A meeting of the **Design Review Board was held on July 14, 2011 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Donald Starkey, John Dickerson, David Karlyk, Eric Brown, Jerry Ashmore, and City Historic Preservation Planner Donna Alley.

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
Chairman Starkey called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Ms. Alley noted that the Hanover Park PUD was amended June 15, 2011. She reviewed the conditions related to the site that were made as part of the conceptual approval at the DRB meeting on June 9, 2011. The board had received a narrative from the applicant as to the changes made.

NEW BUSINESS: Buffalo Wild Wings Grill & Bar
12 Robert Smalls Parkway (Hanover Park PUD)
Applicant: Andrews & Burgess, Final Review (11-09 DRB.2)

Ryan Lyle of Andrews & Burgess Engineering, Inc. said they "matched the Bojangles (parking) spaces and added back the landscape island to split the two." The increased space allowed the building to be pulled closer to the street, but then the building grew by a couple of feet in width. It's still a larger buffer than is required by the city. The landscape architect believed it didn't allow enough space to plant an overstory tree.

Mr. Lyle said there are eight foundation buffers. There are pervious parking stalls and per the previous review, they are "including a sliding piece. A lighting plan has been prepared. If they receive final approval, he asked if lighting could be approved by staff. The lights will be shoe box and hat box. Mr. Dickerson said the biggest issue for the board is not to have the add-on vapor in "an offensive-looking light spectrum."

Mr. Brown said the dumpster was an issue, and he asked if the matter was addressed; Mr. Lyle said wax myrtles will be planted as dumpster screening. There will also be brick to match the building with metal gates. Ms. Alley said the DRB will need a drawing of that.

Chairman Starkey said they asked for the building to be moved back for plantings. He asked Mr. Ashmore if the buffer in front was sufficient for planting. Mr. Ashmore said they should be able to get palms in there. Mr. Lyle said they asked for that but the overhang was 2.5'. If that's adequate, they could do that. Mr. Ashmore said it can be done. Mr. Lyle said he'd go back to the landscape architect and ask him to put that back. Mr. Ashmore said other than that, the choice of plantings was excellent. Mr. Dickerson said the look from the road is great.

Ryan Nicholson, architect, said they went back to Buffalo Wild Wings corporate to address design board concerns and to also meet the store's branding needs. All light fixtures will be cut off so the light doesn't exceed 90 degrees above the horizontal. On accent features, i.e., a wall sconce, the up fixture will be a low wattage bulb so as not to exceed the top of the building as requested. Other lights would be baffled

and have a lower wattage bulb to stay below the top of the building. Buffalo Wild Wings has agreed to eliminate the LED lighting band.

The checkers are part of the brand and a key element, but they agreed to eliminate all those accent features from the building. On the outdoor seating roof and structure, they requested to maintain the metal to tie it in to other elements, but they added brick piers up to 7' tall with a stone piece and accent 3' tall to break it up and tie it in with the building's masonry.

On the entry tower "wedge" with the "zinger," they strongly requested to maintain the look of the tower with the zinger and canopy is a trademark item for them.

Glen Remus said corporate could agree to change the yellow to a shade less to blend better with the palette of the building, and they reduced the amount of the zinger to compromise but still maintain the integrity of the brand. The yellow and black are important to them throughout the store. Mr. Brown said the DRB understands brand is important to Buffalo Wild Wings and the board feels that same way about Beaufort and Highway 170. Mr. Brown said last time that they understand the store's core branding requirements, and he'd asked what they could do to help Beaufort maintain its own brand. He feels that they haven't done that as much as he had hoped. Colors can be carried through, but Beaufort needs its corporate elements and branding, too.

Mr. Remus said the report he saw said the color of the roof was the issue, and Mr. Brown clarified that the problem was with the details, not the color. He reiterated the board's suggestion in that regard, such as a pressure-treated wood. They could have a black metal roof, but they need more of a match to how things are done in the Lowcountry. Brick is not typically indigenous in the Lowcountry. He'd like to see the porch come back, and he'd feel better about the other entry tower needs.

