

The regular meeting of the Beaufort County Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") was held on Tuesday, October 2, 2001, in the County Council Chambers of the Beaufort County Administration Building at 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Jim Hicks, Chair  
Mr. John Abney  
Mr. Jerome Goode  
Mr. Paul Keyserling

Mr. Ben Johnson, III, Vice Chair  
Ms. Nancy Ann Ciehanski  
Ms. Margie Jenkins  
Mr. Mike Zara

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mr. Thomas Mike, Sr

**EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Mr. Anthony J. Criscitiello, Planning Director  
Ms. Delores Frazier, Long-range Manager  
Ms. Barbara Childs, Admin. Assistant to Planning Director  
Mr. H. "Buz" Boehm, Deputy Administrator of Development & Services

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Hicks called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Chairman Hicks led those assembled in the pledge of allegiance.

**REVIEW OF MINUTES:** The minutes of the September 4, 2001, Commission meeting were reviewed. No corrections were noted. **MOTION: Mr. Abney made a motion, and Ms. Jenkins seconded, to accept the amended minutes of the September 4, 2001, meeting. The motion was carried (FOR: Abney, Goode, Jenkins, and Keyserling; ABSTAINED: Ciehanski, Johnson, & Zara).**

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT:**

1. **CIP:** Chairman Hicks noted that this year's CIP committee would include Commission Chair as member, with the Vice Chair filling in as an alternate for the Chair if needed. Chairman Hicks noted that there would not be many new projects added. After the facilities study is completed, recommendations will be handled separately over a period of years. Mr. Boehm addressed Commission concerns included road improvements, the Broad River boat landing improvement, the Facilities Study, this year's CIP process, and the re-rating of projects if needed.

2. **Resignation:** Ms. Ciehanski, the Commission's parliamentarian, resigning effective today due to health reasons. Chairman Hicks noted that her input would be missed and thanked her for her contributions to the Commission.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

1. Pastor Woodrow Daniels, Jr., a Lobeco resident, presented a petition that opposed the proposed Lobeco Community Preservation/CP District. He noted that there may be duplicated names on his petition and the original petition requesting consideration for the Lobeco CP District. He stated that some petition signers were scared into signing the first petition. Many did not know how they were actually zoned. His petition is asking the Commission to hold off any decision until the Lobeco community comes together in agreement.
2. Mr. Willis Daniels, a Lobeco resident, likes it the way it is (in Lobeco now). He echoed Pastor Woodrow's comments. He noted that a fact sheet and what was promised earlier differed. Told of dog & bone story. Consider waiting.
3. Mr. Gerald Dawson, a former Planning Commissioner and a Lobeco resident, noted that this was his third appearance before the Commission. He knew of the opposition to the proposed Lobeco CP District, and believed that non-Lobeco factions were influencing the opposition. He asked the Commission to allow the Lobeco CP committee to continue its planning process. Without the CP designation, the Lobeco community will be vulnerable to outside development forces.
4. Ms. Carol Tuynman, in regard to the Comprehensive Plan review process, noted that the people in Beaufort are not anti-development and anti-growth. These people simply want to see good growth. She commended the cooperation between the County staff and the municipalities.
5. Mr. Leroy Evans, a resident of Lobeco, stated that he had signed the first petition but does not want the area to be changed. He asked that all residents become informed before any decision is made regarding the Lobeco CP District.
6. Ms. Alice Jones Busby noted the one-and-a-half year's work by the Lobeco CP committee. The Lobeco residents want to be able to plan our community and want to preserve our community. Let the Lobeco CP process go forward.
7. Mr. Woodrow Daniel Sr., a Lobeco resident, stated that the community has not been given any details and a mutual understanding has not occurred. There is confusion even among the CP committee members. The signers of the original petition did not know what they were signing. A promise of better jobs seems unlikely since the area has been designated as a poor district. He noted some past false promises from non-residents. Higher taxes are not needed. Hold off any decision till we understand the CP process. We don't want to jump into it (CP district) and then find out it's too late to turn back.
8. Mr. Frank Mullin, a Lobeco resident, disagrees with holding up the CP process. The Comprehensive Plan supports the Lobeco CP District. Some say the community is divided and the original petition contained forged signatures. Why would the supporters do that? We've worked hard and deserve the CP designation. Everybody can't win. We have the majority voice. We've done our homework. There are some things we don't understand, but we'll learn as we go. Ego is involved, the opponents want to drive the bus and not just ride. Put the Lobeco CP district in a designation state to move it forward. Those against the Lobeco CP District can opt out of the district.

### **STAFF BRIEFING ON CP DISTRICT**

Mr. Criscitiello briefed the Commission that the Planning staff was directed by the Commission to prepare a logical map that would define the proposed Lobeco Community Preservation/CP area. Based on present departmental workload, the map should be brought before the Commission by the end of this year. Because of the upcoming Comprehensive Plan review, the Planning staff has been directed to continue any current work on the Shell Point, the Seabrook and the Corners CP districts, but no new CP work will occur until the completion of the Comprehensive Plan review. Discussion included the staff process and timeframe regarding the Lobeco CP request.

**TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE BEAUFORT COUNTY ZONING & DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS ORDINANCE (ZDSO), ARTICLE VI: TABLE 106-1526, OPEN SPACE & DENSITY STANDARDS; TABLE 106-1556, LOT & BUILDING STANDARDS; TABLE 106-1098, GENERAL USE TABLE; AND SEC. 106-1291, LIMITED/SPECIAL USE STANDARDS** (to change maximum gross density, minimum site area, minimum lot area, and maximum height requirements in Rural districts; and change general auto repair and gas-convenience marts from Limited to Special Uses in Rural districts with additional development standards)

Mr. Criscitiello briefed the Commissioners. These amendments were reworked by Staff as recommended by the Planning Committee and the Commission. Mr. Criscitiello noted typographical errors on the use table and gave the corrected references.

