



AGENDA
BEAUFORT COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Wednesday, August 5, 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 JULY 8, 2015, MEETING MINUTES ([backup](#))
3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
4. NEW BUSINESS: Conceptual Review of McDonalds, 22 Sams Point Way, Lady's Island ([backup](#))
5. OLD BUSINESS:
 - a. Final Review of Grayco Bluffton Redevelopment ([backup](#))
 - b. Final Review of Bluffton Fire District Maintenance and Training Facility ([backup](#))
6. OTHER BUSINESS: Next Scheduled Meeting—2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, September 2, 2015 at Palmetto Electric Cooperative, 1 Cooperation Way, Hardeeville, SC 29927
7. ADJOURNMENT



BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
July 8, 2015, Community Room, Palmetto Electric Cooperative

Members Present: James Atkins, J. Michael Brock, Peter Brower, Donald L. Starkey

Members Absent: Patrick Kelly, James K. Tiller

Staff Present: Robert Merchant, Long Range Planner

Guests: Andy Harper, Court Atkins Architects; Ryan Lyle, Andrews and Burgess; Chris Nardone, CNNA Architects, Inc.; David Oliver, JAZ Development; Greg Baisch, Ward Edwards; Tom Michaels, Architect

1. CALL TO ORDER – 2:30 P.M.
2. PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.
3. MINUTES: Mr. Brock motioned to approve the minutes of the June 3 meeting of the Design Review Board. Mr. Brower seconded. Motion carried.
4. NEW BUSINESS: **Bluffton Fire District** - James and Michael recused themselves. Mr. Merchant gave the project background. He said that the applicant is proposing to construct an 11,740 square foot maintenance building for the Bluffton Fire District located behind Station #30. The proposed building would share a 9.24 acre parcel with Station #30 which was completed two years ago. The site would also include a 40 foot tall training tower. The tower is a prepackaged training apparatus which he said he requested that the applicant present at the meeting. The project was given conceptual review by the Staff Review Team (formerly DRT) in June. The project is vested under the former Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance because it is part of a multi-phase development approved under the old ordinance. He said that the proposed structure was a pre-engineered metal building that would have metal siding that simulates board and batten. The roof would be a standing seam metal roof and incorporate overhangs and brackets.

Andy Harper presented for the applicant. He passed out images of the training tower. He said that the applicant would like to consider the tower a tool rather than a structure.

Mr. Scott asked what side the tall part of the tower was. Mr. Harper said it would be closest to Burnt Church because they need access around the structure.

Mr. Brower said that it looked like a good project. He would like to see the brackets have more of a vertical element than a horizontal one. Mr. Harper said the building was secondary to the fire station. He said that the buffer should screen the building.

Mr. Starkey asked how tall the trees were around the site. Mr. Harper said that they were mature trees. Mr. Starkey said that behind the dumpster there was a square. Mr. Harper said it was a pump station.

Mr. Scott asked if the board and batten was used on all four sides. Mr. Harper said it was. Mr. Scott asked if the detailing - columns and brackets would match station. Mr. Harper said yes. Mr. Scott said he was concerned about the height of the tower and where it was located on the site. Mr. Harper said it was sided with metal.

Mr. Brower motioned to conceptually approve the project. Mr. Starkey seconded. Motion carried.

5. **OLD BUSINESS: Grayco Bluffton Redevelopment:** Mr. Merchant gave the project background. He said that 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. He said that the project was given conditional conceptual approval by the Design Review Board at their June 3, 2015 meeting and that revised plans were submitted that address most of the comments. Mr. Merchant said that the Board asked that Outparcels B and C need to be restudied to provide consistency in architecture and incorporate more Lowcountry architecture. He said that no changes have been made architecturally Outparcels B and C. The Board did not conceptually approve Anchor A. The revised plans show the space to be redesigned and more consistent with the standards of the Corridor Overlay District, and that minor changes were made to Anchor B and the shop façade. He said that the Board asked for the right-in/right-out access lane to be realigned. The revised plans show the lane to be realigned to line up with the parking aisle and preserving four oaks. The Board requested the applicant provide larger tree islands. He said that only minor changes had been made. He said that the applicant would address the Board's request to provide more screening of the service drive aisles. He said that the pump station had been removed from its prominent location at the intersection of 278 and Timblestone Road as requested by the Board. He said that the new plans showed the location of the dumpster enclosures for the outparcels. Mr. Merchant said that the only additional comments he had is that he requested that the applicant bring material and color samples and details of the columns, shutters and brackets to the meeting. Also, Mr. Merchant said that the lacebark elms planted in parking lot islands needed to be at least 3 ½" caliper at time of planting.

