

**MINUTES
CITY OF GOOSE CREEK
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 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 initiated roll call.

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

Absent: None

Staff Present: Planning and Zoning Technician Brenda Moneer

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 20, 2021

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

Discussion: None.

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

III. MINOR APPLICATIONS – OLD BUSINESS

A. 2021-074 SIG: EXXON: 670 COLLEGE PARK ROAD – SIGNAGE

Mr. Hugh Welch presented on behalf of Total Image Solutions as they could not be in attendance. The applicant is looking to lower the street sign to meet the City’s ten-foot height requirement. They will install a new reader panel and change the canopy from Speedway to Exxon. Board Member Soto stated the address needs to be added to the street sign on both sides and landscaping needs to be cut down in order to see the sign from both sides. Board Member Clopton inquired if any changes to the pumps will be made. Mr. Welch did not have an answer. Questions regarding the secondary fascia rendering ensued as it shows the pumps blue, a synergy sign above the pump, and features that was not listed on the application for approval. It was stated only the street sign and canopy sign is up for review.

Motion: A motion was made to approve only the canopy and street sign request provided they trim the landscaping in order to make the street sign visible and that the address numbers are added to both

sides. **Moved by** Board Member Clopton, **Seconded by** Board Member Cantrill.

Discussion: None.

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

B. 2021-082 SIG: JOE'S KWIK MART: 670 COLLEGE PARK ROAD – SIGNAGE

The applicant presented the application. She stated they are proposing an aluminum pan sign to read Joe's Kwik Marts to replace the Speedway sign that is currently on the building. The applicant did not provide samples.

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

Discussion: None.

Vote: Chairman Dresel, Board Member Wise, Board Member Cantrill, Board Member Soto and Board Member Victor voted in favor. Board Member Clopton opposed (5-1). Motion carried.

C. 2021-075 PT: CROWFIELD PARK PLAZA: 119 SPRINGHALL DRIVE – EXTERIOR PAINT

The applicant requested ARB review for exterior paint for Crowfield Park Plaza. He stated he purchased the property at the end of 2019. He stated he is fixing up the exterior as the previous walls were stained and pressure washing was not helping. He painted the exterior walls Sherman Williams Essential Gray and Snowfall prior to ARB approval. He stated he was unaware he needed a permit. The applicant presented color samples.

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

Discussion: None.

Vote: Chairman Dresel, Board Member Wise, Board Member Cantrill, Board Member Soto and Board Member Victor voted in favor. Board Member Clopton opposed (5-1). Motion carried.

D. 2021-078 SIG: HURRICANE COFFEE: 2424 MAIN STREET – SIGNAGE

The board stated they will skip Hurricane Coffee sign review and will revisit this minor application with the major at the end of the meeting.

IV. NEW BUSINESS: MINOR APPLICATIONS

A. 2021-076 SIG: DELIVERANCE OF FAITH: 107 ST. JAMES AV. – SIGNAGE

The applicant presented the application. The request is to remove the lighted cabinet sign that is currently install and replace it with a panel sign. The colors of the panel sign will be black background and white letters. Mrs. Moneer stated this sign exceeds the maximum allowable size by two square feet. The applicant stated he will cut it to meet the ordinance. Board Member Clopton stated she would like to see signage a little more innovated and shared her concerns with visibilities.

Motion: A motion was made to accept the application as submitted contingent on the size meeting the code requirements and to paint the front fascia to match the rest of the building once the original sign is removed. **Moved by** Board Member Cantrill, **Seconded by** Board Member Victor.

Discussion: None.

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

B. 2021-083 SIG: ESPIONAGE SALON AND SPA: 136 RED BANK ROAD – SIGNAGE

The applicant presented the application. He stated the applicant wanted the rainbow color of her logo with a white background. He stated there is a sign next door to this property that is similar, and his client was trying to model it after that sign. The applicant stated it is a double sided 10 mil alumacorr panel with printed graphics on 4x4 posts with white vinyl sleeves. The board shared concerns regarding legibility. Mrs. Moneer stated staff suggests the board decision be contingent on removal of the bubble flag banner and the unpermitted portable sign. The board discussed placement of the address on the sign.

Motion: A motion was made to deny the application as submitted based on the aesthetics of the sign and visibility. The sign will not be visible for people driving by and it would not be in the best interest, long term for the owner and asked the applicant to submit more options. **Moved by** Board Member Cantrill, **Seconded by** Board Member Victor.

