CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: AN ORDINANCE TO ANNEX TMS 042-00-04-011 & 042-00-04-019 INTO THE CITY OF HARDEEVILLE CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY +/- 225.49 ACRES OF REAL ESTATE LOCATED IN JASPER COUNTY NOT ALREADY WITHIN THE HARDEEVILLE CITY LIMITS, AS WELL AS ALL ADJACENT PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY, RAILROAD RIGHTS OF WAY, WATERS, LOWLANDS AND WETLANDS.

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING FOR TMS PARCELS 041-00-03-028, 042-00-04-019 & 042-00-04-011 CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY +/- 356.39 ACRES LOCATED BETWEEN I-95, US278 AND JOHN SMITH ROAD FROM HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL (HC) IN THE CITY OF HARDEEVILLE AND RURAL PRESERVATION IN UNINCORPORATED JASPER COUNTY ZONING TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (PDD).

DEPARTMENT: **Planning**

ATTACHMENTS: x__Ordinance ___Resolution ___Motion
____Support Documents ____Appointment ____Other

SUMMARY:

The applicant is requesting approval of a Planned Development District (PDD) for approximately 356.39 acres to accommodate a mixed use development consisting of single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial uses.

The applicant has also petitioned for annexation of TMS# 042-00-04-011 & 042-00-04-019. The parcels are currently located in Unincorporated Jasper County and are contiguous to the City of Hardeeville limits by sharing a contiguous border. This request meets all standards and requirements of the 100% annexation method as based in state law. The properties are also located in the City of Hardeeville's proposed annexation boundary.

A Planned Development District and Initial Master Plan were initially proposed in May 2022 and were recommended for approval by Planning Commission. The project was later denied by City Council and has been revised to address concerns expressed at the meeting.

The proposed Planned Development District consists of approximately 356.39 acres proposed to be developed with a mix of commercial and residential land uses. The uses proposed in this application are consistent with goals of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan which aims to encourage mixed use developments.

The property is presently wooded containing timber pines and located on John Smith Road, US278 and I95. The project includes a potential of 3 access points from US278 and 5 access points on John Smith Road. During the review process for the original application, Staff recommended that potential connectivity to the neighboring tracts of land be provided. The City should require future developments to provide connections to adjacent developments except when it is not practical due to environmental or safety reasons. The Land Use Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan states that "the City should emphasize connectivity by striving to connect development within the City's boundaries whenever possible." The current plan has been updated to include the additional 225 acre adjacent site securing the additional opportunities for connectivity. Additionally, the Applicant and Staff have been coordinating with SCDOT officials in order to ensure the plans are in compliance with future improvements at Exit 8 as part of the I95 widening project.

Additional interconnectivity is proposed to be provided via a sidewalk network and a proposed recreational trail/pathway. The Applicant is proposing a 15' easement along John Smith Road to accommodate the recreational pathway. This recreational trail will help facilitate pedestrian connectivity within the project as well as to the downtown (US Highway 17) area. Staff recommends that a minimum 8' pathway be required to be constructed within the easement by the Developer as a condition to the PDD.

The development is anticipated to be constructed in phases. Phase 1 is anticipated to consist of a multi-family apartment project and a townhome project by Ryan Homes on Southpoint East. Phase 1 and any subsequent phases will require review and approval of project-specific Initial Master Plans which will be reviewed by Planning Commission and City Council prior to the Site Development Permit process.

A traffic study identifying recommended improvements based on the proposed PDD has been provided with this application. A summary of the improvements is provided in the Executive Summary of Exhibit J of the Master Plan. Staff and SCDOT will continue to coordinate on traffic recommendations and improvements as we have more detail in the Initial Master Plan and Site Development Plan application processes.

At adjacent property boundaries of the PDD, buffers shall be 20', at a minimum; except along John Smith Road, US278 and I-95 where buffers shall be an average of 50'. Additionally, the requirements of the Highway Corridor Overlay District will be enforced for properties fronting US 278.

The applicant is proposing open space requirements which will meet or exceed the requirements of the City's MZDO. A minimum of 20% open space will be provided in the commercial land tracts. The remainder of the PDD will be considered as residential land uses requiring 30% open space with a minimum of 10% active open space.

The City's MZDO promotes the incorporation of open space into new developments which is critical in preserving wetlands and other natural areas. Open space within a development also provides its citizens with the opportunity to enjoy recreation without leaving their community, resulting in decreased roadway congestion. The Land Use

Element of the Comprehensive Plan and the Natural Resources Element state that open space should be a component of every development. Based on recommendations from the City's Comprehensive Plan and the requirements of the MZDO, Staff finds that the applicant has met the requirements for open space for this Planned Development District.

Staff recommends the proposed Annexation be accepted as presented. Staff and Planning Commission recommend the proposed Planned Development District be approved with the condition that a minimum 8' pathway be required to be constructed by the Developer within the easement.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt Ordinance 2022-10-27A & 2022-10-27B at first reading with the condition that a minimum 8' pathway be constructed by the Developer within the easement..

DEPARTMENT	Submitted:	__Planning_____	Date: 10-20-22
	Requested Agenda	___City Council_____	Date: 1 0 - 2 7 - 2 2
FINANCE DEPARTMENT	Budgeted____Yes_____No _x_N/A		Date:
CITY ATTORNEY	Approved as to Form and Correctness		Date:
CITY MANAGER	Approved Agenda Item For:		Date:
COUNCIL ACTION:	____Approved as Recommended	____Disapproved	
	____Approved With Modification	____Tabled To Time Certain	
	____Other		