



CITY OF BEAUFORT
1911 Boundary Street
Council Chambers
BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA 29902
(843) 525-7070
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION AGENDA

March 15, 2016

PLANNING CONFERENCE ROOM – 1ST FLOOR
1911 BOUNDARY STREET

7:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

February 16, 2016

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. White Hall Update
- B. Property Sale of excess land completed
- C. Main Street Beaufort USA & Beaufort Regional Chamber of Commerce Merger
- D. Parking at 500 Carteret
- E. Parking Garage
- F. Arts Overlay District Update

IV. INITIATIVE UPDATES

Economic Development – Stephen Murray
Infill – Mike McFee
Downtown – George O’Kelley
Boundary Street – Billy Keyserling
Codes and Regulations – Phil Cromer

V. INITIATIVES IN PROGRESS UPDATED REPORT

Revisions since 2/15/16

VI. ADJOURNMENT

NOTE: IF YOU HAVE SPECIAL NEEDS DUE TO A PHYSICAL CHALLENGE, PLEASE CALL IVETTE BURGESS 525-7070 FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

STATEMENT OF MEDIA NOTIFICATION

"In accordance with South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d), as amended, all local media was duly notified of the time, date, place and agenda of this meeting".

A meeting of the Beaufort Redevelopment Commission was held on February 16, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the Beaufort Municipal Complex, City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Jon Verity, Commissioners Mike McFee, Phil Cromer, George O'Kelley, Stephen Murray, Steven Green, and Frank Lesesne, and Bill Prokop, city manager. Commissioners Billy Keyserling and Mike Sutton were absent.

In accordance with South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d), as amended, all media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

MINUTES

Chairman Verity called the Redevelopment Commission meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

Commissioner Murray made a motion, second by Commissioner O'Kelley, to approve the minutes of the January 19, 2016 Redevelopment Commission meeting. Commissioner Cromer said on the first page, in the first paragraph, the "and" in the fourth line should be deleted. *(The "and" should be maintained because this is the correct form for a list. The attendees have different titles; without the "and," it would appear that the city manager was also one of the commissioners. – steno).* On page 3, Commissioner Cromer said "is" in the phrase "'cookie cutter overlay' is a diverse neighborhood" should be "in"; on page 4, Commissioner Cromer said that Commissioner Sutton's statement – "this 'has to be washed out'" – should be "hashed out." *(An audio check showed that he did not say "hashed." When there was uncertainty about the minimum size of an accessory dwelling unit, Commissioner Sutton said "they have to wash out" the number, which he believed was 420 square feet. – steno.)* **Deborah Johnson** said that on page 2, in the second paragraph, the apostrophe in "artist's" should go after the "s" to indicate plural possession (i.e., the studios of more than one artist). On page 2, Ms. Johnson said the word "go" is missing between "crime will" and "down"; on the same page, she said, Mr. Prokop was incorrectly stated to be "meeting tomorrow with the developers" because she believed he had met with staff. Mr. Prokop said the meeting *was* with staff, and an audio check confirmed the error. **The motion to approve the minutes as amended passed unanimously.**

Chairman Verity said the council retreat on February 25 from 1:00 to 4:00 pm will include the Redevelopment Commission, so he invited those commissioners who could attend to do so.

PUBLIC HEARING: AMENDMENT TO BOUNDARY STREET REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Chairman Verity opened this public hearing. Libby Anderson said council had adopted the Boundary Street Redevelopment Plan in conjunction with the Boundary Street Master Plan in June 2007. It set out a number of capital improvement projects for Boundary Street, such as putting in a landscaped median, a parallel road, etc., which are part of the current Boundary Street project.

Ms. Anderson said one project that is *not* included in the plan's list is the Greenlawn Drive streetscape. She described how the project would improve Greenlawn Drive by constructing sidewalks, on-street parking, pedestrian-scale street lighting, tree planting, and drainage improvements. The streetscape project has become a priority, Ms. Anderson said, because of

the recent completion of the Ashley Pointe Apartments, a 56-unit, low- to moderate-income housing development at the end of Greenlawn. There are approximately 20 Housing Authority dwellings on the street as well. These residents “need a safe, attractive way to get to shopping and employment on Boundary Street,” she said.

