



AGENDA
BEAUFORT COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
RESCHEDULED to Thursday, October 20, 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
Bill Allison / Architect-Landscape Architect
Peter Brower / Architect-Landscape Architect
Pearce Scott / Architect-Landscape Architect
Donald L. Starkey / At-Large
VACANT / Landscape Architect

1. CALL TO ORDER – 2:30 P.M.
2. REVIEW OF September 1, 2016 , MEETING MINUTES ([backup](#))
3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
4. NEW BUSINESS: No New Business
5. OLD BUSINESS:
 - a. Sprenger Healthcare – Okatie, 234 Okatie Village Drive – Final ([backup](#))
 - b. A Priori, LLC (formerly BFG Communication) – Bluffton - Project Revision – 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive – Final ([backup](#))
 - c. Parker’s Convenience Store – Lady’s Island, SC Hwy 802 & Oyster Factory Road – Final ([backup](#))
6. OTHER BUSINESS: Next Scheduled Meeting—2:30 p.m. on Thursday, November 3, 2016 at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC, 29909
7. ADJOURNMENT



BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
September 1, 2016, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

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

Members Absent: Pearce Scott

Staff Present: Robert Merchant, Long Range Planner; Nancy Moss, Planner

Guests: Tim Huber, Ramsey Development; Mary Roberson, Ramsey Development; Jim Rowan, Fraser Construction; Greg Baisch, Ward Edwards Engineering; Eric Hoover, Ward Edwards Engineering; Chris Todd, Ward Edwards Engineering; Jim Strecansky, General Contractor; William Court, Court Atkins Architects; and, Stewart Barnwell, Carolyn's Landscaping, Inc.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** James Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.
2. **MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins asked if there were comments on the August 4, 2016 minutes. No comments were made. Mr. Starkey motioned to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Brower seconded to approve. Motion carried.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** There was no public comment.
4. **NEW BUSINESS:** There was no new business.
5. **OLD BUSINESS:**

A. Sprenger Healthcare – Okatie, 234 Okatie Village Drive – Final

Mr. Brock recused himself. Ms. Moss gave the project background. Tim Huber, General Manager of Ramsey Development Corporation, gave the presentation. Mr. Huber said that they took the DRB's advice and tried to mimic the tower structure and added towers on the front right corner and on the rear center elevations. He said that the new window configuration of the interior windows worked better for them and that the windows had to be 4'-0" wide x 6'-6" tall for all resident rooms to meet the natural light requirements for the State Health Department. Mr. Huber stated that the remaining windows would consist of 3'-0" wide x 6'-0" tall windows and that the two roof dormers were removed.

Mr. Atkins asked for comments from the Board.

Mr. Brower indicated that the DRB expected to see the tower element used more prevalently in most of the protruding elements and that the additional tower elements were used in a very token way. Mr. Brower added concern about a discrepancy between the floor plan and the elevations. He said that the floor plan shows space between the shutters on the right portion of the west elevation, but the elevation does not reflect this space. Mr. Brower said that the floor plans do not indicate that the tower elements protrude past the face of the building. He said that the floor plans and elevations should be much more accurate at this final review stage, but that the design is better than it was with past submissions.

Mr. Starkey asked them to explain the various exterior materials and colors. He wanted an explanation of where specific materials were to be used throughout the design.

Mr. Huber said that the floor plan had not been updated. He said they are working on the elevations first and then they will match the floor plan to the elevations and that the notes were from old elevations. Mr. Huber said that the architects explored the option of incorporating the tower element at the main entry, but in order to meet the minimum vehicle clearances, it became too massive and out of proportion so they decided not to use it there.

Mr. Starkey asked about the window notes and wanted additional information. Mr. Huber said that all of the windows would be single-hung and that the large windows in the note are not on the elevation anymore. The note was left over from an older design. Mr. Starkey recommended that they look closer at their drawings before releasing them to the Board.

Mr. Allison said that he never really liked this concept, but that there have been some improvements made to the design.

Mr. Atkins said that they need more detailed plans and color boards for final review. He felt that the design has come a far way and it addressed a majority of the conceptual review comments. He liked the window configuration; the application of Bahaman and traditional style shutters, and the towers on the far corners. Mr. Atkins commended the design team for developing a consistent design using Lowcountry elements, but could not consider final approval without final drawings.

