

grading and remediation of the new County Square site and easement, the Family Court relocation timeline, plans for the demolition of the current office building, planned move-in of the new county office building and the timing for the build out of the Master Plan.

Patrick Leonard gave a status update of the project. He stated the Master Plan had not changed significantly. It had been tweaked; but the Master Plan was still the Master Plan. The goal and objective has been to create a mixed-use project downtown; that has not changed. The county building was the anchor for the project and had to be completed before the current building was demolished and the build-out could begin. Mr. Leonard stated they were continuing to meet their goals and deadlines. He stated by the end of the year they would like to demo the tire store and complete any remediation. They also hoped to have the design documents completed by the end of the year; they were currently working through all the block plans. They hoped to have the full CDs complete by Q1, with the permits and ability to start construction in Q2. Demolition of the Family Court was planned for Q3 and Q4.

Councilor Kirven asked what obstacles could they foresee.

Mr. Leonard stated they did not expect any obstacles unless it was the timing of the demolition of the Family Court building, which would affect their ability to build the parking deck. Relative to the current zoning, the new building was designed around the current zoning so if that were delayed, they could continue with the office building construction.

Mr. Leonard stated as they go into the new year, one of the critical milestones for this part of the project was when they take the project out for bids. He stated they have been pricing the project as they went, but when the bids come back in, that was the time to determine whether or not they could build the building.

He stated their goal was to start putting in footings and the like by April since they would have bids out for site work in 2019. That would allow site work to take place in December, January, February and March so that footings could be installed by April.

Key milestones for the Master Plan would include resolving the zoning issue within the next 100 days.

Councilor Kirven stated the City Planning Commission was scheduled to vote on the zoning matter October 17th. Pending the results of that vote, the City Council would hear the matter in December, which would require two readings.

Mr. Leonard stated once they were over that hurdle, they would need to finalize the Master Plan.

Mr. Kirven asked him to give an overview of the Master Plan.

Mr. Leonard stated they were designing multi-family around the perimeter of the project with a more dense commercial corridor in the middle; focusing on the county office building being the anchor. They did, however, allow themselves the ability to massage the Master Plan around buyers' needs and wishes (ie. utility easements, bike lanes, larger parking spaces, etc...) He stated there would be details to work out, such as the Governor's School's emergency access. That issue would require them to tweak the plans in order to keep that access point open. He stated they strategically laid out all the parking decks and the number of parking spaces, which could be a bit fluid based on the uses and the users.

Mr. Kirven inquired about the parking decks.

Mr. Leonard stated they were designed into the plans and were conveniently tucked in behind the buildings so that they were easily accessible but out of the way.

Dr. Taylor asked about the cost of a parking space.

Mr. Leonard stated on another project they were working on, there were about 1300 spaces and the cost was about \$10,000 per space. He stated precast was getting more expensive, and would run about \$14-15,000 per space.

Going into Quarter 2 of next year they wanted to start construction documents relative to the Master Plan. Once they had the Plan complete, they could start talking about engineering and the size of pipes, and the like, in order to get a leg up on the permitting process. He stated this would allow them to be ready to go when they were ready to go. He stated after the demo of the current office building, some parts of the project might come on sooner than later.

Mr. Kirven asked about the redirecting the streets around County Square.

In regards to Claussen and Thurston Streets, Mr. Leonard stated they would be done at the same time as the demo of the building; all streets were considered part of the site preparation.

Mr. Leonard stated in about a year, he would like to take a couple of parcels out to market for pre-sell; and perhaps even start the sales process by the end of next year. If they were sold a year before they were ready to build out, it would give time for design and permitting so that they were in place at the time the site was shovel ready.

Dr. Taylor asked if there was any interest from outside buyers.

Mr. Leonard stated he already had a good list of interested parties; retailers, office people, restaurants, even a movie theater. However, they would not be ready to take it to market until they solidified the zoning.

He stated one of the big things they were working on right now was the plaza area because of its importance to the project. He felt the plaza would ensure that the building to the left, which they would take to the market first, would fill with tenants very quickly. They were working on hardscape/landscape designs that would benefit the county building but would also benefit the rest of the project.

As far as timing, they would be designing the building this year (2019); building the county office building in 2020 through 2021 and hopefully moving into the building at the end of 2021. 2022 would be spent building the infrastructure and 2023-24 would be spent selling the land and new developers would be coming in. He stated they put a 24-month time period in the plan for sell out; that would be the timing for the cash.

In regards to the traffic mitigation. The city had fundamentally agreed to the mitigation plan they had in place, but they had not yet formalized a development agreement with the city. He stated they would also have to formalize a development agreement with the DOT because Church Street and Augusta Street were state roads. Mr. Leonard stated the County currently had 437,000 square feet of office space on site for which there was no current off-site traffic mitigation required. He stated there were two triggers they were dealing with; a square foot trigger and a phasing trigger. Once they hit one of those triggers, which were trip-based, they had to make off-site improvements so as to not create mitigation issues. He stated they would not be making all the mitigation improvements upfront because the project would come in phases; based on where the square footage was located on the property and the trip generation. He stated it was a fluid process.