Mr. Nicholson said there were concerns about the maintenance of the wood, but they can look at that. Mr. Remus said he's sure it could be engineered to wrap the steel columns in wood. Mr. Brown said that's not easy or cheap, but they could do that. They'd prefer simpler materials. Mr. Brown said Ms. Alley could provide them with examples to look at.

Chairman Starkey shared what his concerns were as to breaking up the front of the building – the long side – and Mr. Nicholson said they "could break the blank wall up some more." Mr. Brown said the column spacing on the porch needs to be consistent. Mr. Nicholson said they can be adjusted; they are meant to replicate the columns in the building. Mr. Nicholson said in regard to the exposed wood rafters, if there was a specific stain or color they prefer in Lowcountry architecture. Mr. Brown said he's willing to consider what Buffalo Wild Wings wants for colors. "Painting stuff black is difficult here" because of the fading; typically, things are white here, but that doesn't go with what the restaurant is doing. If it's done more traditionally Lowcountry, he would be open to what they want to do as far as color.

Mr. Dickerson commented that while the DRB is pushing Buffalo Wild Wings toward the Beaufort brand, he is going back and forth as to what makes the most sense in terms of marketability vs. architecture. He doesn't have a clear recommendation at this point, but when he compares the two, going to the bricks softened the long side and made it less industrial. There are columns topped with thinner supports in stone.

Mr. Karlyk said he recalled a comment about the zinger, and he had envisioned them coming back with something more subtle than the black and white, such as contrasting brick to have the intent of the contrast without it being so stark. There were examples given of porches in Beaufort for them to look at, but it doesn't look like it has been changed, he said.

Mr. Nicholson said they fear that if all the elements are stripped away, only the sign will distinguish the building. Chairman Starkey asked about the zinger, and Mr. Nicholson said it's painted with scoring between the colors. Ms. Alley said they'd have to determine if it meets sign requirements. If it were part of the building and contrasting brick, it wouldn't be considered part of the sign, as Mr. Karlyk suggested. Chairman Starkey said a porch and an awning aren't trademark, to him, though the colors are. If there were more give there, they could discuss the sign.

Mr. Remus said he's open to combinations of brick and timber and the landscaping suggestions. He thinks he could make pilasters on Highway 170 work. The zinger feature is not the most prominent feature they see driving up Highway 170, and they'll only see it driving one way or pulling into the lot. Mr. Remus said they have to maintain brand identity to be competitive, and suggested that the board make porch suggestions contingent on approval. If they want all wood columns and break up the expanse of the awning treatment on one side, they could change that. Mr. Brown said they could give final approval on the site with architecture to be determined.

Mr. Dickerson said Buffalo Wild Wings has a specific thing in mind with the awning. If the DRB goes to approval, they could meet with Ms. Alley. Mr. Brown said that's not fair to the board. It's either up to staff or not. He feels there are several solutions, and he's identifying the problems. Chairman Starkey said he agrees that in the site plan now, they need the landscaping to come back, and he would like to see the plans for making it more Lowcountry before it's approved. He thinks it would be approved quickly if they came back with more changes to the "front" of the building.

Motion: Mr. Brown made a motion for final approval of the site plan as presented with the addition of landscaping between the drive aisle and the building, of at least a palmetto if not an overstory tree, and the DRB would like the architecture to come back on the porch (materials – wood based or a more formal column – eliminate masonry) and entry detailing and the colors for further review. Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. Chairman Starkey added that the city will need the drawings of the plans for the dumpster.

Discussion: Mr. Remus asked for elaboration on the entry and the colors the DRB would find acceptable. Mr. Brown said the motion asks for the entry canopy (silver) to be redone. The zinger as is will all qualify as a sign, and that will not likely pass the sign ordinance. Mr. Remus said the yellow color of the building isn't necessarily signage. It's been toned down to blend in with the beige colors but still be similar to the trademark color. Mr. Brown said he wants to see the porch and canopy and not make individual decisions separately. He acknowledged there may be mixed opinion on that.

The motion passed 4-1, with Mr. Ashmore opposed.

