



City of Greenville
Design Review Board – Urban Design Panel
Minutes of the **March 4, 2021** Regular Meeting
Webex Virtual Meeting

Meeting Notice Posted on Wednesday, February 17, 2021
Minutes prepared by Austin Rutherford

Members Present: Carmella Cioffi, Danielle Fontaine, John Edwards, Jeff Fort

Members Absent: Mitch Lehde

Staff Present: Jonathan Graham, Planning and Development Director; Logan Wells, Assistant City Attorney; Matt Lonnerstater, Development Planner; Courtney Powell, Planning Administrator; Kris Kurjiaka, Senior Development Planner; Harold Evangelista, Development Planner; Ross Zelenske, Development Planner; Austin Rutherford, Development Planner; Edward Kinney, Senior Landscape Architect

Call to Order:

Ms. Cioffi called the virtual meeting to order at 4:01 PM. She welcomed those in attendance and explained the procedures for the meeting. The minutes of the February 2, 2021 Agenda Workshop and February 4, 2021 meetings were approved unanimously by a motion by Ms. Fontaine and a second by Mr. Edwards. Ms. Fontaine moved to approve the agenda for the March 4, 2021 meeting, and Mr. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously. All affidavits were received. No conflicts of interests were cited.

Old Business:

A. CA 20-775

Application by **BILL DONOVAN** for an **EXCEPTION TO SIGN STANDARDS** for monument signage for 'Honda' at 330 Woodruff Rd (TM# 026200-01-00103).

Mr. Rutherford explained it is a 16-foot sign with a 25 square foot area to replace a current nonconforming 21-foot sign with 31 square foot area that was constructed under an older ordinance. The area is under the special sign overlay district with a 10-foot staff-level sign approval restriction. It is a proposed double faced white and blue led illuminated pylon sign. Mr. Rutherford explained that the DRB may allow signs up to 25 feet in height for free standing signs if they are appropriate in design and meet the criteria. The site does not have an unusual building location, is not a recreation venue, nor does it have highway frontage. Mr. Rutherford noted that staff does not believe that the sign will give any advantage, and that the sign meets design standards. Staff, however, is concerned about location of the sign contributing to visual clutter and suggests that the sign be moved 90 feet away in a manner that will double the space between the sign and another Honda sign on site. Staff recommends approval with condition of landscaping around the base with a plan submitted and approved, and a further west location for the sign to allow for space between the two signs.

Mr. Donovan expressed willingness to comply with movement requirement. He noted that there is usually a requirement for 7-9 feet around the base of the sign for maintenance and prevention of rust.

Ms. Fontaine expressed contentment with the proposal and its conditions. Mr. Edwards concurred.

Ms. Fontaine moved to approve CA 20-775 with staff conditions for landscape plan submittal and relocation. Motion seconded by Mr. Edwards and approved 4-0.

B. B. CA 20-783

Application by **HARRY KAUFHOLD/SUPERIOR SIGNS** for an **EXCEPTION TO SIGN STANDARDS** for monument signage for 'Mitsubishi Motors' at 325 Woodruff Rd. (TM# 025900-01-00303).

Mr. Rutherford gave the staff report including the signs dimensions at just under 22 feet. He noted back to the sign overlay reasons for exception. He also mentioned that the applicant supplied other corporate approved signs at various heights. The sign colors match in color and consistency to the entry way into the building, and the sign complies with design standards. He noted that staff cannot comment on visual clutter at this time, but that an additional sign is to be placed in the future that could become an issue. Staff recommends approval with the condition of the alternative 12.5-foot sign or 17-foot sign height.

Mr. Edwards inquired about the landscape provisions.

Mr. Rutherford explained that this requirement was not in the staff report but can be placed as a condition by the board.

Ms. Cioffi inquired about the applicant's willingness to go with the alternative heights.

Mr. Rutherford explained that the conversation led him to believe they wanted the 22-foot sign but would be willing to go lower if needed.

Ms. Fontaine inquired about where the Truck Farm sign will go in the future.

The applicant, Mr. Gilstrap, 325 Woodruff Rd, explained that Mitsubishi wanted a taller sign than 22-feet, and the 12.5-foot sign would not be approvable. He explained that the 17-foot sign could be a possibility. Further, he explained that the sign will be placed on the edge of the property so as not to create clutter.

Ms. Cioffi noted that she would not be willing to vote on a 22-foot sign but would be willing to allow a 17-foot sign due to the 16-foot sign approved across the street and the grade difference. Ms. Fontaine echoed this.

