

BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
April 9, 2020, via conference call, Beaufort County, SC

Members Present: James Atkins, J. Michael Brock, Sallie Brach, Peter Brower, Brad Hill, H. Pearce Scott and Donald L. Starkey

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Nancy Moss, Beaufort County Community Development Department

Guests: David Oliver, Bluffton Land Partners; Kelly Wagoner, Buckel Design Group ; Edward Copeland, Copeland Architecture; Pacho Pimsaguan, IE Design; Ryan Lyle, Andrews Engineering; Brianna Huffman, Court Atkins Architects; and, Annette Lippert, Court Atkins Architects; Taylor Reeves, Ward Edwards Engineering and Lisa Wilson, Island Packet

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:32 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, 2020 minutes. Mrs. Brach motioned to approve the meeting minutes and Mr. Brock seconded to approve. Motion carried.
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.
5. **NEW BUSINESS:**
 - A. **McCullough Tract – Commercial Subdivision – Discount Tire & Dunkin Donuts – Bluffton – Conceptual**

Mr. Hill recused himself from the meeting. Ms. Moss stated that Mr. Hill submitted a recusal form then gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. David Oliver, the applicant and Owner, made the presentation for the Dunkin Donuts project. He stated that the HVAC equipment would be roof-mounted and that elevations for the drive-thru and back service area would be submitted in follow-up to the meeting. Ed Copeland, the Architect for Dunkin Donuts, said that having rooftop equipment was the goal and that he would send views of the drive-thru and service area next week. Ryan Lyle, the Civil Engineer for subdivision, said that he submitted a slightly revised site plan exhibit earlier in the day that showed the pervious landscape areas and all of the parking bays would be pervious. He stated that the pervious parking spaces would give aeration to the tree island plantings. He pointed out that a foundation buffer was added at the entrance to Discount Tire. Kelly Wagoner, the Civil Engineer for Discount Tire, stated that the rooftop units would be screened by the roof parapet, the utility boxes would be painted to match the facade, and that the articulation on the front & back sides would be addressed.

Mr. Brock stated that interconnectivity is typically encouraged and asked why a connection from this development was not made to the Buffalo Wild Wings site. Ryan Lyle said that a stubbed road was built at Buffalo Wild Wings in anticipation for a future connection to the north Bluffton Property; but legally could not make the connection without the consent of the adjacent property Owner. Mr. Brock said that he liked the facade, roof pitches, brackets and form of the Dunkin Donuts building. He said that the Discount Tire building needed to add something across the parapet to break it up; especially on the south elevation.

Mrs. Brach agreed with Mr. Brock's comments about the Discount Tire building. She said that the second "D" on the Dunkin Donuts proto-type building did not look like an appropriate color for the Lowcountry. Mrs. Brach commended Ryan Lyle for adding pervious parking to the revised site plan.

Mr. Brower concurred with Mrs. Brach about the branding colors of the prototype building and signage. He questioned whether the approval of this development could be contingent of the removal of the billboards. Per staff, that would not be an option.

Mr. Scott said he liked the backside of the Discount Tire building, but that the right side of the building needed to be better articulated because it faced Highway 278. He suggested an offset at the middle bay to pop it out and that he would prefer to see the metal trellises versus the scoring on the EIFS. Mr. Scott said they should add a roof or corbels on the corner tower element to give it more Lowcountry character. Mr. Scott commented on the Dunkin Donuts building and said that he was not sure how the seams would wrap the corners on the mansard metal roof or how the brackets would work and that more detailing would be needed. He suggested that the awnings be tucked in over the doors and to add brackets and to refine the window trim detailing. He said that the window vertical/horizontal proportions did not look right and needed more study. Mr. Scott said that the column design needed details.

Mr. Starkey agreed with Mr. Scott's architectural comments and stated that the dark colors shown on the Dunkin Donuts proto-type building should be lighter, and not black, for the Bluffton store. He said that the Dunkin Donuts interior drive elevation had a blank wall that appeared to look like a large picture frame and that something needed to be done to break it up. Mr. Starkey commented that there was no information with the submission regarding the order boards, which needed to be looked at.

