



**CITY OF BEAUFORT**  
302 CARTERET STREET  
POST OFFICE BOX 1167  
BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA 29902  
(843) 525-7070  
**REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**  
**AGENDA**  
AUGUST 5, 2010

CITY HALL CONFERENCE ROOM  
**302 CARTERET STREET**

**4:00 P.M.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

July 1, 2010 Regular Meeting

**III. REPORTS**

- A. Parking Update
- B. Bladen Street Update

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. Discussion regarding The Point Neighborhood Parking Plan

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Discussion regarding Historically Significant Buildings

**VI. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Pursuant to Title 30, Chapter 4, Section 70 (a) of the South Carolina Code of Laws:  
Discussion regarding Land Acquisition

**VI. ADJOURN**

**Proposed Mission Statement**

The City of Beaufort Redevelopment Commission has been established to renovate, revitalize, and regenerate distressed areas of Beaufort.

BRC's mission is to lead a coordinated strategy of redevelopment and design strengthening the City of Beaufort as:

- The heart of economic development for Northern Beaufort County
- A prosperous place for business and institutions; and
- An attractive urban environment for residents and visitors

**NOTE: IF YOU HAVE SPECIAL NEEDS DUE TO A PHYSICAL CHALLENGE, PLEASE CALL IVETTE BURGESS 525-7070 FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**STATEMENT OF MEDIA NOTIFICATION**

"In accordance with 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."

A meeting of the Beaufort Redevelopment Commission was held on July 1, 2010 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room at 302 Carteret Street. In attendance were Chairman Bob Pinkerton, Commissioners James Bellew, Martin Goodman Mike McNally, Wendy Zara, City Manager Scott Dadson and Shirley Hughes, Gene Rugala, and Jon Verity. Ed Barnhart and Denise Bolin were absent.

In accordance with 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.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Chairman Pinkerton.

### **MINUTES**

The minutes of the June 3, 2010 meeting of the commission were presented for review. On motion by Commissioner Zara, seconded by Commissioner Goodman, the commission voted unanimously to approve the minutes as amended.

### **PARKING UPDATE**

Mr. Dadson said it was the first day with the new kiosk system, and noted that the fines have gone up. He said Lanier is trying to help people work with the new meters. The transfer “went fairly painlessly,” he said. There has been a rise in the number of applicants for the monthly passes, Mr. Dadson said, according to Mr. Cook. Chairman Pinkerton said this shows that economics do drive parking. There is no breakdown yet. He said there’s a limited number of 8-hour spaces. Commissioner McNally asked about the payoff time for the new stations, i.e., when they’d start making money. Mr. Dadson said the city underwrote the cost of them, but they’re depreciated over a 5-year structure. There’s also a synching fund out of TIF1 money.

Commissioner Goodman said that at the MSB meeting, there were questions because they’d thought there would be a kiosk for the lot at Scott Street Park. Mr. Dadson said it’s a metered lot. Ms. Hughes said they’d check on it, but Mr. Dadson doesn’t remember it being discussed as a metered lot. Changing the meter times has been tabled for awhile. The library lot has a kiosk. General discussion ensued about various aspects of the new parking system, including the parking marks on the pavement. Chairman Pinkerton said he has a real concern that the kiosks are now visitor-unfriendly because of a lack of signs, i.e. between West and Charles Streets. He said there’s no way for an out of towners to know that he should pay or where and a ticket could mean an angry visitor. Mr. Dadson said he believes that “on the white part” of the painted number “it says something.” He said there’s a sign committee and more will be coming. There was general discussion about this matter, and Mr. Dadson said it’s the first day with the kiosks; there are ambassadors out there to work with people and “we should just let it work itself out.”

### **BLADEN STREET UPDATE**

Commissioner McNally said they’ve met with all the owners. The last was Mr. Dowling; Commissioner McNally said that as an architect, “he’s had a lot of questions.” They have sent out letters to each property owner, listing everything that was said at every meeting, reiterating

that the things they said they would get to the owners would be gotten to them. All of that material is being put together in packages for various owners.

They also met with Denise Draper who showed them “the rules of the road for going forward.” The properties have to be appraised in value, even though they are asking the easement be gifted to them. They have told the owners that the new zoning will exceed anything they’re giving. Those who give it as a gift can take a deduction for the value of that easement. There won’t be stringent onsite parking requirements. In some cases there will be zero setbacks. The zoning will be done on a lot-by-lot basis, depending on a variety of factors. He feels the owners felt that the Redevelopment Commission is working with them.