BMH NEW MEDICAL OFFICE FACILITY, 955 Ribaut Road
Applicant: Andrews & Burgess, Inc. Conceptual review (11-08 DRB.1)

The application is for an 80,000 square foot building for use as medical offices. The site is 4.7 acres.

Ms. Alley reviewed stormwater retention, site issues, zoning, architecture and building issues, lighting plans (to be submitted at another date), and landscaping. The applicant was given suggestions to achieve more compatibility with the existing architecture of the hospital campus and to fit in with the urban/civic context of the corridor. The applicant has met with staff and the Office of Civic Investment and revised the plans accordingly and is asking for conceptual approval from the board.

Mr. Lyle said in 2010 a plan was submitted to the technical review committee (TRC), and they received a request for alternate building placements. They have received recommendations on access points; it's been "flip-flopped." The Office of Civic Investment suggested adding a drive. **Michael Satterfield** said the idea is that it will all be medical offices at some point in the future. The current use will be administration *and* medical offices. There's not an urgent care plan as previously submitted. He showed an aerial image of the surrounding buildings and where the proposed building would be. Mr. Lyle said they can add roughly 100 parking spaces. There are 100 dedicated spaces across the street on Allison Road. The parking requirements will be met, Mr. Satterfield said.

Mr. Lyle went on to review the site issues as enumerated in the staff report. He detailed access to describe their efforts to avoid the wetlands buffer for the future extension. Mr. Satterfield said the connection is on the edge of the buffer; he asked if the DRB is looking for a sway back the other way, and **Craig Lewis of the Office of Civic Investment,** said yes. Mr. Satterfield said they'd make that change. Mr. Satterfield asked what the bump-outs were, and Mr. Lewis indicated on the image where the Office of Civic Investment would like it to be more like a street. Mr. Satterfield said the two entry points around the drop-off canopy need to be there in a medical office building. It's part of "a national standard." Mr. Satterfield said they need to have proper access to keep the traffic circulating and to enable people to easily find the entrance points to the building.

Mr. Karlyk said the hospital entryways are all in the front of the building, and it's been flipped. He asked what the purpose was in flipping it. Mr. Satterfield said that was their original scheme and showed original plans. Through consultations with staff and the Office of Civic Investment, they ended up turning the building around. Mr. Karlyk said the original layout seems to have saved more trees, and Mr. Satterfield said they saved a lot more in the original plan, at least 5 or 6 mature ones. Mr. Brown said the new scheme seems to be missing a master plan. He asked if the hospital has a master plan for that block. Mr. Lyle said each property owner has been approached, and they have secured pieces along the marsh, but while the applicants "know what they want, it's hard to say." Mr. Satterfield said the hospital is currently doing its master plan. This could take more than a year, but the building can't wait that long. People need the services. **Bill England** said there is not confidence that they'll get those other properties, which accounts for that. Two have been approached and have declined, and there's another that the hospital has a future right to negotiate for but no guarantee.

Chairman Starkey expressed concern about pedestrian access crossing Ribaut Road. Mr. Satterfield said both configurations have the same issue. In the current plan, they have tried to push pedestrian traffic down to the corner of Allison Road with landscaping, etc. Chairman Starkey said, assuming they eventually add buildings, a walkway across Ribaut Road would seem to be appropriate. Mr. Lewis said

an overpass walkway “wouldn’t be used.” An at-grade crossing would be different. Mr. Lewis said there’s not enough pedestrian traffic to justify the cost.

Chairman Starkey asked about SCDOT’s response to adding more signals. Mr. Lyle indicated where the three signals are at TCL and the hospital main campus. He said they know people jay-walk, though the walk to a light isn’t far. General discussion ensued about the pedestrian traffic, crossings, etc. Chairman Starkey asked if there will be traffic across the road and how it will be handled. Mr. Satterfield said they don’t know and may not know, but he foresees the pedestrian traffic being hospital employees, not patients. Mr. England said they’re trying to devise a walk to get people to the corner to the safest crossing space.

