

A Special Worksession of the Beaufort-Port Royal Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC) was held on **June 4, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.** in the Beaufort Municipal Complex, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Bill Harris, Commissioners Robert Semmler, Judy Alling, Caroline Fermin, Tim Rentz, and Jim Crower, and Lauren Kelly, City of Beaufort planning.

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

Chairman Harris called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

#### **REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE BEAUFORT CODE**

**4.2.2** – Building design standards applicability – Ms. Kelly said there are two recommendations to modify this section to apply to any subdivision variance in T3 zoning districts and to any subdivision greater than 15 acres. There were no commissioner comments.

**4.5.3.B.7** – Carriage houses and their maximum size – Ms. Kelly said the language says that carriage houses shall not exceed 50% of the footprint of the primary building; the proposal is to clarify that the footprint includes covered porches. A house with a porch counts the porch in the square footage, so the porch would count on the carriage house, too, she said. There were no commissioner comments.

**4.5.3.B.7** – This section would allow the conversion of existing accessory structures that exceed the maximum size if the administrator determines there would be no adverse effect on the surrounding property. Ms. Kelly explained a case that had come up that led to this change.

Ms. Kelly told Commissioner Fermin that an appeal of an administrative decision goes to the ZBOA. There were no further commissioner comments.

**4.5.7.B.4** – There's a limit on building width, Ms. Kelly said, and a question arose about whether a greater width would be allowed if a house were on a corner, so this clarifies that the building width shall be between 16 feet and 160 feet.

Ms. Kelly told Chairman Harris that no one has ever wanted to do a 14'-wide apartment building, and he replied that someone might want their buildings units that width; 16' may be as narrow as staff wants, but he asked, "Why is there a minimum at all?" Ms. Kelly said there are minimum frontage standards, but she agreed with Chairman Harris that they should maintain the maximum width but not have a minimum.

**4.6.1.H** – Outdoor display of merchandise – Ms. Kelly said the proposal is to merge 4.6.3.E and 4.6.4.G into this section. While some standards are specific to certain zoning

districts, Ms. Kelly said, they're similar enough that they could all be consolidated here, and "any differences" could be addressed in 4.6.1.H. There were no commissioner comments.

**4.6.1.H** – Also outdoor display of merchandise – Ms. Kelly said this is to correct something that was accidentally omitted from the new code. It applies to businesses that display their merchandise outdoors (e.g., a shed company) in front of the property, and says there should be a buffer between that display and neighboring properties. It's "a pretty limited application," she said.

Chairman Harris asked whom this would affect. Ms. Kelly said a business would have to have a buffer wherever one is required. She showed the code and said it probably needs to be clarified that the buffer requirement doesn't apply to the front of the lot – where the merchandise is displayed – but only to adjacent parcels that are of a different use. There were no further commissioner comments.

**4.6.3.A.7** – Prohibited materials – Ms. Kelly said the proposal is to "add a prohibition against unnatural roof colors" (e.g., blue, orange and purple). This would apply only wherever Article 4 applies, she said. There were no commissioner comments.

**5.4.1.A.2** – Ms. Kelly said there is a requirement to trim a specimen tree, but staff wants to clarify that this is only for overstory trees, that pruning "must be done under the guidance and direct supervision of a certified arborist," and that the pruning must meet ANSI A300 standards.

There was a general discussion about utility company tree trimming and the cost to get a permit. Chairman Harris clarified that this provision is for overstory and landmark trees.

**5.6.2.C.1** – Ms. Kelly said under this proposal, if a tree is removed in a residential district without the appropriate permit, mitigation is required. This would make it clear that this applies to T3, T4-HN, and Light Industrial districts, she said.

**5.8.4.1. & 2** – Ms. Kelly said this is about the heights of light fixtures; it makes it clear that the maximum height is for the post and does not include the fixture. She described the different sizes that are permitted in different districts.

