



AGENDA
SOUTHERN CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, October 23, 2013
3:00 P.M.
Bluffton Branch Library Large Meeting Room
120 Palmetto Way, Bluffton, SC 29910
Phone: (843) 255-2140

1. CALL TO ORDER – 3:00 P.M.
2. PUBLIC COMMENT
3. REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES
 - A. September 18, 2013 ([backup](#))
4. NEW BUSINESS: Beaufort County
 - A. Conceptual Review of Tanger Outlet #1, Outparcel A – Chipotle (restaurant) ([backup](#))
 - B. Conceptual Review of BFG Communications, 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive ([backup](#))
5. OLD BUSINESS: None
6. OTHER BUSINESS
 - A. Next Meeting: Wednesday, November 6, 2013, at 3:00 p.m. at the Bluffton Library Large Meeting Room, 120 Palmetto Way, Bluffton, SC 29910
7. ADJOURNMENT



SOUTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD (CRB) MINUTES
September 18, 2013, Bluffton Library
120 Palmetto Way, Bluffton, SC 29910

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

Members Absent: Pearce Scott

Staff Present: Ian Hill, Beaufort County Historic Preservationist

Guests: Andy Harper, Court Atkins Architects; William Court, Court Atkins Architects

1. CALL TO ORDER – 3:00 P.M.
2. PUBLIC COMMENT: None
3. MINUTES: Mr. Pinckney motioned to approve the minutes of the September 4, 2013 Southern Corridor Review Board Meeting. Mr. Ogden seconded. Motion carried with James Atkins abstaining.
4. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Belfair Entrance Revision: Mr. Hill gave the project background. He said that The project consisted of revisions to the Belfair entrance. He summarized the changes being proposed that included providing outgoing and incoming right turn lanes; the removal of 4-12” diameter live oaks; removing a low brick wall and replacing with low lying vegetation and groundcover; and installing a new entrance sign located in the center median. Mr. Hill reminded the Board that signs were not in the purview of the CRB but details of the proposed sign were submitted so that the Board could forward their comments to staff. Mr. Hill said that the removal of the four trees was permissible under the Belfair PUD regulations and that it would not affect the highway buffer, which is located behind the entrance. He said that the only staff comment was that because the project consisted of minor revisions to the Belfair Entrance, staff had directed the applicant to submit the project as a final submission. He said that staff recommends approval of the project.

Judd Carstens of Witmer, Jones, Keefer presented for the applicant. He said the project was a simple revision to the Belfair entrance coinciding with the widening of US 278. He said the ultimate objective was to improve circulation at the entrance. Their goal was to retain as much plant material as possible given the new entrance lanes. He said that they eventually planned to remove the existing “v” sign located east of the entrance and replace it with a simple sign to be located in the narrow median at the entrance.

Mr. Pinckney asked for clarification on when the “v” sign would be removed. Mr. Carstens said within a two year time frame. He said that for the time being there would be four signs at the entrance until the “v” sign is removed. Mr. Pinckney said that he felt

the letters on the proposed sign seemed too small for a six lane highway. He said the letters should be between 13” and 19” tall to be seen from the highway based on general signage principles. He said that the design of the sign didn’t seem consistent with Belfair. He recommended that the applicant take a careful look at the clubhouse at Belfair and match the character of that building. He said that the proposed sign looked too rustic for Belfair.

Mr. Ogden said that he did not have a problem with the design of the sign but asked why the applicant chose such a small sign for its location.

Mr. Atkins said that the sign seemed to be oriented toward the entering and exiting traffic rather than drive by traffic. He said that having a cantilever sign seemed a little informal for Belfair. He supported the changes to the entrance with respect to improving safety and circulation.

Mr. Ogden motioned to approve the submittal with respect to the landscaping revisions and tree removal with the condition that the Board forward to Planning Staff their concerns about the size and character of the proposed sign. Mr. Atkins seconded. Motion carried.

5. OLD BUSINESS: There was no old business
6. OTHER BUSINESS: Mr. Hall questioned why the agenda said that the next scheduled meeting was October 18. Mr. Hill said he would have Robert Merchant contact the Board to clarify the next meeting date.
7. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:32 pm.

Chipotle - Tanger Outlets #1 – Outparcel A

Type of Submission:	Conceptual
Applicant:	COROC Holdings, LLC
Project Architect:	Ross G. Adams, Adams & Associates Architecture
Engineer:	William G. Powell, Ward Edwards Engineering
Type of Project:	Retail
Location:	Located on US 278 at the west side of the entrance to Tanger Outlets #1
Zoning Designation:	PUD
Project Information:	The applicant proposes to construct a 4,900 square foot building on Outlot A of the Tanger Outlets #1. The building will house a Chipotle restaurant and one other retail tenant. Before Tanger #1 was redeveloped, the site was a parking lot for the outlet mall. Since the original site was cleared and redeveloped, Outlot A was cleared and graded for future development. The applicant is submitting for conceptual review and has included a site plan, landscaping plan, architectural elevations, a lighting plan and cutsheets.

Staff Comments:

1. The architectural elevations are mislabeled on the plan. The elevation labeled as “north” is actually west facing with the other three elevations erroneously labeled accordingly. This needs to be corrected before final submission.
2. The Corridor Overlay District does not permit long unarticulated facades. The façade fronting the entrance road does not meet this requirement and has high visibility from U.S. 278.
3. The lighting plan needs to include cutsheets of all proposed exterior lighting fixtures. The plan also needs to clearly indicate which fixtures are existing and which are proposed for the new development.
4. There is a hot spot that exceeds 10 footcandles at the northeast corner of the proposed building. The fixtures shall be reconfigured to lower the lighting levels at this location.

BFG Communications, 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive

Type of Submission: Conceptual
Applicant: BFG Communications
Project Architect: David Sklar, Sklar Design Ecotecture
Engineer: Greg Baisch, Ward Edwards Engineering
Type of Project: Commercial Office
Location: Located on the east side of Buckingham Plantation Drive approximately 350 feet from US 278.
Zoning Designation: Commercial Regional
Project Information: BFG Communications is a graphic design and advertising company with its headquarters located in two buildings in a commercial business park on Buckingham Plantation Drive. The applicant proposes to develop a third building at 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive which is located directly north of the two buildings which the company is located. There is currently a 6,000 square foot building on the project site. The applicant proposes to construct an 18,000 square foot two-story building around the existing structure utilizing as much of the structure as practical for the new building. The applicant also proposes to provide a 58 space gravel parking lot to be located east of the building across from Anolyn Court, a County road.

Parking Lot Buffers: The applicant proposes to provide four rows of parking. The width of the site cannot accommodate the required 10 foot wide perimeter buffers (north and south of the parking lot) and the required 5 foot wide parking lot median between the two sets of parking rows. Staff directed the applicant to eliminate the parking lot median and reduce the width of both perimeter buffers to 5 feet in order to accommodate the parking.

Building Architecture: The applicant proposes to construct a signature building that reflects the image and culture of the company. Because of the original design of the building, staff directed the applicant to submit a conceptual sketch to the Board early on in the design phase to receive input. The submitted sketch shows the west facing elevation. The applicant has indicated that they will provide a perspective drawing to the Board at the meeting to provide more information on the design of the building.

Staff Comment: Due to the distance and lack of visibility of the parking lot from US 278, staff supports narrowing the widths of the perimeter buffers in the parking area to 5 feet and eliminating the parking lot median in order to accommodate the parking needs of the proposed building.