

SOUTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY  
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD MINUTES  
March 24, 2010, Hilton Head Library

---

**Members Present:**

Laura Barrett  
Jake Lee  
Joe Hall  
Ed Pinckney  
Martha Crapse

**Members Absent:** Jim Tiller

**Staff Present:** Judy Nash Timmer, Development Review Planner  
Linda Maietta, Planning Assistant

I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:00 p.m. by Mr. Jake Lee, Acting Chairman.

II. **General Public Comment:** There were no public comments.

III. **Review of Minutes:** The Board reviewed the February 24, 2010, meeting minutes. **Motion:** Mr. Ed Pinckney made a motion, and Ms. Martha Crapse seconded the motion, **to accept the February 24, 2010, minutes as written.** The motion **was carried unanimously** (FOR: Barrett, Lee, Pinckney, Crapse).

(Mr. Joe Hall arrived at the meeting.)

IV. **Old Business:** There was no old business to discuss.

V. **New Business:** Chairman Lee moved on to new business.

A. AutoZone (Final Approval)

Chairman Lee asked if there was a spokesman present from AutoZone. Chairman Lee asked the representatives to come forward, state their name, and who they represent. The group representing this project was Mr. Ryan Lyle, Andrews & Burgess Engineering & Surveying, Inc., and Mr. Jim Kilburn, Project Developer, Twinrivers Capital, LLC.

Chairman Lee asked for staff comments from Ms. Judy Timmer.

Ms. Timmer stated that this application was filed for final but its the staff's opinion that the submittal does not meet the requirements that the Board suggested during the conceptual review. Ms. Timmer thought it best to allow AutoZone to come back before the Board to clarify anything that they didn't understand and, at the same time, for the Board to give them input. Ms. Timmer then read the staff report (copy attached).

Mr. Lyle began his presentation stating that AutoZone has hired a local landscaping architect to assist and will be incorporating the changes recommended by the Board in a revised landscape drawing.

As for the site, it appeared AutoZone met the intent of the recommendations from the Board at the last meeting. They have added additional parking spaces and rotated the building parallel to Best Buy but that has presented a situation where they can't meet the 8' foundation buffer in the rear of the building. It is not visible from the highway and Mr. Lyle would like the ability to reduce the rear foundation buffer to 3'. Plantings would be shown on the revised landscape drawing.

Ms. Barrett asked if the Board had received the photographs that AutoZone was to provide for the existing site. No photos had been received. Mr. Kilburn will email those to Ms. Timmer for distribution to the Board.

Ms. Timmer then clarified that the area where the foundation buffer cannot be met is at the rear of the store where parking is required; it's about 20' across the back.

Mr. Pinckney provided feedback on the landscaping: there are enough plants on the plan, they just aren't properly located. Some of them are 2' apart and they could be 4' apart. Also more variety is needed. There are entirely too many Indian Hawthorns; you could have 3 or 4 plants that basically do the same thing without being overplanted with one species. And the back wall next to the dumpsters, you could get some tall plants to break up the wall.

Mr. Hall stated it would help the Board if you could show 3 years of growth for the landscaping against the building, showing spacing, spread and height. That would give some comfort to those residents nearby that the landscape does help buffer. Mr. Hall requested to show this on the three elevations that are exposed and the front as well. The front would show that the building would be framed by landscaping.

To clarify the issue of the rear buffer being reduced to 3', as opposed to the 8' required, Mr. Pinckney stated that if you take advantage of the space that you do have and plant some tall trees and shrubs, the Board could overcome that requirement.

Chairman Lee asked if there were any comments on the building architecture, specifically the sign-bearing parapet. Ms. Timmer stated that at the last meeting, the architects talked about how the sign was attached to the building (it was not appropriate) and called it a "sign wall."

Mr. Kilburn stated that this was changed and reduced in size from the last meeting. (Pointing to the drawing) This part was wider the last time and we reduced the center section over the doors and added some standard, seamed roof on either side of the sign. Chairman Lee suggested that if the sign extended back into the building more like a roof form, it might be acceptable. It would also help if the gable part of the building appeared more roof-like than sign board-like by extending it back over the building some dimension.

Mr. Hall stated that it's very important that we look at what the adjacent building is and what its scale is so this building can be put in context. It appears as though the building is sitting out in the middle of the landscape and its not. Its part of another building context and we need to see that in concert. Mr. Kilburn stated that he has that and will submit that with his plans. Mr. Hall also suggested that a realistic depiction of the electrical junction boxes, depiction of meters and other devices needed be shown on the plans. Mr. Kilburn will provide an elevation showing that. Chairman Lee asked if the AC compressors, etc., are on the flat roof covered by the parapet. Mr. Kilburn confirmed that and said the elevation will show a dotted line indicating the equipment is hidden by the parapet.

