

A meeting of the **Design Review Board was held on December 13, 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 2:00 p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of the November 8, 2012 meeting were presented to the board for review. **Mr. Dickerson made a motion, second by Mr. Franklin, to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.**

The minutes of the November 30, 2012 special meeting were presented to the board for review. **Mr. Karlyk made a motion, second by Mr. Dickerson, to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.**

Lady's Island Publix – 2 Inlet Road, Final Review. (12-06 DRB.4)

Applicant: Andrews & Burgess, Inc.

Ms. Kelly went through the staff report. This is the fourth time the DRB has heard this application, she said. The applicant is proposing new construction of a grocery store and two liner shops. The site plan portion was given preliminary approval with provisions, and the architecture was given conceptual approval "with significant studies to be done in regard to form, mass, detailing, materials, and colors." The revised Traffic Impact Analysis has been reviewed by the Technical Committee and SCDOT. Staff feels five conditions have been addressed, one mostly addressed, and one needs the input of the DRB.

For condition #5, regarding the sidewalk on the west side of the plan on Inlet Road, Ms. Kelly said staff suggested that it be moved adjacent to the property line to allow tree plantings and a buffer. In regard to condition #8, cleaning up truck access in the back, staff wondered what the material in stripes is and wants to know if it could be colored stamped asphalt and raised slightly.

In regard to the right-in / right-out along Lady's Island Drive, the applicant is in discussions with SCDOT, and they have been discouraged from doing this. It may be helpful for the DRB to know if the right-in / right-out is to be allowed for certain because it will have an impact on the site plan. There's a question about the location of impervious pavement, and one about a door and awning shown as being on the right side of the parking lot elevation. The landscaping plan shows a tree there and no door access. Staff suggests that the drawings be coordinated to show

that being accessed, Ms. Kelly said.

On the matter of a screen vs. an amenity, staff feels the landscaping and vegetative screening is generally a good solution. **Liza Hill** had questions about size and some species.

All pervious parking areas must be shown on the site plan. Staff wanted to know the percentage of pervious surface, and a bike rack needs to be shown on the site plan. There are other screening issues as well, Ms. Kelly said.

In regard to architecture, the on the front (at Lady's Island / Frontage Road), which is screening the big generator on the front elevation, staff has questions about how to hide it and make it seem like the front elevation. Staff feels this is an improvement, and wanted to know if the trellis idea had been explored. If the false shop front is preferred, the service door should also be covered by the awning and the wall made of one material, but Ms. Kelly thinks it's moving in a better direction than it was.

In regard to the articulation of the front building form as it turned the corner to Lady's Island Drive, Ms. Kelly said it's been given more mass, and staff suggests it be matched on the opposite elevation. There are a couple of other small detail comments for the applicant to discuss. On the drive-through side, they had discussed having a more formal feeling, and the applicant has addressed that with some piers; staff suggests adding two more piers to complete the bay system on that side.

A lighting plan is required, Ms. Kelly said, and it was received only recently. Staff hasn't yet looked at it or distributed it to the board. Ms. Hill made some specific comments on landscaping, and the applicant talked about them with her.

Staff had concerns about the screening; in the rear elevation, it can't be an unarticulated facade that is visible from the street. Though some modifications have been done to the corner, it's very visible from the right-in / right-out access point. They also want to make sure the screening at the back of the pond really is a screen because of the height of the building. This is in the ordinance, Ms. Kelly said. Staff is working with the applicant in regard to signs, and they received some ideas in the last couple of days, but Ms. Kelly said "they are going in the right direction."

Mr. Karlyk asked if they had submitted everything required for final approval. He said he didn't see pavement elevations. Ms. Kelly said some material articulation needs to be done and submitted, and the lighting pan has to be looked over. Chairman Brown said the final engineering and grading needs to be submitted, and Mr. Karlyk detailed what is missing. Mr. Dickerson said the November 9 letter from **Mark Nesbitt** at SCDOT had a concern about the driveway on Lady's Island Drive due to the close proximity to Ferry Drive and the right turn lane at the intersection of Lady's Island and Sea Island Parkway.

