A meeting of the **Beaufort-Port Royal Metropolitan Planning Commission** was held on May 20, 2013 at 5:30 p.m. in council chambers of the Beaufort Municipal Complex, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joe DeVito and Commissioners Alice Howard, Robert Semmler, Bill Harris, Jennifer Bihl, and James Crower, and City Planner Libby Anderson.

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

Chairman DeVito called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

Commissioner Semmler said on page 3, in the third paragraph from the bottom, if he said that, it should have been "asked," not "said." **Commissioner Semmler made a motion, second by Commissioner Harris, to accept the minutes of March 18, 2013 as amended. The motion passed unanimously.**

REVIEW OF PROJECTS FOR THE CITY OF BEAUFORT

UDO AMENDMENT REVISING SECTION 7.5, "OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING STANDARDS" TO EXEMPT CERTAIN USES FROM ON-SITE PARKING REQUIREMENTS

Applicant: Staff

Ms. Anderson said staff is proposing to revise the parking aspect of the ordinance for single-family and two-family dwelling for on-street parking. One major goal of the streetscape projects was to stimulate private investment through public investment. Without on-street parking, it can limit development, particularly in historic areas. The city wants to be sure that its investment pays off, she said.

The areas used of on-site parking could be utilized for building improvements or green space. On-site parking can be done unsightly and generate increased stormwater run-off. There's always potential for pedestrian/vehicle conflict when driveways cross the public sidewalk. Finally, a driveway on a street with on-street parking results in the loss of one-two spaces for on-street parking and compromises the city's investment in the streetscape improvement.

Ms. Anderson said all uses in the Core Commercial District are exempt from on-site parking, except for hotels. She listed the streets outside the Core Commercial District that currently have on-street parking, i.e., Charles Street. Duke, Calhoun, Charles and Newcastle, Bay Street east of Carteret, Craven, and Newcastle, etc.

The proposed changes are to change the title of the ordinance section to Parking and Loading. They propose to eliminate the language pertaining to "when a convergence in use occurs." In

the use table, “night club” isn’t listed, because bars and restaurants are considered night clubs and have the one-space per four seats requirement.

When 1) formalized on-street parking is available for single-family or two-family residences; 2) non-residential uses are less than 4000 square feet, or 3) any structure is considered historic, they’re exempt from these off-street parking requirements, Ms. Anderson said. There needs to be a curb and appropriate parking surface and appropriate stormwater controls.

For multi-family dwellings over 3 units, and for commercial buildings over 4000 square feet, if you want to create on-street parking in a development, adjacent on-street parking within 400’ of the property line can count toward the on-site parking requirement.

Any structure on the vacant and abandoned properties list, if it doesn’t already have on-site parking, is required to have it if possible, but if there’s not enough room, they won’t be required to do so.

On a single family lot, “stacked parking” which is a narrow 9-10’ driveway and two cars next to each other, is already allowed, Ms. Anderson said. Chairman DeVito pointed out that this should say this is on-site parking, not on-street parking.

Ms. Anderson said that the minimum size for off-street parking spaces has changed, so now there’s a maximum of 9’ x 18’. Last, the loading standards will be consolidated into a paragraph that says that for business, trade, and industry uses, except in the Core Commercial area, loading and unloading of vehicles will be off of public right-of-ways. This will be worked with through the design review process on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Crower asked, in regard to B2, what’s available in areas where formalized on-street parking is available. Ms. Anderson said the intention is that it’s within the block. She agreed it should be clarified.

Commissioner Bihl asked if there were concerns about exceeding capacities for on-street parking on some blocks. Ms. Anderson said she advocates more on-street parking, and the city will, too, in the streetscape projects. People may have to go around the block. This doesn’t mean you *can’t* park on-site, but you don’t *have* to, Ms. Anderson said. You are not giving up your on-site space if you want it, but you don’t *have* to put it in if you don’t feel you need it.

Commissioner Harris asked about the word “reasonably” in B4: if on-site cannot be “reasonably accommodated.” Ms. Anderson said she was trying to get at, if they can do it properly, the city would like them to do it. She said she’s open to clarifying wording, but the intention is to say they’ll look for on-site parking, but if it can’t be “reasonably” done, they won’t require it.

