

SOUTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
January 11, 2012, Hilton Head Library

Members Present:

Jim Tiller
Joe Hall
Laura Barrett
Ed Pinckney
James Atkins
Daniel Ogden

Members Absent:

Pearce Scott

Staff Present: Judy Nash Timmer, Beaufort County CRB Administrator
Linda Maietta, Beaufort County Planning Assistant

Guests: Target Intersection & Dick's Sporting Goods: Will Euart, Project Developer, Stafford Properties; Chris Nardone, Project Architect, CNNA Architects; Pat Wilson, Stafford Properties; Mike Small, Landscape Architect, The Greenery; Ryan Lyle, Project Engineer, Andrews & Burgess
Hilton Head Automotive: Michael Griffith, Project Architect
Joe Croley (representing Hilton Head Chamber of Commerce) and Judy Miller

- I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 2:05 p.m. by Chairman Tiller.
- II. **General Public Comment:** None
- III. **Review of Minutes:** The Board reviewed the November 16, 2011, meeting minutes. **Motion:** Mr. Hall made a motion, and Mr. Atkins seconded the motion, **to accept the November 16, 2011, minutes as written.** The motion carried (FOR: Tiller, Hall, Barrett, Atkins, Ogden ABSTAINED: Pinckney).

IV. **New Business:** None

V. **Old Business:**

1. **Target Intersection & Dick's Expansion**

Ms. Timmer presented the staff report. Mr. Nardone presented the color samples and outlined the changes/reiterated architectural plans for the project:

- Proportion of the canopy was reduced due to signage requirements
- Raising parapet 4'
- Loading dock is side-by-side with Staples
- No downspouts or scuppers
- Location of roof-top units
- Front canopy sticks out farther than the existing canopy; still in basic, same footprint

Comments/questions from the Board included:

- Green is a composite even though not labeled on the drawing (Yes, it's a custom panel.)

- The roof-top unit in the back - based on site plan, Staples is lower than Dick's; it appears you'll be able to view that unit. (Wall will be built up to be taller than Staples; unit is not actually placed, can possibly move unit forward)
- When the proportions of the building were brought in, your storefront entrance element became more vertical as compared to the other retail storefronts' canopy entrance elements which are more horizontal in nature. Was there a reason why you needed the height? (Height is to get the signage up at a higher elevation.)
- From a proportion standpoint, there is a concern about the amount of metal panel that will be exposed and be somewhat different than the rest of the center. Not a critical concern; not an issue.
- Lighting plans; maximum foot candles is 40; doesn't that exceed our ordinance? Could not find where that is located on the plan. (To the right of the front entry - on the wall). County ordinance does not allow. (Might be right underneath the down lights).
- Lighting cut sheets were not submitted. Not an issue to hold up the process. Need to submit to Ms. Timmer; **Ms. Timmer will send PDF copies out to Board members; will approve at staff level with overview by Board member(s), if necessary.**
- Building gets expanded in the rear, taking out a lot of the plant material that is there. Haven't seen any landscape plans. Also dumpsters in the rear. Haven't seen any plans for relocation. The Board needs to see that; **needs a landscape plan. Ms. Timmer will approve at staff level with overview by Board member(s), if necessary.**

Motion: Mr. Hall made a motion, and Mr. Ogden seconded the motion, **to approve Dick's Sporting Goods Expansion with the following provisions:**

1. **Lighting Plan to be approved at staff level with overview by Board member(s),**
2. **Landscape Plan to be approved at staff level with overview by Board member(s)**
3. **Placement of dumpsters to be approved at staff level with overview by Board member(s).**

The motion was carried unanimously (Tiller, Hall, Barrett, Pinckney, Atkins, Ogden).

Part 2- Target Intersection

Not previously reviewed/discussed at conceptual review of Dick's Sporting Goods by Board.

Mr. Lyle provided background on this part of the project. Back in 2005/2006, we were redesigning the Target/Home Depot/Best Buy intersection on 278. It was reviewed and all permits were issued but we just couldn't reach all the agreements we were seeking on the south side so it did not get constructed. We are here today, before the Board, to start over. Eleven parking spaces are lost in Target's lot plus a few more throughout the site but we gain a few on the Starbucks site. Basically, it's a wash; still meeting the minimum threshold for parking requirements. The DRT has reviewed and approved the plan as far as zoning and engineering but we have not received final approval on the landscape aspect of this. We have included a landscape and lighting plan. Mr. Lyle reviewed specifics.

Ms. Timmer provided staff comments.

Mr. Small presented a late request for a change from what was submitted. Request to gain a little more visibility for Target from this intersection so they are requesting to replace the live oaks with the same number of palms to present a more vertical element.

Comments from the Board:

- Due to the changes, are you planning on resubmitting your landscape plans? (Request changes be approved at staff level).
- Recommended replace the four Oak trees with six Palmetto trees.

- Seems appropriate that palms should be on both sides of that road. (One side of the street had wetlands so the oaks made more sense; the other side has more parking lot and a number of palms in the islands of parking lot already. Fit better).
- Palm trees would be better served if they are not so tall (8', 10', 12'). (Probably start around 10' or 12'; usually spec out at 12' – 16'). Need to specify heights on plan.
- Raised island are curbed.
- Staging for construction of the road (have not given much consideration to staging area but there is a power line easement for construction lay down)
- Fill part of the lagoon to fill this road (yes). On the other side of the lagoon, no planting indicated on the drawing (just be seeded; just grass) Please indicate on plan.
- Planting Plan – Ensure plant labels are correct and match verbiage. Pine straw coverage - change to read a minimum of three inches. This Board needs to approve any changes to plant material prior to changes being made.
- Clarify line that indicates intersection work; redoing parking spaces by Giuseppe's Pizza. (Not included at this time; not ready to submit for that). DRT requirements? (Conceptually approved by DRT). Needs to be taken off plans.

