



AGENDA
BEAUFORT COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Wednesday, June 3, 2015, 2:30 p.m.

Palmetto Electric Cooperative

1 Cooperative Way, Hardeeville, SC 29927.

Phone: (843) 255-2140

Committee Members:

James Atkins / Architect

J. Michael Brock / Landscape Architect

Peter Brower / Architect-Landscape Architect

Patrick Kelly / Architect-Landscape Architect

Pearce Scott / Architect-Landscape Architect

Donald L. Starkey / At-Large

James K. Tiller / Landscape Architect

1. CALL TO ORDER – 2:30 P.M.
2. REVIEW OF APRIL 07, 2015, MEETING MINUTES ([backup](#))
3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
4. NEW BUSINESS: Conceptual Review of Grayco Bluffton Redevelopment ([backup](#))
5. OLD BUSINESS: None
6. OTHER BUSINESS: Next Scheduled Meeting—2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, July 1, 2015 at Palmetto Electric Cooperative, 1 Cooperation Way, Hardeeville, SC 29927
7. ADJOURNMENT



BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
April 7, 2015, Community Room, Palmetto Electric Cooperative

Members Present: James Atkins, J. Michael Brock, Peter Brower, Patrick Kelly, Pearce Scott, Donald L. Starkey, James K. Tiller

Staff Present: Robert Merchant, Long Range Planner; Eric Larson, Director of Environmental Engineering

Guests: Rob Montgomery, Montgomery Architecture and Planning; Ryan Lyle, Andrews and Burgess; Peggy Allard, Joe Allard, and Frank Gibson, Friends of Crystal Lake

1. CALL TO ORDER – 2:30 P.M.
2. NOMINATION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR: Robert Merchant opened nominations for a Chair of the Design Review Board. Jim Tiller nominated James Atkins. Peter Brower seconded. James Atkins was appointed Chair of the Design Review Board. Chairman Atkins opened up nominations for the position of Vice-Chair. Hearing no nominations, Mr. Atkins nominated Michael Brock for the position of Vice-Chair. Patrick Kelly seconded. Motion carried.
3. PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.
4. NEW BUSINESS: **Crystal Lake Park – Observation Tower:** Mr. Merchant gave the project background. He said that Crystal Lake Park is a 25+ acre assemblage of parcels purchased through the Beaufort County Rural and Critical Lands Preservation Program. The site contains a 6.8 acre lake along with freshwater and saltwater wetlands. Beaufort County has been working with the Friends of Crystal Lake to develop a passive park with an interpretive center; a network of trails and boardwalks encircling the lake; and offices for the Beaufort Open Land Trust and the SC Soil and Water Conservation District. He said that the Northern Beaufort County Corridor Review Board had already approved the building rehab, parking lot and landscaping, and that plans were submitted for reference purposes only. The Design Review Board was being asked to look at the architecture of the tower. Mr. Merchant said that in evaluating the tower using the architectural standards of Section 5.3.30 of the Community Development Code with the exception of the requirement that new buildings are compatible with surrounding buildings and the minimum roof pitch of 4:12. The proposed project is a landmark building and therefore by its very nature is meant to be singular and stand out.

Rob Montgomery, the project's architect, presented for the applicant. He said that Crystal Lake is unique because it acts as a filtration system for the entire neighborhood. It is also the headwaters of Distant Island Creek and during high tide, the water is brackish. He said that the tower is being proposed so that people can see the importance of filtering stormwater and the unique position of Crystal Lake in its watershed. Mr. Montgomery said that the

superstructure is wood pilings with a heavy timber finish. He said that the observation deck is at 71 feet and that the footprint of the tower is 30 feet by 30 feet. He said that the tower will be connected to the building with a covered walkway. He said that the proposed tower is twice as tall as the tower at the Sands in Port Royal. He said the top of the bell tower at St. Peters is 135 feet and that the bell platform sits as 95 feet above grade.

