



**AGENDA**  
**BEAUFORT COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**Thursday, September 1, 2016, 2:30 p.m.**  
**Grace Coastal Church**  
**15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC 29909**  
**Phone: (843) 255-2140**

Committee Members:

James Atkins / Architect - Chairman  
J. Michael Brock / Landscape Architect – Vice Chairman  
Peter Brower / Architect-Landscape Architect  
Bill Allison / Architect-Landscape Architect  
Pearce Scott / Architect-Landscape Architect  
Donald L. Starkey / At-Large  
James K. Tiller / Landscape Architect

1. CALL TO ORDER – 2:30 P.M.
2. REVIEW OF August 4<sup>th</sup> 2016 , MEETING MINUTES ([backup](#))
3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
4. NEW BUSINESS: No New Business
5. OLD BUSINESS:
  - a. Sprenger Healthcare – Okatie, 234 Okatie Village Drive - Conceptual ([backup](#))
  - b. A Priori, LLC (formerly BFG Communication) – Project Revision – 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive – Conceptual ([backup](#))
6. OTHER BUSINESS: Next Scheduled Meeting—2:30 p.m. on Thursday, October 6, 2016 at Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC, 29909
7. ADJOURNMENT



BEAUFORT COUNTY  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) MINUTES  
August 4, 2016, Grace Coastal Church, 15 Williams Drive, Okatie, SC

---

**Members Present:** James Atkins, J. Michael Brock, Bill Allison, Peter Brower, Pearce Scott and Donald L. Starkey

**Members Absent:** James K. Tiller

**Staff Present:** Robert Merchant, Long Range Planner; Nancy Moss, Planner

**Guests:** Patrick Orefice, Glick, Boehm Architecture; Andrea Atherton, Beaufort County; Greg Baisch, Ward Edwards; Eric Hoover, Ward Edwards; Jim Strecansky, Strecansky & Company; Bill Bishop, Parker's; Nathan Long, Thomas & Hutton; Andrew Lynch, Lynch Associates Architects; Wallace Milling, Witmer, Jones, Keefer Ltd.; Thomas Rhodes, Lady's Island Resident; Jim Rowan, Fraser Construction; Dan Riedel, President of the Sunset Boulevard Homeowner's Association; Chuck Newton, Sea Island Corridor Coalition; Tim Huber, Ramsey Development; DeAnn Komanecky, Savannah Morning News.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** James Atkins called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** There was no public comment.
3. **MINUTES:** Chairman Atkins brought attention to a typographical error within the second paragraph of old business in the Design Review Board meeting minutes dated July 7, 2016. The last sentence should read " Mr. Allison said that the setting of the building was different than Port Royal because one can drive around it and see all four elevations." Mr. Allison motioned to approve the amended minutes of July 7, 2016. Mr. Brower seconded to approve as amended. Motion carried.
4. **NEW BUSINESS:**
  - A. **Beaufort County Animal Shelter – Barrel Landing (SC 170):** Mr. Merchant gave the project background. Patrick Orefice of Glick/Boehm Architecture and Greg Baisch of Ward Edwards gave the presentation for the applicant. Mr. Orefice passed out a rendering of the proposed building. Mr. Orefice said the rendering was for illustration purposes. Mr. Baisch asked for the area not meeting the foundation buffer to be pointed out. He said that it fronts exterior green space. He said that they would remedy the deficiency. Mr. Orefice said that the HVAC units are screened from view by fencing and roof elements. He said that the railing could be changed to something more opaque, but it was not visible from the public.

Mr. Brower said it was one of the best looking projects he saw in a while. He had no comments for improving it. Mr. Scott commented on the hip dormers. He suggested they could be shed dormers to be more Lowcountry. Mr. Orefice said that the shed dormer needed to be higher and greater proportion to accommodate the shed roof. He said increasing the proportions would throw off the whole Lowcountry aesthetic. Mr. Starkey asked why they changed the window type in the front shed roof area. Mr. Orefice said that the rendering was more updated than the drawings they submitted for DRB review. He said that they proposed having cross mullions in all of the windows.

