MINUTES

**CITY OF GOOSE CREEK**

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

**MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 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 6:30 p.m.

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

Absent: David Cantrill

Staff Present: Kara Browder, Brenda Moneer

# Review of Minutes from September 18, 2017

*Discussion*: Mr. Arenson noted to corrections to deleting the word “let” within the Goose Creek Samurais portion of the minutes and add: “per the discussion” to the motion for the Care Now application.

*Motion*: Mr. Risso made a motion to accept the minutes with corrections as noted.

*Discussion:* There was none. Ms. Burdick seconded.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (4-0)

**New Business – Minor Applications**

1. **Time to Shine Car Wash – Wall Mounted Signage**

The representative presented the application, and color samples to the Board. Chairperson Clopton inquired to the applicant how the sign would be mounted to the building. The applicant stated it would be bolted.

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

*Discussion:* There was none.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (6-0)

1. **Optical Impressions - Signage**

The representative presented an application for the shopping center sign. He noted it would be monument in type and would be built with the same brick as used on the building, with Optical Impressions on the top panel with the three panels below for future tenants. He added it would be an illuminated LED sign. Mr. Arenson inquired about the height of the current sign. The owner stated the current sign was higher and would be torn down. Chairperson Clopton asked the applicant for clarification of the location. The applicant stated it would be closer to the middle. Mr. Risso inquired about the base landscaping. The applicant stated there would be base plantings, evergreen in nature around the entire base of the sign.

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

*Discussion:* Mr. Becker inquired about the 10’ setback, and if it was from the curb. He stated that it appeared to be from the inside of the sidewalk. Staff stated that it is required to be 10’ from back of curb, unless the property line is further back, then the requirement is to ensure the sign is within the property lines. Mr. Arenson inquired about the reference from the ordinance, for freestanding signs, to be required to withstand 110 mile an hour winds and a certain pressure; and inquired if Staff is ensuring this met. Ms. Browder stated that yes, and added that the building department reviews it as well. Mr. Arenson stated that the ordinance also states that a professional engineer’s review might be required, and inquired if that was being required. Staff stated that some of the signs, depending on the size, are required to be stamped, sealed and signed by an engineer before they can proceed with construction, and the building officials make sure that it is built accordingly. Mr. Becker inquired to the applicant about the colors, panels, and what the blank panels would be until there are tenants. The applicant stated the tenant panels would remain white, and would be illuminated. Mr. Becker inquired to the applicant if they would remain white, glaring panels. The applicant stated yes, they would remain white, blank, until they secured tenants.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (6-0)

1. **Crowfield Village – Shopping Center Sign**

The representative presented the application to the Board. Mr. Arenson inquired about the height of the existing sign. The applicant stated he did not have that information, and added that this sign would be a little bit higher, and would utilize the existing brick base. Mr. Arenson inquired about the overall square footage of the sign, and if the allowance of one square foot per frontage foot was applied. Staff stated it is the width of the building frontage that is considered. There was discussion about the 500-square foot maximum, with the limit of two signs. Chairperson Clopton inquired about the materials. The applicant stated routed aluminum faces, channel letters on the aluminum backing, and a routed aluminum face on the very top of the Crowfield portion of the sign, using the existing brick monument. Mr. Becker commented about the base as illustrated versus what was shown in the photograph appearing to be larger than the proposal. He stated that the sign total height of 18’ above grade exceeded the ordinance by 10’. Staff stated that shopping center signage size is determined by the overall size of the shopping center, to keep it proportional in size, as determined by the zoning administrator. A representative stated that the other sign would be removed and they would be consolidating to one sign. Chairperson Clopton inquired if there were any color samples. The applicant brought the red sample, but did not bring any other samples. Chairperson Clopton inquired to Staff if Staff had seen the color samples. Staff stated no, however, it was requested to the applicant that material and color samples be brought to the meeting.

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

*Discussion:* Chairperson Clopton stated that she felt the application was incomplete without the samples, and called for a roll call vote.

*Vote*: Joel Arenson, yes; Gary Becker, no; Lisa Burdick, yes; Sharon Clopton, no;

Chris Cook, yes; Tom Risso, yes. (4-2) The motion carried.

