

The scheduled meeting of the Beaufort County Development Review Team was held on Wednesday, April 9, 2008, in the Executive Conference Room, Beaufort County Administration Building at 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms. Hillary Austin, Zoning Administrator
Mr. Arthur Cummings, Building Codes Director
Ms. Delores Frazier, Assistant Planning Director
Mr. Robert Klink, County Engineer

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF PRESENT

Ms. Audra Antonacci, Codes Enforcement Supervisor
Mrs. Amanda Flake, Natural Resource Planner
Mrs. Lisa Glover, Zoning Analyst III
Ms. Judy Timmer, Corridor Review Board Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Austin called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

Ms. Austin explained, that the members of the Development Review Team reviewed each item independently and provided their comments to the Zoning Administrator.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES: The Development Review Team decided to adopt the minutes at the next scheduled meeting.

3. AAA STORAGE FACILITY (REVISIT/FINAL)

Mr. Klink stated, that the applicant shall move the driveway further east.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the applicant shall label the protection forest locations on the plans. The applicant shall also revise the plans to change the tree protection zones, to 1-inch equals 1 foot of tree.

Mr. Cummings stated, that due to the size of the building and the spacing between the building, the applicant shall meet with the fire marshall to discuss the fire flow and the type of construction that may be effected. The applicant may also need to move the building, in order to comply with the building code, and/or sprinkle the buildings.

Ms. Timmer stated, that the fire marshall also stated, that between the buildings, the access was not wide enough.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the applicant shall provide the fire safety form, signed off by the fire marshall for the revised plan.

Ms. Austin stated, that the silt fence is located in the clearing area, where they are saving trees; so the applicant shall move the silt fence on the other side of the trees. Also, mini warehouses are not allowed in the Commercial Regional zoning district; so the applicant shall change the plans to label the units as residential storage units.

THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM UNANIMOUSLY DEFERRED THE PROJECT, UNTIL THE APPLICANT REVISE THE PLANS TO CHANGE THE TREE PROTECTION ZONE, TO 1 INCH EQUALS 1 FOOT OF TREE. THE APPLICANT SHALL REMOVE THE DRIVEWAY FURTHER EAST. THE APPLICANT SHALL LABEL THE PROTECTED FOREST LOCATIONS ON THE PLANS. THE APPLICANT SHALL MEET WITH THE FIRE MARSHALL TO DISCUSS THE FIRE CHART AND ACCESS, TO INCLUDE THE OFFICIAL FIRE SAFETY STANDARD FORM. THE SILT FENCE MAY NEED TO BE RELOCATED TO SAVE THE TREES. THE APPLICANT SHALL REVISE THE PLANS TO RELABEL THE STORAGE UNITS FROM MINI WAREHOUSES TO RESIDENTIAL STORAGE UNITS. (FOR: AUSTIN, CUMMINGS, FRAZIER, KLINK).

4. LOT 1, COMFORT POINT (BULKHEAD AMENDMENT)

Ms. Austin stated, that the critical line that was approved, is different in the revised plans. The applicant shall revise the OCRM permit to state rock revetment, instead of bulkhead.

THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE AMENDMENT, SUBJECT TO THE APPLICANT CORRECTING THE OCRM CRITICAL LINE LOCATION, AND CORRECT THE OCRM PERMIT, TO CHANGE FROM BULKHEAD TO ROCK REVETMENT. (FOR: AUSTIN, CUMMINGS, FRAZIER, KLINK).

5. WINDMILL HARBOUR – LOT 7, REEF CLUB (VIEW CORRIDOR)

Ms. Austin stated, that the Development Review Team recommends approval, with the condition that the Natural Resource Planner inspects the site, once the trees are removed.

THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE PROJECT, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE NATURAL RESOURCE PLANNER INSPECTS THE SITE AFTER THE TREES ARE REMOVED. (FOR: AUSTIN, CUMMINGS, FRAZIER, KLINK).

6. LIFE HOUSE CHURCH (REVISIT/CONCEPTUAL)

Ms. Austin stated, that the Development Review Team recommends conceptual approval.

THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE PROJECT AS SUBMITTED, FOR CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL. (FOR: AUSTIN, CUMMINGS, FRAZIER, KLINK).

7. VILLAS @ BROAD RIVER (REVISIT/CONCEPTUAL)

Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant requested a deferral.

THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM UNANIMOUSLY DEFERRED THE PROJECT, AT THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST. (FOR: AUSTIN, CUMMINGS, FRAZIER, KLINK).

8. SHIPMAN'S WHARF (REVISIT/CONCEPTUAL)

Ms. Frazier stated, that if the alternative system is approved, that eliminates the need for a remote drain field; because the system is on the site, and the drip arrogation method of disposal of the water could be done on the lot. Ms. Frazier stated, that the Development Review Team prefers this alternative system, because it would eliminate the remote drain fields and save some trees. Ms. Frazier stated, that if the applicant cannot commit to the alternative system, then the drain fields would have to be considered as traditional drain fields.

Mr. Lorick Fanning, Land Resource Consultants explained to the board, the need for a remote drain field on the ridges of the lots.

The Development review Team continued to discuss the alternative system with Mr. Lorick Fanning.

Ms. Frazier stated, that she prefers to use the alternative system, and work to see how the system can be totally contained on the lot.

Ms. Austin asked Mr. Fanning, "Will you install the system?"

Mr. Fanning answered, "Yes".

Mr. Klink asked Mr. Fanning, "Is the drain field going to be placed on bad soil?"

Mr. Fanning answered, "No, it's going to be place on excellent soil".

Ms. Frazier stated, that the Development Review Team needs to work with Dhec regarding this alternative system, in order to understand the system better, and how it is installed.

Mr. Lorick Fanning asked, "Is there a place in the regulations that supports your preference?"

Ms. Austin stated, that there's nothing in the ordinance that talks about off-site drain fields, everything is supposed to be on-site.

Mr. Lorick Fanning asked, "There's nothing that says we are mandated to have the drain fields on site from a regulatory perspective?"

Mr. Klink stated, that the board has denied in the past remote drain fields, because the Development Review Team generally considers it, not a good design.

Ms. Frazier asked the applicant, "Since the plans are showing, that you're going to grade the lots; is your applicant going to build the houses?"

Mr. Leigh Colyer, representative for the applicant stated, that he's not sure if the applicant is going to be responsible for building all of the houses on the lots.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the Development Review Team cannot as part of the subdivision process approve the grading of the lots, which involves tree removal, if the client is not going to build the houses; because the county determines which trees need to be removed when the applicant comes in with the house plans. Ms. Frazier also stated, that the applicant shall provide a justification for the walkway in the buffer, to include a cross-section showing what materials was planted, and what additional plantings would be needed to improve the quality of the buffer area. Ms. Frazier stated, that the lots were also missing setback lines.

Ms. Timmer stated, that there's not a difference in the plans between the existing and proposed grade lines.

Ms. Austin stated, that she is not approving this project, because the applicant is requesting 12 lots instead of 11 lots; the natural resource calculation shows that the applicant is supposed to only have 11 lots. Ms. Austin also stated, that the ordinance does not allow trails in the buffer; that would have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance. Ms. Austin stated, that when she counted the open space, it appears to be short .25 acres.

Mr. Lorick Fanning asked Ms. Austin, "Do you recommend that I remove the trail off of the subdivision plans, and then come back to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance request?"

Ms. Austin stated, if the applicant is going to show the trail on the plans, in her opinion, he would need a variance approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Fanning asked, "Would the variance request be done simultaneously with the subdivision approval?"

Ms. Austin answered, "If you want the trail on the plans".

Mr. Klink stated, that he would suggest the applicant remove the trail off of the plans.

Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant shall provide a plant back plan at final submittal for the four specimen trees that would be removed. Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant shall provide the covenants and restrictions at final submittal. Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant shall provide the septic tank permits at final submittal; and it shall be shown on the plans.

THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DEFERRED THE PROJECT UNTIL THE APPLICANT REVISE THE PLANS REMOVING THE GRADING PLAN, AND SHOW THE SETBACKS ON THE LOTS. THE ALTERNATIVE SEPTIC SYSTEM SHALL REMAIN ON SITE. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE THE TREE PLANTBACK PLAN AND COVENANTS AND RESTRICTIONS AT FINAL SUBMITTAL. THE APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT SEPTIC TANK PERMITS, AND SHALL SHOW THE LOCATION OF THE SYSTEM ON THE PLANS AT FINAL SUBMITTAL. (FOR: CUMMINGS, FRAZIER, KLINK; AGAINST: AUSTIN).

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:59 a.m.