discussion about criteria that could be added to the language to control and address some issues of current facilities. Mr. Connerty inquired if the new economic development director had weighed in on the concern of available properties to market for businesses, such as restaurants and other businesses. Staff stated he has not expressed anything to staff. There was discussion about the overall development process through the Planning Department before it goes before the Architectural Review Board, but with language to support the request. The Commission requested Staff come up with a resolution letter to the Architectural Review Board from the Planning Commission regarding the aesthetics of storage facilities.

VI. Comments from the Commission

Chairman Wall suggested review of minutes gradually.

VII. Comments from Staff

There was none.

VIII. Adjournment

Mr. Connerty made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Johnson seconded. All voted in favor. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:38 p.m.

Allen Wall, Chairman

Date: _____