



**JOINT MEETING:
UNIVERSITY RIDGE PUBLIC FACILITIES CORPORATION
&
UNIVERSITY RIDGE REDEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
Minutes**

June 20, 2019
12:00 noon
County Square – Conference Room D

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, notice of the meeting date, time, place and agenda was posted on the bulletin board at the County Square and made available to the newspapers, radio stations, television stations and concerned Citizens.

Members Present

Butch Kirven, County Council Chairman
Bob Taylor, Councilor, District 22
Joe Kernell, County Administrator

Absent

None

Others Present

Councilor Joe Dill, District 17
Councilor Willis Meadows, District 19
Patrick Leonard, RocaPoint Partners
Phil Mays, RocaPoint Partners
Danielle Hamby, RocaPoint Partners
Carolyn Gembls, Foster and Partners
James Dean, Sr. Project Manager, RocaPoint Partners
Alex King, Intern, RocaPoint Partners
Mark Tollison, County Attorney
John Hansley, Deputy County Administrator
Regina McCaskill, Clerk to Council
Shannon Herman, Assistant County Administrator
Nicole Wood, Assistant to the County Administrator
Kim Wunder, Assistant County Attorney

Item (1) Call to Order

Mr. Butch Kirven

Item (2) Project Update

County Attorney Mark Tollison gave an overview of what the Public Facilities Corporation was and why it was being used for the project.

Mr. Tollison stated the PFC was created as an alter-ego of the County. The mechanics of the design was to provide a way for the County, through its alter-ego, to hold the property and to work with the developer. This would allow the County to take advantage of the non-profit status and the County's exemption from ad valorem taxes while the property was being held for redevelopment.

Patrick Leonard gave an update on the University Ridge Redevelopment Project. He stated the first critical path was the erection of the building and the timeline to do so. Mr. Leonard stated by the end of the year they were hoping to break ground, remove the old tire building and begin remediation of the ground and so that they were ready for permitting next year. They have been through the schematic and concept designs and were beginning to get into the design documents. He stated it would take roughly two years to get the County office building built and everyone moved in; which would trigger the master redevelopment of the property.

The second critical path was the rezoning of the property, which was part of the old Haynie-Sirrinc PD. The City of Greenville was in the process with coming up with their own downtown plan which incorporated the project plan. The city anticipated 6000 new residents coming into the downtown area. They anticipated the need of about 1.2 million square feet of office space and about 300,000 square feet of retail space, as well as another 4-5 hotels. He stated the University Ridge property was a big part of that master plan as there was not a lot of land left downtown to fill those needs.

Mr. Leonard stated retail sales downtown had increased leaving only about a 4% vacancy rate. That lack of space created a great market for additional retail space. What the downtown could use was entertainment venues, grocery, health clubs, restaurants, music venues, an opportunity for corporate relocation, corporate headquarters, and co-worker space. He stated they designed the Master Plan with those needs in mind. Mr. Leonard stated they developed a plan that was economically viable for what was needed, which also included several thousand more residential units. The current PD was an existing PD that they were looking to modify. Mr. Leonard stated the County office building would be the anchor for the property, and it was very important how the public space interacted with the Master Plan.

Councilor Taylor asked if the office space was flexible.

Mr. Leonard stated they were flexible, and it was their wish was to be as flexible as possible. In regards to zoning, however, they did have to pick a number and stick with it for things like the traffic study. He stated all the numbers could vary depending on how the market evolved. Their goal was to have built-in flexibility in order to maximize the land value. Mr. Leonard stated, for the current, it was important to get the streetscapes right and the traffic flow right, but the uses could change as the market changed.

Chairman Kirven asked if they were saving a portion of the development for special type users, such as corporate headquarters.

Mr. Leonard stated they would love to do that. As they developed the Master Plan with that in mind, there were some possibilities for great corporate locations.

Councilor Taylor asked about height restrictions.

Mr. Leonard stated the current PD did have height restrictions. The proposed PD modifications would lift those height restrictions for the central part of the project. He stated

in keeping with the current image of Main Street, they were designing the project to be very walkable. He stated they were intermixing parking to achieve efficiency and not over-park the property. The office people would be there during the day, but in the evening there would need to be efficient parking for those coming for the entertainment aspect of the project. He stated there have already been discussions with users for the big box entertainment venues, which he felt would enhance the quality of downtown. On the slide presentation, Mr. Leonard pointed out the potential office locations, stating there would be great views of the mountains and of downtown from those locations. He also pointed out the hotel locations within the project as well as the multi-family residential areas, which would run around the perimeter.

