



AGENDA
BEAUFORT COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
Thursday, April 4, 2019, 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
Sallie C. Bridgwater / Architect-Landscape Architect
Peter Brower / Architect-Landscape Architect
Brad Hill / Landscape Architect
H. Pearce Scott / Architect-Landscape Architect
Donald L. Starkey / At-Large

In accordance with South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d), as amended,
all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place and agenda of this meeting.

1. CALL TO ORDER – 2:30 P.M.
2. REVIEW OF March 7, 2019 MEETING MINUTES ([backup](#))
3. NEW BUSINESS:
 - A. John Harris Body Shop – Okatie – Conceptual ([backup](#))
 - B. Taco Bell Upgrade Project – Bluffton – Final ([backup](#))
4. OLD BUSINESS:
 - A. Hilton Head National Luxury RV Park - Bluffton – Final (2) ([backup](#))
 - B. Okatie Center - Home 2 Suites – Conceptual (3) ([backup](#))
5. OTHER BUSINESS: Next Scheduled Meeting - 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 2, 2019 at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC, 29909
7. ADJOURNMENT



BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
March 7, 2019, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

Members Present: James Atkins, J. Michael Brock, Sallie Bridgwater, Peter Brower, Brad Hill, H. Pearce Scott and Donald L. Starkey

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Nancy Moss, Beaufort County Community Development Department

Guests: Kevin Grenier, KRA Architecture; Brian Witmer, Witmer, Jones, Keefer, Ltd.; Barry Johnson, Johnson & Davis, PA; Tom Gardo, HHN Consultant; Jeremy Barlet, Developer; Bruce Brotherton, WB Services; Jason Broene, Court Atkins Architects; Jim Rowan, Fraser Construction VP; Thomas Michaels, SM7 Designs; Taylor Reeves, Ward Edwards Engineering; and, Gwyneth J. Saunders, Bluffton Sun.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.
2. **MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins asked if there were comments on the January 3, 2019 minutes. No comments were made. Mr. Atkins motioned to approve the minutes as written. Ms. Bridgwater seconded to approve. Motion carried.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.
4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Hilton Head National Luxury RV Park – Bluffton - Final:

Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Kevin Grenier, the project Architect, and Brian Witmer, the project Landscape Architect, introduced themselves to the Board. Mr. Witmer responded to the Staff Comments point-by-point. He said that Thomas & Hutton would add the Tree Removal Plan note requested by SRT. Mr. Witmer stated that tree islands at the secondary entrance would not save as many trees as one single driveway would, so their preference was not to add a tree island. Mr. Witmer said that the landscape and site lighting plans for the civic dock space and for the pocket park at the main entry were being worked on and should be completed soon. He said that the landscape plans at the parking areas would be revised to add High Rise Oaks in the tree islands. Mr. Witmer stated that the service yard location for the Main Amenity building would be added to the plans and that the rectangular objects east of the Main Amenity building were corn hole games and would be labeled at final. He said that the entry gate details were being worked on but said there would be brick columns on each side of the gates. Mr. Witmer concluded the presentation and stated that the RV pads would be concrete or tabby pavers, the swimming pool deck would be decorative tabby pavers and that the interior walks would have granite fines.

Mr. Brock asked that they bring the details back to the Board for the incomplete landscaping plans. Mr. Witmer said they would do so.

Mr. Brower said that the architecture looked great and was nicely detailed.

Mr. Starkey echoed Mr. Brower's architecture comments, but said that there were too many unanswered site plan questions. Mr. Starkey stated that the final pieces must be presented to the Board before issuing final approval.

Mr. Scott said that the columns on the Main Amenity Building front porch were oversized; there were too few and they were too big. Mr. Grenier agreed with Mr. Scott's critique. Mr. Scott added that the gables on the Main Amenity sides were not well articulated and to either bump it out or bring it in. He stated that the red roof color needed to be toned down two shades.

