

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

The Design Review Board (DRB) met in the City Hall Council Chambers on Tuesday, November 6, 2018 at 5:30 P.M., with the following members in attendance: Ricky Richardson, Mike Henthorn, Tip Pitts, and Kevin DeMark. Representing the Planning Department were Natalia Rosario, Planner III, and Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant. City Manager Chris Story 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 members of the current four member Board were present, constituting a quorum; and he went over the procedure for the meeting.

The Agenda for the November 6, 2018 meeting was approved by acclamation.

Disposition of the Minutes from the July 17, 2018 & August 7, 2018 Meetings:

Both sets of Meeting Minutes as listed above were approved by acclamation.

Old Business – None.

New Business:

Public Hearing re Approval of the Redevelopment of 127 W. Main Street. Proposed Redevelopment at 127 W. Main Street, Parcel #7-12-21-048.00 located in the DT-6 District, from Joseph Lauer, Clerestory Projects Group, Agent on behalf of Sean McEnroe, Owner.

City Manager Chris Story came forward and was sworn; and he informed the Board Members he would be presenting tonight for Ms. Rosario, Planner III, who was present tonight but had lost her voice. He said the first item was the subject of Historic Tax Credit Redevelopment which had some impact on some of the design issues of the exterior; and he said Donnie Love with McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture was here to present the project.

Mr. Donnie Love, Historic Preservation Architect, McMillan Pazdan Smith came forward and was sworn; and he informed the Board Members Joe Lauer, Clerestory Project Group was also present representing the Owner of the property for any questions. Mr. Love explained to the Board Members with this being a Historic Tax Project that meant it was a project where part of the funding comes from the Federal Government in the form of tax credits, and so the project design had to be approved by the S.C. Dept. of Archives & History, SHPO, as well as the National Park Service, who implemented the tax credit project. He said this was an adaptive reuse project aimed at providing a multi-occupancy function for the public. Space functions would include bowling, dining, and a main event space. The historic context would be preserved to provide as much of the original buildings features as possible. Mr. Love showed a lot of slides, past and present and provided all of the background information for the proposed project. Mr. Love explained the building opened in 1928 and did not look like it did today. Mr. Love said the building completely burned to the ground in 1943; and then rebuilt by its former owner that same year for about \$75,000.00 which he thought was a very good price, and it was redesigned in the Art Deco Style that was typical for South Carolina. The building was closed in 1996 and was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1983, which is critical to its being able to receive the tax credits. Some years ago Rome Nightclub had occupied the building and later closed, and the property had sat vacant for some years now. Mr. Love explained to the Board Members the scope of work as follows:

• **Basement Floor:**

Install new bowling alleys with elevated solid wood flooring approach.

Separate 2 bowling lanes from the remaining 6 for private lanes and gathering.

Add a bar as a focal point in the dining space.

Clean and stain existing concrete floor.

- **First Floor**

Restore Main St. Entry to imitate the 1940's façade which includes all new windows in the street level, and restoring accent banding.

Refinish existing terrazzo flooring and add any terrazzo flooring removed by renovations dating after the 1940's design.

Split floor space into two main areas: restaurant and main event space with kitchen separating the two.

Add large group toilet to serve dining and another to serve main event space.

Keep existing wood lattice trusses above exposed and accentuated as much as possible.

Broad St. Façade and windows painted and restored with possible event sign to be added to match historical reference.

- **Mezzanine Floor**

Restaurant side – used as supplemental dining space overlooking Main Street through existing restored windows.

Main Event side – used as a staging/dressing area for main event space productions.

Mr. Love presented and explained building samples to the Board Members as well.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak in favor of the request to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson asked anyone who wished to speak in opposition of the request or if anyone just had questions to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

City Manager Chris Story came forward again and explained they were asking for full final approval tonight for this project.

Mr. DeMark moved final approval be granted; and he was seconded by Mr. Pitts. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Public Hearing re Conceptual Review and Commentary regarding proposed Redevelopment (New Construction) of 142 & 144 E. Main Street, TMS#7-12-21-016.00 and 017.00 located in the DT-6 District, from William Gray, McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture, on behalf of K. Patel, Owner.