Mr. Leonard gave an overview of the connection plan. He stated they were spending a fair amount deal of time making sure there were plenty of sidewalks with connections to the existing neighborhoods.

Chairman Kirven inquired about the width of the trails/sidewalks. Ms. Gembles stated the trails would be 12 and 15 feet wide.

In regards to the timing of the plan, Mr. Leonard stated they hoped to start the new building this year; move in at the end of 2021; build the infrastructure in 2022 and start the buildout in 2023-2024 with the land sales which generated the money to pay for the building. The County building would be self-funded through land sales. The project would create 7700 new construction jobs; 5500 new office jobs; \$560m in new annual business revenue; \$720m in construction spending; \$23.5m annually in new property tax revenue, and \$17.5m annually in new state income and sales tax revenue; resulting in a \$1billion impact to the region. In regards to the local taxes, the schools would get a little better than half, the city would get 31% and the County would get about 18% after all the debts are paid.

Mr. Leonard stated Gay Sprague was hired in September to do a traffic study. She studied the entire downtown area and as a result, they were proposing 10 off-site mitigations to potentially improve and eliminate any congestion this project would create.

Councilor Taylor asked if University Ridge would be re-routed.

Mr. Leonard stated University Ridge would be re-routed to the roundabout that headed up to Main Street. They were also proposing a secondary access that connected to Claussen Street.

Carolyn Gembles gave an overview of the building's design. She stressed that integration with downtown was an important part of the design. She stated they were trying to create a space where people could come and enjoy; not just a space for the users. The County's building would be surrounded with landscaping and water features. She pointed out the Veteran's Memorial Wall that would be integrated within the plaza where intimate spaces would be created to allow for people to sit and stay for a while.

Patrick Leonard pointed out that the lawn area could also be used for ceremonies and would be a great place to have a café due to the proximity of the retail area; it could prove to be multi-functional.

Ms. Gembles stated the County's building would be the first one on site so it needed to be iconic to set a high bar for architecture.

Chairman Kirven inquired about the energy efficiency of the glass construction.

Ms. Gembles stated Foster & Partners had experts in mechanical and environmental engineering; specialists who worked together to make each building efficient with a small

carbon footprint as well as to be flexible in anticipation of future needs.

Chairman Kirven inquired about the cost of the building in light of Council's fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Leonard stated Senior Project Manager James Dean's daily activity was to keep the building's cost in line. He stated it was a fairly efficient building; it just had a unique design and good design did not necessarily have to cost a lot. He stated there was a whole team in the background working on the design and the budgeting. They were working to maintain the budget they originally presented with.

Chairman stated it was his understanding the County had a contract with RocaPoint Partners to be the project managers. He asked how did relationships work when other contactors were brought into the development.

Mr. Leonard stated RocaPoint had two contracts with the County. One to be the project manager for the building, the other was to be an integral part of the master development. He stated they had a vested interest to be sure the project went well. Mr. Kirven confirmed with Mr. Leonard that no property would be sold until there was a viable development plan for that particular parcel. Mr. Leonard stated RocaPoint would probably build less than 1/3 of the buildings. They would bring in other developers so that the project was completed in a timely manner. He stated the best thing for the project was to get to the end of the project.

Councilor Joe Dill inquired about access for the disabled. Mr. Leonard stated the elevation was higher in the back of the building where the parking deck would be located. The main entrance to the building would be on the higher level.

Mr. Dill expressed his concern with the glass being hard to heat and cool.

Ms. Gembles stated they met with the manufacturers of the glass and there were films that were placed on the glass to deflect light and heat. Mr. Leonard stated there were different levels of tint used based on which side faced the sun.

Phil Mays updated Council on the rezoning process with the City of Greenville. He stated their first meeting with the city was in May of 2018. The Master Plan was presented to them in September of that same year. He stated there was a community meeting with Haynie-Sirrine in May of 2019 (last month) and the City Planning Committee workshop was to take place that evening (June 20th). The City's Planning Commission public hearing would be held in July 2019 and then move to the City Council meeting in August for their approval. He stated there had been many meetings and conference calls with the City of Greenville over the past year.

