

MAYOR
CHRISTIE RAINWATER

CITY ADMINISTRATOR
MIKE COCHRAN



CITY COUNCIL
KEVIN HEDGPETH, MAYOR PRO-TEM
KEN BOGGS
JEFF C. CHANDLER
MIKE DYSON
MICHAEL SALLY
ADAM SPURLOCK

AGENDA
HANAHAN PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Wednesday, November 3, 2021
6:30 P.M.

Call to Order

Pat Eckstine

Pledge of Allegiance

Pat Eckstine

Old Business:

Approval of Minutes from October 5, 2021 Meeting

Pat Eckstine

CITIZEN COMMENTS REGARDING AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

New Business:

Comprehensive Plan

Kathryn Basha,
BCDCOG

ADJOURNMENT

HANAHAN PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

October 5, 2021, 6:30 P.M.

The meeting of the Hanahan Planning Commission was held in the Debbie Lewis Municipal Chambers at 1255 Yeamans Hall Rd on October 5, 2021. Chairman Eckstine presided over the meeting.

Commissioners Carolyn Lackey, Craig Bennett, Marika Kary, Michael Moseley, and Butch Thrower were in attendance. Commissioner Earl Gurley was absent. A quorum was present. This meeting agenda was posted on the bulletin board at City Hall. Staff members in attendance online were Alexis Kiser, City Planner and Economic Development Director, and Larry Sturdivant, Building Official. Visitors were present. A copy of the sign in lists have been attached for record.

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Eckstine called the meeting to Order at 6:35pm. The Pledge of Allegiance was made.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Chairman Eckstine stated that the Planning commission was going into an Executive Session for a legal matter. She stated that there would be no action taken.

The Planning Commission came out of the Executive Session at 6:54pm and resumed the meeting in the Municipal Chambers. Chairman Eckstine stated that the session was for information only and no action was taken.

OLD BUSINESS:

Approval of Minutes, August 3, 2021

Chairman Eckstine Chairman Eckstine asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Kary made a motion to approve the Minutes of August 3, 2021. Commissioner Bennett seconded the motion. Motion passed after a Roll Call Vote. Commissioner Moseley abstained.

NEW BUSINESS:

Preliminary Plat Request: TMS #259-00-00-025; 259-00-00-024

Bowen "Midtowne" Development

Chairman Eckstine asked Alexis Kiser to make the presentation to the Commission. Alexis stated that the applicant was going to make the presentation first. She informed the Commission that this was a part of the approval process for the developer. It was approved in the 2006 PUD and was not new, but just a part of the approval process that must be followed in order to meet the density in their PUD agreement.

Lee Rodriguez of LFK Architects presented to the Commission. He displayed slides to the Commission of the proposed buildings. He relayed the parking spaces that would be provided, the number of stories, the number of units, etc. He then asked if there were any questions. Commissioner Bennett stated he wanted to have Alexis present the staff report first.

Alexis presented to the Commission regarding the Midtowne at Bowen. She stated that the developer was proposing a total of three buildings. Two buildings are to be multi-family and the third would be a mixed-use building with office/retail in the front section. The section of the building, 1-A with the office/retail space would be a permitted use in the zone if the FCV-1 lines were to be extended by 100 feet to encompass that section of the building. The number of dwellings of 105 to 120 units is consistent with the density requirements of the PUD.

Alexis displayed slides to the Commission showing the site plans and layouts of the proposed development. She stated that it did meet the minimum of 5 acres for the FCV-MF District. The lot did conform with the twenty-foot lot width minimum and meets the density requirement as outlined in the PUD. Alexis said that this was a site plan; however, she reviewed as if it was a plat to let the developer

