A meeting of the Design Review Board was held on November 8, 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.

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 2:03 p.m.

MINUTES
The minutes of the October 11, 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.**

PUBLIC HEARING
602 Linton Lane – Side Yard Setback Development Design Exception
Chairman Brown opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chairman Brown closed the public hearing.

NEW BUSINESS
602 Linton Lane – Requesting a Side Yard Setback Development Design Exception in order to build a garage with an accessory dwelling unit. (DE12-03)
Applicant: Denny's Construction, Inc.

Ms. Kelly described the application. The side setback is 12', and the applicant is requesting that one side be 7.8' from the property line. She cited staff questions. There have been no public comments to date. Ms. Kelly said that staff feels that given the compatibility with the neighborhood, this would be a compatible accessory dwelling unit.

Lloyd Denny with Denny's construction said, addressing the staff questions, that the structure was placed on the property because of an existing concrete pad there. The accessory dwelling unit will line up with the house, he said, and this design is compatible with the house. They built a house adjacent to this one, and this garage and the adjacent house are designed to be compatible.

Mr. Karlyk said the survey showed no trees on it, and he asked Mr. Denny how close the structure comes to the tree on the property in a photo. Mr. Denny said it's at least 20' away from the tree. Mr. Karlyk said the survey shows an existing deck on the side of the house, and he asked if it juts out as much as it appears to; Mr. Denny said it does. There were no other board questions or comments.

Mr. Dickerson made a motion for approval as written in the draft motion. Mr. Franklin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Dollar Tree</u> – 201 Robert Smalls Parkway, Final Review. (12-07 DRB.3)
Applicant: David R. Karlyk, Carolina Engineering Consultants, Inc.

Mr. Karlyk recused himself as he is the engineer on the project. Ms. Kelly described where the property is and said that the board gave the applicant preliminary approval with the provision that the applicant look at connectivity issues. Ms. Kelly said staff still contends that head-in parking is inappropriate, but accepts the board's decision if it determines that it is appropriate for the design district. She described the connectivity changes the applicant had made.

Ms. Kelly read staff questions in regard to the revised landscaping plan. She said evaluating the plan was a little bit difficult because the floor plan didn't match the architectural drawings. Regarding the architecture she said the vertical trim boards adjacent to the piers are wider than others and staff suggests they all be the same size. She went on to detail other staff questions. The bays seem to be different widths, too, and staff wondered why. The side and rear elevations are to be as attractive as the front elevation when they are visible on a public street. She said that they have lighting questions as well.

Liza Hill has made suggestions in the staff report about switching out plant types. Kelly said that on the southwest side of the building, adjacent to the interior property line, the number of parking spaces shouldn't exceed 12, so there should be a landscaping island in the middle. There also needs to be a terminal island adjacent to the future connection. This needs to be at least 7' wide to allow an over-story tree to be planted. Ms. Hill also wondered why they didn't expand the tree island on the southwest corner, which could be flush with the building. She also made suggestions for planters in the front, if they do that instead of a planting strip. She said that an elevation of the monument sign showing the landscaping will be required for final landscape approval.

Chairman Brown asked if there were a staff recommendation on either the site or architecture. Ms. Kelly said they want to hear discussion, so there was not at this time.

Mr. Karlyk, Carolina Engineering, addressed some of the staff comments. They increased the front planting bed by 5' and expanded the awnings on the front of the building. The ordinance requires 66.6% of the elevation have foundation planting so they couldn't fit another concrete walkway that would go underneath the awnings. They increase the size of the bed and eliminated paving. They also put a sidewalk on the side and reconfigured the sidewalks in the area to create pedestrian connectivity. They prefer not to do the tree wells, Mr. Karlyk said. They have looked at switching the sidewalk, but people would walk through the landscaping, so that's not good. He feels "Dollar Tree can live with" the changes staff suggested.

Mr. Dickerson said on the 13 contiguous spaces, there's a tree there that is to be taken out. Mr.

Karlyk said they can keep that. Mr. Dickerson asked if, where the future connector is, they are making spaces, and Mr. Karlyk said yes, they'll have two wide spaces, and then when there's connectivity, they will pave them over. Mr. Dickerson thanked Mr. Karlyk for the sidewalks. Chairman Brown asked if the lower sidewalk can be pulled back off the travel lane. Mr. Karlyk said it can be pulled off, but he hesitates to create a narrow strip of grass that might not remain that way; however, they can swing the sidewalk out to get it away from the edge of the curb.

