



Town of Surfside Beach
Planning, Building & Zoning Department
115 US Hwy. 17 North, Surfside Beach, SC 29575
(843)913-6341

**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 2020 AT 6:00 PM**

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM. Commission members present Mr. Brown, Mrs. Laveglia, Mr. Pesce, Mr. Von Buseck, Mrs. Abrams, Mr. Kinken, and Chairman Truett. Also present Town Clerk Medina, Ms. Carol Coleman, WRCOG Local Planning Services Director, and Mr. Kevin Talbert, applicant and Tina Mazzo, via teleconference.
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** Chairman Truett led in the Flag Salute.
3. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Rezone properties fronting Highway 17 from C1 Highway Commercial to PD Planned Development. PIN numbers of the properties are 45915010046 and 45915010048
4. **AGENDA APPROVAL** Ms. Abrams moved to approve the agenda. Mr. Von Buseck second. All voted in favor. **MOTION CARRIED.**
5. **MINUTES APPROVAL** – February 4, 2020, Mr. Brown moved to approve the February 4, 2020 meeting minutes as submitted, Mr. Pesce Second. All voted in favor. **MOTION CARRIED.**
6. **PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS**
 - A. Colleen Zurawski, 516 4th Ave South, I am a new resident to Surfside Beach. Please do NOT rezone the property on Kings Highway to allow a three-story storage building. We moved here because it's a small town and we would like it to stay that way.
 - B. Peggy Wilcox, 1481 Southwood Drive, Please do NOT rezone Kings Hwy in Surfside. I didn't move to Surfside Beach to be surrounded by big buildings.
 - C. Linda Andrews, Please, please reconsider the proposition to rezone the property on Kings Highway. We do not want a three-story tall storage facility to be built- it will be an eyesore and change the feel of our wonderful community. If it needs to be built, there are other places that would make more sense.
 - D. Beth Kohlmann, My public comment: The PD being requested is nothing more than industrial uses (other than the restaurant/retail) being placed directly on Highway 17. This is a precedent

48 for all other properties around that area. The Town will look and have a feel of Seaboard Street
49 in Myrtle Beach if this is accepted. Storage units of this caliber should be located on either Sandy
50 Lane or in the county. This is not the uses or building character that says 'family beach.' It
51 simply says, 'Surfside will accept anything on its newly improved corridor.'

- 52
- 53 E. Paul Richardson, It has come to my attention that a storage facility might be built on 17 business
54 in close proximity to 11th Ave North. I have several issues with this proposal. First, this would be
55 an eyesore for our community. This is a family beach area. A storage facility has no place in this
56 location. Second, there are several storage facilities within a short distance from this area. Why
57 would we need another? Third, Traffic, The traffic during the summer has gotten terrible. It backs
58 up from 544 past 11th Ave North. Sometimes it is so bad I go to Glens Bay Rd to get away from
59 it. This would be another source for increased traffic. As a result of the increased traffic, it
60 becomes more dangerous driving on 17 business. In the past, accidents were few. As the number
61 of vehicles increase on 17 the number of accidents increase. We need to keep this a family beach
62 as well as a safe place for residents and vacationers. I have been a resident of Surfside Beach for
63 20+ years.
- 64
- 65 F. Al Lauer, I just read an announcement of the Planning Commission meeting scheduled for this
66 afternoon. I note that they will be discussing and 'voting ' on a recommendation to rezone the
67 property on Kings Highway, approximately opposite the Giant/Pancake House strip. I would
68 suggest that this is quite improper considering the unsettled condition of the nation at this
69 moment. First, it is incumbent on the PC to open up the discussion to the public. The public's
70 input is crucial to Town decisions. A poorly announced, telecommunication (I personally have
71 seen two different times listed- 4 PM and 6 PM), will effectively exclude a large number of
72 residents who haven't heard about the meeting (they have too many other things on their
73 plates), and/or do not know how to participate in anything that has 'tele' in the title. I would also
74 suggest that, because of the current economic status in our State, nothing will be able to be done
75 at this property for months. There is no apparent rush to have the PC pass this Zoning change on
76 to Council. My recommendation would be to postpone the PC meeting to a time when residents
77 can attend and express their feelings. I have to say that personally, I have no great objection to
78 the structure, though I would like to have the opportunity to learn more, see pictures and hear
79 the Town's ideas as to why this is a good idea. The thought of having such a meeting tonight
80 flies in the face of the Council's pledge to transparency. If, as residents, we cannot see, hear, and
81 respond to actions, our democracy continues to be eroded. Please postpone this meeting...
- 82
- 83 G. Blaine Liljenquist, I individually, and my two companies listed on the letterhead, are OPPOSED
84 to the rezoning request referenced in your letter, a copy of which is attached, IF whatever is
85 built on the subject property plans to use the road leading to Platt Boulevard for ingress and
86 egress. There is way too much vehicle traffic on Platt Boulevard as it is. IF, however, whatever is
87 built on the referenced property IS NOT going to use the road leading to Platt Boulevard for
88 ingress and egress, then I, individually, and my two companies, SUPPORT the rezoning request.
- 89
- 90 H. Mrs. Connie Newton, I spoke with you about the questions and concerns I have about the
91 Planning commission hearing on the proposed rezoning for the Surfside Beach Park project. You
92 indicated I should send my comments directly to you via e-mail. So I have attached my concerns
93 in a Word Document. I also am sending you in the mail a hard copy. Hopefully, you will receive
94 both and be able to direct this to the appropriate committee members. Thank you for your time
95 and professionalism in this matter. If possible, please reply and let me know you received this.
- 96
- 97 I. Kelly Michalowski, I am opposed to letting a storage unit off Hwy 17 be built-in Surfside

