City of Clemson
PLANNING & CODES ADMINISTRATION
1250 Tiger Blvd., Suite 4 • Clemson, SC 29631-2662• (864) 653-2050 • Fax (864) 653-2057 • www.cityofclemson.org

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
November 11, 2014 – 6:00 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER

Members Present: Russ Hebert, Jane Brown, Wayne Leftwich, Davis Moorhead, Tom Henderson, and Curtis Arnold

Members Absent: Gina McLellan

Staff Present: Todd Steadman, Zoning and Codes Administrator and Beth Connor, Recording Secretary

1. **Call to order:** Chairman Russ Hebert called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Hebert introduced himself and the members of the Board and explained that the Board members are appointed by City Council. Mr. Hebert went on to explain that the Board's responsibilities are focused on the design aspects of projects located within one of the five architectural overlay districts in Clemson.

   Mr. Hebert asked for a show of hands indicating how many people were planning on speaking to the Board regarding the action item on the agenda.

   Mr. Hebert directed the people wishing to speak to complete the sign-in form available from the recording secretary, which must be filled out prior to speaking. Ms. Connor, the Recording Secretary was asked to number the forms as she receives them indicating the order in which the speakers will be called to the podium.

   Mr. Hebert informed the audience that 30 minutes total was the allotted time for Public Comment, but at the discretion of the Board, the allotted time may be increased.

2. **Adoption of Minutes:** Jane Brown moved the minutes for the October 7, 2014 meeting be accepted as presented. Tom Henderson seconded the motion. Minutes adopted unanimously.

3. **Action Items**

   a. **Building and Site Review:**
      1) 2014-AR-4: Applicant Tom Winkopp is requesting final review of architectural plans and drawings for the proposed Dukes Centre at 386 College Avenue.

      Jane Brown recused herself.

      Staff Report: Todd Steadman asked permission from the Chairman to address a few related issues. Mr. Hebert granted that permission.

      Mr. Steadman proceeded to address multiple issues being addressed in a variety of media that are somewhat misleading.

      Mr. Steadman addressed the volume of student housing currently available in Clemson. Over the past 10 years, the enrollment at Clemson University has increased more than 5,000 students and the elimination of 32 bedrooms on campus.

Mr. Steadman reported that currently 71% of the enrollment at Clemson lives off campus, which totals approximately 15,000 students. With the help of an Intern in Planning and Codes the staff was able to come up with an estimate that there's a little over 5,000 units in Clemson now. This number includes apartments, duplexes, condos, single family homes…all types of rentals within the City and the University has not added bedrooms, they've actually lost bedrooms. Mr. Steadman said that enrollment at the University is increasing each year and therefore there is a need for more housing and the town is going to respond and that's part of the reason we are here tonight.

Mr. Steadman also responded to some letters that are being circulated as well as some questions on different websites that he has seen and others have brought to his attention. Mr. Steadman expressed gratitude for those that have contacted him and other people to find out the facts or hear another side to the story.

Mr. Steadman reminded everyone that the last time the BAR ruled on this project was in April and after that ruling a group of citizens filed an appeal. At that time the judge who is ruling on this case had the opportunity to stop any further action on this project. The judge decided not to do that.

Mr. Steadman also pointed out that the judge could have denied the request for the City to respond to some of the allegations in the appeal. The judge chose to allow the city to respond. The judge knows that the BAR is meeting tonight on this project. Mr. Steadman pointed out that citizens might have heard different sides of that story, but these are the facts in this matter.

Another issue that Mr. Steadman addressed was the allegation that this project was rushed through the system. Mr. Steadman reminded everyone that this project was first brought before the City in October of 2013 and the zoning was approved in December of 2013. It is now November of 2014. Between then and now there have been 4 public input sessions and the opportunity at the February meeting where Mr. Steadman responded the every public comment and concern that had been brought to the staff's attention in the preceding 2 months.

Mr. Steadman stated that although it wasn't a public input session, that the concerns of the public were heard and addressed. Thus the allegations that people have been making that this is a rush job and there's no public input is patently untrue.

Mr. Steadman also addressed the allegations that the City, the BAR, the defendants in this appeal have admitted this was unlawful. Mr. Steadman stated that this is untrue, he has heard no one admit that. Mr. Steadman also addressed the allegations that the public has not been duly notified of any meeting. This has been proved to be untrue. Every meeting has been publicly posted.

Mr. Steadman also responded to the allegations as recently as last Saturday that no one has seen the new plans. The new plans have been posted for weeks. As recently as last Saturday people are posting images of a concoction of one of the earlier iterations of this project which was never brought before the BAR for review.
Mr. Steadman stated that people will hear complaints about the fact that the BAR now has a sign-in sheet and Mr. Steadman said that the process for developing the public input session at the BAR was itself a public process. This has been posted online since May or June as have the

bylaws of the BAR. These are public knowledge. These documents are online and available to anyone at any time.

