

The scheduled meeting of the Beaufort County Development Review Team was held on Wednesday, January 7, 2009, in the Second Floor 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, 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 11:04 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 defer the adoption of the minutes until the next scheduled meeting. Mr. Klink seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier, Klink).

Mr. Criscitiello stated, that item #3 (USCB – New River Housing – Phase 1) will be moved to the end of the agenda, due to the need to get records pertaining to the project.

3. SHEPHERD’S HOUSE (AMENDMENT)

Ms. Frazier stated, that the applicant was requesting to reduce the buffer from 50’ to 25’, which the zoning ordinance permits. Ms. Frazier stated, that she recommends approval of the modulation to 25’; but in regards to the revised planting for the buffers, the applicant shall meet with Judy Timmer, the Corridor Review Board Planner to discuss the landscape plan, and the possibility of relocating appropriate plantings as needed.

MOTION: Ms. Frazier made a motion to approve the amendment with the condition, that the Corridor Review Planner meets the applicant in the field to discuss the landscape plan and the possibility of relocating appropriate plantings as needed. The Development Review Team approved the modulation of the buffers from 50’ to 25’. Mr. Cummings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier, Klink).

4. BEAUFORT COUNTY – SHERIFF’S DNA LAB – SPECIAL USE (REVISIT/CONCEPTUAL)

Ms. Frazier stated, that she was okay with what the applicant proposed, with regards to the mitigation of the buffer. Ms. Frazier stated, that she would like to recommend approval, with the condition that the

applicant submits a revised landscape plan at final submittal, which may need to go to the Corridor Review Board for approval. Ms. Frazier stated, that the applicant shall revise the narrative to state the correct section of the zoning ordinance; the applicant used the standards of Section 106-522 instead of Section 106-552 of the Zoning & Development Standards Ordinance.

MOTION: Ms. Frazier made a motion to approve the project with the condition, that the applicant revises the landscape plan, which may be approved by the Corridor Review Board. The applicant shall revise the narrative to reflect Section 106-552 (Special Use) instead of Section 106-522 (Variance Section) of the zoning ordinance. Mr. Cummings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier, Klink).

Mr. Criscitiello stated, that he is recusing himself from the discussion of this project. Mr. Criscitiello asked Ms. Austin to take over the meeting for this project; Mr. Criscitiello left the meeting room @ approximately 11:15 a.m.

5. BULL POINT – PHASE 7 (REVISIT/CONCEPTUAL)

Ms. Austin stated, that at the last meeting, the Development Review Team had issues regarding the off-site drain field, and needed proof from the property owners that the small little lots were going to be deeded back to the developer; the property owners have not submitted letters stating, that they were okay with deeding the lots back to the developer. Ms. Austin stated, that the applicant submitted the septic tank permits and the deeds, but not the letters. Ms. Austin stated, that she briefly reviewed the tree survey, and it looks like a lot of trees are slated to be removed; the applicant may have to pay into the tree reforestation fund. Ms. Austin stated, that there was a discrepancy on the application; the acreage on the application is different from the acreage on the base site area.

MOTION: Mr. Klink made a motion to defer this project, until the required letters/affidavits from the property owners are submitted, agreeing to the deeding of the small lots, and also agreeing to the new septic system on their respective lots. The applicant shall indicate the correct acreage of the property to be subdivided. The application and the natural resource analysis should reflect the same acreage. The tree removal/plant back requirements will be available at final submission. Mr. Cummings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier, Klink).

Mr. Criscitiello was called back into the meeting at approximately 11:21 a.m.

6. SHANKLIN ROAD CITIZEN'S CONVENIENCE CENTER (CONCEPTUAL)

Ms. Frazier stated, that the applicant shall revise the wording on the plans, from "8-foot berm is constructed with white goods", to "8-foot berm to be constructed for the screening of the white goods area". Ms. Frazier stated, that the applicant is proposing to construct a small septic system for the project instead of tying into the sewer force main along Shanklin Road.

Mr. Klink stated, that he's okay with the use of the septic system, due to the small size of the proposed building.

MOTION: Ms. Frazier made a motion to approve the project, subject to the applicant revising the wording on the plans, from "8-foot berm is constructed with white goods", to "8-foot berm to be constructed for the screening of the white goods area". The Development Review Team approved the use of the septic system, due to the small size of the proposed building. Mr. Klink seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier, Klink).

7. USCB – NEW RIVER HOUSING – STUDENT CENTER RELOCATION (CONCEPTUAL)

Ms. Austin stated, that she doesn't think that the original permit can be amended, due to the fact that the project received a Certificate of Compliance.

Mr. Klink stated, in regards to the road, in the past there's been some dispute about the ownership of the road, and he would like that cleared up prior to the approval of this project.

Ms. Austin asked Mr. Klink, "Was the road deeded to the county?"

Mr. Klink answered, "No, it's not a county road".

Mr. Mike Parrot, USCB representative stated, that the road is either owned by D.R. Horton or the University Park Property Owners Association.

Ms. Austin stated, that the road needs to be owned by the Property Owners Association, not D.R. Horton.

Mr. Klink stated, that the Property Owners Association is in the process of turning the road over to the county. Mr. Klink stated, to disregard his concern, because he's going to push to get the road accepted by the county.

Ms. Frazier stated, that since a new permit has to be issued, the applicant has to receive conceptual approval and final approval in order for the permit to be issued.

Mr. Scott Monson, Thomas & Hutton Engineering stated, that he was told that the Development Review Team could approve the project as an amendment.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the Development Review Team could consider this project as conceptual today, but the applicant would have to go back to the Development Review Team for final approval.

Ms. Austin stated, that if the county takes over the road, the applicant shall get an encroachment permit through the county.

MOTION: Ms. Frazier made a motion to conceptually approve the project, with the condition that the applicant submits for final approval. The applicant shall apply for a county encroachment permit after University Boulevard has been turned over to the county. Ms. Austin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Austin, Cummings, Frazier, Klink).

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:41a.m.