

Meeting Minutes of the Design Review Board (DRB)
Meeting
Tuesday, March 5, 2019

The Design Review Board (DRB) met in the City Hall Council Chambers on Tuesday, March 5, 2019 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. Chris Story, City Manager and Craig Lewis, City's Consultant with Stantec 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 four 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 March 5, 2019 meeting was approved by acclamation.

There were no Meeting Minutes ready for approval.

Old Business – None.

New Business:

Final Review & Approval re Cambria Hotel – New hotel construction & development 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.

Ms. Natalia Rosario, Planner III came forward and was sworn; and she submitted the meeting packets the Board Members had previously received along with tonight's slides and presentation into evidence as Exhibit A. She said Mr. Craig Lewis, with Stantec was here tonight and would do most of the presenting regarding this item. She informed the Board Members in their packets they had a list of seven or eight items that Mr. Lewis had brought to their attention that would need to be discussed during the final approval hearing. Ms. Rosario said regarding the packet, it was pretty much the same one they had at the February meeting, with some added details. She informed the Board Members, Ms. Katie Kirby was present representing ODA Architects, and she would be walking them through tonight's presentation and would answer any questions they had; and Mr. Lewis would give his assessment and recommendation.

Ms. Katie Kirby with ODA Architects came forward and was sworn. She said she knew they had all seen the presentation a number of times; and she would mainly address the sidewalk and landscaping issues from previous meetings. She referenced a slide and pointed out they had added a low barrier screening wall to screen the parking; and they had significant landscaping in front of the parking.

Mr. Richardson asked about the height of the screening wall.

Ms. Kirby said the columns would be five feet and was on Saint John Street. She said there was an approximately ten foot sidewalk, and they had kept the trees in the rendering which was what they would like to see; but DOT had the final call. Ms. Kirby said as far as the transparency on the ground floor, they were going by the code that was on-line regarding 60% vs 70% transparency for ground floor fenestration; and she said they were at 69% and they had discussed this with Mr. Lewis and they believed they had a little lee-way on that. Ms. Kirby referenced another slide and said regarding roof-top screening they had added a parapet around the building which would hide all of the mechanical units on the roof. They had two buffers and two pathways breaking into the landscape buffer in front of the handicapped parking in order to have easy access for them, and originally they had only been showing one. Ms. Kirby concluded her presentation by saying those were essentially the changes that had been made. She said in order to reach the 69% transparency on the ground floor they had raised the windows up to fourteen feet high, which would give more light and make it more open.

Board Questions:

- Mr. Henthorn asked Ms. Kirby if the changes she had just talked about were reflected in the drawings.
- Ms. Kirby said they were.
- Mr. DeMark asked did that mean the canopies at the first floor were higher now than they were before.
- Ms. Kirby said previously they were at twelve feet and now they would be at fourteen feet; and she explained on a slide; and she also referenced it was in their meeting packets.
- Mr. Richardson asked Ms. Kirby had the parking lot been reconfigured.
- Ms. Kirby said no; and she explained the parking lot had been the same for a few months now.
- Mr. Richardson referenced the same slide; and asked if that was a planter in the center.
- Ms. Kirby said it was a single tree planter.
- Mr. Richardson asked was there any more room for any other trees in the parking lot.
- Ms. Kirby said not really; they had planters on the corners and they had talked about adding greenery on the wall.
- Mr. Pitts asked Ms. Kirby about item no. 7 of the memo regarding the parking area just past the building frontage line.
- Ms. Kirby said she believed what Mr. Lewis was saying that the building line along where the terrace was, to maybe extend that building line over; and she said they would have about three spots would extend over it. They felt they would have enough landscaping with the screening wall so as not to see cars parked (with the exception of maybe one car at the most).
- Mr. Pitts said his concern was all the meters in that tree location area, and if you went back to the site plan; Spartanburg Water was probably not going to allow that tree. Mr. Pitts said losing one space as Mr. Lewis had suggested would help that.
- Ms. Kirby said they would actually have to lose at least three spaces in order to bring the whole thing back, and they had already reduced their parking from what was originally planned. She said Mr. Pitts may be correct in the fact they may not be able to have that one tree; but she did not see why they would not be able to bring in some three foot high evergreen shrubbery there.

Mr. Craig Lewis, Consultant with Stantec came forward and was sworn; and said the outstanding items they had were basically sidewalk with parking and transparency. He said when they did their calculations he thought they had looked at the area instead of the width; but he felt it would be fine. That would leave the following two items that would require the Board's specific exceptions:

#1 Sidewalk width: Mr. Lewis said sidewalk width was a minimum of twelve feet with a preference of sixteen feet. He said Staff had some issues because the code that had been up on the website up until very recently was the old code and they had gone back and forth about it; but it was definitely an issue the City had to own; and he would understand giving some flexibility regarding that. The petitioner is showing the minimum sidewalk width in some areas to be ten feet; which was sort of a minimum acceptable, but he felt the Board Members would need to give express approval of it because it was definitely an exception. Mr. Lewis said to provide a comparison would be the distance that is in front of the Montgomery Building along Church Street was ten feet. It was definitely a narrow sidewalk section, and even if they go back and put trees in, the typical tree well would be five feet which left a five foot sidewalk in that area. He said it was something to keep in mind; and it would require a very specific action on the Board's part.

