

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held on **October 11, 2012 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Eric Brown, Brian Franklin, David Karlyk, John Dickerson and Chuck Rushing and city staff Lauren Kelly and 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

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

MINUTES

The minutes of the September 13, 2012 meeting were presented to the Board for review. **Mr. Dickerson made a motion, second by Mr. Karlyk, to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.**

LADY'S ISLAND PUBLIX – 2 Inlet Road, Conceptual Review (12-06 DRB.2)

Applicant: Andrews & Burgess, Inc.

Ms. Kelly said this project was presented at the September DRB meeting. Since, the staff has met with the applicant to discuss traffic issues and site design. The applicant is revising their Traffic Impact Analysis. It was determined that a stoplight would be required, so the applicant and the engineer are working with DOT to get the paperwork to proceed with the stoplight.

Ms. Kelly said access is still challenging owing to the build-to line the applicant needs to comply with and there's a liner road along Lady's Island Drive and the shops fronting it in order to meet the requirement. There's effort to make it more of a frontage road, and that has been revised in this plan. The right-in / right-out plan is still less than ideal, staff feels, and the access along Ferry Road is still not being utilized fully.

Ms. Kelly said that staff feels the retention pond is in a better location, but it's still on a public right-of-way and "has to be treated nicely," but there's less pressure than when it was on a corner. According to the ordinance, a sidewalk needs to be added on any street that does not have one, and staff discussed placing it on the east side of Inlet Road to give access to people in that neighborhood.

In regard to architecture, Ms. Kelly said, at the last DRB meeting, they discussed getting a more Lowcountry feeling to the architecture, and some materials have been incorporated into the revised design. Staff feels it's a step in the right direction, but staff report suggestions should be fully incorporated instead of picking and choosing among the suggestions. They want traditional, authentic Lowcountry design instead of just changing a few materials. Staff suggests consulting a local architect at the conceptual level to determine what's more appropriate in this part of the country, Ms. Kelly said.

There was “a lot of discussion about the parking lot,” according to Ms. Kelly, and she said **Liza Hill** can speak to that. The revised plan has staggered some of the tree islands in the parking lot, but there are other elements that have changed and are maybe less desirable than before. Ms. Hill has some suggestions about that and about a few trees that could be preserved if some other things are done. In regard to signs, the process requiring a separate application is clear.

Chairman Brown asked Ms. Kelly about the Village Center District designation, which has the 6-12’ build-to line. He asked if that’s just to the primary street, and she said she believes it is, but she’ll check.

Dave Mattson showed the newest site plan. In regard to access, they have extended it to Ferry Drive and widened the entrance to make the access to Ferry Drive more inviting for customers to leave the store. Signs will direct them to Ferry Drive. The liner road trajectory has been straightened out. There’s a concrete median now to restrict the right-in / right-out access. In regard to the stoplight, the Traffic Impact Analysis will be finalized next week, and they will look into the signal more. The landscape plan will come with the application for final approval.

The parking lot meets the ordinance in regard to the requirement of being within 55’ of a tree, Mr. Mattson said. There’s a sidewalk entrance into the store if they want to use it. They shifted the building to save the 54” and 46” live oaks.

Ms. Hill thanked them for their tree preservation efforts. She would like them to take another look at the parking lot generally. She would like them to look at the Grayco parking lot as a model. In the ordinance, there’s a tree island required every 10-12 spaces and a 4’ aisle. At Grayco, they have wider aisles. She said they would lose parking, but there’s full asphalt now going across the lot. The islands are designed for the trees to keep the heat down from the asphalt. Ms. Hill said if they “could tighten up and shift,” they could save a 24” tree. They have no aisles now except for the one that creates the streetscape. Mr. Mattson said in regard to parking requirements that Publix has said that they won’t do the project if they can’t get more parking spaces, based on the issues in the old Publix parking lot. Ms. Hill asked him to look at getting in one other aisle. Mr. Mattson said he’s “going skinnier on one-way aisles now.” To get one more, they’d lose another row of parking, and he’s been told clearly that this ratio is less than what is at the old building and, he said again, that Publix will not build the building without the current parking. The drive aisles have been narrowed, Mr. Mattson said. **Ryan Lyle** said there would be little heat island effect in the front because it will be pervious concrete.

Chairman Brown said the DRB appreciates the applicants’ efforts and being in the Village Center, “it’s not an easy suburban site.” Mr. Franklin said he likes how they took some of the DRB’s comments to heart. He’s concerned with the screening of the back service area; he said they need to think about how much room they leave for plantings with the retention pond. They need to leave plenty of room.