City Manager Chris Story came forward and said this was a new construction of 142 & 144 East Main Street, and Mr. Gray with McMillan Pazdan Smith was present to address the Board. He reminded the Board Members that several months ago the Applicant/Developer had come to the Board to discuss this project, and had since refined the design. The City Manager said the Board Members had received Staff's memo previously in their meeting packets that identified a couple of discussion points which he was sure would be addressed tonight.

Mr. William Gray, McMillan Pazdan Smith came forward and was sworn; and he informed the Board Members that he along with Glenn Campbell of McMillan Pazdan Smith would both be presenting to the Board. Mr. Gray explained they were very excited to be back with the proposed project tonight. He said they now have a contractor on board who had helped them with pricing, and they had been working very closely with the owner discussing some changes he wanted to make, which would grow the project by two stories. Mr. Gray noted that was a point of discussion from Mr. Lewis's comments and that would be addressed tonight.

Mr. Glenn Campbell, McMillan Pazdan Smith came forward and was sworn; and showed an aerial view and pointed out the Smith Drugs property and said it was outlined in yellow on the slide.

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Campbell if this site also took in what was the park.

Mr. Campbell explained that their project did not take in the park; but their property stopped at the park. Mr. Campbell showed a slide of the street front looking from Main Street, and he showed the White Oak Management Building and the park.

Mr. Richardson asked was the parking lot theirs.

Mr. Campbell explained it was, and that the parking was accessed from Main Street only, and the building was accessed from Main Street and Dunbar Street. He pointed out the picture at the bottom of that particular slide showed the roof tops of the buildings regarding mass and scale that showed the Dunbar Street Parking Garage, the White Oak Management Building (a 3-story building), the existing Smith Drugs, and then the Aug. W. Smith's building that was a 6 story building that had recently been done. He said they would like for their building to be the exact same height as the Aug. Smith's; and from a height standpoint they would be matching what was on the very next block. Mr. Campbell said looking at the Aug. Smith Building, and then the public parking garage, they were very similar to the same height. He showed a slide of the proposed site plan and said one of the things that was unusual about this building was they wanted to have a one-way drive-thru pharmacy lane as well. Mr. Campbell said from the initial submittal a couple of weeks ago, the owner had now decided to eliminate the on-site parking in order to capture some store space. From Main Street was an entrance only (a one way drive-thru pharmacy) and then exit left on to Dunbar which was a one-way street. He said they were proposing and working with the City to provide a handicapped parking space right outside the pharmacy. He further explained on the Dunbar Street side they would have a residential entrance with the hope that the residents would use the Dunbar Street Parking Garage and have a handicapped parking space right outside the store entrance to Smith Drugs. He said on the Main Street side, would be the corner of the drugstore, and the park which would continue, the glass side and tenant space. He showed another set of slides that he said were more updated than what the Board Members had seen before; and showed the view from Main Street side with more colorful renderings. Mr. Campbell said what the Main Street showed was how they tried to take the mass and scale of the adjacent White Oak Building regarding the cornice line to continue on down the street; and he pointed out the mass of the other buildings were very much in line with that. He pointed out the Aug. Smith Building as well and said the massing was very much in line with that building; and also the Aug. Smith building was recessed about the same amount as their proposed building. On the Main Street side he showed the corner entrance, which was basically all glass, and they had some accent colors of cementous (fiber cement panels) and he showed some brick. He said with the drive-thru pharmacy they wanted to minimize the impact of that drive; and he said what the horizontal and vertical element did was lead your eye away from that opening. He showed another slide of the pedestrian scale, the entrance to the park area; and said they were working with the City on that area regarding their building. Mr. Campbell said on the first floor area all the way around they were proposing brick masonry, and on the side of the building would be fiber cement siding. He showed a slide of Main Street looking west, and said the setback for the fifth and sixth floors; and things were still on going with the color studies which they were still working on; and he said they wanted the top section to kind of recede and blend in to the background, and they were trying not to draw attention to it. He showed another rendering that showed the one way entrance into the drive; and said you could see the street front along Main Street was predominantly glass.

