

Meeting Minutes of the Design Review Board (DRB)
Meeting
“Tuesday”, March 6, 2018

The Design Review Board (DRB) met in the City Hall Council Chambers on Tuesday, March 6, 2018 at 5:30 P.M., with the following members in attendance: Ricky Richardson, Mike Henthorn, Tip Pitts, Gabriela Giron, and Kevin DeMark. Representing the Planning Department were Natalia Rosario, Planner III, and Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant. City Manager Ed Memmott, also attended the meeting.

Roll Call

Mr. Richardson, the Chair, called the meeting to order and stated that notice of this meeting was posted and provided to the media 24 hours in advance as required by the Freedom of Information Act.

Mr. Richardson said all five Board Members were present, constituting a quorum; and he went over the procedure for the meeting.

Mr. Pitts moved approval of the Agenda for the March 6, 2018 meeting; and he was seconded by Mr. DeMark. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 5 o 0.

Disposition of the Minutes from the January 2, 2018 Meeting.

The minutes from the January 2, 2018 Meeting were approved by acclamation.

Old Business – None.

New Business:

Public Hearing regarding proposed new construction of multi-unit housing, mix-use development at the parcels: TMS#7-12-05-345.01; 7-12-05-288.00; 7-12-05-290.00; 7-12-05-291.00; 7-12-05-292.00; 7-12-05-293.00; 7-12-08-294.00; 7-12-05-295.00; and 7-12-05-296.00 for the properties located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Howard Street and College Street in the DT-5 District, from Brian Keith, JHP Architecture, on behalf of the Northside Development Group, Developer.

Ms. Rosario, Planner III, came forward and was sworn; and she entered the Meeting Packets the Board Members had previously received by email; tonight’s presentation and slides; as well as the JHP response to Craig Lewis’s email they had received at tonight’s meeting into Evidence as Exhibit A. She said the City was asking for preliminary conceptual approval of the site’s orientation and massing; and that additional details were up for review; and that the Design Team was present to give their presentation to the Board Members.

Mrs. Hawkins, Project Manager, Northside Development Group came forward and thanked the Board Members for the opportunity to present the project for conceptual approval. She said they were seeking financing for new market tax credits for this project, many of which would be decided upon during the next thirty days. She said they had been working with several investors and opportunities to access those funds. Ms. Hawkins said this was an \$11,500,000.00 project.

Mr. Brian Keith, Architect, JHP Architecture came forward and was sworn. He said this was the second phase of the Northside Development Project; and Cullen Pitts and Sara Robinson with McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture were present to talk about their role regarding the VCOM portion of the project, as well as Hilda Ben-Avraham, AIA, Project Architect/Designer from JHP that worked with himself on the project. Mr. Keith referenced a map and said this phase of the project would be on the northeast side of College and Howard Street; and there were the same type of topographical concerns as before. He said there were between fifteen to eighteen feet of topo change on the site. He showed slides of some of the sites along College and Raindrop Street. He mentioned a couple of significant trees along College Street, and they would be working with McMillan Pazdan Smith regarding saving those trees. He said there would be a lot of cut and fill and retaining walls; and that the other project met fill; and that with this project they had cut. He referenced a slide going from College to Raindrop. He referenced the site plan; and said the first phase was only housing. The proposed Second phase would be Building 1 which would be VCOM offices that would front College Street, Building 2-A would be the Wofford Dorm which would consist of sixteen dorm rooms with four suites of four units each and would be two stories. He