Ms. Bridgwater wanted clarification on sheet L501 because it was unclear which plant species were being proposed. Mr. Witmer indicated that a plant template was listed on the plans to allow discretion to make field decisions at the time of planting based upon the sun/shade conditions.

Mr. Hill cautioned the applicants in using *Magnolia grandiflora* between the RV sites because they grow large and that it is a messy tree. Mr. Witmer said that the tree is native, but they would most likely cluster these trees in remote locations where screening is needed.

Mr. Atkins agreed with Mr. Scott's comments about the oversized porch columns at the Main Amenity Building. He said to make them delicate and that the beam would look more in scale. Mr. Atkins stated that the window and corner trim needed to be better developed on the Pool Amenity Building cupola. He also said that the large panels on the sides of the Outpost Greeting Building needed to be broken up a bit.

Mr. Hill made a motion to table this project until the incomplete site and landscape plans were submitted for review. Mr. Starkey seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

B. Okatie Center – Choice Hotel – Conceptual:

Mr. Brock recused himself from the meeting. Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Jeremy Barlet, the project Developer and Bruce Brotherton, the project Architect, introduced themselves to the Board. Mr. Brotherton said that based upon the staff comments and by observing the architecture in the Lowcountry area, they made adjustments to the original design. He stated that they wanted DRB input to determine if the design was headed in the right direction. He said that they minimized the appearance of PTAC grilles by matching them with the EIFS facade color. Mr. Brotherton said that they changed the Porte cochere roof to a gable roof, that shutters were added across the front, that hardie plank horizontal siding was incorporated in the front and that a raised area with windows was added to the back of the building to help break up the facade.

Mr. Hill said that the changes made to the architecture improved the look of the building. He encouraged them to use taller plants between the windows to help break up the facade.

Ms. Bridgwater agreed with Mr. Hill's comments.

Mr. Scott said that he also liked the changes made but that the design was still missing Lowcountry elements. He stated that the porte cochere needed more detailing and that the brick

bases seemed too tall. Mr. Scott suggested that it would help to push the water table up to the second floor. Mr. Scott said that due to the high visibility onto Highway 278, the back of the building needed to look like the front of the building.

Mr. Starkey agreed with Mr. Scott's comments. He said that the back facade should have offsets with brick to add shade and shadow and to perhaps add shutters so the back of building would better address Highway 278.

Mr. Brower said that this building looked very much like the new hotels in Charleston which were very stark and that they should not attempt to break up the facade with color and material changes, but rather use offsets to create shade and shadow.

Mr. Atkins stated that the overall composition of the project did not have a Lowcountry vernacular. He said that due to the vertical nature of the building, the design does not lend well to Lowcountry features. He suggested that they raise the brick water table, add trim around the windows and to add corner boards. He said that the rear of the building faces a very busy intersection and that the back and left sides of the building were very important sides. Mr. Atkins said that the facade material selection was good, but that the overall detailing, massing and composition needed to be improved.

Mr. Brower made a motion to Deny this project and to come back with a fresh take on the Architecture. Mr. Scott seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. Beaufort County Emergency Medical Services – Shanklin Road – Final:

Mr. Brock returned to the meeting. Mr. Atkins recused himself from the meeting. Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Brock asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Jason Broene, the project Architect, made the presentation for the project. Mr. Broene stated that they were very conscious of the budget, so the landscaping very minimal.

Mr. Brower said that it was a good looking project and that all of the architectural items were addressed.

Mr. Starkey agreed with Mr. Brower and said it was a very nice project, but the 20' buffer needed to be added.

Mr. Scott, Ms. Bridgwater and Mr. Hill said it was a nice job.

Mr. Brock said that the overhead power line would restrict the overstory trees so a modulation would be needed. He said that 3 gallon containers for the Muhly grass should be specified.

