

A work session of the Beaufort City Council was held on January 14, 2014 at 5:00 p.m. in the Beaufort Municipal Complex, 1901 Boundary Street. In attendance were Mayor Billy Keyserling, Council members Donnie Ann Beer, Mike Sutton, Mike McFee, and George O'Kelley, and City Manager Scott Dadson.

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.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Keyserling called the work session to order at 5:00 p.m.

### **BEAUFORT MUSEUM'S MOVE TO ARSENAL**

**Katherine Lang** said the museum is anticipating getting into the Arsenal in early spring. The city is working on the HVAC, and the Chamber of Commerce is trying to get ATAX money for an elevator. She said they would hold their annual meeting at the Arsenal, though they won't yet be there. They have contracted with a consultant out of Charleston about permanent exhibits. She will help the museum put together a long-term plan, Ms. Lang said. They want the museum to be unique because Beaufort was instrumental in what was going on in Colonial and pre-Colonial times as well as later.

**Robb Wells** said the museum is a natural fit for the Visitors' Center and the Chamber of Commerce and having a museum in the downtown core will be a good merger. **Stephen Murray** thanked council, **Scott Dadson**, and others in the city for their help. They are trying to work together as non-profits as the council wishes. He said there are a number of advantages to this plan. Ms. Lang said there would be a space for educational programming. Mr. Murray said the request on the elevator is a one-time request. **Blakely Williams** and Ms. Lang also thanked the city for all their help.

Councilman Sutton said council has to approve the lease in the next regular meeting. Mr. Dadson said it was already approved. There's no formal action to be taken.

### **MILITARY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE (MEC) - PLEDGED SUPPORT FOR 2013-2014**

Mayor Keyserling said they had received a letter asking for fulfillment of a pledge in anticipation of a BRAC. There is no BRAC, he said, so he thinks before money is distributed they should know "What is the plan and what are we paying for?" He asked if MEC would still need \$100,000+ a year and if so, what the money would be used for. The city's contribution is only a small portion, Mayor Keyserling said.

**John Payne** said that there *will* be a BRAC. "Sequestration was more devastating to the military than the BRAC ever was," he said, "because it was indiscriminate about the areas that were diminished and done away with." He said one of the biggest things MEC does is informing the public of what the issues are. **Jim Wegmann** said their understanding is that there will be a request for a BRAC, though it probably won't happen until 2017, in his opinion. He said, "It's coming; it's just a matter of when." Some communities are already gearing up for it.

Mayor Keyserling said he agrees, but what he has asked was if there aren't things that could be done "to better prepare ourselves for an anticipated BRAC." He asked if maybe that should be done separately. He gave an example of, in Hinesville, the Ft. Stewart commander asking the city to annex them.

Mr. Wegmann said the state is looking at whether there's a conflict with using a shared lobbyist. They are trying to be a part of more regional issues and plans. Mayor Keyserling asked if there's a state-based plan and Mr. Wegmann and Mr. Payne said yes.

Councilman O'Kelley said that Mayor Keyserling had talked about the general in Sumter. Columbia and Charleston are the other two cities in the state that have military projects. He asked if they have an equivalent to the MEC. Mr. Payne said they all do, and they all have a consultant working for them in Washington. They meet with the Military Base Task Force in Columbia at least quarterly. Mr. Wegmann explained what had been communicated with Charleston.

Councilman McFee said that the communities with bases are partners in this and should be considered as part of the future of the bases: joint services, etc. He feels the lines of communication need to be very strong and the relationships solid. Mr. Payne said it shows the DOD that the town is interested in supporting its bases.

Councilman Sutton said he feels there's not been a lot of bridge-building between MEC and city government. He said they have asked a lot of groups what they are doing with the city's dollars. Last year \$75,000 was pledged. If a group operates off public dollars, Councilman Sutton feels they should have insight on a plan and where the money is going. He asked if the city is "buying a PR agency for MEC," and if it wouldn't be a part of the Chamber of Commerce's budget. Mr. Payne said the Chamber of Commerce's funds are segregated. He said there's a budget for 2013, and they are working on the 2014 budget now. Councilman Sutton said the community needs to know a little more and the budgets would help. He said the MEC blast has been helpful.

Mr. Payne said that, when they've been asked, they say that the purpose of MEC is to get the information out and to determine whether they have the answers or not. Councilman Sutton said, "That's kind of a soft answer." Councilman Sutton said when they ask for money, they should show the budget and say what they are using the money for in a more specific way.

Councilwoman Beer said with the last BRAC, they got the support of the locals who support the military, and they went to Atlanta and saw the demonstration and the information given out, and "it made a difference because we're still here." Mr. Payne said, "the folks in Washington who help us out are expensive, but they get things done." Mr. Wegmann said the consultants are up for review and renewal. There's been a significant cut to it, with an option that when a BRAC is announced, they will readjust the budget. The consultants give a monthly update to MEC.

