

Meeting Minutes of the Design Review Board (DRB)
Meeting
Tuesday, January 7, 2020

The Design Review Board (DRB) met in the City Hall Council Chambers on Tuesday, January 7, 2020 at 5:30 P.M., with the following members in attendance: Ricky Richardson, Kevin DeMark, and Carolyn Schoepf. Tip Pitts was absent. Representing the Planning Department were Natalia Rosario, AICP, Planner III, and Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant.

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 three members of the current four member Board were present, constituting a quorum; and he went over the procedure for the meeting.

Mr. Richardson moved the Agenda for tonight's meeting be changed to hear the business items in reverse order as to how they were listed on the agenda; and the amended Agenda was approved by acclamation.

Disposition of the Minutes from the December 3, 2019 Design Review Board Meeting:

The Minutes from the December 3, 2019 Meeting were approved by acclamation.

Old Business – None.

New Business:

Final Review and Approval of the Restoration/Redevelopment of proposed residential and commercial mixed-use development, located in the DT-6 District at 186 East Main Street, Parcel #7-12-18-078.00 from William J. Gray, McMillan Pazdan Smith, Agent, on behalf of Alexi Orehowski, Property Owner.

Ms. Natalia Rosario, Planner III came forward and was sworn; and said this item was up for final review and approval; and Mr. Craig Lewis, with Stantec, the City's Design Consultant recommended final approval be granted provided the developer showed the location of and any required screening for any rooftop mechanical equipment.

Mr. William Gray, McMillan Pazdan Smith, Agent on behalf of Alexi Orehowski, Owner came forward and was sworn. He informed the Board Members they had taken everything into consideration the Board Members had suggested from their last appearance before the Board; and they had tried to address all of their issues, which he explained in detail the changes they had made, as well as showed the slides.

Board Questions:

- Mr. DeMark asked Mr. Gray about the mechanical equipment screening.
- Mr. Gray assured the Board Members the mechanical equipment would be properly screened.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked anyone present who wished to speak in favor, or speak against, or just had any questions they wished to ask, to come forward and state their name and address for the record. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Richardson felt the Owner and Architect had done a dynamic job to make a nice upgrade to a building that had been vacant for quite some time.

Ms. Schoepf moved final approval be granted; and she was seconded by Mr. DeMark. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

(continued)

Conceptual Review and Approval (to a previously approved design change) for the Restoration/Redevelopment of Project 158 located at 158 East Main Street, Parcel #7-12-21-022.00 located in the DT-6 District from Dwayne E. Wood, AIA, GPN Architecture, Inc., Agent on behalf of Champion Investment Corporation, Owner.

Mr. Dwayne Wood, GPN Architecture came forward and was sworn. He explained to the Board Members once they had gotten under construction with their previously approved project design, that the Nichiha had posed a serious problem, and they had to rethink things; and he was now back before the Board Members asking for a change to their previously approved design which he showed slides and explained as follows:

- 1) Clean and paint existing brick Color #1, "Chatroom" SW6171;
- 2) Paint cast-in-place concrete knee wall, at storefront entrance, Color #1, "Chatroom" SW6171;
- 3) Clean and paint existing architectural masonry arches Color #2, "Techno Gray" SW6170;
- 4) Clean existing rusticated stone horizontal accent boards and arch keystones and leave natural color;
- 5) Install sand finish Exterior Insulation Finish System (EIFS) in-fill panel, above existing canopy and below existing horizontal steel beam, and paint Color #1, "Chatroom" SW6171 to match existing brick;
- 6) Finish trim existing canopy and add sag rods, to match 172 Main Street canopy, and paint dark bronze to match storefront entrance.
- 7) Clean and paint existing horizontal steel beam dark bronze to match canopy.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked anyone present who wished to speak in favor, or against, or just had any questions they would like to ask, to come forward and state their name and address for the record. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Mr. Richardson moved final approval be granted to the design changes; and he was seconded by Ms. Schoepf. The motion was approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

Ms. Rosario asked for clarification; was the Board giving final or conceptual approval as had been recommended by Mr. Lewis, regarding what comments he had made.

Mr. Richardson asked the Board Members if they were o.k. with their final approval determination; and they said they were good with final.

Mr. Richardson said he was confident the Architect and Owner would continue work with Staff to do what they knew they needed to do.

