

Town of Lexington  
**BOARD OF APPEARANCE**  
**Minutes**

July 10, 2018

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Larry Wilund and Board Members Bob Britts, Carlton “Cocky” Oswald, and Wayne Rogers were present. Board Member Ian MacLean was absent. The meeting was held at Town Hall in the Council Chambers at 9:00 a.m.

Others in attendance were Director of Planning, Building, and Technology John Hanson, Municipal Attorney Brad Cunningham, Economic Development Johnny Jeffcoat, Digital Media Coordinator Darrell Pritchard, and Municipal Clerk Becky Hildebrand.

Seven (7) citizens were present and no members of the news media were present.

---

---

Chair Wilund read an introduction to the meeting and called the meeting to order at 9:12 a.m.

**ADDITIONS/DELETIONS:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Proposed Caliber Collision at 521 Columbia Avenue - Director of Planning, Building, and Technology John Hanson:** Mr. Rusty Coan submitted a proposal to convert the building located at 521 Columbia Avenue to an auto body repair facility. He also intends to subdivide the property to create a separate outparcel that will be marketed to another business. A separate review of the outparcel will occur at a later date. This project was reviewed by the Staff Committee as a change of use meaning that it is required to meet the current appearance and zoning standards. Due to the potential large amount of vehicle related activities, the amount of community interest in this property, the condition of the site, the high profile location and the impact this project may have on neighboring properties, the Staff Committee felt that it was important for the Board of Appearance to provide input on this proposal. Some areas of the manual that you may wish to consider are:

Section SG1: States to “design new development to be compatible with the general physical character of adjacent neighborhoods”. *This property is adjacent to a residential area. It is not uncommon for the Town to receive complaints about the current condition of the property.*

Section SG4: States that new development should “provide significant architectural features to emphasize the public streets and enhance streetscape”. *The Staff Committee felt that additional features could be added to the building such as additional awnings, columns or the installation of some accent materials*

**Board of Appearance Minutes  
July 10, 2018**

*such as stone or hardy plank to help to bring this building up to the current appearance standards. Additionally, the Staff Committee discourages the use of cloth awnings due to the maintenance concerns associated with these features. Finally, similar new projects are required to orient the service bay doors away from major roadways to minimize the visual impact of these areas.*

Section SG6: States to “create visual interest and shadow play through techniques including, but not limited to, the use of offsetting planes with a variety of depths”. Mr. Hanson added that the building is rectangle.

Section SG8: States “color schemes shall tie building elements together, relate separate buildings within the same development and enhance the architectural form of a building”. *The Staff Committee reviewed a separate plan using a different color scheme that seemed to meet this standard much better than the current proposal.* Mr. Hanson stated that he was surprised when the package came in to be submitted to the Board that it did not include the grey building, which he just distributed, but was back to the yellow building.

Sections SG11 and SG14 address site lighting. These sections state: To “provide lighting that is appropriate to the ground floor use and that focuses on pedestrian areas,” to use “efficient white light sources on site to reduce energy costs and to create a natural color balance for safety and security,” to “design lighting so that light does not spill over or cast a glare onto adjacent properties,” and to “use outdoor lighting that is in accordance with the design style of the project and is compatible with surrounding property lighting”. *No information was provided about the proposed lighting for this site, but there are indications that the intent is to utilize the existing lighting. This lighting consists of large spot lights positioned around the property. It was installed for the car dealership that previously occupied the space and would not be approved on a new building.*

Section SG15: States to “enclose all utility equipment within buildings or screen it from both the public street(s) or other public areas”. This section refers to both rooftop mechanical units and ground equipment. *Typically rooftop screening is achieved with a parapet wall which this building does not have. The submitted elevation indicates some sort of intermittent roof screening, but this type of screening is not normally approved. The elevation provides no information about any type of ground equipment that may also need to be screened.*

Section SG17: States to “design garbage enclosures that are external to the building with the same materials as the building”. *No information has been provided on a dumpster enclosure.* Mr. Hanson added that it typically means if you have a brick building a brick enclosure is required. He stated that metal doors are suggested because wooden doors deteriorate within a week.

