

**Town of Hilton Head Island
Design Review Board
Minutes of the Tuesday, September 23, 2014 Meeting
1:15p.m. – Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers**

APPROVED

Board Members Present:	Chairman Scott Sodemann, Vice Chairman Jake Gartner, Ron Hoffman, Galen Smith, Dale Strecker and Kyle Theodore
Board Members Absent:	Brian Witmer
Town Council Present:	None
Town Staff Present:	Jennifer Ray, Urban Designer; Teri Lewis, LMO Official Gregg Alford, Town Attorney; Brian Hulbert, Staff Attorney Heather Colin, Development Review Administrator Richard Spruce, Plans Examiner Charles Cousins, Director of Community Development Kathleen Carlin, Administrative Assistant

1. Call to Order

Chairman Sodemann called the meeting to order at 1:15p.m.

2. Roll Call

3. Freedom of Information Act Compliance

4. Approval of the Agenda

Ms. Ray corrected a typo under New Business, Alteration/Addition, for application DRB-001479-2014, Shelter Cove Town Center. The correct building number is 104. The Board **approved** the agenda as corrected by general consent.

5. Approval of the Minutes

The Board **approved** the minutes of the September 9, 2014 meeting as submitted by general consent.

6. Staff Report

None

7. Board Business

None

8. Unfinished Business

A. Alteration/Addition

Red Rover Inn – DRB-001157-2014

Ms. Teri Lewis presented opening statements on behalf of staff. At the DRB meeting on August 12, 2014 there was some question as to whether or not this application could be heard by the DRB. The question was whether or not the application had been reviewed by one or more applicable Architectural Review Board(s). At that time the staff advised the DRB to go

ahead and review the proposed project and provide the applicant with any comments that they may have. The staff recommended that the Board not take action on the application until the outstanding issue was resolved.

Since the August 12th meeting, the attorney for the Red Rover Inn researched the issue to find out if there is an applicable ARB associated with this property. The attorney found out that the property is subject to the review of the Sea Pines Commercial ARB. The applicant has since received approval for this project from the Sea Pines Commercial ARB.

The attorney also found out that the Palmetto Bay Center's Owners Association ARB is not currently operational. The staff believes that since the Palmetto Bay Center's Owners ARB is not currently operational, the Red Rover Inn has satisfied their ARB obligations and the Board can proceed with taking action on the application today. Chairman Sodemann thanked Ms. Lewis for her statements and requested that Ms. Ray make her presentation.

Ms. Ray stated that this project is located at 25 Bow Circle. Ms. Ray presented an overhead review of the presentation made to the Board on August 12, 2014. The applicant proposes to renovate an existing two story wood framed building formerly occupied by PSD into a facility for daycare, boarding and grooming of dogs.

Ms. Ray reviewed several photos of existing site conditions including the building's front entrance, the side entrance, the view from Bow Circle, and the existing parking lot. The majority of the work will be to the interior of the building including the removal and replacement of walls and improvements to water and waste services.

The exterior work is limited to the windows and doors, shutters, a privacy fence, and small miscellaneous amenities. Ms. Ray reviewed details regarding the privacy fence and the small miscellaneous amenities which are waste stations with lights.

The highlights of the exterior work are the windows which will be removed and replaced. The shutters are being closed to conceal and insulate the walls and limit noise to within the building. The window trims will be maintained and painted in the same color as existing.

Ms. Ray reviewed the elevations and the wood fence. The wood fence is 6'-6" with shutters similar to the building to continue the look of the building. The wood fence has a cap and some wood trim. The lap siding on the fence will match the building. All of the finishes will be stained to match the building.

Ms. Ray reviewed details of the waste control stations including the wood posts with a goose neck light fixture, the sign, a bag dispenser, and trash receptacle. The staff recommended that the posts be left natural or stained or painted to match the building color.

At the August 12th meeting the Board agreed with staff's recommendation for submitting a landscape plan to freshen up the overgrown, tired landscaping around the building. The existing trees will remain as is but the rest of the landscaping will be removed and replaced with evergreen plant material. The landscape plan includes native materials and materials commonly used on the island. Some of the plant material will have seasonal interest. Ms. Ray reviewed the locations of the landscape material on the landscape plan.

