

SOUTHERN BEAUFORT COUNTY
CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
May 26, 2010 Hilton Head Library

Members Present:

Laura Barrett
Jake Lee
Joe Hall
Martha Crapse
Jim Tiller
Ed Pinckney

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

I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 3:00 p.m. by Chairman Jim Tiller.

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

III. **Review of Minutes:** The Board reviewed the May 12, 2010, meeting minutes. Motion: Mr. Jake Lee made a motion, and Mr. Joe Hall seconded the motion, to accept the May 12, 2010, minutes as written. The motion was carried unanimously (FOR: Barrett, Lee, Hall, Tiller, Pinckney, Crapse).

IV. **Old Business: Longhorn Steakhouse, Tanger 1 (Final)**

Chairman Tiller asked for staff comments from Ms. Timmer. Ms. Timmer read from the staff report (copy attached). Applicant provided lighting plan at the meeting. Applicant also brought the sample board for the Board to review.

Chairman Tiller asked that the representative come forward, state their name and who they represent. The group representing this project was Mr. Michael Brock with Ward Edwards representing Darden for the Longhorn Project and Mr. Greg Soltis representing Darden.

Mr. Brock went on to say that significant changes have been made to the project based on feedback received from the Board at the conceptual review. Mr. Brock will review the site plan and the landscape and try to address Ms. Timmer's comments.

- Took to heart the suggestion of relocating the dumpster and service area to make it more in line with what is adjacent at the Panera site.
- By turning the building, it afforded a little bit more of a buffer area on the retail side, making everything a little bit more in line with each other.
- Pulled the building back away on the entrance side; pulled it from the entrance drive approximately 3' to allow for a little more space on the

- sidewalk for the entrance and also to allow for a little bit more landscaping at the front entrance.
- Met most of those concerns regarding pedestrian access. Pointing at plans on the easel, pedestrian access goes all the way across, access to the Longhorn side, even have access on the Panera side and circulation around the building.
 - The landscape changes made addressed one of the comments of having too many material types and number of plants. Cut those down significantly to allow those to mature.
 - In line with Ms. Timmer's comments on 5-gallons, could make those changes from 5 to 7 gallons.
 - Did find in the emerald greens, that arborvitae are actually in zones 4-8 and since we are in zone 8, they are allowable. If the Board would like to switch those out, that can be done.
 - The same with the sky rocket junipers. Plant can be put in zone 8. If that's also a concern with the Board, can look at changing that plant also.
 - Per Ms. Timmer, the lighting footcandles are a concern all along 278. That is the Tanger Master Lighting Plan but we could shield those areas and resubmit that plan again and make sure we have the proper shielding on those. Lighting fixtures to shield from the property line
 - The lighting for the building will be done by Longhorn. Because we wanted all the lighting in the front parcels and in the outlet center to be the same, Tanger is going to be installing those light fixtures.
 - The wall paks are located in service area and they are below the top of the fence that is shielding the dumpster area so those are actually going to be lower. And in a sense will be shielded by a whole wall.

Ms. Timmer stated that our ordinance requires that they have to be cut-off fixtures. My advice to the Board would be that not knowing how many of the lights there are and where they're being mounted may make a difference in whether they're approvable or not. To decide on the wall pak we would have to know the height that it's mounted to make sure the angle of the light is not going to be spilling out into light trespass.

Mr. Greg Soltis stepped up for her presentation. He hoped the Board had already seen the rendered elevations that depict the changes that were made since the last meeting, eliminating the stone and incorporating some of the other elements that were discussed. Mr. Soltis asked the Board for questions/comments. Before he did that though, Mr. Soltis addressed the wall pak issue. That wall pak is typically mounted at 7' above slab. The closing wall around the trash and service yard is 8' tall so there should not be any light trespass from those fixtures.

Chairman Tiller asked for comments on the architecture as presented.

Mr. Hall had questions regarding the signage and the logo on the chimney. Ms. Timmer stated that the logo on the chimney will count as signage, as well as the lettering for Longhorn Steakhouse. Mr. Lee suggested that if one of the signs

were eliminated, it might be more appropriate to take the roof line across there rather than having a big, blank panel of color. Mr. Soltis agreed to this suggestion.

Mr. Soltis went on to summarize colors:

- Primary color of the body of the building is to be the Jackson Tan
- The feature areas of the architecture which include those areas we currently show signage on and also have the hip roof above would be the Benjamin Moore Desert Tan, the lighter color, to provide some sort of contrast but let some definition to those areas of the building
- The stucco which is behind the signage as well as the chimney and the two columns out front by the entry will be the Raisin color.
- The standing seamed metal roof doesn't have a name but you can see it there on the sample board.
- The brick that you see on the sample board should be fairly obvious as you see it on the elevation. It is a wainscot around the entire building. Mortar is gray.
- The Olympic Walnut stain, we have timbers at our front door that come up out of the center of our stucco columns and beam work across the front.
- Country redwood would provide accent to the coping and the top of the parapet as a drip as the edge of the standard seam.
- The faux chimney would be a stucco cap simulated stone like in the same color.

Mr. Lee stated that the architect has responded to what the comments were previously from the Board. The treatment around the entry door is obviously a Longhorn requirement. Mr. Lee is inclined to cut a little slack on that because of all that has been given up a lot to get to this point. Mr. Lee is inclined to go along with that to help their identity issues.