Mr. Allison asked about the proposed siding materials. Mr. Orefice said under the porch is

Savannah-gray colored brick. The main siding is hardie-plank lap siding and above 8' board and batten siding would be used. Mr. Allison suggested having fewer material types to be simpler. He would prefer to see a consistent overhanging eave with rafter tails or without. He suggested that Mr. Orefice pick one roofing material. Mr. Atkins said it was a very nice looking project. He agreed that there should be consistency of windows, and that having vertical proportions to the window panes is important to keep a Lowcountry residential style. He also preferred shed dormers to be consistent. Mr. Orefice said that the hand railing would be a fiberglass material and that the structural columns would be wrapped in a fiberglass material.

Mr. Brower motioned to approve as is conceptually. Motion died for lack of a second. Mr. Allison motioned to approve with the following conditions:

- Simplify the architectural design by incorporating fewer material types;
- Provide a consistent overhanging eave;
- Select one roofing material;
- Maintain consistency of windows by having vertical proportions which are in keeping with a Lowcountry residential style; and,
- Integrate shed dormers to keep a consistent architectural design.

Mr. Scott seconded. Mr. Brower said he preferred the exposed rafter tails on the porch but did not feel that it needed to be repeated throughout. Mr. Orefice explained that there were three tenants and the different treatments are meant to give distinction to the three tenants. Motion carried.

**B. A Priori, LLC (BFG Communications), 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive, Bluffton:** Mr. Merchant gave the project background. Mr. Baisch presented for the applicant. He clarified that the BFG Communications element would not be utilizing this building for advertising. He said that the owner may be utilizing tenant space within the building. He said that they were limited on the foundation buffer along the front because the utility easement on the back limited the ability to move the front of the building back. He said that they did not want this property to be used as a cut-through from Buckingham Plantation Drive to Anolyn Court so the front parking area was physically separated from the side loading area. Mr. Strecansky presented the architecture. He felt that they could get there on most of the comments. He said that they would have trouble meeting the Lowcountry vernacular; he said it's just a warehouse.

Mr. Allison said that he worked with metal buildings before. He said that with a little creativity, it's easier to incorporate Lowcountry elements than most buildings. He said that there are a lot of good precedents. He would like to see more creativity. Mr. Brock reflected Mr. Allison's comments. Mr. Scott said that what was presented before was so much better than this. Mr. Brower felt that many Lowcountry buildings were agricultural; there are ways to break up roofs and make it a whole lot better than what was presented. Mr. Atkins echoed the other board members' comments. He acknowledged that the original building proposal was very elaborate. He said that the building that was torn down had better detailing than what is being presented. It had a stucco façade, porch element, gables and other features that articulated it.

Mr. Brower motioned to disapprove for conceptual. Mr. Scott seconded. Motion carried.

**C. Parker's Convenience Store – Oyster Bluff Drive, Lady's Island:** Mr. Merchant gave the project background. Mr. Long passed out plans to the board members. Mr. Bishop of Parker's gave the presentation. He said that they designed an entirely new type of Parkers store to address this site. He said that the building faced Oyster Bluff Drive. He said that they designed a two sided store. He

said that they would widen Oyster Bluff Drive and provide parallel parking. He said that the pavilion on the corner would make it more of a walking community. He said they would install bicycle racks there. He said that these improvements shifted the operations into the site. He said that their design team was present to answer board questions.

Mr. Atkins asked if there were any public comments about this project.

Thomas Rhodes, a property owner on Oyster Factory Road, commented. He said that the current configuration of the site plan was a nuisance by having parking along Oyster Factory Road. He felt that the building should be up to the road as stated in the master plan with the pumps on the northern side of the building. Dan Riedel with the Sunset Boulevard Homeowner's Association and the Sea Island Corridor Coalition provided public comments. He mentioned that there would be a worse traffic problem on Sunset Boulevard. He wanted to bring this issue to the attention to the DRB. He wasn't objecting to this project, but felt that it contributed to the use of Sunset Boulevard as a short cut.

Chuck Newton with the Sea Island Corridor Coalition asked the applicant to explain how Oyster Bluff Drive would provide access. Nathan Long said that Oyster Bluff drive would run parallel to Sams Point Road and connect Oyster factory road and the DR Horton development. Bill Bishop explained that Oyster Factory Road would become narrower as you approach Sunset Boulevard. They propose to construct speed control devices.

Mr. Brower said that he doesn't completely understand the whole site configuration. He said that everyone wishes for the store they used on Drayton in Savannah. He felt that this was oriented appropriately given the road located to the west.

