

**Minutes**  
**Regular Meeting of the Florence County Planning Commission**  
**Tuesday, December 19, 2023 at 6:00 p.m.**  
**County Complex, Room 803**  
**180 N. Irby St., Florence, South Carolina 29501**

The Florence County Planning Department staff posted the agenda for the meeting on the information boards at the main entrance and lobby of the County Complex and on the information board in the lobby of the Planning and Building Inspection Departments office.

The agenda was also mailed to the media.

**I. Call to Order:**

Chairman Cheryl Floyd, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**II. Attendance:**

**Commissioners Present:** Cheryl Floyd, Chairman  
Dwight Johnson, Vice-Chairman  
Allie Brooks  
Doris Lockhart  
Linda Borgman

**Commissioners Absent:** Glynn Willis  
Karon Epps  
Mark Fountain  
Jeffrey Tanner

**Staff Present:** J. Shawn Brashear, Planning Director  
Ethan Brown, Deputy Director  
Derrick Singletary, Senior Planner  
Brian Kennedy, Engineering  
Lisa Becoat, Administrative Assistant/Secretary

**Public Attendance:** See sign in sheets on file with the Florence County Planning Department.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd led the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag and Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson provided the invocation for the meeting.

**III. Review and Motion of Minutes**

- **Meeting of October 24, 2023**

**Motion to approve minutes** – Commissioner Allie Brooks made a motion to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of October 24, 2023 / Second – Commissioner Doris Lockhart / Unanimously approved 5 to 0 the minutes of the October 24, 2023 Planning Commission meeting.

#### **IV. Public Hearing**

##### **Map Amendments:**

**PC#2023-38 A Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment Requested By Sammie Jo Lewis To Change The Future Land Use Designation From Suburban Development District To Variable Development District 2 For Property Located At 321 N. Pamplico Hwy As Shown On Florence County Tax Map Number 60001, Block 01, Parcel 006.**

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear requested of the Commission to remove the item for presentation from the agenda as the applicant had since rescinded their request. He further stated that it still appeared on the agenda because it had already been advertised as an item for public hearing at the meeting. The item is a request for a Comprehensive Plan map amendment which had to be advertised well in advance of the additional items that appeared on the agenda. Staff is requesting that the item be withdrawn from the agenda for presentation.

Commissioner Allie Brooks made a motion that the requested map amendment **PC #2023-38** be withdrawn and removed from the meeting agenda. / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / The Commission voted 5 to 0 to remove the map amendment request **PC#2023-38** from the meeting agenda.

**PC#2023-39 Map Amendment Requested By David Marshall Munn To Change The Zoning Designation For Property Of Tax Map Number 60003, Block 01, Parcel 005 Located At 211 S. Walnut Street Pamplico, SC From R-1 Single Family Residential District To B-3 General Commercial District.**

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <http://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the property was 2.35 acres on South Walnut Street in County Council District 2. Water and sewer are available through the Town of Pamplico. The property is presently split zoned R-1 and B-3 and the applicant desires to rectify the split zoning of the property. He stated that a letter was received from the Town of Pamplico and a copy was previously provided to the Commission Members. Additionally, an amendment to the letter was received by staff and provided to the Commission Members which indicates that the Town does not oppose the map amendment request. He went through the slide presentation and provided some images of the property including an alleyway on the property that was never developed. The property is split zoned with the B-3 designation on the front of the property facing Walnut Street and the R-1 designation on the rear of the property which sides Second Avenue. The applicant desires to have the entire parcel zoned with a B-3 designation. Staff posted the property and sent letters to adjacent property owners per the Florence County Ordinance.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there were any questions and or discussion from the Commission.

There were no questions and or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there was any public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested map amendment.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there was any public in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested map amendment.

There was no public in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested map amendment.

There were no further questions, comments and or discussion and Commissioner Doris Lockhart made a motion that the requested map amendment **PC #2023-39** be approved / Second – Commissioner Allie Brooks / The Commission voted 5 to 0 to approve the requested map amendment **PC #2023-39**.

