



**AGENDA**  
**BEAUFORT COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**Thursday, February 2, 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 January 5, 2017 , MEETING MINUTES ([backup](#))
3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
4. NEW BUSINESS: No New Business
5. OLD BUSINESS: Kitties Crossing – Lot 4 - Bluffton - Final ([backup](#))
6. OTHER BUSINESS:
  - a. DRB Annual Election for Chairman and Vice Chairman
  - b. Next Scheduled Meeting—2:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 2, 2017 at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909
7. ADJOURNMENT



BEAUFORT COUNTY  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES  
January 5, 2017, 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:** H. Pearce Scott

**Staff Present:** Robert Merchant, Long Range Planner and Nancy Moss, Planner

**Guests:** Chris Nardone, CNNA; Mark Tiller, Jaz Development; Dale Hartwig, Buffalo Wild Wings; Ryan Lyle, Andrews Engineering; Gary Kubic, Beaufort County Administrator; Phil Foot, Beaufort County Assistant County Administrator; Andrea Atherton, Beaufort County Project Manager; Patrick Orefice, Glick Boehm Architects; Myles Glick, Glick Boehm Architects; Eric Hoover, Ward Edwards Engineering; and DeAnn Komanecky, Bluffton Today.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** James Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:38 pm.
2. **MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins asked if there were comments on the October 20, 2016 minutes. No comments were made. Mr. Brock motioned to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Starkey seconded to approve. Motion carried.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** There was no public comment.
4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Kitties Crossing – Lot 4 - Bluffton – Conceptual**

Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked if there were any public comments about this project and no comments were made. Ryan Lyle and Chris Nardone gave the presentation. Mr. Nardone said they presented a few different site plan options to the SRT, but the challenge was that the site has two different streets it faces. He said the SRT agreed that the building orientation was good but wanted the building to address the side street so they enhanced the side with a patio area with nice landscaping to draw attention to it. Mr. Nardone acknowledged that the color of yellow is a corporate color. Dale Hartwig, with Buffalo Wild Wings, said that they may consider introducing muted yellow color options at a later date. Mr. Lyle commented on the site plan issues. He indicated that the sewer lines and sewer manholes would be moved into the parking lot to free up the tree islands for planting; tree islands will be increased to a minimum of 180 square feet; pervious parking stalls were added adjacent to the tree islands; and, the two approach walks on the west side of the building would be added once the tenant building plans are finalized. Mr. Lyle said that this was the last undeveloped lot in the Kitties Crossing shopping center and that the site has been reviewed by the SRT a few times and that the site plan was approved. He said the building orientation seemed to be the remaining issue and that the building corner was accentuated with the tower feature from both the side street and the Highway 46 main corridor. Mr. Lyle stated that this project had to have a service area and was placed on the east side of the building which was shielded from view from Highway 46 and the interior road by masonry fencing. He said the sidewalk behind the two retail slots was undersized and would be increased to 5 feet wide. Mr. Nardone questioned whether the sidewalk had to go all around the building and if the 8' foundation buffer was required on the east side of

the building. He said that three sides of the building had an 8' landscape foundation buffer and that the service area was on the east side. Ms. Moss said that a foundation buffer was required between the parking lot and the building. Mr. Lyle said if they secured conceptual approval, they would provide the landscaping, lighting, color boards and material samples at final.

Mr. Nardone elaborated on the building elevation and the Buffalo Wild Wings main entrance. Mr. Nardone said that they needed to front the side street without having parking in front of the building. He said parking was on the side of the building and the front of the building was on the side of the site; therefore, outdoor public seating was added with landscaping and hardscaping with umbrellas to front the access road to get the presence of a primary facade. Mr. Lyle showed the perspective drawing of the building viewed from the interior access road from Highway 46. He said that movement of people on the corner of this site would help address the frontage issue.

Mr. Atkins asked if the patio area next to the building was contained with a metal railing. Mr. Nardone confirmed that the shed roof covered patio was contained, but the other outdoor patio was not contained and would be available for a public eating area but would not be fenced in. He said that the typical Buffalo Wild Wings building would have a wrap-around porch on the corner, but they added a tower feature to address the interior road.

Mr. Brock commented on the site plan and said it was a tight site with an odd shape, but that facing Highway 46 was the best solution. He said that the back entrance should be re-worked because there was a lot of space in the back southeast corner; and to pivot or shift back the parking spaces on the curve to create a larger green landscape area to screen the service area. Mr. Brock said he would strongly encourage the applicant to mute the yellow color.

