



**AGENDA**  
**BEAUFORT COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**Thursday, December 12, 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. Brach / 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 NOVEMBER 7, 2019 MEETING MINUTES ([backup](#))
3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
4. NEW BUSINESS:
  - A. Matthews Marine Storage Facility – Bluffton – Conceptual ([backup](#))
5. OLD BUSINESS: none
6. OTHER BUSINESS:

Next Scheduled Meeting - 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, January 9, 2020 at Grace Coastal Church,  
15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC, 29909
7. ADJOURNMENT



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

---

**Members Present:** James Atkins, J. Michael Brock, Sallie Brach, Peter Brower, Brad Hill and Donald L. Starkey

**Members Absent:** H. Pearce Scott

**Staff Present:** Nancy Moss, Beaufort County Community Development Department

**Guests:** Jeremy Barlet, Premier Atlantic Hospitality; Brian Kraft, WB Services; and, Eric Hoover, Ward Edwards Engineering

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.
2. **MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins asked if there were comments on the October 3, 2019 minutes. No comments were made. Mr. Starkey motioned to approve the minutes as written. Mrs. Brach seconded to approve. Motion carried.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.
4. **NEW BUSINESS:** None
5. **OLD BUSINESS:**

**A. Okatie Center – Choice Hotel – Final:**

Mr. Brock recused himself from the meeting. Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Brian Kraft with WB Services, gave the presentation for the project. He said that banding was added at the top of the Porte Cochere to help with the proportion as well as lowering the roof pitch.

Mr. Hill said that he liked the revisions made to the Porte Cochere and that it was in better scale. Mr. Hill referred to the color board and wanted clarification as to where the colors were going to be applied. Mr. Kraft said that the water table would have a tabby veneer, that the lap siding was gray and the board and batten was green. Mr. Kraft added that the billboard area was smaller and changed out with prestige stone with a reclaimed wood color to coordinate with the siding colors. Mr. Hill said that the green color proposed was not appealing to him.

Mrs. Brach said that there was a lot going on but was ok with the design.

Mr. Starkey had no comments.

Mr. Brower said that there was a big improvement from where the project started.

Mr. Atkins said that tabby stucco traditionally had shell in it and asked whether the tabby stucco would have shell. Mr. Kraft said that the tabby stucco would have shell in it. Mr. Atkins said that it was difficult to determine how the colors would look on the building without colored

renderings. He said that the green and purple colors should be used in a limited fashion. Mr. Atkins agreed with Mrs. Brach and said there was a lot going on with the facade materials and that the Board needed a clear understanding of where the materials and colors were being applied. He stated that there were no wall or building sections so it was difficult to see the depth of the window trim, soffit details, transitions between stone & hardie and the porte cochere ceiling material.

Mr. Brower stated that the tabby stucco should be a cementitious color. Mr. Kraft said that it would.

Mr. Brower made a motion to table this project until the color renderings, building sections and details were submitted. Mr. Starkey seconded the motion.

Jeremy Barlet, franchisee of the hotel, requested to speak to the Board. He said that he cared deeply about how this building would look and was happy that it would not look like a prototype hotel. He said that they have been working on the DRB approval since March and requested that they consider a conditional approval versus tabling it.

The Board had a discussion about Mr. Barlet's request for conditional approval.

Mr. Brower said that he appreciated all of the efforts made to make this project different.

Mr. Hill said that conditional approval might be a better option as opposed to tabling it to resolve the color issues.

Mr. Starkey said that the building footprint and height would not change, but they were missing the building details.

Mr. Atkins said that the colors could be handled with colored elevations but not having building details to review gave him pause.

Mr. Kraft said that they are seeking conditional approval because the building code changes will take effect on January 1, 2020.

The Board voted on the motion to table the project. Mr. Atkins and Mr. Brower were in favor of the motion. Mrs. Brach, Mr. Hill and Mr. Starkey were opposed to the motion.

Motion failed.

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

- Submit colored elevations of all four building sides
- Provide wall & building sections
- Submit building details: window trim, soffits, transitions between stone & hardie, overhangs widths, corner trim details, etc. so the Board can get a clear understanding of how the building will look.
- Submit the drawings to Staff to forward to the DRB for electronic review.

Mrs. Brach seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

Mr. Atkins stated that “the structure, landscaping, lighting, and other design elements 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.”

Mr. Brock returned to the meeting.