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

- Create the 20' buffer along Shanklin Road to meet 5.8.50 of the CDC. The overhead power line constricts the site so the overstory tree requirement will not apply provided the shrub quantities are increased to offset the overstory trees 2:1 to provide a continuous buffer at maturity.
- Revise the Plant Schedule so 3 gallon containers are specified for the Muhly grass

Mr. Starkey seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

Mr. Brock stated that “the building facade improvements and lighting must be built/installed according to the plans reviewed and approved by the DRB. The material and color board reviewed and approved by the DRB must be adhered to during construction. Any changes to the approved plans or submittals must be requested for and submitted to the DRB for formal approval.”

B. Okatie Center Home 2 Suites – Conceptual (2):

Mr. Atkins returned to the meeting. Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Thomas Michaels, the project Architect, made the presentation for the project. He stated that significant changes were made from the original conceptual sketch.

Mr. Brock had no questions.

Mr. Brower said that the original sketch was exciting. He said that he understood that there are budget constraints but that the design was very stark and void of detail.

Mr. Starkey agreed with Mr. Brower’s comments. He said that the flat front did not look Lowcountry. Mr. Michaels said that the tower elements and the brick areas were bumped out to create shade and shadow but that it did not show well in elevation.

Mr. Scott said that he really liked the original sketch. He said that the tower elements looked nice in elevation, but the rest of the design lacked the nice detailing shown in the original sketch. Mr. Michaels said that the revised design carried over the tower elements and light beacon from the original sketch but that a brick centerpiece and shake siding were substituted for budgetary purposes. Mr. Scott suggested that the cornice be accentuated and that more offsets be added to create shade and shadow.

Ms. Bridgwater had no comments.

Mr. Atkins concurred with the previous architectural comments from the Board. He said that the use of the facade materials helped bring the building to scale, that the brick base shows a strong foundation and that the tower elements and trellis work well. Mr. Atkins said to break up the monotony of the windows, to vary the siding details and to add shutters on the windows. Mr. Michaels said that the windows were fixed so he didn’t think that shutters should be added.

Mr. Starkey said to add elements to break up the facade so the building is more in keeping with the Lowcountry vernacular. He also said that vertical landscape plantings at the base of the building and pervious pavers around the pool should be incorporated into the landscape and site design.

Mr. Scott made a motion to Table this project and Mr. Brock seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

5. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. John Harris Body Shop – Okatie - Informal Architecture Discussion:

Mr. Atkins and Mr. Brock recused themselves from the meeting. Mr. Brower assumed the Chair for this discussion and asked the Board for comments. Jason Broene, the project Architect, was available to take questions from the Board.

Mr. Starkey said that the building really looked good for a body shop. He stated that these businesses have venting issues and that some type of parapet should be added to screen the exhaust stacks from Highway 278. He stated that the back of the building lacked articulation and that vertical elements should be added.

Mr. Broene said that the building elevations under review were from the Summerville, South Carolina prototype and that the design was most appropriate for the Lowcountry area. He said that the building had a sloped awning, was clad in brick and that it was a challenging site. Mr. Broene said that the site had a nice established buffer which would be preserved and enhanced.

Mr. Broene asked the Board's opinion on the use of an insulated metal panel with a stucco finish for portions of the building facade. He said that the panels come in varying widths such as 24", 36" and 42". Mr. Brower, Mr. Starkey and Mr. Scott all liked the panels.

Mr. Brower suggested architectural louvered panels to screen around the rooftop exhaust stacks. Mr. Scott suggested a green roof to screen the exhaust stacks.

Mr. Hill suggested that a photograph be taken from Highway 278 onto the site and superimpose the building on it so the Board would have better idea of how the building will look from the highway. He also said that several large water oaks near Cecil Reynolds Drive are proposed for removal on the site plan but should be saved. Taylor Reeves the project Engineer with Ward Edwards, said that they are working with an Arborist and will add tree wells to save the trees.

B. Mr. Atkins and Mr. Brock returned to the meeting. Mr. Atkins said the next scheduled meeting was at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, April 4, 2019 at the Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909.

6. ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Brower made a motion to close the meeting and Ms. Bridgwater seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

John Harris Body Shop

Type of Submission:	Conceptual
Developer:	Bill Owen, Owen Real Estate LLC
Design / Builder:	Chad Lindler, Chapin Commercial Construction
Architect Consultant:	Jason Broene, Court Atkins Architects
Engineer:	Eric Hoover, Ward Edwards Engineering
Type of Project:	Commercial
Location:	35 Cecil Reynolds Drive, Okatie
Zoning Designation:	C5 Regional Center Mixed-Use

The applicant is proposing to construct a body shop building and attached fenced-in storage yard, including service drives, parking, landscaping, stormwater basin and associated infrastructure. The interior of the undeveloped 2.5-acre site is heavily treed with a mixture of young pines, live, red & water oaks and gum trees, but the south and east buffers have very few trees. The site is constrained by Highway 278 to the north, a wooded SCDOT highway easement to the east, Matthews Marine, Tractor Supply & Taylor's Greenhouse to the south and a 150' wide cleared/mowed Santee Cooper power line R.O.W. to the west.

The proposed one-story 13,578 square foot body shop has an 875 SF low-slope canopied drop-off area connected at the front building entrance and contains a shop area with ten (10) service bays/doors, four (4) offices, a break room, employee/staff toilets, customer toilet and a reception with customer waiting area. The building roof has a two-step parapet roofline with the tallest portion of the parapet at 23'-4" above grade and the lower parapet at 22' above grade. The highest point of the low-pitch gable roof is behind the parapet and runs along the entire length of the building and slopes down to both the front and back sides of the body shop. Rainwater is collected with a gutter and a downspout system which is directed to underground piping and routed to an on-site stormwater infiltration pond. The building massing will include variations in wall materials, parapet heights as well as the use of awnings to articulate the wall plane using Lowcountry vernacular elements. The building will be clad with a brick veneer on the bottom half and vertical stucco-like insulated metal panels on the top half with standing seam metal awnings over the ten (10) glazed sectional overhead doors, the six (6) storefront/emergency entrances plus four (4) rear awnings to break up the facade.

This project was approved at the January 23, 2019 SRT meeting with the conditions that the landscape plan add plantings to the south and east buffer and that covenants be created to preserve the buffers for the life of the property. This project was discussed informally at the March 7, 2019 DRB meeting and the following comments were provided for design guidance:

1. There are rooftop venting issues and some type of parapet should be added to screen the exhaust stacks from Highway 278 or add architectural louvered panels to screen around the stacks or have a "green roof". ***The elevations and roof plan were updated. The parapet will screen the rooftop HVAC units. The exhaust stacks have been removed from the rooftop and the venting is now louvered on the back building facade.***
2. The back of the building lacked articulation and that vertical elements should be added. ***The back elevation has been revised. Stucco embossed metal panels are orientated vertically to aid in articulation on the long facade.***
3. The Board was receptive to the insulated metal panels with a stucco finish for portions of the building facade. ***The stucco embossed metal panels are incorporated in the conceptual design.***
4. Take a photograph of the site from Highway 278 and superimpose the building on it so the Board would have better idea of how the building will look from the highway. ***Photographs have been***

Beaufort County Design Review Board
April 4, 2019

provided with views from Highway 278 to the project site and the existing vegetation along 278 which will be retained as a screening buffer for the building.

5. Several large water oaks near Cecil Reynolds Drive are proposed for removal on the site plan but should be saved. Continue to work with the Arborist and add tree wells to save the trees. ***An Arborist was hired to perform a Tree Risk Assessment for the property & noted that the surveyor mislabeled some of the trees; an updated tree & topo where submitted for this review. SRT is requiring that the Owner place a 50' tree preservation buffer along 278 into a covenant.***

The applicant has submitted an updated tree & topo survey, site plan, photographs, floor plan, roof plan, elevations and renderings for this review.

