TOWN OF SUMMERVILLE
COMMERCIAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – AGENDA
Summerville Municipal Complex
Annex Building 2nd Floor Training Room
June 20, 2019 4:00 p.m.

Approval of May 16, 2019 meeting Minutes

APPLICANTS –
For additional information regarding this public meeting please contact the Planning Department at 843.851.5200. All applications and related documents for this public meeting are available for review at the Planning Department during regular business hours, Monday–Friday, 8:30–5:00 excluding Town of Summerville holidays.

OLD BUSINESS:
1. Avid Hotel – Development of a new hotel on Holiday Drive (B-3)
   The applicant is requesting Final Approval
2. Synovus Bank – Requesting changes to approved plans (B-3)
   The applicant is requesting Final Approval

NEW BUSINESS:
1. Gum Street Office – Development of a new 2,279 sf office building (B-3)
   The applicant is requesting Conceptual Review
2. Signs

MISCELLANEOUS:
None

ADJOURN:

Posted June 13, 2019
Commercial Design Review Board Minutes  
Thursday, May 16, 2019  
Summerville Municipal Complex – Annex Building Training Room

Members Present:
Bill Beauchene  
Mildred Blanton  
Chris Campeau  
Michael Gregor - Absent  
Jennifer Palmer  
Candace Pratt  
Carolyn Rogerson

Staff Present:
Tim Macholl, Zoning Administrator  
Rich Palmer, Building Official  
Bonnie Miley, Assistant Town Engineer  
Mathew Halter, Staff Engineer

Items on the agenda:

OLD BUSINESS:
1. Weathers Tract Lot 2 – Development of new Dental office and quick lube on N Main Street (B-3)  
2. Tru Hotel – Development of a new 92 room hotel on Holiday Drive (B-3)  
3. Varnfield – Development of a new 41,075 sf industrial building on Varnfield Drive (I-1)  
4. North Maple Street – Development of a new Industrial building on N. Maple Street (I-1)  
5. Mofat Hwy 78 – 14,000 sf warehouse addition and board barn to existing business on Hwy 78 (B-3)

NEW BUSINESS:
1. Vantage at Summerville – Development of a new 288 unit apartment complex on Tupperway Drive (PUD)  
2. Signs

MISCELLANEOUS:
1. None

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 pm by the Chairman. Mr. Campeau asked for consideration of the April 18, 2019 meeting minutes. Mr. Beauchene made a motion for approval of the minutes as presented and Ms. Blanton seconded. The motion carried 6-0.

Mr. Macholl addressed the board explaining that the applicants for the Vantage at Summerville had requested that they be heard first due to a flight schedule issue. Also Weathers Lot 2 was recommended to be moved to last under Old Business. The Board considered and a motion was made to amend the agenda by Mr. Beauchene and seconded by Ms. Blanton. The Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

NEW BUSINESS
1. Vantage at Summerville – The first item under New Business was a request for Conceptual Review of a proposed new 288 unit apartment complex on Tupperway Drive. Mr. Campeau and Ms. Palmer recused themselves and they left the room. Mr. Chris Weigand of Vantage Communities and Mr. Steven Mahlmann of BD/A Architects came to the table to present the project. Mr. Beauchene went over the staff comments from the staff report. Mr. Weigand explained that they had discussed most of the issues with staff prior to the meeting and they had made some of the requested adjustments, including moving some of the buildings to meet the setbacks and provide the needed buffers. He explained that they are working on the tree survey right now and that this is a heavily wooded site. Mr. Macholl stated that the required buffer is 15 feet with a six foot tall fence required. Mr. Weigand pointed out the front landscaped border and that it was actually deeper than required, and that they intended to preserve the large oaks that are in the border. Mr. Beauchene asked them to present the architecture. Mr. Weigand presented the project, it will be a 288 unit apartment complex with a pool, a pet park, and clubhouse. Mr. Mahlmann addressed the supplied elevations. He explained that they buildings would have the stucco removed from the main entrances and brick accents would be used. The columns would be squared up, and that the clubhouse would be modified to include more brick and siding and a standing seam metal roof. Ms. Rogerson asked is there would only be brick at the entrances, Mr.
Mahlmann confirmed that would be the case. Ms. Rogerson asked if these would be low income housing or market rate. Mr. Weigand explained that these would be offered at market rate. Ms. Rogerson expressed a desire to see more brick used on the buildings. Mr. Mahlmann said that they had looked at other complexes in the area, and that brick was not used widely in those other locations. Mr. Beauchene pointed out that foundation plantings would be required to help soften the buildings. He asked about the other materials on the apartment buildings. Mr. Mahlmann explained that different materials and colors would be utilized for the different floors. Lapp siding on first and second with a board and batten used on the third. Ms. Rogerson asked how much brick would be used on the clubhouse. Mr. Mahlmann explained that at this time they were showing a brick wainscoting all of the way around the building, not just the front. They would then use a mix of siding similar to the apartment buildings. Mr. Weigand stated that it was their intent to preserve as many as possible on site, to provide a nice apartment complex.

