The scheduled meeting of the Beaufort County Development Review Team was held on Wednesday, December 10, 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

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mr. Robert Klink, County Engineer

STAFF PRESENT

Mr. Tony Criscitiello, Planning Director Ms. Audra Antonacci, Codes Enforcement Supervisor 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 11:05 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: Ms. Frazier made a motion to defer the adoption of the minutes until the next scheduled meeting. Ms. Austin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier).

3. 23 DOLPHIN VIEW POINT (REVISIT/BULKHEAD)

Ms. Frazier stated, that she recommends approval of this bulkhead, with the condition that the plant back for the fill area be native vegetation, instead of sod.

MOTION: Ms. Frazier made a motion to approve this project, with the condition that the plant back for the fill be native vegetation, instead of sod. Mr. Cummings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier).

4. CALLAWASSIE ISLAND GOLF COURSE TREE REMOVAL (FINAL)

Ms. Frazier stated, that she recommends approval.

MOTION: Ms. Frazier made a motion to approve the application for tree removal. Mr. Cummings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier).

5. FOUR SEASON RESIDENTIAL STORAGE – PHASE 2 (REVISIT/FINAL)

Ms. Timmer stated, that the applicant has to revise the landscape plan, and submit an application to the Corridor Review Board for approval.

Mr. David Karlyk, Carolina Engineering explained to the board, that they had already submitted a landscape plan to the Corridor Review Board, showing plantings on both sides of the property, and the board approved that plan.

Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Karlyk, "Was the landscape plan showing a 50 foot buffer?"

Mr. Karlyk stated, that they showed plantings going all along the border of the property.

Ms. Timmer stated, that the Corridor Review Board approved a 15' buffer, not the required 50' buffer.

Mr. Karlyk stated, that a lot of vegetation was planted in the 15' buffer, and Mr. Criscitiello previously visited the site and determined, that since it was so dense on the site, they did not have to add any more vegetation to the buffer area.

Ms. Timmer stated, that there is a new requirement, that requires the property owner to plant a 50' buffer on their property.

Mr. Criscitiello asked, "When was the new requirement adopted?"

Ms. Frazier stated, that the county amended the ordinance to state, that if there is no buffer required in the table, and you have an adjacent single-family use, then you have to put a 50' buffer on that side.

Ms. Timmer stated, that the applicant shall provide pictures of the buffer, when he submits his application to the Corridor Review Board.

Ms. Austin stated, that the plant back cannot be less than the reforestation of the buffer section, so the applicant has to work out the numbers in order to be in compliance with the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Karlyk asked Ms. Austin, "Why would we be required to reforest any buffers?" Mr. Karlyk stated, that there are currently 72 trees on site, so that's more than enough trees currently on site.

Ms. Austin stated, that the buffer is different than the minimum requirement for the post development, so the applicant has to regenerate the buffer, and that does not count towards the minimum requirement of the trees.

Mr. Karylk stated, that he was not told that he had to reforest the buffers at the previous meeting. Mr. Karylk read into the record, the Development Review Teams comments from the previous meeting.

Ms. Timmer explained to the board, that the applicant's previous conceptual approval expired, and since it expired the applicant is now required to meet the standards of the current ordinance.

Mr. Karylk stated, that the conceptual approval expired, because the county relocated the wetland ditch on the property, and they had to get a new wetland delineation letter from the Army Corp of Engineers, and it took over a year to get the letter back.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the applicant could have asked for an extension for the conceptual approval; the ordinance allows the Development Review Team to grant an extension for conceptual approval, one-month prior to the expiration date.

Ms. Austin asked Mr. Karylk, "Are you planning to relocate the powerlines?"

Mr. Karlyk answered, "Yes".

Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant has to show the relocation of the powerline easement on the plans, and provide an approval letter from SCE&G, approving the relocation of the powerline. Ms. Austin stated, that she suggests the applicant plant around the pond, instead of the 30' drainage easement.

Ms. Frazier stated, that she suggests that the applicant meet with the Corridor Review Planner, Judy Timmer to discuss the landscape plan, prior to submitting to the Corridor Review Board.

MOTION: Ms. Frazier made a motion to defer the project until the applicant revises the landscape plan to vegetate the 50' buffers on a portion of the south side and a portion of the north side of the property, and submit the plan to the Corridor Review Board for approval. The applicant shall show on the plans the relocation of the powerlines, and submit an approval letter from SCE&G for the relocation of the powerlines. The Development Review Team suggested that the applicant meet with the Corridor Review Board Planner, Judy Timmer, prior to the Corridor Review Board submittal. Mr. Cummings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier).

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:25 a.m.