



# PLANNING COMMISSION

Town Council Chambers, Moncks Corner Municipal  
Complex, 118 Carolina Avenue  
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 2025 at 6:00 PM

---

## AGENDA

### CALL TO ORDER

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of Minutes for the October 28, 2025 meeting.

### NEW BUSINESS

2. Consider a Text Amendment (TA-25-01) request to amend Article 7-13 (Architectural Standards) of the Town Zoning Ordinance to modify exterior building material standards.

### OLD BUSINESS

### PLANNER'S COMMENTS

### MOVE TO ADJOURN

*In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons who need accommodation in order to attend or participate in this meeting should contact Town Hall at (843) 719- 7900 within 48 hours prior to the meeting in order to request such assistance.*



# PLANNING COMMISSION

Town Council Chambers, Moncks Corner Municipal  
Complex, 118 Carolina Avenue  
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2025, at 6:00 PM

## MINUTES

### CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m.

#### PRESENT

Chairwoman Charlotte Cruppenink  
Commissioner Glen Pipkin  
Commissioner Rev. Robin McGhee-Frazier  
Commissioner Shanda Phillips  
Commissioner Kathleen Prosdocimo  
Commissioner Patryce Campbell  
Commissioner Drew Ensor

#### STAFF PRESENT

Justin Westbrook, Development Director  
Carter France, Planner

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of Minutes for the September 23, 2025, meeting.

Motion made by Commissioner Pipkin to approve the Staff provided September meeting minutes, Seconded by Commissioner Ensor.

Voting Yea: Chairwoman Cruppenink, Commissioner Pipkin, Commissioner McGhee-Frazier, Commissioner Phillips, Commissioner Prosdocimo, Commissioner Campbell, and Commissioner Ensor.

### NEW BUSINESS

2. Consider an Annexation (AN-25-03) request for one (1) parcel (1421001079) totaling ~0.93 acres, addressed as 525 S. Live Oak to be annexed in to the Town's corporate limits, seeking be zoned Office & Institutional (C-1).

Mr. France presented the agenda item.

Commissioner Campbell asked what the subject parcel's current zoning designation is.

Mr. France responded to the question.

Commissioner Campbell asked the applicant why they wish to annex into the Town of Moncks Corner.

Miki Garcia, the potential tenant of the subject parcel responded, stating they wish to connect to the Town's water and sewer systems, and it is only possible to do this by annexing into the Town.

Chairwomen Cruppenink stated that Planning Commission is not a public hearing, but has the authority to open up the meeting to public input. The chairwomen made the

decision to open this meeting up to public input.

Domminic McCatcwin, of 224 Pou Court, asked what parcels the subject parcel abuts with, and asked what about this proposal is mixed use.

Mr. Westbrook responded, noting the subject parcel is adjacent to Pruitt health and other undeveloped parcels located within Berkeley County's corporate limits. Mr. Westbrook also explained the typical use-types that are permitted by-right in the C-1 zoning designation.

Motion made by Commissioner McGhee-Frazier to approve the Zoning Map Amendment request to rezone the subject parcel from General Commercial (GC) (Berkeley County) to Office & Institutional (C-1). Seconded by Commissioner Campbell.

Voting Yea: Chairwomen Cruppenink, Commissioner Pipkin, Commissioner Phillips, Commissioner Prosdocimo, and Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Ensor, and Commissioner McGhee-Frazier.

3. Consider an Zoning Map Amendment (CZ-25-02) request for a parcel (142-08-04-012) totaling ~4.2 acres, located at 402 Wall Street. The parcel is requesting to be zoned Conditional Zoning Single Family Residential (CZ R-2).

Mr. Westbrook presented the item.

Mr. France provided the dates and times this request would be heard by Town Council.

The applicant, Davis McNair, of McNair Design and Development, stated he wishes to work closely with the neighboring community, and plans to host a community wide meeting to hear their suggestions for the potential development.

Chairwomen Cruppenink noted the commission has no question for the applicant at this time and opened he floor to the public to offer input.

