The Beaufort Code			
Public Comment Summary Sheets			
Code Section	**Public Comment/Recommentation**	**Course of Action**	**Follow Up in April 6 Revision**
General	The public should have more time to review the code which is a 280 page document. The Technical Review Committee had 3 months. Consider extending the review another 30 days and start at the end of April.	Staff understands this concern and will **make a determination** on whether more time is needed during the Metropolitan Planning Commission Public Workshop.	This schedule has been extended 30 days.
	It would be very helpful to have a red lined version of the drafts to understand what has changed between each draft. *Staff Response - those changes will be documented in this summary sheet. However we will investigate the feasibility and expediency of this.*		Staff has prepared a bulleted list of all changes to the code except for reference changes and grammer/punctuation corrections.
	There is a perception - why are we (the public) wasting time reviewing this when it is a done deal? There is lack of faith in the process. *Staff Response - The goal of these meetings is to alleviate this perception. We want this process to be as open as possible and we want to hear all of your comments, concerns and suggestions.*		
	One of the goals of the code is that it's easier to use and understand. It's not easier to read and is not clear. *Staff Response - this is something we are striving for, so if there are any specific suggestions of things that are not clear or need to be reworked, please let us know and we will address them.*		
	One of the goals of the code references 'neighborhoods ripe for change." Who decided this? *Staff Response - This has to do with a number of factors including analysis that was done during the 2009 Comprehensive Plan process and the 2011-2014 Civic Master Plan process. Particularly evaluation of concentrations of rental property can indicate areas that could potentially accommodate infill development. Proximity to the downtown area, parks and public spaces, and commercial corridors was also considered, along with number of vacant lots.*		
	One of the goals of the code is to encourage walkable urban placaes. In Higginsonville there is a lack of sidewalks, the streets have debris, and the street cleaner does not come. How can we improve this? *Staff Response - we will notify public works. Please always keep us notified of these issues.*		
Article 1			

1.3.2	Is selling an already existing plotted parcel of land, with existing infrastructure, development?	Staff will **review and clarify** if needed.	This is covered in 1.3.2.C.2 - A transfer of title to land not involving the division of land into parcels.
1.3.3	More information is needed regarding covenants, how they apply particularly when it comes to uses that covenants prohibit but the zoning permits	Staff is **reviewing** this. and will **adjust** accordingly. There is a state statue that handles this. SECTION 6-29-1145. (B) If a local planning agency has actual notice of a restrictive covenant on a tract or parcel of land that is contrary to, conflicts with, or prohibits the permitted activity:	Additional language was **added** to clarify this.
Article 2			
2.3.3	Staff/HBF - need new photos	Staff will **replace** these images	These were **replaced.**
2.4.1	Hermitage Road/West End residents - R1 to T3-S - why are front and side setbacks reduced? Need to be careful with front setbacks because changing them can disrupt the streetscape. *Staff Response - to be more flexible and more permissive in the case of new development or additions to existing houses. Safeguards include % of lot coverage jto prevent reduced setbacks resulting in larger houses and more impervious surface coverage.*		
	Is "The Point" defined?	Staff will **add** a definition of this neighborhood.	This was **added** in Article 13.
	What is the height limit for Allison Rd? *Staff response - it's currently 2-4 stories (2 stories are only required within 500' of the intersection with Ribaut Rd. The remainder may be 1 story).*	Staff will **review** this to see if any changes are needed.	**No change** was made. Staff is **still considering** limiting the height to 3 stories except for the area within 500' of the intersection if Ribaut Road and Allison Road.
	Hermitage Road residents - R1 to T3-N - this is too big of a change, don't understand what the point is. Will fundamentally affect the DNA of the neighborhood		The **boundaries of the T3-S were expanded** to limit the number of R1 to T3-N conversions; **additional language was added** to permit setbacks greater than 30' in T3-N for larger lots. This helps the existing structure of the neighborhood to be retained if desired, but also allows change if desired.

	Hermitage Road/West End residents - it should be clearly shown what the density increases will be. *Staff Response - since much of the neighborhoods are built out, additional density may come but it will happen incrementally. It's difficult to predict how/where, but we will work on providing examples.*	Staff will **work to provide examples** of how a neighborhood could infill.	
2.4.1.A.1	The 100' lot width maximum in the historic district. Anything over that requires HRB review - what does this mean? Limiting lot width is not good if it renders smaller lots and hampers resale. Focus should be on preventing lots smaller than 60' *Staff Response - the intent of this provision was to protect some of the quintessentially "Beaufort" lots - e.g. The Castle, Marshlands… - mostly along the water in the Point neighborhood. They can currently be subdivided by right. This would provide a lever of oversight in case one wants to subdivide them in the future.*	Staff will **look a**t incorporating this provision a different way. The lot widths may not be the best way to address this. That will be **removed.**	This was **removed.** Additional standards to provide for HRB oversight for subdivision of significant historic properties was added in Section 9.9.2.D.3.
	HBF - the historic landscapes of the city should be protected. Subdivision of large, significant edge lots should have oversight. Could some of the significant properties lose their contributing status if they were subdivided insensitively?	See previous course of action.	See previous follow-up.
	Resident Comment - Currently property owners can subdivide their property "By-Right". The new Beaufort Code requires that property owners must first attain approval from the HDRB. Will this added and redundant restriction cost homeowners more money for review fees and more time for review meetings as well as potentially more money and more time for more legal, survey and design services knowing that the new Beaufort Code minimum "Lot Size" and "Lot Configuration" requirements already accomplish this same civic goal?	See previous course of action.	See previous follow-up.
2.4.A.3	The maximum lot coverage in T4-HN is 50% of the lot area. What does this mean for the desired Arts District?	Staff will **review and update as needed** to ensure compatibility.	This is actually 55% which should be adequate enough to accommodate these units on typical lots in the Historic District. For a typical 40'x100' lot, 2,200 squqre feet of building footprint would be permitted. **No change** was made.
2.4.A.4	In T-5 districts, a 75% frontage buildout is required. Can this be achieved over time, or is it required to be accomplished at once? What mechanism will be used to permit phased development? *Staff Response - Permitting phasing is important. Phasing language from the Boundary Street Redevelopment District ordinance will be incorporated to clarify this.*	Staff will **add** language.	
2.4.1.B.1	in T3-N the maximum setback is 30'. Is this intended to make sure buildings are close to the street? What if there are lots on the water? This may make sense for lots that are smaller, but what if lots are large? It may not make sense to be so prescriptive; this is limiting. *Staff Response - the intent is to bring buildings forward and closer to the street over time; something should be added to permit larger lots to remain as they are if that's desired as well.*	Staff will **add provisions** for waterfront lots, and will also **add provisions** for larger lots that may be zoned T3-N.	**Language** regarding phasing was **added** in 2.5.1.B; **Language** giving flexibility to the setback zone for larger lots in the T3-N district was **added.**