1. **KFC – Up-fit and signage**

The representatives, one for the up-fit and the other representative for the signage, presented the applications, materials, and color samples to the Board. The up-fit representative stated that the up-fit would include interior and exterior branding modifications. He stated that the proposal included demo of existing awnings, switching out lights, painting the exterior of the building, along with a separate application for the signage up-lift.

Chairperson Clopton inquired if the windows would be changed. The up-fit representative stated no. Mr. Arenson inquired about the reference of the word “banner” used with the application. After lengthy discussion, it was determined that it was not a “banner” as defined by the City zoning ordinance but rather a branding term used by the company. Mr. Cook inquired what the difference was between the B1-b sign, and the S1-b sign. The sign representative stated that the vinyl portion was part of the sign application submittal. Chairperson Clopton inquired about the materials of that portion of the signage. The sign representative stated that it would consist of vinyl on an aluminum face. Mr. Arenson inquired if vinyl on aluminum is considered a permanent material. Chairperson Clopton stated that vinyl is a common type of signage. Mr. Arenson inquired if the vinyl was bonded to the aluminum. The sign applicant stated yes. Mr. Becker stated that the sign was being presented as if it is about eighteen square feet, but noted that the entire area is a sign, in his opinion. He stated concerns for it being excessively large, and he was not sure if the square footage exceeded the maximum. Mr. Becker inquired to the Board if there was agreement that the entire banner is a sign. Mr. Arenson stated that the applicant was submitting it as a sign even though the application states banner. Mr. Becker stated that terminology was not of concern. Chairperson Clopton deferred to Staff. Ms. Moneer stated that the vinyl was what was considered as signage, with the red and white stripe panel considered as a portion of the up-fit application. She added that the original proposal included an excessive amount of signage, and in working with the sign company, brought the total under the maximum allowed square footage to meet the ordinance requirements. Mr. Becker inquired to Staff if the sign was 10’x6’. Staff stated that the red and white striping was not considered as signage. Mr. Becker disagreed. Mr. Arenson inquired if the striped portion would be attached to the building. The representative stated yes. Mr. Arenson stated that the entire portion should be considered a sign. Chairperson Clopton inquired to Staff if they could explain why the lines aren’t considered part of the sign. Ms. Moneer stated that other areas of the building included striping, and had signage painted over them. She added that this was the consideration when reviewing this application, and Staff had considered it as part of the branding up fit application. There was disagreement over what was considered as signage, and how it was calculated.

*Motion*: Mr. Becker made a motion to deny the application as submitted. Mr. Arenson seconded.

*Discussion:* Mr. Arenson stated that the nomenclature needed to be resolved for the City to recommend approval. He mentioned that if the striping was the actual façade, not a fabricated piece attached to the structure, it would not be considered as a portion of the sign. The applicant inquired to the Board if they could reface the existing cabinet to match the new branding. Chairperson Clopton invited the applicant to stay to the end of the meeting, and they could revisit the application. She requested a roll call vote.

*Vote*: Joel Arenson, yes; Gary Becker, yes; Lisa Burdick, yes; Sharon Clopton, yes;

Chris Cook, yes; Tom Risso, yes. (6-0) motion carried.

1. **Habitat Restore – Solar Panels**

The representative presented the application to the Board for solar panels on the roof of the building. He stated it was proposed to be installed on the South facing roof, as it is the most efficient for solar panels. The North side would be a 30% reduction in efficiency. He mentioned this was the first commercial solar project in Berkeley County.

Chairperson Clopton inquired about the quantity of panels. The applicant stated there would be 216 4kw panels. There was discussion about how the panels are mounted, and if they would be visible from the street. The applicant stated the roof is a 2:12 pitch. Chairperson Clopton inquired about the color of the cabinets. The applicant stated they are black. There was discussion about the visibility, and if there should be screening around the units. Chairperson Clopton inquired about the color of the existing roof. The representative stated it is silver. Staff presented a street view on the overhead. Ms. Browder stated that there is not a current ordinance in place that would preclude anyone in a commercial zoning district from having solar panels. She added that they are reviewed within the residential districts. There was a lengthy discussion about the location, while the Board viewed several different angles from street views on the overhead. The representative stated that it would be located on the upper portion, not the porch overhang on the Belknap side of the building. Mr. Becker added concerns for setting a precedent. Chairperson Clopton asked the Board if they wished to table the review of the application until the end of the meeting.

