

NORTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
August 21, 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

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

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

3. **Review of Minutes:** Minutes from the July 24, 2012, meeting were reviewed. Mr. Bowden made a **motion**, and Mr. Sammons seconded the motion, **to accept the July 24, 2012, minutes as written**. The motion was **carried unanimously** (FOR: Brock, Bowden, Dixon, Sammons, Coffman).

4. **New Business:** None

5. **Old Business: Family Dollar Store – Laurel Bay, Shanklin Road (Final)**

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, noting the changes made based on Board comments from the last meeting:

- Removed sidewalk along the front of the building to maintain the 8' buffer.
- Flipped parking to the outside to create a landscape median at the corner of the building to increase the buffer screening ability at the corner.
- Dumpster area slid up and hidden more; allowed another landscape opportunity at the corner of parking area to help screen the loading zone.
- No grading within any of the trees or buffers.
- The architecture of the building was changed; attempted to address the comments by adding the porch element and pitched-look roof on the front.
- Back of the building was left as metal as per discussion at the previous meeting.
- The existing vegetation in the buffer does meet the linear foot requirements. An on-site meeting can be accommodated.

- An SCE&G lighting plan was submitted. However, the architect did take SCE&G's lighting plan and integrated the wall paks which are identified with the site lighting so I do have a copy to share with you.

Board discussion included:

Site and Landscaping:

- Agree with Ms. Timmer's comments.
- Suggestion made that the Carissa Hollies shown against the foundation in the loading zone should be replaced with something with a little more height.
- More landscape screening needed for the dumpsters.
- Do think it's important to meet on-site with staff to look at existing conditions.
- Need to have grading plan submitted.
- Bringing the landscape down along the loading zone helped.
- No problem with flipping the parking; works well, will help that east side.
- Clarification made regarding roses as additional accent plants: requirement is that all shrubs be five gallons or larger. The industry doesn't have five gallons so you have to bump up to seven gallons.
- Concerned with no sidewalk in front of the parking. The driveway is 30' wide; 24' is typical. That is for access for deliveries and access to the median on the corner. A sidewalk could fit up-front but preferred green space.
- If the architecture stays as is, it would be better to extend the sidewalk. Would prefer the sidewalk to alleviate foot traffic through landscape.
- Seeing what the screening is for the dumpster is critical.

Site Lighting:

- Clarification requested on new plan and lighting under the canopy. Plan submitted is showing two wall paks on the front above the canopy. That is exactly what the photometric plan has. The plan is the same as what was submitted, the only difference is that plan only has the SCE&G numbers. The new plan provided by the architect is SCE&G numbers (parking) and his numbers (wall paks) together.
- Would be nice if those H fixtures on the front of the building were a little nicer. They are basic wall paks but they are a little more rounded than the normal box.
- The new lighting plan is above what the maximum allows. A new plan to address lights will be required.
- Size of H fixture. No dimensions on cut sheet.

Architecture:

- Clarification on material. Painted brick with stucco entry elevations? Yes. Color samples provided.
- Drawing shows roof color to be cool bright red. Correct to show terra cotta.
- Color samples submitted appear to be within standards.
- Adhere to staff comments regarding elevations/architecture.
- Need to refer to the Design Guidelines as stated previously. Looks like a big brick box with pieces added on. The front piece could integrate more into the brick façade so it appears that it's a single building, not a tacked on element.

- The side roofs that you have on the front might work better if you bring that down in height to a pedestrian scale. These are the places you can incorporate the lowcountry style, not so industrial.
- The side elevations are a good attempt at breaking up the mass but those could be toned down; overpowering; scale those down. Make it appear more part of the building, not something that is just tacked on. The roof floating above the parapet wall appears to separate the elements rather than bring it into a continuous structure.
- Metal wall panels in the back are acceptable.
- As noted in the staff comments, incorporating some of that brick into those front entry elements.

Mr. Sample asked for clarification about moving the brick under the porch. Chairman Coffman explained if there was a way to incorporate the brick into this element somehow maybe that's one way of helping to make it into a cohesive façade.

Mr. Baisch wanted to make sure the Board was okay with the metal being used in the rear of the building. Board was okay with this.

