



MINUTES

MEETING OF DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 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 4:15 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, and Aaron Arnett

Staff Present:

Edward Kinney, Principal Urban Designer; Eva Bateman, Assistant City Attorney; Mary Douglas Hirsch, 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

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

Katie Skoloff moved to approve the minutes. Aaron Arnett seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

5. Call for Public Notice Affidavit from Applicants

Staff reported receiving all applicants' affidavits.

6. Acceptance of Agenda

Jeff Tiddy moved to approve the agenda. Meg Terry seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

7. Conflict of Interest Statement

None

8. Old Business

None

9. New Business (public comment)

a. **CA 25-924**

Application by Kirk Crawford for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a Mixed Use Hotel at 30 and 2 East McBee Avenue

Staff report presented by Edward Kinney. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

None

Applicants Present Project:

Bo Autry,

Mr. Autry explained how they came to get involved in the project and their history in the downtown. He explained of the projects they have completed in the area, they have only sold 1 so they intend to keep the building, not develop and sell. He stated they were trying to work with staff to make the project everything it could be, and they wanted to honor other downtown architecture with a very timely design that would look as good 40 years from now as it will once finished. He pointed out the tight site and economics of the project, but stated they managed 149 rooms, a restaurant, and about 7000 square feet of meeting space on the less than 1 acre site. He stated they had already shifted the building in several directions to meet code requirements and stated the size constraints on the 1st floor in particular were significant. Regarding staff recommendations, he pointed out the recommendation to extend the glass panels down near the front door would expose the glass to potential damage. In regard to the comment on creating a second entrance on Main street, he stated it would require they significantly reduce the number of seats in their restaurant that already has a very tight footprint, which would in turn impact the overall economics of the project and requested that recommendation be waived. He stated he and their architect for the project were present to answer questions.

Questions to Applicant:

Ms. Skoloff asked about signage locations which their architect, Mr. Tuchet, pointed out.

Mr. Tiddy asked for clarification on where the metal materials were located, the type of glass used, and the reason for the green color.

Mr. Tuchet explained where the specific materials were located. He stated a glass selection had not been made yet but said it would be clear glass, and explained the green color was a request from the owner and was a historic color.

Ms. Skoloff asked about the deck of the balconies, which were stated to be painted concrete and asked the architect to go through the brick detailing.

Mr. Tuchet explained the detailing and stated they had had multiple studies to look into the detailing. He explained they ended up increasing it along the east side, but they did not want to take away from the entry massing. When asked to clarify on the spandrels between the windows, he stated they would continue the pattern and that there would be an additional soldier course that would run at each floor line to break up the facade.

Ms. Skoloff and Ms. Terry asked about the canopies, which were explained to be striped and that the colors would be the same for the canopies, but that the one at the hotel corner would be painted steel with glass where the one at the restaurant would be an ACM panel and he clarified the location of the colors.

Mr. Tiddy asked about the stone materials which were explained to be cast stone.

Ms. Skoloff asked if they had considered doing extra tall doors to incorporate more glass.

Mr. Tuchet stated there may be ADA considerations on the size and on the push-pull force for the doors they'd need to contend with, but he stated they could look into options for that.

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

Mr. Edwards stated the project was a great use and was scaled appropriately with appropriate materials. He stated he respected the fact that they got this to work considering the entrance presents challenges and that they had done a good job of getting this to work in a confined location. He pointed out the renderings of the awnings look correct, but that the elevations look like they could be bigger/extend further and suggested if they needed to extend them further, he would support any easement needed and asked the Board to do the same. He asked staff if they knew if any of the larger trees on Main Street would need to be removed to facilitate the construction.

Mr. Kinney stated he couldn't address that, but if they would, the developer would need to go through remediation for it.

Mr. Arnett commented the site had been in its current form since he'd lived in Greenville, which he felt was underutilized. He stated the project was a great opportunity and that he appreciated the comments on mimicking design elements of more historic buildings. He stated he had respect for comments on the extra entryway, but pointed out even if there wasn't another entry, the project would include proposed active use which is not there currently and argued he wouldn't make the extra entry something that has to happen, but understands the concerns and comments. He stated that for the most part, it meets the design guidelines and is a really good design.

Mr. Tiddy agreed and stated the extra entry was the only concern he had with design as well. He pointed out though it didn't necessarily meet all the requirements, the project seemed to have a lot of glass and transparency and a lot of lighting and movement on the McBee facade especially and was still a good design. He still stated there may be a way to encourage the 2nd entry on Main, it was just a matter of finding a way without damaging the intention of how they use the space.

Mr. Edwards stated that even if they didn't put one in now, in 50 years if there was another user where it would make more sense, it could be remedied.

Mr. Tiddy agreed, but said there was still a question on whether the outdoor furnishings would even be viable if there was no access point and that he overall agreed with staff that an additional entrance would be a strong addition to the design.

Ms. Skoloff stated that flow-wise, a second entrance would be critical for the outdoor space, but aesthetically the design was fine without it. She pointed out that there were plantings and the ability for windows to open on the cafe side was mentioned previously, which may help to break up the expanse of wall on the Main Street side which arguably may give stronger activation to the facade than a door the applicant didn't want.

Mr. Edwards stated he could support a condition to explore it in a 2-member review, but he was reluctant to say they would have to make the change if they might just send the project back to the Board for a second review later on.

Board members discussed and agreed that a review of options within a 2-member review would be appropriate on the issue of a second entrance.

Ms. Skoloff asked the other Board members about their opinions on extending the glass down at the entry doors.

Mr. Edwards stated it would look better, but function-wise would not work the same.

Ms. Skoloff asked about the color differences of the canopies.

Mr. Edwards explained his view was that material of the same kind should be same color, but that they could look at specifics in a 2-member review as well.

***MOTION:**

Katie Skoloff moved to approve CA 25-924 with staff conditions and a request that within the 2-member review, they look at the material, size, and color of the canopies/awnings. Meg Terry seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0.

10. Advice and Comment (no public comment)

11. Other Business (no public comment)

Edward Kinney provided the Board with updates on the 2026 Design Review Board calendar, the passing of the Board's bylaws, and the updates to the Downtown Design Guidelines.

12. Informal Review (no public comment)

None

13. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:06 PM.