



The City of Spartanburg Design Review Board

AGENDA

April 1, 2025, at 5:30 P.M.

**Dr. TK Gregg Community Center
650 Howard Street – Spartanburg, SC 29303**

(Please Note: Items as they appear on the Docket may or may not be considered in the order as they are presented. The Chairperson will announce any changes after the roll call).

I. Roll Call.

II. Freedom of Information Act Compliance – Public notification of the Design Review Board meeting has been published, posted and mailed in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the requirements of the City of Spartanburg Zoning Ordinance.

III. Rules and Procedures for Meeting Conduct.

IV. Approval of Agenda.

V. Disposition of the Minutes of March 4, 2025 meeting.

VI. Old Business:

1. DRB-24-020-00020 – The Design Review Board (DRB) has received a request for Full and Final Approval for the proposed Building, Magnolia Block Apartments located at 187 W Broad Street (Tax Map Sheet: 7-12-20-048.00, 7-12-20-049.02, 7-12-20-049.00, and 7-12-20-050.00) with a zoning designation of DT-5 Zone (Downtown Urban District) **Owner: Haven at West Broad, LLC. /Applicant: Chris Van Kley, Dwell Design Studio.**

VII. New Business:

1. DRB-25-020-00002 – The Design Review Board (DRB) has received a request for Preliminary Conceptual Approval for the proposed building, Townes of Howard, located at 535 Howard Street (Tax Map Sheet: 7-12-05-113.00) with a zoning designation of DT-4 Zone (Downtown Urban District). **Owner: GVL Property Group, LLC / Agent: Bryan De Bruin, VanRock Holdings.**
 - Application filed
2. DRB-25-020-00003 – The Design Review Board (DRB) has received a request for Preliminary Conceptual Approval for the proposed development, Spartanburg County / City Administration, located at 145 W Broad St (Tax Map Sheet: 7-12-20-056.00, 7-12-24-001.00, 7-12-21-062.00, 7-12-24-002.00, 7-12-21-063.00, 7-12-21-064.00, 7-12-21-066.00, 7-12-21-067.00, 7-12-21-069.01, 7-12-21-069.00, 7-12-24-004.00, 7-12-24-003.00, and 7-12-24-003.01) with a zoning designation of DT-5 Zone (Downtown Urban District). **Owner: City of Spartanburg / Agent: Michael Schwartz, McMillan Pazdan Smith.**
3. DRB-25-020-00004 – The Design Review Board (DRB) has received a request for Full and Final Approval for the proposed Sign, Hub City Market, located at 214 S Church St (Tax Map Sheet: 7-12-14-065.00) with a zoning designation of DT-5 Zone (Downtown Urban District). **Owner: Jeet Patel / Agent: Signs by Tomorrow.**



The City of Spartanburg Design Review Board

VIII. Staff Announcements:

IX. Adjournment.

For more information, please contact the City of Spartanburg Planning Department at planning@cityofspartanburg.org or call (864) 596-2068.

Meeting Minutes of the Design Review Board (DRB)
Tuesday, March 4, 2025, at 5:30 PM
Dr. TK Gregg Recreation Center

The Design Review Board (DRB) on Tuesday, March 4, 2025, at 5:30pm. The following Board Members were in attendance: **Lauren Rogers, Jean Crowther, Tori Babcock, Alexander Newman, and Lukas Hauser.** Representing the City of Spartanburg's Planning Department was **Fredalyn Frasier, Planning Director, Nan Zhou, Planner II, and Oksana Holbrooks, Sr. Administrative Assistant.**

Roll Call:

Mr. Newman: Alexander Newman
Ms. Crowther: Jean Crowther
Mr. Hauser: Lukas Hauser
Ms. Babcock: Tori Babcock
Ms. Rogers: Lauren Rogers.

Ms. Rogers: With the Freedom of Information Act Compliance, public notification of the Design Review Board meeting has been published, posted and mailed in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the requirements of the City of Spartanburg Zoning Ordinance.

Amend the Agenda:

On a motion by Ms. Babcock to approve and seconded by Ms. Crowther the case has been moved to the top of the agenda list by a vote of 5 to 0.

DRB-25-020-00002 – The Design Review Board (DRB) has received a request for Preliminary Conceptual Approval for the proposed building, Townes of Howard, located at 535 Howard Street (Tax Map Sheet: 7-12-05-113.00) with a zoning designation of DT-4 Zone (Downtown Urban District). Owner: GVL Property Group, LLC / Agent: Bryan De Bruin, VanRock Holdings.

Approval of Agenda

On a motion by Ms. Babcock to approve and seconded by Mr. Hauser, the amended agenda was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Ms. Babcock: Motion to approve.
Mr. Hauser: Second.
Ms. Rogers: All in favor?
Attendees: Aye. Any opposed?

Approval of Meeting Minutes for February 4, 2025.

On a motion by Ms. Babcock to approve and seconded by Mr. Newman, the amended minutes were approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Old Business:

DRB-24-020-00019 – The Design Review Board (DRB) has received a request for Full and Final Approval for the proposed building, 189 W Main Street Development, located at 189 W Main Street (Tax Map Sheet: 7-12-20-030.00) with a zoning designation of DT-6 Zone (Downtown Urban District). Owner: OTO Development / Agent: McMillian Pazdan Smith Architecture.

GENERAL PROJECT OVERVIEW

The proposed redevelopment includes a 6-story hotel, a ballroom, and a 4-story office building along West Main Street in the block bound by Daniel Morgan Avenue to the west and Spring Street to the east. It is a part of a larger development that includes shared parking in the block to the south of Broad Street. The project received Preliminary Approval by the DRB on January 7, 2025.

AUTHORITY & APPLICABILITY

This project is zoned D-T6 and is a full site redevelopment. Formal design review and approval by the Design Review Board is required.

DETERMINATION OF COMPLETENESS

- Application is complete.

FINDINGS- EXCEPTIONS

- **3.3.4.a Building Height:** To permit a one (1) story building element – The minimum number of stories is two (2).
- **4.4 Main Street Height Overlay:** To permit a partial encroachment into the maximum 60-foot building height.
- **6.4.3 Ground Level Detailing:** To permit certain blank wall conditions along Daniel Morgan Avenue, Broad Street, and Spring Street.
- **6.4.4.a Minimize Blank Walls & 4.4.4.c.2 Transparency Zone:** To permit in excess of 20 feet of building that lacks transparent windows or doors not exceeding maximum four (4) feet in height above the sidewalk grade along the Daniel Morgan Avenue, Broad Street, and Spring Street frontages.
- **6.4.5 Materials:** To permit the use of EIFS on walls visible from a public street.
- **8.1.a & b. Minimum Streetscape Zone:** To permit a sidewalk zone along Spring Street that is less than 16 feet in total width (shown as 14 ft 6 in between the retaining wall and the edge of curb) and sidewalk that is less than 8 feet in total width (6 ft 3 in).

