



AGENDA
BEAUFORT COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
Thursday, July 7, 2016, 2:30 p.m.
Grace Coastal Church
15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909
Phone: (843) 255-2140

Committee Members:

James Atkins / Architect - Chairman
J. Michael Brock / Landscape Architect – Vice Chairman
Peter Brower / Architect-Landscape Architect
Bill Allison / 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 JUNE 2nd 2016 , MEETING MINUTES ([backup](#))
3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
4. NEW BUSINESS: There is no new business.
5. OLD BUSINESS:
 - a. Sprenger Healthcare – Okatie, 234 Okatie Village Drive - Conceptual ([backup](#))
1. OTHER BUSINESS: Next Scheduled Meeting—2:30 p.m. on Thursday, August 4, 2016 at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC, 29909
2. ADJOURNMENT



BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
June 2, 2016, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

Members Present: James Atkins, Bill Allison, J. Michael Brock, Peter Brower, and James K. Tiller

Members Absent: Pearce Scott and Donald L. Starkey

Staff Present: Robert Merchant, Long Range Planner

Guests: Eric Hoover, Ward Edwards; Tim Huber, Ramsey Development; Tyler Smith, Sandcastle Constructors; Andrew Moon, RHA Architects; Matt Edwards, Kimley Horn; Nathan Tidd, Kimley Horn; Jason Broene, Court Atkins

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** James Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** There was no public comment.
3. **MINUTES:** Mr. Brock motioned to approve the minutes of the May 5, 2016 Design Review Board meeting. Mr. Allison seconded. Motion carried.

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. **Sprenger Healthcare - Okatie, 234 Okatie Village Drive - Conceptual:** Michael Brock recused himself. Mr. Merchant gave the project background. Eric Hoover with Ward Edwards presented; Tim Huber with Ramsey Development represented the developer. Mr Huber said that they are aware of the architectural shortcomings and are working on them. He said that they are building an identical building in Port Royal. Mr. Tiller asked if the PUD had separate architectural guidelines. Mr. Merchant said that there were architectural guidelines in the PUD. Mr. Tiller said that the CRB required a wall to shield dumpsters and loading areas in the Food Lion which is right down the street. He said it was important to deal with the service area because it was right on the road. He said the landscaping plan should deal with tall spindly pines that were left over. He felt that the plan dealt well with the existing vegetation. He suggested adding leisure trails to the pine thickets to provide more outdoor spaces.

Mr. Allison said he felt this type of development was sprawl. It's way too much building. It should be more vertical in configuration. He felt that the east elevation needed much more articulation. He felt the entry was a faux plantation house and did not find it attractive or appropriate for the Lowcountry. Mr. Huber said that the residents were not capable of self preservation and one story worked better. He agreed that more fenestration was needed and articulation. He said that they were struggling on what the focus on the architecture should be. Mr. Allison felt that more interesting things could be done to the mass of the building, and that more variation in the courtyard spaces would serve to break up the massing. Mr. Huber said it increased the travel distances between spaces within the development.

Mr. Brower shared Mr. Tiller's thoughts on screening the dumpster area. He was not as concerned as Mr. Allison with having a one story building. He felt that a one story building was easier to screen. He felt that more work was needed on the blank elevations.

Mr. Atkins agreed with the Board comments. He didn't mind the single story but felt that the

architecture had to take leaps and bounds to compensate. He felt that that building hasn't bought into an architectural language. He felt the design was more like Virginia Tidewater and too classical. He felt that varied roof pitches and porches would help provide more Lowcountry elements. He felt more consistency on the placement of the dormers with respect to the windows below was needed. He said when the dormers add articulation they should serve to make it not feel like a large single story building. Mr. Tiller said that using landscaping would also help. He felt beefing up understory plantings among the pines would help break up the facade better. Mr. Atkins felt that long term the placement of the building facing Food Lion was good. However, in the short term, people will be using the existing roads to access the building, which the building turns its back to. Mr. Huber felt that the building was a good buffer between retail and residential. Mr. Atkins felt that the use was good for the location. He asked if the town of Port Royal had plans on file for the Sprenger location in the town. Mr. Merchant said that they did, and that the project went before the Town's design review board. Mr. Huber said that the entrances had 20 foot ceilings and they would try to mimic local building facades that are local for those entrances. He said that they would work on the blank elevations.

Mr. Atkins said that traditionally when there is this much architectural refinement needed, the board typically has tabled projects. Mr. Atkins motioned to table needing more architectural refinement. He asked that the applicant address why a single story configuration was needed for this building. Peter Brower seconded.

Mr. Atkins encouraged the applicant to look at pattern books for the treatment of larger commercial buildings common of this region. He felt that this particular entrance style was not in keeping with Lowcountry architecture. Mr. Allison said that it's a tough decision because it's both residential and commercial. It's hard to choose the appropriate language. He said that people don't live in 78,000 square foot houses, and therefore, it may look fake using a residential architectural language and should use more commercial language. Mr. Brower said that the board was more concerned about the two stories appearance on the exterior rather than the interior.