Councilman Sutton said they appear to be paying to have a direct link in Washington who have their ears to the ground and provide information to MEC. Mr. Wegmann said they have more information than they would have otherwise in regard to the Navy Hospital. Mr. Payne said the new CO of the hospital will be at the meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup> but will not do a presentation.

There was a general discussion about the helicopter pilots and what they fly.

**Skeet Von Harten** said that Councilman Sutton was right: that council should have a report on how funds are spent. He said council should remember that the base closing or any steps toward a BRAC are an ongoing process. The MEC keeps its ear to the ground about what happens in Washington and how it affects this community. Mr. Von Harten said the MEC will continue to do what it did in the times when the threat was imminent or when it's over the horizon somewhere. They can't be complacent if a potential crisis happens. They stay tuned in so they will have all the information they need to move forward when it happens.

Mayor Keyserling said he hoped that they hadn't heard that the city wouldn't support them, but they have been asking questions about strengthening relationships. He sees downtime as a way to get proactive and do other things. He said the marines are struggling with money by building schools when the public schools have space, and they could be integrated, which would save them a lot of money and make the commander look good by bringing the school board into the mix. Mayor Keyserling thinks communication is good, and he hopes that they understand that they have city support for the MEC. He suggested looking at the way other places do things. Mr. Wegmann said they would send two people to the ADC in February. Mr. Dadson said the city would have a staff member there.

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Pursuant to Title 30, Chapter 4, and Section 70 (a) (2) of the South Carolina Code of Law, **Councilwoman Beer made a motion, second by Councilman McFee to enter into Executive Session for receipt of legal advice and discussion of property acquisition. The motion passed unanimously.**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

A regular meeting of the Beaufort City Council was held on January 14, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. in the Beaufort Municipal Complex, 1901 Boundary Street. In attendance were Mayor Billy Keyserling and council members Donnie Ann Beer, Mike Sutton, Mike McFee, and George O'Kelley.

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.

**Councilwoman Beer made a motion, second by Councilman O'Kelley, to come out of Executive Session and begin the regular session. The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Keyserling called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

#### **INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Councilwoman Beer led the invocation. Mayor Keyserling led the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Amberlee Vanderhoof Pelkey** read from a letter she had written about the incoming mooring fields and the need for boats to move to allow their installation. She is a boat owner in permanent residence, and she said she didn't receive proper notice in a timely fashion or with a return receipt. The ordinance reference doesn't cover the need for boat owners to seek permission at the downtown marina. Only Section 3-2001-E does, and it applies to the distance from which boats may moor with or without permission. This permits Ms. Pelkey's boat and others. The notice to remove boats for the moors' installation will then take place.

The notice from the city references 46 upcoming anchors, which is significantly more than the public was notified of, Ms. Pelkey said. She said if council persists, and the moors are anchored, she should be grandfathered in and she cited the reasons why. She installed a permanent anchor and buoy in 2004 and has fulfilled all of the requirements. She asked council to consider the current boat owners with private and permanent moors. Ms. Pelkey went on to describe how she has cared for her boat and paid taxes. She feels she and the other boats like hers can live with the moors to be installed and should be allowed to stay where they are and not have to move within 30 days.

Councilman Sutton said the permit's been issued, the moorings will be put in, and the planning has been going on for years. He said Ms. Pelkey will have to think about moving her boat from its location whether it's in 30 days, 90 days or a year. It's not just for transient boats, he said, and described the reasons for the need for the moorings. There's no entity or money to rescue sunken boats, so they have to do it themselves, so as not to have derelict boats. Councilman Sutton offered to talk to Ms. Pelkey about how to make it easier, but, he said, "It will happen."

Councilman O'Kelley said they don't have permission to anchor there. Ms. Pelkey said that they do have permission that they obtained so as not to be considered littering. Her family is in the process of trying to find the paperwork that gave her permission in 2004.

## **PUBLIC HEARING: ADOPTING THE CIVIC MASTER PLAN AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**Mayor Keyserling opened this public hearing. Libby Anderson** said the public hearing was on the adoption of the city's Civic Master Plan, an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. They have been working on the Civic Master Plan for more than 2 years. The Sector One area began the development of the Civic Master Plan in January 2011. There were boards and meetings – more than 17 – and on November 22, 2011, council adopted the Sector One plan. They then went to 4 other sectors and added an amendment to apply to the marina area in downtown Beaufort.

Ms. Anderson went on to describe the public meetings that were held. The first meetings about the draft plan focused on the sectors to which they applied. This past summer and fall, they did citywide presentations and presented to the appropriate city committees. **Lauren Kelly** worked with Historic Beaufort Foundation on their concerns and had 9 meetings in October for over 14 hours. The Redevelopment Commission endorsed the Civic Master Plan, and recommendation of adoption of the Civic Master Plan followed from the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

Ms. Anderson said this hearing was advertised in December. The document under consideration is dated November 4 and is the same one the Metropolitan Planning Commission approved; it incorporates the input of many, including the public. No changes have been made to the November 4 version posted on the website, so the public has had 2 months to read it.