After the motion was approved the Secretary made the presenter aware that there were public comments regarding PC item #2023-39 that were not provided to the Commission. Mr. Brashear read the comments received pertaining to the requested map amendment PC #2023-39. (A copy of the comments and inquiries are maintained at the Florence County Planning and Building Department.) He further stated that the Commission would have to reconsider the motion so that they could include and consider the comments that were received regarding the requested map amendment PC #2023-39.

Commissioner Doris Lockhart made a motion that the requested map amended be reconsidered with the received comments / Second – Commissioner Allie Brooks / The Commission voted 5 to 0 to reconsider the motion for the requested map amendment PC #2023-39.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there was any questions and or discussion regarding the map amendment request from the Commission and or from any of the public that were in attendance at the meeting.

Mr. David Marshall Munn 210 S. Walnut Street, Pamplico the property owner was present in the meeting and made comments. He stated that he grew up in the house that is on the property. The front of the property is zoned B-3 and was zoned years ago by his father when he was the Mayor of Pamplico. The alleyway that was previously there was closed many years ago and no longer exists. He desires to extend the B-3 zoning designation that is already on the property to the entire parcel. The zoning designation will not affect any of the neighboring properties as the back of the property drops down to a slop. This would make it hard to build anything on the back of the property unless it were on stilts as it drops about fifteen to twenty feet. He further stated that they did not intend to do anything undesirable with the property but just desired the entire parcel to be zoned as B-3.

There was questions and discussion by the Commission.

In response to questions and discussions by the Commission Mr. Munn stated that Mr. Holt's property was to the West of the proposed lot.

In response to questions and discussion by the Commission Mr. Brashear stated that the Comprehensive Plan designated the property to an area that supports B-3 and not R-1.

There were no further questions, comments and or discussion and Commissioner Doris Lockhart made a motion that the requested map amendment **PC #2023-39** be approved including all comments and inquiries received regarding the requested map amendment / Second – Commissioner Allie Brooks / The Commission voted 5 to 0 to approve the requested map amendment **PC #2023-39** including all comments and inquiries received.

**PC#2023-40 Map Amendment Requested By Hugh Wilcox To Change The Zoning Designation For Property Of Tax Map Number 00053, Block 04, Parcel 030 Located At The Intersection Of W. Palmetto Street And Alligator Road Florence, SC From Unzoned To Planned Development District, Designated As (PD-23-2).**

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <http://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the property was located in County Council District Four and is approximately 53.65 acres. The property is located off of West 76, Palmetto Street just past the interstate where Palmetto Street intersects Alligator Road. The property is currently unzoned and staff conducted a Technical Review of the Sketch Plan and all matters have been resolved to bring the item to the Commission for review and recommendation approval.

Mr. Brashear provided the comments and inquiries received pertaining to the requested map amendment PC #2023-40. (A copy of the comments and inquiries are maintained at the Florence County Planning and Building Department.)

Mr. Brashear continued through the presentation and stated that the sketch plan provided information regarding the planned development including the dimensions of the lots and the parcels and what could be expected to be built on the planned development. Once the Commission approves the planned development that is what can be built and nothing more without additional review and approval. It is a three phased project with a combination of 92 single family residential units, 70 townhome lots, 216 multi-family units, and 90,000 square feet of commercial space available and or allotted on the property. Two separate options for the commercial aspect of the planned development and information has been provided on the submitted sketch plans.

(Staff has additionally received some emails regarding the requested map amendment and copies of the emails were provided to the Commission. Mr. Brashear provided the comments and contents of the emails received and copies of those emails and comments are maintained at the Florence County Planning and Building Department.)

Mr. Brashear further stated that Mr. Brian Kennedy, Florence County's Engineering Manager, who supervises stormwater projects as they progress in the County, was also present in the meeting and had visited the area of the site over the weekend after and during a heavy storm. Letters were sent to all property owners, adjacent property owners, and the public meeting was posted and advertised in the local newspaper per Florence County Ordinance.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there was any questions and or discussion from the Commission.

