



Design Review Board Meeting

Chairman

JAMES C. ATKINS

Vice Chairman

J. MICHAEL BROCK

Board Members

PETER BROWER
KRIS FELDMANN
ROGER JADOWN
ERIC WALSNOVICH
VACANT

County Administrator

MICHAEL MOORE

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, July 11, 2024, 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 – June 6, 2024
4. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS (Comments are limited to 3 minutes)

ACTION ITEMS

6. **NEW BUSINESS:**
 - A. Okatie Center – Medical Office Building Renovations, 40 Okatie Center Boulevard – Bluffton - Conceptual
7. **OLD BUSINESS:**
 - A. Okatie Center - The "H" Building, 211 Okatie Village Drive – Bluffton - Conceptual (Revisit)

OTHER BUSINESS

8. **NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING** – 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, August 1, 2024, at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909
9. ADJOURNMENT



BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
June 6, 2024, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

Members Present: James Atkins, J. Michael Brock, Peter Brower, Kris Feldmann, Roger Jadown and Eric Walsnovich

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Nancy Moss, Beaufort County Community Development Department
Mary Brantley, Beaufort County Community Development Department

Guests:

Moss Creek – Seven Brew Thoroughfare Buffer Improvements: Will Glisson, East Coast Construction; and Keilen Richardson, 7 Venture

Okatie Center – The “H” Building: Mike Vaccaro, Vaccaro Architecture; Jose Hurtado, J & G Concrete; Kathleen Duncan, J. K. Tiller Associates; and Steve Richbourg, May River Contracting

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:34 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 April 4, 2024, meeting minutes. Mr. Jadown motioned to approve the meeting minutes and Mr. Atkins seconded to approve. Mr. Feldmann and Mr. Walsnovich abstained from voting. Motion carried.
4. **MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins asked if there were comments on the May 2, 2024, meeting minutes. Mr. Walsnovich motioned to approve the meeting minutes and Mr. Jadown seconded to approve. Mr. Brock abstained from voting. Motion carried.
5. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.
6. **NEW BUSINESS:**
 - A. **Moss Creek Commercial Seven Brew Thoroughfare Buffer Improvements – Bluffton – Final:**
Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Will Glisson, the agent for the Developer, stated that the proposed work would not involve any soil disturbance or grubbing work. He said that they would keep most of the existing native plants but would remove the tallows and sweet gums 8” in caliper and under. Mr. Glisson said that supplemental native shrubs would be selectively placed in the open buffer areas after the buffer clean-out work was performed and that the buffer landscape plan was schematic, and the locations of the plantings may change.

Mr. Walsnovich stated that an As Built of the buffer plantings should be done as part of the close-out of this project. He said that gum and pine sapling removal size should be reduced to 4” versus 8” and that the tallows and other invasive trees can be removed. Mr. Walsnovich asked if there would be irrigation in the thoroughfare buffer. Mr. Glisson said that the buffer would not be irrigated but that the native shrubs are drought tolerant and that sporadic rain events would help them survive. Mr. Walsnovich concluded by stating that the supplemental buffer planting sizes should be increased to a 7-gallon container size for the evergreen shrubs and a 15-gallon container size for the saw palmettos.

Mr. Brock agreed that an As Built of the buffer plantings should be done, and said that when the plantings are inspected prior to this project receiving a CO, if there is a hole or holes in the buffer, the Developer would be required to install additional plantings. Mr. Brock said that the vine removal would be a two-tier schedule and that the contractor would have to first remove what they can and then have to come back months later to remove the remaining dead vines so this area must be managed.

Mr. Atkins, Mr. Feldmann and Mr. Jadown made no comments.

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

- Change the supplemental buffer plantings container sizes from 3-gallon to 7-gallon for the evergreen shrubs and 15-gallon for the saw palmettos.
- Provide an as-built landscape plan of the thoroughfare buffer prior to the CO of the building.
- If there are any buffer holes found at the final planting inspection, the Developer will be required to plant additional shrubs per the discretion of the DRB.
- The allowed size of pine & gum sapling removals can be no larger than 4” caliper.
- All invasives are approved to be removed.

