

Town of Summerville Planning Commission June 15, 2020 - 4:00 PM

Town Hall, Town Council Chambers

The public and Town Council members are strongly encouraged to attend virtually

The meeting will be live-streamed through the live-streaming link on the Town's website: https://sc-summerville.civicplus.com/159/Live-Streaming-Meetings

For additional information regarding items on this agenda including any public hearings, please contact the Planning Department at planning@summervillesc.gov or 843.851.4217. Applications and related documents for this meeting are available for review at any time at www.summervillesc.gov/AgendaCenter Public that chooses to attend this meeting in person will be required to have their temperature scanned and abide by social distancing requirements.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of minutes from meeting on May 18, 2020.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS: (notice in Post & Courier on 05.31.20)

- 1. Proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 8, Section 8.3.3.B.3, Preservation During Construction; Barriers Required.
- 2. Proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 5, Section 5.6.9, Alley; Chapter 10, Section 10.2.1.A, Applicability, Section 10.4.2.A, Monument Signs, Section 10.7.2.C, Temporary Banners; Maximum Area, and Section 10.8, Signs That Do Not Require A Permit
- 3. Proposed road name change to a section of Parsons Road (from W. Richardson Avenue to the intersection with the new section of road to be built connecting to N. Maple Street).

III. OLD BUSINESS:

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. New Street Names:
 - a. Community Road Townhomes: Parkington Lane or Circle and Rosefield Court
- 2. Proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 8, Section 8.3.3.B.3, Preservation During Construction; Barriers Required.
- 3. Proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 5, Section 5.6.9, Alley; Chapter 10, Section 10.2.1.A, Applicability, Section 10.4.2.A,

Monument Signs, Section 10.7.2.C, Temporary Banners; Maximum Area, and Section 10.8, Signs That Do Not Require A Permit

4. Proposed road name change to a section of Parsons Road (from W. Richardson Avenue to the intersection with the new section of road to be built connecting to N. Maple Street).

V. MISCELLANEOUS:

1. Comprehensive Plan & Master Transportation Plan Update

VI	Δ	DI	OII	RN	ME	VT.
V I.	_		. , . ,	17 7	1.0	1 .

Chairman or Vice Chairman

Posted June 3, 2020

The Town of Summerville Planning Commission Meeting Minutes May 18, 2020

This meeting of the Town of Summerville Planning Commission was held in Town Council Chambers and was attended by Commission Members, Jim Reaves, Chairman; Kevin Carroll; Tom Hart; Jonathan Lee; Charlie Stoudenmire; Betty Profit; and Elaine Segelken. Staff in attendance included Jessi Shuler, AICP, Director of Planning; Michael Lisle, Economic Development Coordinator; and Bonnie Miley, Assistant Town Engineer. The public was encouraged to view the meeting via the live-stream and submit any comments in advance of the meeting through email or by phone.

Jim Reaves, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

Approval of Minutes:

The Chairman asked if there were any edits or additions to the minutes from the meeting on April 20, 2020. Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, and Mr. Carroll made the second. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Hearings:

The first public hearing opened at 4:02 PM and was for the petition by The Whitfield Company to annex Berkeley County TMS# 208-00-02-013 (approximately 973 acres) located along Interstate 26, Drop Off Drive, and Linda Way, currently zoned HI, Heavy Industrial, and Flex1, Agricultural, in Berkeley County and will be zoned PUD, Planned Development District, upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council District 2) Mr. Reaves introduced the item and asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Robby Robbins, on behalf of HIC Land, LLC, provided background information on the proposed development. He explained that they basically had to start over with the details of the PUD following the wetlands delineation, bringing them to 660 homes, only single-family, no multi-family, 250,000 square feet of light industrial, and 500,000 square feet of commercial. Mr. Robbins informed the Commission that they had worked closely with the Nexton Del Webb residents even though they are not in Town and added a 50 foot buffer and removed the through road adjacent to their development. He also emphasized that the Economic Impact Analysis showed a positive cash flow of over \$300,000/year. Mr. Robbins explained that the last issue to resolve is the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), which just received a third party review and will be addressed accordingly. He declared that the proposed PUD is compatible with what is currently in the area, and that Council is amending the Future Land Use Map in the current Comprehensive Plan to bring it into compliance. Mr. Reaves then asked for any other public comment.