*Motion*: Mr. Becker made a motion to table the discussion until the end of the meeting. Mr. Arenson seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (6-0)

**New Business – Major Applications**

1. **Phoenix Landscaping – Site Design, Landscaping, Elevations, Materials**

The representative presented the application, and color samples to the Board. Chairperson Clopton inquired about the location of the project. The representative stated 107 Auto Supply Drive. Ms. Burdick clarified the location to be the right of “This Time Fitness”. The representative confirmed.

Chairperson Clopton inquired what the proposal is for the site. The representative stated that they are proposing a landscape shop where they can run crews, and propose building a garage on site to house the gear. Chairperson Clopton inquired about the materials to the applicant. He stated it would stick built, vinyl siding, black shingles and noted the samples as submitted. Mr. Burdick inquired about the orientation of the building to the representative. The representative noted the location per the drawings as submitted. Mr. Cook inquired about the grassed area towards the front, and if the rest of the area was all grass. The representative stated yes. Mr. Becker inquired to Staff about which lot was being reviewed on the overhead. Staff pointed out the location. Mr. Arenson noted the residential area behind the site. Mr. Arenson inquired if the Board was reviewing the site plan. Chairperson Clopton stated the review included site design, landscaping, elevations and materials.

Chairperson Clopton inquired about two areas within the parking area labeled new gravel pavement, and overflow gravel parking. She also requested explanation of the difference between gravel pavement and asphalt pavement. The representative stated the application had omitted the gravel due to the City zoning ordinance requirements. Mr. cook inquired about the rest of the area to be grass. The applicant confirmed. There was discussion about the location of the building, and the buffer. The representative stated that they exceed the 30-foot buffer requirement with the existing heavily wooded area between the properties to leave undisturbed. Mr. Arenson inquired if there was any lighting at the rear of the building. The representative stated no.

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

*Discussion:* Mr. Cook inquired to the representative if the interior portion of the parking, as shown on the plans, did not include curb and gutter. The representative stated it did not include it. He asked if there was a functional reason why they did not have the curb and gutter. The representative stated no. Mr. Cook inquired if the second sheet as submitted is the landscape plan. The representative stated yes. Mr. Arenson inquired if they planned to store materials on the site. The representative stated no. Mr. Becker inquired if the building was to be used just for office space. The representative stated that it would be storage for equipment overnight, with an office upstairs.

*Vote*: 5 voted in favor, 1 voted against. The motion carried.

1. **Goose Creek Villages – Site Design, Landscaping, Elevations, Materials**

The applicant presented the application to the Board. Chairperson Clopton requested the applicant provide the location. He stated that the project is located off the intersection of St. James Avenue and Plantation North, adjacent from Walmart. The applicant stated there would be a mixed use of businesses, to include several restaurants, with a main entry featuring a round-a-bout. He added it would feature artwork that is to be determined to be the main focal point of the development. He also mentioned that the parking plan exceeds the ordinance requirements. Mr. Arenson inquired if all structures were single story, and if they would all contain businesses. The applicant stated yes.

The applicant stated the development of this particular piece of property brings challenges, as to the south of the property are wetlands, to remain preserved. He added most of the site to the north, where the development will be, is currently treeless. He presented the landscape plan, and mentioned the buffer variance that was recently granted, with the exception that a physical barrier be installed with the landscaping. The applicant mentioned the drainage ditch between this property and the adjoining subdivision to the west. There was discussion about the two-access entry/exits, the main entry at the round-a-bout and the shared access at the existing Sun Trust. Mr. Cook inquired about pedestrian connections. The applicant stated they would tie into the existing asphalt paved sidewalk in two locations. Staff highlighted the locations on the overhead. There was some discussion regarding the detention pond location. Mr. Arenson inquired if the wetlands would be the buffered area. The applicant stated it would be maintained in its current state. There was discussion regarding the depth of the wetlands buffer. Staff highlighted a measurement showing the depth on the overhead to be over 200’. The applicant stated the tree-line would remain preserved, and they would supplement with additional landscaping as well as the screening barrier. Mr. Arenson inquired about the lighting, intensity in relationship to the residential neighboring properties. Staff noted the photometric plans that were included with the packet.