Mr. Walsnovich seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

B. Okatie Center – Lot S-15 – The “H” Building, 211 Okatie Village Drive – Bluffton – Conceptual:

Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Mr. Brower arrived at the meeting. Mike Vaccaro, the Architect for project, introduced himself and the project team to the Board. He stated that the Developer, Jose Hurtado, owns a concrete factory and the building was basically a concrete bomb shell with poured concrete slab floors and concrete walls, clad with brick and stucco. Mr. Vaccaro said that it is a straightforward building with a 30’ grid system and traditional detailing. He stated that they were excited about this project and yielded to the Board for questioning.

Mr. Feldmann asked Mr. Vaccaro what the driving design decisions were for this building. Mr. Vaccaro explained that Mr. Hurtado’s personal offices would be located on the second floor and that the restaurant and retail units would be on the first floor. He said that they wanted to bring the building close to the street to provide a pedestrian connection to the Food Lion shopping center development across the street. He said that the building was initially designed as a drive through

but became a pedestrian walk through. He said that the building would be class A with a restaurant, retail and office space, and that the 2nd floor conference room sits above the breezeway. He said that it was a traditionally proportioned building with parapets but that the half arches are unique to this building and would offer shade to the retail entrances and maximized the 2nd floor office space. Mr. Feldmann stated that it was a strong architectural design, but the design of the rooftop stair runs and penthouses were taken into less consideration and possibly detracted from the overall building design and that the shed roofs stand out. He said that there was still an opportunity to rework the shed roofs on the penthouses, or to possibly consolidate the roof access points or to move the stair runs back from the parapet or to determine if both stairways are needed. Mr. Vaccaro said that the main parapet was well thought out and that he tried to minimize the penthouse design by using the shed roofs because they were the more functional versus aesthetic portion of the building. He said that the penthouses originally had hipped roofs and would probably tie in better with the center breezeway and agreed that they could use some additional detailing on the cornice to tie it in better.

Mr. Jadown said in general he liked the building but that the concrete haunches seemed a little heavy and the building lacked Lowcountry design. He stated that the central conference curtain wall looked like it was not part of the building and that the north and south ends could use more articulation. Mr. Jadown said that more detailing was needed on the breezeway walls. He asked Mr. Vaccaro to consider adding a door on the breezeway wall for access to the restaurant. Mr. Jadown asked where the kitchen hood would be located. Mr. Vaccaro said there was a space for a 16' hood with a vertical chase located next to the stair tower. Mr. Jadown asked what treatment was proposed on the breezeway floor. Mr. Vaccaro said it hasn't been determined but would either be concrete or pavers.

Mr. Brock said that the units on top of the roof looked out of place and overall, the building doesn't look to scale with Lowcountry architecture. He stated that the columns and arches looked bulky. He stated that the landscape plan must have enough plantings for adequate screening within the buffers, particularly from highway 278. Mr. Brock said that because a pedestrian sidewalk was not required at the Okatie Retail Center, there would be a dead-end sidewalk and he did not think it should be required for this project. Mr. Vaccaro said that the width of the sidewalk perpendicular to the building would be reduced from 13' to 5'.

Mr. Brower said his first reaction to the design was that the stairway covers would look better if they had hip roofs to help tie into the center area. He said that it was nice to see an applicant want to spend the money to build something at great expense. He said that on the front elevation the members that come out seem relatively heavy and not Lowcountry and suggested changing them out to columns with brackets attached to extend it out further, and adding a shallow shed roof or a trellis to help soften the building a little.

Mr. Walsnovich said that he liked the boldness of the building. He would like to see more detailing on the central tower structure curtain walls seem a bit large. He stated that he did not have an issue with reducing the perpendicular sidewalk width, but the width should match the walk on the parking lot side of the building. Mr. Walsnovich said that an Arborist report would be beneficial for the multi-trunk live oak and to make an assessment on whether the other saved trees are worthy.