**Jon Verity**, Redevelopment Commission chair, said, "This is a terrific plan." It identifies developable property and ranks their merit for development. They have spent more than 100 hours on community input and lately more of that time has been spent working with Historic Beaufort Foundation, all to the plan's benefit. He listed the ways the Civic Master Plan would be used by the city. The plan doesn't answer all of a developer's questions, i.e., stormwater questions, as these are not the intent of the plan. They want the developer to go to the source on these issues. It doesn't give anyone permission to circumvent the regular processes and gives no one the right to build any particular building without permission. When a developer is identified, the Redevelopment Commission will work with the developer in a variety of ways, which Mr. Verity iterated. They will also look for developers for specific sites that the Redevelopment Commission feels have particular merit for development.

Mr. Verity said that they need to continue to develop economically for the city to survive and sustain what Beaufort has. They can't do that without the residents having to pay more and more in taxes and fees. The plan respects the National Historic Landmark designation, he said, and the diversity of the area. He concluded, "Let's get on with it."

**Conway Ivy** said that the characterization of the Historic Beaufort Foundation's participation was correct, "but many of our recommendations were not incorporated in the Civic Master Plan." Historic Beaufort Foundation recommended that the Civic Master Plan be amended to include "the 7 Integrities" and infill design principles. They have also proposed these to the

Metropolitan Planning Commission, which chose not to modify the plan to include them, so they are asking council to include them as an amendment. He stated why Historic Beaufort Foundation feels the 7 Integrities and the design principles should be included in the Civic Master Plan.

Mr. Ivy said **Cynthia Jenkins** has found evidence of these infill design principles being used successfully elsewhere. Historic Beaufort Foundation strongly urges the addition of these things into the plan to make them readily available to anyone working in the Historic District and to help the architectural review process.

Ms. Lutz reviewed what the 7 Integrities are and said that they're "motherhood and apple pie and (council) couldn't say no to including them into the Master Plan." Design, setting, materials, workmanship, and feeling are among the 7 Integrities.

Ms. Jenkins said one the reasons Historic Beaufort Foundation asked her to come up with Infill Design Principles was because when the 7 Integrities are met, they have to file a report to document the steps the city has made to maintain the National Historic Landmark status. The Secretary of the Interior's guidelines were geared to how additions are added to historic buildings, with little added about infill construction or new construction in historic areas. In 2011, Oregon came up with a new set of Infill Design Principles to make it easier for Historic District Review Boards, developers, property owners, etc. to know what was appropriate. More than 40 people developed them over a year. Ms. Jenkins said she knows that they want to do new infill, and the architecture has to be specific to its time and respectful of what's built. Federal Street has buildings from 1813 – 1952 "but they all work." They respect size, mass, and scale, etc. HBF hopes that including these infill guidelines will do that for the whole city.

Mr. Verity said he believes that Historic Beaufort Foundation has put together a strong set of principles that will be helpful to developers so they'll have a clear idea how to work with Historic Beaufort Foundation. They feel they don't need to be included in the plan because it doesn't focus enough on the development side, and they don't want "developers reading these on the Internet," as opposed to meeting with Ms. Lutz, Ms. Jenkins, and Mr. Ivy and discussing the principles in person. No one is denying that they are valid, Mr. Verity said.

**Amelia Aimar Cromer** said saying that something shouldn't be included on the Internet because it might be misconstrued does not credit the developers, and she thinks "it should be out there from the get-go."

**David Tedder** said he acknowledges that there's such strong language about the drawings being illustrative, but when he gets to the regulating plans showing street sections, he's not certain there's the same degree of flexibility as in the early sections. He fears development will be killed by too much rigidity in the regulations. He's concerned that some of the street sections may not be viable, but he's looking at the practical applications of how to take this and move it on. They need to be sure they are not straitjacketed or handcuffed into a place they don't want to be and not be able to get out of it.

**Michael Dixon** said the decisions council makes affect people, and he spoke of the parallel road on Boundary Street and how it would force out people who have lived there 50 years. He said that he calls the plans for Boundary Street “the road to nowhere” because it stops at Hogarth, and the city needs millions to finish it. He doesn’t understand why the city would want to build more commercial space when there’s so much commercial space empty already. **Mayor Keyserling closed this public hearing.**

**PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE REZONING FIVE PARCELS OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1001, 1005, AND 1009 CRAVEN STREET; 412 CHARLES STREET; AND 415 NEWCASTLE STREET, FROM COMMERCIAL DISTRICT TO NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT**

**Mayor Keyserling opened this public hearing.** The applicant is the City of Beaufort, Ms. Anderson said, based on the application submitted originally by private owners. The map she put up on the overhead showed the 5 properties in the Bluff Neighborhood. She reviewed the use and the owners at each address.