In response to questions and comments from the Commission Mr. Brashear stated that the Florence County Ordinance did not require a traffic study for the proposed project.

There were additional comments from the Commission regarding a traffic study, the safety of the new residence and surrounding area and the true impact the proposed planned development would have on the community.

In response to questions and comments from the Commission Mr. Brashear stated that a review of the plans showed three egress points from the residential portion of the proposed development. One at the top right

towards W. Palmetto where the townhome sections are and one further down where the apartments are towards Alligator Road. There is also an access for the multi-family section that is towards Alligator Road and across the road from there is an existing commercial establishment.

There was additional comments and discussion regarding a traffic study and the planned development.

In response to questions and comments from the Commission regarding a traffic study Mr. Brashear stated that Florence County did have an Ordinance that discussed and had the requirements for a traffic study and the requested project did not meet the threshold for requiring a traffic study for Florence County and or the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT). Although the County Ordinance does not require a traffic study, if the Commission requested a traffic study the developer would have to pay a third party to conduct such a study. The South Carolina Department of Transportation representative was present at the Technical Review Meeting. If the Commission denied the request for the planned development some parts of the project could still move forward. The commercial aspect of the project including the apartments could move forward under the present unzoned zoning designation. The townhomes could not be constructed because they have zero yard setbacks and since the property is unzoned the minimum side yard setback is five feet. Private roads are only allowed in a planned development so the developer would have to request sketch plan approval for the residential single family dwellings but they could push and build multi-family units by right entirely across the site as access to the apartment buildings would be considered parking lots and not roads that would be addressed by the Commission. If they desired to build single family housing it would require sub-division of the land and sketch plan approval by the Planning Commission.

There were no further questions and or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there was any public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the requested map amendment.

Mr. Mike Wooten with Bolton & Menk Engineering, 1298 Professional Drive, Myrtle Beach, SC was present in the meeting and spoke in favor of the requested map amendment. He stated that they are the Engineers for the proposed project and that Mr. Wilcox was representing the map amendment as they are close friends and he is local and could answer any questions that staff and or others may have regarding the project quicker than it would be to get in touch with him. He indicated that Mr. Bob Weaver a local Engineer was unaware that he was involved as the Engineer for the project. He indicated that they are friendly competitors as Mr. Weaver also has an office in North Myrtle Beach. He stated that when he learned that Mr. Weaver had some concerns regarding the project he emailed him a copy of the plans and they traded some emails back and forth. He read one of the last emails that Mr. Weaver sent him. (Chris, Mike and Hugh: Thanks for the proposed PD plan. The proposed plan should work well with the uses listed, however, I would hope that if the PD is approved entertainment commercial uses would exclude sexually related businesses. I also wanted to make sure that all turning movements at the U.S. 76 Alligator Road intersection will have clear site distances with adequate lighting. The intersection is very dark at night and with no existing street lights, except for my business, trucks and adjacent businesses have trouble making the turns at the intersection as it exists today. I will not be attending the meeting and just want to let you know that I am not opposed to this project. Bob.) He stated that he could read to the Commission his response but that was the content of the email. The developer does intend to conduct a traffic study, even though it was not required by SCDOT or by Florence County as they want to ensure that their turning lanes and everything are completed per the regulations. They anticipated some questions regarding stormwater management and just over the weekend the area experienced about eight inches of rain and none of their previous projects had any issues. The purpose of a Planned Development (PD) District (PDD) is to allow for a mix of uses and to be able to plan those mixed uses and integrate them together so that one benefits the other. The State Law was abused for many years as people used PD's just to get smaller lots or to get something that normally was not allowed under regular zoning. The proposed project meets the letter of the law and the intent of the law for a PDD.

