

*Jasper County Planning Commission  
358 Third Avenue  
Ridgeland, SC 29936  
843-717-3650 phone  
843-726-7707 fax*

**Minutes of the September 14, 2010  
Regular Scheduled Meeting**

**Members Present:** Chairman Kim Thomas, Dr. Bostick, Mr. Theo Drayton, Mr. Alex Pinckney, Ms. Courtney Flexon, Ms. Juanita White and Mr. Thomas Jenkins.

**Staff and Consultants Present:** Mr. David Jirousek and Lisa Lamb

**Others Present:** Mr. Heath Duncan and Mr. Tom Kendall.

**Call to Order:** Chairman Thomas brought the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 pm.

**Invocation & Pledge of Allegiance:** Invocation was given by Mr. Pinckney. The Pledge of Allegiance was done in unison.

**Approval of Agenda:** Chairman Thomas suggested revising the Agenda to move the workshop to the end of the meeting. She suggested that after all business items and discussion items the meeting be adjourned and then enter into workshop mode. Mr. Pinckney motioned to amend the agenda per Ms. Thomas's suggestion, seconded by Mr. Drayton. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Approval of Minutes: July 13, 2010:** Mr. Jenkins motioned to approve the minutes of July 13, 2010 as written, seconded by Mr. Drayton. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Approval of Minutes for August 10, 2010:** Mr. Jenkins motioned to approve the minutes of August 10, 2010 as written, seconded by Mr. Drayton. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Old Business:**

**A. Road Name Petition – Blue Jay Way:** Mr. Jirousek explained that this is a petition to have a road named Blue Jay Way. Jasper County Emergency Services personnel, David Halopoff formerly submitted the request. He reminded the Commission this petition was presented at last months meeting. He pointed out this was a road that came before the Commission in September 2009 at which time the road was approved to be named Addison Drive. He said as instructed by the Planning Commission last month, each house was visited and Ms. Lamb prepared a staff report which included the findings of those visits. He pointed out feedback from each of the residents and said it was the consensus of the residents to name the road Blue Jay Way.

Mr. Pinckney pointed out Jerry Sheftall's name is on the petition but the staff report says Ms. Sheftall wants the road to be named Blue Jay Way. Ms. Lamb explained when the inspectors made the house visits Jerry Sheftall told the inspectors that it was not up to him; it was up to his mother because he was living there with her. The inspectors called and spoke to her by phone the next morning. Mr.

Pinckney asked if the decision of road names should be based on the people who live on the road or the actual property owners. Mr. Pinckney said he spoke to Mr. Burrison and 85% of the property is owned by the Addison's. He said Mr. Burrison is 100% for the road being named Addison Drive but he signed the petition for Blue Jay Way because he is confined to a wheelchair and knows the road needs to have a name so EMS can find them during any type of emergency. He said since Ms. Sheftall doesn't agree to Addison Drive, he suggests the road be named Addison-Sheftall Drive. He also said he tried to call Ms. Sheftall but was never able to reach her.

Mr. Jenkins said he understands the significance of naming the road in honor of someone but he doesn't understand if there is a disagreement why hasn't any of the Addison family come to the PC to protest Blue Jay Way. He read the last paragraph in the staff report and pointed out that everyone is in agreement on the road name being Blue Jay Way. Mr. Pinckney said naming the road Blue Jay Way would benefit people who were in an area such as; Robertville or Tarboro and may be looking for that road they would probably be sent back to Ridgeland where as if someone were looking for Addison-Sheftall Drive it would be known where the road is located because of the family name. Chairman Thomas said she recalls discussions in the past about naming of roads whether preference is giving to people who live on the road or based on people who own property on the road but she doesn't remember the verdict. She explained to Mr. Jenkins people probably aren't aware of the meeting since a public hearing does not take place at the PC level. She also said the PC helps the Council figure out what to do so if they don't have input from the community then it is hard for the PC to make a recommendation to Council.