Mr. Bowden made a **motion**, and Mr. Dixon seconded the motion, to **deny the final approval with the following recommendations for resubmittal:**

- A. The sidewalk shall be relocated to front the parking spaces to provide better pedestrian access as well as protect the landscape.
- B. Provide manufacturer cut sheet which addresses the size of fixture H.
- C. Confirm that no lights are installed under canopies.
- D. Architecture plans should agree with the materials and colors chosen and discussed at the meeting i.e. terra cotta roof submitted yet plans state bright red roof.
- E. Require onsite meeting to discuss the front buffer as recommended by staff.
- F. Provide floor plan of building.
- G. Provide grading plan as outlined in submittal requirements.
- H. 08/20/12 Staff Report Comments shall be applied to the next submittal as follows:

Architecture:

1. At the July meeting the Board motioned the architecture designer refer to the design guidelines to specifically look at roof overhands and roof pitch along with other items in the architecture design guidelines. It is staff's opinion this requirement has not been met in the current submittal.
2. The towers on the building sides do not relate to the building architecture and are not integrated into the building
3. The front façade has not been integrated with the remainder of the building but appears to be applied to the box.
4. The façade and side tower building materials should be incorporated into the building body to promote design integrity and continuity. Staff recommends the applicant's architect be present for future meetings if the board decides the current submittal needs revisions.
5. The rear building material is metal wall panels. Staff recommends that some portion of the other building materials be included on the rear. To again provide for design integrity and continuity. **Board stated they were okay with building rear material being only metal wall panels.**

6. No building details have been provided.
7. Dumpster details have not been provided.

Site Plan:

1. No changes were made to address staff's concerns regarding the proposed grading and construction of the building. How will the items be constructed without encroaching into the buffer? **Provide limits of construction.**
2. A grading plan has not been submitted as required for final review. The project may not receive final approval without this information.
3. Wheel stops are required at all parking stalls.
4. Limits of construction still unclear. Note that a protection fence must be erected at this line to prevent encroachment into the buffers.
5. Do the handicap stalls meet minimum width requirements?

Landscape Plan:

1. Highway Corridor Buffer: The proposed buffer does not meet the ordinance requirement based on the information provided. The photos show existing vegetation which may be counted toward required landscaping. Staff recommends an onsite meeting with applicant's representative, staff and one board member to discuss how to integrate the existing landscape with the proposed. Based on the ordinance requirements, staff estimates the front buffer without existing vegetation would require the following:
 - a. West Buffer = 250 linear feet rounded up to 300 linear feet as outlined by the ordinance requires
 - 1) Broad-leafed Overstory Trees: 3 x 4 per 100' = 12 (8 are shown)
 - 2) Understory Trees: 3 x 14 per 100' = 42 (20 are shown)
 - 3) Shrubs: 3 x 30 per 100' = 90 (53 are shown)
 - b. East Buffer = 170 linear feet rounded up to 200 linear feet.
 - 1) Broad-leafed Overstory Trees: 2 x 4 per 100' = 8 (8 are shown)
 - 2) Understory Trees: 2 x 14 per 100' = 28 (11 are shown)
 - 3) Shrubs: 2 x 30 per 100' = 60 (24 are shown)
2. A tree is needed in the island located on the southeast side of the parking lot.
3. The Sabal Palm and Cathedral Live Oak shown on the northeast side of the building will conflict as the Live Oak overcomes the Palm.
4. Bald Cypress must be 2 ½" not 2".
5. The Knock Out Roses must be 7 gallons (5 gallons or larger) not 3 gallons.
6. Note 3 on the landscape notes should also state that changes must be approved by County staff.
7. Note 7 – mulch should not touch the tree trunk – recommend not coming any closer than 6 inches to the trunk.
8. The height/width ratio given for the Carissa Holly is in line with typical 3 gallon containers and not 7 gallon.

9. Carissa Holly shown planted at 3' o.c. Is this correct?
10. Windmill Palm list 10' as condition – will it be B&B or container?
11. Additional landscape is needed at the dumpster as outlined at the previous meeting.

Lighting Plan

1. At the last meeting, the board addressed that the wall paks were not appropriate lighting to use on all sides of the building. The lights still shown as previously submitted.
2. The cut sheet for the wall pak does not state the light is a cutoff fixture.
3. Wall Pak lighting has not been included in the foot-candles on the plan.
4. Wal Paks should not be used as substitute for parking lot lighting.
5. No poles have been submitted for the parking lot lighting.
6. Will there be lighting underneath the front façade canopy? If so provide cut sheets and show where they will be located.
7. Will there be lighting under the entrance area? If so provide cut sheets, locations and how many to be used.
8. Staff recommends the security strobe lights not be approved. No other businesses use them and staff believes it will be setting a precedent that does not need to be duplicated along our corridors.

Motion **was carried** (FOR: Bowden, Dixon, Sammons, Coffman; ABSTAINED: Brock).

6. Other Business:

Motion: Mr. Bowden made a motion, and Mr. Dixon seconded the motion, to **nominate Mr. Michael Brock as Vice Chairman**. Motion **was carried** (FOR: Bowden, Dixon, Sammons, Coffman; ABSTAINED: Brock).

7. Chairman Coffman adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:31 p.m.

APPROVED 9/11/12