

BEAUFORT COUNTY
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES
November 3, 2022, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

Members Present: James Atkins, J. Michael Brock, Peter Brower, Brad Hill, Roger Jadown and Donald L. Starkey

Members Absent: Sallie Brach

Staff Present: Nancy Moss, Beaufort County Community Development Department

Guests:

Moss Creek Commercial – Seven Brew: Craig Winnall, Site Design, Inc. (in-person) and Beth Walker, Narramore Architecture (via telephone conference)

Okatie Center East – Caliber Collision: Bill Wiseman, McNeel Properties, LLC and Bret Flory, Cross Architects

No members from the public were in attendance.

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 May 5, 2022, minutes. Mr. Brock motioned to approve the meeting minutes and Mr. Starkey seconded to approve. Motion carried unanimously.
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** There was no public comment.
5. **NEW BUSINESS:**
 - A. **Moss Creek Commercial – Seven Brew, 1553 Fording Island Road – Bluffton – Conceptual:**

Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Mr. Winnall, the project Civil Engineer and Ms. Beth Walker, the project Architect, made the presentation for the project. Mr. Winnall stated that the site had three existing driveway cuts, but SRT required that the driveway cut nearest to Highway 278 be removed. He provided an account of the demolition planned for the site and that the parking lot and pavement within the 50’ highway buffer would be removed and stabilized with vegetation. He said that two 20” live oak trees located in the existing tree islands would be preserved and that they would follow the precautions of a Certified Arborist during construction throughout the pavement & curbing demolition work. Mr. Winnall stated that the Moss Creek ARB recommended a faux wrought iron fence in front of the two dual drive-through lanes. Mr. Atkins asked Ms. Walker if she had any comments. She stated that she had nothing to add other than that the dumpster enclosure materials would match those on the main building.

Mr. Brower arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Jadown asked if there was any kind of protection around the canopy columns near the drive through lane. Mr. Winnall said that none were shown but bollards could be added. Mr. Jadown said that the front half of the building seemed disconnected from the cooler in the rear. He said that the side facades had no articulation and wondered what the rectangular elements on the sides of the building were. Mr. Winnall said that they were sign boards. He said that there would be order boards and that employees would have I-Pads to take orders and that the customers do not park or come into the building and that it was strictly take-out only. Mr. Atkins stated that the building signage may exceed the combined 80 SF allowed but they could apply for a variance but it would most likely not be granted. Mr. Jadown asked how the roof equipment would be accessed and whether a roof ladder would be needed. Ms. Walker stated that there would be internal roof access with an attic-type stair unit and that no exterior ladder would be needed. Mr. Jadown stated that there was a lack of continuity between the main portion of the building and the rear cooler.

Mr. Brower said that he would withhold his comments until the end.

Mr. Hill stated that he had no comments.

Mr. Starkey said that the building did not have a Lowcountry look, reminded him of the coffee drive-through building that formerly existed on Boundary Street in Beaufort and appeared to have the proto-type architecture used by the Company. He stated that the drive-through canopy needed detailing and should not have a flat roof. Mr. Starkey said that the curved roof should be substituted with pitched roof. He agreed with Mr. Jadown that the area between the main building and the cooler looked off. Mr. Starkey suggested that false windows or louvers be substituted for the wall sign boxes on the sides. He said that the front blank windows did not have a Lowcountry look and recommended they be broken up architecturally.

Mr. Atkins agreed with Mr. Starkey's comparison of the appearance of this building to that of the now demolished coffee drive-through building in Beaufort, that it was not successful and an eyesore. Mr. Atkins wondered why the drive through canopy was proposed along the south elevation because there wasn't a drive through lane under it so it looked out of place. He suggested they re-study the architecture of the building and that the curved roof bothered him. Mr. Atkins stated that gabled or shed roofs are typically part of Lowcountry architecture and strongly encouraged that a gable roof that runs east-west on the main portion of the building and that a gable roof be added over the freezer be incorporated. He agreed with Mr. Starkey and did not like the flat drive-through canopies and to look at the Shell Gasoline station across the street for ideas on how to improve the canopy appearance. He recommended they incorporate a wrap-around shed roof or a bracketed canopy. He stated that subtle roof & canopy changes would make a big improvement and that the proposed materials & colors looked fine. Mr. Atkins suggested that a low pierced brick wall fronting the dual drive-through lanes would give the site a nice look near the Moss Creek residential development and to get brick entry wall design ideas from other developments along Highway 278. He requested that a preliminary landscape plan be submitted at the next meeting. Mr. Atkins said that he would not support a curved roof design, that the front windows should not be square, but rather be rectangular in shape with jamb, head & sill details and the siding should be finished off with corner boards. He concluded by stating that the canopy columns looked very large and did not mind the metal but suggested that a brick base be added.

Mr. Brower agreed with Mr. Starkey's and Mr. Atkins' critique of the architecture and stated that he could not find any Lowcountry elements on the building. He said that the curved roof was

unacceptable, that parapets should be on the north drive-through canopy and to remove the south canopy.

Mr. Brock made a motion to table this project to allow the applicant time to revise the architecture, provide a preliminary landscape plan and to develop a fence detail.