Discussion: Board Member Dresel stated he like to see more options, increase letter size and something more visible from the road. The applicant requested recommendation from the board as to what they want to see so he could relay that to his client. The board stated the opaque background is being proposed in the future

ordinance and suggest that to his client. The board stated they cannot tell him exactly what to do. Board Member Clopton stated it makes a huge difference closing the letters. The applicant stated it puts him in a difficult position when he tells his client that the board does not like the font when the client tells him this is their logo.

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

C. 2021-084 SIG: ALIGNLIFE: 105 GREENLAND DRIVE – SIGNAGE

The applicant presented the application. She stated the proposal is for a double sided dibond panel sign to be installed with wooden posts. The board stated they want to see the address on the sign. Mrs. Moneer stated this meets the sign ordinance. She stated this is in the executive park of Crowfield and is very similar with other signs that are already in place.

Motion: A motion was made to accept the application as submitted contingent on adding the street number to the sign and in accordance with the code requirement for height and width and that they provide some low-lying evergreen landscaping beside the sign. **Moved by** Board Member Cantrill, **Seconded by** Board Member Wise.

Discussion: None.

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

V. OLD BUSINESS: MAJOR APPLICATIONS

D. 2021-077 NBLD: HURRICANE COFFEE: 2424 MAIN STREET – SITE, PARKING, LANDSCAPE, ELEVATIONS, BUILDING MATERIALS AND COLORS

The applicant requested ARB review for site, parking, landscaping, elevations, building materials and colors for Hurricane Coffee. This is the third time the applicant appeared before the board to present this project. The applicant presented revised plans for which the board requested at the September meeting. The applicant rotated the building, added architectural interest and colors to the exterior of the building which was a recommendation the board made previously. She presented an updated site, stacking and landscaping plan.

Motion: A motion was made accept the application as submitted. **Moved By:** Board Member Cantrill, **Seconded By:** Board Member Wise.

Discussion: None.

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

The board revisited Hurricane Coffee Signage. The applicant presented multiple sign designs for both the roadside and store front for the board to choose from. The board agreed that they liked option D for both. The applicant stated both the road and store front sign will be internally lit. The applicant provided a bumper sticker to show the proposed colors instead of paint samples.

Motion: A motion was made accept option D of the sign application for both the street sign and building sign. **Moved By:** Board Member Soto, **Seconded By:** Board Member Wise.

Discussion: None.

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

VI. CLOSING REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT

Board Member Wise asked for clarification regarding which applications need to wait 30 days to present before the board again if denied. She also stated at the last meeting the board was discouraged from denying an application which she thought was not appropriate. She requested clarification as to when to have a continuance instead of denials. Mr. Cook stated special meetings generally should be discourage as it is at the discretion of this board. He stated the board does have the ability to give staff some direction.

Mr. Cook stated continuing education will be offered. He stated there is a three-hour requirement that must be met every year.

Mr. Cook stated the sign section of the City's ordinance will be amended. He stated the intent is to have the ARB review specifics for building, color, and architectural design; the proposed ordinance will have staff reviewing signage. Mr. Cook stated if someone wanted to appeal staff's decision it could be appealed with the ARB. Board Member Cantrill inquired if state law covers this change. Mr. Cook stated yes. Mr. Cook stated we will be revisiting our rules and procedures and make some changes. He stated he is also working on internships with architectural students to assist with training. He stated something to consider moving forward is a less formal approach for board meetings such as sitting around a table with the architect to go over plans and get feedback.

Board Member Clopton stated she is frustrated that the board is not getting color samples. Mrs. Moneer stated that is a requirement as it is stated on the application and the applicants are reminded to bring samples to the meeting if they have not done so prior. Board Members shared their concerns regarding certain businesses violating ordinances.

Chairman Dresel stated he wanted to remind everyone that their concerns are valid however the board is not code enforcement. The Board inquired how staff would like to receive the boards complaints. Mr. Cook stated we have two code enforcement officers that traditionally did property maintenance and will be transitioning to assists with these issues in the field. He stated if the board made an approval and it is contingent upon something being done, let staff know and it will be addressed. Discussion regarding continuing education ensued.

Motion: A motion was made to adjourn (7:09p.m.) **Moved By:** Board Member Wise, **Seconded By:** Board Member Cantrill.

Discussion: There was none.

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

_____ Date _____
Ricky Dresel, Chairperson