know of any issues. A list of requested corrections was displayed. In addition, a street scape would need to be shown as well as site lighting. Alexis mentioned that a tree survey would need to be submitted because the area is wooded. Parking would need to be shown too, and submittals to the respective utilities. She asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Eckstine asked a question about the right-of-way width allowing for the landscaping. She also asked about the number of units only applying to the residential units. Alexis answered yes to both questions. Chairman Eckstine asked about the commercial spaces. Alexis stated that before any retail/office, the Planning commission would have to approve the extension of the 100-foot line to allow that use in the building. Commissioner Kary asked if the Commission was also approved the 100-foot line tonight. Alexis said that they would be if the Commission approved. Lee Rodriguez showed where the 100-foot line would fall on the location of the building. Commissioner Bennett asked if the 100-foot line would apply to the entire building or the section. Larry Sturdivant answered that it would only apply to the section of the building. Ray Wrenn, Bowen Development, clarified that they were not sure if they would locate any retail/office space. They wanted to go ahead and at least have it approved so it would allow them flexibility. Commissioner Kary asked about the corner of the building for the retail space. Ray Wrenn said they would look for a type of business that would be a good for the community. Chairman Eckstine asked if the mixed use covered the office and retail. Alexis answered with a yes. Chairman Eckstine asked Alexis about the parking requirements. Alexis stated that for the residential it was 1.75 spaces per dwelling for residential. For the commercial and depending upon the type of establishment, it could range from 1/250gfa up to 500. Ray Wrenn stated that for the commercial it averaged about 5/1000 ft. Chairman Eckstine asked if the parking would be under the building. Lee Rodriguez stated it would be under the building only for Building C. Ray explained that they shaped the design of the building to save as many trees as possible. Commissioner Kary asked about the height of the buildings. Lee responded that they would be between 45 and 55 feet except for the tower which would be taller; however, it would be unconditioned space. Chairman Eckstine asked regarding the 105-120 units compared to the approximate 80 units listed in the PUD. Ray responded that the PUD was a projection.

Chairman Eckstine asked if there were any other questions. Mac McQuillan, City of Hanahan's attorney, clarified the 100-foot line extension for the Commission. Commissioner Bennett asked where the street parking would be located in relation to the sidewalk. Lee Rodriguez answered the question. Commissioner Bennett stated that he liked the concept shown. Ray responded that he had ordered four sets of speed bumps to put on Bowen Corner Avenue. Chairman Eckstine asked if the parking would be assessed by the number of units. Alexis responded with a yes.

Chairman Eckstine informed the audience about the nature of the PUD and its history, and the type of approval that the developer was seeking. She stated that this type of approval did not require a public hearing like the application that was before them at the last meeting. Chairman Eckstine asked what the feeling of the Commission was. Commissioner Bennett made a motion to approve the preliminary plat with staff conditions. Commissioner Kary seconded the motion. Commissioner Thrower asked if that motion also included the moving of the 100-foot line. Commissioner Bennett said yes. The motion passed after a roll call vote.

**Preliminary Plat Request: TMS #259-00-00-170; 259-00-00-125
Bowen "Greenway" Development**

Lee Rodriguez presented the Proposed development to the Commission. He stated that it was four townhome buildings totaling 17 units with 2 parking places per unit plus additional guest parking. They would also be between 2 ½ to 3 stories. Lee discussed the staff finding that the lot size did not meet the minimum. He showed an interpretation of a townhome and handed a supplement to the Commission in order to explain why they were pursuing townhomes. He asked was the definition of the townhome the 2500 square feet for each owner or for the entire cluster of townhomes. He said it seemed strange that the townhome requirement would be more than the single-family requirement.

Alexis Kiser presented to the Commission. She said the developer was presenting for 17 multi-family units. Alexis read the definition of a townhome from the American Planning Association's documents which stated it is owning the land from the ground vertically up. She stated that the preliminary plat site plan did not show that which meant that it was interpreted at multi-family. She therefore had to review the proposal according to the PUD which stated that the minimum lot size for townhomes was 2500 square feet. The proposed location is in the multi-family district so a multi-family development would be allowed given it meets the minimum lot size outlined in the PUD. She stated that the lot size was only listed as 0.7 acres, so if it was a true townhome development, that was not shown. Also, the parking was not shown. She did say it did conform to the 20-foot minimum lot width requirement and did meet the density requirements. Alexis said the main issue was the minimum lot size. She also listed the items that were missing and needed to be shown on the plat. Alexis stated that based on the definition from the American Planning Association, staff's recommendation was to defer the application until the developer met the minimum lot size or made a new submittal.