Mr. Cook inquired about the dumpster locations. The applicant stated they were still working on the locations, and how many they would need. There was discussion about the excess parking spaces within the current layout. Mr. Becker noted dumpsters would require screening of like materials to reflect the building materials. Mr. Arenson inquired if they would be required to come back with dumpster enclosures, elevations, and colors. Ms. Burdick inquired about the number of tenants per building. The architect for the project, stated that two of the smaller buildings would be single tenant building, with the larger buildings to include multiple tenants. He noted that they were unsure of the specific number at this time.

The architect noted that concept of the “Goose Creek Villages” would include all building materials to have similar details. He presented the brick for the water table, the Hardie® panel and Hardie® trim for the siding. He stated that the colors would vary per building, keeping lighter colors in mind. Chairperson Clopton inquired if they are proposing different colors for each building. The architect stated yes. He presented the materials for the windows, surrounds, and awnings. Mr. Arenson inquired about the location for the HVAC. The Architect stated all buildings have a continuous parapet around the entire roof, to hide any units, and detailed why this site design required the units to be roof top. He also noted the dumpster enclosures would need to be nice as they would be visible from all areas of the development. Mr. Arenson inquired if there would be one area of containment for the entire area, or if each building would have its own. The architect stated they would probably try to share, wherever it makes sense to share. The applicant added they would be located out of view, but easily accessible for the tenants.

Mr. Cook inquired about the intention for the center of the round-a-bout, and if it included landscaping. Mr. Berenyi stated that the developers are currently working with the City to include some type of historic art, such as a statue with a combination of landscaping. Mr. Berenyi addressed the dumpster location, and the restriction of the property due to the floodplain. He added the enclosures could possibly be at a lateral location on the left and right sides of the site, and to ensure that the corrals are aesthetic, hardened, and that the doors are secured, welded. Mr. Becker expressed concerns for the location of the dumpster enclosure near the residential side. Mr. Berenyi assured him that they would not be encroaching into the variance buffer. Mr. Arenson stated concerns for the dumpster enclosure review, and noted that the approval of this application does not contain the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Berenyi requested the Board consider the dumpster enclosures to be reviewed and approved at Staff level. Mr. Cook suggested two enclosures to minimize, and noted that they be of like materials of the buildings. Mr. Berenyi stated the brick that matches the building water table could be used to match. Mr. Cook inquired about the patios, and if they were covered. The applicant stated they were just patios. Mr. Cook inquired if they would be required to come back before the Board if they were proposing to cover. Staff stated they would ensure that it would come back for ARB approval. The architect stated that one restaurant may need a more permanent roof for the outdoor dining area. Mr. Berenyi noted some of the restaurants that he could disclose included; La Hacienda, Sake House Japanese Steak House, Charleston Sports Bar and Grill, 1000 Degrees Pizza, and Groucho’s Deli. Ms. Burdick inquired about the design elements, such as siding, and if they would be working with City Staff on that. The architect stated they were looking at softer pastels, such as green and blue.

*Motion*: Mr. Arenson made a motion to accept the application as submitted contingent upon the developer working with Staff to finalize details on the color combinations for the various buildings, and also the location and detail elevations of the dumpster containment areas. Mr. Becker seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (6-0)

Chairperson Clopton brought the KFC application to the table, as the applicant had stayed to revisit the application.