The appraisals have to be done. Mr. Dadson said it’s being ordered now as well as engineering and surveying. The values have to be presented to the property owners. The easement strip will be marked out on their land with paint to show them how much will be in the easement and what the value is, as well as a grant and information about how they can still use it. They can sign the easement grant then or take it under advisement. Chairman Pinkerton said the form-based code as it applies to their property will be given to them. Commissioner McNally said when the people are spoken to and are given the form-based code, it will be a recommendation from the Redevelopment Commission that this seems to be the right thing.

Mr. Dadson said there have also been meetings with Planning Commission members and others. Chairman Pinkerton said there are no surprises coming. Commissioner McNally said of about a dozen owners, 9 or 10 were delighted with the whole concept. Chairman Pinkerton said no one seems to be really against it. Commissioner McNally said some had reservations. Chairman Pinkerton said the owners want to see it on paper so they’ll know that the promises will be stood behind. Chairman Pinkerton said Cooter Ramsey has been listening to their concerns and wishes. Commissioner McNally said they explained the form-based code, and properties’ owners had asked if they could put commercial on the first floor and then a story and a half of apartments above. They were happy to find out that they could.

Mr. Dadson said engineering’s really been done; they have to have documents in order and construction could start in the fall. It may take as long as a year. Ms. Hughes said she couldn’t recall the grant timing. Mr. Dadson said the depth of the stormwater is part of the delay; “the system is a mediator for quality.” Commissioner McNally said many were concerned that the retention will be in the street system, not on their properties. Mr. Dadson said it’s being designed that way. Commissioner McNally said someone was concerned that during heavy stormwater events in a high tide condition, there’s no escape valve by the river. Mr. Dadson said there isn’t one there because it’s a high point. Commissioner McNally asked if it should work fine without that. Mr. Dadson said yes.

Mr. Dadson complimented Chairman Pinkerton, Commissioner McNally, and Mr. Ramsey for their work on this. Ms. Hughes said that grant has to be fully completed by December 2011. Mr. Dadson said this fall is the first benchmark.

## **DISCUSSION OF WORKING GROUPS**

Mr. Dadson said he and Ms. Hughes have had discussions about the 3 working groups. For the Finance group, they've discussed pulling out all the financial pieces. Ms. Hughes will lead the process with that group. Chairman Pinkerton said the other groups sat down with Mr. Dadson and went through some of this stuff. He said economic development is key with whatever has to go on with the university.

Mr. Dadson said council had interviewed two new potential members. One is a financially-oriented and has been an advisor to a lot of development and would be a nice complement to the current group. Commissioner Goodman asked if they should set a date for getting together with Ms. Hughes. Commissioner Zara asked that notices of committee meetings be sent out to the whole commission in case anyone wanted to come.

Mr. Dadson said if they're doing a committee system, they need to figure out how to do it. The various options he suggested were:

1. All committee meetings could be prior to the regular Redevelopment Commission meeting at 1:30 pm, 2:30 pm, etc.
2. Each committee could pick a day and time to meet.
3. Each committee could pick a day (like the second Tuesday of every month) and that becomes it that committee's day to meet.

Mr. Dadson said he feels the meetings need to be steadier so that people can plan for them. He suggested they keep their regular meetings on the 1<sup>st</sup> Thursday of the month and then committee meetings could be on the 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of the month.

There was some discussion of what the Redevelopment Commission members thought would be best.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Commissioner Goodman asked that everyone take down his e-mail because he doesn't receive all e-mails: [goodman@uscb.edu](mailto:goodman@uscb.edu)

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

On motion by Commissioner Zara, seconded by Commissioner Goodman, council voted to move into Executive Session pursuant to Title 30, Chapter 4, Section 70(a) of the South Carolina Code of Laws for discussion regarding land acquisition. The motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Zara, seconded by Commissioner Goodman, made a motion to come out of Executive Session and resume the regular Redevelopment Commission meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Commissioner Zara made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Verity. The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:41 pm.

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
IVETTE BURGESS, CITY CLERK

HISTORICALLY  
OR  
ARCHITECTURALLY  
SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURES

WHICH ARE  
UNFIT FOR HUMAN  
HABITATION

# Present Beaufort Ordinances

- ▣ Relating to Vacant & Abandoned Structures:
  - ▣ Commercial
  - ▣ Residential
  - ▣ Historically Significant
  - ▣ Architecturally Significant
  - ▣ No special Significance – can be demolished

# Ordinance Article B

## Sec. 5-1021 to Sec. 2-1036

- ▣ BUILDINGS UNFIT FOR HUMAN HABITATION
- ▣ COMPLAINT
- ▣ BUILDING DEPT. INSPECTION
- ▣ ORDER TO REPAIR OR DEMOLISH
- ▣ PUBLIC HEARING
- ▣ CITY AUTHORIZED TO REMOVE, REPAIR OR STABILIZE – Place lien to cover costs
- ▣ City \$\$\$ spent for lien – Doesn't work!

