

Mayor
Rutledge Leland III

Town Council
Malcolm Baldwin
Christopher Bates
Robert Gannon
James Scott



Town Administrator
Michelle McClellan

Zoning Administrator
Kathryn Basha

Phone: (843) 887-3712
Fax: (843) 887-3094

Staff Report

To: McClellanville Architecture Review Board

From: Eddie Bernard, RLA, Planner

Date: June 16, 2026

Re: 1043 Leland Creek Rd (TMS 764-00-00-530) Approval of proposal for 3 additional storage buildings, expanded gravel lot, and expansion of perimeter fencing

The applicant is seeking approval of an expansion to the existing Village Storage site fronting Leland Creek Road. The property is zoned PD within the Carolina Seafood PD. The PD ordinance states that all development will be consistent with regulations for the Highway Commercial District.

The location has one existing storage building (6,232 sf) with 3 walls of vertical metal siding with the front being open air. Unlike the current building, the three proposed buildings will be fully enclosed structures with garage and entry doors to each bay. Each of the proposed buildings will have different dimensions being: (Building 4) 50' x 280', (Building 5) 40' x 180' and (Building 6) 50' x 100'. The total amount of new storage space proposed is 26,200 sf.

The gravel area "expansion" appears to have already been implemented on site, but the plans call for alteration of the existing perimeter chain-link fencing to include this new area while tying into the 3 proposed storage buildings.

The proposed site development is subject to the design guidelines for the Highway Commercial District contained in Sections 5.4.7 through 5.1.13, specifically, but not limited, to the following that foster compliance with the above objectives:

Section 5.4.9 states "All structures or buildings shall be specifically designed for their particular site and with consideration of the character of the HCD. Individuality in the design of each building shall be encouraged, however, unity or compatibility between buildings should be achieved by proportional relationships, material composition, setbacks, heights, parking arrangements and other site planning elements. Relationships between color, texture and materials between existing and proposed structures should be considered and established."

(c) Proportion of Facades. The relationship between the width and the height of building facades shall be varied. Changes in the planes of walls, direction or variety of roof forms will create diversity and visual interest. Long, monotonous façade designs, including those characterized by

unrelieved repetition of shape or by unbroken extension of line, shall not be permitted. Structures greater than sixty (60) feet in length shall exhibit a prominent shift in the façade so that no greater than 75% of the building façade appears unbroken.

Staff Assessment: *Heights of various proposed and existing buildings have not been provided to know if the proposed buildings are of similar height to those existing or varied as discussed in (c) above.*

The architecture plans are not clear as to whether the metal siding is oriented vertically or horizontally. The rear wall and side opening details on sheet 2 of 4 indicate that vertical siding is standard and that horizontal lap siding is optional. The example photos of a built version of these structures (image #3 and the second image #3) both show vertical siding but the application does not clarify which option is proposed by the applicant.

All three of the proposed buildings have façade lengths greater than 60' which are straight, unbroken planes and do not meet the intent of (c) above to have changes in the façade planes. No architectural elevation drawings have been provided to illustrate how the combined design and layout of these structures will look.

To break the monotony of the facades and roof lines, the buildings can either be reduced in size to less than 60' in length, have varying unit depths per building such that there is not a flat façade and also pop up the roof above the others for the deeper units, or providing some kind of architectural element to the front of the façades giving the flat façade some relief, or some other architectural treatment that meets this ordinance section. Adding a porch-like element to the entry doors with a shed roof or building up portions of the garage doors such that they project from the building façades are other possible options. A proposal will need to be provided for the board's review.

(e) Proportion of Openings. The relationship of width to height of windows and doors shall be proportionate. The proportion of windows should complement the proportions of the building. Window shapes other than rectangles shall be used sparingly as accents to avoid creating busy facades. Window and doorframes shall have a visual mass that is typical of architecture in the town. Doors shall be located in a manner that complement the design of the building as well as serving their intended function.

Staff Assessment: *There is no architectural elevation provided which shows how the last 40'+/- of the western end of building #4 will incorporate garage doors facing the south side while the remainder of the building has garage doors facing northward.*

(h) Relationship of Color. Wall colors shall harmonize with the surrounding landscape. A predominate color scheme, preferably one of warm earthy hues, should blend with trim colors.

Staff Assessment: *Existing building #3 has a cream-colored vertical metal siding while existing building #2 has a two-tone horizontal metal siding of dark green and a cream base. Existing building #1 has both horizontal cream colored lap siding in the front and dark green vertical metal siding to the rear. The proposed buildings have dark green walls, cream-colored roofs, and white doors. With the new buildings proposed as dark green, this will leave existing*

storage building 3 as the only structure on site as a single color and the only one predominantly cream in color.

Section 5.4.14 lists information required to provide a complete application for DRB and/or zoning review. Staff review has identified that the following information, at a minimum, is insufficient for complete design review:

Section 5.4.8(k): “lighting fixtures attached to a building...should complement buildings and shall not produce light that illuminates areas off site. Exterior lighting features should be simple in design, of dark colors, with lights of warm effect... The applicant has not provided information regarding building lighting fixtures.

Section 5.4.10, 5.4.11: The application indicates that in addition to the new buildings and fencing that ‘some brush clearing, tree removal and landscaping’ is to occur. There has not been a landscape plan submitted. The specifics of what is to be removed and planted should be clearly identified and/or provided to ensure compliance with Section 5.4.11.3 (Non-residential uses adjacent to other Non-residential uses) along the property line west of the new buildings bordering other properties, as well as property lines to the north and east of building #6. The buffer line, labels and plant requirements need to be identified on the plans and landscape plan addressing these requirements will be needed prior to Planning Commission consideration.

Zoning Considerations:

Per Section 10.3.4(b)(2), upon the Zoning Administrator’s determination that a Site Development Plan application contains all information required by §10.6 of this ordinance (and that the proposed site development will comply with all other provisions of this Ordinance), the application shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission for consideration. Developments such as the subject proposal within the Highway Commercial District can be concurrently considered by the Planning Commission while the HCD Design Review Board considers the design of any proposed structures and the site.

It is Staff’s intention to take this application to the Planning Commission at its next meeting on June 22nd, provided all information required by Sections 5.4.14 and 10.6.3 have been provided. Preliminary review for zoning conformance indicates that the site development plan will need to be revised as follows:

- Property line bearings and distances will need to be added;
- A signature block for the Planning Commission’s approval must be added;
- Dimensions from each of the building corners to the property lines to demonstrate setbacks provided are compliant with the HCD lot and building requirements;
- Dimensions between buildings will need to be shown (minimum distance required between structures per Section 5.4.6.3(e) is 20 feet);
- A detailed buffer and landscape plan as discussed above;
- The chain link fencing, whether existing or proposed, needs to be labeled accordingly, and

- The site plan shows circled numbers (3 and 4) next to buildings #1 and #2 which are not labeled. It is not clear if these indicate anything of relevance.

Additionally, the applicant was given permission by Town Council to remove trees on the adjacent public conservation area to the west of the site. The site plan indicates an intent to replace the trees removed with a berm and planted shrubs. Shrubs should be native species as listed in Appendix I of Article 6 and information thereto must be provided as part of the landscaping plan prior to site development plan approval. Documentation of the Town's approval to allow for this area to serve as the site's required buffer must also be provided as part of this application (Sections 5.4.14(s) and 10.6.3(p)).