**5.8.4.B and 5.8.6.B** – Lighting standards – In the new code, a change was made to regulate residential lighting, which had never been regulated, Ms. Kelly said. The changes made were that spotlights could not shine into other people's property, and security lighting had to be motion-activated in T3 and T4-HN. Staff received comments that motion-activated lights might be too "arduous of a provision," she said, so they propose that the motion-activated lights be eliminated, but there are still provisions of

how the lights must shine. This also reduces the full cutoff lighting requirement from 5,500 to 1,800 lumens, Ms. Kelly said.

Chairman Harris said he doesn't know how motion-activated or non-motion-activated lighting could be policed; Ms. Kelly said it is mostly driven by people's complaints.

**6.2.2.G.3** – Master sign plan – There was a one-size-fits-all approach to multi-tenant signs, Ms. Kelly said. In the old ordinance, it didn't matter if there were 5 businesses or 30 on a parcel; the increase in the sign size was still small. Now it's tiered, with more of an increase in size as the number of businesses increases. The proposal is to make the maximum sign size 125 square feet would be; that would accommodate as many tenants' signs as needed.

Chairman Harris asked about the rules about how far from "your building a [monument] sign can be"; Ms. Kelly said it's a matter of how far from the right-of-way a sign needs to be. On Boundary Street, it is 3', for example. Chairman Harris said that's if the parcel is adjacent to the right-of-way; if a business is "second row off of a corridor like that," he asked how it could "sneak a sign up to the street." Ms. Kelly said, "You can't have off-premises signs," so it could only be done if the developer "did a signage easement," which is why it is important to make sure that multi-tenant signs are allowed to be as big as they can be without "overpowering the area" they're in.

**6.5.1.A, B, C & D** and **6.6.1.A, B, & D**– Ms. Kelly said these two provisions in the UDO that were unintentionally omitted from the new code. With multiple street frontages, signs are permitted on each street, so if you have frontage on two streets, you can have signs on both streets, which is something that's been done in practice for 20 years but wasn't in the code, she said. Also, buildings may have signs on facades that face parking lots and on multiple facades if they are on corner lots.

Ms. Kelly discussed provisions for sandwich board signs with Commissioner Alling.

**6.7.3.E** – A provision for directional signs internal to a site (e.g., "enter" and "exit" signs or a "reserved parking for customers" sign in a downtown area) – This provision is for the height of such signs; an "Enter" sign could only be 30" above the ground, for example, Ms. Kelly said, but that doesn't make sense for a parking stall sign, so those can be up to 5' high. This is how staff administers this now, she said, but this would put it into the code.

**6.10.1.J** – Billboards – A prohibition against billboards and a plan for phasing out existing billboards were added to the new code, Ms. Kelly said, but because of recent litigation and the state billboard lobby, this is not really enforceable. The advice of the city attorney is to change this section to not permit new billboards, she said. There are currently only two billboards in the City of Beaufort, so staff will work with the billboards' owners to try to get them to phase them out, she said.

**7.2.3.B** – Lot access standards for double-frontage lots – This section says now that lots can have one curb cut, but it’s not clear that double-frontage lots can have one curb cut on each side, Ms. Kelly said.

**7.4.2.A** – Community green space and open space requirements – Ms. Kelly said the commissioners had received letters pertaining to these requirements. Whitehall is a good example of using a subdivisions to reevaluate these standards, which seem a little too low in some instances, she said, so staff is proposing to increase the requirements based on what they have seen in projects: Whitehall for example, has plans for 20% open space, but it’s required to have 0%. For stormwater, you realistically need more open space, anyway, Ms. Kelly said, and staff wants it to be usable space.

Staff’s proposal is to increase open space requirements in T3-S to 20% in 10–15 acres; increase open space in T3-N to 15% in 10–40 acres and 20% in more than 40 acres, increase it in T4-N to 10% in 10–40 acres and 15% in more than 40 acres, Ms. Kelly said. This will ensure that the largest, most rural properties have the most green space, and the smallest, most urban properties have the least green space.

Ms. Kelly told Chairman Harris there is no minimum amount of open space except in cottage courts. **Rikki Parker** said Coastal Conservation League had commented in support of this change in a letter sent to the commissioners.

