Town of Hilton Head Island
Design Review Board **APPROVED**
Minutes of the Tuesday, July 14, 2015 Meeting
1:15p.m. – Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers

Board Members Present:	Chairman Jake Gartner, Vice Chairman Dale Strecker, Ron Hoffman, Debbie Remke, Brian Witmer and Kevin Quat
Board Members Absent:	Kyle Theodore
Town Council Present:	None
Town Staff Present:	Jennifer Ray, Urban Designer Richard Spruce, Plans Examiner Teri Lewis, LMO Official Kathleen Carlin, Administrative Assistant

---

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. Freedom of Information Act Compliance
Public notification of this meeting has been published and posted in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Town of Hilton Head Island requirements.

4. Swearing in Ceremony for Mr. Jake Gartner, Ms. Debbie Remke and Mr. Kevin Quat*
Brian Hulbert, Staff Attorney, performed the swearing in ceremony for re-appointed DRB member, Mr. Jake Gartner, and new DRB members, Ms. Debbie Remke and Mr. Kevin Quat.

5. Approval of Agenda
The Board **approved** the agenda as submitted by general consent.

6. Approval of Minutes
The Board **approved** the minutes of the June 23, 2015 meeting as submitted by general consent.

7. Staff Report
a. Ms. Ray stated that former Chairman Scott Sodemann will present the DRB's Semi-Annual Activity Report to Town Council on July 21, 2015 at 4:00p.m.

b. Ms. Ray stated that staff will present the updated Design Guide to the Public Planning Committee on July 23, 2015 at 3:00p.m. Staff recommends that the Public Planning Committee forward the updated Design Guide to Town Council with a recommendation of approval.

8. Board Business

A. **<u>Election of Officers for term July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016</u>**

Vice Chairman Gartner requested that a motion be made to elect a Chairman for the new term. Mr. Strecker made a **motion** to nominate Mr. Jake Gartner to serve as Chairman for the new term. Mr. Witmer **seconded** the motion. There were no additional nominations for the office of Chairman. Mr. Gartner accepted the nomination and the motion **passed** unanimously.

Chairman Gartner then made a **motion** to nominate Mr. Dale Strecker to serve as Vice Chairman for the new term. Mr. Hoffman **seconded** the motion. There were no additional nominations for the office of Vice Chairman. Mr. Strecker accepted the nomination and the motion **passed** unanimously.

Chairman Gartner then made a **motion** to nominate Ms. Kathleen Carlin to serve as Secretary for the new term. Mr. Hoffman **seconded** the motion. There were no additional nominations for the office of Secretary and the motion to elect Ms. Carlin as Secretary **passed** unanimously.

9. Old Business

A. **Hilton Head Ice Cream** – DRB-000983-2015

Ms. Ray stated that this is an Alteration/Addition located at 55 New Orleans Road in Fountain Center. On May 26, 2015 the DRB approved a deck addition at Hilton Head Ice Cream. Ms. Ray presented an overhead review of the approved plan which shows the proposed extension of a brick paver sidewalk between a large oak tree and the new deck. The new deck includes a 4-ft. planter at the base of the deck. Discussion at the time included the type of plant material used for screening of the deck. Elevations show the proposed deck and handrail, which is similar to existing handrails at Fountain Center but has been updated to meet current Code requirements. The area under the deck is shown as being open.

The deck was installed and the staff along with one-two Board members noticed that lattice was added below the deck. The brick sidewalk has not been installed. The staff brought this issue to the applicant's attention and the applicant stated that the owner requested that the lattice screen be added for several reasons. First, Fountain Center has a feral cat issue and they do not want the cats to take residence up under the deck. It is a health issue as well as a smell issue. Second, they want to prevent children from crawling under the deck on the south side adjacent to the live oak tree. The North side cannot have plantings because either the sidewalk or the service area is on the other side. The third reason is that they believe lattice can be found elsewhere on the site. The owner states that its use allows the owner to see under the deck to check for debris and will allow vines to grow over the lattice to create a greener space. The lattice initially went in with an untreated color and since bringing it to their attention, the owner has painted it in a dark Charleston green or black and they have added larger landscaping that hides a majority of the lattice. Ms. Ray presented a couple of site photographs for the Board's review. The area adjacent to the service area is visible and cannot be screened.

What has been installed is not consistent with what was approved and staff directed the applicant to return to the Board today to discuss this issue. The majority of Fountain Center includes stucco walls and blue/gray painted wood louvers as seen in a recent application. The Board should decide whether the lattice can remain, or if the Board would require an alternate treatment for below the deck. Staff stated that they do not know why the brick walkway was not installed. The staff also stated that they have seen blue/gray wood horizontal louvers used at Fountain Center, but they have not seen lattice used at the Center as indicated by the applicant.

The applicant was not present at the meeting for comments or questions from the Board. A couple of Board members stated that they agree with the staff that they have not seen lattice used at Fountain Center. The Board stated that consistency is important and that the wood horizontal

louvers are preferred over the lattice for aesthetic reasons. The Board stated that they do like the dark Charleston green color over the blue/gray color.