Chairman Starkey asked if there were walls on both sides, and Mr. Satterfield said there’s not one currently planned. Chairman Starkey said he likes the wall/fence at TCL when they took down the gym; its brick pillars with wrought iron in between. Mr. Satterfield said they agree with that model.

Mr. Lyle said there was a suggestion that there be a multi-purpose path for pedestrians, bikes, etc. for those travelling north toward Port Royal, so that will be considered instead of a sidewalk. Mr. Lewis said it needs to be 10’ to accommodate both bikes and pedestrians. Mr. Lyle said they have a 15’ setback. Mr. Lewis said they’re looking at the corridor currently, and they should stay with sidewalks. Discussion continued about access and egress points.

Mr. Lewis said the discussion with the Office of Civic Investment included putting the building on the street instead of parking lots. They don’t own enough properties to accommodate that and the circulation that they would need. Then they determined further priorities, i.e., a second connection up and down for another north-south route. This necessitated the building moving. If it’s not on the corner, the next discussion is how to align it to set up a block condition to make that happen in the future. They will have to sacrifice existing trees, get a connection north-south and have a sister building on the street with circulation between the streets. In the future, a building could be in the corner; when “we’re all driving smaller cars,” a parking lot can become a building.

Chairman Starkey asked where a parking garage would go. **Demetri Baches** said the Sector Two and Sector Three plans will cover that, but the applicants needed to make plans now.

Mr. England said he was also concerned about the amount of walking that’s required; in a medical office building, “that’s not a crowd-pleaser.” Mr. Baches said they could possibly have a one-story deck over an existing pad. Mr. Dickerson said he’s walked the property, and on the plans it’s neat and looks flat, though in reality, it’s not flat at all. The water catch ponds are on the highest points, Mr. Dickerson said. Mr. Satterfield and Mr. Lyle reviewed where they will be. Mr. Dickerson said on the north area, moving toward the marsh, there's a descent. At the bottom, where stormwater will accumulate, there’s no catch, and it will go right in the marsh. Mr. Satterfield said they will catch it. Mr. Dickerson said he’s not opposed to what they have, but there’s a significant slope, and the northwest corner will need a catch of some kind.

Mr. Dickerson said there’s also a walking issue with the not-flat area for elderly patients. Mr. Satterfield explained how they planned to deal with that. Chairman Starkey said they need to add more pervious parking and Mr. Lyle said they can. Chairman Starkey asked whether it’s superior to have pervious

parking or something that forces stormwater back into the system and lets it settle a little bit. While the city of Beaufort advocates pervious parking, unfortunately there's no maintenance of it. Mr. Satterfield said if it appears to be in the wrong place, they can switch it around. Mr. Lyle said state and local codes require all stormwater runoff be collected in a system percolated and recharged. Two inches will be stored and not piped out to the marsh.

Chairman Starkey said in the write-up on the building, there would be large equipment for imaging, and he asked how it would be entered from a loading dock. Mr. Satterfield said typically they have knock-outs on the building, and it's invisible. Mr. England said the equipment that goes in there today may not be there in two years. Mr. Satterfield showed a typical building section of a medical office building and explained the dimensions in regard to equip. 14' is the typical floor-to-floor height in a medical office building.

A discussion ensued about elevations and slope. There will be a trail along the wetlands that will snake through and be in the buffer.

Mr. Satterfield said they will tweak the connection point in the new plan. They would prefer to keep the lane configuration for functionality, though that could change in the future as buildings are added, etc. The pedestrian entry is on the Ribaut Road side, Mr. Satterfield said. They envision a typical medical office through-building connection like is in City Hall. Mr. Lewis said that improved the internal layout of the building from the first plan.

Mr. Lewis said the underground detention is at Allison Road and Ribaut Road. They would like to see that area building in some point in the future, so they would rather have that detention placed elsewhere. Mr. Brown said with the lack of a master plan for that, they have to reserve the connections and future areas that can redevelop in the best manner.

Mr. Satterfield showed photos of the materials used in the hospital buildings. They used the same materials reinterpreted in the medical office building, so it will clearly look like its part of the campus. He showed the architectural rendering of the administrative and medical office building. He said what they are planning in the way of windows and bays are what are typically done in medical office buildings.