The Board was asked to review the proposal to determine whether it meets the Town’s appearance standards and if necessary make suggestions to enhance the project so that it will meet these standards.

**Board of Appearance Minutes  
July 10, 2018**

Chair Wilund called on any representatives for Caliber Collision who wished to speak.

**Mr. Todd Burnett**, Freeman and Caughman, Landscape Architect and Engineer, stated that he and Mr. David Scroggins from Cross Development were present to answer any questions. He described the property as asphalt from property line to property line and they had worked with Mr. Hanson to increase the landscape, buffers and islands, especially between this property and the adjacent property and along Columbia Avenue. He added that they are reducing the impervious area for the site by adding more landscaping. Mr. Burnett stated that they will add a six foot wooden screen fence around the entire rear area which will screen the storage of vehicles. He added that currently there is a chain link fence with slats in it. He stated that their idea on the dumpster is that since it will be behind the new fence it would not need additional screening (not shown on the proposal).

Board Member Rogers asked about the location of the six foot fence. Mr. Burnett stated that it would go down Caughman Road and turn to the right toward the building. He stated that they were trying to include everything behind the building since that is where vehicles would be stored. Mr. Burnett stated that there is a 70 foot wooded undisturbed buffer at the back and fencing along the front and sides that would block the view.

Board Member Britts stated that Mr. Burnett had indicated that they do not need additional fencing around the dumpster since it is behind the new rear screening fence, but he wanted to know if the residents could see it. Mr. Burnett responded that there would be a fence in the rear of the property plus 100 feet of trees, but if they needed to add a screening at the dumpster for that reason they could look at it, but to build it out of brick to match the building would be redundant. Mr. Hanson wished to clarify and stated that he did not know the dumpster was planned for behind the fence. He added that the Town's Landscape and Tree Ordinance requires screening eight feet tall and 90 percent opaque between the business and the residents, therefore the back line of landscaping would have to be so you could not see or the fence would have to be eight feet tall. He stated that the fence could be six feet tall on the side road, but it would have to meet the ordinance requirements at the rear of the property.

Board Member Oswald asked what was between the two buildings. Mr. Burnett responded that currently it is just a paved drive and they plan to install a five foot landscape buffer as required by ordinance. He added that they plan to leave the drive for fire access. Mr. Burnett stated that the buffer would go all the way to Columbia Avenue and stops short in order to provide cross access to limit traffic on Columbia Avenue. He added that currently there is an asphalt curb that someone paved between the two lots. Board Member Rogers confirmed that by removing asphalt it would increase the buffer at Columbia Avenue. Mr. Burnett responded yes that currently the buffer is eight feet and they will increase it to 20 feet which is required by ordinance. Board Member Rogers asked if the two rows of parking facing each other had hardscape or landscape between them. Mr. Burnett responded that it was landscaping which also serves to improve the grade.

**Board of Appearance Minutes  
July 10, 2018**

Board Member Rogers asked if the hatch area at the front of the drawing and if it was going to be hardscaping. Mr. Burnett responded that it would just be striping. Board Member Rogers confirmed that the parking near Columbia Avenue would be for guests and that the vehicle storage area would be accessed between the two buildings through a gate. Mr. Burnett stated that they do not need a lot of customer parking because their biggest need is storing vehicles. He added that the lot behind the building is currently used for vehicle storage but it is made of dirt and stone.

Board Member Britts confirmed that there are also service bay doors on the rear side of the building.

**Mr. David Scroggins**, Cross Development, stated that they are the primary real estate developer for Caliber Collision. He added that they have spent a lot of time planning for this building which works well for them. He stated that the economics of this location is to use the existing building which is a steel free span building and the front of the building is block. Mr. Scroggins stated that they plan to improve the appearance of the building and he would answer any questions from the Board.