Mr. Richardson asked just to be clear there would only be stopping to pick up a prescription, but no parking.

Mr. Campbell said that was correct.

Mr. Richardson said previously there had been some conversation where they had talked about security gating; and he asked how they would address that now; or if it would remain open all the time.

Mr. Gray came forward and said it would be closed after business hours.

Mr. Pitts had a question about what was proposed to be brick regarding the building.

Mr. Campbell pointed out the different portions of the building that would be brick; and he said there would not be any brick on the fifth and sixth floors.

Mr. DeMark asked were the colored panels proposed to be cementitious fiber board.

Mr. Campbell said that was correct. He showed what would be fiber board, what would be smooth face panels and what would be lap siding. He explained that was also what they proposed on the sides. Mr. Campbell then showed a view from Dunbar Street and the pedestrian crossing at the Dunbar Street Garage. He showed the entrance to the park and the residential entrance, and a small elevator lobby. The building would be about seventy feet in height. He showed Dunbar Street looking west; and said one other thing they had done in terms of scale was they had pulled the building back on that side about ten feet. He said for safety features they would have a change in paving, and a speed bump.

Mr. Richardson said he assumed they were proposing the apartments on floors two through six; and he asked how many were they proposing.

Mr. Campbell said about 59 units.

Mr. Richardson asked would all of those people be able to park in the garage right behind the building.

Mr. Campbell said that was the intention.

Mr. Gray explained they had started that conversation with the City's Economic Development Team, who was still exploring the funding and how that would play out.

Mr. Richardson said just to be clear, this would all be new construction and there would not be anything left of the building currently there.

Mr. Campbell said that was correct.

Mr. Pitts asked Mr. Campbell how he would respond to Mr. Craig Lewis comment regarding the proposed building design was in stark contrast to the adjacent traditionally designed buildings.

Mr. Campbell felt what was important from an urban standpoint was they were trying to match the mass and scale, and would be creating an interesting and lively streetscape using modern materials and a slightly modern form to do that. He also felt it was important to have an activated streetscape, having the glass, having the canopies; and he said the owner had requested a contemporary look.

Mr. Henthorn felt that was a good justification but he said from the first presentation until now; it seemed to him that the first one was simpler. He said his problem was there seemed to be so much going on; and one of the things that bothered him was not the contemporary look, but in its massing and detail. Mr. Henthorn said if you looked at the buildings around it that were pretty restrained in general – that this one really jumped out at you. Not because it was modern but because it was so busy. He wondered if some of the things in the elevation could be simplified to make it a little more elegant. He explained what he meant regarding the dark brick and the light brick. He asked for instance if they really needed the two different colored brick portions, as well as other things. Mr. Henthorn said from an architectural point of view they might want to try to integrate the forms better.

Mr. Campbell said they would keep working on the design.

Mr. Richardson asked if any of the Board Members had any heartburn regarding the setbacks.

Mr. Henthorn asked was it set back further than in the original package.

Mr. Campbell said it was the same.

Mr. Henthorn asked about the setbacks again.

Mr. Campbell said it was 37' to the edge of the street, 28' to side of the parallel parking, and about 12 to 13' from the face of the building; which was probably about 16' from the property line.

Mr. Henthorn asked how far the fifth and sixth floor were from the front of the building.

Mr. Campbell said 16' from the property line, and 12' from the building; and he explained it allowed the sidewalk to be a little bit bigger and a little nicer for the Main Street side; and it also allowed the visual and easier walk into the park.

Mr. Henthorn felt the setback was o.k. The thing that bothered him the most was the piece that was set back did not relate to the piece up front at all. He would feel a lot more comfortable if there was something that tied those things together; and he mentioned what had been done with the Aug. Smith building; and he said if you were going to contrast the building, you had to really contrast it.

Mr. DeMark asked was the yellow or orange color being driven by the owner; and he felt it was so sharp and stark looking.

Mr. Campbell said it was owner driven; and it was actually supposed to be more copper looking, but had not turned out that way in the rendering.

