MEETING AGENDA
The City of Beaufort
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
Thursday, April 13, 2023, 2:00 P.M.
City Hall, Council Chambers, 2nd Floor – 1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, SC

Please click the link below to join the webinar:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88544535434?pwd=NWI5dk9INGlBezVuZHRNMU1qbTZHQT09
Passcode: 773357  Meeting ID: 885 4453 5434  Call in Phone#: 1+929-205-6099

STATEMENT OF MEDIA NOTIFICATION:
"In accordance with 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."

Note: A project will not be reviewed if the applicant or a representative is not present at the meeting.

I. Call to Order

II. Review of Minutes:
   A. Minutes of February 9, 2023 Meeting

III. Applications:
   A. Battery Creek Apartments, PIN R120 028 00A 0409, 0410, 0411, 0412, 0413 0000, 25 Old Jericho Road.
      Applicant: Ryan Lyle, Andrews Engineering (23-01 DRB.3)
      The applicant is requesting preliminary approval for an 83-unit four-story building with a pool and pool cabana.

   B. Beaufort Senior Apartments, PIN R120 029 000 0625 0000, 1556 Salem Road.
      Applicant: Michael Riley, Architect (23-02 DRB.2)
      The applicant is requesting final approval for a 156-unit apartment building including (112) 1-bedroom units, (44) 2-bedroom units with on-site parking.

IV. Discussion

V. Adjournment
CALL TO ORDER  00:00:54

A regular meeting of the Design Review Board was held in-person on Thursday, February 9, 2023 at 2:00 PM.

ATTENDEES  00:02:16

Members in attendance: Kimberly McFann (Vice-Chair), Erik Petersen, Clinton Hallman, and Bill Suter. Benjie Morillo (Chair) was absent from the meeting.

Staff in attendance: Jeremy Tate and Maria Short (Meadors Architecture).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES  00:02:16

Motion: Mr. Hallman made a motion to approve the [January 12, 2023] minutes as submitted; seconded by Mr. Suter. The motion passed (4-0).

All Design Review Board Meeting minutes are recorded and can be found on the City’s website at http://www.cityofbeaufort.org/AgendaCenter. Audio recordings are available upon request by contacting the City Clerk, Traci Guldner at 843-525-7024 or by email at tguldner@cityofbeaufort.org

APPLICATIONS  00:03:05

A. Desai Hotel, PIN R120 026 000 0160 0000, 3670 Trask Parkway (formerly 12 County Shed Road)

Applicant: Thomas Michaels, Architect (22-13 DRB.3)

The applicant is requesting final approval for a new five-story, 116-room hotel.

Motion 1 (0:08:16): Mr. Hallman made a motion to give the project final approval subject to the conditions in the staff report; seconded by Mr. Suter. Motion passed (4-0).

B. Pointe Grand Beaufort, PIN R122 029 000 0233 0000, 135 Burton Hill Road

Applicant: Nick Everly, Hillpointe, LLC (22-02 DRB.5)

00:08:55
The applicant is requesting final approval for a 328-unit apartment complex composed of (14) 3-story and 4-story apartment buildings, a clubhouse, fitness center, mail kiosk, and (9) 7-car garages.

**Motion 1 (0:17:44):** Mr. Hallman made a motion that the project be given final approval subject to the applicant complying with the staff recommendations in the staff report; seconded by Mr. Petersen. Motion passed (4-0).

### 5 Discussion

There was no discussion.

### 6 Adjournment

00:18:22

Mr. Petersen made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Suter. Motion passed unanimously (4-0). Meeting adjourned at 2:19 PM.
CITY STAFF INTRODUCTION

25 Old Jericho Road
Battery Creek Apartments
January 16, 2023

Ryan Lyle
2712 Roll Street Suite A
Beaufort, SC 29902

RE: 23-01 DRB.1 25 Old Jericho Road – Battery Creek Apartments

Dear Mr. Lyle:

On January 12, 2023, the City of Beaufort Design Review Board (DRB) met to review your application for construction of the Battery Creek apartments at 25 Old Jericho Road. The Board voted to grant conceptual approval subject to staff conditions and recommend that the applicant consider modifications to the south and northwest areas as discussed.

Board Conditions:
1. Applicant to consider modifications to the southwest and northwest corners of the building along Jericho Road.

Staff Conditions:

Site:
1. Per Section 5.7.4, the applicant must provide a minimum of 132 parking spaces. Applicant has provided 119 spaces but must provide the additional 13 spaces unless the applicant can demonstrate compliance with Section 5.7.6 Shared Parking and Parking Reductions, or if the applicant is utilizing on-street parking or meets the requirements of off-site parking in Section 5.7.4.D.
2. In future submissions, applicant to show crosswalks at the driveway entry to connect the sidewalks.

Apartment Building:
1. Staff does not believe the building currently meets the frontage buildout requirements. Per Section 2.4.1.A.4, the frontage build-out in a TS-UC zone must be at least 60%, but this does not appear to be met as most of the façade facing Old Jericho Road lies more than 15' from the property line. While some areas, such as the driveway and sidewalk on either side of the building, are exempt from the frontage buildout requirements, staff believes that the applicant could introduce a designed pedestrian use area per Section 2.5.1.B.4 that may be exempt from the frontage buildout. Alternatively, applicant could utilize the RMX zoning classification, as the building meets the RMX
setback requirements of 10’ min. and 60’ max. Staff recommends the applicant revise the drawings to include the RMX setbacks rather than TS-UC setbacks.

2. Applicant has met the requirements for a forecourt private frontage type per Section 4.4 and has utilized balconies as the additional frontage type; staff supports this design. In future submissions beyond conceptual review, applicant is to provide greater detail for this forecourt area, including a section through this forecourt.

3. Applicant has stated that the building meets the 30% minimum fenestration requirements per Section 4.6.3.C.1. Applicant is to submit an elevation sheet with shaded fenestration areas/wall areas and their square footage to confirm the 20% and 30% requirements.

4. Staff supports the use of the brick base around the building but recommends that the applicant keep it at a continuous height around the building and either reduce it to the first floor only or raise it on all facades to the second floor height.

5. In future submissions, staff requests additional details for the roof above the forecourt area and illustrate it in the forecourt section drawing.

6. Staff supports the applicant’s choice to place the HVAC units on the roof. Applicant to provide details illustrating the placement and screening of these units in future submissions.

7. Staff recommends the applicant add additional fenestration on the side walls of the forecourt to break up the larger blank expanses on either side.

8. Staff recommends the applicant add a window on the north corner, west façade (within the kitchen) to break up the blank wall on this corner.

**Pool Cabana**

1. Staff supports the pool cabana as designed; applicant to submit section and detail drawings for this building in future submissions.

If you have any questions, feel free to call the Development of Community & Economic Development at (843) 525-7011.