Mr. Dickerson asked if the applicant has dealt with not having right-in / right-out. Ms. Kelly said she's not sure; she knows that the applicant has had a number of meetings with SCDOT, and they are creating alternatives while they wait for a final decision. The applicant and the City of Beaufort are asking for a final ruling, and have told them it affects the site plan, Ms. Kelly said. Chairman Brown clarified that SCDOT said that they don't agree, and Ms. Kelly said yes. Chairman Brown asked what the county said. Ms. Kelly said the county concurred with the DOT, and the city does as well. Ms. Kelly concluded that nothing concrete is known.

Chairman Brown said some of the plants are too small to screen the mass of the building. Ms. Kelly said yes, and some are not substantial enough to provide complete screening. Chairman Brown said most of the rear elevation being unarticulated in the ordinance goes along with that. They could allow that with "some bullet-proof screening," but the unarticulated façade is an ordinance issue.

On Inlet Road, Chairman Brown said, staff made a point about the sidewalk being moved to one side or the other. Ms. Kelly explained what the applicant did, which was bringing it through the site which is fine, but on Ferry Drive, it needs to run along the property line. Chairman Brown said he knows they need final grading and engineering, but asked if there is a staff recommendation. Ms. Kelly said there are a few things unresolved that the DRB needs to address, and she doesn't think there's "a concrete recommendation."

Dave Mattson said he met with **Libby Anderson** and Mr. Nesbitt at SCDOT, but he hasn't heard anything definitive from SCDOT. If they don't get the right-in / right-out, the applicant "will walk on the \$10 million project," he said, so they are assuming they will get it. He had asked Mr. Nesbitt "if the driveway going away will help." Mr. Mattson said the access road [connecting down to Ferry Road] is "opening up a can of worms."

Mr. Mattson said in regard to the site plan condition #5, staff's suggestion of moving the sidewalk on Ferry Road is something they can do. The striped material, he said, can be a stamped brick concrete in red, and they could do it in the other space as well. He doesn't want it raised too much, but it will be clear where cars should go. Mr. Mattson said the impervious pavement ratio is at 65%, and they "are going back and forth with Publix on where to put the impervious concrete." They meet the ordinance with that. The shop front door matter will be fixed by making an island a little smaller so that the sidewalk will go to the front door.

Mr. Mattson said none of those landscaping issues are a problem. In regard to screening, they are changing out trees and plants, having talked to Ms. Hill. They have pictures that will show the kind of coverage that will be attained. They are making more parking spaces pervious than is required. There was a discussion of the size of the trees they will use, and they will create "a substantial screen," **Wallace Milling**, the landscaping architect said. They are using wax myrtles and replacing the palms with magnolias. They don't know what the street trees will be, but they will have five magnolias and at least 10' tall wax myrtles.

Chairman Brown said 10' on the back elevation is not that high. Mr. Mattson said the magnolias will screen above that on the back elevation. Mr. Dickerson asked if the street side trees were existing, and the Mr. Milling said some are existing and some are proposed, and they will probably add an evergreen there as well. Mr. Mattson said he thinks the trees will do a better job than a green wall would.

Mr. Dickerson asked the height of the trucks coming in, and Mr. Mattson said probably 12' high. Mr. Dickerson said at 10' it will screen 80% of the trucks. They have multiple layers of vegetation, a lake, and other things going on, so that draws the eye away from an unarticulated back wall. Mr. Franklin said 10' is a good-sized plant.

Chairman Brown indicated his concerns about the screening to **Rick Maxian**, the project's architect. Mr. Maxian said they would stucco over the panels. He said they have a roof plan, and he offered to draw it on the elevation to show Chairman Brown. They are there, Mr. Maxian said, "but they're pretty far up on the roof." Chairman Brown said he's had an issue with "showing everyone who comes to the store your worst stuff." They've taken care of it some, but there's still an issue, and Mr. Maxian said he didn't know how to screen it. Chairman Brown made a suggestion "to give it depth and character ... so the customer will only see the top of the entablature coming around." Chairman Brown said they are fine with what's happening on the roof, but the same condition on the one side now is on the other. Mr. Maxian said he would go back to Publix on that. There was a general discussion among the applicant's representatives and the board about the building's roof, wrapping, and proportions using the elevations.

Mr. Franklin asked about the plantings on the wall, which are fig ivy now, and he asked how it would look with the windows and work maintenance-wise. Mr. Maxian said his intent was to keep the ivy in a place and let it grow up the brick wall; the problem is probably that he "didn't get the information to the elevation-maker fast enough."

