



**AGENDA
SOUTHERN CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD**

February 6, 2013

3:00 P.M.

**Rotary Community Center, Oscar Frazier Community Park
11 Recreation Court, Bluffton, SC 29910**

1. CALL TO ORDER – 3:00 P.M.
2. PUBLIC COMMENT
3. REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES ([backup](#))
4. NEW BUSINESS
5. OLD BUSINESS
 - A. Beaufort County Application: Modern Classic Motors – Car Wash/Detail Shop, 161 Fording Island Road (US 278) (Final) ([backup](#))
6. OTHER BUSINESS
 - A. Next Meeting – Wednesday, February 20, 2013 at 3:00 p.m.
7. ADJOURNMENT



SOUTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD (CRB) MINUTES
January 16, 2013, Hilton Head Island Library Large Conference Room

Members Present: Joe Hall, Ed Pinckney, Daniel Ogden, Pearce Scott, James Atkins

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Robert Merchant, Beaufort County Long-range Planner

Guests: Scott Corkern; David Karlyk, Carolina Engineering Consultants, Inc.; Michael Griffith

1. CALL TO ORDER – 3:10 P.M.

Mr. Hall explained that the meeting was rescheduled because the January 9 meeting was cancelled due to lack of quorum.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

3. REVIEW OF NOVEMBER 14 AND NOVEMBER 28, 2012 MEETING MINUTES

Robert Merchant passed out the minutes for the November 28 meeting. Mr. Pinckney motioned and Mr. Scott seconded to approve the minutes as drafted. Motion carried.

Mr. Merchant passed out the minutes for the November 14 meeting. Mr. Atkins motioned and Mr. Scott seconded to approve the minutes as drafted. Motion carried.

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Sunset Bay Seafood Restaurant, formerly Sea Trawler Restaurant on Fording Island Road Extension in Buckingham Landing Community Preservation District (Conceptual)

Mr. Merchant presented to the Board the staff report. He said that the project consisted of adding a rooftop deck at the site of the former Sea Trawler Restaurant at Buckingham Landing. He said that the building was highly visible from the Hilton Head Island bridge. He also said that the project would result in no land disturbances or alterations to the existing site plan.

Scott Corkern, the project architect, presented for the applicant. He said that the rooftop deck would cantilever out from the central cupola. The structure would be painted to match the existing railings. Mr. Ogden asked about the vertical line shown on midway on the elevations. Mr. Corkern said that it was a steel post, probably 6” square, which would be painted to match the railings. He said that precast steel stairs would be used.

Mr. Atkins asked if there was any thought about the staging of construction to minimize land disturbance. Mr. Corkern said that it will be technically challenging, but they will minimize disturbance. Mr. Corkern said that he would provide to the Board steel drawings with the next submittal. Mr. Ogden asked what was driving the total size of 2,500 square feet. Mr. Corkern said that he was maximizing the total area of the deck possible with the constraints inherent in the cantilever design, per the wishes of his client.

Mr. Scott asked if it was possible get to the deck from the existing cupola. Mr. Corkern said that it was problematic due to the existing structure and level of the deck. Mr. Ogden asked if there would be elevator access to the deck. Mr. Corkern said that there wouldn't and that the existing building already has an elevator to the dining level. He said that if ADA requirements required handicap access to the rooftop deck, it would probably be achieved with a ramp from the first floor.

Mr. Scott asked about a possible trellis for shade on the deck. Mr. Corkern said that they will probably address shade with tables and umbrellas. Mr. Pinckney said that they could choose a lighting fixture that was less visible. He also said that having white handrails would make the addition less obtrusive and blend into the surroundings. Mr. Scott said that a skinnier post or pole for the lights would be less obtrusive.

Mr. Hall said that he was troubled by the project. He said that the original construction of the restaurant was controversial. He felt that because of the existing building's prominence, altering the building would be problematic. He said he would have trouble approving the project as submitted. Mr. Corkern asked if any alternative approach to the project would be acceptable, or was he opposed to the deck itself. Mr. Hall said that he doesn't like to give hints to what's approvable, but reviews what is submitted to the Board.

Mr. Atkins said that there might be opportunities to revisit the existing architecture to provide a deck, rather than adding to the building which was proving to be a very expensive approach. Mr. Corkern said that the existing restaurant is successful and that they couldn't justify altering the existing building. He said that if the deck were constructed, it would be tremendously popular. Mr. Pinckney said that the whole project would be improved if sabal palmettos could be planted along the north elevation, to soften the building when viewed from the bridge.

