

BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
September 1, 2016, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

Members Present: James Atkins, J. Michael Brock, Bill Allison, Peter Brower and Donald L. Starkey

Members Absent: Pearce Scott

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

Guests: Tim Huber, Ramsey Development; Mary Roberson, Ramsey Development; Jim Rowan, Fraser Construction; Greg Baisch, Ward Edwards Engineering; Eric Hoover, Ward Edwards Engineering; Chris Todd, Ward Edwards Engineering; Jim Strecansky, General Contractor; William Court, Court Atkins Architects; and, Stewart Barnwell, Carolyn's Landscaping, Inc.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** James Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.
2. **MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins asked if there were comments on the August 4, 2016 minutes. No comments were made. Mr. Starkey motioned to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Brower seconded to approve. Motion carried.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** There was no public comment.
4. **NEW BUSINESS:** There was no new business.
5. **OLD BUSINESS:**

A. Sprenger Healthcare – Okatie, 234 Okatie Village Drive – Final

Mr. Brock recused himself. Ms. Moss gave the project background. Tim Huber, General Manager of Ramsey Development Corporation, gave the presentation. Mr. Huber said that they took the DRB's advice and tried to mimic the tower structure and added towers on the front right corner and on the rear center elevations. He said that the new window configuration of the interior windows worked better for them and that the windows had to be 4'-0" wide x 6'-6" tall for all resident rooms to meet the natural light requirements for the State Health Department. Mr. Huber stated that the remaining windows would consist of 3'-0" wide x 6'-0" tall windows and that the two roof dormers were removed.

Mr. Atkins asked for comments from the Board.

Mr. Brower indicated that the DRB expected to see the tower element used more prevalently in most of the protruding elements and that the additional tower elements were used in a very token way. Mr. Brower added concern about a discrepancy between the floor plan and the elevations. He said that the floor plan shows space between the shutters on the right portion of the west elevation, but the elevation does not reflect this space. Mr. Brower said that the floor plans do not indicate that the tower elements protrude past the face of the building. He said that the floor plans and elevations should be much more accurate at this final review stage, but that the design is better than it was with past submissions.

Mr. Starkey asked them to explain the various exterior materials and colors. He wanted an explanation of where specific materials were to be used throughout the design.

Mr. Huber said that the floor plan had not been updated. He said they are working on the elevations first and then they will match the floor plan to the elevations and that the notes were from old elevations. Mr. Huber said that the architects explored the option of incorporating the tower element at the main entry, but in order to meet the minimum vehicle clearances, it became too massive and out of proportion so they decided not to use it there.

Mr. Starkey asked about the window notes and wanted additional information. Mr. Huber said that all of the windows would be single-hung and that the large windows in the note are not on the elevation anymore. The note was left over from an older design. Mr. Starkey recommended that they look closer at their drawings before releasing them to the Board.

Mr. Allison said that he never really liked this concept, but that there have been some improvements made to the design.

Mr. Atkins said that they need more detailed plans and color boards for final review. He felt that the design has come a far way and it addressed a majority of the conceptual review comments. He liked the window configuration; the application of Bahaman and traditional style shutters, and the towers on the far corners. Mr. Atkins commended the design team for developing a consistent design using Lowcountry elements, but could not consider final approval without final drawings.

Mr. Brower asked if the tower element was considered at the two front intermediate protruding areas of the building in addition to the two ends for continuity. He felt it would be worth studying the change. Also, work on the window placement on the protruding element on the right side so the shutters are not butted right up to each other. Mr. Huber said that the tower element would work well in the residential portion and at the right end for a total of three towers, but does not work well on the left end. Mr. Brower suggested that they adjust the window placement so there is space between the shutters.

Mr. Atkins listed the options available to the Board for this project. Mr. Brower motioned to table this project because it was not ready to be considered for final approval.

Mr. Starkey seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Mr. Atkins followed up the motion by saying that the DRB could not give final approval until the drawings were finalized, but that the project was headed in the right direction. Mr. Huber asked for guidance on the tower element. Mr. Atkins said to share the intermediate design ideas with County staff for feedback before the final drawing package is updated.

The following issues need to be addressed for final approval:

- *Consider additional tower elements on the intermediate protruding areas;*
- *Refine the drawings to eliminate discrepancies between the floor plan and the elevations;*
- *Adjust the window placement on the right side of the front elevation to allow wall space between the shutters; and,*
- *Provide finalized drawings and color boards for final DRB approval consideration.*

B. A Priori, LLC (BFG Communications), 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive, Bluffton: Mr. Atkins recused himself. Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Court provided an updated landscape plan, a three-dimensional rendering and presented for the applicant. He indicated that he addressed the details to have a more uniform character and incorporated tabby details to make

it more consistent with Lowcountry Architecture. He said the Owner asked him to take a fresh look at the architecture and to leave the general footprint and site configuration similar to the previous submission. Mr. Court indicated that adjustments to the size of the building footprint were made to create an 8' foundation buffer. He stated that the heavy timber canopy structure with exposed bracket-work and the green wall with elements from the steel structure added visual interest. He added that above the human scale at the 10' – 14' range, the proposed metal lattice work provided shade/shadow work on the front gable facade; that the strong overhang break-up was done to separate the four center bays from the three outer bays; and that the new wall structure surrounding the trash area was architecturally appropriate.

Mr. Brock asked the Board for comments.

Mr. Allison liked the front elevation with the brackets on the porch-like structure and the tabby dumpster enclosure, but would like to see what is being proposed on the left-side of the building.

Mr. Starkey indicated that he would like to see more attention made at the rear elevation facing Anolyn Court. He suggested adding columns or stucco to provide more detail in order to break up the blank wall. Mr. Starkey said that the existing vegetation on the north side needs to be identified, to explain what is being proposed to the buffer and to include this information on the Landscape Plan.

Mr. Barnwell said that there was an existing drainage area in the buffer area and that palmetto, wax myrtle and crape myrtle trees existed there.

Mr. Brower agreed that these drawings were a tremendous improvement to the previous submission and he liked the bracketing, the screening and the stucco. He said that he preferred a uniform overhang width across the bay areas versus breaking it up.

Mr. Brock liked the building. He asked that the plant quantities be adjusted and to add tree caliper sizes and label it on the drawing. He added that because there is only a 10' buffer area along the north side, a note should be added to the drawings stating "that any plants/trees removed/damaged during construction should be required to be planted back" because there is not a lot of space to work in and the buffer may become damaged during construction.

Mr. Allison motioned for conceptual approval with the following conditions:

- *Maintain a uniform, wide overhang around the perimeter of the building;*
- *Provide more visual interest on the rear elevation; and*
- *Adjust the landscape plan by adding a plant schedule showing tree quantities and calipers; include a buffer protection/replanting notation "that any plants/trees removed/damaged during construction should be planted back" and submit an updated tree survey.*

Mr. Brower seconded the motion. Motion carried.

6. OTHER BUSINESS: Mr. Atkins asked Mr. Merchant if there was any Other Business. Mr. Merchant mentioned that Jim Tiller resigned and that there was a vacancy for a Landscape Architect on the Board. Mr. Atkins said that he appreciated Mr. Tiller's dedication to the Board over the years and that they will look for a replacement.

7. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.