The Design Review Board (DRB) met via Virtual Zoom on Tuesday, October 6, 2020 at 5:30 P.M., with the following members in attendance: Kevin DeMark, Ricky Richardson, Carolyn Schoepf, and Lucy Lynch. Absent was Lauren Rogers. Representing the Planning Department was Martin Livingston, Neighborhood Services Director, and Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant, Planning Department. City Manager Chris Story was also signed on to the Zoom Meeting.

Roll Call
Mr. DeMark, 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.

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

Disposition of the Minutes from the September 1, 2020 Meeting
The Minutes from the September 1, 2020 Meeting were approved by acclamation.

No Old Business.

New Business:

The Design Review Board has received a request regarding Preliminary Review & Approval of proposed building’s form, massing and placement on the site for proposed new mixed-use project, located in the DT-5 District at 578 N. Church Street, Parcel #7-12-01; 173.00 and 174.00, from William Gray, Applicant & Architect, McMillan Pazdan Smith, on behalf of the Northside Development Group (NDG).

Mr. Craig Lewis, the City’s Design Consultant, Stantec said this request was for the Sunshine Inn site, and was for FYI review only tonight as the application was incomplete at submission. This is a very complex site and a challenging development program. We have been working with the development team since June, 2020 to help coach them as to the many priorities they need to satisfy. Mr. Lewis said it was kind of a quirky site that kind of holds the City together. He oriented the Board Members as to the site and surrounding; and he said there were a lot of expectations regarding streetscape for the site. It was a very geometrically challenged site.

Mr. Lewis said an important factor to keep in mind was that The Ellington was under construction; and they had approval from SCDOT for new unfunded streetscape for regulatory purposes only. He showed Magnolia Street Streetscape and said there was a Bike Facility Plan.

Mr. Lewis explained they now had an approved Streetscape Section they are now requiring of all applicants; and this will require some additional r-o-w from all property owners as they develop over time. It’s approximately 10 additional feet on each side.

Mr. Lewis showed the North Side Master Plan that showed the site, and said it doesn’t give us frankly, a whole lot of guidance. The one piece of guidance that it does provide to us is an extension of Evins Street across in through there. Some of you are aware, this is a signalized intersection. The next
signalized intersection will be Pearl. And then we have to go all the way down to College which is actually quite a ways down off the map for the next signalized intersection there. So one, two, three signals, the bigger picture view of that you can see there's a lot of activities happening in the North side. You all have seen almost all of these projects in the last couple of years. It's very exciting to see how much momentum there is. The TK Greg Center is actually in the upper left corner just peeking in the Ellington. You can see where the site is located, where the main quad is at Wofford. You can see the townhomes that we just approved two months ago, the Wofford and Northside Development Groups' Redevelopment project at that location. And then the apartments on the other side of the street hall of which are in various phases of construction at this point. So good amount of activity that's starting to happen within walking distance of the site. So it's very exciting. And as I said, in the middle of everything these days. No longer this scruffy old site along the side of the highway that it once was. So that's the big picture. Those are the various issues that are going on. As we have been talking to the applicant, we really do view this site as having two frontages, both Magnolia and Church. I think it's really that opinion is reinforced by the fact that the Ellington is really a known quantity and right across the street reinforces the fact that Magnolia is in fact, a frontage that needs to be recognized as well. So with that, I'll turn it over to William to walk through their application and we can have a chat about some of the issues and go from there.

Mr. William Gray, McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture said Mr. Alec Evans home was right across the street; and he was also on the Zoom meeting tonight. I'm sure he'll have some comments later, but just wanted to acknowledge him and say, thank you for joining us. I don't disagree with Craig. This is a very high visibility site, there's no doubt about it. But just like he referenced, it is absolutely geometrically challenged. And furthermore, like any designer or planner, you look for precedent to influence your design. And so as we started this project with Michael, Mr. Fletcher rather, and Seamon Whiteside who is on the call; we did some quick site analysis and I'm going to show you some photos after this, just looking through the area. So this is looking northwest down Church Street, Wofford and Mr. Evans' house would be up here, right, and the site is highlighted in yellow. You can see the finance store off to the left and then really not a lot happening along that street edge even past the light at Pearl Street. It's important to realize in this view, the entrance to the World Finance area on the far left, that is not owned by us, obviously; and that does align with Evins Street. So we talk about expanding Evins Street, we have multiple challenges in doing that which we can get to later, but we don't have control over that idea by any stretch of the imagination. So when we did the master plan, and by we, I mean McMillan Pazdan Smith did the master plan of the Northside with JHP out of Dallas.

