

**Meeting Minutes of the Design Review Board (DRB)**  
**Meeting**  
**Tuesday, October 1, 2013**

The Design Review Board (DRB) met in the City Hall Council Chambers on Tuesday, October 1, 2013, at 5:30 P.M., with the following members in attendance: Ricky Richardson, Bill Joslin, Tip Pitts, Mike Henthorn, and Jessica Folk. Representing the Planning Department were Joshua Henderson, Julie Roland, and Natalia Rosario. Assistant City Manager Chris Story, and Craig Lewis with the Lawrence Group also attended the meeting.

[Editor's Note: A Pre-Agenda meeting was held at 5:00 P.M. in the City Manager's Conference Room, where they were briefed on the revised plans regarding the August 6, 2013 new construction case].

***Roll Call***

Mr. Richardson, the Chair, 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 Design Review Board Members were present, constituting a quorum; and he welcomed New Board Member Jessica Folk to the meeting.

The Agenda for the October 1, 2013 meeting was approved by acclamation.

***Disposition of the Minutes from the August 6, 2013 Meeting regarding "partial approval" of minutes pertaining to New Construction Case at 120 W. Broad Street.***

---

[Editor's Note: Mrs. Roland explained to the Board Members she had not had time to transcribe the whole set of minutes from the August 6, 2013 Design Review Board Meeting; and said in lieu of tonight's revised case; she had completed the minutes from the new construction case for 120 W. Broad Street; and was asking if there were no changes, that the Board Members grant approval regarding the above mentioned portion of the minutes].

The portion of the minutes from the August 6, 2013 Design Review Board Meeting regarding the New Construction case at 120 West Broad Street portion were approved by acclamation.

**Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for the 2013-2014 Calendar Year:**

Mr. Pitts made a motion to keep Mr. Richardson as Chair, and Mr. Henthorn as Vice-Chair for the 2013-2014 Calendar Year, and was seconded by Mr. Joslin. There were no other nominations for Chair or Vice-Chair. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**Old Business:**

***Revised Plans regarding the New Construction of proposed mixed-use three story building, wood frame with masonry veneer; and residential apartments shall occupy the upper two floors with shell tenant spaces on the ground level for property that is located at 120 West Broad Street in the DT-6 District. Royce Camp, Owner of Royce Camp Construction, LLC.***

---

Mr. Joshua Henderson, Planning Coordinator came forward and was sworn; and he submitted the meeting packets the Board Members had previously received of the revised plans, which he felt addressed the points that were conditioned at the August 6, 2013 meeting, as well as the slides and presentation into evidence, as Exhibit A. He informed the Board Members this case was for a proposed new construction project from Royce Camp, Developer, of a three-story mixed-use building, to have commercial on the first floor, and residential on the second and third floors; and would be located on the corner of Wall Street and W. Broad Street, directly across from City Hall, in the D-T-6 District. The current address was 120 West Broad Street; however, that would be changed after the proposed building was constructed to a Wall Street address.

Ms. Nancy Hogan of GPN Architectural Firm came forward on behalf of Royce Camp Construction, LLC the developer and was sworn. She showed some slides and explained to the Board Members there were only a few minor changes to the plan that had been made per their request at the last meeting. She said on

the floor plan one of the changes was the stair had now been moved outward; and she explained Mr. Camp had decided to do that in order to pick up a little more room.

#### Board Questions:

- Mr. Joslin referenced another slide in the presentation, and informed Ms. Hogan that another thing he felt changed was at the previous hearing on this matter, on the ground floor there was an area the Board Members had questioned that was not labeled at the time, and were told it was regarding the Fair Housing Act; and now it looked like it was intended for use as a one bedroom apartment. Ms. Hogan said that was correct.
- Mr. Richardson referenced a slide regarding Broad Street and the parking lot of the proposed building and the proposed apartment; and he asked Ms. Hogan to tell the Board Members what point from a design perspective the wall was to be where they had it proposed. Ms. Hogan explained it was basically to create some cover because of the story up above. She further explained if you lived in one of the apartments it would be nice to have a little cover, and that would face the parking lot.

Ms. Hogan continued her presentation and showed a slide of the revised site plan, and said another thing they were suppose to address from the last meeting was regarding the unfinished site plan. She informed the Board Members they had a Civil Engineer draw up the revised site plan. She referenced on the slide in the parking area there was a small tree island with one tree on it; and she then pointed out another tree island that had some mulch and a little tree island on it that was on public property. The Civil Engineer felt they should leave the curb cut where it was regarding deliveries, as well as leave the tree island that was on public property. Ms. Hogan explained the rest of the site was covered up by the building, and there really wasn't any room for more landscaping. She referenced the brick paving that would end at the new sidewalk, and then become part of the existing concrete sidewalk.

