

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held on **August 18, 2016** at 2:00 p.m. in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Brian Franklin, board members Jane Frederick, Bob Albright, and Chuck Rushing, and Lauren Kelly, city staff. Dan Ahern were 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**

**Ms. Frederick made a motion, second by Mr. Rushing, to approve the minutes of the July 14, 2016 meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as submitted passed unanimously.**

### **HARRIS TEETER AT LADY'S ISLAND, 163 SEA ISLAND PARKWAY**

**Identified as District R123, Tax Map 15, Parcel 587 and District R200, Tax Map 15, Parcel 592 and 169 Sea Island Parkway, R200, Tax Map 15, Parcel 606 (16-01 DRB.5)**

Applicant: Ryan C. Lyle, Andrews Engineering, Inc.

*The applicant is requesting approval for the building's architecture and the designs of the c-store and liner buildings.*

Ms. Kelly said the intent of this meeting is to get final approval for the architecture of all of the Harris Teeter buildings.

With regard to the site plan, Ms. Kelly said, it had been suggested that the applicant reconfigure parking to bring it more adjacent to the liner buildings, and she had done some sketches, but putting parking closer to the liner buildings did not seem to be "what Harris Teeter wanted to do," and since the site plan has been approved, they are not required to make those changes, but staff feels it's still a good suggestion.

Also, Ms. Kelly said, **Dan Ahern** had asked about the status of recycling rainwater to use for irrigation, but "for most of the site, the infiltration rate is so high that it would require additional infrastructure to capture the rainwater," which is already going back into the water table, so it's not logical to do this in most areas on the site.

All of the buildings have received preliminary architectural approval with varying levels of comments, she said.

### **Main Harris Teeter building**

All staff and board comments appear to have been addressed, Ms. Kelly said, including modifying the cornice bracket detail, articulating blank facades with more windows and recessed brick openings, and coalescing the detail on the corner element along Sams

Point Road with the rest of the building by lining the elements up to link them. Some changes occurred that are in this new submission, she said: the tower at the pharmacy entrance was relocated to the corner, and the pharmacy drive-thru detail was modified. **Ron Kirkpatrick** said the door is now “an emergency egress,” and the door through which “Express Lane” attendants will take groceries that were ordered online out to a waiting car.

Ms. Kelly said the tower is not functional, so whether it’s needed or not could be discussed. Mr. Kirkpatrick said Chairman Franklin had commented that he “wanted emphasis . . . to work along the axis of the Sea Island Parkway entryway,” so they were trying to give it “more interest that better lined up when you’re arriving on the site off Sea Island Parkway.” Also, they were able to add more windows up high to connect the two entities. It’s difficult to put glazing in that corner above the pharmacy, so this allowed them to put more glazing in the front of the building.

Ms. Frederick asked if the door to the pharmacy could be centered under the window above it. Mr. Kirkpatrick said they had looked at that, but because of the interior layout, the doors have to be there “based on proximity to the inside.” The emergency egress area is also the “consultation area for the pharmacy,” he said, so it needs to be adjacent to the pharmacy. Ms. Frederick asked if they could just have a single door, and Mr. Kirkpatrick said they could do that.

Ms. Kelly said she doesn’t have a problem with where the new tower is, but inside doesn’t line up with the tower. Chairman Franklin asked what the use is of the awning and the pull-in. Mr. Kirkpatrick said there’s a pneumatic tube with a video screen; they couldn’t have a pharmacy window on the side of the building. The awning doubles as a cover for people delivering groceries. Mr. Kirkpatrick showed how that would work. Is it covered “all the way down?” Ms. Frederick asked, and Mr. Kirkpatrick said, “Not for the employee.” Chairman Franklin said it’s only one lane, and Mr. Kirkpatrick said that’s correct.

Ms. Kelly said building sections haven’t been fully developed, so they have discussed doing that during the permitting process. Also the landscaping plans are not completed yet, so they will need to come back to the board.

Ms. Frederick asked about having two bays instead, so the proportions are the same. Mr. Kirkpatrick asked if she meant that they should stretch it, and she said yes; “massing it would be nicer because it’s . . . small there.” Mr. Kirkpatrick said it’s “pretty big,” so he’s hesitant to make it larger.

Chairman Franklin asked how much traffic they expected through the delivery door. Mr. Kirkpatrick said there will be no hardware on the outside, and it’s not for customers. Employees will scan a key card on the inside and the outside to use it. It’s not a public entry because of security; it’s “not easily watched from a risk management perspective.”

The building footprint is 56,000 square feet, Mr. Kirkpatrick said.