The sketch plan provides Florence County a clear picture of what the developer plans to do and they feel this is the best zoning for the proposed tract of land. With the zoning as it presently is there could be five or six different uses for the property but the PD limits the site to what has been presented and requested. As for the stormwater management of the project, he stated that they would meet and or exceed many local and or State standards for the stormwater management in the design development of the project. Mr. Chris Chockley is their Senior Landscape Architect for their Engineering Firm and is responsible for developing the plan. He was present in the meeting along with Mr. Wooten and could respond to any questions if the Commission, staff and or public had any.

There was questions and discussion by the Commission.

In response to questions and discussions by the Commission Mr. Wooten stated that they would be conducting a traffic study and did not want to spend any monies on the study until they were certain the zoning would be approved. If the zoning were not approved the developer was going to look at other options of building out their property. The beauty of the project has a broad spectrum of uses. With the cutting industry of Florence County and the existing industry, Florence County is in short supply of housing. This project will provide an array of housing. Three different opportunities for living in the area and the opportunity for commercial uses adjacent to it. You may not have to get into your car to get a loaf of bread. In regards to schools, with growth in the area comes children and with children you will need schools. He apologized for and to the school district but there is not anything the developer can do about the school system unless people just stop having babies. He stated the concerns of the schooling were valid but they could not speak to that, but that there would be greater concern if the zoning were not approved and the developer chose to build out the property with multi-family housing. That would produce twice the number of housing on the property.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there was any public in attendance who desired to speak in opposition to the requested map amendment.

Mr. Jason Pierce Vice-President of the Layton Anderson Funeral Home 4210 W. Palmetto Street, Florence, SC was present in the meeting and indicated that he was not actually in opposition but desired to read a statement that he typed to present to the Commission.

The contents of his letter is as follows: Dear Planning Commission Members: I want to thank you for your important contributions as you attempt to work toward the good and proper development of lands within our county. It is very much recognized that your decisions as Commissioners potentially effects everyone who enters within the borders of our county, but most especially your decisions have great impact upon those who live, work, and learn within our county borders.

With the above knowledge in mind, I would like to comment on the proposed planned development district (PD-23-2) which is located approximately to the northeast of the intersection of West Palmetto Street and Alligator Road. My immediate interest in this project is as Vice-President of Layton-Anderson Funeral Home, Inc. (Hereafter referred to as Layton-Anderson) which is successor to Layton-Perry, Inc., I am a stockholder with plurality of stock. It is to be noted that the proposed development will surround, as you well aware, all three sides of Layton-Anderson property.

After visiting the Florence County Planning Office, which you are also aware of, I was able to get somewhat of an idea of what is being planned for the property in question. It is quite obvious that this will be a major development if completed. Indeed many questions exist in light of this planned development and I am sure more will arise after reviewing the sketch plan for this project.

This project appears to be one of much higher density than has been traditionally found within our area. One of my questions is will there be or has there been a traffic study conducted (and we already have that answer and know what is going to happen there).

Also, the next thing does the Planning Commission consider the impact that higher density developments will have on the quality of life within the area of a proposed development or is this question better posed to our policy makers on county council? It should be noted that within Article 5 of the South Carolina Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act of 1994 it is stated that one reason for local planning and zoning is “to prevent the overcrowding of land, to avoid undue concentration of population, and to lessen congestion in the streets.” No doubt higher density projects greatly increase the likelihood of the above concerns of our legislators occurring and hopefully our county planners and policy makers will take proper note of these concerns as found within South Carolina law.

Additional concerns, this is probably for later on but I want to go ahead and state them now. Will there be any limitation on the height of the proposed building? Can the height of the buildings be given at this time?

Is there a proposed fence planned on any or all sides of our adjoining property? If a fence is planned what is the proposed height of the fence and of what type of materials will it be constructed of?

What will be the setback requirements of the proposed buildings? Will the setbacks be different for each type of construction and if so what are the setbacks for each type of construction?

Will these proposed housing units be owner occupied or rentals? (We kind of got some of that answer already.) If there is a mixture of owner occupied and rental of units then what type of construction will be designated for each type of unit? In other words—I think we’ve got that information pretty much too.) And also, will short term rentals be allowed?