Mr. Brower asked if the tower element was considered at the two front intermediate protruding areas of the building in addition to the two ends for continuity. He felt it would be worth studying the change. Also, work on the window placement on the protruding element on the right side so the shutters are not butted right up to each other. Mr. Huber said that the tower element would work well in the residential portion and at the right end for a total of three towers, but does not work well on the left end. Mr. Brower suggested that they adjust the window placement so there is space between the shutters.

Mr. Atkins listed the options available to the Board for this project. Mr. Brower motioned to table this project because it was not ready to be considered for final approval.

Mr. Starkey seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Mr. Atkins followed up the motion by saying that the DRB could not give final approval until the drawings were finalized, but that the project was headed in the right direction. Mr. Huber asked for guidance on the tower element. Mr. Atkins said to share the intermediate design ideas with County staff for feedback before the final drawing package is updated.

The following issues need to be addressed for final approval:

- *Consider additional tower elements on the intermediate protruding areas;*
- *Refine the drawings to eliminate discrepancies between the floor plan and the elevations;*
- *Adjust the window placement on the right side of the front elevation to allow wall space between the shutters; and,*
- *Provide finalized drawings and color boards for final DRB approval consideration.*

B. A Priori, LLC (BFG Communications), 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive, Bluffton: Mr. Atkins recused himself. Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Court provided an updated landscape plan, a three-dimensional rendering and presented for the applicant. He indicated that he addressed the details to have a more uniform character and incorporated tabby details to make

it more consistent with Lowcountry Architecture. He said the Owner asked him to take a fresh look at the architecture and to leave the general footprint and site configuration similar to the previous submission. Mr. Court indicated that adjustments to the size of the building footprint were made to create an 8' foundation buffer. He stated that the heavy timber canopy structure with exposed bracket-work and the green wall with elements from the steel structure added visual interest. He added that above the human scale at the 10' – 14' range, the proposed metal lattice work provided shade/shadow work on the front gable facade; that the strong overhang break-up was done to separate the four center bays from the three outer bays; and that the new wall structure surrounding the trash area was architecturally appropriate.

Mr. Brock asked the Board for comments.

Mr. Allison liked the front elevation with the brackets on the porch-like structure and the tabby dumpster enclosure, but would like to see what is being proposed on the left-side of the building.

Mr. Starkey indicated that he would like to see more attention made at the rear elevation facing Anolyn Court. He suggested adding columns or stucco to provide more detail in order to break up the blank wall. Mr. Starkey said that the existing vegetation on the north side needs to be identified, to explain what is being proposed to the buffer and to include this information on the Landscape Plan.

Mr. Barnwell said that there was an existing drainage area in the buffer area and that palmetto, wax myrtle and crape myrtle trees existed there.

Mr. Brower agreed that these drawings were a tremendous improvement to the previous submission and he liked the bracketing, the screening and the stucco. He said that he preferred a uniform overhang width across the bay areas versus breaking it up.

Mr. Brock liked the building. He asked that the plant quantities be adjusted and to add tree caliper sizes and label it on the drawing. He added that because there is only a 10' buffer area along the north side, a note should be added to the drawings stating "that any plants/trees removed/damaged during construction should be required to be planted back" because there is not a lot of space to work in and the buffer may become damaged during construction.

Mr. Allison motioned for conceptual approval with the following conditions:

- *Maintain a uniform, wide overhang around the perimeter of the building;*
- *Provide more visual interest on the rear elevation; and*
- *Adjust the landscape plan by adding a plant schedule showing tree quantities and calipers; include a buffer protection/replanting notation "that any plants/trees removed/damaged during construction should be planted back" and submit an updated tree survey.*

Mr. Brower seconded the motion. Motion carried.

6. OTHER BUSINESS: Mr. Atkins asked Mr. Merchant if there was any Other Business. Mr. Merchant mentioned that Jim Tiller resigned and that there was a vacancy for a Landscape Architect on the Board. Mr. Atkins said that he appreciated Mr. Tiller's dedication to the Board over the years and that they will look for a replacement.

7. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Sprengr Healthcare - Okatie

Type of Submission:	Final
Developer:	Sprengr Real Estate, LLC (Ramsey 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 11th. 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 and tabled at both its June 2nd and July 7th meetings over issues primarily related to the architecture of the building. The applicant submitted plans for final approval at the August 4th DRB meeting, but the Board motioned to table the project because the drawings were not detailed enough for final approval, there were conflicts between the floor plans and the elevations and design elements conditions given at conceptual were not met. The Board suggested that the applicant (the bold and italicized print indicates how the applicant's submission addresses the Board's conditions):

- Consider additional tower elements on the intermediate protruding areas. ***The front left-side and back central tower features from the previous submission was removed. Two new tower features were incorporated into the protruding areas of the front elevation.***
- Refine the drawings to eliminate discrepancies between the floor plan and the elevations. ***The Elevations and Floor Plan match each other.***
- Adjust the window placement on the right side of the front elevation to allow wall space between the shutters. ***The applicant has adjusted the window placement on the right side of the front elevation to provide wall space between the window shutters.***
- Provide finalized drawings and color boards for final DRB approval consideration. ***The applicant has provided finalized floor plans which coincide with the elevations. A "Color/Material List" and samples have been submitted as well.***

A Priori (formerly BFG Communications) - Conceptual

Type of Submission:	Final
Developer:	A Priori, LLC
Architect:	William Court, Court Atkins Architects
Engineer:	Greg Baisch, Ward Edwards Engineering
Type of Project:	Commercial Office/Warehouse
Location:	The 1.49 acre site is located at 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive, Bluffton, SC 29910 which is on the corner of Buckingham Plantation Drive and Anolyn Court. This property is less than ¼ mile south of the traffic signal at the intersection of Fording Island Road (SC 278) and Buckingham Plantation Drive.
Zoning Designation:	Regional Center Mixed Use (C5)

In February 2014, the Southern Beaufort County Corridor Review Board gave final approval to a corporate headquarters building for BFG, an advertising agency located at 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive. The approved building was unique with many different sloped roofs, corrugated metal siding and reflective glass. The existing 6,000 square foot building was cleared from the site, but the approved building was never built. The applicant is requesting to amend the development permit with a revised site and building plan. The applicant is proposing to construct a 1 story 13,100 square foot building with front offices and back warehouse space which includes parking areas, sidewalks, loading area and associated infrastructure. This project has two points of direct access; one from Buckingham Plantation Drive on the west and one from Anolyn Court on the east side of the property which bi-sects the building from the Phase I parking lot. The site is bound to the north by Anolyn Court, to the east by Anolyn Court, to the south by Lot #7 which is a Commercial building and to the west by Buckingham Plantation Drive.

This project was presented at the 9/1/2016 DRB meeting for conceptual approval. The DRB gave conceptual approval with the following conditions (the bold and italicized print indicates how the applicant's resubmittal addresses the Board's conditions):

- Maintain a uniform, wide overhang around the perimeter of the building. ***The drawings were revised to provide a uniform, wide overhang.***
- Provide more visual interest on the rear elevation. ***Three (3), equally spaced, corten steel frame "Grow" wall features were incorporated 1' from the rear facade.***
- And, adjust the landscape plan by adding a plant schedule showing tree quantities and calipers; include a buffer protection/replanting notation "that any plants/trees removed/damaged during construction should be planted back" and submit an updated tree survey. ***The Landscape Plan has not been revised since the conceptual review. The buffer protection/replanting notation needs to be added. A tree survey was provided for this submission.***

Staff Comments:

1. The Landscape Plan does not show the existing 17" Pine at the NW corner of the site.
2. The landscape plan has not been revised since the conceptual review of this plan. A plant schedule has not been developed for this project as requested, but the proposed plant quantities, names and sizes are indicated in the top key.
3. A continuous tree protection zone must be shown on the plans. Please indicate the placement of 4' tree protection fencing around the existing buffer along both Anolyn Court roads so the buffer does not get destroyed during construction. Plans must provide this information to receive SRT final approval.

Beaufort County Design Review Board
October 6, 2016

4. A building material legend and color spec is listed on the drawings, but Color Boards were not included with this submission.
5. The applicant has only shown wall mounted light fixtures for the south side of the building. No lighting is shown at the west parking area. If additional exterior lighting is proposed, this information will need to be provided.
6. The buffer protection/replanting notation was not included on the Landscape Plan as requested by the DRB.
7. Corrugated metal panels proposed on the sides & gables are typically considered a prohibited facade material per Section 5.3.30, but the DRB gave conceptual approval for these materials.