Sincerely,

Benjie Monillo, Chair
Design Review Board

Via email: mgay@andrews-sc.com

cc: file copy
APPLICANT PRESENTATION

25 Old Jericho Road
Battery Creek Apartments
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 525-5606
Email: development@cityofbeaufort.org / website: www.cityofbeaufort.org

OFFICE USE ONLY: Date Filed: Application #: Zoning District:

Schedule: The Design Review Board (DRB) typically meets the 2nd Thursday of each month at 2pm. Upon receipt of an application, staff will review the submittal and then contact the applicant letting them know when the meeting will be. A complete schedule can be found at https://www.cityofbeaufort.org/379/Design-Review-Board

Submittal Requirements: All forms and information shall be submitted digitally + 5 hardcopies of all documents. In addition to a complete application form, applicants shall submit the required items according to the checklists on the subsequent page.

Review Request: ☐ Conceptual ☐ Preliminary ☐ Final

Pursuant to Section 6-22-1145 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, is this tract or parcel restricted by any recorded covenant that is contrary to, conflicts with, or prohibits the activity described in this application? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Applicant, Property, and Project Information

Applicant Name: Ryan Lyle, PE
Applicant Address: Andrews Engineering, Inc., 2712 Bull St. Suite A, Beaufort SC 29902
Applicant E-mail: ryan@andrews-sc.com 843-379-2222 x226
Applicant Title: ☐ Homeowner ☐ Tenant ☐ Architect ☐ Engineer ☐ Developer
Owner (if other than the Applicant): Battery Creek SC LLC (c/o Jay Bernstein)
Owner Address: 1515 Mockingbird Lane, Suite 1010, Charlotte, NC 28209
Project Name: Battery Creek Apartments
Property Address: 25 Old Jericho Road
Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number): 5 Parcels: R120/028/00A/0409, 0410, 0411, 0412, 0413
Date Submitted: 02/09/2023

See Section 8.8 of The Beaufort Code for complete information about the Design Review process | Updated Sept. 26, 2022 | p. 1 of 2
This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org
Required Project Information

Project Name: Battery Creek Apartments

Property Size in Acres: 5.16 ac

Proposed Building Use: Apartments

Building Square Footage (if multiple buildings, please list each one and their square footage by floor): 83 MF units in a single 4 story apartment building; 1 pool and cabana

# of Parking Spaces Required: 132

# of Parking Spaces Provided: 132

Is this project a redevelopment project: Y N

Are there existing buildings on the site: Y N if yes, will they remain: Y N

Provide a brief Project Narrative and outline any specific questions you would like addressed.

This 83 unit apartment project will provide a mix of 1, 2, and 3 bedroom units, a pool, cabana, and playground. The site will be accessed by Old Jericho Road.

Applicant's Signature: [Signature] Date: 02/09/2023

Owner's Signature: [Signature] Date: 02/09/2023

(The owner's signature is required if the applicant is not the owner.)

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Attention: Julie A. Rachey, Administrative Assistant II
City of Beaufort Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina 29902
E-Mail: development@cityofbeaufort.org | Phone: (843) 525-7011 | Fax: (843) 986-5606
March 9, 2023

Julie A. Bachety
City of Beaufort
1911 Boundary Street
Beaufort, SC 29902

development@cityofbeaufort.org

RE: Project No. J21029 Battery Creek Apartments – 25 Old Jericho Road, Beaufort
   • Preliminary DRB submittal- staff and board comment responses

Dear Mrs. Bachety,

On January 12, 2023, the City ORB granted conceptual approval subject to the conditions below:

Board Conditions:

1. Applicant to consider modifications to the southwest and northwest corners of the building
   along Jericho Road.
   a) Architecture modified as requested.

Staff Conditions:

Site:

1. Per Section 5.7.4, the applicant must provide a minimum of 132 parking spaces. Applicant
   has provided 119 spaces but must provide the additional 13 spaces unless the applicant can
   demonstrate compliance with Section 5.7.6 Shared Parking and Parking Reductions, or if the
   applicant is utilizing on-street parking or meets the requirements of off-site parking in Section
   5.7.4.D.
   a) All required parking spaces now provided onsite.

2. In future submissions, applicant to show crosswalks at the driveway entry to connect the
   sidewalks.
   a) Crosswalk has been added.

Apartment Building:

1. Staff does not believe the building currently meets the frontage buildout requirements. Per
   Section 2.4.1.A.4, the frontage build-out in a T5-UC zone must be at least 60%, but this does
   not appear to be met as most of the façade fronting Old Jericho Road lies more than 15’ from
   the property line. While some areas, such as the driveway and sidewalk on either side of the
   building, are exempt from the frontage buildout requirements, staff believes that the applicant
   could introduce a designed pedestrian use area per Section 2.5.1.B.4 that may be exempt from
   the frontage buildout. Alternatively, applicant could utilize the RMX zoning classification, as
   the building meets the RMX setback requirements of 10’ min. and 60’ max. Staff
   recommends the applicant revise the drawings to include the RMX setbacks rather than
   T5-UC setbacks.
   a) Site plans revised to adhere to RMX zoning requirements including the 10-60’ setback.
2. Applicant has met the requirements for a forecourt private frontage type per Section 4.4 and has utilized balconies as the additional frontage type; staff supports this design. In future submissions beyond conceptual review, applicant is to provide greater detail for this forecourt area, including a section through this forecourt.
   a) Forecourt detail has been added.

3. Applicant has stated that the building meets the 30% minimum fenestration requirements per Section 4.6.3.C.1. Applicant is to submit an elevation sheet with shaded fenestration areas/wall areas and their square footages to confirm the 20% and 30% requirements.
   a) See revised architectural plans.

4. Staff supports the use of the brick base around the building but recommends that the applicant keep it at a continuous height around the building and either reduce it to the first floor only or raise it on all facades to the second-floor height.
   a) See revised architectural plans.

5. In future submissions, staff requests additional details for the roof above the forecourt area and illustrate it in the forecourt section drawing.
   a) See revised architectural plans.

6. Staff supports the applicant’s choice to place the HVAC units on the roof. Applicant to provide details illustrating the placement and screening of these units in future submissions.
   a) Architect and MEP determined condensers best on ground level as opposed to RTUs. Landscape to screen condensing units along building perimeter.

7. Staff recommends the applicant add additional fenestration on the side walls of the forecourt to break up the larger blank expanses on either side.
   a) See revised architectural plans.

8. Staff recommends the applicant add a window on the north corner, west façade (within the kitchens) to break up the blank wall on this corner.
   a) See revised architectural plans.

Pool Cabana:

1. Staff supports the pool cabana as designed; applicant to submit section and detail drawings for this building in future submissions.
   a) See revised architectural plans.