98 Beach. Surfside is a family beach and has storage units already. I have been to Surfside Beach
99 for 53 years, and the atmosphere needs to remain family. I am opposed to the storage unit off
100 Hwy 17 for the following reasons: 1. it would not be an invite to family visits.2. The traffic it
101 would create would be havoc along with traffic accidents caused by traitors, trucks trying to
102 access the storage unit.3. Surfside Beach does not need this unit in this location off Hwy17 - an
103 eyesore.4. This is not the commercial use that should be used for a storage unit. Questions you
104 need to ask...is this a chain unit? Do they keep it clean? Is it a high rise with climate control
105 units? Is this a fly by night open to tons of problems? Thank you - vote wisely, please!

106 J. Hey, I am Allie Argoe, a resident of Surfside Beach. I do not want the property on Kings Highway
107 to be rezoned to allow a huge storage facility. We already have numerous storage facilities in and
108 around the area. I believe the property should be used to attract tourists to the area rather than
109 for a building that will be nothing more than an eyesore. Thank you for your consideration.
110

111 K. Wes Jones, I am currently a resident of Surfside Beach and am writing regarding a proposed
112 storage facility due to be built on Hwy 17 near Deerfield Resort. I have just recently become
113 aware of the planned use of the site to house a multi-level storage complex and have a few
114 concerns. First, it would seem that another similar storage business is located near Dagwood's
115 deli on Hwy 17, so I'm not sure the value of having another one in such close proximity. With all
116 the recent development going on in Deerfield, adding hundreds of homes to such a small area,
117 I'm afraid traffic will become unbearable in our area. They are currently building another gas
118 station in front of Deerfield, which will only add to the congestion. The idea of another large
119 commercial storage facility right on Hwy 17 would seem only to hurt the look and appeal of
120 Surfside Beach, as well as negatively impact the values of properties both east of 17 and within
121 Deerfield. Most of these storage complexes are large and unsightly, and would only take away
122 from the appeal of Surfside Beach as a family beach. I always enjoyed Surfside Beach because it
123 looked and felt distinctly different than downtown Myrtle Beach. I would hope that this issue
124 would at least be given more time for local residents to voice an opinion. I can say that most
125 neighbors I speak with are completely unaware of the construction taking place in this area,
126 including this storage facility. Thanks for hearing our concerns.
127

128 L. Tim and Eileen Glover, 712A South Ocean Blvd Surfside Beach. HOW many storage facilities do
129 we actually need? There is one right up the road on Glenn's Bay. We are consuming more and
130 more space for storing God knows what. Is this just another way of collecting taxes for vacant or
131 unused properties? We need to stop creating the concrete jungle, or we will be like any other
132 metropolitan city, with tall buildings and structures that are not in conformity with the general
133 populace. The appearance of Surfside is not the sleepy, fishing, and beach community it once
134 was. Traffic on South Ocean is impossible, and more buildings will only bring more traffic.
135
136

137 **7. BUSINESS ITEM**

138
139 Vote on recommendations to send to Council

140
141 Chairman Truett stated he had concerns about access on the back of the property to Platt
142 Blvd. Chairman Truett spoke to Chief Hoffman and requested he go down there and take
143 a look to see if what is proposed will work. Chief Hoffman said he spoke to SCDOT, and
144 he is comfortable with it. Mr. Brown asked if people coming out of the property can go
145 North on Hwy 17. Chairman Truett stated you could only go South on Hwy 17 and only
146 South on the frontage road. Mr. Kinken asked if you can cross Hwy 17. Mrs. Coleman
147 stated, yes. Mrs. Coleman asked if this property will be gated. Kevin Talbert stated no

148 and that there are no plans to connect to Platt Blvd. Mrs. Abrams referred to a previous
149 meeting, and the decision to connect would lie with Deerfield. Chairman Truett stated
150 there would be an 8-foot fence enclosing the outside storage. There also will be
151 landscaping in this area.