Ms. Anderson described the uses permitted in Core Commercial and Neighborhood Commercial zonings. Office Commercial allows all the same uses as Core Commercial but adds residential. There’s a 2500 square foot limit on the footprint unless the building is a mixed use building with residential on top. The rezoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Future Land Use map designates this area as Neighborhood Mixed Use. They are intended for a mixture of uses that serve surrounding neighborhoods. In regard to surrounding land uses, Ms. Anderson reviewed them. The area’s served with water and sewer, and there is some on-street parking, which is a real advantage.

November 26, public notice was made and no public comments were received. The Metropolitan Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval. There were no questions from the public. Councilman McFee asked if the change of zoning would require changes in parking requirements. Ms. Anderson said if they have formalized on-street parking, it could account for a portion of the on-site requirement. Councilman O’Kelley asked Ms. Anderson if the change in zoning will require the property owners to do anything different in regard to parking, and Ms. Anderson said it would not affect parking. **Mayor Keyserling closed this public hearing.**

**PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE REZONING THREE PARCELS OF PROPERTY ON GREENLAWN DRIVE, FROM SUBURBAN DISTRICT TO BOUNDARY STREET REDEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

**Mayor Keyserling opened this public hearing.** Ms. Anderson said these 3 properties are proposed for rezoning because of a petition for annexation, which is why they need to be rezoned. All the properties surrounding it are zoned Boundary Street Redevelopment District. She said staff feels this rezoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and the Civic Master Plan shows the Greenlawn area as a redevelopment opportunity.

Ms. Anderson identified land uses in the general area: the Marsh Point neighborhood, some single family residences, a vacant lot, Jean Ribaut Square, and Beaufort Town Center. Public

notice was made and no public comment was received. The Metropolitan Planning Commission considered both annexation and rezoning. **Edie Rodgers** asked if the properties surrounding it were within the city limits already and why these weren't included. Councilman O'Kelley said at the time, some of them didn't want to be in the city and wanted to stay in the county. Ms. Anderson said, "This would fill in the missing spaces on Greenlawn." Mayor Keyserling said as they were bought, they were annexed for a future development. **Mayor Keyserling closed this public hearing.**

**PUBLIC HEARING: UDO AMENDMENT REVISING SECTION 6.8.H, "BOUNDARY STREET REDEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, TO REVISE FLOOR TO CEILING HEIGHT AND FIRST FLOOR ELEVATION**

**Mayor Keyserling opened this public hearing.** Ms. Anderson said this revision pertains to the Boundary Street Redevelopment District. The first revision is the minimum floor to ceiling height for first floor space. They propose to reduce the minimum floor to ceiling height by one foot. This will make it consistent with the Bladen Street code. For commercial and mixed use buildings, residential structures, 1 – 3 family homes, and townhomes, there will be a reduction of 1'.

The second revision, Ms. Anderson said, is about how far a first floor must be raised above grade. Currently all residential structures are elevated 3' above grade. For some structures, they propose that it be reduced to 2'. It allows flexibility in porch design as well. The Metropolitan Planning Commission unanimously recommended this, and an architect on that commission said these are safe numbers that make it easy to do good things.

Mr. Ivy asked, in regard to the structures along Boundary Street, what it does to the overall building height for buildings in the Historic District, if they're part of the Boundary Street Redevelopment. Mayor Keyserling described where the Boundary Street Redevelopment starts and ends and said it doesn't go into the Historic District. Ms. Anderson showed the Boundary Street Redevelopment area. Ms. Anderson said it doesn't change building height at all. **Mayor Keyserling closed this public hearing.**

**MINUTES**

**Councilwoman Beer made a motion, second by Councilman McFee, to accept the minutes of the work session and regular meeting December 10, 2013 as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.**

**ADOPTING THE CIVIC MASTER PLAN AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**Councilman Sutton made a motion, second by Councilwoman Beer, to adopt the Civic Master Plan on first reading.** Mr. Ivy said the Metropolitan Planning Commission had a question as to whether the Civic Master Plan would be regulating or legally binding. In last night's Metropolitan Planning Commission meeting, it was made clear that the Civic Master Plan was approved and vetted, he said, and it was argued that what was in the Civic Master Plan should be done. He said that's Historic Beaufort Foundation's concern and one of the reasons they want to insert the 7 Integrities and the design guidelines into the CMP. Should there be

questions, Mr. Ivy said, they could make the argument that this has already been decided. If they have these in the Civic Master Plan, it gives Historic Beaufort Foundation the opportunity to argue rationally that a project fits within the guidelines or not. In regard to Mr. Verity's point against including them, Mr. Ivy said he is "totally perplexed." If the Civic Master Plan is a marketing tool, the memorandum should create certain expectations of what someone could do. He said developers would look at the plan, see open areas in the Historic District and then expect to develop it.