Joel Arenson, a resident of Nexton Del Webb, stated that he and some of his fellow residents provided a letter to Ms. Shuler with their comments with three main points that they would like to see addressed.

Ms. Shuler read the letter from the Nexton Del Webb residents into the record, which expressed their gratitude to the developer and staff, but requested that additional language be added to the PUD to ensure that a natural 50 foot buffer be included adjacent to their development; only single-family detached homes be allowed adjacent to their development; and that no arterial road would be allowed adjacent to their development. She also displayed four photos of the existing boundary taken by one of the residents using a drone.

Mr. Robbins reiterated that his client had no obligation to work with the Nexton Del Webb residents, but he wanted to be a good neighbor. He stated that the word "undisturbed" was added to the buffer that morning, the road is gone, and no apartments are going to be built, just single-family.

Jeff Tibbals, on behalf of the owners of Nexton, expressed his agreement with the staff comments, particularly the third party review of the TIA and an additional access for the proposed development. He stated that his clients, as adjacent property owners, were ready to cooperate and discuss an additional access to the proposed development. Mr. Tibbals reiterated the need for traffic concerns to be addressed, as the third party review

was received today, and he feels approval would be premature given the need for traffic issues to be addressed; however, if it does progress forward, his clients would be amenable to that if the applicant agrees to address all recommendations from the third party review prior to final review by Town Council.

Mr. Arenson reiterated his concern about the clauses included in the PUD document, which allow flexibility, and stated that he had a detailed markup of the PUD document showing where they would like to see additional language, which he provided to Ms. Shuler.

Mr. Stoudenmire asked if police and fire had been considered, and Mr. Robbins responded that the Development Agreement included three acres of land for a fire/EMS station after consultation with Chief Waring and Chief Rogers.

Hearing no further requests from the public to offer any comments, this public hearing was closed at 4:24 PM.

The second public hearing opened at 4:25 PM and was for a petition by Thomas A. Limehouse and Robert L. Arrington to annex Berkeley County TMS# 221-00-00-007 (approximately 2.926 acres) located at 1321 Beagle Road; currently zoned HI, Heavy Industrial, in Berkeley County and will be zoned G-B, General Business, upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council District 2) Mr. Reaves introduced the request, and Ms. Shuler read an email from the applicants into the record explaining their decision not to attend the meeting due to health concerns. The applicant's email further explained that these properties were surrounded by the Rosemary tracts that were recommended for annexation back in March, and their intent was to match that request and not create a donut hole. Mr. Reaves then asked Ms. Shuler if she had received any public comment. Ms. Shuler responded that she had not received anything.

Hearing no requests from the public to offer any comments, this public hearing was closed at 4:27 PM.

The third public hearing opened at 4:27 PM and was for a <u>petition by JSCA Investments, LLC to annex</u> Berkeley County TMS# 221-00-00-006 (approximately 7.36 acres) located on Beagle Road; currently zoned HI, Heavy Industrial, in Berkeley County and will be zoned G-B, General Business, upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council District 2) Mr. Reaves introduced the request, and explained that if there were no objections this hearing would be combined with the previous one as the parcels are adjacent. Hearing no objections, this hearing was considered combined with the previous hearing.

The fourth public hearing opened at 4:28 PM and was for a request to rezone TMS#s 154-00-00-073, Miles-Jamison Road; and 154-06-15-006, 310 Beverly Drive (approximately 306.809 acres), and owned by Dorchester County from PUD, Planned Development District, to PL, Public Lands (Council District 6). Mr. Reaves introduced the request and asked if the applicant was present. Eric Davis with Dorchester County Parks and Recreation explained that the site was a little over 300 acres and was originally planned for a park and homes, but following the wetland delineation, it was only going to be a park. Given this change in use, they no longer needed the PUD zoning. He also provided details on the plans for the park.

A resident from Greenhurst II subdivision expressed her concern about the boundaries of the Town and the County. Ms. Shuler used the map exhibit on the screen to explain the areas in the Town, which included the entire park property, but not the Coastal Center or the Greenhurst subdivisions.

Hearing no additional requests from the public to offer any comments, this public hearing was closed at 4:39 PM.

