



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

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
TOWN OF SURFSIDE BEACH
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS
August 3, 2010
6:30 P.M.**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Seibold called the Planning & Zoning meeting to order at 6:30 PM. In attendance were: Planning & Zoning commission members Seibold, Hanson, Abrams, Rhoades, Pruitt, Cook and Livesay were present. There was a quorum. Staff present: Clerk Pinnell. Also present were Waccamaw Council of Government Representatives Tom Britton and Dan Newquist. Building Director Donevant was absent.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.**

Chairman Seibold led the pledge of allegiance.

3. **AGENDA APPROVAL**

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

4. **MINUTES APPROVAL**

Approval of minutes from July 6, 2010 meeting. Mr. Rhoades made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Hanson seconded the motion. **All voted in favor. MOTION CARRIED.**

5. **OLD BUSINESS**

a. **Article VI Signs**

Mr. Britton reported that being presented this evening is the second draft of the sign ordinance with suggested changes. Mr. Britton stated that everything added has been highlighted in yellow. Most for the changes have been formatting; the definitions section has also been amended to add several definitions. One of the definitions included an issue surrounding murals. Mr. Seibold brought up a mural that currently exists on the corner of Surfside Drive and Ocean Blvd. It was confirmed that an advertisement that is an off-site sign would fall under the billboard criteria of the town ordinances and the advertisement would not be allowed under the current ordinance. Mr. Britton stated that page 5 of the amendment added a provision to cover how to determine number of signs and height of signs. Under section 17-620 (a) some language was moved to another location in the ordinance.

Ms. Livesay stated that she had reviewed the Conway ordinance the commission was referred to and questioned signs attached or painted on a vehicle and suggested the removal of the word painted. Mr. Britton stated there was a problem with the application of the definition and referred the commission to a handout of list of prohibited signs. A sign is prohibited if it goes beyond the body frame of the car and there are projections. There was

52 some discussion regarding vehicle sign size including projected size. Using
53 the Conway definition was discussed. Mr. Britton recommended placing a
54 square footage into the definition. There was consensus to regulate this and to
55 add to the existing definition 'extends beyond manufacturer profile' and to
56 change square footage to three square foot. Mr. Britton reported on Page 7
57 which refers to the appeals process. Some sections were removed so as not to
58 be redundant. Signs that are exempt from permitting are now clarified in the
59 ordinance. Signs listed must comply with dimensional requirements as well
60 as setbacks in the ordinance. Residential signs which include political signs,
61 real estate signs, name plate signs or similar signs do not require permits.
62 Public service and informational signs are not required to get permits. Flags
63 and flagpoles and governmental signs were included in the list. Ms. Livesay
64 asked about the status of digital signs. Mr. Britton stated that there is a
65 section in the back referencing message boards and this is something the
66 commission would need to discuss and determine requirements on. Mr.
67 Britton discussed the chart added to the ordinance as a quick reference. There
68 was some discussion regarding mixed use and its placement in the chart. Mr.
69 Britton stated that on Page 14 a 'catch all phrase' was added to dimensional
70 and illumination standards in order to make it more consistent throughout the
71 ordinance. Under prohibited signs a correction was made; the request was to
72 modify item 17-631 (3) to give allowance for limited use for pennants,
73 streamers, etc. Ms. Livesay addressed balloons. There was consensus to
74 allow temporary use of balloons and to add balloons to the list. Mr. Britton
75 stated that in item 6 'flashing signs' were added. There was a short discussion
76 regarding the difference of animated and flashing signs and it was confirmed
77 that definitions are included in the ordinance. Page 16 referenced illumination
78 and addressed light intensity. Page 19 has a couple provisions stricken due to
79 redundancy. Signs permitted in commercial district were discussed. The
80 caveat was added to stress that certain signs are permitted for non-residential
81 uses in the commercial districts. The distinction is now made clear. Page 20
82 item 3 addresses wall signs as discussed by the commission previously.
83 Illustrations and pictures would also be included on final cut. If there are
84 three or more establishments with their own principal interest they would be
85 allowed an additional wall sign not to exceed 10 square feet. The commission
86 agreed that the 10 square feet was reasonable.