Mr. DeMark felt it was so shocking and did not meet the fabric of downtown Spartanburg. He felt the Aug. Smith Building did a great job of melding all their colors.

Mr. Richardson said he liked a lot about the proposed building; but he also found it very busy. He did agree with Mr. Henthorn regarding the top and bottom either needed to be totally separate or a little bit more together.

Mr. DeMark asked how wide it was between the buildings.

Mr. Campbell said it was twenty feet.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak in opposition to come forward and state their name and address for the record. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson asked anyone who wished to speak in favor or had questions to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Pitts moved conceptual approval, and he was seconded by Mr. Richardson. The motion was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Mr. Richardson said he was sure the Design Team would take their thoughts into consideration regarding the project.

Public Hearing re Preliminary Review and Commentary regarding proposed New Construction at 179 N. Church Street of Cambria Hotel, TMS#7-12-18-002.00; 003.00; and 014.00 located in the DT-6 District, from Choli Aronson, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Overcash Demitt Architects (ODA), Agent on behalf of Suraj Mistry, Owner/Developer.

City Manager Chris Story came forward and introduced the case, and said the Owner/Developer had met with City Staff a number of times regarding the proposed project; and had wanted him to apologize for his absence at tonight's meeting because he was in southern California. The City Manager said he had been very actively involved with the City's Design Consultant as well on the project. He said there were two matters that were highlighted in their review memos they previously received in the meeting packets – one related to building materials, and the other related to parking structures. Mr. Story said he would ask the Architect to come forward and then he would answer any questions from Staff's perspective.

Ms. Choli Aronson, Architect, Overcash Demitt Architects (ODA) came forward and was sworn; and she said the Project Designer and Ownership Team were with her, as well as the Engineer. She explained they were looking to do a Cambria Hotel on what they knew was a very prominent corner; and they had been working hard to make sure it would fit in well with the downtown area. Ms. Aronson said she would let their project designer speak about the design.

Ms. Katie Kirby, Project Designer, ODA came forward and was sworn. She referenced a slide and said there would be 119 keys, 6 floors, and were looking at approximately 82 parking spaces which she said would be on a parking deck (one level at street grade, and one at upper Trade Street, with no ramp between the levels. It would be two separate entrances. Ms. Kirby pointed out on a slide the entrance into the lower level which would have one row of 30 spaces; and the other parking level was if you go up Trade Street you could turn into the other parking level which would basically be on grade at the back of the site and would be built over the top of the front side of the site.

Ms. Aronson then showed a slide of the proposed site plan, and she said one of the things they had been working with DOT was trying to get drop-offs. She said it looked like the one on North Church Street would not be approved by the DOT; but they thought the one on East Saint John would be approved. She said they had been trying to get as much as they could; but those were SCDOT roads and they had to follow their laws. The hotel would front both on North Church and East Saint John to try and engage that corner. She said there would be a lot of glass, and said they were trying to engage with the very active corner to the building. There would be lounge seating; and as you continue up the street on the right hand side they would have an outside seating area where the bar and restaurant would spill out onto the outside area to give an active street corner. Ms. Aronson said they were really trying to carry the pedestrian activity inside and outside; and had lots of glazing so you could see into the active hotel; and then along the top side they

had a covered walkway that gets one from the parking area into the entrance of the building. She showed a slide and said on the lower right hand side they would have meeting space, as well as a pool with a trellised area which would be protected by the raised parking area. A slide was shown of the typical plan for the six story building; and she said regarding materials on the building that they were trying to follow the Cambria prototype as much as they could along with interspersing it with downtown Spartanburg. She referenced the color palette and said it was one that was specific to Cambria that they really hoped to be able to use. She said they proposed brick for the first two stories, and then above that they hoped to do EIFS; which she said she knew it was not something within the current Code. However; regarding the cost factor, that was really something that would help them out to be able to do. She explained the big orange thing they saw was a metal fin specific to Cambria, and then all the glass on the corner. She said they would like to hear the Board's questions and thoughts.