Staff Comments:

1. At final DRB:
 - Show the monument sign location and design of the sign structure,
 - Submit the dumpster enclosure design in plan and elevation,
 - Present the attached storage yard opaque fencing details and incorporate facade materials and colors with the screen details to match the building design theme.
 - Submit the final Architecture plans, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan with fixture cut-sheets.

End of Report

Taco Bell Upgrade Project

Type of Submission:	Final
Developer:	Ronald Fiscus, Planscape Partners for Bravo Foods
Architect:	Kent Doble, RSP Architects
Engineer:	Alliant Engineering
Type of Project:	Commercial
Location:	11 Gateway Village Road, Bluffton
Zoning Designation:	C5 Regional Center Mixed-Use

Project Background:

The existing 2,956 SF Taco Bell building and attached 288 SF storage room were built in 1999 and sits on a 0.77-acre parcel within the Gateway Village shopping center which includes Home Depot, Carolina Volvo and Parker's. This building was reviewed and approved by the Corridor Review Board under the 1990 ZDSO guidelines. The one-story building currently has flat stepped parapets around three sides and a gable shaped parapet above the main entrance, but the rooftop equipment on the main building and rear storage room is very visible to Highway 278 and the west service drive. The main body of the building has a 42" gold-colored precast stone water table with a gold-colored stucco veneer and salmon-colored stucco accents & trim and dark green metal coping & roofing. In 2008, a new signalized intersection was created on Highway 278 to connect both the Village Gateway and the Target shopping centers coupled with a new 4 lane service drive west of the Taco Bell parcel complete with new landscaping along the west thoroughfare and perimeter buffers. Over the past years, some of the service drive buffer planting adjacent to Taco Bell did not survive or were removed so there are voids. The site is constrained by Highway 278 to the south, Carolina Volvo and the Gateway Village Drive main entrance to the east, Home Depot to the north, and the new four-lane signaled entrance drive off Highway 278 to the west.

Bravo Foods is seeking approval from the DRB to make modifications to the building exterior to achieve an updated look. The basic shape of the structure will remain the same except for the addition of a new gray metal roof structure over the main building, modifications at the entry doors and drive-thru window and the installation of gray-colored aluminum architectural louvered screening around the rooftop equipment. The existing silver-colored storefront doors and windows and gold-colored precast stone water table are scheduled to remain. The exterior facade changes include the removal of the south and east entry door & west drive-thru roofs with lattice adorned gables supported wood square columns on stone bases at the doors and wood brackets over the drive-thru window, the stucco arch and window trim at the storefront windows and back faux windows plus the red-colored wall signage on the east and west elevations. Three new towers, which project out 18", will be added as part of the exterior renovation work; one will be added to each entry door and one at the drive thru window, complete with gray-colored metal standing seam roofing & awning structures, dark red-colored metal fascia, dark brown EIFS veneer on the corners, hardie plank lap siding in the center painted dark red and a 9" gold-colored stone base to match the existing water table. The gold-colored stucco on the main body of the building will be patched & repaired and a new smooth light brown EIFS veneer will be applied to the facade and a dark plum-colored EIFS with natural-colored horizontal EIFS trim will be applied to the parapet on three sides of the back portion of the main structure. The rear storage cooler will be painted light brown to match the main building color. The applicant is proposing a new drive-thru metal canopy with an arched roof as part of this review.

The applicant is also proposing to perform landscape work which includes the removal of the building foundation buffer pine straw mulch and replace it with limestone gravel, the maintenance & removal of the

Beaufort County Design Review Board
April 4, 2019

overgrowth within an adjacent off-site detention pond and to remove the undergrowth within the entire Highway buffer and apply pine straw mulch.

The existing wood square parking lot light poles and shoebox fixtures are to be replaced with bronze colored metal poles and square LED light fixtures.

