

SOUTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD (CRB) MINUTES
June 5, 2013, Bluffton Library
120 Palmetto Way, Bluffton, SC 29910

Members Present: Joe Hall, Ed Pinckney, Pearce Scott

Members Absent: James Atkins, Daniel Ogden

Staff Present: Ian Hill, Beaufort County Historic Preservationist; Erin Schumacher, Town of Bluffton Senior Planner; Shaun Leininger, Town of Bluffton Principal Planner

Guests: Mike Small, John Binder, Michael Brock, Jessie Hancock; Roberts Vaux, Walter Nestor

1. CALL TO ORDER – 3:00 P.M.
2. PUBLIC COMMENT: None
3. MINUTES: No action was taken on the minutes.
4. NEW BUSINESS: None
5. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Beaufort County: Target-Bluffton Mitigation Plan, 1050 Fording Island Rd, Bluffton, SC. Mr. Hill read to the Board the staff comments. He informed the Board that earlier this year Stafford Properties cleared all the understory vegetation in the Target buffer. He said that the buffer originally consisted of existing native vegetation. The buffer was also illegally cleared in 2009 to give the site greater visibility and plantback was required. He said that a violation was issued to Stafford Properties and that they were required. He said that a buffer mitigation plan was reviewed by the CRB at the May 8 meeting. At the meeting the applicant also brought an alternate landscaping plan that did not include understory trees. The applicant was concerned that if they planted a solid buffer, they could run into the same situation in the future where the buffer is cleared illegally because the tenants want more visibility. He said that the Board did not look favorably on the alternate plan and preferred the original mitigation plan that was submitted. The CRB directed the applicant to go back to the owners and determine if they would be ok with the first plan or would like to modify to allow for some windows into the site. The CRB also requested that the applicant provide some elevations that showed the appearance of the windows through the buffer. He said that the applicant has submitted a revised plan with 18 understory trees, fewer azaleas, and an elevation that showed the visual impact of the buffer with the existing and proposed vegetation. He said that technically one additional understory tree was required in the mitigation plan. He also informed the CRB that once the mitigation plan was approved, the applicant would have 30 days to install the plants in the buffer.

Mike Small presented for the applicant. He said that in comparison with other highway buffers, this buffer will be very thick and it would be difficult to add one more tree. Mr. Hill informed the Board that they could waive the requirement for the additional tree.

Mr. Pinckney motioned to approve the plan as submitted and waive the requirement for an additional understory tree. Mr. Scott seconded. Motion carried.

B. Town of Bluffton COFA-2-13-5330. A Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the development of a Parker's Convenience store consisting of a 3,875 SF building, 7 dual gas fueling stations, and associated site improvements on 1.71 acres of property located at the intersection of Buck Island Road and May River Road and zoned Neighborhood Core: Erin Schumacher, Town of Bluffton, gave staff report. She informed the Board that the project was before the CRB at their May 8 and May 22 meetings. Ms. Schumacher said that the Board had tabled the project at their last meeting and asked that the following conditions be met:

- Articulate the rear of the building using parapets or other measures to adequately screen the roof top mounted equipment from all sides.
- Add bracketing to the canopy posts.
- Simplify or eliminate the dentil detail on the building.
- Examine the use of rafter tails and other details on the pitched roof elements of the building to create the sense of a porch.
- Consider using a flat color finish on the ceiling of the canopy or a 19% gray (or similar color).
- Reduce the number of azaleas in the buffer.

She said they submitted a revised landscaping plan that addressed plant diversity and reducing the number of azaleas. They submitted a letter from the Bright Subdivision stating that the design met the covenants. They supplied color and material samples specifying the canopy ceiling. They submitted the two lighting plans and revised architectural elevations. Ms. Schumacher said that staff determined that the landscaping plan still did not meet the diversity requirements of their zoning code. Staff requests that the CRB approve lighting plan option A with the lifestyle fixture which is consistent with the May River Road streetscape enhancements. She said that while the project's architecture technically met the Town's architectural requirements, staff looked to the CRB to determine whether the project was consistent with the Town's character.

