

Meeting Minutes of the Design Review Board (DRB)
Meeting
Tuesday, July 17, 2018

The Design Review Board (DRB) met in the City Hall Council Chambers on Tuesday, July 17, 2018 at 5:30 P.M., with the following members in attendance: Ricky Richardson, Mike Henthorn, and Kevin DeMark. Tip Pitts and Gabriela Giron were absent. Representing the Planning Department were Natalia Rosario, Planner III; Apoorva Kumar, Associate Planner; 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 of the five Board Members were present, constituting a quorum; and he went over the procedure for the meeting.

The Agenda for tonight's meeting was approved by acclamation.

Old Business – None.

Public Hearing re Final Review and Approval: New Construction of the Dr. T.K. Gregg Community Center at 650 and 704 Howard Street, parcels 7-12-05-001.00 and 7-12-01-072.01. The properties are zoned DT-4, from Adam Flynn, McMillan Pazdan Smith, on behalf of the City of Spartanburg, Owner.

Ms. Rosario came forward and was sworn and said Mr. Craig Lewis could not be here at tonight's meeting; but she believed that most points had been addressed from the previous meeting and probably their major item would be that main corner as discussed previously. She said Staff was asking for final approval tonight in order for this project to move forward to secure financing.

Adam Flynn, McMillan Pazdan Smith Architects came forward and was sworn; and he showed some slides from the May, 2018 meeting when they had secured conceptual approval of the project. He showed a slide of the location map of the property which he said was on the former site of Oakview Apartments that had been designated as part of the Northside Master Plan for a community center; and he explained they were only disturbing about 40% of the site. Some conceptual renderings were shown to show the existing conditions of the site; and he said there were some pretty significant grade changes along Howard Street and inside the site, as well as along Preston Street. Mr. Flynn showed a slide of the current set of civil plans that showed existing conditions and the project constraints. He explained primarily they were looking to build the center on the former Oakview property, and a parking amenity per the master plan that had previously been designated for vehicular amenity. They were proposing a driveway across what would remain of Aden Street, and that between this property, the PCA site and the Cleveland Academy would be closed; and he explained how it would be reconfigured. The primary approach to the building was shown on Plan North from Howard Street, and there would be a rear entry and primary access parking shown on Plan West. Mr. Flynn said per Craig Lewis' comments he noted the building was set inside the traditional setbacks for DT-4, but as a civic building that was typically allowed, especially since they were approaching the street through a plaza and two locations. They had noted the other primary setbacks and said they were looking at anywhere between 29 and 35 feet from both Howard and Preston from the current property lines. As a general rule and on the building corner of Howard and Preston it just touched the 18' typical set back. They also wanted to note on the Plan South side of the site there would be a screened trash hold (roll-out canisters) per the City instead of a dumpster because the amount of waste generation was anticipated to be minimal. They also would have a screened equipment yard beside that to house a transformer and some pool equipment. Most all of the other equipment would be on the roof. In terms of material for screening they would be matching material of the masonry wall in that area as well as using some landscaping screen. He explained in terms of grading, they would primarily be doing a cut and fill procedure to cut in to the PCA site and using that to create the pattern in which the building would be constructed. As part of this they were also doing a rough grade procedure on the front part of the PCA site and the intent there was to leave an area that could be used for future development on Howard Street, and the parking would be set back from the current property line roughly 80 feet to accommodate such a building in the future. This was not part of the City's plan but they just

wanted to leave that option open. Mr. Flynn showed a slide of the Landscape Plan and explained regarding landscaping they were primarily focused on the Howard Street side; and they were providing landscaping for the parking lot, as well as use screen vegetation to help block the mechanical yard from the public's view. They were creating the DRB required curb yard and sidewalk all the way around the facility, except on the corner; and they would extend that along the front of the PCA site at 704 Howard to go ahead for any future work, as well as safety regarding public access from the Cleveland Heights Community and the Cleveland Academy. More slides were shown of the site showing the main plaza and corner plaza. He said they were considering two color schemes, and the primary materials on all facades would be brick masonry. They were considering an over-sized double monarch sized brick as the primary element for both base and field condition. The topping material over most of the building on top of the masonry would be a metal panel system with some cast stone accents which he explained. They were considering two different color schemes which he showed and explained. Elevations were shown that did not face the street area. They had updated renderings with the two color options so the Board Members could see what that looked like. On the corner, on the primary façade they had the window two feet below grade to highlight the water slide that would be behind that. Mr. Flynn showed a view from the primary plaza which he said would be primarily level to the street; and he said there would be a slight slope. They had slightly elevated the building over the plaza area, and more renderings were shown; and he explained mechanical units, would all be on the roof. Four of the units would require screening, and the others would be recessed considerably between the building, and most of the other units would be completely hidden.