For this review, the applicant has provided photographs, site plan, building & storage room rooftop equipment screen details, color renderings of the elevations, material/color board and parking lot light fixture cut-sheet.

Staff Comments:

1. The drawings do not indicate that the silver-colored storefront door and window frames will be painted to match the new dark gray metal roofing, but the renderings show dark gray on the window and door frames. Provide clarification.
2. The metal awnings over the doors and drive thru window lack Lowcountry detailing.
3. The east and west back portions of the building are void of fenestration and lack articulation.
4. The DRB must determine whether the plum-colored EIFS on the rear parapets are compatible with the Lowcountry vernacular color palette.
5. The southwest and southeast corners of the foundation buffer have unplanted bare spots which should be filled-in with landscape materials to help soften the structure.
6. The thoroughfare buffer undergrowth removal proposed in note #17, on Sheet C-1 does not conform to planting requirements listed in Division 5.8.50D which requires that for every 100 linear feet, 4 overstory trees, 14 understory trees and 30 shrubs be installed. A plant back plan should be submitted to mitigate any undergrowth removal to conform to the Code.
7. The west side buffer void areas and/or missing plant material installed at the time the new service drive was built should be replaced to meet the perimeter buffer requirements in Division 5.8.90. The detention pond vegetation removal will create a large opening with a direct view to the back-side of the Taco Bell drive-thru and service area. Provide a plant-back plan.
8. The monument re-face and proposed wall signage is handled under a separate Sign Application process with Staff.
9. The menu board, order conference board with speaker and clearance bar details do not specify the box and/or frame color, but should not stand out and should be a muted color to meet the Code and meet DRB approval. These items will also be approved with the Sign Application process with the DRB suggested color guidance.
10. A detail of the arched drive-thru canopy is shown on Sheet C-2 of the drawings, but its material-type, frame color and site location are not shown; a muted color should be specified to meet DRB approval.
11. A lighting plan with photometrics was not submitted so it is difficult to determine what the foot-candle levels are at the property lines. The light pole height is not indicated on the plan, but cannot exceed 20' in height per Division 5.7.40B

End of Report

Hilton Head National Luxury RV Park

Type of Submission:	Final (2)
Developer:	Billy Palmer, Scratch Golf
Architect:	Michael Kronimus, KRA Architecture & Design
Engineer:	Nathan Long, Thomas & Hutton
Type of Project:	Commercial
Location:	60 Hilton Head National Drive, Bluffton
Zoning Designation:	T2 Rural (T2R)

This project will be developed on the northwest corner of a 306-acre parcel which currently has a clubhouse, maintenance buildings, parking areas, golf course holes, landscaping with mature trees and wetlands for the Hilton Head National Golf Course. For this project, a 92-acre portion of the 306-acre parcel will be developed for a luxury RV Park and will have over 300 high end RV stalls, three amenity buildings, a greeting outpost building, a pocket park, swimming pool, pickleball courts, playground, kayaking & dock facility, dog parks, walking paths, landscaping, lighting, parking, infrastructure and an expanded stormwater pond. The site has direct access off Bluffton Parkway and a secondary access off Malphrus Road.

A 995 SF greeting outpost building is proposed at the main RV Park entrance and three amenity buildings are proposed on the interior of this project. A 2,207 SF Dog Park Building will be centrally located and a 2,211 SF Pool Building and a 6,000 SF Main Amenity Building will be located together at the back of the RV Park. All four of the new structures have Lowcountry architecture featuring red metal roofing, white lap or board & batten hardie plank siding, exposed rafter tails, bracketed awnings, large windows with operable black shutters and portray a southern theme.

The site contains a set of abandoned golf course holes and is densely wooded. Tree preservation is planned in selective organized groupings within the development and saved completely within the required 100' buffers. Formal tabby concrete walking paths are proposed around the new buildings & through the pocket park in the RV Park and are interconnected to an oyster shell gravel pathway system within the RV park and the gravel nature trails proposed within the buffers. Detailed Landscape & Streetscape Plans for the proposed buildings, central interior drive and the RV pads complete with lighting have been prepared.

