



Design Review Board Meeting

Chairman

JAMES ATKINS

Vice Chairman

J. MICHAEL BROCK

Board Members

SALLIE BRACH

PETER BROWER

BRAD HILL

ROGER JADOWN

DONALD L. STARKEY

County Administrator

ERIC GREENWAY

Clerk to Council

SARAH W. BROCK

Staff Support

ROBERT MERCHANT

Administration Building

Beaufort County Government

Robert Smalls Complex

100 Ribaut Road

Beaufort, South Carolina 29901

Contact

Post Office Drawer 1228

Beaufort, South Carolina 29901-

1228

(843) 255-2140

www.beaufortcountysc.gov

Design Review Board Meeting Agenda

Thursday, March 3, 2022, at 2:30 PM

Large Meeting Room, Grace Coastal Church

15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909

All persons who attend this meeting must practice 6' social distancing and wearing a face mask or covering is currently optional.

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 – January 6, 2021
4. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS (*Comments are limited to 3 minutes*)

ACTION ITEMS

5. NEW BUSINESS: None
6. OLD BUSINESS:
 - A. Storease Bluffton Annex (formerly named: Hwy. 278 Self-Storage Facility) - Bluffton – Conceptual (2)

OTHER BUSINESS

7. Next Scheduled Meeting – 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, April 7, 2022, at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909
8. ADJOURNMENT

BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
January 6, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

Members Present: James Atkins, J. Michael Brock, Roger Jadown and Donald L. Starkey

Members Absent: Sallie Brach, Peter Brower, and Brad Hill

Staff Present: Nancy Moss, Beaufort County Community Development Department

Guests:

Highway 278 Self-Storage Facility: Jason Broene, Court Atkins Architects

Seaglass Windowsapes: Nikki Pettitt, Savannah Blinds; Kevin Grenier, KRA Architecture; and, Rick Gammon, Landsource.

No members from the public were in attendance.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m.
2. **FOIA:** Chairman Atkins said that “public notification of this meeting has been published, posted, and distributed in compliance with the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act”.
3. **MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins asked if there were comments on the December 2, 2021, minutes. Mr. Brock motioned to approve the meeting minutes and Mr. Jadown seconded to approve. Motion carried unanimously.
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.
5. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. **Highway 278 Self-Storage Facility – Bluffton – Conceptual:**

Mr. Atkins asked Mr. Brock to officiate during this project review and 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 this was a unique linear site which lended well with the linear storage building design. He said that the building was placed 130’ off the corridor and was a two-story structure with Lowcountry detailing in the front to screen the one-storage buildings behind it. Mr. Broene presented a sample of the stucco textured metal panel to the Board and stated that it was the same material that was used at the John Harris Body Shop. Mr. Broene referred to the east building elevation and said that gable elements were incorporated to help break up the massing and that an 8’ privacy fence, similar to that used at John Harris Body Shop but without the barbed wire, would be installed on the west property line. He said that the rooftop HVAC units would be tucked behind the 2-story front portion of the building and would be fully screened from view and that no other roof-mounted units were proposed. He said that there would be ground-mounted HVAC units in the service yard between buildings 1 and 2.

Mr. Jadown asked why there was a change in the building height from building 1 to building 2. Mr. Broene stated that the height change was to give building number 2 a little different look because it was located further from the corridor. Mr. Jadown asked whether a dumpster would be

proposed, and Mr. Broene said no. Mr. Jadown asked how the site would be lit. Mr. Broene stated that typical Dominion Energy lights would be proposed and that a lighting plan would be presented at the final DRB review. Mr. Jadown stated that the gable features on the east elevation appeared to look like watchtowers in a prison. Mr. Starkey agreed and stated that was one of his concerns also. Mr. Starkey continued to say that the three gable elements should be flattened. Mr. Broene stated that the gable elements were introduced to help break the structure up but would study this issue.

Mr. Starkey asked what the pervious to impervious ratio was because there were a lot of hard surfaces proposed on this site. Mr. Broene did not know. Mr. Starkey asked if there was any screening with ground level fencing. Mr. Broene stated that the service yard would be screened with solid fencing. Mr. Starkey expressed concern about the blank wall on the west elevation next to the open field and that there was not much room for a dense buffer. Mr. Starkey asked that they break-up the blank west wall in some manner.