This being a Conceptual Review no vote was taken.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Weathers Tract Lot 2 – The first item under Old Business was a request for Final Approval proposed modifications to lot 2 of the Weather’s Tract. This item was moved to the end of the agenda for discussion.

2. Tru Hotel – The second item under Old Business was a request for Final Approval of a proposed 92 room hotel on Holiday Drive. Mr. Vince Sottile of Earthsource Engineering came to the table and explained that the owners of the property were not available to make the meeting. He explained that at the last meeting the board had discussed the building and had settled on the design. There were other site related issues that had been addressed including moving the sidewalk, and the elimination of a compactor. Mr. Campeau asked about the staff’s comment concerning the tree overlay and efforts to preserve trees. Mr. Sottile explained that they had tried to look at this situation and identify locations where trees could be preserved. Mr. Campeau told the applicant that it is hard to evaluate if you do not supply the plan showing the overlay. Mr. Campeau said that the remaining staff comments are all eligible to be worked out with staff. Mr. Beauchene asked to make sure that they had worked out all of the details of the building at the last meeting. Mr. Sottile confirmed that the colors and design had been extensively discussed at the last couple meetings.

Mr. Beauchene made a motion for Final Approval, with the condition that the remaining comments be worked out with staff. The motion was seconded by Ms. Rogerson. The motion passed unanimously 6-0.

3. Varnfield – The third item under Old Business is a request for Final Approval for a new 41,075 square foot light industrial building on Varnfield Drive. Mr. Chris Karpus of Karpus Design and Mr. Kyle Taylor of Hoyt + Berenyi came to the table to discuss the project. Mr. Campeau went over the outstanding staff comments, and asked the representatives to address the building design first. Mr. Karpus explained that the building had not changed in design from the last time that it was in front of the board. The roof will be galvalume, with the metal siding being a “limestone” and a gray base color. Mr. Campeau moved to the site issues. Mr. Taylor addressed the board, explaining that the plan had been revised after the last meeting to address the buffer area. Efforts were made to try to preserve the trees located in the five foot border. Mr. Beauchene asked if the roof drainage was going to the front of the building and about the off-site grading. Mr. Campeau asked about the three feet of fill on the west side of the building. Mr. Taylor said yes that the roof drains will go to the front of the building and to the ponds. He explained that they had approached the adjacent property owner about the necessity for grading on that adjacent property to be able to make the grades needed on their project property. The adjacent property owner had agreed to the work, and they are in the process of securing a letter of permission. Ms. Palmer asked if they were removing any trees from the adjacent property. Mr. Taylor said it was possible. Ms. Palmer pointed out that staff would need to see those tree removals. Mr. Beauchene asked for dimension to be on the site plan. Mr. Taylor addressed some of the comments. He said that they could add the dimensions, as well as the required fence for the buffer area. Mr. Macholl addressed the placement of a structure in the required use buffer. There was extensive debate concerning the nature of the buffer and the language concerning “construction activity” and its prohibition on the buffer. Ms. Miley addressed the board and explained that engineering still had some concerns regarding the discharge of stormwater onto the adjacent property. Mr. Beauchene agreed that discharge directly into the Weatherstone property could be problematic. Mr. Taylor explained that the stormwater report shows that the water naturally flows in that direction. Ms. Palmer pointed out that this was not the purview of the Board and that those details would need to be worked out with staff. The board continued to discuss at length the nature of the use buffer and how it should be planted. The board moved onto the parking requirement. They directed the applicant to remove the last space to give maneuverability on the site. The board directed the applicant to show the extra parking appropriately and supply a parking justification letter. Ms. Palmer pointed out to the board that a lot of the outstanding issues were technical issues that need
to be worked out with Town Staff. These issues though could have an impact on the site layout. Mr. Taylor stated that he was working with staff to address those issues and concerns.

Mr. Beauchene made a motion for Final Approval with the following conditions:
- The applicant shall continue to work out technical issues with staff
- The applicant shall provide a parking justification letter and show the additional parking appropriately on the plan
- Dimensions should be added to the site plan

The motion was seconded by Ms. Rogerson. Additional discussion added that if the technical issues require changes to the site plan, the applicant is required to come back to the board for approval. The motion for Conditional Final Approval passed unanimously 6-0.