Motion: Mr. Hall made a motion, and Mr. Pinckney seconded the motion, to approve the Target Intersection with the following provisions:

1. Replace four (4) oak trees with a minimum of six (6) palm trees. Palm trees need to be on both sides of the road. Palm trees should be at a lower height (10-12').
2. Staging should not impact any of the landscaped area.
3. Add to the plan that the lagoon area is going to be hydro-seeded.
4. State on the plan that three (3) inches of pine straw will be used, not specs currently on the plan.
5. Change SPAB to SPAP on plans; change Indian Hawthorne to Ligustrum.
6. Change note to include statement that CRB has to approve any changes.

All changes will be reviewed at staff level with overview by Board member(s) as necessary.

The motion was carried unanimously (Tiller, Hall, Barrett, Pinckney, Atkins, Ogden).

2. Hilton Head Automotive (Conceptual)

Chairman Tiller asked if the original plans for this site were available. Ms. Timmer stated they would be in storage. Chairman Tiller asked if the Board has entertained changes from that original landscape plan. Ms. Timmer was not aware of any. Chairman Tiller stated that this building use to have palm trees planted in front of it; not sure whether The Board approved the removal of those. Chairman Tiller stated that before the Board gives final approval of this project, he'd like to see what was approved and what has happened on this project over the years.

Ms. Timmer provided staff comments.

Mr. Michael Griffith, the Architect of record for the project, addressed the Board. The submittal in front of the Board today is just to address colors. Previous submittals for additions to the footprint are no longer a part of what we're going to be involved with as far as any review in the future. The process with the corporate management now is to get Board opinion and suggestions on colors. What you have in front of you in your packet are pictures to age you through the processes, from the original building to as it stands today. Included is a picture of what General Motors is proposing; essentially a black and white façade. The owner is suggesting an alternative as seen in the third photograph which is painting the stucco (part of the color board submission). The only

color difference - there's a stripe on the left side only. It is a recessed panel. Request is only to approve the colors.

Mr. Pinckney asked what rights the County has to go back and make them upgrade the planting plan. Ms. Timmer stated that any time there are changes made to a building, the CRB has to approve it. The CRB can look at the landscape and see what is non-conforming. Based on past reviews there is precedence for the Board to address these non-conformities. Chairman Tiller proposed that the Board review the colors and approve/disapprove. The Board goes no further to address landscape non-conformities. Mr. Pinckney suggested the Board approve the proposal today and ask to review the original landscape plan. Although Mr. Griffith has submitted this project for conceptual review; if approved, it would not have to come back to the Board. The Board could hold up final approval until the original landscape plan is reviewed.

Motion: Mr. Pinckney made a motion to **delay approval of the colors until the original landscape plan is reviewed.**

Discussion: Mr. Griffith asked the Board as this owner decides to make upgrades and bring his building more into a corporate look, is this Board then going to hold him from not doing that until landscaping issues are addressed and finalized? We need to be clear on that. Ms. Timmer stated that at the staff level, she has already approved changing of lighting (just two lights). The concern now would be piecemealing this project for approval. Mr. Atkins stated that what is being submitted is just a paint color and that's what the application is for.

Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

Discussion: Having expressed this concern in previous meetings and having Mr. Pinckney's motion seconded, Chairman Tiller said staff should pull the original landscape plan file from archives so the Board can review it. Chairman Tiller advised Mr. Griffith that the Board may be coming back to him for further changes to this project if/when site engineering comes forward. At that time, we'll make a decision if the landscape needs to be brought up to standards. Mr. Timmer noted that since Mr. Jeff Ackerman is involved, it does appear there is going to be future work. The Board could make a statement at this point that no further approvals of this project will be issued until the landscape plan is addressed. This way the colors get approved but if anything new comes in for review, the Board could address the landscape issues. Seems fair for the submitter and addresses the Board's concerns.

Amended Motion: Mr. Pinckney amended his motion, and Mr. Hall seconded the amended motion, **to approve the colors as presented. However, the Board will make no further approvals of this project until the landscape plan is addressed.** The motion carried unanimously (Tiller, Hall, Barrett, Pinckney, Atkins, Ogden).

Ms. Timmer will pull copies of the landscape plans and forward a copy to all Board members for review at the next meeting.

VI: **Other Business:**

Election of Officers – although not on the agenda; elections are typically done at first meeting in January. Board agreed to leave as is – Mr. Tiller as Chairman and Mr. Hall as Vice-Chairman.

Chairman Tiller heard that the Bluffton Library is being renovated and may be finished as early as June. When that room becomes available, he recommends that we move our meetings out there. Board agreed. Meeting time to be moved back to 3:00 pm. Also suggested that we try Palmetto

Electric, Trey Hunter. Ms. Maietta is not sure that room would be suitable for television. Would need to check with the Broadcast crew.

Motion: Mr. Pinckney made a motion; Mr. Hall seconded the motion, **to adjourn the meeting.** The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Tiller, Hall, Barrett, Pinckney, Atkins, Ogden). Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:15 p.m.

APPROVED 2/8/2012