Mr. Atkins commented about the Dunkin Donuts building and said that there were no details about the covered drive-thru or fencing at the outdoor dining area. He agreed with Mr. Scott's and Mr. Starkey's architectural comments. He commended the applicant for modifying the building proto-type to conform to the Code. Mr. Atkins stated that the windows, brackets, eaves, fascia, soffits & massing looked good but needed refinement. Mr. Atkins commented on the Discount Tire building and agreed that there needed to be more articulation on the parapet wall and suggested to move the wall up, or bump it out, to break up the parapet.

Mr. Brock made a motion to approve the McCulloch Tract Discount Tire and Dunkin Donuts conceptual DRB project with the following conditions:

Dunkin Donuts Building:

- Submit the elevations for the drive-thru and service sides of the building
- Provide better detailing to the drawings:
 1. For the seams that wrap the corners on the mansard metal roof and how the brackets work;

2. The awnings should be tucked in over the doors and to add brackets;
 3. refine the window trim detailing and re-study the vertical/horizontal proportions of the windows
 4. column & panel detailing
 5. Refine the “feature wall” on the back half of the building on the interior side of the development to break it up.
- The dark colors shown on the proto-type building should be toned down/lighter and not be a black color for the Bluffton store. The bright colors on the building trim and signage must be toned down to meet the color requirements in the Code.
 - Include information and detailing on the order boards, covered drive-thru and outdoor dining area fencing.

Discount Tire:

- Provide better articulation on the lower parapet wall. Consider moving the wall up (or bump it out) to break up the parapet.
- Add a roof or corbels on the corner tower element to give the building a more Lowcountry character
- Improve the articulation on the north wall; perhaps add an offset at the middle bay to pop it out and incorporate the same type of metal trellises as proposed on the back of the building versus the scoring on the EIFS

Mr. Starkey seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Oliver asked that Ed Copeland address the concerns raised by the Board. Mr. Copeland said that the drive-thru side of the building would look different from the interior side of the building because there would be bump outs and canopies for the drive-thru to break up the massing. He said they would refine the rear wall to simply things and that the proto-type “feature wall” siding is customized for each location and that “Bluffton Runs on Dunkin” signage would be placed within the large picture frame area on the back-half of the wall. Mr. Pimsaguan stated that they would be able to implement the modifications to the Discount Tire building to satisfy the DRB.

6. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Piedmont Goodwill Bluffton Retail Store – Conceptual (2):

Mr. Atkins recused himself from the meeting and asked Mr. Brock to preside over the Piedmont Goodwill project and asked Mr. Starkey to preside over the CapRock project; Mr. Brock and Mr. Starkey agreed. Ms. Moss stated that Mr. Atkins submitted a recusal form then gave the project background. Mr. Brock asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Brianna Huffman, the project Architect, made the presentation for the project. She stated that they would address the architectural issues and show the downspout locations and further develop sections of the loading dock area at the final DRB submission. Ryan Lyle, the Civil Engineer for the project, said that the underground detention chamber location would be modified and out of the tree island at final. He stated that the monument sign would remain at the current location, but they would calculate the sign area out of the natural resource protection area and add it to another place on the site.

Mrs. Brach asked whether the underground chamber would be moved from the tree island. Mr. Lyle said that it would be moved at the final submission. Mrs. Brach asked about the fencing at the Natural Resource Protection area. Mr. Lyle said that the same type of fencing installed at Buffalo Wild Wings project would be used at this project. He said that Goodwill considered the wheel stops as trip hazards and would prefer not having the stops at the main entry. Mr. Lyle said that the concrete sidewalk would be 6" taller than the parking bays at the main entry.

Mr. Hill said that he liked the changes with the architecture and colors. He questioned whether moving the tree island over one space would be better than re-designing the system. Mr. Lyle said that another company designed the placement of the underground chambers. He said he was considering another system, preparing new calculations to re-size the chambers and that the change could easily be done.

Mr. Starkey commented on the wheel stop issue. He stated that if wheel stops were not used, the sidewalk fronting the parking would have to be widened 1-2 feet to allow for the car overhang. He said that he agreed that the building looked better on the rear elevation, but would like to see the dormers spread out evenly across the back. He said to put one dormer in the center and one dormer over each wide gap in the wall. Mr. Starkey requested better articulation on the north wall to break-up the blank spaces and that more information was needed on the loading dock.

Mr. Scott said that the three rear dormer spacing needed more study. He said that the board & batten siding on the east gable end should be taken down to the ground to match the board and batten at the front main entry. Mr. Scott said that, overall, the building looked good.

Mr. Brower agreed with Mr. Starkey about the wheel stops and if they were not used, the walk should be increased in width. He said to add 5 dormers or spread them out further in the back.

Mr. Brock agreed with all of the comments made by the Board for this project. He said to provide more information about the loading dock and to provide more articulation on the north wall and to re-work the dormer spacing.

Mr. Scott made a motion to approve the second conceptual submission of the Piedmont Goodwill Bluffton Retail Store DRB project with the following conditions:

- The spacing for the three north dormers needed more study; spread the dormers out further and evenly across the back (one in the center and one dormer over each wide gap in the wall) or add 5 dormers.
- Provide better articulation on the north wall to break-up the blank spaces;
- The board & batten siding on the east gable end should be taken down to the ground to match the front main entry board & batten siding.
- Submit more information on the loading dock.
- Move the underground chamber from the east tree island
- If wheel stops are not used, the sidewalk fronting the parking bays would have to be widened 1-2 feet

Mrs. Brach seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

B. CapRock Island Park Senior Living – Lady’s Island – Final:

Mr. Brock recused himself from the meeting and Mr. Starkey presided over the meeting. Ms. Moss stated that Mr. Brock submitted a recusal form then gave the project background. Mr. Starkey asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Annette Lippert, the project Architect, made the presentation for the project. She said that the focus of the building design was to reduce the massing of the building with variations of the facade materials and offsets with interconnecting corridors tying the building together and respecting the neighboring residential properties. The landscape plan had a variety of plant materials. She concluded by saying that the generator was being sized but that it would be fully screened with fencing and landscaping.

Mrs. Brach wondered how the awning and shutter placement was determined and asked if there were any pervious parking spaces. Taylor Reeves, Civil Engineer for the project, stated that the end parking spaces were pervious.

Mr. Brower had no comment other than to say that it was a nice looking project.

Mr. Hill agreed with Mr. Brower and said that it was a good looking project. He asked how the recommendations in the Arborist report would be adhered to. Per Staff, the Natural Resource Planner would be in frequent communication with the Arborist and visit the project site before, during and after construction to assess the trees.

Mr. Scott said that he was originally concerned about the number of facade materials, but when he saw the rendering, the materials worked really well to break up the mass of the building.

Mr. Starkey agreed that the building was very well done and said that the landscape plan was excellent. He stated that the Arborist indicated that there could be issues with the 70” live oak. He said that he was concerned because this tree was the focal point of the courtyard. Mr. Starkey concluded by saying that the site light levels at the sidewalks were very low and that additional walkway lighting would be helpful for the elderly to see better at night.

Mr. Brower made a motion to approve the CapRock Island Park Senior Living final DRB project as submitted. The generator must be fully screened and consider adding walkway lighting.

Mrs. Brach seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Starkey stated that “the structure, landscaping, lighting, and other design elements must be built/installed according to the plans reviewed and approved by the DRB. The material and color board reviewed and approved by the DRB must be adhered to during construction. Any changes to the approved plans or submittals must be requested for and submitted to the DRB for formal approval.”

7. **OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Atkins said that the next scheduled meeting was at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 7, 2020 at the Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909.
8. **ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Brower made a motion to close the meeting and Mr. Starkey seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 3:49 p.m.