said as you came around the corner of that building there would be Access Health and the NDG offices on the ground floor of the building with a community function classroom that would get programmed in more detail. He said the crucial thing was to provide street access along Howard Street and access the parking behind it. He explained they also had a Building 3 which would be a future phase of the project. All the buildings had to be put on this site and they had referred back to the Master Plan where they always tried to emphasize this corner which they felt was a gateway. The NDG and the Community Room would have parking access, street access and open access to the corner plaza, as well as a common lobby; which he said was for some functional reasons in that they had limited resources. They wanted to have an elevator available for both the housing units (which he had failed to mention earlier that would be on two levels on top of the Access Health Building); which there would be a three story building and a two story building. They positioned the two story building as it went up the hill so that its first level would level out with the second level above the Access Health; and they were calling this building 2-A which was a warehouse building and dorm which had different forms. He showed a slide of the massing, and explained they looked at about a dozen different options of where things would go on the site and tried to deal with the topo, how parking would work, how uses worked in order to maintain building access and they had settled on what they felt would be the best balance of function, economics and some symbolic reasons of why buildings faced certain ways. He referenced the Master Plan again, and showed the blow-up of the building illustrating the exceptions, in that they met the setbacks along Howard Street, and they did not meet it with the Wofford Dorm building, which he said was a function of the size, location, and geometry, and the fact that they had a big sweeping intersection there. He explained they would almost touch the 12' setback line up to about 30'; but they would have outdoor terraces that were essentially within the setbacks and maintained the setback which was a common residential thing that was seen all over the neighborhood. The other exception would be that the VCOM building was only a one story building and that was for a lot of functional reasons, which he said Ms. Robinson and Mr. Pitts would talk about in their presentation regarding the VCOM Building.

Ms. Sara Robinson, Architect, McMillan Pazdan Smith came forward and was sworn and informed the Board Members that the VCOM itself would be a one story building and they were seeking a variance for that because of the functions of the space and the type of medical testing and medical care they would deliver within the space. She said they were very concerned about the proximity of tenants above and below them, the sound of transmission and how that might impact the care they were giving inside the space. Also VCOM had a signed Letter of Intent with Northside Development Group to buy the space and that they were committed to making the investment to that corner. They were very interested in the proximity to their existing building and what the character and identity of those two might be. Based on this particular population group they were very concerned about the topographic change from the back side of the building to the front. She explained the grade change between the two was about ten feet so they were very concerned with how they would keep a street front presence and how to keep the presence from the back. She said it would really serve a very large population, so there would be patients who would travel by foot, and car; and that a lot of patients would need accessibility aids. Because of the fall, knowing where the parking would be behind the building, the most accessible route for patients to enter the building would be from the parking lot side, but there would be foot traffic, students, faculty, folks from the neighborhood that would need to enter; and so they organized the building to connect both sides of the building. So that helped them to organize a preliminary scheme to where they would have the clinic to one side and staff support functions to the other. That began to tell the story of how they would address the street front in order to try to meet as many of the requirements of the code as possible. She said Mr. Keith had mentioned that on the corner of the building there were those two large existing trees and they were not sure of the health of those trees and they had the building stepped back right now to accommodate those. The other thing to be concerned about was the amount of windows on the front. She referenced a slide of proposed elevation on the street side and said one of the components of the Downtown Code was there was a limit of how far above the grade you could be before you started your windows; and those were things they could definitely work on; but to keep in mind they had patient exam rooms that would be the bulk of the spaces in the building. They had to be concerned with how far you could see into the building, and had to be concerned with patient privacy. She referenced what would serve as the main entrance to highlight the building and to give it some height, and also they had the advantage of being up on a hill, and felt that helped to give the building a taller presence since it was next

to two, two-story buildings. She said using the gabled roof piece would allow them to accommodate mechanical units, and components inside the building without adding additional mechanical units to the site. Also it would add additional height to the building itself. Another thing to keep in mind that she pointed out on another side of the site was the AT&T sub-station (with heavy fiber; and they knew that was probably something that would never change, so there would not likely ever be a need to ever build a tall building on that side of the structure so they felt this building would be a good compromise. She mentioned one of Mr. Lewis' comments was to bring the building down to grade, and their concern in doing so was that on the back of the site it would sink so much of the building or it would be extremely costly to excavate that much grade to make the building accessible at street level from both sides. She showed alternate views of the space; and said they would like to keep the earlier mentioned trees if they were healthy and able to stay. She explained they studied different options for how they could bring taller structures to the face of the building to help minimize some of the gables and give it more of a street front presence.

Mr. Keith came forward again and introduced Hila Ben-Avraham, AIA, who worked with him on the project Board Members, to give her presentation regarding the design concept.