Chairman Lee introduced Mr. John Fraser, a resident in the adjacent community; Mr. Fraser asked a few questions regarding planting and paint colors.

Mr. Kilburn then reviewed the color selections for the building. Suggestions were made on possibly reducing the number of colors to be used on the building and possibly additional brick detail in lieu of the medallion. Mr. Kilburn will bring a full color elevation of the shopping center showing that the roof color selected does appear elsewhere in the shopping center.

This project was deferred with comments.

#### B. St. Gregory the Great – School Expansion (Final)

Chairman Lee then moved on to the next agenda item, St. Gregory the Great school expansion. It is in for final approval. Chairman Lee asked Ms. Timmer for staff comments.

Ms. Timmer did not have any comments specifically on the project because it is mainly the architecture that will be reviewed and that is the Board's purview. As part of her staff report, Ms. Timmer did read an excerpt from the February 24, 2010; minutes (see staff report attached).

Mr. Pinckney asked that the record show he will be abstaining from comment and voting on this project. Chairman Lee confirmed.

Chairman Lee then called on Mr. Dan Ogden, D. L. Ogden Architecture, to begin his presentation.

To refresh the Board's memory, Mr. Ogden provided a rendering of the previous proposed cabin in the woods. In addition, he provided a revised depiction of the building based on comments provided from the Board in the February meeting. The building is 30' away from the existing school building. The columns, roof, and dormers will match the existing school. The colors of the shutters, stucco and roof will also match the existing school. There will be metal on the porch covering and the gable ends. The color is very close to the old town grey.

Mr. Hall reviewed the elevation drawings determining what part of the building will be seen from the highway. Mr. Ogden presented the Board with pictures

showing these views. Discussion continued regarding future expansion and views from the corridor.

The Board then moved onto landscaping issues. Mr. Michael Brock, Landscape Architect, Ward Edwards, addressed the Board. Prior comments were pertaining to the rear of the building. A foundation buffer has been added to address those comments. The HVAC unit is now shown on the drawing and is screened in. Pine trees will remain on the other side of the easement. The red maple tree previously shown in a picture will be relocated closer to the parking lot to help with the buffering. Twice as many plants have been added. Staff has no comments on landscaping.

Ms. Barrett made a motion that the Board approve the expansion for St. Gregory the Great. Chairman Lee confirmed the motion and asked if there is any discussion on the motion. Chairman Lee raised the question – if St. Gregory does add ball fields, does that project come back to the Board for approval? Ms. Timmer answered yes. Chairman Lee continued that the Board would then have the opportunity to create a greater buffer separation between the building and the ball fields. Chairman Lee then asked for a second motion. Ms. Crapse seconded the motion. Chairman Lee asked for a vote to approve the expansion for St. Gregory the Great as revised and resubmitted. **The project was approved (for: Lee, Crapse, Barrett; no vote: Hall; abstained: Pinckney).**

#### VI. Other Business: Review of Checklist for Project Submittal

Moving onto other business, the CRB checklist. Ms. Timmer asked Ms. Maietta to review the changes made to the checklist. Ms. Maietta noted the following changes:

Conceptual review: added wording that this step is optional but strongly recommended. No vote will be taken by the Board at this step. Board will review and provide feedback and recommendations.

Preliminary review: added wording that this is not an optional review step. Clarified what elevation drawings are needed and that the drawings also be submitted electronically in PDF format. Feedback will be provided by the Board via checklist with comments. The Board will review and vote on action at this step. If denied, the applicant will need to re-submit for preliminary approval again.

Final review: added wording that this is not an optional review step. Asked for drawings to be submitted electronically in PDF format. Board will provide feedback via checklist. The Board will vote on this application. The body of the checklist has not changed from what Judy had.

The following changes still need to be made to the checklist:

- hard-line drawings will still be required
- electronic version will be required for staff to retain

- preliminary submittal is required but preliminary approval is not. Applicant can be denied at the preliminary stage but re-submit for final (at their own risk that it may be denied)
- checklist should be a single sheet per step

(Not on agenda)

Mr. Pinckney raised a question regarding master plans and approval of subsequent applications. He suggested that for future submissions, the Board should have a policy that says if any project that the Board approves is part of a prior, previously approved master plan; the Board should then be approving that project in the context of that master plan or a new, revised master plan. Chairman Lee suggested that the application be revised to add a line item: Is this project part of a pre-approved master plan or previously considered master plan.

Ms. Timmer stated that the key here is if there is a project within the corridors that has a master plan, the CRB needs to be aware of any changes. The Board also needs to approve the changes. Ms. Timmer will look into procedures for this situation.

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Pinckney. Chairman Lee adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:16 p.m.

Approved 4/14/10