

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held on **May 12, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Brian Franklin, board members Bob Albright, Dan Ahern, and Chuck Rushing, and Libby Anderson, city staff. Jane Frederick was absent.

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

### **MINUTES**

**Mr. Ahern made a motion, second by Mr. Albright, to approve the minutes of the April 14, 2016 meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as submitted passed unanimously.**

### **Home2 by Hilton, 12 County Shed Road**

Identified as District 120, Tax Map 26, Parcel 160 (16-02 DRB.3) ☐

Applicant: Tom Michaels, Architect ☐

*The applicant is requesting to construct a new 107-room, 62,000 square foot hotel.* ☐☐

Ms. Anderson reviewed the conditions of the preliminary approval from the last time the applicant was before the Design Review Board. She said this hotel would provide “a node for commercial development in this area.” The new siting and disposition reinforce the connection to the Spanish Moss Trail.

### **GENERAL**

- In regard to vehicle circulation, the street alignment makes sense, Ms. Anderson said; staff suggests introducing on-street parking on internal roads in the future.
- What color is the concrete at the entry?
- A sidewalk may be required on County Shed Road when the parcels develop, Ms. Anderson said, so staff suggested they might do that now, rather than passing it on the next developer.
- Are stairs being shown adjacent to the tunnel?
- Crosswalks and curb cuts should be included wherever sidewalks cross vehicular travel lanes.
- The city’s parking requirement has been met.
- Trees and landscaping: A large number of trees are to be removed in the stormwater area, Ms. Anderson said, and grading should be adjusted to preserve those pointed out in the certified arborist’s report.
- Staff suggests reconsidering the plant material in the bio-retention areas.
- All removed and preserved trees should be shown on a landscaping plan.

- Staff recommends using sabal palms or the equivalent strategically in the foundation beds, especially on the east and west sides of the building.
- In the rear/south elevation, increase the number of palms from 3 to 5.
- In the parking lot, redbuds may not be the best choice because they prefer partial shade.
- Is it possible to better coordinate the lights with the landscaping plan?
- The applicant should provide a detail for the American electric lights in the middle of the parking area.
- The applicant should provide details of any building lighting – including cut sheets and intensity – including the fluorescent LED lights in the beacon; they must be full cut-off if they're more than 5500 lumens.
- On the smoke hut, what is the material – masonry or tile?
- Tree mitigation calculation is required, as are bike racks, and they need to show where they will be located.
- As a result of the traffic impact analysis, the applicant needs to create an access easement on the road that connects County Shed Road to Highway 21, Ms. Anderson said, to help those traversing the site to avoid the County Shed Road and Parris Island Gateway intersection, which is proposed to fail upon completion of this project. This easement must be platted and recorded before the CO is issued for the project.
- Wayfinding signs are needed on the interior of the site to give directions as people head out.

### **Building**

- All comments from the previous meeting have been addressed, Ms. Anderson said.
- All mechanical equipment must be screened. The applicant needs to show the screening materials' details and color.
- Staff wondered where the solar panels are. The applicant should show them if they're being used.

Ms. Anderson said staff recommends final approval with the condition that staff's and the board's comments and questions are considered, and then outstanding issues can be addressed by staff when the building permit is submitted.

Mr. Ahern asked where the easement is that the city is requesting. Ms. Anderson showed him and said it can be relocated when the development is completed. The traffic impact analysis looked at the complete build-out of the project, and this development is "adding a few . . . trips to that intersection." She discussed trying to get people to cut through the site to avoid the failing intersection at County Shed Road and Parris Island Gateway. There was general discussion with Ms. Anderson, the board, and the applicants about what can be done to address that.

Chairman Franklin asked if they anticipated the new retention pond would hold water all the time, and **Greg Baisch** said he thinks the retention ponds would all be “really dry.” Chairman Franklin asked if the embankments could be landscaped, so they don’t need to be mowed. Mr. Baisch agreed that natural grasses “would be a better look.” Chairman Franklin asked if they could add that to the landscape plan. **Tom Michaels** said he had met with **Liza Hill** and discussed “all plant issues in depth.” Chairman Franklin said he agreed with Ms. Hill’s statement that in the parking lot, they need to change plant materials where they have low areas that will hold water.

There was a general discussion of the parking spaces, wheel stops, curb and gutter, and pervious and impervious surfaces. Chairman Franklin asked if they planned to connect two areas with the retention pond. Mr. Baisch said yes and demonstrated how that would work. A future parcel development will have “a stub out for that same outfall.” Chairman Franklin asked if that retention pond would cover future development on any of the other parcels, and Mr. Baisch said “Not much.” They will “get as much as (they) can . . . out of it.”

Mr. Baisch confirmed that they *are* showing stairs into the Spanish Moss Trail. Final details of the tunnel and stair design are being completed now. He explained how it would work to open up the wall and let light into the tunnel. There’s no landscaping on the stormwater pond, and Chairman Franklin suggested “planting to hold the bank,” so there’s “not a big hole in the earth” that won’t hold water permanently. They want it to be more of an amenity, not full of drowned plant material, Chairman Franklin said.

Mr. Ahern thanked the applicants for the bio-retention in the parking lot. He asked about the tunnel drainage. Mr. Baisch said it would “have a slow longitudinal slope.” Any rainwater will come out into drains, not into the pond. It will be 8’ high x 12’ wide, he said. Chairman Franklin asked if it would have signs and be lighted at night. Mr. Baisch said he thinks it will be, but he isn’t sure. It’s about 40’ long, with 10’ on either side, he said.

Ms. Anderson asked the color of the concrete at the entry; Mr. Baisch said “concrete-colored,” which Ms. Anderson clarified is gray.