# Article G. Preservation of Architecturally and Historically Significant Structures Sec. 5-1201 to 5-1209

Demolition by Neglect: Deterioration of structure  
Unsafe electrical/mechanical  
Any defect threatening  
structure or architecture.

NOTICE to OWNER –Must restore or stabilize  
HEARING

CITY AUTHORIZED TO RESTORE OR STABILIZE –  
Place lien to cover costs

City \$\$\$ spent for lien – Doesn't work!

# Present City Ordinances do not work!

- ▣ City is reluctant to spend \$\$\$\$ with uncertain payback
- ▣ \$\$\$\$ spent to stabilize or restore building can only be backed by a lien on the property
- ▣ May be years before property is sold and lien can be collected
- ▣ Value of sold property may not cover lien amount
- ▣ SO... WHAT CAN BE DONE TO SAVE THESE IMPORTANT STRUCTURES?

# Change the Rules of the Game!

- ▣ Rewrite Ordinances to provide other options
- ▣ Redevelopment Commission and Historic Beaufort Foundation need to become active participants – this means \$\$\$\$.
- ▣ Proper “stabilization” must take place – if only option
  - Attractive
  - Effective
- ▣ Rehabilitation must begin:
  - Restoration Agreements with willing owners
  - Create Special Historic District Tax Assessments against unwilling owners

# Stabilize and Restore Significant Structures

- ▣ Stabilize all structures that cannot be programmed for a timely restoration – either by Restoration Agreements or Special Historical District Assessments

## Investigate each structure

- Owner – willing participant? If yes...
- Explain Options – Do the work yourself
  - Enter into *Restoration Agreement*
- If Owner is unwilling ...
  - - Establish a *Special Historical District Tax Assessment*

# Restoration Agreements

- ▣ Willing owner with no \$\$\$\$ - deeds property to: Beaufort Redevelopment Commission (BRC) , HBF or both as “Partners” with Owner.
- ▣ BRC / HBF funds and contracts restoration.
- ▣ Property is then sold to recover \$\$\$\$
- ▣ Restoration costs repaid first at time of sale
- ▣ Any additional \$\$\$ paid to Owner

# Special Historical District Tax Assessment

- ▣ Applies to property owners unwilling or unable to participate in Restoration Agreement
- ▣ Introduce City Ordinance to allow for the Creation of Special Historical/ Architectural Tax Assessments with tax sale default proviso
- ▣ Assess full cost of restoration
- ▣ Establish payment schedule for Assessment
- ▣ Assessment default would trigger tax sale
- ▣ Tax sale buyer would be required to restore.

# Building Stabilization

- ▣ Current Ordinance describes stabilization but needs to be enforced
- ▣ Ordinance needs to address the “mothballing” as to specification and aesthetics.
- ▣ Lien provision needs to be changed to a “Stabilization Tax Assessment” with default provision of a tax sale
- ▣ Building Stabilizations should only be done if there is a “good reason” for not restoring building in a timely manner.

# Pilot Project

- ▣ To prove workability of Restoration Agreement
- ▣ Choose willing owner
- ▣ Historically Significant house
- ▣ Redevelopment Commission best suited to sponsor and fund project
- ▣ Work with local architect, builder, bank
- ▣ Based on costs, sell restored property to repay restoration costs
- ▣ Balance of proceeds revert to owner

# The road to success

- ▣ Get started now...waiting leads to further deterioration of buildings
- ▣ Prioritize list of buildings...easy ones first
- ▣ Rewrite City Ordinances as required and enforce others through new options...Restoration Agreements or Special Tax Assessments
- ▣ Start Pilot Project for residential building
- ▣ Explore similar options for commercial buildings
- ▣ A completed project will provide momentum and incentives.

# Goals for Success

- ▣ Investigate and assess each building
- ▣ Get each building owner into a Restoration Agreement or a Special Historical District Tax Assessment
- ▣ Prioritize all buildings
- ▣ Instigate a Pilot Project – Redevelopment Comm.
- ▣ Establish a realistic time line goal for completion
- ▣ Commit to Success
- ▣ Remain Persistent