Conceptual Review and Approval of proposed Spartanburg County Judicial Center Parking Deck, located in the DT-6 District at 191 N. Daniel Morgan Avenue, Parcel #s 7-12-10-003.01; 003.02; 002.01; 002.02; and 006.00, from William Gray, Associate Principal, McMillan Pazdan Smith, Applicant on behalf of Spartanburg County, Owner.

Mr. William Gray, Associate Principal, McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture came forward and was sworn; and said they were here tonight for Conceptual/Final Review and Approval for the parking deck (only) associated with the Spartanburg County Judicial Center. For the benefit of the audience he went over to the screen and pointed out on the slides all of the buildings; and he gave a brief description of the different phases the project would go through. Mr. Gray oriented everyone to the location and showed the current court house and the court house annex that he said appeared as a diagonal cross hatch on the slide. He said the first phase of the project was to build a central energy plant, and they were not here tonight for because the energy plant was a separate structure which was not really a building, but an open mechanical yard. The parking deck was the other portion of phase 1 which was what they were here to talk about tonight. He said they had currently done some recent demolition in preparation of the parking deck. He pointed out the central energy plant and explained it would support everything including the existing court house, etc., as well as the new court house for a moment in time. Mr. Gray said regarding the Parking Deck, they had engaged a Landscape Architect, Mr. Adam Quear with LandArt who was present tonight as well. They planned to do landscaping and vegetation all around it for screening purposes. Mr. Gray showed the latest rendering of the parking deck; and said their original rendering had shown seven stories if you included the ground level zero; and they had now lowered it to six stories. Mr.

Gray explained and showed on one of the slides regarding some previous comments by the Board and the City's Design Consultant; they had now added some brick piers going around the deck and steel articulation and a canopy to help break down the massing of the structure. They had also tried to use warmer materials and had dressed up the vehicular entrance; and he explained how they tried to make that portion more clear regarding vehicular entrance. He showed and explained how they had really articulated the decently sized pre-cast cornices from how it was originally presented. Mr. Gray said they had lightened up the pedestrian canopy and the idea was if you were coming down Library Street, it was easy to identify that as the pedestrian entry, and it was also easy to see through that and where you should pull your vehicle into. More slides were shown of what the completed project would eventually all look like.

Board Questions:

- Mr. Richardson asked about the height of the walls.
- Mr. Gray explained since the topography was a little bit sloped, it would be kind of recessed down into the ground, so to speak. He explained it would be a six story parking deck with 578 parking spaces, but with all of the other parking there would be about 745 total spaces; and the maximum wall height would be about 43' until you got to the architectural accents. He said it had come down from what it had been; and they felt it would help the courthouse stand out more.
- Mr. DeMark asked was the grade accurate in the model he had shown.
- Mr. Gray explained it was not.
- Mr. Richardson asked about pond retention.
- Mr. Gray explained there would not be any; and they had already addressed that with their Civil Engineer.
- Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Gray to go through Craig Lewis' comments and address to the Board how they had looked at that.
- Mr. Gray said the design team for this project consisted of 30 to 40 people who were working on this project. He said the team really felt very strongly they needed to keep this as simple as possible. He explained they had gone around the City and looked at different examples for what a parking deck could be regarding a precedent. This design has certain elements of the deck on Dunbar Street and the Magnolia Street deck, which they felt were attractive decks. He said they did not feel doing a high-end design for a parking deck would be the best strategy for the new court house or for the tax payers. Mr. Gray regarding Mr. Lewis' comment about the parking structure should be wrapped by retail, office or some other active use along the primary façade – that if they really wrapped things; he explained they would have to worry about mechanical issues like exhaust.

Mr. DeMark said there were no tree wells on the roof; and he asked should there be in order to soften things up.

Mr. Gray explained they could not do that.

Mr. DeMark said he was assuming there was an elevator and some mechanical equipment for the elevator equipment room on the roof.

Mr. Gray said yes; and everything would be housed in that area hidden behind the parapet.

Mr. Richardson said he liked the way they had incorporated their previous suggestions; and felt this building had a better intent, such as the ingress and egress, awnings, and the brick accent and he liked the vertical features as well; and he thought it made it more attractive. He said he did not have any heartburn over a wrapped building. Mr. Richardson said this building was not going to disappear because it was so close to the road. He also felt the landscaping looked to be full.

Mr. DeMark asked Mr. Gray if he could help them understand more about the materials.