Chairman Tiller called for any other comments. He then moved to the site plan for review.

A discussion ensued regarding the Tanger Master Plan and the changes that have been made to it:

- The master plan was approved based on pedestrian access everywhere; good pedestrian circulation.
- As the Board reviews these submittals building by building, the pedestrian circulation is being lost.
- Seem like we should insist on maintaining and promoting better and safer pedestrian circulation.
- Seems like a main, central pedestrian corridor that actually penetrated the buildings just below these and linked up these two facilities has been changed from the original master plan.

- The things that were said to County Council at the time that this master plan was approved are not playing out in what the Board is seeing and part of our concern is that ought to be easily and plainly understood in the plans brought to us even though these are individual property owners of individual sites. They are part of this larger plan and what we want to see is that plan carried through. The Board is trying to keep the project holistic as it was presented but yet we're presented with pieces that don't necessarily relate to the holistic. That is our concern here.
- The Board ought to make it a rule that if you're showing a project that is part of an approved master plan, the approved master plan is part of the package so if you have deviated from that you show where and how you did and the reason for it. This has come up in a strong situation now twice in the last 3 meetings.
- The master plan the Board remembers had a central area that would be a pleasant place to be, covered with trees. As it has evolved, it looks just like another parking lot and it short-circuited the Board in the evolution. The continuity of the approval process is broken.

Mr. Brock gave a brief overview of the changes made and approved to the Tanger master plan, including adding a tenant and re-routing pedestrian walkways.

Chairman Tiller observed that the changes discussed were major changes; however, if the Planning Staff has made the decision not to send it back to County Council for approval, this Board has no purview over that. Back to the Longhorn submittal, Chairman Tiller offered the following comments regarding landscaping:

- The trees that are in the parking lot or in the parking islands, aren't they suppose to be 3.5" caliper trees? Ms. Timmer thought 3" caliper. Chairman Tiller believed it to be 3.5" but it's shown on the plan as 2.5".
- The Lace Bark Elm is shown as an understory tree. The ordinance requires broad leafed, overstory trees in the tree islands.
- Suggested to go with the height and spread of the plant rather than the gallons. Ms. Timmer suggested a 7 gallon minimum and that is probably appropriate. (Mr. Brock agreed to change.)
- Verify that the Red Star plant is a shrub and not a tree. (Mr. Brock can change if necessary.)
- Review your traffic flow, check intersections and view corridors, to ensure they are clear and plant material is the correct size that will accommodate being able to see oncoming traffic.

The Board provided the following comments regarding lighting:

- Lighting plan should take into consideration the proposed landscape.

- Verify ordinance that lighting poles mounted within 50' of 278 corridor may not exceed a height of 20'.
- Site lighting should be shown on the landscape plan.

Ms. Timmer proceeded to summarize the conditions of approval:

1. Architecture - Approved as submitted.
2. Building Materials and Colors – Approved as submitted.
3. Landscape Plan –
 - a. Verify the Red Star is a shrub and not a tree.
 - b. As 5 gallon pots are not readily available in the nursery industry, the plant size should be specified as 7 gallon pots. More important is the appropriate height and spread dimensions. Please ensure the heights and spreads given are appropriate sizes for a 7 gallon pot.
 - c. Trees in the islands must be 3.5 inches not the 2.5 specified.
 - d. The Lace Bark Elm is an understory tree. The ordinance requires broad leafed understory trees in the tree islands.
4. Pedestrian Access: Improve pedestrian access from the Longhorn site to the Tanger Outlet Site. Consider raising the pedestrian access areas located between cars to promote safety.
5. Lighting Plan:
 - a. Revise lighting plan to show approved landscape plan. The lighting plan should take into consideration the proposed landscape.
 - b. Light trespass may not exceed 0.30 footcandles across the property line. Revise plans to meet this requirement.
 - c. All lighting footcandles should be carried out to 0.0 fc on site or to minimally show footcandles levels at property lines.
 - d. Lights along buffers must have backshields.
 - e. Maximum light pole height is 30'.
 - f. Lighting poles mounted within 50 feet of the highway right-of-way may not exceed a height of 20 feet, and only forward-throw, or type IV lights may be used to light entrances. The minimum mounting height for a pole shall be 12 feet.
 - g. Wall paks must be shielded.
 - h. Provide proposed building light locations on plan for review and approval. Provide a list of these lights with total numbers to be used.

Mr. Pinckney made a motion based on the conditions noted above, and Mr. Lee seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously (Crapse, Barrett, Hall, Pinckney, Tiller, Lee).

V. **New Business:** None

VI. **Other Business:** Narrative Questions

Board did not discuss this issue.

The master plan issue will be discussed at the next meeting, June 9, 2010, with the Planning Director, Mr. Tony Criscitiello.

The Board discussed the policy of not accepting incomplete submittal packages. The Board agreed that they will review incomplete packages and just not make a motion to approve. The first thing that Ms. Timmer should say when a project is introduced is that the application is incomplete. On that basis, the Board will provide feedback only.

Chairman Tiller reminded the Board that on June 9, 2010, the meeting will be held with out a project but Ms. Timmer is going to present information to the Bluffton group.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:06 p.m.

Approved 6/10/10