Mr. Franklin said, on the landscape plan, the sidewall stops and doesn't continue through. Mr. Karlyk said it was a printing error. Mr. Franklin asked if the crosswalks will be painted, and Mr. Karlyk said yes. The shrubs are listed as one-gallon, Mr. Franklin said, and he asked if that's the planting material being put in. **Brad Hill**, the landscape architect, said yes. Mr. Franklin asked why they aren't doing three- or seven-gallon plants. Mr. Hill replied "budget." Mr. Karlyk said "budget is a serious issue with Dollar Tree."

Chairman Brown asked about the placement of the mechanical units for this building, which he said was not in the board's packet. **Linda Snapp** said the change to the size of the building to accommodate planting is not correct on every drawing, but it's been revised. She showed sight lines and the location of the units. From an energy standpoint, Dollar Tree likes to use skylights, she said. She showed the board the drawings as they relate to the different views. Chairman Brown said they have a sloping roof and a parapet that fluctuates a little bit. Ms. Snapp agreed. There was a general discussion about the visibility of the mechanical units from different angles. Chairman Brown suggested they provide drawings to show the view from the Robert Smalls Parkway, as it says in the ordinance that the units should not be visible at all from a public right of way. Ms. Snapp agreed she would study this and bring back revised plans at the next meeting.

Chairman Brown said the meter areas on the rear of the building should be screened. Mr. Karlyk said that might present a safety issue in regard to SCE&G. Mr. Dickerson suggest "a solution that is functional and eliminates the need for additional landscaping." This idea was to use the shuttered openings to enclose the meters within the envelope of the building. In regard to architecture, Chairman Brown suggested that "the trim work could be done in the white color." The cornice is one color traditionally. Ms. Snapp said they considered a shutter under the Dollar Tree sign but decided landscaping would be better.

Mr. Franklin said the one-gallon plant material concerns him. He has no problem with the palms. Mr. Hill said he thought "bumping up the size of the front material is a reasonable request."

Mr. Dickerson said the necessary tweaks on the site are: widening the first tree well on the northwest side; adding a tree well on the western side; providing drawings on the trash enclosure; extending the curb radius on the southwest corner of the building; moving the sidewalk off the curb on the southern side of the property; landscaping in general terms of size and some specific plantings for which the applicant can see staff comments.

In regard to architecture, Mr. Dickerson said, the primary comment is they need to fully screen the mechanical equipment from the public right-of-way; there's concern about service in the rear of the property; color schemes need to be simplified and echo the staff comments. Chairman Brown and Ms. Kelly said that they were given preliminary approval, and Chairman Brown would feel okay about giving final approval after these matters discussed today were taken care of. That adds a month the time for Dollar Tree, Mr. Dickerson said, and they need to move forward. If they gave final approval on the site plan, they can start moving forward and do the other tweaks. There are no other really big items left. To help move this forward, he would like to see the DRB do more than just ask them to come back again.

Ms. Kelly said screening along Burton Hill Road "seems pretty major." There was a discussion about the approvals they have gotten, and Mr. Karlyk said this is their third appearance before the DRB. In regard to the screening, they agreed with staff comments, and he agrees that this is a matter of tweaks, not major changes. Mr. Dickerson said the DRB doesn't have to approve landscaping. The building, parking lot and trees are done, which is the vast majority of what they were looking for. He is concerned "with holding up a project for screening." Mr. Hill said they need to get started on the building and engineering. Staff could do final approval of landscaping, Mr. Rushing suggested. Mr. Dickerson said if they use the shutter areas for wells, they will be done: the meters won't show. Chairman Brown said they might come back to the DRB and say they can't do it. All of this could have been worked out last time, he said. Chairman Brown said the site is "pretty clear," though changes may have to be made with the screening issue, and they could make a motion with that caveat.

Mr. Dickerson made a motion for final approval on the site plan, separating out the landscape plan which will be approved by staff and adding the "tweaks" that were listed earlier. Additionally, if the screening is not acceptable to staff, then the project comes back before the DRB. Mr. Rushing seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

Chairman Brown said he'd like to see the architecture again before final approval. There was a discussion about the screening. Mr. Dickerson said if they wanted to do an additional special meeting, they could do so in a week or two. Mr. Karlyk suggested that they could do it by email, but it still needs to be a public meeting. Chairman Brown described the issues that he still has; Mr. Hill said that they can't get the contract signed until everything is approved.

Ms. Kelly said she could coordinate a special meeting. Mr. Dickerson asked if the mechanicals can be relocated on the roof. Mr. Hill asked how far the screening needs to go and Chairman Brown said "the ordinance said it needs to be not visible." Ms. Snapp asked if they couldn't submit at all until this approval, and was told that was correct.

<u>Family Dollar Store</u> – 1255 Ribaut Road, Preliminary Review. (12-03 DRB.3)
Application: Premier Builders & Development Company and Ward Edwards, Inc.