Board Member Questions:

- Mr. Henthorn asked about the stacked metal next to the corner glass.
- Ms. Kirby said it was glossy fiber cement board panels.
- Ms. Aronson said there was a lighting strip between the two to illuminate the metal fin.
- Mr. DeMark asked if the brick stopped at the second floor.
- Ms. Aronson said it stopped at the underside of the third floor.
- Mr. DeMark asked if the white at the top was also EIFS.
- Ms. Aronson said that was correct; and the hope was that they could have the orange insets, the gray and the white to all be EIFS. She said they had a much better quality EIFS these days than the way it used to be.
- Mr. Richardson said it was a very nice project and they were delighted to have them with the Board tonight; and he thought it was great to have the pull-off there on Saint John Street and he had no problem with the adjacent parking. What he was really struggling with was the EIFS. He said when the Code called for something and then when they found themselves varying away from that, then the Board sets a precedent.
- Mr. Henthorn said they had shown two elevations, and he knew there were two or three more; and it looked to him like the EIFS wrapped all the way around to the inside as well.
- Ms. Aronson said that it would.
- Mr. Henthorn said so it started at the stair corner and wrapped all the way around to the other stair corner.
- Ms. Aronson said that was correct; and she said both of those interior corners were fairly well hidden by the building next door; and that by the slope change and her reading of the Code, she understood that the non-street facing elevations could be EIFS. She said the decorative pattern on the stairwell wrapped around but the color palette would continue across the back side of the building.
- Mr. DeMark asked where the rendering sort of stopped; was that a parking deck, and would there be some type of fencing or something there.
- Ms. Aronson explained there would be a 42" wall above the deck of the parking; and the cars would be underneath and cars on top.
- Mr. DeMark asked was it sort of like a brick wall that would make up that edge.
- Ms. Aronson said yes and she explained, and it would have landscaping in front of it.
- Mr. Henthorn agreed with Mr. Richardson about the EIFS. He thought this would be a major building on a major corner and he would hate to see them agree on something like this at a major corner.

- Mr. Henthorn said he knew the Cambria in Mt. Pleasant was all brick, so he knew that it could be done. He wasn't saying it had to be all brick and he liked the color changes with the building, but for him it was all about the EIFS.
- Ms. Aronson said they had discussed some other options knowing that EIFS may be challenging to the Board; and she said one of the things they had discussed was using larger format fiber cement panels for a portion of the building and perhaps maybe doing the top white portion in EIFS as an accent; or she did not know if hard-coat stucco had the same problem as EIFS. She said the Code was not clear on hard-coat stucco, which would be the other option they could use if that was something the Board Members felt would be appropriate. As far as the articulation, it was very achievable in either EIFS or hard-coat stucco, with a combination of reveals carved into it, as well as pieces built out.
- Mr. Henthorn said for him it would be about how the hard-coat stucco was actually finished.
- Mr. Pitts said he did a google search for Cambria Hotels and he saw a huge number of those done in all brick; which he said would be his preference.
- Ms. Aronson said that was correct, but there was a cost implication to do an all brick building, which would be outside of their budget.
- Mr. DeMark said he was concerned about the HVAC grills shown across the front façade, as well as the other facades of the building.
- Ms. Aronson said that was correct.
- Mr. Richardson asked about the alternative to that.
- Ms. Aronson said there were a couple of alternatives they could offer. She explained the most common one was to integrate it into the window system which would probably be the most common way to handle it.
- Mr. DeMark said he was concerned because of the beautiful Montgomery Building right across the street.
- Mr. Henthorn agreed it would definitely be an issue and said he thought they needed to see more details.
- Mr. Richardson asked if any of the Board Members had any issues with the parking and the long brick wall.
- Mr. Pitts said he did not; but he wished there was the ability to put landscape planters or something in the parking lot at the top deck. And the other question he had was it sure did look like it was more impervious than the original site; and he wondered what they were going to do with their stormwater.
- Ms. Aronson asked the Civil Engineer to speak to that.
- Mr. Danny Balon, Seamon Whiteside Engineers came forward and was sworn and said they had met with the City and it was considered impervious based on what was there before, which was a furniture store at one time and a gas station at one time.
- Mr. Henthorn said he had no problem with people parking on it; that the site was what it was.
- Mr. Richardson said if he was coming to that hotel, he would not be parking at the George; and that was not going to work for him.
- Ms. Aronson said one of the things they did talk about was if the parking lot directly across the street could have some availability; they could probably convince Cambria to let them have a certain slot of spaces to use there; however her understanding was there was no availability over there. The two other garages that were within walking distance were too far away for the Cambria to allow them to use those.
- Mr. Richardson asked City Manager Chris Story if she was speaking about the QS1 Extended Stay Garage that did not have the capacity.