Alexis asked if there were any questions. Losse Knight with LFK Architects, stated that the definition of a townhome was defined as attached units with a vertical firewall, typically multi-stories. He also said that in looking at the PUD, it defined them as attached units meaning they are more than one. He said they were not asking for anything that was more than 12 units per acre and felt like this proposal was consistent. Alexis then read the definition again stating that each unit is separately owned, and the owner of the unit has title to the land that it sits on. Per the site plan, she stated that the owner would not have title to the land that it sits on. This proposal would be a condominium regime according to the site plan. She said that if the developer would like to lower the minimum lot size, then the PUD could be amended, and staff would be happy to work with them.

Larry Sturdivant commented on the definition that Losse Knight stated in that a word was left out. He said that the Building Code and the Residential Code both define a townhome as a single-family dwelling unit that is attached. He said this is actually multi-family that is being proposed which falls under the R-2 Occupancy Classification in the code, which is apartments, and not R-3, single-family. He said from the ground up, the property lines are the fire walls. Townhomes are single family per the code. Commissioner Kary suggested to defer to items could be cleared up. Losse Knight stated that on the master plan, they wanted to show that the square footage was present in order to subdivide. He agreed that the vertical fire walls have to be present and individual property lines. He said that they could revise and come back to staff on this. Ray Wrenn stated that this did not make sense about the square footage. He said that he had personally looked up the definition and the question is which one will be used. He said that they were open minded and could come back next month. Ultimately it would be left as an interpretation of the Planning Commission to whether they want townhomes there or if he wanted townhomes. Chairman Eckstine asked if the product would be the same if they were called condominiums since the owners would not own the land. Ray stated they could call the 0.7 acres as a regime and sell them as condominiums from a legal standpoint for transferring ownership. He said you could look at them and just apply the Webster's or Meridian's dictionary and call them townhomes. Chairman Eckstine and Commission Kary said that they would have to abide by the City's zoning and standards. Larry Sturdivant stated that the American Planning Association is what the City's zoning land use codes are based on and that the city has to abide by the building codes which are State Law. Therefore, the city is bound by the zoning ordinance and the building code. Ray suggested that they just come back.

Commissioner Bennett asked for clarification about the two single family categories, SF-1 and SF-2, if they were ADU units. Ray explained how the chart worked. Alexis also explained the chart to the Commission. Commissioner Thrower asked for clarification about deferring the decision. After some discussion and legal comment from Mac McQuillan, Ray Wrenn said that in good faith he was withdrawing the application.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

Chairman Eckstine informed the audience that the Commission would be having future meetings on the Comprehensive Plan and that they were welcome to attend. She said if there were comments or questions, they would try to answer them. In addition, she asked that comments be brief. Last she asked that names and addresses be given so that accurate records could be taken.

- 1) Marc Copeland (6903 Tanner Hall Blvd) He commented on the parking requirements, the timeframe for the PUD stating that it had expired. He gave documents to staff.
- 2) Scott Hairfield (2023 Codorus Ln) He stated that his immediate neighbors and he were not in favor of the proposed development.
- 3) Megann Spraggis (2009 Codorus Ln) She stated that her neighbors and she were not in favor of the development.
- 4) Brittany Woodby (1007 Island Crossing Dr.) She asked about the agenda posting.
- 5) Piper Crockett (1228 Pasture View Rd) She was concerned about crime and the property values going down.
- 6) Gary Greenman (7010 Lanier St) He was concerned about development and about Airbnb's.