02/28/2023 TRC meeting - Staff comments and responses:

1. Staff does not support the parapet roof elements at the corners and believes that the new corner conditions do not complement the more traditional apartment architecture present throughout the rest of the building. Staff believes the front gable accents are more indicative of traditional Beaufort architecture, and the parapet roofs do not appropriately accentuate the corners of the building as was recommended by the Board. Staff recommends the applicant consider another element, such as larger cross gables at the corners.
   a) The corners were revised to reflect more traditional Beaufort architecture, with cross gables at the main corner, per the staff recommendation. Please see A-105, A-201, and A-202.
2. Staff believes the roof plan is too complex and recommends the applicant simplify the roof forms to include fewer protrusions and fewer smaller front gables. Staff believes that the majority of the north façade has a clearer pattern of accent gables that is clearly articulated in the roof plan (see staff diagram).
   a) The roof plan has been simplified and articulated more clearly, per staff recommendations. Please see A-105, A-201, and A-202.

3. As discussed with the Community Development Director at the 2/28 TRC meeting, the building must adhere to RMX building requirements, including 40% fenestration requirement on the ground floor facing Old Jericho Road and 15% on upper floors. Staff can grant a 10% adjustment to reduce the requirement to 36%. Applicant to include this revision in future submissions.
   a) The ground floor windows were enlarged in both width and height, and windows were added to the courtyard entry, to achieve 36% transparency on the ground floor. Please see the “West Elevation” on A-201.

4. Applicant to note that per Section 2.4.2.B, the impervious surface coverage for the site shall not exceed 65% for RMX; applicant to demonstrate compliance.
   a) See civil plan with site data table illustrating the impervious ratio is 43%, considerably less than the 65% maximum.

5. Staff recommends the applicant align exterior wall of the southernmost stair with the adjacent bedroom to the north.
   a) The stair was aligned with the bedroom, per the staff recommendation. Please see A-101 thru A-104.

6. Staff recommends the applicant select lighter colors for the brick and gray siding; staff believes the current colors make the building appear visually heavy.
   a) Colors were adjusted on the exterior to lighten the building visually, per the staff recommendation. Please see A-201, A-202, and A-301.

7. Staff recommends that the areas of lap siding be carried to the top of the wall. The current termination level of the lap siding appears arbitrary.
   a) The areas of lap siding are now carried to the top of the wall, per the staff recommendation. Please see A-201, A-202, and A-301.

Please continue your review of the project and contact me with any questions/concerns at (843) 379-2222 or ryan@andrews-sc.com.

Sincerely,

Ryan Lyle, P.E.
BATTERY CREEK APARTMENTS – 25 OLD JERICHO ROAD
CITY OF BEAUFORT – DBR PRELIMINARY
PROJECT NARRATIVE
Submit Date: March 09, 2023
Meeting Date: April 09, 2023

PROJECT SITE
Location: Old Jericho Road

TMs:
R120 028 00A 0409 0000
R120 028 00A 0410 0000
R120 028 00A 0411 0000
R120 028 00A 0412 0000
R120 028 00A 0413 0000

Zoning: Split Zoned property. The building and the site will adhere to RMX.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
The proposed 5.25 ac site is located at 25 Old Jericho Road in the City of Beaufort. The project consists of demolishing two single-family homes and constructing a four story multi-family apartment building as well as a cabana and pool. The development proposes 83 units with a unit mix of 23-1 Bedroom units, 44-2 Bedroom units, and 16-3 Bedroom units. The project will be completed in a single phase. The building setbacks for the RMX zoning are 10-50' along the front, 10' along the sides, and 10' along the rear. The apartment building was designed according to the Beaufort Code by raising the finished floor 18", entering from Old Jericho Road through a forecourt / courtyard. Transparency on the ground floor is 30% and, on all floors above, is 25% of the total wall area for the elevation fronting Old Jericho Road. The exterior materials consist of brick veneer at the base and a combination of fiber cement lap siding, fiber cement board and batten siding, and fiber cement panels. The roof is pitched with a 6:12 slope. The HVAC condensing units will be screened from view by landscaping along the building perimeter.

STORM DRAINAGE, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND UTILITIES
The site generally drains north to south and west to east. Drainage and grading plans will be prepared after the conceptual site layout is generally acceptable by the City. Parking will be provided as needed and if required. The site is 43% impervious (less than 85% maximum). Water and sewer service will be provided by extending main lines from Malvern Center. Dominion Power will provide electric service as well as provide leased site lighting. Hargray will provide tele-communications.

ACCESS
One full turn access is planned along Old Jericho Road which is maintained by Beaufort County.

PARKING NEEDS
Parking has been provided at the ratios shown below:

1.00 spaces / 1 Bedroom Unit
1.75 spaces / 2 Bedroom Unit
2.00 spaces / 3 Bedroom Unit

The total number of spaces required is 132 which are provided onsite.
1 SUMMARY OF REQUEST

25 Old Jericho Road, Battery Creek Apartments
Applicant: Ryan Lyle, Andrews Engineering

The applicant is requesting preliminary approval for an 83-unit four-story apartment building with pool and pool cabana.

Background: This application received conceptual design approval at the November 2021 DRB meeting. The applicant significantly altered the design, resubmitted, and received conceptual approval at the January 2023 DRB Meeting. The applicant met with city staff at the 2/28/2023 TRC meeting.

2 FACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address:</th>
<th>25 Old Jericho Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel ID:</td>
<td>R120 028 000 0409/0410/0411/0412/0413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Number:</td>
<td>23-01 DRB.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Ryan Lyle, Andrews Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Request:</td>
<td>Conceptual New Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>TS-UC/RMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Single-family Residential/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District Development Standards for TS-UC:
- Setback requirements -- Primary Structure:
  - Front: 0' min./15' max.
  - Rear setback -- 5' min.
  - Side Corner/Alley -- 0' min./15' max.
  - Side Interior -- 0' min.
- Maximum Lot Coverage: 100%
- Frontage Buildout: 60% Min
- Conditional Uses: Retail with Drive-Thru Facilities are conditional in TS-UC

District Development Standards for RMX:
- Setback requirements -- Primary Structure:
  - Front -- 10' min./60' max., when corridor buffer requirements-Section 5.5.1.8 are required, the maximum front setback may be increased to no greater than 50' behind the buffer.
  - Rear setback -- 15' min.
- **Side Corner** – 10’ min.
- **Side Interior** – 10’ min./15’ min. when abutting any Transect-based district
- **Minimum Lot Width**: 60’ min.; where properties are accessed via a rear alley or lane, this standard may be decreased by 25%.
- **Lot Size**: 6,000 sf min.; where properties are accessed via a rear alley or lane, this standard may be decreased by 25%.
- **Impervious Surface Coverage**: 65% max.
- **Maximum Building Height**: 4 stories max.
- **Residential Density**: 30 units/acre max.; measured as gross density

**Streets:**
Old Jericho Road is a two-lane road, with no drainage ditch and no sidewalks. The applicant is proposing to build a sidewalk along their portion of the road.

