



AGENDA
SOUTHERN CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD
December 10, 2014
3:00 P.M.
Bluffton Branch Library Large Conference 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 SEPTEMBER 24, 2014, MEETING MINUTES ([backup](#))
4. NEW BUSINESS
 - A. County: Grayco Bluffton Redevelopment, 1113 Fording Island Road / Andrews & Burgess (conceptual review) ([backup](#))
 - B. Town of Bluffton: No items for review
5. OLD BUSINESS
 - A. County: No items for review
 - B. Town of Bluffton: No items for review
6. OTHER BUSINESS
 - A. Next Meeting: Wednesday, January 7, 2014, at 3:00 p.m. at the Bluffton Branch Library Large Conference Room, 120 Palmetto Way, Bluffton, SC 29910
7. ADJOURNMENT



SOUTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD (CRB) MINUTES
September 24, 2014, Bluffton Branch Library Large Conference Room
120 Palmetto Way, Bluffton, SC

Members Present: Joe Hall, James Atkins, Dan Ogden, and Pearce Scott

Members Absent: Sam Britt and Ed Pinckney

Staff Present: Robert Merchant, Long Range Planner

Guests: Dan Keefer, Witmer Jones Keefer; David Porter, Belfair Plantation

1. CALL TO ORDER – 3:00 P.M.
2. PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.
3. REVIEW OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2014, MEETING MINUTES: Mr. Scott motioned to approve the minutes of the September 10, 2014 meeting. Mr. Ogden seconded. Motion carried.
4. OLD BUSINESS:

Belfair Buffer and Landscaping Revisions: Robert Merchant gave the project background. He said that the project consisted of landscaping revisions to the portion of Belfair Plantation along US 278 that were initiated in August 2014 without receiving CRB approval. The applicant submitted the revisions to the buffer to the CRB at their September 10 meeting where the Board motioned that the applicant take into consideration the comments made by the CRB at the meeting and the history of the site and make necessary adjustments to the landscaping plan. The applicant has submitted a revised landscaping plan that simplifies the landscaping around the entrance signs and maintains an edge between the DOT right-of-way by proposing to have the lawn maintained at two different heights.

Mr. Keefer presented. He reiterated that the grass in the ROW would be rough and the interior grass maintained at a lower height. He said the plan also simplified the entrance and opened up the view to the white fence.

Mr. Atkins asked where the line would be that separated the different grass heights. Mr. Keefer said that it would follow the ROW line which is located roughly 25 to 30 feet from the pavement of US 278 and that it would taper at the entrance road.

Mr. Ogden said he was concerned that the plan doesn't show existing flower beds at the entrance and wanted to clarify that the plan doesn't reverse what the landscaping revisions that the CRB approved in September 2013.

Mr. Hall said that he felt that the CRB had the responsibility to preserve the original intent of the landscaping plan and it should be the criteria that the Board uses to evaluate the plan.

Mr. Scott said that the plantings around the sign were fine. He asked if the treatment of the sot at the front was adequate to replace the original intent of the hedge.

Mr. Atkins said that it would be hard to police the weekly mowing to ensure that the distinction of sod would remain.

Mr. Ogden asked if the owner was required to maintain the SCDOT ROW. Mr. Porter said that Belfair had chosen to maintain the ROW to a higher level of service than SCDOT typically maintains within their ROW. He said that he felt that having the two different grass heights would help define the property line with less vegetation than the hedge and also provide filtration on the taller maintained grass. He also said the tall grass will be more drought tolerant. He said that the grass would be “celebration” Bermuda and that it would be overseeded with rye grass during the cooler season.

Mr. Scott said that he felt that the revised landscape plan maintains the pastoral feel of the original plan.

Mr. Atkins said that he always felt that the fence served to pull the buffer back from the highway and serve as the backdrop for the open area in front. He felt that the differing grass heights helped and that he would like to see an even greater contrast in height.

Mr. Ogden said that the site without the juniper hedge accomplishes more openness on the site.

Mr. Scott motioned to accept the revised landscaping plan with the stipulation that the applicant consider maintaining the grass at a taller height within the DOT right-of-way and that the landscaping at the entrance road would remain as approved by the Board. Mr. Atkins seconded. Motion carried.

5. NEW BUSINESS: There was no new business.
6. OTHER BUSINESS: There was no other business.
7. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:28 pm.

Grayco Bluffton Redevelopment

Type of Submission:	Conceptual
Developer:	David Oliver, JAZ Development, LLC
Architect:	Chris Nardone, AIA, CNNA Architects, Inc.
Engineer:	Ryan Lyle, PE, Andrews & Burgess, Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Michael Small, RLA, LEED AP
Type of Project:	Commercial Retail
Location:	Located on the north side of US 278 at the site of the former Grayco Building Center and Green Thumb nursery directly east of Home Depot and the Volvo Dealership
Zoning Designation:	Commercial Regional
Project Information:	<p>The applicant is proposing to redevelop a 10.6 acre site that is currently occupied by the Grayco Building Center and Green Thumb nursery at the northwest corner of US 278 and Timestone Road. The proposed development would include a 98,500 square foot shopping center with two outparcels totaling 15,800 square feet. The site consists of three parcels (the shopping center and two outparcels) that will share stormwater and open space. The County's new commercial subdivision provision allows for a multi-parcel commercial site to be master planned and eliminates internal buffer and setback requirements for individual parcels.</p> <p>The applicant has submitted a site plan, and architectural elevations for conceptual review. The DRT has not given this project conceptual approval, but the applicant wished to get initial input from the CRB on the site plan and architecture.</p>

Staff Comments: See above.