



Design Review Board

Chairman

JAMES C. ATKINS

Vice Chairman

KRIS FELDMANN

Board Members

CAROLINE ATKINS
ELIZABETH EPSTEIN
CELINA MORELLO
DENISE PROCIDA
JOHN TETER

County Administrator

MICHAEL MOORE

Council Liaison

PAULA BROWN

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, October 1, 2026, 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
- [4.](#) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – April 2, 2026
- [5.](#) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – June 4, 2026
- [6.](#) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 9, 2026
- [7.](#) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 6, 2026
8. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS (Comments are limited to 3 minutes)

ACTION ITEMS

9. NEW BUSINESS:

- [A.](#) 64 Bluffton Road Medical Office Building Repainting Project – Bluffton – Final

10. OLD BUSINESS:

- [A.](#) Osprey Point, Malind Centre Commercial Buildings A - H & J, 1569 Pritcher Point Road – Okatie – Final

OTHER BUSINESS

11. **NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING** – 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, November 5, 2026, at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909

12. ADJOURNMENT



BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
April 2, 2026, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

Members Present: James Atkins, Denise Procida and John Teter

Members Absent: Kris Feldmann

Staff Present: Nancy Moss, Beaufort County Planning & Zoning Department
Carolyn Wallace, Beaufort County Planning & Zoning Department

Guests:

The Reserve at Broad River: Shelly Blakesley, Kaas Wilson Architects; Eric Walsnovich and Brad Hix, Wood & Partners, Inc.; Edmund Waddill, Chaucer Creek Capital; and Alex Rhode, Seamon Whiteside

Beaufort County Councilwoman Paula Brown, District 8

Members of the public were not in attendance.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:30 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 March 5, 2026, meeting minutes. Mr. Teter motioned to approve the minutes as prepared. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.

ACTION ITEMS

5. **NEW BUSINESS:** None

6. **OLD BUSINESS:**

- A. **The Reserve at Broad River (Multi-Family), 101 Broad River Boulevard – Beaufort – Final:**
Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Ms. Moss provided the project background. Eric Walsnovich, the Landscape Architect for the project, and Shelly Blakesley, the Architect for the project, attended the meeting to represent this project. Mr. Walsnovich stated that he had nothing to add to the staff report and will make the minor adjustments to the landscape plan. Ms. Blakesley said that it was very important to them to have the white color on the building body between the stacked porches and on the porch columns as wayfinding to the building entrances. She stated that the building had symmetry with the bracketed cantilevered porches being painted white, that the green board & batten areas always had a brick base on the first level, that the green color was added to the small gables above the areas with green board & batten siding to

add balance and that the red color was added at the top of the large gables, Bahama shutters and on the doors. She said that the window shutters were added to the building as a Lowcountry design element.

Mr. Teter said that he appreciated the change from 24” board & batten spacing but thought that the 12” spacing went a little too far and made the design look busy. He suggested that 16” spacing would work better especially with the volume of space.

Ms. Procida recommended that they study where the battens end up and to make sure they line up so they make sense. Ms. Blakesley stated that she agreed and that it was a Revit issue and that it would be adjusted. Ms. Procida said that she liked the fact that they incorporated more red on the building and liked it on the doors and shutters because it ties it all together better.

Mr. Teter said that the colors were excellent and well proportioned.

Mr. Atkins said that he liked the color scheme and the design updates. He referred to the 3D rendering the applicant brought to the meeting said that the color blocking bothered him a bit that the two small gables over the stacked porches were different in color and to remove the white trim and to be consistent gable to gable. He stated that the scale of the brackets under the stacked porches appeared to be 4x4’s and that the columns on the porches appeared to be 10x10’s and that the brackets should be the same size as the columns because the existing brackets appear too small to support a 2-story porch. He stated that the landscape plan had a disclaimer that the grading may reduce the number of significant trees and that County approval is required before any significant trees are removed. He said that the HVAC ground mounted units are not shown on the civil plans but are shown on the landscape plans. He said that some of the HVAC units have landscaping to screen the units while other HVAC units are not screened with landscaping. He requested that the electric meters are adequately screened from the public way and that the top of the wetland bank adjacent to the traffic circle seems a bit sparse and that additional plantings should be added.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve the project subject to the following conditions:

- Adjust the plans to address the staff comments.
- Study the scale and detail of the brackets under the stacked porches.
- Study the gable end color blocking to ensure trim color matches the gable facade color.
- Revise the landscape plan to add more plantings at the top of the wetland bank adjacent to the traffic circle and make sure the HVAC units are adequately screened (preferably with a ventilated structure that blends the unit into landscaping & buildings).

Ms. Procida seconded the motion.

Mr. Atkins asked the Board if a discussion was needed about the motion. There was no discussion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Atkins read the standard final condition and stated that “the buildings must be constructed, and the landscaping & lighting must be installed per the plans reviewed and approved by the DRB. The 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”.

OTHER BUSINESS

7. **NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING:** Mr. Atkins stated that the next scheduled meeting is currently at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 7, 2026, but will likely be rescheduled on Thursday, May 14, 2026, at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909. The DRB is waiting for the Church Board to approve the rescheduled meeting date.
8. **ADJOURNMENT:** Ms. Procida made a motion to close the meeting, Mr. Atkins seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.



BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MEETING MINUTES
June 4, 2026, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

Members Present: Kris Feldmann, Elizabeth Epstein, Celina Morello, and Denise Procida

Members Absent: James Atkins, Caroline Atkins and John Teter

Staff Present: Nancy Moss, Beaufort County Planning & Zoning Department
Carolyn Wallace, Beaufort County Project and Development Coordinator

Guests: Parris Island Commons – Grady Woods, Woods Dendy Architects and Mike Cox, Witmer, Jons Keefer, Ltd.

Members of the public were not in attendance.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Vice Chairman Feldmann called the meeting to order and took roll call at 2:28 p.m.
2. **FOIA:** Vice Chairman Feldmann said that “public notification of this meeting has been published, posted, and distributed in compliance with the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act”.
3. **04.02.26 MINUTES:** Vice Chairman Feldmann stated that they would have to table the vote for the April 2, 2026 meeting minutes because there wasn’t a quorum of the Board members present that attended the April Board meeting. He asked that this vote get postponed to the July 9th meeting agenda.
4. **05.14.26 MINUTES:** Vice Chairman Feldmann asked if there were comments on the May 14, 2026, meeting minutes. Ms. Procida motioned to approve the minutes as prepared. Ms. Morello seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
5. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.

ACTION ITEMS

6. **NEW BUSINESS:**
 - A. **Parris Island Commons Amenity and Apartment Buildings, 395 Parris Island Gateway – Beaufort – Conceptual:**

Mr. Feldmann asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Ms. Moss provided the project background. Grady Woods, the Architect for the project, and Mike Cox, the Landscape Architect for the project attended the meeting to represent this project. Mr. Woods stated that he appreciated the Board meeting with him informally to discuss the building architecture and for providing comments at the March 5, 2026 DRB meeting. He said that they addressed all of the Board’s previous comments and manipulated the Amenity building facade facing Parris Island Gateway by relocating the mailroom location and creating better articulation. He said that there was an odd number of units allowed so building #1 has a large penthouse. Mr. Woods stated that he would be glad to answer any questions. Mr. Cox said that they intentionally kept as many

significant trees as possible and that angled parking was incorporated along the interior street and that the parking areas were located behind the apartment buildings.

Ms. Epstein wondered about the buildings having to meet a 2.5-story building height. Mr. Woods stated that this very issue was under discussion at the March 5th DRB meeting and that the building design was revised per the suggestion of the DRB to recede the upper floor to reduce the mass and to let the roof continue to wrap around to make it look like a 2.5-story building.

Ms. Procida said that she liked how the design evolved from March to now. She said that the Amenity building needed more articulation and suggested that shutters or brackets get added to incorporate more Lowcountry features. She stated that the upper-level facade material had the same horizontal siding that was on the rest of the building and recommended that they introduce another siding material such as shake or board & batten. Ms. Procida stated that the proportion of the second level screen porch seemed too tall and that perhaps they lower the level of the second-floor porch roof or add panel & board siding as was done on the first floor or add horizontal louvers to break up the opening. She asked Mr. Woods if the building colors had been selected. Mr. Woods stated that the renderings were a good representation of the white building color being proposed. He said there was strength in simplicity with the white color and crisp detailing.

Ms. Epstein stated that the building design should incorporate more Lowcountry detailing.

Ms. Morello appreciated the effort to save the specimen trees. She said that the dumpster enclosure and dog park should be properly screened and that the sidewalk should be extended to the dog park.

Mr. Feldmann said that the architect responded well to the previous DRB comments with the updated architecture and massing presented at today's meeting and that they achieved 2.5-story buildings. He stated that he disagreed with Ms. Procida's comment about changing the facade material on the upper level and liked the horizontal siding but recommended that they introduce exposed rafter tails or eave brackets. Mr. Feldmann said he loved the open corridor concept. Mr. Feldmann commented on the site plan and said that it felt overparked and should be reduced. Mr. Cox said that 152 parking spaces are required but that they were allowed to have up to 20% above the number required and that 169 parking spaces were proposed. Mr. Feldmann said that some of the extra parking spaces should be removed, like the ones on the curved portion of the drive, to provide better access to the dog park and to reduce the amount of asphalt surface. Mr. Feldmann stated that the condenser locations should be identified and should ideally be fenced in. He said that on the Amenity building articulation on the blank walls may be resolved with heavy landscaping or faux openings. He asked that they better tie the amenity building architecture with the apartment buildings, particularly at the Amenity entry by adding a metal roof with Lowcountry detailing such as exposed rafter tails.

Ms. Procida agreed that will be very important to know where the condenser units will be located.

Mr. Feldmann recommended that they consider using the artisan Hardie plank siding versus the standard Hardie plank siding.

Mr. Feldmann made a motion to approve the project subject to the following conditions:

- Study the proportion of the second-floor porch height and the articulation at the screened in porch areas by incorporating Lowcountry elements.
- Identify the A/C condenser locations and specify the screening method.

- Better tie the entry area architecture of the Amenity building with the Apartment buildings by syncing the Apartment building metal entry porch roof detailing to the Amenity building and provide better facade articulation with the use of shutters, brackets or faux openings.
- Reduce the number of parking spaces to provide better access to the dog park and to reduce the amount of asphalt surface.
- Introduce exposed rafter tails or eave brackets to the upper-level areas on the Apartment buildings.
- Consider applying the artisan Hardie plank siding on the building facades.

Ms. Epstein seconded the motion.

Mr. Feldmann asked the Board if a discussion was needed about the motion. There was no discussion.

Motion passed unanimously.

7. OLD BUSINESS: None

OTHER BUSINESS

- 8. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING:** Mr. Feldmann stated that the next scheduled meeting is at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, July 9, 2026, at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909.
- 9. ADJOURNMENT:** Ms. Procida made a motion to close the meeting; Ms. Morello seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.



BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MEETING MINUTES
July 9, 2026, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

Members Present: James Atkins, Caroline Atkins, Elizabeth Epstein, Celina Morello, and Denise Procida

Members Absent: Kris Feldmann and John Teter

Staff Present: Nancy Moss, Beaufort County Planning & Zoning Department

Guests: Hilton Head Gasoline Station – Carlo Pardo, Morris & Ritchie and Hamzah Allawda, EDI Group

Malind Centre – Jason Broene, Court Atkins Architects, Josh Tiller, J. K. Tiller Associates and Dan Schael, Forino

Beaufort County Councilwoman Paula Brown, District 8

Members of the public were not in attendance.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Atkins called the meeting to order and took roll call at 2:30 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. **04.02.26 MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins stated that they would have to table the vote for the April 2, 2026, meeting minutes because there wasn’t a quorum of the Board members present that attended the April Board meeting. He asked that this vote get postponed to the August 6th meeting agenda.
4. **06.04.26 MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins stated that they would also have to table the vote for the June 4, 2026, meeting minutes because there wasn’t a quorum of the Board members present that attended the June Board meeting. He asked that this vote get postponed to the August 6th meeting agenda.
5. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.

ACTION ITEMS

6. **NEW BUSINESS:**
 - A. **Hilton Head Gas Station Reconstruction Project, 1610 Fording Island Road – Bluffton - Conceptual:**

Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Ms. Moss provided the project background. Carlo Pardo, the Civil Engineer for the project, and Hamzah Allawda, the Architect for the project both attended the meeting via telephone to represent this project. Mr. Pardo stated that the gasoline canopy was going to remain but would be modified to match the new building colors and design, that there was an inactive drain field on the property and they would tap into the force main and that he did not have any other comments to add.

Ms. Atkins stated that there were many spelling errors on the civil set of plans and had no comments on the architecture. She asked that the spelling and labeling issues get corrected for the final review.

Ms. Epstein suggested that all the pervious parking spaces get placed together versus being placed at the end of the parking bays. Mr. Pardo stated that the pervious parking spaces as placed were a requirement of the SRT. Ms. Epstein commented on the architecture and stated that the visibility of the entire roof could be seen from the flyover, so all of the rooftop HVAC equipment had to be screened from view.

Ms. Morello said that there appeared to be a clerical error because there was a discrepancy between the plant quantities shown on the plant schedule and the number of plants shown on the plan.

Ms. Procida stated that the roof of the gas station is in the direct sightline from the flyover and that she was concerned that the roof parapets would not fully screen the rooftop equipment. She asked them to consider incorporating traditional Lowcountry features and to consider the texture of the materials. She said that the parapet roof should probably be changed out with a gable roof and suggested to slide the dumpster back, so it aligns with the front facade. Ms. Procida stated that the right side of the building was very plain and needed better articulation, with architecture detailing or enhanced landscaping. She asked about the gas canopy details on sheet A-600 and asked for clarification on its modification. Mr. Allawda said that brick would be added at the bases of the canopy columns and that a crown detail would be added around the top of the canopy, similar what was done at Parker's, and that the canopy renovations would have materials and colors applied to match the new minimart.

Mr. Pardo asked if the HVAC units could be ground mounted at the rear of the building. Ms. Atkins stated that the ground level may be too low, but if it can be done, the exhaust fans and vent stacks should be lined up so they can be concealed from view from the flyover.

Mr. Allawda asked whether a pitched roof or a flat roof would work best. Mr. Atkins stated that it would be highly possible that the project would be more successful with a pitched roof.

Mr. Atkins stated that he was excited that this site was being redeveloped and would like to hear from the architect. He said that most people who drive to Hilton Head would see this as Lowcountry architecture but try to design the building so it ties in with Hilton Head architecture as well. Mr. Atkins asked Mr. Allawda what about this building design had Lowcountry features. Mr. Allawda said they tried to design the building to fit in with what's already on buildings, like Parker's, in the area with the use of materials and awnings. Mr. Atkins said that the design for this building must be more representative of Hilton Head architecture and suggested that they take a look at the architecture at Parker's at Sea Turtle Market Place and Circle K across the street on Hilton Head to use as a guidance with the use of brackets, window patterns and awnings. He stated that the amount of vertical mullions was too much and that the windows should be more vertical to have the appearance of individual double-hung windows. He said there should be some level of detail on the right blank wall and that they would give them grace on the rear wall because it was mostly hidden. He said that adding a crown around the gas canopy and adding brackets on the columns would be great. He also liked the idea of moving the HVAC to the back of the building with a service yard around it.

Ms. Atkins made a motion to table the project to give the applicant the opportunity to revise the architecture and to address the Board's comments:

- Correct spelling errors, labeling and title block issues on the Civil plans.

- Adjust the discrepancy on the Landscape plan between the plant quantities shown on the plant schedule and the number of plants shown on the plan.
- Incorporate traditional Lowcountry features and consider the texture of the facade materials.
- The parapet will not screen the rooftop equipment from the flyover and should be changed out with a pitched roof with a rear roof well to house the rooftop equipment or place the HVAC units behind the building.
- Consider sliding the dumpster back so it aligns with the front facade.
- Better articulation is needed on the right side of the building.
- The architecture should be more representative of Hilton Head architecture.
- Reduce the number of window mullions; the windows should be more vertical to appear as individual windows with a center rail.
- The Board was receptive to adding a crown around the gas canopy, brackets at the top of the columns and brick at the base of the columns.