Board Questions/Comments:

Mr. Richardson felt they had done an excellent job in addressing all of the concerns from the last meeting; and he asked if there were any questions. There were no questions.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked anyone that wished to speak in favor of the request to come forward and state their name and address. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson asked anyone who wished to speak in opposition to the request to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Mr. DeMark moved to grant final approval as presented; and he was seconded by Mr. Henthorn. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

Mr. Richardson said he thought this was a really great project.

Public Hearing re Final Review and Approval: New Construction of a Wendy's Restaurant at 150 S. Pine Street, Parcel #7-12-11-127.00 The property is zoned DT-5, from Tige Darnier, Tar Heel Capital, on behalf of FFC Limited Partnership DBA Wendy's, Owner/Developer.

Ms. Rosario came forward again and said before she forgot; she submitted the meeting packets the Board Members previously received via email, regarding all of tonight's presentations and slides into evidence as Exhibit A. She said Staff was hoping for a final approval on this case as well; the City was recommending they try to make it come as close to the appearance of having two stories as possible; the blank wall area – and she thought the Board had decided up to this point they would accept it being utilized as a green wall; and the parking area access which in the DT-5 zone by the Code no access should be from the front of the property, but as of right now there was no way to access that from any other street other than Pine Street; so Staff was recommending approval of those exceptions as well as the final approval of the design at tonight's meeting.

Jim Furman, Boone N.C., Petitioner came forward and was sworn. Mr. Furman felt like they had addressed all of the questions that had been raised by the Board Members and the City's consultant. He informed the Board Members they had indicated the height of the screenings and the HVAC; and they had also added the bicycle rack; and had put the trees closer to the building outside of the sidewalk without the rails, pending the discussion with SCDOT.

Board Questions:

- Mr. Richardson asked Ms. Rosario if the slides on the screen were the latest and most updated drawings.

- Ms. Rosario said they were.
- Mr. Richardson asked about the trash containment area and would it be screened.
- Ms. Rosario referenced a slide and said it would be near the back of the property, and it would be screened.
- Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Furman if the DOT would determine the streetscape.
- Mr. Furman explained to the Board Members it was his understanding the DOT was not entirely happy with the trees being that close to the road, and explained their options.
- Mr. Henthorn asked Mr. Furman about the mechanical screening.
- Another gentleman that did not identify himself went to the screen and explained where all the rooftop mechanical screening would be mounted on the units themselves; and as well as over the kitchen area.
- Mr. DeMark asked about the roofline regarding the screening.
- The other gentleman explained.
- Mr. Henthorn wondered if it was a three sided screen or not, and asked from the front elevation how far back was the screening from the main façade.
- The gentleman said about six to eight feet back; and it attached to the rooftop itself.
- Mr. Henthorn asked if the lay walls were red.
- Mr. Furman said that was correct.
- 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 to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson asked if there was anyone who had any questions to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberation:

- Mr. DeMark made a motion to approve the request as presented; and he was seconded by Mr. Richardson. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

Public Hearing re Final Review and Approval: New Construction of Multi-Unit Housing at TMS#7-12-05-345.00 for the property located at the Northwest corner of the Intersection of Howard Street and College Street in the DT-5 District, from Brian Keith, JHP Architecture on behalf of the Northside Development Group, Owner/Developer.

Ms. Rosario came forward again and explained the City was recommending final approval tonight of the North Side Housing, Phase I. She said the only exception as a divergent from the code was the 60% build-out; other code reviews that included the Linear Pocket Park; trash location and screening; and mechanical equipment and screening. An important point to be made was the main office had been moved from the parking lot corner to the corner of College and Howard. Also another important point was the streetscape issue which was a DOT related issue; and the City was trying to work through that, and was recommending final approval tonight on those issues, as well as the site design of the Northside Housing Phase 1.