Mr. Kirven asked about the cost.

Mr. Leonard stated there would be a few million dollars in improvements but it was largely based on the amount the right-of-ways would cost. That figure was basically unknown until they approached the owners and worked out a transaction.

Mr. Kirven asked about the use of eminent domain.

Mr. Leonard stated they would love for the county to utilize eminent domain, but until they approached land owners, they really did not know what they would need.

Phil Mays stated they wanted to look at what would be the best way to move forward with the project. He stated they had some earlier discussions with the city and the city's belief was that it would be to modify the existing Haynie-Sirrine PD; therefore that was the direction they took. They felt they could operate under the current zoning but that current zoning and master plan was over two decades old. They felt it would be better to update the PD into a current, world-class type of land plan. That has been done with some input from the City of Greenville. One thing they agreed to do was to adopt a Downtown Design guideline. Those guidelines were far more restrictive than what was currently in the Haynie-Sirrine community zoning plan. They also agreed to 100 of 119 comments provided by city staff; all of them further restricted the property from what actually existed today. The remaining 19 comments they gave alternate proposals to. In an effort to be good neighbors, they agreed to the adjustment of heights along the edge of the development as well as streetscape standards and traffic mitigation.

The uses under the existing zoning were residential and commercial. Under the modifications suggested, it was basically the same uses but with some restrictive conditions. There were certain items they agreed would not be a part of the development, such as light industrial. Under the current zoning there was no density limit, whereas the modified zoning would limit density to 3.5 million square feet. The current zoning allowed for six stories across the project, which they could live with; but under the modification, they would go with four stories along the outer edge with higher buildings in the middle. Currently there was no traffic plan versus the modification's proposed comprehensive mitigation plan.

Mr. Mays ran through several slides outlining the street layout, the pedestrian and bicycle plan, trail / sidewalk tie-ins as well as street parking. He also provided a site context diagram showing the greenspaces and parks.

Mr. Kirven inquired about the opportunity to connect to Dunbar Street.

Mr. Leonard stated there were preliminary plans to connect with Dunbar Street, but that would require the use of property they did not control.

Dr. Taylor asked about the six-story limit.

Mr. Mays stated as the zoning existed, there was a six-story height limit across the entire property. Under the proposed modifications, they were proposing four-stories along the outer edges of the development for housing and then step up to eight stories in Zone F. Zones B and C would have two buildings from 8-12 stories and one building that would be 13-20 stories high.

Mr. Leonard stated in regards to the architecture, they planned to mix-up the mediums with brick and glass creating a blend of modern and classical designs. He stated the buildings would not be homogenous, which was an idea the city liked and was in keeping with the downtown image.

In regards to timing, Mr. Mays stated the Planning Commission meeting would be October 17th. Once approved, the plan would move to the City Council with the first of their two readings being in November and the second in December. He stated the affordability issue was still being discussed and as well as the review process on multifamily, which could generate some conditions.

Mr. Kirven recognized three Councilmembers who were in attendance; Joe Dill, Willis Meadows and Lynn Ballard. He asked if they had any questions.

Mr. Meadows inquired as to how much impact the height restrictions would have on the generated income.

Mr. Mays stated the buildings over six stories were not for multi-family or residential use, they were more designed to attract high quality tenants; corporate relocations requiring office space tended to migrate to the larger buildings.

Mr. Meadows asked about how much tax would be generated per zone.

Mr. Mays stated the zones, as a whole, had equal value.

Mr. Leonard stated the multi-family/residential zone would create more in property taxes, but the retail establishments would create more sales tax; therefore, both are equally valuable.

Mr. Meadows inquired about the \$20 million in taxes that would be generated.

Mr. Leonard stated once the entire 3.5 million square feet is fully built-out, the project would be worth about \$1 billion in real estate; which would generate about \$20 million in new property taxes per year. The build out would also generate hospitality tax, accommodations tax, sales tax and income tax due to all the new jobs created. The estimated annual local and state tax total was \$40 million; with \$23 million of that being local.

Mr. Dill inquired about the city's height restrictions.

Mr. Mays stated currently they were limited to six stories across the entire property. He stated they could live with that but the better design called for varied heights. Their proposed modified PD called for four story residential areas along the perimeter of the site and then higher buildings as they moved toward the center of the project.

Mr. Dill inquired about escalating costs by stepping up and stepping down heights of buildings.

Mr. Leonard stated he did not see that costing more. They would be selling the sites off which would be developed at the new owner's expense. None of those concerns would affect the county's building; it would not change.

Joe Kernell gave an update on the Family Court relocation. He stated they had already started the design process for the buildings on Halton Road. With the standard already having been created with the new magistrate offices; having that experience put them ahead with their plans.

Mr. Kirven asked when work would begin on those buildings.

Mr. Kernell stated it was his hope that work would begin after the first of the year.

Mr. Dill asked if they were going to be able to keep the Memorial Wall.

Mr. Kirven stated it was the County's wall and they would keep it.

Mr. Kernell stated the wall would be incorporated into the public space for activities.

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 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Joe Kernell, Secretary - Treasurer