We did look for opportunities of connectivity, but to be quite frank with the group, it was really quickly drawing lines on a site plan. It was a sketched master plan, it's a guideline. It's not something that should be hard-lined and force our hand. On the next slide this is the same street, Church Street, looking southeast. So in this scenario, Wofford would be off to your left. You can see, again, this is another cash checking store pushed up to the street, parking along Church Street. And you can, again, see not a lot of precedent for how we engage Church Street, but we see this project as a real opportunity for how to do that.

On the next slide; by now we're on Magnolia Street, looking southeast. This would be looking down towards the Northside. So you see our site highlighted in yellow off to the left. Craig mentioned the Ellington that would be off to the right in that grassy area. So right now there's really no precedent
about how to engage Magnolia Street; though I hear that the Ellington may be setting that. On the next slide, this is looking back Northwest, our site's off to the right. And again, this is just giving everybody a flavor of the area. There's not a lot of development happening here, and I think everybody knows that who lives in Spartanburg. But we do have to acknowledge that the Ellington will be happening across the street. But I think an important part of this picture is to realize that there is plenty of precedent for parking on Magnolia Street, up against Magnolia Street. All right on the next slide, again, not trying to beat a dead horse, but here's an aerial looking at the site highlighted in yellow. You can see Church Street on this side and then Magnolia Street on this side forcing our site into a wedge, just further communicating the geometric challenges we have here. You need to keep in mind, whatever anybody does, you got to park the site. And you'll see in our plan - that does present a challenge in how we front the streets. On the next slide, this is looking in the opposite direction, Magnolia Street here, Church Street here. Just further driving home the geometry of the site and that we have some pretty significant challenges with that geometry. And that also, there are plenty of precedents along both Magnolia and Church about how to engage Magnolia Street. Mr. Gray said so this is the site Plan that Seamon Whiteside developed, and I am more than happy to stop talking and allow them to walk us through that.

Mr. Danny Balon, Seamon Whiteside Engineering said they have gone through several iterations working with Mr. Fletcher on how to look at the site. We have coordinated with the DOT as William said, there is an existing red light across the street from Evins Street, which is what is driving the access as shown. He said the DOT, because it is a signalized intersection, the DOT requires 150 feet of stacking from the edge of the pavement back, so that's what we show here. In addition to that, there is a 55 foot shared access easement that the site shares with the next door property in the front, at the red light you have there. There's a 55 foot shared easement they share with the Catholic Church who owns that parcel. Mr. Fletcher has tried several times to contact them to discuss trying to do something with the easement. They do not have any intention of removing the easement or doing anything with it. He said we are restricted by what we can do there because of that access easement as it stands today. Because of that access easement, we don't own the property to allow a new road to go through the site like the master plan shows. There's access further up the street shown, further up Church Street, top left, right there. Mr. Balon said there's also access shown on the back on Magnolia Street. There's currently approximately 60 parking spaces shown. This is based on talking with Mr. Fletcher and what the requirements would be for his potential tenants. There's also an outdoor gathering area, which is a big key to say with the effort with working with Wofford, it would give a place for the students to come cross the street and come gather based on what the actual tenants may be. Also obviously the landscape hasn't been designed, but you can see there is perimeter trees and green trim along Magnolia Street, as well as along Church Street. And as both Craig and William have said, it's shaped very awkwardly. The way we show it, the actual buildings front Church Street, it's really hard to front both Church and Magnolia Street and still have room to actually park the sites. I know that is a concern of Craig's, but we feel that in this layout, we're fronting Church Street, we're bringing the site to Church Street, which provides ample opportunity to park on the remainder of the site.