Mr. Atkins motioned to deny approval of the project with the following comments:

- The Board needs to see more clarity on how the project would be pulled off technically. The applicant should consider integrating the rooftop deck into the existing structure.
- The scale of the light fixtures need to be less obtrusive.
- The color of the railings need to be lighter to blend with the surroundings.
- Additional landscaping is needed, especially along the north elevations, to soften the building from views from the bridge.

Mr. Pinckney asked for clarification that if the structure was resubmitted addressing the comments made by the Board, would it possible meet with the Board's approval. Mr. Atkins said that the proposed deck, as submitted, doesn't integrate well with the existing building. He said that he wasn't opposed to a rooftop deck as such, but not the way it was designed. Mr. Ogden asked the Board if the applicant made the deck better proportioned and architecturally integrated with the existing structure, would it be acceptable. Mr. Atkins said that it would.

Mr. Ogden seconded. Motion carried with Mr. Pinckney voting no.

5. OLD BUSINESS

A. Beaufort County Application: Modern Classic Motors – Car Wash/Detail Shop, 161 Fording Island Road (US 278)

Mr. Merchant gave a brief project background. He said that Board denied the conceptual submittal of the Mercedes Carwash and Detail Shop. The Board requested that the applicant redesign the building to incorporate design elements used in the Mercedes dealership building. This includes replacing the semi-circular feature with a gabled feature similar to the dealership building. Also, the applicant should consider using a trellis feature to soften the massing of the headwall. He said that the applicant has resubmitted a conceptual architectural rendering of the project.

Michael Griffith, the project architect, presented for the Board. He said that proposed building was 3,000 square feet and would be sited 493 feet from the centerline of US 278. He said that they would like to match the colors of the dealership building. He said that the owner preferred a Charleston/Colonial design theme. Mr. Griffith passed out an alternative conceptual architectural drawing of the building.

David Karlyk, the project engineer also presented for the applicant. He said that the existing site already had adequate parking and stormwater management to handle the new structure. Mr. Atkins said that the architecture was a good improvement over the previous submittal. He said that it addressed the Board's concerns. Mr. Atkins recommended that the architect consider reducing the size of the trellises on the front elevation.

Mr. Ogden motioned to approve the conceptual drawing that was passed out at the meeting with the following conditions:

- Readdress the parapet behind the front gable
- Reduce the size of the trellis work on the front elevation.

Mr. Scott seconded. Motion carried.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

7. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Modern Classic Motors – Car Wash/Detail Shop

Type of Submission:	Final
Developer:	Gordon Faulkner
Architect:	Michael Griffith, RA
Engineer:	Carolina Engineering Consultants, Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Beaufort Planning Group
Type of Project:	Commercial Retail
Location:	161 Fording Island Road (US 278)
Zoning Designation:	Regional Commercial

Project Information: The applicant proposes to construct an approximately 3,000 square foot building to house a drive-through carwash and a detail shop as an accessory use to the Mercedes dealership. The proposed project is located at the rear of the existing dealership west of the parking area (please refer to the attached narrative provided by the applicant).

This project was conceptually reviewed by the Southern Corridor Review Board at their November 7, 2012 meeting. At that time the Board did not approve the project. The project was resubmitted to the Board and reviewed at the January 16, 2013 meeting. At that time, the Board approved the conceptual drawing that was passed out at the meeting with the following conditions:

- Readdress the parapet behind the front gable
- Reduce the size of the trellis work on the front elevation.

The applicant is now submitting for final review. They have submitted a site plan showing the existing site and proposed building. They have provided the landscaping and lighting plans for the existing site for reference. Additional landscaping will be provided along the foundation of the new building and along approximately 280 feet of additional highway buffer. The submittal also includes architectural elevations showing reduced trellis on the front elevation.

Staff Comments:

1. Cutsheets and photometrics of any additional exterior lighting will need to be submitted to the CRB for review.
2. The quantity of understory trees in the proposed highway buffer landscaping does not meet the minimum standards for buffer planting. It is important to note that the quantities of overstory trees and shrubs exceed minimum requirements. The table below provides a comparison assuming 280 feet of highway frontage.

Plant Type	CRB Requirement	Submitted Plan
Overstory Trees	11	18
Understory Trees	39	4
Shrubs	84	137 shrub 114 ornamental grasses

The Board will need to determine whether the plant quantities in the proposed highway buffer will still meet the screening and opacity objectives of the highway buffer or whether they need to be revised to meet the ordinance.