Mr. DeMark asked Mr. Lewis if the ten feet was from the curb line to the building.

Mr. Lewis said they needed ten feet to back of curb.

Mr. Henthorn said it looked like it was more than that.

Mr. Richardson asked was the narrowest part where the parking lot was.

Mr. Lewis said that was correct.

Mr. Richardson asked on the side of the building and on Church Street, was the narrowest point at the patio area.

Ms. Kirby said it was 12.6 feet.

#2 Parking in front of Building: Mr. Lewis said he knew he had brought this up since day one, and he knew they had a lot of discussion about it; but it was something he felt strongly about because they do discourage open surface lots in the downtown area for a number of reasons, which were as follows: They were trying to promote a walking environment and they wanted to get people to walk one more block, and anything that provided negative space discouraged people from walking one more block. Surface parking lots were a negative space. He knew this Board had addressed this on previous applications and permitted side yard parking areas; and their view to this point had been that they viewed these as being temporary. They want them to be behind the frontage line of the building which was what the code called for, but they do them as temporary with the hope they will fill in over time, just as other spaces had filled in over time. He also mentioned this Board approved last month the fill in of a parking lot right on Main Street; and he said they wanted to continue to see that over time. The key was when you walked down the street, what you don't want to see were cars. They wanted to encourage you to keep walking. Mr. Lewis said this would require the Board's specific exception to be able to grant this.

Mr. Lewis asked Ms. Rosario to pull up the parking slide; and he referenced a low wall with wrought iron which he said the Board Members had seen used in a lot of other cases in the downtown, with generous plantings, and he would encourage that, if the Board Members were going to permit the exception.

Mr. Henthorn asked were those shown on this plan.

Mr. Lewis said they were not; but what they would recommend was if the Board was OK for allowing this parking to approach into that frontage, to allow them to work with applicant to achieve the performance specifications they had identified in the illustration as they moved forward.

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Lewis what was the width of the planting strip between the sidewalk and the fencing.

Mr. Lewis said it varied; he thought the minimum was four feet and then it widened out a bit.

Ms. Kirby said the minimum was five feet and it went up to seventeen feet.

Mr. Lewis said the applicant had worked with them on this issue; and had reduced their parking since they first started meeting with them; which he felt had merit. Mr. Lewis said if the Board was going to permit the exception they would need to be very intentional and would in fact be setting a precedent.

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Lewis to be clear, was he saying the solution to take care of this would be to lose the parking space and move the line of cars back.

Mr. Lewis said it was that space and perhaps 1 ½ more.

A gentleman then spoke that was not identified and said they would lose the whole row of parking if they did that.

Mr. Lewis said if everything just shifted down they would lose that one.

Mr. Henthorn asked Mr. Lewis that he was not saying to get rid of it, he was just saying shift it behind the front of the building.

Mr. Lewis said that was correct, to shift it down.

Ms. Rosario said the Development Team had met today regarding the site plan; and it was not finalized; and the Development Team needed to finalize their submittal to Spartanburg Water. She said regarding the number of water meters mentioned earlier, she felt that number would stay the same.

A gentleman that was not identified said more than likely they would reduce one of the 2" meters. They would still have the irrigation meter as well.

Ms. Rosario said as part of the Site Plan Review Committee Meeting they had gone over all the comments together today; and one of the notes to the Civil Engineer was to show on the Landscape plan, exactly what they showed on the rendering. She said today was the first round with the Civil Engineer; and they would get another iteration answering those comments from today.

Mr. Henthorn asked Mr. Lewis if his objection to this was the farthest left corner parking space in the top row where the two spaces were in front of the building façade.

Mr. Lewis said there was probably five or six that stood out in front of that one.

Mr. Henthorn said if you looked at the overhang of the building line or the column line on the plans that it looked like the columns did not line up.

Ms. Kirby explained they were in plane with the building; and that was just the canopy on top that was overhanging four feet. The columns were in plane with the second floor.

Mr. Henthorn said from his point of view, that originally they had a parking structure there which could be shielded, and he was OK with that. When they put the surface parking in he was not OK with it. He does understand the logistics of how they all got to that point; but now that they are at that point; he asked was anything they would do would keep people from looking at that parking lot because it was at grade, there was nothing there, and whether it was five, ten, or twenty feet you would still see it.

Mr. Lewis said it was all part of whether you saw it when walking down the street; and they had other conditions around town where they had screening and it was less evident, and he felt that was what it came down to.

Mr. Henthorn said one of the issues was it was not parallel to the building front, so at one end there was a fair amount of screening, and at the other end you were almost on the sidewalk. He explained if it was pulled back you would lose four to six spaces; and if you took one or two spaces off the left side and rotated it so that row of parking was parallel to the street and added more to the right side and moved the entry, could you get by with just losing one or two spaces; and that way when you do that to pull it back you would end up having a buffer space all the way across.

Ms. Kirby asked Mr. Henthorn did he want less buffer on the corner than what they were showing currently.

Mr. Henthorn said he was trying to even it out because seventeen feet was quite a bit; but at the other end there was maybe four or five feet.

