MINUTES

**CITY OF GOOSE CREEK**

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2017, 6:30 P.M.**

MARGUERITE H. BROWN MUNICIPAL CENTER

**519 N. GOOSE CREEK BOULEVARD**

# Call to Order – Chairperson, Sharon Clopton

Chairperson Clopton called the meeting to order at 6:27 p.m.

Present: Joel Arenson, Gary Becker, Lisa Burdick, David Cantrill, Sharon Clopton, Chris Cook, Tom Risso

Absent: none

Staff Present: Kara Browder, Sarah Hanson

# Review of Minutes from January 19, 2017

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

*Discussion:* There was none.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (7-0)

1. **New Business – Minor Applications**
2. **Plantation Center – Monument Sign**

The applicant presented the application to the Board, explaining the sign would be extended 3’ in height to provide space for two additional tenants. Mr. Arenson inquired about the method to be used. The applicant stated it the aluminum frame would be extended, welded, and painted to match the existing signage. There was discussion regarding the existing paint as proposed.

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

*Discussion:* There was some discussion about the tenant panels.

*Motion:* Mr. Risso amended the motion to include that the extension piece will be seamless and the weld will be ground smooth so there is no appearance, and will match the same color of the existing rail. Mr. Cook seconded.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (7-0)

1. **Stratford High School – Freestanding Sign**

The applicant presented the application to include updating the panel and LED signage portion of the existing sign. Mr. Arenson inquired regarding the LED portion of the sign remaining as a message board. The applicant stated yes. There was some discussion about the size of the LED message. Chairperson Clopton inquired with Ms. Hanson regarding the technology. Ms. Hanson stated the ordinance language to explain the regulations for LED message boards. There was discussion about the color of the LED to be white or amber.

*Motion*: Mr. Risso made a motion to accept the application as submitted, provided that the sign follows the standards and guidelines set forth in the ordinance. Mr. Cantrill seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (7-0)

1. **139 Red Bank Road Shopping Center – Freestanding Sign**

The applicant presented the sign application to the Board. He described the sign to include 8’x8’ steel poles on the outsides, with an aluminum sign frame that will solid in the front with individual panels screwed to the front. The applicant added the sign is not illuminated. Mr. Arenson inquired if the sign would be illuminated. The applicant stated that according to the order the client placed, it would not be. Mr. Arenson inquired about the specific location of the sign. The applicant stated that the sign would be placed in lieu of one of the parking spaces. Mr. Arenson inquired to Staff for feedback on the location. Ms. Hanson stated Staff had given the applicant feedback to suggest the sign be relocated to a more central portion of the property. The applicant agreed with Staff that the sign would be more appropriate to locate towards the center of the property. There was discussion about the location of the sign, and setback requirements as per the ordinance. Chairperson Clopton inquired about the landscaping. The applicant stated the intent would include landscaping at the sign base. There was discussion about the sign lacking a base to the sign.

*Motion*: Mr. Risso made a motion to deny the application as submitted, and suggested the applicant come back with a modified application per the discussion. Mr. Arenson seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (7-0)

1. **Sapphires – Minor Up-fit**

The business owner, also the applicant, presented the scope of work to the Board, adding that some of the up-fit was due to storm damage, and described the proposed patio structure. There was discussion about the front portion being extended out, and the age of the structure not being able to support a parapet roof. Chairperson Clopton requested project clarification from the applicant. The applicant stated the wood would be covered, treated and painted to match the existing colors. Mr. Arenson inquired about the parapet of the building front. The applicant stated the front material vinyl siding will be removed, then extended out to the brick wall (approximately 30” tall) with 6”x6” post attached to that. He added the wall would be replaced with a wood product that would be painted a tan beige to match the existing brick. Ms. Burdick inquired if the brick wall would be removed. The applicant stated yes. The applicant inquired to the Board if the proper architectural drawings were submitted would be sufficient with the concept. Mr. Cantrill inquired about the siding details. The applicant explained the angled siding. There was a detailed discussion about the elevations and materials. Mr. Arenson inquired about the attachment of the patio structure. The applicant explained it would be supported through the foundation, and the attachment to the structure would only consist of the flashing. Chairperson Clopton inquired if the Board had a motion or suggestion for the applicant.

*Motion*: Mr. Arenson made a motion to accept the concept of canopy design as presented to the ARB, requesting that the applicant come back to the Board with full plans and elevations detailing the design and integrity of the project for a formal review and approval. Mr. Becker seconded.

