

Planning Commission

June 21, 2023

A meeting of the Planning Commission was held this date at 5:14 p.m. in the public meeting room at 2 George Street.

Notice of this meeting was sent to all local news media.

PRESENT

Commission Members: Charlie Karesh, Chair, Harry Lesesne, Vice-Chair, Jimmy Bailey, Donna Jacobs, McKenna Joyce, and Sunday Lempesis.

City staff: Christopher Morgan, Ana Harp, Philip Overcash, Omar Muhammad, and Philip Clapper.

Others: Timothy Cook, Nathan Schutte, Todd Richardson, Ezra Zankel, Stephen Adams, Kevin Grammer, Chris Young, Tim Cook, Thomas Wilson, and Gerald Willis.

Link to meeting recording: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ykvm-ix0I74&t=303s>

Chair Karesh explained the rules and procedures of the meeting, and introduced the Commissioners.

Mr. Morgan introduced Planning staff.

MINUTES

1. **Request Approval of Minutes from April 20, 2023, Joint Meeting of the Planning Commission and Community Development Committee; and May 17, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting.**

Ms. Jacobs listed corrections to the minutes.

On a motion of Jimmy Bailey, Jr., seconded by Harry Lesesne, the Commission voted unanimously to approve Minutes Item 1, with corrections.

REZONINGS

1. **1739 Hollydale Ct Johns Island | TMS #313000023 | Approx. 5.37 ac. Request rezoning from Single-Family Residential (SR-1) to Business Park (BP).**

Owner: TBLB LLC

Applicant: Timothy Cook

Mr. Morgan explained the Item and its location.

Staff felt BP was a use that would fit better. Single family development had been challenging because of the topography.

It was designated City Center in the Comprehensive Plan.

Images of the property were shown.

Staff recommended approval.

Chair Karesh called for the applicant to speak.

Mr. Cook said he was there to answer any questions.

Chair Karesh asked for speakers in favor or in opposition to speak.

No one asked to speak.

Ms. Jacobs asked if it was correct that there would be a small portion that would remain SR-1.

Mr. Morgan said that was correct, and pointed it out.

Ms. Lempesis said her concern was that across the lake was all residential, and she was worried that the residential area could eventually be turned into BP.

Mr. Morgan said the border would have to be buffered as a part of the development process.

Ms. Jacobs said it was in the Future Land Use Map as City Center. She wished the Water Plan was finished, because to her knowledge, the location of the property was on one of the highest corridors.

Mr. Bailey said the change seemed appropriate, given the buffer requirement.

Ms. Lempesis asked Mr. Morgan if the adjacent parcels would also be going to BP.

Mr. Morgan said there was a request for one of the parcels to be rezoned to BP, but there was no change being proposed on the properties Ms. Lempesis had indicated.

Mr. Lesesne said creating more jobs on Johns Island would ease traffic coming off the Island.

On a motion of Jimmy Bailey, Jr., seconded by Harry Lesesne, the Commission voted unanimously to approve Rezoning Item 1.

2. 1745 – 1709 Meeting Street Road Peninsula – Neck Area | TMS #4640200091, 4640600009, 4640600010 | Approx. 1.01 ac. Request rezoning to include property into the Accommodations Overlay (A).

Owner: 1745 Meeting Street Road, LLC

Applicant: Nathan J. Schutte

Mr. Morgan explained the Item.

The site was adjacent to the Wonderer. The applicant wanted to add the site to the Accommodations Overlay. The property was on a primary route and not in a residential area. The Accommodations Plan had not yet identified that area for accommodations use. Nothing yet had come up that far on the peninsula.

Staff wanted to wait for more data to be gathered on the area, and thus were not comfortable with placing the property into the Accommodations Overlay. However, they did realize that it was a transition area for the City, and perhaps the applicant could make the case for why Accommodations Overlay could work there.

Mr. Schutte said that they acknowledged that they were in a gray area. That said, his client had been successful in the area with the social club. Accommodations would be more than appropriate to complement the site. They were adjacent to themselves, a rail line, and Meeting Street.

Accommodations were already approved on the Magnolia side. They appreciated that the City wanted to spend some time thinking about it, but he said they were in a position to do a

successful accommodations project in the area and complement the already-approved accommodations on the Magnolia side.

Lastly, they knew that the Planning Commission was but one step in the process, and ultimately they would need to get approval from the BZA and acquire a Special Exception. He asked that they be given that opportunity.