Ms. Procida seconded the motion.

Mr. Atkins asked the Board if a discussion was needed about the motion. There was no discussion.

Motion passed unanimously.

B. Osprey Point – Malind Centre Commercial Buildings H & J, 1569 Pritcher Point Road – Okatie – Conceptual:

Mr. Atkins recused himself from this portion of the meeting and asked Ms. Procida to officiate in his place and left the room. Ms. Procida asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Ms. Moss provided the project background. Jason Broene, the Architect for the project, and Josh Tiller, the Landscape Architect for the project, attended the meeting to represent this project. Mr. Broene stated that this was a master planned development and the two buildings for review would be the last conceptual review and that at the final DRB review they would present all nine buildings at one time. He said that the design of Buildings H & J took the character from the other seven buildings and that Building H was two-stories for office space and Building J was three stories for office space with fenestration on all four sides of the building. He said that Building H's facade facing the parking lot had a lot of nice glazing and Lowcountry elements with columns and metal roofing. He said that Building J used change of color, glazing and vertical elements to help break up the scale of the 3-story building. He referred to the color board and said that they incorporated black and gray colors and engineered wood products to soften the facade. He said that all the HVAC units & hoods would be located on the roofs screened with roof wells.

Ms. Atkins asked if buildings H & J would have ebony window units, and Mr. Broene confirmed that would be the case.

Ms. Morello stated that there is an opportunity to layer more ground covers on the landscape plan. Mr. Tiller stated that the landscape plan submitted was a courtesy set and that he was working with Carolina Engineering and that there would be a lot of site changes once the civil work was complete which would allow them to finalize the landscape plan. Mr. Tiller stated that the Master Plan was modified and that the monument sign was shifted to allow room for enhanced buffering. Ms. Morello did not think that the ginkos were a good tree island choice. Mr. Tiller said that they would not use ginkos.

Ms. Atkins said that the ornamental trees were nice but that most of them would bloom at the same time of the season and to add other ornamentals that would bloom later in the year. She said that

she did not think there were enough dumpster locations on the site. Mr. Tiller said that there were nine dumpsters on the site, and that some were paired, but there was one dumpster for each building. Ms. Atkins stated that the dumpsters were awkwardly located at 45 degrees and it did not look like the turning radius was adequate for the garbage trucks. Mr. Schael said that the civil engineer could use the truck radius CAD program to confirm there was adequate room for the garbage trucks to maneuver in & around the site.

Ms. Epstein asked Mr. Broene to explain where the vertical cementitious siding would be placed on Building H. Mr. Broene showed where the cement siding would be placed and said that engineered wood would be applied on the soffits, columns and rafters. Ms. Epstein commented on the color board and suggested that an accent color, possibly blue, should be added for interest. She said that the window trim color on Building J did not give her a Lowcountry vibe with the black storefront and brown panel trim. She said that there was an interesting selection of materials but that she preferred a bronze storefront. She stated that Building J's gable over the entry seemed a little awkward and appeared unfinished. She wondered if the barn door elements were really needed but changed her mind once Ms. Procida said that they were operational. Mr. Broene thought the barn door elements were important to create character and that it carries through development.

Ms. Epstein stated that the flat canopies appeared a little high and that the smaller the canopy the lower they should be. Mr. Broene said that the canopies help identify the entry points and would make sure they were functional and added Lowcountry character.

Ms. Procida commented on Building H and wondered if the metal roofing on the entry gable continued down the sides of the gable because it reads as the same color as the roof. She asked that they study the rear elevation and to bring it down or bring the tall bands up where the parapet meets the gables. She said to tie the left stair tower into the architecture, that the facade was a flat surface with no awning and to consider changing the material on the angled area. She commented on Building J and that the water line seemed off and that the verticality of the windows draws the building design upward and to perhaps remove the band, study the window panel colors and change out the dark color with a lighter one. She said she liked the mix of materials. She referred to the site plan and thought it would be good to add an island to conceal the large loading area behind building A.

Ms. Atkins made a motion to approve the project subject to the following conditions:

- Review the ornamental tree selections & their blooming seasons.
- Study the dumpster locations, number of dumpsters and the accessibility to service them.
- Review the color palette and consider adding an accent color for interest.
- Celebrate the facade materials with different textures.
- Review the elevations of the canopies so they are functional on Building J
- Study the entry canopy on Building J and possibly removing the band board.
- Consider the trim color on Building J so it looks less vertical.
- Study the facade material & color on the side of the entry gables & refine this detail.

Ms. Epstein seconded the motion.

Ms. Procida asked the Board if a discussion was needed about the motion. There was no discussion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Atkins returned to the meeting room.

7. **OLD BUSINESS:** None

OTHER BUSINESS

8. **NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING:** Mr. Atkins stated that the next scheduled meeting is at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, August 6, 2026, at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909.
9. **ADJOURNMENT:** Ms. Procida made a motion to close the meeting; Ms. Epstein seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.



**BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MEETING MINUTES
August 6, 2026, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC**

Members Present: James Atkins, Kris Feldmann, Elizabeth Epstein, and John Teter

Members Absent: Caroline Atkins, Celina Morello, and Denise Procida

Staff Present: Nancy Moss, Beaufort County Planning & Zoning Department
Carolyn Wallace, Beaufort County Planning & Zoning Department

Guests: Hilton Head Gasoline Station – Carlo Pardo, Morris & Ritchie and Hamzah Allawda, EDI Group

Parris Island Commons – Grady Woods, Woods & Dendy Architects and Brian Witmer, Witmer, Jones, Keefer, Ltd.