Mr. Karlyk said they have a lot of viburnums, and he's concerned that they will block cars in 3-7 years and what the maintenance will be like. They can typically be between 6-10' tall at maturity. He suggested that they might want to switch it out. Mr. Milling said that they can look at shrub requirements.

Mr. Mattson asked if the board was okay with the dumpster as it is. He reviewed the plans for a brick wall for the small dumpster for the shops. Ms. Kelly said the dumpster needs to be screened on all sides.

Mr. Dickerson said the right-in / right-out is the only issue outstanding. Chairman Brown said other than seeing it come back, that's the only unresolved issue. Chairman Brown said they gave concept approval on the architecture, and they could move the building to preliminary approval with comments to "advance them along," so that when they solve their issues, they can come back and get a final next time. The applicants are missing engineering, Chairman

Brown said, and Mr. Dickerson said they need to know if SCDOT comes around on the matter of the right-in / right-out.

Mr. Mattson said the driveway to Ferry Road is still causing a problem. They can build it in the future, he said, if they need it for other businesses. It would provide prime screening from Lady's Island Drive to the back of the building. "It's really snowballing on us," Mr. Mattson said.

Ms. Kelly said, going back to the siting of the building and shops, they introduced the frontage road to help them meet the build-to requirement, but it's not really a road if it stops at a right-in / right-out, and that's why it was crucial - to meet the ordinance - and have that extend all the way down to Ferry Drive. She said she doesn't know if it would meet the ordinance, and in her opinion it wouldn't, if it stops. Mr. Mattson asked if they would have to get a variance and whose issue it was. He also asked if it was "open to interpretation." Chairman Brown said they generally can't work around an ordinance. Ms. Kelly said, in her opinion, staff has interpreted it. Chairman Brown said when they first came in, what was important to the DRB was the connectivity. He has felt "the orientations are a bit off," but the connections they have made may have made up for some of that in the short-term. Mr. Mattson said asked if think that they really need the connection, and Chairman Brown said yes. They had stressed that connectivity was important to the DRB in terms of the macro-level plans for the area and connectivity. The applicant has done a great job of that and "mitigated some of the less than ideal things."

David Tedder said he wonders who's going to make that decision. He thinks the DRB "could decide that Inlet Road is the same as this road." Chairman Brown said staff feels it's an ordinance issue, and the DRB can't override an ordinance. Mr. Tedder said he'd "like to see in the ordinance" the section that says "that isn't a road without that, according to the Village Center." Ms. Kelly said it would be the setbacks in the Lady's Island Village Center. Typically they would have the building on the street. Mr. Tedder said "we're creating a Street that has an access point off of 278 that we're wrapping around ... all the way through." If DOT doesn't want them to have an encroachment onto Ferry Road, Mr. Tedder continued, they can't get one and have the right-in / right-out. He asked who was making the determination about "whether this counts as a road or set-back." Chairman Brown said this is how the projects come in; "that's been the foundation and assumption." He has let other things go because they were getting what they wanted. A different street arrangement changes the equation. He suggested Mr. Tedder ask Ms. Anderson who the decision-maker would be. Mr. Tedder asked, if staff determines that without the connector it still satisfies the set-back requirements as being a liner road, do they have to come back to DRB or is that a staff decision?

Mr. Mattson said that when he agreed to do it, he was reluctant because he "can't lose that driveway." Ms. Kelly suggested waiting for the DOT decision. She feels the DRB and staff have been helping, and to discuss that road "would be another compromise on that compromise." Mr. Dickerson said it hinges on DOT's decision. If they say "No, you can't have it," there's nothing the DRB can do about it.

Mr. Tedder said, "What if they say, 'you can't have it if you keep the other; if you get rid of that, than you can have it.'" Mr. Dickerson said that if SCDOT says "You can have right-in / right-out, but that road has to go away," the DRB can't do anything. The applicant is also hearing from the city that it wants that connectivity, but if SCDOT says no, it can't be overridden. Ms. Kelly said if SCDOT says, "You can have this if you get rid of that," it changes the orientation of the building and how it fronts the road, so they have to make sure that the ordinance is being met. Mr. Mattson said the original plan was to put shops in and create a liner road, and that was the staff's original decision.