Chair Karesh asked how they saw the development, as it was only a one-acre site.

Mr. Schutte said the social club worked as a wonderful set of amenities to the community.

Chair Karesh asked Mr. Schutte to explain the social club.

Mr. Schutte said the Wonderer was a social club that had various amenities for anyone in the community who wanted to be a member. There were events and other activities, as well as a fitness component. The Accommodations was an evolution of that which would allow for a place where a member's guests could stay.

Mr. Bailey asked if the hotel would be operated by the Wonderer.

Mr. Schutte said they would be operated in conjunction with one another. One would not necessarily have to be a member to stay there. If one were a guest of the hotel, they would have access to the amenities.

Mr. Bailey asked if it would look and feel like a hotel.

Mr. Schutte said it would.

Mr. Bailey asked if the hotel could be operated independently if the Wonderer were to fail.

Mr. Schutte said he imagined so, but was unsure. He said they would not have to put many things required of most hotels into this one because the Wonderer had those requirements already, such as meeting space and other amenities. They were complementary uses.

Mr. Lesesne asked what the requirements were for going to BZA.

Mr. Schutte said all accommodations requests went to the BZA. The challenge was to demonstrate that they would be complementing the City.

Mr. Lesesne asked how much capacity the hotel would have.

Mr. Schutte said they currently conceived of 80-90 rooms. They would be unable to secure 150. It remained to be seen whether they could do 90 rooms well. They were asking for the opportunity to explore that process.

Ms. Jacobs said she had previously seen small sites that met all requirements.

Chair Karesh said the changes in that area were tremendous.

Mr. Lesesne asked what a potential planning process might look like.

Mr. Morgan said the Peninsula Plan would cover upper Meeting. A lot of stuff was going on up there.

Ms. Jacobs said she thought it was better to wait for the plan, as staff had suggested.

On a motion of Donna Jacobs, seconded by Sunday Lempesis, the Commission voted unanimously to recommend disapproval of Rezoning Item 2.

Mr. Bailey said that while he agreed with the motion, he did believe that while the planning process unfolded, accommodations would certainly be deemed appropriate for that area, but he did not know where and it may have been early.

Mr. Lesesne agreed.

SUBDIVISIONS

1. **806 Magnolia Road Magnolia – West Ashley | TMS 4180900030 | Approx. 2.08 ac. Request subdivision concept plan approval for nine (9) Single-Family homes with associated infrastructure. Zoned: SR-2.**

Owner: STYO

Applicant: Barrier Island Engineering

Ms. Harp explained the Item.

It would be an infill project. There was a single-family home there. The applicant was proposing pervious pavers.

The proposed lots conformed with SR-2 requirements.

Images were shown.

No wetlands were on the parcel. There were some grand trees on the lot that were proposed to be removed. The applicant was aware that their removal required approval from the BZA – Site Design.

It was surrounded by single-family residential uses.

Approval of the request would only be for the concept plan. The applicant would have to return to TRC for preliminary plat and road construction approvals. The plans needed to comply with the City Code and most importantly the Stormwater Design Standards Manual.

TRC had approved the concept plan and staff recommended approval.

Mr. Richardson with Synchronicity said he was representing the applicant. He explained the application and offered to answer questions.

Public Comment

Opposed

Ezra Zanke!

- Represented a majority of the homeowners who were affected by the plan.
- Understood the property would be developed, but felt strongly that it should be done in a way that honored the nature of the neighborhood.
- The plan proposed placing much larger homes unlike anything nearby.
- Said they would oppose the development unless the developers agreed to conditions.
 - o All homes built with a 25ft setback from the property line.
 - o No home height higher than 20ft.
 - o The developer installs a 6ft fence around the subdivision prior to transferring the land to any homebuilders.
 - o The developer installs a 15-ft landscape barrier around the perimeter of the subdivision prior to transferring the land to any homebuilders.

- Believed that those conditions were essential.
- Asked the Commission to hold the developer to those conditions.

Stephen Adams

- Supported Mr. Zankel's points.

Kevin Grammer

- Supported Mr. Zankel's points.