Chair Wilund asked about the plan for the brick in the proposal submitted. Mr. Scroggins stated they plan to power wash the brick because it is in good shape and accent it with dark trim to bring out the natural color. He stated that they had considered painting the brick but presented this as their preferred option instead. He added that when brick is painted it can make a building look older and it is usually to hide a problem. Chair Wilund asked if the existing metal work was being painted. Mr. Scroggins responded that it is not a new structure, but the parapet is new as well as the decorative awnings over the openings and the roof screen. He added that the screen or vents on the left side is to screen the mechanicals. He stated that he had a copy of the floor plan if the Board was interested in seeing it. Mr. Scroggins stated that the right side of the building is offices; the far left side is the paint shop; and everything in between is standard work stalls. He stated that all the work comes and goes from the back of the building which also contains lifts, frame racks, parts storage, and detail bay. He added that there is not a lot of movement with cars when they come in and any movement happens from the back of the building except for the two doors on the left front of the building which is the exit for the paint booth.

Chair Wilund asked if the metal work and the roof would be repainted black. Mr. Scroggins stated that all the front trim will be black, but the metal roof could not be seen. He added that a portion of the right side of the roof is a single ply membrane and it is being replaced as well as the roof on the back of building. He stated that the metal roof on the front building is in good shape. Mr. Scroggins stated that the double doors on the far right side are new; the opening in the center is existing and they will paint the frames; and the five doors with glass are existing and will be painted; and the two doors on the left are new. He stated that the two doors on the left are not roll up doors because the paint booth is about two feet behind it. Chair Wilund confirmed that on the main structure they are adding the

**Board of Appearance Minutes  
July 10, 2018**

mechanical screen and the parapet. Mr. Scroggins stated that the building is low and they needed a place for identification of the entrance and the parapet is suspended over the roof.

Chair Wilund stated this is a tough one and he did not have any more questions but he has some comments concerning design. He added that since this is a change of use, it is triggering the appearance issues. He stated that it is an abandoned site now and they would love to see some life come to it, but they also need to see that it meets appearance standards which is a challenge in itself. Mr. Scroggins stated that they had read the design manual which was well written, but it was not clear as to what to do with an existing building.

Board Member Rogers stated that the building is what it is, but he liked what was being proposed to remove asphalt and introduce landscape which is the most important part of the proposal. He stated that the key is to add as much landscaping as possible and he thinks they are doing that. He added that site lighting should be more appropriate to what is going on out front and reduce light pollution. Board Member Rogers stated that he was not sure how to address the building because when you add too much to it and embellish it, it becomes something that it is not. He added that he liked the painted brick solution better, but he did not have a strong opinion about it. He liked the introduction of black metal and making it an accent to freshen the building up. Mr. Scroggins stated that they agreed that lighting needed to be reduced and they have addressed it before since they have taken over many existing car dealership buildings.

Chair Wilund called on any others that would like to make a statement regarding the proposal for Caliber Collision.

**Ms. Jan Schavstein**, 106 Smith Street, and her husband Greg Schavstein, adjacent residential property owners for 18 years, stated that during the time they have lived on Smith Street very little has been done to maintain or enhance the commercial property at 521 Columbia Avenue. She stated that their back perimeter is totally adjacent to 521 Columbia Avenue, therefore decisions regarding the property would greatly affect them as homeowners and for potential resale value. She listed several concerns including: privacy – she requested that any privacy fence be eight feet tall and that the current wooded area be retained; light and noise pollution – they already have noise pollution from the Firestone Tire Company and are concerned about the new company. She also requested that outdoor lighting be minimized after dusk because the windows in their master bedroom face the property; and rainwater runoff – if it rains much in a short period of time they experience significant runoff and flooding from this adjacent property resulting in scored plants and mulch removal which then has to be repurchased. She added that during one recent rain the water was six to seven inches deep under their deck. Ms. Schavstein stated that besides causing damage to their property, storm water runoff contains chemicals and other pollutants therefore they requested that this issue be carefully studied and addressed.