Mr. Scott asked for clarification on the build-to zone.

Mr. Allison asked if there would be a pond on the other side of Oyster Bluff Drive. Nathan Long said that DR Horton modified their design to have a small pond on the other side. He said that the parallel parking along Oyster Bluff Drive would continue to be added as development occurs.

Mr. Scott liked that the building had two entrances. He recommended that having the outdoor eating area along Oyster Bluff Drive.

Mr. Bishop said that they didn't want to build an inconvenient convenience store. He said that's why they didn't have the building on the corner. He created the pavilion to have a dining area that was removed enough from the paved areas.

Mr. Starkey felt that the utility boxes were too prominent. They needed screening to make it work. Andy Lynch said that they tried to locate the mechanical units on the least visible side of the store. He said they would try to consolidate the utility boxes into one large box and install additional landscaping. Mr. Starkey wanted the utility boxes less obvious and asked that they be painted the same color as the facade color. Mr. Starkey did not think the pavilion would get much use and wanted the street side to have more room for tables along Oyster Bluff Drive.

Mr. Brock said he liked the new configuration for the store and the parallel parking along Oyster Bluff Drive. He asked if the concrete spheres are set in stone. Nathan Long said that Greg Parker liked having a flush entrance and that the spheres served as bollards. Mr. Brock said that introducing oyster shells in the architecture, bollards, or paving would be a good idea to reflect the name of the development.

Mr. Allison said he had an issue with the zoning of the property. He said it is serving more as an outparcel. He felt that he would personally prefer turning the building sideways backing on to Oyster Factory Road. He would rather have the pavilion on the other side where it's closer to future development.

Mr. Atkins said that the pavilion is not quite large enough to work. He felt it could be simplified but expanded a little bit to act more as an extension of the structure. He liked the architecture of the store and felt it fit in a more residential area. He said it would be nice to change the detailing behind the Bahaman shutters, to a different siding material so that the shutters didn't look tacked on. He would like to push up the pavilion up to both corners to anchor the corner.

Chuck Newton asked a question. He asked why they spend so much time on design when the canopy is dominating the front of the building. He said that it would look much better if the frontage is not dominated by gasoline pumps.

Mr. Scott asked if they gave rotating the site any consideration. Bill Bishop said that it didn't function as well. Mr. Allison said he is in favor of the architecture. He would like the SRT to look further at the site. He felt it didn't reach the intent of the T4 zoning because there is a retention pond across the street. He felt that T4 zoning wasn't appropriate for a small area as this.

Nathan Long clarified that SRT needed a determination from the DRB on the site plan issue before it could move forward

Mr. Atkins motioned to approve conceptually with the following conditions:

- The site plan meets the build-to zone requirements with the following modifications. The pavilion needs to be moved toward the corner of Oyster Factory Road and Oyster Bluff Drive. The pavilion should be enlarged in size and simplified to serve as an architectural extension of the main building.
- The applicant will need to address the long gas pump canopy when presenting to the DRB for final approval.
- Mechanical equipment will be to be adequately screened
- The buffer along Sams Point Road is required to be a minimum of 10 feet wide.
- Refine discrepancies between plant schedule and plan and make sure that all plants meet the minimum size requirements.

Mr. Brower seconded. Motion carried.

## 5. OLD BUSINESS:

- A. Sprenger Healthcare – Okatie:** Mr. Brock recused himself. Mr. Merchant gave project background. Tim Huber, General Manager of Ramsey Development Corporation, passed out a hard copy of the architectural elevations to the Board. Mr. Huber said that there are some modifications to the elevations. He said that the operator doesn't want two windows in every resident room. He said they need to meet 10% natural light requirements for each room. He said that the rooms were 13 feet wide. It made it impractical to have two windows per room (additional material costs, increased energy costs, additional window treatments, difficult to arrange furniture under the windows). The operator asked them to appeal to the Board to request one window per room.

Mr. Brower said it looks better than the last time. He felt that in the long areas where the roof is lowest, it would look better with fewer windows and use shutters to break up wall areas. He felt

that the tower element detailing wasn't replicated across the building. He felt the dormers on the center section didn't add much. He said it's possible that shed dormers would look better. Mr. Scott agreed with the dormer comments. He agreed with repeating the right side tower element. He said that the protruding element on the south elevation should have a gable, not a shed. Mr. Starkey said that the dormers should be larger or taken off. The parking lot is too close to the building on the north side of the building. There should be enough room for plantings next to the windows. Mr. Allison felt the building improved over the last meeting, but he characterized the building as being a "land-scraper", a term used by Leon Krier.