Mr. Steadman also pointed out that some members of the public have been accusing the BAR of catering to the whims of the developer and were not operating with the best interest of the public in mind. Me. Steadman went on to say that anyone who made such accusations towards the BAR should be ashamed and consider apologizing to the men and women who volunteer for and honorably serve the Board.

Mr. Steadman proceeded to address the project that is currently before the Board.

Mr. Steadman reported that the project before the Board is being presented for final review. He pointed out that this is a revision of a project that was previously approved by the BAR on March 4, 2014, which is a mixed-use building supported by the Comprehensive Plan in many ways.

Mr. Steadman said that though this project is different than the previous version, it is similar in footprint and scope as the version that was approved on March 4th. In saying that, very little has changed from a code perspective. Mr. Steadman reminded the Board that this project is being done under the codes that were in place when the project was initiated.

Mr. Steadman informed the Board that, in due diligence, he did compare the project against the new code adopted August 18th, 2014 and it meets both sets of standards.

Mr. Steadman said that this project is being reviewed as a commercial project since it's in the C District and reminded the BAR that it is located in AR District 2 from the old ordinance. All code issues have either been met or exceeded.

Mr. Steadman said that the applicant is prepared to give some details to the lighting that is proposed and explain the building materials to be used. The sign package will be addressed at a later date which is customary.

Applicant Report: Tom Winkopp, resides at 1250 Shackleburg Rd., Anderson and his business is located at 391 College Avenue, Clemson. Mr. Winkopp thanked everyone for allowing them to present. Mr. Winkopp informed the Board that there have been some additions to the development team; Mark Riley, Inland American Communities; Entasis Design, Todd Mackley and Jeremy White and Steve Peckham from Signature Architecture. Mr. Winkopp said that Inland builds and manages what they build on-site. Mr. Winkopp feels that these additions will make a stronger team.

Mr. Winkopp, with the use of the site plans and information distributed to Board explained the changes that has been made from the previous version.

Mr. Winkopp, acknowledging Mr. Steadman's concern about some of the landscape plantings assured the Board that there will be an arborist engaged with the project from start to finish. Mr. Winkopp said that in terms of buffers and plantings, what was originally talked about will remain the same with the exception of the addition of a berm along the northern line. This will be a four foot berm with planting on the top. Plus they will also have a 60 foot fence that will come along the Carolina Real Estate side.

Mr. Winkopp said that there will be two-way traffic on Findlay which is something that the Fire Marshal wanted. Mr. Winkopp pointed out on the site plan that there is an emergency egress. The northern side will only have the emergency egress, so there won't be cars going back and forth. There will also be a maintained right-in, right-out only at College Avenue in order to control the traffic along College Avenue.

Mr. Hebert asked how this would be controlled, with a gate? Mr. Winkopp stated that this would be determined by the Fire Marshal, but he thought possibly with a knock-box.

Mr. Winkopp continued to describe that they have reduced some of the commercial square footage from the last time and removed all commercial off the north side that faces the neighbors.

Mr. Winkopp pointed out that the building on the north side has been dropped another story. It is now five stories and steps back up the hill to another five stories.

Jeremy White, Entasis Design spoke, using site plans, explained how they want to activate the street with materials, colors and various architectural features, as well as landscaping and hardscaping.

Mr. White said that they tried to keep material choices very simple, feeling that less is more. Using the rendering that all Board members had, Mr. White described colors and materials along the façade of the building.

Mr. White talked about the use of canopies and awnings in the retail area not only as an inviting atmosphere but also signage, which will be discussed at a later date.

Mr. White also talked about the public and private plaza spaces with the intention of using colored landscape.

Mr. White also reiterated the opportunity of public art on the plazas along with landscaping.

Mr. Hebert asked if the bulk of the building will be stucco. Mr. White asked if he meant the cream colored area, which Mr. Hebert was focusing on. Mr. White said that they had tossed around a couple ideas, but they are focusing on using a fiber cement panel system. Mr. White showed some samples of the material he's talking about.

Tom Henderson asked if the fiber cement will be overlapped. Mr. White said that there is a system called a Reveal System, which is a proprietary name, but is basically a composition of the fiber cement panels that has a very subtle aluminum track.

Mr. White spoke in reference to the lighting. Mr. White said that the lighting for this project is very limited. There will be recessed lighting under the canopies for security and lighting at the entryways. There will be some bollard lighting for the pathways for the student's safety and security. But outside that they don't see where there is a need. The street lighting is on College Avenue.

Wayne Leftwich pointed out that the rendering is different from the elevation and wondered which was more accurate. Mr. White said that the rendering is more accurate.

Mr. Leftwich asked what the material on the shading device was. Mr. White said that it was cap aluminum, metal coping for durability.

Mr. Leftwich asked how they would separate the public plaza from the private plaza. Mr. White said that it is required by the Fire Marshal and said it would be gated with a knock-box.

