

**MINUTES
CITY OF GOOSE CREEK
PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JULY 3, 2018, 6:30 P.M.
GOOSE CREEK MUNICIPAL CENTER
519 N. GOOSE CREEK BLVD.**

I. Call to Order – Chairman Allen Wall

Action: Chairman Wall called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
Present: Gary Berenyi, Paul Connerty, Jeanette Fowler, Joshua Johnson, Jeffrey Smith, Allen Wall
Absent: Barry Washington
Staff Present: Kara Browder

II. Approval of Agenda

Motion: Made a motion to accept the Agenda as posted., **Moved by** Paul Connerty; **Seconded by** Jeanette Fowler
Discussion: There was none.
Vote: All voted in favor.

III. Review of Minutes from June 5, 2018

Discussion: Noted to correct the call to order to Chairman Wall. Josh Johnson also noted that the Impact Study report should read “they have” in lieu of had and add the words “and to” determine fees.
Motion: A motion was made to accept the minutes as submitted, with the corrections as discussed., **Moved by** Paul Connerty, **Seconded by** Jeanette Fowler
Discussion: There was none.
Vote: All Voted in favor.

IV. Public Hearing – Request for Rezoning for property located at: 117 Wallace Drive, designated as TMS# 234-12-03-034 from Conservation Open Space (CO) to Residential Low Density (R1)

Chairman Wall opened the Public Hearing and opened the floor to Staff. Ms. Browder stated the applicant, Mr. Douglas Bell, was present. She presented an aerial of the location on the overhead. Ms. Browder noted that the property was 1.42 acres in size, and the owner may want to subdivide in the future. She also added the requirements for the property to be low density single family residential (R1). She stated the property to the North, South, East, and West are mostly single family residential, and this area is designated as single family residential per the comprehensive plan.

Chairman Wall invited Mr. Bell to come forward with any additional information. Mr. Bell noted that the intent for the property was to subdivide, and rezone to single family low density residential (R1) to develop a residence next door.

Chairman Wall invited anyone to speak for the issue. There was no one. Chairman Wall invited anyone to speak against the issue. Ms. Judy Stafford, of 123 Wallace Rd., stated concerns for development in that area. There was a brief discussion regarding the impact on traffic with additional development of a residential property.

Chairman Wall asked Staff if there was a recommendation for the Commission. Ms. Browder noted that the request was for low density residential (R1), and restated that it is designated as such per the comprehensive plan. Chairman Wall inquired to Mr. Bell, the applicant, if he had additional information to add to his request. Mr. Bell stated his intent to add one additional residential house and did not see that it would have a heavy impact on traffic. Mr. Connerty inquired to Mr. Bell if he had plans for the home to be built. Mr. Bell stated he did not have plans at this time, however they would be designed in keeping with the zoning requirements. There was a brief discussion about utilities. Mr. Bell added all the homes on Wallace are on septic as he had verified with the County. Mr. Johnson inquired if the plan was to build one single family home. Mr. Bell stated the intent was to subdivide the property to add one additional single-family home.

Chairman Wall closed the public hearing.

There was a brief discussion that one additional residence should not create an issue.

- Motion:** A motion to approve the request to rezone 117 Wallace Drive, designated as TMS#234-12-03-034 from Conservation Open Space (C0) to Residential Low Density (R1)., **Moved by** Jeffrey Smith, **Seconded by** Gary Berenyi
- Discussion:** Mr. Johnson noted the property is zoned (CO) at time of annexation into the City, and (R1) would be the lowest intense residential use. Chairman Wall asked if there was any further discussion. There was none.
- Vote:** All Voted in favor. The motion carried.

V. Public Hearing – Amendment of Zoning Ordinance §151.084: Sign Regulations

Chairman Wall opened the Public Hearing.

Chairman Wall noted this discussion would cover the language for the A-frame signage only. Chairman Wall invited staff to address the Commission with the language proposed to amend the sign ordinance for §151.084. Ms. Browder mentioned that the definition section would be the first area to be changed within the zoning ordinance. She also noted the additional language that would be required to go under §151.084. Ms. Browder mentioned the section under “standard signs” would need to be deleted as it no longer applied. Ms. Browder highlighted the language for portable sign requirements to go under the section for portable or sandwich board signs.

Chairman Wall invited anyone to speak for the issue. There was no one. Chairman wall invited anyone to speak against the issue. There was no one.

Staff noted that this would be good for businesses to be able to advertise specials and such. Chairman Wall asked Mr. Broom if he had any response or feedback from the EDAC. Mr. Broom stated they suggested the A-Frame signage not be too far from the entrance, nor out near the street.

Chairman Wall closed the public hearing.