Councilor Taylor asked if the city had seen the road layout.

Mr. Leonard stated they had seen the layout. He stated in the PD modification submittal there were over 300 pages on traffic. He stated Danielle Handy worked day-to-day with the city's zoning department and staffers.

Danielle Handy stated the existing zoning for the property dated back to the 1998 Master Plan which envisioned mixed development, high-density multi-family residences and high-intensity commercial uses in the area. In 2001 there was a Master Plan and a Neighborhood Code that was adopted; the Haynie-Sirrine Community Master Plan and Code. That PD created what was known as the University Ridge Village Center. The County's property was located in the center of the village center sub-district. The uses included in that sub-district were a lot of the same uses they were trying to incorporate into the proposed modification.

She stated the zoning allowances allowed for 6 stories height across the entire site.

In comparison of what existed versus what was proposed, the land uses were more or less the same. The current PD has no limit on density so they were proposing a limit of 3.5 million square feet of all the different uses. In terms of height, they were looking to reduce the height along the western and southern edges of the property, otherwise they were looking at increasing height as you work toward the center of the property; ranging between 1 and 11 stories and in some instances the allowance to go above 11 stories. In terms of traffic, the existing zoning did not take into account any mitigation; this modification did provide for specific traffic improvements. As the approval process went, the only items that were required to go before the Design Review Board was multi-family. All other development was administratively reviewed and approved. What they were looking for through the modification was administrative approvals that were subject to covenants that they would record privately. They were also looking to have the design standards that were incorporated into the planned development administratively reviewed along with some of the land management ordinance standards that were already in place with the city.

Patrick Leonard stated they were putting mechanisms in place, specific to the project, so that the County would have ultimate say in what got built.

Joe Kernell stated it was imperative to keep the quality level very high because that was where the value needed to be to pay for the project.

Ms. Handy stated they wanted to make sure the buildings that came through for review were meeting some of the minimum design requirements. What they were proposing was something that would be woven into the existing fabric of Greenville but to also have some modern and interesting touches to it.

Ms. Handy went through the different zones of the property citing Zone A as being where the County office building would be located with a maximum 6-story allowance. Zone B & C was the village core with heights allowances of 1 to 11 stories, and up to 20 stories with some of the office type buildings. Zones D & F were intended to taper density away from the core into Zone E where the maximum height was 4 stories. This was meant to soften the view and share compatibility with the surrounding area. She then outlined the vehicular diagram as well as the pedestrian diagram; all of which tied into the amenities provided by the city.

She stated in March they submitted their zoning text and received about 119 comments on it from the City staff. She stated they were willing to agree to about 100 of those comments. She felt like they could work with them; they were good comments and standards to incorporate into the development. Ms. Handy stated there were about 19 comments where they proposed alternatives; most pertained to open spaces and traffic. Design standards they felt would enhance the existing PD would include signage, landscaping, buffering and lighting. The parking design would also be an enhancement as well as reducing the height along the southern and western edges from 6 to 4 stories. She stated they also extended the list of prohibited uses, which includes storage facilities, drive-thru restaurants, bail-bonding, tattoo parlors and the like.

Councilor Taylor expressed his concern about traffic in and out of the development area.

Patrick Leonard stated their proposal included aligning the roads and placing a light at Claussen. He stated they would like to include a second entrance to assist with the rush-hour traffic. He then showed on the diagram the others areas where they planned to make intersection improvements to mitigate the traffic.

Chairman Kirven inquired about public transit.

Mr. Leonard stated they had designed bus stops and drop-off locations within the development.

Councilor Joe Dill inquired about the city assisting with some of the parks.

Mr. Patrick stated a lot of the parks were small and could be incorporated into the multi-family projects. Joe Kernell stated the large green space on the diagram was the plaza in front of the County office building and it would be a part of the county's build-out.

Joe Kernell stated that evening they would be meeting with the City's Planning Commission to expose them to the development plan as it was presented to the committee.

Item (3) **Adjournment**

ACTION: There being no further business, Mr. Kirven moved to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 1:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Joe Kernell, Secretary - Treasurer