Mr. Gray said as Danny mentioned, the design team as we worked together up to this meeting, we were in an effort to meet Mr. Fletcher's goals and meet the parking goals associated with the building at this time. We were forced to engage one of the streets and we feel very strongly that the primary street is Church Street. So we pushed the building up to Church Street and pushed the parking to the back on Magnolia Street as you see here. So here's what we're proposing. Obviously you can read the notes.
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We're going to have aluminum storefront, cementitious siding, some painted white brick, and a little bit of painting on some of the detailing. Mr. Gray said the intent here is to relate to some of the architecture across the street at Wofford College. I'd love to tell you we could do a beautiful building like Alec Evans' house, but I don't know that we could find a contractor to build anything like that anymore. But the intent was to take some of the architecture, the newer architecture in the area and use some of those elements and put them here. He said what you're seeing is a concentration or an acknowledgement of the corner of Church Street, and then the parking lot adjacent to Mr. Fletcher's site. The building is, well, you call it two stories, but it's a story in a mezzanine similar to, I guess, what we all approved at UCB bank. The next screen was a sharper angle looking down Church Street as if you were in the parking lot at the building that the Diocese of Charleston owns. There's not a lot to explain in terms of the architecture that I can explain beyond what you see here, but I know everybody wants to know who the tenants are. Mr. Gray said honestly, we don't entirely know. We've allowed for some flexibility in that there's probably going to be some retail. There's probably going to be ideally a food service component to this and/or a coffee shop, and then perhaps even something that might require a drive-thru. Whether it's a bank or something like that. The tenants are not locked in yet, but Mr. Fletcher's working real hard to make that happen. So with that, Michael, do you want to say anything or just let's keep rolling.

Mr. Michael Fletcher said to keep rolling; and he appreciates everyone's time here and I'll answer any questions or comments.

Mr. Gray said he would be happy to take any questions or comments.

Mr. DeMark asked Mr. Craig Lewis; before questions/comments; if he wanted to go over the letter he issued to the Board Members this afternoon about some of the challenges affecting the site; and then they could have the Board Members ask any questions if they have them and then we can talk through what we like and don't like.

Mr. Lewis said absolutely. We've been talking about this site since May or June and it is definitely complicated. There are a number of key issues and all these things are things that we've been talking about for a couple of months now, the street going through Evins Street extension aside. So I think it's important that is not a code issue but it is a planning issue, and it was part of an adopted plan. From the city's standpoint, we need to acknowledge that that is part of an adopted plan. And if we are going to deviate from that adopted plan, we need to make sure that we're clear about that. So it is not specifically a code issue, but again, it's part of a bigger city issue. For your purview, there are a lot of other issues. There's the issue regarding drive-thrus, there's specific guidance in the code about when you have a drive-thru what you need and how you need to comply with that. That's on a side piece right now, but there are a number of things that are going to require your attention as a Board. There's a bunch of them on this particular project that I think are important. We'll start with the minimum building height and it is a minimum of two stories. There are a couple of reasons for that. We've talked about that in previous workshops. So one of the reasons why we set minimum building heights is to make sure that we maximize development potential on each particular parcel. Certainly have a lot of underdeveloped sites today we want to make sure that we are densifying and creating a much more compact walkable downtown area. And so that's one of the reasons why we do two stories. The other reason why we do two stories is because it provides a presence that's important to help to get a
sense of arrival to the motorists as they're entering into the downtown. Shorter buildings don't really provide that sense of arrival. They tend to disappear off into the distance, whereas a taller building does. It helps to frame your view as you're working your way through into the community. So that's why we feel like it's an important component. But we have offered deviations from that on other projects along certain corridors. So it is certainly not a hard and fast issue, but it is one for you all to consider.

Mr. Lewis said a lot of the other ones really fall into the category of how we're going to choose to reflect Magnolia Street as a street frontage. I think the fact that Church Street in terms of in order of hierarchy related to the importance of the rest of the community is a very important corridor coming into the community. But Magnolia Street is also, and particularly with development coming on, again, right across the street we're going to have neighbors that we haven't had in a really long time. I think we need to respect that. And so many of the comments that flow from that have to do with whether or not there's going to be frontage on Magnolia Street. So we really do need guidance from the Board as to whether you feel that it's important that we have that element of frontage and we treat Magnolia appropriately or not. If we choose not to as a Board, then a number of these essentially fall away.