Mr. Brock too had concerns about the appearance of the blank wall next to the adjacent open field because it would most likely be developed in the future.

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

- The three gable elements on the east elevation should be flattened/redesigned.
- Show the locations of the gutters and downspouts on the elevations.
- Break up the blank building wall facade next to the open field to the west.
- Provide fencing details for the front security fencing & gates and for the fencing at the service yard.
- SRT staff will provide confirmation about the maximum amount of impervious area allowed.

Mr. Jadown seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Atkins returned to the meeting.

6. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Okatie Center – Seaglass Windowscapes – Bluffton – Final (2):

Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Kevin Grenier, the project Architect, and Rick Gammon, the project landscape designer, made the presentation for the project. Mr. Grenier submitted detail A.04 to the Board members which demonstrated that the parapets fully concealed the rooftop HVAC equipment. He stated that the rooftop displays were no longer going to be done on the roof. Mr. Gammon stated that the landscape plan was revised and that supplemental plantings were added along the rear drive loop.

A group discussion ensued between the applicant, her presenatives and the Board regarding the rear drainage easement and where the rear buffer plantings should be installed and the feasibility of the rear drive loop because the turning radius on the drive would not be great enough for 18-wheelers to maneuver around it. In addition, the Board wanted a dense rear buffer to be in place to screen this commercial site from the Sun City residential homes. After much discussion, it was determined that the tree removals shown in the drainage easement would not be removed, the back

drive loop and sidewalks would no longer be proposed and that staff would provide clarification as to where the rear buffer plantings should begin.

Ms. Nettitt stated that the rear of the building lacked articulation because her goal was to add 3 to 4 units in the back sometime in the future. She presented a revised building rendering to the Board, one without the mansard roof, and asked that they consider it as a design option. Ms. Pettitt presented photographs of other buildings under 10,000 square feet in Okatie Center that did not have gable roofs and wished to do the same. Mr. Atkins indicated that the building examples that were presented had roof accents and overhangs that provided Lowcountry detailing.

Mr. Jadown stated that the modified roof design with the wide overhang should have a band board added under it. He asked for clarification about the interior stairway and if there was a way to access the stairway other than from the side exterior door. Mr. Grenier stated that the stairway could be accessed from the interior as well. Mr. Jadown asked if the monument sign would be lit. Mr. Grenier said that a small gooseneck fixture would be proposed.

Mr. Brock said that he wanted clarification on the rear buffer and road drive loop, but was good with everything else.

Mr. Starkey stated that the tree island locations on the civil, architecture and landscape plans did not match. He also stated that he wanted clarity on the type of pervious paving that would be installed at the handicapped parking spaces. He said that he too had concerns about the rear buffer location.

Mr. Atkins said that the corner boards on the front entry feature looked too large and that painting them the same as the siding color would possible help. He said that the three wall packs shown on the rear elevation and the wall packs above the overhead doors on the right elevation were not part of the photometrics. Mr. Grenier said that the rear wall packs would be removed. Mr. Atkins stated that the light fixture cut-sheets needed to be provided for the exterior wall light sconces and goosenecks. He said that the sloped bracketed canopies on the first floor and new gable truss entry element looked good. Mr. Atkins said that they could go back to the parapet roof design but that canopies should be added to the second-floor windows and that they could be broken up into separate canopies. He concluded by stating that the rear buffer issue must be resolved and be located permanently.

Mr. Starkey said that there was not much lighting at the front of the building and suggested that additional wall lights be added and that the locations of the light poles be adjusted to offer more lighting.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve this final (2) project with the following conditions:

- Remove the rear drive loop & sidewalks and do not remove existing pine trees in the rear drainage easement and resolve the rear buffer planting location with SRT.
- Replace the mansard roof with a parapet roofline as presented along with individual sloped roofs over the second floor windows.
- The corner boards on the front entry feature look too wide and should be painted to match the gray siding color.
- Provide light fixture cut-sheets for all exterior light fixtures.
- Remove the rear wall packs on the elevations. Provide a comprehensive lighting plan with photometrics which also includes the wall packs and gooseneck lighting.