Mr. Franklin said "it went from a travel aisle in a parking lot to more of a streetscape." The DRB feels that "all the way up and around, it's become more of a road than a travel lane in a parking lot." The board can respond to it when DOT makes a decision.

Mr. Mattson said Ms. Hill suggested some changes: to screen the parking lot, they will add bigger over-story oaks. They will keep some of the palms. Chairman Brown said if there's supposed to be infill later, they might not want to have to move a 20-year-old live oak in 20 years. Ms. Kelly said she can talk it through with Liza and get some clarification, especially in the area Chairman Brown referred to. Mr. Mattson said he'd told Ms. Hill that DOT wanted "a consistent uniform road feel." Mr. Milling said over-story trees will screen the back of the building. He indicated where the canopy trees will be.

Chairman Brown said Dollar Tree had a similar cornice, and the board asked for it to be in all white, and "it looked a lot better." Mr. Maxian said he likes the darker color for anchoring, and Ms. Kelly said it was all one color, and she would send it to Mr. Maxian. Mr. Dickerson said it's more about consistency than color selection.

Ms. Anderson said in regard to the DOT's approval of the right-in / right-out access, if they are comfortable with the site plan, they should approve it. If the applicant doesn't get right-in / right-out approval, they will come back, and if DOT approves it with a slight modification, staff will decide if it needs to come back to the board. Staff can review the changes, but they "want to keep things moving along."

Mr. Dickerson said he's all for moving it forward, and Mr. Karlyk said he has no problem with staff review of the remaining items. Mr. Franklin agreed.

Chairman Brown made a motion for final approval of the site: with adjustment of the sidewalk along Ferry Drive closer to the lot line; adjustment of the vehicular striping along Inlet Drive to a type of stamped brick or different material; and drainage and grading engineering. On the landscaping as part of the site, the applicant must make minor adjustments per staff. For final approval on architecture: on the front elevation, the DRB suggests a uniform color along the cornice and entablature; suggests staff review of modification of the entry way in regard to the panel proportions; for the drive-through elevation side, to wrap the parking side elevation around the corner, and to remove one of

the pilasters, and simplify for staff approval of the final elevation. For the rear elevation, turn the corner facing Sea Island Parkway in a similar manner to how they treated the opposite corner at a dimension to be approved by staff; and the brick screening around the compacter. Mr. Karlyk seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Parker's Convenience Store/Gas Station – 12 County Shed Road, Final Review.

(12-04 DRB.3)

Applicant: Thomas & Hutton for The Parker Companies, Final Review.

Ms. Kelly reviewed the staff report. She said this is the third submittal to the DRB. At the August 9 and November 14 meetings, the applicant was given a number of suggestions in regard to the site plan and architecture, but there have been no motions made by the DRB. The applicant met with the mayor and city manager for more suggestions to improve the submission. In regard to access and master planning, all the comments still apply "because not much has changed since the previous submittal." The new road has changed a little bit and parallel parking, sidewalks, and street trees have been added. Staff suggests that staff and the applicant coordinate details with the Public Works department to meet with what the city would like it to look like.

In regard to the sidewalk and the Rail Trail, Ms. Kelly said the sidewalk that turns west should be turned north to the property line to allow for a planting strip between the sidewalk and the edge of the pavement, so they don't see the sidewalk directly adjacent to the pavement.

The stormwater and drainage hasn't changed since the last time the applicant appeared before the DRB, Ms. Kelly said. The parking requirements have been met. More pervious parking spaces were added. The dumpster was discussed at the last meeting. Ms. Kelly read from the ordinance in regard to the purpose of the design district. City staff doesn't feel the current location of the dumpster in the front of the building meets these standards.

According to site design standard #7, Ms. Kelly said, they should provide significant architectural or landscape features at the corner on corner sites to address the public realm and enhance the streetscape.

Ms. Kelly said there have been many suggestions given about how to address that corner, including a porch that wrapped the corner, and the applicant said they might be willing to do a trellis. In the rendering, it's started to be articulated, but it's not shown in any other plans. All the plans need to be coordinated, and staff feels that something needs to wrap the corner and having it on one elevation doesn't meet the ordinance requirements.