Beaufort County Councilwoman Paula Brown, District 8

Members of the press and the public were in attendance (See Exhibit A).

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Atkins called the meeting to order and took roll call at 2:40 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. **04.02.26 MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins stated that they would have to table the vote for the April 2, 2026, meeting minutes because there wasn’t a quorum of the Board members present that attended the April Board meeting. He asked that this vote get postponed to the September 3, 2026, meeting agenda.
4. **06.04.26 MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins stated that they would have to table the vote for the June 4, 2026, meeting minutes because there wasn’t a quorum of the Board members present that attended the April Board meeting. He asked that this vote get postponed to the September 3, 2026, meeting agenda.
5. **07.09.26 MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins stated that they would have to table the vote for the July 9, 2026, meeting minutes because there wasn’t a quorum of the Board members present that attended the April Board meeting. He asked that this vote get postponed to the September 3, 2026, meeting agenda.
6. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.

ACTION ITEMS

7. **NEW BUSINESS:** None
8. **OLD BUSINESS:**
 - A. **Hilton Head Gas Station Reconstruction Project, 1610 Fording Island Road – Bluffton - Conceptual (Revisit):**

Mr. Atkins informed the members of the public about the order of the review procedure that would take place. Ms. Moss provided the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comments about this project and reminded the public that their comments would be limited to three minutes per person.

Ben LeGrand wanted to know if any testing was done on the underground gas tanks, or if the tanks would be replaced or if there were any potential hazards. Ms. Moss stated that the tanks were tested and passed the State inspection. She said that the testing report was on file with the Planning & Zoning Department. Mr. LeGrand asked if there any was any testing done for asbestos or other hazardous materials with respect to the building demolition. Ms. Moss indicated that issue would be handled with Building Codes.

Diane Mazzochi said that she really liked the building design, was excited to see it being built and was waiting for the eyesore to be removed.

Public comment was closed.

Carlo Pardo, the Civil Engineer for the project, and Hamzah Allawda, the Architect for the project both attended the meeting via telephone to represent this project. Mr. Pardo said that the landscape and lighting plans were revised based upon comments in the staff report and asked the Board members if staff shared them with the Board. Mr. Atkins stated that the revised plans were on the screen and that the landscaping looked much better.

Ms. Epstein stated that the design was headed in a better direction. She stated that the angled canopies in the recessed areas on the building seemed superfluous, were not going to be very visible and asked whether they would be submitting more detailed drawings of the gas canopy so the Board would have a better understanding of what the proposed changes would be.

Mr. Teter said that it was a lovely building and a great improvement. He said they made great efforts to extend the roof parapet height to screen the HVAC equipment and wondered if it would still be visible from the flyover and wanted to know if there was a reason the HVAC equipment couldn't be located behind the building.

Mr. Feldmann said that the quality of the documentation and the design packet was not quite sufficient and coordinated. He stated that sections are included but don't really relate to the building. He said there was a dimension of 10' per level with a dimension of 27' next to it. He stated that the architecture was headed in an acceptable direction but from a submission standpoint it would be hard to trust the design because it is not well documented. He said that this is such a critical site it does not seem that enough time was done studying it & putting together coordinated drawing from a Lowcountry detailing standpoint. He said that the 12 :2 roof pitch and the 12:4 roof pitch was not clear and to resolve these things. He wanted to understand what was driving the 20' wall height because the building feels a little disproportionate from a footprint to height standpoint. He said the sections don't give information on the mechanicals or roof drainage and that roof forms in renderings don't seem to be reflected in the sections at all. He asked the architect to address the discrepancy between the section and the 3D views and how the roof drainage and concealing the mechanical equipment would work. He referred to Section A-A and asked him to explain the 27' dimension at the rear of the building yet the front elevation shows a 20' height. Mr. Feldmann referred to the elevations and stated that adding some sort of water table, change of brick or material especially on the front & sides may help break up the design.

Mr. Atkins thanked the architect for the changes made and said that the design had improved dramatically. He said that because the parapet walls are taller, the architect will have to better develop the wall details and submit more detailed drawings because it felt like the Board was making the review off the renderings. He stated that the details were not aligned with the updated design and that the light fixtures should be more in keeping with the Lowcountry. He said he was not convinced that the parapets would block view to the roof equipment from the flyover. He said that the landscape plan looked much better with the additional buffer plant materials and from a stormwater perspective, the current site plan increased the pervious area with the removal of the pavement behind the building. Mr. Pardo stated that existing conditions of impervious area on the site is 38% which has been reduced to 30%.

Mr. Teter made a motion to table this project.

Mr. Feldmann seconded the motion.

The Board had further discussion about the motion. Mr. Atkins said that there was significant improvement with the building design from the initial submittal to the current design and agreed that the drawings are difficult to review from a technical standpoint. He said that because of the design decision to raise the parapet wall it looks a bit out of proportion but was not sure the wall should be lowered. Mr. Teter said that the parapet wall had to be raised to adequately screen the roof equipment. Mr. Atkins said that this design screens the rooftop equipment better than the previous design and that he's not sure any design with a parapet roof could hide the roof equipment from the flyover. Mr. Teter asked if it would be a problem to place the HVAC equipment behind the building. Mr. Feldmann said that there were unresolved issues for such an important site. He said that he did not understand how the roof forms were working and the sections made it more confusing. Ms. Epstein said that the design was headed in the right direction and that if the roof equipment were to remain with parapet screening, it should be modeled from the flyover to confirm the equipment is fully screened.