1. **KFC – Up-fit and Signage (continued)**

Chairperson Clopton requested Staff clarify the signage for the project. Mr. Cook inquired about the maximum allowable square footage, and if it is 60 square feet. Ms. Moneer presented the application as originally submitted. She explained that there were two separate applications, one for the up-fit and one for the signage. Ms. Moneer also added that the up fit included the exterior painting of the building, the panel on the front and the awnings, along with the canopy over the drive-thru. She added that all of that was taken into consideration with the review of the up-fit application, noting the sign permit to include the text on the canopy over the drive-thru, the portion reading “world famous chicken” as painted signage on the side, along with the black vinyl to include graphic and text over the front entry on the red and white aluminum panel. Mr. Arenson inquired to the applicant about the alternative previously mentioned utilizing the current sign cabinet, and update with the new branding. The up-fit applicant stated that the existing cabinet is an illuminated cabinet, so they could propose to keep it and re-face it if the tower signage as proposed is not approved. He added that the tower sign as proposed is not illuminated, but has goose neck lighting on the parapet. Chairperson Clopton inquired if the existing signage is as large as the proposed sign. The up-fit applicant stated it fits within the columns. Mr. Cook inquired if it was approximately the same width. The applicant stated yes. There was discussion about the interpretation of the overall size of the tower. Michele Pononski, with BW Signs tabled the review of the signage portion so that the up-fit review could be finalized. Chairperson Clopton clarified that the sign applicant wanted to pull the signage portion of the application. The sign permit applicant stated yes.

*Motion*: Mr. Arenson made a motion to accept the application for the up-fit of the building as submitted, not including any signage that would be required to be reviewed at a future meeting. Mr. Risso seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (6-0)

1. **Habitat – Restore – Solar Panels (continued)**

*Motion*: Mr. Risso made a motion to bring the application back to the table. Mr. Becker seconded.

*Discussion:* There was none.

*Vote*: All voted in favor. (6-0)

Mr. Arenson expressed concerns for how the panels might appear from the road. There was discussion about the view from the road. The applicant stated he could go back to the client and suggest placing the panels on the north facing roof, however this would create a 30% reduction in electricity usage. Chairperson Clopton requested feedback from Staff. Mr. Arenson inquired to Staff if there was any language regarding solar panel usage within the commercial zones. Ms. Browder stated no, there are only specifications and regulations for residential use. Mr. Arenson suggested adding language to the ordinance for commercial uses. The applicant added that from the pictures show you will not be able to see the panels from the road. Mr. Cook added that this is a wonderful opportunity to see a commercial business utilizing solar panels. Staff displayed street views for the Board to see different angles of the building. Chairperson Clopton inquired to the applicant how high the panels would extend off the roof. The applicant stated approximately five inches.

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

*Discussion:* There was none.

*Vote*: Five voted in favor, one voted against. The motion carried.

1. **Comments from the Board**

Mr. Cook stated that the village would have been good to have actual elevations for review, rather than just the renderings. He added that this would be more helpful for the Board to understand the concept of the project. Mr. Arenson cited §151.084 Sign Regulations, specifically the first paragraph. He stated concern for banner trucks being used as signage. He suggested that they be regulated. Chairperson Clopton mentioned that she had discussed with Staff to add discussion items to the Agenda that the Board has concerns about. Mr. Becker stated concerns for the allowable height of signage to include shopping center signs within the same guidelines as the monument type signs, limiting them to 10’. Ms. Browder re-directed him to §151.084(D)(2)(e), and cited the regulations for shopping center signage. Mr. Becker stated concerns for interpretation and not specific language. Ms. Clopton stated that each application is reviewed individually, depending on the location, and other variables.

1. **Comments from Staff**

Ms. Browder presented the Board with a sample summary for applications, and requested feedback from the Board. She invited them to add or take away from the form as they felt it would work best. Chairperson Clopton inquired if Staff reviews the lighting plan prior to the Board getting the application to ensure it meets all necessary guidelines and requirements. Staff stated yes, the applicant submits a photometric plan. There was a brief discussion regarding lighting, and Mr. Cook mentioned the backflow preventers that are not part of the submittal. He added that they are a necessity, but could have some landscape screening provided. He also suggested that the Villages may need site checks to ensure that they are screened.

1. **Adjournment**

Mr. Risso made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Arenson seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The meeting adjourned at or about 8:14 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Sharon Clopton, Chairperson