**Access:**
The Applicant is proposing to build one entrance point at the southwest end of the property. A possible second entrance point is proposed on the north side of the property to connect to Horton Trail. No traffic study has been completed, as required by the Code.

**Lots and Blocks:**
The property is zoned T5-UC/RMX, and a typical urban lot and block street pattern does not currently exist. The lots are larger in size with small buildings on each lot; Old Jericho Road is not a densely populated road.

**Heights:**
No four-story buildings exist on Old Jericho Road. The adjoining properties all are either one story commercial or residential buildings.

**Future Land Use:**
The Area is planned for Urban uses and development.

**Zoning:**
The zoning of the property T5-UC/RMX does not have a density limit but does regulate a four-story maximum height (RMX), and basic setbacks to the road. The use of multi-family housing is permitted by the Code. The applicant has selected the RMX zoning classification.

**Amenities:** A pool and pool cabana is proposed on the northeast corner of the lot.
The Project does

References:
- The Beaufort Code
- Civic Master Plan

3 STAFF COMMENTS

Analysis:

Section 9.8.2.1 Decisions/Findings of Fact: Following the public meeting, the Design Review Board may approve, deny, or approve with conditions the application for a Major Development. No Major Development shall be approved unless the following findings of fact can be made:

1. The plan is consistent with the adopted plans and policies of the City.
   - Applicant has shown a future connection to Horton Lane.

2. The plan complies with all applicable requirements of this Code.
   - A. Since the conceptual application, applicant has selected the RMX zoning classification. Staff has reviewed this project based on RMX zoning classifications for both building architecture and site.
   - B. Since conceptual approval, applicant has provided the minimum required 32 on-site parking spaces.
   - C. Applicant is in compliance with the frontage buildout requirements for the RMX zoning classification, as the building has an approximate frontage buildout percentage at 74%.
   - D. Staff believes the applicant has met RMX fenestration requirements with 40% fenestration on the ground floor and 15% on the upper floors per Section 4.6.4.C.1. In future submissions, applicant to submit an elevation sheet with shaded fenestration areas/wall areas and their square footages to confirm the 15% and 40% requirements. The administrator can grant a 10% adjustment on these percentages.
   - E. Applicant to note in future submissions that the building is designed to meet requirements of the RMX district, rather than TS-UC. Current drawings state that the building is designed to meet TS-UC requirements.
   - F. Applicant has relocated the HVAC units from the roof to ground level. Applicant to confirm that the initial and mature planting heights for the shrubs will properly screen the HVAC equipment.
   - G. Applicant to add additional screening around the landscaped areas to the north and south of the primary driveway entrance.
3. There exists adequate infrastructure (transportation and utilities) to support the plan as proposed.

- A. No traffic study or improvements to the infrastructure of Old Jericho Road are being proposed.

- B. Staff has significant concerns that there is no sidewalk, curb and gutter, or other urban infrastructure close by or adjacent to this property.

4. The proposed plan conforms to the character of the neighborhood, considering the location, type and height of buildings or structures and the type and extent of landscaping on the site.

- A. There could be concern as per Section 4.3.2.C.1 about establishing very urban densities and 4-story heights adjacent to traditional suburban residential development.

5. The proposed plan conforms to the Building Design Standards in Article 4.

- A. Applicant has added additional fenestration on the side walls of the forecourt as well as on either side of the double entry doors; staff supports this change.

- B. Applicant has added a window on the north corner, west façade (within the kitchens); staff supports this change.

- C. Staff believes that the façades lack a clear pattern, and the corners are not well-defined. Staff does not support the small projecting front gables above some of the porches and believes that these additional front gables overcomplicate the massing of the building and create too many variations in the roof plan. Staff offers the following recommendations to help remediate these issues and simplify the overall massing of the building. See staff diagrams attached at the end of the agenda packet.

  i. Flipping the A(b) and B(b) units (south and north of the forecourt) so the porches are directly adjacent to the forecourt. This will allow A(b) units to be symmetrical about the larger hip roof.

  ii. Removing the additional hip roof over the bedroom in the B(c) units, west façade at the northwest corner. This one-bay accent hip roof is not present anywhere else on the building.

  iii. In the B(c) corner units (northwest corner) extend the kitchen/living room walls beyond the bedrooms to better define the corner and cross-gable roof.

  iv. Replacing the walls enclosing the northwest corner balconies with the same railing and column condition as seen on the ground floor.

  v. Extend the porch in the 3-bedroom (C[b]) units (southwest corner of the building) to the outside corner of the bedroom to the north and eliminate the single-bay
providing a gable over balcony. This comment applies to all balconies with a single-bay projecting gable.

- D. Some of the balconies appear to be missing the railings; staff believes this is a graphic error. Applicant to revise for final submission.
- E. Applicant to enlarge and refine the building forecourt section to be at least ¾" : 1'-0" scale for future submissions.
- F. Applicant to enlarge and refine the typical window section details to at least ¾" : 1'-0" scale for future submissions.
- G. Applicant to submit a section drawing through a typical balcony/hip roof area at ¾" : 1'-0" scale or larger.
- H. Applicant to note that all fiber cement trim and siding must be smooth per Section 4.6.3.A.1.a.
- I. Applicant to submit cutsheets for the brick, asphalt shingle, windows, exterior doors, lighting, vinyl louvers, and railings as well as specific paint colors for all wall elements.
- J. Staff supports the pool cabana as designed; applicant to submit section and detail drawings for this building in future submissions.
- K. Applicant to provide a roof plan for the pool cabana.
- L. Applicant to follow comment 5.I above for the pool cabana regarding paint colors and cutsheets.

6. **The application will not substantially lessen the value of adjoining or abutting property, and will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or other neighborhood uses.**

- A. There could be concern as per Section 4.3.2.C.1 about establishing very urban densities and 4-story heights adjacent to traditional suburban residential development.

Staff finds the project does not clearly satisfy Section 9.6.2 specifically the findings of 2, 3, 4, 5 listed above and raises concerns as to how the project satisfies findings 1 and 6. Staff would note an X signifies no concern as to compliance with the Beaufort Code.

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Staff recommends deferral of preliminary approval based on the findings of Section 9.6.2.**
CITY STAFF INTRODUCTION

1556 Salem Road
Salem Road Senior Housing
January 16, 2023

Michael Riley
215 Church Street Suite 200
Decatur, GA 30030

RE: 23-02 DRB.1 1556 Salem Road – Salem Road Senior Housing

Dear Mr. Riley:

On January 12, 2023, the City of Beaufort Design Review Board (DRB) met to review your application for construction of the Salem Road senior housing apartment complex at 1556 Salem Road. The Board voted to defer preliminary approval and have the applicant and staff work together on all staff comments and Board comments and retain for preliminary approval comments include the roof, entrances, possible main entrance along Salem Road, moving the building back, ensuring the parking is compliant, and break up the façade on Salem Road.

