

The scheduled meeting of the Beaufort County Development Review Team was held on Wednesday, May 28, 2008, in the Executive Conference Room, the Beaufort County Administration Building at 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT**

Ms. Hiillary Austin, Zoning Administrator  
Mr. Arthur Cummings, Building Codes Director  
Ms. Delores Frazier, Assistant Planning Director

#### **MEMBERS ABSENT**

Mr. Robert Klink, County Engineer

#### **STAFF PRESENT**

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

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** Mr. Criscitiello called the meeting to order at approximately 11:04 a.m.

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

#### **2. REVIEW OF MINUTES:**

**MOTION: Mr. Cummings made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Ms. Austin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier).**

#### **3. MELROSE BEACH COTTAGES – LOTS N, O, P, & Q (REVISIT/FINAL)**

Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Monson, "Were you proposing to show a building envelope on lot 1?"

Mr. Scott Monson, Thomas & Hutton Engineering Company answered, "Yes".

Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Monson, "Have you brought in the new construction plans?"

Mr. Monson stated, that after he submitted the new information addressing the previous comments on May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2008, he thought that he would get feedback from the Development Review Team, as to whether or not they were in agreement with the proposed changes; then he would have done the final plats.

Ms. Frazier asked Ms. Austin, "Do you have an issue with them just putting the construction envelope on the plats?"

Ms. Austin answered, "No".

Mr. Monson asked Ms. Austin, "Were you in agreement that lot P was adequate, at the setback line?"

Ms. Austin answered, "You have to show the setback also". Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant shall show all of the setbacks on the plats.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the plats shall be signed off by OCRM.

Mr. Monson stated, that they will have OCRM sign off on the plats.

Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Monson, "Did you find out whether or not these are single-family homes or duplexes?"

Mr. Monson stated, that he cannot answer that question today, he has to speak with the developer to obtain that information.

Ms. Austin stated, that if these are considered duplexes, there is a minimum site area of two acres. Ms. Austin stated, that the setbacks are 20-feet from the front property line, 20-feet from the rear property line, a 20-foot separation between single-family attached and multi-family buildings, and a 10-foot side-yard setback for the end unit.

Mr. Monson stated, that he believes, the intent was to subdivide the property as single-family residences; but he need clarification from the developer as to how the homes will be marketed.

Ms. Austin stated, that the GIS system does not show Easter Beach Lane; it shows Avenue of Oaks. Ms. Austin asked Mr. Monson, "When did the road name change?"

Mr. Monson answered, "The Avenue of Oaks R-O-W is designated as the road that goes behind the front row of cottages, and the second row of cottages; Easter Beach Lane is the access that runs ocean side of the front row of the cottages. It is shown on all of the Master Plans; it is not a platted R-O-W, but it is an access lane that's acceptable to the fire marshall.

Ms. Austin asked Mr. Monson, "Have you spoken with the Addressing Department about that name?"

Mr. Monson answered, "No".

Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant shall check with the addressing department, regarding the change in the name of the road.

Mr. Monson stated, that Easter Beach Lane is designated for emergency vehicle access and golf cart access only.

Ms. Austin asked Mr. Monson, "Why can't the fire marshall come down Avenue of Oaks?"

Mr. Monson stated, that it's a two-way for the standard vehicles, which are golf carts; but the fire marshall said that he wanted a loop, because of the original size of the Avenue of Oaks pavement; which was less than 20 feet when it was originally approved.

Ms. Austin stated, that the Avenue of Oaks has a 50-foot R-O-W. Ms. Austin asked Mr. Monson, "Why can't the fire marshall get down a 50-foot R-O-W?"

Mr. Monson stated, that there are areas where the road splits into boulevards; so he doesn't know what the exact objection is to it.

Ms. Austin stated, that if it's a 50-foot R-O-W, she does not see why they can't have two-way traffic.

Mr. Monson stated, that it's related to the actual width of the pavement.

Ms. Austin stated, that we keep platting lots on this road that doesn't support safety vehicles. Ms. Austin stated, that the road was built for cottages; there were no subdivisions back then. Ms. Austin stated, that when a property is subdivided, it needs to be subdivided on a road that is adequate.

Ms. Austin stated, that she thinks that this should be the last time the Development Review Team approves anything on this road, without looking at what's actually out there.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the Development Review Team should speak with the fire marshall about the conditions of the road. Ms. Frazier asked the applicant to show what's out there now, in terms of the road sections.

