A meeting of the **Design Review Board** was held on January 12, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Vice Chairman Jerry Ashmore, David Karlyk, Eric Brown, Chuck Rushing, John Dickerson, and City Planner Libby Anderson.

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d) as amended, all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

CALL TO ORDER
Vice-Chairman Ashmore called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

MINUTES
The minutes of the December 8, 2011 meeting were presented to the board for review. **Mr. Brown made a motion, second by Mr. Rushing, to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.** Mr. Dickerson abstained from voting because he was not present at the meeting.

717 & 721 Ribaut Road. Requesting a Lot Width Development Design Exception in order to reconfigure three lots to two large lots.
Applicant: Walden's Place at Ribaut Road, LLC. (DE11-01).

Ms. Anderson said this was tabled at the last DRB meeting to allow the applicant to provide more information on driveway access and setbacks from the marsh. Ms. Anderson went on to review the background on the application. The applicant would like to combine the landlocked waterfront parcel with the house lot to create one lot, and then recombine the two remaining lots. One lot would narrow and the other would widen. The narrow lot currently is 50' wide, technically buildable, but only for a Charleston-style house. The other issue is that the narrowing lot goes under minimum lot width for this district, which is 100'; if this is approved, it would be 88' and non-conforming.

Ms. Anderson reviewed what a design exception is. The Office of Civic Investment is concerned that this does not meet the intent of the ordinance because it's not about design issues; the implication, Ms. Anderson said, is that it's premature at this point. Form-based code is forthcoming and may offer some relief to the applicant, Ms. Anderson said.

In regard to the design exception criteria, Ms. Anderson said the first is compatibility with surrounding land uses, and the use is not proposed to change. In regard to design, there is not a specific house plan, so this is an issue. And as far as consistency with adopted plans, staff feels it's consistent with the city's plans for infill.

Bill Jones, the applicant, said combining the 3 lots into two would enhance the adjacent properties. The worst that could happen would be the need to add a curb cut, which he sees as

a definite negative. He feels subdividing the lots into two, with two nice homes on them, is the best idea; the value of the land alone would make it high-end, he said. Mr. Jones added that they have no problem with one curb cut, one dock, and the setbacks.

Mr. Brown said on December 8, the DRB was concerned about not having enough information about the applicant's plans. He feels the information they've received since is not much different. Mr. Jones said the concept is what they are proposing: to combine the lots and to build two homes on the three lots. Because they don't have approval, it's premature, he feels, to present a design. Mr. Brown said that's a Catch-22, but he needs to see the design. The applicant said he doesn't object to getting approval contingent on design at the appropriate time. Mr. Dickerson said they could attach requirements, allow the property to be sold, and give the DRB the future ability to say whether the design works or doesn't. Part of the exception would be that they have to bring conceptual plans to the DRB.

Mr. Brown said moving the properties would change all the conditions. Ms. Anderson said if the application is approved, they could give preliminary approval, and it couldn't be recorded, but they could talk to potential buyers. Mr. Dickerson said that might be preferable because Mr. Jones could sell both lots or just one of them. The best use of the property, Mr. Dickerson feels, is high-end residential to be consistent with the neighborhood. But the economy means there are many fewer million dollar lot buyers than a few years ago.

Mr. Rushing quoted some of the development design exceptions which concern him in application to this property. He feels that there are no design questions on the table, so the DRB shouldn't be discussing it without design plans. This is a discussion of changing boundaries, which is not the intent of the design exceptions.

Mr. Brown said the DRB is sympathetic but doesn't have the ability to do what Mr. Jones wants it to do. Conceptually they could do it, and market it, then come back to the DRB. The standard used to evaluate it is higher than what they have. Mr. Jones said if they could get a good architect, they could get a design for the 50' lot. Mr. Brown said the task of the board is a specific evaluation of what they are going to do. If the applicant isn't ready to do that, he can come back later. Mr. Jones said they won't design and build the houses, so they want to market the lots as two lots subject to final designs and setback being approved by the board.