4. North Maple Street – The fourth item under Old Business is a request for Final Approval of architectural revisions to the previously approved building on North Maple Street. Mr. Kyle Taylor of Hoyt + Berenyi and Mr. Michael Smith of Tidewater Architects came to the table to discuss the project. Mr. Smith explained that they are proposing to remove the parapet wall on the rear of the building, and replace that with a louvered screen to provide the necessary screening for the rooftop mechanicals. They also are requesting that the canopies over the overhead doors be removed. Mr. Beauchene pointed out that this would reduce the wind load on the building. Mr. Palmer asked what the total height would be with the screening. Mr. Smith addressed this by pointing out that they would provide the appropriate notch out for the roof height and access.

Ms. Palmer made a motion for Final Approval as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Beauchene. The motion passed unanimously 6-0.

5. Mofat Hwy 78 – The fifth item under Old Business is a request for Final Approval for site revisions to the previously approved plan for an expansion to the existing warehouse structure located on highway 78. Mr. Paul Eitel of Focus Design Builders and Mr. Nick Allport of HLA Inc. came to the table to explain the project. Mr. Eitel stated that the same night that they had received the approval from the board last month, his client had called to request changes to the proposed layout of the expansion. He explained that they were consolidating the warehouse and the cover structure on the side into a single 14,000 square foot expansion on the back, and that the proposed board barn at the rear of the property was requested to be moved forward to allow for better circulation. Mr. Campeau asked if the staff suggestion to thin the landscaping and utilize existing materials on site had been taken into account. Mr. Eitel explained that they were in the process of assessing the material on-site, but had revised the plan to give the proposed materials a better chance. Mr. Campeau asked if they were utilizing the same colors as presented last month. Mr. Eitel said yes.

Ms. Rogerson made a motion for Final Approval as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Beauchene. The motion passed unanimously 6-0.

6. Weathers lot 2 – The final item under Old Business is a request for Final Approval of revisions to a previously approved plan. Mr. Campeau and Ms. Palmer recused themselves and left the room. Mr. Les Lewis and Mr. David Rogers of Greenstone, and Mr. Preston Busbee of Seamon Whiteside came to the table to discuss the project. Mr. Beauchene asked if they wanted to address staff’s comments. Ms. Pratt asked staff to read the comments into the Record. Mr. Macholl stated staff’s position that the project as presented could not be supported by staff due to safety concerns with the circulation on the property, he addressed that staff had from the beginning been opposed to the front drive aisle requested by Aldi on lot 1, and that it had created site constraints from the beginning conceptual layout of this property, and that staff recommended denial of the proposed site plan as presented. Mr. Lewis addressed the staff’s concerns pointing out that it was not a scientific study of the property layout. Mr. Macholl acknowledged that it was not scientific, and that he was not a traffic engineer, but stated that it was his professional opinion that this layout would be problematic. Mr. Lewis pointed out that they had moved the building back to address staff’s concerns about stacking. He also addressed the parking concerns. Mr. Beauchene asked if it were possible to change the full access at the front of the lot to a right-in/right-out only access point. Ms. Pratt asked about Aldi’s requirement for the front drive aisle and Mr. Lewis explained that it was part of their contractual obligation to provide that access. The board discussed possible changes and Mr. Lewis opposed any and all suggestions to changes to that access. After the discussion was settled regarding the lack of ability to alter the access point, Mr. Beauchene suggested constructing a raised island at the edge of the building, planted with shrubs, to help channelize traffic and reduce the possibility of traffic crossover through the stacking lanes. Mr. Lewis thought that would be possible but was concerned about a truck being able to maneuver through the site. The board discussed at length whether a truck
should be maneuvering through this part of the property when there are access aisles both on the front and at the back of the property. Mr. Beauchene suggested a hooked island to help provide additional movement area. Mr. Lewis felt it would limit the last bay too much. Mr. Lewis suggested moving on to the design of the buildings. He pointed out that the only changes to the proposed Dental office was that the columns were changed to all brick. Ms. Rogerson asked if they had approved the blue proposed for the building. Mr. Lewis explained that it had been presented previously and approved on the building last year when it was given final approval. He explained that the blue is their corporate brand and that they would not be willing to remove it completely. He moved on to the quick lube building. He explained that this is Express Oil Changes building designed specifically for this site. He pointed out the addition of brick to the front façade. He pointed out the use of hardi plank and a similar cornice to the adjacent building to provide for a more cohesive design. There is also a standing seam metal awning like on the Aldi building and those chose a lighter brick color. Ms. Blanton and Ms. Rogerson felt that the proposed blue was too much. Mr. Rogers explained that the blue has not changed on the dental office, it is the same blue presented last year, and that he felt that maybe it may not have been representative of the actual blue due to printing differences in machines reproduction of the color. Mr. Lewis explained that the blue is an accent color and that the only substantial change to the building is a couple new windows due to internal layout changes. Mr. Rogers stated that both buildings are exclusive designs to Summerville. Ms. Pratt asked if there would be a compromise to get some of the blue off the dental office. Mr. Macholl suggested to the board that the blue coping could be removed from the building, and leave it on the awnings and in the sign. Mr. Lewis stated that they have signed leases and that any new changes could possibly kill the deals. Ms. Pratt argued that just because there is a signed contract does not mean that there is not still an ability to negotiate changes. The board further discussed the colors and possible changes. It was suggested that because of the issues it would be beneficial to break the approval up into three parts, one vote for the site and one each for the individual buildings.