Board Conditions:

1. Study the roof conditions, entrances, possible main entrance along Salem Road, moving the building back, ensuring the parking is compliant, and break up the façade on Salem Road

Staff Conditions:

1. Staff supports the garden on the northeast corner of the property but requests greater detail of this garden area for final submission.
2. Applicant to demonstrate compliance with Section C.5.8 – Neighborhood St. 2 – Yield Street Section along Salem Road.
3. Applicant to provide a 5’ minimum side and rear buffer per Section 5.5.1, which follows screening requirements per Section 5.7.8 Parking Lot Screening and Landscaping.
4. Applicant to demonstrate compliance with Section 5.8 Lighting.
5. Applicant has demonstrated that the parking area will be screened with a brick wall; staff supports this element. Applicant to provide details for this brick wall at future submission.
6. Staff recommends the applicant include additional screening along the southern and northern edges of the property to screen the parking from Salem Road. Applicant to refer to Section 5.7.8 for screening shrub or wall requirements.
7. Applicant to provide a plant schedule for final submission. Applicant to note that all screening shrubs must have a minimum 4' projected height per Section 5.7.8. Please refer to Appendix A for a list of approved plantings.

8. Applicant to provide material choice for dumpster enclosure.

Apartment Building:
1. Applicant to label the elevations using cardinal directions rather than “front,” “rear,” “side.”

2. Applicant to note that the primary façade is the east façade along Salem Road.

3. Applicant to demonstrate compliance with Section 4.6.3.C.1 to show that the fenestration percentage for the ground floor along Salem Road is at least 30%, and upper floors along Salem Road are at least 20%. Applicant to submit an elevation sheet with shaded fenestration areas/wall areas and their square footage to confirm the 20% and 30% requirements.

4. Applicant to ensure that the stoops meet the dimension requirements and are a minimum of 6’ deep and 4’ wide per Section 4.4.D; staff believes the stoops meet this requirement but does not see a dimension called out in the drawings.

5. Staff supports the use of the awnings on the tower structures; applicant to submit a section drawing through the awnings.

6. Applicant has provided an appropriate roof detail showing the parapet roof. Applicant has also provided a roof plan showing the HVAC units on the roof, staff supports this.

7. Applicant to note that all doors and windows must be simulated divided lite windows with external grilles and interior spacer bars.

8. Applicant has noted that Hardie panel, siding, and trim will have a “flat finish.” Applicant to clarify if this means smooth finish. Smooth finish siding and panels are required per Section 4.6.3.A.1.b

9. Staff supports the use of the boxed and batten siding on the second, third, and fourth floors of the projecting gable footed elements.

10. Staff recommends the applicant rework the fenestration on the west and south elevations at the ground floor to assist in the French door setup rather than the proposed door and transom with large sidelight beside. The proposed cress conditions are best visible on sheet A3.1, bottom right of page and A3.3 bottom of the page.

11. Staff recommends the applicant revise the eased opening in the stairwell to be vertical in proportion rather than square.

12. Applicant to provide clarity on the fenestration at the south end of the building (all four floors) and west end of the building (all four floors) – refer to sheet A3.1 (top) and A3.3 (bottom). The elevations show four vertical columns of windows flanking the central hall; however, these windows do not show up in the floor plans. Furthermore, the rendering on sheet A3.4 shows some windows as faux windows. Applicant to clarify. Staff recommends that all of these windows be fully functional windows.

13. For final submission, applicant to submit cutsheets for materials including brick, asphalt shingles, metal roof, windows, doors, exterior lighting, etc.

14. Staff recommends the applicant extend the main entry/lobby to Salem Road so that it also fronts to the street. Staff understands this will affect the program of the first-floor plan to accommodate. While the applicant is using individual entrances along Salem Road for those first-floor units that face the street and staff supports this design, staff believes the other occupants should have a more direct route to the street that such an extension of the entry/lobby would afford them.
15. Staff believes the applicant does not adhere to Section 4.6.3.C.2.a regarding window treatments. The current design illustrates the fiber cement head and sill casings flush with the outside face of the window as well as the outside face of the lap siding. Staff recommends the applicant switch to a 1 1/4" fiber cement trim for all windows, doors, corner boards, skirtboards, etc. to provide proper reveals and shadow lines to all windows, doors, and siding.

16. Staff believes the main roof at the two-bay tower connection on the west façade (labeled partial front elevation) on sheet A3.1 creates an odd connection with the low-sloped roofs. Applicant to redesign these roof areas to more properly balance with the geometry of the architecture. Staff recommends the applicant mirror the pattern of the bays and tower elements on the west façade so that it matches the east façade facing Salem Road.

17. Staff recommends the applicant consider a cross-gabled condition at the northeast corner rather than the hipped condition currently proposed.

18. Staff recommends the porte cochere be extended to fully cover the drop-off lane.

If you have any questions, feel free to call the Development of Community & Economic Development at (843) 525-7011.

Sincerely,

Benjie Morillo, Chair
Design Review Board

Via email: mmorillo@andrews-sc.com

cc: file copy
APPLICANT PRESENTATION

1556 Salem Road
Salem Road Senior Housing
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS

DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / E. (843) 966-5606
Email: development@cityofbeaufort.org / website: www.cityofbeaufort.org

OFFICE USE ONLY: Date Filed: Application #: Zoning District:

Schedule: The Design Review Board (DRB) typically meets the 2nd Thursday of each month at 2pm. Upon receipt of an application, staff will review the submittal and then contact the applicant letting them know when the meeting will be. A complete schedule can be found at: https://www.cityofbeaufort.org/379/Design-Review-Board

Submittal Requirements: All forms and information shall be submitted digitally + 5 hardcopies of all documents. In addition to a complete application form, applicants shall submit the required items according to the checklists on the subsequent page.