Mr. Lewis said how we measure setbacks, the location of parking and a lot of other issues flow away from there. The other components that I think are important are the streetscape that I mentioned at the very beginning. We actually went through quite a long process with SCDOT to get some approvals from them onto the final streetscape for Magnolia. And the one that we proposed and as accepted and we're asking to be applied was one that we felt was appropriate for this area. And so right now, particularly along Magnolia Street, at least that's one thing that's still is left to be resolved. There's not enough detail in the plan to show compliance with that streetscape. And so that's another issue that we need to resolve as part of that. So big bucket issues, key pathways for you all to choose. We do think that there are ways to develop the site and try to address those issues. The challenge may be that the program proposed makes that difficult if not impossible. So I can't speak to whether or not this program can work. We did look at a couple of alternatives, which we shared earlier and the idea of breaking the program up into two buildings, fronting one on Magnolia, fronting the other one on Church does a couple of things. Obviously addresses the issues along Magnolia Street that I talked to and provides a building mass and actual building that this is the Ellington as well as the corner building. The other thing that it does, and I think it's something that you all need to think about is whether the frontage along Church Street for the current site plan provides really, truly usable front entrances along Church Street.

Mr. Lewis thought it's going to be very challenging given the conditions of Church Street and where all the parking is going to be located. Everyone is really going to be entering in from the rear of the site. So it questions whether or not those are real and authentic front doors. And so that will play into the architecture ultimately down the road. The upside downside to the potential for a plan like this, and this is just a quick study to see how the program can be broken up is that there could be side yard parking. People can park on the side and walk along the street to get into a front door as opposed to having to enter through the rear. So these aren't necessarily ideal; but I think it's worthy of conversation, but it just simply shows that there are some alternatives for the particular plan that achieve parking issues and achieve site circulation and achieve building square footage. I think the one challenge that we have out here is what to do with the drive-thru. We all struggle with drive-thrus. Every project that comes through with the drive-thru is a struggle. But that's ultimately what we're looking at. If you were to ask me, Craig, what program fits on this site really well in absence of this - I
would say it would be probably a largely residential program with maybe a little bit of mixed use at the corner. Simply because the parking demands wouldn’t be as high, building depths could be a lot more flexible on the site. I’m not suggesting that the parking program or that the overall development program changes. I’m just simply saying, if you want a program that fits and satisfies both frontages and all the other things is probably more of a residential program and taking a look at it. So that’s the situation in terms of where we are and what kind of guidance we’re looking for from the Board. I will turn it over to you, Mr. Chairman.

**Board Comments/Questions for Design Team:**

Mr. DeMark said Great. Thank you. Just a couple of questions, and Danny or William, if you can help answer these for us. The general scheme, I guess, I understand what Craig is saying. It seems like if you’re going to park in the back, it would seem odd that you would walk to the front to get into those spaces. It also seems like you have that outdoor covered dining area on the back of a restaurant, which I always think about where all the trash comes out and goes somewhere; and there’s odors and all that other stuff. So probably need to better understand how that works both on Church and then along Magnolia. And also realize that because we did approve a residential style building along Magnolia, we have to have some kind of addressing of that side. It seems like 60 spaces is the magic number that you have to have. I guess I’m a little concerned with that large of a parking field without some kind of masking or covering from the side yard.

Mr. DeMark said he thought Mr. Lewis and the Board Members talked about this a lot when we were reviewing the hotel and the side yard and how we were going to address not seeing the cars from the street. Obviously this is not as active a street, or maybe it is as active a street, but I think somehow addressing covering those cars from the streets is going to be important from my perspective. And then how the site works. Where is trash, how do we orient things. It doesn’t seem to be addressed here in this plan at all. So we’ll just have to look into that. As for the aesthetics of the architecture, I agree that it kind of looks out of place a little bit. It’s hard because there is no context around. But if you look back to those pictures, you have the Evans house on one side, a church across the street. Actually, a church on both sides and going to be a new retirement house as well. So there is some context, I just don’t think we thought that through completely. Anybody else have any comments on the Board, Lucy or Carolyn or Ricky.

Mr. Richardson said he had a couple of comments. One is I am not wedded to the street coming through and I appreciate all the connectivity and the city’s desire and all that. But also in the plan, they had Evins Street coming through and looked like continuing on another street into the Northside, which due to the fact that the Ellington’s being built, yeah, that would cause an additional street be made. I don’t think that’s going to happen. So the street issue I can appreciate, and I’m not so concerned about the street coming through. This is really, really difficult. It’s going to require a spot. It’s going to require a lot of creativity. To reiterate what you said, Craig, when I first started looking at all this stuff, I said, “This is not the right use for this property. Making this a commercial space is not the best use for this because of all of the setbacks, etc. So I concurred on that, but if the developer wants to put a commercial property here, then it’s our job to try to figure out how we do that. My one question is, I’m still confused about on street Magnolia parking. When I saw the picture of Magnolia Street, boy, it sure didn’t look like it was suitable for on-street parking. So I assume, and somebody clarify this, that what you do is you move
the parking and all of these other things that we want to do on Magnolia each apart of this parcel of property, is that the understanding.