**Board of Appearance Minutes  
July 10, 2018**

**Mr. John Addy**, owner of property at 521 Columbia Avenue, stated that the property had been a car dealership since 1935 when his father purchased it following World War II. He added that his father had also owned all the property where the houses are now located behind it and there would not be houses there today if his father had not sold the land for the houses to be put there. He stated that the people that bought those houses knew there was a car dealership there when they bought it. Mr. Addy stated that Caliber is a well known establishment with over 600 locations in the United States and you won't find a better neighbor. He hoped that they would come to Lexington because he would rather see someone like them in that building instead of it sitting there deteriorating. He added that there is nothing uglier than a building sitting and deteriorating so we need to get a good neighbor in there to rejuvenate the facility so it can live another 50 years. Mr. Addy stated that the Board Members were business men and they knew there was a budget to work by and you can't put but so much into something to be able to stay in business. He asked the Board to work hard to help Caliber come to Lexington.

**Mr. Ron Vaughn**, Lexington Attorney, stated that he has known Mr. and Mrs. Addy for a number of years both in business and socially. He added that they are lifelong residents and have three sons who own four houses in the Town limits. Mr. Vaughn stated that he was not here about the appearance, but wished to ask the Board to consider these ordinances in the light that they should be applied and to be reasonable. He stated that the existing business obviously has a lot of problems and does not meet the appearance standards and they never have met them because no one cared about appearance 40 years ago. He stated that it had only been in the past 10 to 15 years that he has noticed a focus on the appearance. He requested a sensible approach on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Addy. Mr. Vaughn stated that Caliber is a major national business and he had been told that they were going to hire 20 to 25 employees; it will generate approximately \$2 ½ to \$3 million a year; and, improve the community. He stated that it was apparent that the engineers and architects are willing to do anything within the scheme of the cost factor of improving the appearance. He agreed with the Board Member that mentioned landscaping in that it was the key to the project because that is what people will see and obviously the building can be made to look better. Mr. Vaughn stated that he was sure the neighbors were good people and their complaints are legitimate and the concerns they raised can be addressed such as making the screening in the back eight feet. He added that Mr. and Mrs. Addy still own two businesses located on Main Street including their son's upscale clothing store and the Blowfish Baseball office. He again asked the Board to be reasonable in any requirements that they placed on the property. He stated that there is a contract pending and if all these items can be cleared up hopefully there will be a closing within the next few weeks.

Chair Wilund asked the developer if he could address their plans for noise abatement. Mr. Scroggins stated the modern body shop is different than they use to be when they pounded fenders. He added that now they pull and replace and the environment is fairly quiet and clean. He stated that the days of sanding and bonding dust are gone in that sanders now have vacuums attached. Mr. Scroggins

**Board of Appearance Minutes  
July 10, 2018**

stated that since Caliber is from California, they are way ahead of the environmental concerns and bring a standard of operation that you probably have not seen before. He added that it is not very noisy and they only have impact wrenches which are rarely used. Mr. Scroggins stated that they are used to dealing with light pollution and using cutoff screens and photo metrics so they agree not to install any lights that would shine past their property lines. He added that there is some live screen in place but if they need to do something opaque to help, they will do it. He was not aware of any drainage issue. Mr. Scroggins stated that Caliber wants to be a good neighbor and he can address any concerns.

Board Member Oswald asked about the normal business hours and if lighting could be reduced after 5:00 p.m. Mr. Scroggins responded that business hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. five days a week. He added that some shops open for a half day on Saturday but that is unusual. Mr. Scroggins stated that for Caliber the lighting is for security and they have a standard that they have to keep for insurance purposes. He added that they have found that it is better if you can see through the fence for security reasons, but they go both ways on that issue. He stated that they need security lights at night, but it does not have to be bright or extend beyond the property line. Chair Wilund stated that he did not see lighting in the back on the proposal. Mr. Scroggins stated that there would need to be some light in the backyard because most of it is remote from the building.

