

**CITY OF NORTH MYRTLE BEACH, SOUTH CAROLINA  
NORTH MYRTLE BEACH CITY HALL  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
Tuesday, September 8, 2020  
5:00 PM**

MINUTES

Harvey Eisner, Chairman  
Jessica Bell, Absent  
Harry Bruton, Absent  
Silvio Cutuli  
Ruth Anne Ellis  
James Snyder  
Callie Jean Wise

City Staff:  
Jim Wood  
Suzanne Pritchard  
Aaron Rucker

Allison Galbreath, City Clerk

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Eisner called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.
2. **ROLL CALL:** The Clerk called the roll and declared a quorum present.
3. **COMMUNICATIONS:** None
4. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:** The motion to approve the minutes for the August 18, 2020 meeting as presented was made by Commissioner Cutuli and seconded by Commissioner Ellis. Chairman Eisner called for the vote. The motion passed 5-0.
5. **OLD BUSINESS:**
  - A. **LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS TEXT AMENDMENT STX-20-01:** City staff had initiated a text amendment removing Appendix A, updating all city street design standards, and created a separate policy document outside of the Land Development Regulations detailing all street planning and design guidelines. Mr. Rucker stated the staff had requested to table this agenda item. Chairman Eisner called for a motion. Commissioner Wise motioned to table Land Development Regulations Text Amendment STX-20-01 and was seconded by Commissioner Cutuli. The motion passed 5-0.
6. **NEW BUSINESS—"CONSENT ITEMS":** None
7. **NEW BUSINESS:**

Mr. Rucker asked if the Board would consider moving item C to discuss first, because the majority of the public was there to discuss this item. Chairman Eisner and Board agreed.

  - C. **ANNEXATION & ZONING DESIGNATION Z-20-12:** City staff had received a petition to annex lands on Possum Trot Road totaling approximately 171.24 acres identified by PIN 357-00-00-0012. The lot was currently unincorporated and zoned Single-Family Residential 6 (SF 6) by Horry County. The petition also reflected the requested City of North Myrtle Beach zoning district of Planned Development District (PDD) to be heard concurrently. The development would be known as Chestnut Greens. Ms. Pritchard stated this was one of three golf course areas that presented a unique opportunity for the city. There were three planned accesses to the property. It would be single family residential with 5 phases of development. There would be three different lot sizes; 42', 52', and 66'. The density would be 497 units up to 535 units, as market conditions dictated. Ms. Pritchard stated that no more than 75% of the single family building permits would

be issued before the commercial element received its certificate of occupancy. The details of the commercial element would be developed in a future amendment to the PDD. There would be a large amenity site around the commercial element and the details of the amenity site would be worked out on a future amendment. A PDD had a requirement of 15% open space and this project had a 23% open space, as well as an additional 13% open space over the ponds. Ms. Pritchard stated there was a 50 foot buffer around the property. The applicant was in attendance to answer any questions. Chairman Eisner asked Ms. Pritchard to address the comments from the different departments and their concerns.

From the Parks and Recreation Department:

1. They would like to review the amenity center major amendment and provide comment when that goes forward at a future date.
2. They were satisfied with the \$100,000 park enhancement fee in lieu of the park land donation.

From Public Works Department:

1. There was a lingering concern over the low trip generation assigned to Senior Adult Housing Use (4). Traffic count estimates also feel low. That said, these assumptions had been justified and sourced in the traffic study.
2. The intersection improvements at the entrance and exit and on Possum Trot Road need to be adjusted. Final tweaking of those intersections can occur as we move towards construction drawings, and need not cause delay in the project.
3. Need to verify the existence of a permanent maintenance easement on the ditch that provides drainage out of the project. Horry County had concern that the recent clearing project was done under a temporary authorization.
4. In lieu of vegetated pond banks (which the city prefers as it keeps away waterfowl), provide water quality improvement measures such as fountain, aeration devices or water quality device at outfall.

Mr. Rucker added that the stormwater was being designed at a 100-year storm event, as opposed to the required 25-year storm event. There would be some other off-site road improvements, as well. Chairman Eisner stated the Board spent some time at the workshop discussing the details. Robert "Shep" Guyton, Attorney for the developers, went through a brief overview of the project. Mr. Guyton stated this was the same project, but from a different applicant, not Pulte, so this was not the same plan. He stated the attraction to this project was that this was a proposed Del Webb Community, which was nationwide and consumers were familiar with it. It was a single-family only development, with no commercial element, other than the one at the amenity site. Del Webb was an internal community, where they provided amenities to keep residents on site. Mr. Guyton recognized the 100-year storm event that was being designed over and above the requirements. He stated Greg Duckworth, Landscape Architect, was there to address any questions about the perimeter buffer. From a home plan standpoint, Mr. Guyton stated the plans that were available to the other Del Webb communities were available in this project. He stated with the help of the staff, they had tried to present a much better project in keeping with the Del Webb brand and expectations. Commissioner Cutuli asked where the outflow would be located. Mark Stoughton, Engineer, for Development Resource Group, pointed out the outflow 48" pipe coming out from Tom E. Chestnut Road on the diagram.

