

NORTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
July 24, 2012, Beaufort Industrial Village #2

Members Present:

Brian Coffman
Bradley Bowden
Mark Dixon
William Sammons
Michael Brock

Member Absent:

Staff Present: Judy Nash Timmer, Development Review Planner
Linda Maietta, Planning Assistant

Guests: Mr. Greg Baisch, Ward Edwards; Mr. Robert Sample, Owner; Mr. Joe Strickland, Vice President, Premier Builders & Development Company

I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:30 p.m. by Chairman Brian Coffman.

II. **General Public Comment:** There were no public comments.

III. **Review of Minutes:** Minutes from the December 7, 2010, meeting were reviewed. Mr. Dixon made a **motion**, and Mr. Sammons seconded the motion, **to accept the December 7, 2010, minutes as written**. The motion was **carried unanimously** (FOR: Brock, Bowden, Dixon, Sammons, Coffman).

Minutes from the January 18, 2011, meeting were reviewed. Mr. Dixon made a **motion**, and Mr. Brock seconded the motion, **to accept the January 18, 2011, minutes as written**. The motion **carried** (FOR: Bowden, Dixon, Sammons, Brock; ABSTAINED: Coffman).

IV. **Old Business:** None.

V. **New Business: Family Dollar Store – Laurel Bay, Shanklin Road (Conceptual)**

Mr. Brock recused himself from review of this submission due to a professional interest in the project. Ms. Timmer presented her staff report to the Board (copy attached).

Mr. Baisch presented the project. Addressed site and landscape comments included in the staff report:

1. Will do some pervious parking in the spaces as indicated.
2. Space originally left striped to allow for delivery truck. Reviewed plan and can work with that space being landscaped.
3. Dumpster can be moved over slightly to ensure there is room between it and the modulated buffer to allow construction.
4. Ponds are shown conceptually. Will make sure they are in any buffer modulation. The intent is to leave anything we have labeled buffer either undisturbed.
5. Sign will be relocated to the opposite side of the driveway to improve the landscape.

As an alternative to what was submitted to the Board, Mr. Baisch presented a revised architectural drawing (not previously shared with the Board).

Board discussion included:

Site Issues: no major problems.

Landscape issues: In addition to comments made in the staff report, Mr. Dixon had the following to offer:

1. Concern with view of the loading zone and dumpsters; suggest extending the landscape down the south side so it's buffered a little better in front of that loading zone.
2. Suggest doing some more buffering at the end of that parking area because of the residential area surrounding the facility; will soften the parking lot.
3. Is it possible to bring that foundation planting area down into the loading zone area a little bit further? (Don't think that should be an issue to extend the foundation buffer.)
4. The pad for the HVAC was not noted on the plan received. Based on the plan presented today, showing the HVAC in the back, it should be fine.
5. Plant symbols – unsure what they mean. Are not defined on the plan. (Plan will be labeled for next submission.)
6. Existing wood fence – will that remain? (Intent would not be to disturb anything in that buffer area.)

Lighting:

1. Need to submit a site lighting plan with final submission along with building lights, making those more architectural as opposed to the wall packs. Ms. Timmer read from the Ordinance regarding building lighting.
2. Mr. Strickland questioned the egress door lights that cannot be shielded and Family Dollar's burglar alarm system that has strobes on each corner of the building that enunciates when the alarm goes off. The Board responded that these are not covered as part of the lighting because they are not always on and are considered emergency lighting. The Board does not want light to trespass off the property, does not want glare in the neighbor's houses or on the corridor itself. An alternative may be to use multiple low-level fixtures as opposed to one big high-output light. Photometric plan is required including building lights and parking lights.

Architecture:

1. The drawing originally submitted was the typical Family Dollar store with long, unarticulated facades. The Board likes the direction of the new scheme presented today. It strides to break up the facades and the mass of the building.
2. Building is located in a residential area and most of the residences in that area are clapboard; not a lot of brick homes throughout this area, clapboard could be an alternative to brick. Mr. Strickland wants a maintenance-free building. Clapboard requires painting. Brick is acceptable.
3. The shade of red selected is going to be a problem. Suggest made to tone it down to a darker red.
4. Soften the glass because we are in a residential area.
5. New plan – suggested the entrance be made more prominent; bolder; maybe wider. By doing so, may help to shade the glass and break up the front façade. If the front is widened and pulled forward, suggest a pitched roof be used.

6. Mr. Strickland raised a question about the back of the building that is facing the woods. Would like to cut back on costs and possibly just use metal panels on the back. Board will consider this; concern is with three visible sides.

Motion: Mr. Bowden made a motion, and Mr. Sammons seconded the motion, **to recommend conceptual approval of the plan submitted today, July 24, 2012, at the meeting** (the conceptual plan submitted prior to the meeting and handed out to the Board members has been taken off the table) **with the following conditions:**

- Incorporate the staff comments for both the original design and the new design submitted at the meeting today
- Along with the site comments from staff, the screening at the end of the parking area be incorporated
- Bring the planting area in front of the loading area
- Signage acceptable to be relocated to the opposite side of the driveway than is currently shown
- That the pervious parking be incorporated again as staff notes and as was presented at the meeting today
- To delineate the existing materials on the plans in a more clear manner
- The building lighting/site lighting be submitted in totality and provide comment on what it is when submitted.

Amended motion to include:

- Refer to Design Guidelines to specifically look at color, roof overhangs, and roof pitch, along with the other items in the Design Guidelines.

The motion (and amendment) **was carried** (FOR: Coffman, Bowden, Dixon, Sammons; ABSTAINED: Brock).

VI. **Other Business:**

Amend the agenda to include Board elections. **Motion:** Mr. Bowden made a motion, and Mr. Brock seconded the motion, to **nominate Mr. Coffman as chairman**. Motion **was carried** (FOR: Bowden, Dixon, Sammons, Brock; ABSTAINED: Coffman).
Vice-chair election tabled until next meeting.

VII. Chairman Coffman adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:25 p.m.

APPROVED AUGUST 21, 2012