Ms. Kelly said the property is wooded and undeveloped and will be subdivided into two lots. The building will be 9000 square feet. The new submission has taken into consideration many of the DRB's recommendations. A sidewalk access easement will be required. Staff had questions about making the parking spaces pervious near the drainage pond. They will require a screening detail on the dumpster and the HVAC unit. In regard to signage, the memorial side needs to be at least 10' from the right-of-way. Ms. Kelly said the wall signs seem large, and staff recommended the area to which they should be confined.

In regard to the architecture, Ms. Kelly said, they had discussed last time that the board was excited about the building changes and that the elevation reads well, but in plan it looks like a deviation of only a few inches; staff requests that they increase that deviation 4-6 feet which would help clear area near the large live oak, and would break up the massing. On the north elevation, there's a brick panel with an awning above it, likely to break up the long unarticulated façade; staff feels that better solution can be achieved. There's a small discrepancy about a door in the rear, and staff wants clarification. They also suggested various traditional Lowcountry elements, and staff wants to know if that's been studied. There are a few questions about specific lighting fixtures. In regard to landscaping, a tree is required to be planted in all terminal islands. Retaining the 17' laurel oak that was previously discussed to retain would fulfill this requirement. There were also suggestions for adding or replacing the landscaping in the planting strips along Ribaut Rd. Staff suggests 3.5' tall to screen the parking. There is also a question of the landscaping used around the stormwater basin, Ms. Kelly said. Signs are only permitted on the elevation facing the front right-of-way, according to the ordinance but this can be discussed and modified if the DRB feels it's appropriate.

Mr. Karlyk asked if they are required to have a foundation buffer. Ms. Kelly said she's not sure but will ask Ms. Hill. Ms. Kelly said the staff "would recommend the site with a few tweaks," but they would like to hear the DRB's suggestions regarding the architecture.

Ms. Kelly said that the applicant was asking for final approval, not preliminary as was stated in the staff report.

Michael Brock said one of the things he wanted to point out is that this is their third meeting, so they are looking for final approval to move the project forward. The stormwater access easement will be shown on the site development plans. They have no problem creating the pervious surfaces facing the stormwater drain with pervious paving material.

Detail on the dumpster screen is on the landscape plan, Mr. Brock said. As far as HVAC screening, it will be "a little wall tied into the building for consistency." The sign can be pushed back off the right-of-way 10'. One idea was to put it on the property line so it's a shared sign since it will be a shared development at some point.

In regard to architecture, **Bill Harris** said the paneled awning was "a holdover," and he proposed a different solution; they would rather continue the recessed panels/windows, and

they “can be treated the same as the others.” The main mass bumping out is at about 8”. To help that, they have differentiated the brick, Mr. Harris said. They have brought it down as much as they could and got about 8”, but they have done other things with height and color. In regard to the comment about the live oak in front, Mr. Brock said, **Mike Murphy**, Ms. Hill and Ms. Kelly had spoken to him. The issue is that trimming needs to happen on the tree and that will take care of the issue. The canopy won’t go into the building. Once the limb is removed, the tree will be healthier and balanced and its overall health improved with only one 9” diameter branch. At the last meeting, there was discussion about another tree on the northwest corner, a 38” laurel oak, and Mr. Murphy suggested taking it out. This will give the adjacent live oak healthier growth in the long run.

Mr. Harris described the materials and where they would go. Mr. Brock said in regard to lighting, the fixture that’s labeled “ceiling” is a shoe box light mounted on a pole and the height is 25’. Fixture “K” as discussed is a 17’ light to light the sidewalk and he indicated where it will be mounted. Mr. Brock said the lights on the exterior are accent lights, not enough to light the sidewalk. Mr. Brock said they can remove it if the sidewalk light is a deciding factor for the board. Chairman Brown said big fixtures tend to be very bright. Mr. Brock indicated where it is on the elevation. Chairman Brown said if you’re on the sidewalk, you’re looking up into it. Mr. Brock suggested taking the light out. Chairman Brown asked if there’s lighting under the canopy. Mr. Brock said, “There’s that one right there.” Mr. Brock said the palm trees won’t conflict with the lights and windows.

In regard to landscaping, there was talk of the 17” laurel oak discussed at the last meeting. There was a push to save the 22” live oak. The problem is the loading zone for the truck; they had discussed the turning radius, and that’s why they have the pervious surface there: to save the 22” live oak.