Mr. Brower agreed that by rotating the parking lot drive to the southeast would enlarge the landscaping buffer needed to screen the service area and would enhance the building tremendously. He said he liked the position of the outdoor courtyard seating area on the south side of the building to control the use of the space. He questioned Mr. Nardone about the size of the seating area and said that it looked larger in the rendering than on the site plan, but that it was a nice public seating area. Mr. Brower said the yellow corporate color on the building should be muted and that the overall architecture of the building is nice and fit in with the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Starkey agreed with comments about re-working the drive to enlarge the screening of the service area. Mr. Starkey questioned how many existing trees within the Highway 46 buffer would be removed and if additional trees would be planted. Mr. Lyle said that highway buffer will meet the buffer standards; they will claim the trees in the buffer and may supplement the highway buffer once the landscape architect gets involved with this project. Mr. Starkey asked whether there was a separate monument sign proposed on Highway 46 or if there would be an addition onto the existing monument sign on Highway 46. Mr. Lyle said he was not certain about their rights to the existing monument sign, but believed they had rights to add to the sign.

Mr. Allison said that there was no back of the building and that it was a 4 sided building. He said that straightening out the parking lot will help give a better buffer around the service area and would allow the design to integrate more with the architecture of the building. He liked the outdoor eating area and was not bothered by the yellow corporate color.

Mr. Atkins liked the architecture and asked the applicant to treat the service side of the building as an equal or secondary side. Mr. Atkins said he appreciated that the site is unique and challenging but thought the building was not properly orientated and wondered whether there would be an

opportunity to tie into the proposed parking lot adjacent to this site.

Mr. Brower said that the terrace and awning on the south side, along with the activity that may be taking place, will make it feel like the front of the building to draw people in.

Mr. Nardone agreed that it was good idea to connect this parking lot drive into the adjacent parking area, but due to landlord restrictions and a dedicated easement area he questioned whether they could pursue this option. Mr. Lyle said there was a 50' access easement and that is where they were limited to enter the project.

Mr. Atkins said this project may make a bad traffic circulation situation worse and added that when exiting the Kitties Crossing development, the proposed service area will be very visible.

Mr. Allison thinks the applicant should provide more pedestrian connectivity with the adjacent businesses and hotel.

Mr. Allison moved to grant conceptual approval with the following conditions:

- *Re-work the way the service yard is sited & designed and how it relates to the driveway*
- *Change the yellow corporate color on the building to a CDC approved muted yellow color*
- *Address the Staff comments:*
  - *Move the sewer lines and sewer manholes from the tree islands to the parking lot*
  - *Tree islands must be a minimum 180 SF*
  - *Identify where the approach and service walks are located on the tenant side of the building*
  - *Propose sidewalk widths which meets code*
  - *Propose 8' landscape foundation buffers between the building and the parking lot*
  - *Include a landscape plan, lighting plan with fixture cut sheets, color boards and material samples for final DRB approval.*

Mr. Starkey seconded. Motioned carried.

## **5. OLD BUSINESS:**

### **A. Beaufort County Animal Services – Okatie Highway– Final**

Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment about this project; there was none. Mr. Orefice distributed the material boards to the Board and made the presentation for the applicant. He said that the same materials were still being proposed, that there was a slight revision done to the handrails and ramp and addressed the conditions set by the DRB point-by-point: the use of brick at the porches was minimized, but kept at the piers so it would correlate with the brick on the monument sign; the eaves were encapsulated to maintain a consistent eave because the open rafter tails would be a maintenance issue; metal roofing was proposed where needed to function properly at the low slope roofs on the shed dormers and porches and that asphalt roofing was proposed on the main structure because of the limited budget; they revised all windows to have more vertical proportions which is in keeping with the Lowcountry style and shed roofs were integrated into the dormer roof design.

Mr. Allison said he did not like to mix asphalt shingle with metal panels on the roof and prefers using one roofing material. He said he liked the overall design and suggested that they not use the wood grain face of the hardi-plank siding because it shines and looks like vinyl siding, and to use the smooth face of the hardi-plank. Mr. Orefice said that the smooth face of the hardi-plank siding would be exposed and that the metal dormers, along with the porches, accentuate the three distinct entrances and of the building to balance out the design. He said the roof pitch on most dormers is 2:12 and had metal roofing proposed. Mr. Allison said that the roof pitch could go down to a 3:12 roof pitch and still use asphalt shingle.

Mr. Starkey liked the changes and said that the new three dimensional sketch made the central focal point area look much better.

Mr. Brower compared the two renderings and thought the previous design looked better; he noticed that the curved railing and ramp were not proposed in the revised design. Mr. Orefice said there were budgetary issues and had to straighten out the railing and ramp. Mr. Brower liked the exposed rafter tails on the previous design and prefers keeping the tails on the porches to delineate the porches if the budget would allow it. He suggested that adding exposed rafter tails to the porches would give the building more interest and texture.

Mr. Brock asked what the detail was between the brick columns. Mr. Orefice said it was planned to be an exposed concrete sealed off with grey paint, or a color to match the brick, in order not to have too many materials and that most of this area would be hidden from view with landscaping.