Ms. Kirby said that was to keep it parallel with Trade Street.

Mr. Henthorn asked did it need to be parallel.

Ms. Kirby said she meant perpendicular.

Mr. DeMark did not feel like it could go down any further towards Saint John Street.

Mr. Richardson said no; that he thought that corner was set.

Mr. Henthorn said if they took the two spaces out on the left side and rotated them around and then straightened it out, that it would give move buffer between the parking and get it behind the building façade, and that you might lose two spaces maximum; but you might also when you rotate that and move the entrance up, you might be able to add another one back to the other side.

Mr. DeMark asked if the wall was taller; would that help.

Mr. Pitts felt the wall, plus he said the code said four foot shrubs and the applicant was calling for three gallon shrubs, which would probably go in at fourteen inches tall; but he said they needed to go with at least a fifteen gallon shrub or more depictive of what was on the rendering as opposed to what was on the landscape plan.

Ms. Rosario said that was a comment the Site Plan Review Committee had made earlier today to them; that they needed to adjust to show that they were coming in at three feet in height and four feet in width within the code.

Mr. DeMark felt it kind of was a mute point because the plan showed a tree well and a tree and then three back flow preventers stick out of the ground there.

Ms. Rosario said backflow would be in the building, and those were just meters.

Mr. DeMark asked Ms. Rosario that no tree could go there anyway if a meter box existed; was that correct.

Ms. Rosario said that was more than likely correct.

Mr. Richardson said if you changed the line a little you might move it away from the meters.

Ms. Kirby said they would also have a screen wall at the turn, and what you would see walking down the street would be a column.

Mr. Pitts asked wasn't there supposed to be eight shrubs per ten parking space according to code.

Mr. Johnathan Stewart, Seamon Whiteside Engineering came forward and was sworn, and he said that was a very good comment about the parking rotation that Mr. Henthorn had made; and he said they would lose the two spaces on the side there but also decrease the travel lane width so those two parking spaces in the center they would also lose. He said re the comment for all the parking to be behind the façade of the building, he said if you followed the column line they were only twelve inches over that line with the parking place on the corner. Mr. Stewart said if you go from the very corner façade of the building, they were only miniscule amounts behind that building façade, so with changing the parking – losing more spaces; that would be tough. He said they already talked with the landscape architect and they were willing to increase the amount of shrubbery on that side and relocate the water/backflow preventers if at all possible to prevent anyone walking down the sidewalk to see the parking. He said any of the travelers walking under the canopy behind the columns, that it should be screened from the parking lot as well with more shrubs in that area. He said again that losing four more parking places would be very rough.

Mr. Richardson knew the site had been a challenge from day one and he was sensitive to that and understood that, and he was trying to give them all the benefit of that he could. He asked how many parking spaces they had now vs. how many rooms.

Mr. Stewart said 54 parking spaces and 119 rooms.

Mr. Pitts asked did that include handicapped.

Mr. Stewart said yes.

Mr. Richardson said he guessed they could argue since they were so under-parked anyway, what's another four spaces. He said he did not want to be cynical, but he really wished they had more parking.

Mr. Stewart said they did too.

Mr. Richardson asked if there was anyone else from the Design Team that wished to speak. There was not anyone that wished to speak.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak in favor of the request to come forward and state their names and address for the record. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson asked anyone who wished to speak in opposition or who just might have a question to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Board Member Comments/Deliberation:

Mr. Richardson felt parking had been very challenging from the very beginning; and the petitioner had worked with the Board Members extensively on trying to get the design correct and the materials correct; he felt the fenestration on the building was terrific, and that he was sort of at a loss on the parking.

Mr. Henthorn asked to blow up a slide regarding the parking; and he asked about the wall.

Ms. Kirby said the wall was a brick wall that was five feet at the column sitting on an iron fence.

Mr. DeMark asked at what height did the fence start.

Ms. Kirby said at 18 inches.

Mr. Henthorn felt the wall might be a better solution than pulling it back, but his issue was if the wall was just in the front, it would not do much good because if you were walking down the sidewalk on Church Street you would be able to see right down to the parking. He felt the wall should at least turn around and wrap the parking so you couldn't see it. He said the problem was, at that one end there wasn't enough space to soften that against the sidewalk. It looked OK at one end, but at the other end it was pretty tight.

Ms. Kirby explained they did have it turning.

Mr. Henthorn said he saw the line in the front of the parking, but he did not see it wrapping around.

Ms. Kirby said they would be happy to extend it some more.

Mr. Henthorn said it needed to hide the parking.

Mr. DeMark asked would there be any other vegetation around the parking lot.

Ms. Kirby explained there was a tree in the middle and along the corners, and they would work with the City to add in more vegetation in the buffer zone.

Mr. DeMark asked Ms. Kirby wasn't there a wall that went up Trade Street also.

Ms. Kirby said correct.

Mr. DeMark asked if that matched the same wall on the front.

Mr. Stewart said it was a cast-in-place retaining wall.

Ms. Kirby said it went around the back too.

Mr. DeMark asked was there any landscaping there.

Ms. Kirby said they were suggesting doing a mural and have a local artist come in.

