

The regular meeting of the Beaufort County Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") was held on Tuesday, April 1, 2003, in County Council Chambers of the Beaufort County Administration Building at 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Jim Hicks, Chair  
Mr. Jerome Goode  
Mr. Alan Herd

Mr. Ben Johnson, III, Vice Chair  
Ms. Joy Guyer  
Mr. Mike Zara

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mr. Matthew Margotta, Mr. Cecil Martin, Jr., and Mr. Vernon Pottenger.

**EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Mr. Anthony J. Criscitiello, Planning Division Head  
Mr. Stan Williams, Community Planner  
Ms. Barbara Ann C. Childs, Administrative Assistant to the Planning Director

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Hicks called the meeting to order at approximately 6:03 p.m.

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

**REVIEW OF MINUTES:** The February 4, 2003, Commission meeting minutes were reviewed. **MOTION:** Ms. Guyer made a motion, and Mr. Goode seconded, **to accept as written the minutes of the February 4, 2003, meeting.** The motion was carried (FOR: Goode, Guyer, Hicks, Johnson and Zara; ABSTAINED: Herd).

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT:**

1. **Ms. Gladys Hunsberger:** Chairman Hicks indicated that Ms. Hunsberger, a former Planning Commissioner, was ill and he would send a greeting card to her from the Commission.
2. **Certification of Appreciation:** Chairman Hicks presented a plaque to Ms. Margie Jenkins for her past work as a Commissioner.
3. **Introduction of New Planning Commissioner:** Mr. Alan Herd was introduced as the newest Commissioner.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None were received.

**TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE BEAUFORT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, APPENDIX F, SECTION 5, Seabrook-Stuart Point Community Preservation/CP Area)**

Mr. Criscitiello briefed the Commissioners.

Mr. Williams, Community Planner, stated that several people would be briefing the Commission on the Plan.

Ms. Margie Jenkins, in her introduction of the plan, commended the community members who attended the public meetings. She noted that although Highway 21 divided the two communities, the residents were able to formulate a working plan.

Mr. Pat Garrett, noted that the community wanted to maintain a semi-rural character while still maintaining access to urban amenities and low-density single-family residences with accessory uses compatible to the rural surroundings.

Mr. Don Smith noted the two commercial areas at the corners of Highway 21 and Stuart Point and Garrett Smalls Roads. The allowable uses in the Plan include food stores, traditional-type shops, auto repair and restaurants. The maximum size building would be 5,000 square feet. The community did not want to see strip commercial along Highway 21.

Mr. Bill Harris of Allison-Ramsey Architects noted the proposed projects for the area such as signage to denote the boundaries of the area, a covered bus stop, and landscaping on the Highway 21 median. He stated the maximum building height would be two stories.

Mr. Cooter Ramsey of Allison-Ramsey Architects introduced the architectural design guidelines. The buildings and buffers will maintain the rural character, as requested by the community. He addressed signage, franchise architecture, roof pitch, wall fenestration, and other architectural elements. The Planned Community option is available to 35 lots within a half-mile from the Whale Branch school campuses and must contain a mixture of residential and commercial uses.

**Public Comment:**

1. Mr. Claude McLeod, a Seabrook resident whose family owns over 100 acres, noted that his family invested in the land. He read the purpose of the Seabrook-Stuart Point CP Area. His family's property originally were allowed four units per acre, the CP zoning allows two units per acre. He said the planned community option excludes others who might otherwise use the option. The Seabrook-Stuart Point Plan does not provide the McLeod family for its land investment. He asked that commercial uses be allowed along Highway 21. He believes the Plan is flawed.
2. Dr. Bill Samuels sympathized with the McLeods and their loss of income through their property. Those that have bought property with their life savings/retirement should not have to lose their investment either. He urged compensating the McLeods for their land, but protecting the other property owners by adopting the Plan. He recognizes that compromise is needed and asked that the Commission consider both sides.
3. Ms. Loretta Gross, a CP Committee member, noted that the CP members went door-to-

door with meeting flyers. The members noted that that the people believe that the Planning Commission and County Council had made their minds up on the plan and that public participation would not alter the outcome, so why participate.