Mr. Jones said the property is listed; if **Edward Dukes** sells the 50' lot, the applicant has no control over what's built there, and it could have an adverse effect on the values of the adjacent properties. Mr. Dukes said if the building envelope is what's required, that could be done, but to do a full elevation creates a chicken-egg scenario. Mr. Brown said they could start to evaluate it if they show where the house would sit and where the adjacent houses sit. Mr.

Brown said he'd asked for a drawing that showed the relationship of the houses and the proposed house; that would be something for the DRB to look at.

Mr. Ashmore said he'd like to see progress made and see what can be approved with conditions to not impede the progress. Mr. Brown said he asked at the last meeting to see at this meeting what he is asking for again. Mr. Dukes reviewed what the applicant had brought to the meeting and said the only thing that's missing is the position of the adjoining neighbors. Mr. Rushing agreed that the board needs to see that. Mr. Jones asked if the board wanted a site plan showing where the buildings will sit. Mr. Brown explained what he wanted to see, particularly on the river side. Mr. Jones reiterated that they are in agreement about setbacks. Ms. Anderson clarified that they need to take what they have and put it in context with the adjoining properties. Mr. Dickerson said the county can provide a map that would help.

Mr. Dickerson asked how the decision is made to bring it to the DRB. Ms. Anderson said this is the first time, and it fit the criteria for percentage of variance that was being asked for. A wider house would blend in better than a Charleston house, which is all that could fit on the 50' lot. Mr. Dickerson wondered, if this is a re-drawing of map lines, if it is appropriate to refer it back for a zoning change. Ms. Anderson said it would be a variance request, but it may not meet those criteria, either. Mr. Rushing said the best way to make new construction fit on that property is to have it as one piece of property. Mr. Dukes said in a perfect world, one would be ideal, but it has two on the water. The best way the property can be utilized is by doing what they're trying to do; if someone wanted the whole property, that would be great, but it's unlikely right now.

Mr. Brown suggested he could make a motion to table the application. Mr. Dickerson said first they need to know if it's appropriate that this be before the DRB, and also they need an "in context view." Mr. Brown said at the last meeting they had asked staff for a set of recommended documents for applicants to come to the DRB with. Mr. Jones said they need a definitive plan of what the DRB wants him to do so that they can market the property and make it good for everyone. If the DRB closes the door, they can sell the 50' lot separately, and "sell the other 2 lots with the guest house on it." They are not trying to have an adverse impact on anyone, he said. Ms. Anderson said they could market it as two lots, and have potential buyers give an idea of what they want to do, which then could be presented to the DRB. Mr. Dukes said that would be too cumbersome for potential buyers to do. He said they can bring in a Google Map of the adjoining properties and the other materials discussed and see where it goes.

Mr. Brown made a motion to table which died for lack of a second.

Mr. Ashmore made a motion to grant approval of the application contingent on the applicant coming to staff with the footprints that they propose and the footprints of the neighboring houses, keeping in mind the one curb cut and the one dock. Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. Mr. Dickerson asked if anyone disagreed with the two lots. Mr. Karlyk and Mr. Brown said the houses on it are still unknown. Mr. Karlyk said he has a hard time approving "a sub-standard lot that doesn't meet the ordinance." Ms. Anderson reviewed the changes in lot size. Given the setbacks, they could only build a 20' house. Staff can allow waivers and adjustments to permit a reasonable structure to be built, i.e., 1-2' to allow steps. It would be a modest structure in any case. **With a vote of 2-3, Mr. Rushing, Mr. Brown and Mr. Karlyk opposed, the motion failed.**

Mr. Rushing said everyone agrees with it in concept. **Mr. Brown made a motion to deny the application for lack of documentation. Motion failed for lack of a second.**

Mr. Dukes asked about coming back with the footprint showing the neighbors' houses. Mr. Brown said they could withdraw their request. Mr. Dickerson said if they want an opportunity to come back, they need specifics. Mr. Dukes said it's clear what the DRB wants to see: the building envelope and the context to scale.