Ms. Hila Ben-Avraham, AIA, Project Architect/Designer, JHP Architecture, Dallas, Texas came forward and was sworn. She Informed the Board Members when they were researching the area and trying to get a concept for the site; they looked into the textile mill heritage of the area and had gotten inspired with that aspect. She said when you looked at the proposed buildings you saw three main pieces: First Building was the proposed use building; and they were trying to use the flat roof and red brick, but they wanted to be a little bit playful within the requirements but still keep the textile mill language. They proposed the brick articulation on the two floors, and after hearing some comments, had brought the building all the way to the street on the first building to create a street connection. Regarding the second building (dorms) they had looked at Wofford College and their student housing, as well as the college itself. She said the language of the gabled roof also inspired them. She explained the third building in the middle was really the connector; and that it was where the lobby, stairs and elevator would be, which was the entrance point connecting to the dorms and the plaza which they felt would be a very active area. She said they wanted to do something light and airy with transparency of materials and hopefully you could see people through that material walking from the dorms going down and connecting into the plaza area. There was potential for the dorm's community room to also open into the plaza, but right now there were some concerns with security; so they were not providing any direct access, but they were planning for future openings if possible. She said the NDG Offices would also open in to the plaza main lobby as well. When they were looking into the dorms, one of the reasons they put them a little bit up from the street level was because when you lived in your sleeping unit in the bedroom, you did not want to be right on the street; that you needed to have a little bit of privacy. They tried to bring the building as close as they could to the street, and raised it a little bit up so they could have some sense of security and privacy, but still give the school an edge in connection to the street with some landscaping elements that they could activate and have some seating and assembly elements in place.

Mr. Keith pointed out that this building would only be two stores; and they had relocated the student lounge to the basement. He showed a slide of where the lounge would be for right now dealing with some Wofford security concerns they were still trying to address; and that in the future they had made allowances for the building to be changeable when they had addressed the security issues. He said this was a residential dorm that was really meant to be similar to the residential neighborhood and was meant to be on College Street.

Ms. Ben-Avraham showed a slide of the back of the building and said it opened into a small entry plaza to try to make sure it was very accessible and connected to the street and parking. She explained the parking was split into two sets of smaller retaining walls to kind of accommodate a natural topography.

Mr. Keith explained further about the parking issues regarding the topography issues and challenges at the upper and lower VCOM area, and Wofford Dorm area. He said technically by the Code they were supposed to have access between all the parking courts; but at the moment they did not have access between the VCOM building and the Wofford building and that it was site constrained due to topography issues. He said what they had currently proposed worked functionally, economically and aesthetically.

Ms. Ben-Avraham referenced and explained more slides in order to better illustrate the request.

Mr. Keith referenced a slide of the materials and explained they tried to be very simple; and the warehouse building evoked a simple shape and it was not a very long building. There was one brick that would be used in ways when it was turned in and out to create a weaving texture.

Ms. Ben-Avraham said she forgot to mention regarding the connector piece regarding the same concept of weaving would be used and how it could be used with the semi-translucent panels to kind of create the textile feel of materials and they wanted to use it on both buildings as well as the connector piece. She said the textile mills was a very simple brick, but they wanted to bring some warmth into that and have windows and different orientations and have some wood elements as well to give it a warm and residential feeling, with a little bit more commercial feeling on the bottom.

Mr. Keith said regarding the connector piece they were trying to be cost efficient; so they wanted to have the smallest enclosed space as possible, which would have an open stair and would be open air, but not secure. It would be a matter of different translucencies and different amounts of openness. They would have an enclosed elevator and passageway; so there would be security so the Wofford students could be able to access it as well as their dorm side thru a security electronic box; and vice versa, the mixed-income housing would be able to access it as well as only their units, and they would share a common elevator and common stair. The idea that they wanted to make a special element which invoked the weaving of texture and the play of light to create a space that was very special; and as had been said earlier since everyone would be using the lobby area, it would make the plaza very activated.