Mr. Atkins said he liked the overall concept of the building with the split ground level and the pedestrian connection so there was a lot of design merit. He said he appreciated the uniqueness of the design but struggled with the overall design, vertical/horizontal, with the roof structures popping up without being thought through in the overall massing fluid with no expressionary integration with the overall design. Mr. Atkins stated that the arches, with glued-on brick accents on the corners, were not very authentic for a traditional arch. He said on the left side there was a sense that the arches were supporting the upper masses, but on the right side it is bisected with the horizontal plane and appeared that the enormous arches were supporting a small metal roof. Mr. Atkins stated that the primary pedestrian thoroughfare being created is backed up to solid structures with no fenestration and felt like a tunnel versus a pedestrian arcade, which was a missed opportunity. He said the building has two sections on the ends and the element in the middle but there is no expression how the middle piece is supported and how it integrates with the rest of the overall design. Mr. Atkins said that this lot is part of a PUD with specific language about Lowcountry architecture and although the building has unique architectural expression it lacks Lowcountry character. He stated he was not convinced that the execution of the details and expression of the forms were there yet, but he liked the idea.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the comments were valid and helpful. He said that this is a masonry building that is heavy and bold and that the thickness of the columns is needed to support the second floor. He said there are 24"x24" poured concrete columns with 36' spans between the floors, and 8" post tension concrete slab floors with 8' cantilevers. Mr. Vaccaro stated once the design is cleaned up, it will be more in-scale and be a handsome building.

Mr. Feldmann said that the arches appear to be truncated and, traditionally in the Lowcountry, there is a bracket supporting a cantilever but the way the arch comes up and continues past the floor line makes it feel like it is supporting the columns above versus the floor above. Mr. Feldman said that the pass-through is a missed opportunity to be a collector and arrival point and encouraged them to relocate the restaurant entrance off the breezeway. Mr. Vaccaro stated that they could address the issues between the interior wall on the breezeway between the restaurant space. Mr. Feldmann said he liked the boldness and the quality materials. He said that concrete can cantilever & do some things that can't be done with some of the more common methods and to consider using concrete on the arches to showcase what a solid structure is.

Mr. Brower said the building had a Vizenor or Flagler look and a bit of a train station look too and some of that architecture could play into this architecture if it's softened.

Mr. Vaccaro said he would massage the design to make sure the details are right.

Mr. Feldmann made a motion to table this project to allow the applicant time to investigate the Board's suggestions and come back for review.

Mr. Brock seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

7. OLD BUSINESS: None

8. **OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Atkins stated that the next scheduled meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, July 11, 2024, at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909.
9. **ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Walsnovich made a motion to close the meeting and Mr. Brower seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Okatie Center – Lot S-19 – Medical Office Building Exterior Renovations

Type of Submission:	Conceptual
Developer:	Teresa Wall, Lillibridge Health Services, Inc.
Architect:	John Powell, Seed Architecture, LLC
Engineer:	Brian Baskin, Pearson Engineering
Type of Project:	Institutional
Location:	40 Okatie Center Boulevard, Bluffton
Zoning Designation:	Planned Unit Development (PUD)

This project is located on the corner of Okatie Center Boulevard & Okatie Village Drive and is on an 8.99-acre site that contains a three-story 49,320 square foot medical office building, service drives & parking, landscaping and infrastructure constructed in 1998 with approximately one-third of the lot remaining wooded. The building has a mansard hip roof covered with gray shingle with a central equipment roof well, a pale peach colored smooth finished stucco facade with dark orange accents, bronze framed & dark colored glass on the arched doors & windows on the first and third floors and rectangular windows on the second floor and a brick water table around the entire structure. After decades of exposure to the coastal salt air, moisture, extreme heat, and wind, coupled with grading issues at the perimeter of the building, exterior renovations are needed to upgrade and repair the facility.

The scope of the exterior renovations includes the removal & replacement of the brick water table and the application of an elastomeric coating on the facade for moisture protection, selective storefront window replacement, the addition of cream colored gutters & downspouts, the construction of a new rear brick & stucco screen wall to conceal upgraded & larger HVAC equipment at the northeast corner of the building, the installation of a new rooftop dedicated outdoor air system unit, plant removal & grading correction in the foundation buffers around the building, creating a French drain system & installing downspout collection piping around the perimeter of the building, the installation of new foundation plantings and the removal of one parking stall.

The facade renovation work will be done to maintain the character of the building by matching the existing materials, colors and finishes on the building. The proposed foundation buffer landscaping was selected to deter the application of mulch that caused the rise in grade and so as not to interfere with the French drain system.

