

COUNTY COUNCIL OF BEAUFORT COUNTY Beaufort County Planning and Zoning Department Beaufort County Covernment Pohert Smalls Complex

Beaufort County Government Robert Smalls Complex Physical: Administration Building, Room 115 100 Ribaut Road Mailing: Post Office Drawer 1228, Beaufort, SC 29901-1228 Phone: 843-255-2140 / FAX: 843-255-9432

The regular meeting of the Beaufort County Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") was held in Council Chambers on Monday, June 5, 2023 at 6:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Ed Pappas, Chairman Mr. Jon Henney Ms. Cecily McMillan Mr. Glenn Miller Ms. Gail Murray Mr. Dennis Ross

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Dan Riedel

STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. Robert Merchant, Planning and Zoning Director Mr. Mark Davis, Planning and Zoning Deputy Director Mrs. Chris DiJulio-Cook, Senior Administrative Specialist Ms. Kristen Forbus, Long Range Planner

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Ed Pappas called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

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

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES: Mr. Glenn Miller made a motion to approve the May 1, 2023 minutes. Mr. Dennis Ross seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: Mr. Pappas asked if there were any citizen comments, not related to the agenda, there were none.

ACTION ITEMS:

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT/REZONING REQUEST FOR 21 ACRES (R100 025 000 0068 0000, R100 025 000 068A 0000 AND R100 025 000 0068B 0000) LOCATED AT LAUREL BAY ROAD, AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF ROSEIDA EXTENSION, FROM T2 RURAL (T2R) TO INDUSTRIAL (S1)

Ms. Kristen Forbus, Beaufort County Long Range Planner, gave an overview of what the applicant was looking to do by rezoning the property from T2R to S1 Industrial. She explained that staff did not recommend approval of the rezoning.

The applicant, Mr. Joshua Ward, showed a PowerPoint presentation and explained what they were trying to do with the property – mainly storage facilities.

Mr. Richard asked how the rezoning would impact the neighboring residents, he wanted to know what the setbacks and requirements would be for the surrounding properties. Mr. Merchant explained there are 50' buffers for industrial usage but because it is a zoning map amendment, the usage is speculative at this time.

June 5, 2023 Planning Commission meeting minutes Page 2 of 4

Ms. Maria Mims, stated the area was already full of crime and was worried about traffic and trespassing in the area if the property were to be rezoned and storage facilities to be opened.

Ms. Rhonda Doherty commented that there are already storage facilities in the area that are not at capacity and don't want to see the rural area kept the way it is.

Mr. Blake Kennedy, property owner, stated they would honor buffer zones and they would have fencing and security in place to address trespassing concerns. They want to take everyone's opinions into account in this project.

After discussing the rezoning amongst themselves. Mr. Jon Henney made a motion to recommend denial of the rezoning from T2R to S1. Mr. Glenn Miller seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT/REZONING REQUEST FOR 502 ACRES (R300-012-000-0001-0000, R300-012-000-0254-0000, R300-007-000-0002-0000, R300-012-000-0255-0000, AND R300-012-000-0256-0000) LOCATED AT 288 DULAMO ROAD TO BE REMOVED FROM THE CULTURAL PROTECTION OVERLAY (CPO) BOUNDARY

Mr. Merchant gave a brief explanation and background of the Cultural Protection Overlay (CPO). He read from the Purpose Statement of the CPO and the Comprehensive Plan and explained that the staff's recommendation was for denial.

Mr. Elvio Tropeano, the owner of Pine Island, spoke about his plans to build on his property and how he wants to develop it. He stated he wants to remove the property from the CPO so he can build a golf course and, therefore limit the number of houses he builds. He stated he has the right and is going to develop his property and the property is not for sale.

Chairman Pappas opened the meeting up to public comment after the Commissioners had a chance to ask Mr. Tropeano a few questions.