	Regarding oversight on subdivision of waterfront lots - Since this impacts a relatively small number of lots, it seems reasonable that those property owners be notified of the specific change. Has this been done? *Staff response - It hasn't since there hasn't been an exact determination of the scope of this requirement. However this is a good suggestion.*		
	If properties are upzoned from R1 or R2 to T3-N, this required 15-30' setback will change the "line" of buldings on the street. *Staff Response - see previous comment.*	See previous course of action.	**Language** giving flexibility to the setback zone for larger lots in the T3-N district was **added.**
2.4.1.C	Jericho Woods needs an exception for carports. The lots aren't wide enough to accommodate them to the side or rear of a house.	Staff will **add** this.	This was **added.**
	Battery Shores need an exception as they have garages protruding in front of houses; similar to current ordinance.	Staff will **add** this.	This was **added.**
2.4.1.D	We are unclear about the applicability of standards in areas facing the Historic District. For example, Newcastle Square (now T5-UC), faces the Historic District, but it appears to be T5-UC and T4-N. What standards would apply? *Staff Response - The main difference is that in T5-UC, the height limit is 5 stories, but in and fronting the HD that is reduced to 3 stories.* How would a project here be reviewed? *Staff Response - The projects are still reviewed by the DRB or staff, depending on the size – Section 9.8.I* s a 3 story building on the north side of Boundary Street possible? *Staff Response - Yes*		
	The Primary Building height requires 2 stories in some areas. As was discussed during Boundary Street discussions, this may inhibit redevelopment / development in some areas. Where is the noted corresponding map for the 250' radius zone that applies to Boundary Street? *Staff Response - It is done via Significant Corridors and Significant Intersections in the Appendix. Staff will be sure this reference is clear* . Requiring two story height provides needed street enclosure. Requiring full two-story buildings undermines goals 6, 7 and 10. *Staff Response Section 2.6.2 addresses this.*		
2.4.1.E	Is parking prohibited in front of houses? Will that make everyone who parks in their driveways non-conforming? This is confusing. Please don't make everything non conforming. *Staff Response - That is not the intent of this provision. The intent is to prevent head-in parking pads in front of buildings. There are a handful parcels that would become non-conforming but they would not have to be brought into compliance if they are single-family (per Article 11). If they are non-contributing and anythnig other than detatched single-family and 75% of the fair market value of the structure was invested into repairs or modifications, they would have to bring the parking into compliance or request a variance.*	Staff will **clarify** this.	This **language** was **clarified.**

	possibly work with the site plan (i.e. the site isn't 40' deep)? Why 40 feet? The Boundary Street Redevelopment Plan includes specific language encouraging design flexibility to attract national businesses and discourage sprawl. The premise of the $33 million Boundary Street project contemplates attracting $150 million in private investment. We are all aware of the damage to trees, community and walkability caused by sprawl. Where is the language encouraging flexibility to attract national businesses? As written, this undermines goals 5, 6 and 10.	Staff will **review** this.	Staff **added flexibility** to this provision I 2.4.1.E footnote
2.1.5	How is phasing addressed for large sites? Owners may not be able to meet the % build out requirements all at one time. *Staff Response - this was addressed in the most recent update of the Boundary Street Redevelopment ordinance and will be carried over into the new code.*	Staff will **add** this.	Language added in 2.5.1.B.2
2.5.1.D.4	Suggest changing "shall" to "should".	Staff will **change** this.	**Change** was made.
	Should address orientation to the street here or somewhere.	Staff will **add** this.	**Change** was made.
2.5.2	Remove "front or side" so it applies to all setbacks. Add specific language that the side setbacks in Battery Point, and Islands of Beaufort are 10' if needed.	Staff will **remove** and **add** language as appropriate.	**Change** was made.
	Will this provision eliminate the need for variances and take the public out of the process?*Staff Response - the intent is for the Administrator to have enough flexibility to permit things that meet the intent of the code, so minor deviations. If anything was out of the realm of minor, the administrator would not be able to approve it and would take it through the typical public process.Some of this flexibility currently exists in the historic district, as well as in areas where the platted lots are smaller than the lot size requirements.*	Staff will **review** this.	**No change** was made
2.6	HBF - what happened to the overall heigh limits per story? They should be put back. If one used the 15' max limit provided for in 2.6.1.A a 45'-70' building could be constructed if one used mezanines between 15' floors. *Staff response - the TRC recommended that these be removed and are not needed given the other levels of oversight such as the HRB and infill standards. They limit creativity and don't address any problem that the HIstoric District has had.*	Staff will **review** this.	**No change** was made

2.6.2	What is the impact of FEMA on this section? *Staff response - FEMA regulations supercede our ordinance if they are stricter. Building Code requires that height be calculated as the amount above base flood elevation if present.*		
2.6.1	When a numerical height is given, does it mean to the mean roof height? Should coordinate with 2.4.1.D. Are there any places where the height is NOT measured from first floor above BFE?	Staff will **review/clarify** this.	This was already stated as mean roof height in 2.6.1.B. Similar language was added in 2.4.1.D.
	Measurement of Building Height – "A story is a habitable level in a building of no more than 15 feet in height from finished floor to finished ceiling." As such, the maximum height downtown, which is limited to 3 stories, is 45 feet above the flood zone. Is that correct? *Staff Response - In the T5-DC district (basically historic commercial downtown), height maximum is 3 stories at the property line, and can be increased to 4 stories 15' back from the property line (see footnote 9 on 2.4.1). With regards to numerical height, that assessment is somewhat accurate from a technical perspective (15' is clear floor to ceiling height not floor to floor height), however keep in mind that there are also infill standards which require compatibility with adjacent buildings so utilizing full 15' floor to ceiling heights for each level may not yeild a compatible building that meets the Infill Design Guidelines, or the Building Design guidelines. All of these should be factored into a building design.*		
2.6.2.A	Requiring 18" elevation above grade and prohibiting slab on grade will increase building costs. *Staff Response - given the excess rain and flooding that has occurred lately, this is something that staff and the building official feel is very important. There is a difference between housing that is cheaply constructed and housing that is affordable. The general intent of this requirement, aside from reducing flooding, is to encourage higher quality construction that will be more durable, and reduce long term maintenance and insurance costs.*		
	Isn't this what was before City Council not long ago and was tabled? This will add costs and make housing less affordable. *Staff Response - yes, this is similar to what has been tabled. It is being brought back to the table. The thinking here is that there is a difference between affordable housing and cheap housing. If a house floods due to the fact that it was built on grade, the cost incurred by remediation for that flood, in addition to insurance costs, would far offset the initial cost of raising the building 18". This upfront additional has been listed at around $7,000.* It would be appropriate to quantify that costs so that it could be understood by property owners and builders. As written this undermines goals 6, 7, 9 and 10.		
2.6.2.A.1	This language should say 18" minimum.	Staff will **change** this.	This was **changed.**
2.6.2.B	Building Height above Grade – Specific to Zone T4 and T5 – The use of shall in these areas proscribes identical floor to ceiling heights in all buildings. The result will be cookie cutter sameness. Is this what we want? What are you trying to achieve? *Staff Response - This establishes a minimum but doesn't prescribe a certain height. So the intent is to restrict uncharacteristically low floor heights, but permit them to be at or above certain measurements.*		

2.6.4	Certain appurtenances are not included in the *height as long as they are 20' back from the front elevation. Did this used to be 10'? Staff Response - There is no specific setback in the current UDO. The current UDO does limit the square footage of bulkheads, elevators, water tank, ore mechanical appurtenances to 33% of the roof area. The new code removes this restriction but adds a setback.* What is the purpose of the change?	Staff will **review** this.	Language was **clarified** to add flexibility.
2.7	Arts Overlay District - will this be incorporated into the code? *Staff Response: the intent of the AOD is to allow Modular (or stick-built), pre-approved small-scale houses in the downtown areas that are likely to attract artists or others in need of affordable spaces to live and make/produce their items. Since the city already permits Accessory Dwelling Units, much of this can be done already. Staff will adjust a couple other provisions in order to permit tmultiple (2) ADUs in other areas of the city, and specifically permit these artisan units in the Conservation sub-District of the Historic District*	Staff will **adjust** standards as listed elsewhere in this chart to provide for this concept.	Standards for this special model were **added** to the code in numerous places
	Arts Overlay District - HBF - how would pre-approved buildings work in the Historic District? *Staff Response - in the Conservation District, these new accessory structures could be approved at the staff level. In the Preservation District, the applicant would have buildings pre-approved, with conditions on siting and context, at the HRB. The HRB may still need to approve the location on the site and coordination with the primary structure.*		
	Arts Overlay District - We are unclear as to how the accessory dwellings, as proposed in the Arts District proposal, are accomplished within this code? The way we read it, they are still approved on a case-by-case basis by the Administrator. Is that correct? *Staff Response - Any new construction has to have zoning approval, regardless of the area. So each of these would need to go through a building permit and zoning review. Regarding the design, the strategy as we understand it is to have 5-6 designs pre-approved for specific contexts so that the design approval would be streamlined See previous two responses for more information.*		
2.7.1.E	What does "Redevelopment District Exempted" mean? *Staff Response - this exempts the bladen Street RD from HRB review to maintain the existing redevelopment district code standards.*		
2.7.2	What is the Retail Frontage Overlay? Where are these districts? Absence of detail undermines goals 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. *Staff Response - This overlay delineates areas in the T4-N district where retail is permitted. It allows zoning districts to be consolidated, but lets retail occur where appropriate.These are denoted in the zoning map. Staff will clarify in the text of the code.*	Staff will **clarify** this.	**Clarification** was added.