The rack for bikes needs to be shown on the plan. In regard to the architecture, aside from the rendering, no changes have been made. CMU is not allowed on any building façade, Ms. Kelly said, and long, unarticulated or blank facades are not permitted on a portion that's visible from a public or private street, access points or parking areas. The side and rear elevations should be

as visually attractive as the front. The way the building is sited, the rear of the store in the applicant's point of view faces a public right-of-way, and there hasn't been any articulation on that façade. Staff doesn't feel that complies with the ordinance.

In regard to the landscaping, the trees to be saved and removed need to be marked on the landscaping plan, which should be overlaid with the tree survey. That may be the case and there may just not be trees, so staff wanted clarification, Ms. Kelly said. The location of all signs should be shown on the landscaping plan. The landscape treatment on the parking lot side is "more urban in nature and a lot simpler," so the applicant should consider simplifying and repeating this urban lay-out on the north and east sides. It should have an urban treatment through the whole building, including the landscaping. Staff doesn't feel that, as submitted, this project complies with the ordinance. The submittal has remained the same throughout the process; the applicant needs to provide more details to meet the ordinance.

Mr. Dickerson asked about the orientation of the building. It faces into the gas canopy. If they took the entire square (pumps and everything) and rotated it 90 degrees clockwise, he said, and have the front of the building facing the Rail Trail, the back of the building will face internally into an area where there is nothing now. He asked if that "would change the back of the building from a façade to the back of the building." Ms. Kelly said yes, but the ordinance says they can't have a pump in front of the building. The DRB can allow for pumps on the side, but not in the front. Parris Island Gateway is their main frontage. Mr. Dickerson said he's "trying to get away from the four sides in the façade." To deal with it, one side has to be made no longer a façade or do what they did with Dollar Tree.

Ms. Kelly said she feels like the DRB has given the applicant some suggestions not to change their prototypes and internal configuration, but how to articulate the exterior with "some seemingly simple changes, in order to address that, especially the corner" and then maybe landscaping could be similar to what was just discussed with Publix. If the corner is treated correctly, she said, then maybe landscaping can help the rest. It is tricky and when prototypes come in that don't have street entrances, it's something they have to work with.

Mr. Karlyk said he had wondered about rotating the building, too. Mr. Dickerson said the pumps are effectively in the front of the building now. Chairman Brown said "the way the ordinance reads is a precursor to the way that form-based code is going to deal with gas stations." They "have to come up on that corner somehow" per the ordinance. They could rotate 90 degrees counter-clockwise, but that doesn't help much, he said.

Chairman Brown asked for a summation of the major issues from the previous and current staff reports. Ms. Kelly said the landscaping plan has a continuation of street trees, which is nice for cohesiveness, but it doesn't differentiate between what's a street and what's a driveway. Chairman Brown said they have the dumpster located facing the street, which is an ordinance issue. He summarized the major issues as the corner feature, the unarticulated parts which are an ordinance issue, the dumpster, and some of the landscaping.

The staff report includes a December 3 memo from Ms. Anderson; Chairman Brown asked if there was resolution on the Parris Island Gateway median. Ms. Kelly said they met with DOT about it and had a lot of discussion. The applicant said installing the median wouldn't fit within the curb that exists right now; the lanes are wider. Having 14' lanes shared to include a bike lane doesn't give enough room to add a median. DOT suggested having the applicant install a multi-use path that ran along the road, along the west side of Parris Island Gateway. It would allow the lanes to be narrowed to get the bikers onto the multi-use path. When DOT is doing their intersection improvements, they could install the median later. Mr. Dickerson said the bike lane then would be moved to the lot lane. Ms. Kelly said you can't see the bike lane on the site plan. It would allow the lanes to shrink to allow the median without changing the curb location. Mr. Dickerson said it also gives access to the Rail Trail and extends the bike trail into the property.

Chairman Brown said the applicants are asking for final approval on architecture and the site plan.

Kevin Smith, Thomas and Hutton, agreed that this is a similar plan to what has been previously submitted and said they "would like this to be a working meeting." The goal is to get at least one approval. They want to resolve some of the issues. He said Chairman Brown said among the major issues is the street hierarchy, and they plan to solve some of that with landscaping. They didn't feel like they received a lot of feedback in the November 8 meeting. They will do something with shrubs or different species to differentiate those two roads. They will work with staff to ensure that there's a hierarchy there. **Greg Parker** said it was always meant to be brick in the back of the building.