The Board also stated that since the brick pathway was previously submitted by the applicant and then approved by the Board, it should be installed as agreed upon at the meeting. Chairman Gartner and several Board members stated that the lattice should be removed. The Board stated that they hope the applicant will install horizontal louvers in a Charleston Green color. This would be preferable to leaving the deck area open. Following final comments, Chairman Gartner requested that a motion be made.

Mr. Witmer made a **motion** to approve DRB-000983-2015 with the following two conditions: (1) the lattice is to be replaced with wood horizontal louvers painted in Charleston Green; (2) the brick pathway is to be installed as previously submitted by the applicant and agreed to by the Board. Mr. Hoffman **seconded** the motion and the motion **passed** with a vote of 6-0-0.

10. Unfinished Business

None

11. New Business

A. New Development - Final

1. **Golf Academy** - DRB-001268-2015

Ms. Ray stated that the project is located at 128 Beach City Road. The applicant proposes to construct three principal buildings for the JPGA Campus. This project received approval of its Conceptual submittal in February 2015 with the following conditions: (1) some attention and diligence shall be paid to engineering the drive coming in off of Beach City Road; (2) the site plan should be examined to shift the Fitness Building in order to get uniform soffit overhang; (3) consideration shall be given to adding some applied moldings and possibly some applied water table banding on the Academy Building to give it more detail; and (4) that the clerestory windows on the Academy Building should be more in scale to the Fitness Building.

Ms. Ray stated that the site plan has been revised per the Board's previous comments. The entrance and the drive for the campus have been relocated off of Finch Street. Parking for 24 cars including two handicap spaces are arranged along the perimeter of the property. Sixteen spaces are located along Finch Street and additional spaces are located along Beach City Road. All of the required parking, according to the applicant, has been carefully planned and designed to minimize vehicular traffic on the site and to encourage pedestrian circulation on campus. At a recent pre-application conference, it was identified that adequate backing distance was not provided for the parking along Beach City Road, which will require that the drive aisle be shifted. Since it cannot be shifted into the buffer it will impact the site plan and the site will need to be revised to meet those requirements.

The three principal buildings for the JPGA Campus include the Office Building, a Fitness & Training Center Building, and a Classroom Building. The three buildings total 10,970 square feet. The buildings are arranged and organized in a 'U' shape configuration around a central outdoor courtyard. The buildings are physically linked by a central porch with a continuous shed roof. Wood posts and beam define the perimeter edge of the porch and the courtyard.

The engineered site plan shows the site plan relative to the survey. A fence is proposed along

Beach City Road as well as along Finch Street. The site plan needs to be updated for review and approval by the DRB to clarify and identify all proposed site elements including the courtyard. It is unclear on the site plan, but in looking at the section it appears that the courtyard is sunken via steps that lead from the sidewalk down into the courtyard. Ms. Ray stated that these items need to be identified and made clearer in order for the Board to review this application.

A landscape plan was provided and includes some native plants and a lot of non-native plants. Along Beach City Road, the applicant is proposing five red bud trees with Formosa and azaleas proposed behind the fence. The location and the spacing of these trees and shrubs should be reconsidered and take into account the existing trees in that area. Along Finch Street the applicant is proposing 'Cathedral' live oaks with ligustrum between the parking and the fence. The parking lot islands include anywhere between two and three crape myrtles or little gem magnolias with five hydrangeas under them and appear to be over planted and should be scaled back.

The staff believes that landscaping should be added to screen the dumpster enclosure. Additionally, the buffer area along the adjacent property lines should be planted. The staff recommends wax myrtles or saw palms under the existing trees in a staggered appearance to provide additional buffer. Landscaping should also be provided between the parking and the sidewalks and the buildings. The goal should be to retain some of the existing trees as much as possible and then to supplement with large-scale landscaping to provide some natural environment and to reduce the impact and mass of the three buildings with parking.

Ms. Ray stated that a separate landscape plan was submitted by the applicant just prior to today's meeting. Unfortunately, it did not provide the staff enough time to review and comment on it. It appears that extra landscaping was added on the sides and possibly along Beach City Road. Existing trees were taken into account because it seems that some of the shrubs that were proposed have been removed. It also appears that some landscaping is being added between the sidewalk and the buildings.

Ms. Ray described the fence that is shown along Beach City Road and Finch Street. It is a 4ft. high wood fence and is intended to be the same as the fence at JPGA at Mitchelville Golf Cottages. The vehicular gates are anticipated to remain in the open position. The staff stated a detail for the fence and gates should be provided for review and approval by the DRB.

The design of the floor plans for the three buildings is based on a lowcountry vernacular and regional architectural of the traditional dog trot house. Each building is organized around a central passage way that includes the building's entrance, a lobby, and enclosed glass room beyond all of which provide natural light and views through the building front to back.

The roof pitch is 5 and 12 on the asphalt shingle roof. The porch roofs, shown in gray metal standing seam, are 3 and 12 pitch. All of the dormer roofs are 1.5 and 12 pitch.