The fifth public hearing opened at 4:40 PM and was for a petition by Knightsville, LLC to annex Dorchester County TMS# 144-01-00-005 (approximately1.00 acre) located at 795 Orangeburg Road, currently zoned R-4 Multi-Family Residential in Dorchester County and will be zoned PUD Planned Development District upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits and the existing PUD for the Knightsville Tract shall be amended to include this parcel for open space and commercial uses. (Council District 4) Mr. Reaves

introduced the request and asked if the applicant was present. Chris Campeau, representing the owner, explained that they were adding this one acre property to the development to clear up entrance issues.

Mr. Charpia questioned if the LLC was the new owner and if this was being done in order to four-lane Orangeburg Road. Ms. Segelken informed him that two years ago the larger development was annexed and delineated as a PUD with houses, townhomes, and a commercial area at the front. She emphasized that this had nothing to do with road widening. Mr. Charpia reported that he used to live in the house with his father, and the ownership of the lot was under appeal with his brother and will be going back to court. Ms. Shuler stated that the applicant had submitted a recorded deed showing ownership of the property, which was required by the Town, and this deed was displayed on the screen.

Hearing no additional requests from the public to offer any comments, this public hearing was closed at 4:47 PM.

Old Business

The first item under Old Business was the petition by The Whitfield Company to annex Berkeley County TMS# 208-00-02-013 (approximately 973 acres) located along Interstate 26, Drop Off Drive, and Linda Way. currently zoned HI, Heavy Industrial, and Flex1, Agricultural, in Berkeley County and will be zoned PUD, Planned Development District, upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council <u>District 2</u>). Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval to Town Council, and Mr. Carroll made the second. Mr. Carroll asked if they were voting on a final document, and Ms. Shuler explained that they could amend the motion to include additional changes or send it forward as presented. She displayed the most recent version of the PUD on the screen, which addressed all of the staff comments except the TIA concerns. Ms. Shuler detailed the additional access that was added, although it still fed into Drop Off Drive, and she stated that the third party review of the TIA was just finalized that day. Mr. Hart made a motion to amend his previous motion to add that the recommended approval would be subject to the applicant addressing the recommendations of the third party TIA review to the satisfaction of the Town's Engineering staff. Mr. Lee made the second. Mr. Hart explained his position, stating that the developer has worked with the Town to address all other concerns, and he is confident the traffic concerns can be worked out prior to Council approval. Mr. Carroll then asked if the Del Webb requests were adequately addressed, and Mr. Robbins described that language had been added that the 50 foot buffer would be undisturbed, the road was gone, and no multi-family was included. Mr. Arenson argued that the PUD still contained flexibility to allow changes and the Del Webb residents wanted additional written language. During the discussion, Ms. Segelken called for the question. Mr. Reaves brought the amendment to a vote, and the amendment passed 6 to 1 with Mr. Carroll in opposition. Mr. Reaves then called for the vote on the amended motion, and it passed 6 to 1 with Mr. Carroll in opposition.

New Business:

The first item under New Business was <u>New Street Names</u> for the Knightsville Tract. Ms. Shuler stated that the Commission had previously approved four names for this same development off of Orangeburg Rd. just south of Knightsville Elementary School. This time, four additional proposed names, Cantona, Cruyff, Weldin Gate, and Wolverton, passed review by the County addressing entities, although they were somewhat concerned with the spelling of Cruyff. Ms. Segelken made a motion to approve the four names, and Mr. Carroll made the second. The motion passed unanimously.

The second item under New Business was the <u>petition by Thomas A. Limehouse and Robert L. Arrington to annex Berkeley County TMS# 221-00-00-007 (approximately 2.926 acres) located at 1321 Beagle Road; currently zoned HI, Heavy Industrial, in Berkeley County and will be zoned G-B, General Business, upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council District 2) Ms. Segelken made a motion to recommend approval to Town Council as presented with Mr. Carroll making the second. Ms. Shuler brought the map exhibit up on the screen and explained that this property and the next one on the agenda are surrounded by the Rosemary tracts. Following the discussion, the motion passed unanimously.</u>

The third item was the petition by JSCA Investments, LLC to annex Berkeley County TMS# 221-00-00-006 (approximately 7.36 acres) located on Beagle Road; currently zoned HI, Heavy Industrial, in Berkeley County and will be zoned G-B, General Business, upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council District 2) Ms. Segelken made a motion to recommend approval to Town Council with Mr. Carroll making the second. Following no discussion, the motion carried.