Mr. Ivy also said Historic Beaufort Foundation has concerns about mass and scale that will go through review by the Historic District Review Board. He said the documents should be included to set an expectation for the developers, which should be important to everyone to maintain Beaufort's "unique sense of place."

**Craig Lewis** said the intention of the Civic Master Plan is "to show where opportunities are for development, understanding zoning today, the appetite for change in certain areas, and where infrastructure is to be put." Vague guidelines, like the 7 Integrities, which on their website HBF says are deliberately vague, are *not* written for infill, so that's why they want infill design guidelines. The preservation manual update and the Northwest Quadrant Guidelines are already in place, Mr. Lewis said, "and part of the process today." The developers can see where there's an opportunity and can contact and meet with the Redevelopment Commission. This information is already there and in more detail, Mr. Lewis said. They want the Civic Master Plan to be as proactive and as detailed as possible.

Mr. Ivy said in regard to the guidelines' flexibility, "Beaufort is unique in the evolution of its architecture, and the Civic Master Plan wants to freeze Beaufort in time based on a vision of what would fit." What the Historic Beaufort Foundation supports is contrary to this, and the guidelines will ensure the new structures are complementary to the old and give the architects more creativity. Mr. Ivy said Beaufort's architecture is eclectic.

Mayor Keyserling said the process today is to take a picture of what exists and try to copy it, which means that they've missed a whole area of creative design. The Northwest Quadrant had a group of architects come up with appropriate infill. He feels that the pictures give a sense of what fits, but only in terms of mass and scale. Mr. Ivy said that's why they need the infill development guidelines: for flexibility. If something is clearly outside the guidelines, they can't argue that the structure should be built.

**Henry C. Chambers** said that for 37 years, The Point and the Historic District have almost quadrupled in tax income to the city because of the guidelines, the Milner report, strict zoning, and reconstruction. They sold the Anchorage for \$275,000 then \$675,000 then \$1.2 million and "that's true of every house that's designated as part of the District." He urged council to keep the guidelines in the new ordinance.

Mayor Keyserling said he doesn't think the regulating document, which is the zoning ordinance, will ignore those. It will be incorporated as it is today. He feels they are being asked to approve

a document that could lead the developers astray and not make them feel like they have to go through the historic review process. He doesn't think the documents from HBF weaken this CMP. He feels the argument is whether this language belongs in a vision document or a zoning document that shows the processes. The difference, as he sees it, is that no one is differing except on where these words are printed.

Councilman Sutton said he heard Mayor Chambers say that they were taking a regulating document out of something that's been working. That's not what's being proposed tonight. Councilman Sutton said they spoke about a document that Historic Beaufort Foundation wants put into another document that has no impact on all of this. Mayor Chambers said, "If it's not broke, don't fix it."

Mr. Ivy said they are not proposing changing the review process. These 7 Integrities are the guidelines the National Historic Registry uses for review. The infill development principles are consistent with the Milner guidelines, just less detailed than Milner.

Ms. Jenkins said in regard to the infill principles, there has been more unsuccessful infill than infill that was good. With inclusion of "a cutting edge marketing document" to developers who want to work in the National Historic Landmark District, they will know that they are doing what the Secretary of the Interior expects, if they have these documents in the Civic Master Plan.

**Beth Grace** said that she serves on the regulatory committee, and she concurs with Mayor Chambers in many ways. She has been concerned about infill and new construction in the Historic District. She's been before the Historic District Review Board about the quality of the development. The mass, scale, density – the integrities of the National Historic Landmark District Trust – are visionary, as is the Civic Master Plan, which is meant to attract people to invest in Beaufort and make it a better place. Ms. Grace said she started to come and say, "Just leave the National Historic Landmark District out of the Civic Master Plan."

Ms. Grace said Mr. Tedder has concerns with how the regulations are set. She referred to the example of Federal Street; she said Charleston and Savannah are urban, and Beaufort is a Garden District with 10 -12 houses per acre. She lives on North Street, where three garden lots were turned into five, which makes it not a Garden District. The 30 small subdivided lots shouldn't set the tone for the National Historic Landmark District. They don't want all the houses to be like they are on Craven Street. Ms. Grace said the documents that Historic Beaufort Foundation wants added to the Civic Master Plan either have to be taken out and the Landmark District made separate, or council should include these two pages of principles with the Plan.

Ms. Rodgers said if she were a developer, she would want to see up front that she would have other requirements to do building in the Historic District. She sees no harm in including the documents, and if they don't include them, they should have a note for developers to refer to them. She is concerned with how "we seem to be concerned with filling in every square inch of

The Point.” Some residents’ breeze is blocked by the new development on The Point. The large lots and a breeze flowing through was what made Beaufort different from Charleston, she claimed. She is “very opposed to the plans for the marina area.” The community has spent tax money to preserve open space for the views and the breezes. They support the Open Land Trust and building back 50’, etc. but then would fill in one of the most beautiful views in the city.