Mr. DeMark asked was that on the back wall area.

Ms. Kirby said correct.

Mr. DeMark said he was talking about the side wall on Trade Street; and he asked how tall the wall was.

Mr. Stewart said it was about four feet.

Mr. DeMark asked if the grade got steeper as it went up Trade Street.

Mr. Stewart said that was correct.

Mr. Henthorn felt if they pulled it back just one space it would give them room to soften the wall, but he said you would still be able to see the parking. He said in his opinion it was a pretty important location; and he felt Mr. Lewis was right about his comments.

Mr. DeMark felt they needed to see it on the plans, and he did not want to approve it in the vacuum. He said this was a critical piece that needed to be addressed before the Board Members gave final approval.

Ms. Rosario referenced a slide of the site plan and explained including the street-scape they expected it to transition into a stronger street-scape buffer once City Staff and Mr. Lewis had come to an agreement with the SCDOT about what they would allow. She said that seventeen feet of space shown right now as landscaped area could be reduced to allow for more sidewalk area. She said City Staff and Mr. Lewis believed the project was ready for final approval. Ms. Rosario said they would be happy to bring it back or they could make it conditional, but they already had made those comments to them, as well as on the site plan also. She said as far as losing the parking spaces that she would leave that up to the developer. Again she said at this point they believed it was ready for final with a few details to work out throughout the site plan process which had already begun.

Mr. DeMark said they talked about this at the last meeting how they had looked at something in a rendering; and then when it was built it was not what they had approved; and now they had to live with it forever. He felt it was important the Board understand what it was going to look like.

Ms. Rosario said they had started the Site Review process and Mr. Lewis was very much involved with that meeting; and that all the comments would get answered because they had already been made to the developer; and was he asking they put off final approval until the Board had a final Site Plan, was that what she was understanding him to say?

Mr. Richardson said he felt that was the consensus, that as much as they wanted to move the project forward; that was such a big question to be answered that they could not approve it unless they saw it.

Ms. Rosario asked Mr. Richardson, so they were saying no to the proposed orientation of the project.

Mr. Richardson felt it needed to be addressed.

Ms. Rosario said with that said; what would the Board prefer to see regarding reduction of a space and pushing it back, or additional detailing.

Mr. Richardson said they would like to see a solution; and he said if you were walking down the street, that was not encouraging to make you want to go another block.

Mr. Lewis said as Ms. Rosario had said, it would be good for them and the developer to know exactly what the Board Members expected back from them before final; and he asked which line did the Board Members want them to hold.

Mr. Richardson said whichever line was the building.

Mr. Lewis explained he would let the Board Members determine that, because they had an upper story; and then underneath it was private and it was behind the columns.

Mr. Henthorn said in making a decision on whether it was the front or back was arbitrary right now because the Board Members did not have a view of what that looked like. He said the view they gave them of that area was an aerial view which did them no good. Mr. Henthorn said their concern was what it would look like to someone walking down the street; and if one would be able to see the parking, then that was an issue. He said if one walked by and the columns blocked the view for the majority of the walk it was not an issue; so then it would go out to the front. His problem was the same one that Mr. DeMark described earlier – they really don't know exactly what they were proposing. He said he had a concept of it; but he doesn't know when he is walking from Church Street with the proposal they currently had, would you see the parking; but he felt that you would. Mr. Henthorn said they needed to see clear view from both locations.

Ms. Rosario asked were they asking for another rendering of what it would look like from Saint John Street.

Mr. Henthorn said he was asking for a rendering of what it would look like as you were walking down the street.

Mr. Richardson said primarily from Church Street.

Ms. Kirby said they were showing a screening fence with shrubbery which was really all they could show.

Mr. Henthorn said he understood what a screening fence was but he did not see what it was they were putting on it or could he see through the fence; and at three feet he could see over the fence. He said if they put a fence above it that he could see through, that would not be helping matters.

Ms. Rosario said she was just trying to get some clarification for the development team's sake.

Mr. Henthorn said they did not want to see the cars.

Ms. Kirby said this had been the same site plan for three months; and this was the first time this had come up.

Mr. Henthorn said it was not information before; and now that they were talking site plan, it was coming up.

Ms. Kirby said they had shown it for three months, and had been showing screening for three months which was required. She asked did they want a full five foot brick wall, and they had to have parking for the site, as much as they could get. She felt they had gone out of their way to show shrubbery and a screening wall, that they just needed to know what they wanted.

Mr. Suraj Mistry said they kept coming back and forth with solutions that wasn't approved and asked how long was this going to go on. He told the Board Members if they had a solution that would work, they will see if that would work, but the way they kept going back and forth was just delaying the process.

Mr. Richardson said he understood their frustration.

Mr. Mistry said to begin with they had proposed the deck to accommodate the parking they would need; and then they were discouraged from doing that regarding the long-term goal would be to have another building on the site, so they had lost parking trying to accommodate the Board's wishes, and now had lost even more parking spaces; and to now have this confrontation at the 12th hour it was just very frustrating.

Ms. Rosario said this was the orientation of the parking since the Board Members had granted conceptual approval.

Mr. DeMark said conceptual and final were two different things.