Mr. Brian Keith, AICP, AIA with JHP Architecture came forward and was sworn; and he introduced Carl Malcolm to the Board Members, who was one of his Partners at JHP; and he said Mr. Malcom would be taking over this side of the project for him. Mr. Keith said he would briefly go through the presentation; and the Board Members had seen a lot of it; and he would point out the changes that had been made since the last meeting, and he had the Landscape Plan and additional information. Slides were then shown and explained. He showed a slide of the Landscape Plan and said again they knew there were a lot of grade changes and challenges, but he felt they had made some good changes. Mr. Keith said Paul Mills from Site Design, the Civil Engineer was also present to talk about the project. Mr. Keith said as Ms. Rosario had pointed out there were some DOT constraints on both Northside Projects because Howard Street was

a State Highway. Regarding landscaping he showed a slide of the southern elevation looking down from Butterfly Creek; and said there was a significant crawl along College and Howard Street. He showed a slide and showed where they had a lower terrace level (depicted by the reddish brick he pointed out on the screen) that was stepped down to be closer to grade. He explained to the Board Members they also had some easements and some sewer constraints; and the bottom element was along Howard Street. He said a significant thing they had heard at the last meeting when they obtained conceptual approval was they had now flipped the leasing office and put it on the left side (at the corner of College and Howard.) They also had simplified the elevations and tried to refine them in order to be simpler; and they refined their roof lines and roof massing. Mr. Keith showed again the grade change from College Street, which was more significant at the corner of the intersection; and he said they had some retaining walls that tapered out as you got down to Butterfly Creek. He explained they had actually developed some units that had direct access out on to College Street. A slide was shown from the western elevation that was for the parking lot; and he again showed the significant grade change; and they were keeping the building at Howard Street where they had the fall-off, and they were using that to their advantage to screen the parking.

Board Member Questions:

Mr. DeMark had a question about something on that slide.

Mr. Keith explained that was the retaining wall; and the courtyard was behind it; and back behind that would be the Monarch Café.

Mr. DeMark asked would there be access from the parking lot to the plaza.

Mr. Keith explained there would be steps to get you back up to Howard Street and into the building, and there was also direct access into the lower side of the building, with some ramping behind the wall for accessibility.

Mr. Keith showed another slide and explained it showed Plan North and the top side was Howard Street; and College Street was to the right (and that was the lower terrace level, which was the closest to the creek.)

Board Member Questions:

Mr. Richardson asked which ones had access to go outside.

Mr. Keith explained.

Mr. Richardson asked didn't some of the apartments have direct outdoor access.

Mr. Keith pointed them out on the slide and said some of them would only have little terraces.

Mr. Keith showed the Howard Street level and showed the accessible ADA units, and he showed where on the right hand side where the leasing and the amenities would all be on that end. They were able to get parallel parking on Howard and College Street, in terms of parking for leasing and that enabled them in some other areas. He showed the upper levels and said they were still working out some of the façade and banding on the building details. Mr. Keith showed a slide of the Corner of Howard Street with College Street on the left, and of the plaza and the landscaping; which he said they would continue to refine that corner; and that it was a place they believed was a very significant corner, and they had put a lot of emphasis there. Mr. Keith brought actual brick and paint samples to the Board Members. He said they tried to articulate the streetscapes. A slide was shown from Howard Street looking back to show how they tried to define the interactions between both sides of the street regarding how the buildings lined up, the crosswalks, etc. A slide was shown regarding the view from Butterfly Creek looking up; and he said there was a greater grade change coming down to the creek; and he explained they had tried to articulate it so it was not just a blank wall.

Board Member Questions:

Mr. DeMark asked about a blank wall on the 2nd and 3rd floors.

Mr. Keith explained those were amenity units; and there may be some additional things they could do.

Mr. Keith showed a view of the Linear Plaza with parking to the right.

