MINUTES

MEETING OF DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 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

Chair John Edwards called the meeting to order at 4:39 PM.

2. Roll Call

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

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

Staff Present:
Edward Kinney, Principal Urban Designer; Logan Wells, Deputy City Attorney; 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

Chair John Edwards 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

Jeff Tiddy moved to approve the minutes. Aaron Arnett seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

5. Call for Public Notice Affidavit from Applicants

Staff reported receiveing all apllicants' affidavits.

6. Acceptance of Agenda

Katie Skoloff moved to approve the agenda. Meg Terry seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

7. Conflict of Interest Statement

Chair John Edwards expressed a conflict with item CA 25-784.
Meg Terry expressed a conflict with item CA 25-809.

8. Old Business

None

9. New Business (public comment)

a. **<u>CA 25-783</u>**
Application by Harrison Horowitz for a **Certificate of Appropriateness** for Exterior Renovations at **505 North Main Street**

Staff report presented by Barrett Armstrong. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:
None

Applicants Present Project:
Harrison Horowitz, 104 W. Broad St
Mr. Horowitz stated they were largely redeveloping the existing site, but that it would appear as new construction and would incorporate uses such as a neighborhood shopping center, grocery store, coffee shop, bakery, and workout center.

Questions to Applicant:
None

Public Comment:
None

Board/Commission Discussion:
Mr. Edwards stated this project has been long anticipated for anyone who has driven through or lives in the North Main area. He pointed out it was a peculiar, dated building and the understated approach seems appropriate along with staff comments in regard to the facade facing Main Street. He did state with the recent approvals for the building on North Main, the project still needs more to activate it and connect the buildings to sidewalks and stated that would be an important thing to push back on.

Ms. Skoloff stated it looks excellent and it appears previous comments given to the applicant had been integrated. She stated it appears to have been designed with intentionality. She stated the comments that should be taken most seriously are those regarding the east and west facades because they already know there is a plan for a mural on the main street side, though it is not part of this application package to review. She did pointed out the Townes street side had not been addressed yet though.

***MOTION:**
Meg Terry moved to approve CA 25-783. Jeff Tiddy seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0.

b. **<u>CA 25-784</u>**
Application by Nathan Asire for a **Certificate of Appropriateness** for an Addition at **105 River Street**

John Edwards stepped out at 5:00 pm

Staff report presented by Alyson Smith. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:
None

Applicants Present Project:

Nathan Asire, 2 W Washington
Mr. Asire thanked the board members and stated he could present specific materials if needed. He pointed out the historic property had been built in 1909 and was a long-standing member of the community. He pointed out in looking at their long-term plan, they will eventually have a new main sanctuary and other lobby area off River Street, but intend to keep the original sanctuary on the corner to and maintain its prominence. He stated they look to eventually create 3 main doors facing all 3 main streets. He stated he appreciated the removal of staff condition #1 to accommodate their long-term plans. In regard to staff comments on the width of the windows, they confirmed they were open to slightly adjusting. He mentioned their goal was a more traditional building, and they wanted to keep the punched opening look for context, but that they were open to staff's comments and look forward to board members comments on those elements as well.

Questions to Applicant:
None

Public Comment:
Mel Duncan, 105 River Street
Mr. Duncan introduced himself as a member of the churches administration and pointed out the history of the church in the community. He stated in recent years, the church has started growing, which was a wonderful situation to be in, but that there is not a place to have programming for everyone due to the growth and these changes would allow them to continue to grow their programming.

Danielle Fontane, 236 Rhett street
Ms. Fontane stated she lived next door and was excited for the project. She stated she agreed with most comments made, and the that the project does well, except for the west facade, which she said has been treated more like the back of the building, being very industrial. She said as a corner lot, there isn't really a back to the lot and the west facade is very visible from Rhett street, particularly in the driving lanes. She stated it is important to cary a message of openness and invitation in the architecture and commented on her opinions of the architecture and the staff's comments on specific architectural detailing, specifically regarding how the project would be phased. She stated her living room looks right up to facade and with landscaping she was hoping it would help the view. She also stated she felt it was a beautiful building that would be boxed in by parking and suggested it would make more sense to have parking on north side to keep cars where other cars are and so the other side with the brownstones would be more pedestrian friendly.

Adrian Stiman, 236 Rhett Street
Mr. Stiman stated he agreed with Ms. Fontane's opinions on added an additional concern with hiding the air conditioning units on the roof, asking if screening could be added to cover them.