Mr. Brock said he had no problem changing the street trees from cathedral elms to the drake elms as suggested in the staff report. On the landscaping, they have shrubs on the islands, and he’s concerned about visibility. A lower shrub than the 3.5’ requirement, he thinks, would be safer. With regards to the comment about planting shrubs along the north property line to screen the parking, there are existing trees they’re saving, and putting shrubs under them creates some concern. He asked Ms. Kelly if that comment was meant for the length of all the parking spaces. Ms. Kelly said she’s not sure but would check with Liza Hill. Mr. Brock said they are trying to limit the amount they are getting into the root zone. Ideally, they would like some groupings, not necessarily a hedge row. Mr. Franklin offered his perspective on this. He agreed with keeping it low for sight reasons.

Mr. Karlyk asked Mr. Brock about the pond. Mr. Brock said they are awaiting a report to determine the capacity. Mr. Karlyk said if it serves the other parcel, this is one of the highest pieces of ground in the area, and they are setting up a situation where tree wells would be required, if that happens. Mr. Brock said he thinks it will work.

Mr. Brock said the bottle brushes have extensive roots, and they plan to spray the bottom and sides of the pond. Mr. Dickerson commented on the light in front. He said they have 4 palm trees, and they will interfere with the light. He recommended omitting it unless there's a better place to put it because it's not beneficial where it's shown. Mr. Brock said they will take it out.

A general discussion about landscaping in specific areas followed. Ms. Kelly suggested a pervious gravel tree well to serve as the terminal island adjacent to the NE corner of the building. The fence on the property line can't be touched, Mr. Brock said. They've determined that they will do a connector fence between the building and the existing fence to screen the mechanical equipment on the side of the building. Mr. Rushing said it would be good to stop pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Dickerson asked, if they expect that the trucks will roll over the area on the NE corner of the building on exiting, and Mr. Brock explained that's what they do, so they don't want landscaping there. Mr. Dickerson questioned if anyone would want that to be a parking space there, adjacent to the service area and truck turning area. Mr. Brock said they will have no conflict with cars in the early morning and late at night with the parking space, but they will always have a problem with a planting.

Chairman Brown said he likes "the idea of repeating the architectural rhythm" with the windows along the parking lot elevation. The CMU isn't an acceptable material. Mr. Harris said they have gone to a larger brick now, and it's 16 x 18. Chairman Brown said the same thing for the dumpster enclosure; it will need to be the same style.

Mr. Harris said the sign could absolutely shrink a little bit, but that they would like signage on Ribaut Rd elevation as well as the parking lot. Ms. Kelly said it's not guaranteed to happen, but needed approval either from the board or staff. There was general staff agreement that the signs on two sides worked. The board agreed as well.

There followed general conversation about architecture as it related to an element near the end of the building. Mr. Harris said the door isn't going to be there, and they are "eliminating that whole part."

Chairman Brown asked about the window glazing. Mr. Harris said light will come in, but some will be black while others will have full glazing and can be seen through. Chairman Brown said this doesn't meet the intent of what's in the architecture part of the ordinance. Mr. Harris said a plantation shutter was a possibility. They could look at how they're treated on the inside as a typical window, Mr. Harris said.

Chairman Brown listed the necessary "tweaks": on the site, the change to eight parking spots adjacent to stormwater to go to pervious; a connector fence screening the building services and HVAC that would be a 5' tall board on board wooden fence and then some resolution on the end of the parking aisle on the northeastern corner; the two planting beds closest to Ribaut

Road to increase height of plantings to about 3'. For the building, remove the split-face CMU block and go to a large material and also on the dumpster screening; eliminate the bracketed canopy on the parking lot elevation and stay with windows; eliminating the "K" light fixture on the southern face of the front elevation; and changing all glazing to be clear; the board agrees with building signage on both elevations.

Mr. Franklin made a motion to give Final approval based on Chairman Brown's comments, seconded by Mr. Rushing. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Lady's Island Publix</u> – 2 Inlet Road, Conceptual Review. (12-06 DRB.3)
Applicant: Andrews & Burgess, Inc.

Ms. Kelly said the applicant proposes a 54,000 square foot grocery store with two liner shops. They were given conceptual approval of the site at the last meeting with six conditions, which she read from the staff report. The applicant's traffic engineer has submitted a revised TIA that will be reviewed the following day. The last four conditions have been met, and "the first two may still need some refinement." Ms. Kelly said in regard to access, they have discussed it with the applicant as to why there is no angled parking. Also parking is not shown on the portion of the frontage road between Ferry Road and the liner shops.

Ms. Kelly said staff suggests maintaining the tree wells adjacent to the road rather than moving them back from the road. Staff wants to know if they have explored other options than the right in - right out. They want to know if it's possible to extend the sidewalk on the western side of the site, along Gray's storage units, to the rear east-west road. The north west intersection between the frontage road and the east-west road is now a T-intersection, so this has been addressed. The area at the northwest corner of the building has been modified. They want to know the impetus for the modifications that include an additional right turn lane. They also want to discuss the retention pond as an amenity.