Mr. Dickerson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Brown, to table the application. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>1105 Rodgers Street</u>. South Carolina Bank & Trust New Building.
Applicant: Alliance Consulting Engineers, Inc., Preliminary Review (12-01 DRB.2)

Demetri Baches was also present as staff, Ms. Anderson said. Ms. Anderson reviewed where the property is and the proposal for redevelopment and construction of a one-story bank. This is the second review of the project. A traffic analysis has been submitted. On December 20, the ZBOA approved variances for the build-to line and for the maximum number of parking spaces. The site plan and architecture are on the agenda today; landscaping, lighting, and drainage can be handled on the staff level if the DRB chooses to let staff make those decisions.

Ms. Anderson said the site plan has been significantly revised. The first recommendation pertains to the curb radius on the three driveways, which needs to be reduced from 20' to 15'. Second, curb needs to be installed for the protection of the sidewalks and pedestrians. Third, the sidewalk on Rodgers needs to be "correct." It winds in and out and needs to be parallel to the street. Also, where it crosses Boundary Street, it needs to be straight / perpendicular to each other. Fourth, the parking aisle needs to be extended a bit so cars can back out. The two parking spaces could be eliminated, or it could be extended a little toward Boundary Street with pervious surface.

Conceptual approval was given to a different design last month. The Office of Civic Investment and the applicant have had a lot of discussion, and this is the result. The outstanding plans are lighting, landscaping, and drainage. Staff would recommend board approval with the condition that these other plans be approved at staff level.

Mr. Baches said the changes to the architecture and the site plan are positive and are approved internally. They can work with the applicant on the remaining site plan issues and the other remaining documents.

Ryan Slattery, Alliance, described the site, currently Sea Island Marine. The site has closed access currently on Boundary Street. There's continuous pavement all along Boundary Street with no definitive edge. At the edge of Boundary Street and Rodgers, there's zero curb, just paving. They'll be removing multiple curb cuts. From Rodgers Street to the site, they will remove the pavement. Calhoun Street is similar to Rodgers Street; it has a defined boundary but just a paved shoulder. The applicant has worked with staff for three months. They've proposed a main access driveway, no longer on Boundary Street as was previously proposed. They have a 24' drive aisle – down from 30' – that will still accommodate a fire truck and big SUVs. A fire truck will hit a car on Rodgers Street with a 20' driveway. That's why there's a 25' radius on Rodgers Street and Calhoun Street. They don't object to the drive-through request.

Mr. Slattery said in the front of the building, they have a 38" diameter live oak that they've received a variance for. Above code requirement, they have worked hard changing the design. In a financial institution, security is of the utmost concern. They don't like coves and spots around the building where people can plan their next heist. The urban plaza in the corner was therefore not their first choice, but they are presenting it in the spirit of collaboration. Mr. Ashmore said he likes the urban plaza, and Mr. Slattery agreed that it fits into the future plans.

Mr. Slattery went on to describe the entrances and parking spaces. Mr. Karlyk asked what the DOT access separation standards are for Rodgers Street, and Mr. Slattery said 75'. They are going to get the approval from SCDOT, but they have not yet submitted, he said. Mr. Karlyk said it would change the site plan if they're denied. Mr. Slattery said it wouldn't and described why. They have 73.81', and if they have to shift, it would not be a substantial change for them.

Ms. Anderson said a fire truck can fight the fire from the street if they can't get access. Mr. Brown said they have smaller trucks now. Mr. Slattery said they used the truck turn template they were given by the Fire Department. He said that's not their only issue with it; since it's a dead end, they need that width on the driveway to prevent collisions.

