I. Call to Order

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Review Commission Meeting Minutes:
   A.  March 18, 2018 Meeting

IV. Questions Relating to Military Operations

V. Review of Projects for the City of Beaufort:
   A. City of Beaufort – Discussion of comprehensive plan update - staff’s initial assessment and public comments of current plan. Applicant: City of Beaufort
   B. City of Beaufort – Presentation of draft zoning amendment re light pole heights in auto-centric areas.
   C. Update of Council Actions

VI. Review of Projects for the Town of Port Royal:
   A. Town of Port Royal – Rezoning Request. Rezone District 110, Map 8, Parcel 63. This is an undeveloped parcel at 2600 Smilax Ave. The current zoning is T5 Main Street. The requested zoning is T4 Urban Center.
   B. Town of Port Royal – Rezoning Request. Rezone District 110, Map 8, Parcels 114, 115 and 118. These properties are 1830 Ribaut Road, 1844 Ribaut Road and 1807 Rahn Lane. The properties are currently developed as The Sea Island Apartments and the former Coca Cola Bottling and Distribution facility. The current zoning is T4 Neighborhood Center - Open. The requested zoning is T5 Main Street.

VII. Review of Projects for Beaufort County:
   A. None
IX. Adjourment

Note: If you have special needs due to a physical challenge, please call Julie Bachey at (843) 525-7011 for additional information.
A meeting of the Beaufort-Port Royal Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC) was held on **March 18, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.** in the Beaufort Municipal Complex, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Bill Harris; Commissioners Robert Semmler, Judy Alling, and Jim Crower; David Prichard, City of Beaufort planning and Rob Merchant, Beaufort County planning. Commissioners Caroline Fermin and Mike Tomy were absent.

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d) as amended, all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

Chairman Harris called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**MINUTES**
Commissioner Semmler made a motion, second by Commissioner Crower, to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2019 MPC meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as submitted was approved unanimously.

**REVIEW OF PROJECTS FOR THE CITY OF BEAUFORT**

**RECOMMENDATION/OPTION** about light pole standards and/or appropriate zoning in the vicinity of 41 Robert Smalls Parkway

*Applicant: City of Beaufort*

Mr. Prichard said according to the Beaufort Code, the maximum height of light poles in transect districts is 15’ above grade, and in conventional districts, it’s 25’. As there is a transition to newer development patterns, 15’ seems like it would be “a lot of poles,” he said, while there could be fewer poles if they were taller. He asked if the 15’ limit is still appropriate in a large parking lot. Mr. Prichard said the city is asking for the MPC’s recommendation on 15’ poles in pedestrian-oriented spaces and 25’ or higher poles in spaces that are auto-centric.

Commissioner Semmler said in the Staples lot, the light poles are very tall – taller than 15’ feet. Mr. Prichard said they are higher than 25’, and he has heard they’re 41’, but he hasn’t measured them. As the trees in parking lots grow taller and fill out, Commissioner Semmler said, which the trees in the Staples parking lot are doing, taller light poles are not in the trees’ way, which they might be if the poles were only 15’ tall.

Commissioner Semmler said in this parking lot, there are “8 different variations of light poles,” and his other concern is whether a developer who wants to change the height of light poles in a parking lot, “will . . . do all the light poles.” Mr. Prichard said not necessarily. If a developer is redeveloping an entire shopping center – as this one will “eventually” be – s/he might, he said. Publix wanted a certain foot-candle, he said, and wanted to use 28.5’ poles. They didn’t want to use 15’ poles because of cost, but Mr. Prichard thinks the 15’ poles are like streetlights, and they aren’t full cut-off. He asked if the MPC feels 15’ is appropriate for a parking lot, as it is for a pedestrian space.
Mr. Prichard showed a graphic of a 15’ pole with a 5’6” person standing 5’ from the pole to show the difference between it and a 25’ pole that is 20’ away. The latter would seem “less domineering than a 15’ pole,” he said.

Chairman Harris said the poles in the City Hall parking lot are 15’, which he found “pretty surprising.”

Mr. Prichard showed a graphic of Beaufort Plaza in the Civic Master Plan, with the vision of it not being a traditional parking lot, but “much more of a pedestrian-type space.” This vision might happen at some point in the future, but during transitions, the parking lots in strip-malls would “still be somewhat auto-centric.” He showed a “conceptual strip mall retrofit” of parking lots from the Civic Master Plan.

Chairman Harris said he feels great about trusting staff’s judgment on what is pedestrian-centric and what’s auto-centric to make the light pole height determination.