Mr. Paul Mills, P.E., Site Design, Inc. Civil Engineer & Landscape Architects, Greenville, SC came forward and was sworn; and he showed a slide of the Landscape Plan and informed the Board Members it was code compliant; the trees listed on the plan were Elms, Oaks and Maples and they planned to add more shrubs in the future. He said as was mentioned earlier, Howard Street was a DOT road; and they had shown on their plans the lane widths, curbing, trees, etc.; but until they actually submitted it to the DOT they would not know for sure that it was o.k. with them because the DOT typically did not like trees that close to the curb. Regarding Stormwater/Sewage, along the back side of the property was an existing 60" storm drain line that ran through, and they had to keep the building off of that so the structural impact of the building did not affect the storm drain line; so if the line had to be replaced in the next five to twenty years, they could do it without any problems without having to shore up the building. He said there would also be a sanitary sewer line that ran just down from that between the storm line and Butterfly Creek that would pick up the sewage from what was on Howard Street now and the Access Health and NDG building, and bring it down and go to College Street. Mr. Mills referenced another slide of the plan and pointed out the large plaza area they developed; and he said one of Mr. Lewis' previous comments had been there was too much hardscape on concrete in that area and it was supposed to be a gathering point. He said they added a little round planter bed, or it may even become a small statue in order to break up the expanse of the concrete; and he explained it would still be a good gathering space and you would be able to sit on a little knee wall or some benches, and it was sunken a little bit from the road because of the grade change.

Board Member Questions:

- Mr. Henthorn asked Mr. Keith about ground running equipment/mechanical units.
- Mr. Carl Malcolm explained there was no ground running equipment, and all of that would be on the roof behind parapets, so they should not be visible from the ground.
- Mr. Henthorn asked a question from one of the detail sheets that showed a section through the condenser well that looked like it was under the sloped roof.
- Mr. Malcom explained they did have some carved out of the roof wells and those were open to the courtyard side, and they were trying to shield them from the street.
- Mr. Henthorn asked about the perimeter flat roof.
- Mr. Malcolm said they were putting some there as well behind the parapet.
- Mr. Henthorn asked about the height of the parapet.
- Mr. Malcom said it was around 4' which was the standard residential height.
- Mr. DeMark asked was a trash corral or something added.
- Mr. Mills explained it was addressed earlier and that it was at the bottom left side of the parking lot and would have screened walls around it.
- Mr. DeMark asked did he hear them talk about a sidewalk or dog walk or something.
- Mr. Keith explained.

Mr. Richardson, the Chair, 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 to the request, or if someone might have a question to come forward and state their name and address. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Board Comments/Deliberation:

Mr. Richardson thought they had ended up with a really great looking building and appreciated them working with the Board Members; and he made a motion to grant final approval; and he was seconded by Mr. DeMark. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

Public Hearing re Final Review and Approval: New Construction of Multi-Unit Housing, Mixed Use Development at Parcel #7-12-05-345.01; 7-12-05-288.00; 7-12-05-290.00; 7-12-05-291.00; 7-12-05-292.00; 7-12-05-293.00; 7-12-08-294.00; 7-12-05-295.00; and 7-12-05-296.00 for the properties located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Howard Street and College Street in the DT-5 District, from Brian Keith, JHP Architecture on behalf of the Northside Development Group, Owner/Developer.

Ms. Tammy Hawkins came forward with the Northside Development Group and thanked the Board Members for all of their help on the project thus far. She explained they had secured the tax credits and were hoping to close on those at the end of August, 2018.

Mr. Brian Keith, Architect, JHP Architecture came forward again and said they would follow the same format as with the last item. He referenced a slide and explained there was Howard Street at the bottom, the curb, and then College Street; and that in the bottom building they had Access Health and NDC (commercial uses) on the bottom floor, with a lobby around the corner and then a Wofford component made up of a student lounge and Wofford housing above, and then mixed income housing above NDG and Access Health. Along College Street would be the one story VCOM Building. Mr. Keith said an important consideration on this was per the Code they had a maximum amount they could be away from the curb; and they also had the parallel parking they had been working through, and a big wide curb going on, as well as significant grade challenges. He said the parking was now divided into an upper and lower lot, with VCOM parking in the upper lot, and NDG, Access Health, and Wofford in the lower parking lot, which helped them tremendously regarding the grade changes. A slide was shown of the Howard Street elevation where he said they had what they called the warehouse building (which was the Access Health), then the commercial NDG uses was on the bottom, with a simple form of housing on top of that. Mr. Keith showed the Board Members actual material samples for this as well. A slide was shown of the upper elevation, which he said was the grayish area on the screen; and he pointed out the lobby element that held the two elements together. He said then there was an obtuse view of the Wofford section. On the bottom was the parking, then the elevation from College Street; and he pointed out the elevation views were all hard to understand and the renderings showed them much better. He showed a rendering and said on the first floor was the commercial, and showed the commercial with access out; access to lobby, and also access to the parking in the back; and he said they had challenges of the different grades at different access points. Mr. Keith showed at the ground the corner was still being held with some low planters and a few steps so they could have the lounge there that came out to an area which was on grade and then two or three steps up. He said on the second floor was all the housing, with mixed income housing above the commercial, and then the Wofford Student housing with the controlled access between them and the shared elevator and stairs. He showed another rendering of the same area and explained it was segmented so that it held the corner, and that it stepped up. There was one unit that was on the bottom and it had a sunken private terrace that had a lot of iron around it for visibility. Once you rounded the bend was where the Wofford lounge would be; and he explained how they had designed it so that it could be transformed at a later time to open into doors after the security issue was resolved. Mr. Keith explained the NDG doors would open out into the plaza; and then they had the commercial uses. He showed a slide from Howard Street looking back toward College Street and the VCOM building, and they would see how the two buildings interacted and lined up.

