

**MINUTES
CITY OF GOOSE CREEK
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2016 6:30 P.M.
MARGUERITE H. BROWN MUNICIPAL CENTER
519 N. GOOSE CREEK BOULEVARD**

I. Call to Order –Vice Chairperson, Tom Risso

Vice Chairperson Risso called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Present: Joel Arenson, Gary Becker, David Cantrill, Chris Cook, Tom Risso

Absent: Sharon Clopton

Staff Present: Sarah Hanson

II. Review of Minutes from January 19, 2016

Motion: Mr. Arenson made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Becker seconded.

Discussion: There was none.

Vote: All voted in favor. (5-0)

III. New Business – Minor Applications

A. Smiles at Goose Creek – Signage

Ms. Michelle Ponoski presented the application with color samples to the Board. Mr. Becker inquired if the base of the monument is brick. Staff stated yes. Mr. Arenson inquired if there would be landscaping around the monument. Ms. Hanson stated it is part of the overall landscaping plan. Mr. Cantrill inquired about the color of the brick. Ms. Ponoski stated she was not provided with the color of the brick from the client. Staff stated the monument brick to be used would match the building brick. There was discussion about the white background and the colors to be used with the logo.

Motion: Mr. Becker made a motion to accept the application as submitted to include the wall mounted signs and the monument sign. Mr. Arenson seconded.

Discussion: There was none.

Vote: All voted in favor. (5-0)

B. DeLuca and Maucher Law Offices – Signage

Mr. Doug Rucker presented the Board with color samples along with photos of the proposed signage to the Board. Mr. Risso inquired about the photos showing the existing signage and the proposed signage. He also inquired about the orange color to be used. The applicant noted the orange as shown on the artwork as submitted.

Motion: Mr. Arenson made a motion to accept the application as submitted. Mr. Cantrill seconded.

Discussion: Mr. Becker inquired if there would be landscaping at the sign base. Mr. Rucker stated there was existing; however, they could add additional landscaping.

Vote: All voted in favor. (5-0)

C. Hardees – Freestanding Signage

Mr. Hugh Welch presented the application along with color samples to the Board. He presented two designs to the Board. Mr. Arenson inquired if the sign configurations were the corporate branding. Mr. Becker inquired if the reader boards submitted on the two options were different sizes. Mr. Welch stated the reader board on option #1 is smaller than the revised option #2.

Mr. Risso inquired if Staff had any comments. Ms. Hanson stated Staff suggested the applicant come up with an alternate design in order to comply with the ordinance, which states reader boards should be uniform in appearance and proportion in relationship to the sign. She added it would be the purview of the Board to determine the aesthetics of the design. There was discussion about signage used at other locations. Mr. Risso inquired if both signs were legal signs. Ms. Hanson stated that although both signs do meet the size requirements of the ordinance, Staff felt the first design does not meet the proportional guidelines in uniformity.

Motion: Mr. Arenson made a motion to accept option #2 of the application as submitted on February 15, 2016. Mr. Cantrill seconded.

Discussion: Mr. Becker stated that he preferred Option #1. There was discussion about the sign being taken down if the business was not to remain at this location. There was some discussion about the ordinance and the requirements to remove signage after a business is closed. There was a brief discussion about the size of the reader boards on both options.

Vote: All voted against option #2. (5-0)

Motion: Mr. Arenson made a motion to accept the original application as submitted with option #1. Mr. Cantrill seconded.

Discussion: Mr. Becker inquired if the Board could request the sign to be taken down should the business close.

Motion: Mr. Arenson revised his motion to approve the original design, option #1, as submitted, reflecting the rectangular Hardee's sign with star. He added the contingency that the sign be removed should the Hardee's be sold or abandoned. Mr. Cantrill amended his second to agree with the amended proposal.

Vote: All voted in favor. (5-0)

IV. New Business – Major Applications

D. Waffle House – Site Design, Elevations, Materials, Landscaping and Signage

Mr. Ken Williams presented the application along with color and material samples to the Board. He introduced Mr. Kyle Hoyt, the Civil Engineer for the project. Mr. Hoyt stated the project is located on Red Bank Road, and described the landscaping and buffers as incorporated into the project at Staff's request. There was discussion about the landscaping exceeding the 12% requirement, building materials, and signage as proposed. Mr. Arenson inquired if there would be landscaping at the base of the sign. Ms. Hanson stated the landscaping plan reflects where the landscaping is layout.

Mr. Arenson inquired about the ingress and egress. Mr. Williams explained the access easement on the property. There was brief discussion about the reasons for the placement of the egress, and the location in relationship to Red Bank Road. Ms. Hanson described the SCDOT standard operating parameters for curb cuts.

Mr. Cook inquired about the locations of light pole, and the concrete pad locations as per the submitted plan. Mr. Hoyt described the lighting locations and the concrete pads for egress and the transformer. There was discussion about canopy trees in relationship to the location of the light poles. Ms. Hanson stated the applicant submitted a photo metric plan to take the neighboring properties into consideration. Mr. Hoyt stated there is at least 100' to the nearest residential house. Mr. Cook inquired if there was any other lighting. Mr. Hoyt stated no additional lighting other than at the back egress door and the interior illuminated cabinet for the wall mounted sign.

Mr. Arenson inquired about the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Williams stated it would be constructed of the same materials of the building and would be gated. Mr. Becker stated concerns for the private road and maintenance of it. The applicant stated it would be maintained.

Motion: Mr. Arenson made a motion to accept the application as submitted. Mr. Cook seconded.

Discussion: There was none.

Vote: All voted in favor. (5-0)

v. Comments from the Board

There were none.

vi. Comments from Staff

There were none.

vii. Adjournment

Mr. Becker made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Cantrill seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The meeting adjourned at or about 7:18 p.m.

_____ Date _____
Tom Risso, Vice Chairperson