CODE REVIEW

Deficiencies noted, or exceptions or deviations required, are noted in *blue italics*

A. Use Standards: The proposed use (office) is permitted by right in D-T6.

B. District Standards:

- **3.3.1 Lot Configuration:** Frontage Build-Out: 60% except in Side Yard Parking Overlay – *Compliant*
- **3.3.2 Primary Building Standards:** *Compliant*

- **3.3.4.a Building Height:** *Exception required for 1 story element at mid-block. Minimum height is two stories.*
- **3.3.5 Permitted Parking Location:** *Compliant*
- **3.3.6 Building Frontage:** Shopfront – Permitted

C. General Standards:

4.4. Main Street Height Overlay: *Exception required to permit an encroachment into the Main Street Height Overlay restricting the height within 60 feet of Main Street to 4 stories.*

D. Lot/Site Standards:

- **5.1.1 Lot Frontage:** All lots must front on a street, square, or common open space - *Compliant*
- **5.1.3 Pedestrian Entries from Frontage Line:** Buildings must have their principal pedestrian entrances on a frontage line. - *Compliant*
- **5.1.4 Setbacks:** Front and side setbacks must be consistent with surrounding buildings. - *Compliant*
- **5.1.5 Adjacent Lots:** Grading between lots to be sensitively considered. – *Not Applicable*

E. Utilities and Trash Containment:

- **5.2.1 Underground Utilities:** *Compliant*
- **5.2.2 Solid Waste Storage Areas:** *Compliant*
- **5.2.3 Mechanical and Utility Equipment:** *Compliant*

F. Building Standards:

- **6.1.1 General Design Principles - Connectivity:** *See note regarding façade transparency.*
 - **6.1.2 General Design Principles - Housing:** *Not applicable*
 - **6.1.3 General Design Principles – Mixed-Use Infill & Redevelopment:** *Compliant*
 - **6.1.1 General Design Principles - Downtown Should be Urban:** *Compliant*
 - **6.1.5 General Design Principles - Put People First:** *See note regarding ground floor activity 6.1.5.B) and wide sidewalks (6.1.5.C)*
- **6.2 Required Building Design Standards:**
 - **6.2.1 Architectural Style:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.2 Compatibility:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.3 Proportions:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.4 Wall Materials:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.5 Façade Treatment:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.6 Building Entrances:** *Compliant. However, corner buildings are encouraged to have a corner entrance.*
- **6.4 Specific Building Design Standards for all D-T5 Mixed-Use and Commercial Buildings**
 - **6.4.1 Roof and Eaves:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.2 Canopies/Awnings:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.3 Encroachments:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.4 Ground Level Detailing:** 60% Glazing in Transparency. *Please provide dimensions to the facades to be able to calculate the frontage transparency. Exception required for elevations along Daniel Morgan Avenue, Broad Street, and Spring Street.*
 - **6.4.5 Materials:** *Exception required for the use of EIFS on elevations that are visible from public streets.*

G. Parking:

- **7.1 Parking Area Access:** Parking must be accessed from a rear alley or a secondary frontage unless approved as a Discretionary Review. (D-T5 & D-T6) – *Compliant*
- **7.2 Bicycle Parking:** *Compliance to be confirmed with Final approval.*

H. Streetscape and Site Landscaping:

- **8.1 Required Streetscape:**
 - o D-T6: 16 ft zone with 16 ft wide sidewalk and trees in wells: *Non-compliant along Spring Street and Broad Street. Exception required.*
- **8.2 Parking Area Landscaping:** *Not applicable*

I. Signage: *Staff level approval*

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION

Broad Street & Spring Street: As discussed in previous meetings and reviews, the redevelopment in the core of downtown presents an opportunity to take a comprehensive look at the streetscape along Broad Street and Spring Street. The City has coordinated a review with design teams for 189 W. Main Hotel, W. Broad/Magnolia Block residences, the Joint Government Center, and Morgan Square to ensure a cohesive streetscape that meets DT standards.

RECOMMENDATION

A Final Approval by the DRB is recommended.

Applicant:

McMillian Pazdan Smith Architecture.

Public Comments: None.

Discussion:

The board discussed the proposed artwork rendering, noting that a final decision has not yet been made. The Board expressed a preference for artwork that is inviting and complementary to both the hotel and the Eastside, avoiding a design that would compete or appear too busy. The artwork should have a statement of its own while maintaining harmony with the surrounding area. Regarding the sidewalk width on Broad Street, the Board reviewed the tree wells and confirmed that a minimum width of 12 feet, with an 8-foot pedestrian zone, was established. The city has confirmed that the full design team has met and discussed these specifications. However, the Board suggested exploring the possibility of smaller tree wells as an option. The streetscape design has been fully addressed, and staff has recommended full and final approval for the plan.

A motion was made by Ms. Rogers, seconded Ms. Babcock for Full & Final approval, with the variance request accepted by a vote of 5-0.

DRB-24-020-00020 – The Design Review Board (DRB) has received a request for Full and Final Approval for the proposed Building, Magnolia Block Apartments located at 187 W Broad Street (Tax Map Sheet: 7-12-20-048.00, 7-12-20-049.02, 7-12-20-049.00, and 7-12-20-050.00) with a

zoning designation of DT-5 Zone (Downtown Urban District) Owner: Haven at West Broad, LLC. /Applicant: Chris Van Kley, Dwell Design Studio.

GENERAL PROJECT OVERVIEW

The proposed redevelopment includes a 5 story apartment building and shared parking structure, with primary frontage along West Broad Street and bound by Daniel Morgan Avenue to the west and Spring Street to the east. It is a part of a larger development that includes 189 West Main Street to the north of Broad Street. The project received Preliminary Approval at the January 7, 2025 meeting.

AUTHORITY & APPLICABILITY

This project is zoned D-T5 and is a full site redevelopment. Formal design review and approval by the Design Review Board is required.

DETERMINATION OF COMPLETENESS

Application is complete.