Board Questions:

- Mr. Richardson, the Chair, asked Mr. Keith about the Wofford Dormitory; and said he did not understand why it was going to be on College Street and away from the Wofford Campus.
- Mr. Keith explained to the Board Members that Wofford had wanted to be in the partnership with the Northside Development Group; and that they wanted to put a student dorm into the neighborhood. He said although it would be a small building it would be a very complexed building when you had Wofford students, mixed-income housing, a clinic, and then the VCOM and with all of that happening in such a pretty small site; and that Mrs. Hawkins may be able to better answer his question.
- Mrs. Hawkins came forward again and said Tim Smith was present from Wofford College; but they were creating a program called a Living/Learning Communities, as part of a choice of curriculum for Wofford students; and part of that was around environmental economics and social sustainability, and so those students that selected that curriculum would actually live in the facility and do community engagement. They would be able to go over to the creek and learn about how that was un-piped, and about fresh food, the farmers market, etc.
- Mr. Richardson said he would start with the McMillan Pazdan Smith building, and said in short order by Code, they had a commercial space that transitioned into a residential and such; and was it topography that really kept the building from going up on the street.
- Mr. Pitts asked was it within the twelve foot setback.
- Ms. Sara Robinson, Architect with McMillan Pazdan Smith came forward and said it was within the setback, and they had the portion of the stair that allowed access to the building which they had made a space allotment for that which was because they kept the finish floor elevation even with the parking lot so the people with mobility issues could come straight into the building on an even surface. The other portion of stepping it back was to try to accommodate the trees because they were kind of given the direction that might be important if they were healthy trees.
- Mr. Pitts asked was the entry portal in the twelve foot setback, but anything else would be outside of it.
- Mr. Keith said the rest of the building was within the twelve foot setback there for the entry north; and the other end was stepped back because they were trying to accommodate for the trees which they felt was worth it.
- Mr. Richardson asked if they had it on one floor because it was more efficient.

- Ms. Robinson said it was more efficient and also because of the nature of the care that they delivered. She said sound and distractions from tenants above and/or below could interfere with when they were listening to heartbeats or doing sensitive tests; and that it got in the way of the delivery of care. Another reason was because VCOM had a very specific program at the 10,000 square foot range and that was most efficient for the care team, and that most of that was clinic and you would really need to keep all of the clinic on one floor. She said the other thing they had looked at, if they did try to do some type of second story, based on the topography they would have to fill the site with grade up to about eight feet that would be very cost prohibitive. VCOM intended to purchase the building, and it would be more challenging for them if it was two stories.
- Mr. Henthorn said the whole intent of the Code was to activate the street; etc.; and the problem was none of the functions they were proposing seemed to want to have street frontages; which made the Code unworkable.
- Mr. Keith said they did have ground floor entrances.
- Mr. Henthorn said he was talking about activated shop fronts; and that just a couple of entrances did not activate the street; and if they read the Code, it was very specific that 50% to 70% of the ground floor needed to be shop front.
- Mr. Keith said he thought this was in a transitional area.
- Mr. Henthorn said it was still in the downtown core area in DT-5, which required that and he felt they would be precedent setting to allow suburban type development in what they were trying to make an urban environment.
- Mrs. Hawkins said she understood what he was saying; they did not have a retail tenant yet. She explained they had a commitment of LOI's from Access Health, a service provider that was very much needed in this community; they had their office space, etc. She explained they did envision a storefront eventually and that was one of the reasons they designed it the way they did.
- Mr. Henthorn asked about the intent for the long building, 2B.
- Mr. Keith said on the left side was the Access Health Clinic with two entrances and storefront, and then they had the NDG Office with entrance and storefront; and then on the plaza side would be the community room, and community facilities at NDG. He felt like they were activating shop fronts. He said what they were not activating on the College Street side were the dorms because it stepped back due to topography reasons, and then they had residential.
- Mr. Henthorn asked if those things did not want to be on the street, why they were sitting on the street. He said if they thought of this as a mixed-use building they could put all three in one building and make it work vertically.
- Mr. Keith said they had limited financial means; and could not go four or five stores.
- Mr. Henthorn said they might could go two or three and stretch it out in order to put what they needed on the ground floor, and then put the other portions up. He said according to the Code; they needed activated street fronts; and they did not need residential on the street. They needed retail or retail frontage on the streets
- Mr. Keith said the only place they were proposing residential on the street was on the Wofford Dorm side. The other residential would be placed above the ground floor.
- Mrs. Hawkins said there were twenty units above regarding residential; and for this particular catalyst project there were several needs they were addressing from the community – knowing there was no retail at the moment. They hoped the next phase next door would create some retail opportunities. She said VCOM needed to build a clinic for their programming, and the Dean was present to address those issues. She said through their partnership with VCOM they had committed to purchase the building and had committed to work with them for the New Market Tax Credits timeline to get the building that they needed; and at the same time creating a catalyst opportunity for the neighborhood.

