



AGENDA
BEAUFORT COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, October 7, 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 AUGUST 5, 2015, MEETING MINUTES (backup)
3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
4. NEW BUSINESS: Conceptual Review of Bluffton Gateway Outparcels (backup)
5. OLD BUSINESS: Final Review of McDonalds, 22 Sams Point Way, Lady's Island (backup)
6. OTHER BUSINESS: Next Scheduled Meeting—2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, November 4, 2015 at Palmetto Electric Cooperative, 1 Cooperation Way, Hardeeville, SC 29927
7. ADJOURNMENT



BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
August 5, 2015, Community Room, Palmetto Electric Cooperative

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

Members Absent: Peter Brower

Staff Present: Robert Merchant, Long Range Planner

Guests: Anthony Lynch, PE, Integrity Engineering; Michael Smalls; David Oliver, JAZ Development; David Hale, CNNA Architects; Becky Sharp, McDonalds Corporation; and Michael Eggers, McDonalds Franchise Owner

1. CALL TO ORDER – 2:30 P.M.
2. PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.
3. MINUTES: Mr. Scott motioned to approve the minutes of the July 8 meeting of the Design Review Board. Mr. Brock seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Lynch requested to have the Lady’s Island McDonalds item moved to later in the agenda.

4. OLD BUSINESS:

A. **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 reviewed by the Design Review Board at their July 8 meeting where the Board tabled final approval of the project until several architectural issues were addressed. The Board requested that the Anchor B façade be reworded. The Board requested Outparcel B fit better architecturally with the rest of the buildings and facades. The Board wanted the parapet on the side elevation of Anchor C to be given more depth. The Board requested that the mint green color and the blue awnings be toned down. They requested that the lighting plan show the photometrics of the combined architectural and site lighting. Finally, the Board requested that the side elevation of Anchor A be giving more articulation. All of these revisions were made by the applicant in the revised drawings.

David Hale, CNNA Architects presented for the applicant. He passed out revised architectural elevations and material samples. He said that the revised drawings were

similar except for the changed painted colors. He discussed the revision of Anchor B and said that it was simplified to match the overall detailing for the rest of the shopping center. He said that the parapet on the side elevation of Anchor C has a longer return so that it doesn't appear so thin from the front view. The elevation of Outparcel B was revised to get rid of the arched parapet. He said they tried to articulate the side elevation of Anchor A. He also brought details of the brackets and information on the Bermuda shutters.

Mr. Scott said the revisions were good. Mr. Starkey said that they fixed all the issues that the Board had with the recent submittal. Mr. Brock asked about the side of Anchor A. He asked if the height of the palms would match what the elevations showed. Mr. Smalls said after a couple of years they would. Mr. Atkins agreed that the modifications met the Board's comments. Mr. Tiller asked if they were going to have shopping carts. Mr. Oliver said that some of the tenants would. Mr. Tiller said that usually the front portion of the parking lot gets destroyed by the carts. He said that he usually plants grass in these locations or else the vegetation would get destroyed. Mr. Smalls said he would take it under consideration.

Mr. Brock motioned to approve the project as submitted. Mr. Starkey seconded. Motion carried.

- B. Bluffton Fire District Maintenance and Training Facility:** Mr. Atkins and Mr. Brock recused themselves. Mr. Scott chaired the meeting. 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. He said that 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. He said that the trees proposed to be planted in tree islands need to be at least 3 ½" caliper at time of planting.

Mr. Tiller said that all of the trees would be removed in the area that is to be disturbed. He asked what the mitigation plan was. Andy Harper of Court Atkins said the mitigation would be on site. Mr. Tiller said that the Board would need to see what the mitigation trees would be in order to review the landscaping plan. Mr. Tiller said that the plans showed expansion on the northeast side of the site. He wanted to know how the Board could justify removing the trees at this location. A representative from the Fire District said that they needed an area for trailers and other items for outdoor storage. He said that future expansion would include having another bay on the building. Mr. Tiller wants to know why all the trees need to be removed right now. Mr. Starkey said that a note on the drawing said that the tree mitigation would be met with 2 1/2 inch magnolia trees.

Mr. Tiller looked at the lighting plan and found conflicts with the proposed fixtures and proposed trees to be planted. He also noticed that there was a lighting plan prepared just for the building lights. He asked if they looked at the site lighting and what the cumulative effect would be on the combined lighting. Mr. Harper said that he did not. Mr. Harper said that he would refer to Ward Edwards for info on mitigated trees. Mr.

Tiller had a question about irrigation. He said that the plans showed a drip system. He said that the plans were not clear on how much irrigation was proposed and how it would be accomplished.

Mr. Scott had no comments on the architecture except that it was consistent with the fire station.

Mr. Tiller motioned to ask the applicant to take up the issues that the Board raised with the tree mitigation, landscaping, and lighting and provide staff with revised plans. Mr. Kelly seconded. Motion carried.

5. **NEW BUSINESS: Mc Donald's - 22 Sams Point Way:** Mr. Merchant gave the project background. He said that 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. He said that 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.

