

NORTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
May 11, 2010, Beaufort Industrial Village #2

Members Present:

Brian Coffman
Bradley Bowden
Kevin Farruggio
Mark Dixon
William Harris
William Sammons

Members Absent:

Michael Brock

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

- I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:30 p.m. by Mr. Brian Coffman, Chairman.
- II. **General Public Comment:** There were no public comments.
- III. **Review of Minutes:** December 8, 2009, minutes were not available to review. Minutes from April 13, 2010, were reviewed. Mr. Bowden made a motion, and Mr. Sammons seconded the motion, to accept the April 13, 2010, minutes as written. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Coffman, Bowden, Farrugio, Dixon, Harris, Sammons).
- IV. **Old Business:** There was no old business to discuss.
- V. **New Business:** There was no new business to discuss.
- VI. **Other Business:** Review of Corridor Review Board (CRB) Checklist for Project Submittal

Miss Timmer gave a brief introduction of trying to combine comments received from both the Northern and Southern Board. Ms. Timmer tried to simplify the checklist but at the same time tried to provide direction to the applicant.

Chairman Coffman proceeded to give a brief overview of what happened at the last meeting to bring those members that were absent up-to-date. The Board thoroughly reviewed the conceptual review checklist, discussing ways that the Board might be able to integrate a reference to the actual ordinance standards and objectives. Chairman Coffman would like the Board to review the updated conceptual review checklist Miss

Timmer emailed everyone, take comments, and then meld that into the standards and objectives.

Chairman Coffman started out by saying he still thinks a conceptual review should be required especially if the Board is trying to incorporate the ordinance standards and objectives. One other thought is that if there is going to be charge of \$50 for a submittal fee for conceptual review and it is not required then most people will not come to the conceptual.

Ms. Timmer stated the \$50 fee is primarily to recoup the costs of mailing fees and act as an incentive for applicants to have the review done.

Chairman Coffman stated that it would be very beneficial for the applicant to come in and get some preliminary feedback. Conceptual review may potentially reduce the number of times during the preliminary and have to pay \$175 every time. Mr. Bowden and Mr. Sammons agreed with this assessment.

Mr. Harris stated that while the Board may see this trend, some applicants only do this once so they don't realize how much money they could save. Their design professional should, of course, be advising them that this is the better approach.

Chairman Coffman stated the Board really shouldn't be that concerned about the fee. The County should be; if they want to charge a fee, they charge a fee. From the Board's perspective, it's probably more important that a decision is made if a conceptual review should be required or not.

Mr. Harris thought that time may be an issue with applicants. It may mean another month for reviews to be completed if a conceptual is required.

Ms. Timmer thinks the people above her would agree with that point too. What has to be understood is that if an applicant comes in for conceptual and is willing to listen, (there is an architect and landscape architect on-board who understands what is required), an applicant could get through the process in two meetings. Records typically show three meetings. If we add this, it could appear to some people it may now be four meetings.

Chairman Coffman suggested that the conceptual review could be prior to or concurrent with a DRT conceptual submittal. If both are done at the same time, an applicant may only lose a week or two. Mr. Farruggio agreed. Also, along those lines, item #6 on the checklist should be item #1 instead.

Mr. Bowden then broached the subject of organizing some kind of format or form that would be submitted with the application that was basically a narrative summary of how

the applicant feels they have met the standards and objectives of the ordinance. The Board would then have something in hand when reviewing a project. Chairman Coffman also stated that it gives the Board a piece of paper to look at when they come back in for preliminary and final and say you know your elevations did change quite a bit, I'm not sure that you fit that, do you still feel like you fit this category? How do you feel like to you met that intent? Mr. Farruggio also stated the he felt a lot of times the civil engineers typically drive the whole program and it seems like they're adding the comments for the architecture, as well as the landscaping. Maybe the Board could have the architect be required to add his narrative and his description and the landscape architect and so forth. Just shaking up the narrative a little bit helps.

Mr. Harris felt the idea of a narrative is a good one. However, he feels the more requirements there are, the more forms there are, and the more you have to do for this step, the less attractive it's going to become. Mr. Harris feels some of the items listed on the checklist are beyond conceptual. One worry is that if it becomes too regulated, it's no longer conceptual.

Miss Timmer did bring up this point: if the Board says we see the conceptual plan at the same time as the conceptual DRT, applicants have to show parking spaces and buffers, etc. A conceptual DRT is really a preliminary and it has engineered drawings. Something else that needs to be considered, CRB doesn't need to be reviewing site plans that don't meet the basic ordinance requirements like buffers and building setbacks. The pre-application meeting with Ms. Hillary Austin in Zoning is where the applicant will get the basics for what is required: zoning, open space requirements, square footage of the building. While a pre-application meeting is not required Ms. Timmer feels that it should be a requirement before the Board can do a conceptual review.

Mr. Harris stated that some action on the part of CRB, possibly making recommendations, to let DRT know what the Board's concerns are so that when DRT looks at it, they're not overlooking what the Board thinks are the good things about that conceptual submittal. And when the conceptual plan is given to the CRB to review, a copy of the pre-application form from Ms. Austin should be provided to the CRB so the Board could see the requirements that have been set.

Ms. Timmer thought maybe she should be recommending a change in the DRT process by trying to pull the conceptual review back in. In the long run, just like what we're trying to do here, it will help the applicant more. A conceptual DRT where applicants can come to staff level review by both Ms. Delores Frazier and Ms. Austin.

Mr. Bowden questioned if the Board has the responsibility to create the questions or will the staff do that? Ms. Timmer volunteered to take that section of the ordinance and create those questions. She suggested the Board email her their ideas and then she could pull something together and share it with the Board. Chairman Coffman agreed

that Ms. Timmer should do a concise, consolidated list of questions. He asked that the questionnaire should say the following questionnaires need to be addressed to indicate how you meet Section 106.582 of the ordinance. All Board members were in agreement with this action.

Chairman Coffman stated that next review of the questionnaire will occur at the meeting scheduled for May 25, 2010, after review of the project on the agenda.

A few other changes were suggested:

- Submittal requirements: a minimum of two architectural elevations. Do not say front and rear because those could be the same.
- Possibly just significant elevations.
- Someway of indicating the proposed massing of a building. It could be a little 3D sketch as opposed to limiting it to elevations.
- Just a hand-drawn or printed conceptual.
- Just a north orientation for plantings and so forth.
- And then photos of the existing site, possibly give them examples -- existing highway buffers, trees on site. Take some pictures of significant things. Aerial photos recommended. Ms. Timmer stated that one of the notes that she's made as staff is to start providing the Board with more general information to give a preview as part of her staff report. The staff report would not only include comments on where the project doesn't meet the ordinance but to state this is where its located, this is what's adjacent to it, and to give the Board more information.
- Proposed site plan: information requirements – where it says existing and proposed, need the d.
- Streets needs a colon or semi-colon on the next line.
- The number of parking numbers - don't know if it's something required or not.
- Take the word labeled off the next one.
- Two lines down from that there's a label required buffers, foundation buffers on site plan – may be the same as the bullet above.
- The last bullet where it says submit eight sets of plans, are we open to taking 11 x 17 sets for conceptual or something smaller? (Ms. Timmer will wrestle with this due to the fact that the Southern Corridor Review Board may not agree to smaller drawings).

Judy handed out training certificates to those who attended the South Carolina Association of Counties videoconferences.

Meeting adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

Approved: 5/25/10