Because this is a developed site with a building that will undergo renovations, the Staff Review Team will not review this project.

Staff Comments:

1. The new rooftop air system unit is comparable in size to the existing unit, but the associated duct work is required to be installed under the unit, so the unit is sported by an elevated frame thereby exposing a small portion of the unit to view above the roofline from the front view.
2. The existing trees within the foundation buffer must be mitigated inch for inch and planted back as close as possible to the disturbed area.
3. The Grading Plan (G1) proposes drainage work within an area that contains “vegetation” by installing 3’ wide drainage swales from the low points of parking bays (12) on the perimeters to allow flow into the existing lagoon. No tree removals are proposed (LS1) for this work but it is unclear what type of vegetation exists. The plans do not specify how the swales will be stabilized.

END OF REPORT

Okatie Center – Lot S-15 – The H Building

Type of Submission:	Conceptual (Revisit)
Developer:	Jose Hurtado, J & G Concrete
Architect:	Michael A. Vaccaro, Vaccaro Architecture
Engineer:	Empire Engineering Company
Type of Project:	Commercial
Location:	211 Okatie Village Drive, Bluffton
Zoning Designation:	Planned Unit Development (PUD)

This project involves the development of an existing 1.21-acre sparsely wooded lot within the Okatie Center South commercial subdivision with a two-story 12,458 square foot mixed-use commercial building which also includes the installation of internal services drives & parking, landscaping, and associated infrastructure. The site contains non-specimen trees. The project fronts Okatie Village Drive and the Food Lion Shopping Center to the south, the Okatie Retail Center which is currently under construction to the west, Highway 278 to the north and an undeveloped commercial lot to the east.

The Staff Review Team conceptually reviewed this project on May 1, 2024, and allowed this project to proceed with the Design Review Board (DRB) process. This project was conceptually reviewed by the Design Review Board on June 6, 2024, and it was tabled but comments were provided by the DRB:

- The shed roofs & design of the stair runs and penthouses were taken into less consideration and possibly detract from the overall building. Consider adding hip roofs, possibly consolidating the roof access points, moving the stair runs back from the parapet or determining if both stairways are needed.
- The arches seem a little heavy and not very authentic for a traditional arch.
- The building lacks Lowcountry design.
- The central conference curtain wall looks a bit large and as though it is not part of the building. There is no expression on how it is supported and how it integrates with the rest of the overall design
- The north and south ends of the building could use more articulation.
- Add more detailing & fenestration on the breezeway walls and floors to create a sense of arrival. Add an entry door to the restaurant off the breezeway.
- Reduce the perpendicular sidewalk width to match the walk width on the parking lot side of the building.
- Provide an Arborist report for the multi-trunk live oak and to make an assessment on whether the other saved trees are worthy.
- Consider changing out the brick arches with concrete to showcase what a solid structure is.
- A new sidewalk parallel to Okatie Village Drive will not be required.

For this review, the building design has been modified to highlight the concrete aspects of the structure. The bricked half arches have been changed out with a concrete bracket/outrigger at the cantilevered sections, a horizontal concrete band has been added to the sides of the building, bracketed metal awnings have been added over the doors on the right, left and rear sides of the building, the shed roofs on the roof access points have been changed to hip roofs and the roof access points and the two story conference room walls have been lowered.

The site plan has also been modified which includes the removal of all exiting trees within the interior of the site, which is contrary to the request of SRT and the DRB was in favor of saving the multi-trunked live oaks. An Arborist Report was not submitted to document the decline of the trees. The parking lot has been

Beaufort County Design Review Board
July 11, 2024

revised to align the center tree islands and the front walkway was reduced to match the 8' sidewalk width on the parking lot side of the building.

Staff Comments:

1. Incorporate a sidewalk connection from the handicapped parking aisle to connect to the walkway parallel to the building for safer access (sheet C-2).
2. Relocate the bike rack from the foundation buffer (sheet C-2).
3. A Landscape Plan (sheet L1) has been submitted for this review. As a condition of SRT and a request from the DRB, the thoroughfare and perimeter buffers are required to have enhanced plantings.
4. It does not appear that parking lot lighting is being proposed.

END OF REPORT