Mr. Richardson said that in the past, they had contemplated a rezoning and encountered two different people claiming to be the neighborhood president. They heard that a rezoning was not supported at all, so they came back with a by-right plan. They met all the SR-2 standards. A perimeter 25ft setback was required, and they were honoring that. It would likely be the intention to build a property fence. The Planning Commission was not able to grant a height cap. That was an impossible conditioning. They would be in compliance with SR-2 zoning. They were doing everything right, and the application was legally compliant.

Mr. Young said they had met with the neighborhood president and had gone back and forth to address everyone's concerns. They had done their best to put their best foot forward.

Chair Karesh closed the public aspect.

Ms. Jacobs said the property was originally subdivided as a part of the original subdivision of Maryville. It went back to 1896. There were 18 lots that were combined to create the existing lot.

She said she knew the answer would be 'no,' but she wanted to ask the development team to be respectful of the existing home, which was over 100 years old. It was an important house with history that was currently being worked on.

Mr. Richardson said it was a candidate for the historic register, also. Their goal was to fix the house up.

Ms. Jacobs said she normally sided with the neighborhood, but the team had met all requirements at TRC, and they were using pervious pavers for stormwater management. This was perhaps the first time since she had been on the Planning Commission that there were no comments from Stormwater on the concept plan. There were extensive comments on the first review, but they had all been addressed.

Ms. Lempesis agreed. It complied with the standards.

Mr. Lesesne said the Commission's job was to approve or disapprove based on whether or not it met the requirements, and to do no further judgement beyond that. Staff said it met the requirements, so it would be approved.

Chair Karesh said Mr. Richardson could attest that things did not always go the developer's way.

On a motion of Donna Jacobs, seconded by Sunday Lempesis, the Commission voted unanimously to approve Subdivisions Item 1.

2. Primus Park Cainhoy | TMS 2680000133 | Approx. 105.1 ac. Request subdivision concept plan approval for 102 Single-Family homes. Zoned: SR-2.

Owner: McAlister Togant Clements LLC

Applicant: Thomas and Hutton

DEFERRED

ZONINGS

1. **3124 Maybank Hwy Johns Island | TMS #313000021 | Approx. 5.0 ac. Request zoning of General Business (GB) on approx. 2.25 acres for the front portion of the property and Business Park (BP) on approximately 2.75 acres for the rear portion of the property. Zoned Maybank Highway Corridor Overlay Zone (OD-MHC) in Charleston County.**

Owner: TBLB LLC

Mr. Morgan explained the Item.

Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Cook explained the application and believed it fit right in with what the City was looking for.

On a motion of Jimmy Bailey, Jr., seconded by Harry Lesesne, the Commission voted unanimously to approve Zonings Item 1.

2. **1080 Bees Ferry Road West Ashley | TMS# 2870000219 | Approx 1.0 ac. Request Zoning of Conservation (C) on a portion of the property. Zoned R-4 in Charleston County.**

Owner: Commissioners of Public Works of the City of Charleston

Mr. Morgan explained the Item.

Staff recommended approval.

On a motion of Jimmy Bailey, Jr., seconded by McKenna Joyce, the Commission voted unanimously to approve Zonings Item 2.

3. **2202 South Dallerton Circle West Ashley | TMS# 3100700042 | Approx 0.26 ac. Request Zoning of Single-Family Residential (SR-1). Zoned Single-Family Residential (R-4) in Charleston County.**

Owner: Harriet E. Kitt

4. **1652 Boone Hall Drive West Ashley | TMS# 3531400141 | Approx. 0.29 ac. Request Zoning of Single-Family Residential (SR-1). Zoned Single-Family Residential (R-4) in Charleston County.**

Owner: Lisa and Kenneth LeBoeuf

5. **2944 Sugarbush Way West Ashley | TMS# 3581000078 | Approx. 0.29 ac. Request Zoning of Single-Family Residential (SR-1). Zoned Single-Family Residential (R-4) in Charleston County.**

Owner: Tupelo Hassman and Bradford Earle

6. **325 Stinson Drive West Ashley | TMS# 3500900076 | Approx. 0.23 Request Zoning of Single-Family Residential (SR-1). Zoned Single-Family Residential (R-4) in Charleston County.**

Owner: Gerald Willis

7. **1426 Bedford Drive West Ashley | TMS# 3520900088 | Approx. 0.33 Request Zoning of Single-Family Residential (SR-1). Zoned Single-Family Residential (R-4) in Charleston County.**

Owner: Wiley and Casey Sinkus

8. **1866 Ashley Hall Road West Ashley | TMS# 3531400007 | Approx. 0.32 Request Zoning of Single-Family Residential (SR-1). Zoned Single-Family Residential (R-4) in Charleston County.**

Owner: Darby Little

9. **1875 Saint Julian Drive West Ashley | TMS# 3331400024 | Approx. 0.44 ac. Request Zoning of Single-Family Residential (SR-1). Zoned Single-Family Residential (R-4) in Charleston County.**

Owner: Ashutosh Jaswani

Zonings Items 3-9 were taken together.