Wonda Watts, of 108 Jankins St, noted the graphic posted on the subject parcel is different from their neighborhood, as the new development seems to be clustered while the existing neighbors have plenty of space. Ms. Watts does not believe the proposed development will "enhance the community at all". In addition, the proposed connection to the Town's existing recreation facility will likely bring in additional foot-traffic which is undesirable.

Ms. Bishop, of 198 Jankins St, is concerned that the existing neighborhood's "tight-knit" community is going to be changed by the proposed development. Furthermore Ms. Bishop wishes that a community meeting takes place at their community center. She further wishes that this group of residents and the Town are able to work closely together for any future projects.

Commissioner Ensor asked Mr. McNair how he determined the percentages for the proposed density bonus.

Davis McNair, of McNair Design & Development, believes the proposed connection to the Town's recreation center is worth a large percentage. Furthermore, he believes dedicating land is worth a significant amount of percentage points.

Chairwomen Cruppenink suggested that the proposed dog park does not seem possible at this time and suggested the addition of a gazebo as the Town is in need of additional public meeting space. In addition, the chairwomen emphasized that the developer could develop the land by-right if he wished.

Davis McNair, of McNair Design & Development, stated if this proposal is denied he will proceed with developing land with by-right zoning.

Mr. Westbrook elaborated on particular by-right standards as they appear in the Town's Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Bishop, of 198 Jenkins St, asked if a re-zoning was required for the developer to do what he intends to do.

Mr. Westbrook estimated the developer could construct approximately seven (7) homes with by-right zoning.

Wonda Watts, of 108 Jenkins St, noted the proposed lot sizes are comparatively small to the existing lots in the general area.

Mr. Westbrook stated that by using a conditional zoning for this development the Town can make the subdivision appear more organic.

Chairwomen Cruppenink requested that the developer meet with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Campbell asked if the developer would pursue by-right zoning if this proposal is denied.

Davis McNair, of McNair Design & Development, stated that he would pursue by-right development but would still intend on meeting with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Ensor asked why Staff recommended denial.

Mr. Westbrook responded, stating Staff still has outstanding question and concerns regarding the proposed density incentives.

Commissioner Proscocimo asked Mr. McNair if he would keep working with Staff to revise the density bonus.

Mr. McNair, of McNair Design & Development, stated he is seeking Planning Commission approval with the ability to revise the density bonus.

Mr. Westbrook noted that if the Planning Commission denies the request, the applicant could still proceed to the first Town Council hearing the following month.

Commissioner Pipkin asked what the developer estimate of a price range per unit would be.

Davis McNair, of McNair Design & Development, estimated each unit would be on the market for approximately \$300,000.

Commissioner Campbell asked if it is possible to recommended approval with the caveat that the proposed density bonus was revised.

Mr. Westbrook stated yes.

Motion made by Commissioner Ensor to deny the Zoning Map Amendment request to rezone the subject parcel from Single Family Residential (R-2) to Conditional Zoning Single Family Residential (CZ)(R-2) with the intention that the developer would work to address the Town's concerns regarding the submitted density bonus and that this proposal will be revisited in the future. Seconded by Commissioner Proscocimo.

Voting Yea: Chairwomen Cruppenink, Commissioner Pipkin, Commissioner Phillips, Commissioner Proscocimo, and Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Ensor, and Commissioner McGhee-Frazier.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

## **PLANNER'S COMMENTS**

## **MOVE TO ADJOURN**

Motion made by Commissioner Proscocimo to adjourn, Seconded by Chairwomen Ensor.

Voting Yea: Chairwomen Cruppenink, Commissioner Pipkin, Commissioner Phillips, Commissioner Proscocimo, and Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Ensor, and Commissioner McGhee-Frazier.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:14 p.m.