Ms. Kelly said in regard to the building configuration, the liner building should wrap around the side, but the elevation shows a wall wrapping the corner. Staff made some suggestions in the staff report regarding this. In regard to parking, pervious parking should be denoted on the plan. In regard to sidewalks, all street frontages must have one unless the DRB waives this. Staff made some suggestions regarding this. The continuation of the sidewalk along the stormwater pond stops abruptly. Staff suggests that it either continue along Ferry Road to Inlet or turn west to Lady's Island Drive.

In regard to architecture, Ms. Kelly said an updated elevation has been received, and staff has been talking to the applicant, but many comments are still applicable, i.e., proportion (it was suggested to add more bays) and also of the entry form. On the revised elevations, some piers were added to the left part of the building which works to elevate the façade. It was suggested wood be the default material, but most of the sides and rear of the building are constructed in block for cost reasons.

In regard to landscaping, the staff questioned if the rear of the building will be screened with a fence, Ms. Kelly said. The elevation should be revised to show the tree wells and sidewalk continuing down Ferry Road. There are places where they need planting; staff recommends tree planting along Lady's Island Drive. There are comments on specific trees, and some of the plan might show what has been discussed. In regard to signs, staff has been in touch with the architect and a separate application is required, but the location of any free-standing sign should be shown on the site and landscaping plans.

Ms. Kelly said staff didn't make a recommendation for the architecture or the site plan, but she thinks they would approve site with a few tweaks and would like the DRB's comments on architecture.

Dave Mattson began with the conditions of approval last time. They have an alternative plan with a driveway on Ferry Rd. to get trucks in, which he showed the board. He said they'd still need rear access to the dumpster and for a fire truck to get in. Ms. Kelly said they didn't specify removing that rear access. Mr. Mattson said he can make that happen, but he would "rather not cut down trees and open up the view category."

Mr. Dickerson commented about a "natural exit" which would save most of the trees. Mr. Mattson said when a truck is coming in it is fine, but going out, they need a wider radius than that would allow. Chairman Brown said the ordinance says the pond should be an amenity, but a conflicting part of the ordinance says they need to do screening to the service area of the building, which makes it not an amenity. The bad part of the building is exposed as-is. They were making suggestions to mitigate this problem. Mr. Mattson said an option would be shrubs that grow 10' tall, and that will screen it completely.

Wallace Milling said they want to "take some of the screening material and beef it up on the edge and let this be a front door" – not as much a buffer. They want to leave the trees but clear up underbrush and make it nice and park-like. The sidewalk could lead to a picnic table area. The trees in a rhythm do away with "that." Chairman Brown said if they do that, they need to pay close attention to plant selection.

There was general conversation about the equipment that is there; the coastal stores are designed to withstand severe weather and stay fully operational. Mr. Mattson indicated the latest screening plans on a revised elevation.

Rick Maxian showed ideas that they had had to soften the building; they might have a brick water table and go back to wood siding, he said. Mr. Maxian said the generator can't be moved; Chairman Brown said "the two uses are in conflict." Mr. Milling said if there were a fig vine on the wall, they could use that "to create architecture with trimming." Mr. Mattson said they can look at doing something with that wall. Chairman Brown said there's still a disconnect for him putting services on the main entry. Mr. Mattson said even if were moved, it would still expose

another side of the wall. Chairman Brown said they're putting shop fronts there but also a diesel generator and brick screening of it.

A general discussion of possible solutions ensued. Mr. Franklin said they are not asking for specific changes so much as they are asking them to articulate the end of the building which is blanker than the other side, which is superior. Ms. Kelly said they "are looking for simpler and more integrity in material choice." Chairman Brown said it's an improvement at this version, and it's quieted down, which he likes. Chairman Brown said they could keep it simple, but let the forms articulate a little differently from each other. If it's broken up, they achieve their goal. Mr. Maxian said it makes sense to leave the brick water table and use a different color. The cornice could have a different feel, too, and be simpler. Chairman Brown said if the cornice is one color, which would help.

Mr. Maxian said they took the front arch away at the main entry, and it keeps it cleaner. Mr. Maxian said it's still top-heavy, and he'd still like to have the brick down low. He said one submittal shows a second panel which breaks it up. The transition between the brick and the siding is hard right now, and this could aid in that transition. The Publix corporate architect, **David Rubin**, said they can't have ledges because birds will rest on them. The height needs to be 11' and no more, because of the need to pressure wash.