Mr. Morgan explained the Items.

On a motion of Sunday Lempesis, seconded by Jimmy Bailey, Jr., the Commission voted unanimously to approve Zonings Items 3-9.

10. **1532 Joan Street West Ashley | TMS# 3521300142 | Approx. 0.20 ac. Request Zoning of Single-Family Residential (SR-2). Zoned Single-Family Residential (R-4) in Charleston County.**

Owner: André Gallant

Mr. Morgan explained the Item.

On a motion of Sunday Lempesis, seconded by Harry Lesesne, the Commission voted unanimously to approve Zonings Items 10.

11. **1349 Ashley River Road West Ashley | TMS# 4180500002 | Approx. 0.30 ac. Request Zoning of Limited Business (LB). Zoned Saint Andrews Corridor Overlay District (OD STA) in Charleston County.**

Owner: Warfield Holdings, LLC

Mr. Morgan explained the Item.

On a motion of Jimmy Bailey, Jr., seconded by Harry Lesesne, the Commission voted unanimously to approve Zonings Items 11.

12. **3338 Maybank Hwy Johns Island | TMS# 2790000035 | Approx. 0.82 ac. Request Zoning of Limited Business (LB). Zoned Johns Island Maybank Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District (OD JO-MHC) in Charleston County.**

Owner: Paul Keller

Mr. Morgan explained the Item.

Mr. Wilson said he was happy to answer any questions. He was one of the business' owners and the leaseholder.

On a motion of Donna Jacobs, seconded by Sunday Lempesis, the Commission voted unanimously to approve Zonings Item 12.

13. 711 Blitchridge Road West Ashley | TMS# 3500100074 | Approx. 0.34 ac. Request zoning of SR-1 (Single-Family Residential). Zoned Dupont-Wappoo Overlay District (OD DUWAP) in Charleston County.

Owner: George and Lila Hawkins

Mr. Morgan explained the Item.

On a motion of Donna Jacobs, seconded by Jimmy Bailey, Jr., the Commission voted unanimously to approve Zonings Item 13.

PP&S STAFF UPDATES (as needed)

Mr. Morgan gave a short update on the Peninsula Plan.

He said Mr. Robert Summerfield would give the Commission an update in July.

Ms. Jacobs said the banner on the website for the Zoning Code Rewrite had a picture of the peninsula, but no other parts of the City. It gave the message that the Rewrite was only for the peninsula. She had suggested to them that it should have parts of every portion. People might see the peninsula view, and just turn away from it. She thought they needed to get their messaging right.

She asked if they could get an update from Mr. Dale Morris on the Water Plan. The information related to it was informative, but shocking.

Mr. Morgan said they could arrange that meeting for August.

Ms. Jacobs said she thought they should see him on a regular basis.

She said it was disconcerting that she did not find out about the potential Waterfront District before it was already in the media. She had concerns about it not being considered formally. It set a bad precedence.

Discussion ensued regarding the origination of the idea of the Waterfront District.

Ms. Jacobs asked if it was possible to look at the definitions they had at a more granular level. She had put a lot of thought into it before the previous meeting. She thought they had destinations that would work well within a "waterfront district" separate from the Union Pier area.

Ms. Lempesis agreed.

Mr. Lesesne agreed. It was an unusual way to arrive at the need for a new district.

Mr. Bailey said they had a Zoning Code Rewrite, the Peninsula Plan, the Water Plan, and he was concerned about having important updates combined with their regular agenda. He knew they had to have public meetings, but he asked if they could have Zoom meetings for updates on things like the Water Plan. He thought it might have been easier to schedule additional meetings that way.

Being at a meeting for 2.5 hours, followed by a presentation, it was tiring. The work was daunting, and he would do it, but time could be managed better.

Discussion ensued on the possibility of such virtual update meetings. It was agreed that staff would look into it.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

Philip Clapper
Clerk of Council's Office