- The City Manager said hotels were great parking users, but to meet the hotel brand requirements for assurance of availability they were right up at capacity at the Magnolia Garage in terms of leases with other entities. He said he was not suggesting they could not attempt to work something out but everything would just have to all fall the right way in order for it to happen.
- Mr. Richardson said his question and the reason to pursue that was if they made this parking lot a little *greener*, because it would be seen by everybody at the Montgomery Building and whether or not you could in fact do that and carve out some parking across the street. He said it would be nice to have some greenery on that deck.
- Ms. Aronson said they could certainly take some area around the stairwell and referenced the striped out portion on a slide of the parking; and put planting in to them, because that would not lose any parking spaces. She said the other thing was they had the ability to swap and they had the low level planting they could reduce the size of that and maybe build out and put a planter box on the upper level. Additionally they are only parking 82 spaces for 119 rooms.
- Mr. DeMark asked if the trash enclosure would be exposed.
- Ms. Aronson said it would be walled in, but it was on grade at the upper level.
- Mr. DeMark asked was there a cover there.
- Ms. Aronson said there was not.
- Mr. DeMark asked her if she had a section.
- Ms. Aronson said she did not but could certainly provide one at another meeting; as well as provide the other two elevations as well.
- Mr. Pitts said he would also like to see more streetscape detailing with the tree wells and lights shown on anymore renderings.
- Ms. Aronson said they would definitely get all of that in place for the next time they saw the Board.
- Mr. Richardson said he thought it would be a great project and hoped they could get all the concerns worked out.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak in favor of the request to come forward and state their name and address for the record. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson asked anyone who wished to speak in opposition of the request to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson asked if anyone wished to ask a question to come forward.

- Mr. Bill Joslin of 103 Candler Place, and Architect with McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture, and former member of the Board came forward and asked if the architect could talk a little bit about the corner to the adjacent building; and he referenced a slide and said he would like to understand a little more about what happens to the lower side of the building next to the stairwell.
- Ms. Aronson came forward again and said it was a relatively narrow alleyway, and showed the recessed area regarding the seating they were proposing; and said due to fire ratings and how close they would be; and that side of the building really could not have any windows. They were proposing it would be treated with a decorative pattern to try and enliven that space, and they were also proposing that becomes an access point from the front to the back, as a service way you would go up the hill to get in to that trash area in the back, as well as sort of a back access to the parking.
- Mr. Joslin asked about the material of the wall.
- Ms. Aronson said right now they were proposing it be EIFS.
- Mr. DeMark asked the proximity of that wall to the adjacent structure.
- Ms. Aronson said between five and ten feet; and that it was more likely six feet.
- Mr. DeMark asked how they would handle ADA parking from the upper deck to the lobby.

- Ms. Aronson said they were planning on putting it on the ground level.
- Mr. Richardson asked if there were any more questions. There were no more questions. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Board Discussion/Deliberation:

Mr. Pitts said he did not have so much issue with the parking as he did with materials.

Mr. Richardson said the Board Members knew they heard all their thoughts and opinions and suggestions.

Mr. Richardson asked was there a motion to give preliminary review approval.

Mr. Henthorn said he would motion; and he was seconded by Mr. Richardson. The vote was 2 in favor and 2 against.

Mr. Richardson asked the City Manager what they needed to do now.

The City Manager said he thought the applicants could address all the comments from tonight and bring forward a revised submittal before the Board Members at future meeting.

Mr. Richardson said he knew the applicant would take into consideration all they had discussed tonight and come back with a more approvable proposal.