Mr. Brown said in regard to the 90 degree parking, "it's nice to keep it behind the façade" but asked if it "can be shoved up at all." Mr. Slattery said they could do pervious pavement there. They intend to screen it with landscaping. They're "talking about an additional 2'" to the 3' radius on the south side. The parking is still behind the primary façade of the building. There

will be a hedgerow all along the front, Mr. Slattery said. Mr. Rushing said he'd eliminate the two furthest south parking spaces to push it up. Mr. Slattery said they'd have to move a parking space over if it were required to push it back. Mr. Brown said Boundary Street is important to get right, and he doesn't like the parking out that far in front of the building, adding that that seems easily solved.

Mr. Slattery said Rodgers Street isn't curbed, and they have proposed creating a definitive edge. The grades make it less simple than just adding curb. The curbing requirement without major reconstruction of the road will create pooling and ponding, he said. There is a lot of sediment in the gutters now from when the water evaporates because it's flat there. It's not just curbing, he said. The flatness of the road and the added expense of putting in catch basin and storm drain lines were the reasons they didn't propose it. Rodgers Street is an SCDOT road and Calhoun is a city street.

Mr. Karlyk asked about provisions to keep people from entering the drive-through lanes by accident, and Mr. Slattery explained that they will use signs. He added that between the drive-through entrance will be a contiguous raised curb. Mr. Slattery said they need it for stacking of cars in the drive through. He asked how many cars can stack in the area, and Mr. Slattery said 16 total in all lanes. Mr. Brown asked what the current bank has for queuing. **Chris DeVoter**, SCB&T, said it's inadequate, and only four can be stacked and come out to Calhoun Street.

There was some discussion about storm drainage plans. There will not be underground detention, Mr. Slattery said. The stormwater quality is handled through the infiltration; the quantity will be well under what is there currently. Mr. Slattery said they will capture as much as they can with the pervious surfaces.

Mr. Dickerson said that in the area north of the drive-through, Mr. Slattery had said it will be grass and have some plantings. Mr. Rushing asked about the area above that. Mr. Slattery said around the perimeter of the site, they intend to have landscaping. There's no plan for that space at this time.

Mr. Slattery said in regard to the sidewalk, they might mimic the cemetery site. When someone is at the stop bar, they should have the ability to see both ways. They want to make sure the vehicles are stopped before the pedestrian walkway.

Mr. Ashmore asked how the drainage at the front corner would be addressed. Mr. Slattery said they will tie into a basin via an underground pipe. Mr. Ashmore said the basin is inadequate now. Mr. Slattery said they will dump less in that basin; the whole site won't be dumped into it. Mr. Ashmore said in a storm, this is where the flooding starts, and it bottlenecks there. Mr. Slattery said development of the site will help with that situation. It won't fix it all, but it will help.

Mr. Ashmore asked about the live oak, saying that in the space between the building and the road, they will want to create an urban field. There's an opportunity to create a park-like feel or something like that, he said. Mr. Slattery said they plan more extensive planting in there, e.g., more street trees. Mr. Slattery said there's no problem connecting the two sidewalks. Mr. DeVoter said they'd rather have trees than hedges, though those will mask the parking. Mr. Baches said the critical piece is the corner in regard to how they deal with the tree and the groundscape. Mr. Karlyk asked if there was sidewalk on Calhoun Street. Ms. Anderson said further east there is but not in this block.

Mr. Dickerson said in regard to the sidewalk on "the meandering part," he understands the setback edge for a clear view, but it makes more sense to him to have the sidewalk line up with the stock bars for a straight sidewalk, and they can still achieve the view. Mr. Slattery said he's fine with that, and they can match the other side of the roadway. Mr. Slattery said there would be 20' or more of landscaped area.