Mr. Atkins polled the Board members about the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Atkins summarized the Board's comments for further study:

- The architecture is moving in the right direction.
- Submit the necessary drawings that are required for conceptual review. Make sure the details, section views, roof plans, etc., that are submitted are coordinated so the drawings can be adequately reviewed.
- If the applicant moves forward with the parapet scheme, spend time looking at how the taller walls get articulated.
- If the applicant moves forward with a full sloped roof, they may be able to lower the overall scale of the building.
- Provide gas canopy modification drawings.

B. Parris Island Commons Amenity & Apartment Buildings Project, 395 Parris Island Gateway Beaufort – Final:

Ms. Moss provided project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment.

Ann Ublis had a big problem with this project and asked the Board to place a hold on this project until the house and senate closed the affordable housing loophole. She said that the project would be underserved by the police and fire departments and would increase traffic. She stated that affordable housing property tax freezes would be in perpetuity.

Linda Norton with LRTA had a concern that public transportation was not considered because there were no ADA sidewalks to serve the public, nor was there a bus pull out lane or bus shelter.

Charles Russo questioned whether there was a demand for apartment housing. He asked who reviewed the tree removals for this project. Mr. Atkins said that SRT reviewed the tree removals.

Kris Hepburn echoed the same concerns about the need for apartments and that by adding 77 units that feed into Parris Island Gateway, it would increase traffic problems.

Jared Madison stated that this project may lead to the displacement of native people, and that it was important to protect the culture and preserve the character of Beaufort. He said there was no pathway to ownership with apartments.

Michael Swiecicki said that within two years over 9,000 apartment units would be in Beaufort and that there is no industry so these apartments may turn into public housing. He said that less than 10% of the marine families moving into the area want to live in an apartment and that they preferred to live in single-family dwellings.

Charles Mitchell with LRTA said that he appreciated the Board listening to Linda Norton's concerns.

Gray Wilson said that his family owned the agriculture property next to this project site and that their family previously owned the property which was under discussion. He said he was disappointed that this property was being developed and that this project would increase traffic.

Mr. Atkins said that he appreciated the public comments that were shared.

Grady Woods, the Architect for the project, and Brian Witmer, the Landscape Architect for the project, both attended the meeting to represent this project. Mr. Woods stated that they had addressed all of the DRB comments from the last meeting and would be happy to answer any questions from the Board. Mr. Witmer said that the site plan was revised and that the number of parking spaces has been reduced.

Mr. Atkins asked Mr. Witmer to point out on the site plan where any significant trees were being removed. Mr. Witmer stated that the best stand of trees on the site was located behind the amenity building and that they would be preserved. He said that most of the trees that are proposed for removal are not of significant size. Mr. Atkins said that the per Building Codes, the definition of the third story on a 2.5 story building is that it is built into the roof and not out to the perimeter, which pushes the tallest, most exposed side of the building toward the internal portion of the site. He said that he did not see a service yard on the two-story building and did not want to see it facing Parris Island gateway and that the scale of the trellis' were a bit large.

Mr. Feldmann commended the design team for responding to the DRB comments from the previous meeting. He said that the amenity building has come a long way and feels cohesive with the apartments. He agreed with Mr. Atkins' comment about the size and number of the trellises because they felt heavy. He said there was thoughtful site planning, and he appreciated the tree preservation.

Mr. Teter stated that there was a remarkable difference from the initial building design submittal to now and that the current designs were very attractive. He said that the project should make some provision for public transportation.

Ms. Epstein stated that there was a color differential between the 3D rendering and the color board proposed for the siding & trim colors. Mr. Woods said that they wanted a monochrome color scheme but if the Board would prefer, there could be a slight contrast between the siding & trim.

Mr. Atkins said that the renderings read as two different colors which look nice and that he would embrace a subtle color contrast. He said that the board & panel on the ground level porches appeared taller than the water table on the drawings. Mr. Woods said that the board & panel and water table were intended to be the same height.

Mr. Feldmann made a motion to:

- Realign the board & panel height on the first-floor screen porches with the water table height.
- Align the color palette on the buildings to better reflect the renderings so there is a subtle contrast between the siding and the trim colors.
- Study the scale and number of trellises.
- Add the service yard location to the two-story apartment building so it does not face Parris Island Gateway.
- Consider public transportation & traffic issues.
- If there are significant revisions to the site plan based on the TIA, the County should reach out to Palmetto Breeze regarding the pull over lane and bus shelter.

Mr. Teter seconded the motion.

Mr. Atkins asked the Board if a discussion was needed about the motion. There was no discussion.

Motion passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

9. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: Mr. Atkins stated that the next scheduled meeting is at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 3, 2026, at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909.

10. ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Teter made a motion to close the meeting; Mr. Feldmann seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.



SIGN-IN SHEET EXHIBIT A

Design Review Board (DRB) Meeting

Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909

August 6, 2026

	Project Name	Print Name	Organization/Title	Phone #	Email
1.	PARRIS ISL	ANNEBELIS	BEAUFORT TEA PARTY		otp@islc.net
2.		Krist KristHephum	LRTA/Palmetto Breeze		khephum@palmettobreeze transit.com
3.	mini-mat	Ahmed Alsalim			
4.		Diane Mazzocchi			
5.		Diane Berry			
6.		Sue Yi			
7.		Linda Norton	LRTA/Palmetto Breeze		lnorton@palmettobreeze transit.com
8.		BRIAN WITMER	WJK		BRIAN@WJKLTD.COM
9.		SID DANIEL	WSK		SID@WSKLTD.COM
10.		Jared Madison			jaredmadison@icloud.com
11.		Charlie Russo			DARROST+2129@gmail.com
12.		Michael Swiecicki			lens310@yahoo.com
13.		Ben Lebrand			ben.legrand@islandproducts.com
14.		GRADY Woods			woods@gradywoods.com
15.		Charles Mitchell			cmitchell@palmettobreezetransit.com
16.					
17.					
18.					