In addition the Wofford Sustainability Initiative as well, as part of their grant and proposal was to be a part of the Northside and with them to create more housing above. Mrs. Hawkins said Access Health knowing their client base came from that area was a huge opportunity for them in bringing these services to the community. There were some services they were trying to deliver to the neighborhood, while also creating a catalytic project for redevelopment on that corner.

- Mr. Henthorn said he guessed that was what he was saying, that a lot of those functions did not need to be on the street front.
- Mr. Keith felt this was the only piece of the project where they would run into this issue. He said given this was part of the catalyst project they had limited resources and they were trying to get the most bang for the buck. He said there was a symbolic presence of being on College Street, invoking a residential feel, having the terraces which were going to get more eyes on the street and it be a secure environment.
- Mr. DeMark asked about the shrubs and wall.
- Mr. Keith explained it was a small retaining wall and fence, and then the residential started at the second floor.
- Mr. DeMark asked could the lounge not wrap to the front and have a store front, which was one of the things he thought Mr. Henthorn was saying. He said if it had some ability to look like a store front on that front face that would help a lot, whereas right now it was just a wall.
- Mr. Keith explained the lounge only went down so far, and then they also had to slope it up some. He said they may be able to wrap it around a little bit more.
- Mr. DeMark said he was out there today, and fifteen feet was a lot of dirt to cut out.
- Mr. Keith said they had heard over and over again that the building should be on grade at Howard Street; and if you were on grade that you had a floor level down; and then the site sloped back up; so what did you do. You would have half the building tucked in and then how were they going to get where the clinic and everyone would be parking; and asked how do you get back there in an efficient means, and when they had thought about the whole development, that right across the street they needed a lot of fill; and they had a lot of cut. The same Civil and GC were doing both, and they had already been in discussion of how that would be an efficient use of that cut and fill.
- Mr. Keith said Mr. DeMark was correct and it was a lot of cut, but it drove a lot of decisions about how VCOM building was placed, and how their building was placed. He said they had studies where they had the Wofford Dorms back on Raindrop, and had created a lot of problems for their selves in terms of grading; and it made more sense for them to step up the hill. He referenced the topo model again and explained that they had already cut in some to the retaining wall; and he said they may even be able to cut in a little more; but there was absolutely no way they could do this project without retaining walls and that they only had a limited budget; and yes there was a couple of exceptions they needed which was why they were here before the Board.
- Mr. Pitts asked where the detention would be located.
- Mr. Keith said their Civil Engineer was not present tonight; but he thought it would probably be in the parking lot, underground.
- Mr. Pitts said he had heard a lot about the grade and retaining walls, and just like Phase I had been, it was very vague. He would like to see more about the site, grading – drainage areas, streetscape elements.
- Mr. Pitts asked Mr. Keith to show the slide of their Master Plan again and zoom to the corner. He asked about something in red on the plan and what that was.
- Mr. Keith said it was the previous Master Plan, and the red was meant to be where they were previously going to activate the corner at the VCOM Medical School; but it ended up being more building than what they needed at this point.

- Mr. Henthorn asked if it was more building than they needed, why couldn't they pull the building in some and leave space on the ends for future development.
- Mr. Keith explained.

After a lot more questions between the Board Members; and more input from the Design Team; Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of the request to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in opposition to the request; or that may have question to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing portion.

Board Deliberation:

After the Board Deliberation; Mr. Richardson asked if there was a motion to give preliminary approval of the conceptual design that was before them. There was no motion. It was the consensus of the Board Members that the corner of the building being recessed into the site did not hold the corner well; and they asked the applicant to return with something that met the setback and addressed the corner, and for the buildings to have some kind of continuity as their materials and designs made them appear to be separate buildings and not one cohesive site. It was also the consensus of the Board that the Wofford residential portion should have a stronger relationship to the street (storefront).