Mr. Leftwich, referring to the public plaza, asked about the wall that abuts the plaza (the southern wall). Mr. Leftwich feels that all the dynamics of the architecture are lost along College Avenue. Mr. Leftwich asked the architects to "make it pretty". Mr. Leftwich asked if there has been any thought to this concern. He feels it's a real concern both the southern wall frontage and the opposite corner (the north side).

Mr. White agreed and stated that one of the attempts that they had taken is, at various places on the project, to have different treatments along the roof line. He pointed out that the parapet line wraps the volume Mr. Leftwich was concerned about.

Todd Mackley, President of Entasis Design explained that the area concerning Mr. Leftwich is actually the egress stair tower. Mr. Mackley stated that it was a serviceable piece that's difficult to just add windows. He stated that it is a cost consideration but that can be looked at.

Mr. Leftwich also asked about the emergency drive, the section that's actually closed off, what type of material that was being considered other than pavement. Mr. White said that they were looking at pervious pavers, such as Grass-Crete, which would give the area a softscape feel to the development.

Mr. Hebert then proceeded to open the Public Input session by reminding the audience of the sign-in sheets and the rules and guidelines that was on the back of the sign-in sheet. Mr. Hebert reminded the speakers that there was a 3 minute limit to each speaker and that he would be reminded when 3 minutes were up.

Mr. Hebert asked that there be no personal attacks or personal name-calling to the applicant, the staff or you're going to be asked to step back from the podium.

Ms. Connor asked if there were any more forms that need to be turned in before the session began. There were 2 more people that completed the sign-in sheet, bringing the total speakers to 7.

The following people spoke to the Board in regards to the project:

Patricia Whitner
Virginia Carner
Derek Hodgin
Margaret Thompson
Alan Grubb
Earl Wagener
James McCubbin

Ms. Connor reported that there was a total of 22 minutes of time used during the Public Input Session.

Mr. Hebert asked if Mr. Steadman had any further comment for the Board.

Mr. Steadman responded to one thing that was said and the record will show this, that he had never mentioned or indicated that the judge ruled on this appeal. Mr. Steadman said the judge had the opportunity to stay action on the appeal and chose not to. Mr. Steadman said the judge had the opportunity to deny the staff to provide pertinent information in response to the allegations. The judge chose not to. The judge was aware that this was being presented tonight. Mr. Steadman never said that the judge had ruled on the appeal.

Mr. Steadman also wanted to point out that there was a comment made about there was a need to rewrite the ordinance. Mr. Steadman just wanted to remind everyone that the last two years Clemson has been rewriting their zoning ordinance and it was adopted after multiple public hearing on August 18th of this year.

Mr. Hebert asked if anyone had any comments or discussion on the project at hand or need further information from the applicant.

Mr. Leftwich again reiterated his strong concern about the north and south elevations. He does not want a building that looks like "we ran out of money". He strongly encouraged the developer and architects to find a better way to address those corners. "The north corner, if you were to drive down College Avenue, that is the end you are going to see." He feels it screams lack of detail. He also feels that the south end, where the stairwell is, has the same look.

Mr. Hebert asked Mr. Leftwich if he had a suggestion on an architectural design or just bringing the windows over on the north and increasing the window size on the south.

Mr. Leftwich feels that there's different ways that it can be treated, just to give some life to that wall.

Mr. Hebert asked the architectural team if they understood Mr. Leftwich's concern. Mr. Mackley responded that he did and proceeded to address both the north and south sides. Explaining that architects do things from a cost perspective to start with, but if it's the direction of the Board they would work to meet the concerns of the Board.

Mr. Leftwich asked about for clarification of the location of the four foot berm. Mr. Mackley explained the location of the berm and the aesthetics of it.

David Moorhead asked about spinning the project 45 degrees so the opening is on College Avenue. Mr. Steadman informed Mr. Moorhead that code dictates the location of the commercial portion of the project.

Mr. Hebert asked for a motion if there was no more comment.

Wayne Leftwich moved to approve but with the stipulation that the architects and the developers get final approval on the changes that he mentioned on the north and south elevations, particularly the corners just off of College Avenue. Mr. Leftwich would like the developer and architect to get final approval from the Zoning Administrator, if he feels comfortable with that.

Mr. Hebert asked if Mr. Leftwich would be more specific on the architectural details.

Mr. Leftwich said that the portion on the north elevation above the commercial space deserves similar treatment to the rest of the building and on the south elevation in particular as it approaches the public plaza also warrants some better treatment.

Davis Moorhead seconded the motion.

Mr. Steadman agreed to the motion and said that he would share the architects proposal with the Board for their feedback, but he believes that the BAR has the right to delegate authority to him and in doing that, he accepted. Mr. Steadman reiterated that whatever is submitted to him will be shared with the Board as well.

Mr. Leftwich said that the only other option would be to table it and have the applicant appear again before the Board with the modifications.

Mr. Hebert called for the vote.

Motion unanimously approved.

4. Staff Reports: none

5. Other Business - none

6. Adjourn – 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Connor
Recording Secretary

Note: Proceedings of this meeting have been recorded.