Mr. Franklin said if parking remains like it is, they should consider using sizable trees so they don't end up with a big island with a 2.5" "stick" in it. Mr. Mattson said he's thinking big live oaks. They will have a landscape plan for the next meeting, as well as the landscape architect in attendance, Mr. Mattson added. Also, Mr. Franklin said if they had a planting strip as staff discussed on the southern road along Inlet Rd., a similar treatment would frame both ends of the property with access. Mr. Mattson said he was planning that; Mr. Franklin said look at the island northwest of that. Mr. Mattson said, "There's no way to squeeze it in any more," and he would lose 20 parking spaces if he did it. He could run a sidewalk down the right side, though, or put landscaping there.

Mr. Karlyk asked Mr. Lyle how many trucks come in there. Mr. Lyle said that's why they need the right-in / right-out access to Highway 280. They have tried to eliminate the need for it but can't. They are truly trying to screen the pond, as the city requested, so they can cut back on an island a little. Mr. Karlyk asked about trees on Highway 802 and if there was enough room to plant street trees in that depth. Mr. Lyle said they have discussed it. They have the sidewalk, a ditch, and the top bank of a ditch with grass, then the property line where the buffer starts. He doesn't remember the street tree, but it's a 5' planting strip and "Liza was happy" with it, whatever kind it was. Ms. Kelly said she didn't remember discussing the 5' distance. She said the detail was a 10' sidewalk with 5 x 5 planting wells, a la the Boundary Street master plan.

Mr. Karlyk said he's concerned that, without wheel stops, cars may go up to the curb and the sidewalk can be taken up by the front of the car. He asked if they could have planters for trees or something in there. Mr. Lyle said they could do planters and do concrete curb to curb instead of a 5' grass strip and a 5' sidewalk. Mr. Lyle said that may go against what Ms. Hill suggested with the view category.

Mr. Karlyk asked what they would plant for the screening on the back corner. Mr. Lyle said he wants to minimize underground detention. If it needs to go to 8-10', they might use a fence or some higher plants. Mr. Mattson said they use Leland Cypress trees in Atlanta, and they screen well. They have a landscape architect, and he will be called after this meeting. He will be better able to answer the questions. Mr. Franklin expressed concerns about allowing the trees to get to mature size without needing to shear them and stressing them. Mr. Mattson said they have looked at living fences. There will be screening on the pond's other side, too. Mr. Franklin asked, in regard to the circulation, why the trucks' entrance is predetermined. Mr. Lyle said there would be loading and unloading from the rear at the bump out from the building.

There was general discussion of how they could slide the liner shops building to create a corner feature. Chairman Brown said the access could be changed, and the liner shops could be slid to the left. Conceptually, if it were an L-shaped building, it would solve problems. Mr. Mattson said there's a screen wall to hide equipment. Chairman Brown said the equipment can't be on the primary frontage. Mr. Mattson said he could do it, but couldn't get the truck back out. There was general discussion of the entrance and egress issues and what could and couldn't be changed. The access to the compactor still has to be maintained, it was concluded, but Mr.

Mattson said he could turn the compactor. Chairman Brown said if they “can knit the circulation together visually,” it would be better. Mr. Franklin asked if they could get rid of the right-in / right-out, which is only for trucks, and make the other way work. Mr. Mattson said it’s for customers *and* trucks. He explained why it’s critical to customers at the store, at the liner stores, and to Publix.

Mr. Karlyk asked about 90 degree drive aisles and two-way parking. Mr. Lyle said they had 60 degree everywhere, and they would get more stalls with 9’ wide perpendicular stalls, but that is not accommodating to the shopper. Publix thinks this is “easy in and out,” Mr. Mattson said. Mr. Karlyk asked if they’re taking over access from Inlet down to Ferry; Mr. Mattson said that’s in process right now. Mr. Karlyk asked about a gazebo on the corner. Mr. Mattson said that’s to go with the pond. Mr. Karlyk said his opinion is to keep it natural with vegetation. Mr. Mattson agreed.

Mr. Dickerson said there’s an area on the east side of the plan (adjacent to the self storage) where they don’t have a sidewalk now, and if they put one in, to him that gives them the second aisle. Mr. Mattson agreed. Mr. Dickerson said where the brick is now in front of the store is good, but at the current Publix, there’s nothing slowing kids running out into the parking lot. Mr. Dickerson likes the screening on both sides of the retention pond and the site plan improvements.

Chairman Brown said the site is challenging. In regard to the city’s planning goals, as a Village Center, stitching it together or letting it grow together with a street network is essential. They provided the framework for this last time. The frontage road is the proper response here. He thinks now it’s a question of getting it designed in the right manner; they’re “now connected but also disjointed.” There are a number of street sections that comprise the street network they are putting in. He’d like to see them knit together so that it’s clear: the current frontage road has four different street sections, he said. He wants a solution that’s generally consistent for each of these new sections. There should be a different one behind the Steamer section. Chairman Brown said he wants consistency, and he feels the city has given them good direction on that. He feels the current model will be confusing to people. What’s on the street sections is in the public realm, which is the most important.

