



## Design Review Board Meeting

### Chairman

JAMES ATKINS

### Vice Chairman

J. MICHAEL BROCK

### Board Members

SALLIE BROCK  
PETER BROWER  
BRAD HILL  
H. PEARCE SCOTT  
DONALD L. STARKEY

### County Administrator

ASHLEY M. JACOBS

### Clerk to Council

SARAH W. BROCK

### Staff Support

ERIC GREENWAY

### Administration Building

Beaufort County Government  
Robert Smalls Complex  
100 Ribaut Road

### Contact

Post Office Drawer 1228  
Beaufort, South Carolina 299901-  
1228  
(843) 255-2140  
[www.beaufortcountysc.gov](http://www.beaufortcountysc.gov)

# Design Review Board Meeting Agenda

Thursday, January 9, 2020 at 2:30 PM

Large Meeting Room, Grace Coastal Church

15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. FOIA – PUBLIC NOTIFICATION OF THIS MEETING HAS BEEN PUBLISHED, POSTED, AND DISTRIBUTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE SOUTH CAROLINA FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - December 12, 2019
4. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS (*Comments are limited to 3 minutes*)

---

## ACTION ITEMS

---

5. NEW BUSINESS: none
6. OLD BUSINESS:
  - A. Okatie Center Home 2 Suites – Final

---

## BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

---

7. Next Scheduled Meeting – 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 6, 2020 at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909
8. ADJOURNMENT

BEAUFORT COUNTY  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES  
December 12, 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:** Pearce Scott

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

**Guests:** Brian Pennell, Key Engineering, Inc.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.
2. **MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins asked if there were comments on the November 7, 2019 minutes. No comments were made. Mrs. Brach motioned to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Starkey seconded to approve. Motion carried.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Matthews Marine Storage Facility – Bluffton – Conceptual:**

Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Brian Pennell, the project civil engineer, gave the presentation for the project. He said that materials, such as lumber products, would not be stored under the structures; just boats, RV's and large vehicles. Mr. Pennell said that the owner would like to enclose the back and sides of the structures to screen the view into the buildings to eliminate the need for a solid fence on the perimeter of the property.

Mr. Hill had no comments.

Mrs. Brach said that she did not like the location of the structures as the site is within view from Highway 278. She questioned whether the structures could be located behind the existing building to block them from view. Mr. Pennell referred to the site plan to orientate the Board with the site and the proposed structures. He said that the northwest corner of the site would be used as a new trailer sales display area, that the two front structures were orientated away from Highway 278 and that the third building was located farthest from Highway 278. Mr. Pennell stated that the Owner wanted to have security fencing around the trailer sales area and would fully utilize the storage area in the back. He said that the Owner sold too much of his property to Tractor Supply, and that this parcel was zoned and purchased for this use.

Mr. Hill asked whether the front corner gravel area was for storage or for sales. Mr. Pennell said that this area would be used for trailer sales and not for storage. Mr. Pennell asked if the 8' solid fencing along the front property line at the sales area would be required due to its use. He also wanted clarification about the solid fencing requirement along the back and sides and

whether enclosing the sides and backs of the structures would eliminate the need for a solid fence.

Mr. Atkins stated that Mr. Pennell should work with Staff for a final determination about the fencing issue and come back at final with a fencing layout for their review.

Mr. Starkey referred to the color sample and questioned what the metal roof color would be. Mr. Pennell stated that galvalume roofing was proposed. Mr. Starkey asked what the hurricane rating was for the structures. Mr. Pennell did not know what the rating was but that the buildings would be engineered to meeting the hurricane rating requirements. Mr. Starkey requested that the hurricane rating of the buildings be provided at final DRB review. He also said that the front buffer needs a landscape plan for both sides of the driveway and would like to see an 8' brick wall across the front to block the view because the site was so close to Highway 278. Mr. Pennell said that a landscape plan was being developed.

Mr. Hill stated that due to the proximity of the site to Highway 278, the landscape plan should not be minimal.

Mr. Brower wanted to know if all of the trees other than the buffers would be removed. Mr. Pennell said that the Natural Preserved forest area along with the front and side buffers would be preserved. He said that the interior trees need to be removed in order to have enough room to maneuver the large vehicles in and out of the structures.

Mr. Starkey asked how the Natural Preserved forest area would be protected from being run over by the boat trailers and large vehicles when backing into the storage structures. Mr. Pennell stated that a split rail fence would be installed all around the Natural Resource protection area.

Mrs. Brach stated that there was only one way in and one way out. Mr. Pennell confirmed this and added that there was a hammerhead turnaround for fire trucks and large vehicles to maneuver. He also said that there would be eyewash stations as required by Code.

Mr. Brower asked whether fire protection was required. Mr. Pennell said that he didn't think the buildings would be required to be sprinkled.

Mr. Starkey asked if a dumpster would be proposed. Mr. Pennell said that this site would be combined with Matthews Marine and that the existing dumpster and restrooms at Matthews Marine would be used for users of the storage facility. Mr. Starkey wanted to know how pedestrians or vehicles from the storage facility would access the Matthews Marine dumpster and restrooms. Mr. Pennell said that vehicles would not have access to Matthews Marine and the final site plan would show the pedestrian access to the dumpster and restrooms.