Chairman Brown indicated some painted block which is not permitted in the ordinance. Mr. Mattson said "the Publix guys don't want to spend all their money on the back of the building"; they will screen back there, etc., but they don't have the budget for wood siding. Mr. Maxian said they could put a stucco finish on there. Mr. Rubin described the "flat, plain, smooth penthouse" for equipment storage. There are rooftop units, but the parapet doesn't make them visible. He said it's a "pretty clean roof." Mr. Brown said they needed a roof plan locating the fixtures.

Mr. Maxian asked about the colors, and a discussion ensued about the building's façade. Mr. Maxian said they needed to show more detailed site sections.

In regard to cornices, Chairman Brown recommended something other than stucco or EIFS, such as Hardie board.

In regard to the site plan, Mr. Mattson offered two possibilities for sidewalks in response to Mr. Dickerson's concern about the safety of "moms with strollers." His other concern was the underground stormwater storage that goes "right through these trees." Mr. Mattson suggested they could go around it. There's a pond there now.

Mr. Franklin suggested they could add a small planting island near the drive through. He also said that the trees would be very small, and if some of them had height variation, it would help. Mr. Mattson said he thought they were required to have some bigger caliper trees, too. Mr. Franklin compared a 2.5" vs. a 4" caliper tree; it's not a big jump in cost, but will allow a little

more height variation.

Chairman Brown said connecting the sidewalks, as per the staff report, is important, and he appreciates them doing it. Chairman Brown said they've gone a long way toward getting street connectivity. Chairman Brown said there's a lot of infrastructure in one area, where the additional right turns were located along Inlet R., and asked if they needed all of it. Mr. Mattson said the area is for the trucks, and in addition to the stripe, he could pave it in a different material. Chairman Brown suggested losing the sidewalk and maybe moving it to the other side. It might make it connect. The point is not to have it right next to the road, he said.

Mr. Maxian said they had discussed transoms above the openings, but as a coastal store, they want to eliminate glass and so he asked about putting a shutter on it to pull the height up. Chairman Brown said that sounded fine to him.

There was discussion of differentiating the car lane from the truck lanes. They moved to a discussion of saving trees on the property. In regard to street planting on Lady's Island Drive, Mr. Mattson asked for clarification of what staff wanted. Mr. Milling said they were trying to create a streetscape. Ms. Kelly said she would obtain clarification.

Issues in regard to the site: Conflict between amenity and screen with regards to landscaping; change to the parallel parking in front of the shop; the comments about street trees down the frontage road; staff comments regarding tree wells in the parking lot; continuing the sidewalk along Inlet Road and maybe studying it to get it on the west side of the road; the underground detention conflicts with some of the trees; final connection behind existing gas station with a 3' minimum sidewalk; straightening out truck access by cleaning up the motion of the trucks.

Chairman Brown made a motion for preliminary approval of the site plan with these 8 points; Mr. Franklin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Maxian said Publix needs some kind of approval to close on the land. **Chairman Brown made a motion for conceptual approval for the building "as discussed up to this point with many significant studies in regard to form, articulation of the mass, detailing, materials and colors." Mr. Franklin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

<u>Parker's Convenience Store/Gas Station</u>, 12 County Shed Road.
Application: Thomas & Hutton for The Parker Companies, Conceptual Review.
(12-04 DRB.2)

Ms. Kelly said the property is vacant and the owner wants to subdivide it and put a gas station on it. The DRB was given the application in July and the applicant was given many suggestions. The TIA will be looked at the following day. Coordination between SCDOT, Beaufort County, the PATH Foundation, Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer, and the City will be required for the new road onto Highway 21. Staff appreciates the master plan and made suggestions for that plan

such as building placement, location of the pump station, etc. They want to know if the option of a concrete median was explored. A new road is proposed to connect Highway 21 and County Shed Road; it's not a sure thing the city will take it over, Ms. Kelly said. The applicant came to the Technical Review Committee and many things were discussed. There's currently a lack of differentiation of the Street; staff feels it should be clearly defined as a street, and they made a suggestion as to how to do that. Other options can be explored as well. Also, a stop bar is currently at the north-south portion, but not at the east-west access, so traffic is encouraged to go into the gas station as opposed to along the trajectory of the actually road.

Ms. Kelly said the Rail Trail may be able to serve as a sidewalk on the north side. It may, though, not be directly adjacent to the property. The sidewalk on County Shed Road should be pulled north to the property line. The Rail Trail path is not yet set in stone, and the intersection with the Rail Trail and the new road needs refinement and consensus between the PATH Foundation, the county, SCDOT and the city.