FINDINGS- EXCEPTIONS

- **4.2 Required Shopfront designation:** To exclude these frontages from compliance with the required shopfront designations (proposed as exclusively residential frontage conditions). – Approved at the 1/7/25 DRB Meeting.
- **7.1.4.b. Parking Area Access:** To permit access to parking from the primary frontage. – Approved at the 1/7/25 DRB Meeting.

CODE REVIEW

Deficiencies noted, or exceptions or deviations required, are noted in *blue italics*

A. Use Standards: The proposed use (office) is permitted by right in D-T6.

B. District Standards:

- 3.3.1 Lot Configuration: Frontage Build-Out: 60% except in Side Yard Parking Overlay – *Compliant*
- 3.3.2 Primary Building Standards: *Compliant*
- 3.3.4.a Building Height: *Compliant*
- 3.3.5 Permitted Parking Location: *Compliant*
- 3.3.6 Building Frontage: Shopfront – Permitted

C. General Standards:

- 4.2 Required Shopfront Designation: The frontages of Daniel Morgan Avenue and Spring Street are required to have ground-floor commercial frontages supported by Shopfront & Awning, Gallery, or Arcade frontages. *Exception approved at the 1/7/25 DRB Meeting.*

D. Lot/Site Standards:

- **5.1.1 Lot Frontage:** All lots must front on a street, square, or common open space - *Compliant*
- **5.1.3 Pedestrian Entries from Frontage Line:** Buildings must have their principal pedestrian entrances on a frontage line. - *Compliant*
- **5.1.4 Setbacks:** Front and side setbacks must be consistent with surrounding buildings. - *Compliant*
- **5.1.5 Adjacent Lots:** Grading between lots to be sensitively considered. – *Not Applicable*

E. Utilities and Trash Containment:

- **5.2.1 Underground Utilities:** *Compliant*
- **5.2.2 Solid Waste Storage Areas:** *Compliant*
- **5.2.3 Mechanical and Utility Equipment:** *Compliant*

F. Building Standards:

- **6.1.1 General Design Principles - Connectivity:** *Compliant*
- **6.1.2 General Design Principles - Housing:** *Not applicable*
- **6.1.3 General Design Principles – Mixed-Use Infill & Redevelopment:** *Compliant*
- **6.1.1 General Design Principles - Downtown Should be Urban:** *Compliant*
- **6.1.5 General Design Principles - Put People First:** *Compliant*
- **6.2 Required Building Design Standards:**
 - **6.2.1 Architectural Style:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.2 Compatibility:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.3 Proportions:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.4 Wall Materials:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.5 Façade Treatment:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.6 Building Entrances:** *Compliant.*
- **6.4 Specific Building Design Standards for all D-T5 Mixed-Use and Commercial Buildings**
 - **6.4.1 Roof and Eaves:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.2 Canopies/Awnings:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.3 Encroachments:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.4 Ground Level Detailing:** 60% Glazing in Transparency. *Compliant*
 - **6.4.5 Materials:** *Compliant*

G. Parking:

- **7.1 Parking Area Access:** Parking must be accessed from a rear alley or a secondary frontage unless approved as a Discretionary Review. (D-T5 & D-T6) – *There is a parking access from the primary frontage of Broad Street. – Exception approved at the 1/7/25 DRB Meeting.*
- **7.2 Bicycle Parking:** *Compliance to be confirmed with Final approval.*

H. Streetscape and Site Landscaping:

- **8.1 Required Streetscape:**
 - D-T6: 12 ft zone with 8 ft wide sidewalk and trees in wells: *Compliant*
- **8.2 Parking Area Landscaping:** *Not applicable*

I. Signage: *Staff level approval*

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION

Broad Street & Spring Street: As discussed in previous meetings and reviews the redevelopment in the core of downtown presents an opportunity to take a comprehensive look at the streetscape along Broad Street and Spring Street. The City has coordinated a review with design teams for W. Broad/Magnolia Block residences, the Joint Government Center, 189 W. Main Hotel, and Morgan Square to ensure a cohesive streetscape that meets DT standards.

RECOMMENDATION

A Final Approval by the DRB is recommended.

Applicant:

Chris Van Kley, Dwell Design Studio.

Public Comments:

Julia Keanor

Discussion:

The DRB reviewed the proposed two large residential buildings, discussing the following key points:

- **Entrances:** Appreciated the Spring Street porches and townhome entrances on Daniel Morgan.
- **First Floor Use:** Concern over lack of retail or mixed-use potential on the first floor. Suggested exploring residential amenities or retail space to better integrate the project into downtown.
- **Shed Roof & Materials:** Recommended further refinement of material choices, particularly for the white windows.
- **Retaining Walls & Transitions:** Suggested breaking down the retaining walls and incorporating vertical detailing or material changes where the side meets the wall to soften transitions.
- **Tree Placement:** Preferred trees along the curbside for pedestrian protection and increased sidewalk space, with consideration of the viewshed and courtyard tree placement.

A motion was made by Ms. Babcock, seconded Ms. Crowther by a vote of 5-0 to defer the case to the April meeting in order to address the following:

- **Activate the first-floor shopfront intent.**
- **Regulate residential elements to the courtyard, including white railings and columns preferred on the public right of way.**
- **Address concerns regarding the white windows.**
- **Refine design style transitions.**
- **Move trees at the corner of Broad and Daniel Morgan to the curbside, considering viewshed from the street.**
- **Address the transition from red brick to the townhome and unit design, making the transition more uniform around the corner of the building.**
- **Clarify design for the back courtyard, cantilever decks, and additional renderings for the back corner.**

New Business:

DRB-25-020-00001 – The Design Review Board (DRB) has received a request for Preliminary Conceptual Approval for the proposed development, Homes of Hope, located at 770 Howard St (Tax Map Sheet: 7-11-04-206.01) with a zoning designation of DT-4 Zone (Downtown Urban District). Owner: Northside Development Corp / Agent: Jeffrey B Randolph, The Randolph Group.

GENERAL PROJECT OVERVIEW

The 2.77 acre site is bound by Fairgrounds Road, Howard Street, and West Fremont Avenue. The existing site is cleared of the previous structures and has several trees on the site. The proposed 26-unit townhome buildings are proposed in seven (7) buildings and will include parking to the rear and a new detention pond.

AUTHORITY & APPLICABILITY

The project is zoned DT-4. Formal design review and approval by the Design Review Board is required.

DETERMINATION OF COMPLETENESS

Application is complete.