Mr. Danny Balon, Seamon Whiteside said yes, that would be correct. If the streetscape as shown on that diagram that you can see there is required, it would offset into the property approximately 10 feet, I believe.

Mr. Lewis said that's right.

Mr. Richardson said Okay. As I look at it now, where the car stops, the black stops, we have a bike line there, but it looks like it's not five feet, the current one. So you would take, what - two feet or three feet or one foot, and then the sidewalk and the strip is surely not total of six and a half feet. Maybe it is. I don't know. Anyway, it just looks like it's eating up a lot of the property. And I think Magnolia, I love on-street parking there at Magnolia. I think that's something we all would like to continue particularly if we've had the Ellington do that. And we did have the Ellington do that, right.

Mr. Leis said yes; that is exactly what they are building. That's why we went through all this because we had asked them to do it, and SCDOT pushed back and said, "We don't know what's happening elsewhere, but if we want on-street parking, we'd like for that to be expected and regular." So they don't want just to be in this block.

Mr. Richardson said I'm sorry. I'm in favor of continuing that. But this is a tough one.

Mr. DeMark said one question I guess I have, I agree with Ricky about the road, obviously. It's great that it was shown on the master plan from 2007, but that's been 13 years and it hasn't come to fruition. The current plan or the current rendering shows that you're connecting to that signalized outflow, but you really don't have that approval, correct, from the adjacent property owner to actually make that an exit. Is that correct.

Mr. Fletcher said they did have approval; and there's an existing easement that goes 55 feet off of Church Street and it's five feet on each side of the boundary line. And I've been in charge to talk with the Catholic church of South Carolina who owns the property. And we've been in touch about expanding the easement to the current width so we can access both properties. They were not interested in extending the length of the easement. They want to keep it at 55 feet because they think anything longer than that is going to impair the value of their property. They also have a cross easement on this site. And again, it was made with both of our predecessors entitled, but that allows them to have 10 parking spaces. So we share 10 parking spaces with the adjacent site. So that's one of the reasons why the parking field I guess you think it's a little large. If we get restaurants, they need parking from a practical standpoint. And two, 10 those spaces are owned by the church property.

Mr. Fletcher said and right now they're facing the church property, our proposals put them in ours. I guess if Magnolia Street gets widened, we lose 20 spaces there on the back in order to gain eight, six, I don't know how many are shown on the road, parallel parking sites. It's the trade-off of parking and density. You want more density, but you want less parking. There's some give and take we've got to work on there. But I guess the other thing I'd say while I'm still boxing it here is we've got McMillan
Pazdan Smith and Seamon Whiteside, it's an A-team I got here and we've spent a lot of time, trust me, revising this plan because of the SCDOT issues and the access issues. We've got that right in, right out on the North side of the property. We've got this easement issue with the adjacent property. And then we have met with the city staff to talk about aligning our exit on Magnolia Street with Ridge Street because the Ellington was coming.

Mr. Fletcher said so we're trying to get the access right, because if we can't get the access right, then we can't get users to come to the project. And so that's what we're trying to accomplish. And I guess a couple of comments here that, I think you all raised some good points on which side is the building fronting and where are people going to access it. This project is based on project I've worked on with Seamon Whiteside in Greenville called Weston, it's on Weston Avenue on a similar corridor near the neighborhoods and downtown Greenville. We have about 18,000 square feet of buildings, but the big driver of the project is this outdoor common area. And again, this plan was come up pre-Coronavirus. I think post-Coronavirus it's even more important to have outdoor spaces where people can space out and eat and gather. And so we really don't want to give up the outdoor space in order to add more parking and make the site even smaller. Obviously the drive-thru is a placeholder. I would agree that we can get the details on that if in fact one comes, but we're trying to see if we had one, where it'd go. And I think the buildings, they're going to put Church Street, there'll probably be some doors there for certain users to come in, but we got to face Magnolia Street as well.