Mr. Richardson asked would there be a brick walk-way up the side between the parking lot and the other side? Ms. Hogan explained there would be a curb and then about 5' at the narrowest point.

Ms. Hogan said another point she was suppose to address from the last meeting was the rooftop units and whether or not they would be screened. She referenced a slide and said for all the tenant spaces they would be using "mini-splits" in which there was no duct work involved, which were little exterior units about the size of a suit case, and explained the duct work was actually pvc piping. She said there would be one little outside unit per tenant space (for a total of 14). She explained for now Mr. Camp was going to put one in for each residential unit; and explained the others will go in as the tenant spaces were filled. Ms. Hogan pointed out the two areas where the rooftop units would be arranged, and explained the parapets made a big "C" shape, and then referenced another area where there were no parapets, where the roof drained off through the gutters and downspouts. She explained if you looked at it from the street, the parapets turned and you did not notice where they ended. Ms. Hogan informed the Board Members the height of the building and color had changed since their last meeting. She explained they had also dressed up the back entrance.

#### Board Questions and Comments:

- Mr. Richardson asked Ms. Hogan what they called the architectural design of the staggered wall. Ms. Hogan said it corresponded with the apartments, and by staggering it was easier to lay it all out and made all the walls perpendicular or parallel.
- Mr. Joslin asked about lighting. Ms. Hogan said there would be decorative lighting.
- Mr. Richardson emphasized the need for enough lighting. Ms. Hogan explained there would be adequate lighting, and especially in the main entrance.
- Mr. Pitts felt it would be good to have better pedestrian scale lighting on Wall Street, and that he would prefer it be two-way.
- Mr. Pitts also felt regarding safety issues, he did not know how well the curb cut was going to be.

- Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Pitts was there not a benefit to having a pull-off there with some bollards or something on the far side, protecting the sidewalk from a car. Mr. Pitts said there was a crosswalk at City Hall, and the busy intersection at W. Broad and Church St.
- Mr. Joslin asked was the question whether or not it could function.
- Mr. Pitts said there would be plenty of loading spaces, but he did not know whether it was the City's job or Mr. Camp's job.
- Mr. Joslin felt it was a good question, because he had mentioned earlier it would not be for parking, that it would be for loading and unloading for temporary use. He said there would need to be signage that indicated it as such, similar to Growler Haus.
- Mr. Richardson said if it could function and was safe, he would not have a problem with it.
- Mr. Pitts asked if it could not be all brick.
- Mr. Joslin said that was a good point; and if in the future the corner establishment became some type of café, coffee shop, etc. he would assume the sidewalk would have greater than 12 feet.
- Ms. Hogan referenced another slide and said Mr. Camp was hoping to have an outdoor seating in one area she pointed out, should a restaurant ever be put in that spot.

Ms. Hogan concluded her presentation by saying the other issue brought up at the last meeting was regarding the stone; and that they had eliminated most of the stone on the building. She referenced a slide of the proposed structure and pointed out the few areas where Mr. Camp would like to keep the stone on the proposed structure.

#### More Board Questions and Comments:

- Mr. Henthorn asked Ms. Hogan to explain again about the need for the stone. Ms. Hogan said Mr. Camp had given her a picture which she could not find to bring with her tonight, of an Irish Pub that had a lot of wood and arched glass, and real stone that he really liked; and she felt like he was just trying to do something at street level that he felt really looked good. She did reference some pictures she had printed off the internet that she showed the Board Members that he would like. Ms. Hogan said it would not be the residential pre-fab veneer.
- Mr. Henthorn said that although he liked it; he just felt it was a little inappropriate for Spartanburg.
- Mr. Pitts said there was some cut granite along Daniel Morgan Avenue. Mr. Henthorn said that was o.k., and felt it was more of an urban treatment.
- Ms. Hogan mentioned the Church of the Advent had all kinds of stone shapes on their building.
- Mr. Joslin asked what type of stone Mr. Camp wanted. Ms. Hogan said it would be like a Pennsylvania field-stone, and there would not be very much of it; and it would be grayish in color.
- Mr. Richardson felt the design team had done an over-all, excellent job on the proposed structure, but some of the color combinations he didn't exactly agree with.
- Mr. Henthorn felt the rest of the building was fine and made a lot of sense, with the exception of the stone portion.
- Mr. Richardson asked why not use brick; and was there going to be any brick at all on the building. Ms. Hogan referenced slides of the different sides of the building and explained the rest of the building would be all brick, and would be three different colors, grayish brick, chocolate brick and lighter tan brick. She said they worked pretty hard on making sure the colors would go well; and they had even looked at what was being done Greenville, S.C.
- Mr. Henthorn said his only problem with the building was the stone. He said originally at the last meeting she had stone proposed between the rotunda and the rest of the building; and the comment was according to the Code "commercial building walls must be brick, pre-cast concrete, cut stone, residential applications such as field stone and ledge stone are prohibited"; and he said that did not