152 Mr. Brown stated it seems as if the residents are concerned about the traffic. Chairman
153 Truett said as long as the Police Chief and SCDOT are okay with it, so is he. Mrs. Abrams
154 stated she was fine now that she heard comments from the Police Chief. Mrs. Laveglia
155 agreed. Mr. Von Buseck stated he doesn't feel that there will be a lot more traffic. Mrs.
156 Coleman stated the estimated number of trips to the property submitted by the applicant
157 are higher than usual. The applicant has proposed 479 trips per day. The retail portion
158 having 310 trips, and the trade portion having 24 trips. Usually, people who use the
159 storage building facilities bring their items, put them in a unit, and leave them there for a
160 specified period. A minimal amount of renters visit the property regularly. Mr. Brown
161 questioned if there were any comparisons done with other existing storage facilities to
162 find how practical these numbers are.

163 Mrs. Coleman stated no but would look into it. Mrs. Abrams stated what set this project
164 apart from the other existing storage centers is that it is climate controlled. Mrs. Coleman
165 stated the storage building is an approved use in the zone. The reason for the applicant
166 having to come before the board is for the outdoor storage. Mr. Talbert stated the reason
167 for the 8-foot fence is to mitigate the view for the residents behind the property. Mr.
168 Brown asked if the trees will be placed closer than 25 feet apart. This property is our
169 billboard to the world. Seems the feel of the residents is that a warehouse feel is not
170 what they are looking for. Mrs. Laveglia stated the property owner has the right to build a
171 storage facility on that property. Mrs. Abrams stated Code 17-396.42 states warehouse or
172 other storage facilities are permitted in the zone without outdoor storage. Without the
173 outdoor storage, the applicant could go directly to commercial review and approval. Mr.
174 Pesce said there had been many commercial buildings that are now vacant; this building
175 also has other uses (flex space) and feels this could be beneficial. Mr. Brown feels the
176 residents do not want this. Chairman Truett stated the height limit is 55 feet, and this
177 building is only 42 feet. This does not seem to be an eyesore. Also, there will be
178 landscaping and trees that will be no less than 15 feet. Mr. Brown feels this parcel is not
179 the appropriate place for a storage building. Mr. Kinken stated he agreed to reduce the
180 spacing of the trees along the frontage road from 25 feet to 15 feet.

181 Mrs. Coleman stated she is very familiar with the area. What is proposed is within the
182 zoning code. This building allows for people who have relocated, probably downsized and
183 have campers or boats, a place to store their belongings. The applicant has given
184 concessions, such as reducing the height of the building. They are willing to screen above
185 and beyond, even the areas that are not able to be seen. Mr. Brown asked if the
186 configuration of the building be changed to have the retail in the front. Mrs. Coleman said
187 the configuration that was submitted is the best. Mr. Talbert stated that retail does not
188 have a specific rendering because it depends on who occupies the space will probably
189 have their design. The flex space will be a minimum of 2000 square feet. The retail will
190 be a minimum of 400 square feet.

191 Mr. Brown asked if the sign will be illuminated, and will it be on 24 hours, seven days a
192 week. Mr. Talbert stated a plan for the street sign has not been submitted at this time
193 but would meet code.

194 Mr. Brown made a motion to require a traffic study. Hearing no second. Motion failed.
195 Mr. Kinken asked if there are Butler buildings. Chairman Truett stated that Butler
196 buildings are permitted.
197

198 Mr. Pesce made a motion to rezone the parcel from C-1 to PD. Mr. Von Buseck second.
199 Ayes: Ms. Laveglia, Mr. Pesce, Mr. Von Buseck, Mrs. Abrams, Mr. Kinken, and Chairman
200 Truett. Nays: Mr. Brown

201 **Motion Carried.**
202

203 **8. COMMISSION COMMENTS**

- 204 A. Mr. Von Buseck thanked everyone and stay safe.
- 205
- 206 B. Mrs. Laveglia thanked Sheri, Carol, and Tina for helping the committee getting
207 through this type of meeting.
208
- 209 C. Mr. Kinken thanked Mrs. Coleman for her time this evening.
210

211

212 **9. ADJOURNMENT** Chairman Truett adjourned the meeting at 7:30 PM.
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227