Mr. Brown said he appreciated the images of the precedent buildings. Mr. Satterfield said they came from the Office of Civic Investment, and they feel like they're in the right ball park proportionally. They have tall, thin windows, with separation of about the width of a typical window. Mr. Brown asked if he was talking about window proportion for the opening. Mr. Satterfield said yes. Mr. Brown said "there are a couple patterns in there," and the proportions may get "out of whack." Mr. Satterfield said they're completely consistent with the precedents. Mr. Satterfield went on to explain the choice of the proportions for the windows. Mr. Brown said it might be a better idea to look at a vertical panel system, "given the visible control joints." Mr. Satterfield said they've done that in other buildings before. A discussion ensued about different considerations, given the score joints. Mr. Brown said it doesn't make sense to him. Mr. Satterfield said he hears Mr. Brown saying he sees "a smooth, plainer surface," and that's possible to solve the suggested problems.

Mr. Satterfield showed a side view of the entryway. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Satterfield to discuss the bracket work on the center form and why it's there. Mr. Satterfield said there's a lot of this incidental

type of work and went on to explain the element. He said he feels it needs to be there “to convey a sense of being up-to-date,” which is important in a hospital or medical office. There are “non-traditional cues to that which serve that purpose.” Mr. England said “progressive” is the word. Mr. Satterfield said they’re wary of wood, stone is too heavy, and they would be willing to look at either a GFRP or a wood or foam element wrapped in metal. Mr. Brown said there are limitations on bare metal. Mr. Satterfield said it would be painted. Ms. Alley said the ordinance specifies appropriate materials and metal isn’t one, typically. Mr. Satterfield said metal would be preferred, because next to the brick, it’s “the message we’re looking for.” Mr. Brown said to do a traditional cornice on the whole building says they’re a traditional form, and then doing something different is a mixed message. Mr. Satterfield said a medical office building shows technology (progressive) plus stability (tradition). Mr. Brown said he’d just prefer a simpler building.

There was a discussion about the different precedent buildings. EFIS is the building material, Ms. Alley said, and it fits in the context of the campus, but it’s not a great material. Mr. Brown said they should pick one material and do it well, rather than combining them.

Mr. Satterfield said in regard to the equipment screen, from Allison it won’t be seen at all, and the conditions are virtually the same from Ribaut Road, where virtually all that will be seen is the parapet. Ms. Alley asked what the screen material would be, and Mr. Satterfield joked “not metal, apparently.” Mr. England said it adds some profile to it, and that’s what is shown. Mr. England suggested “a louver look.” Mr. Satterfield said it would be a small splash of “hospital green.”

Mr. Satterfield asked what to expect from the board. Chairman Starkey said the board will vote on the concept of the site plan and the building with notes / comments to come back to make changes for the next meeting. The steps are usually concept, preliminary, and final, Chairman Starkey said. If the applicant takes the board's comments and tries them, they can also say why they weren’t able to do them.

Ms. Alley said it appears they’ve addressed most of the issues. Chairman Starkey said the board has added a few additional issues. Mr. Dickerson said the building has been turned and changes made to allow for a future road. Chairman Starkey asked the board what they thought of the proposed lay out, as opposed to the original. Mr. Karlyk listed various reasons he preferred the original. Mr. Ashmore said he agreed, and Chairman Starkey said he liked the original plan better: it preserves trees, and 20 years from now, if he needs to come into the property, and he can’t see where he’s going from the road to go see his doctor, the original design where it can be seen from the road seems to be better. The alternative is nice, but the original allows the infirm to see where they’re going. It would be a godsend if the Ribaut Road property were able to be purchased.

Chairman Starkey said he sees both sides and likes the idea of putting in the road; they could make provisions for that road to go through, whichever option they voted on. Mr. Satterfield showed where a road could potentially be, though the property isn’t owned by the hospital yet. Other future possible roads with the original plan were also discussed. Mr. Lewis said the road could happen in 20 years or less, even 10 years. Chairman Starkey said if they could come up with a road in a similar place around the building to where it is right now, he feels it’s important to have an alternative road.