Ms. Fowler inquired if this would encompass anything with the word commercial in the zoning classifications. She suggested adding language for the location of the A-frame to not create a hazard for foot traffic. Mr. Johnson suggested that the distance be ten feet in lieu of six feet and add language that the location could not be within the ADA accessible route. Mr. Berenyi stated concerns for the definition of the portable sign, specifically the word "wheels". There was discussion about the size requirement, and wheels. They discussed striking the word "wheels". Chairman Wall reiterated it had been suggested for the location to be changed to ten feet in lieu of six feet and asked the Commission if this was what they wished to do. All stated favor of changing the language to ten feet. There was discussion about not adding the ADA language. Mr. Berenyi suggested scratching the word "wheels" in the definition. No one objected.

There was discussion about the specific location of the A-Frame signage on the business property. Mr. Johnson suggested that additional language should be added. There was some discussion about the location being within ten feet of the subject business entrance. Mr. Johnson brought up the specifications of the materials being traditional, and not allowing plastic. There was discussion about the signage being approved by the Architectural Review Board. They discussed striking the word traditional and adding language for the Architectural Review Board to give guidelines to determine signage approval. There was also discussion about the review process for approval at a Staff level. Ms. Browder stated that this is the process currently used for banner approvals. There was a brief discussion about sign violations and fines should a business choose not to bring the signs in after hours. There was discussion about temporary signage being discussed at a future meeting.

- Motion:** Made a motion to approve the amendment to section 151.084 with revisions as per the discussion., **Moved by** Paul Connerty; **Seconded by** Jeanette Fowler
- Discussion:** Jeffrey Smith added for the record the amendment of section 151.028, to striking the word "wheels" from the definition.
- Vote:** All voted in favor. The motion carried.

VI. Public Hearing – Amendment of Zoning ordinance §151.087: Municipal Impact Fee; specifically, a resolution recommending the capital improvements plan and a change in the amount of development impact fees.

Chairman Wall opened the Public Hearing.

Chairman Wall opened the floor to Mr. Broom. Mr. Broom outlined the municipal impact fee resolution, along with the fees for residential and commercial units. He added they had worked with a consultant to project growth and the cost of improvements to set fees accordingly. He presented the capital improvements plan to the Commission, explaining the difference in fees based on demand and services. Mr. Broom stated that he had presented the same information to the EDAC and to City Council, and City Council had discussed concerns on the total fees as presented for multifamily. Mr. Broom presented an example of what the fees would be, showing the current and the draft fee for single family residential use, and a commercial example of current fees and what the draft fee would be. He mentioned that there is no transportation fee per this study. Mr. Broom added that City Council discussed apartment complexes, giving the current fees and the draft base, noting the significant jump for apartment fees, stating Council may wish to amend at a future date. Mr. Broom presented the commercial development numbers within the last 5 years. He invited the Commission to ask any questions.

Ms. Fowler inquired about what was the plan to review the impact fees in the future. Mr. Broom stated it should be updated approximately every 5 years. Ms. Fowler inquired if it would be a good time to line it up with the comprehensive plan review. Mr. Broom agreed. There was a discussion regarding the multifamily rate and the data taken into consideration for the impact fees. Mr. Johnson inquired why a transportation fee does not work for the City at this time. Mr. Broom stated there currently is no staffing to do traffic engineering or traffic studies.

Chairman Wall invited anyone to speak for the issue. There was no one. Chairman wall invited anyone to speak against the issue. There was no one.

Chairman Wall closed the public hearing, noting that the Planning Commission is mandated by state law to make a recommendation to Council.

Motion:	Made a motion to recommend the amendment to the impact fees as presented to City Council., Moved by Jeanette Fowler; Seconded by Paul Connerty
Discussion:	There was none.
Vote:	All voted in favor. The motion carried.

VII. Comments from the Commission

Mr. Johnson requested reviewing the portion of the sign ordinance language on temporary signage at the next public hearing meeting. Chairman Wall deferred to Staff. Ms. Browder stated that there would be opportunities at future meetings with public hearings to add that discussion to the agenda. Mr. Smith noted the impact fees as presented would add a slight increase for residential monthly payments. Mr. Johnson noted that the August meeting falls on the same

evening as the SCDOT meeting regarding St. James Ave. There was discussion regarding the times for the meetings overlapping. The Commission suggested the Planning Commission start at 7:30pm in lieu of 6:30pm. Ms. Browder agreed.

VIII. Comments from Staff

Ms. Browder had nothing further to add.

IX. Adjournment

Mr. Johnson made a motion to adjourn, and Ms. Fowler seconded. All voted in favor. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:23pm.

Allen Wall, Chairman

Date: _____