2.7.3	Does this code permit other Redevelopment Districts to be added in the Historic District? *Staff Response - it neither permits nor prohibits additional districts. They would require an ordinance amendment.*		
	The Bladen Street and Boundary Street Redevelopment Ordinances will be superseded by this Code. Is this legal? Specifically, in regards to Boundary Street, there is currently a redevelopment project with multiple millions of dollars tied to a very specific redevelopment Code. Is it legal to do away with that Redevelopment Ordinance at this time? Many years and dollars went into that Code. We are unclear as to why it is being abandoned when it has yet to be used. Does this create a default with federal funding sources? *Staff Response - These districts are not being eliminated or superceded. However the standards are , as much as possible, incorporated into the code as opposed to being redundant, stand alone sections of the code. There are still redevelopment overlay districts for these areas which will contain any special requirements that permit them to be designated and function exactly asthey do today. In addition, staff is working on a handout to highlight all of hte requirements for this area, similar to what is available now in Section 6.8 of the UDO.*	Staff will **add to/clarify** the Redevelopment Overlay district as needed.	**Language** was **added** for Boundary Street & Bladen Street
2.8.2	Could cottage courts be permitted in IC zone? *Staff Response - they are currently limited to the T3 and T4 zoning districts.*	Staff will **review** this to see if any changes are needed.	**No change** was made regarding these in IC zones.
	Are cottage courts permitted in T3-S? This is a significant increase in density; there will be parking everywhere. *Staff Response - we will study this and provide a good illustration of how this could work. We will also confirm that minimum lot dimension needed for these. It's important to note that there are other standards that apply, for example parking configuration and open space. So just because someone has a lot that meets the size requirement doesn't necessarily mean they will be able to do this. It needs to be designed and make sure all the other standards can be met.*	Staff will **review** and **clarify.**	**Changes were made** to Sections • 2.8.2.C & D (formerly F), & L; Diagrams showing examples of this development type are pending.

	If we are providing this flexible option (the Cottage Courts), why are we being so inflexible in size? What is the justification for 800 sq. ft. limit? *Staff Response - This was proposed after much research into these cottage courts and looking at a number of ordinances that permit these. The idea is to not permit large buildings fronting these courts but rather very specific unit types. That is in exchange for an increase of density. Typical cottages with no maximum size are permitted to front green spaces in this code (2.8.1) but the underlying density would need to be maintained.*		
2.8.3	TND Overlay standards should be calibrated based on base zoning and proposed zoning. Are industrial uses permitted in these types of areas?	Staff will **review** and **clarify.**	This was **changed.**
2.8.3.B	Is my understanding correct that any development over 100 acres must be a TND development? *Staff Response - Yes.* What if that is not what the owner wants? *Staff Response - There are not currently many, if any, 100 acre vacant parcels in the city. This is in there for potential annexation to set a standard for the expectation the city will have if large landowners want to annex.* How does this impact the Industrial Park? *Staff Response - 2.8.3.B.4 excludes the industrial park.* Is this intended to discourage annexation? *Staff Response - No.*		
	Process for parcels 15-40 acres should be clarified based on Base Zoning.	Staff will **review** this.	This was **changed.**
2.8.3.F.3	Will property owners be compensated for the 2% of land donated for civic use? Will the city maintain this? *Staff Reply - the intent is that since the density is allowed to be increased, this offsets this 2% requirement and is the compensation. It also ensures sufficient public spaces when larger-scale new development occurs.*	Staff will **review** this.	This was **modified** from shall to should to add flexibility.
2.8.2(4)	LPUD - this should be coordinated with map key.	Staff will make this **change**.	This was **changed.**
Article 3			
3.2	Vehicle/Boat Sales and Major Service & Repair should be included in T4-NA	Staff will make this **change**.	This was **changed.**
	What are the uses permitted in T3-N? Could lots be subdivided? *Staff Response - T3-N is primarily a single family detatched zone. However 2/3 unit buildings are permitted on the corners. A lot could be subdivided if the current lot is large enough; this is true today as well. Factors to be considered are whether or not there is an existing house and if the new lots would accommodate the required setbacks for that house.*		

	Hermitage Road/West End residents -Lodging should not be permitted in T4-NA	Staff will **review** this	**No change** was made.
	Hermitage Road/West End - Residential should not be permitted in T4-NA. The surrounding neighborhood will not support this change.	Staff will **review** this	Rowhomes modified to be permitted by Special Exception rather than by right.
	Major Vehicle Service & Repair should be Conditional in T5-UC - consistent with Boundary Street Master Plan		
3.5.2	Are more standards required for schools in T3 district? Minimum lot size, special setbacks?		This was **changed.**
3.6.2.B	add "side or rear" to property line		This was **changed.**
3.7.3.B	Are rules on short term rentals changing in Pigeon Point and Higginsonville? *Staff Response - Not in this draft of the code. City Council is appointing a STR task force to take a closer look at these in all neighborhoods so at some point, standards may change and be incorporated into this code. But nothing is proposed at this time.*		
3.7.3.A.5	No B&B may be located within 500 feet of the proposed B&B – Why? Is this bad for Beaufort? What is the objective? *Staff Response - This is maintaining the current standard that was developed as residents were concerned about a proliferation of these uses in their neighborhoods.*		
3.7.5.B.1	General Retail / Service – Specific to T4-NA – No alcohol sales permitted. Why? *Staff Response - This is maintaining the recent ordinance amendment that applies specifically to the Depot Industrial area – see above comment response.*		
3.8.2.A	This may not be possible if the site is surrounded by four streets. At what point is visibility determined? Is the intent to drive these businesses out of the City? Can examples of where such criteria be met on Boundary Street? On Hwy 170? The current language in the Boundary Street Redevelopment District encourages flexibility to attract "national" anchor businesses. Is that being eliminated?	Staff will **review** this to perhaps prioritize the major streets and permit development such as has occurred with the new Starbucks.	Clarifying **language** was **added.**

3.8.3	Staff-need a provision to address stand alone car washes	Staff will **add** this.	This was **added** in 4.5.12.
3.8.6	Commercial Surface Parking Lots may not be located along Retail Frontage Overlay zones. Where are these? Why not mark them on maps? *Staff Response - They are on the map.*		
3.12.G	specifically for outdoor use are permitted so long as they are not permanently affixed to the ground. If a playhouse is permanently affixed to the ground or a tree, they are considered a shed and shall comply with the standards of paragraph C of this section. This is silly. Anyone who has every installed a playhouse knows that, in order for it to be safe, it should be permanently affixed in some way. Are we trying to discourage safe installation of swingsets by requiring families to go through the building permit process to install a playset in their yard? What are you trying to achieve? *Staff Response - the intent was to distinguish between these structures that were affixed to a concrete slab.*	Staff will **clarify** this.	Clarifying **language** was **added.**
3.12.H	Remove this section except for size of boat house. For a number of reasons, including property values, ability to replace in a storm, etc… dock length should not be regulated by the City. The city should defer to OCRM rules and not add additional ones. *Staff Response: Dock regulations in the historic district may be evaluated and discussed in a different forum if council chooses.*	Staff will **remove** this section as noted.	This was **removed.**
Article 4			
4.3.1	The public was told, repeatedly, that the Civic Master Plan was illustrative and policy setting and the designs contained therein were not proscriptive. The statement in this section states differently. Is it City Council's intent to make the illustrative the binding requirement for development? *Staff Response - The intent is to facilitate the development patterns suggested and illustrated by the code but not to mandate them to be implemented verbatim. The language in the Section 4.3.1 will be clarified accordingly.*	Staff will **clarify** this.	**Language** was clarified.