FINDINGS- EXCEPTIONS

- None requested

CODE REVIEW

Deficiencies noted, or exceptions or deviations required, are noted in *blue italics*

A. Use Standards: The proposed use (multi-family) is permitted by right.

B. District Standards:

- **3.3.1 Lot Configuration:** *Compliant*
- **3.3.2 Primary Building Standards:** *Requires confirmation of compliance – please show setbacks on drawings to confirm a maximum setback of 18 feet as measured from a current or proposed public right-of-way.*
- **3.3.4 Building Height:** *Compliant*
- **3.3.5 Permitted Parking Location:** *Compliant*
- **3.3.6 Building Frontage:** *Stoop – permitted*

C. Lot/Site Standards:

- **5.1.1 Lot Frontage:** All lots must front on a street, square, or common open space. *Compliant – Lots 14-26 front on a green space.*
- **5.1.2 Corner Lots:** Buildings located at street intersections must place the main building, or part of the building, at the corner. *Compliant*
- **5.1.3 Pedestrian Entries from Frontage Line:** Buildings must have their principal pedestrian entrances on a frontage line. *Compliant*
- **5.1.4 Setbacks:** Front and side setbacks must be consistent with those of surrounding buildings. *Provide adjacent buildings to confirm.*

D. Utilities and Trash Containment:

- **5.2.1 Underground Utilities:** *Compliance Presumed – to be confirmed prior for Final Approval*
- **5.2.2 Solid Waste Storage Areas:** *Compliance Presumed – to be confirmed prior for Final Approval*
- **5.2.3 Mechanical and Utility Equipment:** *Compliant*

E. Building Standards:

- **6.1.1 General Design Principles - Connectivity:** *Compliant*
- **6.1.1 General Design Principles - Downtown Should be Urban:** *Compliant*
- **6.1.5 General Design Principles - Put People First:** *Compliant*

- **6.2 Required Building Design Standards:**
 - o **6.2.1 Architectural Style:** *Compliant*
 - o **6.2.2 Compatibility:** *Compliant*
 - o **6.2.3 Proportions:** *Compliant*
 - o **6.2.4 Wall Materials:** *Compliant*
 - o **6.2.5 Façade Treatment:** *Compliant*
 - o **6.2.6 Building Entrances:** *Compliant*
- **6.3 Specific Building Design Standards for Mixed-Use and Commercial Buildings in D-T5**
 - o **6.3.1 Roof and Eaves:** *Main roofs shall have a pitch between 8:12 and 12:12. Either a design adjustment or a design exception is required. – Applicant adjusted. Compliant*
 - o **6.3.2 Façade Design:** *Please confirm that the corner elevation transparency along public streets is at least 15%. It appears to be a little blank. - – Applicant adjusted. Compliant*
 - o **6.3.3 Building Entrances:** *Please confirm raised entries heights for each building with finished floor elevations and sidewalk elevations. Please provide dimensions for front porches.*
 - o **6.3.4 Garages:** *Not Applicable*
 - o **6.3.5 Materials:** *Compliant*

F. Parking:

- **7.1.4 Parking Area Access:** *Compliant*
- **7.2 Bicycle Parking:** *Compliance Presumed – to be confirmed prior for Final Approval*

G. Streetscape and Site Landscaping:

- **8.1 Required Streetscape:** 11 ft streetscape zone with a minimum 5 ft sidewalk and street trees in a 6 ft wide planting strip. *Proposed 14 foot streetscape section exceeds current standards. Compliant*

H. Signage: Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION

- **Alley:** Alley A only needs to be 12 feet in total width – 10 feet of asphalt with a 1 foot ribbon curb on each side.
- **Howard Street Streetscape:** Please provide an existing survey to confirm the location of the existing trees. If these trees are to be used, a sidewalk between them and the street is permitted though a small planting strip between the sidewalk and the curb is preferred. The sidewalk shall be a minimum of 5 feet and we recommend a minimum 2 foot grass strip.
- **Detention Area:** Please relocate the detention area from the Howard Street frontage. We recommend consideration of a dry detention solution using the proposed green area. While the low point is at the northeast corner, most of the impervious surface can easily be directed to flow towards the west with some thoughtful grading
- **West Fremont Avenue Streetscape:** The existing street trees can be transplanted to be between the curb and the sidewalk in a grass strip a minimum of 6 feet in width.
- **Buffer Landscaping:** The buffer landscape along and behind Alley C and along Lot 1 appears to be over planted. Over time the lower branches of the Magnolias will crowd out the Loropetalum below. We recommend remove of the understory shrubs to allow the trees to flourish.

RECOMMENDATION

The Applicant is aware there are several deficiencies that will require correction prior to consideration for Preliminary Approval and plans to address prior to Board review.

Applicant:

Jeffrey B Randolph, The Randolph Group.

Public Comments: None.

Discussion:

The DRB reviewed the proposed project, noting that it mirrors a similar project from two months ago and adds more housing to the Northside. Concerns were raised regarding alleyways, parking pads, and window design, which were identified as key takeaways. The Board suggested exploring alternative color renditions and more organic design approaches to separate each house. Additional discussion focused on landscaping and lighting options.

A motion was made by Ms. Rogers, seconded Ms. Babcock for preliminary approval for the proposed building Townes of Howard with a designation zoning of DT-4 by a vote of 5-0.

Staff Announcements:

None.

Adjourned meeting at 7:51 P.M.

Lauren Rogers, Chair

DATE

March 20, 2025

TO

Design Review Board Members

PROJECT/ADDRESS/ TAX IDMagnolia Residences/W. Broad Street/7-12-30-4248990;
7-12-30-4153140; 7-12-30-4045895; and 7-11-39-4948449**PROJECT NUMBER**

DRB-24-020-000020

REVIEW STATUS – continuance - Full and Final**COPIES TO**

City Departments/Applicant

STAFFFredalyn M. Frasier, Planning Director
Nan Zhou, AICP, Planner II**GENERAL PROJECT OVERVIEW**

The proposed redevelopment includes a 5 story apartment building and shared parking structure, with primary frontage along West Broad Street and bound by Daniel Morgan Avenue to the west and Spring Street to the east. It is a part of a larger development that includes 189 West Main Street to the north of Broad Street. The project was presented for Full and Final Approval on March 4, 2025 and the Board voted to continue the case to its April 1, 2025 meeting to allow for additional refinement by the Applicant. The project received Preliminary Approval at the January 7, 2025 meeting.