Mr. Mattson said he could just switch the parallel parking in front of the retail shops to angled parking. Mr. Dickerson said it would add back spaces lost from other things they’ve done. Mr. Mattson said he can do landscaping along the property that they don’t control / own and consistent plantings elsewhere. Mr. Franklin said, “It needs to be the form, not just plantings.” The hardscaping problems will not be solved just by planting. Mr. Lyle said he could see a sidewalk at the upper, unowned county section along the road behind Steamers. Ms. Kelly said that might have been something that the city said where the frontage road would be a frontage road and the rear access is secondary. Mr. Dickerson said the city’s center form moving from a lane to a street concept would work.

Ms. Kelly said that, in regard to the dimensions, if they have a wrapping frontage road, there's that space and then 250' between Sea Island Parkway; there's only 150' to develop, which means there's not enough for another property to front that lane. Mr. Dickerson said they are trying to encourage pedestrian traffic and make it safe and easy; adding that will give broader, safer access.

Ms. Kelly said when she talked to the county, they were thinking that eventually there would be a frontage road along that street, too. Sea Island Parkway is unlikely to urbanize anytime soon. Chairman Brown said the frontage road dead-ends into the building, and he thinks it should turn. Mr. Mattson agreed. Chairman Brown said he's not 100% on board with the building's orientation. He thinks there's a better solution; they could do the "L" shape and have a corner. They would prefer easier architecture. He appreciates the connection with Ferry, and they could reserve it for public space in the future. It's just hard to have a truck near that and make it a public space. If they can make the connections that are the public business, Chairman Brown said, the right-in / right-out is their business.

Mr. Rushing said in the far corner, near where the frontage road is, on the building, the large concrete corner area would be better perceived as a frontage road if there were a sidewalk and planters in the bottom of the corner. It would be more of a continuation of the street and sidewalks. If they're connected, it will be more like a typical urban intersection. Mr. Mattson said they could definitely do that.

Mr. Mattson passed out samples of the brick and the most recent elevations of the building. The architect, **Rick Maxian** said that from the comments they'd received, they'd added a pitched roof and siding. The prototypes for Publix need to be worked with, but they understand the Lowcountry requirements, too. The entrance and exit need to be accented, and there has to be a degree of cover. They looked at local buildings that have a newer Lowcountry feel with richer colors and pitched roofs. From 10' down, they have to keep a substantial material for durability so they had a brick base, which they then worked into the feature element. Then they came up with a secondary canopy with a metal sloped roof and an exposed metal beams, and exposed wood ceiling. The wood siding would be painted and would give a softer feel than stucco. The siding and brick colors "play off one another," so that there are fewer colors and are they're in the same family.

Mr. Rushing said it is much improved. He said he would like another entrance on the shop side of Publix. It would make the building on the main frontage look even more independent of the Publix building behind it. Mr. Franklin said on the front elevation, the canopy extends across only partway, and he would recommend it extend it all the way, so that if there's sidewalk access, they are providing covered access for people with groceries. Mr. Maxian said they had considered that at one point. Also, on the Lady's Island Drive elevation, an anchor element for the corner would be desirable, Mr. Franklin said. The mechanical house is "pretty visible," and he wondered if it could be made more central for sight line purposes. He agreed with Mr. Rushing about access from the Lady's Island façade. On the rear elevation, Mr. Franklin said,

there are no changes in color or treatments. There's "nothing to look at." The drive-through area is articulated, but half of the façade is blank. He encouraged them to go further. He said there aren't a lot of windows in the building. He would encourage them to see where else they can add more light into the building. Mr. Maxian said they have cases against the windows, but he'll look at it.

Mr. Karlyk said he feels the same way on the rear and side elevations. The rear needs something to break it up, and the side before the drive-through needs breaking up, too. Mr. Dickerson agreed with them, as well. He made a suggestion as to how to get more light into the building, which Chairman Brown said is what Wal-Mart does.

Chairman Brown said the Board wants to have the form articulated a little bit "because it's a big flat form." Ms. Kelly had suggested two good solutions, he said. One is a larger "barn" (there's a Family Dollar like this on Lady's Island) and the other form is a "Main Street" form, which is "not far from where you are." Mr. Maxian said he feels that will work better.

Mr. Franklin said, based on the current site plan, they won't have room for cypresses. They want the landscaping to shape and frame the architecture, not hide it. Even if a corner is heavily planted, you will still look through it at a nice façade. Chairman Brown said the southwest corner of the building will never be fully screened. He suggested wrapping the back corner. Mr. Maxian said he thought the sketch was good; adding glass would be hard, but the form works. It can't be unarticulated if it's on a right-of-way, Chairman Brown said.

Mr. Maxian asked about shutters, and Chairman Brown said they could do that, especially on the back. Chairman Brown and Mr. Maxian discussed colors and the best way to use them. Chairman Brown said the siding should be "your default as opposed to the brick."