As part of the landscape plan the applicant is proposing to cut some of the existing pavement to create a landscape bed adjacent to the proposed fence. Staff recommends that the cut in the

pavement should have a nice smooth transition.

The staff recommended that the project be approved as submitted with consideration given to the staff's comments. Following staff's presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested that the applicant make his presentation.

The applicant for this project, Mr. Don Baker, is unavailable today. His representative, Mr. Tom Crews, Architect, presented statements in support of the application. The applicant agreed with the staff's suggestions. Following Mr. Crews' brief presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested comments from the Board.

The Board discussed the project and agreed with the staff's comments regarding staining the pet station posts in order to match the building. The Board also discussed the shutters on the wood fence. Most Board members agreed that the shutters are unnecessary and should be removed from the fence. Following these comments, Chairman Sodemann requested public comments and the following were received:

- 1) Tom Taylor, Esq., presented statements in opposition to the application on behalf of Chester C. Williams, Esq., agent, for the Church of Christ. Mr. Taylor stated that the Church objects to the DRB's consideration of this application based on the letters sent by Chester C. Williams, Esq., to Ms. Teri Lewis, LMO Official.

Mr. Taylor reviewed several exhibits that were submitted today on behalf of the Church (Exhibit # 1, Exhibit # 2, and Exhibit # 3). Mr. Taylor stated that the Palmetto Bay Center ARB is not dissolved, although they are currently not operational. Mr. Taylor stated that a notice from this ARB is required and has not been received by the applicant. Mr. Taylor stated that the DRB should decline taking action on this application until the above issues are resolved.

Gregg Alford, Town Attorney, presented statements in response to Mr. Taylor's comments. Mr. Alford stated that the Church of Christ is also without an approval letter from the Palmetto Bay Center's ARB for their property. The Palmetto Bay Center's ARB does not functionally exist and should not be an issue in deciding this application. The applicant has received the Sea Pines Commercial ARB approval for the project. Mr. Alford recommended that the Board accept the LMO Administrator's decision regarding this application.

- 2) Mr. Joe Hendrix, elder of the Church of Christ, stated his opposition to the application based on concerns with excessive noise and odors resulting from this business.
- 3) Mr. James Marsh, member of the Church of Christ, also stated his objection to the project based on concerns regarding excessive noise and odors associated with the business.

Following these public comments, Chairman Sodemann stated that the Design Review Board is responsible only for reviewing the aesthetics of a project. The Board has no jurisdiction over legal issues. The DRB will rely on the legal recommendations provided by the Town's attorney. Following final comments by the Board, Chairman Sodemann requested that a motion be made.

Vice Chairman Gartner made a **motion** to **approve** application DRB-001157-2014 as submitted with the following conditions: (1) the shutters shall be removed from the fence; and (2) the applicant shall stain the waste station posts to match the building color. Mrs. Theodore **seconded** the motion and the motion **passed** with a vote of 6-0-0.

9. Old Business

None

10. New Business

A. Alteration/Addition

1) Shelter Cove Town Centre Building 104 – DRB-001479-2014

Ms. Ray introduced the application and stated its location, 40 Shelter Cove Lane. Ms. Ray presented an in-depth overhead review of the application. This project was originally submitted as part of the overall package that was approved in February 2013.

As tenants have been secured by Shelter Cove Towne Centre, changes have been made along the way. Those changes have been submitted for various buildings within Towne Center. In April 2014 the applicant submitted a revised plan. This plan was submitted with the flat roof elevation and no action was taken by the DRB on this building because it was determined not to meet the intent of the Design Guide.

The applicant returned in May 2014 with a resubmittal based on the Board's comments relative to the flat roof. The Board approved this submittal with some minor conditions. During the building permit process the elevations changed from what the DRB had approved and therefore the applicant is back today with another revised elevation.

The changes include reducing the top of the steel from 20' to 13'-4". The applicant has increased the roof slope from 5 and 12 to 8 and 12. The top of the roof only changed from 29'-10" to 29'-11" so the overall height has changed very little.