Board/Commission Discussion:
Mr. Tiddy stated they should flip through the application images again to review the comments they'd received. He stated he personally thought the overall mass, scale, and fenestration to be moderate and appropriate for this building type. He pointed out that wide open windows were more for retail purposes and a sanctuary would support smaller windows. He also commented that regarding comments about the west elevation, with the buildings placement in the city, they did need to consider all facades from the pedestrian

view. Regarding comments about the rooftop equipment screening, he pointed out there was a call out on the rooftop plan for screening, but stated they could add a condition to a motion for review.
Board members discussed the need for a specific condition about the screening.
Ms. Skoloff stated that at first glance she agreed that the scale was well done and the architecture was nice, but pointed out the modern additions end up looking really modern, though she appreciated the nods to the original architecture. She stated she would like to see a little more attention to the heavy limestone detail that occurs, potentially coming over the caps of the parapet walls with it and that for future additions, potentially mimicking the buttresses as another opportunity to tie in the architecture across additions. She stated she would love to see more of that material and without it, the entry on the east feels rather heavy, but that that entry is beautiful, and she wouldn't want to damped it down, but would rather see other features rise to it.
Mr. Arnett stated his agreement and added just a bit more detailing in respect of architecture of the church would help make the building a little more prominent itself. He stated there was a great sense of design too in the larger long-term plan of the site. He pointed out it was okay to think about that moving forward as the building would eventually be interior to the site and surrounded by other structures. He did point out an area of the long-term plan where it appeared some demolition of potentially historic structures would need to occur and advised the applicant to look into that more and be ready to discuss that if necessary.
Ms. Terry stated she disagreed with other board members, stating the west elevation articulation needs a bit more attention, but overall she liked the simplicity of the addition. She stated the sanctuary itself is the gem, and in thinking about additions to historic buildings, those additions should have identities and gestures of their own. She stated she felt the quietness was appropriate, and it was interesting to consider that it'll get covered up eventually. Overall, she stated she though making the addition more ornate to match the sanctuary would take away from the sanctuary itself.
Ms. Skoloff disagreed stated the addition could have its own character in window proportion, but if you were looking at it in an isolated situation, it felt lacking. She stated even a subtle nod, maybe adding even just a bit on the parapet, could get it some balance.
Mr. Tiddy pointed out the primary and secondary components to the building and that the church was interested in keeping the prominence of the sanctuary, so the addition should be secondary to keep the attention on the original building. However, he said he could understand there can be some additions and that it would be fine to consider how they would revise elements slightly to give it a little more, without guiding them to match the church.
Ms. Skoloff clarified she was not asking for more detailing, just a bit more on the caps that could be handled at staff level.
Mr. Arnett stated he could see all sides and it was a successful design to the existing church. He stated his main concerns were for future phases.
Board members discussed the west facade and making a condition as part of the motion.

***MOTION:**
Katie Skoloff moved to approve CA 25-784, striking #1 of staff conditions, and with an added condition to review the top line detail of the parapet and west elevation entry detailing. Meg Terry seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

John Edwards returned at 5:30 p.m.

c. **<u>CA 25-809</u>**
Application by the City of Greenville for a **Certificate of Appropriateness** for Exterior Renovations at **15 South Main Street**

Meg Terry left the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Staff report presented by Barrett Armstrong. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff (also applicant):
Mr. Tiddy asked about the storefront windows materials.
Mr. Armstrong clarified the existing storefront is silver.
Ms. Skoloff asked about the selection of color for the door logo.
Mr. Armstrong stated they'd done a study of how the City's branding would stand out, and there were only a few other options that weren't chosen.
Ms. Skoloff asked that the City try other colors as well to test it, but stated she loved the design and all the thoughtfulness and activation of the space.
Mr. Edwards agreed that that corner had been an underperformer forever, and the project helps enliven the courtyard.

Public Comment:
None

Board/Commission Discussion:
Mr. Edwards stated the office would be more centrally located and wouldn't be as odd of a path to find. He stated it was a solid approach in the context of the building that plays off the base of what is already there.
Ms. Skoloff stated her biggest question was the site furnishings and the way the public realm is activated and she was excited to see something very playful there.
Mr. Kinney stated the owner was redoing the outdoor furniture in the whole plaza so staff was waiting for that. He said they would apply for CA for that as well once there was more information. He stated staff was also going through a redesign of the sign package as well.
Mr. Arnett stated the proposed colors were fine and would work better than other options and would be more durable.
Ms. Skoloff stated she was excited to see the public art proposed and suggested staff gave consideration for creative lighting.

***MOTION:**
Jeff Tiddy moved to approve CA 25-809. Katie Skoloff seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

10. Advice and Comment (no public comment)

None

11. Other Business (no public comment)

Edward Kinney informed the board of an open RFP for artwork for the hallway leading to the new Design Center and encouraged board members to share the RFP information with anyone they thought might be interested. He also have an update on the Downtown Design Guidelines process and informed Board members of a meeting occurring on October 28th to showcase results of the consultants' public input processes.

12. **Informal Review (no public comment)**

None

13. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 5:45 PM.