



Members present: Kristen Corri-Krause (Chair), David Thompson, Jeff Johnston, Michelle Smyth, John Tarkany

Staff present: Dennis Dowd, Linda Bennett, Peggy Jordan (recorder)

RESULTS

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

JANUARY 3, 2017

5:00 P.M.

2 GEORGE ST

1. 1871 Ashley River Road – TMS# 351-10-00-036

Request after-the-fact approval for use of synthetic turf in lieu of sod as per documentation submitted.

Owner: Ashley River Residences, LLC
Applicant: Richard Bailey/Hussey Gay Bell
Neighborhood/Area: West Ashley

MOTION: Denial of after-the-fact request based on staff comments.

MADE BY: Tarkany SECOND: Thompson VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 1
(Smyth recused; Johnston opposed)

2. 1406 Savannah Hwy – TMS# 349-03-00-199

Request preliminary approval for new construction of a convenience store/gas station as per documentation submitted.

Owner: VGO Convenience Stores
Applicant: Beth Novak/SGA Architecture
Neighborhood/Area: West Oak Forest/West Ashley

MOTION: Deferral with all staff and Board comments.

MADE BY: Thompson SECOND: Johnson VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

3. 3012, 3088 Maybank Highway – TMS# 313-00-00-407/408

Request preliminary approval for new construction of a mixed use commercial development as per documentation submitted.

Owner: Crowne Partners Inc.
Applicant: Chris Altman/Stubbs Muldrow and Herin Architects
Neighborhood/Area: Johns Island

MOTION: Preliminary approval of master plan and Buildings 1 – 5; Deferral of Building 6; with staff and Board comments.

MADE BY: Thompson SECOND: Smyth VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0
(Johnston recused)

4. Ashley Crossing Lane at Highway 61 – TMS# 354-08-00-003

Request Conceptual approval for new construction of a multi-family development as per documentation submitted.

Owner: Ashriv LLC/Ted Kirkpatrick
Applicant: LS3P
Neighborhood/Area: West Ashley

MOTION: Deferral with staff comments #1, 2, and 3 and Board comments regarding site plan and improvement of 5th floor massing.

MADE BY: Johnson SECOND: Thompson VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 2
(Thompson and Smyth opposed)

5. 2408, 2409 Maybank Highway – TMS# 346-00-00-559/167

Request conceptual approval for new construction of multi-family development as per documentation submitted.

Owner: St. John's Marina Commercial LLC
Applicant: Eddie Bello/Bello Garris Architects
Neighborhood/Area: Johns Island

MOTION: Preliminary approval with caveat that significant changes to design come back to Board and Board comment regarding plant palette changes.

MADE BY: Thompson SECOND: Tarkany VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

6. Floyd Road – TMS# 301-00-00-027

Request conceptual approval for new construction of multi-family development as per documentation submitted.

Deferred by applicant

7. Ellis Oak Avenue – TMS# 340-00-00-095

Request conceptual approval for new construction of three-story office building and associate site work as per documentation submitted

Owner: Twin Rivers Capital/Andrew Smith
Applicant: James Geiger/David Thompson Architect
Neighborhood/Area: James Island

MOTION: Conceptual approval with comments to screen parking from street (wall or landscape); ground building w/screening material; study combination of materials/massing; reserve right to screen mechanicals.

MADE BY: Johnson SECOND: Tarkany VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0
(Thompson recused)

Staff Comments
For
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
January 3, 2017

1871 Ashley River Road :

Staff Comments:

1. Synthetic turf was not approved for the project and has been typically not approved by the Board. Allowing it on this project could be interpreted as precedent-setting.

Staff Recommendation: We recommend denial of the After-the-Fact request, with the synthetic turf to be replaced with organic turf.