Mr. DeMark asked if the inset around the window was wood, with the rest of it brick.

Mr. Keith explained. He pointed out that Howard Street got pretty wide at the intersection because it was a dedicated turn lane. More views of the area were given and explained and Mr. Keith then showed an overall view to show how everything was all tied together and said it was like one continuation of the whole project. He said Mr. Robinson would talk to them about VCOM.

Ms. Sarah Robinson, McMillan Pazdan Smith came forward and was sworn; and said the last time they met and had received conceptual approval, there were still a lot of questions regarding how the building was going to interface with the street level; so by working with the Civil Engineer and with JHP, the grade that was causing their building to sit so high off the ground and was not really jiving well with the pedestrian scale; they were able to bring that down some and bring the windows more in with the pedestrian level to create a more friendly appeal and interaction. She explained they were also able to set in a streetscape and incorporate more of the hardscape and put in the parallel parking that had been an

issue; and in doing so lowering the finished floor area, then they were really able to bring down the number of stairs to the monument entrance to this side of the building and that let them increase the height at the tower, face, and the amount of windows to give a more open, light look; and having the recessed window pocket gave them an opportunity to extend that hardscape up to the façade of the building and have seating or have opportunity that really engaged the public as they were coming by. Ms. Robinson said the other thing that was important as they lowered the finished floor, as they had less steps, they pulled that tower back into the building which let them bring the entire building up to the face, and it was not sitting back so far as it had been; and as a result much more of the building was now closer to the 12' required setback.

Board Questions:

- Mr. DeMark asked Ms. Robinson how they had resolved the privacy issue regarding patients.
- Ms. Robinson explained working with VCOM it was a matter of privacy control and how they controlled that from the inside; but one thing they did do was to give it the appearance of larger sections of glass by grouping the windows so that now one large window splits between two exam rooms. They also went back and refined the size of the windows to make sure they were meeting and exceeding the 50% glazing rule within that area, and also tried to refine that around the building. She said since this building was seen from all sides they wanted to enhance that glass; and also they wanted the building to look like it could hold a multitude of functions, and not necessarily a medical office.

Ms. Robinson said VCOM wanted to reiterate the relationship of the building across the street, but they had to be very selective on how they did that because there were so many bold elements on that building, so they were selective on how they chose their materials in order to simplify things. Another thing they did with the tower was now the tower element would be all glass, and so when it was lit from inside, it would have a much greater street presence.

More Board Questions:

- Mr. Richardson asked Ms. Robinson if she would address Mr. Lewis' comments and how she felt about those.
- Ms. Robinson said she saw Mr. Lewis' point, and that they mentioned taking reference from the VCOM Building, but she explained the intention was never to make it a miniaturized version of the VCOM. It was just to take certain elements of the materials. Mr. Lewis had also mentioned very strong corners and really strong angles and those were things that were great for the scale of the building that was across the street, but not on the proposed building at the proposed scale. She mentioned another one of his points were that the proposed building seemed to be out of context; but she said if you pulled back and look at what's across the street with VCOM and what's across the street with their other properties, with the one story Sub Station next to it, and with the development to the other side of the building; their proposed building was not necessarily out of context for the overall part of the site.
- Mr. Henthorn said he kind of felt the same way as Mr. Lewis about this building. There were some success parts to it; and he felt the middle three bays were pretty successful, but not the other bays and arches. He felt the materials certainly made a lot of sense and some of the detailing of the middle section really tied into the VCOM, but not so much to him on the other parts. Mr. Henthorn felt the building was already low, and they were making it even lower by extending those bays out. He understood what she said about making those windows bigger in the middle; but he wondered if it made more sense to make those bays more vertical and separate those windows; then they would have a more urban form. He thought the middle portion was much more successful; and that was just his own interpretation. He said it was a one story building and there was no way around that, but they could help the situation by grouping the fenestration and organizing the bay structure so it was vertical instead of horizontal. The arch was a long slow arch that looked like it should be holding something above it; but it was just holding two feet of brick and a roof; and so it looked thin to him. He said even though it was a masonry building, that it looked spindly to him. He did feel it was great they had lowered the building and it did look better because it had been lowered.