Mr. Tiller said that the long corridors in the interior were depressing. He suggested more variation in the interior of the building. Mr. Huber said that the courtyards served to break up the corridors and that none are greater than 100 feet in length. Mr. Allison said that opening up the corridors to the outside would be easy and would serve to open up light to the interior. Mr. Huber said it would make the building footprint larger. He said that once the building got too large, it would be too expensive to operate. He said that there was an escape risk for some residents, and the courtyards worked better for this situation.

Motion carried.

5. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Bluffton Walmart - Revised Fuel Station: Mr. Merchant gave the project background. Nathan Tidd, Andrew Moon, and Matt Edwards presented for the applicant. Mr. Brock was pleased with the revised landscape plan. Mr. Atkins agreed and liked the architectural modifications. Mr. Brower said the canopy over the gas pumps would look better without the signage. Mr. Allison agreed that the building was improved. Mr. Tiller said the "gumpo pink" azaleas may not survive where they are currently proposed. Mr. Tiller motioned to approve. Mr. Brock seconded. Motion carried.

B. Sea Smiles Pediatric Dentistry - Final: Mr. Tiller recused himself. Mr. Merchant gave the project background. Tyler Smith of Sandcastle made the presentation for the applicant. He clarified that they added the shutters to meet the Board's comments. He passed out color samples

to the Board. He said the roof would be galvalume similar to what is being used at the Promenade. He said that SCE&G would provide pole lighting plan. He also said that a Savannah Grey brick was being used. He said the front doors would be mahogany. Mr. Allison liked the building design and colors. Mr. Brower agreed. Mr. Atkins echoed staff comments that staff would need a color and material board and full lighting plan that includes exterior and site lighting. Mr. Allison motioned to approve with above conditions. Mr. Brower seconded. Motion carried.

C. Taylor's Quality Landscaping New Retail and Office Building - Final: Mr. Atkins recused himself. Mr. Brock took over as chair. Mr. Merchant gave the project background. Jason Broene from Court Atkins presented for the applicant. He summarized the changes to the building to make it less top heavy. He said that they added the cupola to provide more interior natural light and to give more visual interest to the building. Mr. Brower said it was the best looking building they saw today. Mr. Tiller asked if an 8-foot wide foundation buffer is needed. Mr. Merchant said that it was. Mr. Tiller also commented the the azaleas proposed for the island next to the parking area would present sight line issues for cars. He requested that a lower shrub be used. Mr. Tiller asked what would happen inside of the stormwater detention area. Mr. Broene said that it would have grass. Mr. Brower motioned to give the project final approval with the following conditions:

- The site and landscaping plan need to incorporate an 8 foot foundation buffer along the south elevation.
- The applicant needs to consider a lower shrub than azaleas for the island next to the parking area to avoid sight line issues for cars.
- The crape myrtle proposed at the western end of the row of parking along south elevation needs to be an overstory tree.
- The island in the center of the row of parking along the south elevation has a tree and lighting fixture proposed for the same location.

Bill seconded. Motion carried.

6. **OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Atkins asked the board members to check their vacation schedules to determine whether they could attend the next meeting scheduled for July 7.
7. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 3:38 pm.

Sprenger Healthcare - Okatie

Type of Submission:	Conceptual
Developer:	Sprenger Healthcare Development
Architect:	Michael Riley, Impact Architects
Engineer:	Greg Baisch, Ward Edwards
Landscape Architect:	Michael Brock, M. Brock Designs, LLC
Type of Project:	Institutional
Location:	60 Okatie Village Drive near Sun City
Zoning Designation:	Okatie Center PUD

The applicant is proposing the construction of a 110 unit, 77,782 sf assisted/independent living community.

The project is located in the southwest quadrant of McGarveys Corner on Okatie Center Blvd. S approximately 600 feet east of the Food Lion Shopping Center. The site consists of primarily planted pine ranging in size from 12 to 15 DBH. The building is primarily one story and is organized around internal courtyards that provide light and open space to the residents.

The project received conceptual approval from the Staff Review Team on May 11. At that time, staff approved a minor PUD master plan amendment that consisted of a reconfiguration of proposed streets and building footprints.

The project was reviewed conceptually by the DRB at its June 2 meeting. At that time the Board motioned to table review until the following comments could be addressed:

- The building needs to have a consistent architectural language that reflects traditional Lowcountry architecture. The existing design is too classical and is more suitable to the Virginia Tidewater region. The applicant is encouraged to look at pattern books for the treatment of larger commercial buildings common of this region. Elements such as varied roof pitches and porches would help provide more Lowcountry detailing.
- The architecture should have more consistency on the placement of the dormers with respect to the windows on the first floor below.
- The north and east elevations need to have the same level of architectural articulation and detailing as the rest of the building. The Beaufort County Community Development Code (Article V, Table 5.3.30) requires wall planes to be divided into modules that express traditional dimensions such that a primary facade plane shall not exceed 75 feet in length. If a wall plane exceeds this dimension, then an offset shall be provided to divide it into subordinate elements each less than 75 feet in length. The wall planes are required to be divided into smaller components by the arrangement of windows and other facade articulation features, such as columns, pilasters, canopies, and awnings. The elevations need to incorporate such elements as wainscoting, water tables, canopies, rooflines and parapets to provide vertical articulation. Varied roof pitches and planes are required to break up the massing.
- The applicant should provide a wall to shield the dumpsters and loading areas similar to what was done at the Food Lion.