Commissioner Semmler asked where the Core Commercial district is, and Ms. Anderson described it for him. He said when Ms. Anderson listed the streets, Carteret was on as metered and not-metered. Near USCB, there's not adequate on-street parking, and the off-street parking is a dirt field for parking for classes or functions. He asked if the university will be required to pave it or put non-pervious material in there. Ms. Anderson said it wouldn't affect USCB, but there are businesses in the area, and if someone wanted to come in and change from an office to retail, they will not be required to dig up their backyard to make an on-site lot; this is just for businesses less than 4000 square feet. Commissioner Semmler said there are a number of businesses on Carteret Street, and he wondered if they are being too specific with the streets. Ms. Anderson said the side streets don't have formalized on-street parking, so this is only on the few streets with formalized on-street parking with stormwater drainage, curbs, etc. Chairman DeVito said if another street gets on-street parking, they will automatically fit into this ordinance.

Commissioner Harris asked if this "opened the door for the city to put meters wherever they want." Ms. Anderson said that wouldn't be cost-effective, but they just want people to use the on-street parking and ultimately encourage investment.

Commissioner Howard made a motion to recommend the amendment with the following changes: section B2 to clarify that it's within the block; in C1 add "off-street"; and in B4, cross out the word "reasonable" with the changes that were noted. Commissioner Crower seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

UDO AMENDMENT REVISING SECTION 8.2.A.11, "SUBDIVISION DESIGN STANDARDS; STREETS; SIDEWALKS," BY CLARIFYING THE REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SIDEWALKS AS PART OF SUBDIVISION

Applicant: Staff

Ms. Anderson said this is a change to the ordinance's subdivision section pertaining to sidewalks. This section is called "Streets," but it's not intended to require a sidewalk on *any* street, just to clarify where sidewalks are required as part of the subdivision process and to increase the width of sidewalks when they are required.

Sidewalks are required on both sides of all new streets *unless* they serve 5 or fewer residential lots. Sidewalks are to be required if a subdivision is constructed on an existing lot, just as sewer is required, for example. The Family Dollar on Ribaut Road is a commercial development and a subdivision is being put in. With a commercial or partial mixed-use, if it's subdivided, putting in sidewalks is required. Six or more lots is a major subdivision. Ms. Anderson said Family Dollar is grandfathered because it's already underway. Ms. Anderson said when a sidewalk is required, it's always been 4' wide as a minimum, but they are suggesting going to 5' for sidewalks as part of subdivision development.

Commissioner Howard asked about the minimum 4' planting strip in the more urban areas and if it would be an issue. Ms. Anderson said that's currently what's required. In the street sections of the Civic Master Plan, it's probably 6'.

Commissioner Harris said there's a minimum number of 5 or fewer single family lots. Ms. Anderson said that's *on the new street*, not on the block. Commissioner Harris asked if it would always be required to have sidewalks on both sides of the street. Ms. Anderson said for new streets, yes; currently the ordinance says that the Planning Commission can waive the sidewalks on both sides.

Chairman DeVito asked what is required if the block only has four lots; Ms. Anderson said it says "street," not "block." The sidewalk is to be on the same side as the subdivision in the frontage, and Chairman DeVito said he thinks that should be added in. Ms. Anderson said as one doesn't put water and sewer into the whole block, just into one's subdivision.

Commissioner Semmler asked if this applies to paving an old street. Ms. Anderson cited a division that will put in new streets and will have to put in sidewalks. Commissioner Semmler asked if there's a possibility of someone purchasing an area to raze and put in houses, and there are no new streets, but there's something there and he thinks they would want sidewalks. Ms. Anderson said if they want to subdivide a large lot, unless they have street frontage, they would have to put in sidewalks. Ms. Anderson said subdivision of another lot, when it's developed, has to have sidewalks. A single-family development of three houses torn down and subdivided into six lots would be required to have sidewalks, and Ms. Anderson said that's correct. Ms. Anderson said the impact may not be great, but even if they get one more sidewalk, it will be good.

Commissioner Howard moved that the recommendation as written be adopted with the word "frontage" added to 11-A, in the second sentence. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>CITY OF BEAUFORT – UPDATE ON COUNCIL ACTIONS</u>

Ms. Anderson said that in regard to outdoor display, council agreed that a site plan is needed for even re-occupancy, and it must be well-organized. They were also inclined to allow outdoor display; if it's outdoor merchandise, like a lawnmower, it can be displayed near the street but behind the buffer, if a buffer is required. She thinks the first reading will come back next month. The ZBOA reversed the order of the Zoning Administrator in regard to the Randle's business and came up with a plan for where it would be displayed and how.