*In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons who need accommodation in order to attend or participate in this meeting should contact Town Hall at (843) 719- 7900 within 48 hours prior to the meeting in order to request such assistance.*

## **SECTION 7-13 – ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS**

Purpose The Town of Moncks Corner seeks to promote architectural design which is harmonious with adjacent structures and sensitive to the natural environment. No single architectural style will be mandated within Moncks Corner. However, the reliance on or use of a standardized “corporate or franchise” style is strongly discouraged, unless it can be shown to the Town administrations’ satisfaction that such style meets the objectives noted below. Strongly thematic architectural styles 72 associated with some chain restaurants, gas stations, big box, and service stores are discouraged and, if utilized, will be recommended to be modified to be compatible with the Town’s design objectives. The primary purpose of this policy statement is to achieve the following goals: Enhance and protect the Moncks Corner quality of life and community image through agreed upon architectural design objectives; and protect and promote long-term economic vitality through architectural design objectives which encourage high quality development, while discouraging less attractive and less enduring alternatives.

### **Design Objectives.**

The following architectural design objectives are intended to apply to all nonresidential, attached and multi-family residential development within the Town. New building construction shall provide a sense of permanence and timelessness. High quality construction and materials should be used to ensure that buildings will not look dated or worn down over time, nor require excessive maintenance:

Exterior building materials should be aesthetically pleasing and compatible with materials and colors of nearby structures. Predominant exterior building facade materials shall consist of high quality, durable products, including but not limited to cementitious siding (i.e. HardiePlank), brick, sandstone, fieldstone, decorative concrete masonry units, wood, and glass. Metal exteriors are not permitted on principal structures or accessory structures over 1,500 square feet of GFA, unless used as an architectural style, such as modern steel and glass architecture, and approved by the Zoning Administrator. Metal warehouse-type architecture shall not be permitted except in the Industrial Zones. External Insulation

Finished Systems (E.I.F.S.) material shall be utilized only on the building trim and accent areas.

Building colors should accent, blend with, or complement surroundings. Façade colors are recommended to be earth tone colors which are low reflectance, subtle, and neutral (e.g., grays, greens, burgundies, browns, and tans). The coloring of all materials should be integral to the product and not painted on the surface of said product. The use of high intensity colors, metallic colors, black or fluorescent colors is discouraged. Primary colors are requested to be reserved for trim and accent areas.

Exposed neon tubing, LEDs, marquee lights or other bright lighting used for the purpose of attracting attention is not an acceptable feature on buildings or windows facing the exterior. This does not prevent the use of lighting as an accent (such as goose neck lamps with white lights lighting the roofline) or the use of interior-lit signage. Pitched roof designs are highly recommended for lowrise retail, office, and multi-family residential buildings utilizing architectural asphalt shingles or standing-seam metal panels. Flat roofs are not encouraged.

In the case of strip malls, big box stores, and shopping centers; such buildings shall provide elevations which reflect this objective through variations in facade setback and parapet wall presentations. Roof colors are requested to be muted and compatible with the dominant building color; long blank walls on retail buildings are to be avoided through the use of foundation landscaping and architectural details and features.

Large scale retail buildings are encouraged to have height variations to reduce scale and give the appearance of distinct elements; and lastly, roof top mechanical installations shall be appropriately screened so as to block the view from adjacent public and private streets and properties. Such screening shall match or compliment the overall theme of the building.

**Signs.** Signs provide important functions of both advertising and navigation by motorists and pedestrians. However, signs often dominate a site and can be counterproductive to the

primary function of directing patrons. Through careful and well-planned site design, signs should be designed with the following elements in mind:

1. Compatible with their surroundings in terms of size, shape, color, texture, and lighting and not promote visual competition with other signs along the corridor.
2. Architecturally integrated with the site's primary building(s).
3. Located such that they do not restrict sight distances of pedestrians or motorists, especially at driveways and intersections.
4. Limit the number necessary to direct patrons throughout the site. Discourage the use of pole, pylon, and temporary signs.
5. Limited to necessary information, regardless of the size permitted by the sign ordinance. Repetitive information shall not be permitted, such as dual signs on corner building when one sign is highly visible from the intersection.

It shall be the duty of Zoning Administrator, Building Official, and Town Administrator to determine whether any specific request shall be considered in accordance with the Architectural Standards. Any party who disagrees with the decision regarding the Architectural Standards may appeal the decision to the Board of Zoning Appeals.