Mr. Prichard said the movie theater and auto parts store would be torn down, Publix would be set back. Some of the strip mall’s stores will remain, but there will be liner stores up near Robert Smalls Parkway. He said the Civic Master Plan is for 100 years, and he doesn’t know how long it will be before the mall example on the far right would happen. Chairman Harris said there are strategies, which take place a step at a time, to turn strip malls into shopping villages.

Commissioner Crower said some of the poles on the Staples end of the lot in question don’t work. He asked if there is value in reusing the poles that are already in the parking lot. Mr. Prichard said he doesn’t know. He’s only seen part of the development plan for this mall, and he can’t recall what the developer wants to do with those tall poles.

Mr. Prichard said this issue began because Publix, which is going into a site on this property, wanted the taller light poles, but it would apply to other redevelopments, too. This developer’s design is to have 15’ poles near the street and the liner buildings, he said, and where the sidewalks go from the liner buildings to the existing buildings.

Commissioner Semmler asked what kind of motion they should make; he feels they should defer to the planning director in this matter. Mr. Prichard said the MPC could make a recommendation for the city to amend its ordinance to allow the planning director to make the decision about pole heights used in pedestrian-versus auto-oriented areas.

Commissioner Alling said that there would have to be a limit on the pole sizes. There was general agreement with this. Mr. Prichard said the maximum height is 25’ now, but the taller poles are about 28.5’: usually a 25’ pole on a 3’ or 3.5’ pedestal. He added that he doesn’t know why the pedestals are used.
There was a discussion about maximum and minimum heights to recommend. Chairman Harris said he was surprised at how high a 15’ pole is when he stood beside one. Mr. Prichard said he likes the 12’ to 30’ range. He discussed how the feeling of the poles’ heights changes with a person’s proximity to them.

Commissioner Semmler asked if Mr. Prichard needs language for light pole heights in new developments as opposed to in redevelopment sites. Mr. Prichard said he just wants to change the standards and not make them specific to redevelopment.

Commissioner Alling said a 25’ pole lights 20’, which is “a long way.” Mr. Prichard said yes, but a parking spot is 19’. Commissioner Alling said it would light the width of 4 cars. Chairman Harris said there are still rules about the minimum and maximum amounts of light that each pole’s lamp can generate, and those standards will remain the same in the code.

Mr. Prichard said he could go to city council’s meeting the following night and tell them what the MPC discussed and recommended. He said he’d come back to the MPC with the ordinance amendment, and then the commission could vote on the actual language.

Commissioner Crower wondered if there were “actual guidelines that need to be considered,” e.g., how many lights there are, how frequently they are spaced, etc. Chairman Harris said each project’s lighting plan is based on the things Commissioner Crower is suggesting, and those plans have to be approved.

**UPDATE OF CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS**

Mr. Prichard shared the schedule for the Comprehensive Plan update. A public meeting about it will be held April 8 at City Hall in the planning conference room, he said, and he’d like to bring it to the April 15 MPC meeting. After that, it would go to city council for its assessment on April 23 at 5:00 p.m. He said the City of Beaufort would partner with other jurisdictions on the Comp Plans.

On February 26, city council authorized the city manager to open negotiations on the marina lease with Safe Harbor and supported a resolution on the Spanish Moss Trail connector, Mr. Prichard said. There was a lot of discussion about the preferred route that was presented, and language particular to it was removed, so it is more general to “a trail connecting the Spanish Moss Trail to downtown.” Council was in favor of the connectivity, he said.

City council also authorized the city manager to enter into a contract with McSweeney Engineers for repair of the pilings under Waterfront Park, Mr. Prichard said.

At the March 12 council meeting, Mr. Prichard said city council approved on first reading the release of TIF II funds, to be used along with CDBG funds, on the Greenlawn Drive
streetscape project.

**REVIEW OF PROJECTS FOR BEAUFORT COUNTY**

**ZONING MAP AMENDMENT/REZONING REQUEST** for R100 029 000 0046 0000, 10.69 acres at 126 Broad River Boulevard from C3-Neighborhood Mixed-Use District (NMU) to C5-Regional Center Mixed-Use District (RCMU)

*Owner: 10 Frontage Road, LLC*

Rob Merchant said the county is bringing forward an amendment to the zoning map for a property at 126 Broad River Boulevard. It is within the growth boundaries of unincorporated Beaufort County. He showed the property and surrounding properties on an overhead map. The applicant is interested in changing the zoning from C3-Neighborhood Mixed-Use District to C5-Regional Center Mixed-Use, Mr. Merchant said.