The fourth item was the request to rezone TMS#s 154-00-00-073, Miles-Jamison Road; and 154-06-15-006, 310 Beverly Drive (approximately 306.809 acres), and owned by Dorchester County from PUD, Planned Development District, to PL, Public Lands (Council District 6). Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval to Town Council with Ms. Segelken making the second. Following no discussion, the motion carried.

The fifth was the petition by Knightsville, LLC to annex Dorchester County TMS# 144-01-00-005 (approximately1.00 acre) located at 795 Orangeburg Road, currently zoned R-4 Multi-Family Residential in Dorchester County and will be zoned PUD Planned Development District upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits and the existing PUD for the Knightsville Tract shall be amended to include this parcel for open space and commercial uses. (Council District 4) Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval to Town Council with Mr. Carroll making the second. Following no discussion, the motion carried.

Miscellaneous:

The first item under Miscellaneous was the <u>Comprehensive Plan & Master Transportation Plan Update.</u> Ms. Shuler informed the Commission that she would be receiving a complete draft of the plan by Wednesday for review by the CPAC and Planning Commission. Mr. Hart asked when those meetings would be scheduled, and Ms. Shuler responded that she would be sending out an email to the CPAC members to find a suitable date the second week in June for the virtual meeting, and it would then move forward from there.

Adjourn

With no further business for the Commission, Mr. Carroll made a motion to adjourn with Mr. Hart making the second. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 5:07 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,		
		Date:
Y : (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
Jessi Shuler, AICP		
Director of Planning		
	Approved:	
	Jim Reaves, Chairman or Kevin	Carroll, Vice Chairman

UDO AMENDMENTS STAFF REPORT PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 15, 2020

<u>Description</u>: Amendment of Section 8.3.3.B.3, Preservation During Construction, Barriers Required

Reason for request: The requested amendment was made by Town Council and received first reading at their May 14, 2020 meeting. This change would allow greater flexibility in the materials allowed to be used for tree protection barriers, while still giving staff the ability to reject materials that would not adequately protect the trees.

Description: Amendment of Section 5.6.9, Alley

Reason for request: In applying the UDO, staff noticed that this section was not entirely clear on the width required for an alley. This language is being added to clarify the width for either a one-way or two-way alley.

Description: Amendment of Section 10.2.1.A, Applicability

Reason for request: No exemption section exists, and no other section appears to be correct for the reference, so this language will be deleted.

Description: Amendment of Section 10.4.2.A, Monument Signs

Reason for request: In applying the UDO, staff has realized that requiring DRB approval for internal illumination for all monument signs in the G-B and UC-MX districts where internal illumination is the norm, would be an unnecessary delay for an applicant. This change will remove the requirement.

Description: Amendment of Section 10.7.2.C, Temporary Banners; Maximum Area

Reason for request: In applying the UDO, staff has come to the realization that a 15 sf sign securely placed on a building that may be 20 or more feet from the road is hard to read. This change will allow for a larger temporary sign if the sign is securely fastened to a building.

Description: Amendment of Section 10.8, Signs That Do Not Require A Permit

Reason for request: The previous sign ordinance included this exact wording to cover wayfinding signage and sponsorship signage, such as those that we have a Gahagan Park and the Miracle League Field. This language was inadvertently left out of the UDO, and staff is requesting that it be added back in to make that existing signage conforming and allow additional signage on public property of a similar nature.

AN ORDINANCE

TO AMEND THE SUMMERVILLE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE SECTION 8.3.3 PRESERVATION DURING CONSTRUCTION, SUBSECTION (B) ENTITLED BARRIERS REQUIRED, NUMBER 3

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the Town Council of Summerville for the Unified Development Ordinance to have flexibility in providing protection for trees during construction of any type of structure.