4.4	Private Frontage Type – Each Frontage Type proscribes a very specific dimension – "shall be a minimum depth of 8'", "shall be a minimum of 12' in depth and 12' in width", "shall have a minimum depth and width of 4'", etc. Should not we add some flexibility in here to provide for site specific conditions? *Staff Response - The intent is that if certain elements are going to be used, they need to be used correctly. This creates authenticity. A 6' deep colonnade is not useful for walking or having tables under, and actually restricts visibility into shopfronts. Similarly on a house, a 5' deep porch is not useful for having furniture, a swing, etc….* Again, this will create a cookie-cutter landscape. If a resident of an existing neighborhood such as Moss Oaks seeks to add a room, will that room have to be placed on the front of the existing		
4.5.3	Allow 2 Accessory Dwelling Units per lot, per the Arts Overlay District intent. Also permit these to be built on a vacant lot if sited appropriately. HBF - would there be a time limit for construction of a primary structure if they are built on vacant lots?	Staff will make these **changes** and **evaluate** time limit.	**Change** was made; no time limit was established.
4.5.5	Hermitage Road Area/ West End Residents: don't want 2 or 3 unit buildings, multi-family or rowhouses in T3-N. Want to remain T3-S. Any change in this neighborhood conflicts with the "purchased expectations" of the neighborhood. Even if something looks compatible, it may not be compatible with regards to noise, traffic. Don't want affordable housing in this neighborhood. *Staff response - it is important to understand the conditions associated with each use marked with "C" in the use chart. The condition for multi-family pertains to Battery Point only and is based on their current PUD. The condition for 2/3 unit buildings and rownhouse are that they can be utilized in very specific conditions.*	Staff will **review** this	**Conditions** for 2/3 unit buildings were **clarified; rowhome** was **removed** from T3-N.
4.5.6.B.5	Rowhouses are currently, and should remain, permitted in Bladen Street Redevelopmetn District.	Staff will make this **change.**	**Change** was made.
	Are rowhouses permitted in the old Jail property? *Staff Response - Currently they are not however it's something that can be explored, especially if they are articulated differently than traditional rowhouses.*	Staff will **review** this.	**No change** was made. Staff is **still considering** this.
4.5.10	Are large footprint buildings permitted in the Historic District? *Staff response - they currently are, however they may be self-limiting due to the development opportunities.*	Staff will **review** this and add provisions for the Historic District if needed.	This was **changed** to make these Special Exception in the Historic District.

The Beaufort Code			
Public Comment Summary Sheets			
	The height requirments should also be clarified in this section to further discourage sprawl. Two-story buildings will deter people from coming into the city. Do Port Royal and Beaufort County require this?*Staff response - They do in certain urban districts. In the city two story buildings/masses are only required in very specific conditions- at significant intersections of significant corridors (see Definitions for exact locations). For the Large Footprint buildings, the liner is very important b/c typically large footprint*		**Language** regarding two story requirements for liner buildings was **modified.**
	This section refers to 50% glazing, however during the rework of the Boundary Street code this was set at 40%. This should be consistent.	Staff will **change** this.	**Change** was made.
4.5.11	Requirement for liner or setback for a parking structure will hinder development of parking lots in the historic downtown that have currently be identified as potential garage sites.	Staff will **review** this.	
4.6.3.A.1.a	Why is "termite resistent" listed as a requirement for wood siding? It may prevent paintable wood and would create materials that are not traditional to Beaufort. *Staff Response - this was to be consistent with the county but it will be reviewed.*	Staff will **review** this.	**Change** was made.
4.6.3.A.1.b	Recommend to use "fiber cement" and remove Hardie as this is a brand.	Staff will **change** this.	**Change** was made.
4.6.3.A.1.g	Corrugated metal is not appropriate in residential neighborhoods. It may be appropriated in an artist district but not on a typical residential street. There are not enough design standards; one could paint their home rainbow colors without consequence. Concerned that code addresses how buildings behave but doesn't address design enough. *Staff response: this definitely needs to be a balance.New code proposes to limit colors to 3, but in general, if it's not in a design district there is limited oversight on design.*	Staff will **review** this.	

4.6.3.A.1.3	Do these material standards for columns apply to the Historic District? *Staff Response - yes, however in this district they would likely be mostly for new construction unless deemed appropriate for historic buildings by the HRB. 4.2.3 defines the relationship between the building design guidelines to the Historic District standards and stats that in the event of a conflict, the Preservational Manual and Supplement shall take precedence.*		**Change** was made.
4.6.3.A.1.3.e and 4.e	Why do these materials need special Approval by the administrator? *Staff Response - this was intended for the Historic District only.*	Staff will **change** this.	**Clarification** was made.
4.6.3.A.2	Is this too restrictive to limit materials of chimneys? Some contractors use wood/fiber cement to clad chimneys. Consider changing should to shall. *Staff Response - wood or sy nthetic wood clad chimneys are not characteristic in Beaufort and can be another way to stigmatize certain types of housing.*	Staff will **review** this.	**No change** was made.
	It doesn't make sense to have a chimney be wood because it's flamable. *Staff Response - agreed.*		
4.6.3.A.4	Aluminum should be added to this list.	Staff will **change** this.	**Change** was made.
4.6.3.A.6	What about materials for flat/monopitched roofs?	Staff will **change** this to reflect these apply to visible roofs only.	**Clarification** was made.

The Beaufort Code			
Public Comment Summary Sheets			
4.6.3.A.7	What's the criteria for the Prohibited materials? Someone doesn't like them? Eliminating vinyl may increase building costs and reduce affordability. A certain type of house and family will be priced out of Beaufort. Vinyl siding can be durable and cheaper. It does have UV light sensitivities and can deteriorate. It costs $14K more to have a raised slab, fiber cement siding and operable shutters. *Staff Response - this will be considered. There is a difference between housing that is cheaply constructed and housing that is affordable. The general intent of limiting materials is to encourage higher quality construction that will be more durable, and reduce long term maintenance and insurance costs.*	Staff will **review** this.	No change was made. This will be **discussed further** with MPC/Council.
	Stone should never be considered an appropriate building material? There are contributing buildings in the historic district with stone. Cast stone columns are preferable to wood. The staff of HRB have authority to review materials so why is this needed? *Staff Response - This applies to the entire city, not just the historic district. Staff will delineate Cast Stone as an appropriate material.*	Staff will **change** this.	**Change** was made.
4.6.3.B.1	Why are mansard roofs prohibited? Need a definition of these.	Staff will **review** this.	This was **removed.**
4.7.2.A	More emphasis should be put on individual buildings here. Specific Beaufort elements such as south-facing houses, raised foundations, porches/piazzas, etc… should be included	Staff will **review** this.	**Clarification** was made.
4.7.2.C	4.7.2.C. – New Construction (in the Historic District) will complement and support the district. The Code states that "lot size, massing, siting, floor area, ratio, and height must correspond to the contributing adjacent buildings within the district." Clarity should be added to ensure that context is clearly defined, as not all adjacent or nearby buildings are contributing or significant. Why is this needed.	Staff will **review and clarify** if possible.	**Clarification** was made. However, some new buildings, which may not be contributing due to their age, still follow the discernable rhythm of the district and should be considered by additional new construction. This was reflected in the
4.7.2.D	4.7.2.D. – Infill (in the Historic District) will be Compatible yet Distinct. The Code states "Because the district is the resource, the reconstruction of buildings that existing within the district during the period of significance is allowed." Does this mean building "fake" buildings is encouraged, or is this encouraging preservation? *Staff Response - This means that buildings can be reconstructed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Reconstruction - https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-reconstruction.htm. If these standards cannot be met, the building could not be reconstructed. It is not encouraging fake buildings, but rather encouraging infill that is in keeping with the*		