**Mr. Schavstein**, adjacent neighbor, did not address the Board but wished to ask the developer some questions. He stated that the soil had been compacted for about 83 years and it would be great to get rid of some of the asphalt but that did not change the compactness of the soil. He added that the buffer at the back has been undisturbed for the 18 years he had lived there and some of the plants are indigenous to the area that he would rather not have, but there had been no maintenance to that area. Mr. Schavstein stated that there is a semi-tractor trailer disconnected from the truck which is being stored there now and his concern is the area is being represented as a buffer but it is not desirable. He knows that the country is terrible about caring for forest but everything on that side of Highway 378 is a geological ridgeline and it drains to 14 Mile Creek and on the other side it drains to 12 Mile Creek and both go into the Saluda River which has trout fishing and we should think about it. He added that he appreciated the developer for trying to eliminate the problem but they are on a ridgeline and the runoff could be contained in a retention pond. He asked the Board to consider these issues. Mr. Schavstein stated that he was all for using old stuff but Americans do not think that way and want to throw it away. He added that he was all for saving money the building is structurally sound. Mr. Schavstein stated that they want to cooperate and get the best thing done for everyone. Chair Wilund thanked Mr. Schavstein for his comments.

Mr. Hanson reminded everyone present that this is the Appearance Board and not the stormwater board. He added that a lot of things that the applicant is telling the Board that they are going to do to enhance the property, those items are required by the Zoning and Landscape Ordinances. He requested that the Board stay focused on the appearance of the building. He appreciated all the information that

**Board of Appearance Minutes  
July 10, 2018**

was given this morning and Staff will have some items to address. Mr. Hanson stated that in regard to lighting he needed the Board to address the look and style of the lighting because the Zoning Ordinance will address the brightness and the applicant will be required to provide a photometric plan showing that the lighting does not exceed the requirement set in the Ordinance. He added that it's not to say that landscaping does not add to the appearance because it does and there is a section in the manual regarding landscaping, but what is being proposed is what is already required. Board Member Oswald confirmed that Staff would get a lighting plan. Mr. Hanson stated that a lighting plan would be required which will need to show that offsite lighting does not exceed the limit before a permit is issued. He stated that what he needs from the Board is what that lighting will look like – either stadium lighting which is already there or will it be brought into code and what is accepted today as required when there is a change in use of the property.

Chair Wilund asked Mr. Hanson to brief the Board on the items that they should make comments on today because he has some comments toward landscaping. Mr. Hanson stated that landscaping should include the minimum requirement set by the Landscape and Tree Ordinance and that is what the Board has before them. He added that if there are enhancements to that which the Board feels is necessary to enhance the overall appearance of the building that would be within the Board's purview. Mr. Hanson stated that with regard to storm water runoff, Staff would have to talk to Lexington County to determine if they would be required to issue a Storm Water Permit when it is obvious that storm water will be reduced and an existing property may not be required unless there were previous problems noted. Mr. Hanson asked the Board Members if that was a parapet on top of the building where the sign is located, because the Town's Sign Ordinance does not allow for a sign to be above the roof line. He added that it just looks like a sign to him. Chair Wilund responded that it is a 6½ foot tall addition and is a parapet that serves as a sign. Mr. Hanson stated that a parapet that serves as a sign may not be allowed by the Sign Ordinance. He added that he likes the parapet because it gives some shape to the building.

Chair Wilund stated that in the islands where new parking will be located shows six trees but no landscape buffer between parking spots and he wanted to know if they could add landscape to better hide the cars and soften the look of the building. Mr. Burnett had Chair Wilund show him the areas on the proposal at which time he stated that he did not see any reason why they could not add more landscape horizontally in that area. He added that they left part of that area with stripes at the canopy was for ADA access. Mr. Burnett stated that the area is not ADA compliant now and they will have to bring it up to compliance so leaving it flush was the idea behind it but they could add a tree at each end. Chair Wilund stated that would be helpful to soften it and it would help with drainage. He asked if the 5 foot buffer that separates what is referred to as the proposed parcel from the new parking area, it appears that landscaping stops at the corner. Mr. Burnett stated that they could continue that row of shrubs, but they were unsure when the out parcel develops what they would need. He added that his notes state that it would be landscaped when the out parcel is developed. Chair Wilund asked if the back

**Board of Appearance Minutes  
July 10, 2018**

canopy was cloth because black cloth deteriorates rather fast. He preferred metal. Mr. Scroggins stated that he agreed and they would also prefer a metal canopy.