Ryan Lyle presented for the applicant. He introduced Chris Nardone, Mike Smalls, and David Oliver. He said that the right in-right out intersection was realigned and they plan to keep the oak trees. Mr. Lyle said that the landscape islands in the front exceeded the minimum size. He said on the rear buffer, they provided additional screening and a fence. He said they worked with BJWSA and will pursue gravity sewer. If they use a pump station it will be on the rear of the site.

Chris Nardone presented the project's architecture. He said Anchor B was revised to go with a flat roof to lower the height of the space. He said the towers were basically the same. He

said that the shop space was broken down into 4 tenants, but the space was flexible. He said they undulated the wainscoting. They incorporated columns into more of the project and on the trellises. The unifying themes were the towers, columns, brick bases, stucco and lap siding. He said that little change was made to Outparcels B and C. He said they went from stucco to hardi-plank. He passed out material samples. He also passed out a dumpster enclosure detail. He said that the Anchor A design is more solidified.

Mike Smalls presented the landscaping. He said that they did end caps to the end islands closest to the shopping center to reduce people walking through the landscaping. He said they added wax myrtles along the rear road along with a wood board-on-board fence to screen loading areas.

Peter Brower said it was a big improvement over the last submittal; especially the links between the anchor tenants. He said Outparcels B and C needed to have the same vocabulary as the other buildings. Chris said that the stair enclosure on the side facade was provided to tie the feature in architecturally.

Mr. Brock asked what the paver material was. Mr. Smalls said it would match or compliment the building – perhaps *Sweetgrass* or *Lowcountry Paver*. Mr. Smalls said they were putting in more trees than required.

Mr. Scott agreed with Mr. Brower. He said that Anchor B still needed a little help, it seemed like a bunch of elements that didn't go together well. He said the same about Outparcel B.

Mr. Starkey had two issues. He said that in the front elevation of Anchor C, the parapet needed mass behind it. Mr. Nardone said there should be more depth to it. He said it will be wider because of the stairs. Mr. Starkey asked if a parapet could be used to break up the rear and side facade of Anchor A. Mr. Nardone said that they wanted to put more money into the more visible facades. He said he could articulate the parapet a little better.

Mr. Atkins said that they still may have a thin parapet on Anchor C. He asked to redesign around the front to give more thickness to the parapet wall. He felt that minimal articulation was needed to the side facade of Anchor A. He said that Anchor B needed more work and can possibly use sloped roof to match the entrance feature in Anchor A. He said to revisit arch in Outparcel B. Mr. Atkins also had issues with the mint green and bright blue awning. He said the polo blue was better. Mr. Nardone said they would tone down those two colors.

Mr. Brower said that the undulations on the front elevation didn't match the rear elevation. Mr. Nardone said that the rear roof is taller than the front for drainage. The rear parapet is 28 feet for Anchor A. The shop rear facade could be lower. Mr. Starkey asked if all the air handling is below the visible line. Mr. Nardone said that that was their goal in designing the parapets. Mr. Starkey said that there were places in the parking lot that didn't meet the minimum illumination requirements. Mr. Nardone said that the two plans were not coordinated. The front drive has more illumination because of architectural lighting. The sidewalk may need more lighting.

Peter Brower motioned to not grant final approval and for the applicant to address the following architectural issues at the next meeting:

- Rework the façade on Anchor B to unify the elements together better;
- Rework Outparcel B to fit in better architecturally with the rest of the buildings and facades.
- Address the parapet on the side elevation of Anchor C to give it more depth.
- Address the side elevation of Anchor A to provide more articulation.

Mr. Brower, Mr. Brock and Mr. Scott voted Yes. Mr. Atkins and Mr. Starkey voted No. Motion carried.

5. OTHER BUSINESS: Mr. Starkey said that he would like to have digital copies attached to email and not worry about having paper copies of plans sent to Board members. Rob said he would look at it and poll the members via an email and determine how to move forward.