Mr. Karlyk asked if Mr. Lyle could indicate a potential alternative drive that doesn't go into the buffer. Mr. Lewis said better future development is allowed if it's less shallow to Ribaut Road. Mr. Dickerson said "the marsh is fluid and evolves over time." Putting anything near the marsh could be risky over time. Mr. Lewis said right now, buildings are there, so marsh access and the view are shielded, and this would open it up and allow for a larger block structure for future development.

There was further discussion of Myrtle and Hobbs and securing the first 400' of the connection, of which Mr. Lewis said "This is your best opportunity to do that and secure future building." It will provide all the circulation they need, he added. Mr. Satterfield disagreed and said the porte cochere and being able to see the front of the hospital is important. Mr. Lewis said they are thinking of the long-term block structure and how everything fills in over time. Mr. Lewis claimed "people aren't going to have a problem finding this building."

Mr. Baches went on to explain the area, which is urbanizing as the hospital campus and TCL expand; the rural marsh will not remain the same over time as a result, he said. He said the new plan addresses the marsh, and brackets Ribaut Road to the new road because the development fronts both of them. The building "will eventually be a building on the street facing the marsh." To make the front of the building on Ribaut Road will dictate that for the life of the building, Mr. Baches said. They eventually want on-street parking, slower speeds, and ancillary uses on Ribaut Road. The "most important part of the plan is the road," Mr. Baches said. The marsh is, in the long-term, irrelevant. Mr. Dickerson said it makes more sense to him "because Myrtle could continue on and up and be a true bypass." Mr. Baches said if there's a connection in this 'node,' the city can make a long-term stance as more property is purchased and Myrtle is extended.

Chairman Starkey proposed another alternative to get the entrance in the front, but Mr. Satterfield said that disconnects the parking too much and it's too tight because it cuts the circulation path. Mr. Lewis said it might be possible. Chairman Starkey said getting the building in the front and maintaining the possibility of the road is what he's trying for.

Discussion continued about alternatives. Mr. England said if it's 20 years, the building works well fronted toward Ribaut Road with patients, and then it can just become part of the road. That's a long time to wait on something that may never happen, Mr. England said. Chairman Starkey said it's like the hospital now, with a number of entrances; this configuration has one entrance and all the parking in the front. Mr. England said the original option saves the trees, gets the building working now, and in the future, they have the road coming in the back of the building.

Ms. Alley asked if the pavement in front of the building can be done to mimic or be a parallel, on-street parking to detail it as a road. Mr. Baches said that's how they see it. Ms. Alley said the house being there is not that odd and is just for now. Mr. Lewis said the ownership of the house is "short-term," and they can decide what to do with the property after that.

Mr. Dickerson asked as far as the internal structure of the building which plan is better, and Mr. Satterfield said the new plan is better, but the original plan will work, too. He "can make both buildings perform the same," whichever option for configuration they choose. Chairman Starkey said the entrance has to be near the parking, which is near Ribaut Road. The original works better for that specific application, Mr. Satterfield said.

Mr. Dickerson said if the two plans are combined to maintain the road and the entry location is visible from the front, they may have a better plan all the way around. Mr. Satterfield said they can if he's told to ignore the trees in the middle. Mr. Karlyk said there are going to be tree issues either way. Mr. Lewis said the biggest trees are toward the back. There was further discussion about the trees. Mr. England asked, if the road were to happen in ten years, can they develop it then? Mr. Lewis said they need to get the right-of-way set today, then there doesn't have to be further discussion from the city's point of view about losing parking, etc.

A discussion ensued about who the property owners are in an area. Mr. Lyle said they're mostly medical offices, and they don't foresee problems with them in the future. He said they can take what they've heard and come back with something that can be achieved. Chairman Starkey reiterated the need to have the front entrance on Ribaut Road and said the city wants a pass-through that can be a dead end for parking now and turned into a road later. It's going to be the hospital's complex, and they will want transportation and a road around it, not just Ribaut Road. He thinks there can be a good compromise. They want to maximize the land between the new road and Ribaut Road, Mr. England said.