Ms. Kelly recommended being consistent with the details, e.g., a cornice. Chairman Brown suggested that the DRB make a motion to generally approve the site plan with some specifics to say that if they "don't change certain elements it will be difficult to go forward." Mr. Dickerson said they could just do the site plan now. Chairman Brown said the connectivity needs to be refined, and his other issue was an orientation issue and screening the corner on Ferry Drive. He doesn't feel those things are settled enough to go forward. Mr. Mattson said he can address that as Chairman Brown had said.

Mr. Dickerson made a motion for conceptual approval of the site plan with the following areas to be addressed: looking at the right-in / right-out access for trucks as opposed to possible access from another way (Ferry / Inlet); the screening adjustments in that same area; the sidewalk that would go along the Gray Storage areas and creating a new aisle with a sidewalk down the southern perimeter; to straighten out the road element going along Grayco and the left hand turn at the north side of the property; looking at the landscaping at the northwest corner of the building as it is positioned today; the consistency of the northeast corner (frontage road). Mr. Franklin seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

DOLLAR TREE – 201 Robert Smalls Parkway, Preliminary Review (12-08 DRB.2)

Applicant: David R. Karlyk, Carolina Engineering Consultants, Inc.

Mr. Karlyk recused himself because his firm is doing design on this project.

Ms. Kelly said this project had been presented at the September DRB and that the DRB gave the applicant a number of suggestions, some of which had been included in this review. Ms. Kelly said staff feels it's especially important to make clear that they don't feel it's appropriate to have head-in parking along any major right-of-ways. Staff has no problem with allowing the larger right-of-way width with head-in parking. There is a better solution to not include head-in parking on the perimeter. Some of the planting beds have increased on the sides to 5', Ms. Kelly said, and there were no parking planting beds in the rear, but that is in the process of changing.

The facades are an improvement from the previous submittal, Ms. Kelly said. She said staff feels that, as suggested at the previous DRB meeting, the main entrance could be "actually a true form as opposed to a false parapet." The materials should be used as authentically as possible, she said, as opposed to heavy cornices over a lighter wood material. The awnings need to be functional, so should be *at least* 4' deep, though 5-6' is recommended.

Ms. Kelly said they are still looking for front landscaping. More urban planted tree wells are recommended by Ms. Hill. There are suggestions about potential trees to be saved as well.

Mr. Karlyk said this is a retail building, and the more difficult the parking access is, the fewer people will come. In regard to changes from the last time, there was an increase in the side bed size. Brad Hill had recommended planting wax myrtles, viburnums, palms, and knock out roses. They added the 5' foundation buffer at the rear of the building. They have left room to plant screening along the back of the building. At the Walgreens by Chick-Fil-A, they had a vine-covered lattice, Mr. Karlyk said.

Another change made was to move the bike rack to the front. The parking was flip-flopped to be along the building, not on Robert Smalls. That left room for more planting. They saved maples by removing a façade. Angled parking denotes one-way, Mr. Karlyk said, and traffic confusion could ensue. This will flow better and eliminate congestion. They didn't incorporate additional pedestrian access. They're at 65-35 impervious to pervious, and this site plan works for what the Dollar Tree needs.

Mr. Rushing said in regard to the pedestrian and vehicular access to the next lot, he would encourage them to allow for it, even if they don't do it now. Mr. Franklin asked the reason for the width of the aisle to the south side of the building. Mr. Karlyk said the delivery truck will come off Burton Hill, go up, and then back in, so the pavement is at the tightest they can get it and still get in to the back of the store. They could break up the mass of the asphalt a little, Mr.

Karlyk said. Mr. Franklin asked if that's [adjacent to the grass island] where the truck will park, if they could scoot the building back to allow for plantings up against the front of the building. Mr. Karlyk said they would have to move the dumpster down but might be able to accommodate that. Mr. Franklin said moving the building back even 3-4' would offer planting space without affecting too much for planting in the front. He also suggested that with the parking on the west side of the building, they can shift it down a little more so that the sidewalk could flow across as a straight line. The bike rack could move down. In regard to circulation, he's fine.

Mr. Dickerson asked, on the Burton Hill Road side, if there was parallel parking. Mr. Karlyk said there's no parking there now, but they have added sidewalk. Staff had asked for angled parking, but they couldn't do it. Mr. Dickerson asked Ms. Kelly about parallel on-street parking on the frontage. Mr. Karlyk said there's a ditch beside the property and an inlet it drains into. He doesn't know how acceptable it will be to DOT, which has discouraged it on other buildings. Mr. Dickerson said that he appreciates more trees are surviving than in the clear cut of last time.