The City Manager asked the Board Chair if he could request at this time if they could deviate from the Agenda for a moment to introduce Brandon Wilson, the District 3 Engineer with the SCDOT who had been invited to speak at the meeting tonight who was on a time constraint this evening; and he knew they had another public hearing to hold as well tonight. He said it was very important to have Mr. Wilson participating in their discussions of projects and streetscaping.

Mr. Richardson welcomed Mr. Wilson and said they would go ahead and let him speak to the Board Members at this time.

Mr. Brandon Wilson, District 3 Engineer, SCDOT came forward and was sworn; and he thanked the Board Members and Staff for having him tonight. He said the City Manager had asked him to come and speak a little about the SCDOT and how they looked at their permitting, and in particular their landscaping guidelines, since they interacted with the City's streetscape or trees and plantings along the roadways. He referenced the SCDOT Landscaping Guidelines that would be coming out shortly; and he said they were a little more restrictive than what they had in the past. Mr. Wilson said quite a few of the roads in the City of Spartanburg were SCDOT maintained roads, and the new guidelines would apply to those roads. He said the biggest thing he wanted to point out was the horizontal clearances for trees, small and large. In the past they used to be able to plant trees within 1.5' of the curb, which was now being moved to 4' for a small tree at breast height. For large trees on a slope and speeds of 25 mph or less they could still go 4'; but if it was greater than 25 mph they would need to go to six and eight feet from the back of curb to the tree itself.

Mr. Richardson asked him the reasoning for that.

Mr. Wilson said he was just the messenger; that they got their instructions from Columbia, SC. He said it made it extremely difficult to get it within their r-o-w to get a curb lawn and tree; and still get a 5' sidewalk and still get a building.

Mr. Pitts said a lot of the downtown had tree wells which were usually 5' off back of curb.

Mr. Richardson said it would cut down on a lot of foliage.

Mr. Wilson said when they received the new Guidelines and read through them that was the most obvious restriction they would notice; and that it went into detail regarding site lines, shrubbery, etc. He said that was one of the reasons the City Manager wanted him to speak and give the Board Members an opportunity to ask questions; and he would be glad to come back at another time as well.

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Wilson if he needed to address anything else of real significance he wanted to mention tonight.

Mr. Wilson said he was a little shocked about the parking on Church Street. He said they were not that excited about the pull-off on Saint John, but they tried to work with the City and developer to at least provide a location where their patrons could unload.

Mr. Richardson said they really did appreciate that.

The City Manager said they really did appreciate Mr. Wilson being with them tonight and for continuing to try and get further upstream engagement with the SCDOT for the City's projects that were on their right of ways; and he talked about how important that relationship was.

Public Hearing re Final Review and Approval regarding Requested Changes re Dr. T.K. Gregg Community Center development at 650 Howard Street, TMS#7-12-05-001.00 located in the DT-4 District, from Adam Flynn, McMillan Pazdan Smith, Applicant, on behalf of City of Spartanburg, Owner.

City Manager Chris Story came forward and said this case was seeking Board Approval for some changes to the Dr. T.K. Gregg Community Center (due to operational and cost issues) that the Developer had to make after they had received final approval from the Board at a previous meeting; and so that was why this was back before the Board Members tonight.

Mr. Adam Flynn, McMillan Pazdan Smith came forward and was sworn; and informed the Board Members after they had received final approval from them a few months ago, they had to make a few changes to the plans; and he wanted to primarily go over those changes. He showed some slides of the plans and said the site for Dr. T.K. Gregg was the former site of the Oak View Apartments site on the north side. As part of the project they were also taking over the adjacent property that contained the PCA Building, the old armory building which was being demolished. He said the building would be focused on the Howard Street portion of the site with the remaining segment being left for future green space or other civic usage. Mr. Flynn said the first change he wanted to go over was primarily focusing on the Howard Street Streetscape; and said they had added a number of on-street parking, as well as a drop-off/loading/unloading space along Howard Street.

Mr. Richardson asked if DOT approved those.