64 Bluffton Road Medical Office Exterior Painting Project

Type of Submission:	Final
Applicant:	Thomas Rhea, WellStreet Urgent Care
Type of Project:	Commercial
Location:	64 Bluffton Road, Bluffton
Zoning Designation:	C4 Community Center Mixed Use

The project consists of changing the exterior color scheme to an existing building. The roofing material and facade cladding will not be changed. This medical office building was constructed in 2005 on a 0.90-acre parcel complete with a drive aisle & parking areas, landscaping, lighting, and infrastructure. This site is located approximately 1,500 LF north of the Bluffton Road/Bluffton Parkway traffic circle and has direct access off Highway 46 and Goethe Road.

The building currently has brown shingles and is clad with yellow horizontal lap siding with white horizontal band boards, fascia, trim, columns & water table and has black Bahama window shutters as an accent.

The applicant is seeking approval from the Board to repaint the lap siding, horizontal trim boards, columns, and front gables white; to apply a pale gray color on the window trim & on the panel below the windows, on the water table, the downspouts & gutters, the building & cupola fascia boards and on the cupola panels; and, to apply a dark gray color on the cupola louvers and Bahama window shutters. In addition, wall pack light fixtures are being proposed below the roof eaves, two on the north side and one on the west side of the building. No other building alterations or site modifications are being proposed.

Because this is a developed site and no land disturbance is proposed, the Staff Review Team will not review this project.

Staff comments:

1. WellStreet is planning to close on this property in November and would like to repaint the building exterior once they acquire the property.
2. The downspout colors proposed on the rendering are shown as gray on the north side of the building and white on the other sides of the building.
3. Consider painting the existing wall mounted electrical box on the north elevation to match the proposed facade colors.

END OF REPORT

Beaufort County Design Review Board
October 1, 2026

Osprey Point - Malind Centre Commercial Development - Buildings A- H & J

Type of Submission:	Final
Developer:	Forino CO LP
Architect:	Jason Broene, Court Atkins Architects
Engineer:	Jeff Ackerman, Carolina Engineering
Landscape Architect:	Josh Tiller, J. K. Tiller Associates, Inc.
Type of Project:	Commercial
Location:	1569 Pritcher Point Road, Okatie
Zoning Designation:	PUD (Osprey Point)

This 16.543-acre project site is currently undeveloped, is fully wooded, contains two isolated wetlands and is the commercial parcel which is part of the Osprey Point Planned Unit Development. The existing isolated wetland at the southeast portion of the parcel and the existing trees within the perimeter buffers and around the preserved wetland are scheduled to remain. The site fronts Highway 170 and is bound and will be accessed from Malind Bluff Drive to the south, Perimeter Road to the east, and Pritcher Point Road to the north.

The project site has been master planned and contains nine commercial building that are allowed to total up to 207,000 square feet which includes on-site pedestrian plazas & walkways, outdoor dining patios, pocket parks, tree lined internal drive aisles with a main central boulevard and on-street parking, defined screened parking lots, landscaping, preserved wetlands and wetland filling, infrastructure and stormwater facilities. This project also includes off-site Perimeter Road right-of-way improvements which include diagonal parking, walkways, landscaping and Malind Bluff open space upgrades with a pavilion, walkways and landscaped berms to create enhanced buffering.

The applicant made an informal presentation at the December 4, 2025, DRB meeting. Conceptual architecture and landscape plans were presented at the March 5, 2026, DRB meeting for buildings A, B & C; at the May 14, 2026, DRB meeting for buildings D, E, F & G and on July 9, 2026 for buildings H & J. The building designs were well received by the Board with DRB comments provided to the applicant after each review.

For this final review, the applicant has submitted final architecture for all nine buildings that will be located on this parcel. All of the buildings address the main internal commercial boulevard, have an agrarian architecture style with gable roofs covered with charcoal gray metal roofing material, large storefront systems with ebony framing, ebony finished wall-mounted gooseneck light fixtures, roof-mounted HVAC units and have a gray & charcoal color scheme with clear grain pine wood siding accents. The building facades are clad with one or more of the following materials: cement reverse board & batten siding, stucco, horizontal lap siding, vertical barn siding, engineered wood, metal panels, with various Lowcountry detailing placed on each structure which may include roof cupolas or roof monitors with fixed glass windows, galleries and recessed entry ways, steel beam headers, steel or wood columns, large operable barn doors, trellis features, wire mesh railing infills, brick water tables & chimneys and vertical open gapped wood siding rainscreens at the storefront entrances.

Building “A”: This multi-tenant building is centrally showcased on the site, and is the largest sized building being proposed. The building has three (3) units that contain a 1-story 20,000 SF grocery store anchor unit on one end, with a 1-story 32,400 SF hardware store anchor unit on the other end and a two-story retail connection in the center. The large anchor units have flat parapet roofs with gabled entry features on the corners with faux hayloft doors that are topped with decorative cupolas. Four tall silo-like elements covered

Beaufort County Design Review Board
October 1, 2026

with corrugated metal siding with brick water tables have been integrated across the front facade that are connected to a central 2-story packing shed-like structure with a narrow roof monitor that runs the depth of the unit, a tall recessed two-level storefront area with stacked porches that are book ended with large operable barn doors and covered stairwells. The facade is clad with a combination of horizontal & vertical cement siding with vertical slat rainscreen accents.