Parker's Convenience Store – SC HWY 802 & Oyster Factory Road

Type of Submission:	Final
Developer:	Parker's
Architect:	Lynch Associates Architects
Engineer:	Nathan B. Long, Thomas and Hutton
Type of Project:	Commercial
Location:	The project is located in the Oyster Bluff PUD on the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Highway 802 and Oyster Bluff Road.
Zoning Designation:	Planned Unit Development

Background: The applicant is proposing to construct a 4,500 square foot Parker's convenience/full deli store with 12 pumps with a covered canopy in the Oyster Bluff PUD. Currently, the site has no direct access from Highway 802. It has two (2) full access locations proposed with one onto Oyster Bluff Drive (to future road with full access to Oyster Factory Road) and one right-in/right-out access onto Highway 802. The site is constrained by two public roads and two private drives within the proposed development site.

Unique Site Planning Issues: The site is located in the Oyster Bluff PUD which adopted transect zones from the County's Community Development Code which require new buildings to be oriented toward streets. The T4 Hamlet Center District within the PUD has a "build-to zone" of a minimum setback of 5' and a maximum setback of 25' from the street right-of-way. The entrance of the building is required to front the street. The applicant is has identified Oyster Bluff Drive as the street that it fronts and the facade facing Oyster Bluff Drive the front facade. In addition, they are addressing Oyster Factory Road by having a pavilion serve as an extension of the building to front that street.

When this project was reviewed by the Staff Review Team, the SRT had considerable discussion as to whether the building actually met the build-to zone requirement. The SRT voted to defer the project and require the applicant to go before the DRB to determine if the plan met the built-to-zone requirement both architecturally and functionally. It was determined at the August 4th DRB meeting, that this project met the build-to zone. This project is received conditional SRT approval and those conditions were met.

On August 4th, the DRB gave this project conceptual approval with the following conditions (the bold and italicized print indicates how the applicant's submittal addresses the Board's conditions):

- The site plan meets the build-to zone requirements with the following modifications. The pavilion needs to be moved toward the corner of Oyster Factory Road and Oyster Bluff Drive. The pavilion should be enlarged in size and simplified to serve as an architectural extension of the main building. ***The pavilion footprint was enlarged and moved toward the corner of Oyster Factory Road and Oyster Bluff Drive.***
- The applicant will need to address the long gas pump canopy when presenting to the DRB for final approval. ***This condition has not been adequately addressed by the applicant.***
- Mechanical equipment will be to be adequately screened. ***The applicant says that the equipment will be adequately screened, but the staff has concerns whether the equipment will be adequately screened.***
- The buffer along Sams Point Road is required to be a minimum of 10 feet wide. ***The applicant has reconfigured the site plan to provide a 10' buffer and has shifted the underground gasoline storage tanks westward to preserve a few more trees within the buffer along Sams Point Road.***
- Refine discrepancies between plant schedule and plan and make sure that all plants meet the minimum size requirements. ***The landscape plan has been updated to match the revisions made to the site plan.***

Beaufort County Design Review Board
October 6, 2016

Staff Comment:

1. The parking spaces adjacent to tree islands must be pervious (for the entire parking space).
2. The gas pump canopy, as proposed, is one long continuous canopy. The drawings (for the gas canopy) are not labeled and material & color specifications have not been provided for review.
3. The applicant not presented sufficient documentation to ensure that the rooftop equipment will be adequately screened. Based upon the elevation drawings submitted, the rooftop equipment may be visible (particularly from the east and west sides of the building). The pedestrian level wall-mounted electrical gear boxes were moved from the west side of the building to the east side of the building wall and a rooftop access ladder was added on the same side. A dwarf Podocarpus hedgerow is proposed to screen the wall boxes (maximum dwarf Podocarpus height is 5' but the equipment boxes are 9' in height); the equipment will not be adequately screened.
4. The plant schedule needs a minor revision; the Pink Muhly Grass must be a minimum 3 gallon container size in lieu of 1 gallon shown. Also, the Oyster Bluff Drive Street trees should be on both sides of the street.