Chairman Brown asked Ms. Kelly about the two-sided frontage road she had discussed. Ms. Kelly said the original plan was like this, but there was parking along the street, so they are suggesting no head-in parking along the street so that eventually they could have parallel parking on both sides, and it "would continue on as more of a real street." There was a discussion of Bojangles and Buffalo Wild Wings and their parking situations relative to this project. Mr. Dickerson said that with a 20' setback, they will have lots of opportunity to put in landscaping.

Chairman Brown said getting some of the street network in is the big thing to be able to do. He feels Buffalo Wild Wings was a start. If they can do something here, creating connectivity to the adjacent parcel, they should. Mr. Karlyk said the frontage road is nothing but a frontage road, and the parking was not used very much. Chairman Brown said if that's so, then the building may not be oriented right for when the next parcel comes in. He said if the building is spun, it could make a lot of sense. They have asked the master property owner to look at these things in a lot of cases. Chairman Brown said he knows the property is broken up. Mr. Karlyk said they looked at moving the building to the front corner, but the fire chief said that was problematic, and there's dead end parking on the other side. Mr. Karlyk said this is the best plan for everybody, in consultation with Dollar Tree. Others have tried to develop this site, Mr. Karlyk said.

Chairman Brown asked about "a dumpster and service stuff." Mr. Karlyk showed where it is screened. It was moved from Burton Hill Road. Chairman Brown asked what could be done for screening of pallets and other messy things. **Doug Burr** said Dollar Tree isn't the typical grocery, so they're very efficient about putting things into the store straight from the truck, so it's generally not messy. There are deliveries a couple times a week.

Mr. Burr said that in regard to connectivity, this site doesn't lend itself to the city's

requirement, so trying to keep, as much of the parking to the front of the building and stay away from angled parking is really important to them. Chairman Brown said it's their decision as to what works for them.

Mr. Dickerson said wrapping the sidewalk along the Lowes connector road as it comes down Burton Hill Rd. might make sense for future connectivity so the sidewalk would go all the way around. Right now, it ends in a road. Mr. Karlyk said that they can do it if they sacrifice some trees. Mr. Dickerson said he'd rather leave the trees than have the sidewalks. Mr. Franklin said he likes the idea of the sidewalk. Mr. Karlyk said the site plan meets the ordinance, and he can't see a better way to do it. The parking, he said, is less than what is required by industry standards.

In regard to architecture, **Linda Snapp** handed out elevations. She said they had looked at trying to bring the front out as suggested by staff, but it creates a problem with the handicap ramp and being able to get a wheelchair into the building. On the front elevation, she changed the pilasters to be the siding. The awnings were already 4'6", but because it's recessed, it's a little bigger. The cornice work there was a suggestion to use something other than EIFS. They can use a Fypon product that looks like wood but is more durable and holds up better. On the elevation, she changed the pilasters to the wood, though they felt the brick broke it up a bit more. They kept the center section to look similar to what they had on the front. They have planting there, so if they wanted tall trees or palms, they didn't want any projections on the façade; they could address it with landscaping. For the rear façade, they've done something similar, and there's an area where they can break it out with plantings. The pilasters there extend 8" out and are not just flat, Ms. Snapp said. They eliminated the green band as well, she offered.

Mr. Rushing said it looks better. He encouraged "doing something more over the top than what they have," like extending the detail out and not bringing it all the way to the ground level. Mr. Franklin said the southwestern elevation looks still like it should have more articulation to it. It's a simple blank wall at the moment; the southeast elevation is the same way, too. It's right off the frontage road. He's looking for more Lowcountry articulation. Three sides of the building are for pedestrian access, and in a rain event, the awnings are for show, not functionality. They have the opportunity on all three of the sides to provide pedestrian protection. Mr. Karlyk said they could flip the sidewalk and foundation buffer. Mr. Franklin said trellises on the building might work. If the architecture evolves a little more, he would be willing to give in on the planting requirements.

Mr. Dickerson said as far as the southwest elevation, if they replicated it to the northeast elevation, it would eliminate the issue of a big blank wall. Chairman Brown said he agrees with the articulation comments. Being consistent with it is the main thing, Chairman Brown said. In regard to the rear loading area, it's unarticulated and he's not sure where the equipment goes. Ms. Snapp said it's on the roof. Chairman Brown said they need to see that on the roof. The form, he said, is reasonable and the change in materials is a great step forward. Chairman Brown said they should eliminate the stucco. He also said that they should "go all the way" with

wood including corner boards, and trim around the windows. This is especially important to articulate the pilasters. Chairman Brown said suggestions about additional rain protection are an easy, inexpensive way to soften a building up. He's still conflicted about the site plan, but if there are site things that are unresolved, he fears they won't make it.