*Discussion:* There was suggestion for the tenant to contact the owner.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (7-0)

1. **LIDL – Signage**

The representative presented the sign application and samples to the Board. Chairperson Clopton stated the application consisted of two wall mounted and one freestanding. The representative stated yes. There was clarification of the orientation of the store front, parking, entrance and signage. There was discussion regarding the landscaping in proximity to the monument sign.

*Motion*: Mr. Risso made a motion to accept the application as submitted. Ms. Burdick seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (7-0)

1. **New Business – Major Applications**
2. **Time to Shine – Elevations, Site Plan and Landscape Plan**

Chairperson Clopton stated this application is for a carwash and specified the location. The architect for the project presented the project, along with building materials and paint samples to the Board. Mr. Arenson inquired about the refuse enclosure location, and materials. The architect stated it would be screened on all four sides and landscaped. Chairperson Clopton stated the refuse screening would be required to match the primary structure. The architect stated an understanding. Mr. Arenson requested the material be specified. The architect stated they wished to use split face block if that would be acceptable to the Board. The was a detailed discussion on the orientation of the enclosure. The architect presented the colors for the project. Chairperson Clopton inquired about parking under the canopy. Staff stated the landscaping would be offset in other areas of the project to make up for the inability to place it under the canopy. Chairperson Clopton inquired about the location for the vacuums. The architect stated the areas would be located under the canopy. There was a brief discussion about the location of the pay station. Mr. Arenson asked for clarity on the detention pond, to specify that it would not hold water. He professed his concern of the maintenance, depth and landscaping. The architect stated that it would not be fenced, since it would only be a depth of three feet. Chairperson Clopton clarified the materials as; brick on the bottom with concrete siding above, and a dark bronze metal roofing. The architect agreed. There was discussion confirming the refuse screening would be split face block painted the darker color with pressure treated wooden doors.

*Motion*: Mr. Risso made a motion to accept the application as submitted, with the addition that the refuse screening would be split face block painted the darker color with pressure treated wooden doors. Mr. Cook seconded.

*Discussion:* There was some discussion about the material for the enclosure, and painting it after installation. There was discussion about the franchise and colors, and vacuum hose locations, black in color within the canopy. There was also discussion about the system that conveyors the automobiles through the wash station. Ms. Burdick inquired about if the blue would match the signage that would be brought back at a future date. The applicant stated yes. Mr. Becker inquired to Staff if the existing short brick columns would remain. Staff stated they would remain.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (7-0)

*Discussion*: Mr. Cantrill inquired about the lighting on the property. The architect stated the lighting would be under the canopies, and possibly two pole lights.

Staff requesting the addition to the agenda of a major application review for a MOB.

1. **Goose Creek Medical Office Building – Elevations, Site Plan and Landscape Plan**

Chairperson Clopton inquired about the location of the site. The applicant stated it is located on the corner of St. James Avenue and Fairfax. The applicant presented the proposed development for a medical office facility. Mr. Arenson inquired about the hours of operation. The applicant stated the hours were typically an hour before a typical business day and an hour after. There was discussion about the height of the building consisting of a single-story building. There was discussion about the detention pond on the site plan, and the landscaping plan. There was a brief discussion regarding the sidewalk and the access to the parking. Staff detailed the landscaping that would screen the base of the building as represented in the drawings submitted. Mr. Arenson inquired if the stucco was artificial or a masonry material. The applicant stated it would be a masonry material.

*Motion*: Mr. Risso made a motion to accept the application as submitted. Mr. Becker seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (7-0)

1. **Comments from the Board**

Mr. Arenson inquired about training. Staff stated it was unknown at this time, and there would be two at some point of the beginning of the year and two at the end of the year as required. There was some discussion about the use of color, and the screening of refuse containers with commercial properties.

1. **Comments from Staff**

Ms. Hanson introduced the new Planning Director, Kara Browder. There was also a brief discussion regarding the renderings as submitted, and the purview of the Board. Ms. Hanson mentioned the Planning Commission requested a signage ordinance amendment to require the restriction to 10’ and that they be monument in style is currently pending legislation with City Council, with a first reading in March, with a second reading in April.

1. **Adjournment**

Mr. Risso made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Cantrill seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The meeting adjourned at or about 7:57 p.m.
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Sharon Clopton, Chairperson