Mr. Atkins called for public comment. Joe Allard mentioned that there was a lot of enthusiasm from both north and south of the Broad River for the proposed rain garden. Peggy Allard said that Rick Kurz, the vice-president of the Friends of Crystal Lake, leads tours of the property of groups of 20 to 25 people and usually has a long waiting list. About 50% of the people attending the tours live in Bluffton and Hilton Head Island. She emphasized that the tower will help to explain the unique position of Crystal Lake in its watershed. Frank Gibson, the treasure of the Friends, said that he owns the buildings on either side of the site and has no problems with the proposed tower.

Mr. Tiller said that his firm was involved with the original landscaping plan and that it did not take into account the tower. He said that the proposed structure is not compatible with the surroundings. He felt that the building should be better shrouded in vegetation. He said that St. Peters is set back and hidden in the trees.

Mr. Brower said he shared some of Mr. Tiller's comments. He said that if the tower was used for commercial purposes, such as for a miniature golf course or entrance to a gated community, the Board would be compelled to turn it down. He said that he has mixed feelings about the project. He felt that the County should be held to the same standards as its citizens.

Mr. Scott asked for clarification on the materials and colors. Mr. Montgomery said that it would be weathered wood and galvanized bolts. Mr. Scott said the project was different than a commercial project because it had a function that benefitted the community. He liked the weathered finish and open feel of the project.

Mr. Starkey said that the tall trees and the bell tower at St. Peters will not make the project stand out as much. Mr. Starkey asked about provisions for handicap accessibility. Mr. Montgomery said that they are considering a camera at the observation deck that would transmit to a monitor in the visitors' center.

Mr. Brock asked about the height limit. Mr. Merchant said that accessory structures in parks are exempt from zoning height limits. Mr. Montgomery said that building codes had a limit of 85 feet. Mr. Brock said he supported the project. He asked if the tower would be secured at night. Mr. Montgomery said that it would.

Mr. Kelly said he supported the project as a whole. He asked if the tower would be lit. Mr. Montgomery said that it would not be lit except at the ground level. Mr. Kelly asked if the project was priced out. He was concerned that if the project came over budget, the design would be altered. Mr. Montgomery said that they are budgeting \$250,000 and that several experts said that this estimate is very generous and that the actual cost is more in the

neighborhood of \$180,000. Mr. Kelly said that with such an iconic project, he would like to see more classical proportions, such as a more pronounced pedestal and top piece. Mr. Montgomery said that since the tower is being secured, the base will be larger.

Mr. Atkins said that the project is a little heavy handed architecturally. He said that traditional fire towers are lighter and that one can experience the landscape as they climb. He preferred a lighter structure.

Addressing Mr. Starkey's concern, Mr. Gibson said that the boardwalk to the lake and the building were handicapped accessible. He said that the park will have a lot to offer, and that the tower will be the icing on the cake.

Mr. Brower asked if the project was exempt from the architectural standards in the new code. Mr. Merchant said that it was exempt from height limits but not architectural standards. Mr. Tiller said if the building was lighter in design, it would blend better. He said that along a busy roadway, it will stand out. He said more vegetation was needed to shroud the tower.

Mr. Scott motioned to approve the tower with the following conditions:

- The base of the tower will be redesigned to be more prominent and act as a pedestal for the tower.
- The applicant will look at options to lighten the structure, such as providing more openings in the tower.
- The applicant will landscaping plan will be revised to provide more vertical screening to soften the view of the tower from the highway.
- The applicant will rework the proportion of the top of the tower to make the top begin at the observation level.
- The applicant will provide staff and one Board member revised architectural elevations and landscaping plans that meet the above conditions.

Mr. Kelly seconded. Motion carried with Mr. Tiller abstaining.

5. OLD BUSINESS: There was no old business.
6. OTHER BUSINESS: Mr. Merchant provided the Board members with copies of the Board membership, meeting dates, and the architectural and landscaping standards of the new Code.
7. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm.