Mr. Jirousek pointed out there are inconsistencies between two (2) different ordinances which deal with road naming. Dr. Bostick asked on what grounds can the PC deny the request for Blue Jay Way or does the PC even have that authority. Mr. Jirousek explained this could be forwarded to Council with either a positive or negative recommendation. Mr. Drayton pointed out; one ordinance gives approval authority to the PC while the other ordinance gives approval authority to Council. He asked if this should be resolved first. Mr. Jirousek told the Commission if they preferred the staff could send letters to the property owners and then bring this back to the Commission at a later time. Mr. Pinckney said he thought everybody would be happy with Addison-Sheftall Drive but if it is named Blue Jay Way there will still be disagreements. **Dr. Bostick motioned to name the road Addison-Sheftall Drive for relevance sake to the community and forward to Council. Mr. Drayton seconded the motion. The Commission voted in favor of the motion.**

Ms. White asked if the Commission is changing the road name their-self when there is a petition requesting Blue Jay Way, which everybody that lives on the road signed and agreed to. She said the Commission should change the guidelines first before changing the name to something that was not requested by the majority of the people who live on the road. She said there are guidelines that should be followed and if they are unhappy with those guidelines then the guidelines should be changed first. There was some discussion about if another motion should be called for or if the motion should be rescinded. Mr. Jirousek said the motion could be rescinded and another motion offered or we can just move on. He said we are in a difficult situation with two (2) conflicting ordinances and the Planning staff and EMS staff needs to take a look at the County Code and the LDR so we aren't in this position again. Chairman Thomas suggested that enlightenment of Ms. White's comments they should deny the name Blue Jay Way and send a recommendation forward to Council to name the road Addison-Sheftall Drive with the minutes attached. Dr. Bostick asked Ms. Lamb to read the motion since there seems to be some confusion. Ms. Lamb told the Commission that the motion was to name the road Addison-Sheftall but she did not know if it was road, street, drive or what. Mr. Pinckney said it is Drive. Chairman Thomas said she thinks Mr. Jirousek offers up a better decision to deny the application and make their recommendation so that they are following the guidelines as Ms. White pointed out. Dr. Bostick said he did not want to rescind the motion he wants this application to be

forwarded to Council. Mr. Drayton asked if we are going to look at the two (2) conflicting ordinances and combine them together. Mr. Jirousek said yes. Chairman Thomas said she thinks the road name should be up to the owners and the residents who live on the road.

### New Business:

**Peninsula Village Commercial Subdivision – Final Plat:** Mr. Jirousek explained this application is to stamp a final plat for the Peninsula Village subdivision located in the Peninsula Planned Development District (PDD). He explained this project was approved in 2005 by Hardeeville under the Joint Planning Agreement (JPA), which was in effect at that time. He said the 2003 LDR is what applies to this development since it was in effect at the time of approval. He said the entire infrastructure has been put in place. The applicant has provided as-built surveys for the lagoon, utility drawings, design drawings, regulatory close-out letters, the original development permit by the City of Hardeeville, subdivision plat, covenants and the POA documents. These documents have been reviewed and a site inspection has been performed. Staff recommends approval to stamp final plat since all the standards have been met. Mr. Jirousek pointed out the Developer, Mr. Tom Kendall and his Engineer, Heath Duncan who were in attendance and said they could answer any additional questions.

Mr. Pinckney inquired about this property being proposed for annexation in the City of Hardeeville and if it was denied or if the process was never completed. Mr. Jirousek said he is not aware of this property being intended for annexation; however, this was the first project under the JPA and everything located in the JPA was encouraged to annex but annexation could not legally be forced. Mr. Kendall said he is not aware of any annexation of his property and he has never been notified of annexation either. Dr. Bostick asked if they are the right body to review this application since Hardeeville approved the project. Mr. Jirousek explained since the authority was rescinded from Hardeeville in 2008 it would be the County's responsibility. Ms. Flexon asked what is planned for this subdivision. Mr. Kendall explained that this subdivision is for commercial development and his intent from the beginning was to put all infrastructure in place and offer the lots for sale to people who want to build facilities, which is still his intention although the current market is not helping to accomplish that right now. Dr. Bostick asked if the standards for close out were included in their packages. Mr. Jirousek said those regulations were not in the package but the requirements are; a set of final plans, as-built surveys for sanitary sewage system, water distribution system, and storm drainage conditions.