## **6. OTHER BUSINESS:**

### **A. Bed Bath & Beyond Exterior Painting Project – Bluffton – Informal Discussion:**

Ms. Moss presented an aerial view of the site to give an orientation of the project. The owners of the development were located in Pennsylvania, were not in attendance and requested input from the Board about the new exterior paint colors for the Bed Bath & Beyond storefront. Googled color samples, a photo of the street view of the Hilton Head Village shopping and a photograph of another Bed Bath & Beyond storefront with the new gray color scheme were presented to the Board. The owners would keep the violet accent tiles on the facade along with the navy canvas awning and blue metal tower roofing.

Mr. Brower commented that the googled paint color samples looked less stark than how the gray paint colors appeared at another Bed Bath & Beyond store location.

Mrs. Brach stated that because of the buffer plantings, the shopping center was difficult to see from highway 278 so the new paint colors would be fine.

Mr. Atkins indicated that the new gray color scheme should be continued within the shopping center and suggested it be applied on the facade under the next set of towers also. He stated that it was difficult to make a determination without a colored elevation.

Mr. Brower liked the new gray color scheme and would like the owners to consider eventually applying the new gray color scheme on each storefront as painting was needed.

The Board unanimously agreed that the new paint colors would be a nice change for the storefront.

Ms. Moss relayed a request from the owner that the DRB to consider an expedited review so the new color scheme could be applied before the end of the month.

The Board would allow an expedited review providing the applicant submit the following:

- The applicant must send the actual color samples on a color Board for review
- The gray color scheme is nice but may be a bit jarring adjacent to the tan storefront within this shopping center and would like to see the new gray color scheme carried down to the first set of towers east of Bed Bath & Beyond for continuity.
- The new gray colored scheme must be applied on both the left and front sides of Bed Bath & Beyond
- Provide rendered east and north elevations of the entire shopping center showing the proposed gray paint colors

- B.** The Board unanimously agreed to reschedule the December 5, 2019 DRB meeting to the second Thursday or December 12, 2019.

- C. Mr. Atkins said the next scheduled meeting was at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, December 12, 2019 at the Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909.

Mr. Atkins stated that for all future projects, the building details must be submitted; otherwise, the application cannot be accepted. The Board members unanimously agreed.

- D. **ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Brock made a motion to close the meeting and Mrs. Brach seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

## Matthews Marine Storage Facility

|                            |                                      |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Type of Submission:</b> | <b>Conceptual</b>                    |
| <b>Developer:</b>          | Rob Matthews                         |
| <b>Architect:</b>          | n/a                                  |
| <b>Engineer:</b>           | Brian Pennell, Key Engineering, Inc. |
| <b>Type of Project:</b>    | Commercial                           |
| <b>Location:</b>           | 56 Cecil Reynolds Road, Bluffton, SC |
| <b>Zoning Designation:</b> | C5 – Regional Center Mixed Use       |

The applicant is proposing to construct three (3) storage structures for RV's, large vehicles or boats with gravel drive aisles, an open trailer sales & display area, infrastructure, stormwater pond, landscaping and lighting. The 1.74 acre undeveloped site is immediately adjacent to the Matthews Marine facility and will be combined with the existing facility and is located at the foot of a dead-end road. This parcel is covered with young forest trees and underbrush and 10% of the forested area will be preserved as required. The front 20' thoroughfare and 10' perimeter buffers will also be preserved, but all of the trees on the interior of the site will be removed. The site is constrained by Matthews Marine and Tractor Supply to the west, undeveloped Beaufort County passive park property to the south & east and Cecil Reynolds Road and Highway 278 to the north.

The proposed storage buildings all vary in size but will all possess the same basic design as open pole barn storage structures with low pitch gable roofs clad in metal galvalume roofing supported by pressure treated 8x8 wood columns.

The project was approved at the SRT conceptual review meeting held on November 20, 2019 with one of the stipulations being that the front and west buffers at the marine sales business get cleaned-up (boats removed) and replanted per the buffer planting guidelines.

For the conceptual DRB review, the applicant has submitted the site plan, photographs, building elevations & details and roof plan.

### Staff Comments:

1. As a storage yard, this use must comply with Division 4.1.180 and must meet the following conditions:
  - a. Storage Height. Storage of any equipment may not exceed 12' in height from the lowest ground elevation. ***The open-sided structures and front display area will expose equipment to view.***
  - b. Screening of Storage Areas. All outdoor storage areas shall be screened with a solid wooden fence or masonry wall at least 8' high. One evergreen shrub shall be installed for every five linear feet of fence or wall on the side of the fence or wall facing a neighboring property or public right-of-way. ***At final, solid fencing must be shown on the plans, fence details must be provided with evergreen landscaping as required.***
2. Provide a wooden split rail fence around the protected forest for the life of the project to prevent damage and/or disturbance in this area.

END OF REPORT