TK Gregg – Informational Item

Ms. Rosario, Planner III, came forward and said this was purely an informational item with no vote required tonight. She informed the Board Members the City had the architect present and talk about the preliminary drawings and he would like the Board's feedback.

Mr. William Gray, Architect with McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture came forward and referenced a slide of the aerial to orient the Board Members to the site. He explained their intent was to engage the street and pedestrians on some level regarding Howard Street and maintain the frontage that had been set across their site. He explained to the Board Members where they intended for their building to be and he referenced a boundary survey that showed the footprint. Mr. Gray said their intent would be to engage the street and engage the pedestrians on some level, and also maintain the frontage that had previously been set forth. He said there was a jog in the façade that kind of bumped out beyond that. He said that Aden Street would be abandoned when they did the development, and it would no longer cut through the site. He referenced an area on a slide and said they intended to place a parking lot in that area but it had yet to be surveyed. He thought the acquisition was underway and the demolition would take place at the PCA building, and then they would parcel the site and then put in the parking. He referenced a slide coming down from Butterfly Creek area and said the grade did slope down to a low point that he showed; and he explained they could not put parking in that area. They would need to put it closer to Howard Street, and their building was kind of up against Howard Street. Mr. Gray said their intent would be to preserve a green space up against Howard Street to have future development for the creation of an urban edge. They would not put parking up against Howard Street.

Mr. Adam Flynn, Architect with McMillan Pazdan Smith came forward and said he would talk about the Building Design and Architecture since they were still fairly early in conceptual design and hope to get the Board's feedback. He said as Mr. Gray had pointed out, this was the entirety of the Oakview Apartment site, and that Aden Street in this case had been rotated in Plan North Brawley Street had technically been abandoned, and that section would be completely removed and demolished as well as Aden Street being closed. They were looking to push TK Gregg all the way up against Howard Street. The building was a stand-alone civic amenity that was greatly desired for this site and community. Mr. Flynn said parking would be Plan North and they would be leaving an area to create an urban edge in front of that parking component as part of the development and hopefully the next time they were in front of the Board, they would have something to show conceptually of that. He said the building was intended to be used as a community center, and it would have a gymnasium, natatorium with an indoor lap pool and recreational pool, as well as common space lounge; and then on the second level there would be some fitness components and other multi-purpose uses. They really wanted to address Howard Street as the primary façade of the building where the main entrance would be; but knowing they were also on the corner of Howard and Preston they wanted to make sure that their design addressed the corners in some

shape, form or fashion. They had two bump-outs from the main façade of the building, one was the corner element which was in the natatorium and would contain a feature element viewable from the outside (a water slide component) and then the main entry which they would show later in elevation and rendering as a two story prominent location to entry that should be highly visible. He showed the two elevations that would front the street once the project was completed and they were not showing Aden Street because it would be removed. The primary entry for TK Gregg he referenced on a slide was a two-story component that was distinguished by material, color and by the formation of the roof. For utilizing a sloped roof there and in the corner box to highlight those components and then utilizing a high quality metal panel and some color differentiated again, to highlight that and create a front other than that on the rest of façade they were looking at setting up rhythms in areas where they had large expanses of wall, using glass and pilaster and masonry to break up long expanses. He said the façade where the natatorium stated was roughly one hundred feet, so they wanted to break that up with windows, giving views into the building and then infusing variations in color and material as well as some plainer bump outs. He said they were carrying that language around the corner component down Preston Street. Mr. Flynn showed a 3-D slide to give an overall view of the building, using a dynamic sloped roof, some color contrast, as well as a large two story opening to frame the main entry. He said they were wanting this not to compete with the box although some of the language was similar. A slide from the corner of Howard and Preston Street was shown, again; he said with that corner box they were looking to use a slight variation in the language but keeping a rhythmic pattern of masonry and window, as well as peeling back the masonry in the corner with a glass box that would prominently display that water slide element inside as well as give a view into that area. Mr. Flynn said also using that sloped roof component as a callback to the main entry to highlight the importance of the corner. He showed a couple of more views, specifically looking at the main entry knowing that they had a relatively large height object, they wanted to use some structural canopy components to break and introduce a human scale to the entry of the building. He informed the Board Members one of the things that was being considered was a plaza in front of the building to give it a little bit more of a stately approach to that component and also taking back the stair and glass to create a covered entry as you would come from either direction considering a large number of the occupants of the space would be coming up that ramp and into that and to also highlight a stair composition behind the glass in that area. Mr. Flynn said he would appreciate the Board's feedback.