In regard to stormwater, pump station and a stormwater pond and infiltration – staff asked if they had considered a pump station location internal to the site. Also Ms. Kelly said that four of the parking spots shown must have pervious paving.

In regard to parking spaces, all spaces over the minimum should be shown as pervious, Ms. Kelly said. The dumpster should be in a concealed location internal to the site and screened. The building has been moved closer to the corner of the site, but the landscaping plan doesn't address this. They need to see plan for mechanical equipment, Ms. Kelly said. There is no drive-through, so that should be taken out of the project description. There was discussion of more Lowcountry vernacular at their last meeting, she said, and the applicant was shown photos. Most of the Bluffton stores aren't reminiscent of the Lowcountry, and next time, the rendering should show Lowcountry elements. There's also a part of the ordinance about unarticulated long facades and the elevation along Parris Island Gateway is unarticulated, Ms. Kelly said. Staff suggests additional detailing with canopies, etc. to make it more pedestrian-oriented. Gas canopies with pitched roofs are strongly suggested.

In regard to landscaping, the applicant needs to show what's saved and what's new. There are plan groupings on Highway 21; staff suggests modifying the landscape plan to be overlaid on a tree survey.

In regard to signs, Ms. Kelly said that staff has discussed this with the applicant. The sign in the median at New Road and Highway 21 will have to be approved by the county as it is in the Rail Trail easement. Ms. Kelly said there are no recommendations from staff at this time.

Chairman Brown asked for an update from the applicant. **Kevin Smith** said Parker's will subdivide four acres. The use of the remainder of the property on the master plan is unknown at this time. Stormwater-wise, they have to meet the ordinance, and they will have to use the county's adopted BMPs to infiltrate and manage the volume. Mr. Smith said there are a lot of

public right-of-ways, but they are concerned that the use of the remaining property is unknown. They have a full access intersection on Highway 21. There will be a right in - right out on Parris Island Gateway. Regarding the concrete island in the middle, Mr. Smith said, the road is two lanes heading south and three lanes heading north, so there's no room for a median without tearing up that whole stretch of road. They can put in a "no left turn" sign, according to the DOT, and that's what they would like to do. The drive-through is removed, Mr. Smith said. Maximum impervious area is 64%, and the stormwater system was designed for that at build out, he said.

In regard to the road sections, the Office of Civic Investment has recommended on-street parking. The applicant wonders if it's necessary, Mr. Smith said, and wondered if they could build one section and then the other when there's further development. Mr. Smith said sidewalk and street trees will off-set that. It's tough to pin down right now since they don't know what will go in there. Chairman Brown asked if they haven't yet finalized the street section they want the city to take over, and Mr. Smith said they had. Ms. Kelly said the city wants parallel parking on both sides, with sidewalks and street trees. The goal is to create a place so that "people coming in know what kind of place it is," a little more walkable. Mr. Smith said in regard to the Rail Trail that they went 40' back, and that will cover stacking for most vehicles except semi-trucks. They have tried to optimize that as much as possible.

Mr. Smith said the pump station location is on a corner, but they "have a lot of corners." It's an ideal location for serving this parcel. Mr. Smith said where it is is the most cost-effective place. The stormwater needs more discussion, Mr. Smith said. Groundwater's 18' below the surface, he said. They're assuming 64% impervious surface.

Mr. Smith said in regard to the trajectory of the street, they think they should have a 3-way stop with a pedestrian crossing. The public streets will have sidewalks and trees, etc., and he suggested what they can do with their internal streets; too many turns will be "problematic for business." Mr. Dickerson asked the depth of the right turn lane [onto Parris Island Gateway] and if they were being forced to locate their road west because of that, and Mr. Smith said yes.

Mr. Smith said in regard to the dumpster, they need to talk about how to get around it. It's a 350' walk to carry garbage to the dumpster if they internalize it. They are hoping to offer additional vegetative screening. In regard to lighting, the plan was submitted, and Ms. Kelly said they have gotten it. Mr. Brock shared what he had discussed with Ms. Hill about landscaping: they discussed species and street trees. They have since talked about the location of sidewalks and the street trees to go there.

Ms. Kelly said in regard to signs, they need to talk about them to obtain more detail.

Mr. Franklin said that in regard to the site, his main concern is that the road dead ends into a parking lot. If they're going to set a tone for the gateway into the city, there's no differentiation between the street and the parking lot. It can be a drive aisle, not a dead end to the street. Mr.

Franklin suggested a possibility of moving the access to the gas station further south; he's concerned that there's an interconnected point for all for entrances, but "the street needs to be articulated as a street." Doing this will set the tone. Chairman Brown said if they have on-street parking there, it will be an amenity for future businesses and people also could park there and then ride a bike on the Rail Trail.