Mr. Beauchene made a motion for Final Approval of the site plan, with the curbed island and 36” shrubs added to the corner of the express lube front building to channelize traffic. The motion was seconded by Ms. Pratt. The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

Mr. Beauchene made a motion for Final approval of the Express lube building as presented with the Berridge Royal Blue as the accepted color. The motion was seconded by Ms. Pratt. The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

Ms. Pratt pointed out that the buildings don’t need to have the same blue color, but the amount of blue should be reduced on the dental office. Mr. Beauchene said they need to remove the blue coping from the entire roofline. Ms. Pratt asked if they would change the color of the awnings. Mr. Beauchene suggested black awnings. Mr. Lewis objected and said it would be easier to sell them on the removal of the blue coping, than on the removal of the blue awnings.

Mr. Beauchene made a motion for Final Approval of the dental office with the blue coping removed from the entire roofline, replaced with coping to match the cornice. The motion was seconded by Ms. Pratt. The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

1. Signs – There was one sign to review by the Board. The property located at 909 N. Main Street is back for final approval of the revisions of the proposed signs. Mr. Tim Murray of Murray Sign came to the table and presented the revised drawings for the monument sign on the property. He explained that the red had been completely removed from the sign, and that brick columns had been added. He requested that they be able to move the existing signs from the current location to the new building to be hung on the front like they exist now.

Ms. Rogerson made a motion for Final Approval of the signs as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Beauchene. The chairman asked for any additional discussion, and asked Mr. Murray about the repainting of the building. Mr. Murray explained that the owner asked to hold off on the repainting until the signage issue was settled. Mr. Campeau asked about the van that is parked out front of the current location that never moves, and is essentially another sign for the business. Mr. Macholl explained that the Town Staff had done enforcement on this issue previously, but we can definitely look into further enforcement of this issue again. Mr. Murray stated that these colors are unique to the identity of this business and that the owner really does rely on signage to drive his business. Ms. Pratt said that she felt the sign was an improvement from the last version. Mr. Campeau expressed concerns about the painting issue and the van signage and didn’t feel that the board should vote on the issue until resolution of those issues. Mr. Beauchene pointed out that they are separate issues and that they don’t have jurisdiction over the van. Ms. Palmer asked what the hanging signs would look like. Mr. Murray explained they would take the existing signs down and repaint the boxes and put in new panels and rehang them at the new location. The Board discussed the appropriate location for the hanging of these signs. They settled that the signs should be hung symmetrically on the front of the building.
Ms. Rogerson amended her initial motion for Final Approval to include the discussed location of the hanging signs. The motion was seconded by Mr. Beauchene. The motion passed 4-2, with Mr. Campeau and Ms. Palmer voting against.

**MISCELLANEOUS:**

1. None

**ADJOURN:**
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 PM on a motion by Mr. Beauchene and a second by Ms. Rogerson.

Respectfully Submitted, Date: ______________

Tim Macholl
Zoning Administrator

Approved: Chris Campeau, Chairman ________________________________; or,

Michael Gregor, Vice Chairman ________________________________
STAFF REPORT  
CDRB Meeting  
June 20, 2019 at 4:00 p.m.