BOARD ACTION MARCH 4, 2025**DRB Vote: Deferral of application for additional refinement and clarification**

On March 4th, the Design Review Board (DRB) voted to defer the application for the Magnolia Residences on West Broad Street. This decision was made to give the applicant time to address the comments made by the Board. A summary of the Board's feedback was provided to help the design and development team respond to the recommendations, which can be found in the attached materials from the applicant.

RECOMMENDATION

A Final Approval by the DRB is recommended.

AUTHORITY & APPLICABILITY

This project is zoned D-T5 and is a full site redevelopment. Formal design review and approval by the Design Review Board is required.

DETERMINATION OF COMPLETENESS

Application is complete.

EXCEPTIONS REQUIRED & PREVIOUSLY APPROVED

- **4.2 Required Shopfront designation:** To exclude these frontages from compliance with the required shopfront designations (proposed as exclusively residential frontage conditions). – **Approved at the 1/7/25 DRB Meeting.**
- **7.1.4.b. Parking Area Access:** To permit access to parking from the primary frontage. – **Approved at the 1/7/25 DRB Meeting.**

CODE REVIEW

Deficiencies noted, or exceptions or deviations required, are noted in *blue italics*

- A. **Use Standards:** The proposed use (office) is permitted by right in D-T6.
- B. **District Standards:**
 - **3.3.1 Lot Configuration:** Frontage Build-Out: 60% except in Side Yard Parking Overlay – *Compliant*
 - **3.3.2 Primary Building Standards:** *Compliant*
 - **3.3.4.a Building Height:** *Compliant*
 - **3.3.5 Permitted Parking Location:** *Compliant*
 - **3.3.6 Building Frontage:** Shopfront – Permitted
- C. **General Standards:**
 - **4.2 Required Shopfront Designation:** The frontages of Daniel Morgan Avenue and Spring Street are required to have ground-floor commercial frontages supported by Shopfront & Awning, Gallery, or Arcade frontages.
Exception approved at the 1/7/25 DRB Meeting.
- D. **Lot/Site Standards:**
 - **5.1.1 Lot Frontage:** All lots must front on a street, square, or common open space - *Compliant*
 - **5.1.3 Pedestrian Entries from Frontage Line:** Buildings must have their principal pedestrian entrances on a frontage line. - *Compliant*
 - **5.1.4 Setbacks:** Front and side setbacks must be consistent with surrounding buildings. - *Compliant*
 - **5.1.5 Adjacent Lots:** Grading between lots to be sensitively considered. – *Not Applicable*
- E. **Utilities and Trash Containment:**
 - **5.2.1 Underground Utilities:** *Compliant*
 - **5.2.2 Solid Waste Storage Areas:** *Compliant*
 - **5.2.3 Mechanical and Utility Equipment:** *Compliant*
- F. **Building Standards:**
 - **6.1.1 General Design Principles - Connectivity:** *Compliant*
 - **6.1.2 General Design Principles - Housing:** *Not applicable*
 - **6.1.3 General Design Principles – Mixed-Use Infill & Redevelopment:** *Compliant*
 - **6.1.1 General Design Principles - Downtown Should be Urban:** *Compliant*
 - **6.1.5 General Design Principles - Put People First:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2 Required Building Design Standards:**
 - **6.2.1 Architectural Style:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.2 Compatibility:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.3 Proportions:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.4 Wall Materials:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.5 Façade Treatment:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.6 Building Entrances:** *Compliant.*

- **6.4 Specific Building Design Standards for all D-T5 Mixed-Use and Commercial Buildings**
 - **6.4.1 Roof and Eaves:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.2 Canopies/Awnings:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.3 Encroachments:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.4 Ground Level Detailing:** 60% Glazing in Transparency. *Compliant*
 - **6.4.5 Materials:** *Compliant*

G. Parking:

- **7.1 Parking Area Access:** Parking must be accessed from a rear alley or a secondary frontage unless approved as a Discretionary Review. (D-T5 & D-T6) – *There is a parking access from the primary frontage of Broad Street. – Exception approved at the 1/7/25 DRB Meeting.*
- **7.2 Bicycle Parking:** *Compliance to be confirmed with Final approval.*


H. Streetscape and Site Landscaping:

- **8.1 Required Streetscape:**
 - D-T6: 12 ft zone with 8 ft wide sidewalk and trees in wells: *Compliant*
- **8.2 Parking Area Landscaping:** *Not applicable*

I. Signage: *Staff level approval*

1. Activation:

As this area was originally designated as shopfront and the modification to residential conceptually approved; is there a way to open up the corner creating visibility into the common area?



1. Activation:

As this area was originally designated as shopfront and the modification to residential conceptually approved; is there a way to open up the corner creating visibility into the common area?



PREVIOUS 2/10/25 DRB RENDERING




UPDATED 3/19/25 DRB RENDERING

PRIMARY
ENTRANCE
LOBBY (BEYOND)

2. Cohesive Vernacular

c. Explore a way to use this masonry language for more of the Spring Street section of the building, which would be more internally consistent and more consistent with the character of a city center. Rather than the white (wooden?) spindle railings.

d. Keep the Spring Street side more internally consistent by using the wonderful dark metal railing style, which they are already using for the porches, for the stoop railings too.



2. Cohesive Vernacular

- c. Explore a way to use this masonry language for more of the Spring Street section of the building, which would be more internally consistent and more consistent with the character of a city center. Rather than the white (wooden?) spindle railings.
- d. Keep the Spring Street side more internally consistent by using the wonderful dark metal railing style, which they are already using for the porches, for the stoop railings too.



PREVIOUS 2/10/25 DRB RENDERING



UPDATED 3/19/25 DRB RENDERING

RAILING AESTHETIC AT STOOPS
MATCH DESIGN, MATERIAL AND
COLOR OF UPPER BALCONIES.

3. Window System Colors


- a. Darker colors would be truer to the masonry materials than the white / off white /light colors which look like vinyl windows. Turn-of-the-century and art deco urban architecture generally had darker mullions and not white ones. Michael and his team made great improvements in this realm on some of the other projects we've seen from them recently and I look forward to what they come up with here.
- b. One scheme they could explore is a slightly darker grey fro the Spring Street section, and the green copper (similar to the Grain District office building) for the red brick art deco side. I mentioned at the meeting that if I was forced to choose, a lighter color makes sense for the Spring Street side.