The Beaufort Code			
Public Comment Summary Sheets			
4.7.2.F	The term "feeling" is very subjective. Staff Response: This is taken directly from the "7 Aspects of Integrity" from the National Park Service - https://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/nrb15_8.htm		
Article 5	could use some diagrams; look at ones from Alexandria, VA	Staff will **review** this and add imagery.	Pending
5.2.2.B.5	The Code states that the property owner remains responsible "for replacement of any tree or plant displaying 50 percent or greater decline of canopy or foliage which occurs due to poor maintenance or damage." For how long and by whose determination? *Staff Response - This will be updated to show a 2 year provision and clarify the next thought you bring up.* As an example, if lightning damages a tree and causes it to decline or die through no fault of the owner, thenwhat liability will that	Staff will **clarify** this if needed.	**Clarification** language was **added.** Additionally, **language** speaking to continued landscape compliance was **added** as item 6.
5.3	Why is the landscaping requirements changing? What is broken that needs fixing? *Staff response - the best way to see a summary of what's changing is in the Summary Sheets by Article. These can be found on the website in the Beaufort Code/Document Downloads page.If you have specific questions we can certainly answer them.*		

5.3.2	5.3.2 – Specimen and Landmark Trees – Who has created this list and who has reviewed it to determine its reasonableness? *Staff Response - List of trees was generated by Park and Tree Advisory Commission (PTAC) from information from various sources: tree survey conducted in 2004, Beaufort Cty. standards, local knowledge of urban forest and comparisons with tree lists from cities of similar size to Beaufort. Members of PTAC composed of 2 certified arborists, 2 Landscape Architects and a real estate professional. The main considerations by PTAC in list generation in order of priority were: preservation of diversity of urban forest, preservation of old growth Live oaks and tenets of qualifications as a Tree City USA.* Does the last line mean that any tree over 24" is a specimen tree? *Staff Response - Yes. We will review and add any exceptions to this as appropriate. Note, if arborists report rates any tree, 24"+ as high or imminent failure (see Appendix A, A.1.2), tree mitigation is not required in any form.* Palmetto trees should be removed. *Staff Response - Sabal palms withstand hurricane force winds; they are one of the few trees which remain following a direct hit and like Live oaks, can actually afford a means of protection from excessive damage to structures. In current UDO, a 2' ht. Sabal is a grand tree; PTAC redefined as 20' ht. specimen tree. This greatly reduces the number of palms that would require preservation on a site.*		**Exempted species** to the Specimen/Landmark classification were **added.**
5.3.3	Tree Root Protection Zone Requirements – What if a site and/or tree is enhanced by construction, as it was a Newcastle Square? That is not addressed at all by this Code. Likewise, this Code seems so rigid, there is no flexibility. As we read this, if we cannot achieve the desired TPZ, during sitework and construction, should I just remove the tree? What process of appeal exists to allow the owner to seek relief? *Staff Response Language will be added to make this flexible in more urban conditions and deal with trees on a case-by-case basis when needed.*	Staff will **change** this.	**Change** was made - added 5.3.3.C.2.
5.4.1.A.3	Is there a list or a plan that note such trees designated for preservation, or is this to come later? *Staff Response - This is intended to refer to trees shown to remain on an approved site plan. If circumstances, during the construction phase, require a change to the retention of a tree formerly shown to remain, (this occurs fairly often) whether it be pruning or removal, then approval by the city arborist and a permit will be required to either remove or prune as necessary. If tree requires removal due to building or infrastructure installation that wasn't accounted for by project engineer or architect prior to final plan approval, then mitigation per 5.6.3.B applies.* There are a number of places specifying minimum lot frontage coverage, setbacks and other building site specifications. Which shall take precedence, those requirements or the tree requirements? What criteria will be use to decide? Who shall have authority? What path of appeal is available to seek relief? This undermines goals 1 and 2. ***Staff Response - Please provide examples of conflicts you find. The landscaping and buffer standards were designed to complement and not contradict the build-to requirements and other design requirements in more urgan areas.***		Language was **clarified in 5.4.1.A.3.**

5.4.1.B.2	Development Potential – "Whether or not the tree constrains reasonable development of the site". In whose opinion? What is process of appeal? This undermines goals 1 and 2.	Staff will clarify this.	No change made - **clarification pending.**
5.4.1.C	need example of tree retention/removal schedule	Staff will **add** this in the Appendix A	**Pending**
5.5.1	What buffer is required between parking lots in T4-N and lots in T3?	Currently there is none. Staff will **revise** this to address this issue.	This section was **modified** to add buffer and screening.
5.5.1.C	Rob M. from the county said that these are about 1/2 what county requires in same corridors	Staff will **review** this	**No change** was made. Still under review.
5.6.1.D	Overstory trees must be installed at 3 caliper inches and understory trees must be 8' high. What are the current standards? *Staff Response - Minimum size requirement for overstory trees currently is 2" caliper and 10' ht. and 1" caliper and 6' ht. for understory trees. 3.5 caliper inches is required for stree tree plantings.* Will the replacement landscaping along Boundary street meet these standards? *Staff Response - Yes. The overstory trees on this project will be 3.5 caliper inches*		
5.6.1.M	Where site conditions are inappropriate for an overstory tree, as determined by the Administrator, up to two overstory trees may be substituted for one overstory tree. This doesn't make sense.	Staff will **change** this - The second "overstory" will be replaced with "understory."	**Change** was made.

5.6.3.B	Fee in lieu – The example is confusing. Is the Damage during Construction example a damaged Landmark Tree?	Staff will **clarify** this.	**Change** was made.
5.7	Public Comment - Add a requirement for construction of a driveway to accommodate 2 vehicles for any new or refurbished residential housing within the T4HN district where no on-street parking exists. *Staff Response - This is primarilky addressed in 7.2.3.D.2; two cars could be accommodated in a stacked fashion. The intent is to prevent "double wide" driveways in front of houses. Behind the parking setback, driveways can widen into parking pads as long as the impervious surface percentages are maintained.*	Staff will **clarify** this if needed.	This is addressed in 7.2.3.D.2; a **reference** was **added** to this section.
5.8	Look at lighting standards in residential districts; particularly at motion-activated/sheilded security lighting.	Staff will **add** provisions for this.	**Change** was made to **5.8.2.C & 5.8.6.B** to address this. **11.7.3 added** to address current nonconformities.
Article 6			
6.5.1	Why are monument signs and post and arm signs no longer allowed in the Boundary Street area? This should be removed. If it stays, when will non-conforming signs have to be removed? *Staff Response - Free standing signs are not currently permitted in Boundary Street except for existing buildings.*		
	Why are monument signs capped at 10 SF in T4 and T5 (in those few areas where they are still allowed)? Properly designed signage contribute to safety and business success. This ignores the impact of vehicular traffic. How does length of frontage impact signage? Why not allow sign every 50 feet just as access doors are required every 50 feet? *Staff Response - As buildings are pulled closer to the street, there is less room for monument signs, which are a response to buildings being pulled away and buffered from the street. There is a direct relationship between length of a building and size of the sign, so the longer the building, the more signage is permitted. The new sign standards are more flexible with regards to building signage.Staff is owrking working on special provisions for signage for buildings in these T5-UC areas that are not right on the street.*	Staff will **update** this.	**Additional standards** for master sign plans (areas with 5 or more tenants) were **added** to increase flexibility.
Article 7			