Greg Baisch and Eric Hoover of Ward Edwards and architect Tom Michaels requested to bring an off agenda item to the Board. Greg Baisch presented. He said they were looking at a Home2 Suites by Hilton Hotel at 196 Okatie Village Drive in Okatie Center. He said it would be next to the Food Lion shopping center near Sun City. He said that he intended to extend the street from Food Lion south of the building as a street. They will provide parallel parking along that street. He said that the pool area will be revised with an outdoor pool near the intersection. Mr. Michaels said it would be a four story building. He said he was trying to bridge between the corporate requirements and the Boards requirements. He said most of the exterior materials were stucco. Greg said that the project would need a PUD amendment to divide the parcel into two. Mr. Brower said he didn't have a problem with the building at this location. Mr. Starkey said he did not prefer stone because it wasn't a local material. Mr. Atkins said that the building needed to incorporate sloped roofs on canopies and entrances. Also consider pergola elements to give the project more local character. The project should use hardi-plank instead of stone.

6. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 pm.

McDonald's – 22 Sams Point Way

Type of Submission:	Conceptual
Applicant:	McDonald's USA, LLC
Project Architect:	Andrew Paul Knight
Project Engineer:	Anthony Lynch, P.E.; Waylon Hoge, P.E., Integrity Engineering
Type of Project:	Retail
Location:	Located on Lady's Island on the northeast corner of Sea Island Parkway and Sams Point Way
Zoning Designation:	ZDSO Designation - Lady's Island Village Center

Project Information: The applicant is proposing to remove the existing 3,011 square foot McDonald's restaurant on Lady's Island and replace it with a 4,218 square foot building that conforms to the new image for McDonald's. The new restaurant will have 50 parking spaces and a drive-through lane that contains dual order points. The larger building and expanded drive-through configuration will result in the parking lot being 15 feet closer to Sea Island Parkway than the existing site. A detention pond is located between the parking lot and Sea Island Parkway that handles stormwater for the entire Food Lion shopping center. The pond will remain; however, the encroaching parking lot will require a retaining wall to be constructed on the north side of the pond. The revised site plan will require the removal of three Bradford pears and one 15" caliper live oak that were planted when the parcel was originally developed.

Lady's Island Village Center Standards: Since the project was conceptually reviewed by the DRT in October 2014, it is vested under the standards of the Lady's Island Village Center district in the ZDSO. The Beaufort County Zoning Administrator has determined that the project is part of the 50,000+ square foot "Oaks at Lady's Island" shopping center. Therefore the removal and replacement of the restaurant does not exceed 15% of the total square footage of the shopping center and does not trigger the project needing to conform to the site planning standards of the Lady's Island Village Center district.

The architectural standards of the Village Center district do need to be met. The district requires specific architectural standards such as roofs, eaves, windows, doors, and storefronts are designed at an appropriate pedestrian scale. These standards are attached to the staff report.

Special Use Permit: When the DRT conceptually reviewed this project, they directed the applicant to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBOA) for a Special Use Permit due to the site's non-compliance with the standards of the Lady's Island Village Center district. The applicant is also seeking to reduce the required number of parking spaces from 59 to 50. The DRT is requesting that the Corridor Review Board provide comments that will inform the decision made by the ZBOA.

Arborist Report: The DRT requested that the applicant provide an arborist report determining whether the 16" and 36" live oaks located near the footprint of the new building would be salvageable since they are shown as being saved on the site plan. On page 6, third paragraph, the

report states that the trees are good candidates for conservancy.

Submittal: Attached are the site plan, architectural elevations, and an arborist report for conceptual review.

Staff Comments:

1. The DRB will need to determine whether this building has architectural styles compatible with the Lowcountry as required by the Lady's Island Village Center standards.
2. Cut stone is not an approved exterior material in the Village Center district. However, the Corridor Review Board can consider materials that are not specified in the district on a case-by-case basis.
3. Fixed frame windows are required to have a maximum size of 36 square feet.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

A. *General guidelines.*

1. Architectural styles should be compatible with architectural styles that exemplify the unique character of the Lowcountry region and conform to general standards of architectural quality. It is not the intention of these guidelines to create replicas or imitations of historic structures.
2. The same level of architectural integrity shall be applied to all four elevations of the building.
3. Building materials not specified below will be permitted on a case-by-case basis if the application of such materials is incorporated in an architecturally sound design and otherwise meets the objectives of this section.