Ms. Rosario said correct.

Mr. DeMark said at conceptual and the five subsequent other visits, that this level of detail was not provided. He said there was no screen wall the last time they met, there was no understanding of a screen wall the last time they met, there was not a landscaping understanding; and he said they had asked about the traffic triangle which was of a concern. He said there was definitely a path here, but they were at the final; and the Board needed to make sure it was final.

Ms. Rosario said Staff's recommendation was to vote favorably for final approval with a certain set of conditions; and one of those would be for clarification in the site plan showing full buffer, full screening of this orientation as shown if the Board Members accept it. She said if the Board Members would like to see anything different they would appreciate very much any type of guidance that they could provide to Staff and the developer, and be very specific as they could be; and she said she just wanted to acknowledge all the frustration, and all the work this team had put into this.

Mr. Richardson said he was very appreciative and sensitive to all of that; and he was sorry the website had been incorrect. In their prior meetings they had spent a lot of time on the building itself and those type issues, as well as EIFS, etc. and that they were just now getting to the parking lot. He felt like their attention was at the parking lot for the first time. He does think their question regarding what the Board would accept was a fair one. Mr. Richardson said from a site line perspective walking down the street they did not want to see the parking lot, they do not want to see the cars. He felt a wall wrapped around so you would not see the cars was a fair request. He said he was no expert on landscaping, walls or fencing, etc.; and he next asked the other Board Members if they had any comments to offer that would soften that corner.

Mr. Pitts asked would it be problematic for them to continue forward meeting with Spartanburg Water and Planning Staff, and have their civil team only come back before the Board. He felt it was really all site related issues at this point.

Ms. Rosario said the Civil Engineer and the Architect were here; and that was one reason she had the Site Plan Review Committee Meeting earlier today; but she said they would be happy to provide the Board Members with whatever they wanted.

Mr. Pitts moved final approval be given with the condition the Board Members be provided the final site plan for review that would include grading and screening of the parking lot along East Saint John Street prior to issuing any grading permits; and he was seconded by Mr. Henthorn. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Conceptual Review and approval re proposed new construction and development at 431 East Kennedy Street located in the DT-5 District, TMS#7-12-11-237.00 (The Robert Hett Chapman, III Center for Philanthropy) from Adam Flynn, McMillan Pazdan Smith, Agent on behalf of the Spartanburg County Foundation, Owner.

Ms. Rosario came forward again and said the Board Members previously saw this case in January, 2019.

Mr. Adam Flynn with McMillan Pazdan Smith came forward on behalf of Spartanburg County Foundation, and he was sworn. He said Spartanburg County Foundation had been seeking to expand their programming and their space and he said also present were Troy Hanna, Mary Thomas, and John Bauknight who were also affiliated with the project, which was the The Robert Hett Chapman III Center for Philanthropy. It was an extension of The Spartanburg County Foundation's Program and Operations inside of Spartanburg and Spartanburg County. Mr. Flynn reminded the Board Members the proposed site was located at 431 E. Kennedy Street (cattycornered across the street from the Foundation headquarters site) and was the former Hardee's No. 1, which that building had previously been demolished, and was now a flat site parking remained with a small grassed area in the rear. He said it was located in DT-5 and was along the Kennedy Street side yard parking overlay. The relevant portions of that included the setback of 0' minimum, 12' maximum and also the exemption for the frontage build-out requirements which would typically be 60%, which was exempted because of the side yard parking overlay. He informed the Board Members there was another building that was on the property prior to the Hardee's building and it had also been demolished; and what remained was grassed and the remainder of the site was paved pretty much all the way to the property line. There were some retaining walls in existence along two areas he pointed out on the slide.

Mr. Richardson referenced something on the slide and asked if that was a detention pond.

Mr. Flynn said it did not appear to be but they were not entirely sure.

Mr. Richardson said it looked like it was recessed.

Mr. Flynn said there was the former building on the site prior to the Hardee's. He showed a slide looking from Kennedy Street at the proposed site and showed the grassy area. A slide was shown from St. Paul Street corner that showed small retaining wall and what they believed was formerly a dumpster that had been enclosed on that street. He said in the previous presentation there was some debate among the Board Members about what an appropriate setback for the building was, and they had originally set it back at the maximum allowed at 12 feet. He said there was discussion about what a good precedent would be for Kennedy Street, but also the potential if the street was ever expanded. They are now showing the building to be setback 15' in the current Civil Plan which he showed. Mr. Flynn said it matched within about a foot the setback for the Foundation Headquarters and they were taking from the City review to match the street trees which he said they would see briefly along the side of the building; and he said it also gave them a generous opportunity for a sidewalk 8' wide per the City recommendation. Parking was to the rear of the site going back on St. Paul Street. Since the January meeting they made the decision to shift the building closer to the side nearest the shopping center that originally held the Farmer's Market, which allowed them to move the drive against the front of the building and have a drop-off lane and really activate the main entrance, which they felt was lacking in the previous scheme. He said that also allowed them to directly align the front doors of this facility with the front doors of the current Foundation building. They were providing a conceptual landscape plan that he showed, that showed a paved plaza area in front of the building they felt really highlighted the front corner. Mr. Flynn pointed out on the landscape plan, a service sidewalk along the back of the building would handle most of the service entry needs, with parking to the rear. He said they were fairly generous with landscaping particularly along that shopping center side as it was not the most desirable frontage. He pointed out a dumpster enclosure, but he said they were not showing it currently screened, but that it would be screened, as well as a pad for a transformer kind of back in the site that would be screened in both directions with vegetation. Regarding materials, he said the Foundation felt very strongly the building should relate to the headquarters and they would use primarily a white masonry that would be standard brick with some accents, and to cap the building they were proposing a cast stone matched color. Inset in the windows would be a metal panel both in the deeper recesses in the front corner and in the trim elements surrounding the windows which he pointed out. They were also proposing same material in the band on top of the raised portion and a hard stucco eyebrow to cap it off.

