

**MINUTES
CITY OF GOOSE CREEK
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, AUGUST 16, 2021, 6:00 P.M.
MARGUERITE H. BROWN MUNICIPAL CENTER
519 N. GOOSE CREEK BOULEVARD**

I. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL

Chairperson Dresel called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and initiated the Pledge of Allegiance. Mrs. Moneer stated Mr. Gary Becker has resigned from the ARB and initiated roll call.

Present: Ricky Dresel, Jen Wise, David Cantrill, Mary Kay Soto, Teri Victor

Absent: Sharon Clopton

Staff Present: Planning and Zoning Director Mark Brodeur
Planning and Zoning Technician Brenda Moneer

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JULY 26, 2021

Motion: A motion was made to accept the minutes as submitted. **Moved by** Board Member Cantrill, **Seconded by** Board Member Wise.

Discussion: None.

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

III. MINOR APPLICATIONS – NEW BUSINESS

Motion: A motion was made to amend the agenda to include a last-minute application for Food Lion. **Moved by** Chairman Dresel, **Seconded by** Board Member Cantrill.

Discussion: None

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

A. 2021-060 EMOD: FOOD LION:142 ST. JAME AVE – EXTERIOR MODIFICATION

The applicant presented the application. He stated the proposal is to renovate the facade of the building. He stated currently there are three panels of opaque glass on the façade which he proposes to remove and replace with stucco. The stucco will be painted to match the adjacent colors. The applicant presented paint samples and exterior elevations for the board to review.

Motion: A motion was made to accept the application as submitted. **Moved by** Board Member Wise, **Seconded by** Board Member Victor.

Discussion: None

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

B. 2021-53 SIG: LOWCOUNTRY BELL CLUB: 219 S. GOOSE CREEK BLVD – SIGNAGE

The applicant presented a rendering of a post and panel sign for Lowcountry Bell Club. The board suggested that the address be added to both sides of the sign. The board inquired about landscaping around the sign. The applicant suggested either azaleas or evergreens.

Motion: A motion was made to accept the application as submitted with the addition that the street address is clearly visible on both sides of the sign and that evergreen plants be planted at the base of the sign, as displayed in the exhibit. **Moved by** Board Member Cantrill, **Seconded by** Board Member Victor.

Discussion: Mr. Brodeur stated there is a requirement that the address numbers be eight inches tall in order to be seen for safety reasons.

Motion: An amended motion was made to accept the application as submitted with the street address added to both sides of the sign and that the numbers be eight inches high, in the color black; also, evergreen plants be planted at the base of the sign, as displayed in the exhibit. **Moved by** Board Member Cantrill, **Seconded by** Board Member Victor.

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

C. 2021-054 SIG: EXXON: 670 COLLEGE PARK ROAD – SIGNAGE

The applicant was not present. The board chose to revisit this at the end of the agenda.

D. 2021-055 PT: CROWFIELD PARK PLAZA: 119 SPRINGHALL DRIVE – EXTERIOR PAINT

The applicant was not present. The board chose to revisit this at the end of the agenda.

E. 2021-056 PT: NA:- 103 MARILYN STREET - EXTERIOR PAINT

The applicant stated they are proposing to paint the brick and siding in an off white. The doors and shutters will be black. Mrs. Moneer presented a google street view of the property for the ARB. The applicant stated the siding has been replaced with HardiePlank.

Motion: A motion was made to accept the application as submitted. **Moved by** Board Member Cantrill, **Seconded by** Board Member Victor.

Discussion: Mr. Brodeur stated while we are not fans of painting brick, he stated painting the brick will make it look like a commercial structure as opposed to a house.

Vote: Chairman Dresel, Board Member Cantrill, Board Member Soto and Board Member Victor voted in favor. Board Member Wise opposed (4-1). Motion carried.

F. 2021-057 SIG: HURRICANE COFFEE: 2424 MAIN STREET – SIGNAGE

The applicant presented the application. He stated the building is set back far from the street which plays into his proposal. He stated his allowable signage is up to thirty-seven (37) square feet. He presented an internally illuminated cabinet sign that is thirty-four point four (34.4) square feet. He provided the board with documentation that was not included in the packet.

The board ask Mrs. Moneer to display the property on google maps. The applicant stated the building has not been built. He presented an exhibit that displayed the proposed building however it was not painted. The applicant stated the proposal is for a roof mounted sign for visibility from the street. Mr. Dresel stated the board needs to see the structure with everything that needs approval before they can approve signage. He stated this is to make sure the signage goes well with the building, and everything is aesthetically pleasing.

The applicant presented a second roadside monument style sign. He stated under the ordinance this sign is allowed to be forty-five (45) square-feet which is what he presented. He stated it is a double sided, internally illuminated cabinet sign. He provided engineering drawings. He stated he can add eight (8) inch white numbers on the base of the monument sign. Board Member Wise stated landscaping is required around the base of the monument sign and suggested a different location for the address as the base of the sign is only two feet. Board Member Wise stated Hurricane Coffee is hard to read on the monument sign and stated she would like to see a different proposal. Chairman Dresel agreed. The applicant stated he can remove Hurricane Coffee and replace it with the address. Board Member Wise stated she would not feel comfortable with a sign that just read Coffee. She stated the sign is to advertise the business, if the business name is not on it, it seems odd. The applicant stated this is acceptable for the business owner.

