

SOUTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY  
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD MINUTES  
April 14, 2010, Hilton Head Library

---

**Members Present:**

Laura Barrett  
Jake Lee  
Joe Hall  
Ed Pinckney  
Martha Crapse  
Jim Tiller

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

I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 3:05 p.m. by Chairman Jim Tiller.

II. **General Public Comment:** There were no public comments.

III. **Review of Minutes:** The Board reviewed the March 24, 2010, meeting minutes. **Motion:** Mr. Jake Lee made a motion, and Mr. Ed Pinckney seconded the motion, **to accept the March 24, 2010, minutes as written.** The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Barrett, Lee, Hall, Pinckney, Crapse, Tiller).

IV. **Old Business: Seaquins Ballroom & Fred Astaire Studio (Final)**

Chairman Tiller asked for staff comments from Ms. Timmer. Ms. Timmer reiterated that this project was submitted for final approval. She then read from the staff report (copy attached).

Chairman Tiller asked that the representative 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 stated that what would be presented today to the Board for a final review would be two schemes in which the team addressed some of the concerns and issues raised by the Board in February's review. Mr. Church passed out color renditions of each site scheme including the monument out front with its proposed signage, along with the building in the foreground with more detail. Mr. Griffith then proceeded to review the pictures on the easel which showed the existing Patio Shoppe in its present day condition, buildings on the immediate left – Paxton Plaza and the Mattress Shop, and buildings on the

immediate right – Title Max and a vacant building. Mr. Griffith then detailed both options:

- Has stucco exterior front facades, in keeping with exteriors of adjacent properties (both options) (color sample provided, along with a sample of the existing brick)
- Both options have flat facades with additions to that façade
- Will be using existing windows
- Option 1 has the concept of a trellis, barrel vaulted above the existing windows
- Corner of the building was emphasized because of the vehicular view coming down Highway 278. Addition would be built on top of the existing roof for hurricane reasoning
- Option 2 is using trellising in such a way to leave the exposed framework for an intended visual roof. They do not intend to cover it with a roof, just want to leave a sloped trellis. In the middle is an existing door that will remain to be used as an egress door and also an access door for outside activities or functions.
- They are removing the existing wood frame build-out on the right-side elevation and not rebuilding anything; however, they are going to make it an entrance into the main ballroom facility.
- Both options are keeping the outside capability of a courtyard.
- Signage proposed is same in both options.
- Color schemes as indicated before includes brick and stucco but will also include banding. The banding color is one to match the logo of the Sequins Ballroom (light blue, similar to blue on the adjacent property)

Mr. Church proceeded to go over the landscape plan:

- The comment concerning the use of ornamental grasses only in the buffer area – there is a power line going right through the middle of that buffer which precludes using any trees.
- The main reason grass is used it though is the whole theme of this development is sea grass, sequins, and sea. We tried to create a sea of grass in front of the parking, wrapping around right up to the front door.
- The grass being used is taller grass, 3 to 4 feet high. Grass will help buffer the front ends of the automobiles in the parking lot. It is thickly planted and presents a solid sea of grass.
- Although listed as live oaks on the side and back of the building the client would prefer to use willow oaks.
- Retained the five crepe myrtles from the original sketch around the courtyard, as well as other plant material to screen the front of the building without blocking the glass/windows.
- Plant material used in the foundation under the window and on the columns is to help complement the architectural elevations.
- The existing large sago palm on the property will be re-used on the right front corner.

Mr. Pennel reviewed the site plan changes:

- Sidewalk was reduced from 6' wide to 5' wide

- Modified the back parking lot, shifting some parking, to address drainage
- The parking in front has been reduced

Chairman Tiller then entertained questions/comments from the Board. Strong concerns were expressed about the grasses in the buffer, the lack of trees in the buffer, the lack of height variation in the buffer.

Ms. Timmer addressed the ordinance requirements: 7 under story trees per 100'. That is what the Board would be looking at for a new project. Understanding that there is limitation because of the over story power line, there is the ability to group trees. The Board typically looks for something that is about 6' tall upon installation for an under story tree. The live oak trees cannot be removed because of the trees island and the requirement to have an over story tree in the tree island.

The architecture was discussed. Mr. Lee stated that one of the options is very compatible with its neighbor and that is very important. Mr. Lee is in favor of Option #1 (curved option). No lighting plan with foot candles was submitted for review.

Mr. Lee made a motion and Mr. Pinckney seconded the motion to approve the project with the condition that a revised landscape plan and lighting plan be submitted for staff/Board review. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Barrett, Lee, Hall, Pinckney, Crapse, Tiller).

#### V. **New Business:**

##### **A. Enmark Gas Station, Lot B-2A, Island West Commercial PUD (Conceptual)**

Chairman Tiller recused himself from this part of the meeting. Mr. Lee took over as Acting Chairman. Mr. Lee asked that the representative come forward, state their name and who they represent. The group representing this project was Mr. Ryan Lyle, Project Engineer, Andrews & Burgess; Mr. Chris Darnell, Landscape Architect, JK Tiller Associates; Mr. Stewart Daniel, Project Architect, Colonial Group, Inc.

Ms. Timmer read the staff report (copy attached).

Mr. Lyle proceeded with his presentation:

- To address Ms. Timmer's comment about the care of the 30" live oak where construction of the building will trespass into the tree protection area, Mr. Lyle does have an arborist report to share with the Board. Mr. Lyle will certainly provide for all the recommendations made in the report.
- There are 50' corridor buffers.
- Because of the new storm water ordinance, there is a rain garden on-site, the 278 buffer and the Island West park buffer will also treat storm water.