Board Member Rogers stated that he was concerned that the parapet is not really a parapet and is free standing and floats off the building. He thinks from an architectural standpoint that the building is the building; the metal canopy does help soften the building on the left side; the project needs as much landscaping as possible with appropriate site lighting; and the design of the site worries him because it opens the opportunity to start putting large structures on buildings and calling it a parapet. He would prefer for the sign to be tied in over the canopy with a free standing look to the letters. He recommended that the applicant resubmit the sign portion since this cannot be called a parapet. Board Member Rogers later stated that he would prefer that the sign on the roof be moved to the main metal building roof which would make it look like a parapet. Mr. Scroggins asked what if it was moved over one bay to the left. Board Member Rogers stated if they did that the right end of the sign would align more with the right end of the main part of the metal building and that would fix it. Mr. Scroggins stated that he agreed because the canopy actually has a little hip to it. He asked if the Sign Ordinance would allow for some type of identification such as "office" at the entry door. Mr. Hanson stated that if you put signage on the inside of the glass it is not regulated. Mr. Hanson suggested that signage on this project be considered as a commercial center where group signage would be allowed. Chair Wilund asked if there was a sign at the street front. Mr. Burnett stated there was a monument sign on the plan. Board Member Rogers clarified that he was not against branding on the building he was just concerned about it being called a parapet. He understood from the drawing why it was on the right side to show customers where to enter, but if it were moved more to the left it would be more like a parapet. Chair Wilund stated that the sign in the drawing drops off to the far right. He added that the whole canopy in the front needs to be redesigned. Mr. Scroggins stated that because of the elevation on site you cannot see the gap at the sign and they didn't want to bring it all the way down because it would leak and there was no way to gutter it. He added that they wanted to impact the roof as little as possible so it is impacted at the column lines. Board Member Oswald asked if there were two signs on the monument sign on Columbia Avenue and if the eight light poles would be left on Columbia Avenue as indicated on the plan. Mr. Burnett responded yes, one sign on the monument was for Caliber Collision and the second sign would be used in the future by whoever occupied the out parcel. He stated that as discussed today it appeared they would have to replace the eight light poles to meet the ordinance requirements. Mr. Hanson stated that he was not concerned with the signs as submitted if they met the square footage requirements, he was more concerned about setting a precedence with a sign above the roof. Chair Wilund stated that the sign appeared to be rather large.

Board Member Rogers wished to clarify the points mentioned before a motion was made regarding the item. He stated the points include: site lighting and how it looks; an 8 foot buffer is needed at the rear of the property; landscape needs to be improved; signage needs to meet standards; and a metal canopy instead of cloth.

**Board of Appearance Minutes  
July 10, 2018**

There being no further questions or discussion, a motion was made by Chair Wilund and seconded by Board Member Rogers to send the item back to Staff for review of the following five items:

1. The style of lighting to be revised to meet design requirements at the new site.
2. Landscape additions as discussed including at the islands that currently do not show landscaping; enlarging the landscape area at the parking area where handicap parking is located; and extend a landscape buffer from where it currently ends at the wrap around parking at the connector drive at Caughman Road.
3. Change the cloth canopy to metal roof canopies.
4. Change parapet and shift it over one bay and make it meet the sign design requirements.
5. Provide an 8 foot high fence at the rear of the property.

As part of the motion, upon approval of these items by Staff, the Board would approve the proposal from Caliber Collision with the revisions. The motion was unanimously carried by all those present.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was made by Board Member Britts and seconded by Board Member Rogers to approve the Minutes as submitted from the April 24, 2018 Board of Appearance meeting. The motion was unanimously carried by all those present.

**OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Hanson stated that he had received a Façade Grant request yesterday and he needed to set a time in the next week or two for the Board to review the request. Chair Wilund asked Mr. Hanson to email the Board with several date and time options.

**ADJOURNMENT:** A motion was made by Chair Wilund and seconded by Board Member Rogers to adjourn the meeting. The motion was unanimously carried by all those present. The meeting adjourned at 10:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Becky P. Hildebrand, CMC  
Municipal Clerk

**APPROVED:**

Larry Wilund  
Chair

*FOIA COMPLIANCE – Public notification of this meeting was published, posted and mailed in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Town of Lexington requirements.*