



**AGENDA**  
**BEAUFORT COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**Thursday, January 5, 2017, 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  
VACANT / Landscape Architect

1. CALL TO ORDER – 2:30 P.M.
2. REVIEW OF OCTOBER 4, 2016 , MEETING MINUTES ([backup](#))
3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
4. NEW BUSINESS:
  - a. Kitties Crossing Lot 4 – Bluffton – Conceptual ([backup](#))
5. OLD BUSINESS:
  - a. Beaufort County Animal Services – Okatie Highway (SC170) - Final ([backup](#))
6. OTHER BUSINESS: Next Scheduled Meeting—2:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 2, 2017 at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC, 29909
7. ADJOURNMENT



BEAUFORT COUNTY  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES  
October 20, 2016, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC  
(Rescheduled from the October 6, 2016 DRB Meeting)

---

**Members Present:** James Atkins, J. Michael Brock, Pearce Scott and Donald L. Starkey

**Members Absent:** Bill Allison and Peter Brower

**Staff Present:** Nancy Moss, Planner

**Guests:** Tim Huber, Ramsey Development; Rob Bush, Ramsey Development; Eric Hoover, Ward Edwards; Jim Rowan, Fraser Construction; William Court, Court Atkins Architects; Bill Bishop, Parker's; Nathan Long, Thomas & Hutton; Andrew Lynch, Lynch Associates Architects; Dan Keefer, Witmer, Jones, Keefer; Chuck Newton, Sea Island Coalition; Greg Campbell, Sea Island Coalition; and, Jessicah Lawrence, Beaufort Today.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** James Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:40 pm.
2. **MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins asked if there were comments on the September 1, 2016 minutes. No comments were made. Mr. Brock motioned to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Scott 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 revised the floor plans to match the elevations. He said that they could not make the left-hand tower element work because they needed two separate entrances; one for the healthcare area and one for the assisted living area. He said that they really like the new tower elements on the front elevation. He indicated that the Board had the brick, shingle and color boards and he would answer any questions.

Mr. Starkey asked about the brick facade on the central gable on the North elevation. He suggested that the brick be continued along this facade because it appears to be cut off.

Mr. Scott likes the addition of the tower elements along the front elevation. He said it looked like the towers were detailed slightly different from each other which he liked because the functions behind them were different. He thought the main entrance was a little lost and the porte-conchére element should have more tower language incorporated. He suggested adding some high Bermuda shutters on the corners to signify the entry. Mr. Scott said the colors selected were fine.

Mr. Huber said that they tried to repeat the tower element on the porte-conchére, but because of

the 14' clearance requirement, it became too massive.

Mr. Atkins liked the colors and materials, but said the applicant should also address the other lobbed-off gable element on the south side of the building. He said that the gable element may require a column to complete the gable character. Mr. Atkins agreed with Mr. Scott about either copying or incorporating the tower element language to the main entry. He said that the entries could be accentuated by going above the main soffit line so there is a presence to them and to drop the porte-conchére from the main soffit level; and that perhaps it's a width and height issue and possibly adding a hipped roof with brackets so there is cohesiveness in the access elements. Mr. Atkins said the design has come a long way since May and is much more in keeping with surrounding structures in the area.

Starkey made a motion to approve this project but to rework the chopped-off brick facade within the gable element. Mr. Scott seconded the motion. During further discussion of the motion, Mr. Starkey amended his original motion to include that the applicant re-study the two lopped-off gable elements and re-study the porte-conchére to be reviewed by staff and a DRB representative.

Motioned carried.

#### **B. A Priori, LLC (BFG Communications), 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive, Bluffton - Final:**

Mr. Atkins recused himself. Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Court passed out color boards and lighting plans to the Board for review. He said that they would address the landscaping issues. He stated that the corrugated metal will be a nice and unique material that will pay homage to the lowcountry vernacular character especially on the lower elements. He said the corrugated metal is primarily on the lower or human scale roof forms and not on the main building itself; it is behind the corten steel lattice work on the gable but would not show up and the main roof would be a conforming metal. Mr. Court said that the corrugated metal provides a unique character and texture with both corten steel trellis features and living wall elements.

Mr. Scott said the architecture was interesting and that he liked the play between lowcountry traditional and modern design elements and the old and new materials.

Mr. Starkey questioned why there was no lighting in the front parking lot and asked that lighting be added. He was concerned that some of the wax myrtles within the buffer were very close to the proposed building and may get damaged during construction.

Mr. Brock liked the architecture and does not have any problem with the materials specified.

Mr. Scott made a motion to approve the architecture and site plan with the conditions that:

- ***The lighting plan be updated to add lighting at the front parking lot; and,***
- ***Revise the landscape plans to address staff comments:***
  - ***Add the existing 17" pine tree at the NW corner of the site, which is scheduled to remain, to the Landscape Plans.***
  - ***Add a notation on landscape plans stating that "Any plant/trees removed/damaged during construction should be planted back".***
  - ***A continuous tree protection zone must be shown on the plans. 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.***

Mr. Starkey seconded the motion. Motion carried. Mr. Brock said the conditions could be worked through and approved by the Planning Department staff.