The SRT approved the conceptual site plan, with conditions, on September 5, 2018. This project was reviewed and tabled at the March 7, 2019 DRB meeting but received positive feedback and the following comments from the Board:

- Architecture:
 - Main Amenity Building:
 - a. Re-work the oversized front porch columns as they are too big and too few. Provide delicate columns so the beam looks more in scale. *The eight (8) large square porch columns were removed and twelve (12) smaller square columns are being proposed.*
 - b. Provide better articulation on the side gables; either bump it out or bring it in. *The side wing gables were pushed back toward the central portion of the building.*
 - Pool Amenity Building: Add window and corner trim to better develop the cupola detail. *The cupola was removed and a central shed dormer with twin windows was added on each side of the roof. The new dormer matches the dormers on the Main Amenity Building.*
 - Greeting Outpost Building: Break-up the large panels on the sides. *The wall panels were divided into smaller components.*

Beaufort County Design Review Board
April 4, 2019

- Dog Park Building: Design revisions were not requested by the DRB, ***but the twin porch columns at the breezeway were removed and single square columns are now being proposed.***
- Tone down the red metal roof color two shades. ***The material/color board shows a new muted red metal roof color, but the actual red color is not specified.***
- Landscape Plans:
 - Submit the detailed landscape and site lighting plans for the civic dock area and the pocket park at the main entry; ***Landscape Plans have been submitted to meet this condition.***
 - Better define the plant species being proposed within the overall streetscape and around the RV pads. ***Updated plans have been submitted to meet this condition.***

For this DRB review, the applicant has submitted revised 3-dimensional color renderings, building elevations, roof & floor plans, landscape plans and lighting plan with photometrics and fixture cut-sheets.

Staff Comments:

1. One conditions of the SRT approval has not been addressed:
 - a. Tree islands were not added at the Malphrus Road entrance to save the trees. SRT will make the final determination on whether the tree islands must be incorporated into the entry design.
2. The applicant does not anticipate using exterior wall mounted light fixtures on the pool and dog park buildings. If additional exterior lighting is needed, the fixtures will either be recessed ceiling lights or they will match the copper gas wall lanterns used at the main amenity & greeting outpost buildings.
3. The color shown on the renderings on Sheet R1.0 is a little off, but the red roof color is meant to match the new muted red color shown on A2.0.
4. The Main Entry (L600) & Malphrus Road (L601) Gate details have been provided, but the plans are not well labeled to quickly determine which gate goes where.
5. The main entry gate and Malphrus Road gate detail doesn't specify the aluminum gate color (TBD). The applicant would like the flexibility to select either Charleston green or black to match the fencing.
6. The brick kiosk shown on Sheet L600 (Streetscape plan set) is proposed within the traffic median at the main entrance, but it is not labeled on the plan. There another brick kiosk at the Malphrus gate but it too is not labeled on the plan.
7. The dock construction details are not shown on the plans.
8. The dog park rendering shows an aluminum fence with masonry columns vs. the wood and wire fence shown on the plans. The rendering is incorrect; refer to the WJK detail.
9. The gate(s) and screen at the for the pump station may have to be raised if the pump station equipment is taller than 7' once installed. The applicant indicated that the screen height will be increased if necessary and will be built to fully screen the equipment.
10. There are over 300 RV pads and trash will be generated. Why aren't dumpster pad locations being proposed at this development?
11. Where are the locations of the monument signs for this development?

End of Report

Okatie Center - Home 2 Suites

Type of Submission:	Conceptual (3)
Developer:	Sam Patel, Sai Bluffton Hotel, LLC
Architect:	Thomas Michaels, SM7 Design, LLC
Engineer:	Eric Hoover, Ward Edwards Engineering
Type of Project:	Commercial
Location:	196 Okatie Village Drive, Okatie, SC
Zoning Designation:	Planned Unit Development (Okatie Center PUD – Southern Tract)

This project received Conceptual DRB approval with conditions on August 2, 2018. Subsequently, the site plan was amended to flip the development from the northern portion of the parcel to the southern portion of the parcel and was approved by the SRT on February 6, 2019.