Review Request: □ Conceptual □ Preliminary □ Final

Pursuant to Section 6-29-1145 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, is this tract or parcel restricted by any recorded covenant that is contrary to, conflicts with, or prohibits the activity described in this application? □ Yes □ No

Applicant, Property, and Project Information

Applicant Name: Michael Riley

Applicant Address: 215 Church Street Suite 200, Decatur, GA 30030

Applicant E-mail: mriley@martinriley.com

Applicant Phone Number: 404-373-2800

Applicant Title: □ Homeowner □ Tenant □ Architect □ Engineer □ Developer

Owner (if other than the Applicant): Beaufort Salem Road Development LLC

Owner Address: 22 Mulberry Bluff Drive, Savannah, GA 31406

Project Name: Beaufort Senior Apartments

Property Address: 1556 Salem Road, Beaufort, SC 29902

Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number): R122 029 000 0625 0000

Date Submitted: 3/8/2023


This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION
Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 986-5606
Email: development@cityofbeaufort.org / Website: www.cityofbeaufort.org

Required Project Information
Project Name: Beaufort Senior Apartments
Property Size in Acres: 4.203
Proposed Building Use: Multi-family Residential
Building Square Footage (if multiple buildings, please list each one and their square footage by floor): 141,860 sq. ft.
# of Parking Spaces Required: 189
# of Parking Spaces Provided: 189
Is this project a redevelopment project: Y N
Are there existing buildings on the site? Y N If yes, will they remain? Y N
Provide a brief Project Narrative and outline any specific questions you would like addressed.
The project is a 4-story senior apartment building with 112 one-bedroom units and 44 two-bedroom units. It includes common spaces such as a community room, office, kitchen, fitness center, media room, community laundry room, and mail center. On-site surface parking and bicycle racks are also provided.

Applicant's Signature: ___________________________ Date: 3-8-23
Owner's Signature: ___________________________ Date: 3-8-23
(The owner's signature is required if the applicant is not the owner.)

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Attention: Julie A. Bachety, Administrative Assistant II
City of Beaufort Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina 29902
E-Mail: development@cityofbeaufort.org | Phone: (843) 525-7011 | Fax: (843) 986-5606
Response to Design Review Board comments (01-16-2023)

RE: City of Beaufort Design Review Board
   Proposed Beaufort Senior Village, Beaufort, SC

Board Conditions:

1. The Study the roof conditions, entrances, possible main entrance along Salem Road, moving the building back, ensuring the parking is compliant, and break up the façade on Salem Road.
   a. See updated sheets.

Staff Conditions:

Site:

1. Staff supports the garden on the northeast corner of the property but requests greater detail of this garden area for final submission.
   a. See sheet A.1.18
2. Applicant to demonstrate compliance with Section C.5.8 – Neighborhood St. 2 – Yield Street Section along Salem Road.
   a. See sheet SP.1.
3. Applicant to provide a 5' minimum side and rear buffer per Section 5.5.1, which follows screening requirements per Section 5.7.8 Parking Lot Screening and Landscaping.
   a. See sheet LP.1.
4. Applicant to demonstrate compliance with Section 5.8 Lighting.
   a. Shall be provided in future submission.
5. Applicant has demonstrated that the parking area will be screened with a brick wall; staff supports this element. Applicant to provide details for this brick wall at future submission.
   a. See sheet A1.18
6. Staff recommends the applicant include additional screening along the southern and northern edges of the property to screen the parking from Salem Road. Applicant to refer to Section 5.7.8 for screening shrub or wall requirements.
   a. See sheet SP.1.
7. Applicant to provide a plant schedule for final submission. Applicant to note that all screening shrubs must have a minimum 4’ projected height per Section 5.7.8. Please refer to Appendix A for a list of approved plantings.
   a. Shall be provided in future submission.
8. Applicant to provide material choice for dumpster enclosure.
   a. CMU wall with brick veneer exterior.

**Apartment Building:**

1. Applicant to label the elevations using cardinal directions rather than “front,” “rear,” “side.” Applicant to note that the primary façade is the east façade along Salem Road
   a. See sheets A3.1 – A3.9.

2. Applicant to demonstrate compliance with Section 4.6.3.C.1 to show that the fenestration percentage for the ground floor along Salem Road is at least 30%, and upper floors along Salem Road are at least 20%. Applicant to submit an elevation sheet with shaded fenestration areas/wall areas and their square footages to confirm the 20% and 30% requirements.  
   a. See sheet A3.9.

3. Staff supports the use of the stoops along Salem Road. Applicant to ensure that the stoops meet the dimension requirements and are a minimum 4' deep and 4' wide per Section 4.4.D; staff believes the stoops meet this requirement but does not see a dimension called out in the drawings.
   a. See unit plans sheets A2.1 & A2.2.

4. Staff supports the use of the awnings on the tower structures; applicant to submit a section drawing through the awnings.

5. Applicant has provided an appropriate roof detail showing the parapet roof. Applicant has also provided a roof plan showing the HVAC units on the roof, staff supports this.
   a. As previously provided.

6. Applicant has provided a section showing a typical window detail with 1x4 fiber cement trim. This detail, however, lacks a projecting window sill required in Section 4.6.3.C.2.a; applicant to revise these sections to include a projecting sill in future submissions.
   a. See detail 5, sheet A1.18, changed fiber cement trim to 1 ¼".

7. Applicant to note that all doors and windows must be simulated divided lite windows with external grilles and interior spacer bars.
   a. As previously provided.

8. Applicant has noted that Hardie panel, siding, and trim will have a “flat finish.” Applicant to clarify if this means smooth finish. Smooth finish siding and panels are required per Section 4.6.3.A.1.b.
   a. Yes, flat finish is smooth. Flat means little to no shine.

9. Staff supports the use of the board and batten siding on the second, third, and fourth floors of the projecting gable fronted elements.
   a. As previously provided.

10. Staff recommends the applicant rework the fenestration on the west and south elevations at the ground floor stair egress so that the fenestration mimics a French door setup rather than the proposed door and transom with large sidelight beside. The proposed egress conditions are best visible on sheet A3.1, bottom right of page and A3.3 bottom of the page.
    a. See updated sheets A3.1 and A3.3.

11. Staff recommends the applicant revise the cased opening in the stairwells to be vertical in proportion rather than square.
    a. See updated sheets A3.1 and A3.3.

12. Applicant to provide clarity on the fenestration at the south end of the building (all four floors) and west end of the building (all four floors) – refer to sheet A3.1 (top) and A3.3 (bottom). The elevations show four vertical columns of windows flanking the central hall; however, these windows do not show up in the floor plans. Furthermore, the rendering on sheet A3.4 shows some windows as faux windows. Applicant to clarify. Staff recommends that all of these windows be fully functional windows.
    a. See updated sheets A3.1 & A3.3. The fake windows have been removed.
13. For final submission, applicant to submit cutsheets for materials including brick, asphalt shingles, metal roof, windows, doors, exterior lighting, etc.

14. Staff recommends the applicant extend the main entry/vestibule to Salem Road so that it also fronts to the street. Staff understands this will affect the program of the first-floor plan to accommodate. While the applicant is using individual entrances along Salem Road for those first-floor units that face the street and staff supports this design, staff believes the other occupants should have a more direct route to the street that such an extension of the entry/vestibule would afford them.

15. Staff believes the applicant does not adhere to Section 4.6.3.C.2.a regarding window treatments. The current design illustrates the fiber cement head and sill casings flush with the outside face of the window as well as the outside face of the lap siding. Staff recommends the applicant switch to a 1 1/4" fiber cement trim for all windows, doors, corner boards, skirtboards, etc. to provide proper reveals and shadow lines to all windows, doors, and siding.
   a. See detail 5, sheet A1.18. Changed fiber cement trim to 1 1/4".