87
88 Mr. Seibold asked about trailers with advertising. Mr. Britton stated that these
89 would either fall under portable signs or vehicle signs. Would the trailer be
90 considered a separate vehicle or a portable sign? Mr. Britton stated that the
91 definition of portable signs fits the description of a sign on a trailer if the
92 trailer is detached from the vehicle. Additional clarification could be added to
93 include a trailer. There was some additional discussion. On site advertising
94 as opposed to off-site advertising was discussed. Mr. Britton stated that his
95 take is that he feels the intention is not to disallow someone from having
96 advertising on their vehicle parked in their driveway but to prohibit people
97 from having additional on-site advertising on a vehicle. There was some
98 additional discussion. Mr. Britton stated that upon approval of the
99 commission the document would be sent to the attorney for review.

101 Mr. Britton stated that on page 22 a provision was added for construction
 102 signs in the mixed use. They would be allowed in the mixed use area. Page
 103 24 referred to a section added addressing electronic message boards. Ms.
 104 Abrams stated she has a question on how electronic signs are manufactured.
 105 Mr. Rhoades stated that they are all display adjustable. Mr. Britton stated that
 106 the idea was to avoid a sign flashing or changing too often. The time of 10
 107 second minimal display for businesses and 3 second time and date change
 108 suggestions came from other similar zoning ordinances. Mr. Britton stated
 109 that time intervals among ordinances differ so there is latitude the town could
 110 use to set a time limit. Mr. Britton stated that the suggested times set seemed
 111 reasonable but it was up for discussion to possibly change. Not allowing
 112 scrolling was discussed and that it tends to be a safety issue on main
 113 roadways. Mr. Britton stated that most ordinances do not allow scrolling;
 114 some do but most do not. There was consensus to not allow scrolling. Mr.
 115 Britton stated that the severability clause was stricken since it was included in
 116 Article I. Mr. Britton stated that the changes would be noted and with
 117 approval from the commission the document with changes would then be
 118 forwarded to council for their input. Mr. Hanson made a motion to send an
 119 advanced draft of the sign ordinance for attorney and the town council
 120 comments. Ms. Livesay seconded the motion. **All voted in favor.** Mr.
 121 Britton stated it would also still need to go for a public hearing as well.
 122

123 **b. Zoning Text Amendments**

124 Mr. Britton stated that council has not yet received any comments from
 125 council regarding the draft sent and Ms. Donevant was working on scheduling
 126 a meeting with the town attorney to review the draft. Mr. Britton stated that a
 127 meeting with the town attorney should happen soon and will advise the
 128 commission on the outcome of the meeting. Mr. Britton asked if the
 129 commission wanted to change or address anything from the current drafts.
 130 The commission had no issues.
 131

132 **c. Transportation Element**

133 Mr. Britton reported that the commission recommended the transportation
 134 element to council a couple months ago and a brief presentation was given by
 135 Mr. Britton to council approximately a month prior and Mr. Newquist gave a
 136 recent presentation and a public hearing was held.
 137

138 Mr. Newquist gave an update on the presentation. Mr. Newquist reported that
 139 he informed council on the process the planning commission went through
 140 and gave a summary of the goals and strategies the planning commission
 141 approved. Traffic projections were explained along with planning
 142 improvements. There was some good feedback from council and there had
 143 been questions about where the projection information came from. Mr.
 144 Newquist stated that the only feedback received that may cause an edit to the
 145 element was regarding some of Business 17 Highway. On one of the tables
 146 transportation projects were listed which included those drafted by the
 147 GSATS along with some projects council had already approved such as bus
 148 shelters, parking lot improvements and sidewalk improvements. The project
 149 of concern was US Highway 17 Business between 13th Avenue North and 16th