Mr. Brock said that the solid fencing is critical especially along the park property. Mr. Pennell said they would like to enclose the backs and sides of the storage structures and install chain link fencing with plantings for security purposes.

Mr. Atkins said that he didn't mind the simple pole barn structures, but that wanted to know what the colors of the gable ends, fascia and trim would be. He stated that he would prefer a patrician bronze roof color so the structures would blend in with the forested park property. Mr. Pennell said that the gables might be open and not sided. Mr. Atkins said to let the DRB know at final whether the gables were open or closed and the colors proposed. He said that the

structures would not be seen on westbound Highway 278. Mr. Atkins said that the front buffers along Cecil Reynold Road should be enhanced and side buffers next to the park were very important. He requested that a pathway to the restrooms and dumpster be shown on the final plans.

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

- Work with Staff on the screening requirements and show the locations of the solid fencing and security fencing
- Show the pathway from the storage facility to the dumpster and restrooms
- Substitute a patrician bronze metal roof color for the galvalume roofing color.
- Specify whether or not the gables will be open or closed and identify what the fascia, trim and gable end colors will be.
- Provide the hurricane rating for the storage structures
- Provide an enhanced landscape plan for the Cecil Reynolds Drive buffer and at the buffers adjacent to the park property.

The Board had a discussion about the motion.

Mr. Brock asked whether the DRB would be required to review the proposed plantings at Matthews Marine's west and north buffers. Ms. Moss said the DRB would review the Matthews Marine buffer plantings at final.

Mr. Hill questioned whether there were different screening issues for a storage versus sales use on the site and to resolve this question at final.

Mr. Starkey said that in addition to the previous conditions of the motion, he asked to include the condition that the applicant:

- Provide an overall combined plat of the Matthews Marine Property and the Matthews Storage Facility to show the new pedestrian pathway connections and cleaned up Matthews Marine west and north buffers with new plantings.

Mr. Atkins seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

**5. OLD BUSINESS:** None

**6. OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Atkins said the next scheduled meeting was at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, January 9, 2020 at the Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909.

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

## Okatie Center – Home 2 Suites

<b>Type of Submission:</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Developer:</b>	Sai Bluffton Hotel, LLC
<b>Architect:</b>	Thomas Michaels, SM7 Design
<b>Engineer:</b>	Eric Hoover, Ward Edwards Engineering
<b>Type of Project:</b>	Commercial
<b>Location:</b>	196 Okatie Village Drive, Okatie, SC
<b>Zoning Designation:</b>	Planned Unit Development

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, drives, sidewalks, infrastructure, landscaping and lighting on the southern half or 2.5 acres 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. 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 stepped parapet roofline with wide corner tower elements at the main entry and backside of the building. The main tower/beacon element has fixed glass windows on the front-side and on the parapet with wood louvered panels and decorative wood brackets above. The parapets on the central and back offsets have wood louvered panels topped with a gray EIFS cornice. A cantilevered awning with a natural wood finish ceiling will be installed over the main building entrance and a white wrap-around trellis feature will be placed on the northeast corner of the building. The building facade has a gray color scheme and will be clad with a combination of brick, lap and shake siding. Bahamian shutters with a natural wood finish have been applied to the front and back tower elements. An additional white trellis feature will be installed at the north first floor central offset.

A series of brick columns and wall sections are topped with a trellis structure which surrounds the outdoor swimming pool, patio and barbeque area on the backside of the building.

A 10' trash enclosure with two dumpster bays and an attached storage garage with roll-up door is proposed at the northwest corner of this project and will have a gray EIFS veneer.

A conceptual sketch of the building was first presented at the August 2, 2018 DRB meeting and was well received by the Board. A second set of conceptual building elevations were reviewed at the March 7, 2019 DRB meeting but lacked the detailing shown in the conceptual sketch and was tabled. A third set of conceptual building elevations were approved as submitted at the April 4, 2019 DRB meeting.

### Staff Comments:

1. At the March 7<sup>th</sup> DRB meeting, the Board requested that vertical landscape plantings be incorporated at the base of the building and to add pervious pavers around the pool to reduce the impervious coverage area on the site:

Beaufort County Design Review Board  
January 9, 2020

- a. The Board must determine whether the sabal palmettos provide adequate vertical dimension to meet the request of the DRB; and,
  - b. It is unclear whether the pool deck material will be pervious as requested by the DRB.
2. Show where the air condensers and service yards will be located to for the office, workout area, etc. and detail how they will be fully screened from view.
3. Move the underground electric & water lines outside of two south tree islands to avoid tree root growth conflicts.
4. Please submit exterior light fixtures cut-sheets for the building and drop-off canopy.
5. The Lighting plan does not have site lighting proposed at the main drop-off canopy and is very dark.
6. Please show the monument sign location(s) and sign structure design.
7. The color/material board and 3-D renderings will be submitted for review at the meeting.

END OF REPORT