Chairman Brown said that the DRB wants to make sure that the decisions occur so that they can happen "when it's sensible for them to occur." Mr. Franklin said he's not sold on the location for the trash truck entrance, and he doesn't think it's the best use of the space. They don't want the dumpster to be the centerpiece of the rest of the development.

Chairman Brown said they are putting services on the perimeter but have a lot of internal space they could use. Mr. Franklin said the alley is for parking and future services. Discussion continued on parking and the location of the dumpster.

Mr. Karlyk asked why they put the pump station centrally. Mr. Smith said it was more cost-effective for Parker's. He said BJWSA has asked the same question. Mr. Karlyk said he has the same concerns as Mr. Franklin did about parking. Chairman Brown reiterated that the big thing is setting up the street right and differentiating it from the other. He also addressed the dumpster issue and said the DRB has to consider "all of the frontages." Chairman Brown referred to the gas station design guidelines; the gas station has to do something if it's on the corner in terms of an amenity. He feels this "seems to have gone away." One of the site developers said the Rail Trail people have differing ideas than Parker's does. There's a high bluff which is ideal for the height of the bike path. The Rail Trail people have moved the access several times, he said, and Parkers has offered those cash; they can do it either way. Chairman Brown read from the ordinance that "they must provide significant architecture or landscape features to enhance the public realm."

There was discussion of the value of making it easy for people to leave the Rail Trail and go to Parker's to get a drink, etc.

In regard to architecture, the architect **Bob Potincy** showed the current Parker's prototype. They've moved away from the Lowcountry look of "years ago," he said. There are materials in the plans that feed into blending with a variety of architecture styles. In the build out, Mr. Potincy said, if there are big box stores, they won't blend with a Lowcountry Parker's, he feels. One of the site developers said they see this Parker's "in an urban context to create that sort of environment." The glass and brick gives it "a new urban look", he said, and makes upkeep easier. Chairman Brown said the prototype was discussed last time. The gateway it's on is not that developed. As a DRB, they are trying to default to a more Lowcountry look. There's an effort to get away from "more generic architecture." The developer said they see themselves as more like the shopping center that is at the next red light after Parker's [the Crossings of Beaufort]. This building is a minimal maintenance-type building and will be more enduring.

Mr. Franklin said they want to make the property more pedestrian, and the style of building that they want to build "is asphalt and cars." The board wants a more pedestrian atmosphere. He said he doesn't have a problem with the material as much as with the *shape* of the architecture. Parker's needs to determine how to fit their brand in with the Beaufort brand that the DRB supports. A porch on a prominent corner, Mr. Franklin said, would make it more pedestrian. There was a general discussion about a Bluffton store's architecture as opposed to the prototype. Mr. Franklin said they need to have "a functioning, viable business, but the community would better receive something that's less generic and vehicularly-oriented." **John Binder** insisted repeatedly that Mr. Parker would not go back to architecture that has been used at the stores in the past.

Chairman Brown said there are multiple problems in terms of what the ordinance says about an unarticulated side, the dumpster location, etc. They can't plug in their prototype and meet the provisions of the ordinance. Mr. Potincy said they can articulate it, but there are limitations. Mr. Franklin said the DRB will push for them to articulate two sides on that corner. There was a discussion about the way the building is turned. Mr. Potincy said they do feel like they are meeting the design intent. They met with Office of Civic Investment, too, and now they "are getting mixed signals." Chairman Brown said the site plan is in conflict with the architecture. Chairman Brown referred to some things from the staff report as "certain elements that they can try."

Ms. Kelly suggested that when they look at the more Lowcountry version, the landscaping and entryway has a much softer feel and the landscaping plan is lush, so the rendering doesn't reflect the location. Mr. Potincy said that's not adapted for individual locations.

The back/front issue is a big one, Chairman Brown said, and however they want to do it is up to them, i.e., porches; cast stone is not inherent here in the Lowcountry, but brick might work; CMUs can't be done; the wood detailing is the easier route. Mr. Dickerson said also that he would also add that when they discussed the Rail Trail matter, they had a 2-sided store concept. It might be an opportunity to take the prototype away from the standard box, extend it out, and make it more interesting. The street side can be more bike-oriented and have a pump side that's more car- oriented. Mr. Potincy said they thought about the double entrance used in another store, and it presents a number of operational issues. He agreed that they will try to add Lowcountry elements and join them into the more formal building.

Mr. Rushing said it sounds like they have been down this road before with a Skidaway store, and Mr. Potincy said yes.

No Motion was made on this project.

DISCUSSION: FORM-BASED CODE

The discussion was tabled due to time.

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:04 p.m.