The stucco and brick both related to the materials used at the current headquarters building. He said there was still some decision on the metal panel in terms of finish and color, but there would be some effort to relate back to the building should the Foundation decide to go that route. Mr. Flynn said to address some concerns from the original review, about the amount of glazing they had ran calculations, and right now they were showing an elevation length that included the 45 degree angle that faced the street of 111.5" and of that 67'4" was windows which amounted to 60.4% which was the City recommendation. They had also updated renderings showing the drive lane pushed to the other side of the building; and he pointed out what was the front of the building from roughly eye level; from standing level; and from standing at the front door of the current headquarters building. He showed from the sidewalk across Kennedy Street looking at the main façade of the building, an aerial from the rear showing parking and drop-off; and an aerial from over the headquarters building showing the front and the relationship of that entry. He said there was also some push back on their preferred use of the monument sign; and they wanted to document the existing signage that was along Kennedy Street that he showed which included Spartanburg Community College, the NBSC sign, Smith's Jewelers, and both neighbors of the property which was the shopping center and an insurance office to the far side, all that had monument signs. Mr. Flynn said they felt like there was precedent on Kennedy Street for that type of signage, and since their building was in honor of Robert Hett Chapman III, they would very much like to feature his name prominently on some signage at the front of the building. They knew it was an exception but they would propose that based on the existing conditions of the site and the general design which they would present at final.

Board Questions:

Mr. Henthorn asked was the paperwork the Board Members received via email prior to the meeting the same presentation that had been shown tonight.

Mr. Flynn explained they had sent Ms. Rosario a more updated version before the meeting.

Mr. Richardson asked if any of the Board Members had any problems with the sign.

There were no problems with the sign.

Mr. Richardson moved conceptual approval of the project which included the proposed monument sign; and he was seconded by Mr. DeMark. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Conceptual Review and approval re Restoration/Redevelopment of proposed Project 158, located in the DT-6 District at 158 East Main Street, Parcel #7-12-21-022.00 from Dwayne E. Wood, AIA, GPN, Architecture, Inc., Agent, on behalf of Champion Investment Corporation, Owner.

Ms. Rosario came forward and said the applicant was here and seeking conceptual approval, and had brought sample materials for the windows and doors for the Board Members to see. She said the awnings would probably change.

Mr. Dwayne Wood, AIA, GPN Architecture, Inc., Agent on behalf of Champion Investment Corporation came forward and was sworn. When they met with the Board Members a month ago for preliminary design the basis of the design was to take an existing building that was currently weathered, and whitewash and paint it, and take it back to its original natural brick façade, to renovate the street level for mercantile space and to add two apartments on the two floors above. The current building showed what were now shown as window openings were currently infilled with brick, and he explained they proposed to remove the brick and bring those up, and for the apartments beyond to recess those patio or balcony doors back five to six feet and turn those into outdoor spaces. Mr. Wood said in general, the Board seemed to be favorable on their concept to take the brick back to its natural state, clean it, seal it and remove the existing Kosch & Gray stuff (outdated); and he showed slides. He said there was considerable detailing around the openings they wished to take back to its original state. Mr. Wood said the Board Members did not seem to be favorable of the awning, which he referenced a slide of the awning; and he said they were still studying that. He said Mr. Lewis had commented the proposed site posed an opportunity at that end of the street to emphasize it as a destination; so they were going to pay more attention to the awning(s) regarding a better solution regarding texture, color, shape and quantity. He showed the Board Members the sample materials which he brought for their review and comments; and he said the predominant new storefront material would be the dark bronze anodized aluminum (very dark bronze) if you looked at the way the light changed

on it, and it was very compatible with the storefront aluminum on the adjoining buildings, and to coordinate with the brick and the dark bronze, a light bronze high performance glass. They were seeking conceptual approval tonight so they could proceed with completing their engineering documents that they would like to submit for permit, so when the weather dried out they could begin to clean the brick, with the conditional hold on the awnings to be brought back at a later date. He said Mr. Lewis recommended they give serious consideration to a pendant mounted sign vs something simple on the glass as they had proposed; and they knew that signage was a separate issue. He said as it was right now, the mechanical, hvac, roof would be concealed.

Board Questions:

Mr. Henthorn asked about the pieces at the bottom of the storefront rendering/slide (what were those).

Mr. Wood said it was a precast concrete.

Mr. Richardson asked was that new or existing.