Mr. Hill seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

B. Okatie Center East – Caliber Collision, 107 Traders Cross – Bluffton – Conceptual:

Ms. Moss gave the project background. Mr. Atkins asked for public comment, but no comments were made. Bill Wiseman, the project Developer, and Bret Flory, the project Architect, made the presentation for this project. Mr. Wiseman stated that the trees and vegetation would be retained in the buffers and that they would also be supplemented with plantings. Mr. Flory provided the Board with a brief description about Caliber Collision's business and said that it was an upscaled collision shop. He stated that the building under review was the proto-type architecture for Caliber Collision, but it could be changed to better meet the architectural requirements of Beaufort County. Mr. Flory said that the perimeter buffers would have heavy landscaping and a wood-stained fence to screen the service yards from view. He added that a Porte Cochere is typically part of the building front but would not work at this site because the building was pulled forward. Mr. Flory described the various facade and roofing materials and colors that were proposed and that the front overhead doors had more detail than the standard overhead doors behind the decorative opaque fence. He concluded his presentation by describing how the damaged vehicles were dropped off at the building, either by the customer or flatbed tow truck, and would be removed from the site within 24 hours if the vehicle was deemed totaled.

Mr. Starkey suggested that the building be extended and to incorporate the exterior finishes to include the back shed area, so it did not look like an after-thought. Mr. Flory said that the back shed area would be screened behind the fencing and landscaping along Traders Cross. Mr. Starkey asked what the fencing would look like. Mr. Flory stated that in the front there would be a faux wrought iron fence mounted between masonry columns up to Commerce Place East and then the fencing would make a transition to a wood-stained fence on Commerce Place East and wrap around the corner and run all the way down Traders Cross, continue next to Goodyear and end at the southeast building corner.

Mr. Hill stated that there was not a lot of Lowcountry architecture on the building. He said that the preliminary landscape plan was not very extensive and to beef it up at final.

Mr. Brock stated that the ligustrum called out on the preliminary landscape plan would not do well next to Goodyear because it was wet in this area. Mr. Brock agreed with Mr. Hill's comments and said that more plant variations should be added and to beef it up. Mr. Brock requested additional information about the fencing. Mr. Flory stated that the decorative fencing in the front would have a dense mesh material attached to the backside of it and it would withstand the winds in this area. He said that both the decorative and wood fences would be 6' tall.

Mr. Brower said that he liked the building but that it had a lot of signage on it. He suggested that the black parapet be removed and the brick should be brought all the way up. Mr. Brower said that the rainbow stripe under the letters did not help the look of the building. Mr. Wiseman stated

that they had a building in Mt. Pleasant that had to meet architectural guidelines and provided the Board with photographs of it and asked the Board if this design would be acceptable in Beaufort County. The Mt. Pleasant building was well received by the Board.

Mr. Jadown stated that the metal roof screen added toward the back side of the building looked hodgepodge and to dress-up the front entrance. He recommended that a low parapet wall be added all the way across the front to hide the roof equipment and to add the metal screen on the back. Mr. Jadown questioned whether a fire truck could access the back of the building. Mr. Flory referred to the site plan and explained how the fire truck would maneuver around the site and would terminate at the southeast corner of the site and the hose length on the truck would provide fire protection service across the back of the building and service yard.

Mr. Atkins stated that Caliber Collision's local competitor attached barbed wire above its security fence which the DRB did not approve and advised the applicant to submit fence details so that no wiring would be visible on the exterior side of the fencing. Mr. Wiseman and Mr. Flory stated that there would be no barbed wire attached to the fencing and that their security wires would not be visible from the front-side of the fencing. Mr. Atkins stated that the decorative fencing in the front should be extended out and end at the Commerce Place East & Traders Cross intersection to dress up the front portion of the site. He said that the elevations looked schizophrenic, and that the simplicity of the front elevation shown on the Mt. Pleasant store with the change in brick patterns and colors with striations looked good. He said that the Highway 170 elevation was the most important side that would be seen even with the buffer, that another window should be added as was done at the Mt. Pleasant store and to substitute brick for the lap siding. Mr. Atkins stated that there would be a front taller mass at the office portion of the building and a second lower mass over the service bays. Mr. Atkins said that there were too many roof shapes and materials and suggested that a single sloped roof running north to south with a parapet wall on the front and the screen wall in the back. He said that the pilasters could run all the way up with siding infill areas between on the front and that the rear roof screen may not have to run across the entire rear of the building. Mr. Atkins said that the applicant would have to submit perspectives or an exhibit at final DRB to demonstrate that the roof equipment would be fully screened from view to northbound traffic on Highway 170.

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

- Revise the front taller office mass and remove the black parapet and add brick all the way up using the similar brick colors, patterns, and striations used at the Mt. Pleasant store. Add another window on the west elevation and remove the lap siding and substitute it with brick.
- Restudy the roof design at the lower service bay massing on the building. Consider a single sloped roof running north to south with a parapet wall on the front. Add brick pilasters all the way up to the top of the parapet with siding infill areas above the overhead doors and that the rear roof screen may not have to run across the rear of the building.
- Provide perspectives or an exhibit at final DRB to demonstrate that the roof equipment would be fully screened from view to northbound traffic on Highway 170.
- Study the rear shed area and how it can be better integrated with the overall design.
- Enhance the number and variations of plant materials on the preliminary landscape plan.
- Look at the transition of the decorative fencing and the solid fencing on the site.
- Bring color samples and fencing details to the next meeting.

Mr. Brock seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

6. **OLD BUSINESS:** None

7. **OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Atkins stated that the next scheduled meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, December 1, 2022, at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909.

Mr. Atkins asked if there was any other business to discuss. Ms. Moss stated that Grace Coastal Church had not confirmed the County's request to use their meeting room in 2023. A draft 2023 meeting schedule was prepared, and the only potential conflict would be at the July meeting. A Conflict of Interest form and Letter of Intent form for Brad Hill was needed and the Board must notify staff if any contact information had been changed so the Board Roster could be updated.

8. **ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Starkey made a motion to close the meeting and Mr. Brock seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.