The north and south elevations were revised to have an open gable design and the applicant added a sloped standing seam metal awning with wood braces. The applicant has increased the main roof overhang to 3'. The applicant has also removed the transom windows, revised the top of the store front to be 11', and increased the louver sizes.

The staff's initial concern in seeing this submittal was what appeared to be a lot of roof on the building. Over half of the building is roof when you look at the flat elevations. This would be especially a concern looking across the parking lot that is in front of Kroger toward the east elevation of this building.

The applicant has submitted a perspective rendering that does help lessen the impact to the roof. They show that in perspective the pitch is not as obviously flat on as you see in the elevation, and there is not as much concern from staff since there is some relief between the different building elements. However, one of the elements on the previous building that tied it to the other buildings within Shelter Cove Town Centre was the flat metal awning. It was breaking up all of the pitch and it is seen throughout Town Centre on several buildings. Staff recommended some consideration for keeping that flat metal awning as opposed to the sloped standing seam metal awnings.

Ms. Ray stated that the Shelter Cove Architectural Review Board has approved the proposed changes. The staff recommended approval of the application with consideration for the flat awnings versus the sloped. Following staff's presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested that the applicant make his presentation.

Mr. Mark Senn presented statements in support of the application including comments regarding the elevations and the roof. Mr. David Narramore, Architect, presented comments regarding the sloped roof and flat awnings. The applicant stated that building 104 is designed with a sloped standing-seam metal roof similar to adjacent free-standing buildings in the area. Following the applicant's presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested comments from the Board.

The Board stated their appreciation to the applicant for the perspective rendering. The Board discussed the roof pitch and stated their concern with the proportion of the roof to the body of the building. The Board recommended that a lower roof pitch of 6 or 7 and 12 be considered. Most Board members agreed that 8 and 12 is too steep. The Board complimented the larger overhangs.

The Board stated some concern with fascia details (the header supporting the roof structure). The Board discussed the base of the building and stated that a reveal may be needed. The Board also discussed the screen wall. The Board stated that a wood service yard is preferred versus the proposed aluminum tube caps. The aluminum tube caps are considered too industrial for this location. Additionally, the service yard should be tall enough to screen the equipment beyond. Following final comments by the Board, Chairman Sodemann requested that a motion be made.

Vice Chairman Gartner made a **motion** to **approve** application DRB-001479-2014 as submitted with the following conditions: (1) the screened wall detail for the service yard shall be a wood detail to match the adjacent building instead of the aluminum tubes; (2) the bracket detail for the overhang shall be set behind the fascia in the header behind the framing on the outside of the awning. Mr. Hoffman **seconded** the motion and the motion **passed** with a vote of 5-1-0.

2) One Hot Mama's – DRB-001438-2014

Ms. Ray introduced the application and stated its location, 7 Greenwood Drive. This project received DRB approval in March 2014 to add outdoor seating on the side of the building. That project was not constructed and the applicant has returned with a new proposal. Ms. Ray presented an in-depth overhead review of the application.

The proposed improvements include removal of the existing fireplace, removal of the fabric canopy over the outdoor bar, extending the mansard roof into the courtyard, replacing the outdoor service bar, and replacing the half-height garage door with a full-height garage door to match the existing one.

Ms. Ray reviewed the site plan including the limits of construction. Ms. Ray identified the locations of the fireplace, the extension of the mansard roof, and the extension of the outdoor bar and outdoor seating.

Ms. Ray reviewed the elevations including the location of the full garage door, the new

brick bar, and the outdoor seating area. The columns will match the existing. The staff recommended that the applicant consider relocating the bar to retain the existing landscape area. The sprinkler system will have to be extended under the new canopy and the glazing in the new door will have to be impact resistant.

The staff noted that the proposed bar extends beyond the existing paved area. Consideration should be given for retaining any bit of existing landscaping because the entire plaza has very little contributing landscaping, especially as you get further into the property. Any landscaped area that can be retained or enhanced will go a long way in breaking up the hardscape.

