

SOUTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
May 23, 2012, Hilton Head Library

Members Present:

Joe Hall
Laura Barrett
Ed Pinckney
Daniel Ogden
Pearce Scott
James Atkins

Members Absent:

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

I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 2:00 p.m. by Vice Chairman Joe Hall.

II. **General Public Comment:** None

III. **Review of Minutes:** The Board reviewed the April 11, 2012, meeting minutes. **Motion:** Mr. Pinckney made a motion, and Mr. Ogden seconded the motion, **to accept the April 11, 2012, minutes as written.** The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Hall, Barrett, Pinckney, Ogden; Abstained: Scott, Atkins).

IV. **New Business:**

1) Beaufort County Application: Tractor Supply Company, 40 Cecil Reynolds Drive, Bluffton, SC (Conceptual)

Representatives present included: James Cochrane, Co-Manager of F&C of Aiken, LLC; Chris Cochrane, F&C of Aiken, LLC; Todd Hass, Registered Land Surveyor in SC and a Registered Forester, Hass & Hilderbrand, Inc.; Glen Oxford, Project Architect, Oxford Architecture.

Mr. James Cochrane introduced his team and provided background on the Tractor Supply Company. He introduced Mr. Hass to continue to the presentation. After receiving Ms. Timmer's comments, Mr. Hass applied the comments to the plan and offered to share a revised plan with the Board members. Typically the Board does not receive new plans at the meeting. Vice Chairman Hall suggested Ms. Timmer read the staff report to help the Board gain perspective of where the submitter is heading at this point. Ms. Timmer proceeded to read the staff report (copy attached). The revised drawings were handed out to Board.

Comments from the Board included:

- A landscape plan will be submitted for final review? Yes.
- Some landscape needs to be added to the front; not much. Sides will be addressed also.
- Outdoor display may have some limitation based on SF. Has already been approved by DRT.
- Outdoor display is behind buffered area; seen by customer, not from the highway.
- Canopy broken or continuous? The canopy is now contiguous.
- Plans show smooth-faced CMU and split-faced CMU. Will the building be all split face? Yes, all split face at this location.

- From a local, architectural perspective, rather than the continuous front porch-esque emulation appear floating; the metal brackets used for support get expressed with some bracket work. Mr. Hass has noticed some wood brackets, a little heavier looking, which would definitely be more appropriate here.
- Columns - suggested they become more traditional and more vertical in nature in proportion with the entry; i.e., double columns.
- Roof line – does the ordinance require a percentage of awnings and/or sloped roofs depending on the size of the building? Typically, the Board was required a pitched roof if the building was less than 10,000 SF. There is nothing in the ordinance stating a ratio like this. However, the ordinance points toward the entrance features appearing to be an integrated part of the building.
- Lighting - Wallpaks would not be allowed on the front of the building because they are not cut-off fixtures. The County usually has architectural lighting on buildings as opposed to security lighting. Wallpaks are usually seen on the rear of buildings.
- Will there be lights underneath the awning cover? Yes, to project directly down.

The applicant did want to address the 8' strip of landscaping in the front of the building that is covered by an awning. Typically that is display area. The applicant would like to put the landscaping in the front of awning so there is no landscaping directly up against the face of the building. Discussion continued:

- Ms. Timmer was asked to address the ordinance in regard to long, unarticulated dimensions on the building. The ordinance states that long, unarticulated facades (including the rear and sides of a building) are not allowed; there has to be something that breaks up those facades. A suggestion was made that the applicant consider some other pieces that make that front and sides more interesting. Landscaping (especially tree forms) can help break up large expanses as is evident up and down the corridor.
- What is type of fence material is used around the outside? Typically, its chain-link fence. The applicant is looking at alternatives for this location; possibly a black vinyl-coated-type of chain link fence material which seems to disappear. Screening the fence is an option. A suggestion was made that the fencing could become integrated with the architecture similar to Lowe's on 278. Their outdoor fence area integrates some brick columns that match the building façade at the corners.
- Has the fencing been cleared with Santee Cooper? Yes. Ms. Timmer stated the County does require the applicant to provide a letter from the utility company expressing their approval/allowance. The letter is required to be submitted before the project gets final approval from the County.
- A request was made by the Board to show the size of the fenced area somewhere on the plan/documents because it is a major architectural element.

Motion: Mr. Scott made a motion, and Mr. Atkins seconded the motion, **recommending approval with the following conditions:**

1. Making the entrance columns more traditional and more vertical in proportion with the entry.
2. Addressing the long, unarticulated walls which include the front, as well as the sides.
3. Fencing is a major architectural element and should be incorporated with architecture and match the building.
4. Continuous front porch-esque emulation be more expressed with bracket work.
5. Some additional landscape will be necessary for the front buffer.

Chairman Hall brought up the fact that the landscaping along the west side of the building needs to be considered because of what happens when you approach on Cecil Reynolds Drive.

Amended Motion: Mr. Scott amended the motion **to include the landscaping issue on the west side of the building.** Mr. Atkins seconded the amended motion. The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Hall, Barrett, Pinckney, Ogden, Scott, Atkins).

