



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
TOWN OF SURFSIDE BEACH
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS
April 5, 2011
6:30 P.M.**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Seibold called the Planning & Zoning meeting to order at 6:35 PM. In attendance were: Planning & Zoning Commission Chairman Seibold and members Hanson, Pruitt, Abrams, Cook, Rhoades and Livesay. There was a quorum. Staff present: Clerk Pinnell, Building and Zoning Code Enforcement Officer, Morris and Waccamaw Council of Government Representative Tom Britton. Building and Zoning Director Donevant was absent.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.**

Chairman Seibold led the pledge of allegiance.

3. **AGENDA APPROVAL**

Mr. Rhoades made a motion to approve the agenda. Motion was seconded. **All voted in favor. MOTION CARRIED.**

4. **MINUTES APPROVAL**

Ms. Livesay made a motion to approve the minutes from January 7, 2011. Ms. Abrams seconded the motion. **All voted in favor. MOTION CARRIED.** Mr. Pruitt made a motion to approve the minutes from March 1, 2011. Ms. Abrams seconded the motion. **All voted in favor. MOTION CARRIED.**

5. **DIRECTORS REPORT**

Ms. Morris reported that Ms. Donevant approved one plat for 18 Dogwood Drive North. The lot was a split from one parcel to two with each lot having 3,300 square feet. It is zoned R-3 and plans have already been received for both lots. Staff is requesting the boards' permission to add Moonwood Planned Development to the next agenda for rezoning consideration. It is located off of Highway 17 North. This was approved as a planned development several years ago but there has been no activity on the property and there is a provision in the zoning ordinance that two years is given for zoning and after that time the Planning Commission revisits the development for zoning. A copy of the development plan will be presented to the Planning Commission. Mr. Pruitt made a motion to add Moonwood to the next agenda. Mr. Rhoades seconded the motion. **All voted in favor. MOTION CARRIED.**

Mr. Britton reported that some of the Census data is beginning to be released. Within the next few months some of this information will be presented to the Commission to add to the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Britton reported that scheduled on the work plan later this year is for the Planning Commission to revisit the Zoning ordinances to check to see if there are any glitches that need to be changed. The amendment made by Council to the Zoning ordinance was discussed briefly.

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

7. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business to be discussed.

8. NEW BUSINESS

a. Article IV (First Draft)

Mr. Britton stated approximately 2 to 3 years ago there was the desire of Council to look at the Town ordinances and update them. The Planning Commission was asked to take care of the ordinances they are responsible for. The Planning Commission is primarily responsible for three ordinances/documents; the Zoning ordinance, the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations. The most pressing issue at the time was updating the Zoning ordinance; this is the document most widely used. Over the last year the Zoning ordinance was updated, the Comprehensive Plan was also looked at since there is a statutory requirement for review every five years and update every ten years; two additional elements were added which were required by the Priority Investment Act. The two elements added were the Priority Investment and the Transportation element. The third major document the Planning Commission is responsible for is the Land Development Regulation. The Land Development Regulations “primarily kick in with the subdivision of property”.

Mr. Britton gave an overview of Article IV of the Land Development Regulations. The State Enabling Legislation is specific when it talks about the appeals process; how long there is to approve plats, etc. There was not a lot of flexibility in the first few articles reviewed; the State statute requires certain items to be included. Article VI, the Design Criteria, is the area that holds the most flexibility. This is what the Town requires of new subdivision developments and other developments within the Town; the bar can be set really low or really high. The design guidelines currently in place; the main section of what is required of the developers, is currently only about 5 to 7 pages at the most. Mr. Britton stated that 18 pages are being presented this evening; it has more than doubled what currently exists. Mr. Britton stated that he brought a copy of the Horry County ordinance for referral. Mr. Britton stated that if there is something that the Commission feels needs to be covered it can be addressed during the review. New items have been added that are currently not addressed in the ordinance. One very important item is the conformance with other applicable rules and regulations which is not addressed well in the existing ordinance. This would come into play, for instance, with a development that involves a road being created over a wetland, this would involve an Army Corp permit or issue, the local ordinance does not have all of the Army Corp regulations codified but there is a basis to deny or postpone the construction of the road. This provision gives the latitude to postpone an approval based on a non-compliance issue with another requirement that is out there without having to codify all of those provisions into the ordinance.