16. Staff believes the main roof at the two-bay tower connection on the west façade (labeled partial front elevation) on sheet A3.1 creates an odd connection with the low-sloped roofs. Applicant to redesign these roof areas to more properly balance with the geometry of the architecture. Staff recommends the applicant mirror the pattern of the bays and tower elements on the west façade so that it matches the east façade facing Salem Road.
   a. See sheet A3.1.

17. Staff recommends the applicant consider a cross-gabled condition at the northeast corner rather than the hipped condition currently proposed.

18. Staff recommends the porte cochere be extended to fully cover the drop-off lane.
   a. See sheet A1.1, porte-cochere has been extended to cover the drop-off area.
Response to comments (03-02-2023)

1. Staff would like to see the north end of the east elevation have more brick in central gable section to balance the brick in the southern section. Given the board’s concerns of adding more variety to the elevation, I don’t think brick should be in every segment, but a better balance should be studied. Brick should also be considered on the north elevation.
   a. Added more brick on the north and east elevations. See sheets A3.1 – A3.9.

2. Staff recommends the applicant consider some segments of the Salem Road (east) Elevation utilize clapboard siding and retain some with vertical board siding to help with visually breaking up the scale of the building.
   a. Added more horizontal siding on the central gables with no brick. See sheets A3.1 – A3.9.

3. The recessed (hyphen) areas could benefit from a different color to ensure they recede visually they also could be clad in a different pattern.
   a. Changed the recessed lap siding to a darker shade. See sheets A3.1 – A3.9.

4. While the board asked for the gables to be considered for the south and west ends, staff doesn’t think the slit in the roof under the added gables is a good solution. Staff recommends the slit in the roof be eliminated and the roof made continuous in this area below the added gable. The added gable could be made slightly larger to be closer in size to the small gables on the street elevation.
   a. Changed the south and west ends. See sheets A3.1 – A3.9.

5. On the northeast corner – drop the cross gable down to engage with roof and make it the same width as the gable just south and west of it (at inlets).
   a. Changed the cross gable. See sheets A3.1 – A3.9.

6. Staff recommends the applicant provide one 3D view of the west elevation to show how the pitched roof to flat roofs are resolved in 3D rather than just having 2D elevations of this condition.
   a. See sheets A3.8.

7. Extend sidewalk to the south of the ingress/egress drive to property line and provide pedestrian crossing marking at ingress/egress drive.
   a. See sheets SP.1.

8. SP.1 appears the building needs to shift west on the site, so the hyphens are at 16 feet to comply with the 100 feet max building width at frontage. Note, I believe the southern portion of the building from end of building to first recess is approximately 104 feet. This section needs to be less than 100 feet between the minimum and maximum front setback.
   a. Updated the building footprint. See sheets SP.1.

9. Staff recommends the applicant eliminate the faux windows on the south elevation or deal with these differently. Applying shutters to these is odd because there aren’t shutters elsewhere on the building.
   a. Removed the faux windows. See sheets A3.1 – A3.9.

10. Windows in Hardie areas need the projecting sill (no picture framing) per section 4.6.3.2.a. Refer to link for an example of what could be done to satisfy this requirement.
    a. See sheet A1.18.
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SENIOR RESIDENCE BEAUFORT - BUILDING RENDER @ NORTH - EAST SIDE

BEAUFORT, SC.
1. EAST (SALEM ROAD) ELEVATION - FRONTPAGE PERCENTAGE

2. EAST (SALEM ROAD) ELEVATION - LOT FRONTAGE PERCENTAGE
SITE LIGHTING NOTES:

1. Light poles shall be erected and provided with GFI as indicated to avoid energizing on adjacent property. Cut swales to avoid induced room currents.

2. Location may be adjusted if site to avoid other utility or structure conflicts.

3. Circuits shall be direct bury and served from house panel or pedestal transformers as required.

4. All fixtures shall have photocell control.

5. Installation shall comply with local jurisdictional requirements.

6. Circuits below parking or traffic surface shall be 24" protective covers unless separate treatment requirements in other divisions of the issue.

7. Poles shall be black round nonclass direct burial.
Design Review Board Meeting
Staff Report
From the Department of Community and Economic Development
12 April 2023

1 SUMMARY OF REQUEST

1556 Salem Road, Beaufort Senior Apartments
Applicant: Michael Riley, Architect

The applicant is requesting final approval for a 156-unit apartment building including (112) 1-bedroom units, (44) 2-bedroom units with on-site parking.

Background: The project has been in review for some time, and across three different Community Development Administrations. The applicant first participated in a pre-design meeting on 12/8/2020 and a revision meeting on 3/2/2022. The applicant met with the city on 4/26/2022 and then attended a pre-app meeting with the city on 11/2/2022. This application was deferred at the January 2023 DRB meeting. The applicant met with city staff at the 2/28/2023 TRC meeting. The current Staff has raised issues that heretofore were unaddressed through the last 2 plus years. The Applicant contends that many of the issues had not previously been raised, and they had corrected all issues they were aware of until the February 28th meeting. In light of the history and time, this project is moving forward to the DRB, but with new Administration's comments and concerns.

2 FACTS

Property Address: 1556 Salem Road
Parcel ID: R122 029 000 0625 0000
Case Number: 23-02 DRB.2
Applicant: Michael Riley, Architect
Type of Request: Preliminary New Construction
Zoning: T4-N
Current Use: Vacant
Proposed Use: Residential

District Development Standards for T4-N:
- Setback requirements – Primary Structure:
  - Front – 0’ min./15’ max.
  - Rear setback – 10’ min.
  - Side Corner/Alley – 0’ min./10’ max.
  - Side interior – 5’ min. or 0’ if attached.
- Maximum Building Height: 2 stories min. at significant intersections/4 stories max; 3.5 stories max in & fronting Historic District & interior lots along Allison Rd.
- Frontage Build-Out: 60% min./85% max.
• **Maximum Lot Coverage:** 70% maximum for rooftops, additional 10% allowed for total impervious coverage.

**Streets:**
Salem road is a two-lane road, with a drainage ditch and no sidewalks. The applicant would build sidewalk along their portion of the road, which would link to the County's funded Salem Road sidewalk project.

**Access:**
The Applicant is proposing to build two entrance points at the North and South ends of the property. The Southern end entrance lines up with the entrance across Salem Road but is along a sharp curve. The Northern Entrance would be a shared access drive with the adjoining Northern property. No traffic study has been completed, as required by the Code.

**Lots and Blocks:**
While the property is zoned T-4N, a typical urban lot and block street pattern does not currently exist. Moreover, due to the sharp curve and natural features to the South, an urban grid pattern cannot continue Southward. There is a car dealership on the adjoining non-Salem side of this lot.