Mr. Brodeur stated the current location where this sign is being proposed is going to be a line of site issue for cars exiting the property. He suggested that the sign be pulled back away from the edge. He stated staff prefers to see the name of the company instead of the word

“Coffee” on the monument sign. Mr. Brodeur asked the board to look at scale regarding the proposed sign on the building as the proposed building is about three hundred and fifty (350) square-feet. He stated City Council is considering a modification to the sign ordinance and one of the modifications is not to permit roof signs. Mr. Brodeur stated this project is being reviewed under the current ordinance; however, he feels it would be counterproductive to approve a sign that will be prohibited in the new ordinance as there is only a month or two before its adoption. He stated staff does not have a finished elevation of what the building will look like, hence the applicant is asking the board to adopt the sign without a full development package. He stated the other issue he sees is in the proposed new sign ordinance, internally illuminated can signs are a type that the City’s Planning Commission is trying to reduce the number of in the City. He stated in the new proposed sign ordinance the background is going to have to be opaque. He stated the proposed sign ordinance is well meaning.

The applicant stated while he understands Mr. Brodeur’s concerns, the new law has not been passed, hence he is operating under the existing ordinance. The applicant asked for clarification regarding what Mr. Brodeur meant pertaining to the scale of the roof sign. Mr. Brodeur stated he is not sure if this will be the final elevation of the building. He stated most of the time applicants bring a sign proposal with the proposed or existing building and you get to see it in total.

Chairman Dresel stated there is a good bit to work out. He stated the entrance sign and the lack of submitting a sign proposal without the actual building are hindrances for him. The applicant stated the proposed building will be gray with white trim and gray shingles. The applicant stated he cannot imagine how the color of the sign would change based on the color of the building. Chairman Dresel stated the board cannot make a decision based on assumptions.

Motion: A motion was made to deny the application as submitted. **Moved by** Board Member Wise, **Seconded by** Board Member Victor.

Discussion: None.

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

IV. NEW BUSINESS: MAJOR APPLICATIONS

A. 2021-057 NBLD : TIME TO SHINE: 539 ST. JAMES AVE – SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE PLAN, ELEVATIONS

The contractor for the project presented the application. He stated the applicant is looking to build a second car wash located down the street from their current location on Thomason Blvd. The contractor stated the proposal is the exact same layout as the one on Thomason Blvd. Chairman Dresel stated in looking at the submission, there seems to be an inconsistency with the type of building that Time To Shine is doing at other locations. He stated since this one is in a prominent intersection; he would like the St. James location to

look something like the Savannah Highway location. Board Member Wise stated she feels the current proposal is a commercial/industrial block building and the other locations are aesthetically pleasing and blend into their surroundings. She stated with this being such a prominent location, she would like to see another option than what is being presented. Chairman Dresel presented a rendering from a Time To Shine's Savannah Hwy location and stated he feels it would make the entrance to the neighborhood look a lot better. Board Member Wise suggested making the traffic flow one way.

Mr. Brodeur commended some of the features of this project however agreed with the board regarding wanting to see something like the Savannah Hwy location. He stated this is a prominent location in the city. Board Member Wise shared her concerns regarding multi color lights inside the carwash as it could affect drivers on the main road.

The board recapped what they would like to see:

- They like the Time To Shine located on Savannah Highway.
- They are concerned with noise and lights facing the intersection.
- They are concerned with traffic flow.
- They would like to see brick accents.
- They would like to have diagonal and one way parking.

Motion: A motion was made to deny the application as submitted. **Moved By:** Board Member Cantrill, **Seconded By:** Board Member Victor.

Discussion: Board Member Cantrill stated this is a great proposal and appreciated all the effort. He stated hopefully the board made their intentions known.

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

Chairman Dresel stated he would encourage the applicant to speak with staff before the project is resubmitted. Mrs. Moneer stated the first Monday of the month is the deadline to have an approve design to go before the ARB.

The board revisited Exxon. The applicant did not show. Mrs. Moneer stated this location currently has unpermitted banners and ask the board to include in their motion to acquire the appropriate permits.

Motion: A motion was made to deny the application as submitted. **Moved By:** Board Member Wise, **Seconded By:** Board Member Victor.

Discussion: Board Member Wise stated we do not have a complete package, and no one was here to discuss the package. Board Member Cantrill stated they did not speak to staff about not showing. Chairperson Dresel stated he would like the applicant to work with staff.

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

The board revisited Crowfield Park Plaza. The applicant did not show. Mr. Brodeur stated the applicant already painted the building. Board Member Wise stated she recommends denying the application as the applicant did not submit paint samples, the applicant only sent a picture of the paint samples. Mrs. Moneer stated the building went from beige to gray. Mrs. Moneer stated she has asked the applicant for three (3) months to come in for permit review and to appear before the ARB. Board Member Wise inquired what would happen if the board denied the application as the building is already painted. Mrs. Moneer stated it would be based on the board's request. Board Member Wise stated they did not provide a picture of the building.

Motion: A motion was made to table the application as submitted. **Moved By:** Board Member Cantrill, **Seconded By:** Board Member Victor.

Discussion: Chairperson Dresel stated he would like for the applicant to present an ARB submittal. Board Member Cantrill stated he would like to see before and after photo's with the application.

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

V. CLOSING REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT

Board Member Wise stated there is a banner in Goose Creek Village and there is a banner and monument sign for a bakery by Ye Old Fashion Ice Cream and Sandwich Cafe. She suggested to fine the sign company if they install a tenant panel without coming before the board. She also stated the dumpster behind Domino's is still a mess.

Mr. Brodeur stated the board did a great job as it was a particularly tough agenda. Board Member Cantrill inquired if the board could visit different businesses in the Lowcountry for aesthetic comparison for training. Mr. Brodeur stated he could look into that.

Motion: A motion was made to adjourn (7:22p.m.) **Moved By:** Board Member Wise, **Seconded By:** Board Member Cantrill.

Discussion: There was none.

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

_____ Date _____
Ricky Dresel, Chairperson