necessarily mean cultured stone. He explained it referred to the lay of the brick, irregular mortar joints, pulled stone out of the river and put it on the wall stone. He said what is being referred to was cut-stone, limestone, granite, etc.

- Mr. Joslin said they already had the discussion and the conversation in which they made reference in the minutes regarding the Code; that this type of material was not permitted within the Code; and the Board Members suggested in the spirit of the Code if the developer wanted to use a cut-stone as space to building, they would have no issue with that. He felt they were still having the same conversation of what it could be, what it might be; and he felt with what is being presented the Board did not have enough information. He informed Ms. Hogan the Board needs to have some method of documentation.
- Mr. Joslin said the Board's decision would set a precedent for future projects; and there was a reason why things were the way they were in the Code. Mr. Joslin felt from what he was hearing the developer would like to use that type of material on the hunch that they might get an Irish pub on that particular corner; and he asked Ms. Hogan if there was already a merchant lined up for that space. It was not the Board's desire to have that type material on the building.
- Ms. Hogan explained it would be a real stone veneer; and if the Board Members would feel more comfortable with a more rectilinear stone, they could probably come up with a picture they could follow. She referenced a slide and explained there really wasn't very much stone at all proposed on Wall Street or the alley. Ms. Hogan pointed out that the amount of stone facing Wall Street was now only two 2' wide by 12' high vertical panels on either side of one of the entrances.
- Mr. Joslin said he wanted to talk about the elevation regarding the alley, and knew it was not this Board's purpose to determine that; and he asked about the adjacent building across from the alley regarding was that glazing permitted. Ms. Hogan said it was, and she explained it could be as much as 25% of the whole story, and they were at about 24%.
- Mr. Joslin asked if that had gone through review analysis. She explained it had gone through review in their office only.
- Mr. Joslin asked Ms. Hogan if for whatever reason that glazing was not permissible under the building Code, and the City would not grant approval, how she would treat that façade. Ms. Hogan felt pretty certain they could have the proposed glazing.
- Ms. Hogan said again, there was not a whole lot of stone proposed. She explained Mr. Camp really liked the stone; and they were hoping since there was not that much of it, the Board would agree to it.
- Mr. Joslin explained again that it was not permitted per the Code; and they don't know what it is and they have seen samples of the bricks; and he felt it made it very difficult to approve irrespective of the developer's wish for the material.
- Mr. Richardson said there was stone they could approve.
- Mr. Joslin said that was correct.
- Ms. Hogan asked if the Board was saying she needed more documentation.
- Mr. Joslin said he was hearing descriptions of what it could be; and if they conclude this hearing with an approval based on what it could be, and then during construction it turned out to be some type of other stone, that the Board would have erred. He stated again that decisions made by this Board based on the Code for these projects set precedents for future projects, and that was why this item was an issue.
- Mr. Henthorn said the note on the revised drawing said gray field stone.
- Mr. Joslin said field stone was prohibited.
- Ms. Hogan asked if the pictures she had brought to show the Board Members tonight seemed too rough.