Ms. Ray stated that today's proposal is an improvement over the proposal submitted in March 2014. The staff recommended that the application be approved as submitted with consideration given to the staff's comments. Following staff's presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested that the applicant make his presentation.

Mr. Chris Moscola, representative for the project, presented statements in support of the application. The applicant presented comments regarding their need to increase seating. The applicant discussed several issues including the brick fireplace and landscaping issues. The applicant would like to improve the functionality and the aesthetics of the area. Following the applicant's comments, Chairman Sodemann requested comments from the Board.

The Board stated that they agree with the staff's recommendation to retain open space and enhance some of the existing landscaping. The Board agreed that today's submission is a better proposal than the one reviewed in March 2014. The Board recommended that the existing landscaping be retained. Enhanced landscaping should be considered along the main entrance path. Column details should match the existing. Following final comments by the Board, Chairman Sodemann requested that a motion be made.

Mr. Strecker made a **motion** to **approve** application DRB-001438-2014 as submitted with the condition that the new columns match the existing columns. The applicant should consider enhancing the existing landscaping along the main entrance path. Mrs. Theodore **seconded** the motion and the motion **passed** with a vote of 6-0-0.

(Mrs. Theodore recused herself from review of the following application, Harbour Town Golf Course Clubhouse, DRB-00015000-2014, due to a professional conflict of interest. A Conflict of Interest Form was completed and signed by Mrs. Theodore and attached to the record).

3) Harbour Town Golf Clubhouse – DRB-0015000-2014

Ms. Ray introduced the application and stated its location, 11 Lighthouse Lane. Ms. Ray presented an in-depth overhead review of the application. In January 2014 the DRB approved New Development Final for the clubhouse portion of the project. When that project came through as New Development Conceptual, the applicant had included the promenade that connects the clubhouse to the yacht basin. This part of the project lagged behind when the application came in for Final review.

This portion of the project has now been finalized and is submitted for review. Today's application includes landscape and hardscape throughout the corridor. Ms. Ray reviewed several landscaping issues. The existing pavement and plant material will be removed.

Existing trees will be trimmed as necessary to enhance views of the lighthouse.

Ms. Ray reviewed the site survey as well as several photos showing existing site conditions. The site plan shows the proposed promenade as well as the location of bike racks and the expanded paved area at Lighthouse Lane. The pathway is an oyster shell concrete sidewalk with a brick border at the transitions to existing walkways.

Ms. Ray reviewed the proposed brick plaza area with bluestone borders around the planter and a brick wall with columns. This plan does not have steps or a ramp from the yacht basin to the clubhouse. The grade will be made up throughout the plaza. The staff believes that this is an improvement over existing.

All of the materials will match the existing and what has previously been approved. The brick columns and the brick wall will have the same detail as before. Ms. Ray reviewed details of the oyster shell concrete, the Savannah Grey brick, the 45-degree Herringbone pattern, the double brick border, and the bluestone border. The bike racks, in a rust texture finish, are located near Lighthouse Lane.

Ms. Ray stated that the plant material is the same plant palette with lots of color and texture. The plant material will help soften the walls. The lighting plan shows the proposed pathway bollards in the same rust texture finish as the bike racks. Ms. Ray stated that the Sea Pines ARB has approved the project. Staff recommended that the application be approved as submitted. Following staff's presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested that the applicant make his presentation.

Mr. Cliff McMackin, Director of Resort Development for Sea Pines Resort, and Ms. Kristen Mansfield, Wood + Partners, presented statements in support of the application. The applicants discussed the landscape plan and the redevelopment of the existing pathway. Following the applicants' presentation, Chairman Sodemann Chairman Sodemann requested comments from the Board.

The Board complimented the project. The Board stated that they like the bollards and the elimination of the steps from the plan. The proposal is a big improvement to the site. Following final comments by the Board, Chairman Sodemann requested that a motion be made.

Mr. Smith made a **motion** to **approve** application DRB-0015000-2014 as submitted. Mr. Hoffman **seconded** the motion and the motion **passed** with a vote of 5-0-0.