Mr. Gray explained the parking deck wall panels would all be pre-cast would include pre-cast, brick, and some glazing of black steel.

Mr. Richardson said ideally Daniel Morgan Avenue would be two lanes with a turning lane; and they would propose a bike lane on the inside of the curb in front of the building. He asked how wide the sidewalks would be; and he asked Mr. Gray if he would go over the site plan.

Mr. Gray said there was a road diet proposed along Daniel Morgan Avenue; and he would let the Landscape Architect address that issue.

Mr. Adam Quear came forward and said along Daniel Morgan there was a 5' to 6' wide sidewalk. He said they were at a disadvantage with the site-triangle regarding the SCDOT; and that was why there was not much landscaping there regarding trees. He said currently they had a 2' grass strip along Daniel Morgan and then a 5' wide sidewalk.

Mr. DeMark said really they were talking about turf there only.

Mr. Quear said that was correct.

Mr. Richardson asked how wide of a bike lane would they propose.

Mr. Quear said there would not be a bike lane.

Mr. Richardson asked was it hard to make the sidewalk wider.

Mr. Quear said they could not do that with the grade change.

Ms. Schoepf said she felt the changes they had made with the detail were very attractive.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak in favor of the request to come forward and state their name and address for the record.

- Mr. Cole Alverson, Spartanburg County Administer came forward and said he lived at 767 Otis Boulevard, in the City Limits; and as a project owner he was very much in favor of the request. He explained they had tried to do all they could to take the previous feedback of the Board Members and incorporate as much as possible into this site. This was part of a much broader capital pending series of about \$220,000,000 to be invested within about half of mile of this facility of a combination of City and County facilities. Mr. Alverson said they were still in discussion with SCDOT and they were trying to do the best they could as far as the traffic, as well as moving prisoners in and out of the facility and were trying to minimize pedestrian traffic to keep that as much away from the prisoner traffic as possible regarding safety.

Mr. Richardson asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak in favor of the request. No one else came forward. Mr. Richardson asked if there was anyone who wished to speak against the request. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson asked if there was anyone who just wanted to ask a question.

- Mr. Ken Anthony, an Attorney with an office near the proposed site was here as a part owner of one of the adjoining buildings, and he also represented the owner of another building; and he pointed out on the screen which building(s) he was referring to. He said regarding the renderings that were proposed, it looked like he did not have a parking lot anymore, which he knew was not the case because he had not been served with any condemnation action; but it also looked like the liquor store on the corner was not there anymore; and he would like some clarification on that. He also said it did not look like there was going to be a sidewalk on Library Street, and he would also like to know about that.

Mr. Gray said the best he could tell him was they were not taking his parking lot or the liquor store; and the sidewalk on Library Street would remain.

There being no more questions, Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Schoepf felt all of the changes were very attractive.

Mr. Richardson said he liked all the changes and he appreciated all of their work on this project. He also said as County Administrator Alverson had reminded him tonight; he would much rather the tax payer

dollars go into the new Judicial Center and not the parking deck per say. He did think it was a relatively attractive parking deck as well.

Ms. Schoepf moved to approve the request; and she was seconded by Mr. DeMark.

There was a question regarding whether or not this was conceptual or final approval on the parking deck.

Ms. Rosario said Staff put Conceptual/Final regarding to leave it up to the Board Members as to whether or not they were satisfied enough for it to get final or not. She said Mr. Lewis did not seem to think it should receive final yet regarding his commentary.

Mr. DeMark and Ms. Schoepf said they were fine to give it final approval tonight.

The motion was approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

Staff Announcements:

Mr. Richardson said they knew there was still one Board Member vacancy; and he had spoken to someone the other day regarding that, and he hoped they would soon go before City Council. Mr. Richardson said the Board appreciated one of their new City Council Members being in attendance tonight.

Ms. Rosario informed the Board Members the Selection Committee had decided on a Consultant, Town Planning & Urban Design Collaborative, to do the proposed New Comp Plan for the City; and they would give the Mayor and Council their presentation on January 13, 2020; and hopefully Council would approve them for the Contract. This meeting would be held at the County Council Chambers. If it was approved they would then go full steam into the process. Ms. Rosario said she hoped that all of them would come and be a part of the process.

There being no other business the meeting adjourned at 6:25 P.M.


Ricky Richardson, Chair

Edited by Julie Roland, Secretary