1406 Savannah Hwy. :

Staff Comments:

1. Staff continues to feel that this is a well-thought-out and creative design for this site.
2. The offset of the two distinct masses is an improvement in the overall massing; however the apparent equal size of the two masses is now not as successful (see A222C vs. A222P).
3. The main entry canopy on the street has been narrowed making it appear less prominent and proportional to the mass. Staff feels it should be made deeper.
4. A second canopy has been eliminated on the E. side, an unfortunate development in our view.
5. The gas canopy appears to have been shortened and widened somewhat. Also, staff prefers the more sculptural nature of the previous canopy structure.
6. The dumpster enclosure is appropriate.
7. Drip edge and parapet caps appear more flush with the wall than perhaps they will be.
8. Per the prior staff comment adopted by the Board motion, provide screen walls at both street frontages. Provide details.
9. Provide cut sheets for the bollards, which should be decorative in nature and not painted in a safety color.
10. Provide locations of flood lights and photometrics on flood and gas canopy lighting.
11. The only comment the Board had previously regarding landscaping was a directive that the landscape design support the architecture and have an open feeling. Staff defers to the Board on the landscape plan.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral with the conditions noted.

3012, 3088 Maybank Hwy. :

Staff Comments:

Overall Master Plan Comments:

1. Buildings #6 has been eliminated. There is no longer a park space in front of building #7.
2. The legend that was provided with the previous Master Plan drawing has not been provided this time making it difficult to better understand the site plan.

3. The location of the dumpster is very prominent and should be relocated to a much more discreet location.
4. There were very few comments previously about the architecture, which is consistent with the Conceptual submittal. This is likely the reason for the lack of comparison elevation drawings.
5. Submit a comprehensive signage package.
6. Submit a comprehensive color scheme.
7. Staff defers to the Board on the landscape plan.

Staff Recommendation: P/A with the conditions noted.

Building #1:

1. Materials are generally good quality.
2. The accent panel (E. and W. elevations) with its second header suggests an in-filled window. Ideally that would be eliminated in favor of a window at the upper portion of the gable.
3. Reduce the number of light fixtures on the S. elevation from 12 to 8.

Staff Recommendation: P/A with the conditions noted.

Building #2:

1. The in-filled panels on this building work better due to the subtle nature of the header.
2. The tower has been shortened adversely affecting its proportions. It should be increased in height to match the conceptual design.
3. The large window on the E. elevation below the tower has been eliminated and should be added back.
4. Provide information on the pre-engineered awning that has been added to the W. elevation, but not shown on the N. or S. elevations.
5. The elimination of the windows and door from the S. end of the W. elevation is acceptable to us, as is the elimination of the monitor.

Staff Recommendation: P/A with the conditions noted.

Building #3:

1. Ground face CMU facing Maybank is not preferred and seems incompatible with the rest of the complexes' material palette. Modify for an upgraded material, at least on the Maybank side.
2. HVAC equipment on the roof will need to be screened.
3. If the siding is lap siding it should be the thicker 5/8" material.
4. Reduce the number of light fixtures on the S. elevation from 12 to 8 and from 9 to 6 on the N. elevation.
5. Provide detailed information on the fabric awnings.

Staff Recommendation: P/A with the conditions noted.

Building #4:

1. Again, the use of ground face CMU feels like a downgrade to the overall material palette and should be reconsidered.
2. The loss of the monitor is unfortunate as it helped to reinforce the main entry to the primary tenant space.
3. Spacing of the horizontal boards on the E. elevation should be tightened to better conceal equipment.

4. The exposed ladder on the N. elevation should be eliminated and access to the roof provided from the interior.
5. HVAC equipment on the roof will need to be screened.
6. Re-study the vertical signage on the roof, which appears as an afterthought and not integrated.
7. Add back the second window on the W. elevation that has been eliminated.

Staff Recommendation: P/A with the conditions noted.

Building #5:

1. Elevation compass directions are mis-labeled.
2. The elimination of the tower at the SE corner improves and simplifies the overall massing.
3. The entrance lobby mass on the north elevation has been changed from all brick to brick at the first level and siding above. Staff feels it was simpler previously and should return to all brick. Also, the introduction of metal wall panels at the parapet and bays seem arbitrary and should be reconsidered.
4. Reduce the number of light fixtures on the S. elevation from 15 to 10.
5. Reintroduce the trellis on the E. elevation.
6. Windows in the ground floor of the bays should be the same on the E. and W. elevations. Prefer the W.