FACADE TYPE KEY

BLUE = FACADE TYPE 1 (GRAY BRICK BLEND)
• LIGHT GRAY WINDOW FRAME COLOR

RED = FACADE TYPE 2 (RED BRICK)
• DARK GRAY WINDOW FRAME COLOR

MAGENTA = FACADE TYPE 3 (HARDIE-PANEL)



3. Window System Colors

- a. Darker colors would be truer to the masonry materials than the white / off white /light colors which look like vinyl windows. Turn-of-the-century and art deco urban architecture generally had darker mullions and not white ones. Michael and his team made great improvements in this realm on some of the other projects we've seen from them recently and I look forward to what they come up with here.
- b. One scheme they could explore is a slightly darker grey for the Spring Street section, and the green copper (similar to the Grain District office building) for the red brick art deco side. I mentioned at the meeting that if I was forced to choose, a lighter color makes sense for the Spring Street side.

LIGHT GRAY COLORED WINDOW MULLION



PREVIOUS 2/10/25 DRB RENDERING



UPDATED 3/19/25 DRB RENDERING

3. Window System Colors

- a. Darker colors would be truer to the masonry materials than the white / off white /light colors which look like vinyl windows. Turn-of-the-century and art deco urban architecture generally had darker mullions and not white ones. Michael and his team made great improvements in this realm on some of the other projects we've seen from them recently and I look forward to what they come up with here.
- b. One scheme they could explore is a slightly darker grey for the Spring Street section, and the green copper (similar to the Grain District office building) for the red brick art deco side. I mentioned at the meeting that if I was forced to choose, a lighter color makes sense for the Spring Street side.

LIGHT GRAY COLORED WINDOW MULLION



PREVIOUS 2/10/25 DRB RENDERING



UPDATED 3/19/25 DRB RENDERING

3. Window System Colors

- a. Darker colors would be truer to the masonry materials than the white / off white /light colors which look like vinyl windows. Turn-of-the-century and art deco urban architecture generally had darker mullions and not white ones. Michael and his team made great improvements in this realm on some of the other projects we've seen from them recently and I look forward to what they come up with here.
- b. One scheme they could explore is a slightly darker grey for the Spring Street section, and the green copper (similar to the Grain District office building) for the red brick art deco side. I mentioned at the meeting that if I was forced to choose, a lighter color makes sense for the Spring Street side.

DARK GRAY COLORED WINDOW MULLION



PREVIOUS 2/10/25 DRB RENDERING



UPDATED 3/19/25 DRB RENDERING

3. Window System Colors

- a. Darker colors would be truer to the masonry materials than the white / off white /light colors which look like vinyl windows. Turn-of-the-century and art deco urban architecture generally had darker mullions and not white ones. Michael and his team made great improvements in this realm on some of the other projects we've seen from them recently and I look forward to what they come up with here.
- b. One scheme they could explore is a slightly darker grey for the Spring Street section, and the green copper (similar to the Grain District office building) for the red brick art deco side. I mentioned at the meeting that if I was forced to choose, a lighter color makes sense for the Spring Street side.




PREVIOUS 2/10/25 DRB RENDERING



UPDATED 3/19/25 DRB RENDERING

Other Comments:

a. An additional color 3D rendering from the perspective of Daniel Morgan facing northeast, looking north along Daniel Morgan and east on Hub-Bub Way, at the building corner where the rooftop amenity is located.



Other Comments:

a. An additional color 3D rendering from the perspective of Daniel Morgan facing northeast, looking north along Daniel Morgan and east on Hub-bub Way, at the building corner where the rooftop amenity is located.





PREVIOUS 2/10/25 DRB EXTERIOR ELEVATION
(NO RENDERING PROVIDED IN PREVIOUS SUBMISSION.)

A




B







1 LANDSCAPE PLAN
L1 SCALE: 1"=50'





2 SPRING STREET STREETScape PLAN
L1 SCALE: 1/16"=1'



1 BROAD STREET WEST STREETScape PLAN
L2 SCALE: 1/16"=1'



2 BROAD STREET EAST STREETScape PLAN
L2 SCALE: 1/16"=1'



DATE

March 20, 2025

TO

Design Review Board Members

PROJECT/ADDRESS/ TAX ID145 W. Broad Street / 7-12-21-062.00; 7-12-21-063.00;
7-12-21-064.00; 7-12-21-066.00; 7-12-21-067.00; 7-12-21-069.01;
7-12-21-069.00; 7-12-24-004.00**PROJECT NUMBER**

DRB-24-020-0001xx

REVIEW STATUS – Preliminary Review**COPIES TO**City
Departments/Applicant**STAFF**Fredalyn M. Frasier, Planning Director
Nan Zhou, AICP, Planner II**GENERAL PROJECT OVERVIEW**

The proposed redevelopment along West Broad Street and South Church Street is for a 5 (five) story City/County Administration office building. The next phase, the planned mixed-use building and shared parking structure to the west is not included in this review.

This is the first review for Preliminary Approval.

AUTHORITY & APPLICABILITY

This project is zoned D-T5 and is a full site redevelopment. Formal design review and approval by the Design Review Board is required.

DETERMINATION OF COMPLETENESS

- Application is complete.

EXCEPTIONS REQUIRED

- 6.4.4.a Minimize Blank Walls & 6.4.4.c.2 Transparency Zone: To permit in excess of 20 feet of building that lacks transparent windows or doors not exceeding maximum four (4) feet in height above the sidewalk grade along West Broad Street and South Church Street and to have less than 60% of total frontage in ground-level transparent glazing.

CODE REVIEW

Deficiencies noted, or exceptions or deviations required, are noted in *blue italics*

- A. **Use Standards:** The proposed use (office) is permitted by right in D-T6.
- B. **District Standards:**
- **3.3.1 Lot Configuration:** Frontage Build-Out: 60% except in Side Yard Parking Overlay – *Compliant*
 - **3.3.2 Primary Building Standards:** *Compliant*
 - **3.3.4.a Building Height:** *Compliant*
 - **3.3.5 Permitted Parking Location:** *Compliant*
 - **3.3.6 Building Frontage:** Shopfront – Permitted

C. General Standards:

- **4.1. Civic/Landmark Buildings:** *Compliant except (f) below*
 - i. If indicated on the Downtown Master Plan, they must comply with the recommendations therein. *Compliant*
 - ii. They should be sited to terminate a street vista whenever possible and must incorporate appropriate prominent features, designs, and entrances to celebrate a visual termination. *Compliant*
 - iii. They should incorporate detailing and materials that are authentic to the intended style. *Compliant*
 - iv. A pedestrian plaza, courtyard, or similar landscaped area may be substituted for a required building frontage and minimum setback line. *Compliant*
 - v. Building entrances for civic buildings may be raised above the street elevation and accessed via a monumental stair. *Compliant*
 - vi. They should respect the character of the fronting streets through the provision of a pedestrian-friendly orientation including clear entrances from the street and permeable street walls with adequate windows (no blank walls). *See note regarding exception to Section 6.4.4*

