

NORTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
April 13, 2010, Beaufort Industrial Village #2

Members Present:

Brian Coffman
Bradley Bowden
Michael Brock
William Sammons

Members Absent:

Kenneth Dixon
Kevin Farruggio
William Harris

Staff Present: Judy Nash Timmer, Development Review Planner
Linda Maietta, Planning Assistant

I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:35 p.m. by Mr. Brian Coffman, Chairman.

II. **General Public Comment:** There were no public comments.

III. **Review of Minutes:** There were no minutes submitted to review. Meeting minutes will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Chairman Coffman made a motion to add the Board elections for Chair and Vice Chair to the agenda under Other Business. Motion was seconded by Mr. Bowden. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Coffman, Bowden, Brock, Sammons).

IV. **Old Business:** There was no old business to discuss.

V. **New Business:** There was no new business to discuss.

VI. **Other Business:**

A. Elections

Mr. Bowden nominated Mr. Coffman for Chairman. Mr. Sammons seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Coffman, Bowden, Brock, Sammons). Mr. Coffman will continue as Chairman of the Northern Corridor Review Board.

Mr. Brock nominated Mr. Farruggio for Vice Chairman. Mr. Bowden seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Coffman, Bowden, Brock, Sammons). Mr. Farruggio will continue as Vice Chairman of the Northern Corridor Review Board.

B. Review of Checklist for Project Submittal

Ms. Timmer opened the discussion providing background on the revisions to the checklist. In conjunction with the Southern Corridor Review Board, the following changes are suggested:

- Return to a true CONCEPTUAL, preliminary and final process
- Conceptual would not necessarily involve hard-line drawings (could be hand-drawn)
- Conceptual would not be a mandatory step
- Conceptual would be for feedback from the Board to the applicant; no vote/approval necessary
- Have conceptual be reviewed by the Corridor Review Board (CRB) and the Development Review Team (DRT) at the same time or possibly prior to submitting to DRT

Ms. Timmer is confident the review process could still be completed in three meetings. She is hoping these changes will give CRB more input on quality site design issues. Ms. Timmer will be discussing this proposed change with the DRT.

The Board continued to discuss ideas involving conceptual review:

- Important issue to remember: while the Board will be making suggestions to the applicant, the applicant is also receiving direction from DRT, the client, the engineer, the architect. The Board needs to recognize that if one of their suggestions is not implemented; direction may have been given to the applicant by another source.
- Have the applicant submit a building footprint allowing the Board to address, and possibly save, existing trees
- Fees: possibly charging \$50.00 for the conceptual review and keep the \$175.00 fee for both preliminary and final submissions

Mr. Bowden then directed the Board to look at the CRB standards in the Zoning and Development Standards Division (ZDSO), Section 106.582, and objectives listed in Chapter 106, Appendix B, Section 1. Mr. Bowden stated that at a conceptual submission, these standards and objectives should be addressed and reviewed. In reviewing these standards, Ms. Timmer explained the term “use” as what the current zoning is now for the site selected. Ms. Timmer also stated that a few changes needed to be made to the ZDSO, removing “minimizing sprawl” and “encouraging economic development.” These are not the responsibility of the CRB. The Board continued to discuss the inclusion of the standards and objectives as part of the conceptual review:

- Make the standards and objectives into a checklist that is given to an applicant, alerting them to the fact that the Board will be reviewing these issues with them, whether its at the conceptual or preliminary review
- Board needs to pull together and be consistent in implementing the standards and objectives, expressing their opposition to plans presented, as warranted
- If an applicant is not meeting the ordinance requirements, the Board needs to speak to that. That is the responsibility of each of the Board members.
- Mr. Bowden then recommended these standards and objectives be addressed in a narrative submission, by the applicant, presented to the Board.
- Chairman Coffman agreed. The conceptual package the applicant has to submit should be minimal but should include a checklist addressing each of the ordinance issues.
- The Board believed this would make it easier to guide an applicant at a very early stage in the design review process. Including franchise architecture that is not appropriate for the low country.

Chairman Coffman then asked if the conceptual review should be optional or mandatory. He recommended we keep the fee out and have this be a mandatory step. Discussion continued:

- Chairman Coffman reviewed the checklist emailed to the Board and made quite a few changes. He felt there was too much information required at a conceptual level. If the applicant came in with a site plan and maybe two sketch elevations to show proposed building mass and scale, it would get the point across.
- Mr. Brock reminded the Board that at the end of last year, they did talk about the process and getting it back in line with the ZDSO. Making this a mandatory conceptual would do that.
- Mr. Bowden felt it would also help the citizen members of the Board understand the entire process.
- Chairman Coffman summed up what he thought the conceptual review submittal package should include: a narrative to describe the nature and scope of the project and how they meet the ZDSO standards and objectives, proposed usage and square footage, existing vegetation to remain or be removed, parking, and stormwater management ideas. He'd also like to see the checklist revised to a concise format.

- Ms. Timmer stated that the checklist could be massaged a little bit to make it look like less but the information asked for is important for a thorough conceptual review.
- Chairman Coffman stated that a conceptual site plan could be a sketch on top of an existing site survey. The conceptual tree removal plan should show an X marked on the trees being removed. As for the building, a proposed building footprint is all that is needed, with stormwater management pond ideas, locations, proposed parking area.
- Ms. Timmer stated this process could really be simplified. It could be an existing survey (done within the last two years) with an overlay.
- Chairman Coffman also suggested that Ms. Timmer have some kind of basic example on file that she can share with applicants prior to review by the Board. Ms. Timmer also thought it might be something she can post on the County website.
- Mr. Bowden asked about a location map being provided with an original submittal to give a better sense of what is in the area and a picture of what is existing. Maybe this could be a recommendation for applicants to provide, rather than a requirement. Ms. Timmer suggested that this may become part of her staff review.

As the discussion progressed with more ideas, Ms. Timmer suggested that she meet with Chairman Coffman to continue to go over his recommendations and pull together a draft package. Ms. Timmer will set up the meeting and advise all Board members of the date/time.

Ms. Timmer stated that Mr. Kubic has asked the staff to look at some sort of accreditation process for people who are submitting to CRB, specifically the architects. Ms. Timmer has recommended that an existing video about Beaufort County and what it is plus interviews with architects, landscape architects and board members might do the trick. Applicants would need to view the video.

C. Continuing Education

Chairman Coffman asked for information on the requirements for continuing education. Ms. Timmer stated that as a Board member, you are required to get continuing education credits that would apply to your role on this Board. Ms. Maietta had emailed all Board members a website that lists approved events that are creditable. In addition, emails have gone out regarding audio conferences being offered by the City of Beaufort. The requirement is 6 hours during the first 18 months of your appointment, with 3 hours every year after.

Chairman Coffman adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:50 p.m.

Approved 5/11/10

