

SOUTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY  
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD MINUTES  
February 24, 2010, Hilton Head Library

---

**Members Present:**

Laura Barrett  
Jake Lee  
Jim Tiller  
Ed Pinckney  
Martha Crapse

**Members Absent:** Joe Hall

**Staff Present:** Judy Nash Timmer, Development Review Planner  
Linda Maietta, Planning Assistant

I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:05 p.m. by Mr. Jim Tiller, Acting Chairman.

II. **General Public Comment:** There were no public comments. Ms. Judy Timmer reminded the Board and the audience that the meeting is broadcast on live TV. Applicants should speak at the podium for their presentation and then step back to allow for better sound when Board is making comments.

III. **Review of Minutes:** The Board reviewed the February 10, 2010, meeting minutes. **Motion:** Mr. Jake Lee made a motion, and Ms. Martha Crapse seconded the motion, **to accept the February 10, 2010, minutes as written.** The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Barrett, Lee, Pinckney, Tiller, Pinckney, Crapse).

IV. **Old Business:** There was no old business to discuss.

V. **New Business:** Chairman Tiller moved on to new business.

A. Renovations for Seaquins Ballroom & Fred Astaire Studio  
(Conceptual)

Chairman Tiller asked if there was someone representing that group. Chairman Tiller asked them to come forward, state their name, and who they represent. The group representing this project was Mr. Michael Griffith, the Architect on record; Mr. Brian Pennell, the Project Engineer; and Mr. Doug Church, the Landscape Architect.

Mr. Griffith provided the following information about the project:

- existing 9,000 SF, single-story, pre-engineered building
- it is the old Patio Shoppe located on Highway 278 in Bluffton
- the intent of the client is to renovate approximately 6,000 SF and to keep it as a single-story dwelling with its primary use as a ballroom; secondary use, wedding receptions
- plan to renovate front and right-side elevation which has more visual exposure from the highway than the other sides

- the right-side elevation is going to be the main entrance into the dance hall which is why there are entrance doors and canopies
- on the right-side of the structure, the existing brick that comes around the corner will be a painted brick, stucco on top of it. Where the bricks stop, there will be a continuation of that stucco façade to a point just prior to the overhead door. Will not be on the same plane.
- The metal roof of the building is not going away.
- Still under discussion – if eave will be cut allowing for an internal gutter or to put in scuppers designed within the architecture coming out from the wall.
- Replying to the question of how the conceptual architectural character responds to the corridor and its relative architecture, Mr. Griffith replied that they do comply with materials, thoughts in color, and visual exposure (front and side of building) as you're coming down the road

Chairman Tiller then asked Ms. Timmer to present her staff report to the Board Ms. Timmer read her report to the Board. (see attached).

Mr. Pennell, the Project Engineer, then made his presentation which included:

- pointed out this was a redevelopment
- removed pavement in front of building to enlarge the 12' buffer to 15'
- will be formalizing gravel area in the back of the building and extending the parking since parking will be lost in front of the building due to buffer change
- shared driveway/parking access with adjacent building
- sidewalk going from 5' to 6'
- planting plan was not submitted with the conceptual drawings

Mr. Church stated he was waiting to get a hardscape approval from the Board before detailing out the landscape. Mr. Church did share a couple of sketches/ideas:

- increased amount of plant area in the front of the building
- client wants a courtyard out front for married couples to receive their guests. Courtyard will include concrete benches and small paved area
- Added extra 15' buffer area or so between Highway 278 and parking lot
- Curbing is still in question
- Dealing with a power line over the middle of the buffer which is limiting planting of trees

After this review, the Board proceeded with asking questions to clarify conceptual plans. Mr. Lee remarked that the building type and proposed changes may not responsive to the ordinance. It is contrary to things around it. Feedback from the Board included the following:

- Some sort of roof form statement
- Try to be compatible with the building on the left to create continuity and be more responsive to the ordinance

After a brief discussion about voting on conceptual, Mr. Lee made a motion to defer with comments. Mr. Pinckney seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Lee, Pinckney, Tiller, Barrett, Crapse).