Who will enforce restrictive covenants? Will it eventually be the responsibility of a management company?

Will any action be taken to lessen the disruptive nature of construction to our business or any other nearby property owners during the construction phases?

Of particular concern is the existence of wet type soils in much of the proposed development. While I am sure a soil analysis study has been conducted or will be conducted, according to a review of existing USDA soil maps much of the proposed development consists of severe or moderately wet areas which can experience flooding. No doubt the existence of these type soils will require the implementation of engineering controls to address wetness and flooding concerns. It is of great concern to Layton-Anderson as to what type of engineering controls will be implemented as improper lack of drainage to too much fill dirt could adversely impact our property. (And he attached some information pertaining to USDA soil types for the potential development of the subject property for the Commission to review.)

I appreciate the Florence County Planning Commission taking the time to consider the concerns of Layton-Anderson. Addressing these concerns will help us at Layton-Anderson better prepare for what lies ahead with the proposed planned development of the adjoining properties. Although South Carolina law gives us legal standing to adjoining landowners to address their concerns, I have confidence in you as Commissioners to address any concerns in an appropriate manner. And I thank you all.

(The original letter and its contents are maintained at the Florence County Planning and Building Department.)

Mr. Walter White 1422 N. Sally Hill Road, Timmons ville, SC was present in the meeting and spoke opposed to the requested map amendment. He stated that he owns the property across the street from the proposed development on W. Palmetto Street. He presently has serious issues with flooding onto his property from another development that is adjacent to his property. The water from that development runs onto his property and he has been confronted about his property through his daughter who has no say so concerning his properties. He was not sure who contacted his daughter but they made an unreasonable offer for his property which was turned down. Highway 76 already has issues with water retention and Palmetto Paving did not do a good job with the road as flooding continues. It flooded his mother's home that he grew up in, the entire fifty acres that he owns across from the proposed development and their farm. They are concerned of where all the water is going to go from the proposed development as the only ditches for that area are on Alligator Road and if the water goes underground across the road those ditches are already overflowing. His sister has been in constant communication with SCDOT and the county regarding the ditches and flooding along Highway 76. Since Alligator Road and Highway 76 has changed they have experienced issues with vehicles running the stop sign and ending up in their field; destroying the fence and crops. There will be issues with traffic with the proposed development as Alligator Road presently is unpassable with only three lanes. The ditches have been put in but they cannot see where all the water is going or going to go. There will be a water issue with the proposed project and their concern is whether it will further compound that area by adding more water onto their property, as well as, the adjacent property owners along Alligator Road. Since the widening of Highway 76 SCDOT lied to their family and caused water to flood the farm fields and their property. The property now has pine trees and holds water so some would say it is a wetland. He supposes it is wetland now as water has been forced onto the property he inherited since the death of his mother. He is concerned about where all the water is going to go.

The traffic is another issue as he has seen the danger on Alligator Road when Ard Trucking trucks are coming and going. He stated that he wonders why a stoplight was not placed at the intersection when they changed the road. He is more concerned with the water issues than he is concerned with traffic.

Ms. Martha Coats 3 Coach Lane, Simpsonville, SC the property owner of 4445 W. Palmetto Street, Timmons ville, SC property inherited from her mother, was present in the meeting and spoke opposed to the requested map amendment. She stated that she is the sister of Mr. Walter White and that her property additionally is adjacent and across the street from the proposed location. She agrees with the concerns of others regarding the traffic study and reiterated that there is currently a flooding issue after the expansion of Highway 76. She has been informed by the County and SCDOT that the ditches were expanded during the road widening and the ditches are designed to collect water and not to have it run off anywhere. She is not an Engineer but that sounds backwards to her and she is upset regarding the road expansion and the ongoing flooding issues it has caused them. The standing water that now backs up onto their property was never there when they were growing up nor was in there during the lifetime that her mother resided on the property. Their concern is they already have flooding issues on their property and they desire to know where all the excess water is going to go. They also have concerns about the traffic and the additional congestion it will cause, including the concerns with the school district. She stated that she wants and welcomes progress but wants to ensure that the Commission addresses these issues and put more thought into the water and traffic issues before any residential and commercial projects are approved.