**Kathy Lindsay** supported Ms. Rodgers and said there is more citizen concern brewing about the marina parking lot redevelopment that is part of the Master Plan, as was evidenced at the Metropolitan Planning Commission meeting she attended. In September 2011, the first version of the Sector One plan was submitted and was approved. “Not one substantive comment was in the minutes,” Ms. Lindsay said. In November, the plan “went to 2 meetings and was approved.” The November 15, 2011 minutes showed concerns about water taxis, expanded boat parking, etc., but there was “no substantive debate about whether the marina parking lot *should* be developed.” In the October 2012 Master Plan meeting about the day dock, “the meeting was about what to do, not should it be done,” Ms. Lindsay said.

Ms. Lindsay described what had happened at the Metropolitan Planning Commission meeting the night before in regard to the changes in zoning. “The folks that were there said, ‘No,’” she said. A member of the Redevelopment Commission had said at that meeting that they “needed to do this (approval) to support their new strategy.” Ms. Lindsay said the open space is important for a number of reasons. If they have a parking plan, “then the asphalt can come up and have an even better view than is there now.” The Master Plan, Ms. Lindsay said, talks about the guiding principles being “to extend ... Waterfront Park.” It discusses ensuring the open spaces that are there now, and then the zoning request was to strip that protection. She said, “A member of the Redevelopment Commission said this (rezoning) should be done now to protect the developers’ interest in the property.” She feels “this isn’t the way to do business.” Ms. Lindsay said she’s grateful to the Metropolitan Planning Commission for unanimously denying the rezoning recommendation.

Councilman O’Kelley said he has issues with the Civic Master Plan. He said he agreed with Mr. Tedder about looking at the practical application and not being forced into a position where they don't want to be and with Ms. Lindsay. Chapter 1, he said, speaks to a balance between preservation and sensitive infill. Open spaces are deemed a strength, and the city will permanently preserve and expand parks. The plan, in Chapter 2, says there would be potential development in Waterfront Park up to the pavilion area, but the sketches “show it going all the way up into the green space.” He asked, “Why would we cut into our best park?”

Belt Buckle Park is a church, not a park, Councilman O’Kelley said. They don’t want to get rid of their church. He said the same principle applies elsewhere where people don’t want their properties developed, but if there’s a concept that there will be development, he asked if they weren’t taking away property that belongs to other people. Section 2-12 mentions view sheds and their preservation, but Freedom Park will be built on.

There's reference to every home being within walking distance of a park. Councilman O'Kelley said he "won't spend money to build more parks. The city has plenty and they're plenty big." He said he thought Horse Trough Park had been taken out of the plan, and "no one in the neighborhood wants it." Chapter 6 shows infill in the Mossy Oaks and South Side area. He "doesn't think the city should trash an idea because it's not like the plan." In regard to Waterfront Park, he said, "Downtown is being squeezed." Waterfront Park has been referred to as the Golden Goose, but "it's being squeezed," Councilman O'Kelley feels. The Trask lot has been sold, and there are no plans for people to park who work downtown. He stated that he won't vote for the plan without changes.

Councilman McFee said this is not a regulatory plan, it's a guideline, unlike the way Councilman O'Kelley portrayed it. Councilman McFee said he read the guidelines of Ms. Lutz and Ms. Jenkins, and he doesn't see any negativity in what they say, but there seems to be duplication in those documents with what's already in the plan.

Mayor Keyserling said Councilman O'Kelley's "swipes are broad," and "Waterfront Park is not part of any arrangement with any developer." Dr. Kresch was not told to sell or build anything in this vision. Mayor Keyserling's concern is that this document is perceived to be a regulating document. He said this document doesn't make anybody do anything. An agreement with a developer to come up with ideas has committed no one to anything. There's no guarantee; "if the developer doesn't come up with an idea that is passed by the Historic District Review Board, council, and other folks, nothing will be done." Mayor Keyserling said Mr. Ivy had bought his house contingent on being able to improve it because he knew that a purchase in the Historic District meant "they would have to jump through hoops."

Ms. Lindsay brought up the zoning request. Mayor Keyserling said it had been discussed for 5 years, and Ms. Lindsay asked what would happen if the marina developer's ideas were rejected – would it be rezoned?

Councilman Sutton said having served on the Historic District Review Board and council for 8 years, his is "a long process," and as a builder and someone who's worked with clients on a historic rehab, he knows "what's in the plan is cumbersome, but it works." The documents Historic Beaufort Foundation wants don't help a developer or Councilman Sutton as a builder, or the architects who will be told to design buildings. Councilman Sutton said, as Councilman McFee had said, "there's a page that tells where to go to get the answers." They "don't need another layer telling them kind of how to do it in a document like this," he feels.