#### B. Beaufort County Sheriff's Office SWAT Building

Chairman Tiller asked Ms. Timmer for her comments. Ms. Timmer read her staff report to the Board (see attached).

The Project Engineer, Mr. Andy Klosterman from Andrews & Burgess and Mr. Bill Chambers, the Project Architect, were present before the Board. Chairman Tiller stated that he thought the submittal was a big improvement over what was previously submitted and appreciated the effort in what was done. Since there is no requirement for irrigation in the ordinance, Mr. Klosterman advised the Board that they were going to try and reuse storm water for the irrigation. Mr. Pinckney asked about colors. Mr. Chambers stated that colors were submitted in the presentation last meeting but believed all standards were met. Mr. Church went on to explain that there was a minor change in the building architecture: based on the Board's request, they screened the storage building to the extent requested and the canopy on the front porch was removed.

Mr. Lee made a motion to approve. Mr. Pinckney seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously (FOR: Pinckney, Lee, Tiller, Barrett, Crapse)

#### C. St. Gregory the Great School Expansion (conceptual)

Chairman Tiller asked Ms. Timmer for the staff report. Mr. Timmer read the staff report to the Board (see attached).

Mr. Dan Ogden, Ogden Architecture; Sister Canice Andrews, Principal of St. Gregory School; Father Sweeney, and Michael Brock, Civil Engineer from Ward Edwards, were present.

Mr. Ogden began his presentation:

- Stand-alone addition to house the pre-K through K classrooms
- Would like to have a "classroom in the woods"
- Concept includes doing a framed building with cypress siding
- Cathedral ceilings with dormers and covered front porch
- Location of building chosen so it is close to the school for access and function of administration. Also, the trees that are left on the campus are in close proximity to the school, it gave the sense of the "classroom in the woods"
- Size of the building was dictated by classroom attendance for K and pre-K

Mr. Lee thought that what was articulated as a cabin in the woods in actually an environment, not the building. Like it or not, you are tied to the existing building from a functional point of view.

Sister Canice spoke. Her thought was to take the pre-K and K children out of an institutionalized building and away from the older children but at the same time are able to come into the main building for art and music. Sister Canice wanted something with a more “homey” atmosphere; she did not want it to look like a school to make the transition easier from home to the next step and then into an institution.

Ms. Barrett suggested they turn the building inside out. Don’t focus on the exterior as being the cabin but make the environment on the inside. Possibly an atrium to bring in the trees. Ms. Barrett stated that she would not like to see this building next to the existing buildings; they need to relate to each other. Not an exact copy but something that ties the buildings together. Compatibility is what is important.

Mr. Ogden then stated that he is prepared to make an all stucco building, including changing the columns to match the existing building. The site of the building was discussed. Father Sweeney stressed the importance of security for the children and the closeness of the new building to the existing building.

Mr. Lee made a motion to defer with comments. The motion was seconded and motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Crapse, Pinckney, Lee, Tiller, Barrett).

#### VI. Other Business.

Ms. Timmer provided each Board member a copy of the project checklist discussed at the February 10, 2010, meeting. Still need to add:

- Conceptual landscape plan
- Drawing sizes
- Note that gives this Board the right to change, add to, or request additional information if deemed necessary.
- Conceptual not required but strongly recommended. At your own risk if you choose to ignore comments made.
- At a conceptual review, you’ll get recommendations, no vote will be taken (Vote to defer and resubmit according to the comments made)

Ms. Linda Maietta will make changes to the checklist and email it out to the Board for additional changes and comments.

Chairman Tiller asked the group is it would be okay to change the time of the meeting from a 4:00 p.m. start to a 3:00 p.m. start. The Board members were fine with the time change. Ms. Maietta will check with the Library regarding room availability with time change and advise the Board members.

Board replacement: Chairman Tiller had talked to Steve Riley. Mr. Riley will look into it. Again, this is a “citizens” position open. All are invited to recommend someone.

Chairman Tiller adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:30 p.m.