- Mr. DeMark asked Mr. Henthorn what about if they mimicked that three bay section across the front façade, and left the back façade the more residential look (which was the inviting from the vehicular perspective) where the clients pulled up from the back. That on the parking lot side to him did not feel bad and he felt it was successful. He said on the front he kind of agreed with Mr. Henthorn.
- Ms. Robinson said talking about the recess and about the arch; she felt that what was happening was the windows that were on the other side were not much shorter than the ones that were on that pier; and she felt the arch and maybe the depth was casting a shadow which diminished the vertical appearance of that. She said the windows on the end were set back about 18" and she thought the shadow line might be diminishing the view from the windows.
- Mr. Henthorn explained if they got rid of the arch it would help out matters.
- Ms. Robinson said straightening out the arch some could help matters.
- Mr. Henthorn felt the entrance was pretty successful and he would like to see some more studies of the rest of the building to try to tie it in a little better and make it a little more urban and less horizontal and less suburban.
- Mr. DeMark said they wanted the side facing College Street to have the urban look.

Mr. Richardson asked did Mr. Mills want to speak about the landscaping.

Mr. Paul Mills came forward again and said they had a similar issue regarding street trees that had to be worked out with the DOT. He said one thing Mr. Lewis had wanted them to consider, was along an area he pointed out on the slide was to reduce the radius because he was concerned about the speed of cars. Mr. Mills said they could not do that because it was a DOT road. He said another thing he wanted them to do was put a curb lawn with some trees inside. They are showing that right now, but it would need to be approved by the DOT. He showed the sunken area again as mentioned earlier with an iron fence, and also they had a planter there; and he explained about the retaining wall and another area with a planter bed with ADA access.

Mr. Richardson opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak in favor to come forward.

- Mr. Bill Barnet of 168 W. Main Street came forward and thanked the entire Design Team, City Staff, the DRB Board Members, and everyone involved for all of their hard work and effort regarding this project. He explained their very urgent need for final approval at tonight's meeting.
- Mr. Tim Kowalski of 350 Howard Street, with VCOM came forward and said he felt this represented a vast improvement over the last time the project had come before the Board Members, and explained he was in support of the request.
- Mr. Will McCauley of 1999 Roe Ford Rd, Greenville, SC came forward and was involved in the project; and he explained he was in support of the request. He agreed with Mr. Henthorn on the windows and felt if there was a way they could adjust those to not lose the tax credits closing and time line he would be in favor of that. He thanked the Board Members for all their input regarding the project, as well as everyone that was involved.
- Mr. Henthorn explained that he felt the project was excellent and had come a very long way since the beginning. Mr. Henthorn agreed with the City Consultant's comments regarding the window arches, and felt they were only talking about a couple of minor tweaks regarding the arches.
- Mr. Richardson explained it sounded like the Board Members needed legally to give final approval; and he also agreed that the window arch issue had merit; and he would like a verbal agreement that the architect would work with the City regarding that issue if it would not hold anything up to see if that might be achieved.

Mr. Richardson asked anyone else who wished to speak in favor to come forward. No one else came forward. Mr. Richardson asked anyone who wished to speak in opposition to the request to come forward. No one came forward. Mr. Richardson closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Richardson moved to give final approval of the project subject to an informal understanding that McMillan Pazdan Smith would work with the City to address the window issue and share those by email with the Board Members; and he was seconded by Mr. DeMark. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

Staff Announcements: None.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 7:00 P.M.



Ricky Richardson, Chair

Edited by Julie Roland, Secretary