Mr. Fletcher said he thought when you look at the code, it talks about frontages. Obviously if you're on the street, you're a frontage, but the code is very specific about having principle frontages. And I think one decision the DRB Board has to make is, what's the principle frontage here? It's not principle frontages, its principle frontage. And based on our discussions with the city eight months ago, they told us to front Church Street. So the having to front Magnolia and Church Street, I think it's a good goal. I'm not quite sure the code requires it under our careful reading. And also, it makes the site very hard to do because as you saw on that conceptual drawing that Craig had worked on, it changes the access points. And the access points drive this project because of the DOT road and the shared access and all that. We ended up chasing our tail on some of these things when things start getting moved, which is why we tried to pull it up as close to the corner near the street as we could by still preserving that access. Because again, if we don't get the access, I can't get the users. So those are the challenges we're trying to work on. It's like that all out here, but I just thought I'd mention it then go from there.

Mr. DeMark said he thought one of the things that would be super important and I haven't seen it yet and it's hard to conceptualize in my mind, but what is the side that faces Magnolia look like. There is no image that shows that. And I think if there was some kind of understanding of that architecture, we might all say, "Well, that looks great and this is easier to understand." But right now we focus completely on Church and this site doesn't just face on to Church. I think that's part of the challenge.

Mr. Lewis said and you've got the added challenges, this is a single story building largely, a story and a half. The Ellington is four, right. So you're going to have folks up in the upper story who are going to be looking down at the site. So it is as we've talked about with the development team, this is a 360 degree site no matter what you do with it. Every side of this building's got to look great because of everyone who's looking at it. So the fact that the Ellington is going to be looking down at the backs of the building in some ways they're going to be looking down at the roof. And so they're going to see the roof. There's
probably not a whole lot we can do about that just because of their height and this height, but that's how much visual issues there's going to be around this. So it is complicated, definitely complicated.

Mr. Gray said one thing he wanted to mention and he though Kevin had mentioned these questions and I don't know that we addressed them yet, but I can certainly appreciate just from I know what we're trying to do here. I totally get it. And from a bigger picture at the city, and I may be speaking a little bit out of turn here, but I can't imagine a situation where Mr. Fletcher wouldn't be willing to do some sort of landscape architecture or tasteful screening along Magnolia in order to preserve this concept, but also be a great neighbor and drive the perceived density that we're all aiming for. The other thing that was mentioned was the access on Church Street and whether or not that was truly the front door, I forgot what the term was that Craig mentioned. But a major driver for this project was the population right across the street, being the Wofford students. And as we all know, that's a largely pedestrian population and I don't think it's unreasonable to assume that they would not walk across the street and enter off the Church Street side of the building. Certainly people that drive up will park in the back and enter through the back, but there will be a large pedestrian population that utilizes this development from Church Street.

Mr. DeMark said in Mr. Fletcher's conversation about social distancing in the pre-COVID world, don't you think that the front side, if you're going to have a restaurant might want more sidewalk to have more outdoor dining or the thought is, is that it's all in the back.

Mr. Fletcher said I think people would prefer to eat further away from the loud cars.

Mr. Gray agreed there was a lot of traffic on Church Street.

Ms. Schoepf said that is a difficult building.

Ms. Lynch asked did we talk about the two site plans that were sent out to the Board later. She asked were those outcast schemes. She said those seem to have potential to me to minimize this whole problem of the frontage and it breaks up the buildings and gives a little bit of frontage to each and it breaks up the parking, and she was intrigued by those.

Mr. Lewis said those were site plans that we developed at the city's request to see if we could take the program and the parking and fit it on the site and what the various trade-offs would be as part of it. So that was an internal study to explore it.

Mr. Fletcher said he appreciated Mr. Lewis' brainstorming on it. Personally, as a developer for me, by doing that split buildings, we lose that common area and outdoor gathering area and that's really a big driver of the project. Obviously lose the efficiencies of having one building and I'm not sure the code requires it, but Fletcher development is not going to be developing a split building like that.

Mr. Balon said the SCDOT wouldn't approve access as shown either, this way. Where you share the right-in and right out, they won't allow that. They've already told us it's got to be the corner.
Mr. Fletcher said he does not have the easement there on the church property. I can't drive down the church to get in there.

Mr. Lewis said this is all drawn on this parcel, just so we’re clear. So there’s an offset that happens and it’s all drawn on this parcel. So it doesn't include the stuff on the other side. Again, this is for conversation purposes to see if the program can be broken up. It’s not our job to work out the specific site level details.

Ms. Schoepf thought what’s so challenging about it is, why would you park in the back and walk around to the front, it wouldn't happen.