John Binder addressed the Board. He said that Parker's chose not to go with the lifestyle lighting fixture because it was more expensive and didn't provide the direct down lighting that a shoebox fixture provided. Mr. Scott asked why they didn't continue the architectural detailing on the side elevations around to the rear elevation. Mr. Binder said

that rear elevation would be barely visible due to heavy landscaping. Mr. Scott said that the parapet detailing didn't appear to be on the rear elevation. Mr. Binder said that there was no parapet in the rear.

Mr. Pinckney stated that he liked the landscaping plan dated June 4, 2013. Mr. Pinckney asked Mr. Leininger if the Town intended to extend the sidewalk down May River Road to the corner of Buck Island Road with the same lighting. Mr. Leininger said that the Town was currently working on the next phase of the May River Road streetscape which would extend the sidewalk to Buck Island Road; however the lighting was not part of that phase.

Mr. Hall commented that the canopy ceiling was still a refrigerator white. Mr. Binder said that the ceiling was supposed to be white and reflective to make the area safe at night. Mr. Hall asked the applicant to reduce the sheen of the ceiling and still consider off-white.

Roberts Vaux said he objected to the landscaping plan. He said that the plan that the Board was reviewing was revised recently and had no public review. Mr. Vaux stated that the project was addressed piecemeal with the Town's ZBOA approving an increase in the number of pumps and the CRB now trying to mitigate the impact with the design of the building. He said that the project was not Bluffton vernacular architecture and regretted that Parker's couldn't even address the five conditions the CRB made at the previous meeting. He requested that the Board pass a motion saying that the submission was not consistent with Bluffton vernacular architecture. He also said that the zoning along the May River Road corridor is Community Preservation, and that there is nothing in the design of the proposed Parkers that preserves the character of the community. He also objected to the fact that Parkers did not choose the lighting plan with the traditional fixtures.

Mr. Pinckney reiterated that he was ready to approve the landscaping plan. He did want to address Mr. Vaux's concerns that the public hasn't had a chance to review the latest landscaping plan. He asked if there was a specific rule stating that public had to have an opportunity to review a plan before it was approved. Mr. Leininger said that this is a public meeting and that the public has a chance to comment on the landscaping plan today. Mr. Hall asked staff's direction if they felt the meeting should be adjourned for a period so that the public had a chance to review the revised landscaping plan. Mr. Leininger said that the revised plan simply addressed Town staff comments relating to meeting the 15% requirement for plant types in a landscaping plan. Mr. Brock said that the dwarf yaupon hollies on the plan that was submitted were at 19% and that the revised

plan had them at 15%. Otherwise no changes were made to the plan that was submitted for the meeting.

Mr. Pinckney motioned to approve the landscaping plan dated June 4, 2013. Mr. Scott seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Scott motioned to approve the project's architecture on the condition that the canopy ceiling material has a lesser sheen and less bright white shade. Motion died due to lack of a second.

Mr. Pinckney said that the architecture was revised to add shed roofs and brackets, but it still didn't go far enough to be appropriate for Bluffton. Mr. Pinckney motioned to have the applicant revise the architecture and present it to the CRB at a later meeting. Mr. Hall seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Binder asked the Board for more direction on how they should revise the building's architecture. Mr. Pinckney said that if the shed roof that is over the door on the front elevation should be continued along the entire elevation and around the sides. Mr. Binder asked if the Board would consider approving the project with the condition of adding the shed roof over the other windows on the elevation.

Mr. Hall motioned to reject the previous motion. Motion carried.

Mr. Pinckney motioned to approve the architecture with the following condition:

- The building shall be revised to apply the same treatment that was given to the front door to the entire front elevation
- Reduce the canopy ceiling to a less reflective darker material
- Approve lighting plan B with the shoebox fixture.

Mr. Scott seconded.

Mr. Vaux objected because the Board did not address the rear of the building, the rafters tail ends, or providing bracketing to the canopy posts.

Motion carried.

6. **OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Hall informed the Board that the next scheduled meeting was Wednesday, June 19 at the Bluffton Library.
7. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.