**Public Comment:** Mr. David Daniel Clark stated his wife had a ceramic shop and was told the signage was distracting to the Highway 21 traffic. He perceived racial discrimination was involved.

**Discussion** included clarifying the light fixtures screening requirement to mimic the outdoor storage screening requirement; pitched roof canopies over gas pumps for aesthetic purposes; adding general auto repair and gas service station uses to subparagraph 106-1291(2)f.; performance standards regarding traffic, noise, and odor impacts for waste transfer stations in residential areas; and clarification that community impact assessment included a traffic impact assessment.

**MOTION:** Mr. Zara made a motion, and Ms. Ciechanski seconded, to recommend approval of the text amendments to the Beaufort County Zoning & Development Standards Ordinance (ZDSO), Article VI: Table 106-1526, Open Space & Density Standards; Table 106-1556, Lot & Building Standards; Table 106-1098, General Use Table; and Sec. 106-1291, Limited/Special Use Standards, that changes maximum gross density, minimum site area, minimum lot area, and maximum height requirements in Rural districts; and changes general auto repair and gas-convenience marts from Limited to Special Uses in Rural districts with additional development standards, with the following recommendations included in the amendments:

1. adding general auto repair and gas service station uses to subparagraph 106-1291(2)f.

2. staff provides recommended performance standards for waste transfer station uses. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Abney, Ciehanski, Goode, Jenkins, Johnson, Keyserling and Zara).

**SOUTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY REZONING/MAP AMENDMENT TO THE  
BEAUFORT COUNTY ZONING MAP, R600-21-8 & PART OF 7B, FROM RURAL-  
TRANSITIONAL OVERLAY/R-TO TO COMMERCIAL REGIONAL/CR;  
APPLICANT: MR. ROBERT L. GRAVES**

Mr. Criscitiello briefed the Commissioners. He noted that the R-TO zoning was awarded in March 2001. The applicant is asking that a portion (37.34 acres) of his R-TO property be rezoned to CR. Based on ZDSO text amendments, the Comprehensive Plan and staff review, the future land use map was not in error as the applicant contends. Highway 278 could not adequately meet the increased traffic from the proposed commercial site. Staff believes Commercial Suburban zoning is more appropriate. Staff and the Southern Beaufort County Subcommittee recommended denial of this request.

**Applicant Comments:**

1. Mr. Lewis Hammet, the applicant's representative, briefed that Mr. Graves believes his request is consistent with the current area. Mr. Hammet gave the zoning history of the property. The property will not substantially impact Highway 278. He disagrees with staff's opinion that regional commercial is inappropriate. He noted the corridor makeup of commercial developments from Moss Creek, past Mr. Graves' property, to the regional commercial node at the intersection of Highways 278 and 170. He stated that certain requirements were problematic in other zoning districts and undesirable for Mr. Graves' anticipated uses.
2. Mr. Robert L. Graves noted that more people are concerned about the Okatie area. He is very conscientious of the "green" (rural) area.

**Discussion** included the rationale to rezone part of the R-TO property, the environmental impact of the area, long-term implications, selling development rights or using his property as open space or residential uses instead of commercial uses, the possibility of selection uses to accommodate the applicant, establishing commercial nodes to prevent strip commercial from occurring, the various high density allowable uses in CR zoning, and commending Mr. Graves for not developing near the Okatie River.

**MOTION:** Ms. Ciehanski made a motion, and Mr. Keyserling seconded, to recommend denial of the rezoning/map amendment of the Beaufort County Zoning Map on parcels R600-21-8 & part of 7B, from Rural-Transitional Overlay/R-TO to Commercial Regional/CR, to forward the Wilbur-Smith comments, and to recommend requiring the inclusion of park services on these parcels. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Abney, Ciehanski, Goode, Jenkins, Johnson, Keyserling and Zara).

*Note: Chairman Hicks recessed the meeting at approximately 7:40 p.m. and reconvened it at 7:50 p.m.*

**STAFF BRIEFING ON DRAFT PLANNED DEVELOPMENT/PD ORDINANCE**

Mr. Criscitiello lauded Ms. Frazier for the amendments. The 1994 state enabling legislation eliminated the term “planned unit development” for the concept; the new term is planned development/PD. PDs are allowed in most districts. The uses and densities of a PD must be compatible with the surrounding area.

Discussion included concerns for limitless density, migrating inappropriate density, the lack of height limitations, and inappropriate uses abutting neighboring properties; compatible uses adjacent and across or down the street; promoting bike/walking paths in PDs; the Planning Commission reviewing all PDs; vested rights; the subjectivity of the term “significant” in the amendment; use percentage; financial bonding for protection of prospective buyers (performance or maintenance guarantees); PDs as a planning tool; Beaufort as one of few SC counties without PDs in their zoning ordinance; a recommendation to obtain comments from the developers, architectural firms, attorneys and homebuilders association; the exclusion of an affordable housing option in PDs; the required minimum 5-acre size for PDs; the potentially controversial review process; requiring the use of reclaimed water on golf courses instead of fresh water; and requiring current environmental regulations.

**OTHER BUSINESS:** None.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Zara made a motion, and Ms. Jenkins seconded, to adjourn the meeting. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Abney, Ciehanski, Goode, Jenkins, Johnson, Keyserling, Mike & Zara). Chairman Hicks adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:55 p.m.

**SUBMITTED BY:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Barbara Ann C. Childs, Admin. Assistant to Planning Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Hicks, Chairman, Beaufort County Planning Commission

**APPROVED:** November 6, 2001

**Get approved CIP list for Mr. Goode = mail ASAP**