TO: Town of Summerville CDRB  
FROM: Planning Staff  
DATE: June 13, 2019

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Orangeburg Lodging, LLC.  
Property Owner: Steve Patel, Orangeburg Lodging, LLC.  
Requested Action: The applicant is requesting Final Approval for the construction of a new Avid Hotel on Holiday Drive  
Requested Approval: Final Approval  
Existing Zoning: B-3 General Business  
Location: Holiday Drive behind Azalea Square  
Existing Land Use: Vacant

Ordinance Reference:

Sec. 32-141. Commercial design review board.  
(b) Mission statement. The purpose of the commercial design review board is to establish a review process that will protect and improve the visual and aesthetic character and economic value of commercial development within the town. In turn, this establishment of scenic corridors will contribute to the community's sense of place and pride further strengthening the town's unity of character. Through this process, the assurance of respect for the character, integrity, and quality of the built environment of the town will be established without stifling innovative architecture and/or development. All development shall adhere to the definitions and terms outlined in all of the town's zoning ordinances and codes as preliminary criteria. The commercial design review board is granted the authority to determine the appropriateness of the construction of the commercial site in pursuit of achieving that style which is characteristic of the region and of the town in particular as stated in the guidelines of this section.

Recommendation:

Based upon staff review, the following are staff comments. The Building official would like to see the Handicap accessible parking moved closer to the doors of the building. The use of Red Maples on the landscape plan in parking lot islands is strongly discouraged. They do not hold up well to these conditions and an alternative species is recommended. Staff does not encourage the use of River Birch and suggests the choice of an alternative species. A signage plan will need to be reviewed and approved separately. There is on the plans a dark line which appears to be a retaining wall. There is no detail provided for this structure.

Engineering Comments: Berkeley County encroachment permits will be required for the entrances into the site. The plan is currently showing parking within the existing CPW water and sewer easement. Provide documentation showing coordination with the utility allowing for the placement of the parking and landscaping in this easement. Staff has a concern with the proposed underground detention its position on the lot and the conventional pond proposed for the corner of the property and access for maintenance purposes.
COMMERCIAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (CDRB) APPLICATION

REQUIREMENTS: This application, eight (8) 11x17 size hard copy sets of plans, a digital copy (site, landscape, and architectural), and any applicable fees (see fee schedule) must be submitted to the Planning Department at least 20 days prior to the CDRB meeting. Applications must include all applicable information required in the CDRB checklist and all sets of plans must be collated and folded. Final plans must carry the seal of a registered architect or engineer licensed in the State of South Carolina.

***Applicants or a representative must be present for an item to be reviewed by the board. Incomplete applications will not be reviewed.***

Review requested (please check one):
- [ ] Conceptual Review (only requires photos of site, proposed building elevations, and site plan)
- [x] Preliminary Approval (see checklist below)  
- [ ] Final Approval (see checklist below)

Preliminary Approval Granted On: ________________

Project name: Avid Hotel by IHG

Project address (if in shopping center, indicate name): Holiday Drive (adjacent to Staybridge Hotel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMS#</th>
<th>Property zoned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>221-00-00-231</td>
<td>B-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property owner/developer:

Name(s): Hema and Steve Patel  
Firm: Orangeburg, Lodging, LLC  
Phone: 803-535-9300  
Email: sudhir3691@aol.com

Primary Contact:

Name:  
Firm:  
Phone:  
Email:  

Architect:

Name: Craig Otto  
Phone: 803-957-9004 / 803-606-7117  
Email: craig@craigottoarchitect.com

Landscape Architect:

Name: Tom Britt  
Firm: HB Engineering, Inc.  
Phone: 803-957-7027  
Email: tombrithb@gmail.com

Engineer:

Name: Tom Britt  
Firm: HB Engineering, Inc.  
Phone: 803-957-7027  
Email: tombrithb@gmail.com
The Commercial Development Design Review Board will meet at 4pm on: June 20, 2019

I certify that all information required is included and the application is complete. If an application is found to be incomplete, the primary contact will be notified and the application will be removed from the agenda. I also understand that any changes made to the drawings approved by the Commercial Design Review Board must be resubmitted for approval of these changes or alterations. A Certificate of Occupancy will not be issued if the building and/or site and landscaping differ from the approved plans. This approval does not constitute approval by other boards or town departments. Before construction begins a building permit may be required.

Signature of Property Owner/Developer: [Signature]
Date: 5/28/19

[Board Approval Only]:
☐ Approved as Submitted  ☐ Approved as Noted  ☐ Disapproved
Date of Preliminary Approval: __________ Date of Final Approval: __________
Conditions: ____________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
COMMERCIAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION CHECKLIST
MUST BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED WITH APPLICATION PACKAGE

The CDRB meets the third Thursday of each month. Without exception, all required materials must be submitted by the close of business 20 days prior to the meeting to be placed on the agenda. Make sure to include eight (8) 11x17 size hard copy sets of plans and one digital copy to scale for staff review.