Chairman Eckstine asked Alexis what was the number of units that were approved in 2006. Alexis responded that it was a little over 900 and currently the total was around 550. Chairman Eckstine also asked about the status of the TIA and with Berkeley County. Larry and Alexis stated that they would have to look into it. Commissioner Kary asked about Airbnb's specifically in Hanahan if there was a code for it. Larry stated what the ordinance said.

- 7) Rob Spraggis (2009 Codorus Ln.) He was concerned about Airbnb's. Also was concerned about the neighbor with an Airbnb. He was asking that the Commission not approve until they know exactly what will be going into the flex space.
- 8) Tim Crowley (3025 Evening Tide Dr) He was concerned about the quality of life. Also concerned about the roadways such as Tanner Ford Blvd and Foster Creek Rd.
- 9) Antonia Gratton (3033 Evening Tide Dr) She asked about where the boat ramp is. Also asked if there could be a public hearing on the PUD because 2006 was a long time ago. She said there is double parking on the road blocking traffic. She asked about where water would go with the new development. Last she invested into the vision of Mr. Wrenn, now it is blurry.
- 10) Rob Spraggis (2009 Codorus) He said he had a zoom meeting and wanted to know what was going on with the developer. He said the development is unpredictable.
- 11) Rose Simpkins (1944 wild Indigo Way) She talked about the traffic issues, the school capacity, the crime, and the trees being removed.

Mike Cochran, City Administrator, commented about the planning of schools and how the school district handles that. He also commented on how the City's Comprehensive Plan plays a part in the development planning. He said that the school plans for the big picture.

12) Ray Wrenn (Bowen Developer) He reviewed the history of his PUD. Also, he stated for the record that he disagrees with the unit count. He stated that high speed chases could happen anywhere. Last he stated that the information about the PUD timeframe was wrong.

Adjournment

Chairman Eckstine asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Lackey made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Thrower seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:18pm.

Chairman Eckstine

ATTEST:

Larry Sturdivant, Secretary

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 3, 2021
TO: Hanahan Planning Commission
FROM: Kathryn S Basha, AICP, Planning Director
SUBJ: Comprehensive Plan Update

In advance of Wednesday's discussion to kick off an update to the City's comprehensive plan, I am providing a one-page piece that describes the comprehensive planning process and a targeted schedule, as well as a one-pager that describes the various elements/topics that are covered in a comprehensive plan. We will discuss the process in-depth at the meeting and review proposed public engagement opportunities.

In the interim, you'll notice on the back of the one-page piece, three questions that guide the project team's preparation for public and stakeholder input. City Council was previously asked to provide answers to these three questions as well. The three questions are:

1. What has the City "gotten right" in implementation of the 2012 Plan and what areas need more attention.
2. What are the City's biggest challenges going forward? (e.g. population growth or demographic changes, housing options and affordability, the economy)
3. What opportunities exist for the City's future?

To streamline our discussion, please take a few moments to jot down your thoughts so that we can discuss your input at the meeting in lieu of giving you these as "homework". If you do not have a copy of the 2012 Plan or 2018 Plan review, please let me know and I will gladly forward copies of those to you.

Please feel free to contact me at Kathryn@bcdco.com if you have any questions.

The Comprehensive Planning Process Required Elements (S.C. Code § 6-29-510(D))