Mr. Atkins said he liked the shed dormers and agreed with Mr. Starkey that the revised rendering helps clarify how the center low-sloped roof design works. He asked Mr. Orefice for clarification because he mentioned that the eaves were all closed during the presentation but that the three dimensional drawing shows open rafter tails at the porches. Mr. Orefice said that the drawing should have been more accurate, but they would leave the open rafter tails at the porches to help the building design per Mr. Brower's suggestion if the Board agreed. Mr. Atkins said he liked the open rafter tails at the porches along with the functional metal roof accents. Mr. Atkins asked about the detail at the column bases and if the brick applied to the concrete foundation was a full 4" brick depth and how it would meet the porch grade. Mr. Orefice said it was a full brick depth which would be applied to the porch foundation. Mr. Atkins said he was concerned that the porch detail may not work to emulate a traditional porch pier. Mr. Orefice said they would work on developing a better detail to emulate a traditional Lowcountry porch pier. Mr. Atkins asked Mr. Brock whether the proposed landscape buffer along Pritcher Point Road was park-like and Mr. Brock said that it was.

Mr. Brower made a motion to give final approval with the following conditions:

- *Re-look at adding exposed rafter tails to the front porch eaves; and,*
- *Re-work the detail for the porch piers so the brick does not appear to be pasted on*

Mr. Brock seconded the motion. Motion carried. Mr. Atkins asked Mr. Orefice to submit the revisions to staff and they would distribute them to the DRB for approval.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Atkins asked Staff if there was any Other Business and said the next DRB meeting is scheduled on February 2, 2017. Ms. Moss indicated that there was still a Landscape Architect vacancy on the DRB which needs to be filled and asked the members to ask around to fill this vacancy. Mr. Brock said he spoke to a few Landscape Architects, but there was no interest, but

he would continue with the search.

Mr. Kubic, Beaufort County Administrator, asked Mr. Atkins to speak. He introduced himself and thanked the Board, Glick/Boehm Architects and the staff for their work on this project. Mr. Kubic expressed how this was a very important project and a collaborative effort; all ideas and thoughts were welcomed. He said that Beaufort County has a great partnership with the Hilton Head Humane Society and was indirectly representing them at today's meeting. Mr. Kubic said that they are not only a partner in assisting our work for the care and custody of Beaufort County animals; they are also our financial donor toward this project. Mr. Kubic said he will aggressively push his team to accomplish this mission to get complete bids and pricing for this project. Mr. Kubic suggested that critics about the cost of this project go take a look at the condition of the existing animal shelter to see what we are trying to replace and that this effort is 120% better than what we have currently today. He said we should be proud of the final product which will go to ground, that this project is in a significant area, half-way through the County, and will serve our residents very well for the next 20-30 years. He said he came to the meeting to relay his appreciation and thanks to everyone involved for their efforts and that he would be at the ground breaking and at the final step when it is actually done. Mr. Kubic thanked the Board for their time.

**7. ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Atkins closed the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 3:36 pm.

## Kitties Crossing Lot 4

<b>Type of Submission:</b>	<b>Final</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 and expressed concern about the placement of the dumpsters which were in close proximity to the frontage road. This 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. At the January 5<sup>th</sup> DRB meeting, the Board determined that both the building architecture and its placement were appropriate and provided direction on how to better screen the dumpster area. This project received conceptual DRB approval with the following three conditions:

- ***Re-work the way the service yard is sited & designed and how it relates to the driveway;*** the service yard has been rotated to completely screen the equipment from view.
- ***Change the yellow corporate color on the building to a CDC approved muted yellow color;*** The yellow corporate color above the entry door has not changed, but the yellow color on the corner tower element has been muted.
- ***Address the Staff comments:***
  - ***Move the sewer lines and sewer manholes from the tree islands to the parking lot;*** the sewer lines and SMH were moved into the parking lot.
  - ***Tree islands must be a minimum 180 SF;*** the tree islands all meet the minimum size requirements.
  - ***Identify where the approach and service walks are located on the tenant side of the building;*** the approach and service walks have been added to the plans.
  - ***Propose sidewalk widths which meet code;*** these walks have been adjusted to be code compliant.

Beaufort County Design Review Board  
February 2, 2017

- *Propose 8' landscape foundation buffers between the building and the parking lot*; all required 8' foundation buffers are in place.

**Staff Comments:**

- Please adjust the locations of the pole lighting shown in the tree islands on the Lighting Plan so as not to interfere with the required overstory trees.
- The applicant has made a minor adjustment to the architecture of the building. Several parapets have been slightly raised to completely screen the rooftop equipment.
- The rectangular common patio area has been enlarged, is more curvilinear, and includes a mix of multiple brick patterns and concrete. It may help with the pedestrian connectivity if the concrete sidewalk ran parallel to the internal access road and connected to the common patio area.
- A separate monument sign is proposed along Highway 46 for this project. Please consider incorporating shrubbery at the base of this sign (see Landscape Plan L1.1).
- The applicant has indicated that the material samples and color boards will be presented to the Board at the meeting for final DRB approval.