Mr. William Gray came forward again and said he would just like to mention they were very intentional about trying to use some high quality materials and that entry was an expensive part of the project. He said they had gone through City Management to understand what they had designed and the materials they selected were on budget, which was extremely tight, but they were doing all they could to be great stewards of the City's resources.

Board Questions:

- Mr. DeMark asked were they concerned at all about the big blank wall.
- Mr. Flynn said that was actually part of the project looking out, they really would not see.
- Mr. DeMark said the only other concern he had was when they said the parking was at the PCA site, on the other side of Aden which was being closed; he did not think there was any access to the building from that site.
- Mr. Flynn explained they would need to walk across the front into that vestibule.
- Mr. Pitts asked if Aden Street would turn into the parking lot.
- Mr. Flynn said it would turn in to the driveway to the parking lot.
- Mr. Henthorn asked about the setback on Howard Street.
- Mr. Flynn said they were waiting on finalized surveys; but it would stay in line with the John Woodward facility and continue that line moving down the street.
- Mr. Richardson asked if parking behind was not feasible.
- Mr. Flynn explained there were slope concerns and programmatic concerns for the site; and they felt the spirit would still be maintained having parking on the PCA site.

Ed Memmott, City Manager informed the Board Members they did not want a big retaining wall at the beginning of the end of the trail depending on which way you were walking regarding Butterfly Creek; and they would have fire access, handicapped parking, and the bulk of the parking would be where the PCA building was. Mr. Memmott said they were going to have to move forward quickly; they had a General Contractor involved and had been tested and priced and they think they were good on budget. It was a very competitive process regarding getting new tax credits. The tax credits totaled \$6,000,000.00 of a \$60,000,000 project. He explained they needed to know if they were headed down the wrong path, they needed to know it very soon regarding the Board.

All of the Board Members liked the proposed project.

New Applicant Guide

Ms. Rosario came forward again and said that she along with Mr. Story and Mr. Lewis had worked together to produce a new applicant guide so future applicants would know more of what to expect, and what they need to do, and when they need to do it in order to avoid delays regarding the process. She asked the Board Members to please review when they had the chance to look over it.

Board Questions/Comments:

- Mr. DeMark said what would be super helpful for him, he knew they received a memo from Mr. Lewis, etc., but it would be that he would like to know what Staff thinks about these projects before it gets to them.
- Ms. Rosario said she would check in to that.
- Mr. Richardson asked why they had stopped the Pre-Agenda Meetings.
- Ms. Rosario said technically whenever they met and it was not a public hearing it was illegal.
- Mr. Richardson said they use to announce a pre-agenda meeting and anyone could come and they use to do it all the time.
- Ms. Rosario said she would need to check with Mr. Story on that.
- Mr. Henthorn said it needed to be announced in the public hearing.
- Mr. Richardson said they use to do it on the Planning Commission as well.
- Mr. Richardson asked Ms. Roland why they quit doing that.
- Ms. Rosario said they were told to quit doing it.
- Ms. Rosario explained to Mr. Demark that on this particular packet Staff did not receive this packet until a day or so before the meeting.
- Mr. Henthorn said he did not feel like they allowed enough time for this process. He did not feel all of this should happen in one meeting. He felt that after Craig Lewis review something they needed to go back and adjust their design before they came to the DRB. He thought they should then come to the Board with the changes or a reason why they could not do it.

It was the consensus of the Board they should receive all of their pertinent materials earlier than they were currently receiving them if at all possible.

Mr. Richardson said he would like to thank everyone for a great meeting tonight.

Staff Announcements: There were no Staff announcements.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 7:30 P.M.



Ricky Richardson, Chair

Edited by Julie Roland, Secretary