Several people spoke. They were:

Robert New, against the rezoning Elder Jack Ladson, against the rezoning James Smalls, against the rezoning Mike Hughes, Thomas & Hutton Engineering Company, for the rezoning Janet McCauley, against the rezoning Leslie Lenhardt, South Carolina Law Project, against the rezoning Anthony Jones, against the rezoning Earnestine Atkins, against the rezoning Jessie White, Coastal Conservation League, against the rezoning Jack Smith, Attorney with Nelson Mullins, representing the Penn Center, against the rezoning, (provided documentation to be included in the files for the rezoning and administrative appeals) Dr. Marie Gibbs, Penn Center, Inc., against the rezoning Inez Miller, Center for Heirs Property, Woodland Community Advocate, against the rezoning Mr. Samuel Williams, chose not to speak, "just said no" Ms. Star Dunbar, Yamassee Indian Tribe, against the rezoning Ms. Jane Caffrey, against the rezoning Ms. Sally Mayse, against the rezoning Ms. Sally Stone, against the rezoning

June 5, 2023 Planning Commission meeting minutes Page 3 of 4

- Ms. Paula Galane, against the rezoning
- Mr. Thomas Donahue, against the rezoning
- Ms. Elayne Scott, against the rezoning
- Mr. Arnold Brown, against the rezoning
- Mr. Dallas Wood, for the rezoning
- Mr. Samuel Cooper, against the rezoning
- Mr. Craig Reaves, stated he was not for or against but environmentally speaking the development allowed by the CPO seemed more environmentally detrimental than the development plan with the golf course on it
- Ms. Travis Stewart, spoke against the rezoning and appeals but stated there really isn't a good option for the many on St. Helena

Ms. Cecily McMillan made a motion to recommend denial of the proposed zoning amendment that would remove the Pine Island, St. Helenaville Property from the Cultural Protection Overlay Zone. Mr. Dennis Ross seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

APPEALS:

PINE ISLAND GOLF-COURSE A - ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL OF DIRECTOR'S DECISION OF A DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 119 ACRES, 288 DULAMO ROAD; CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR PINE ISLAND SIX-HOLE GOLF-COURSE A (R300-012-000-0001-0000)

PINE ISLAND GOLF-COURSE B - ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL OF DIRECTOR'S DECISION OF A DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 127 ACRES, 288 DULAMO ROAD; CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR PINE ISLAND SIX-HOLE GOLF-COURSE B (R300-012-000-0254-0000)

PINE ISLAND GOLF-COURSE C - ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL OF DIRECTOR'S DECISION OF A DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 115 ACRES, 288 DULAMO ROAD; CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR PINE ISLAND SIX-HOLE GOLF-COURSE C (R300-012-000-0255-0000)

Mr. Ellis Lesemann, the attorney representing the applicant, Pine Island GC, LLC, stated he'd like to treat the appeals as one since the arguments are identical for each.

The Commission went into Executive Session to confer with legal counsel before continuing to hear the appeal.

After hearing the appeal and much discussion, Ms. Cecily McMillan made a motion to affirm the Director's decision to deny the applicant's Development Plan Applications regarding the Pine Island Golf Courses A, B, and C, for Conceptual Plan Reviews for three six-hole golf courses. The reasons for this motion are:

1: golf courses are prohibited uses in the CPO district under the existing ordinances and prior iterations of the ordinance

2: the applications, originally submitted by the applicant, to the county on March 7th were originally incomplete due to the applicant's failure to include mandatory supplemental reports and exhibits.

3: the applications were not complete until March 24th, when they were received and accepted by Ms. Austin

June 5, 2023 Planning Commission meeting minutes Page 4 of 4

4: As of March 24th, 2023, the County had already published notice to the community and the developer of its intent to revise the zoning ordinances for the CPO district.

5: The developer presented little to no evidence that he incurred substantial expenditures in preparation of the permit application, only in brief discussion of "millions of dollars".

6: The applications for three six-hole golf courses circumvent the intent and purpose of the CPO as the applications fail to show how they can function independently.

Mr. Miller seconded the motion.

Ms. McMillan amended the motion to add that there is not a finding of vested rights under the Community Development Code because the application was only received and not stamped and approved.

Mr. Miller seconded the amendment to the motion.

The vote on the amendment was unanimously approved.

The vote on the motion to affirm the Director's decision, as amended, was unanimously approved.

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Pappas adjourned the meeting at 10:41 p.m.