This rezoning request came to the MPC in December 2016, Mr. Merchant said. The MPC didn’t recommend rezoning the property, commenting that the C3-NMU zoning seemed to allow multi-family housing, and that some of the barriers to multi-family development should be removed. Since that time, he said, county council removed a requirement that multi-family housing in C3 has to be in mansion apartments with no more than 6 units per building, but now there are new restrictions. A third story on the apartments would be allowed, Mr. Merchant said, but it can’t have “a complete floor plan with the other stories.”

The applicant came back to the county and “is interested in developing more units on that site,” Mr. Merchant said. Several conditions have led staff to reconsider its recommendation for this property. For one thing, there has “been a lot of movement on affordable housing . . . regionally,” and a report commissioned by the county makes recommendations for a “certain number of housing units within certain price ranges,” which the proposed housing would fit into, he said. Also, the county adopted, within the C5 district, “affordable housing density bonuses,” which allows “no density cap” within the development, Mr. Merchant said, though things like parking, stormwater, and maximum building height would work to cap the density. This gives developers “incentive to commit to a certain number of the units” being affordable, he said.

For those reasons, staff is recommending this map change, Mr. Merchant said. Also, the rear portion of this property is very low, dipping down to 5’ or 10’ above sea level. A large portion isn’t usable in the back, he said; the developable portion is in the front.

Mr. Merchant said the county’s planning department recommends the rezoning but would consult with City of Beaufort planning staff about whether annexation would be feasible for this parcel; it doesn’t seem like it would be for this project, but they want to give city staff an opportunity to look into that and to weigh in on whether the proposed zoning is consistent with the Northern Beaufort County Regional Plan. The next step would be to take this to the county’s planning commission, he said.
Dr. Andy Burris is the applicant, Mr. Merchant added, and he is present at the meeting if the commissioners have questions.

Commissioner Semmler asked if there would be a fill requirement on the low-level marsh portion of the property. Mr. Merchant said he believes most of it’s a jurisdictional wetland, so that’s not a consideration.

Commissioner Semmler said he remembers when this rezoning came to the MPC 2 years ago. Commissioner Alling asked how many units would be permitted with the zoning change. Mr. Merchant said in C-5 District, density is 50 dwelling units per acre, so they could get about 150 units. Dr. Burris said they were planning for 126 units, but they stopped planning because of district restrictions. Parking and stormwater would be limiters, he added. Commissioner Alling feels 3 stories would be fine in this location.

There was general agreement about the need for affordable housing. Commissioner Crower asked about the 80-unit limit and if it has to do with affordable housing. Mr. Merchant said there are restrictions in C3 that keep the impact of multi-family housing down in single-family housing subdivisions. In the old county code, they restricted it to 5 units per acre, but in the new code, rather than limiting impact by density, the county developed a cap. The restrictions on multi-family would not exist if the zoning were changed to C5, he said.

Commissioner Alling said she drove through the property and found it “almost residential.” She doesn’t feel multi-family housing would infringe on any of the single-family residents’ privacy for example, because the area has “a hodgepodge of stuff.” Mr. Merchant said there are a lot of non-residential uses, and there are some abandoned buildings, but he wouldn’t call the area “commercial.” There is a road network nearby to support the nearby commercial area, he said.

Commissioner Alling made a motion to recommend the change in zoning to C5-RCMU. Commissioner Crower seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Merchant said county staff has been discussing the possibility of coordinating efforts to update Comp Plans with other jurisdictions for “a lot more consistency across the board.”

Northern Regional Planning Implementation Committee meets Friday at 9:30, Commissioner Semmler said. Mr. Merchant said they plan to distribute a draft of the Lady’s Island Plan then.

There being no further business to come before the commission, Commissioner Crower made a motion to adjourn, and the meeting ended at 6:21 p.m.
ORDINANCE

AMENDING SECTION 5.8.4.A DESIGN STANDARDS FOR EXTERIOR LIGHTING OF THE BEAUFORT CODE TO ALLOW LIGHT POLES IN AUTOCENTRIC AREAS TO BE A MAXIMUM OF 30 FEET ABOVE GRADE

WHEREAS, the State of South Carolina has conferred to the City of Beaufort the power to enact ordinances “in relation to roads, streets, markets, law enforcement, health, and order in the municipality or respecting any subject which appears to it necessary and proper for the security, general welfare, and convenience of the municipality or for preserving health, peace, order, and good government in it . . .” as set forth in Code of Laws of South Carolina, Section 5-7-20; and