- Increased the caliper for the shrub sizes along the rear of the store to create a thicker buffer for the Island West neighbors.
- Met the requirement for 8' foundation buffer

The Board agreed the landscape design is perfectly adequate. Mr. Lee then moved on to the architecture of the building: the building itself and its covered gas canopies is prototypical of Enmark Stations. Mr. Daniel stated that this Enmark will be identical to the one located on Highway 170 in Okatie. Colors selected should be compatible with the other buildings in the PUD (Toyota, red roof and Goodwill, gray roof). Color samples were provided to the Board, roof sample is called ox blood. Mr. Lee thought the color would work fine.

Mr. Hall made a motion and Mr. Pinckney seconded the motion to approve the Enmark Gas Station as a preliminary design and encouraged the applicant to take comments and incorporate them into the final submission. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Barrett, Lee, Hall, Pinckney, Crapse).

### **B. Longhorn Steakhouse, Tanger Outlet 1 (Conceptual)**

Chairman Tiller returned to the room. Ms. Timmer read the staff report (copy attached). Chairman Tiller asked that the representative come forward, state their name and who they represent. The group representing this project was Mr. Michael Brock, Landscape Architect, Ward Edwards; Greg Soltis, Brand Design Manager for Longhorn, Darden Restaurants, Inc.; Brett Mashchak, Site Development Manager, Darden Restaurants, Inc.

Mr. Brock began the presentation:

- The applicant seeks to retain the tree standard nonconformities as outlined in the PUD. This is also contained in the development agreement as well. Trees that are currently located outside the buffer areas will be either relocated or removed and replaced in accordance with the development agreement. Existing trees that can be relocated will be relocated in the landscape areas shown in the site plan and the applicant proposes replanting the larger caliper trees as space permits. This verbiage was included the Tanger narrative, the Panera narrative and will be in subsequent narratives for the adjacent site.
- Buffer areas throughout the development vary, some exceeding 8', some under 8'. Would like the Board to look at this as a whole, not as individual parcels.
- The HVAC equipment is located on the roof and in subsequent elevations that will be detailed.
- Plant schedule will be provided with the final submission.
- Longhorn is responsible for the landscaping just inside the parcel, around the perimeter of the outside parking spaces and what is around the building as well.
- Lighting plans will be revised to get fixtures outside the islands. A building lighting plan will be provided with the final submission.

Rather than verbally review the architecture drawings provided to the Board, Mr. Soltis stated that they have attempted to be very respectful of the low country architecture by embellishing the Longhorn building with those details – changes in materials and changes in the roof line.

Board comments included:

- Instead of using stone on the building, consider using tabby. Tabby is more indigenous to this area than round river stone.
- Rather than introducing a third material, another approach would be to use brick instead of the stone.
- Architectural form, materials and color is what the Board is trying to keep compatible. Introducing a non-regional material, such as stone, is discouraged and usually denied.

Mr. Lee made a motion to defer this project with comments.

Mr. Brock asked the Board about the tower elements. Mr. Lee responded that it is part of the continuity of the Tanger development. Mr. Brock asked the Board about the brackets. Mr. Lee responded that the use of the window covers is not a problem. He cautioned Mr. Brock about the colors of the brick and the siding being compatible with what is around it. Mr. Lee stated that the entry element and the chimney element would be the challenges that may be appropriate for Longhorn but not for the low country.

Mr. Soltis asked if coquina stone is a possible alternative. Mr. Lee stated that he would put that in the same category as tabby.

Chairman Tiller stated that a motion had been made concerning the architecture of Longhorn and asked for a second.

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

Chairman Tiller asked the Board if there were questions on the site plan. Mr. Pinckney raised a question about the number of parking spaces. Mr. Brock stated they are 2% over the requirement. There are 84 parking spaces shown but there will be some cross use between the retail parking and the restaurant parking.

Chairman Tiller made several comments:

- Could not follow the logic in regard to the number of parking spaces required per thousand
- Concerned about the dumpster locations and delivery drop-offs. Suggested that the service corridor for Longhorn be similar in alignment as it is for Panera Bread so entrance would be from the same location.
- Concerned about the interconnectivity regarding walkways. Part of the selling point of this original project was that it would be easy for

pedestrians to walk from one location to the other, without having to get in their cars to drive from one location to another. While these comments don't specifically relate to this project, they do relate to the project as a whole and need to be addressed by the development.

- Review the plant materials selected; plants used will overcrowd the small areas they are confined to.

Chairman Tiller called for any other comments. A question was raised by the Board as to whose responsibility it is to pick up on what was the original master plan idea of pedestrian connection and do something about it. Referring back to Chairman Tiller's remark about this project being sold as pedestrian oriented, Ms. Timmer stated that it is under the purview of the Board to tweak the plan to make it work. Chairman Tiller felt part of the problem was that the Board does not know what is contained in the development agreement. Ms. Timmer will review the development agreement with the Planning Director and let the applicant and the Board know what determination is made so the project can move forward. Chairman Tiller encouraged Mr. Brock to look at this issue and talk it over with his client because it is an issue with the Board.

Mr. Brock proceeded to address some of Chairman Tiller's comments. There are some things that are changing on the Tanger retail side that have not yet been submitted to the Board that will help the problem with the site plan and the connectivity with the pedestrian walkways, creating that invitation to walk from one location to another. Mr. Brock will investigate the possibility of rotating the dumpster area and look to see how there could be a mirror image of what Panera Bread has making it more pedestrian accessible from the retail side to the front parcels. With the comments provided by the Board, Mr. Brock will re-evaluate and see how modifications can be made.

Chairman Tiller asked for a motion. Mr. Hall made a motion and Mr. Pinckney seconded the motion to defer with comments on the site plan and the landscape plan. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Barrett, Lee, Hall, Pinckney, Crapse, Tiller).

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Hall. Chairman Tiller adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:50 p.m.

APPROVED 5/12/10