Gretchen Lambert, Architect, showed samples of the materials for the building. Maintaining the brand is important to SCB&T, which "is a high-quality bank." The colors and materials are the same, she said, and those plans have been modified very little. The entrances and interiors are in the same locations. She showed the elevations for the front and the drive-through. They created an element with more height and mass at the corner. They maintained the covered entry point. The tree will be a substantial element. There had been talk of a double-hung look in the windows, but the more modern design made it not look good. This works better with the new linear massing, she said. They created a smaller canopy over the ATM. She showed the side elevation where most customers will come in, and the Rodgers Street elevation. The materials are the same, but some metal will be introduced in the capping.

Ms. Lambert asked the DRB about the column example that was sent with the staff note and asked for clarification. Mr. Brown said generally, regardless of the order, they try to align the beam base and the throat. Ms. Lambert said it could be pulled back a little bit.

Mr. Brown asked about the process to get to the new building. Mr. DeVoter said they would have preferred to stick with the original design which is "prototypical." Their intent was to build their design, but the Office of Civic Investment asked them to eliminate that and put a tower apparatus on the corner. Mr. Ashmore said in his opinion it's a great improvement.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Baches to elaborate on that. Mr. Baches said they had discussed the city's intent for the Boundary Street improvements. Boundary Street, Jr. is intended in the code, and the master plan of Sector One intends for it to be a "Main Street." The lanes will be reduced in the next 12-18 months, and this will be the first building that will be seen around that corner; it needs to anchor that corner. They told the applicant where the city is heading, and that their architecture was suitable for a stand-alone building, but not for this area and they came back

with this current design. The Office of Civic Investment prefers a more urban, non-pitched roof, he added.

Mr. Brown said there's a feeling of difference in the tower, though he likes the other elements. He went on to explain why he feels that way. The capper on the tower "is an element unto itself, outside of the language used elsewhere." Ms. Lambert said the pitched roof "feels like a silo." She explained that this is a more modern, urban element mixed in with the more traditional rest of the building. Mr. Baches said it might be an issue of emulating the tablature that's in the rest of the building up at the top. To do a tower element that becomes so substantial infers that the Rodgers Street side of the building is "longer and more substantial than it is."

Ms. Lambert went on to explain the architectural considerations that went into the decision in regard to the tower. Mr. Baches said the top component can be dealt with. Mr. Dickerson said on the floor plan for Office 117, it shows windows on both sides, but then 117 is the tower. Ms. Lambert explained that he was reading the floor plan incorrectly.

Mr. Brown said the more contemporary windows "feel like a default window," and he doesn't like the thick banding in between them. There's an implication of a transom, and it's confusing. Something lighter – without the simulated lights – would be more contemporary. He said the same comment applies to the tower.

Mr. Baches said staff recommends final approval pending the comments to be worked out at staff level. The main issues, he thinks, have been addressed. Mr. Brown said he thinks they've come a long way and taken a different tack and he feels they can give preliminary approval to the site with a few comments, but he'd really like to see the landscaping come back to the board at some point. He'd also like to see how the tower comes out and would like to see that come back to the board.

Mr. Rushing said he agrees that the tower detail is critical, and he'd like to see it come again before the board. Mr. Dickerson said he agrees with Mr. Brown's comments. Mr. Rushing said he's in favor of moving it back some so it's in line with the face of the building line. He doesn't think it's a good idea to tack on 2' of concrete to make it work, which "would look like a correction of an error."

Mr. Dickerson said in removing the two southern parking spaces, he wondered if it would cause congestion for parking at that door. Mr. Rushing agreed but said shifting all of it or eliminating the two parking spaces there and putting two elsewhere would work. Mr. DeVoter said they've already lost two of their original requested spaces, and they have a problem with losing two more. Mr. Brown showed where they could get another spot by adjusting the radius of the lanes. Mr. DeVoter explained why it can't be tightened any more.