Mr. Michaels said he’d brought pictures of the lighting fixtures and the SCE&G lighting plan. He said there is no longer a smoke hut.

Ms. Anderson asked the Design Review Board about the recommendations for the palms. Mr. Michaels said he had no issues with that, and they would work on it with Ms. Hill.

Mr. Ahern asked how Home 2 fits in the Hilton line; Mr. Michaels said it’s “higher end,” and the rooms are like apartments. The project is 5 months behind, he said.

**Chairman Franklin made a motion to recommend final approval with the conditions that staff had presented about lighting, parking, and trees. Staff can review all of these matters. Mr. Ahern seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tidal Wave Auto Spa, 9 Sam's Point Road**

Identified as R123, Tax Map 15, Parcel 160

Applicant: SHJ Construction Group

*The applicant is requesting approval for a new stand-alone car wash.*

Ms. Anderson said this project came to the Design Review Board last month and was granted preliminary approval with the condition that the applicant would rework the tunnel exit most visible from Sams Point Road for the next meeting and would bring a street elevation with all buildings, as well as material samples and a landscape plan.

Staff appreciates the effort to diligently comply with the type of building for the streetscape the city wants to create in this area, Ms. Anderson said. There is a build-to requirement, and this satisfies that for this design district.

**SITE**

- Ms. Anderson said **Lauren Kelly** had asked whether the sidewalk connection into and through the site was not provided due to the preservation of trees. **Martie Murphy**, the project's builder, said at the last DRB meeting, they'd discussed saving the trees, which doesn't allow them "to build a sidewalk to tie into." They do have a sidewalk tied into their "pedestrian usage building," however.
- A tree mitigation schedule is needed, Ms. Anderson said, and a lighting plan is required.

**Landscaping**

- The landscaping plan and a tree survey are needed. Mr. Murphy said they had resubmitted a design this morning. If the board is agreeable, Ms. Anderson said, staff, including the city's landscape architect, can work through any issues. Mr. Murphy and **Greg Auten**, Tidal Wave's owner, said they are willing to do that.
- There are metal louvers on the gable end of the vacuum canopies and the vacuum house/dumpster enclosure; this makes three types of detail, the others being open with exposed cross-bracing and trapezoidal glass. Ms. Anderson said the board should consider whether it would be better to keep the detail consistent.
- Tinted glass is not permitted.
- The rear elevation doesn't show a header or a lintel over the door/window assembly; there is no header on the door on the tunnel entrance elevation.

Staff recommends final approval of the project, Ms. Anderson said, with consideration of comments from the board and staff about the glazing in the gable ends, the

consistency of door/window headers, and landscaping. Staff will review the resolution of these issues at the building permit submission.

Mr. Ahern asked if there would be a maintenance agreement with the city for the underground detention. Ms. Anderson said that's the developer's responsibility. Mr. Ahern said if there's a problem, it needs to be clear who deals with that and how. Ms. Anderson asked the recommended best practices on that. The run-off can't be used from the tunnel, but they can reuse what's coming into it, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Auten said.

It's "open bracing" at the tunnel entrance, Mr. Murphy said. It's a staging area, so they didn't put glass in it. The gables on the ends are louvered vents; "there's nothing in there," he said.

There was general discussion about the glass on the building. Mr. Murphy explained how they had tried to "tie the buildings together with the glass." The glass and gables are proportionate, he said. Chairman Franklin said he "(doesn't) like the aesthetic," whether it's recessed or flush. He thinks they should eliminate the glass at the exit and do "an external treatment." Mr. Ahern said they could put two glass panels at the entrance, if they wanted symmetry. Chairman Franklin showed the applicants why the various uses were different from the one that looks best.

To meet the street frontage, Mr. Murphy said they could drop back the enclosed part of the tunnel. They could make the door so it couldn't be seen. There was general discussion of this idea, but it was determined not to be practical. Mr. Murphy said that the bay door is open the majority of the time. It was determined to eliminate the glass on the front and rear. Mr. Murphy asked if they should do stucco and eliminate the louvers. They can also "brick in the entire end" of the entrances and exits. Chairman Franklin said Ms. Frederick or Ms. Kelly could help them with that decision. The proportion of the door is not resolved in the exit, Chairman Franklin said.

Ms. Anderson read Ms. Kelly's comment about the glazing and articulation on the gable end. Ms. Anderson read the three proposed possibilities from the staff report.

Mr. Auten said the end is so wide because it is part of the turn. On the entrance, a car comes straight at it, and it's easy to enter.

Mr. Murphy asked about putting faux louvers above the stucco where the louvers are now, so that everything except the entrance to the tunnel would look the same. Chairman Franklin asked if they could also raise the roof pitch on the equipment room so it would be "less squatty." Mr. Murphy said it's not much wider than the entrance is, but that's because it's difficult to visualize the depth. The equipment room is recessed, and the entrance has been raised. Mr. Rushing said he thinks it "would solve a lot of the

problem” to eliminate the glass, raise the roof pitch, and consistently use the louver inserts. Mr. Murphy asked if they were OK with eliminated louvers on the roller section of the equipment room and using stucco instead. The panel would be “inset, and then the bands would match,” he said, or be a lighter shade of the same color. It was agreed that Mr. Murphy would provide a drawing, and that Mr. Rushing, Chairman Franklin, and Ms. Frederick could look at it via email, so the applicants would not need to come back to another DRB meeting.

**Chairman Franklin made a motion, second by Mr. Rushing, to give the project final approval, contingent on finalizing the architecture and the applicant’s attention to other comments on building landscaping and layout. The motion passed unanimously.**

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:11 p.m.

DRAFT