Staff Recommendation: P/A with the conditions noted.

Building #6:

1. The composition of the N. and S. elevations are not as successful as previous. Asymmetrical window placements are awkward.
2. The same is true of the door openings and canopies of the W. elevation.
3. Eave overhangs have been significantly shortened and were better previously.
4. The second floor height has been increased 3'-5", which results in an awkward equal dimension of the ground and second floor heights, and excessive wall above the second floor windows.
5. The eave and roofline of the stair bays was better previously also.
6. The E. elevation has improved with the elimination of the masonry "bookends".
7. Add an additional signage band to make the signage symmetrical on this otherwise very symmetrical elevation.
8. Reduce the number of light fixtures on the E. elevation from 15 to 10.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral for re-study of the conditions noted.

Ashley Crossing Lane at Hwy 61 :

Staff Comments:

1. The Board requested the applicant to re-study the building height, but it is still a 5-story building in a neighborhood and general area consisting mainly of elevated 1-story multi-family and 2-story multi-family with flat roofs. Staff continues to feel that this building is out of scale for the height, scale and mass, especially as one large block of a building.
2. They have studied the main entrance and parking entries and exist. The entry lobby looks promising in plan, but the execution in elevation reads more like a commercial storefront than a residential building entry. The garage entry is still facing the street

on a prominent elevation, with no attempt to mask what will appear like a commercial parking garage, especially at night.

3. The 4th floor roof terrace is still poorly located and would be better atop the clubhouse to take advantage of site features.
4. The clubhouse still appears unrelated and an afterthought.
5. We still feel that the ground floor finished in board-formed concrete and metal louvers is cold and uninviting when combined with the fact that it screens parking.
6. We also feel that there are a few too many colors and materials.

Staff Recommendation: Staff does not support the project and feels that it does not architecturally relate well to the context and is inappropriate in its H/S/M. We recommend Denial.

2408/2409 Maybank Hwy. (St. John's Yacht Harbor Condominiums) :

Staff Comments:

1. It will be good to see this site developed as something other than a parking lot.
2. There is no context other than the general context of the low country. The overall design with its form, materials, roof forms, and overhangs is relevant and appropriate. The proportions are also pleasing as evidenced by the transoms over double hung windows making for an elegant vertical proportion.
3. The recess and material change of the top floor, along with the deep roof overhangs, help to break down the mass and scale quite well.
4. The stucco and wood lattice at the base of the building provide familiar and warm materials for screening of the garages.
5. Building entries are not well defined and the small lattice canopies are insignificant to the scale of the buildings. Study this further.
6. Although we like the concept of mechanical units on the roof, they will be highly visible and seem somewhat awkwardly located. Perhaps an enclosure of the top as well as the sides is warranted.
7. The landscape legend is too small to read. Enlarge for the next stage.
8. We also would prefer fold-out drawings over match lines.
9. Again, staff defers to the Board on the landscape plan.
10. Provide material samples, color scheme, lighting, and signage information for the next review.

Staff Recommendation: C/A with the conditions noted.

Ellis Oak Drive :

Staff Comments:

1. This site, not located off of a main thoroughfare, and arranged similar to the adjacent property, is not of concern regarding parking in front of the building. It is also understandable to want to take advantage of the proximity to the marsh and the river.

It would be good however to provide greater screening of the parking from the street either in the form of dense landscaping or a wall.

2. Otherwise staff defers to the Board on the specifics of the landscape plan.
3. The parking below the building should be screened to shield it from view and to help ground the building.
4. Generally the layout of the building is well-conceived, but we feel there are too many moves architecturally for a building of this size. It should be simplified. It also contains too many materials as indicated by the materials key. Simplifying the material palette will also help to simplify the design. Continuing the expression of the top floor at the bay of the north elevation in material and plane would also help.
5. Hopefully the parapet will conceal the mechanical units, but if ultimately visible they will need to be screened.

Staff Recommendation: C/A with the conditions noted for further study.