WHEREAS, the City of Beaufort adopted the Beaufort Code by reference on June 27, 2017, as set forth in section 5-6001 of the Code of Ordinances Beaufort, South Carolina; and

WHEREAS, the amendment of the Beaufort Code is “for the general purpose of guiding development in accordance with existing and future needs and promoting the public health, safety, morals, convenience, order, appearance, prosperity, and general welfare” in accordance with Code of Laws of South Carolina, Section 6-29-710; and

WHEREAS, the amendment of the zoning ordinance still limits the maximum height of light poles in pedestrian areas, and in travel ways containing on-street parking at 15 feet above grade; and

WHEREAS, the amendment of the zoning ordinance does not alter any other exterior lighting design standard, viz., shielding requirements and maximum illuminance; and

WHEREAS, the amendment is consistent with the goals for development as outlined in the City’s comprehensive plan and Civic Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing before the Beaufort City Council was held regarding changes to the administrative adjustment ordinance on <month-day-year>, with notice of the hearing published in The Beaufort Gazette on <month-day-year>;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Beaufort, South Carolina, duly assembled and by authority of same, pursuant to the power vested in the Council by Section 6-29-760, Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976, that The Beaufort Code be amended by revising Section 5.8.4.A, “Design Standards for Exterior Lighting,” by deleting the current paragraph A and replacing it with a new paragraph A to read as follows:

A. Maximum Lighting Height: For purposes of these regulations, the mounting height of a lighting fixture shall be defined as the vertical distance from the grade elevation of the surface being illuminated to the top of the light post, not including the fixture.

1. In pedestrian oriented areas, the height of the light post shall not exceed 15 feet above grade.

2. In auto-centric areas, such as parking lots which support shopping centers, large retailers,
or manufacturing sites, etc., the height of the light post shall not exceed 30 feet above grade.

3. Wherever possible, outdoor seating areas, building entrances, and walkways shall be illuminated using ground mounted fixtures not more than 4 feet tall.

4. In historic districts, light poles exceeding 15 feet above grade must be approved by the Historic Review Board.

(SEAL) Attest:

BILLY KEYSERLING, MAYOR

IVETTE BURGESS, CITY CLERK

1st Reading

2nd Reading & Adoption

Reviewed by: WILLIAM B. HARVEY, III, CITY ATTORNEY
Applicant
Wendell Varnes

Site
Approximately 0.44 acres located at 2600 Smilax Ave, also identified as District 110, Map 8, Parcel 63. The parcel is at the intersection of Smilax Ave and Narcissus Lane. See Location Map, Exhibit A.

Present Zoning and Existing Development
The parcel is zoned T5 Main Street. The parcel is undeveloped. The Main Street Zone consists of higher density, mixed-use buildings that accommodate retail, rowhouses, offices, and apartments along primary thoroughfares within a neighborhood framework. A tight network of streets defines this Zone as a highly walkable area. Buildings are set very close to the frontages in order to define the public realm.

Proposed Zoning
The proposal is to rezone the lot to T4 Urban Center. The Urban Center (T4UC) Zone is intended to integrate vibrant main-street commercial and retail environments into a walkable neighborhood framework. This area serves as the focal point for the community, providing access to day-to-day amenities and transit. See Exhibit B, Zoning Map.

Comprehensive Plan / Land Use Compatibility
The Future Land Use map from the Comprehensive Plan classifies the parcel in an Intended Growth Sector (G-3), Activity Sector. T4 Urban Center is compatible, in both density and allowed uses with what is envisioned in an Intended Growth Sector. See Exhibit C, The Future Land Use Map.

Property zoned T4 Urban Center is adjacent to the east of the subject property. In the event of development the town’s development codes will regulate tree removal and pruning, storm water management, and design standards. The owner’s application (attached) points out that the property is not on a main street and he feels that 3 residential homes would be more fitting for the Royal Palms Subdivision.

Environmental Issues
There are no environmental issues for this property.

Public Service Issues
None

Letters were sent to property owners within 400 feet of the property being rezoned.
PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENT
Town of Port Royal South Carolina

Fee: $250.00
PUD: $500.00 plus $5.00 per acre

To The Honorable Mayor and Town Council:
The undersigned hereby respectfully request that the Town of Port Royal Ordinance be amended as described below:

(1) This is a request for a change in the: (Check one)
   ☑ Zoning Map (fill in items #2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 only)
   () Zoning Text (fill in items #7 and 8 only)

(2) Give exact address and plat map reference for property you propose a zoning change;
   District No. 110  Map 8  Parcel (s) 63
   Address 2600 Smilax

(3) Area of subject property 19,371.46 Sq. Ft. or acres.

