

The special meeting of the Beaufort County Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") was held on Wednesday, June 12, 2002, 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
Ms. Joy Guyer
Mr. Mike Zara

Mr. Ben Johnson, III, Vice Chair
Mr. Jerome Goode
Ms. Margie Jenkins

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Matthew Margotta

Mr. Thomas Mike, Sr.

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: None

STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. Anthony J. Criscitiello, Planning Director
Ms. Barbara Ann C. Childs, Administrative Assistant to the Planning Director

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 May 8, 2002, Commission meeting were reviewed. No corrections were noted. **MOTION: Mr. Zara made a motion, and Ms. Guyer seconded, to accept as written the minutes of the May 8, 2002, meeting. The motion was carried (FOR: Guyer, Hicks, Jenkins, Johnson & Zara; ABSTAINED: Abney).**

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT: Chairman Hicks handed out the proposed Community Preservation guide, as requested by the Commission at their May 7, 2002, meeting. The Commissioners will discuss the guide as part of "Other Business" near the end of tonight's meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None were received.

PARKS, RECREATION & OPEN SPACE ELEMENT OF THE BEAUFORT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Chairman Hicks noted that he, Ms. Guyer and Mr. Criscitiello met on May 23, 2002, with representatives of the municipalities to review and to receive their comments on this element.

The staff would review the various recommendations received from the public regarding this element. Those substantive recommendations that require funding, if determined by staff as viable, will be forward to the Planning Commission at a later date.

Mr. Joe Penale, the Acting Deputy Director of Parks & Leisure Services, briefed the Commissioners on the recommendations for the element.

Public Comment: None were received.

Discussion included clarification of district parks concept and park fee charges to increase revenue production.

Note: *Mr. Goode entered meeting at 6:12 p.m.*

Recommendations:

- **Policy 2.4 – Recommendation.** Reword this policy to give developers the option of providing parkland or paving impact fees. Suggest wording: “Require developments to provide a minimum of 10 acres of usable, active parkland and associated recreation facilities per 1,000 projected new residents or provide park impact fees in lieu of property.”

Discussion included providing an option to the developer to provide unbuildable but usable property for open space/park use in place of impact fees when agreeable to both parties, a preference that meet the need of the community for general access to the waterways, the size of the development as the driving factor in being able to provide usable land for parks, the DRT policy to ask for a potential greenways easement in the required buffers.

MOTION: Ms. Guyer made a motion, and Ms. Jenkins seconded, **to recommend approval of Policy 2.4 recommendation to read: “Developers may provide a minimum of 10 acres of usable, active parkland and associated recreation facilities per 1,000 projected new residents or provide park impact fees in lieu of property, when agreeable to both parties.”** The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Abney, Goode, Guyer, Jenkins, Johnson & Zara).

- **Policies 4.1, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.3, 6.5, 6.8, 12.1, 13.2, 14.4 & 15.7 - Recommendation:** Keep these policies in the Comprehensive Plan.

MOTION: Mr. Zara made a motion, and Mr. Johnson seconded, **to recommend approval of Policies 4.1, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.3, 6.5, 6.8, 12.1, 13.2, 14.4 & 15.7 recommendation as stated.** The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Abney, Goode, Guyer, Jenkins, Johnson & Zara).

- **Policy 8.1 – Recommendation:** Implement the SAMP RQOD Report recommendations and develop the land use standards and requirements for the RQOD ordinance when watershed boundary data is available. (This recommendation is repeated in the Natural

Resources Element review.)

MOTION: Ms. Guyer made a motion, and it was seconded, **to recommend approval of Policy 8.1 recommendation as stated**. The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Abney, Goode, Guyer, Jenkins, Johnson & Zara).

- **Policy 10.4 – Recommendation:** Upon completion and approval of the greenways plan for Northern Beaufort County, this policy should be referred to the Intergovernmental Committee to address multijurisdictional implementation of the two plans.

Discussion included funding sources, a proposed replacement recommendation, deleting the third paragraph of the proposed motion regarding funding, and the cost of paved leisure trails.