The applicant is proposing to develop a 4.49-acre site within the Okatie Center PUD in two phases. As part of phase one, the applicant is proposing to construct a 107 room, 4-story, 66,670 square foot hotel with patios, swimming pool, parking, sidewalks, infrastructure, landscaping and lighting on the southern half of this parcel. The applicant has not determined what will be built for the phase two portion of the project. The site is part of a commercial subdivision which includes an off-site detention area which was master planned for each lot to have a maximum of 65% impervious coverage; this project has 64.8% impervious coverage. Two new private drives will be built on this site; one drive bisects the central portion of the property which ends at a new drive which runs along half of the west side of the site. Parking areas on-site are on the sides and rear of the building and off-street parking is also being proposed. The parcel is partially covered with young pine trees and has no wetlands. The existing young pine trees at the southeast corner and within the Phase 2 area will be preserved. The site is constrained by an undeveloped commercial lot to the west, Okatie Center Boulevard to the south, the Food Lion Shopping Center to the east and Okatie Village Drive to the north. The DRB must evaluate this project using the development and design guidelines of the Okatie Center PUD document.

The proposed building has a corniced stepped parapet roof line with wide corner tower elements at the main entry and backside of the building. A cantilevered awning will be installed over the main building entrance and a wrap-around trellis feature will be placed on the northeast corner of the building. The building offsets contain a fewer number of consecutive window units to help break up the mass and scale of the structure. The building facade will be clad with a combination of brick, lap and shake siding and Bahamian shutters have been applied to the front and back tower elements. An additional trellis feature was added to the north first floor central offset. A series of brick columns with brick wall sections are topped with a trellis structure which surrounds the outdoor swimming pool, patio and barbeque area on the backside of the building which serves as an outdoor extension to the main building complete with an overhead trellis covered walkway which leads from the back entry, along the sidewalk adjacent to the pool yard and terminates at the parking lot.

A conceptual sketch of the building was first presented at the August 2, 2018 DRB meeting and was well received by the Board with comments provided to the applicant. A second set of conceptual building elevations were reviewed at the March 7, 2019 DRB meeting but the formalized building elevations lacked the detailing shown in the conceptual sketch and did not meet the expectations of the Board; the submission was tabled but following comments were made:

- The DRB really liked the original sketch submitted on August 2, 2018. ***The elevations were revised and incorporated more of the detailing which was shown in the original sketch.***
- The tower elements look nice in elevation, but the rest of the design lacked the nice detailing shown in

Beaufort County Design Review Board

April 4, 2019

the original sketch. *More detailing is part of the revised design which includes well defined window trim, horizontal plates between the stories, alternating facade materials and patterns on the primary & offset sections of the building and all of the corner tower features were widened to better anchor the structure.*

- Accentuate the cornice and more offsets should be added, or be better defined, to create shade and shadow. *The revised elevations show that the tower element cornices are accentuated and that wood panel trim work was also added to all of the tower elements to create uniformity and that cornices were added to the lower parapets around the entire building.*
- Break up the monotony of the windows, vary the siding details and add shutters on the windows. *The offset sections contain a fewer number of consecutive windows and Bahamian shutters were added on two of the corner tower elements to meet this condition*
- Add vertical landscape plantings at the base of the building and add pervious pavers around the pool to reduce the impervious coverage area on the site. *These items will be addressed at the Final DRB review.*

The applicant has submitted an architecture site plan, floor plans and rendered building elevations for this review.

Staff Comments:

1. Show where the air condensers and service yards will be located to service the office, workout area, etc. and detail how they will be fully screened from view.

End of Report