**Discussion** included the maximum of 100 units within a planned community unless affordable housing is involved, the lack of public attendance at the subcommittee and the Commission meetings, the two sites that qualify for the planned community option, that access from Highway 21 cannot be denied to a property owner, the highly recommended use of arterial roads instead of Highway 21 for commercial uses, the school system's ability to accommodate the buildout of the CP area at 7% per year over a 10-year period, the housing market the CP will attract, the half mile radius for the planning community to keep the area rural, curb cut constraints, a frontage road recommendation, Emergency Management Services/EMS egress requirements and input on the Plan, the parcels in current agricultural use, the fading agricultural use in this County, compensation to the farmers, clarification on the expected population increase, the limited water and sewer availability in the area and the future expansion plans for water lines throughout the area, the projected amount of transportation on a buildout of 90 additional residents, the road capacity to accommodate far greater daily trips than anticipated in the next ten years, Highway 21 is not scheduled for widening in the future, the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone/AICUZ constraints, the transportation potential of 10.5 trips per day per unit, the potential site high school is not in the CP district, a clarification of the Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance/ZDSO uses for high schools, the Commission will review CIP projects, a recommendation to change the wording regarding inclusion of CP projects in the CIP program to "should" instead of "shall", a clarification on the same wording included in other CP plans that direct the County Administrator to report annually on the plan, a clarification on the CIP program, the \$100,000 cost of these CP projects would be funded by other than the general funds, a clarification of the department budget process and wording, and the delineation of projects from zoning,

Mr. Don Altman, a representative of the Beaufort County School District, stated that the School District is comfortable it will handle the projected growth in the CP area.

**MOTION:** Mr. Zara made a motion, and Mr. Goode seconded, to recommend approval of the Seabrook-Stuart Point Plan, with amendments to page 6, second and third subparagraphs under the Capital Improvements Program section where CIP "shall" is mentioned twice in the second subparagraph and once in the third subparagraph, change "shall" to "should". No further discussion occurred. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Goode, Guyer, Herd, Hicks, Johnson and Zara).

**TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE BEAUFORT COUNTY ZONING & DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS ORDINANCE (ZDSO): adds new development standards for Appendix J, Seabrook-Stuart Point Community Preservation Area**

Mr. Criscitiello briefed the Commissioners

**Public Comment:** None were received.

**Discussion** included the overall goals and densities of the CP plan, a request for the profile of existing lot distributions by size for an overall density, the inconsistency of the recommended half acre density to the rural character goal, the state mandated high school minimum site area of 50 acres, kudos to the planned community concept along the water, a clarification on the open space and density standards, a clarification of “elevation” being sides not floors of the building, the school site development process in relation to the Development Review Team/DRT process, a recommendation to delete the high school issue from the CP plan because of the potential ramifications, the residents’ desire not to expand the existing CP boundaries nor to include a high school in the area, and the Zoning Board of Appeals/ZBOA process.

**MOTION:** Mr. Zara made a motion **to approve the text amendments to the ZDSO, with one recommended change on page 15 in Table 2, Open Space and Density Standards, for single family to be 1 unit per acre rather than 2 units per acre** because a half acre density would not achieve the rural character goal of the plan, and the CP District will lose its uniqueness when the adjacent 1,000 acres outside of the CP District probably is developed into a major residential development. Discussion included a clarification of the motion. **The motion did not receive a second, so the motion died.**

**MOTION:** Ms. Guyer made a motion, and Mr. Goode seconded, **to recommend approval of the text amendments as written.** **The motion was carried** (FOR: Goode, Guyer, Hicks and Herd; AGAINST: Johnson and Zara).

Chairman Hicks thanked the Committee members for their work on the Plan.

**OTHER BUSINESS:** None were discussed.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Ms. Guyer made a motion, and Mr. Goode seconded, **to adjourn the meeting. The motion was carried unanimously** (FOR: Goode, Guyer, Hicks, Herd, Johnson and 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:**       **May 6, 2003**