Mr. Wood said it was new, it would be molded to look like wood, but would be more durable.

Mr. Henthorn said it looked like white precast concrete; and he asked Mr. Wood what it was really going to look like.

Mr. Wood said it was a tinted colored concrete-compatible with color of the aluminum and the brick, so something more in a buff than a white color.

Mr. Richardson asked if it would be something like the neighboring buildings to the left.

Mr. Wood said yes; and that it was kind of patterned after that.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak in favor of the request to come forward and state their names and address for the record. 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 asked if there was anyone who just would like to ask a question to come forward.

Mr. Steven Sikes of 205 Wood Trace, Spartanburg, came forward, and asked about the second floor window openings regarding the bottom sill did not seem to be aligned with the rest of it; and he wondered if that was intentional. He thought it might be better to have it the same all the way across to relate to the neighboring buildings.

Mr. Wood explained they were taking it back to its original state and that it may have been misaligned from the very beginning.

Mr. Richardson asked were there anymore questions or did anyone else wish to speak. No one else came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Mr. Pitts moved to grant conceptual approval as presented and he was seconded by Mr. Henthorn. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Preliminary Review of the new construction proposed at 180 Magnolia Street, located in the DT-6 District, bounded by N. Daniel Morgan Avenue, Saint John Street, and Magnolia Street, from William Gray, AIA, McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture, Agent, on behalf of Spartanburg County.

Ms. Rosario came forward and said this item was the Preliminary Review of the new construction proposed at 180 Magnolia Street, otherwise known as the Spartanburg County Judicial Center; and Mr. William Gray, AIA, of McMillan Pazdan Smith was here to present.

Mr. William Gray, of McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture came forward and he was sworn; and said he was very excited to be here to present this tonight for preliminary regarding the site only. He was presenting on behalf of a very large team of about fifty people; and he announced all those that were present tonight, and who had worked on this project so far for about a year now to get it as far as it was. He explained this would be a very significant project and a very complexed one; and would have a lasting impact for generations to come. Mr. Gray said he would be coming to the Board over the next several months regarding three buildings that would be occurring, which were the new court house, a new parking deck, and a building they were calling the energy plant. He showed the existing court house as it sat now, and

the next slide to show the demolition to prepare for the new projects. He said the old annex building and the old office buildings would be removed. The central energy plant would come into play (the mechanical equipment) and all the equipment that supported the existing court house and they would remove that to prepare for the new court house. They would have to offset that with the new energy plant. Mr. Gray said that was not represented on the diagrams he had, but it would be represented on the site plan. He pointed out on a slide the large gray shapes south of the current court house would be the new court house. Across Library Street to the left was the new parking deck. He explained where the new energy plant would sit. He said the last phase of the whole thing would be to demolish the existing court house and do an entire comprehensive landscape plan and plaza that connected Magnolia to the front door of the new court house with access to the Federal Building across the street. He explained they were expecting most of the traffic to come off Daniel Morgan into the site and either go into the garage, go into the surface lot, or come off of Daniel Morgan to what they would understand in a moment to be the basement level or the bottom level of the deck. They also had a handicapped parking area and loop, a drop off, and it was a little bit closer to the main entrance. For the new energy plant they anticipated some walls to screen the equipment, which would be of some type of rusticated material that related back to the court house. The finish floor elevation would be 778' and the height of the walls (top of walls at 785') and the top of the grade was at 782'; so what they saw was kind of nestled into the earth. He went to the next slide which was the grading plan, and said 782' was top of grade, with the top of wall at 785'; and he explained there would be three feet of exposed wall; and he showed what would be the main service area. A slide of the new parking deck for the project was shown and he said it would be similar to the energy plant regarding materials and would have a masonry type of panels to echo what they were doing on the court house. Mr. Gray said they all acknowledged as a team that it needed to be a stand-alone building and not look identical to the new court house, but relate on some level. Mr. Gray said there would also be some accent features on the corner and on the main entrance. He said basically the way it would operate (they did not see the plan today because they were not reviewing it) but they do have a lobby that housed elevators and stairs; and people would exit through an area he pointed out, and then cross over Library Street and enter the plaza element and be connected with the front entrance which was all ADA accessible. They expected to have 750 to 800 cars in the parking deck, and it was designed by Kimley Horne Association and MPS and Stevens & Wilkinson and they also had their traffic study Engineer looking at the impact it would have on Daniel Morgan, Library Street and Magnolia Street. They do not anticipate anything major, but he said he just wanted the Board to know they were looking into that. He explained the primary entry point to get to the deck would be off of Daniel Morgan and Library Street. There were two entry points in the corners. At both entry points was an option to turn left or right onto either Magnolia or to Daniel Morgan. He said the nice thing about this was there would not be the option to turn left out onto Daniel Morgan; that you could only turn right onto Daniel Morgan. He said there would be 5 and a half stories, and they had a lower level that took advantage of the topography, and the low point was on Daniel Morgan. It would be 45' 10" from Level One to Level Five. The tallest architectural element would be 52' from Level One. From bottom at the lowest point on Daniel Morgan was a 62' height. Regarding the new Court House: Mr. Gray pointed out the main pedestrian entrance he pointed out they would see it better on future renderings but said they were taking everyone from either the parking lot or the parking deck across Library Street and to the main entrance. He informed the Board Members there would also be multiple parking beneath the building under the basement that would only be accessed off Daniel Morgan, which would be for Judges parking, prisoner drop-off which would be controlled) and there would be a service drop off. The basement had a tiered level where the building could be entered from different elevations. Regarding materials it would be a masonry panel type building, and they were still going through that pricing right now. The building would be about 340,000 square feet; and seven levels. He said there would be six levels that he pointed out in one area and then seven levels off the back. He said they understood it would be classified as the high rise in the City of Spartanburg. They had done some due diligence and met with Mr. Bush, the City Building Official and Ms. Rosario the Senior Planner and there had been no major concerns expressed. The height of the building would be 103' 4" from Level One and he pointed out where that would be; and on the back on the basement there would be about 123' 4" from basement level to roof height. The roof stepped up in one particular location, but essentially added about 15' to 28' depending on where you were around the building. Regarding setbacks he said 34' from Daniel Morgan and 26' from St. John Street at the closest point. Mr. Gray said for a number of reasons that the Board Members could talk to more in depth with the Judicial Team, but with a building like this being the size that it was and the nature of it, there were some concerns