Ms. Snapp asked if they mean a continuous canopy or if the sidewalk could go in, create a planting area and then go in. She said a 10' canopy could create wind issues in this area. Mr. Burr said they will look at it; they haven't done it with other buildings. Ms. Snapp agreed that they would look at it. Mr. Burr said they need to consider economics so as not to be back-breaking on the architecture elements on the side. Mr. Dickerson said on the stucco, he sees Ms. Snapp's point on how it breaks it up. Chairman Brown said they don't need brick, stucco, *and* siding on a small building like this. Mr. Dickerson said he feels it gives more drama.

Mr. Karlyk said the foundation beds are only required on 67% of the building, and he suggested what they could do with awnings that could address the rain protection issue. Mr. Dickerson said they may or may not have to address it, but they should think about it. Chairman Brown said for him "there's still a disconnect between having an understood solution to what the city has asked them to do." He asked if there are frontage roads or not. Mr. Karlyk says no, the city says yes. Chairman Brown said architecturally he's fine, but he doesn't understand the frontages very well, and it doesn't go far enough for him. Mr. Karlyk said the city wants angled parking but it doesn't work for the client. Mr. Rushing asked if the city wants a two-way frontage road with one-way parking. Ms. Kelly said it would be a one-way parking. Mr. Karlyk read from the Design District standards: They have provided a safe, accessible design that meets the city ordinance. Angled parking doesn't make it safer.

Mr. Franklin said they have an existing frontage road for Lowe's, and that could be the access road for all the entities that develop along the site. Sidewalk access as Mr. Dickerson suggested it would go along the frontage road that's there. Maybe there could be interconnectivity between stores, but Mr. Franklin asked if the Board feels it needs to be another frontage road. Mr. Dickerson said if they reserve parking spaces now for future use as a connector, they have a connector and a frontage road. There will never be connectivity to Burton Hill, so the frontage road they're talking about adding won't work. While this is not ideal in that it's head in to a particular thoroughfare, they keep with the concept of uniformity around the whole site. It's all the same, Mr. Dickerson said. Chairman Brown said the difficulty is that Buffalo Wild Wings did something different. Mr. Rushing said Buffalo Wild Wings and Bojangles share a common entrance. The way this property is, they're forced to have four entrances off two frontage roads. Chairman Brown said everything's out of whack with looking at this without all the tools they need. Mr. Dickerson said what they don't have is all the *land* they need, but there's no acreage to do much more.

Ms. Kelly said she had told Mr. Karlyk that staff didn't want to see head-in parking on Burton Hill Road, but they will leave it up to the Board. Mr. Rushing asked why the staff is adamant about 60 versus 90 degree. Ms. Kelly said angled parking is in general more pedestrian-friendly,

and they want to make this a more walkable environment. Mr. Dickerson suggested “adding more landscaping then and calling it a day.” Mr. Rushing said he would never notice that the cars weren’t parked 60 or 90 degrees to the road. If they were at the back of the curve of Burton Hill Road, it might be different, but he has no particular problem with head-on in this case.

Chairman Brown said they’re either fronting the frontage road or not doing a proper frontage road. He would like to see the board be more consistent. Mr. Franklin said Robert Smalls will be the main access road. The parking is facing the building, not Robert Smalls. Chairman Brown said as they move into the future, they need this consistency. Mr. Dickerson said they are doing no harm with this, because the north road will never connect. Mr. Karlyk said it will not be a road, but a parking lot, and the lot next to it will be the same. The parking lots will connect and will never be a road. Chairman Brown said if they made that a frontage road by flipping the building, they would have a lot of frontage to Highway 170. Mr. Rushing said he can’t imagine this building not facing Highway 170 and Mr. Dickerson agreed. The present parking lot is not a street, Mr. Dickerson feels, and the adjacent lot will likely be the same, as Mr. Karlyk said. If the parking lot is a frontage road, it becomes a frontage loop, and he can’t picture this as a city street. He agrees with the future connectivity to a parking lot.

Mr. Rushing made a motion that the project be approved conceptually with the provision that the client address vehicular and pedestrian connectivity. Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-1, Chairman Brown opposed.

STATE FARM – 1403 Greenlawn Drive, Preliminary Review (12-07 DRB.1)

Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects, Inc.

Mr. Karlyk recused himself because his firm is doing design on this project.

Libby Anderson described the project, which she said is “a true mixed use building.” The first floor will be office space, and the second floor will be two apartments. Setbacks are listed in the staff report. A lane to the rear will be where parking is; they want that to be pervious. The ordinance requires a sidewalk on Greenlawn Drive where they would like to have a planting strip with over-story trees. In regard to stormwater, Ms. Anderson said, it’s addressed through the larger PUD, and they would like that verified. They need more detail on lighting. Architecture-wise, they will need more details on materials including samples. Ms. Anderson said she appreciates the simplicity of the design. She asked if they had considered vents above windows to minimize tall cornice height. The site is adjacent to the historic cemetery, so they will want appropriate screening. There are 22 trees; they will need a certified arborist’s report in regard to what needs to be done to save the trees they want to save. The arborist’s report will also make recommendations, and that will be a requirement of approval before it begins. Signs are a separate process and will need separate approval.