Deeper into the documents, there are repetitions in the Civic Master Plan. "The infill buildings haven't survived long enough to be historic," Councilman Sutton said. He has two buildings in front of his house designed by a local architect to "look old and look like the Historic District," which is "a far cry from (showing) how the architecture has changed." Bricks weren't readily available when many historic houses were built in Beaufort, so there are few brick buildings in Beaufort. "The houses were built according to the economy, not (because of) standards that didn't exist," Councilman Sutton said. "There's vague redundancy," Councilman Sutton said, in

the Historic Beaufort Foundation documents, and they give no cues on what to do on infill. He said international building codes would be the biggest hurdle of the future, not the things they are presently concerned with. Historic Beaufort Foundation does a great job and is very passionate about preservation, he said, but “it works because the economy works.” At this “level of visioning,” Councilman Sutton said, everyone “should be focused on making sure the process works like it does now.” They “should talk to developers about what they can do, not what they can’t.” Architects are driven by government intervention and told what to build, not creative design, because it’s been over-regulated. The Historic District is protected, Councilman Sutton said, and Historic Beaufort Foundation could perhaps create a one-page draft of ideas that are different from what’s already in the Civic Master Plan. Mr. Ivy said Councilman Sutton had made a lot of assertions he wanted to respond to.

Councilman Sutton said overall he has some concerns. For example, an heirs’ property was taken by the hospital by condemning it; the property means a lot to the family, and it’s shown in the Civic Master Plan as a linear park. He asked if they should be afraid that it would be a linear park. He said the Civic Master Plan doesn’t take the land from them. It may be bequeathed to the city, but the document does not say they *have* to do it. He said there are details that could be tuned up, but it’s been many years already with a lot of citizen effort.

Councilman Sutton said in regard to the marina, the city “should do better than a parking lot on such a valuable, beautiful piece of land.” There’s not enough money to get return on investment with the beautiful parks. He hasn’t seen a plan, so he doesn’t know what will happen at the marina. They can zone however they want in the city, but it doesn’t mean it will be sold. The marina is decrepit, he said, and needs a major overhaul to make money. This city’s maritime history has been erased and nothing has been done to fix that. The sea wall is designed to moor boats but can’t. An intracoastal deep water town should have a focus on that in its planning. His gut feeling is that they’ll never find parking, so why should they give up 130 spaces until there’s a way to replace them?

Councilwoman Beer said she’d reserve comment until the next reading and will talk to Ms. Lutz and Ms. Lindsay before then.

Councilman Sutton asked Mr. Ivy how the 7 Integrities and the design principles would work. Mr. Ivy said a design would be developed based on the economics and the needs of the marketplace. There would be a conceptual design, “and then they would go down the guidelines to see if the design violates the principles.” He said, “It won’t affect creativity or economics, but when it is reviewed, it will be approved.” Councilman Sutton said he’s “still not sold.”

Mr. Verity said “None of this really matters.” The developer will go through the same process whatever is in the Civic Master Plan. Developers will know there’s a significant process they have to go through. The Planning Department will be the developer’s first stop and “going to Historic Beaufort Foundation will be more important than developers having some idea in advance of what they have to do.” They don’t need to go through that process twice, Mr. Verity

said. The plan should tell them that they have to go to these groups and get the details they need. He said they would get more out of visiting Historic Beaufort Foundation than they'd get from reading Historic Beaufort Foundation's guidelines.

Ms. Grace addressed Councilman Sutton, saying she would explain Historic Beaufort Foundation's point. She told a story about a couple who moved to Beaufort but couldn't build the house that they wanted because it didn't meet the 7 Integrities. People want to come to Beaufort from the Northeast and want "to build a cottage that would look good on the side of a mountain in Tennessee but doesn't meet the 7 Integrities."

Ms. Lutz said times have changed, and she thinks Mr. Verity is "optimistic." Historic Beaufort Foundation has encouraged people to do the best project they can in the Historic District. The planning process says to go talk to Historic Beaufort Foundation, but "they had no communication with builders for many years, and people have come in with ideas that are huge mistakes and those houses are empty or hard to sell." She said they should be optimistic, but people will still come in "and you can't tell them a damn thing." The 7 Integrities "will make these people stop and think," Ms. Lutz believes, as will "certain guidelines." An architect coming from elsewhere to Historic District Review Board can come before the board, "and it's obvious they haven't looked at Milner."

Ms. Crowder said council "has a big burden," and they "must maintain the integrity." She said, "The first question is why we need development in the first place and who it will benefit." Council's job is to protect the integrity of the town and the taxpayers whom council represents. She added that "the guidelines are good and creativity is still there."