The North elevation is the Beach City Road elevation and shows the rear of the Office Building and the end of the Fitness & Training Center Building. The East elevation shows the view at the entrance from Finch Street. The South elevation is the view from the adjacent property. All of the facades include similar design characteristics and include a variety of details that appear to be consistent with the Design Guide. Some images were provided that show that show the inspiration for the porch design. The building section shows the height at the top of the ridge at

24’- 9¾”. The courtyard is shown sunken one foot below the sidewalk.

The applicant forwarded a roof slope study that indicates with dash lines a 6 and 12 slope, which is recommended per the Design Guide. It is, however, problematic for several reasons according to the applicant. It adds unnecessary height and volume inside the building, increasing that slope makes the transition from building to porch roof slope more difficult. The shed dormer configurations were difficult to work out with the interior lobby spaces. A 5 and 12 roof slope is proposed and, in their opinion, it works best getting the necessary minimum height for the clerestory windows. It increases the roof height 2’on the Office and Classroom Buildings and 2’- 5” on the Fitness Building.

Ms. Ray reviewed the dumpster detail which is intended to match the buildings. Details for the gates need to be provided by the applicant and the site plan needs to be updated to be consistent (one shows two gates and one shows one gate.) It is not entirely clear what is being reviewed.

Exterior building materials include various James hardi products including horizontal lap siding, vertical board and batten, and base trim boards. Large French door type windows and the use of glass and transom windows at each of the buildings entrance and lobby help provide natural light, openness, and a sense of welcome. The variety of materials and details are consistent with the Design Guide. However, the proposed building colors (SW # 6385 Dover White for the siding and SW # 7006 Extra White for the trim) are not nature blending, especially on a site that lacks a good number of canopy trees. In the context of Beach City Road, these colors are a little too bright. Staff recommends that the colors be toned down to be more nature blending. The applicant has brought a color board for the Board’s review.

The applicant is proposing artificial turf in areas including the courtyard as well as the adjacent Fitness Center Building on either side. The applicant has brought a sample of the artificial turf for the Board’s review.

The building elevations show lantern-style lighting at some of the entrances along the corridor in front of the Fitness Building. A cut sheet for a flood light has been provided. All proposed lighting needs to be located on a lighting plan and cut sheets for all fixtures need to include wattage and lamp type for the DRB to review and approve. The LED shown on the flood light is not permitted, per the LMO. An alternate lamp source will need to be selected.

The Beach City Road Commercial ARB has approved this project. This project appears to meet the intent of the Design Guide and is headed in the right direction; however, the staff believes that there are many items that have not been provided or are not at a point of detail for a Final approval. The staff recommends that no action be taken by the DRB today until such time that the items that staff has identified either in the meeting today or through the staff comments, as well as any Board comments today, be addressed and brought back to the Board for a true Final review. Following the staff’s presentation, Chairman Gartner requested that the applicant make his presentation.

Mr. Christopher Bach, Peninsula Architects, presented statements in support of the application. The applicant presented statements regarding the landscape plan as well as samples of the artificial turf and proposed color for the asphalt cottage red shingle roof. The proposed flood light is deleted from the project. The porch roof and shed dormer roofs will be standing seam metal roof. The applicant agrees with the staff’s comments regarding the building and trim colors. The

applicant proposes maintaining SW # 6385 Dover White for the trim work and a darker beige SW # 6119 Antique White for the buildings.

The lighting cut sheet for the Georgian Colonial Lantern was distributed for the Board's review (a total of 24 lantern lights). Parking spaces for 10 bikes have been provided. The applicant reviewed the selected artificial turf sample. The applicant discussed the three separate buildings linked by an outdoor porch. The applicant also discussed the courtyard. A brick sample for the riser was presented for the Board's review. The applicant also discussed the steps down to the courtyard.

Mr. Richard Spruce, Plans Examiner, stated that a handrail will be needed for these steps. The staff will need to know the color for the handrail. Following the applicant's presentation, Chairman Gartner invited the Board to present comments.

The Board stated that they like the project overall. The submission is an improvement over the first submission and is heading in the right direction. The Board stated that they like the elevations and the details are good. The landscape plan needs to have similar attention to details and needs to show the existing trees along with the proposed trees. The Board reviewed the materials for the Courtyard. The Board stated their concern with the changes that need to be made to the parking (and its impact to the buildings.)

Ms. Ray presented additional statements regarding the parking issue and potential impact to the location of the building. The Board agreed that landscaping is needed between the parking area and the buildings. The Board agreed with the staff that plantings are too close in the islands. The Board stated that they will need additional details regarding the rafter tails. The plan and elevations do not seem to agree. The Board will need to see cut sheets for all of the fixtures. The Board also stated their concern with the proposed colors for the buildings. A darker color will probably be a better solution. The 5 and 12 roof pitch is okay. The Board is concerned with the white fence.

The applicant thanked the Board for their input. The applicant will work with staff on next steps. No action was taken by the Board on this application today.

12. Appearance by Citizens

None

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00p.m.

Submitted By: Approved By: July 28, 2015

_____ _____

Kathleen Carlin
Secretary

Jake Gartner
Chairman