Mr. Atkins said the building made great strides from two meetings ago. He agreed with the dormer comments. He felt that an 18 inch overhang isn't needed on the dormers. He felt that the corner element does a good job anchoring the corner. He would like to see them at the other corners of the building. He felt it would serve as a terminus for a long facade. He agreed that one window with shutters would be better than too many windows. Shutters need to be proportioned with the windows. He felt that the gable on the south elevation should be a gable instead of a shed. He felt that overall it's a lot closer to something that is workable.

The Mr. Huber asked if the tower on the other corner on the front elevation would be enough. Mr. Atkins said that it doesn't need to be exactly the same element, but the Bahaman shutters, roof and accent should be repeated. He said you can replicate the elements on the porte cochere in the center. Mr. Brower said it could be used in the protruding elements on either side of the main entrance. Mr. Atkins said that other elements such as Bahaman shutters could give windows more vertical configuration. Use consistent language from the tower element to carry throughout the entire elevation. Mr. Atkins said on room windows – to use standard shutters; use Bahaman shutters for accent elements.

Mr. Scott motioned to give the project conceptual approval with the following conditions:

- The applicant should integrate a consistent Lowcountry vernacular by incorporating the elements on the tower within the protruding areas of the building design.
- Reduce the height of the taller windows at the entrances to allow for a more workable scale. Consider incorporating Bahaman shutters above the entrance area windows to give the illusion of window height.
- Reduce the number of windows to one per room and add standard shutters on each side which are proportional to the window dimensions.
- Remove or enlarge the two main roof dormers to fit the mass and scale of the roof structure.
- Revise the site plan to provide an 8' foundation buffer on the north side of the building as required in Table 5.8.60
- Use consistent window spacing and consider reducing the number of window units to one per room. Incorporate standard window shutters on each side of the room windows which match the window dimensions.
- Change the shed roof on the south elevation to be a gable roof.

Motion carried with Mr. Allison voting no.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS:** There was no other business.

**7. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:23 pm.

**Sprenger Healthcare - Okatie**

<b>Type of Submission:</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Developer:</b>	Sprenger Real Estate, LLC (Ramsey Development)
<b>Architect:</b>	Michael Riley, Impact Architects
<b>Engineer:</b>	Greg Baisch, Ward Edwards
<b>Landscape Architect:</b>	Michael Brock, M. Brock Designs, LLC
<b>Type of Project:</b>	Institutional
<b>Location:</b>	60 Okatie Village Drive near Sun City
<b>Zoning Designation:</b>	Okatie Center PUD

The applicant is proposing the construction of a 110 unit, 77,782 sf assisted/independent living community. The project is located in the southwest quadrant of McGarveys Corner on Okatie Center Blvd. S approximately 600 feet east of the Food Lion Shopping Center. The site consists of primarily planted pine ranging in size from 12 to 15 DBH. The building is primarily one story and is organized around internal courtyards that provide light and open space to the residents.

The project received conceptual approval from the Staff Review Team on May 11. At that time, staff approved a minor PUD master plan amendment that consisted of a reconfiguration of proposed streets and building footprints.

The project was reviewed conceptually by the DRB and tabled at both its June 2nd and July 7<sup>th</sup> meetings over issues primarily related to the architecture of the building. At the August 4<sup>th</sup> DRB meeting, the project received conceptual approval with the following conditions:

- The applicant should integrate a consistent Lowcountry vernacular by incorporating the elements on the tower within the protruding areas of the building design. ***The architectural tower feature on the southwest corner was duplicated and added to the northwest corner of the building. Standard shutters were added to the room windows.***
- Reduce the height of the taller windows at the entrances to allow for a more workable scale. Consider incorporating Bahaman shutters above the entrance area windows to give the illusion of window height. ***The window height was reduced and Bahaman shutters were added at the main entry and at the northwest and southwest corners.***
- Remove or enlarge the two main roof dormers to fit the mass and scale of the roof structure. ***The two dormers were removed.***
- Revise the site plan to provide an 8' foundation buffer on the north side of the building as required in Table 5.8.60: ***The site plan was revised to allow for the foundation buffer.***
- Use consistent window spacing and consider reducing the number of window units to one per room. Incorporate standard window shutters on each side of the room windows which match the window dimensions. ***The numbers of windows were reduced to one per room and standard shutters were added. The window spacing is not consistent on the front elevation.***
- Change the shed roof on the south elevation to be a gable roof. ***The shed roof was changed to a gable roof.***