Cooter Ramsey said they would like to defer improvements on Greenlawn until a second building is built. The city will be doing some improvements in there, and there are a lot of unknowns. They fear anything they do will be undone. He said in regard to trees, he would like to get rid of those that will be in the pad of the future building so that they can get a tenant sooner rather than later when they see it's a building site. They are not nice trees on the site, though there's a nice live oak that will be taken care of.

Mr. Ramsey said he had looked at vents, but he'd prefer not to add decoration to it so it can remain "simple and clean." There are some things they want to improve architecturally that they haven't finally settled on now. When the time comes, they are looking at painting the brick on the front façade. They have looked at how old buildings were originally done, and they may introduce an element like that to the final approval.

Mr. Rushing said he approved the 3-dimensional picture. He agrees with the idea of a simple building with a simple façade. In regard to painting the brick, he would consider it long and hard before doing it. They mentioned screening it [parking] from the cemetery, but it would be important to screen it from the main road as well.

Mr. Dickerson said Beaufort is a Tree City USA, and if there are 22 trees on site, he doesn't agree with the clear cut concept. One area on the Greenlawn side could have two trees taken out and have a park next to the building. This way "there's no park and no feel for the area in terms of trees." Cutting them down "just for future possibilities eliminates current possibilities," Mr. Dickerson said. In regard to what's happening on Greenlawn, Mr. Dickerson said, why not set the tone rather than having it set later. He likes the building's architecture, but not the clear-cutting of trees.

Chairman Brown suggested adding the Greenlawn street improvements to their application as "future" so they can see them. The building footprint and sidewalks may change, **Jeff Ackerman** said. Chairman Brown said it's a great building, one of the better ones they have seen.

Mr. Ackerman showed the sewer lines that run through the site and said there are trees that are over them, put there 15-20 years ago. No one has maintained the right-of-way, and all of the trees will be gone, anyway, if the sewer line needs to be repaired. That's why they didn't save those trees; getting them out of the easement and then replanting the site will look better. The line is a 10-12" gravity sewer main. There's a 47" oak off their property and the Olive Garden / Red Lobster is closer to it than this building would be. Mr. Dickerson said BJWSA is putting in sewers in the Historic District with a flexible pipe, so they may not have to take down the trees to dig a 10' hole. Mr. Ackerman said that that's not the only reason, but BJWSA likes to have that easement. Slip lines can work, but given the size of the trees, that line's been there 15-20 years. Taking out one tree when it's needed for sewer repairs would be "a tough task."

Tom Patterson said that, looking at the trees' value, "none of them on the site are worth much." Only two trees, in his opinion, are worth saving. There is no really good landscape tree

with a value worth leaving it there. If the building went up, leaving the trees would actually be a detriment, Mr. Patterson said. In regard to the pines, they have lumber value with no limbs to 30-40' and are competing with a live oak on the site.

Mr. Patterson said there's a live oak near Olive Garden / Red Lobster that is worth being saved. He's tried to put some trees in the screening. **Andy Corriveau**, State Farm, said this is an insurance office, and they are spending money to try to make this building as wind resistant as they can make it. They are trying to mitigate it from exposure and debris. The pines break off 20-30' up and can fall on the top of the building. He sees the area where the trees are now as "a grassy meadow or a park like area with grass."

Mr. Rushing asked if this is one property to be purchased and developed by one person. Mr. Ramsey said yes. Mr. Corriveau said he's been talking to people about the adjacent site, but they are only preliminary plans that won't happen until they have a need. He said they have discussed moving the building because of the highway department not knowing what the city is going to do. At some point that may change, and there could be more or less. The sidewalk is short – just from their driveway to the existing sidewalk. They want to be part of whatever goes on to Greenlawn later on, Mr. Corriveau said. They intend to replicate the building they have now on the other portion of the site.

Mr. Dickerson said he understands the concern with the pines, but as far as the look and feel of the area, they will have trees instead of a clear-cut area. Mr. Corriveau said he is in favor of trees, but not pines. Other trees are much more wind-resistant, too. Mr. Dickerson said where the building is going now there are other trees, too, are not *just* pines. Mr. Corriveau said they don't want to take those other trees down. The live oaks are either on the property line or just over.

Mr. Ackerman said the Olive Garden / Red Lobster is closer to a tree of concern than this building will get. Ms. Anderson said it "may already be compromised." A discussion ensued about this among various board members, Mr. Ackerman, and Ms. Anderson. Mr. Dickerson said they have spent so much time and effort to preserve trees on other properties, and this is clear-cutting. Chairman Brown said the zoning here is different. They have to carry a 90% frontage, so the base zoning is more urban than suburban. Mr. Corriveau said the tree survey shows few trees on the other site. Most of the trees that will come out are in the parking lot or the driveway. There will be trees around the periphery that will still be there.