- Tax Map Number(s) for proposed property.
- Tree survey of parcel as well as proposed footprint of building(s). *(If applicable)*
- Site plan, drawn to scale showing exact size, shape and location of existing and/or proposed buildings.
- Site plan (see above) overlaid on tree survey of existing site. *(If applicable)*
- For signs, overall dimensions of sign(s), location and/or placement of sign, and dimensions of front of building.
- Advertising features and signs, including material type, lighting (if any), and colors. *(If applicable)*
- Floor plan.
- All proposed building elevations.
- Color rendering and/or samples of colors to be used in proposed project.
- Materials to be used in the proposed project (bring samples to meeting).
- Location and layout of parking areas and driveways.
- Pervious/impervious surface calculations.
- Proposed grade and drainage plans. *(If applicable)*
- Proposed water and sewer facilities including electrical gas, cable, etc. *(If applicable)*
- Landscaping plans including screening and fencing and showing any existing trees to be saved.
- Photometric plan of site lighting (manufacturer’s specifications will be accepted) and cut sheets showing light fixtures and specifications (i.e. pole height). *(If applicable)*
- Photographs of the proposed project site, properties on either side of proposed site, and of properties across the street from the project site.
2019 CDRB Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submittal Deadline</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 28-Dec</td>
<td>17-Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1-Feb</td>
<td>21-Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1-Mar</td>
<td>21-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29-Mar</td>
<td>18-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26-Apr</td>
<td>16-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 31-May</td>
<td>20-Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 28-Jun</td>
<td>18-Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 26-Jul</td>
<td>15-Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30-Aug</td>
<td>19-Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27-Sep</td>
<td>17-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1-Nov</td>
<td>21-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 29-Nov</td>
<td>19-Dec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings 3rd Thrs begin at 4pm at Town Hall (200 S. Main St.)
Fees apply

*Design Review Fee.* Review fees are paid at submission of the preliminary application and shall be set as follows:

**Fee Schedule:**
- Conceptual: No Charge
- 0-5 acres: $100.00
- 6-10 acres: $150.00
- 11-20 acres: $200.00
- 21-50 acres: $300.00
- 51-100 acres: $400.00
- 100+ acres: $400.00 + $2.00 per each acre or portion thereof over 100
- Signs: $25.00
Substitutions must be equal in construction, finish, energy usage as indicated on detail this sheet. To the Submitting Party ten (10) days prior to bid. Substitute fixtures with these and allow time to review and issue a written approval back. Where fixture is indicated as emergency provide an approved emergency fixture.

Plan for circuiting.

MVOLT LED, 4000K same at type 'OA' except back-to-back at 180°.

Shall be 25'-0" to bottom of fixture including base. Pole height height of base.

Avid Hotel 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0

25'-0" to bottom of fixture. Mounting height all pole mounted luminaires are mounted to pole with handhole.

3500 psi concrete in 28 days.
STAFF REPORT
CDRB Meeting
June 20, 2019 at 4:00 p.m.

TO: Town of Summerville CDRB
FROM: Planning Staff
DATE: June 13, 2019

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Synovus Bank
Property Owner: Synovus Bank
Requested Action: The applicant is requesting Final Approval for the proposed architectural changes to previously approved plans.
Requested Approval: Final Approval
Existing Zoning: B-3, General Business
Location: 616 N. Main Street
Existing Land Use: Bank

Ordinance Reference:
Sec. 32-141. Commercial design review board.

(b) Mission statement. The purpose of the commercial design review board is to establish a review process that will protect and improve the visual and aesthetic character and economic value of commercial development within the town. In turn, this establishment of scenic corridors will contribute to the community's sense of place and pride further strengthening the town's unity of character. Through this process, the assurance of respect for the character, integrity, and quality of the built environment of the town will be established without stifling innovative architecture and/or development. All development shall adhere to the definitions and terms outlined in all of the town's zoning ordinances and codes as preliminary criteria. The commercial design review board is granted the authority to determine the appropriateness of the construction of the commercial site in pursuit of achieving that style which is characteristic of the region and of the town in particular as stated in the guidelines of this section.

Recommendation:

Being proposed architectural changes to the previously approved elevations staff has no position on the proposal.
COMMERCIAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (CDRB) APPLICATION

REQUIREMENTS: This application, eight (8) 11x17 size hard copy sets of plans, a digital copy (site, landscape, and architectural), and any applicable fees (see fee schedule) must be submitted to the Planning Department at least 20 days prior to the CDRB meeting. Applications must include all applicable information required in the CDRB checklist and all sets of plans must be collated and folded. Final plans must carry the seal of a registered architect or engineer licensed in the State of South Carolina.