There were no questions and or comments from the Commission and the Chairman Cheryl Floyd requested if there was any public in attendance who desired to provide any final rebuttal comments.

Mr. Mike Wooten desired to make additional comments and indicated that he has a lot of respect for Mr. Weaver and they have been friendly competitors for approximately thirty-five years. Mr. Weaver is satisfied that the engineering firm has all concerns handled. SCDOT will not allow them and or anyone else to increase the drainage that is going to their right of way by one gallon under a designed storm event. That is a



hard and fast rule that they will not allow the developer and or engineer to change. Under state law they cannot put anymore drainage into a roadway ditch that is not already going there right now. They would have to store the difference between pre and post development runoff on the site. Local ordinances and state regulations forces them to do that. They will conduct a traffic study and have the capability of doing that in house. Because the traffic study was not required, their client did not want to spend the money on the traffic study until they were assured that they would be able to build the project that they had hoped. They feel like they have a handle on the storm water and traffic and have a lot of work to do on the project as they have not initiated the design phase as the present project is just a sketch plan for the proposed zoning. When they begin to design their project they will be working with County Staff closely. They are providing business cards to the adjacent neighbors of the project so that they will be easily accessible to them for any questions and or concerns they may have. He further stated that he has been in the business for over forty years and he understands citizen's fears about development next door and he can appreciate it.

There were questions and discussions by the Commission regarding the stormwater retention ponds on the property.

In response to questions and discussion by the Commission Mr. Wooten stated that the water from the three retention ponds on the sketch plan will go where the water is presently going. The purpose of the retention ponds is to hold the water for a period of time so that the water leaving the project does not leave at a greater rate than it is leaving the property right now. Some counties ordinances require that the difference between pre and post stormwater plus a percentage; so that when a project is finished less stormwater is leaving the site. And they are required to study the stormwater for a two year, five year, ten year, twenty-five year, a fifty and a one hundred year storm. With the rain this past Sunday on the Coast it was equivalent to a five hundred year event and they had no issues with flooding on any of their over thousands of projects. Additionally, their firm has not been brought before a judge from a lawsuit from stormwater in their over forty years of business. Their project would not increase any water from the present flooding that the adjacent property owners are presently having. They cannot help them with the problems they are presently having as their property is across the road from the proposed project and their drainage does not affect what is happening to their property. (He identified on the sketch plan for the public in attendance at the meeting where the three retention ponds were.) He further stated that there is a pipe network that connects the ponds and provides additional storage for water.

There was further discussion by the Commission and a request that the developer and engineer work with Layton-Anderson Funeral Facility to ensure that buffers for noise, trash and the likes be implemented.

Mr. Wooten in response to the discussion from the Commission stated that their client Great Southern Homes was one of the better regional builders that they work for and that they take great care of their sites. They will ensure that buffers and landscaping is in place per Florence County Ordinances.

There was further questions and discussion by the Commission regarding the selection of the proposed site for the project.

Mr. Wooten in response to the questions and discussion from the Commission stated that their engineering firm did not choose the site. The site was chosen by their client and engineering and landscaping architecture assistance was sought from them. They are unsure how their client was made aware of and or selected the proposed site for their project. He further stated that tract builders are actively looking at Florence. It is a natural growth area with industry and people moving into the area and they will need housing. The builders are just trying to get ahead of the curve. Alligator Road widening is presently under construction and will be completed long before any bulldozer comes to the proposed site. The engineering firm has to go through the design of the phases which will take four to six months and then regulatory permitting. Once zoning is

obtained it will most likely be a year before any dirt is moved at the proposed location. That is how long it takes to go through the process.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd made comments to the public in attendance and explained the zoning of a Planned Development. She additionally made them aware that if it changes were made to the proposed sketch plan that was presented for the zoning map amendment then the planned development would have to be brought back to the Planning Commission and County Council for review, recommendation and approval of those changes.