Chairman Eisner opened the floor to public comment.

Ann Cuff, 704 Anne Street, North Myrtle Beach, stated she was concerned about the secondary accesses onto Anne Street. She stated the other problem she had was the construction trucks that would be going through their quiet neighborhood. Those trucks could not get through from Highway 17, so this heavy machinery would be going down Anne Street. Chairman Eisner stated he appreciated the concern, and the land would never be a golf course again. Ms. Cuff stated she agreed, but wanted them to think about how the traffic would flow through the neighborhood. Chairman Eisner stated it would be ideal to have another entrance and exit.

Sterling Alexander, 1015 Anne Street, North Myrtle Beach, stated he had been there since 1995 and there had been some flooding problems. He explained the drainage pipe had been cleaned out and evidently, a beaver dam had created some of the problems. Mr. Alexander asked Mr. Stoughton if the drainage on Anne Street would tie into the pipe going out into the waterway. Mr. Stoughton stated it would, the ditch was cleaned out recently, and the development team could look at potentially cleaning it out again. He stated the 48" pipe was a large pipe to go under Tom E. Chestnut Road. The stormwater ponds would take the drainage within the development and would not be putting it out to add to the existing problem. Mr. Alexander stated they have had flooding problems in the past and asked if this would help or not help the flooding. Mr. Stoughton stated it would not make it worse. Mr. Alexander stated he also had a major problem with the secondary access on Anne Street. In a previous project, there were 50 trucks a day going down Anne Street and they could not get out of their driveways. He stated opening up another access on Anne Street would create more problems. The light at 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue was already a 5 minute light, and it would be much worse when the project was completed. He asked if land could be purchased to exit out on Highway 17. There needed to be more than one entrance for 500 homes. Mr. Duckworth stated he had met with many of the residents and wanted to answer Mr. Alexander's questions. It was important to point out that currently, the water would run off the old golf course and into their yards and onto the street, creating flooding. Upon the implementation of the new stormwater plan for the development, those types of surface water flows would not happen in the future. It would not solve all the flooding problems but would take away some of them.

Damian Triouleyre, Perrin Drive, North Myrtle Beach, thanked Mr. Duckworth for meeting with him and others and explaining the plans. His main concern was the traffic access on Possum Trot, Anne Street, and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. He stated 500 homes were too many homes to have good access. The city just annexed 27 acres between Anne Street and the waterway. Mr. Rucker stated it still needed to go through City Council for first reading. He stated the plans were decent, but the issue was what kind of city we wanted for the future. He asked what else could be done with the land. He asked if the city could buy some of the land and make a park. Mr. Triouleyre stated this was a critical decision, because it could affect what would happen to the other vacant golf courses. Chairman Eisner stated it was the City Council's job to make suggestions and request one thing to be built versus something else, the Planning Commission was an advisory board. Chairman Eisner stated he didn't know if the City would have the funds to purchase the land right now. Mr. Triouleyre asked if the Commission could request different plans for the land use or at least express to the Council citizens would like a different use. Chris Noury, City Attorney, explained how the Commission worked as an advisory board, and a group would have to appeal to the Council for other uses. The appeal would have to go to Council. Mr. Triouleyre stated there was still a lot of concern for this project. Mr. Duckworth stated he wanted to inform the Commission, out of transparency and goodwill, he believed the developer had hired a nice development team to bring the highest and best use plan to the City of North Myrtle Beach. He explained the process of how he reached out to the residents to discuss the plans of the development. He stated he felt most of the individuals accepted the

plans in a positive fashion. They may not have been 100% satisfied with all of the aspects of the project but had positive comments, according to the notes he took at each of the meetings. Those comments were shared with staff and Council. He expressed that Mr. Triouleyre had made positive comments at his office.

Jim Halberry, 601 Hillside Drive North, North Myrtle Beach, stated he wanted to express there was nothing sadder than a dead golf course. He also stated there probably could not be a better way to treat the property than to add 500 high quality homes to the city that would have very little impact to the school systems and other amenities.