He said that the project was conceptually reviewed by the DRT in October 2014; and it is vested under the standards of the Lady's Island Village Center district in the ZDSO. The Beaufort County Zoning Administrator had 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. He said that the architectural standards of the Village Center district do need to be met.

He said that 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.

He said that 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. He said that 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. He also said that fixed frame windows are required to have a maximum size of 36 square feet.

Mr. Lynch presented for the applicant. He introduced Becky Sharp of McDonalds Corporation and Michael Eggers, the franchise owner. Mr. Tiller commended arborist report

done by Preservation Tree. He said that this type of detailed report is necessary to determine whether trees can be saved. Mr. Tiller asked if it was the applicant's intent to follow the instructions from the report. Mr. Lynch said that they would and found the report very helpful. He also said that the architecture is striking.

Mr. Starkey said that he appreciated the changes. He noticed that the roof had a more Lowcountry look. He said that the awnings made it more than just a brick building. He felt that the drive through elevation needed more work such as awnings to better articulate. Ms. Sharp asked if more color was needed, or more brick. She said that awnings may be hit by cars. Mr. Starkey said that if the drive-thru windows have the same treatment of the entrance elevations on the opposite facade. Ms. Sharp asked if the stone was specifically prohibited or if the Board had more discretion.

Mr. Scott said he had issues with the stone as well and said that tabby stucco or vertical board and batten would be a better choice. He also requested divisions in the windows, perhaps asymmetrical layout to play on features in the elevation.

Mr. Brock asked for clarification from staff on what requirements the Board would apply. Mr. Merchant said that the architecture would need to meet the Lady's Island Village center standards. Mr. Brock said that the proposed plans offered more area around the trees, but said that how the trees are treated over the next 5 years would greatly impact whether the trees would survive. Mr. Brock mirrored the comments made about the stone. He also supported the requested treatment of the drive through windows. Mr. Brock preferred tabby as an alternative to stone. Mr. Starkey was concerned that a lot of parking was on the drive through side. He said that people walking across that area were not always paying attention. He requested a pedestrian feature that would aid in getting pedestrians back to those parking spaces. Mr. Lynch said that would put a stainless steel fence at the entrance to keep people from walking in front of cars.

Mr. Kelly also supported changing the stone material to stucco or tabby. He asked what the dimensions were of the proposed windows. He said that he did not have issues with the design of the windows.

Mr. Atkins said that the windows could have a simple horizontal and vertical division of lights on the windows. He commended the sparing use of the McDonald's yellow on the awnings. He said that more pervious area around the trees would help to preserve the trees.

Mr. Tiller said that the new McDonalds had very bright order areas at the drive through were very bright. Ms. Sharp said they could request a less bright material for the canopy. Mr. Atkins asked that it could match the metal on the roof.

Mr. Starkey motioned to approve conceptually the project with the following conditions:

- Change the proposed stone material to stucco or tabby.

- Revise the north (drive-thru) elevation to better articulate the drive-thru windows and provide more contrast by using the treatment similar to what was done to the entrance feature on the south elevation.
- Divide the large picture windows into smaller panes.
- Provide better pedestrian connection between parking on the drive through side and the building.

Mr. Brock seconded. Mr. Tiller asked what the dumpster enclosure would be composed of. He asked about another enclosure in the site plan. Ms. Sharp said it was a storage shed. He said that the building would use the same brick as the main building. Motion carried

5. OTHER BUSINESS: The Board agreed to have future submissions in electronic format. Mr. Tiller asked for copies of the old ordinance when ZDSO ordinance was used, and to have references in the staff report.
6. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:42 pm.

Bluffton Gateway Outparcels 1 & 2

Type of Submission:	Final
Applicant:	David Oliver, Jaz Development, LLC
Project Architect:	Chris Nardone, AIA, CNNA Architects, Inc.
Project Engineer:	Ryan Lyle, PE, Andrews & Burgess
Project Landscape Architect:	Michael S. Small, RLA
Type of Project:	Commercial Retail
Location:	On the west side of Bluffton Road (SC 46) approximately 600 feet south of the intersection with US 278.
ZDSO Zoning Designation:	Commercial Regional

Project Information: When the Southern Corridor Review Board reviewed the Bluffton Gateway Project, there were two one-acre outparcels along SC 46 that were not included in the review. These outparcels are located north and south of the main entrance to Bluffton Gateway along SC 46. On the northern parcel (0.98 acres) is proposed a 2,800 sf bank. On the southern parcel (1.03 acres) is proposed a 4,130 sf multi-tenant building.

Bluffton Gateway Project: The Bluffton Gateway project is located on a 66 acre site at the southwest corner of Bluffton Road (SC 46) and US 278. The proposed development consists of a 188,543 square foot building, a 136,454 square foot building, a gas station, and outparcels along SR 46. The site will have a full signalized intersection on SR 46 across from the access road to Target and Holiday Inn Express. Three right-in/right-out intersections will be provided on SR 46 and US 278. The applicant also proposes to provide a connector road that would connect to Red Cedar Street north of Bluffton Parkway. All but the two outparcels have received final approval by the CRB and the SRT.