Mr. Parker said it's hard to do a landscaping plan without knowing what the DRB will approve. Mr. Franklin asked if the landscaping plan shows the road accurately, or if the site plan does. Mr. Smith said they intend to have parallel parking on the north-south section per the site plan. **Michael Brock**, landscape architect, said he talked with Ms. Hill about the species on that road and having the live oaks along it to signify that that is the main road, "to give it the street presence that it deserves." Chairman Brown said differentiation with landscaping needs to happen, as does treatment of the curb, and he doesn't think it's a big deal and can work itself out next time. Mr. Franklin said when the landscaping plan is done, if the future drive is shown, he thinks if the board were to propose that trees be planted there, down the road the applicant might have to remove them, so he suggested that those two trees not be planted.

Mr. Smith said on page 2 of the staff report there's mention of the parking strip not showing those accesses, so he thinks if it's okay not to show the trees there, maybe they should not show parallel parking where the accesses are planned as well. Ms. Kelly said that on the right side, especially because they are building there, "that's more finite." Staff has heard that on all of the property that the applicant doesn't own, this site plan was provided because the DRB and staff asked for it, so there's nothing there that's set. Mr. Smith said from an access

standpoint, they “don’t have a lot of length on that road to move the accesses around.” Ms. Kelly said they can just talk about it; “it’s not a huge make or break issue.”

Mr. Franklin asked about the future; if they were dividing it and extended the line, “this is what you are really getting, and this element is shown potentially in the back access road.” It reads as access to the site, not as part of the overall road. If this road is put in and there’s room for plantings and access, it’s fine, but the way they are showing it here, “muddies the framework,” so he doesn’t know if it shifts or moves on-site. As they move forward and discuss placement, movement, and access, it reads as a potential drive and another road going into the parking lot.

Mr. Smith said he suggested that they should think about it as they continue to give it to the DRB for review. Mr. Smith said it’s meant to promote interconnectivity. Mr. Franklin said he’s thinking of it as an alley, but it’s not reading like that to him. **John Binder** said it could be labeled as a future driveway. When they know what’s coming, they will have to bring it back to the DRB, and he would be guessing if he had to say today. It’s a future driveway, they are trying to plan accordingly, and they can label it that way.

Chairman Brown said how that works is one of the DRB’s issues. If it were put in now, it would become more valuable to the future parcel. Mr. Franklin said they are trying to plan for future use, and they have to determine the access points. Chairman Brown said it doesn't make sense to do both. Mr. Binder said it’s sitting on a main road with on-street parking. He said there is “plenty of road access and road frontage” for the parcels on that side. Mr. Smith said the interconnectivity of parking will take care of itself at some point in the future.

Mr. Parker said they shouldn’t talk about conjectures when they don’t know what will happen. Chairman Brown asked them to talk about the building orientation, which is an ordinance issue. **John Derring** said they have shown on the front that they have tried to incorporate a trellis on the north side of the building facing Highway 21 for visual interest, and they have also articulated the back of the building with pilasters so that there’s a disparity between the front and the back. They have incorporated some green screens and also created “some more rhythm with the plantings along the back.” Chairman Brown said “this is a huge step forward.”

There’s now a parapet along the back of the building, “so it doesn’t seem like ... the back of a convenience store,” Mr. Derring said. Chairman Brown said if they articulate it a little more by replicating the trellis or with closed shutters, they are “close.” Mr. Derring said they could incorporate “another one of those” or some closed shutters to make the building behind the landscaping more attractive. Mr. Dickerson said the Dollar Tree building was initially much less attractive than Parkers’, which he showed them. He said the challenge is the building with 4 sides addressing the street.

Mr. Parker said no one spends per square foot what Parker’s does. They are committed to great landscaping, and they “will make the back look great.” He has no problem with closed shutters; he likes the trellis “to soften the look.” The CMU back was not supposed to happen. Mr. Parker

said they could do trellises on all five bays. The problem with putting in windows on the Parris Island side is that they end up putting pictures in the windows.

Mr. Franklin said on the service area, where it's not backed by a cooler they could bring in light, and it would help articulate the façade. From the trellis point, too, if they had an access point in that side, if they flipped the building, they will have a hallway that could be a door on the corner. If the plan is flipped, they wouldn't need to change the internal floor plan. Mr. Parker said the back door would not be used for service, but is in there for code. They don't want it as an operable door, but he likes the idea of flipping the plan and adding a door on the side.