(4) Current Zoning (remember to list any overlays)
   T5 Main Street

(5) Proposed Zoning (remember to list any overlays)
   T4 Urban Center
   * Under item #8 explain why this area should be zoned as you proposed.

(6) Does the applicant own all of the property proposed for this zoning change?
   YES ( ) NO ( ) If NO, give the address of the property involved which he does not own
   and the owner's name and contact information:

(7) Proposed language for TEXT change ________________________________

(8) Explanation: the property is not on main street and we feel that three residential homes would look better than town homes and would be more fitting for the Royal Palms subdivision.
   (If more space is needed, continue on back)

Pursuant to Section 6-29-1145 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, is this tract or parcel
restricted by any recorded covenant that is contrary to, conflicts with, or prohibits the activity
described in this application? Yes ( ) No ( )

It is understood by the undersigned that while this application will be carefully reviewed and
considered, the burden of proving the need for the proposed amendment rests with the applicant.

Date: Apr 3 2019  Owners Name: Wendell Varnes
Phone #: 843-321-1495  Address: 997 Katharine Court
Email: info@ch5oflaw.com  Beaufort, SC

Signed: Wendell Varnes
2600 Smilax Ave

April 4, 2019

Addresses Streets Parcels

1:3,009

The information and images contained on this web site are for viewing and informational purposes only.
From the Future Land Use Map

Exhibit C

Legend

- Open Sector (O)
- Open Space Preservation (O_1)
- Open Space Conservation (O_2)
- Restricted Growth Sector (G_1)
- Low Impact (G_1_A)
- Conventional Neighborhood (G_1_B)
- Controlled Growth Sector (G_2)
- Walkable Neighborhood
- Intended Growth Sector (G_3)
- Activity Center
- Infill Growth Sector (G_4)
- Village Core
- Military
- Mallard Area

Parcel
Applicant  
303 Associates  

Site  
Approximately 10.57 acres located at 1844 Ribaut Road, 1830 Ribaut Road and 1807 Rahn Lane, also identified as District 110, Map 8, Parcels 114, 115 and 118. See Location Map, Exhibit A.

Present Zoning and Existing Development  
The parcel is zoned T4 Neighborhood Center-Open. The parcels contain the Sea Island Apartment complex and the former Coca Cola Bottling and Distribution Warehouse. The Neighborhood Center (T4NC) Zone is intended to integrate appropriate, medium-density residential building types, such as duplexes, townhouses, small courtyard housing, and mansion apartments into a neighborhood framework that is conducive to walking and bicycling. Civic, transit, and commercial functions are located within walking distance. The intent of the T4NC-O Sub-Zone is to provide neighborhoods with a broader amount of retail and service uses in the scale and character of the T4NC zone.

Proposed Zoning  
The proposal is to rezone the lot to T5 Main Street. T5 Main Street Zone consists of higher density, mixed-use buildings that accommodate retail, rowhouses, offices, and apartments along primary thoroughfares within a neighborhood framework. A tight network of streets defines this Zone as a highly walkable area. Buildings are set very close to the frontages in order to define the public realm. See Exhibit B, Zoning Map.

Comprehensive Plan / Land Use Compatibility  
The Future Land Use map from the Comprehensive Plan classifies the parcel in an Intended Growth Sector (G-3), Activity Sector. T5 Main Street is compatible, in both density and allowed uses with what is envisioned in an Intended Growth Sector. See Exhibit C, The Future Land Use Map.

Property zoned T5 Main Street is adjacent to the east of the subject property. In the event of development or redevelopment, the town’s development codes will regulate tree removal and pruning, storm water management, and design standards.

Environmental Issues  
There are no environmental issues for this property.

Public Service Issues  
None  
Letters were sent to property owners within 400 feet of the property being rezoned.
Subject Parcels

T5 Main Street
From the Future land Use Map

Exhibit C

Legend

- Open Sector (O)
- Open Space Preservation (G_1)
- Open Space Conservation (G_2)
- Restricted Growth Sector (G_1)
- Low Impact (G_1_A)
- Conventional Neighborhood (G_1_B)
- Controlled Growth Sector (G_2)
- Walkable Neighborhood
- Intended Growth Sector (G_3)
- Activity Center
- Infill Growth Sector (G_4)
- Village Core
- Military
- Waterway