1. **Population element.** Includes information related to historic trends and projections; the number, size and characteristics of households; educational levels and trends; income characteristics and trends; race; sex; age; and other information relevant to a clear understanding of how the population affects the existing situation and future potential of the area.
2. **Housing element.** Includes an analysis of existing housing by location, type, age, condition, owner and renter occupancy, affordability, and projections of housing needs to accommodate existing and future population as identified in the population and economic elements. The housing element requires an analysis of local regulations to determine if there are regulations that may hinder development of affordable housing and an analysis of market-based incentives that may be made available to encourage the development of affordable housing. Incentives may include density bonuses, design flexibility and a streamlined permitting process.
3. **Economic development element.** Includes historic trends and projections on the numbers and characteristics of the labor force, where the people who live in the community work, where people who work in the community reside, available employment characteristics and trends, an economic base analysis and any other matters affecting the local economy. Tourism, manufacturing and revitalization efforts may be appropriate factors to consider.
4. **Natural resources element.** Includes information on coastal resources, slope characteristics, prime agricultural and forest land, plant and animal habitats, unique park and recreation areas, unique scenic views and sites, wetlands and soil types. This element could also include information on flood plain and flood way areas, mineral deposits, air quality and any other matter related to the natural environment of the area.
5. **Resiliency element.** Considers the impacts of flooding, high water, sea level rise projections, and natural hazards such as hurricanes, tornadoes and earthquakes, on individuals, communities, institutions, businesses, economics, public infrastructure and facilities, and public health, safety and welfare. This element includes an inventory of existing resiliency conditions, promotes resilient planning, design and development, and is regionally coordinated.
6. **Cultural resources element.** Includes historic buildings and structures, unique commercial or residential areas, unique natural or scenic resources, archeological sites, educational, religious or entertainment areas or institutions, and any other feature or facility relating to the cultural aspects of the community.
7. **Community facilities element.** Includes many activities essential to the growth, development or redevelopment of the community. The commission should give separate consideration to the following plans:
 - a. water supply, treatment and distribution plan;
 - b. sewage system and wastewater treatment plan;
 - c. solid waste collection and disposal plan;
 - d. fire protection plan;
 - e. emergency medical services plan;
 - f. plan for any necessary expansion of general government facilities (e.g., administrative, court or other facilities);
 - g. plan for educational facilities; and
 - h. plan for libraries and other cultural facilities.
8. **Transportation element.** Considers transportation facilities including major road improvements, new road construction, and pedestrian and bicycle projects. This element must be developed in coordination with the land use element to ensure transportation efficiency for existing and planned development.
9. **Land use element.** Considers existing and future land use by categories including residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, forestry, mining, public and quasi-public, recreation, parks, open space, and vacant or undeveloped land. This element is influenced by all previously described plan elements. The findings, projections and conclusions from each of the previous six elements will influence the amount of land needed for various uses.
10. **Priority investment element.** An analysis of projected federal, state and local funds available for public infrastructure and facilities during the next 10 years and recommends the projects for those funds, based on locally available information. These recommendations must be coordinated with adjacent and relevant jurisdictions and agencies (counties, other municipalities, school districts, public and private utilities, transportation agencies, and any other public group that may be affected by the projects).



Comprehensive Plan Update 2022

Envisioning the City’s Future and Strategies for Implementation

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The authority for local governments to undertake planning and to apply zoning and land development regulations is granted by the SC General Assembly via the Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act of 1994. The Act mandates that a Comprehensive Plan be systematically prepared and continuously evaluated with updates of the ten required elements as often as necessary, but at least every ten (10) years.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENTS



PLAN APPROACH



KEY STAGES OF THE PLANNING PROCESS

- Data Collection, Stakeholder Meetings September – December 2021
- Public Engagement, Surveys and Open Houses Late October – November 2021
- Needs Assessment, Goals and Strategies December 2021 – April 2022
- Commission Draft Review June 2022
- Public Vetting and Draft Finalization July – September 2022

PROJECT CONTACTS

City Staff
843-740-2571

Mike Cochran, City Administrator
Alexis Kiser, Planning/Economic Development

mcochran@cityofhanahan.com
alexis.kiser@cityofhanahan.com

BCDCOG Staff
843-529-0400

Kathryn S. Basha AICP, Planning Director
Shannon Bush, Project Manager

kathrynb@bcdcog.com
shannonb@bcdcog.com



Comprehensive Plan Update 2022

Envisioning the City's Future and Strategies for Implementation

What has the City gotten "right" in implementing the 2012 Plan? What needs more attention?

What are the City's biggest challenges going forward?

- Population?
- Housing?
- Affordability?
- Economics?

What opportunities exist for the City's future?
