

BEAUFORT COUNTY  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES  
July 7, 2016, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

---

**Members Present:** Bill Allison, Peter Brower, James K. Tiller, Pearce Scott and Donald L. Starkey

**Members Absent:** James Atkins and J. Michael Brock

**Staff Present:** Robert Merchant, Long Range Planner; Nancy Moss, Planner

**Guests:** Greg Baisch, Ward Edwards; Eric Hoover, Ward Edwards; Tim Huber, Ramsey Development; Jim Zavist, Easy Building Solutions

1. **CALL TO ORDER/ELECTION OF ACTING CHAIR:** Robert Merchant introduced Nancy Moss, the new planning staff member to the Board. Robert Merchant asked for nominations to serve as Acting Chair for the meeting since the Chair and Vice-Chair were not present. Mr. Tiller motioned for Peter Brower to serve as acting chair. Mr. Scott seconded. Motion carried.
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** There was no public comment.
3. **MINUTES:** The minutes of the June 2, 2016 Design Review Board meeting were approved by the Board.
4. **NEW BUSINESS:** There was no new business.
5. **OLD BUSINESS:**
  - A. **Sprenger Healthcare Conceptual - Okatie:** Greg Baisch introduced Eric Hoover of Ward Edwards who attended the previous meeting. He also introduced Tim Huber with Ramsey Development and Jim Zavist, the architect. Mr. Zavist said that there were concerns about the screening and landscaping, but the main concerns had to do with the exterior design of the building. He said that he had prepared several alternative designs to present to the Board at the meeting. They first reviewed an alternative floor plan that provided more articulation to the blank facades by varying the wall planes. Mr. Zavist also presented a number of alternative elevations. Alternate One reflected the approved plans in Port Royal while adding some dormers. Alternate 2 simplified the roof and eliminated the dormers. Alternate 3 had larger windows with dormers. Alternate 4 had larger windows with no dormers.

Mr. Allison felt the redesign, as submitted to the Board, was in the wrong direction and was glad that alternatives were presented. He felt the more human scale and simpler the design, the more elegant it is. He preferred option 2. He still had issues with the huge mass of building, but was aware that it couldn't be addressed. Mr. Allison liked the tower at the right end of the front elevation because it had appropriate detailing for the local climate and vernacular. He also liked decreasing the scale of the entrance porte cochere to a more human scale. Mr. Zavist said the preferred elevation was similar to what was approved in Port Royal. Mr. Huber said that the operator preferred the building to feel residential because it was comforting to the residents. Mr. Allison said that the setting of the building was different than Port Royal because own can drive around it and see all four elevations.

Mr. Scott said that the two end pieces were scaled right. Mr. Brower felt that if you could get the detailing on the right end to be repeated along the front elevation, it would be better than what

was presented. Mr. Starkey felt that the dormers cluttered the building. He also noted that the changes in the footprint were not reflected in the elevations. He wanted the bump-outs to be larger in proportion and articulated on the elevations similar to what was done on the front elevation.

Mr. Pearce and Mr. Brower preferred a greater quantity of tall narrow windows. They also felt that each elevation needed to be addressed consistently. Mr. Huber asked if they could provide a wall to screen the loading areas. Mr. Scott asked how big the overhangs. Mr. Zavist said approximately 19 inches. Mr. Scott suggested the use of brackets with an increased depth may help to articulate the building better. Mr. Allison recommended choosing one architectural language and sticking with it. He suggested that a contemporary use of Lowcountry architectural elements was appropriate. He said that there is a great risk in using classical elements in the wrong way. Mr. Allison said that the applicant should consider adopting an architectural language that emulates a converted industrial loft apartment building.

Mr. Tiller said they the applicant addressed most of the landscaping comments from the previous meeting. He felt that the architecture needed to be addressed. Mr. Allison motioned to table conceptual approval of the project until the applicant addressed the above comments. Mr. Starkey seconded. Mr. Tiller read to the Board the following comments received by James Atkins in an e-mail prior to the meeting.

*“Regarding the project for review, specific to the architecture – in my opinion, this project does not fit in context with the lowcountry vernacular.*

- *There is one glimmer of hope on the front right side corner with more characteristic elements. Combination of brick and siding, shutters, scale and proportion.*
  - *The main entry and left side have gotten worse. The scale, hierarchy, massing, and details of the main entry are not acceptable. I do not understand the floating column, arched faux foundation wall concept.*
  - *The dormers and details are out of scale*
  - *The rhythm and pattern of windows is inconsistent*
  - *Main roof slope is only 3/12*
  - *I am ok with the single story and the enclosed courtyards*
- Although I will not be there to vote, my suggestion would be to table or vote no.”*

Motion carried.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS:** There was no other business.

**7. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 3:11 pm.