Mr. Dickerson said they want to establish a clear road path for where people come in off of Allison Road; they need to figure out internally what they want the building function to be in order to decide if the lobby goes all the way through or not, then put the entrances at both ends or one end. The building can be shifted at that time. Mr. Karlyk said they should look at the trees and that may help with their considerations. Mr. Satterfield said they *have* looked at them, and the original plan was the result. They will take out healthy trees either way, he warned.

Mr. Lyle said Myrtle Road poses a lot of redevelopment issues. Chairman Starkey said the advantage of the road would be to connect all the campuses along the road. It will be a side street and can have curves. Mr. Satterfield said if the road were planned along the marsh, all the property would be maximized. Mr. Dickerson said as long as they connect Allison to TCL, it establishes the city fabric and gives circulation. Mr. Lewis said they have a 24' easement but don't own it all for the road. The city would like as much formalized connection as possible today.

Mr. Dickerson said the two issues are the road and the use of the first floor dictating the building alignment. They have a marsh view building on a road, and though the road is conceptual, it has a growth plan going toward Ribaut Road. If Hobbs Road is the primary entrance, "the new plan is spot on," Mr. Satterfield said, but if the primary entrance is off of Ribaut Road, "it's lacking something." Mr. Lewis replied that "they'll need every entrance and they'll all look the same." Getting to Allison is essential. Mr. Dickerson said if Hobbs is the entrance of choice, and there are two additional entrances, the new plan makes sense in terms of marsh view, traffic flow, and sufficient parking spaces.

Motion: Mr. Dickerson made a motion to approve the current site plan as shown with Hobbs Road being supported as the primary entrance and the others being secondary. **Motion died for lack of a second.** Mr. Karlyk said he'd like to see the hospital take another stab at it; he doesn't feel ready to make a decision yet and would prefer to see what they come up with.

Mr. Satterfield said they'd like to get back in next month because "they have a push on time." Mr. Lewis asked if the DRB could have a special meeting in two weeks, and Chairman Starkey said that's possible.

Mr. England said it would need to be three weeks. Mr. Satterfield concluded that he feels best about it being considered at the next meeting. Ms. Alley said they'd be happy to work with them.

Motion: Mr. Karlyk made a motion that the hospital and architects look at combining the site plans to consider the hospital's best interests and come back to the DRB with those plans to consider; Mr. Ashmore seconded the motion. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Chairman Starkey asked that the minutes show that the DRB will extend the due date by two weeks with agreement from the staff.

Chairman Starkey said Mr. Satterfield and Mr. Lyle had the comments of the DRB regarding architecture. Mr. Lewis said there are bigger issues than just details, citing Mr. Brown's comments earlier in the meeting. Discussion ensued about these matters. Ms. Alley said there's no issue with the form of the building. Chairman Starkey said they've asked for a variance on the height of the building, and that is for another board to decide. Mr. Lyle said he'd like to know that the DRB approves the height. Chairman Starkey said it is tall, but asked the Office of Civic Investment planners what would happen with an added building in the future. Mr. Baches said the building across Ribaut Road from it will determine it. If the building's up against the street, a 65' building there with the same size building across the street is fine. These heights are not a problem.

Mr. Baches said there's not an issue about front and back; whatever the front is, "it needs to act like a front." It's best if access is not car-driven. They "don't want to end up with a building with a false front."

<u>1190 RIBAUT ROAD, GAS STATION / CONVENIENCE STORE</u>
Applicant: Tom Michaels, Architectonic, Continued Conceptual Review (11-05 DRB.2)

Ms. Alley reviewed the details of the application and the special exception from the ZBOA. The TIA was approved by the Technical Review Committee. She reviewed other details of architecture, lighting, landscaping, and signage.