The applicant has submitted the following documents for this review: Overall Clearing Plan; A Boundary, Tree & Topographic Survey, Lighting Plan, Revised Floor Plan & Elevations for Scheme 4 dated 8/10/2016, a

Beaufort County Design Review Board  
September 1, 2016

Revised Conceptual Site Plan dated 8/18/2016 for conceptual approval.

**Staff Comments:**

1. Along the west elevation there is an irregular spacing of windows and eave brackets. The eave brackets are not shown on the south portion of this elevation.
2. Landscape Plans:
  - a. Plant schedule should include minimum tree calipers for overstory trees (2 ½”) and understory trees (1 ½”) per Section 5.8.30C1 and Section 5.8.30C2.
  - b. Grasses must be a minimum 3 gallon container size per Section 5.8.30C5.

## **A Priori (formerly BFG Communications) - Conceptual**

<b>Type of Submission:</b>	<b>Conceptual</b>
<b>Developer:</b>	<b>A Priori, LLC</b>
<b>Architect:</b>	William Court, Court Atkins Architects
<b>Engineer:</b>	Ward Edwards Engineering
<b>Type of Project:</b>	Commercial Office/Warehouse
<b>Location:</b>	The 1.49 acre site is located at 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive, Bluffton, SC 29910 which is on the corner of Buckingham Plantation Drive and Anolyn Court. This property is less than ¼ mile south of the traffic signal at the intersection of Fording Island Road (SC 278) and Buckingham Plantation Drive.
<b>Zoning Designation:</b>	Regional Center Mixed Use (C5)

In February 2014, the Southern Beaufort County Corridor Review Board gave final approval to a corporate headquarters building for BFG, an advertising agency located at 7 Buckingham Plantation Drive. The approved building was unique with many different sloped roofs, corrugated metal siding and reflective glass. The existing 6,000 square foot building was cleared from the site, but the approved building was never built. The applicant is requesting to amend the development permit with a revised site and building plan. The applicant is proposing to construct a 1 story 13,100 square foot building with front offices and back warehouse space which includes parking areas, sidewalks, loading area and associated infrastructure. This project has two points of direct access; one from Buckingham Plantation Drive on the west and one from Anolyn Court on the east side of the property which bi-sects the building from the Phase I parking lot. The site is bound to the north by Anolyn Court, to the east by Anolyn Court, to the south by Lot #7 which is a Commercial building and to the west by Buckingham Plantation Drive.

This project was presented at the 8/4/2016 DRB meeting for conceptual approval. The DRB denied conceptual approval due to the building design lacking a consistent architectural language that reflects traditional Lowcountry architecture, and that the building design did not conform to many of the General Architectural Standards & Guidelines required in the Community Development Code. The Board directed the applicant to look at packing sheds, barns, and warehouses for examples of vernacular Lowcountry commercial architecture.

### **Staff Comments:**

1. This building does not meet some of the standards in Article 5, Division 5.3 (Architectural Standards and Guidelines) of the Community Development Code:
  - Building facades are required to be designed to provide visual interest through detail and ornamentation that is viewed at the pedestrian level as well as from a distance. Wall plans are required to be divided into smaller components by the arrangement of windows and other façade articulation features, such as columns, pilasters, canopies and awnings. Buildings are required to incorporate such elements as wainscoting, water tables, canopies, roof lines and parapets to provide vertical articulation.
  - Roof Articulation: Varied roof pitches and planes shall be used to break up the massing per Table 5.3.30C
  - No metal buildings are permitted without an approved exterior facade material per Table 5.3.30D
2. The west side of the building should have an 8' foundation buffer between the building and the parking area per Section 5.8.6
3. The windows on the Right Elevation are not shown on the floor plan of the Architectural drawings.
4. The vertical wall features (downspouts?) on the Left Side Elevation are not labeled and not shown on the floor plan of the Architectural drawings.
5. Revise application to show Carolyn's Landscaping as Landscape Designer for this project.