B. *Urban design guidelines.*

1. Site and building design shall emphasize pedestrian needs and develop creative approaches to improving pedestrian interest, access and enjoyment. All buildings shall have a functional entrance at the front elevation.
2. The sequence of continuous pedestrian activity shall not be interrupted. Blank walls and other "dead" or dull spaces at the street level shall be avoided. Visually interesting activities at the sidewalk edge shall be maintained and/or established to engage pedestrian interest. A wall can be articulated with a change in material, a water table, pilasters, or even a trellis attached to the wall to grow plants.
3. Frontage design and signage locations shall be coordinated with streetscape landscaping and street trees.
4. Pedestrian open spaces such as covered walkways, loggias, arcades, courtyards and plazas are encouraged, as well as the development of open and attractive passageways between buildings and blocks.

C. *Exterior materials and architectural elements.*

1. *Roofs:*

- a. *General requirements:* Applied or incomplete mansard roofs are prohibited. Flat flush soffit returns on gabled ends are not permitted (see diagram 1.1). Long, unarticulated roofs are not permitted. Exposed rafter ends or tails at overhangs are strongly recommended.
- b. *Pitch:* Pitched roofs shall have a minimum pitch of 5:12. Buildings having a flat roof shall incorporate a parapet at the front elevation of the building to screen the roof and any equipment located there.
- c. *Materials:* Permitted roof materials include metal (raised seam, galvanized metal, corrugated metal), shingles (slate, multi-layered asphalt, metal).

- d. *Configuration of materials:* Maximum spacing of raised seam metal roofs shall be 24 inches. Panel ends shall be exposed at overhang. Shingles may be square, rectangular, fish scale, or shield.
2. *Building walls:*
 - a. *General requirements:* Building elevations fronting the street or the waterfront shall have a minimum fenestration (doors and windows) coverage of 50% on the first story and 30% for the entire street front and waterfront elevation. Long, unarticulated or blank facades are not permitted.
 - b. *Materials:* Permitted materials include wood siding, wood board-and-batten, "Hardie-Plank," concrete masonry units with stucco, reinforced concrete with stucco, and brick (not encouraged).
 - c. *Configuration of materials:* The width of wood, "Hardie-Plank," and other materials shall conform to traditional or historic uses that these materials are meant to emulate. Stucco surfaces shall be fine sand float or medium sand float according to the Portland Cement Association.
 3. *Windows and doors:*
 - a. *General requirements:* Rectangular windows facing the street shall have vertical orientation.
 - b. *Materials:* Windows and doors may use framing materials of wood, aluminum, copper, and vinyl clad wood. Windows fronting streets or the waterfront shall use transparent, non-reflective and non-tinted materials.
 - c. *Window and door types:* Casement and single- and double-hung windows are encouraged. Fixed-frame windows shall have a maximum surface area of 36 square feet. Windows with muttons shall have true divided lights or simulated divided lights. Snap-on muttons are not permitted.
 4. *Colors:* Predominant color design shall be compatible with Lowcountry or coastal vernacular palette which include traditional historic colors, earth tones (green, tans, light browns and terra cotta), grays, pale primary and secondary colors (with less than 50% 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 planner and/or the corridor review board.
 5. *Other architectural features:*
 - a. *Columns:* Permitted materials for columns include wood (painted or natural), cast iron, or concrete with smooth finish. Columns may be square or round with a minimum nominal width or nominal diameter of 6 inches. Maximum column spacing shall be no greater than the height of the columns.
 - b. *Accessory buildings and uses:* The design of accessory buildings shall reflect and coordinate with the general style of architecture inherent in the primary

structure for the proposed development. Outdoor seating areas and play equipment shall be reviewed for compatible and attractive design that is integrated with the main building architecture.

- c. *Fences and walls:* Unscreened chain-link fences or woven metal fences are not permitted. Permitted materials for walls are concrete masonry units with stucco, or reinforced concrete with stucco. Permitted materials for fences are wood, and wrought iron.
- d. *Shutters:* Individual shutters, if utilized, shall be real, operable, and cover the entire window when closed.
- e. *Pedestrian paving:* Paving materials shall consist of brick, stone, wood, concrete, or oyster shell aggregate concrete.
- f. *Towers:* Habitable towers may exceed the building height by up to 35 percent but shall not exceed a height of 50 feet. The maximum footprint allowed for a tower is 150 square feet. One habitable tower per building is permitted.