Commissioner Rentz said for developers, giving up 15% to 20% of the property for open space would have a big financial impact, “unless you’re getting something in return for that.” He feels “it’s so expensive to try to develop property . . . with all of the regulations” that must be met.

Chairman Harris said there needs to be a balance: “We all want to preserve. We all want open space,” but developers want to “make dollars” and use their property “for the best use.” He asked what counts as open space and what doesn’t. Ms. Kelly said this came up in the development group, which is okay with this provision, as long as stormwater counts as open space when it’s treated as an amenity. What doesn’t count as open space are private yards, public road rights-of-way (planting strips), parking, lands covered by structures not designated for active recreational use (e.g., clubhouses count), and designated outdoor storage areas. Everything else counts as open space (e.g., anything for stormwater that is “done well”), she said; there is a chart of community green space and open space types.

Ms. Kelly agrees that this is a balance; they looked at county standards, and these requirements are 10 – 15% lower than they are in comparable county areas. Also, she said, the city “has smaller lots in general” than the county does.

Commissioner Rentz said if the developers are okay with it, then he is. Commissioner Fermin agreed and said she's "in favor of more open green space, just in general."

Chairman Harris asked what percentage of open space City Walk has. Ms. Kelly said City Walk was at about 21%; it's T3-N, so the minimum would be 15% in that district.

**9.9.3** – Process for review of major subdivisions – Ms. Kelly said the city is proposing to match the process of the county and the Town of Port Royal, where subdivisions are done administratively and don't go to the planning commission.

Commissioner Rentz said, "One thing that people don't understand is" that "the city recommended that Whitehall not be approved on the first go," so "that wouldn't have happened, whether it came to [the MPC] or not."

Chairman Harris said subdivisions currently come to the MPC whether they're major or minor. Ms. Kelly said, in the city, only major subdivisions come before the MPC, which are for "6 or more lots or the creation of a new street." Chairman Harris clarified that in Port Royal and the county, staff handles major subdivisions.

Sea Island Corridor Coalition (SICC) had submitted a letter objecting to the proposed changes in this section, **Chuck Newton** said. The organization opposes this provision because it removes the public from the major subdivision review process, he said. If this provision had been in effect a few months ago, the public would not have had a chance to speak out on Whitehall, which changed its plans after its first proposal because of the public's concerns and the MPC vote unanimously opposing it, he said.

Commissioner Fermin agreed and said the MPC invites the public, welcomes their feedback, and allows them to be heard.

Commissioner Alling asked about the minor/major cutoff. Ms. Kelly said if it's 5 lots or less, it's a minor subdivision, and if it's 6 lots or more, it's a major subdivision.

Chairman Harris asked if a major subdivision would go to city council with this proposed change. Ms. Kelly said no: as in Port Royal and in the county, "it's all administrative," but there are a lot more standards added, and the appeals process would be to the planning commission, as it is in the county and Port Royal.

Chairman Harris said in Port Royal, if a project follows the code, it doesn't have to go to the town's design review board.

Chairman Harris asked what the "big plus is to changing it." Commissioner Fermin said it's more burden on the MPC, "but that's what we're here for." Chairman Harris asked why a developer would want this and said the "plus" is probably that the process for getting administrative approval is more streamlined.

**Bill Prokop**, city manager, said on other matters, the MPC makes recommendations; it doesn't "have final approval." City council is elected by taxpayers, but it "has no say in what you do" on major subdivisions, he said. The commissioners are "not all city residents, so our council feels very strongly that" approving major subdivisions "should be the same [as] in Port Royal and the county." He asked what issues there have been in Port Royal and the county in the past few years with their staffs approving major subdivisions.

Mr. Prokop said Commissioner Rentz was correct in saying that city staff didn't recommend approving the first plan for Whitehall. "The city's point of view" is that it's "very important" that major subdivision approval is "the same throughout the county," he said, adding that city staff "absolutely accept[s] public input on all issues."