Mr. Flynn said yes. He said what they had done was provided five spaces in front of the bulk of the building. He knew there was a comment addressing that he would address shortly leaving that as a drop-off/loading/unloading space for vehicles. The intent for not doing the entire frontage was primarily for safety concerns given one of the largest users of this facility would be children; they wanted to provide some amount of landscaping and separation of the paved plaza area and Howard Street itself as a safety issue; so they had left the very front of the plaza space at the main entry of the building as landscaping as a buffer for that purpose. Also as part of this they had reconstructed the area around the corner where there was still seating and large streetscape; they had softened that in a buffer area which was previously hard planter space – now it was a series of short retaining walls, similar to what you would see at the new Drayton Elementary School. They were continuing to do extensive landscaping along Howard Street street front, and in lieu of doing curb trees they were doing a series of planter boxes to provide some larger vegetation on the front.

Mr. Richardson asked would they be further off the street than originally intended.

Mr. Flynn said they were further off the street on the other side of the sidewalk.

Mr. DeMark referenced a slide and asked was that a sodded walkway or pathway.

Mr. Flynn said that was just grass. He said it was still the intent that the pedestrian path would be between the parking and the landscaped area. One of the other changes regarding the project was in the reduction of the size of the corner of Howard and Preston Streets; which he said was made for programmatic reasons because there was an elimination of some interior program and that box was no longer necessary to be as large or prominent; and they had pulled it back past the main entry element so now it was the dominant element sticking out from that façade. The box was roughly in line with the projection on either side.

Mr. Richardson asked if they had gotten rid of the swimming pool.

Mr. Flynn said they had kept both of them. He said one thing was a slight mistake on the plan when they were translating the material palette and also as part of the general change, one of the building materials primarily that they now saw in white on the slide had now gone from a metal panel to EIFS or a synthetic stucco; and he wanted to bring that to the Board's attention. He showed slides from the original design vs the new design. He said they were still keeping in general the form and layout on that elevation; and had reduced a little bit of the scale of the box of the overhangs.

Mr. DeMark asked to see the before and after slides again; and said now they would see the HVAC equipment.

Mr. Flynn apologized; and said that was his error in the images; and they do now have the HVAC back so far that it was not visible.

Mr. Flynn showed a before/after slides of the Preston Street side; and said the corner box had been pulled in and the tree element was now the forefront element facing Howard Street. He said they did remove one bay of windows because of that reduction back. Mr. Flynn said they still met the twenty foot separation in between windows. There were few if any changes to the elevations that did not face the street. He showed they had included some updated renderings to include the changes which he showed to the Board Members.

Mr. DeMark asked regarding one of the slides if the white or the lightest color was now going to be stucco.

Mr. Flynn said that was correct; and they would have none of it below the second floor level, and it definitely would not be the prominent element; and he said no other materials had changed. He also showed an updated slide of the retaining wall structure and he pointed out he felt it was a softer accessible kind of corner, in terms of the way it had been pulled back from the sidewalk. He did not feel it was as hard edged as the previous look. He said the last thing he wanted to show the Board Members was the locations of the mechanical units; and he said they were now 62' from the front of the building; 63' from Preston Street. He also referenced a portion of the slide and said three were reduced in size so the original screening they had showing, they now had removed that since it was now unnecessary. He showed more views from multiple angles.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak in favor of the request, or in opposition to the request; or if anyone just had any questions to come forward.

There was a gentleman in the audience that did not come forward or state his name that asked if he could get a little more clarification regarding the EIFS portion of the building.

Mr. Flynn explained.

Mr. Richardson asked was there anyone else who wished to speak. There was no one else to speak. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Demark moved approval of the requested changes as presented; and he was seconded by Mr. Henthorn. The motion was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Mr. Richardson asked the City Manager if Board Member Giron had resigned from the Board.

The City Manager explained he had gotten an email from her a few months ago; and she had expressed her need and reason of needing to resign her position. He informed the Board Members he had a call from a former HARB Board Member who would like to be considered by the Mayor and City Council for the vacant position.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 7:14 P.M.


Ricky Richardson, Chair

Edited by Julie Roland, Secretary