**THE DRT UNANIMOUSLY DEFERRED THE PROJECT UNTIL THE APPLICANT SHOWS THE CONSTRUCTION ENVELOPS FOR LOTS O & P. THE CRITICAL LINE LOCATED ON THE PLATS SHALL BE CERTIFIED BY OCRM. THE APPLICANT SHALL INDICATE IF THIS APPLICATION IS CONSIDERED A SINGLE-FAMILY USE OR DUPLEXES. THE DRT SHALL FOLLOW UP ON THE ROAD ISSUE. THE APPLICANT SHALL CHECK WITH E-911 ADDRESSING, REGARDING THE NAME CHANGE OF THE ROAD, FROM AVENUE OF OAKS TO EASTER BEACH LANE. THE APPLICANT SHALL INDICATE THE EXISTING ROAD CONDITIONS FOR EASTER BEACH LANE. (FOR: AUSTIN, CUMMINGS, FRAZIER).**

#### **4. MATTHEW'S MARINE EXPANSION (FINAL)**

Mr. Guscio, representative for the applicant explained to the board, that his client is requesting a boat storage area, adjacent to the Phase 1 project; which went through the Corridor Review Board. Mr. Guscio stated, that he received a calculation from staff, to determine what was to be added to the landscape plan, which was previously submitted. Mr. Guscio stated for the record, that his client believes that phase 1 is completed, and he feels like he is being singled out to get the buffer capacity, which is 70 percent, as required. Mr. Guscio stated, that he will advise his client to go back and comply with the requirements of the county.

Ms. Timmer stated, that she thought that the major portion of the landscaping was supposed to be in front of the new storage area; they are not going in from the driveway back toward the building, they are going from the driveway to the new building.

Mr. Guscio stated, that he will work with Judy Timmer regarding the number of plants and the size of the trees for the project. Mr. Guscio stated, that they are proposing boat storage, RV storage, and parking, but no sales.

Ms. Austin stated, that the Development Review Team was supposed to only approve business storage, as it relates to the boat sales. Ms. Austin stated, that she believed that this approval was to store the extra boats that he had for his business, in the storage area. Ms. Austin stated, that this is a boat sales business, not a RV sales business.

Mr. Guscio stated, that this approval is going to be for people who want to also store their boats in the storage area.

Mr. Criscitiello asked the Development Review Team members, "Is this a permitted use?"

Ms. Frazier stated, that this use is allowed in the Commercial Regional zoning district.

Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant's narrative does not mention anything about a RV park; it only indicates boats with trailers, and empty trailers. Ms. Austin stated, that the fire marshall did not approve the RV park portion of this application.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the Development Review Team needs to defer this project for a week, in order to go back to review the application. The applicant shall revise the narrative that was submitted for this

project, so it's clear what the county is approving, and to make sure that all the paperwork matches the plans.

**THE DRT UNANIMOUSLY DEFERRED THE PROJECT FOR A WEEK. THE APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT A LANDSCAPE PLAN TO COMPLY WITH THE CRB STANDARDS, WHICH WILL BE APPROVED BY JUDY TIMMER. THE APPLICANT SHALL REVISE THE NARRATIVE TO REFLECT WHAT IS REQUESTED. THE FIRE MARSHALL SHALL REVIEW AND SIGNOFF ON THE REVISION FOR AN RV STORAGE AREA. (FOR: AUSTIN, CUMMINGS, FRAZIER).**

#### **5. SUN CITY HH – SPORTS COMPLEX (REVISIT/AMENDMENT)**

Mr. Cummings stated, that he recommends approval to the rest of the Development Review Team members.

**THE DRT UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE AMENDMENT AS SUBMITTED. (FOR: AUSTIN, CUMMINGS, FRAZIER).**

#### **6. ISLAND WEST – COMMERCIAL TRACT S/D (CONCEPTUAL)**

Ms. Austin asked Mr. Lyle, "Why is the access easement still on the plat, since the plat was changed to three lots, instead of four?"

Mr. Ryan Lyle, representative for the applicant answered, "What I was told before getting involved, was that the lot that fronts on Hwy 278 and the Goodwill lot was going to take the single access off of the new North South road; they did not want to have multiple entrances".

Ms. Austin stated, that an access easement is only needed if the applicant is subdividing the property.

Mr. Lyle stated, that they are subdividing lot B2-A.