***Applicants or a representative must be present for an item to be reviewed by the board. Incomplete applications will not be reviewed.***

Review requested (please check one):

☐ Conceptual Review (only requires photos of site, proposed building elevations, and site plan)

☐ Preliminary Approval (see checklist below)  ☑ Final Approval (see checklist below)

Preliminary Approval Granted On: ________________

Project name: Synovus Bank

Project address (if in shopping center, indicate name): 606 N. Main St.

Summerville, S.C. 29483

TMS#: __________________ Property zoned: __________________

Property owner/developer:

Name(s): Jeff Pittman  Firm: Genoa Construction

Phone: 678-770-0627  Email: jeff.pitman@genoaaco.com

Primary Contact:

Name: Robby Glover  Firm: Synovus Bank

Phone: 404-451-4774  Email: Robby.glover@synovus.com

Architect:

Name: Land Blumenfeld  Firm: Warner Summers

Phone: 404-351-6875  Email: lblumenfeld@warnersummers.com

Landscape Architect:

Name: __________________  Firm: __________________

Phone: __________________  Email: __________________

Engineer:

Name: __________________  Firm: __________________

Phone: __________________  Email: __________________
The Commercial Development Design Review Board will meet at 4pm on:

I certify that all information required is included and the application is complete. If an application is found to be incomplete, the primary contact will be notified and the application will be removed from the agenda. I also understand that any changes made to the drawings approved by the Commercial Development Design Review Board must be resubmitted for approval of these changes or alterations. A Certificate of Occupancy will not be issued if the building and/or site and landscaping differ from the approved plans. This approval does not constitute approval by other boards or town departments. Before construction begins a building permit may be required.

Signature of Property Owner/Developer: ___________________________ Date: 6/6/2019

[Board Approval Only]:

☐ Approved as Submitted  ☐ Approved as Noted  ☐ Disapproved

Date of Preliminary Approval ___________________________ Date of Final Approval ___________________________

Conditions: __________________________________________

____________________________________________________
STAFF REPORT
CDRB Meeting
June 20, 2019 at 4:00 p.m.

TO: Town of Summerville CDRB
FROM: Planning Staff
DATE: June 13, 2019

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Chris Karpus – Karpus Design
Property Owner: Robert Pratt
Requested Action: The applicant is requesting Conceptual Review of a proposed new office building on Gum Street.
Requested Approval: Conceptual Review
Existing Zoning: B-3, General Business
Location: 306 & 310 Gum Street
Existing Land Use: vacant

Ordinance Reference:
Sec. 32-141. Commercial design review board.

(b) Mission statement. The purpose of the commercial design review board is to establish a review process that will protect and improve the visual and aesthetic character and economic value of commercial development within the town. In turn, this establishment of scenic corridors will contribute to the community’s sense of place and pride further strengthening the town’s unity of character. Through this process, the assurance of respect for the character, integrity, and quality of the built environment of the town will be established without stifling innovative architecture and/or development. All development shall adhere to the definitions and terms outlined in all of the town’s zoning ordinances and codes as preliminary criteria. The commercial design review board is granted the authority to determine the appropriateness of the construction of the commercial site in pursuit of achieving that style which is characteristic of the region and of the town in particular as stated in the guidelines of this section.

Recommendation:

Based upon preliminary staff review, the following are staff’s comments. Clarification of the platting of the property will be required. If the properties are to be consolidated, the new plat will need to be recorded before Building permits will be issued. If the properties are to remain separate a cross access/parking agreement will be required. A full tree survey will be required, with an overlay of the proposed development. A sidewalk will be required along both Gum Street and E 3rd North Street. The Building official is concerned with the proposed second story use. Please clarify the use of the second story residential or commercial use. A dumpster enclosure designed to match the building should be provided if a dumpster is required. A full lighting plan will be required. A signage plan will be required. A full landscape plan will be required. The shared access on Gum Street should be improved to accommodate two way traffic. Proposed parking exceeds the minimum requirement. A parking justification letter and pervious pavers will be required for the construction of all parking spaces above 10 parking spaces.
COMMERCIAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (CDRB) APPLICATION

REQUIREMENTS: This application, eight (8) 11x17 size hard copy sets of plans, a digital copy (site, landscape, and architectural), and any applicable fees (see fee schedule) must be submitted to the Planning Department at least 20 days prior to the CDRB meeting. Applications must include all applicable information required in the CDRB checklist and all sets of plans must be collated and folded. Final plans must carry the seal of a registered architect or engineer licensed in the State of South Carolina.