**Peter Somerville**, SICC, said, "The problem with getting public input is finding out what's going on." He feels there is "a lack of transparency" in giving the public information so that it has "the opportunity" to offer "meaningful input." For example, the public might only have "two or three days' notice" of a public hearing, which he said is "not a meaningful opportunity." County council has some input on zoning decisions, Mr. Somerville said, but this change proposes no city council input on major subdivisions; "it's all with staff." He believes city planning staff proposed approving the Whitehall developer's first plan, and he hasn't seen any public statement that staff recommended it be turned down.

Commissioner Fermin said the MPC is "an advisory body," not a decision-making body, so she feels whatever the commission decides to recommend about major subdivisions should go to city council for a vote. Ms. Kelly said major subdivisions and zoning issues are two different things: all zoning issues follow the same process in the city, the county, and Port Royal, which is to come to the MPC for a recommendation, and then to go to their respective councils for approval. "Subdivisions are governed by state law," she said. A by-right subdivision goes to "the body that the state has delegated those reviews to go to," which "is a planning commission-type of body." When doing the Beaufort Code, staff looked into the idea of city council approval of major subdivisions, but state law is not written that way: the decision could be administrative, or it could go to the planning commission.

Chairman Harris said his opinion is that it's "just good to have another check and to have more people see it," but he feels Mr. Prokop made a good point, and he wondered why a body made up of representatives from the city, the county, and Port Royal should have "the last say" about major subdivisions in the City of Beaufort. He thinks the city's process is better than Port Royal's and the county's, so he'd prefer they do it the way the city does it, but in lieu of that, he sees the point in "having one process" for all three entities.

Commissioner Rentz said the MPC is “not really the last say” on major subdivisions because it goes back to staff after the MPC’s initial approval; Ms. Kelly said staff gives final approval, but “anything substantive that changed would come back to the planning commission.”

Mr. Newton said the important “philosophical issue” is how to “maintain some reasonable level of community engagement or review in the planning process without bringing everything inside closed doors,” which is SICC’s “key concern.” He also asked if this is “a solution in search of a problem.”

Chairman Harris said the solution might be staff review of major subdivisions, with a city council public hearing “like most things” have, with the public having the opportunity to give its input at that time. He feels “the county and Port Royal should come to where we are,” rather than the City of Beaufort doing what those entities do.

Mr. Newton said in a discussion with **Eric Greenway** today, he learned Mr. Greenway is interested in reviewing it at the county level because he doesn’t feel there has been sufficient public input on county matters.

Ms. Parker said the Coastal Conservation League also opposes this change. It’s unfortunate that the Town of Port Royal and the county have a different process than the City of Beaufort, she said, but she believes in “more transparency, not less.” Whitehall was a great example of the community seeing a change for the better through that process, she said; it led to a better plan, and “our voice was heard.” Ms. Parker said that’s why it’s important for the MPC to review major subdivisions.

Commissioner Fermin said because of the process, people reached a level of acceptance about Whitehall, even if they didn’t agree with all of the plans for the development. Ms. Parker said the public process mended some relationships with the community and the developer, as well.

Chairman Harris said he thinks everyone agrees that they want public input. Port Royal and the county have built their codes – as has the City of Beaufort – so “let’s use it for what it’s meant to do,” he said. Commissioner Alling said, “The key is” whether staff is ensuring that developers are “sticking very strictly to those rules,” and if they are, then “there’s no need to go before a board.” Chairman Harris said that’s “the Port Royal method.”

**Gordon Fritz** said he feels staff does “a great job,” but the interests of the public should not be “subordinated . . . to the efficiency of the staff.” Ms. Parker said she agrees that “staff does an incredible job of reviewing projects,” but she still believes “the public input is important.”

Commissioner Alling said the public gave its input on the Beaufort Code and agreed to it, thereby agreeing to its rules and guidelines. Mr. Somerville said there is “a lot of leeway” in interpreting the code, so that’s why “there needs to be more public input.”

Ms. Parker said it’s also important to allow “the public to support staff recommendations,” such as happened when it stated its support for staff’s recommendations for Whitehall (e.g., the tree plan); this holds “the developer accountable” for implementing those recommendations.