D. Lot/Site Standards:

- **5.1.1 Lot Frontage:** All lots must front on a street, square, or common open space - *Compliant*
- **5.1.3 Pedestrian Entries from Frontage Line:** Buildings must have their principal pedestrian entrances on a frontage line. - *Compliant*
- **5.1.4 Setbacks:** Front and side setbacks must be consistent with surrounding buildings. - *Compliant*
- **5.1.5 Adjacent Lots:** Grading between lots to be sensitively considered. – *Compliant*

E. Utilities and Trash Containment:

- **5.2.1 Underground Utilities:** *Presumed Compliant*
- **5.2.2 Solid Waste Storage Areas:** *Presumed Compliant- will be confirmed at the staff review level*
- **5.2.3 Mechanical and Utility Equipment:** *Presumed Compliant*

F. Building Standards:

- **6.1.1 General Design Principles - Connectivity:** *See note regarding façade transparency.*
- **6.1.2 General Design Principles - Housing:** *Not applicable*
- **6.1.3 General Design Principles – Mixed-Use Infill & Redevelopment:** *Compliant*
- **6.1.1 General Design Principles - Downtown Should be Urban:** *Compliant*
- **6.1.5 General Design Principles - Put People First:** *Compliant*
- **6.2 Required Building Design Standards:**
 - **6.2.1 Architectural Style:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.2 Compatibility:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.3 Proportions:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.4 Wall Materials:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.5 Façade Treatment:** *Compliant*
 - **6.2.6 Building Entrances:** *Compliant*
- **6.4 Specific Building Design Standards for all D-T5 Mixed-Use and Commercial Buildings**
 - **6.4.1 Roof and Eaves:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.2 Canopies/Awnings:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.3 Encroachments:** *Compliant*
 - **6.4.4 Ground Level Detailing:** 60% Glazing in Transparency. *Exception required*
 - **6.4.5 Materials:** *Compliant*

G. Parking:

- **7.1 Parking Area Access:** Parking must be accessed from a rear alley or a secondary frontage unless approved as a Discretionary Review. (D-T5 & D-T6) – *Compliant*
- **7.2 Bicycle Parking:** *Compliance to be confirmed with Final approval*

H. Streetscape and Site Landscaping:

- **8.1 Required Streetscape:**
 - D-T5: 16 ft zone with 16 ft wide sidewalk and trees in wells: *Compliant*
- **8.2 Parking Area Landscaping:** *Not applicable*

I. Signage: *Staff level approval*

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION

6.4.4 Ground Level Detailing: The proposed window spacing and proportions are appropriate for a civic/office building. However, the frontages along West Broad Street and South Church Street do not meet minimum standards of 60% transparency and there is also a series of retaining walls that represent a blank wall condition. The transparency is a minimum of 51% glazing for South Church Street and 39% for West Broad Street. The spaces behind these windows are predominately office/occupied spaces.



The retaining wall across the southern portion of the South Church Street frontage has been designed with high quality materials and ground-level plantings to help soften the transition. The treatment is appropriate to building and does not compromise the streetscape.




RECOMMENDATION

A Preliminary Approval by the DRB will require the following exceptions:

- **6.4.4.a Minimize Blank Walls & 6.4.4.c.2 Transparency Zone:** To permit in excess of 20 feet of building that lacks transparent windows or doors not exceeding maximum four (4) feet in height above the sidewalk grade along West Broad Street and South Church Street and to have less than 60% of total frontage in ground-level transparent glazing.





PROJECT PARAMETERS

PROJECT LOCATION:
145 W BROAD STREET

ZONING CLASSIFICATION:
DT-5

MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE:
100%

FRONT SETBACK:
0 FEET MIN / 12 FEET MAX*

CORNER SIDE SETBACK:
0 FEET MIN / 12 FEET MAX*


INTERIOR SIDE SETBACK:
0 FEET MIN / 24 FEET MAX*

REAR SETBACK:
0 FEET MIN*

FRONTAGE BUILDOUT:
60% MIN AT SETBACK*

BUILDING HEIGHT:
2 STORIES MIN / 6 STORIES MAX

SPECIAL PROVISIONS:
CIVIC / LANDMARK BUILDING (*)



**CIVIC & LANDMARK
BUILDING STANDARDS**

*(Spartanburg Downtown Code Section
515.4.1)*


SITED TO TERMINATE A STREET

INCORPORATE DETAILING AND
MATERIAL AUTHENTIC TO THE
INTENDED STYLE

PLAZAS, COURTYARDS, OR
LANDSCAPED AREAS MAY BE
SUBSTITUTED FOR REQUIRED
BUILDING FRONTAGE AND SETBACKS

ENTRANCES MAY BE RAISED ABOVE
THE STREET ELEVATION

PROVIDE CLEAR ENTRANCES AND
ADEQUATE WINDOWS






ADJACENT CONDITIONS



ALL DRAWINGS, SPECIFICATIONS AND COPIES THEREOF FURNISHED BY KIMMEL AND ASSOCIATES, INC. SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF KIMMEL AND ASSOCIATES, INC. AND SHALL NOT BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF KIMMEL AND ASSOCIATES, INC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.



CIVIL ENGINEER:



SEALS

SPARTANBURG COUNTY

SPARTANBURG COUNTY/CITY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

145 W BROAD ST. SPARTANBURG, SC 29306

ISSUE DATE: NOVEMBER 2024

SHEET ISSUE:
NO. DATE DESCRIPTION

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
DRB PRELIMINARY SUBMITTAL
APRIL 2025


PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE: JDM
PROJECT ENGINEER: CWJ
DRAWN BY: CWJ

SHEET TITLE:

DETAILED SITE
LAYOUT PLAN

SHEET NO. PROJ. NO.
2405.002

C101



CONCEPT PLANT SCHEDULE

	UNDERSTORY TREE	9
	CANOPY TREE	22
	LARGE CONIFER	7
	SMALL CONIFER	27
	COLUMNAR TREE	6
	MEDIUM SHRUB	104
	SMALL SHRUB	357
	LARGE SHRUB	52
	SOD	8,390 SF
	SYNTHETIC TURF	6,656 SF
	GROUNDCOVER	1,320 SF

PLAN LEGEND:

