

**MINUTES
CITY OF GOOSE CREEK
PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JANUARY 3, 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 6:35 p.m.

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

Absent: Jeffrey Smith

Staff Present: Sarah Hanson

II. Approval of Agenda

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

Discussion: There was a brief discussion in regards to the items for discussion as outlined on the agenda.

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

III. Review of Minutes from December 6, 2016

Motion: Ms. Fowler made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Washington seconded.

Discussion: There was none.

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

IV. Discussion – Zoning Ordinance – Barbed Wire

Chairman Wall mentioned concerns that had been reported in regards to the use of barbed wire, and opened the floor to Staff for further details. Ms. Hanson presented the concerns to the Commission, and invited the Commission to discuss language to regulate the use of barbed wire, and fencing regulations. There was discussion in regards to adding the language to the fencing requirements portion of the ordinance, and if existing barbed wire would be grandfathered in. There was a lengthy discussion about different materials that would be appropriate for fencing use, and if barbed wire is deemed necessary in residential or commercial areas. Ms. Hanson suggested some language to amend the ordinance requirements. Chairman Wall inquired about a reasonable timeframe to amortize any existing nonconforming structures on residential properties. There was an extensive discussion in regards to the timeframe for amortization and the permitted materials to specify.

The Commission tasked Staff with phrasing the language as per the discussion with an amortization of six months. Staff clarified the exact specifics with the Commission to detail the language to propose at the next public hearing.

V. Discussion – Zoning Ordinance - Dumpsters

Chairman Wall opened the floor to Staff. Ms. Hanson addressed the Commission with concerns in regards to the use of dumpsters for residential properties. She outlined the current process for permitting a dumpster, which are presently within the current guidelines of a portable storage unit. There was a brief discussion about the allowed locations for dumpsters.

Mr. Berenyi suggested separating the dumpster ordinance language from the POD ordinance language, and add language that would require a building permit in order to have a dumpster. There was discussion about adding the word “dumpster” to the POD ordinance language, with the approval of the Zoning Administrator to extend the permit past the 30 days if needed, and 30 additional days before the POD could be located at the same address with a new permit.

VI. Discussion – Zoning Ordinance – Accessory Structures

Chairman Wall addressed the Commission with the inquiry of how many accessory structures per residential property may be reasonable. Ms. Hanson cited the current ordinance language that pertains to the allowance requirements for accessory structures. She added that per the State building code any structure 200 square feet or more requires engineered, stamped plans. Staff noted this creates the use of smaller structures with less costly requirements, which may entail having 3 smaller accessory structures on one property. Ms. Hanson stated the ordinance is silent when regulating the limitation of the number of accessory structures, specifying only the maximum square footage, and lot coverage within the ordinance language.

Chairperson Wall stated concerns for over regulating, and also mentioned the need for some type of guidelines. There was a lengthy discussion about setting reasonable limitations on types, sizes and quantities of accessory structures. Chairman Wall inquired if the Commission wished to continue the discussion. Commission and Staff agreed to research the topic and come back to it at a future date.

VII. Discussion – Zoning Ordinance – Signage; Specifically, Freestanding Sign Height, and Vehicles used as Signage

Chairman Wall opened the floor to Staff. Ms. Hanson addressed the Commission with current questions pertaining to the height of freestanding signage, and if the current regulations allow for more than is necessary. Staff mentioned that research shows other municipalities are leaning toward signs with lower height restrictions such as 8, 10, and 12 feet. She asked the Commission for feedback as to what they feel is an appropriate height for future development. Chairman Wall stated favor for the current 20' height limitation.

There was discussion if lower signs create a more aesthetic appearance for the community, and if sign guidelines have an affect attracting businesses to develop within our community. Chairman Wall inquired if the Commission supported the lower sign height requirement. The Commission voted to propose modifying the ordinance language requirements. Staff requested suggestions from the Commission to create the language for the ordinance. The Commission agreed to specify a 10 foot height limitation for freestanding signage within the guidelines of the sign ordinance language for future development, and requested to add it to the upcoming public hearing.

Chairman Wall opened the discussion to the use of vehicles as signage. Ms. Hanson addressed the Commission with suggested language for this ordinance. There was a lengthy discussion about current reported issues of this type of signage within the City limits. The Commission agreed to propose the addition of this language to the ordinance to regulate vehicle signage at the upcoming public hearing.

VIII. Discussion – Appendix B – Storage Facilities

Chairman Wall opened the discussion to Staff. Ms. Hanson stated there had been some concerns on the development of similar types of facilities within a close timeframe. Staff clarified the zoning classifications for a more intense commercial use would require a commercial industrial zoning in lieu of the previous required classification of a general commercial zoning. She added it had been suggested to require all storage facilities to be a permitted use within a commercial industrial zoning classification. She requested the Commission give their feedback.

Chairman Wall inquired about the mini storage facilities that are enclosed within a building, and what classifications would permit this type of use. There was discussion about existing nonconforming structures. There was some discussion in regards to the types of uses within zoning classifications that would create an ideal neighboring property, and how language could be added to incorporate the design guidelines, and requirements within the ordinance. Mr. Berenyi shared language from another municipality. Chairman Wall inquired if Staff would come up with some language as per the discussion. There was a lengthy discussion about varied opinions in regards to types of facilities, aesthetics, guidelines, and permitted use. There was some discussion about economic development. Ms. Hanson stated Staff would research language and the Commission could address it at a future meeting.

IX. Comments from the Commission

Mr. Connerty inquired about the items from previous public hearings. Staff updated the Commission with items for the upcoming City Council Agendas. Chairman Wall inquired to Staff about an update for the Planning Director position. Staff updated the Commission. Chairman Wall inquired about training. Staff stated information would be forthcoming within a few weeks.

X. Comments from Staff

Ms. Hanson had no additional comments.

XI. Adjournment

Mr. Johnson made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Connerty seconded. All voted in favor. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:50 p.m.

Allen Wall, Chairman

Date: _____