Commissioner Alling said staff also changes, and while there is great confidence in current city staff, “you don’t know” who might be in those positions in the future. Commissioner Rentz said the MPC right now is also very good, and the commissioners want to “hear and reflect what the public is telling us,” but they also “look out for the staff and the developer.” There could be an MPC that doesn't do that, he said, and projects could come back time and again, causing the developer to lose several months instead of a few weeks.

Mr. Prokop said the city wants public input; the issue is that “the council has no say in this. That is wrong.” Council is made up of elected officials, and they are the ones the public asks about things like Whitehall, he said. On a major subdivision like that, council people had to tell those members of the public that they have nothing to do with it.

**Jennifer Sharp** said there are a number of groups that are “watching what’s happening.” On a recent “needs assessment survey,” 1,800 citizen responses was considered “an extraordinary number,” she said, but that’s much smaller than the numbers of citizens affected. Ms. Sharp is with Beaufort Indivisible, which is also opposed to this change to the code and supports giving the public “time to research issues” and be involved in the process.

Mr. Newton said this is about “who should make the decision” on major subdivisions, but it was determined “years ago” when the MPC was established. This isn’t about design questions, he said; it’s about “bigger picture, 10,000-foot perspectives,” and the public should be allowed to be involved. Whether that takes place through the MPC or council, he said, the public should be heard.

Chairman Harris said the commissioners agree about the need for public input, but he asked how the city can do what the county and Port Royal do with major subdivisions and still allow the public to be heard. He said he doesn't have an answer, but maybe the commissioners and staff could think about it and come up with a plan by the next MPC meeting on Thursday.

Mr. Somerville said the city should decide if it wants the responsibility it “pushed off on” the MPC. City council would have to take over the MPC’s role with major subdivisions,

and he believes council would prefer to have the MPC make such decisions on big matters like Whitehall.

Commissioner Rentz asked what would happen if staff reviewed a major subdivision, and the developer couldn't meet all of the requirements; Ms. Kelly said if there's not staff consensus to approve a project, the appeal would go to the MPC. She said she'd look at state law and see where city council could be fit in. Commissioner Rentz said he doesn't know if the MPC should give city council more work without council approving of that first.

Chairman Harris said he doesn't "see it as pushing the ball around"; the commissioners will try to make it work on Thursday.

Commissioner Crower said this change is proposed from what exists now, and he asked what the impetus was for the change. Ms. Kelly said she thinks it arose from a discussion with the city administration about other entities having a different process than the City of Beaufort has. Chairman Harris said yes, they allow a board that is "fully of their town or county" to make the decision, but some are concerned that the MPC is made up of people from Port Royal, the county, and the city, yet it makes decisions for the city. He doesn't "buy into that," he said, but that's the argument that's being made.

Commissioner Alling said Port Royal wouldn't come to the MPC; they'd go to their design review board. Ms. Kelly said an idea could be for major subdivisions to go to the DRB – which hasn't seen a lot of work because of changes in the Beaufort Code – since all of its members are city residents.

Commissioner Semmler said the city continues to grow, and there's no representative of Lady's Island on city council. The impact of development led to the formation of the SICC, he said, noting that city council has sometimes voted against what the MPC has recommended. He feels the MPC should be a recommending body. There is little public notice given for MPC meetings, Commissioner Semmler said; more notice is given when city council is hearing a matter.

Just 121 residents of Lady's Island are able to vote in city elections, Mr. Newton said.

**11.7.2.A** – Landscaping non-conformities – Ms. Kelly said this proposal is for an existing property with non-conforming landscaping; if at least \$25,000 is being invested to improve the property, 5% is to be invested into getting the landscaping to conformity. She said this is *only* to address non-conforming landscaping.

Commissioner Fermin asked if this is a big enough problem to levy this on businesses. Ms. Kelly said the Oasis Hotel on Boundary Street and the laundromat on Ribaut Road are good examples of how this works because the properties were "old and needed help." The businesses didn't even spend the whole 5% on landscaping, but the city's

landscape architect went out to the sites, made recommendations to get the landscaping to conformity, which the businesses followed, and it really helped the properties, she said.