- Resolve the tree island location issue so that the civil, architectural, landscaping and lighting plans all match.
- The plans should be labeled, and a detail provided, as to the type of pervious paving that is proposed at the handicapped parking spaces.
- Increase the lighting levels at the front of the building with wall lights and/or adjusting the locations of the light poles.
- Submit revised drawings to address the DRB comments to staff who will forward the drawings to the DRB for approval. Another formal DRB is not required.

Mr. Brock seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Atkins read the standard final condition for the Okatie Center – Seaglass Windowscapes project and stated, “the building, landscaping, 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 before changes are made”.

7. OTHER BUSINESS:

- A.** Mr. Atkins stated that the next scheduled meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 3, 2022 at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909

- 8. ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Atkins made a motion to close the meeting and Mr. Brock seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Storease Bluffton Annex (formerly named Hwy. 278 Self-Storage Facility)

Type of Submission:	Conceptual (2)
Developer:	Wilson Moores, Merchants Retail Partners, LLC
Architect:	Annette Lippert, Court Atkins Architects
Engineer:	Andy Klosterman, Andrews Engineering
Type of Project:	Commercial
Location:	1290 Fording Island Road, Bluffton
Zoning Designation:	C5 Regional Center Mixed-Use

The project consists of constructing three one-story storage buildings totaling 24,937 square feet including service drives, security fencing & gates, landscaping, and associated infrastructure. The narrow rectangular 1.80-acre project site contains two small commercial buildings with an asphalt drive and parking lot on the north end of the parcel that were all built in 1974 and will be demolished as part of this project. The back 3/4's of the site is undeveloped that primarily contains pine trees on the perimeters and over-grown underbrush on the interior portion of the site. A wooden split rail fence and 6' green chain link fencing with barbed wire exist on the east property line and are proposed to remain as part of this project. The site is constrained by Highway 278 to the north, a general retail building & two metal storage warehouse buildings to the east, the Bluffton Parkway to the south and Parker's Gasoline station to the west.

The site plan has been re-designed, and the number of storage buildings have increased from two to three buildings, but the overall combined square footage of the buildings has been reduced by 2,063 square feet. The front portion of Building #1 has a 2-story gabled roof covered in metal roofing with bracketed eaves, an eastern entry feature, false windows with standard shutters and is clad with a combination of horizontal siding and stucco. The back half of the west side of Building #1 has four offsets with a series of flat and gabled parapets with false windows and shutters which are clad with horizontal siding. The west wall facade segments between the offsets have lower flat parapet rooflines that are clad with stucco textured metal panels. The east side of Building #1 has a central gabled offset with a series of overhead coiling doors located on each side of it. Building numbers 2 and 3 have similar design features and materials to those on Building number 1 with overhead coiling doors located on the east side of the structures.

The Staff Review Team conceptually reviewed this project on December 8, 2021 and allowed this project to proceed with the DRB process with conditions which, in part include, that the Highway buffer and the east and west buffers are heavily planted to create E-type buffers and that the specimen 26" & 30" pine tree removals be mitigated inch for inch.

This project was conceptually reviewed by the Design Review Board on January 6, 2022, and was approved with the following conditions:

- The three (3) gable elements on the east elevation should be flattened/redesigned. ***The number of gabled elements and the elevations were re-designed.***
- Show the locations of the gutters and downspouts on the elevations at final. ***The conceptual elevations have the gutters and downspouts shown.***
- Break up the blank building wall facade next to the open field to the west. ***Complied.***
- Provide fencing details for the front security fencing & gates and for the fencing at the service yard at final. ***Acknowledged.***
- SRT staff will provide confirmation about the maximum amount of impervious area allowed. After the DRB meeting, SRT determined that this site is required to have 10% open space (per 2.8.40A) and the buffers can count toward that requirement. In addition, because the building square footage exceeds 25,000 SF, this site is required per 2.8.40B to have civic space set-aside of 0.25 acres per 25,000 SF.

Beaufort County Design Review Board
March 3, 2022

The site plan was required to be revised to meet this requirement before this project could move forward with final DRB review. Staff contacted the project Civil Engineer to resolve this issue. ***The site plan was re-designed, and the overall building square footage was reduced to 24,937 square feet so the civic space set-aside will not be required.***

Staff Comments: None

END OF REPORT