***Applicants or a representative must be present for an item to be reviewed by the board. Incomplete applications will not be reviewed.***

Review requested (please check one):
☑ Conceptual Review (only requires photos of site, proposed building elevations, and site plan)
☐ Preliminary Approval (see checklist below) ☐ Final Approval (see checklist below)

Preliminary Approval Granted On: _______________________

Project name: NEW OFFICE BUILDING FOR MR. ROBERT PRATT

Project address (if in shopping center, indicate name):

306 & 310 GUM STREET, SUMMERVILLE

TMS#: 137-07-21-002 137-07-21-003 Property zoned: B-3 (General Business)

Property owner/developer:
Name(s): ROBERT PRATT Firm: REMAX PRO REALTY
Phone: 843-576-2705 Email: robert@robertpratt.com

Primary Contact:
Name: CHRISS KARANS Firm: KARANS DESIGN, LLC
Phone: 843-425-4124 Email: chris@karansdesign.com

Architect:
Name: CHRISS KARANS Firm: KARANS DESIGN, LLC
Phone: 843-425-4124 Email: chris@karansdesign.com

Landscape Architect:
Name: ________ Firm: ________
Phone: ________ Email: ________

Engineer:
Name: CYPRESS ENGINEERING Firm: WILL ROYAN
Phone: 843-225-5151 x100 Email: willr@cyypresseng.com
The Commercial Development Design Review Board will meet at 4pm on: **June 20, 2019**

I certify that all information required is included and the application is complete. If an application is found to be incomplete, the primary contact will be notified and the application will be removed from the agenda. I also understand that any changes made to the drawings approved by the Commercial Design Review Board must be resubmitted for approval of these changes or alterations. A Certificate of Occupancy will not be issued if the building and/or site and landscaping differ from the approved plans. This approval does not constitute approval by other boards or town departments. Before construction begins a building permit may be required.

Signature of Property Owner/Developer: [Signature] (ARCHITECT) Date: **05/31/19**

[Board Approval Only]:
- [ ] Approved as Submitted
- [ ] Approved as Noted
- [x] Disapproved

Date of Preliminary Approval: ______________ Date of Final Approval: ______________

Conditions:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
COMMERCIAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION CHECKLIST
MUST BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED WITH APPLICATION PACKAGE

The CDRB meets the third Thursday of each month. Without exception, all required materials must be submitted by the close of business 20 days prior to the meeting to be placed on the agenda. Make sure to include eight (8) 11x17 size hard copy sets of plans and one digital copy to scale for staff review.

☐ Tax Map Number(s) for proposed property.

☐ Tree survey of parcel as well as proposed footprint of building(s). (If applicable)

☐ Site plan, drawn to scale showing exact size, shape and location of existing and/or proposed buildings.

☐ Site plan (see above) overlaid on tree survey of existing site. (If applicable)

☐ For signs, overall dimensions of sign(s), location and/or placement of sign, and dimensions of front of building.

☐ Advertising features and signs, including material type, lighting (if any), and colors. (If applicable)

☐ Floor plan.

☐ All proposed building elevations.

☐ Color rendering and/or samples of colors to be used in proposed project.

☐ Materials to be used in the proposed project (bring samples to meeting).

☐ Location and layout of parking areas and driveways.

☐ Pervious/impervious surface calculations.

☐ Proposed grade and drainage plans. (If applicable)

☐ Proposed water and sewer facilities including electrical gas, cable, etc. (If applicable)

☐ Landscaping plans including screening and fencing and showing any existing trees to be saved.

☐ Photometric plan of site lighting (manufacturer's specifications will be accepted) and cut sheets showing light fixtures and specifications (i.e. pole height). (If applicable)

☐ Photographs of the proposed project site, properties on either side of proposed site, and of properties across the street from the project site.
**2019 CDRB Meeting Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Submittal Deadline</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>28-Dec</td>
<td>17-Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>21-Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>21-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>29-Mar</td>
<td>18-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>26-Apr</td>
<td>16-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>31-May</td>
<td>20-Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>28-Jun</td>
<td>18-Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>26-Jul</td>
<td>15-Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>30-Aug</td>
<td>19-Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>27-Sep</td>
<td>17-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1-Nov</td>
<td>21-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>28-Nov</td>
<td>19-Dec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings 3rd Thrs begin at 4pm at Town Hall (200 S. Main St.)
Fees apply

---

**Design Review Fee.** Review fees are paid at submission of the preliminary application and shall be set as follows:

**Fee Schedule:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 acres</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 acres</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 acres</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50 acres</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100 acres</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+ acres</td>
<td>$400.00 + $2.00 per each acre or portion thereof over 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Office Building
306 & 310 Gum Street
Summerville, South Carolina

Conceptual Design Submittal
Summerville DRB Submittal Date: 05.31.19
Summerville DRB Meeting Date: 06.20.19