



Town of Hilton Head Island
Design Review Board Meeting
August 23, 2022, at 1:15 p.m.
Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers
MEETING MINUTES

Present from the Board: Chair Cathy Foss; John Moleski, Annette Lippert, Ryan Bassett, Todd Theodore, Judd Carstens

Present from Town Council: Glenn Stanford

Present from Town Staff: Chris Darnell, Urban Designer; Nicole Dixon, Development Review Program Manager; Karen Knox, Senior Administrative Assistant, Brian Glover, Administrative Assistant

1. Call to Order

Chair Foss called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m.

2. FOIA Compliance – Public notification of this meeting has been published, posted, and distributed in compliance with the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act and the requirements of the Town of Hilton Head Island.

3. Roll Call – As Noted Above.

4. Approval of Agenda

Chair Foss asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Ms. Lippert moved to approve. Mr. Moleski seconded. By a show of hands, the motion passed with a vote of 6-0.

5. Approval of Minutes

a. Special Meeting of August 9, 2022

b. Regular Meeting of August 9, 2022

Chair Foss asked for a Motion to approve the Minutes of the August 9, 2022, Special Meeting and the Minutes of the August 9, 2022, Regular Meeting. Mr. Moleski moved to approve. Mr. Theodore seconded. By a show of hands, the motion passed with a vote of 5-0. Mr. Carstens was not present at the August 9, 2022, Meeting.

6. Appearance by Citizens

Public comments concerning agenda items were to be submitted electronically via the Open Town Hall HHI portal. There were no comments submitted.

7. New Business

a. *Alteration/Addition*

i. Billy Wood Appliance, DRB-001911-2022 – Proposed changes to the building façade, color, and landscape.

Mr. Darnell presented the application as described in the Board's agenda package and stated Staff has concerns about the island character as it relates to architecture of the purposed additions, building color, and architectural scale. Staff recommends denial.

Chair Foss asked if the Applicant would like to add to Staff's narrative. The Applicant noted he had nothing to add but was available to answer questions. Chair Foss asked about parking striping already being started on the site. Brantley King, owner of Billy Wood, stated that the striping was a requirement for insurance and was not part of the parking renovation within the application. The Board proceeded to discussion.

The Board expressed many concerns about the project. This primarily included the entry features, front fence, service yard fence, building color, light fixtures, and landscaping choices summarized below.

Entry features:

Many members expressed concerns about the scale of the entry features, as well as the difference in size between the two entry features. Additionally, the Board noted that the features have a top-heavy appearance. The Board recommended making changes or adding some embellishment to remedy this issue. Finally, the Board expressed concern that the second entry feature does not connect to the building. The Board noted that the front entry feature was better suited to the building but was concerned with changes or removal to the second feature.

The applicant stated that the second feature was intended to be dual purposed and serve as both an entry feature and a feature visible from right side road. The applicant acknowledged the boards concerns stated that some changes to the features could be made. The board mentioned that they would like to see improvements to the existing roadside sign, instead of the second feature's secondary purpose as a sign.

Front Fence:

The Board questioned the size of the screening fence on the left of the building and its purpose in the project. They felt the fence is too tall, and the Board recommends it be shortened or matched to the height of another element in the project.

The applicant stated the reason for the fence was to help guide customers towards the entry way of the building. The applicant acknowledged that the fence height could be adjusted to a different height.

Service Yard Fence:

The Board stated the black paint proposed is not a color which fits within the design guidelines and a dark brown or brass replacement is recommended. The Board also recommended the addition of plants in front of the fence to assist with the fence blending into the background.

The applicant stated that the primary purpose of repainting the fence was to help it blend in and that either replacement color would be acceptable.

Building Color:

The board expressed concern with both the white color of the building as well as its highly reflective quality. The building color does not adhere to the design guidelines. Additionally, it was noted window frames are painted the same color as the walls.

The applicant stated that the color of the rendering was not in line with the current plan and showed the Board an updated color sheet. The Board noted that the updated grey color was appropriate and well chosen for the project. The applicant stated that they would be open to painting the window frames a dark bronze to match the lighting and railing elements.

Light Fixtures:

The Board mentioned that the brass lighting units did not match the bronze railings used in the project. Additionally, the Board expressed concerns about the matching themes between the light fixtures for the building walls the goose-neck fixtures for the entry features.

The applicant stated there were changes being made so that all metal elements in the project would be a dark bronze. The applicant acknowledged the themes and colors of all lighting fixtures for the project would need to be chosen appropriately.

Landscaping Choices:

The Board recommended that the applicant consider something other inkberry which is more suited to planters. Additionally, the board recommends the applicant reconsider the foundation planting on the right side of the building.

In addition to the concerns with the presented project, the Board stated that they would like additional details to be added for the brick façades, brick plasters, and connection of the roof to the front façade.

Following discussion, Chair Foss recommended that the applicant withdraw, and the applicant officially withdrew their application.

Chair Foss thanked the applicant for their inclusion of the renderings. She stated that despite the discrepancies with the plans, the visual was very helpful for the discussion of the project. Additionally, Chair Foss expressed hope for the applicant's success with any follow-up submittals and acknowledged the difficulties with renovations over new construction.

8. Board Business

Chair Foss asked if any Board Members had anything to discuss. Ms. Lippert asked if everyone had given any additional thought on changing the meeting time going forward from 1:15 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. A brief discussion was had, and Mr. Darnell advised that there were no conflicts on the schedule with Council Chambers and if the Committee desired to change the meeting time, they would have to vote on it. Ms. Lippert moved to change the start time of the Design Review Board Meetings to 2:30 p.m. Mr. Carstens seconded. Mr. Darnell asked if it would be ok to start the new meeting time with the September 27, 2022, meeting to ensure adequate notice was given to anyone attending. Ms. Lippert amended her Motion to change the start time of the Design Review Board Meetings to 2:30 p.m., starting with the September 27, 2022, meeting. Mr. Carstens

seconded the amended motion. By a show of hands, the motion passed with a vote of 4-2. Chair Foss and Mr. Moleski opposing.

9. Staff Report

- a. Development Review Process Improvement – Nicole Dixon

Ms. Dixon had to leave for a meeting. This report will be on the next Agenda.

- b. Minor Corridor Report – Chris Darnell – There was no report.

- c. Meeting Efficiencies Discussion – Chris Darnell

Mr. Darnell expressed staffs concerns about the meetings taking longer than needed to cover the topics on the agenda. He stated a few things that staff felt were slowing down the meeting process and changes that could help in the future. He stressed that this was not a reprimand, but suggestions to improve future meeting efficiency.

The Board acknowledged that the meetings were longer than necessary, and changes would be helpful for both staff and board members.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:42 p.m.

Submitted by: Brian Glover

Administrative Assistant

Approved: September 27, 2022