Beaufort County Design Review Board
July 7, 2016

- Where clusters of pines have been preserved, understory plantings should be provided among the pines.
- The applicant should consider adding leisure trails to the pine thickets to provide more outdoor spaces.
- The applicant should consider more variation in the courtyard spaces and opening up some of the courtyards to the exterior to break up the massing of the building.

The applicant has submitted revised drawings addressing the above comments. Attached to the staff report is a letter answering each of the DRB's comments.

Staff Comment: The Design Review Board will need to determine whether the applicant has adequately addressed the Board's comments from June 2.

June 30, 2016

Robert Merchant, AICP, Long Range Planner
Beaufort County Design Review Board
P.O. Drawer 1228
Beaufort, SC 29901

Subject: **Design Review Reponse**
SPRENGER HEALTHCARE, 234 OKATIE VILLAGE DRIVE
Ward Edwards Project Number: 150223A

Rob:

In response to the DRB review dated June 6th regarding our most recent submittal, please find the following:

Enclosures

1. Revised Site Grading & Clearing Plans
2. Revised Architectural Elevations
3. Revised Landscape Plans
4. Lighting Plan
5. Narrative

Comment Responses

1. The building needs to have a consistent architectural language that reflects traditional Lowcountry architecture. The existing design is too classical and is more suitable to the Virginia Tidewater region. The applicant is encouraged to look at pattern books for the treatment of larger commercial buildings common of this region. Elements such as varied roof pitches and porches would help provide more Lowcountry detailing.
Architect Comments: We have revised the building to provide a more consistent architectural appearance on all four sides. We disagree that the design is "too classical", but we have attempted to make it more consistent with local design examples.
2. The architecture should have more consistency on the placement of the dormers with respect to the windows on the first floor below.
Architect Comments: We have revised the elevations to be more consistent in the placement of the dormers.
3. The north and east elevations need to have the same level of architectural articulation and detailing as the rest of the building. The Beaufort County Community Development Code (Article V, Table 5.3.30) requires wall planes to be divided into modules that express traditional dimensions such that a primary facade plane shall not exceed 75 feet in length. If a wall plane exceeds this dimension, then an offset shall be provided to divide it into subordinate elements each less than 75 feet in length. The wall planes are required to be divided into smaller components by the arrangement of windows and other facade articulation features, such as columns, pilasters, canopies, and awnings. The elevations need to incorporate such elements as wainscoting, water tables, canopies, rooflines and parapets to provide vertical articulation. Varied roof pitches and planes are required to break up the massing.
Architect Comments: We have revised the north and east elevations, as well as the floor plans, to add more articulation and detailing, similar to the south and west sides.

4. The applicant should provide a wall to shield the dumpsters and loading areas similar to what was done at the Food Lion.
Landscape Architect Comments: In addition to the proposed screen, additional landscape material is added to soften the screen and create more natural look along the rear (east facing) of the building.
5. Where clusters of pines have been preserved, understory plantings should be provided among the pines.
Landscape Architect Comments: Additional understory plantings have been added in these areas to include Red Bud Trees, Dogwoods, Wax Myrtle, and woodland evergreen shrubs.
6. The applicant should consider adding leisure trails to the pine thickets to provide more outdoor spaces.
Landscape Architect Comments: The building currently proposes enclosed courtyards. The development currently has sidewalks surrounding the site and leading to the shopping and adjacent lake, and the additional understory plantings in the buffers, the developer believes the trails would not be used due to the existing options.
7. The applicant should consider more variation in the courtyard spaces and opening up some of the courtyards to the exterior to break up the massing of the building.
Architect Comments: The design and finishing of the four court yards is being handled under separate contracts. Typically, the courtyards are well-landscaped and appropriate for the needs of those residents living adjacent to them. Opening up any of the courtyards to the exterior would have major, negative impacts on both the operation of the facility and on the completion of the project in a timely manner. We have considered the potential to make the suggested changes, but have decided against making any to the current floor and site plans.

If you have any questions or comments during your review, please do not hesitate to contact me at (843) 837-5250 or gbaisch@wardedwards.com.

Sincerely,
Ward Edwards Engineering



Greg Baisch, PE
Project Manager

gb/jb

cc: Tim Edwards, Tim Huber – Sprenger Healthcare / File: 150223A