B. Minor External Change

1) Publix Landscape Renovation – DRB-001497-2014

Ms. Ray introduced the application and stated its location, 11 Palmetto Bay Road. The applicant is proposing to renovate the landscaping at the entire Island Crossing Shopping Center. Ms. Ray presented an in-depth overhead review of the application including the demolition plan and several photos of existing site conditions.

The existing landscaping is dated, overgrown, and diseased in some areas. The existing landscaping is a security concern in several vehicular and pedestrian areas. Overgrown landscaping adjacent to the drive aisles and sidewalks poses a hazard to drivers and pedestrians due to poor visibility. Additionally, years of maintenance failures and

pruning has degraded the health and aesthetics of the landscaping.

Ms. Ray reviewed the demolition plan that shows the trees that will remain. There are a few trees that will be removed mostly due to poor health. As part of the permitting process, the applicant will need to provide calculations of tree removal for review by the Natural Resources Department. The majority of the trees will remain. Two canopy trees will be removed due to poor health. The turf areas within the parking islands will remain.

The proposed renovation will consist of removing approximately 80 -90% of the existing ornamental shrubs in the parking lot, streetscape, and building foundations. New landscaping will be installed in these areas to re-establish an aesthetically pleasing landscape. All of the proposed trees and shrubs will be irrigated by utilizing both existing irrigation and proposed irrigation.

The staff recommended that another palm be substituted for the Lady Palms, as Lady Palms are not typically found outdoors on the island. The staff also recommended that the Arborvitae be replaced with a more suitable plant material as this plant it is not native or used regularly to the island. Staff also recommended that some consideration be given for additional pedestrian access. Staff recommended some stepping stones or sidewalk access be placed in the two areas shown on the plan.

Ms. Ray reviewed the applicant's plans for installing a retaining wall. There is an existing wood retaining wall that is failing in this area. The staff would typically recommend a masonry wall such as stucco; however, there is some precedent for the product in this particular area. Ms. Ray presented a photo of the proposed material. The staff recommended approval with consideration of the staff's comments. Following staff's presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested that the applicant make his presentation.

Mr. Dennis Terry, Landscape Architect Consultant, presented statements in support of the application. The applicant discussed several issues including safety concerns and improved aesthetics for the area. The applicant stated that he agrees with staff's recommended changes. Following the applicant's presentation, Chairman Sodemann requested comments by the Board.

The Board stated that the proposed landscape plan is a big improvement over existing site conditions. The Board discussed the removal of two canopy trees and stated some concern with a lack of shade trees. The Board discussed the staff's recommendation for additional pedestrian access. The Board agreed with the staff's recommendation for some stepping stones or sidewalk in the two areas shown on the plan.

The Board recommended that the applicant consider some taller plantings in the landscape plan. The Board discussed the need to screen the view of the parking area. Taller plant materials (taller than 3-ft.) are recommended at the location of Palmetto Bay Road because the parking area should be screened as much as possible. The Board discussed various plant materials including Azaleas and Ligustrum. The Board recommended that the applicant mix in some additional plant materials to provide additional height and screening of the parking lot.

The Board discussed the retaining wall. The Board stated that they would prefer to see a

more suitable material for the retaining wall such as stucco or lowcountry grey brick. The applicant stated his reasons for selecting the split-faced keystone material. Following their discussion, the Board stated that the final selection of material should be at the applicant's discretion. At the completion of the Board's discussion, Chairman Sodemann requested that a motion be made.

Mrs. Theodore made a **motion** to **approve** application DRB-001497-2014 with the following conditions: (1) the applicant shall replace the Lady Palms and Arborvitae with a more suitable plant material; (2) the applicant shall consider a 10 - 20% introduction of larger scale plants along the Palmetto Road side of the project; (3) the applicant shall follow the staff's recommendation for implementing a walkway connector between the parking lot and the Five Guys building. Mr. Smith **seconded** the motion and the motion passed with a vote of 6-0-0.

11. Appearance by Citizens

None

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10p.m.

Submitted By:

Approved By:

October 28, 2014

Kathleen Carlin
Administrative Assistant

Scott Sodemann
Chairman