Lynn Lindard, Ocean Greens, stated that Mr. Duckworth contacted her by phone and email to discuss the plans. She stated she knew it would not be a golf course, but this would be the best solution possible for that area to have a 55+ community. She expressed a concern for the hard curve in the road at Cenith. It was hard to see around the bend and utility trucks use that road as access to their work. Many people with pets walked that road and it could be scary with the traffic on that road. She stated she would like the home density to be 497 and not 537. She still thought the traffic would be an issue, but appreciated Mr. Duckworth communicating with them.

Sterling Alexander spoke again to thank Mr. Duckworth for coming to his home. He stated he was resigned to these plans, and they were a tremendous improvement to what he had seen before. He was still concerned about the traffic and flooding. He stated he thought the city should make a central park out of it. He was all for growth and improvements, but he built a house here to get away from Myrtle Beach traffic. He thanked the Commission for listening to them.

Graham Hawkins, representative for Pulte Group, stated the unit count was much lower than the previous proposal. It was not a secret that a developer would want to have as many units on a piece of property as possible. However, the city staff and Council had worked with them to keep this a lower density, and it had been discussed for a long time. This also helped to mitigate the traffic. He stated that through the land planning process a spine road was created through the middle of the property. From a developer's viewpoint, this was not ideal, but it helped to get traffic and construction traffic out to Highway 17 and not go through the neighborhoods.

Mr. Rucker read an email comment from Corinne Merrill. She stated she was concerned about flooding in the area and wanted to see higher standards of development for future land use, meaning lower home density development. She was concerned about transit traffic in this and surrounding neighborhoods, which would be impacted by the development. She asked for accommodations for pedestrians and benches for rests along the pedestrian pathways. She stated buffer areas needed to be planted and enhanced prior to construction beginning.

Gayle Smith, 801 Gayle Street, asked if the town had any regulations on the size a lot must be for water to be absorbed. Jim Wood, Director of Planning and Development, stated each zoning district had a minimum lot size requirement, which varied. In a PDD, some standards were negotiated in exchange for other tradeoffs. There were no rules on a minimum lot size for a PDD. The developer proposed a lot size and the city made a judgement if the lot size was acceptable for that PDD. Ms. Pritchard stated the sizes were 42', 52', and 66' wide lots or 4,500, 6,500, and 9,000 square feet. Ms. Smith asked if a lot should be at least 10,000 square feet. Commissioner Snider stated that it didn't necessarily matter the size of the lot, but the engineering numbers were calculated in such a way that the water drainage would go into the

stormwater ponds and management system. Ms. Smith stated there would be more concrete in the development. Chairman Eisner stated it was a 55+ community and many people in that age group did not like a large lawn to take care of. Ms. Smith stated trees were also important and needed to be considered. Chairman Eisner stated they discussed in the workshop about not clear-cutting the area and leaving larger trees, including the buffer.

Director Wood explained the 25-year storm versus a 100-year storm event concept. He stated in any given year, in a 100-year storm, there was a 1% chance of that storm happening and in a 25-year storm event there was a 4% chance of that storm happening. The project was designed at 4 times the minimum requirement.

Mr. Sterling spoke again about the blockage of the drainage, which caused flooding problems. Director Wood stated the staff wanted to make sure there was a maintenance agreement or structure put in place to keep it cleaned out.

Mr. Rucker stated there was a list of unresolved staff comments that were presented and an additional list from Public Works and Parks and Recreation. He asked for where the Commission was in moving forward. Chairman Eisner stated they could decide to hold to next meeting or let the proposal go to City Council and let them hash it out. They were an advisory board of volunteers trying to do the best job they could. Commissioner Cutuli asked if all of the comments had been addressed. Mr. Rucker stated no they had not, but in discussing them with the applicant, they sounded amendable to addressing them. They needed time to flesh it out, or it could be discussed now. Commissioner Wise stated she believed this needed to wait until the items were more buttoned up, and staff was more comfortable with it, especially with the issues of access on Anne Street and Highway 17. She stated it should be tabled until something more concrete was presented. Mr. Rucker stated in a discussion with the Public Works Director having a little time would help in resolving these questions. Commissioner Ellis agreed that if the staff had questions, those and the questions of citizens had to be addressed. She stated it had to be controlled and maintained, because it was our community. Mr. Rucker stated two weeks would help address these comments, but it was important to note that what was before them would not change substantively in two weeks. It would just address the other aspects and the core would not change. Commissioner Wise stated the core would not change, but there were a lot of things that still needed to be buttoned up.