Building “B”: This building will be built directly north of Building “A” and contains two side by side 3,600 SF 1-story restaurant units. Each side of this building has tall gable roofs and two shed roof covered entries on the front portion of the building with a lower-level wing that has a flat parapet roofline on the back service side of the building. The units are attached in the front and rear centers with recessed walls with trellising applied with a flat parapet roofline above. Each gable roof end on the sides are extended outward from the facade and are framed in as a rainscreen comprised of engineered vertical slats. The facade is clad with vertical and horizontal cement siding and ribbed metal wall panels.

Building “C”: This building will be built on the north side of Building “B” and is a one-story +/- 7,500 SF commercial unit for a restaurant. The building has gable roofs on the front and right sides that intersect at the front corner topped with a large central cupola with a lower-level flat parapet roof line on the service side of the building. The main front & back storefront systems are recessed at the gable ends and features a metal grain bin-like structure at the building corner and a shed roof awing supported with bracketed wood columns over a dining patio on the right side of the building with tall storefront windows and an aluminum framed glass overhead door and trellising accents selectively applied to the facade on three sides of the building. The facade is clad with horizontal cement siding, standing seam metal panels with cement reverse board & batten siding accents on the gables.

Building “D”: This one-story +/- 11,500 square foot multi-tenant building has three retail units and is located on the northeast corner of the site. The building has simple gable roofs with a front shed dormer with ganged windows, featuring a tall chimney, operable barn doors on each side of the recessed storefront door & window systems on each gable end and is clad with horizontal cement siding with cement reverse board & batten siding accents on the gable ends. A low-pitched shed roof supported by square columns covers the center unit entry that is located between the front gable ends.

Building “E”: This one-story +/- 8,800 square foot multi-tenant building has five retail units and is located south of Building “D”. The building has tall barn-like retail structures on each end that are topped with roof monitors and are joined with a gable roof that contains three retail units. Large recessed storefront window and doorway systems with operable barn doors are located on each gable end and on the front two retail units and the facade is clad with cement board & batten siding accented with horizontal T&G wood siding.

Building “F”: This one-story structure contains two multi-tenant buildings that are connected with a central roof breezeway and will be located south of building “E”. One side of the structure contains +/- 3,600 square feet and has two retail units while the other side of the structure contains +/- 6,400 square feet and has three retail units. The buildings have simple gable roofs, front shed dormers with ganged windows and feature two tall brick chimneys, operable sliding barn doors at each side of the storefront entries, rainscreen vertical slats at the front gable ends, a covered front pedestrian walkway supported by square wood columns across the entire front facade and is clad with horizontal and vertical cement siding.

Building “G”: This two-story building contains a combined total of +/- 27,300 square foot with three retail units on the ground floor and three office units on the second floor and will be located south of building “F”. This building has simple gable roofs with one small cupola & two large cupolas, stacked covered porches supported by square wood columns & railings with wire mesh infills, a brick smokestack, covered

Beaufort County Design Review Board
October 1, 2026

exterior stairwells & corridors, and is clad with a combination of horizontal cement siding, vertical metal panels with rainscreen vertical slat detailing.

Building “H”: This two-story +/- 13,156 square foot multi-tenant building has four retail or office units and is located on the southeast corner of the site. The building has simple roofs with standing seam roofing that continues down the projecting gable end facades while the remainder of the facade is covered with a combination of vertical cement siding and stucco containing large windows and featuring a front central gallery supported by square columns over the tenant entrances and flat suspended awnings are placed over the entrances located at the gable ends and trellis-like detailing structures applied to the side facade.

Building “J”: This three-story +/- 49,971 square foot multi-tenant building has nine office units and will be located on the southwest portion of the site. The building has a mansard roof with metal roofing applied around the perimeter of the building with projecting gable roof ends at the front main entry which features operable barn door elements on each side and a projecting gable end roof on the back with large storefront windows. The facade is clad with a combination of horizontal cement siding and stucco with cement reverse board & batten siding accents. Large uniformly spaced window units with panel trim are placed on all sides of the structure and two side entrances are covered with shed porch structures supported with square columns while the front and rear entrances are covered with flat suspended awnings.

Staff Comments:

1. Individualized color boards have been prepared for each of the nine buildings.
2. The master plan was approved to have up to 207,000 SF of commercial space at this development. Provide an itemized listing of the final gross square footage of the nine buildings at this development to confirm that the overall building square footage does not exceed the amount of building square footage approved.
3. The gas & electric meters should be painted to match the building facade color especially those meters facing Perimeter Road and pedestrian walkways.
4. The dumpster enclosure & gate details were not found.
5. Provide elevations of the pavilion proposed at the Malind Bluff open space area adjacent to Perimeter Road.
6. The gapped equipment screens on some of the roofs may not completely conceal the roof equipment.
7. There appear to be several light pole/tree conflicts in tree islands primarily located along Perimeter Road.
8. The eight parking spaces on the south side of “Ginko” park on the Landscape Plan meets the requirements of the Code but the civil plan shows ten consecutive parking spaces at this location which does not meet the Code. The Civil plan must be revised.
9. The signage must be applied for separately through the Zoning Department.

END OF REPORT