There was questions and discussion by the Commission of what could be built on the proposed site if zoning were not approved. They discussed the traffic study and stormwater issues that were brought up by the public in attendance at the meeting.

Mr. Brian Kennedy Florence County's Engineering Manager was present in the meeting and stated that because staff had been contacted regarding stormwater concerns in the proposed area that may or may not have involved the SCDOT project on Alligator Road. Staff right after the peak of the storm on Sunday, December 17, 2023 went out and examined the ditches to monitor the swell of the water in the ditches to see which manner the stormwater was flowing on the sides of Alligator Road. The way SCDOT has designed that and executed it has the water that is entering the swells on both sides of Alligator Road going towards interstate 95. That water is carried straight out that way and does not veer off into any of the ditches on the other roads. At Alligator Road and Southern Aire, the location of the original Ard Trucking site before the expansion and the road side drainage ditch on Southern Aire that is next to that property drains towards Alligator Road. That water joins the stormwater that is headed out towards interstate 95. That is away from Highway 76 is what was observed onsite.

There were no further questions, comments and or discussion and Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson made a motion that the requested map amendment **PC #2023-40** be approved / Second – Commissioner Linda Borgman / The Commission voted 4 to 1 to approve the requested map amendment **PC #2023-40 from Unzoned to a Planned Development PD-23-2** / Commissioner Doris Lockhart voted in opposition to the requested map amendment.

The Planning Commission meeting recessed at 7:17 p.m.

The Planning Commission meeting was called back to order at 7:25 p.m.

**PD Amendment:**

**PC#2023-41 Map Amendment Requested By Palmetto Corp (Shawn Godwin) To Amend An Existing Planned Development, Designated As (PD-19-1), Located At The Intersection Of Quartz Lane And Dunton Drive, Florence.**

(Copy of the staff report and presentation are available at the Florence County Planning Department and on the Florence County website at: <http://florenceco.org/planning/commission/archives.php>).

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear presented the staff report and presentation to the Commission. He stated that the existing planned development existed in County Council District Six. The total acreage is 17.75 acres for the particular parcel that is within the planned development. The PD amendment request is to modify a little over 7 acres of the previously approved planned development 19-1. It is a phased project with several single-family residential homes, townhomes, existing commercial properties and vacant land proposed for commercial use. The developer is requesting to modify/amend the planned development to utilize some of

the reserved commercial space and convert it into residential use. The development is on Highway 76 directly behind Bootie Brothers in Florence and the developer purposes to convert some reserved commercial use property with single family residential units complimentary to what is already present within the previously approved planned development. There is a commercial DEA building within the PD and the portion of property below it is where the developer desires to convert to single family residential units complimentary to what is already located just south of the proposed site. Forty-eight single family residential lots with water and sewer available by the City of Florence. It will have to meet all the building setbacks which are already included in the existing planned development. The adjacent property owners were notified and the property posted and public notice ad ran per the Florence County Ordinances.

There was questions and discussion by the Commission of where the stormwater drainage was as the original part of the planned development and would that remain the same. Additional comments were made that indicated when a planned development changed it must be brought back to the Commission for recommendation and to County Council for approval.

In response to the questions and discussion by the Commission Mr. Brashear stated that as the planned development continues to be built out the stormwater drainage will also be built out; and, once the project, if approved, then the stormwater pond would be completed accordingly. The developer with the previously approved planned developed was locked into the commercial use and in order to change that use the planned development had to be brought back before the Planning Commission for recommendation and to County Council to pass three readings for approval to move ahead with any changes.

Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there was any further questions and or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Brashear provided the comments and inquiries received pertaining to the requested amendment to the development PC #2023-41. (A copy of the comments and inquiries are maintained at the Florence County Planning and Building Department.)

There were no further questions and or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there was any public in attendance who desired to speak in favor of the amendment to the requested planned development.