Commissioner Semmler said that a couple months ago he had asked about the trees in front of the Stokes dealership. The owner was required to put the trees in, and the power lines are 4' above them, so in a few years, there will have to be an ugly path cut through them because of

SCE&G requirements. He has seen this elsewhere in the city, too: where someone is required to put in trees and the power lines are only 2' above the landscaping, so those trees, too, will have to have holes in them. He doesn't know the answer – burying power lines, etc. – and asked if anyone is doing anything about this.

Ms. Anderson said that trees in SCE&G lines are required to be trimmed, but if the lines are those of low-voltage carriers, the trees are not required to be trimmed. The city landscape architect should be looking at this. In front of Beaufort Memorial Hospital, the over-story trees were planted, and the lines are there, but they feel that dealing with the overhead line issue can be addressed. A registered landscape architect designed it. Ms. Anderson said she can't speak to the issue at Stokes. She agreed that it was a good point and can talk to Beaufort Memorial Hospital, who purposely planted their trees there.

Chairman DeVito said the burying negotiations are still ongoing, and it will be a long, slow process. Ms. Anderson said growth inhibitors can be applied to keep the trees slower-growing while these issues are being solved.

REVIEW OF PROJECTS FOR THE COUNTY OF BEAUFORT

NORTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY ZONING MAP AMENDMENT / REZONING REQUEST FOR MARSH VIEW SUBDIVISION (R100-15-64A, 289-326 AND 347-349; 38 RESIDENTIAL LOTS AND ASSOCIATED COMMON AREAS TOTALING 27.46 ACRES; OFF DORCHESTER DRIVE AND TOMOTLEY, WHITEHALL AND MCCALLEY COURTS, IN THE GRAYS HILL AREA), TO BE REZONED FROM RURAL (R) TO RURAL-RESIDENTIAL (Rural-Residential)
Owner: Factory Creek Landing Group LLP, Applicant/Agent: Steven Tully

Commissioner Howard asked to be recused due to prior employment. **Rob Merchant** said he's in the Beaufort County planning department. The map amendment is to the ZDSO in the Gray's Hill area. He described where it is and said it's the Marsh View subdivision. The 27.5 acres are proposed to be changed from Rural to Rural-Residential.

Mr. Merchant said that in 1999, when the current zoning ordinance was adopted, the small rural properties were put at a disadvantage because the ordinance rendered it impossible for them to subdivide. So at that time, they proposed Rural-Residential for smaller property owners so that they could subdivide their property. Certain criteria, if met, meant it was automatically zoned Rural-Residential: a cluster of 5 or more contiguous lots that were 5 acres or less in size.

Mapping Rural-Residential is a GIS problem, Mr. Merchant said. They have discovered that they didn't catch all the properties that meet the criteria to be Rural-Residential. These might not have been in the GIS system and were missed.

As far as the ongoing impact, Mr. Merchant said, there is none on additional lots; the property owner will not gain additional density. Two matters of interest are the Northern Regional Plan and the AICUZ. The property is in Port Royal Island and is still in the growth area, and the Northern Regional Plan has an agreement that the density in rural areas won't be increased. This zoning change will result in no increased density and is not in conflict with the Northern Regional Plan, county staff feels. Since it won't result in additional density, it will not bring more people into the AICUZ. Staff recommends approval.

Chairman DeVito said they have known about the map change since 2007 and asked why this took so long. Mr. Merchant said they changed the errors at the staff level but were told that they couldn't do that, "and the onus was on staff." As a result, when they got a large list of these in bundles, they would do it.

Commissioner Semmler made a recommendation to forward with approval from Rural to Rural-Residential. Commissioner Crower seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

UPDATE ON THE FORM-BASED CODE PROCESS

Commissioner Howard said last week's meeting was cancelled, but the City of Beaufort's committee would meet this Wednesday. Commissioner Crower said in Port Royal they are finished with the use table and are on part 4 of the code. The next meeting is May 28.

There being no further business to come before the commission, Commissioner Crower made a motion to adjourn, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:24 p.m.