**Heights:**
A four-story bank building does exist two lots away along HWY 170. However, the adjoining properties all are either one story commercial buildings, with two story houses across the street, and a couple of two story fourplexes to the South.

**Future Land Use:**
The Area is planned for Urban uses and development.

**Zoning:**
The zoning of the property T-4 N does not have a density limit, but does regulate a four-story maximum height, and basic setbacks to the road. The use of multi-family senior housing is a permitted use in the Code.

**Amenities:** A community garden is planned for the Northwest corner next to access point. There is also a small gazebo in the center of the lot.

**References:**
• The Beaufort Code
• Civic Master Plan
3 STAFF COMMENTS

Analysis:

Section 9.8.2.1 Decisions/Findings of Fact: Following the public meeting, the Design Review Board may approve, deny, or approve with conditions the application for a Major Development. No Major Development shall be approved unless the following findings of fact can be made:

1. The plan is consistent with the adopted plans and policies of the City.
   ✓ The plan is consistent with density, use and setbacks of the T4-N district, and the future land use plan.
   ✗ (Or sections the Staff does not believe is consistent with the requirements of Section 9.8.3)
   Staff has concerns that the scale of the building is too large for the surrounding area and does not fit the neighboring context. Per Section 4.3.2, “Monolithic massing that disrupts the predominant building pattern of the neighborhood and corridor is strongly discouraged.”
   ✗ A. Per Section 4.3.2.C.1, “New construction should complement the massing of neighboring buildings by utilizing roof forms, architectural trim, differentiation of façade planes, and a relationship of solids (siding and walls) to voids (window and door openings) that are consistent with the patterns established in neighboring buildings.”
   ✗ B. Per Section 4.3.2.C.2, “When large scale construction is proposed that is not consistent with the predominant building height and lot width of the surrounding area, special attention shall be paid to specific building design elements in order to articulate a building form that is appropriate to the neighborhood context. These include the items listed in the paragraph above, along with siting, setbacks, and façade treatments.”

2. The plan complies with all applicable requirements of this Code.
   ✗ A. The building frontage is currently calculated at 54% and would require 60% frontage.
   ✗ B. Applicant must provide a 5’ minimum side and rear buffer per Section 5.5.1, which follows screening requirements per Section 5.7.8 Parking Lot Screening and Landscaping.
   ✗ C. The applicant has not submitted a traffic study for this project and is required to provide this study per the Beaufort Code. Staff is concerned about the density of the development and its impact on Salem Road which is a two-lane rural road.
   ✗ D. Applicant to demonstrate compliance with Section C.5.8 – Neighborhood St. 2 – Yield Street Section along Salem Road. Applicant has drawn a 0’ sidewalk in compliance with this section, but has not illustrated the planting strip with trees 40’ O.C.
E. Applicant must better screen the parking areas to the north and south of the building per Section 5.7.8.

3. There exists adequate infrastructure (transportation and utilities) to support the plan as proposed.

- A. Staff has significant concerns that an urban block with infrastructure is not present on the property being developed. There is no sidewalk, curb and gutter, or other urban infrastructure close by or adjacent to this property.
- B. No traffic study or improvements to the infrastructure of Salem Bay are being proposed.
- C. Staff is concerned with the location of the southern ingress/egress along Salem Road. While this is directly across from the existing Moss Street intersection, the new proposed drive entry connects to Salem at a severe curve in the road which will cause dangerous conditions for those egressing from the new complex. Staff recommends this ingress/egress be relocated away from the existing Salem Road curve.

4. The proposed plan conforms to the character of the neighborhood, considering the location, type and height of buildings or structures and the type and extent of landscaping on the site.

- A. Staff has concerns that the scale of the building is too large for the surrounding area and does not fit the neighboring context. Per Section 4.3.2, “Monolithic massing that disrupts the predominant building pattern of the neighborhood and corridor is strongly discouraged.”
- B. Per Section 4.3.2.C.1, “New construction should complement the massing of neighboring buildings by utilizing roof forms, architectural trim, differentiation of façade planes, and a relationship of solids (siding and walls) to voids (window and door openings) that are consistent with the patterns established in neighboring buildings.”
- C. Per Section 4.3.2.C.2, “When large scale construction is proposed that is not consistent with the predominant building height and lot width of the surrounding area, special attention shall be paid to specific building design elements in order to articulate a building form that is appropriate to the neighborhood context. These include the items listed in the paragraph above, along with siting, setbacks, and façade treatments.”

5. The proposed plan conforms to the Building Design Standards in Article 4.

✓ Applicant has demonstrated compliance with Section 4.6.3.C.1 regarding fenestration percentage for the ground floor along Salem Road at 32%, second floor at 29.1%, third floor at 29.1%, and fourth floor at 34.1%.

- A. Staff does not support the one over one windows. Per Section 4.6.3.C.2.c.i, “Thin mullions or muntins shall be required on windows larger than 2 feet in any direction, except for shopfronts. The depth of the mullion shall not be less than the width.” Staff would support a two over two lite pattern and recommends that the windows have simulated divided lite external grilles with interior spacer bars.
- B. Staff believes the parapet roof connections on the west façade are still unresolved and believes that the parapet (flat) roof areas should be recessed and flanked with a
front gable on either side as shown on the east façade. On the east façade, the flat roof is appropriately recessed between two gable roofs (see sheet A1.13).

- C. Staff recommends placing the gray lap siding only within the recessed bays below the flat roofs and keep any projecting bays with the board and batten siding or Hardie panel.

- D. Staff supports the addition of a shed roof over the entrance on the south façade. Applicant to show this roof in plan.

- E. Staff does not support the projecting balcony (fourth floor) at the end of the hallway on the south façade and recommends the applicant remove the balcony as well as front façade on this façade.

- F. Staff recommends the applicant choose lighter colors for the lap siding and brick. Staff has concerns that the combination of several darker gray colors and a deep red brick will make the building visually heavier. Note the renderings and 2D partial west elevation on Sheet A3.1 depict different blue colors for the Hardie panel, and these renderings should depict actual proposed materials and colors.

6. The application will not substantially lessen the value of adjoining or abutting property and will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or other neighborhood uses.

- A. There could be concern as per Section 4.3.2 C 1 about establishing very urban densities at 37 units per acre and 4 story heights adjacent to traditional suburban residential development.

Staff finds the project does not clearly satisfy Section 9.8.2 specifically the findings of 2,3,4,5 listed above and also raises concerns as to how the project satisfies findings 1, and 6. Staff would note, an X signifies concerns as to compliance with the Beaufort Code.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends denial of the item or deferring the item to a future DRB date feasible to the Applicant, not to exceed 120 days, based on the findings of Section 9.8.2, in that the Site Plan does not satisfy the findings and requirements of the Beaufort Code found in pages 2-4 of this Staff Report.