**C. Parker's Convenience Store – Lady's Island SC Hwy. 802 & Oyster Factory Road – Final:**

Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment. Mr. Chuck Newton, representing the Sea Island Coalition, spoke to present their concerns about the streetscape issue and the orientation of the building within this development. Mr. Newton said that they would prefer to see the building orientated toward the interior of the property versus toward the 802 highway corridor.

Mr. Bishop presented for the applicant. He stated that they designed this project in accordance with an approved PUD and that they made special provisions to have a two-sided store which faces Oyster Bluff Drive with a service entrance on the interior of the site. Mr. Bishop said that they have addressed all of the DRB and staff issues to the best of their ability.

Mr. Nathan Long said that the underground gas storage tanks were shifted toward the corner of Highway 802 & Oyster Factory Road, tree wells were incorporated and the revised grading was done to save trees along Sams Point and Oyster Factory Roads and along Oyster Bluff Drive. He stated that the build-to zone was determined in the PUD and at the previous DRB meeting. Mr. Long said that street trees and lighting was required on the development side of the street. He said that parallel parking would be added along Oyster Bluff Drive as development progresses.

Mr. Andrew Lynch said that the pavilion was enlarged and moved closer to the corner of Oyster Factory Road and Oyster Bluff Drive. He referenced sheet #A701 within the drawings which provides an analysis of the roof top equipment screening. Mr. Lynch said that the dashed sight line shows that the rooftop mechanicals are fully screened from Sams Point Road and that the equipment is centrally located on top of the building. He said that the wall-mounted electrical gear was moved to the alternate side so it would be less visible from Oyster Factory Road.

Mr. Brock said the applicant addressed all the DRB concerns about the building architecture, the pavilion design and the landscape plans and that they were very well done, other than the electrical gear screening issues on the north side of the building. He said that he was comfortable with this project.

Mr. Scott said that he was troubled because the gasoline canopy was too long; explore breaking it up into two or three sections. He said he wanted to address Mr. Newton's concerns about the orientation of the building.

Mr. Bishop said that the building orientation was dictated by the PUD. Mr. Atkins said that this issue was settled at the previous DRB meeting. Mr. Bishop said they would lose significant trees if the building was orientated toward the interior of the development.

Mr. Long said they would look into splitting the gas canopy as was done at the Bluffton location, but they will have to check the spacing of the pumps when they explore this option.

Mr. Bishop said that if they split the canopy to see more of the storefront, they may have to remove the trees and tree well along Oyster Factory Road to allow room for internal traffic flow. He said the pumps are spaced according to the industry standards and if the canopy is split the pumps would have to be shifted; it may come down to a tradeoff between saving the trees and

breaking up the gas canopy. Mr. Bishop said that they will work with the design to see if they can actually separate the canopy while maintaining the required overhead coverage of the pumps. He said they will check to see if the design can be shifted a few feet and trees can be saved in order to break up the gas canopy.

Mr. Atkins said it would be good to break up the canopy to satisfy the public concerns along the 802 corridor and make it less intrusive.

Mr. Starkey agreed that the gas canopy was too long and that the columns should be increased in size so the structure appears sounder.

Mr. Scott does not like the blue stripe on the gas canopy.

Mr. Scott made a motion to approve this project with the following conditions:

- *Re-study the gas canopy column and roof design and to break it up into sections.*
- *Provide a study from all sides of the building to show that the rooftop equipment is fully screened.*
- *Address the staff comments:*
  - *Specify landscape materials which will adequately screen the side wall-mounted electrical gear panels.*
  - *The parking spaces adjacent to tree islands must be pervious.*
  - *Revise the plant schedule so that the Pink Muhly grass is a minimum 3 gallon container size.*
  - *Street trees should be shown on both sides of Oyster Bluff Drive.*

Mr. Brock seconded. Mr. Starkey asked why the dumpster was on the property line. Mr. Bishop said that it was not a property line, but it was a lease line. Mr. Atkins said that the revisions can be reviewed by staff and a DRB representative.

Motion carried.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Atkins asked Ms. Moss if there was any Other Business. There was no "Other Business". The next DRB meeting is scheduled on November 3, 2016.

**7. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm.

## **Kitties Crossing Lot 4**

<b>Type of Submission:</b>	<b>Conceptual</b>
<b>Developer:</b>	David Oliver, Jaz Development, LLC
<b>Architect:</b>	Chris Nardone, CNNA Architects
<b>Engineer:</b>	Ryan Lyle, Andrews Engineering
<b>Type of Project:</b>	Commercial
<b>Location:</b>	The site is located near the intersection of Highways 278 & 46 and is adjacent to the Kitties Crossing shopping center west of the Food Lion grocery store in Bluffton.
<b>Zoning Designation:</b>	C5

The applicant is proposing to construct a one-story 8,056 square foot multi-tenant building, including parking areas, sidewalks and associated infrastructure, on a 1.82 acre site adjacent to the Kitties Crossing shopping center in Bluffton. The building will have Buffalo Wild Wings as the primary, anchor business with 5,456 square feet with two attached shop spaces totaling 2,600 square feet for tenants to be determined. The site fronts Highway 46, but will be accessed from the Kitties Crossing Shopping Center access drive at the new signalized intersection across from the Sam's/Wal-Mart Bluffton Gateway site. The site is bound to the north by the Crescent subdivision, to the west by the Bluffton Gateway development and to the east by the Kitties Crossing Shopping Center.