Ms. Austin stated, that lot B2-A should be shown on the construction plans/plats. Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant shall remove the access easement off of the plans/plats, because subdivision lots share driveways, not access easements. Ms. Austin stated, that the property owner cannot grant himself an access easement; the applicant shall place a driveway-shared curb cut on the subdivision plat. Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant shall also remove the buildings, parking, etc off of the subdivision plats.

Ms. Frazier asked the applicant to give a 20-foot access easement to the county, that's adjacent to the property; so in the future, the county could build a two-lane road.

Mr. Lyle stated, that as a contingency to get Stokes Toyota approved, they were mandated to construct a one-lane road to Island West; now the Development Review Team is making a separate contingency for Island West – Phase 2 to widen the existing road. Mr. Lyle stated, in order to widen the existing road, it would require impact to the existing non-jurisdictional wetlands.

Mr. Colin Kinton stated, that he will speak with Mr. Klink, the county Engineer regarding the impact into the wetland.

Mr. Bill Krodus, president of the Island West Homeowners Association stated, that he doesn't know how much input the residence of Island West has, regarding anything that's done right around their area, or anything that immediately affects them in accordance with their entrances and exits. Mr. Krodus stated, that he's looking for direction of where to go and who to talk to, if the Island West people have a problem with the design of the building or the layout of the area; how it effects the golf course, how it effects their main entrance, in which they are in the process of moving.

Mr. Criscitiello explained to Mr. Krodus, that he is in the right venue for this conversation, and he is addressing the people who are able to address his concerns. Mr. Criscitiello stated, that the board may

not be able to agree with some of the things that he might ask them about, but they will tell him what they can or can't do within their power to help the people of the Island West community.

Mr. Krokus stated, that some of the citizens have a problem with the design of the Goodyear store. Mr. Krokus asked Mr. Criscitiello, "Is there any way we could have an input, or speak on what is being designed?" Mr. Krokus stated, that the residence would really like to have an input on what's happening in the Island West PUD.

Mr. Criscitiello stated to Mr. Krokus, that the next item on the agenda is the actual conceptual plan for the Goodwill store. What's in front of the Development Review Team right now, is the subdivision of the land, which would allow the Goodwill store to be on the property. This is the technical aspect of the design process, the next aspect of it is more into the architectural and the appearance issues; but they're happy to hear and give him an opportunity for direction, when it's appropriate. The Development Review Team is one phase of the process; the other phase is the Corridor Review Board; they will review the appearance, materials, colors, roof pits, and all of those things that relates to the appearance of the Goodwill store.

**THE DRT UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE PROJECT WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS. THE APPLICANT SHALL REMOVE THE ACCESS EASEMENT OFF OF LOT B-1. THE APPLICANT SHALL REMOVE STOKES HONDA BUILDING, OTHER BUILDINGS, AND THE PARKING OFF OF THE SUBDIVISION PLATS. THE APPLICANT SHALL DONATE A 20' ACCESS EASEMENT TO THE COUNTY, IN ORDER TO BUILD A TWO-LANE ROAD (SANTEE COOPER). THE PLAT SHALL SHOW THE SHARED DRIVEWAY CURBCUT FOR THE GOODWILL STORE'S PROPERTY. (FOR: AUSTIN, CUMMINGS, FRAZIER).**

## **7. ISLAND WEST – GOODWILL STORE (CONCEPTUAL)**

Ms. Austin asked Mr. Lyle, "How did you get the amount of parking for this project?"

Mr. Lyle stated, that he really doesn't know; he was just brought into this project at the last minute. Mr. Lyle asked Ms. Austin, "Since this is a Planned Unit Development, what is the parking ratios requirement for the Goodwill Store?"

Ms. Austin answered, "For retail, it's four parking spaces per 1,000 square feet". Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant has to ask for a modulation, because the numbers are not adding up. Ms. Austin stated, that the ordinance also requires one loading space per 25,000 square foot of building, and the applicant is showing three loading spaces.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the applicant shall remove two spaces off of the plans.

Ms. Austin stated, that the Development Review Team cannot modulate loading spaces, so the applicant would have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance if he doesn't want to remove the spaces off of the plans.

**THE DRT UNANIMOUSLY DEFERRED THE PROJECT UNTIL THE APPLICANT SHOWS THE PARKING LAYOUT ON THE PLANS. (FOR: AUSTIN, CUMMINGS, FRAZIER).**

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