Conceptual CRB Review of Outparcels: The outparcels were reviewed conceptually at the August 6, 2014 Southern Beaufort County Corridor Review Board meeting. The Board took no action, but provided the following comments on the project:

1. The Corridor Overlay District requires roof overhangs and pitched roofs to be incorporated into all building designs. The buildings should pull roof elements from the other buildings in the development. Look at similar projects approved by the Board such as Tanger 1 for ways to incorporate pitched roofs into the buildings. Regions Bank on Bluffton Parkway is also a good local example. **The buildings have been redesigned to incorporate roof elements.**
2. The landscaping plan needs to clearly indicate the species and dbh of the existing trees that will remain in the highway buffer. The plan also needs to indicate that the buffer will remain undisturbed. If any view corridors are proposed, they need to be presented to the CRB for approval. **The trees in the buffer that will remain have been indicated on the landscaping plan. There is no indication, however, that existing understory vegetation in the highway buffer will remain undisturbed.**
3. Rework the landscaping and lighting plan to ensure that one 3 ½" caliper tree to be

- planted in each parking lot peninsula. **See staff comment below.**
4. Provide cutsheets of the proposed exterior lighting fixtures. **Cutsheets for the site lighting fixtures have not been submitted.**
 5. Provide material and color samples to the Board for review. **The material and color samples will be brought to the meeting.**
 6. Consider rotating the bank so that the drive-thru is in the rear of the building. **No revision was made to the orientation of the drive-thru.**
 7. This project has not received conceptual DRT review. There are concerns that there are too many parking spaces for the bank building and not enough for the retail/restaurant building. These issues need to be resolved before submitting to the CRB for final review. **See staff comment below.**

Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance: This project was given conceptual review under the Zoning and Development Standards Ordinance. Therefore, the Corridor Overlay District standards apply to this project.

Parking Issue: The number of parking spaces on Outparcel 1 exceed the maximum permitted for a 2,800 square foot bank. The Staff Review Team (SRT) meets at 11am on Wednesday, October 7. Pending the outcome of SRT conceptual review, Outparcel 1 may need to be revised to reduce the number of parking spaces.

Staff Comments:

1. The number of parking spaces on Outparcel 1 exceed the maximum permitted for a 2,800 square foot bank. Pending conceptual review of this project by the Staff Review Team (SRT), the site plan for Outparcel 1 may need to be revised to reduce the number of parking spaces.
2. The highway buffer is required to have 4 overstory trees, 14 understory trees and 30 shrubs for every 100 feet of highway frontage. The landscaping plan does not indicate that any understory vegetation will be preserved. Either the existing vegetation needs to be indicated that it will be preserved, or additional landscaping needs to be proposed in the buffer to meet the planting requirements.
3. The Community Development Code requires one 3 ½” caliper minimum tree to be planted in each parking lot peninsula. The following peninsulas do not meet this requirement:
 - a. The peninsula located in the northwest corner of Outparcel 2; and
 - b. The peninsula located at the southwest corner of Outparcel 1.
4. The applicant shall provide cutsheets of the site lighting fixtures to the Board for review.
5. The applicant shall provide material and color samples to the Board for review.

McDonald's – 22 Sams Point Way

Type of Submission:	Final
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.

Special Use Permit: The project went before the ZBOA at their August 27, 2015 meeting. and received a Special Use Permit with the following conditions:

1. The applicant is required to submit a shared parking agreement with the property owner stating that parking will be shared with the Food Lion Shopping Center.
2. Prior to receiving the final Certificate of Compliance, the applicant will submit arborist certification that the recommended measures outlined in the arborist report to protect trees during construction were followed.
3. All existing trees and proposed landscape materials shall be bonded for two years to ensure survival.
4. They will receive final DRB approval prior to getting final approval from the Staff Review Team (SRT).
5. The project will meet the stormwater requirements and the comments made by the Stormwater Manager.

Arborist Report: At conceptual review, SRT 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.

DRB Conceptual Approval: At the August 5 DRB meeting, the project received conceptual approval with the following conditions:

- Change the proposed stone material to stucco or tabby. **This material was changed on the revised plans to tabby.**
- Revise the north (drive-thru) elevation to better articulate the drive-thru windows and provide more contrast by using the treatment similar to what was done to the entrance feature on the south elevation. **The drive through windows were revised to have a contrasting color of stucco extend from the wainscoting to the eave.**
- Divide the large picture windows into smaller panes. **This change was made.**
- Provide better pedestrian connection between parking on the drive through side and the building. **A metal railing was added to the northwest corner of the building to give better sight clearance for pedestrians crossing the drive-thru lane.**

Staff Comments:

1. The three parking lot peninsulas that are proposed to be planted with dynamite crape myrtles need to be revised to have an overstory tree planted in them.
2. The average (3.9 fc) and maximum (11.0 fc) illumination levels on the lighting plan exceed the ordinance requirements of 2.4 fc average and 10.0 fc maximum.

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.