Mr. Rushing said he liked the changes since last time. Ms. Frederick agreed and said she only had the comment about the door. Ms. Frederick asked if it would come back to staff for construction document details. Ms. Kelly said yes, for the permit, but they can review with her as well. The landscape plans need to come back to the Design Review Board, incorporating the outbuildings, and the gas station canopy has not been brought to the board yet for it to see how “that integrates into the design.” **Chairman Franklin made a motion to grant final approval, contingent on submission of a landscape plan that includes the outbuildings to the board for final approval; Mr. Albright seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

### **Liner buildings**

Ms. Kelly said the comments that had been addressed were about the excess number of materials, which had been pared down, were “more subdued,” and more “in keeping with the other buildings.” Staff still has two comments: It “still seems a little bit busy,” she said, and could be simplified, and the Sea Island Parkway elevation does not meet the ordinance, which says that all elevations that are visible from primary streets “need to be equitable.” The amount of detailing and articulation of the Sea Island Parkway elevation is “lacking compared to the other elevations,” Ms. Kelly said. There are small awnings over each of the doors, which she pointed out in response to a question from Ms. Frederick. She did a mock-up of how this elevation could be improved. Ms. Kelly said “in general, it’s very close,” and staff recommends final approval on the condition that staff and board comments are addressed.

Ms. Frederick asked if this would be one store or two. Mr. Kirkpatrick said it could be segregated into two, depending on the tenant. Ms. Kelly told Chairman Franklin that if there is a tenant, and the changes are not substantial, the applicant would not have to come back to the DRB, but if the changes were “major” (e.g., significant changes to signs, colors, etc.), the applicant would have to come back to the board.

**Ted Barnes** said he’d “be okay with popping up the sign.” Mr. Kirkpatrick said he’s okay with enlarging the windows, but he struggles with getting a canopy and a sign above them. Ms. Frederick said the lower canopy could run over both doors, and Mr. Kirkpatrick said he’d be happy to do that. Ms. Kelly asked if they could “move it up and beef up the cornice a little bit.” Mr. Kirkpatrick said this is a structural material, not a veneer, so it’s not easy to manipulate.

Chairman Franklin asked if the comment on clear glazing was in reference to the additional windows. Ms. Kelly said it looks as if it’s all intended to be clear glazing, and Mr. Kirkpatrick said that will depend on the tenant and what they want. Mr. Barnes said they will get a tenant before they build the liner buildings, except maybe the building next to the c-store, which they may build at the same time.

**Ms. Frederick made a motion for final approval as submitted, with consideration of changes suggested by staff and combining the awning over the rear doors. Chairman Franklin seconded the motion.** Mr. Barnes said the two buildings that are closest to the corner are probably going to be for a single tenant, and they will want to center a door between the buildings with a sign over them. **Ryan Lyle** asked if internally lit signs are allowable, and Ms. Kelly said they are. **The motion passed unanimously.**

### **C-store building**

Mr. Kirkpatrick said on the Sea Island Parkway side they increased the canopy size. On the previous version, the roof slope went from front to back. They took off the scuppers on the Sea Island Parkway side and brought them to one side, which faces “the other shops,” not Sams Point Way. They put the awning canopy over the top, and the window rhythm is more successful, Ms. Kelly said. There were bay windows with hardie panel on the sides, she said, and Mr. Kirkpatrick said that now “the boxes are internal.” That plan was submitted, he said, but Ms. Kelly said she hadn’t seen that. They increased the width of the building by 2’, Mr. Kirkpatrick said, to allow them to make the windows on the sides into internal display windows.

Chairman Franklin asked if signs would go on the building, and Mr. Kirkpatrick pointed out where they would be. Ms. Frederick asked if the back of the parapet is “the same material as the front of it.” Mr. Kirkpatrick said it is, but it won’t be seen from the road. Ms. Kelly said there should be some signs on what is considered the front of the building.

Ms. Kelly said the only outstanding issue here is the 50% clear glazing requirement, which is “a ‘should’ in our ordinance.” This is a better composition, she said, and she knows it’s difficult to attain because of interior requirements, but the DRB needs to decide if “they are okay with it” being less than 50%. She pointed out the areas that are not clear glazing. Mr. Kirkpatrick said they can have tinted clear glazing in the office area, but beer and soda coolers “go down the whole façade and wrap the other side,” so they would like to be able to put graphics on those windows; they will not be transparent.

Chairman Franklin asked if the coolers are below the upper windows. Mr. Kirkpatrick said the coolers are more than 10’ tall and have “evap coils” on top. Ms. Frederick asked if they could approve the window locations but ask to see the materials before final approval. Mr. Kirkpatrick said they could frost the windows, but they thought the graphics would be “more interesting.” Ms. Kelly said only 25% of the windows may have graphics, per the sign ordinance. Ms. Frederick said frosting is okay and preferable to plastic fill-ins.

Ms. Kelly said the board will want to see the gas canopy from Sams Point Road, “showing the relationship there.”

**Ms. Frederick made a motion for final approval as submitted, with frosting of the glass in the non-functioning windows. Chairman Franklin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:33 p.m.

DRAFT