about it being super close to the street in terms of explosives, and a variety of high risk concerns, they tried to mitigate by setting it back a little further than the Board may have liked to see. He said that was pretty much his presentation.

Board Questions:

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Gray what would be in all the space he was going to refer to as the front yard. Would it all be landscaped, or for a park or future development.

Mr. Gray said right now they had a nice plaza design, hardscaping, and that it was still being worked on.

Mr. Richardson asked how far it was from Magnolia Street to the front of this building.

Mr. Gray said about 200'. He said the design team was making some adjustments to maybe bring the entrance a little bit closer, but they had some very serious concerns about getting too close to the existing building during construction.

Mr. DeMark asked did they have any concern about the fact with it having rained a lot for the last six months with parking people so far away from the building and then not having any way of them getting into the building without getting wet, etc.

Mr. Gray said they understood that concern, and had talked about it, but they were a little landlocked and there were not a lot of options.

Mr. Henthorn asked how close they would be to the existing building.

Mr. Gray said about 30 feet.

Mr. Demark asked about the site lines from the energy plant to the building; and asked was it a berm or a differentiation.

Mr. Gray said that was right and it sloped pretty steeply. He said the Board Members would see that in much further detail in the future.

Mr. Gray said he wanted to point out there had been a lot of thought on how the buildings had been organized with the way court rooms had to be organized across a main corridor and where there needed to be secure zones and non-secure zones. The footprint for better or worse was kind of set as it was; and once they start changing things, it could really compromise the safety of the building.

Mr. Richardson asked would they be adding dirt to this site or taking it off.

Mr. David McCutchen, McCutchen Engineering spoke from the audience and said they would be adding a lot of dirt.

Mr. Richardson asked about the slope from Magnolia Street down to Daniel Morgan.

Mr. Gray said it was 29' across.

Mr. DeMark asked about the energy plant regarding the mechanical equipment.

Mr. Gray said they had talked to Duke Energy; and there was no way around it; and the team was working diligently regarding that.

Mr. Richardson asked would there be solar panels on the roof.

Mr. Gray said not at this time.

Mr. Richardson asked would it be LEED Certified.

Mr. Gray said that was not the plan right now, but they tried to be mindful of those things.

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Craig Lewis if he had any comments.

Mr. Lewis said he knew it was in a very early stage, but he had some things they may want to consider moving forward. He said it was tough to look at the site and say Magnolia was actually the fronting street, but it would be. Daniel Morgan was very utilitarian. He said once you got past St. John, Daniel Morgan did start to change in complexion and probably would over time, particularly as some of the parcels that were there would be redeveloped. Mr. Lewis was personally OK with looking at Daniel Morgan differently

than other street, but he did think it was important they recognize it as a downtown street in that there should be an adequate sidewalk there, street trees along back portion of it; particularly because it was going to be a really big building, and having trees along the back would help to soften that side of it. The side walk should be set back from the curb; the trees would not have to be set in wells there – a planting lawn would be OK along the Daniel Morgan side. He said the St. John Street side was an important street, and in this particular block and the next block up it was well and properly landscaped according to the downtown expectation, and that edge would be very important and they needed to be very thoughtful of the landscaping and architectural detailing because it was sort of the butt end of the building and it would be very large sitting up on the hill there and would be very prominent. Regarding the parking deck he knew it was in a utilitarian street area, and Kennedy Street deck was not really property lined. He felt this would be a visually prominent deck since it would be five stories high and would really be very visible. He suggested as it came across Daniel Morgan that maybe they could have an inexpensive draping incorporated in the sides that would help. Mr. Lewis commended the Design Team on what looked to be a great project.

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Gray if they needed anything from the Board tonight.

Mr. Gray said they did not.

Staff Announcements:

There were no Staff Announcements

There being no other business the meeting adjourned at 7:08 P.M.



Ricky Richardson, Chair

Edited by Julie Roland, Secretary