When this project was reviewed by the SRT, Staff directed the applicant to consider the internal drive within the Kitties Crossing Shopping Center as the frontage road and to design the architecture to address the internal drive because parking is not permitted between the building and the street it fronts per Division 2.6.40G of the CDC. Staff also expressed concern about the placement of the dumpsters which are in close proximity to the frontage road and the lack of pedestrian connectivity of this site to the Kitties Crossing Shopping Center. The project received conceptual approval by the Staff Review Team on November 16<sup>th</sup> but voted to require that the applicant go before the DRB to determine whether the building adequately addresses the frontage road and whether the dumpsters are appropriately sited.

### **Staff Comments:**

1. The architecture and outdoor area does not functionally address the internal road as the front of the building. The central tower element dominates the west elevation at the Buffalo Wild Wings entrance which gives this elevation the appearance of being the primary facade. Consider substituting the taller tower element on the SW corner of the structure to address the internal drive and providing an arcade over the "public" outdoor seating area to better address the internal road.
2. The yellow corporate color above the entry door and on the tower element is not an approved color. Bright, primary colors are not permitted per Division 5.3.30D of the CDC.
3. Sewer lines and SMH run through many tree islands and will cause a conflict with the overstory trees required.
4. Some tree islands appear to be undersized at 153 SF. Per 5.8.80A, tree island minimum size is 180 SF
5. Approach walks are not shown at the two attached tenant entrances on the east and at the back service door near the NE corner.
6. The east walk width adjacent to the parking area does not meet code.
7. An 8' foundation planting buffer is needed between the east side of the building and the parking lot (5.8.60).
8. Please include a landscaping plan, lighting plan, color boards and material samples for final DRB approval.

## Beaufort County Animal Services

<b>Type of Submission:</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Developer:</b>	Beaufort County
<b>Architect:</b>	Glick/Boehm & Associates
<b>Engineer:</b>	Ward Edwards Engineering
<b>Type of Project:</b>	Institutional
<b>Location:</b>	The 6.23 acre project is located on the northeast corner of Okatie Highway (SC 170) and Pritcher Point Road
<b>Zoning Designation:</b>	T2 Rural (T2R)

The applicant is proposing to construct a one-story 20,360 square foot animal services building including parking areas, sidewalks, play areas, walking trails, landscaping and associated infrastructure. The site fronts Okatie Highway (SC 170), but will be accessed by Pritcher Point Road which is proposed to be engineered, widened and surfaced for this development. The site is bound to the north by the Rivers End subdivision, to the south by the future Osprey Point Development.

In 2012, Beaufort County purchased the 97 acre Okatie Marsh property through the Rural and Critical Lands Preservation Program for the purposes of developing a passive park. In 2015, Beaufort County made a “land swap” so that they could utilize the front 17 acres of the Okatie Marsh site for County services. The remainder of the site is still preserved for the eventual development of a passive park. The conceptual plans for this park include a dog park located immediately to the east of the proposed Animal Services building. Staff has directed the applicant to consider Pritcher Point Road as the park entrance and to design the landscaping of the buffer along Pritcher Point Road to be “park-like” with a more open feel with more manicured understory vegetation.

The project received conceptual review by the Staff Review Team in June and DRB conceptual approval on August 4th.

**DRB Conceptual Approval:** At the August 4, 2016 DRB meeting, the project received conceptual approval with the following conditions:

- Simplify the architectural design by incorporating fewer material types; **the brick underneath the entry porches is proposed to remain to help delineate the porches as main entrances to the building.**
- Provide a consistent overhanging eave; **the eaves have been revised to be consistent throughout the structure, without rafter tails.**
- Select one roofing material; **Asphalt shingle is proposed on the main structure and standing seam metal is proposed over the low pitched roofs over the porches and dormers to function properly.**
- Maintain consistency of windows by having vertical proportions which are in keeping with a Lowcountry residential style; **the windows were revised to be more consistent with each other and the Lowcountry residential style.**
- Integrate shed dormers to keep a consistent architectural design; **the hip dormers were changed to shed dormers.**

For Final, the applicant has submitted a letter which addressed the comments from both the DRB and SRT, the proposed entry signage drawing, a color/material list, a tree and topographic survey, revised site plans and elevations, and a landscape plan for final DRB approval.

Beaufort County Design Review Board  
January 5, 2017

**Staff Comments:**

1. A Lighting Plan for the parking lot and site was not submitted for Final review.