MOTION: Mr. Abney made a motion, and Mr. Zara seconded, **to recommend approval of Policy 10.4 recommendation to read: “That the Parks and Leisure Services (PALS) Board, or other appropriate agency, be tasked with preparation of a white paper/study that identifies who has operational control of existing parks, who pays for the short and long-term maintenance of existing parks, what future parks are needed in municipalities and unincorporated areas, the estimated cost of such parks, the estimated cost of annual maintenance of such parks, and who would have operational control of these future parks. It is recommended that the PALS Board, or whoever is assigned the task of preparing this study, invite each of the municipalities to participate in the preparation of this document. In addition, this study should identify countywide greenway/pathway projects and their projected costs and funding sources. This portion of the study should include the County Greenway/Pathway Plan for Northern Beaufort County and seek to obtain a similar plan for Southern Beaufort County.** The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Abney, Goode, Guyer, Jenkins, Johnson & Zara).

- **Policy 16.2 – Recommendation:** Delete this policy.

MOTION: Ms. Jenkins made a motion, and Mr. Zara seconded, **to recommend approval of Policy 16.2 recommendation as written**. No discussion was noted. The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Abney, Goode, Guyer, Jenkins, Johnson & Zara).

Additional Recommendation for Policy 6: Mr. Zara asked that Policy 6 be revised as follows:

- Policy 6.1 – Work with the school district staff to develop contractual agreements to jointly participate in the use of outdoor athletic and recreation facilities. PALS should centralize the scheduling of schools and community events/activities in order to control the often used facilities. PALS and the School District should work out a fair and equitable cost allocation arrangement to provide the upkeep and maintenance of shared/support recreation assets.
- Policy 6.2 – Establish a County-wide approach to the acquisition of all future park and

school sites to be collocated so that integration of facilities and programs can be more easily achieved. PALS and the School District have a shared responsibility to use the assets of the community in a most productive and cost efficient way possible. This will also pay dividends by involving more citizens in the holistic approach to recreation and education.

Discussion included having the staff obtain the School District's input on these recommendations, delaying the vote until the school district has made its input, and consideration for joint land searches for new school and park facilities and coordination of existing facilities. Staff is to obtain input from the School District and return to Planning Commission for further action.

Additional Recommendation on Fees Generation:

MOTION: Mr. Zara made a motion to include a paragraph in Policy 10.4 to read: **“include in the study, consider fee-based services directed especially toward ecotourism as a means to generate income and look at the possibility of district oriented parks.”** Discussion included not wanting to direct the size of future parks until the earlier mentioned study is completed. Mr. Zara amended his motion, and Ms. Guyer seconded, include in Policy 10.4 **“Investigate the feasibility of ecotourism as a fee based service.”** Further discussion included clarification on the concept of a parks study and merging parks acquisition with the \$40 million lands purchase program. The motion **was defeated** (FOR: Guyer & Zara; AGAINST: Abney, Goode, Jenkins & Johnson).

Note: Chairman Hicks recessed the meeting at 6:55 and reconvened the meeting at 7:05 pm

Chairman Hicks thanked Mr. Quakenbush for noting that the phrase “The Nature Conservancy” should be removed from Policy 6. Chairman Hicks directed staff to administratively remove the phrase as noted.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE BEAUFORT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Mr. Criscitiello introduced Mr. John Payne, the County Housing Coordinator, who briefed the Commissioners. He noted the loss of Councilman Pete Covington who made headways in affordable housing policies in the County.

Public Comment:

1. Mr. Mark Sutton, a local contractor and resident, was disappointed by the small public turnout for tonight's meeting. He noted the County's lack of interest for affordable housing and an affordable housing manual that did not include impact fees. The County has unrealistic expectations for affordable housing. He has a problem with limiting heirs' property to 50 years of ownership. If one has property, one should not have to go to numerous County agencies to build a house. You can't build hurricane houses in Beaufort; you must leave when a storm hits. That's an oxymoron. Why have an affordable housing coordinator if we don't know what he does. \$100 per square foot houses are now being built. The new code requirement that an engineer and an architect must design the house plans increases the cost of a home.