Chairman Brown said there are no signs on the side that faces the door. Mr. Derring said they are allowed signs on three sides. Mr. Brock said they have a more urban feel in front and need to wrap it around at the trellis location and also along the side that faces Parris Island Gateway. They have "a lot of landscape back there that we are going to have to tone down and respect the architecture." Mr. Derring said if they put in a door, there's a control issue. Mr. Parker said he likes the idea of reversing the store. He likes the ideas of the closed shutters and trellises. He would like to eliminate the back door, which is where a burglar could come in. He'll incorporate those ideas, he said.

Chairman Brown said the dumpster hasn't been discussed yet. It has not been submitted. Mr. Smith said they moved it from the side of the building to the front. It's further from the road and takes care of the safety issue. They would like to keep employee parking there for the 4-5 employees there on any given shift. Mr. Smith showed where loading is. Mr. Parker showed what they will build.

Mr. Smith said they got a memo on the Traffic Impact Analysis in regard to the 12' multi-use path coming down Parris Island Gateway; they are amenable to that, though he doesn't know that Mr. Parker wants to be the one to put it in. They are now talking about a 12' trail, he said, while they were originally talking about a 5' sidewalk. Chairman Brown asked if they could escrow the 5' sidewalk amount to move it along. Ms. Kelly said it's different because they are putting access onto Parris Island Gateway which causes a median to be required. They don't want to rip up the entire block; that is causing the traffic lane to get narrowed and the bike sharrows to go away, so that is what causes the need for the multi-use path. Escrowing 5' doesn't help because they can't accommodate the bikes and the median.

Mr. Smith said he knows that the county, the city, and DOT all met to discuss it. He feels "it's a little bit much." The lanes are 10' wide, not 14'. They are putting in an island in the right-in / right-out, and that's generally what's used. Mr. Parker agreed that "it's a little much." Mr. Parker said he isn't a developer, doesn't own this property, and he's put a lot of money into it already. He wants "to know when the asking stops." He wants to be a good neighbor and to do good things, but he's being asked to do a lot through the whole process, he feels.

Mr. Brock said it's right now a 5' sidewalk and Ms. Kelly is asking for it to be 12' now, which is

the width of a traffic lane. Ms. Kelly said it was just for a multi-use path; they have heard from the county traffic engineer about what he is going to ask for, so they “are in some ways just the messenger trying to incorporate everyone’s comments and helping the applicant to move along in the most economical way.” Mr. Brock said 12’ “seems like an awful lot”; Ms. Kelly said maybe it was 10’.

Ms. Anderson said they can’t permit anything without the DOT encroachment permit, and the median may be a requirement of that permit. “DOT and the developer can partner to make it happen,” she said. DOT might be able to come up and put in the median that is required for the access. Staff felt positive about it.

Mr. Parker said if it’s required they will do it. Escrow serves no function to him. Ms. Kelly said this may be another instance of needing to hear from DOT as to whether the median is required, and if so, what happens. Mr. Smith said that DOT is not reviewing the Highway 21 access because Beaufort-Jasper has to apply for the county easement before they can apply for that access. It’s in the works right now and they are hoping for feedback soon.

Mr. Parker said he would like this process to be more collaborative, and there should be a better way. Mr. Dickerson said that the city is trying to get form-based code, and that will give developers more certainty as to the guidelines for form and design and allow a more expedited process. Mr. Parker said he knows the DRB is trying to make the community better. He wants to do whatever it takes to get this wrapped up. Mr. Dickerson said if they get a plan that Ms. Anderson and Ms. Kelly like, then the DRB will agree to it. Mr. Parker said the site was “a bombed-out trailer park” before. He said this is urban architecture. All the planning and what they will do is good for the community.

Chairman Brown made a motion for preliminary approval of site and architecture tied to the documents submitted during the meeting reflecting the new site plan, with the architecture articulated differently and the dumpster moved. The applicant should continue to refine the landscaping and articulate it through whatever language they would like to use. Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

BOARD MEMBER TRAINING REQUIREMENT

Ms. Kelly said all board members are required to do three hours of training. Professional training counts toward this requirement. She gave out forms to the board members and a list of approved sponsors. It’s due 12-31-12.