Mr. Fort inquired about the applicant's willingness to comply with a 17-foot sign. Mr. Gilstrap explained that he would prefer to get the 17-foot sign approved to go through his approval process on the corporate side.

Mr. Edwards noted that since the previous application required landscaping, this application should as well.

Mr. Edwards moved to approve CA 20-783 for a 17-foot sign, with conditions for a landscape plan to be submitted and approved by staff with note that the board is denying the 21-foot sign proposal. Motion seconded by Ms. Fontaine and approved 4-0.

New Business (public hearing)

A. CA 21-83

Application by **KEVIN M. HYSLOP** for a **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** for façade and storefront improvements at 21 Augusta Street (TM# 008900-01-01900).

Mr. Rutherford gave the staff presentation for façade improvements the create an eventual outdoor space and pedestrian friendly environment, which will require an additional certificate of appropriateness in the future. He noted that there were no specifications on overhead doors, gooseneck lights, or storefront windows and lights. A relocation of HVAC units to the roof caused staff to note a condition for an architectural parapet to block these from the view of the city's parking lot in the rear. Overall, staff finds the façade improvements to comply with the LMO and design standards. Therefore, staff recommends approval with conditions: to provide detail for overhead doors, gooseneck lights, and storefront windows and lights, and the HVAC unit location at the time of the building permit submittal. If HVAC units are moved to the roof those should be screened with an architectural parapet. The new door and glass should not feature dark tint or reflective material.

Mr. Hyslop, 245 N Main, explained that he will be able to give more detail once the fixtures have been priced and selected. The intent it to create an overhead door that incorporates glass as to match the storefront. The gooseneck lighting hopes to match what Sweet Sippin' has already provided. The HVAC units are intended to be moved to the roof and will be hidden. He explained that there are plans for a rooftop bar, so it will be tucked behind that. Conduit and gas meters will also be located to the back of building.

Ms. Fontaine inquired about the intended color. Mr. Hyslop said that was the intention. Ms. Fontaine expressed desire for a new color that was more playful. Mr. Hyslop explained that for now the plan is to keep the color neutral, but it could be an option in the future.

Katie Lackenbush, 37 Augusta St., inquired about the potential for concerts or live music in the outdoor space. Mr. Rutherford explained that they are not at that stage of the project yet, and Ms. Lackenbush mentioned she will keep up with the project to comment if that application arises.

Mr. Fort mentioned the overhead doors could incorporate the bronze/black color scheme. Mr. Hyslop showed an image of the potential doors that corresponded with Mr. Fort's comment.

Ms. Fontiane encouraged Mr. Hyslop to be mindful of noise and sound in the future of the project.

Ms. Fontaine moved to approve CA 21-83 with conditions to provide details of overhead doors, gooseneck lighting, and HVAC unit location and shielding, new doors and windows shall not feature dark or reflective material, the overhead doors shall include the same bronze material as the storefront windows, and a proposed change of color shall be submitted to staff and a Committee of the Design Review Board for review and approval. Motion seconded by Mr. Edwards and approved 4-0.

B. CA 21-93

Application by **TRULIANT FEDERAL CREDIT UNION** for a **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** for façade improvements at 110 W. North Street (TM# 000200-05-00601).

Mr. Rutherford gave the staff presentation that included an overview of their desire to renovate the stair tower and façade through color, awning, and brick paint updates. The proposed changes are compliant with the design guidelines. The applicant also requests to replace the store front to a more historically appropriate frontage to maintain design standards. Staff recommends approval with conditions of front façade brick inserts remaining the same color as the rest of the façade, application signage shall be consistent for the signage proposed with the projected sign being no taller than the bottom of the second story insert and the monument sign incorporating the architecture of the building and being no taller than 50% of the first floor. A detail of the canopy ceiling shall be submitted to staff and approved by a two-member committee of the DRB. Landscape compliance must be met in the event of a change of use or .

The Applicant Chad Frye, 3200 Reliant Way, expressed that body color as opposed to white paint is acceptable. He mentioned that the current store front seems to comply with the rest of the neighborhood and adding two entry ways would be difficult and cost prohibitive. He also mentioned that if the store front is carried to the front of the building, it would prevent future tenants. Mr. Frye asked that the storefront be approved in existing condition. He noted that the current storefront maintains transparency and is pedestrian friendly.

There were no public comments.