**13** – Adding a definition of a billboard

**13** – Adding a definition of “a detached garage” – This has implications on setback standards, Ms. Kelly said.

**Appendix C.2.4** – Street network diagram – This needs to be updated to show streets, Ms. Kelly said; it will be in Appendix C.

**C.6.5** – Street section: Boundary Street – What’s been built needs to show in the code, Ms. Kelly said. Chairman Harris said there was a lot of discussion about this with the development community, which offered “a lot of resistance” to it. He asked if there was language saying that these connections are “conceptual.” Ms. Kelly said there is language saying that as long as the general connection from point A to point B can be made, a developer can do that. There was a provision to review this part of the code every three months, Ms. Kelly said, so staff reached out to 303 Associates, but they’re not ready to bring in updates to it. Commissioner Semmler agreed that it’s important to make it clear that “this is not set in stone.”

**Map amendment: Salem Road shopping center** – Ms. Kelly showed the Salem Road shopping center on a map. It’s zoned T4-N now, which was an error. It should have transferred as T5-UC to permit retail, so that’s what this proposes. She told Chairman Harris this would come to the MPC as a rezoning. Ms. Kelly said all the notification has been done about this rezoning, and she’s only gotten one call, from someone who thought it was a different parcel. Chairman Harris asked if the property owner has a say. Ms. Kelly said the owner has no issues with this change.

**Map amendment: 2601, 2605, & 2607 Southside Boulevard** – On Southside Boulevard, Ms. Kelly said there have been a lot of questions about parcels that are zoned T4-Neighborhood because of the multi-family housing on that street. These lots would be downzoned to T3-N, which would make it more consistent with adjacent existing residences for someone who wants to build a single-family dwelling on a lot on Southside Boulevard.

**Map amendment: 1402 & 1408 Palmetto Street** – Ms. Kelly said two people are aggregating lots, which have different zoning (T3-N and T5-UC), and all or a part of these lots is also in the Boundary Street Redevelopment District. Staff’s proposal is to take those lots out of the Boundary Street Redevelopment District and rezone both T4-N. The owners are proposing a cottage court-style development, she said, so this recommendation would allow them to put the parcels together and develop them while

avoiding potential issues. There has been no public input on this rezoning, Ms. Kelly said.

**2.6.1.F.** – Allowing story height to be up to 24’ for certain building types in T5-UC – Ms. Kelly said she forgot to put this item on the MPC’s list: Currently, building height is measured in stories, not feet. The code says 15’ counts as one story, but certain building types (e.g., theaters, gymnasiums, convention centers) require taller floor-to-ceiling heights than that on the first floor, so in certain areas, it would be good not to penalize a building meant for those uses. She said the proposal is that in T5-UC, RMX, and Limited Industrial districts, the maximum ceiling height would be 24 feet, and that would count as one story, not two. This wouldn’t apply in the Historic District or in T4, which is “more of a transition zone to residential,” Ms. Kelly said.

Ms. Kelly said currently, an auditorium with a high ceiling could only have three more stories over it; with this proposed change, the first floor would count as only one story, so the building could have four more stories over the first floor. This would only apply when “your use is triggering” the desire for the higher ceiling height, she said.

Commissioner Alling said this sounds like something the public would want to address, because heights of buildings are a concern for many. Ms. Kelly said this provision came from “a very specialized need.” Chairman Harris said these types of spaces – movie theaters, churches, community and convention centers – are good for the community.

Mr. Somerville clarified that a 24’ floor-to-ceiling height would be counted as a single floor; Chairman Harris said yes, in certain cases. Mr. Somerville said the kinds of buildings that need this are unlikely to be 5 stories. Ms. Kelly said this came up because someone is interested in doing something like this. Mr. Somerville said if it were permitted, such a building would “stick out above everything in the neighborhood.”

Chairman Harris asked the zones in which this would apply: Ms. Kelly said T5-UC, which has the densest zoning, RMX (Regional Mixed-Use), and Limited Industrial (e.g., Burton Hill Road Industrial Park and Commerce Park). Ms. Kelly said the proposed change reads, “Certain buildings (such as gymnasiums, religious institutions, theatres, convention centers, ballrooms, concert halls, and other assembly facilities) may require finished floor-to-ceiling heights greater than 15’; in such instances, the number of stories shall be calculated as the finished floor-to-ceiling height (in feet) divided by 15. Any fractions of a story shall be rounded up to the next whole number.”