Grayco Bluffton Redevelopment

Type of Submission:	Conceptual
Developer:	David Oliver, JAZ Development, LLC
Architect:	Chris Nardone, AIA, CNNA Architects, Inc.
Engineer:	Ryan Lyle, PE, Andrews & Burgess, Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Michael Small, RLA, LEED AP
Type of Project:	Commercial Retail
Location:	Located on the north side of US 278 at the site of the former Grayco Building Center and Green Thumb nursery directly east of Home Depot and the Volvo Dealership
Zoning Designation:	C5 – Regional Center Mixed Use
Project Information:	The applicant is proposing to redevelop a 10.6 acre site that is currently occupied by the Grayco Building Center and Green Thumb nursery at the northwest corner of US 278 and Timblestone Road. The proposed development would include a 98,500 square foot shopping center with two outparcels totaling 15,800 square feet. The site consists of three parcels (the shopping center and two outparcels) that will share stormwater and open space. The County's new commercial subdivision provision allows for a multi-parcel commercial site to be master planned and eliminates internal buffer and setback requirements for individual parcels.

This project was reviewed by the Southern Beaufort County Corridor Review Board at their December 10, 2014 meeting. At that time, the Board took no action, but offered the following comments.

- The building needs to have better expression of Lowcountry architecture;
- There needs to be more architectural cohesion between tenant spaces;
- There needs to be clarification on how stormwater will be treated on the site, how the wetland will be paved over, and how many pervious parking spaces will be required.
- More articulation needs to be provided to the facades, especially the side facades. Colonnades may be a good feature to help articulation.

Some revisions have been made to the site plan and the building's architecture. The project received conceptual approval from the DRT on April 29. The project was first reviewed under the old ordinance (ZDSO) and vested under the provisions of that ordinance. The architectural standards are provided below.

The applicant has submitted architectural elevations and a site plan for conceptual review.

Southern Beaufort County Corridor Review Board: Staff Report
June 3, 2015

The design of all applicable structures including habitable structures, walls, fences, signs, light fixtures and accessory and appurtenant structures shall be unobtrusive and of a design, material and color that blend harmoniously with the natural surroundings, and the scale of neighboring architecture, complying with the intent of this section. Innovative, high quality design and development is strongly encouraged to enhance property values and long-term economic assets along designated corridors.

Roofs. Roof overhangs and pitched roofs shall be incorporated into all building designs. Wood shingles, slate shingles, multilayered asphalt shingles, metal (raised seam, galvanized metal, corrugated metal, metal tile, etc.), or tiles are permitted. Not permitted - Partial (less than three sides) mansard roofs; Flat roofs (including a minimum pitch less than 4:12) without a pediment; Long, unarticulated roofs.

Sides of buildings and structures. Wood clapboard, wood board and batten, wood shingle siding, brick, stucco, tabby, natural stone, faced concrete block and artificial siding material which resembles painted wood clapboard are permitted. Wood siding may be painted, stained, weathered, or left natural. Not permitted - Long, unarticulated, blank facades; Plywood, cinder block, unfinished poured concrete, unfaced concrete block, and plastic or vinyl, not closely resembling painted wood clapboard. No metal buildings without exterior skin; Highly reflective glass or materials as the predominant material or visible texture.

Colors. Predominant color design shall be compatible with Lowcountry or coastal vernacular palette which include traditional historic colors, earth tones (greens, tans, light browns and terracotta), grays, pale primary and secondary colors (with less than 50 percent color value), white and cream tones, and oxblood red. Accent color design (i.e., black, dark blue, grays, and other dark primary colors) may be used on a limited basis as part of an architectural motif, at the discretion of the development review manager and/or the CRB. Not permitted - Color contrasts resulting in a clearly disturbing appearance. Primary colors.

Accessory uses. The design of accessory buildings and structures, if permitted within the applicable zoning district, shall reflect and coordinate with the general style of architecture inherent in the primary structure for the proposed development. Covered porches, canopies, awnings, trellises, gazebos, street/pedestrian furniture and open wood fences are encouraged.
Not permitted - Unscreened chainlink or woven metal fences; Internally illuminated and/or neon lighted exterior architectural or structural element(s) that is/are visible from the highway; Exterior storage not completely hidden from view; and Exterior display of merchandise except for landscape structure, plant materials and agricultural products.

Staff Comments: The Design Review Board will need to determine whether the proposed elevations meet the requirements prohibiting long unarticulated blank facades, and that the design adequately incorporates roof overhangs and pitched roofs.