Ms. Fontaine believes that the proposal design is inappropriate to the downtown area. She mentioned that the signage does not synchronize with the surrounding architecture, and specifically mentioned the blue color's inability to comply with the design standards and the design's difference from the original building.

Mr. Edwards noted that the top of the tower's design and mentioned the peculiarity and desire to see change. He also mentioned a desire to mimic the original historic building's windows.

Mr. Fort noted the discrepancy between the historic building and the contemporary design. He mentioned a desire for the stair tower to be subordinate to the main building and noted that the stair tower appears to be a means of signage.

Mr. Rutherford explained that the signage does comply with the LMO and design standards.

Ms. Cioffi expressed that approval with the existing storefront remaining as it is seeming acceptable. She also mentioned that she sees the stair tower as a modern dichotomy to the historic building and finds the contrast acceptable.

Ms. Fontaine agreed with Ms. Cioffi, but still hopes to see an improvement of materials and colors to allow the stair tower to be subordinate and not overwhelm the overall design. She expressed discontentment with the large blue mass at the top of the staircase. She suggests a new design that tones down colors and incorporates materials that match surrounding architecture.

Mr. Edwards echoed this.

Ms. Cioffi asked the applicant if they would be willing to look into the design more to address comments.

Mr. Frye expressed concern over not being able to portray branding and inquired about a previous application's comments to use a playful color while this application seems to elicit comments requesting a toned-down design.

Ms. Cioffi explained that the difference in districts accounts for the change in expectations. Ms. Fonatine mentioned that in the previous application the color would have to be submitted to be approved and would be subject to review.

Mr. Fort suggested removal of some of the blue for a color that was more in harmony with the original blue.

Mr. Frye inquired about the board's opinion on changing the elevator shaft from blue to gray.

Ms. Fontaine mentioned that the elevator shaft is not as visible from the street.

Ms. Cioffi noted the importance of the blue color and suggested choosing a different color for the top of the staircase and redesigning to incorporate a pop of the blue color.

Mr. Frye mentioned the Truliant location off Pelham Road and a desire to maintain similarity between locations through the Truliant blue.

Ms. Cioffi noted the importance of maintaining branding; however, she also noted the importance of being sensitive to historic buildings and integrating into the surrounding community. She mentioned a desire to work to balance both goals with the applicant.

Ms. Fontaine moved to approve CA 21-93 with conditions for a review and approval process focused on design color and material of the stair tower to staff and 2 board members, and condition number 1, 2, 4, and 5 as presented by staff. Motion seconded by Mr. Edwards and approved 4-0.

C. CA 21-96

Application by **ELSIE BICKMANN/CREATIVE BUILDERS LLC** for a **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** for a storefront ATM at 712 S. Main Street (TM# 007000-02-02202).

Mr. Rutherford gave the staff report which included the details of the applicant's desire to remove a storefront window to add an ATM and a few other facade improvements such as awn modifications and front door improvements. Mr. Rutherford explained that this was not consistent with transparency and character standards. Staff also noted that the proposed paint color would not be unique for the store front as there are similar colors adjacent.

The applicant Britt Phillips, 712 S. Main St., is hoping to update the branch due to an extended lease into 2025. He explained that the painting of the exterior is not essential, but rather was something they thought would improve the neighborhood. He mentioned that the adjacent building painting effects their color choice, and they hope to choose a new color and asked for advice on color choice. Mr. Phillips noted that while it does decrease transparency, the ATM promotes pedestrian activity. He also noted that the wood doors are heavy and that residents with disabilities or mobility restrictions have difficulty navigating the door. He noted the desire to create a solution to this problem while improving transparency with a mostly glass door.

Fletcher Kirkland, 712 S. Main St, spoke in favor of the applicant and the proposal.

Mr. Edwards explained that he believes that more work towards a goal that better satisfies both the community and guidelines and the applicant's goals.

Ms. Cioffi mentioned that color is difficult to advise on without an image, but that the goal is to have a variety of color.

Ms. Fontaine recommended a serious color to reflect the use of the building as a bank.

Mr. Fort noted that the issue is not of design, but of use.

Mr. Edward moved to defer CA 21-96 to enable the applicant to work with staff and 2 members of the board. Motion seconded by Ms. Fontaine and approved 3-1.

Advice and Comment (Not a Public Hearing)

A. None

Other Business (Not a Public Hearing)

A. None

Informal Review (Not a Public Hearing)

A. None

Adjourn: Having no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:06 PM.