2. Mr. John Polk, a manufactured housing dealer in Beaufort, noted that the numerous fees required by the County make affordable housing expensive. Manufactured housing evoke negative images; but, the reality is the opposite. He gave examples where manufactured housing would have cost less than stick-built homes—at \$30 per square foot instead of \$100 per square foot. With the low-income level of the County, the manufactured housing community can bridge the gap for home ownership, if concessions are given on impact fees and development costs. Manufactures homes are energy efficient. How much housing could we have provided for the \$40 million we gave for the open land we're going to have? We could have supplied a bunch of housing for \$40 million. What has been done with the \$500,000 that we are going to do this studying on and has it been spent?
3. Ms. Mary Amenetti, a Hilton head realtor, noted redundancy was expensive. People need assistance in getting affordable housing. Manufactured homes need to be placed on land, and that is an additional cost. We don't need another housing program because one is already established. She was curious why realtors were not mentioned in the element. Military housing was mentioned in the review; but, hospitality and service industries need housing also and they are just as important as the military.
4. Mr. John Perrill, a 31-year resident, has been on several County committees, including the Affordable Housing Task Force (AHTF). He praised the work done by the late Councilman Pete Covington. County Council did not include affordable housing in their priority for this year. BRAC was mentioned and public housing and schools are problematic. Figures and costs have escalated. The military drives the economy in Northern Beaufort. When the military leaves, Beaufort will be devastated. Housing shortage has existed for years. Without affordable housing, the military cannot live here and will go elsewhere. Give concessions to the developers. The AHTF gave numerous recommendations, but nothing has occurred. Until the County Council determines the importance of this issue, nothing will be done.
5. Ms. Wendy Zara reinforced Mr. Perrill's statements. The ZDSO has more options than what the AHTF report addressed. The ZDSO does not have the power to waive impact fees. A successful affordable housing program costs money and must have policies promulgated by the elected officials. She noted that numerous grants should be considered and were outlined in the AHTF report. She agreed that increased relationship with the state and federal agencies is great; but recommended adding establishing relationships with the mortgage lenders. Density bonuses do exist in the ZDSO; however, nothing will occur without subsidies added to those bonuses.
6. Ms. Starletta Hairston, a Hilton Head resident and County Council candidate, commended the Commission on the Affordable Housing element. She commended Mr. Covington's work on affordable housing. As a parent with three children in the public school system, she asked for economic opportunities to increase wages for workers and to keep existing businesses and to bring new businesses in the County. Look at the infrastructure; without an infrastructure it is impossible to build on the land.
7. Mr. Reed Armstrong, a St. Helena Island resident, noted that impact fees are for cost for added services to the community. Without impact fees, then property owners will end up subsidizing through the tax base.
8. Mr. Walt Quakenbush, a Lady's Island resident, noted that there is no firm definition for affordable housing. All the costs of housing are driving people out of the County,

including additional costs such as adding one-cent taxes and announced increases by the utility companies. Affordable housing is what people can afford. In order to live in this County, you have to make the high wages. The children and elderly are suffering by the high costs. The Rural and Critical Land Board decreases the amount of available land to build affordable housing.

9. Mr. Robert Cuttino, the Beaufort County District 10 Council member, while at U.S. mayors' conference, noted that affordable housing is pandemic. Affordable housing occurs during economic boom. We must address market failure because those that engage in economic endeavors are chasing costs because incoming retirement population brings dollars. Address market problems with market solutions.

Discussion included a timeline for completing the housing inventory, a profile of profit and loss dynamics of residential versus affordable housing construction, the lack of affordable homes despite the demand for such, land costs that double every 7 years in Beaufort County, setting the definition of "affordable housing", the inability of the working class to purchase a home due to skyrocketing home costs, the need for affordable rentals for service-based income earners, the ramifications of the new building code, the County's median income that excludes Hilton Head incomes, impact fees, cost of living increases not meeting actual economic increases, the exodus of high school graduates, the empty industrial parks, providing affordable housing for military and non-military families, the difficulty in quickly solving the affordable housing problem, and the effort by the military to provide more housing for its personnel.

OTHER BUSINESS: Chairman Hicks asked the Commission to review the Community Preservation/CP Guide and to use it for future CP areas.

ADJOURNMENT: Ms. Guyer made motion, and Ms. Jenkins seconded, to adjourn the meeting. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Abney, Goode, Guyer, Jenkins, Johnson & Zara). Chairman Hicks adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:35 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

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

Jim Hicks, Chairman, Beaufort County Planning Commission

APPROVED: July 10, 2002

Meanings of the abbreviations used in the body of these minutes:

BRAC *Base Realignment and Closure Procedure*
DRT *Development Review Team*
PALS *Parks and Leisure Service Department*
RQOD *River Quality Overlay District*
SAMP *Special Area Management Program*
ZDSO *Zoning & Development Standards Ordinance*