101 Mr. Britton stated that some of the language has been modified. Street frontage is
102 addressed in the zoning ordinance to a degree but it is only addressed for
103 residential lots; there is nothing in the zoning ordinance that addresses
104 commercial lots. Typically the frontage requirements are in the land development
105 regulations to begin with. It was in the zoning ordinance where the thought was
106 to perhaps move it completely but what was kept was what was existing in the
107 zoning ordinance; it was tweaked a little bit; this section addresses the other half
108 of the equation being non-residential lots and frontages. There is 50 feet of
109 frontage for new non-residential lots except in the downtown district which is
110 reduced to 25 feet. This matches what currently exists, lot-wise, in that particular
111 commercial district. Unsuitable soils are typically commented on by the Soil
112 Conservation Service. This will not be as pressing of an issue for Surfside Beach
113 as other places since there probably would be no septic tank placements; soils are
114 a key factor in these placements.

115
116 Mr. Britton stated that some provisions were struck which dealt with the
117 subdivision of individual lot makers; the State has a standard that applies to land
118 surveying in South Carolina and now the section references the State standards.
119 The utility section has been amended and supplemented specifying what the
120 essential and required utilities are; water, sewer, and electric, it also makes a
121 statement that all new lights have to have access and they need to be extended at
122 the developers expense. This was previously not well defined in the existing
123 regulations. The provisions kept refer to requiring underground of utilities; a
124 potential exemption has been provided under certain conditions under minor plat.
125 Does it make sense to underground for one lot if one lot is being divided off; there
126 is an exemption built in, this would come to the Planning Commission for
127 approval. The utility location in relation to streets, some of the existing language
128 has been kept and a provision was added for where the utility line is in
129 relationship to the paved surface of streets; typically a utility company will place
130 new utility lines at the edge of the right of way; that is not always the case. This
131 now requires a minimum setback of 5 feet for water sewer lines from the edge of
132 the pavement; the reason is if there is a breakdown of water and sewer the road
133 construction does not want to be compromised.

134
135 Provisions have been included which coordinate utility construction with streets;
136 this was not well addressed in the existing regulations. Mr. Britton suggested
137 referring this to Grand Strand Water and Sewer as well as the other utility
138 providers prior to finalization by the Commission. Some of the language has been
139 increased dealing with drainage easements. This is a practice under the
140 stormwater ordinance and it needs to be codified.

141
142 Mr. Britton reviewed the standards for street design, street construction and
143 sidewalk construction. In building a road there are many components. There is
144 pavement thickness, right of way width, width of the street itself, width of
145 sidewalks etc. The State of South Carolina SCDOT has a specifications manual;
146 it addresses how to construct streets it does not specify right of way width or
147 some other items. It does reference asphalt composition and what types of
148 asphalt. These specifications are over 1,000 pages in length and address pretty
149 much every particular aspect of construction of streets. In this provision there are

150 local requirements but if there is something not addressed and they are addressed
151 in the State specification then the State specifications apply. The Town would not
152 have to codify 1,000 pages of material it would just reference the SCDOT
153 document specifications.

154
155 Intersections and street jogs have been added. Also added were provisions related
156 to cul-de-sacs that includes cul-de-sac islands and medians. This section allows
157 these islands and medians to be platted; they then become part of the right of way.
158 The Towns responsibility for maintenance does not include the replacement of
159 decorative features. The Town does not assume the responsibility for having to
160 replace items added to the medians or islands. Individual Home Owner
161 Associations can enter into agreements with the Town Council to allow for the
162 maintenance of development features under a permit. Mr. Britton discussed
163 subdivision right of way maintenance. The Public Works Director would be
164 delegated control. Some communities in their Land Development Regulations
165 will say that the median is separate and distinct from the right of way; there would
166 be a separate strip of private ownership that goes down the middle of the road.
167 Mr. Britton discussed right of way and pavement width. Anytime pavement
168 width is increased it increases the speed of traffic and the neighborhood feel
169 diminishes along local roads. During review of the transportation element
170 pavement width data was collected for all of the streets in Surfside Beach. Some
171 of the more familiar roads in Surfside will be reviewed going forward. Marginal
172 access streets would be considered frontage roads; it is a minor service street
173 typically parallel and adjacent to a major street and provides access to abutting
174 property. A lot of existing information in the section was kept; it has been placed
175 into a table format to make it easier to understand. Grades and street crown was
176 added; it was previously not defined. Construction standards and surfacing and
177 replacement signs were addressed. The construction standard surfacing as well as
178 inspection protocol has been kept fairly consistent with what Horry County
179 currently requires. It is probably not likely that there will be a lot of street
180 construction in most of Surfside since it is already developed. If there was to be
181 street construction it more than likely be in areas that connect to Horry County.
182 Paving standards were added and these are the same as Horry County as well.
183 The amount of paving is primarily a local requirement; when the State builds a
184 road and they go through the design process they design each individual road with
185 a particular pavement thickness; there is not necessarily a uniform understanding,
186 it varies depending on the type of roads, etc. Most of the time SCDOT designs
187 their own roads; they have a lot of latitude in what they can require.