Mr. Fletcher said we'll face the buildings on Magnolia Street if it lets us park in the front, but the code makes us park behind the building. And that's the rub. I think we're trying to get the street frontage on the busy street and then have it more suburban on the back. Again, the challenge is the site's not deep enough to do two buildings and still have a common area and adequate parking. And people still drive here, it’s not Main Street where people walk.

Ms. Schoepf asked could you move the buildings back somewhat, so if you came in on one side, you could drive through and then have diagonal parking in front of the buildings between the building and Church Street.

Mr. Fletcher said he thought we only set back 12 feet is the maximum set back per the code.

Mr. Lewis said they typically don't permit a front yard drive.

Mr. DeMark said it was a complicated site. Absolutely. He asked was there anything else for the Design Team; if not he would open it up for any public comment.

Mr. Fletcher said he really appreciated the Board Members helping us sort through this. Certainly we are more than open to good ideas to improve the project. I'm all for it. For instance, that street screening and the other stuff, we'll certainly take it all under considerations and we appreciate all of your ideas and input for sure.

Mr. DeMark, the Chair said he would now open this up to a public hearing and wanted to see if there's anybody that would like to speak for the project. And if you could, since this is a zoom call, if you could raise your hand or raise your hand or put a note in the chat box.

Mr. Lewis said since this is just for information purposes only, you don't have to do any swearing in, you can just receive the comments.

Alec Evans said he lived across the street from the proposed project; and his family had lived there since 1869 and he was still there; and Wofford had not gotten them yet. But I'm interested to hear all of the interesting things that were said and to know what everybody's job is and perspective is. There are a number of things that occurred to me. One is that this is a markedly pedestrian area. If you stand on the corner of Evins Street and/or Church Street and watch the Wofford students go by, it is a steady stream.
And obviously I've lived there all my life and I have seen that develop. I've also seen the other things that have been on this site, which have not been very attractive. The architecture seems to me to be consistent with a lot of things you see on the Wofford College campus. That doesn't seem to be inconsistent. I don't know anything about design standards, so forgive me for that. I'm a lawyer, not a frustrated architect like all my other friends. And so, again, all I would say about this is that I think that you would see a good bit of pedestrian traffic into the front of this building off of North Church Street.

It's similar to maybe the area that is adjacent to the Marriott where there are people walking in and places where you might not necessarily think that there'd be a lot of pedestrian traffic. I also am cognizant of the fact that if you are concerned about what the senior living people are going to look at when they look down on this site, just think about the old Simple Simon's Building, and about the old Goodyear store, which is where the Catholic Church is, think about the old McDonald's that is the Credit Union and think about the sweet shop and the barber shop and everything else. There's plenty to look down on that won't be nearly as attractive as I'm sure top of this proposed development. There are a lot of challenges, I agree, but this looks like something that is consistent with something that if you could provide a dining venue that would get the Wofford College students across North Church Street, you would do this community a great service. Because they are, for the most part self-contained. If you could get them into our community and to get them spending money, I think that we would all be better for that. And as I said, I'm fully supportive of the concept, but I also understand that I don't know enough about design standards and the kinds of things that you folks are trying to balance to really comment on whether or not this is the appropriate development for the site.

Mr. DeMark thanked Mr. Evans; and he asked was there anyone else that would like to speak regarding the project, in favor or against, to raise your hand since this is a zoom meeting. There was not anyone else who indicated they wanted to speak. Mr. DeMark closed the public hearing portion.

Mr. DeMark asked were there any other additional comments from the Board; and he reminded them this was for information only. This is not a voting meeting this month. I think there was a lot said; and I hope that the design team can go back and look at this a little bit more and further develop the plan, work with the city. I know the city is here to help and to better gauge what we might be able to do with this site. I know it's a difficult site. I'm excited that there will be some development here and look forward to seeing a revised plan and maybe some additional sketches showing the architecture of the backside of the building, a little bit more of that screening, possibly, how we're going to handle trash. If the drive-thru could go away, I know it's a placeholder at this point, but it seems like there's a lot of issues as it relates to the drive-thru. I guess a bank drive-thru would probably be the best usage. I don't know that you would get a fast food. Could you imagine a Chick-fil-A there, it would take every spot. So obviously everyone's shaking their head no, and I'm saying the drive-thru I think is scary. I think that's the gist of it.

Mr. DeMark asked did any other Board Members have any comments that they want to share before we close this meeting. Okay. So there aren't any, I'd like to close this portion of the meeting now and that is all we have for new business, but I do want to mention one other thing.