7.1.3	New developments are required to install public street signs and public streets? What is the process of appeal? Who has the authority to grant relief? Does this automatically obligate the City to take ownership and maintenance responsibility for "public streets"? *Staff Response - this is already the case in the Boundary Street Redevelopment District.*	Staff will **review** this.	
7.2.1.C.1	"Where the existing right-of-way is substandard, the fronting property owner shall be required to dedicate the appropriate amount of right-of-way (as measured from the centerline of the existing street)." How is the property owner compensated? What if there are buildings already on the both sides and buildings are required to be built to the prevailing line? What is process to obtain relief? Could these improvements be in lieu of road impact fees?	Staff will **review** this	This section was **modified** to add clarity and provide flexibility for infill situations. Staff is **still investigating** the question of whether or not these investments could be in lieu of road impact fees.
7.2.2	Connectivity - Adjoining parking lots shall be interconnected. Section 7.2.2, Street Network Requirements, also requires properties to connect to one another. Section 7.2.3 requires Shared Access wherever feasible. There are ownership issues – legal, liability, etc. – associated with this. How does this City propose to address this? At what point will connectivity be required? If at the time of redevelopment, this requirement will discourage redevelopment. We already pay street impact fees. By requiring both, this Code fails to meet goals 4, 5, 7, and 10.	Staff will **review** this	**No change** has been made. Connectivity of primary streets and internal access ways is a goal of the city. However there are a number of exceptions and flexible language in this section that permits the administrator to evaluate this on a case-by-case basis.
7.3.3.B	Traffic – The Code states that the Boundary Street Redevelopment Area and a portion of downtown (bounded by Calhoun, Carteret, Bay and Ribaut, and lots zone Industrial), are not required to conduct a Traffic Impact Analysis. Are they also not required to have the Administrator conduct a Traffic Access Management Analysis?	Staff will **review and clarify** this	This is a carry-over from the existing UDO. It was **clarified** to excmpt the same areas that are exempt from a TIA.
7.4.3.B	Why is there are requirement for 50% of waterfront lots to be open? This is expensive property and will kill a copule of specific developable areas. This should not be a requirement. *Staff Response - keeping a portion of waterfront lots or access open is something the city has been doing for many years. This clarifies the language.City Walk and Live Oaks at Battery Creek are two relatively new examples. The idea is that by opening up access to all, it's increasing the internal value of the property and providing a public amenity.*	Staff will **review** this	This has been **modified** to be more flexible.
Article 8	Is there a limit on the amount of fill permitted on a parcel?	Staff will **review** this.	This is still **being studied.**

	HBF - The Historic district is a resource and should be listed here. *Staff Response - The HD is recognized as a resource at the beginning of Section 1.2, and in Article 4. This chapter is intended to discuss Natural Resources. It may not be appropriate to list the historic district here give the content.*	Staff will **consider changing** the nomenclature of this section.	**No change** was made.
8.2	These stormwater standards Beaufort County has developed are too strict and too expensive. The state has good standards. Why not just stick with them? *Staff Response - The city has adopted an adaptation of the county's standars that applies them differently depending on the contexts.*	Staff will **review** this with the city stormwater engineer.	This is still **being studied.**
8.2.2	The definition of Greenfield at 1 acre, or limiting infill to less than 2 acres, is not practical. This number should be increased.	Staff will **review** this with the city stormwater engineer.	**Greenfield and Infill were clarified** to eliminate gap. Note that Greenfield refers to sites that were never previously developed. Pending review from stormwater engineer.
	In the chart if there are no marks, does that mean it doesn't apply? *Staff Response - yes.*	Staff will **add "-" and make all charts consistent**.	This was **updated** to clarify.
8.2.4.B	BMP Tool by Transect Zone – This table is confusing. Does the X mean that that technique can be used or it cannot be used?*Staff Response - Agreed – here the X means it is permitted! Staff will review and modify this for consistency.*	Staff will change this.	This was **updated** to clarify.
8.2.4.C	Rainwater Cisterns – Are these being required? *Staff Response - No, they are just listed as a potential BMP.*	Staff will **clarify** if needed.	**Clarification** was made.
8.4.2	HBF - how are solar panels reviewed in the Historic District? *Staff Response - they would require HRB approval if they are visible from the street per 8.4.1.A.*		
Article 9			
9.10.2.1.b.	HBF - Giving purview over new single-family construction in the NWQ (Preservation Sub-District) gives too much responsibility to the Administrator. Also, it eliminates any public review of these projects. *Staff response - the purview that is proposed to change to staff is for detached single family homes only. That may not necessarily consitute significant development. There is no formal public notice now except for posting of the agenda, and the HRB meeting being open to the public. This would indeed be removed. The goal is to expedite the review process.*	Staff does not agree that this should change. No action will be taken at this time. However this comment will be taken forward to the approval bodies.	**No change** was made. This will be discussed further with MPC/Council.

The Beaufort Code			
Public Comment Summary Sheets			
	Public Comment - 1) Reinstate provisions for HRB approval of siting and public notification for new development, modification and renovation activities within the T4HN conservation district.	Staff does not agree that this should change. No action will be taken at this time. However this comment will be taken forward to the approval bodies.	**No change** was made. This will be discussed further with MPC/Council.
	HBF -Is there any notification for new construction where HRB review is no longer required? Neighbors should be notified at least 2 weeks prior to approval of any new "significant" develpoment around them. *Staff Resppnse - see above.*	Staff does not agree that this should change. No action will be taken at this time.	**No change** was made. This will be discussed further with MPC/Council.
9.5.1.B.2	how dows a barn or agricultural structure fit in? should language regarding the less than 200 SF requirement be incorporated? It may not need to be if the name is changed to Project Permit	Staff will **review** this	**No change.** Ag. Structures are regulated by state law which would supercede this ordinance.
9.5.2	is there a flow diagram for different types of projects?	Staff will **incorporate** this into the How To guide at the front of the code	**This is pending.**
9.6.2 C.1	Engineer sign off is typical but landscape architect's is not. This will require a Certification of Compliance with approved landscaping and tree planting plan by a landscape architect or contractor. Why should the developer incur this expense since the City will inspect for completion prior to issuing the CO? This duplicative and adds layers of expense to doing business in the City. Is this currently being required and when was it authorized? AS written it undermine goals 1, 2, and 6. *Staff Response - This is not intended*	Staff will **change** this.	Landscape Architect requirement was **removed.**
	A digital file of the as-builts. These are often not available for weeks to months after the project is complete. This could potential cause significant delays in timing. What purpose is this intended to serve? We think this is another additional expense to do business in the City with no benefit to anyone. *Staff Response - Staff will change the requirement to post-CO.These are helpful to have on file for many reasons including public safety and infrastructure projects.*	Staff will **change** this.	Clarification was added to make timing of this requirement flexible.
9.10.2.B.6	"Any special area standards as adopted by the HRB." This should be cleaned up a bit; otherwise, it may seem a bit arbitrary. Does this grant legal authority to the HRB which must be reserved to City Council? Are there no limitations? Undermines goals 1, 2, and 3. *Staff Response - This is the current language in the UDO. Staff will change to "policies" instead of standards.*	Staff will **change** this.	**Change** was made.

9.10.2.G	After disapproval of a project by the HRB, the project may not be heard until 12 months from the date of the original public hearing. Why? If the owner/developer is willing to invest the funds to make significant changes to resubmit, why is there such a time limit? *Staff Response - If a project has been modified to meet HRB comments, it can be brought back immediately. This is intended to prevent the exact same submission that was denied from coming back verbatim. Staff will clarify this.*	Staff will **clarify** this.	**Clarification** was added.
Article 10			
10.6.1	HBF - Will there be one administrator or several? Does this mean a new staff position? A serious concern is the power and authority granted this position and few people are knowledgeable in every instance required in this document. *Staff Response - Administrator is defined in 10.5. The administrator may be different depending on the type of review. The staffing and qualifications are determined by the city manager.*		
10.7	The new Beaufort Code guarantees the special interest advocacy group, the Historic Beaufort Foundation, a permanent seat on the City's HDRB. Why should the Historic Beaufort Foundation be given special and preferential treatment and not give all other similar Beaufort design, planning and historic advocacy groups the same opportunity to lobby their viewpoint, but who are instead only invited to express their opinion and are not given one of the 5 "votes" as HBF is, at what is supposed to be a fair and unbiased City HDRB review process?	Staff will **review** this.	**No change** was made. There are no other similar, formalized and longstanding advocacy groups.
	The new Code increases the HDRB terms from 2 years to 3 years. Does this change limit community participation by lessening the number of citizens who can serve on the HDRB? Also, are all 5 individuals of the City's HDRB non-elected members, thereby giving citizens the only recourse to challenge the HDRB decision by suing the City of Beaufort or should a citizen appeal process to City Council be created as a first attempt at reconciliation before causing public money to be spent in the Court System? *Staff Response: the new code proposes increasing the time on all boards and commissions to 3 years. This is already the case for the Planning Commission, and due to the amount of training and adaptation required, the 2 years doesn't seem adequate or efficient.*	Staff does not agree with keeping the term at 2 years. Staff will **review** the appeal body for the HRB	**No change** was made.

10.7.1.B	HBF -. Suggest re-write to put historic buildings first over new construction : • …shall review and approve or deny changes or alterations to the exterior of all structures located within the Beaufort Historic District as well as to review and approve or deny all new construction, including additions and demolitions. The Board will seek to preserve and protect the historic character and architectural integrity of Beaufort's National Landmark Historic District.	Staff will **review** this.	**Change** was made similar to suggestion.
10.7.2.B	HBF - suggest replace "take action on" with "approve or deny". *Staff Response - the emphasis on denial is not one that necessarily encourages activity in this district. Also typically the HRB approves, approves with conditions (most common), tables or denies something so it may not be accurate to limit those choices to two.*	Staff **does not agree** with this change.	**No change** was made.
10.7.2.B.4	HBF - Add sentence at the end …This inventory shall be reviewed and updated every ten years with emphasis on: • recording structures and buildings that have gained historic or architectural significance; and to • record buildings that no longer contribute to the character of the National Landmark Historic District due to demolition or loss of character . *Staff Response - In lieu of committing to a timeframe, we could consider language saying that the inventory will be updated periodically, or something to that effect, and incorporate the rest of the recommended language.*	Staff will **incorporate** comments.	**Change** was made similar to suggestion.
10.7.2.B.5	HBF - Comment to whom? City council or the State Review Board? *Staff Response: It would depend on the type of historic designation. Standards for local designations are found in 9.11.*	Staff will **clarify** this.	**Clarification** was made.
10.7.3	• Suggest rewrite of 3rd sentence because it is redundant and probably does not meet the requirements for Beaufort remaining a CLG. "Two members shall be professionals in the disciplines of historic preservation, architecture, history, architectural history, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, planning, archeology or related discipline."	Staff will **incorporate** comments.	**Change** was made.
Article 11			

11.1.4	Can single family structures be considered non-conforming? *Staff response: fo. Single family detatched buildings can not be non-conforming. If something is non-conforming, however, it may not be permitted to increase or intensify the non-conformance.*	Staff will **clarify** this.	**Clarified** in 11.1.3
11.1.4 and 11.7.2	What happens if these changes make a property non-conforming? How soon would, for instance, a parking lot need to be brought into compliance? *Staff response - Article 11 deals with non-conformities. Note that it's not the intention to make single-family residences non-conforming and require them to be brought to current standards. For parking lots that do not comply with the landscaping standards, any improvement over $10,000 would trigger additions to bring it into compliance. 5% of project cost would go towards landscaping.*	Staff will **review** this and **clarify** if needed.	**No change** was made.
	There has long been a requirement that parking lots be fenced or screened but the lot adjacent to Beaufort Inn at the corner of Scotts and Port Republic is not fenced and people drive across the sidewalk to exit the lot. Will this change? When? What will trigger the change? *Staff Response - we will review this from a safety perspective. As for what will trigger this fron an ordinance perspective, see previous response.*		
11.4.2.A	What if a structure cannot be brought into compliance? What is the path for relief? *Staff Response - ZBOA – See 11.8.1*		
11.6.1	A legal nonconforming sign may lose this designation if it is relocated.What about sign relocations that are being made necessary by the Boundary Street Redevelopment Plan? Will this legal nonconformity be lost? *Staff Response - Boundary Street signs are being moved as part of the land acquisition agreement and will not be deemed nonconforming during this time. If in 2 years, the sign is to be moved again per the owner's request, it will be nonconforming and this will not be permitted.*		
	A legal nonconforming sign may lose this designation if a tenant vacates a building. We have tenants move and signs change on our monuments all of the time. Will this legal nonconformity be lost? This is burdensome and should be deleted. *Staff Response - Agreed. Clarification for multi-tenant signs will be added.*		**Clarification** made 11.6.D.4

The Beaufort Code			
Public Comment Summary Sheets			
11.6.1.C	"Any existing sign not meeting the requirements of this Code shall be brought into compliance with this Code before a business license will be issued for a new resident business or before a business name can be changed." How does this apply to multi-tenant monument signs? This is arbitrary and punitive and conflicts with the stated goals. This should be changed. *Staff Response - Clarification for multi-tenant signs will be added.*		**Clarification** made 11.6.D.4
Article 13			
	Add a definition of Infill to address properties that used to have structures on them but are now vacant.	Staff will **change** this.	**Change** made.
	Add definition of Historic District references such as: National Register, National Historic Landmark District, Preservation District, Conservation District, The Point	Staff will **add** these as appropriate.	The Point definition, as well as National Register and National Historic Landmar District, was **added** to Article 13. Also added definitions of contributing and non-contributing structures. The Preservation District and Conservation District definitions are in 2.7.1.D.
Appendix A	Add the tree save/remove chart	Staff will **add** this	
Appendix B	no comments		
Appendix C			
	At what point are the changes to Port Republic Street made and by whom? We suffered through the redevelopment of Port Republic Street a few years ago. This was partially funded with Federal grants. Does this redesign require that the federal funds be returned? Are you certain? How wide is the existing right of way? It appears this may prevent construction of a parking structure. Has this been evaluated? If	Staff will **review** this	**Still under review.**
	Boundary Street east of Ribaut Road. What is the width of the existing ROW. If we replace existing buildings on block west of Newcastle, what will we be required to provide? *Staff Comment - See previous comment on 7.2.1.C.2.*		
C.2	These colors are hard to read; is it possible online to click on a line and have it say what it is?	Staff will **review** this	**Pending**

p. 255	This image is the same as 256	This section is not 100% complete and will be updated. It will be the same as Chapter 10 in the Civic Master Plan	**Pending**