Mr. Baches asked if they will screen the area where the tree is to make it read like a plaza instead of a setback. Whatever they use for screening, he said, it should meet the sidewalk and continue down to Boundary Street and keep going. Mr. Slattery said they can show that on the landscaping plan. Mr. Dickerson asked if they had discussed extending the sidewalk all the way across in front of the building on the back side of the tree. Ms. Lambert said at the last meeting they discussed that security is of the utmost importance, so the level of screening is critical to SCB&T so no one can hide behind it, especially close to the building.

Mr. Baches said "the urban plaza idea is a space framed by structure." He went on to draw on the site plan to explain it. Mr. Brown said it should be high enough to screen a car; Mr. Slattery said they had said 18" high.

Mr. DeVoter said he can't close on the property until they get DRB final approval which he characterized as "critical." Mr. Ashmore asked if preliminary approval would work for him. Mr. DeVoter said they've already made a lot of adjustments; Mr. Brown said "those weren't at this board's table." Mr. DeVoter said they have modified their plans substantially and keep getting pushed back, and Mr. Brown said again that that was not done by the DRB. Mr. DeVoter said 30 additional days would be taken out of build time.

Mr. Ashmore said he understands Mr. DeVoter's frustration, and the board needs to determine if they can give *final* approval now. Mr. Dickerson said the issues are all "eyelash issues" except for the top of the tower, but even that's a minor detail in the grand scheme of things. It could be a caveat in a final approval. Mr. Brown said they could do final approval for the site but not the architecture. Mr. Dickerson said for getting construction rolling, though, they'd still be pushed back 30 days. Ms. Anderson said they'll still need DOT permits, and if they haven't applied yet, she wishes them luck. Mr. DeVoter said they "need to lock in what they have."

Mr. Ashmore asked if the DRB feels comfortable giving final approval with conditions. Mr. Dickerson said he doesn't see the footprint changing because of landscaping. He felt he could go to final approval with caveats. Mr. Brown said he's fine with final approval on the site plan. Mr. Slattery said he thinks that would work. Mr. Ashmore said the DRB will work with them, and they need to work with the DRB. Mr. DeVoter said he wants staff to review the landscaping plan and to have final approval on the architecture, too. They have completely changed the building, he said. Mr. Brown reiterated that this is only their second time before the DRB. Ms. Anderson said three times is typical.

Ms. Anderson said they could do a special meeting if they can get a quorum. A special meeting was agreed to for January 26. A discussion followed about what they need to bring to this meeting, including the landscaping plan. Mr. Baches said the critical piece is the turn radius of the drive lanes; the site triangles as they get to Calhoun Street and Rodgers Street need to be reduced from 20' to 15'. He said they would talk to the fire department about it internally. Mr.

Karlyk said he thinks what Mr. Baches is saying is not permissible by the SCDOT. Mr. Slattery said the radius is 15' now; they want to keep anything landscaped nicely.

Mr. Dickerson said they had also discussed straightening the sidewalk so that it runs in a straight line with grass to catch more water for filtering. Mr. Karlyk said the curb is another element the DOT would have to maintain, and he doesn't think they would look favorably on additional costs.

Mr. Brown presented the list:

1. *Continue to work with staff on developing the 3 curb cuts with 15' radii, 20' drive entrance.* Mr. Karlyk said he'd be surprised if 25' would be approved on Rodgers Street by DOT. Mr. Brown said he's suggesting working this out with staff. Mr. Rushing suggested they should pick their battles. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Baches about the curb radii and whether the staff wants to pursue them. Mr. Baches suggested that staff will work with DOT to try to get it reduced to 20'. Ms. Lambert said the fire department should be consulted on this at the same time, and Mr. Baches said they would do that. Mr. Slattery asked if slowing traffic and keeping the urban feel could be accomplished with landscaping. He asked that that not be a condition, and that it be approved as it's shown on the plan. Mr. Dickerson said if this needs to be fast-tracked, they should make it so that there aren't any big exceptions. Mr. Brown said that standard is a suburban standard and goes against all the planning of the last 6 years. Mr. Slattery said he's concerned about litigation if something occurs because they didn't follow the fire department's standards; these are DOT's standards. If it's an absolute requirement, it needs to be in the ordinance, he said. Mr. Baches said again that the staff will handle it internally. Mr. Slattery asked if they can keep the widths on the drives. Mr. Karlyk said 24' is where it needs to be.
2. *City will assist with fire maneuvering*
3. *Straighten the sidewalk down Rodgers Street*
4. *Address the landscape plan with attention given to the front plaza and the screening of the parking*
5. *Correcting the sidewalk at Boundary Street per the staff report*
6. *Connecting the porch to the eastern sidewalk*
7. *Revisit the tower element proportion and integration with the rest of the building.*
8. *Getting the column alignment with the beam's finished base*
9. *Restudy the windows in working with the whole building, whether that's more contemporary or more traditional style*
10. *Lighting plan* - Mr. Karlyk asked about the lighting plan; Ms. Lambert said they are doing it themselves, not SCE&G.

Mr. Brown made a motion, second by Mr. Dickerson, to give preliminary approval with these comments with a special meeting to be held on 1-26-12. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Slattery asked about final approval, which he thought they were talking about. Mr. Brown said that wasn't the motion. Mr. Slattery said it was discussed: that the site plan be final but with the contingencies. Mr. Dukes said from the buyer's and seller's aspect, a final approval on the site plan would be important. **Mr. Ashmore made a motion to give final approval on the building and the site plan. The motion died for lack of a second.**

Ms. Anderson said the site plan includes the sidewalks, etc. Mr. Brown said there are a lot of contingencies and he'd want to see them before approval. Mr. Ashmore said if the contingencies are covered in the next two weeks, he thinks there will not be a problem. Mr. Slattery said they are concerned about "snowballing comments." Mr. Ashmore said there will be comments on the landscaping plan, and if they are brought something they haven't seen before, they'll be asked about it. The issue was that they saw a new building today, Mr. Ashmore said which is where the comments resulted from. Mr. Dickerson said everyone wants this to go forward.

DISCUSSION

Cam Campbell, the Director of Operations for the Olive Garden / Red Lobster, said car stops were requested across the fence. Typically the corporation doesn't like to do car stops because of liability, he said. He asked if there were another way to proceed without the car stops. Ms. Anderson said the purpose is to protect landscaping; in some areas, parking doesn't interfere with landscaping, but in other areas it does. Ms. Anderson said if the DRB says they're not needed, she would be fine, but the ordinance is very specific, so she didn't feel comfortable waiving it on her own.

Mr. Ashmore asked if there were wheel stops at Beaufort Town Center or the Hilton, which are adjacent, and Mr. Campbell said no. Mr. Karlyk said there are some areas where they're definitely needed, but they shouldn't have to put them all over the property if they're not elsewhere in the area. A discussion ensued about the ordinance and where they might be needed, particularly in the area by the fence, which everyone agreed had something wrong with it. It's too close to the curb. The options, then, Mr. Campbell said, are to move the fence and landscaping back, or put the wheel stops in front of the fence. The landscaping should grow and blend together, Mr. Karlyk said, and if it's getting run over, they'll be putting new hedges in every year.

Ms. Anderson brought out the site plan. Mr. Dickerson said maybe they should get a variance. Ms. Anderson said the fence can be right on the property line. Mr. Campbell said there's another one behind it. **Mr. Rushing made a motion to waive the requirement for wheel stops except in the narrow planting area adjacent to the fence. Mr. Dickerson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

<u>NOMINATIONS</u>

Mr. Brown made a motion, second by Mr. Dickerson, to nominate Mr. Ashmore to be chairman of the DRB. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Karlyk made a motion, second by Mr. Dickerson, to nominated Mr. Brown to be vice-chairman of the DRB. The motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, Mr. Dickerson made a motion to adjourn, second by Mr. Rushing, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.