Councilman Sutton described the Northwest Quadrant as 40% empty when he was doing the block by block project in the National Historic Landmark District. They counted street by street, "and that started something and a lot of energy has happened since then," he said. In a city of 12,500 people, there are just 5000 garbage pickups, "which is not a big impact." Councilman Sutton said, "The city is depleted of residents." 40% of a coveted area is missing the homes that were once there. They shouldn't be ignored.

The homes in The Point are, for most people, second homes, and even there, a lot of homes are for sale or have been, Councilman Sutton said. Those who are championing infill do so "because a lot can be done without changing lot size." A lot of effort needs to be made. People want a drug store and a grocery store downtown, he said. Without infill, "people won't get the standard they want." Ms. Crowder said if the parking lot at the marina is developed, the parking goes away. She said Beaufort's integrity needs to be protected. **The motion passed on a vote of 4-1, Councilman O'Kelley opposed.**

#### **MOTION ALLOWING CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A SOFTWARE AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH SPILLMAN TECHNOLOGIES**

**Councilwoman Beer made a motion, second by Councilman McFee, to allow the city manager to enter into the agreement. Mr. Dadson said Chief Matt Clancy would discuss the software for**

the city to help law enforcement personnel. Mr. Dadson said it's not been budgeted for because it came in the middle of the year.

Chief Clancy said the current software is Cisco, which the county went to in 1994, and it became antiquated, so the City of Beaufort, Town of Port Royal went to different systems to do reporting. The county stayed with Cisco, so there are "now different software systems that don't mesh together." The county has looked at different systems and came up with this company. Spillman Technologies said if every law enforcement agency were on the same system, it would help. Everyone would be dispatched on the same system, and all the reports would be, too, so if a car is stopped in Beaufort, and then stopped again in Bluffton, the Bluffton police officer will know about the other pull-over, Chief Clancy said. If all agencies in the county go with the same system at the same time, they will save money on training. It's also a big incentive for the company to get the whole county, so they are trying to make it enticing for everyone to do it together. Chief Clancy said it would be a great benefit to the whole county and all of law enforcement; it will also stop duplication of effort for the court system, and "all the systems will talk to one another."

Councilman O'Kelley asked if all the other governments in the county were on board. Chief Clancy said Bluffton and the county are, but the Town of Port Royal hasn't made its decision yet. Councilman O'Kelley asked how much it would cost. Chief Clancy said the total is \$264,000, but it's spread over 5 years. Councilman McFee asked what they are currently budget for. Mr. Dadson said, "equipment turnover," and in the next fiscal year, "it will all get cleaned up." Councilman McFee asked if any of this required updates to the hardware if the software didn't go with a more modern system. Chief Clancy said the hardware they have now can't be utilized to its fullest extent, e.g., the in-car computers can't interface because of a firewall. The software isn't as good as the hardware. Councilman McFee asked about how it funnels into the courts system and if there were benefits in that way. Chief Clancy said they're on a separate system, but there is a way for them to interface. Chief Clancy said the license can be swiped, and it reads it right into the computer, and a component can interface with CMS. Councilman McFee said they do so much for the court systems in the area, so it makes sense to use that interface.

Councilman Sutton asked what the initial amount was. Councilman Sutton said at the county level, they are spending a lot of money because they need to upgrade, and he asked if they had discussed the county buying it and the cities pay them back according to their budget cycles. Mr. Dadson said they are working it into the overall agreements with everyone, and it will be paid for over 5 years. KT said it's \$53,000 a year for 5 years, including maintenance, etc. **Councilman Sutton made a motion, seconded by Councilwoman Beer, to approve. The motion passed unanimously.**

### **REPORTS BY COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Councilman Sutton said the notices had obviously been sent out about the mooring field. They were asked to be proactive, but council should have known about it. Mr. Dadson apologized and said they have been following the steps of the federal grant requirements. Councilman

O'Kelley said Ms. Pelkey had cited some laws and mentioned "adverse possession," so "someone needs to look into that." Councilman Sutton said her comment was that they are being kicked out, and "it's only for transients." Mr. Dadson said some are transient, and some are permanent. Councilman Sutton said *why* they're doing it needs to be clearer. He added that it's hard to send a certified letter to a boat.

Councilman Sutton asked about "the smiley face boat." It had broken free and had some damage, and he asked who's responsible. Mr. Dadson said DNR pulled it in. Councilman O'Kelley and Councilman McFee said they had heard there was Open Land Trust dock damage, but Councilman McFee said he had asked them and they had said that there wasn't. Councilman Sutton said the smiley face boat turned around in its mooring, so someone is moving the boat around. He wants to know who's responsible when it breaks through again. Chief Clancy said it would be DNR's responsibility to investigate. The boat owner would be responsible for the damage.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before City Council, **Councilwoman Beer made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Councilman Sutton. The motion was approved unanimously,** and the meeting was adjourned at 9:46 p.m.

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