- Mr. Richardson felt the stone was a finishing issue; and the Board needed more information regarding exactly what that was going to be. He asked Assistant City Manager Story if the Board could still approve some things regarding the project contingent upon clarification on certain points.
- Assistant City Manager Story said they could.
- Mr. Richardson said they have the stone as an issue; and he felt the Board Members had made themselves quite clear on what they would like to see. He also explained to Ms. Hogan that her personal opinion could help influence Mr. Camp into a solution they could all be comfortable with.
- Assistant City Manager Story said if time was an issue with the developer, the Board could act in a way that they could go forward without approving the stone at this particular point.
- Mr. Pitts explained he would not have a problem with real cut stone.
- Mr. Joslin explained they would love to see a traditional cut stone as a base to the building.
- Ms. Hogan said she wanted to make sure again about the field stone.
- Mr. Richardson said the Code does not allow for field stone or ledge stone.
- Ms. Hogan asked exactly what was meant by cut stone.
- Mr. Joslin explained that it was dimensionally cut stone.
- Ms. Hogan said Mr. Camp was probably not going to want to use that.
- Mr. Richardson explained that was where Ms. Hogan came in; and that the Board Members were trying to be accommodating.
- Mr. Henthorn explained it could also be done in a pre-cast, and made to look like real stone.
- Ms. Hogan said she thought they had talked about everything the Board Members had asked her to address from the August meeting.
- Mr. Joslin said he would like to go back to the beginning discussion from tonight regarding the site plan, stairway, entry to the stairway, and the adjacent apartment in terms of the future. He did not feel like he understood it in terms of property line and what could possibly be there in the future. He felt it would be a potential safety issue because of the proposed design.
- Ms. Hogan said the property line was set back about 10' away from the outermost part of the building. She anticipated there would be a gate and they would block that off similar to what they do in Charleston.
- Mr. Joslin said it became difficult for the egress if it was a gate-type element. He added if it was a door and a block wall it would be a different situation.
- Assistant City Manager Story said to be clear, 10' was a function of the building Code and that is what they agreed upon with Mr. Camp, as long as they retain that line of parking.
- Mr. Henthorn said the idea of protecting that area with a gate or door was probably valid as long as it was a secure gate.
- Mr. Richardson said he encouraged the record and the minutes to show that while the Board Members may approve it; they consider this a future security issue, and that the next generation or two needed to refer back to this meeting and these comments to address the security of that alcove.
- Mr. Joslin said based on these comments, perhaps they could have the discussion with the developer to spend a little more money regarding that recessed alcove, because he felt it was still a hiding place in that area.
- Ms. Hogan said she would discuss that with the developer.
- Mr. Richardson asked Ms. Hogan if she had anything else to show them. Ms. Hogan said she did not.

- Mr. Richardson thanked Ms. Hogan for all her information, and he appreciated her fulfilling all of their requests from the last meeting regarding this project.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing, and asked anyone who wished to speak in favor of this request to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson asked anyone who wished to speak in opposition to the request to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Mr. Richardson said he would ask New Board Member Jessica Folk to abstain from voting on this item of business, because she initially was part of the design team for the project.

Board Member Deliberation and/or Comments:

- Mr. Joslin said there was still the open issue regarding the exact stone that would be used.
- Mr. Pitts felt the curb cut should be closed off for safety reasons, and he also felt the site was so tight. He explained he felt the developer should close that off in order to make a longer sidewalk area or perhaps an outdoor seating area.
- Mr. Richardson asked Assistant City Manager Story if the City would have a strong opinion about that.
- Assistant City Manager Story said possibly; that he personally did not, but he did not know about the Traffic Engineering Department; but he felt it should be a very functional space, and liked the notion of perhaps a tenant in the end space, such as a café or restaurant.
- Mr. Richardson felt it would be very nice to have a pull-off, in particular when you had all the residential and retail there; with no access on Wall Street.
- Mr. Richardson asked Assistant City Manager Story regarding the four-lane Broad Street area, had there been any recent discussion about the Broad Street plan. Assistant City Manager Story explained there had been some discussion that still needed further study.
- Mr. Richardson said he would like the record to duly note that this Board would like to call it to the City's attention to this issue; and that they felt it would be very beneficial to have the Broad Street issue resolved one way or the other.

Mr. Richardson made a motion to approve the petitioner's request, with the exception regarding the stone that the Board needed further evidence of specifics regarding the color, cut, and application of stone; to be presented before the Board Members at another scheduled meeting; and he was seconded by Mr. Pitts.

Discussion of Motion:

Mr. Henthorn said he would be o.k. if they wanted to replace with brick; but that he wanted it brought back before the Board.

The motion was approved by a vote of 4-0-1, with Board Member Jessica Folk abstained from the vote.

#### **New Business:**

There was no new business.

#### **Staff's Announcements**

---

- Mrs. Roland welcomed New Board Member Jessica Folk to the meeting, and she would be letting her know of her required New Board Member Training opportunities; and she explained that she would have to have six hours that was required by the MASC for new members.
- Mrs. Roland also reminded those Board Members who had signed up about the upcoming 2013 Fall SCAPA Conference that would be held at the Spartanburg Marriott on October 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup>.