- 1 CENTRAL PEDESTRIAN ACCESS RAMP
- 2 ARTIFICIAL TURF GREEN SPACE
- 3 RAISED PLANTING BEDS
- 4 RESIDENTIAL BALCONIES
- 5 OUTDOOR DINING AREA
- 6 DOG RUN
- * PROPSD MONUMENT LOCATION



NOTE:
THE BASE INFORMATION FOR THIS DRAWING HAS BEEN COMPILED FROM A VARIETY OF SOURCES AT VARIOUS TIMES AND AS SUCH IS INTENDED TO BE USED ONLY AS A CONCEPTUAL GUIDE. ALL PROPERTY LINES, TRACT DIMENSIONS AND DESCRIPTIONS ARE FOR GRAPHIC PURPOSES ONLY. AS AN AID TO SITE LOCATION AND POSSIBLE POTENTIAL LAND USE. ANY PERSON DESIRING TO DETERMINE ACTUAL COMMITMENTS SHOULD EXAMINE THE APPROPRIATE PLATS, DEED RESTRICTIONS, COVENANTS, AND PLANNING AND ZONING REGULATIONS APPLICABLE TO SPECIFIC PORTIONS OF THE PROPERTY.



SPARTANBURG COUNTY


SPARTANBURG COUNTYCITY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

ISSUE DATE:		03/24/2025
SHEET ISSUE:		
NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION


NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
SCHEMATIC DESIGN

PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE	TP
PROJECT ARCHITECT	TP
DRAWN BY:	TP/KK
SHEET TITLE:	
OVERALL LANDSCAPE PLAN	
SHEET NO.	
PROJ. NO.	21065-00





LEVEL 1
 3/64" = 1'0"



LEVEL 2


3/64" = 1'0"



Spartanburg County / City Administration
Spartanburg, South Carolina





CLERESTORY
PROJECTS GROUP, INC.





LEVEL 6 (ROOF)


3/64" = 1'0"




























157 LINEAR FT OF GLAZING = 51% OF FRONTAGE



52 LINEAR FT OF GLAZING = 39% OF FRONTAGE

VARIANCE REQUEST: 60% GLAZING REQUIRED

The design of the facility includes a rusticated first floor level, elevated floor planes/entrances, and smaller punch openings in keeping with the traditional architecture. Precedent examples of other city hall-type facilities are included on the next page, showing limited glazing on the street level and in the general building design, and serve as a basis for our ask for a variance regarding 60% minimum glazing at street level.

To accentuate the public spaces and main entry, we are incorporating a compliant lobby space on the church and broad street facades, where additional glazing is used to highlight the interior public spaces. We believe the overall effect is in keeping with the civic architecture design ethos incorporated in this code, including authentic detailing and materiality, elevated ground floor plane, and clear entrances.

EAST & NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0"



CHARLESTON CITY HALL, SOUTH CAROLINA




COLUMBIA CITY HALL, SOUTH CAROLINA



ORANGEBURG, SOUTH CAROLINA





CHESTER CITY HALL, SOUTH CAROLINA








S. CHURCH STREET EXISTING CONDITION





SECTION THROUGH CHURCH STREET






SECTION THROUGH BROAD STREET







MODULAR BRICK (FIELD)
 BRICK BLEND: RED
 MORTAR COLOR : TBD



RUSTICATED BRICK @ LEVEL 1
 BRICK BLEND: RED
 MORTAR COLOR : TBD



CAST STONE
 LIGHT SANDBLAST FINISH



METAL RAILING
 DARK GRAY



CANOPY METAL
 LIGHT GRAY



GLAZING



VIEW FROM NE CORNER OF BROAD AND CHURCH ST. MECH EQUIPMENT NOT VISIBLE



VIEW FROM ACROSS BROAD ST. MECH EQUIPMENT NOT VISIBLE




VIEW FROM SE CORNER OF KENNEDY AND CHURCH ST. MECH EQUIPMENT NOT VISIBLE



AERIAL VIEW FROM SOUTH EAST

THANK YOU

APPENDIX A - SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL



LEVEL 0

3/64" = 1'0"



Spartanburg County / City Administration
Spartanburg, South Carolina




CLERESTORY
PROJECTS GROUP, INC.




LEVEL 3

3/64" = 1'0"



LEVEL 4
3/64" = 1'0"



LEVEL 5
3/64" = 1'0"



Spartanburg County / City Administration
Spartanburg, South Carolina



CLERESTORY
PROJECTS GROUP, INC.

MATERIAL LEGEND	
BR01	TYPE 1 BRICK
BR02	RUSTICATED BRICK
CN01	CONCRETE FLOORING
CS01	PROFIED CAST STONE
MSP01	MASONRY SPANDREL PANEL
MT02	DECORATIVE METAL CANOPY
MT05	METAL HANDRAIL
LT09	CUSTOM LIGHT FIXTURE
WN01	FIXED ALUMINUM WINDOW
WN03	SKYLIGHT




EAST ELEVATION

SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0"

MATERIAL LEGEND	
BR01	TYPE 1 BRICK
BR02	RUSTICATED BRICK
CN01	CONCRETE FLOORING
CS01	PROFILED CAST STONE
MSP01	MASONRY SPANDREL PANEL
MT02	DECORATIVE METAL CANOPY
MT05	METAL HANDRAIL
LT09	CUSTOM LIGHT FIXTURE
WN01	FIXED ALUMINUM WINDOW
WN03	SKYLIGHT




S.CHURCH STREET



NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0"



MATERIAL LEGEND	
BR01	TYPE 1 BRICK
BR02	RUSTICATED BRICK
CN01	CONCRETE FLOORING
CS01	PROFILED CAST STONE
MSP01	MASONRY SPANDREL PANEL
MT02	DECORATIVE METAL CANOPY
MT05	METAL HANDRAIL
LT09	CUSTOM LIGHT FIXTURE
WN01	FIXED ALUMINUM WINDOW
WN03	SKYLIGHT



SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0"

MATERIAL LEGEND	
BR01	TYPE 1 BRICK
BR02	RUSTICATED BRICK
CN01	CONCRETE FLOORING
CS01	PROFILED CAST STONE
MSP01	MASONRY SPANDREL PANEL
MT02	DECORATIVE METAL CANOPY
MT05	METAL HANDRAIL
LT09	CUSTOM LIGHT FIXTURE
WN01	FIXED ALUMINUM WINDOW
WN03	SKYLIGHT



WEST ELEVATION

SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0"

