

The scheduled meeting of the Beaufort County Development Review Team was held on Wednesday, April 25, 2012, in the Executive Conference Room, the Beaufort County Administration Building at 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Charles Atkinson, Building Codes Director
Ms. Hillary Austin, Zoning Administrator
Ms. Delores Frazier, Assistant Planning Director

MEMBERS ABESENT

Mr. Robert Klink, County Engineer

STAFF PRESENT

Mr. Tony Criscitiello, Planning Director
Mrs. Lisa Glover, Zoning Analyst III
Mr. Colin Kinton, Traffic Engineer

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Criscitiello called the meeting to order at approximately 11:00 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 approve the April 4, 2012 minutes, as submitted. Mr. Atkinson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Atkinson, Austin, and Frazier).

3. TSC – TRACTOR SUPPLY CO. – (CONCEPT)

Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Hilderbrand, "What is the status of the Santee Cooper approval?"

Mr. Hilderbrand stated, that they met with Santee Cooper about 45 days ago, and that the normal approval takes about 30 days, but it has gone beyond that, and they anticipate having the agreement anyday now.

Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Hilderbrand, "Were you going to have on-site, or sanitary sewer lines?"

Mr. Hilderbrand stated, that they will have on-site disposal. They researched where the existing sanitary sewer is, and it is not feasible to tie into it.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the location of the on-site disposal, needs to be indicated on the site plan. Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Hilderbrand, "Are you aware that this project has to go through the Corridor Review Board?"

Mr. Hilderbrand answered, "Yes."

Mr. Criscitiello asked the board, "Do we have any concerns regarding the Matthews Marine property, as a result of this subdivision?"

Ms. Austin answered, "Yes. The board would like to see a revised plan for the Matthews Marine site; based on what was approved by the DRT, it looks like there is some encroachment, and by changing the lot lines, the board doesn't want to create a non-conforming situation for Mr. Matthews."

Mr. Criscitiello asked Ms. Austin, "What would be the essence of the modifications to the Matthews Marine site?"

Ms. Austin stated, that he would be losing some parking, to include handicapped parking; the pond is also being modified, so the board needs to know exactly how it's going to be done.

Mr. Hilderbrand stated, that once they get further along in the process, they would go through drainage calculations and prepare the natural plan; they just wanted to get through the Conceptual process first.

Ms. Austin asked Mr. Hilderbrand, "Where will the septic system be located?"

Mr. Hilderbrand stated, that he was given an environmental engineer to consult with, so he couldn't say exactly where the septic system would be located. Mr. Matthews has additional property that could be acquired, in order to accommodate the septic tank and drainfield through the fee simple or easement area.

Ms. Austin stated, that an offsite drainfield is not normally done when you subdivide the land, it has to be contained on the property; you might need to look at that before the plat is approved.

Ms. Frazier stated, that she's okay with this application being forwarded to the Corridor Review Board for their conceptual review of the buffers and architecture, if they are ready.

Mr. Hilderbrand stated, that the majority of the property is cleared, and they don't really anticipate any tree impact; very limited areas could be impacted by drainfield, and there's ample room to accommodate it.

Ms. Frazier stated, that it would be nice to know the boundaries of this project at this point, and what impact those boundaries will have on the Matthews property, because the DRT doesn't want to create a non-conforming site for Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Hilderbrand stated, that they are not anticipating a large drainfield.

Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Hilderbrand, "Is bringing the DRT back a revised site plan that shows the septic tank and drainage locations, and ultimately the property boundaries, something you can bring back rather quickly?"

Mr. Hilderbrand answered, "Yes."

Mr. Atkinson stated, that it makes him uncomfortable to do any kind of conditional approval based on the property lines, because we don't know what Mr. Matthews is going to do. If it goes to the Corridor Review Board, he doesn't mind, but the DRT will need to see what the final plan is going to look like.

Mr. Hilderbrand stated, that he prefers to do that. He was asked to draw property lines on the plat to establish some boundaries to what the property would be; but typically they don't do that until they get all of the setbacks, open space etc., worked out.

Ms. Austin stated, that the DRT need to see the septic tank approvals, and how it will affect Mr. Matthews' property.

Ms. Frazier stated, that she recommends the project be deferred, and that the project be forwarded to the Corridor Review Board for review.

MOTION: Ms. Frazier made a motion to defer the project, until the applicant submits all items to the DRT, along with the Santee Cooper approval; the project is allowed to move forward to the Corridor Review Board for review. Mr. Atkinson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Atkinson, Austin, and Frazier).

4. TARGET CTR. HWY 278 – (SITE IMPROVEMENTS/PHASING PLAN)

Ms. Frazier stated, that nothing was received in writing, only a revised site plan; Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Ryan Lyle to explain why they were requesting the phasing plan.

Mr. Ryan Lyle of Andrews & Burgess Engineering stated, that he's been told by his clients and attorney's that they are working out issues behind the scenes, and he is to submit the revised site plan showing what the DRT approved under the development permit. Mr. Lyle stated, that they just want to phase out the construction to show the majority of the intersection in Phase 1; and Phase 2 is the connection to the car dealership.

Mr. Criscitiello stated, that the cross hatching of the area need to be removed off of the illustration on Phase 2, to include the wording "Future Development"; and Phase 2, connecting to the car dealership must be removed.

Ms. Frazier stated, that the wording can still be shown, but it need to be lightened up so it does not become confusing.

Mr. Lyle stated, that they want to show everything.

Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Lyle, "Have you requested a re-inspection of the tree protection barriers?"

Mr. Lyle answered, "Yes, we have".

Mr. Colin Kinton, Traffic Engineer asked Mr. Lyle, "Can you show how Phase 1 connects, and does it violate the encroachment permit with SCDOT?"

Mr. Lyle stated, that it was his understanding that it would not impact the frontage road, nor tie into it until the issues are resolved, so it will be a straight line. Mr. Lyle stated, that they will connect a curve line, so everything can continue to operate. They will resubmit the plans, showing the connectivity, and verify that SCDOT's encroachment permit is still good. Phase 2 will not be approved until the agreement is completed.

Mr. Kinton asked Mr. Lyle, to submit a revised plan, showing the connectivity and the curve lines.

Mr. Lyle stated, that he will revise the plans accordingly, and verify how SCDOT's encroachment permit will be affected.

Ms. Frazier asked Mr. Kinton, if he was comfortable with the approval with conditions, if Mr. Lyle submits a revised site plan, and confirms SCDOT's encroachment permit, and that Phase 2 will not be approved until the connection is agreed upon by the adjacent property owner.

Mr. Kinton answered, "Yes."

Ms. Frazier stated, that she would like to recommend approval with the conditions as previously stated.

MOTION: Ms. Frazier made a motion to approve the project, with the conditions that the applicant revise the site plans, removing the cross hatching off of the illustration in Phase 2, and lighten or remove the wording "Future Development" and "Car Dealership" off of the plans in Phase 2. Also, show on the plans the connectivity and the curve lines on Phase 1; Phase 2 will not be approved until the agreement is finished. Applicant shall verify with SCDOT that the encroachment permit is still good, and that Phase 2 will not be approved until the connectivity is agreed upon by the adjacent property owner. Ms. Austin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (FOR: Atkinson, Austin, and Frazier).

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:24 a.m.