Informal Discussion:

Mr. Henderson said at tonight's Pre-Agenda meeting he distributed copies of the draft Design Review Board Checklist and Application form for the Board's review

Mr. Henderson opened discussion on the proposed Design Review Board Application form he distributed to each member at the Pre-Agenda Meeting; and said he would be happy to address any questions at this time, or if they wished they could look over the form and they could address any questions or concerns at another time.

Assistant City Manager Chris Story informed the Board Members that he would also like their thoughts on the draft application form and checklist; and he also acknowledged that they had the leanest Planning Staff as it had ever been. He was trying to fill in gaps with third parties; and said they had a third party arrangement with Craig Lewis with the Lawrence Group; and he had asked him to join them for tonight's meeting, since he was going to be in town today anyway. He thought Mr. Lewis could help give some direction on some of the issues they had been dealing with lately; and he hoped the Board Members were o.k. with that.

Mr. Pitts asked Mr. Lewis's if his Design Review Board had multiple meetings trying to approve a project; and about their step process.

Mr. Lewis explained to the Board Members that one of the things he initiated was what he called a blink test, which should take about fifteen minutes at the very beginning of a new project before the developer had gotten too far into the project with a lot of drawings, etc. at the schematic level.

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Lewis what he considered a conceptual amount of time from the 15 minute blink test to when they get final approval.

Mr. Lewis explained they should dispose of most of the application during the blink test. He said they might have a second meeting; but did not feel like it should hold the developer up, as long as they understand early on what is expected. The earlier the better.

Mr. Henthorn used tonight's meeting as an example which was a second public hearing on the project and the issues they had regarding the stair safety issue and the stone issue; and asked Mr. Lawrence about when the developer had a perfectly good reason to do something that was not permitted under the Code.

Mr. Craig Lewis suggested from a Board standpoint, he would encourage them to focus on what is the most public; such as public alleys, sidewalks, and public streets, etc.

Mr. Joslin felt that every submission was going to be different.

Mr. Henthorn felt what Mr. Richardson did tonight, to get the Board's opinion and concern on the record was a very good thing.

Mr. Richardson asked how did they get people to come in for the blink test. Mr. Henderson explained that was listed in the new Design Review Board Checklist.

Mr. Henthorn felt they should change that aspect of the checklist to a mandatory requirement.

Mr. Joslin asked if a developer came in from Montana and wanted to buy a lot in the City to build something, how would they know they need to address it per the Code.

Assistant City Manager Story explained that was done most of the time during due diligence of the purchase, and that would lead them to the Design Review Board.

Mr. Henderson explained to the Board Members the process regarding feasibility inspections.

Assistant City Manager Story said they would add to the report regarding any new construction in the downtown area, would be required to come before the Design Review Board for pre-approval. He added that he would make sure the other departments such as Economic Development knew that as well.

Mr. Henderson said they can add to the check list that any new construction must come before the Design Review Board for informal review; and we could also leave it open for upfits to do the same.

Mr. Pitts asked Mr. Lawrence if their Design Review Board had an application fee.

Mr. Lawrence said he was sure they did.

Mr. Henderson explained that all of the Planning Department's other Boards with the exception of the Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review, and the Design Review Board had an application fee.

Mr. Henthorn asked Mr. Lewis his opinion regarding the safety issue and the stone issue regarding tonight's meeting.

Mr. Lewis felt safety issues, as well as the stone were both important; but he did not feel that you needed to spend hours on them. He informed the Board Members with his Design Review Board they focused on what he called the gold triangle; which he explained was the first story down to the base, across the sidewalks to where the cars were parked.

Mr. Richardson said he had another comment he wanted in the record, that he wanted to compliment the City and Assistant City Manager Story for taking seriously and acting expeditiously on the Growler Haus landscaping issue. It made a huge difference, and was a great suggestion by the team, and was very well done by the City. Mr. Richardson then explained what the issue had been to Mr. Lewis, and their solution.

Mr. Richardson thanked Mr. Lewis for being at the meeting tonight; and he felt if they could incorporate the blink test, it would really help alleviate some of their issues.

Mr. Henderson informed the Board Members he would make sure to get the blink test into the new review section of the check list; and if anyone had any other questions, comments, or suggestions to email him, and the Assistant City Manager, and copy the rest of the Board Members. He said if they preferred they could mark it up individually and then scan it to him, and all of them discuss the changes before they were made.

The Board Members thanked Mr. Henderson for his work in putting together the new application form.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 7:10 P.M.

  
Ricky Richardson, Chair

Edited by Julie Roland, Secretary