Chairman Eisner asked if a delay would affect the applicant. Mr. Hawkins stated potentially it could and would prefer to move forward. Chairman Eisner stated he did not think a delay was necessary, and the other items could be worked out before the Council meeting. Mr. Rucker stated the approach to the surrounding roadways may be part of what Public Works would want to discuss. Some of these things may not have been touched on at the meeting. The overall impact of the homes and numbers would not change. Chairman Eisner inquired if there was a reason the Commission would delay the project. Mr. Rucker stated there would be more time to work out the comments, and then have the proposal come back to the Commission in a better state. Commissioner Wise stated she wanted to make sure that items that were discussed in the workshop were going to be changed. For example, the setbacks being 5 feet instead of 4 feet, having Public Works items worked out, etc. Commissioner Snyder stated it could be conditionally approved, and if Public Works had any issues they would carry over to the Council meeting. Commissioner Wise stated if it was approved conditionally, she wanted to make sure all the topics they discussed would be addressed, not just what was talked about at this meeting. She asked if all the items were written down to be discussed, not just Public Works comments, and would there be time to revise these in two weeks. Mr. Rucker stated as a part of the motion,

the Commission would base the approval conditionally on the list of 9 staff review comments. Some of the staff review comments on page 6-7 of the Staff Report could be extensive to complete, for example number 3 home elevations. Commissioner Wise stated what were the 9 things? Mr. Rucker stated it was the 7 that were typed up in the report, plus 2 that were discussed at the workshop: Signage to be approved by major amendment and landscape plans with details for houses and other landscaped areas. Mr. Rucker stated the Commission could approve the proposal with these conditions or table it.

Having no further questions or discussion, Chairman Eisner called for a motion. Commissioner Cutuli motioned to move forward the Annexation & Zoning Designation Z-20-12 to the Mayor and City Council with the recommendation of approval conditioned upon the staff comments being satisfactorily addressed and was seconded by Commissioner Ellis. The motion passed 4-1. Commissioner Wise voted nay.

- A. LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS TEXT AMENDMENT STX-20-02:** City staff had initiated a text amendment modifying the external access standards for subdivisions to allow Planning Commission to consider waivers for site-specific development plans and minor subdivisions in addition to major subdivisions. Mr. Rucker stated this was discussed in the workshop. It would provide the ability for any plan to come before the Planning Commission to receive a waiver. Having no further discussion, Chairman Eisner called for a motion. Commissioner Wise motioned to move forward the Land Development Regulations Text Amendment STX-20-02 to the Mayor and City Council with the recommendation of approval and was seconded by Commissioner Snyder. The motion passed 5-0.
- B. FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT SUB-20-31:** A major final plat of subdivision to create four lots of record off Highway 90 at the intersection of the Robert Edge Parkway and Highway 31. Ms. Pritchard stated the property was currently two lots and zoned Highway Commercial. The applicant was looking to make four lots of record and asked for a waiver on the access standard referenced in the previous item. Chairman Eisner stated there was no choice but approval, as far as access went. Ms. Pritchard discussed the different kinds of sprinklers. Having no further questions or discussion, Chairman Eisner called for a motion. Commissioner Wise motioned to approve the Final Subdivision Plat SUB-20-31, as submitted, and was seconded by Commissioner Cutuli. The motion passed 5-0.
- D. PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT SUB-20-18:** A major preliminary plat of subdivision to create 12 lots of record, one remainder lot and public rights-of-way off Champion Boulevard in phase one of Champions Crossing. Ms. Pritchard stated it was currently 61.8 acres and zoned Highway Commercial. She stated the staff had reviewed the proposal, and there were no issues. Having no further discussion, Chairman Eisner called for a motion. Commissioner Ellis motioned to approve the Preliminary Subdivision Plat SUB-20-18, as submitted, and was seconded by Commissioner Cutuli. The motion passed 5-0.
- E. PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT SUB-20-22:** A major preliminary plat of subdivision to create eight lots of record and public rights-of-way off On Deck Circle in phase four of the Park Pointe development. Ms. Pritchard stated it was adjacent to the 168 lots previously created at Park Pointe and zoned R-2A. Ms. Pritchard stated the staff had no issues, except to note that a new grading permit would be required. Having no further discussion, Chairman Eisner called for a motion. Commissioner Snyder motioned to approve the Preliminary Subdivision Plat SUB-20-22, as submitted, and was seconded by Commissioner Ellis. The motion passed 5-0.

**8. ADJOURNMENT:**

Having no further business, Chairman Eisner adjourned the meeting at 6:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Allison K. Galbreath  
City Clerk

**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.