2) Beaufort County Application: The Big Chill, 138 Bluffton Road, Bluffton, SC (Discussion)

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

Representatives present included: Barry Taylor, FWA Group; Bubba Gillis, Applicant

Mr. Taylor noted that he is here to help Mr. Gillis understand what needs to be done in accordance with County requirements. Mr. Gillis is leasing the space and part of the agreement with the owner is that the owner is to get rid of the cars, boats, etc., that is parked in front of the facility so his building has more prominence. Discussion included:

- Don't understand how pushing the ice machine back 20' and landscaping, someone would still be able to make it between that metal building and park at Sherwin Williams and/or the ice vendor. With a 20' setback, the building would still be in the grass area out from underneath the power lines but would not be in the gravel driveway to impede traffic going to Sherwin Williams. Building would be parallel to the road and has to be a minimum of 20' off the property line.
- Is this an arbitrary placement or was there something restricting its movement north or south? South would be the Sherwin Williams sign; north, we could move it a little farther, parallel to the road.
- Is this considered a building? Yes, it is, by both the County building codes definition, as well as by the County zoning codes. It is not a habitable structure but it is a building. That's the key. Has to have its own water source and own electricity.
- Where do you park? Mr. Gillis brought this in front of this Board for discussion. Mr. Gillis' main concern right now was whether he needed to order and he wanted to get a feeling for what the Board was going to tell him to do architecturally. If there are any site issues they will be worked out.
- Did this come before the Bluffton corridor? It's not in the Town of Bluffton. Mr. Gillis talked to the Town of Bluffton about a different location in Bluffton and they said it would be extremely difficult to get approval because it would be located in the Historic District.
- There will be parking in front of the machine, closer to Sherwin Williams on the north side because all the cars, boats, etc., that's currently there will be gone.
- This place has been an eyesore for a long, long time. That will be some improvement.
- Biggest thing that is missing is the plan that shows the Board what you intend to do. Very difficult to respond to a box that is sitting in a yard.
- Do you have to put some kind of pad down to make sure this thing stays level? The applicant explained it is set down on the dirt, it is tied down like a mobile home, they are built to withstand 150 mph winds but if it doesn't sell enough ice, it can be picked up and hauled away to a new location.
- In reference to the ordinance and other sources researched, Ms. Timmer has seen these ice machines on foundations with hardy plank around them. The one in the City of Beaufort is placed upright and has been made to look like a lighthouse. The Northern Corridor Review Board reviewed and approved one but based on its location, they required that it look like a fruit stand, with a pitched roof, etc. Based on our ordinance requirements, it may not be as mobile as some of them can be. Especially based on the location of this one. Visibility is his key issue.
- The way the applicant has it located now, it has to have the 8' landscape around everything. That's limiting and rigorous for this. The applicant would be much better off if this box could be put right up against another building so you wouldn't be held to these ordinances. Possibly right

up against the metal building. The applicant told the Board If that would satisfy them, he could go back to the fire marshal to discuss. Just have to make sure the traffic flow is not impeded.

- It seems like it would fit more in place and still give you more visibility if you would set it up against the metal building.
- Other option is to set it up like a fruit stand and have a weathered texture and have a Bluffton quirky flavor to it.
- Like the second location suggestion better. Open to anything as long as you want to propose something. Suggestion was made to take a look at the iconic building, Nickel Pumpers. That was the conversion of the ugly duck into something that became regional and looked like it belonged.
- Ms. Timmer wanted Mr. Gillis to understand that if it's in one location, it's going to take dressing up. If it's in the second location, against the building, that may be a different level.
- The building cannot be used as a sign.

Discussion ended. No vote necessary.

3) Beaufort County Application: Gatehouse at Windmill Harbour, 1 Windmill Drive, Hilton Head Island, SC (Final)

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

Mr. Tom Parker was present for the applicant. Submission is for the Windmill Harbour Gatehouse.

Proposal is to take the existing gatehouse and replace it with a new gatehouse in the exact same location on the same island. Doing a little bit of landscaping along the walls, minimal landscaping to start with, basically sprucing up what's there. Will be creating a canopy effect over the gatehouse with four live oak trees. This will be an upgrade on the building style and quality of materials. Circulation and parking remain the same.

Mr. Parker mentioned the new gatehouse will be placed in the exact same location as the existing one. However, Mr. Ogden pointed out plan D16 showing the existing plan vs. plan L16 showing the proposed, the new building comes out about 3' or 4' towards the Island. The front façade and the overhang of the roof are even further. Mr. Ogden is pointing this difference out in case there is an issue of encroachment. The architectural board for Windmill Harbour has given approval for this project. There are no additional regulations that would apply. There would be no liability on this Board if this building goes over and beyond any setback lines. That would actually be part of the Zoning Administrator's duties. Mr. Parker will provide documentation to the Board that the overhang is not an issue.

Motion: Mr. Pinckney made a motion, and Mr. Scott seconded the motion, **to approve the project as submitted for final approval.** The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Hall, Barrett, Pinckney, Ogden, Scott, Atkins).

V: **Old Business:** None

VI: **Other Business:**

1) Follow-up on moving to the Bluffton Library for meetings and changing the meeting time to 3:00 p.m.

Ms. Maietta checked with both the branch manager, Ann Rosen, and Broadcast Specialist, Scott Grooms. Both have confirmed that the construction at the Bluffton Library should be completed by June 13, 2012. If construction remains on schedule, our next meeting will be at the Bluffton Library in the large conference room. The meeting time will be changed to 3:00 pm.

2) Buffer; behind Tanger Outlet 1

Vice Chairman Hall asked that the staff investigate status of the landscape behind the buildings on the Bluffton Parkway and report back to the Board.

Motion: Mr. Scott made a motion; Mr. Ogden seconded the motion, **to adjourn the meeting.** The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Hall, Barrett, Pinckney, Ogden, Scott, Atkins). Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:10 pm.

APPROVED JUNE 13, 2012