Mr. Dan Park 11655 Highway 707, Murrells Inlet, SC a representative of the Earthworks Group was present in the meeting spoke in favor of the amendment to the requested planned development. He stated that their company had completed the original design for the project. He stated the original design was to have commercial use in the proposed area however, they desire to move forward with single family residential housing. They are not redesigning the stormwater for the site so the stormwater will be oversized as single family housing generally has less run off than commercial property as there are no large parking lots and such. There is also the very large swamp that everything is running off into and they are unaware of stormwater concerns in the proposed area. When it was originally designed in the past they provided for more commercial as they anticipated the area to have more than it presently does. Their client has held the property since 2006 and has tried to sell commercial property and they hope to sell more as the area grows but right now they feel the area would benefit more from single family homes. The homes will be priced from \$280,000 to \$300,000 which is not high end or low end.

There were no questions and or discussion from the Commission and Chairman Cheryl Floyd inquired if there was any public in attendance who desired to speak opposed to and or had questions regarding the amendment to the requested planned development.

Mr. Steven Bruno 4056 Milan Road, Florence, SC was present in the meeting and stated that he had some questions as the President of the Homeowners Association of their Community. They are not opposed to the amendment of the planned development just would like some answers to some questions. Will there be a wall dividing the proposed single family residential homes or will there be access to walk right over to that area. Is the proposed area going to part of the same Community that presently exists? The residents within the Townhomes have complained about noise and run off onto their properties. As the residents ask the president questions he is inquiring on their behalf.

In response to questions and inquiries by Mr. Bruno, Mr. Brashear stated that the proposed plans did not show and or demonstrate any privacy fencing and or walls to the proposed site. Some of the property owners within the development have put up privacy fencing to create separation between them and their neighbors behind them and to the sides but the plans do not show privacy fencing or walls. He further stated that as far as the noise and those concerns regarding the property; until the subdivision is built out and completed the community is going to continually deal with that issue. If there are issues concerning run off and or stormwater someone from our office can and will come out and take a look at the site now and in the future. During construction there will be run off if the silt fencing and or other material used is not maintained. But if the community has issues they are to contact the Planning staff so that it can be addressed and corrected. During the construction phases there will be some type of material used to prevent the free flow of sedimentation out into the streets and existing ditches and land.

There were questions from the Commission regarding buffers for residential properties.

In response to the questions from the Commission Mr. Brashear stated that there were no buffer requirements for residential to residential property.

There were no further questions, comments and or discussion and Commissioner Allie Brooks made a motion that the requested amendment to the planned development (PD-19-1) **PC #2023-41** be approved / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / The Commission voted 5 to 0 to approve the amendment to the planned development (PD-9-1) **PC #2023-41**.

The Public Hearing was closed.

## **V. Director's Report:**

Mr. J. Shawn Brashear presented the summary plat and building reports and they were also attached and presented for the Commission's review.

- **Summary Plat Reports for (October and November 2023)**
- **Building Reports for (October and November 2023)**

Mr. Brashear presented the Draft 2024 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule to the Commission for review and adoption. He further stated that some dates had been adjusted to account for holiday periods for Thanksgiving and Christmas.

There was discussion and comments from the Commission regarding the Easter Holiday which is set for March 31, 2024 and the PC meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 26, 2024. There was discussion regarding Memorial Day which is set for May 27, 2024 and the PC meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 28, 2024. Adjusting the date for that meeting would mean adjusting the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting schedule of May 21, 2024.

There was no further questions, comments and or discussion and Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson made a motion that the Draft 2024 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule dates be approved / Second Commissioner Allie Brooks / The Commission voted 5 to 0 to approve the Draft 2024 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule.

**VI. Adjournment:**

There were no further questions, comments and or discussion and Chairman Cheryl Floyd called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Allie Brooks made a motion that the meeting be adjourned / Second – Vice-Chairman Dwight Johnson / The Commission voted 5 to 0 to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

---

Lisa M. Becoat  
Secretary

Approved by:

---

J. Shawn Brashear  
Planning Director

\*These minutes reflect only actions taken and do not represent a true verbatim transcript of the meeting.