Mr. Pinckney asked about the DA and if it has been reviewed as well. There was much discussion about the rules and regulations' being different in the JPA than what was required in the County. Mr. Jirousek explained that the Joint Planning Agreement gave Hardeeville the authority to administer and enforce the County code and the City's regulations could not be applied to land located in the County. Mr. Pinckney asked Mr. Kendall if any type of special fire protection or anything else was promised to him during the approval process. Mr. Kendall said no not that he is aware of. Mr. Jirousek explained that this property falls in the Cherry Point Fire District and a special tax is in place to cover that service. Mr. Jirousek explained that the DA associated with this PDD has no DA fees in place. **Mr. Jenkins motioned to approve the final plat for stamping, seconded by Ms. Flexon.**

There was much discussion about the DA not having fees associated with it. Mr. Jirousek explained this is the only large PDD in Jasper County that does not have fees associated with it. He also said when the County started working with ATM, Tony Maglione helped negotiate a lot of the DA's, which is probably when the County realized they needed to collect DA fees. Mr. Kendall explained that Jasper County approved the DA for the Peninsula PDD and there were not any fees listed in the

DA. After receiving approval for the PDD from Council in 2003, his project was sent to Hardeeville in 2005 and has now been bounced back to the County but nothing ever changed in regards to the plans or the DA. Ms. Lamb explained that the Peninsula Tract was the very first PDD in Jasper County and it did not have DA fees associated with it nor did Osprey Lakes have DA fees; however, these are the only two PDD's in the County that have no fees associated with their DA's. She said this project probably was a learning experience, which resulted in fees being included in all DA's since that time. **The commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.**

#### **Planning Commission Discussion:**

**A. Updates:** Dr. Bostick said the reason he was asking about DA fees is because there is still a lot of acreage left in the Peninsula PDD and he asked if the remainder of the acreage will fall under the same regulations without DA fees. Mr. Jirousek said this DA expires in 2013 and the DA could be re-negotiated at that time to include fees. Mr. Jirousek explained the action which was taken tonight was only a subdivision of thirty (30) acres into lots. DA fees are collected at time of building permits and depending on the pace of development; if lots are developed prior to 2013 the developers and owners would definitely have an advantage over developing in another approved PDD within Jasper County since other PDD's do have fees associated with development. He also said that if the land is developed after 2013 and the DA is re-negotiated to add fees then fees could be charged at that time. Dr. Bostick said we have discussed these types of developments in the past and the cost that is associated with providing police protection and other services and that is why he is concerned with the remainder of the Peninsula PDD.

**ADJOURN: Mr. Jenkins motioned to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Dr. Bostick. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.** The meeting adjourned at 7:42 and the PC entered into a workshop.

#### **Workshop:**

**A. Point South County Improvement District – Design Guidelines:** Mr. Jirousek explained the Point South County Improvement District (CID) is a multi-faceted plan. It includes financing strategies and a list of improvements. He explained this would be an overlay district that would refer to a list of design guidelines. A draft of those guidelines was included in the PC packages. Mr. Jirousek pointed some objectives of the design guidelines which include; site layout, access & vehicular circulation, parking, pedestrian circulation, screening, landscaping, open space, lighting, signs and architecture. Mr. Pinckney asked if this has been introduced to the citizens in the Pt. South area. Mr. Jirousek said once a draft of the design guidelines is completed the next step will be to hold a meeting in the community for their input. Mr. Pinckney said when I-95 went through the Point South area it changed the cultural setting in that area. He pointed out The Settings at Mackay Point is an approved development, which has never been completed but the developers have torn up the road serving the community and nothing has been done about it. He also said the community needs representation especially because of what has happened with the development at Mackey Point. Mr. Jirousek said he agrees with citizen input and the county will definitely seek the community's input. He pointed out the development area, which is approximately one (1) square mile and there are homes north of the property but they will not be included in the extra tax district. It would only be placed on commercial properties.

There was much discussion among the Commissioners about the Pt. South CID plan and some suggestions made by the Commissioners were; to specifically call out "doors" on page seven (7) in regards to enclosures, requiring impervious driveways/parking on page (4) for the purposes of water drainage, incorporate covenants and incorporate stricter buffer requirements for properties that face I-

95 and Highway 17. Mr. Jirousek thought some of the suggestions could be incorporated. Ms. Flexon asked if someone who has interest in the area if they would come to the county to look at the plan or how is that handled. She also asked if the developer would have to adhere to the design guidelines or will staff be able to waive any of the requirements. Mr. Jirousek said the developer would have to adhere to the requirements or the PC could have control over it since it is a lot of responsibility to put on staff. Mr. Jirousek explained the design guidelines will allow some flexibility as long as the intent is met. Ms. White asked if this plan has been discussed with Council. Mr. Jirousek said Council is aware of the plan. A workshop was held which two (2) of the Council members were in attendance and Council also had to approve the funding for the project. Ms. Flexon said overall she likes the plan.