Mr. Ramsey said no one is yet ready to commit to what Greenlawn will be in the future. Mr. Corriveau said SCE&G proposed to drop the utility lines, and there's a huge utility pole in that corner. Because of the uncertainty and because he's anxious for it to be built, they decided the building that addresses the corner should be the second one done and will have the greatest impact. He will have his office closer to the Olive Garden / Red Lobster, and it will be done first.

Mr. Dickerson said on the undeveloped portion, there are just two trees; Mr. Ramsey said yes.

A good cherry is there, but will be between the two buildings, and it will have to be removed when the other building is built. Mr. Rushing said they are assuming the other building will be the same as this one when they know that they *don't* know what will go in there. Mr. Ramsey said Mr. Corriveau is not opposed to keeping trees; Mr. Ramsey was setting up to get the other space built by setting the tone and getting it ready by getting the trees out now. Mr. Dickerson asked if there was an arborist's report. Mr. Ramsey said, no, they don't yet have one.

Mr. Dickerson said, in regard to mass and scale, on the cemetery side, they are putting parking right up against the cemetery. He asked if they will fence it or what they will do. Chairman Brown said they could fence it. Mr. Ramsey said they don't want to respond to it the way that Olive Garden / Red Lobster did. They would address it with landscaping. Chairman Brown said as long as they hide the relative size of a car, they should be fine. The building is fine and in Beaufort character, even at its back. There are good canopy trees at the right side of the property; Mr. Ramsey said the bump out is the big live oak. In a space where there are no plantings, Mr. Patterson said they were thinking of a magnolia planting. He said they proposed three under-story trees.

Ms. Anderson said money can be put in escrow for the cost of the sidewalk and the plantings. Since the property is being developed, they can say they want that, Chairman Brown said. Mr. Ramsey said there's no issue with getting the street trees going in the right direction. They just don't want to come back and rip out the trees later and there's no plan. Ms. Anderson said it's part of the Boundary Street master plan, but they're just doing one lot, not as a block. Mr. Ramsey says the master plan shows this site as a park, not a development, so the master plan will be revised as it's developed.

Mr. Rushing asked if the width of the drive at 16' is mandatory, and Ms. Anderson said for one-way that's what the fire department likes. Mr. Rushing said it looks like a lot of pavement for that size building. Mr. Ackerman said it's 14' of asphalt with 2' of curb and gutter, and it's the normal required width for one-way access. He sees the parking at the rear for employees, mostly; most customers will probably park at Pearl Street and walk up. Mr. Ramsey said they don't exceed the parking space count. He believes they "are meeting the minimum."

Staff mentioned doing pervious surface, Mr. Ramsey said, and there's the potential that they will come back and ask the DRB to consider some pervious instead. Chairman Brown said that might help one of the trees, too.

Mr. Ackerman asked if they wanted an arborist's report on the tree that's not on their property. He feels the money would be better spent fertilizing that tree than in getting an arborist's report. Mr. Corriveau said in regard to the Greenlawn improvements, there's talk of on-street parking which would benefit the eventual building, but they can't get a straight answer from DOT.

Mr. Corriveau asked what trees they were looking for an arborists' report on. Chairman Brown

said they don't have a staff tree report yet, either. Ms. Anderson said there's a certified arborist on staff, and they could have her go look at it. If Ms. Hill said what they're doing will have no impact on the Olive Garden / Red Lobster tree in terms of construction, then fine. But she could look at the cherry, etc. Mr. Corriveau said it's just a matter of timing as to when the trees come down.

Chairman Brown made a motion to grant preliminary approval of the application with stipulations: additional language with future improvements to conform to the city's standard on Greenlawn; revisiting the landscaping and tree issues at final approval, based on new issues there. Mr. Rushing seconded the motion.

Mr. Rushing asked about the escrow account for the eventual Greenlawn improvements. He would want to see that money there and see it spent as soon as it is established what the criteria are going to be, including any over-story trees. Chairman Brown said they can add that language at the final. Mr. Ackerman said it's a small sidewalk and will be a small number. He said they could instruct them to put in a 4' sidewalk.

Mr. Dickerson said as far as the preliminary concepts, he wanted to put forward a question of what trees will go back in when the others are taken out, i.e., what will the streetscape look like as far as trees and the whole concept of landscaping? **The motion passed 2-1, Mr. Dickerson opposed.**

DISCUSSION

Mr. Dickerson said that at the first form-based code meeting, they had said everyone should show up prepared to discuss. The preliminary code is 500+ pages, but it will be cut drastically. The next meeting is October 24, 2012.

There being no further business to come before the , the meeting was adjourned at 5:36 p.m.