General Questions	Question	Response
	How is infill encouraged?	All of these aim to encourage infill: Allowance for smaller lots, encouraging alleys is some instances, providing for creative infill
	Are 1 story buildings on Ribaut Rd. still permitted? Will everything need to look like the fire station?	They are still permitted. 2 story buildings are not required except at significant intersections (p.228 in the Article 13 Definitions). There is a build-to line on Ribaut Road that is similar, but more flexible, than the current zoning (goes from 7-12' to 0-15' build-to). There is also a parking setback of 40' so parking can't be right up to the road and is encouraged to be behind buildings.
	Are there building type requirements for Ribaut Road?	There are some building types found in Article 4. There are also build-to standards and percentage of lot coverage standards in addition to building height standards. All of these will help guide the form of buildings on Ribaut Road without being overly prescriptive.
	How can I comment on the code?	There is an online comment form on the website - http://www.cityofbeaufort.org/beaufort-code.aspx - that was set up to receive very specific comments. That can be found here: http://goo.gl/forms/PcD24nnzc6.
	As Beaufort attracts more development, is there a public review process for new development?	Yes, there is public review depending on the size of the project. This is outlined in Article 9. One of the goals of this code is to expedite the building design review process by giving more design review purview to staff. The trade-off is introducing more building design standards in Article 4. Even for staff-reviewed projects, the city does post them on the website. This can be
	Are there limits on Short Term Rentals introduced into this code?	The standards proposed in this code are the same as the current standards. However more discussion on this topic will take place via the STR Study Group appointed by Council. As recommendations and updated requirements are developed, they may be incorporated into this code.
	How is stormwater standards addressed in this code?	Stormwater standards are found in Article 8. In general, they are the same as the ones Beaufort currently has, which are based on the County's standards.
	Allison Road Streetscape - what side of the street is the sidewalk on? How tall are the street lights? What about drainage?	The sidewalk will be on the north side; street lights will be 14-15' tall; the existing drainage ditch will be piped.
	Would an existing house come under the old code or the new code?	Any project permit received before the new code is adopted would be under the old code. Once the new code is adopted, all projects for both new and existing buildings will be evaluated under the new code.
	Fuller Street residents didn't want a trail access but now there is one. This is causing drainage issues, mud coming into Fuller.	This area being referred to is a city easement. The city has started to maintain it more by keeping it mowed.
	The bowling alley is being flooded more as a result of the new Fire Station.	The new fire station regraded the bowling alley's parking lot and provided 3 inlets to divert water in addition to creating a swale at the rear of the property to accommodate stormwater. A lot was done to improve this parking lot, working with the owner.

Map comments	Comment	Response/Action	
	All properties in Hermitage and West End zoned R1 and R2 should convert to T3-S	Staff will **review** this. Currently at a minimum, staff will **consider changing** the lots between Hermitage and Barnwell, except fronting Ribaut Road, and lots west of the Rail Trail to T3-S	Some **changes** were made.
	How was it determined whether or not something converted from R2 to T3-S or T3-N? Suggest that all R1 start converting to T3-S and all R2 start converting to T3-N. The evaluate if this is appropriate. There will be resistance from Hermitage Road/West End neighborhoods to be rezoned from R1 or R2 to T3-N.	This was not a 1-1 conversion. About 2/3 of R2 properties converted to T3-S, and the remaining 1/2 went to T3-N. Some of the reasons for the T3-N conversion in specific areas were: proximity to downtown/commercial area; proximity to schools, parks or other areas that are compatible with smaller lot sizes; actual existing lot sizes; how the neighborhood was addressed in the Civic Master Plan; evaluating transitions and relationships to adjacent parcels.	
	Hermitage Road Neighbors - This code is not compliant with the Civic Master Plan. The neighborhood was developed in 1951 before zoning. The lots are bigger, there are two story houses with nice trees. There is something called the "Law of Expectation" which means that something is purchased with an expectation of how it will remain. This shouldn't be changed. Permitting smaller lots with small cottages means that someone with a different lifestyle that what our neighborhood is use to may move in next door. This is not what the neighborhood wants.		
	Hermitage Road Neighborhors - Permitting smaller lots with small cottages means that someone with a different lifestyle that what our neighborhood is use to may move in next door. This is not what the neighborhood wants.		
	Hermitage Road Neighbors - Don't agree with introducing 2/3 unit buildings in the neighborhood. Never would have invested in a non-single family neighborhood.		

The Beaufort Code			
Public Comment Summary Sheets			
	Why are there T3-S lots in the middle of Pigeon Point near the park and Boundary Street?	Staff will **review** this.	This was **changed.**
	Iin Pigeon Point, since the area is proposed to get more infill, can the speed limit on the major roads be reduced to 25 MPH similar to Carteret Street? *Staff Response - we will look into this change with the DOT/Public Works*		
	Why was Bull Street and areas north of Hermitage Road converted to T3-N, but some lots (e.g. Fuller Street) south of Hermitage Road are actually smaller; other lots are adjacent to the Depot area and are less Suburban.	Staff will **review** this.	**No change** was made.
	What is the landlocked parcel south of Allison Road?	Staff will **review** this.	Pending
	Why does Clarendon PUD have an underlying zoning of LI?	Staff will **review** this.	This was **changed.**
	Property owned by TCL should be changed to IC	Staff will **review** this.	This was **changed.**
	Southside Park should be zoned T1; Why are some parks T1 and others similar to the neighborhood zoning? *Staff Response - sometimes this can go either way. Parks are permitted in zoning districts so having parks zoned like the neighborhood does not mean it can't be a park. Similarly, just because something is zoned T1 doesn't mean it can't be rezoned in the future. Zoning does not provide protection and the zoning map is not intended to be a use map.*	Staff will **review** this.	Pending
	USCB in the Historic District shouldn't be 30 du/acre. This is too dense. *Staff Response: this is not a change but it is something staff will discuss with USCB. There is still HRB review and also the new infill standards will help ensure a building that is compatible with the district.*	Staff will **review** this.	Pending
	Look at using IC zoning for churches, schools consistently.	Staff will **review** this and ensure it's being used appropriately.	Pending
	What if something in the county currently zoned T2 annexes to the city?	Staff will **review** potential areas for this and **develop** a strategy.	Pending
	Conversion sheets needed for: GR to IC, MED to IC, Boundary Street Redevelopment District to T5-UC	Staff will **prepare** these.	Pending

607 Bay Street	After an hour of constructive ideas and thoughts, the concerned neighbors decided that 607 Bay St. should be zoned exactly the same as the entire Point neighborhood – that is T4 Historic Neighborhood, and the property should remain residential. The current residence is overpriced and if priced competitively it will sell. It can then be converted back to a stately Historic home. A zoning request to sub divide this property into two residential properties might also be met with favorable consideration. The minutes of this formal meeting were sent on to Lauren Kelly and The City of Beaufort, with a copy to The Point Neighborhood Associating and to Point resident Stephen Murry. Additional similar comments were submiited via the online form.	Staff will **review** this and **consider a change** in the updated map.	This was **changed.**
	Like the fact that the zones are clearly defined and simpler.		
	Why is the school on Burroughs Ave not zoned IC.	This property is currently zoned like the neighborhood and in the new code, staff proposes to carry this same thought process over. Schools are permitted in T3-N zoning districts so this works.	
	Could rowhouses be placed on the school at Burroughs if it ever redevelops?	If the provision that rowhouses in T3-N can be done as part of a block face redevelopment is removed, than no. Staff is considering making this change.	This was **changed.**
	On Lady's Island it would be better to just have T1, T2, T3 - less people, less cars, more trees.		No change was made.
Notes:	*Grammatical or spelling errors that have been corrected are not listed in this chart.*		
	All references will be updated for the April draft.		