188
189 Sidewalks were discussed. A requirement placing sidewalks on both sides of the
190 street was put in the regulations. There is an exception for cul-de-sacs or dead
191 end streets. Mr. Seibold stated that many sections of Surfside Beach currently do
192 not have sidewalks on both sides of the street. It was confirmed that the Land
193 Development addresses new developments only and not existing ones. Not
194 allowing permanent dead end streets was discussed. The Commission discussed
195 not wanting to require sidewalks on both sides for new developments. If there is a
196 permanent dead end street it must be a cul-de-sac. The minimum sidewalk width
197 was added to the regulations. The ADA minimum is 5 feet to allow the passing
198 of two wheelchairs. Bicycle lanes were addressed; these are optional and

199 pedestrian paths can be added. Designated on-street parking is also addressed in
200 the regulations. Mr. Britton stated that typically slanted or angled parking is not
201 allowed except possibly in a downtown area. Ideally parallel parking would be
202 the choice. The Town would want to have the ability to decline angled parking
203 in a new development. The process of how streets are approved was reviewed
204 briefly. If all requirements are met and procedures are followed the acceptance is
205 pretty much automatic through the Council. The street would then be taken over
206 by the Town for public maintenance after that point. Legal documents of deeded
207 right of ways, warranty agreement, etc would need to be submitted. When the
208 Town actually accepts it a title for that strip would be received.

209
210 Mr. Britton noted that a conversation would be made with the Public Works
211 Director regarding street signs. The Commission discussed allowing the
212 sidewalks on one or both sides and to include it by zone; commercial districts and
213 high density residential districts would be required on both sides; low density
214 residential districts would allow one side.

215
216 Ms. Abrams made a motion that the Planning Commission request staff to brief
217 the Commission on all existing or pending planned developments in the Town,
218 specifically requesting the names, locations, size, purpose, date of establishment
219 and whether or not Town records include a copy of the base document. Mr. Pruitt
220 seconded the motion. Ms. Abrams stated that as a new member of the
221 Commission she does not feel she has a handle on what PDD's the Town has
222 adding that this is something that Ms. Donevant could probably list off the top of
223 her head. Ms. Abrams stated that the Town apparently has no records for Wild
224 Water and Wheels and if the Town does not have documents on any of the PDD's
225 she would like to know what the situation is. Ms. Abrams stated that she is
226 uncomfortable with the Town map; the map she has does not list the Moonwood
227 PDD. There was discussion regarding a revised map. There was some additional
228 discussion regarding receipt of an updated document listing current Town PDD's.
229 **All voted in favor. MOTION CARRIED.**

230
231 **9. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

232 There were no public comments.
233

234 **10. COMMISSION COMMENTS**

235 Mr. Hanson thanked Carol Cook for her four years of service on the Planning
236 Commission. Ms. Cook stated that it was great serving and thanked Tom Britton for
237 educating her on the various issues. Mr. Hanson brought in a photo showing urban
238 clutter in Hong Kong. Mr. Hanson stated that he picked up a new term, multi-family
239 homes are now referred to as multi-generational; when kids move in with their
240 parents or their parents move in with their kids he saw ads for this in Florida.
241

242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271

11. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Cook made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Hanson seconded the motion. **All voted in favor. Meeting was adjourned at 7:54 PM.**

Charles Seibold, Chairman

Lynn Livesay, Commission Member

Marty Rhoades, Commission Member

Mikey Pruitt, Commission Member

Carol Cook, Commission Member

Absent

Bob Hanson, Vice Chairman

Mary Ellen Abrams, Commission Member

NOTE: BE ADVISED THAT THESE MINUTES REPRESENT A SUMMARY OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AND ARE NOT INTENDED TO REPRESENT A FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING. THE TAPE(S) OF THE MEETINGS IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST, TO BE HEARD IN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY TO THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT. AN AGENDA OF THIS MEETING HAS BEEN EITHER MAILED OR MADE AVAILABLE TO PERSONS, ORGANIZATIONS AND LOCAL NEWS MEDIA AS PER THEIR REQUEST. THE AGENDA GIVES THE DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF THE MEETING AS WELL AS THE ORDER OF BUSINESS. THIS DISCLOSURE IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS OF 1976, SECTION 30-4-80(E).