150 Avenue North. The table cited the reference from GSATS and council asked
151 for specifics and since this is still under the planning stage specifics could not
152 be determined. The table indicated the improvements would be between 13th
153 and 16th North and the request was to change it to 14th Avenue and 16th North.
154 Mr. Newquist stated that this was left flexible. It was confirmed that the town
155 cannot do anything on Business 17 but they could forward recommendations
156 to GSATS. Mr. Hanson agreed that 13th should be changed to 14th. Mr.
157 Newquist stated that he does not want to contradict another document since he
158 was citing one in the table. Mr. Newquist stated that he could insert it in the
159 following page which would suggest some needs along the corridor. Mr.
160 Seibold stated that the document is stating that there will be improvements
161 from 13th to 16th North; it is not saying that a traffic light will go there just
162 improvements and he feels that it should include 13th North since it is just
163 referring to improvements. Ms. Abrams stated that she believes that
164 Councilman Smith wanted to make sure that the town did not leave the door
165 open for 13th to be considered. Mr. Newquist stated that the council did not
166 make a motion to approve the document nor did they make a motion to send it
167 back to the Planning Commission. Mr. Hanson stated that there was a
168 comment from the public concerning 10th Avenue South but it is addressed in
169 the plan. DOT had turned it down since there are not enough accidents in the
170 location. There was consensus to leave the document as it was originally
171 presented.

172
173 **d. Priority Investment Element**

174 Mr. Britton updated the commission. This is one of the elements of the
175 comprehensive plan that needs to be updated by the end of the year. Mr.
176 Britton stated that the commission is approximately 2 to 3 months behind
177 schedule. Information had been requested from the department heads back in
178 May and to date not a lot of information has been received. Mr. Britton stated
179 that Ms. Donevant is working to secure some information on project lists.
180 Some information has been received by the fire department about two weeks
181 ago but they are still waiting for some additional information and should have
182 it all within a week or so. Priority investment element is one required by the
183 state; it is a listing of projects and ranked in priority that the town either needs
184 or anticipates funding and they are sequenced with a time frame. The
185 importance of this element is to coordinate with other projects in the
186 surrounding area. It also includes estimated costs and potential funding. Mr.
187 Britton stated that he is hoping to have a rough outline by the following
188 meeting since this needs to be finalized by the end of the year. There was
189 some discussion regarding the list of projects. Mr. Hanson stated that he had a
190 wish list of items that he presented to the commission members. Mr. Britton
191 asked the commission members to let the chairman and Ms. Donevant know
192 of any questions or additions they have to the list.

193
194 **6. NEW BUSINESS**

195 **a. Fee Schedule**

196 A fee schedule was presented to the commission. Mr. Britton stated that the
197 fee schedule for the town is codified in a separate article from zoning. With
198 the exception of three permit fees all the fees that relate to zoning are in the

199 article. As the zoning ordinance is amended this article would need to be
 200 changed as well. Some items such as special exceptions were added. Mr.
 201 Britton reported that a draft amendment of fees would be presented at the next
 202 meeting. Mr. Britton stated that the idea was not to change the fee structure;
 203 if the commission wanted to consider lowering or raising any fees they should
 204 let him know. A fee comparison of surrounding areas was presented to the
 205 commission. Mr. Britton stated that he had prepared this comparison
 206 approximately 3 years ago and he does not anticipate that much has changed
 207 from then. Mr. Hanson asked how the town compared. Mr. Britton stated that
 208 there are items where the town does not have a lot of coverage such as PDD's.
 209 He did not see a separate PDD fee. In the rewrite this item may be added.
 210 The town variance fee is \$175 and Mr. Britton stated that this is in line with
 211 what other towns charge. The charge to appeal to the Board of Zoning
 212 Appeals is \$175 which is a little higher than some and a little lower than
 213 others; Georgetown County charges \$500 for an appeal. The rezoning charge
 214 is \$175 and Mr. Britton stated that this fee is mid to low with comparable
 215 cities. Mr. Britton stated that they would try to make it consistent and added
 216 "as far as how much it costs the community to process a request under zoning;
 217 give you an example; anytime you get in a special exception request, a
 218 variance request, an appeals request there is notification requirements, you
 219 either have to send out adjoining property owner letters and you have to post
 220 them in the newspaper, I don't know what the town currently . . .it costs the
 221 town currently to post in the Sun News or wherever you post but I know
 222 working for other communities it's about \$75 to \$100 per ad." The adjoining
 223 property owner requirement for rezoning must be sent certified mail and this
 224 could get costly depending on how many adjoining property owners there are.
 225 Most communities try to cover, at a minimum, advertising costs. Some
 226 communities have an applicant absorb 100 percent of costs which would
 227 include advertising and staff review costs and some subsidize it; it is a
 228 community and policy decision. There was some discussion regarding the
 229 town giving itself a permit for work done in town by the town.