DISCUSSION: FORM-BASED CODE UPDATE

Mr. Dickerson said he had given the DRB information about what he is going to discuss. They are working in the form-based code committee with the process concepts: what the boards are, how they work, etc. They are “still defining and doing process stuff.” They have not gotten to the meat of the form-based code, only the underlying structure. A big issue is the pace of the work; only twelve pages have been done in three months. The process has been changed,

however, so that now they will put a chapter on the server for people to read and comment on. Staff will make adjustments to it, get a preliminary adjusted document for everyone to read, and then the committee will come in, get agreement, and move on. Also, there will be no voting; the board is “advisory in nature.” If they have instances where they can’t reach consensus, they will have a minority report that will be brought up if they can’t resolve an issue in a reasonable period of time, Mr. Dickerson said. They won’t get caught up in minor wording adjustments and will be a more effective organization and move forward. He said the number of people on the committee make it very difficult to get things done.

Mr. Dickerson said this is a single-use board: they will make recommendations to **Craig Lewis** and his staff, the suggestions will be integrated into form-based code and other documents, and then they will disband. Chairman Brown said he wondered if there had been discussion of the DRB. Mr. Dickerson said there’s currently no talk of disbanding the DRB or merging it. Trying to integrate Milner and the Northwest Quadrant documents into what they are doing is way too much to ask of a volunteer board, Mr. Dickerson said. He would not support an integration of the HDRB and DRB.

STAFF DISCUSSION REGARDING MOTIONS

Ms. Kelly said she and Ms. Anderson had discussed that it made more sense to deny something as submitted in order to keep an applicant from coming back with the same information to every meeting. Mr. Dickerson said if they do that, “it will send them away.” Ms. Kelly said not if it’s a motion to deny as submitted “for the following reasons.” They would not be denying the project. As it is, it wastes staff and board time and resources.

Chairman Brown said in continuing education, they had learned to deny *with specific reasons*. The applicant can resubmit the same thing, but they must correct those specific points. Ms. Kelly said she heard from Mr. Binder that because there was no denial, they didn’t get something concrete to bring back. Chairman Brown said it “makes the DRB seem wishy-washy.” Ms. Kelly said the discussion model has worked for some applicants but not others. Chairman Brown said with corporate applicants, if it’s rejected for five reasons, they can’t fix two and then come back, because staff won’t accept it. Doing this gives the board “more teeth.” Mr. Dickerson said the staff could determine at the application submission if the applicant can go before the board.

Ms. Kelly said sometimes she’s said to an applicant, “This doesn’t meet our ordinance,” and has been told by the applicant, “We need the board to say it.” Mr. Dickerson said if they say that an applicant can’t go before the board until they have met the UDO requirements, staff won’t schedule the meeting until the applicant has dealt with that. Chairman Brown said corporate applicants “will just dump something” in order to apply, so Ms. Kelly’s first staff report is what should trigger their changes. Ms. Kelly said Parker’s wanted to hear “what the board would let them do” before they made any changes, and what *she* said wasn’t sufficient. If staff recommended denial as submitted, she could express concern that it won’t be approved to the applicant.

Chairman Brown said they had asked Mr. Lewis to come give a presentation at some point about the planning efforts for Sectors Two through Five so that the DRB can filter that down. Mr. Dickerson said as they move forward into the nuts and bolts of form-based code, he will be doing that for the DRB. Chairman Brown said it's more about the city's planning work than about form-based code. This would be "a transition pre-form-based code to bridge that gap."

Chairman Brown said he's asked the city to consider taking the board on a field trip to Mt. Pleasant to look at form-based code-built buildings. Mr. Dickerson said Augusta has clearly got form-based code but very few design guidelines. Chairman Brown said to experience that would show them the issues and help them visualize. Ms. Kelly said they might combine the two meetings (the other one with Mr. Lewis) so they won't have to have two meetings.

Chairman Brown said he would also like to have lunch with a man who's a veteran of corporate architecture to show the board what the corporations are looking for and what they're doing in other markets. He has big corporate clients, and Ms. Kelly said they can put that with the other two meetings, too. Mr. Dickerson suggested integrating both boards for the meetings. Ms. Kelly said they could probably count it as continuing education credits.

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m.