Mr. Jirousek pointed out the entire area is zoned GC and manufacturing uses would not be allowed in General Commercial and he suggested the PC look at some flexibility in the land uses for the overlay district. Mr. Pinckney said he would support that. Mr. Jirousek said he has spoken to the Consultant about the land uses and legally that can be done; however, staff recommends no smoke stacks be allowed or any uses that would be intrusive. Dr. Bostick asked if there have been any studies completed to know how valuable this will be and if this is something that will be profitable to the county or how much is the county going to invest in this project. Mr. Jirousek explained the financing strategy with the tax increase to pay for improvements. He said there is also a tax increment financing, which he explained and said it would only be in place for a limited time. He also explained the County will not invest in any improvements unless a development is coming and at such time, the improvements will be made in incremental steps.

Mr. Drayton asked if this plan was similar to what was discussed with Council in regards to the Frampton Tract. Mr. Jirousek said the island Packet covered a story about the Frampton PDD, which the developer has proposed to the County to buy the 180 acre tract for 4.5 million dollars. The proposal includes; the County finances the improvements and the developer act as the County's Consultant to help the county develop the Frampton tract. Their argument is a local government has access to programs which are available to governments but not available to private developments. According to their calculations they believe the County will get their money back plus more and end up with affordable housing. Mr. Jirousek said the Point South CID is that type of concept but at a much smaller level. Ms. White said Pt. South is a good area for development. Mr. Pinckney said no one is going to locate to this county unless people start supporting the local school system.

**B. Zoning Map Amendment – Area Framed by BJWSA Canal, Lowcountry Commerce Park and Academy for Career Excellence:** Mr. Jirousek showed a map of the Glover building at Hwy 462 next to the Lowcountry Commerce Park PDD. He reminded the Commissioners in 2008 they looked at an application to re-zone this property but at that time staff didn't know where this area was going as far as growth and development. Since that time the adjacent parcels have been re-zoned to PDD, known as the Lowcountry Commerce Park PDD. He pointed out the Glover building is a 90,000 square foot commercial/industrial building, which the county has been receiving a lot of interest in. He said the property is zoned Residential (R) making it a non-conforming use. He said staff is presenting this just for consideration and feedback. He thinks the property should be considered for commercial zoning; however, Industrial (ID) may not be good as it allows all types of manufacturing uses, which may be too heavy for that area. Ms. Flexon suggested the zoning remain Residential until the owner applies for a re-zoning. Mr. Pinckney said that this property was turned down previously for re-zoning because it would allow a variety of things so it should be looked at very carefully.

**Open Discussion:** Mr. Pinckney asked if the PC could get an updated copy of the zoning ordinance and zoning map. Mr. Jirousek said staff would provide the updated ordinance and in the future when

amendments are made staff will provide the specific amendment to them after third reading. Mr. Pinckney said a lot of time is spent on decisions and if they have the guidelines to look it would be easier when making decisions. He also said there are so many businesses that do not have public restrooms and the county could make that a requirement. Mr. Jirousek said staff will look into that issue.

There was some discussion about holding a workshop. Mr. Jirousek reminded the Commissioners that an update will have to be done to the Comprehensive Plan by 2012 so it will be necessary to get started on that project within the next year. Ms. White suggested the PC look at the zoning map and decide what areas we can allow General Commercial zoning as well as deciding what we want certain areas to look like regarding land uses. Mr. Jirousek asked the Commissioners if they would like to have a goal planning session to discuss what the PC goals are in the next five (5) years and the next ten (10) years. He thinks it is important for the PC to let Council know what some of the issues are the PC deals with. He suggested formally listing the goals of the PC. Chairman Thomas asked Ms. Lamb to call and poll each Commissioner to find out when the best time is to hold a goal setting workshop. The workshop ended 8:57 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa Lamb