NOW THEREFORE:

BE IT ORDAINED, by the Mayor and Council Members of the Town of Summerville, in Council assembled that the Unified Development Ordinance Section 8.3.3 Preservation During Construction, Subsection (B) entitled Barriers Required, Number 3 be amended as follows:

3. Protective barriers shall consist of barriers approved by the Planning Department (a minimum of 4 feet in height). Protective barriers shall remain in place until development activities are complete. The area within the protective barrier shall remain free of all building materials, stockpiled soil or other construction debris. Construction traffic, storage of vehicles and materials, and grading shall not take place within the protected areas of the existing trees. Any violation must be addressed immediately or a stop work will be issued.

It is so Ordained this day of	2020.	
		Ricky Waring, Mayor
ATTEST:		
Beth Messervy, Clerk to Council		
First Reading: <u>May 14, 2020</u>		
Public Hearing: _June 15, 2020_		
Second Reading:		

AN ORDINANCE

TO AMEND THE SUMMERVILLE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE FOR CHANGES TO CHAPTER 5, SECTION 5.6.9, ALLEY; CHAPTER 10, SECTION 10.2.1.A, APPLICABILITY, SECTION 10.4.2.A, MONUMENT SIGNS, SECTION 10.7.2.C, TEMPORARY BANNERS; MAXIMUM AREA, AND SECTION 10.8, SIGNS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE A PERMIT, OF THE TOWN OF SUMMERVILLE CODE OF ORDINANCES

BE IT ORDAINED by the Mayor and Council members of the Town of Summerville, in Council assembled, that Chapter 5, Section 5.6.9, Alley; Chapter 10, Section 10.2.1.A, Applicability, Section 10.4.2.A, Monument Signs, Section 10.7.2.C, Temporary Banners; Maximum Area, and Section 10.8, Signs That Do Not Require A Permit, of the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance is hereby amended as follows:

Chapter 5

Section 5.6.9 – Alley

Subsection 5.6.9.2 Lane Widths will be changed to read as follows: "12 ft inverted crown for one-way and 16 ft inverted crown for two-way traffic (including 1 ft ribbon curb on each side)"

Chapter 10

Section 10.2.1.A - Applicability

The following will be deleted: "except for those types of signs noted in Section 10.7.2 (Exemptions)"

Section 10.4.2.A – Monument Signs

After "External illumination only," the following language will be added "except in G-B and UC-MX"

Section 10.7.2.C – Temporary Banners; Maximum Area

Letter C, Maximum Area will be changed to read as follows: "15 square feet with a vertical dimension no greater than 3 feet for signs staked in a yard. 32 square feet with a vertical dimension no greater than 4 feet for signs attached securely to the building"

<u>Section 10.8 – Signs That Do Not Require A Permit</u>

The following will be added as subsection 10.8.5 Other Signs On Public Property: "The zoning administrator officer is authorized to permit informational/directional signs on public property under the following conditions outside of the permitting process contained within this Article:

- (1) The signs direct the reader to the location of a public facility, to a facility operated by a nonprofit entity, to a facility relating to the public health, safety or welfare, to scenic or historical districts or general business or industrial districts or a subdivision. The zoning officer is authorized to develop written and publicly posted guidelines for these types of signs.
- (2) The signs are erected by the town.
- (3) The entire cost of the signs is borne by the entity requesting the sign.

- (4) The signs are installed at locations where they would not constitute a traffic hazard.
- (5) Signs for businesses, donors, benefactors, supporters, business partners may be allowed as considered appropriate by the Planning Department."

Ratified this day of, 20	020 A.D.
	Ricky Waring, Mayor
	Beth Messervy, Town Clerk
PUBLIC HEARING: _June 15, 2020	
FIRST READING:	
SECOND READING:	

ROAD NAME CHANGE STAFF REPORT PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 15, 2020

<u>Description:</u> Road name change for the existing section of Parsons Road that will become a culde-sac with the widening and extension of N. Maple Street.

Reason for request: With the widening of N. Maple Street and the extension of the road through the former Woodlands property, this section of the existing Parsons Road will become a cul-de-sac, and it cannot share the same name as Parsons Road. Both in-town and Dorchester County properties are affected by this project, and the Dorchester County Planning Commission will also be holding a public hearing on the proposed name change at their July meeting. Town and Dorchester County staff are proposing the name of Little Parsons Court for this section of road.



Street section shown in red is the section to be renamed. Street section shown in purple will maintain the Parsons Road name.