Commissioner Crower said he’s curious about what is being given up by calling a first floor over 15’ two stories instead of one. Ms. Kelly said, for example, a convention center building would not be able to have four stories of hotel on it, which is a penalty, because it could be done if there was a restaurant on the first floor instead of a convention center.

Chairman Harris said in T5-UC, this seems like an easy option, but it would not be as easy in the other districts. Commissioner Alling asked, "Why not change the number of stories allowed for everything?" Chairman Harris said this should be allowed for things the city would want to promote – such as for a convention center or a museum – if it would make the city better, so it's "probably worth it."

Commissioner Rentz said it would be worth it for a convention center; he can't imagine someone putting 4 floors on top of a gymnasium. Ms. Kelly said this idea came from 303 Associates, which wanted to expand its PUD from Marsh Gardens into the Kmart shopping center. The city wants to discourage PUDs, but there are ways to achieve 303 Associates' 5 goals, she said, within the ordinance. This provision would be used to build some kind of convention center or performing arts center; there are no plans in the works, Ms. Kelly said, but it was an effort, in some ways, not to expand a PUD.

Ms. Kelly suggested that the MPC could recommend that this would only apply in the Boundary Street Redevelopment District. The goal there is to promote more specific standards, which this would be. Commissioner Semmler said he agrees with Commissioner Fermin that it "shouldn't be a board stroke," so he likes the idea of limiting it to the Boundary Street Redevelopment District. The commissioners generally agreed that they liked limiting this to that district.

Chairman Harris asked if there would be a single vote by the MPC for all of these proposals. Ms. Kelly agreed that they could remove certain proposals and vote on them separately, and then do one vote on all of the others.

There was a discussion of what would take place at Thursday's MPC meeting.

Ms. Kelly said they need to go back to proposed changes/additions about farmers' markets and accessory buildings.

Commissioner Semmler said he feels the farmers' market ordinance is another "solution in search of a problem." Commissioner Fermin asked how different the Beaufort farmers' market is than the area across from the Naval Hospital where the food trucks wanted to go, which the MPC voted against.

Commissioner Semmler said he feels if someone wants to have a farmers' market, they should apply, and staff should approve it. Ms. Kelly said the main idea of adding this to the code was for "what happens when the market's closed": such as not leaving trucks parked there, cleanup, etc.

Commissioner Fermin asked what happens to the money the vendors at the Port Royal farmers' market pay. No one knew. Commissioner Fermin said Port Royal has a system to be in its farmers' market, and there are rules. Chairman Harris said Ms. Kelly said the Port Royal model is what Beaufort's would be based on, and Port Royal's farmers'

market seems like it has grown and is doing well, so it would be a good model for Beaufort's farmers' market.

**3.11.2** – Standards for accessory buildings to residential structures (e.g., accessory dwelling units, garage, carport, workshop, pool houses, greenhouses) – There are currently standards for all of these, but Ms. Kelly said, "They're a little bit too nuanced." If you have a garage or carport, they can be half the size of the dwelling or 1,200 square feet, but a shed can only be 320 square feet. You can't have four units if it takes you over the impervious limit, she said. The number and size of buildings is limited by the lot size, setbacks, and the primary building on the lot, Ms. Kelly said; there's only a certain amount of buildable space in the remaining area.

Ms. Kelly said this is "fairly aggressive, I think," but the property owner is limited by several things. She asked how the board feels about it, adding that she thinks it is "pretty reasonable," but it's "opposite of what we currently do." Commissioner Semmler said he feels staff should make this decision, not the MPC.

Ms. Kelly said there is not a "defined limit" currently. This proposal says you could have four things on a lot, with two of any building type. This is both "more flexible and more restrictive" than what the code says currently.

There being no further business to come before the commission, **Chairman Harris made a motion to adjourn**, and the MPC meeting ended at 4:05 p.m.