D. *Landscaping and buffers.* In addition to the following landscaping requirements, the landscaping standards outlined in section 106-1646 et seq. of this chapter apply to all developments in this district. All landscaping required by this section, and approved as part of an application for development, shall be maintained in healthy condition by the property owner. Plant material used for installation shall conform to the standards established by the American Association of Nurserymen in the American Standards for Nursery Stock provisions. Landscaping requirements of this chapter shall not interfere with fire and life safety standards contained in this chapter.

1. *Installation requirements:* Installation and maintenance of landscaping materials shall adhere to section 106-1647 of this chapter.
2. *Existing plant material counted:* The use of existing vegetation and plant species native to the Lowcountry is strongly encouraged, and shall be counted toward the landscaping requirement.
3. *Landscaping along street frontage:* Planters, window boxes, hanging plants and potted plants are strongly encouraged along front elevations of buildings.
4. *Foundation buffers:* A three-foot wide landscaped buffer is required between the side and rear elevations of the building and parking areas, driving areas, and sidewalks. Foundation buffers are not required in loading areas and drive-through facility areas.
5. *Parking lot planting requirements:* The parking lot planting requirements outlined in the landscaping section of the corridor overlay district guidelines in this appendix apply to the Lady's Island Village Center District.

Grayco Bluffton Redevelopment

Type of Submission:	Final
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

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 Design Review Board at their July 8 meeting. At that time, the Board motioned to table final approval of the project until several architectural issues were addressed. Below is a list of these architectural issues and how these comments have been addressed in the resubmittal.

- Rework the façade on Anchor B to unify the elements together better. *The Anchor B façade was modified to include only the central section of the parapet entrance.*
- Rework Outparcel B to fit in better architecturally with the rest of the buildings and facades. *Outparcel B was modified to change the partial arch to a flat parapet.*
- Address the parapet on the side elevation of Anchor C to give it more depth. *The parapet was modified so that from the front elevation it has more depth than the previous design.*
- Address the side elevation of Anchor A to provide more articulation. *The side elevation of Anchor A was modified to provide better articulation.*

In addition to the comments included in the motion, the Board requested that proposed mint green color and the blue awnings needed to be toned down. These revised materials will be brought to the meeting. The Board also requested that the lighting plan show the photometrics of the combined architectural and site lighting. This lighting plan is included in the packet, however an electronic version that is more legible will be sent to the Board members for review.

The applicant has provided revised architectural elevations, and a revised lighting plan. The site and landscaping plans were included in the submission as well to make the submission complete.

Staff Comments: Staff has no comments.

Bluffton Fire District Maintenance and Training Facility

Type of Submission:	Final
Developer:	Bluffton Fire District
Architect:	James Atkins, Court Atkins Architects, Inc.
Engineer:	Heath Duncan, PE, Ward Edwards
Type of Project:	Institutional
Location:	Located on the northwest corner of Burnt Church and Ulmer Road in Bluffton directly behind Fire Station #30.
Zoning Designation:	ZDSO Zoning Designation – Alljoy Road Office Commercial Mixed Use (Project is vested under former ordinance)

The applicant is proposing to construct an 11,740 square foot maintenance building for the Bluffton Fire District located behind Station #30. The proposed building shares a 9.24 acre parcel with Station #30 which was completed in 2013. The site will also include a 40 foot tall training tower. The tower is a prepackaged training apparatus which will be presented at the meeting. The project was given conceptual review by the Staff Review Team (formerly DRT) in June. The project is vested under the former Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance because it is part of a multi-phase development approved under the old ordinance.

The proposed structure is a pre-engineered metal building and will have metal siding that simulates board and batten. The roof will be a standing seam metal roof and incorporate overhangs and brackets.

The project was given conceptual approval by the DRB at their July 8 meeting. The applicant has resubmitted for final review and has included a site plan, architectural elevations, a landscaping plan, and a lighting plan.

Staff Comment:

1. The trees proposed to be planted in tree islands need to be at least 3 ½” caliper at time of planting. This needs to be revised on the landscaping plan.