MINUTES

MEETING OF DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2025 - 4:00 PM
Greenville City Hall, Council Chambers, 206 S. Main Street
Citizens may access the meeting at the following web address:
https://www.greenvillesc.gov/1694/Online-Meetings

---

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Jeff Tiddy called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

2. Roll Call

Alyson Smith moved on to roll call of board members in attendance.

Members Present:
Vice Chair Jeff Tiddy, Katie Skoloff, Aaron Arnett, and Meg Terry

Members Absent:
Chair John Edwards,

Staff Present:
Eva Bateman, Assistant City Attorney; Mary Douglas Hirsch, Interim Planning Director
Alyson Smith, Senior Development Planner; Barrett Armstrong, Senior Urban Designer;
Jamie Pratt, Development Planner; Deanna Ensley, Planning Assistant

3. Welcome and Opening Remarks from the Chair

Vice Chair Jeff Tiddy invited the other members to introduce themselves, provided normal beginning procedures for the meeting, explained the agenda, and outlined the rules for procedure.

4. Approval of the Minutes

Meg Terry moved to approve the minutes with a correction. Katie Skoloff seconded. The motion passed 4-0.

5. Call for Public Notice Affidavit from Applicants

Staff reported receiving all applicants' affidavits.

6. Acceptance of Agenda

Katie Skoloff moved to approve the agenda. Meg Terry seconded. The motion passed 4-0.

7. Conflict of Interest Statement

Meg Terry stated she had a conflict of interest for item CA 25-608.

8. Old Business

None

Meg Terry stepped out of the meeting at 4:05 PM

9. New Business (public comment)

a. **CA 25-427** ***(Application withdrawn)***
Application by Adam Berry for an **Appeal to Administrator's Decision** on a Projecting Sign Application at **330 South Main Street**

b. **CA 25-608**
Application by W. Barry Agnew for a **Certificate of Appropriateness** for Exterior Renovations at **50 South Richardson Street**

Staff report presented by Barrett Armstrong. Staff recommends approval with conditions.

Questions to Staff:
None

Applicants Present Project:
Barry Agnew- 312 Greenview Cir
Mr. Agnew introduced himself as the architect for the project. He stated the vast majority of the scope of the project was interior to bring the building up to code, specifically in the creation of a 2nd stairwell for egress and an elevator for ADA compliance, and the addition of new mechanical and electrical equipment. Mr. Agnew stated the only location for the stair and elevator would be the corner that they were enclosing, which presented challenges and they had been through several iterations of the design. Mr. Agnew stated at the suggestion of staff the new entrance lobby was created and with an inability to exactly match existing brick, they had looked at using a complementary color brick instead. He stated they had identified an option that mirrored the church across the street which was tied to the tenant of the building in question. In addressing staff comments on studying the facade for transparency, Mr. Agnew pointed out they had increased the transparency from where it started and the only area windows weren't located is right where their new stairwell was, so windows couldn't be added. In response to staff comments on the boarded-in arched entry, Mr. Agnew pointed out there was nothing to restore in the space outside of the framing, and their intent was to keep that intact. He stated they had looked at two ways of addressing it, which was to incorporate some of the accent brick, or to use some of the existing brick that was being removed from other areas and use that to infill, but that he would be happy to discuss alternative solutions if they met the goal of staying contextual. Regarding the screening concerns mentioned by staff, he stated they had looked at potentially replacing the current proposed screens with a steel-framed, thin brick screening as another option, but was open to redesigning them to be more compatible. Overall, Mr. Agnew stated he was open to staff comments of looking at details to address concerns.

Questions to Applicant:
Mr. Arnett asked if the arched window was originally a window or a doorway opening, which Mr. Agnew stated he did not know for sure, but that it had been boarded up for a long time. He stated his main goal in addressing it was to retain the historic masonry and not conflict with the nearby primary entryway.
Ms. Skoloff asked if the roof was accessible by the elevator and stairs and if the screening height and placement was due to requirements of the code.

Mr. Agnew answered the roof was not accessible via the stairs or elevator and that the height was due to code requirements, which was also confirmed by staff. It was also stated that there is proposed to be about 3-4' of spacing between the screening and machines for servicing purposes.
Board members asked about the brick and grout.
Mr. Agnew presented the brick samples and pointed out they would be attempting to match the lighter grout where any would need to be replaced for the red brick, but for the gray accent brick, it had been suggested by staff to use a more complementary grout, which was selected to be a dark gray, but if there were concerns on the color, they could change it to be more monolithic.
Ms. Skoloff asked about the historic corbel design.
Mr. Agnew stated there had not been a precedent for corbels, but wanted to use something that would help identify that area as an entry without using excessive ornamental detail.
Mr. Tiddy asked about the material of the windows.
Mr. Agnew clarified they would be metal, but not the standard aluminum storefront type as they were trying to match the existing windows. He stated they would be stick built, not prefabricated and the profile would be more beveled rather than squared. He also clarified the windows would not be operable, but their design would mimic the original operable windows.
Ms. Skoloff asked about the material on the top of the awnings.
Mr. Agnew stated they would be a gray metal product to match the rest of the awning as closely as possible so there wasn't additional colors that would draw attention unecessarily.

Public Comment:
None

Board/Commission Discussion:
Mr. Tiddy stated they should read through the summary of staff comments to help clarify their positions on different elements of the project.
Mr. Arnett stated with the challenges of the site and project, they had done very well in not making the corner less active and giving better street access. He did say a different solution to the arched entryway might be worth looking at and pointed out the building next to the project also has arched entryways that can be reviewed as a guide as they were most likely built around the same time.
Mr. Agnew agreed it would be good to look at those in more detail.
Mr. Tiddy stated that the review of options for that as well as other details could be done with a 2-member review and potential mock-ups. He commented that he would like to see further details of the screening as viewed from the pedestrian perspective and that an exception to the screening may be warranted if the screening ends up looking worse than what is meant to be screened.
Ms. Skoloff commented that she agreed on the reuse of original brick for infill, and that largely she felt a 2-member review to just discuss the details would be sufficient. She stated she understood the challenges of the site and agreed on the architectural detailing being nice, it just needed a few details called out and addressed.

***MOTION:**
Katie Skoloff moved to approve CA 25-608 with staff comments and the following additions:

- **a request for a 2-member review of finer details of architectural elements including the arched window, and**
- **the consideration of allowing an exception for removing the roof screening of mechanical equipment.**

Aaron Arnett seconded the motion. Motion passed 3-0.

Meg Terry returned to the meeting 4:52 PM

10. Advice and Comment (no public comment)

None

11. Other Business (no public comment)

Katie Skoloff made a motion to approve the amended bylaws. Aaron Arnett seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

12. Informal Review (no public comment)

None

13. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:54 PM.