The scheduled meeting of the Beaufort County Development Review Team was held on Wednesday, July 16, 2008, in the Executive Conference Room, the 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

Mr. Tony Criscitiello, Interim Deputy Administrator Mrs. Lisa Glover, Zoning Analyst III Mr. Colin Kinton, Traffic Engineer 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. Frazier seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier).

3. LOT 1, BIG OAK STREET (BULKHEAD/REVISIT)

Ms. Austin stated, that on the application, the applicant showed the length of the bulkhead to be 38 feet, but the OCRM permit states 85-feet of bulkhead.

Mr. Matt Yocco, applicant, stated to the board, that the lot adjoining his property was originally a part of his property, and it was an error on the surveyors part; the wall is only 40 feet long.

Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Yocco, "When was the property subdivided?"

Mr. Yocco stated, that it was subdivided before he purchased the property.

Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant shall provide an updated OCRM permit with the correct length of bulkhead, and a revised plat removing the portion of lot 2.

Mr. Yocco asked the board to review his landscape plan, to make sure that everything was okay with it.

Ms. Timmer stated, that the natural resource planner informed her that the landscape plan looked okay; there's no problem with the landscape plan at this time.

MOTION: Ms. Austin made a motion to defer the project, until the applicant submits an amended OCRM permit reducing the length of the bulkhead from 85 feet to 38 feet. Submit a revised plat removing the portion of lot 2. Ms. Frazier seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier).

4. LOT 16, SEA CREST LANE (RIVER-BUFFER/REVISIT)

Mr. Cummings stated to the board, that he recommends approval of the river-buffer waiver.

MOTION: Mr. Cummings made a motion to approve the river-buffer waiver @ 20.70 feet from the OCRM critical line. Ms. Frazier seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier).

Mr. Klink arrived to the meeting at approximately 11:22 a.m.

5. TIDEWATCH COMMERCIAL CENTER – PHASE 3 (CONCEPTUAL)

Mr. Steve Mitchell explained to the board, that a development permit was done for this phase of Tide Watch Commercial Center, and the zoning designation changed from commercial to Lady's Island Village Center; they are proposing to place business storage and residential storage units on the property.

Ms. Austin stated, that business storage is not allowed in the Lady's Island Village Center, only residential storage. Ms. Austin stated, that business storage could be used as an accessory use for the tenants only. Ms. Austin stated, that residential storage could be used for anyone other than the tenants of the complex, but the applicant would have to obtain a special use permit. Ms. Austin stated, that the Development Review Team asked for an approval from the owners of the property for the new building, and for the applicant to show the connectivity to Meadowbrook Road.

Mr. Mitchell stated, that on the plan that was submitted to the Development Review Team, it showed the connectivity to Meadowbrook Road, which is not a real road; it is just a right-of-way. Mr. Mitchell stated, that he and the owners are trying to figure out how they can build the road in the most efficient and cost effective way. Mr. Mitchell stated, that MEI, LLC is the owner of the regime, which is stated in the original condominium documents.

Ms. Austin asked Mr. Mitchell, "Do you own all of the spaces in the complex, or do you lease the spaces?"

Mr. Mitchell stated, that the buildings are condominiums, and the owners own sheet rock to sheet rock.

Ms. Austin stated, that she thought that the owners were supposed to own the land underneath the buildings, jointly for the regime. Ms. Austin stated, that all of the owners of the regime have a say in this proposed project.

Mr. Mitchell stated, that the condominium document specifically addresses the fact that they would be building the storage units.

Ms. Frazier asked Ms. Austin, "If it could be approved as an accessory building to this site, to be utilized by the tenants, could it be approved without going through the special use process?"

Ms. Austin answered, "Yes".

Mr. Criscitiello stated, that Mr. Mitchell has a choice to proceed with the residential storage units by going through the special use process, or proceed with the business storage units, as an accessory building, to be utilized by the tenants of the condominiums.

Ms. Timmer stated, that the applicant would also have to go before the Corridor Review Board for approval.

Mr. Mitchell asked the board, to consider this use as business storage units, as an accessory use to the existing building, instead of the residential storage use, to avoid the special use process.

MOTION: Ms. Frazier made a motion to conceptually approve the project, subject to submitting a notarized statement, signed by the owners within the horizontal regime, granting consent for the proposed project. Revise the site plan showing the proposed curb cut into Meadowbrook Drive. The applicant shall obtain approval from the Corridor Review Board prior to submitting for final approval. Ms. Austin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier, Klink).

6. SPRING ISLAND - RECREATIONAL AREA EXPANSION (CONCEPTUAL)

Mr. Klink stated, that he recommends approval of this expansion.

MOTION: Mr. Klink made a motion to conceptually approve the expansion. Mr. Cummings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier, Klink).

7. DUCOIN @ HABERSHAM (CONCEPTUAL)

Ms. Frazier stated, that there were issues with the parking, sidewalk, etc. Ms. Frazier asked Ms. Austin, "Did the applicant respond to the recommendation letter, issued by the Development Review Team?"

Ms. Austin answered, "No".

Mr. Criscitiello read the comments from the Development Review Team, which was dated June 18, 2008.

MOTION: Ms. Frazier made a motion to defer the project, until all of the Development Review Team's comments, dated June 18, 2008 are addressed. Mr. Cummings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier, Klink).

8. LOT 30, DOWNING DRIVE (RIVER- BUFFER WAIVER/PERMIT EXTENSION)

Mr. Klink stated, that he recommends approval of the one-year permit extension.

MOTION: Mr. Klink made a motion to approve the permit extension for one year. Mr. Cummings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier, Klink).

9. BEAUFORT ACADEMY (PRE-APPLICATION)

Mr. Tim Rentz, applicant explained to the board, that Beaufort Academy is a non-conforming use, and would like to get a master plan for the Beaufort Academy approved by the Development Review Team.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the applicant could apply for a special use permit to get the master plan approved; that would be a "by right" development in the future. Ms. Frazier stated, that the first step is for the applicant to come to the Development Review Team for conceptual approval. Second, the applicant would have to go through the Corridor Review Board for conceptual approval of the master plan. Third, the applicant would have to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a special use approval for the master plan. Lastly, the applicant would have to go back to the Development Review Team for final approval. Ms. Frazier stated, that the applicant shall submit a scaled master plan, showing the existing and proposed structures, and provide a plat of the property.

Mr. Rentz asked the board, "Do we need a tree survey at this time?"

Ms. Frazier answered, "No".

Ms. Timmer stated, that the Corridor Review Board would want to see the existing trees on site, and how this plan affects the trees.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the applicant would need to provide a natural resource survey, showing the existing forest areas on the site, and how much forest they are proposing to protect, in the long term.

Mr. Rentz asked the board, "Can we show a boundary, showing the location of the existing trees?"

Ms. Frazier stated, that she's okay with the applicant showing a boundary of the existing trees on site, instead of a tree survey at this time.

Mr. Kinton stated, that since the amount of children will not increase tremendously, the applicant does not have to submit a traffic impact study at this time. In the future, a traffic impact study may be required, whenever the phases of the master plan are proposed for development.

The Development Review Team unanimously decided that the approval process would require the applicant to submit for conceptual approval, conceptual Corridor Review Board approval, Development Review Team's recommendation, special use approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals, and final approval from the Development Review Team. The applicant shall submit the Natural Resource Calculations, an aerial map showing the required forested areas, open space areas, buildings, etc., a survey of the entire property, a scaled master plan showing the existing and proposed structures. The Development Review Team waived the Traffic Impact Study. The Traffic Impact Study may be required whenever phases of the master plan are proposed for development. (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier, Klink).

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:57 a.m.