Tom Michaels said that the curb cuts on First Boulevard "will go away," and one curb cut will be added that mirrors the one at the Shell station. They propose a small wall along Ribaut and on to First. The fence will be behind the existing hedges. The existing sidewalk will be larger. The sidewalk will extend to the wall. The shrubs will stay; the wall will be put up and go behind the shrubs. There are existing parking spots that will be torn out and plantings put in place of the hardscape. The existing curb cuts will necessitate relocating the palms that are there. **Chad Patel** said the overhead power line will make overstory trees difficult, so they will substitute palms.

Mr. Michaels showed the eight existing parking spots. The dumpster pad will remain but will be rotated. There will be better screening than the chain link fence that's there now. There's significant overgrowth. Liza Hill had told them that the fence could stay and be supplemented with bamboo which will then go to the detention basin and screen that. Ms. Alley said she wouldn't recommend keeping the chain link fence if the adjacent owner will be looking at the fence. Mr. Patel said that's why Ms. Hill suggested the bamboo. Mr. Patel said they own "a foot" of the fence. The particular kind of bamboo she recommended will create a non-invasive barrier quickly, he said. Mr. Ashmore disagreed. Mr. Patel said there's a right-of-way between the properties, so there would not be bamboo there.

Mr. Dickerson said the detention basin is a little swale, and there doesn't appear to be any egress from the parking lot into the basin. Mr. Patel said it's existing and "we're not messing with that." Mr. Dickerson said they need several inches of water before it gets into the basin; it's not acting as it's designed to because there's no way for the water to flow into it. It needs to catch the stormwater; Mr. Michaels said their civil engineer will look at that.

Mr. Karlyk asked about screening of the dumpster pad, and Mr. Michaels said he hadn't planned that yet.

Mr. Michaels said there were changes in the canopy: it's gotten somewhat smaller, and there's one column per island, not two. Instead of two pairs of doors, they will take the glass windows back to how they were originally, so there will be one main entrance. Mr. Patel said they'll put solid glass in the walk-up window. Mr. Michaels said they need to talk to the city about some issues and "get their civil worked on."

Ms. Alley asked about monochromatic colors; Mr. Patel said they thought of silver. They're still designing the structure. The structure underneath will be open – with no ceiling – to reduce the cost. Mr. Patel said conventional LED light fixtures are recessed in and go straight down, so as not to disperse as much. Existing lights on the corner will be coming down. Mr. Patel said there's lighting under the building canopy shielded from the road. SCE&G has lighting on the poles to light the property up with white light. Chairman Starkey asked about sign plans. Mr. Michaels said they would like to do a name sign on one corner and another sign on the other corner for gas prices. Mr. Patel said the sign will look like the Boundary Street Exxon sign, but smaller.

Mr. Michaels said tanks will go between the building and the canopy. Mr. Karlyk asked about the radius on the curb cut off Ribaut Road. Mr. Michaels said it's shallow, probably 10', but that will be clarified later. Mr. Patel said the truck will run up and over the island both times which will dictate the way the island is designed. He went on to explain the logistics of fuel delivery. Mr. Patel said they have had discussions with the delivery drivers who have said "it's tough but do-able." The contractors have said they will work out a solution that's best for everyone.

Mr. Dickerson asked on the first side about a bump-out where a table is now; he asked if they need the working space. Mr. Patel said most of it is in the DOT right-of-way. They want it to be aesthetically pleasing. Chairman Starkey asked if they were planning a sprinkler system, and Mr. Michaels and Mr. Patel both said there's irrigation in there, but there's no water currently.

Ms. Alley asked them to bring representation of the signs when they come back next to look at as part of the design. Chairman Starkey said they also need landscaping plans and to see the front fence, the dumpster enclosure, and whatever they decide on for the back-screening.

Mr. Michaels requested getting preliminary approval rather than conceptual.

Motion: Mr. Karlyk recommended preliminary approval and checking screening at the rear of the building, dumpster enclosure detail, description of the signage, landscape design, colors, and civil. Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. **The motion passed unanimously.**

MINUTES

The minutes of the June 9, 2011 meeting were presented to the board for review. **On motion by Mr. Karlyk, second by Mr. Ashmore, the board voted unanimously to approve the minutes as submitted.**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.