230
 231 **b. Development Regulations**

232 Mr. Britton distributed copies for review. Mr. Britton stated that this deals
 233 primarily with the subdivision of property. There was some original
 234 discussion where some of these need to be improved. The changes would be
 235 discussed at the following meeting. Mr. Britton stated that there is not a
 236 statutory time frame to review this but it is usually done in conjunction with
 237 the zoning ordinance review.

238
 239 Mr. Seibold brought up special exceptions and conditional use and asked if
 240 once this is granted if this was granted forever. Mr. Britton stated that
 241 variances for property run with the land regardless of who the owner is; with a
 242 special exception certain conditions could be placed as to when certain
 243 improvements would need to be done etc. It could be perpetual with certain
 244 conditions attached to it. A special condition can set special instructions. The
 245 special conditions must be specific to the application and narrowly tailored. If
 246 conditions are not included it could make it perpetual.
 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
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293

c. 2010-2011 Work Plan (no action rough draft)

Mr. Britton verified that everyone had a copy of the rough draft of the Work Plan to begin familiarizing themselves with it. This would be discussed the following month as well. For the last couple of years a tentative work plan has been put together; this plan identifies the areas and topics that the commission will be considering. This is a way of keeping staff apprised. On the work plan it lists various items such as the completion of the zoning ordinance rewrite which is set to extend no later than November 2010. The comprehensive plan is also on there as being completed no later than November as well. It was verified that there needs to be something on record where it states that the comprehensive plan has been reviewed; this will be done in October. Changes need to be sent to town council and there needs to be an ordinance approved. Mr. Britton stated that some of the items are waiting for new census information and added that this is built into the work plan. Some of the other elements such as the population element will need to be reviewed and updated. The thought is to get the comprehensive plan with the priority investment element out not later than November since council must take action on it before the end of the year. Mr. Britton stated that the next plan is to look at the development regulations and doing a couple articles at a time which would take us through the mid part of the following year and by then the Census information will be in as well.

The plan is to also have orientation and continuing education training; February would be orientation and April would be continuing education. Mr. Britton stated that this timing is flexible and they would try to have training at Surfside so everyone does not have to drive to Georgetown or another location. Extending the contract with the Waccamaw Regional council of Governments was discussed.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

8. COMMISSION COMMENTS

Ms. Abrams stated that she would like to discuss the public comments section and that there have been people in the public that could not stay through the entire meeting to make a comment and have left. There was a discussion in moving the public comments section to the front of the meeting. Ms. Livesay made a motion to move the public comments after the minutes approval and the public can speak on any topic they want and it would be limited to a comment and the chairperson will control the flow of information; time allotted would be 5 minutes and any new item will be added to the next agenda to be discussed. Mr. Rhoades seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

Mr. Seibold stated that he appreciated all the work that Mr. Britton has done.

294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322

9. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Hanson made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Cook seconded the motion. **All voted in favor. Meeting was adjourned at 8:12 PM.**

Charles Seibold, Chairman

Lynn Livesay, Commission Member

Marty Rhoades, Commission Member

Mikey Pruitt, Commission Member

Carol Cook, Commission Member

Bob Hanson, Commission Member

Mary Ellen Abrams, Commission Member

APPROVED

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 ARE 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).