Mr. DeMark informed the Board Members there had been a request to go back from a virtual meeting to an in-person meeting. He asked Mr. Livingston if he would explain that to the Board Members.
Mr. Livingston said the Mayor and City Council had been meeting at CC Woodson for the last couple of months that started approximately in July or August, and had been meeting at CC Woodson and the Marriott. The CC Woodson Community Center's available for meetings if the Board chooses to do so. He explained they could social distance and meet all the requirements of the mask at that location if necessary. We would just need to make a request to the Assistant City Manager, Mitch Kennedy, to begin scheduling meetings at their location in November. He said he knew Mr. Richardson had asked about when they could begin meeting in person again; and Mr. Livingston said he felt it was important for the continuation that we eventually try to get back to some kind of normal. But I want to hear everyone's opinion before we blankly make that decision.

Ms. Lynch asked did somebody say that there's been more engagement with the Zoom than there was before they started the Zoom meetings.

Mr. Livingston said they had increased engagement with zoom.

Ms. Lynch said somebody also said it's hard to do a split Zoom and in-person, I just wonder if that's something to consider. That seems like a good thing.

Mr. Livingston said there had been some discussion regarding getting the software to be able to allow that sort of split zoom/ in person meeting; but right now they had not been able to lock that down yet.

Mr. Richardson said he needed a little clarification regarding there being more participation regarding the Zoom meetings.

Mr. DeMark said he thought what Mr. Richardson was asking was; are you saying that more people are attending online than they would come to the City Hall Council Chambers.

Mr. Richardson said well; was there more than one person regarding this project. Was there anyone else present tonight other than Mr. Evans.

Mr. DeMark said they had about ten people as attendees.

Mr. Richardson said he could assure you from my perspective as a Board Member and the people presenting, it's a whole lot better in my opinion if we're all in the same room. I think it'd be great if we could jointly do it. But for our benefit and the presenters' benefit, I think it's much better if you're in person personally.

Ms. Schoepf said she still worried about COVID with the upcoming flu season. I'd rather wait till after the first of the year. That's only two more meetings and see what happens.

Ms. Lynch said she was neutral.

Mr. DeMark said he would like to hear from Ms. Rogers; and he would reach out to her and ask her thoughts.
Mr. Richardson said he was not in a hurry. I just wanted to make sure that somebody didn’t forget about us, that we could meet in person sometime.

Ms. Schoepf said her thought on it is if there were 10 attendees tonight and I was in a room with 10 other people, even though they were social distancing, the way things are going right now, I’d feel very uncomfortable; and it would be difficult to have all this discussion wearing masks.

Mr. DeMark said we certainly can talk about it. And Martin, maybe we need to talk about it a little bit more before we commit.

Mr. Livingston said what Council has been doing when folks come to speak, you can take the mask off at the lectern or the podium to speak. And Council Members keep the mask on until they’re ready to speak.

Mr. DeMark asked Mr. Livingston if he could send everyone a link to a recent meeting that will show the layout. That would help us better understand, I think or if you said, "Hey, this is--" I don't even know what days those meet. So this is the day they meet. Maybe go and take a look and see if you feel comfortable. Mr. DeMark said he has flown on an airplane every week since June. Life in the hotel industry continues to move forward. So I wear a mask and protect myself and wash my hands a bunch. So we should look at how it's set up. And if you have some photos or a way to show that to us, I think that would be very helpful.

Mr. Livingston said they had a link to the meetings and we have a meeting coming up on Monday at 5:30. I will send you both and I'll send you a photo.

Mr. DeMark said that would be great.

**Staff Announcements:**

Mrs. Roland said Jennifer Vissage with ACOG had emailed her today and wanted to know if Mr. Richardson had finished his Continued Ed on-line training he had signed up for and also if Ms. Lynch had completed her New Board Training she had signed up for. Mrs. Roland said she still needed to send New Member Ms. Rogers her information regarding New Board Training.

Ms. Lynch said she had not completed her yet; but was still in the process of her things to do.

Mr. Richardson was also still in the process of that.

Mr. DeMark said since it was on-line you can put your headphones on and listen to it in the car if you wanted to. Assuming you get in the car now, I don't know.

Mrs. Roland said that was fine; she was just checking on it.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:37 P.M.

---

Kevin DeMark, Chair

Edited by Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant.