

BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
August 6, 2020, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, 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: Michael Johnson, SHAH Architecture; Ryan Whelan, SHAH Architecture; Brian Pennell, Key Engineering; David Oliver, Jaz Development; and, Georgene & Joseph Mongarella, The Crescent POA.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:29 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 July 2, 2020 minutes. Mrs. Brach motioned to approve the meeting minutes and Mr. Hill seconded to approve. Motion carried unanimously.
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.
5. **NEW BUSINESS:**
 - A. **Carolina Volvo Facade Improvements – Bluffton – Conceptual:**

Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Michael Johnson, the project Architect, made the presentation for the project. He said that Corporate was encouraging them to remove the west canopy in its entirety and to present one big long flat. He stated that the building did not sit parallel to Highway 278 and they had issues with Corporate’s concept from a practical standpoint of not having a canopy on the building, especially during the hot summer months. He said they were trying to limit the amount of site work. He referred to the site plan to orientate the Board with how the building was positioned on the site in relation to Highway 278, where the existing canopy was located and where Corporate wanted their new metal & glass white plane located. Mr. Johnson referred to the elevations and said that they would like to keep a balance between Corporate’s vision for a facade refresh and the County’s design standards. He said that the front canopy would remain and they would like to incorporate a new parapet wall, that the outside parapet corner would pick up the blue brand color and the rest would be re-skinned in a white stucco. He stated that they tried to address the rest of the building to bring it down in scale and make it look less like a metal building by bringing the gable end out, adding corn cribbing in the gable above and applying canopies over the recessed bays. He said they did not have an issue with painting the car wash building to match the new color scheme. He concluded by stating that this design concept had to be approved by Corporate.

Mrs. Brach asked if they were going to submit a landscape plan. Mr. Johnson said that a landscape plan would be submitted at final which would show new foundation plantings, but the rest of the landscaping on the site would remain as it currently exists.

Mr. Hill stated that the blue panel for Volvo looked like a sign panel and said that he had not seen the corn cribbing detail in the lowcountry before. He asked whether there would be screening behind it. Mr. Johnson stated that there would be stucco behind it and that the corn cribbing was added texture and to bring more vernacular to the scale of the building. He said that they wanted to bring the focus to the front entry piece that was being re-worked, make the remainder of the building more traditional and adjusted in scale so it does not look like a pre-engineered metal building. Mr. Hill questioned what the spacing would be between the free-standing corn cribbing and the stucco behind it. Mr. Johnson said that the corn cribbing would sit off the building approximately 6"-8" to give it a good shadow line. Mr. Hill said that it would be a haven for birds without the screening behind it.

Mr. Starkey said he had a problem with having a modern portion of the building on one end and having a Lowcountry portion on the other end and combining it into one building because it appeared very abrupt and needed some kind of transition between the two designs. He stated that it would help to add a trellis or trees, versus low plantings, to break up the transitional facade area. Mr. Starkey referred to the corporate design elevations and requested clarification as to what would be done as part of this project. Mr. Johnson stated that that the Corporate design was submitted for reference to show the Board what corporate was proposing. He explained that the canopy would remain; a new parapet wall would be installed and that canopies would be applied over the recessed areas.

Mr. Brower stated that he shared the same concerns raised by Mr. Starkey. He stated that the corn cribbing was out of context with the rest of the building and that he would much rather see trellises or awnings across the gable end. Mr. Brower stated that the colors on the elevation drawings were difficult to read and that the lighter shaded color was actually the darker gray color and that the darker shaded color was actually the lighter color. Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Brower was correct and confirmed that the upper corner and both faces with Volvo on it would be dark blue and white. Mr. Johnson said that metal awnings would overhang the recessed bays and that new landscaping would be done inside each of the bays. Mr. Brower stated that some kind of trellis with something growing on it would be helpful.

Mr. Brock said that he liked the proposed facade changes and modifications. He said that the elevations were difficult to read and at final, submit 3D drawings to better relay to the Board what was being proposed. He also said to provide a color board that was coded well with the drawings and to show a revised transition area. Mr. Brock said that the foundation landscaping would be reviewed at final.

Mr. Scott said that the corn cribbing was being used in one spot and wondered whether it could be pulled in somewhere else; perhaps in the recessed bays or part of the trellis or even next to the blue on the Volvo corporate sign as vertical stripping which would be very interesting but otherwise the design was a nice improvement.

Mr. Johnson asked the Board whether too much white was being proposed. Mr. Brower stated that there were many shades of white and some whites were less reflective than others. Mr. Atkins stated that white stucco looks brighter than some white paint colors.

Mr. Hill said that the blue reads as one big sign, said that it looked good and asked for the other Board members input. Mr. Brower asked if Corporate would consider blue letters with a white background. Mr. Johnson said that all the building panels were typically all blue as opposed to white, but that the monument signs were white with blue lettering.

Mr. Atkins said that he agreed with the other Board members comments. He said that the center area seemed a bit dis-jointed and to bring some of the parapet detail walls around to other locations or vice versa to bring some of the brackets and awnings to the front and that the wall plane is unarticulated other than the few vertical joints. He stated that when the Board reviewed other dealerships, they pushed them to get some details and depths, shade and shadow on those planes which would allow Corporate an opportunity to update the branding if corporate would do something like that and to tie the building together in some way.

Mr. Brower made a motion to approve this conceptual DRB project with the following conditions:

- Revise the elevations:
 - Provide a transitional area between the refreshed areas at the new parapet at the canopy and stucco changes at the main entrance and the east end of the building which is simply proposed to be painted.
 - Consider incorporating the corn cribbing detail somewhere else on the facade to help tie it together.
 - Add metal awnings at the front gable end and trellises in the recessed areas for better articulation.
- Submit 3-D rendered views to better relay to the Board what changes are being proposed.
- Provide a detailed material & color board which lists where the materials and colors will be applied on the building.
- The landscape plan must show the new foundation plantings and metal trellises with confederate jasmine in the recessed areas to articulate and soften the building.
- The car wash building should be repainted to match the new color scheme on the building.

Mr. Starkey seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

6. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Matthews Marine Storage Facility – Bluffton – Final (2):

Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Brian Pennell, the project Civil Engineer, made the presentation for the project. He indicated that he took pictures of the front of the site to show that shrubs existed but were not picked up on the tree and topo survey. Mr. Pennell referred to the landscape plan and explained that the existing azalea and holly shrubs that were located behind the front buffer would be relocated into the gap in the buffer in front of the Matthews Marine building. He said

that the number of shrub plantings that are being proposed and that would be relocated would meet the plant quantities required in the front buffer. He stated that the existing chain link fencing behind the front buffer would be relocated to the back of the front buffer and painted black. He stated that the fencing relocation and the new plantings within the gap area in the buffer would prevent boat trailers or vehicles from parking in the buffer. He said that the Owner was appreciative that the internal 8' wood panel fence would not be required and would help him with the operation of the facility.

Mrs. Brock referred to the fence plan exhibit and asked for clarification as to where the internal wood panel fence would be removed. Mr. Pennell pointed out the location of the wood fencing that would not be removed and explained that a 4' split rail fence would surround the Natural Resource Protection area. Mrs. Brock wanted confirmation that the plants proposed behind the front buffer on the landscape plan would be relocated within the gap in the front buffer. Mr. Pennell said that there would be a combination of existing and proposed shrubs that would be relocated in the buffer gap. Mrs. Brach wanted to know if all of the plantings on the west buffer were proposed. Mr. Pennell said that with the exception of two palm trees, all of the plantings would be new on the west buffer.

Mr. Hill asked why there was a gap shown in the front buffer on the landscape plan. Mr. Pennell said there was an existing gap in the buffer and that he misinterpreted the Code and thought a view corridor would be allowed. Mr. Pennell said that a new landscape plan would be produced showing that the gap in the buffer would be planted.

Mr. Starkey wanted clarification that the gap in the buffer would be planted so as not to allow boat trailers to be parked. Mr. Pennell assured the Board that back buffer line and vegetation would be planted in front of the fence. Mr. Pennell said that the fence exhibit would be revised to show the fencing locations and the plantings within the buffer.

Mr. Brower asked what was being built across the street. Mr. Pennell referred to the aerial and pointed to the J. H. Body Shop site across the street. Mr. Brower wondered if that building was in alignment with Matthews Marine. Mr. Pennell stated that it was not and that an undeveloped triangular strip owned by SCDOT was across the street from Matthews Marine. Mr. Brower wanted to know if the front storage building would line up with the Matthews Marine building. Mr. Pennell said that it would not line up with the existing building and that the new building would be set back further from Cecil Reynolds Road because a retention pond was proposed in front of it.

Mr. Hill said that the landscape plan did not have a note indicating that the new plantings would be irrigated. Mr. Pennell said that he assumed that the new plantings would be irrigated. Mr. Hill said that the revised landscape plan should have a note indicating that all new plantings will be irrigated.

Mr. Hill made a motion to approve the Matthews Marine Storage Facility final (2) DRB project and asked that the following issues be addressed:

- Revise the landscape plan to fill in the gap, with shrubs, in the buffer fronting Matthews Marine building and add a note on the plan that all new plantings will be irrigated.
- Submit a revised Fence Exhibit showing:
 - The relocation of the chain link fencing in front of the Matthews Marine building to the back of the 20' buffer line in front of the building. Add a note indicating that the fence will be painted black.
 - The removal of the chain link fencing on the east side of the Matthews Marine building.

- The removal of the internal 8' wood panel fencing at the storage facility as approved by Staff.
- That a 4' split rail fence will be installed at the perimeter of the Natural Resource Protection Area.

Mr. Starkey seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Atkins read the standard final condition for the Matthews Marine Storage Facility project and said “the structure, landscaping 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 before changes are made”.

B. McCulloch Tract – Commercial Subdivision – Dunkin Donuts – Bluffton - Final (2):

Mr. Hill recused himself from the meeting. Mr. Atkins reminded the Board that the Discount Tire project was conditionally approved and that the Dunkin Donuts project was tabled at the last meeting. Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment but no comments were made. David Oliver, the Owner and Developer for the project, made the presentation. He stated that the colors were an open issue at the last meeting. Mr. Oliver handed the Board several orange and pink color alternatives to consider for the building accent colors. He stated that the Okatie Dunkin Donuts photographs were submitted as a benchmark because the colors at that store are the original prototype colors and that he was hopeful that the Board could come to an agreement with the orange and pink colors.

Mr. Scott said that the Juneberry pink color was nice and muted. He stated that the changes on the building were good but the curly rear gate seemed out of place with the rest of the architecture. Mr. Oliver agreed and suggested that the gate match the patio fencing design and the Board agreed.

Mr. Brock stated that he liked the changes made to the building and that he too liked the Juneberry pink color. He said the changes to the landscape plan were done well and agreed that jasmine vines should be added to the Discount Tire trellises.

Mr. Brower said that he liked the changes made to the building and that it was a good-looking building. He stated that he preferred the Cerise pink color and the Invigorate orange color.

Mr. Starkey asked how far the louvered shutters stuck out from the building. Mr. Atkins said that they looked to be at a 15 degree angle. Mr. Starkey said that the shutters should be out further, possibly at a 30 degree angle. He agreed with Mr. Brower’s pink and orange color choices.

Mrs. Brach asked where the patio was located. Mr. Oliver said it was located in the front of the building and that the fencing would be on the perimeter of the patio and accessed from the front door through the inside of the store. Mrs. Brach asked where the pink accent color was located on the building. Mr. Oliver stated that thin pink accent bands were located at the drive thru and entry doors. Mrs. Brach said she liked the Juneberry pink and Invigorate orange colors.

Mr. Atkins stated that he appreciated the design efforts taken to make the changes to the building and that it had come a long way. He agreed that the rear curved gate should be changed to a simple straight powder-coated aluminum service gate to match the patio fencing. He stated that he preferred the Invigorate orange color and that either the Juneberry or Cerise pink colors would be fine.

Mr. Starkey asked about the drive thru order boards and stated that the colors on the posts and awnings were all orange. He said that they should be painted white or black and not a bright orange color.

Mr. Atkins made a motion to approve this final DRB project with the following conditions:

- Revise the rendered elevations to show:
 - Replace the curly rear service gate with a simple straight picket powder-coated black metal gate.
 - Adjust the louvered shutters to cast out 30 degrees from the building.
 - Specify Invigorate orange and Cerise or Juneberry pink on the exterior accent colors.
- The drive-thru elements (order canopy, menu boards, etc.) must be painted black.

Mr. Brower seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Atkins read the standard final condition for the McCulloch Tract Dunkin Donuts project and said “the structure, landscaping 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 before changes are made”.

7. **OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Hill returned to the meeting. Mr. Atkins said that the next scheduled meeting was at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 3, 2020 at the Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909.
8. **ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Brock made a motion to close the meeting and Mr. Starkey seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.