The city anticipates applying for grants for the Greenlawn Drive project, as it has for the Duke and Bladen streetscape projects, Ms. Anderson said. Having a project included in a “neighborhood revitalization plan” is a prerequisite for the type of grants they would apply for, so amending the Boundary Street Redevelopment Plan will allow them to “meet that threshold.” After this public hearing, Ms. Anderson said staff would like the Redevelopment Commission to recommend to city council that the Boundary Street redevelopment plan be amended to include Greenlawn Drive as #7 on the capital improvement project list.

Commissioner Murray said the proposal discusses the roundabout at Highways 170 and 21, and since that is no longer planned, he asked if that should be deleted. Ms. Anderson said the plan “is a number of years old,” so they could quickly make “some of the obvious revisions.” Chairman Verity said doing so makes sense to him. **Chairman Verity closed this public hearing.**

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AMENDED BOUNDARY STREET REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Commissioner Murray made a motion, second by Commissioner McFee, to approve the resolution. Commissioner O’Kelley asked if the commissioners could enact a resolution right after a public hearing. Ms. Johnson said, unlike council, the RDC doesn’t have to follow a public hearing with first and second readings; if there’s no opposition to the resolution at the public hearing, she thinks they can vote on the resolution. Commissioner O’Kelley asked if staff had sent notice of the public hearing “to everybody affected on Greenlawn.” Ms. Anderson said no; they had published an announcement in the newspaper. Notifying property owners is the protocol for some actions, such as a rezoning. Commissioner O’Kelley said he knows of a homeowner on Greenlawn who “vehemently opposed selling to **Dick Stewart**, 303 Associates, etc.” So to be fair to those who live there, he feels they should be notified about something that it is going to affect the street on which they live. Ms. Anderson said there is “no rush” to get council’s recommendation; the grant application is due in August.

Commissioner Murray said staff is asking the Redevelopment Commission for a resolution to recommend that city council vote on a resolution. He asked if council would have a public hearing, since the RDC is having this one. Ms. Anderson said council *could* have a public hearing, too, but they don’t need to. She clarified that they are asking the commission for a resolution to recommend that council amend the plan, which will enable staff to apply for a grant in the hope of getting money to do the streetscape project.

Commissioner Murray asked Commissioner O’Kelley if he would feel okay about notifying Greenlawn Drive residents when the resolution goes to council for its vote. Commissioner McFee said only one public hearing is necessary per Robert’s Rules of Order.

Commissioner Lesesne clarified that the RDC is “just recommending” that city council approve the amendment to the redevelopment plan with two readings. He asked if the public would have an opportunity to express itself when it goes to council for the ordinance change. Commissioner McFee said yes, and the property owners on Greenlawn could be notified about the proposed changes to the Boundary Street Master Plan before council votes on the ordinance change, even though “they are not residents of the city.”

Commissioner O’Kelley said, “The people have a right to be heard,” and those affected by this revision to the plan wouldn’t necessarily see a notice in the newspaper about the public hearing, nor are they likely to know that they have the opportunity to speak before council’s two readings. Commissioner Lesesne said the commissioners themselves could notify the Greenlawn Drive residents. Chairman Verity suggested tabling action until the following month’s meeting, so property owners could be notified.

Commissioner Murray asked Ms. Johnson if the Redevelopment Commission could now take formal, legal action, and Ms. Johnson said she believes so, because council had done two readings on the amendment to the ordinance that pertains to the composition of the Redevelopment Commission. She was unsure if it had been sent to the secretary of state. **Commissioner Murray withdrew his motion and Commissioner McFee his second.**

Commissioner Murray made a motion to approve the resolution to recommend the amendment to the Boundary Street Redevelopment Plan, pending staff notification of property owners on Greenlawn Drive before city council’s first reading of the ordinance change. Commissioner McFee seconded. The motion passed 6-1, Commissioner O’Kelley opposed.

Ms. Johnson suggested that at future Redevelopment Commission meetings, if a public hearing is scheduled, action on it – such as a resolution – could be scheduled for the *following* month’s commission’s meeting. There was general agreement to this.

GRANTS BRIEFING

Ms. Johnson said she would discuss three grants that staff has been working on that are due within the next few weeks, and see if the commissioners had any comments on them.

ArtPlace America – Ms. Johnson said, “This is a national place-making fund (that) uses art to solve community problems. It’s not an arts programming grant.” She said it’s “half city planning and half arts.” They can apply for up to \$500,000; they are more likely to get \$300,000. There’s no matching requirement, but “you would have to bring some resources to the table. It’s a partnership grant.” When the notice came out, city staff discussed “looking for something in the Northwest Quadrant, in the public safety sector,” Ms. Johnson said, with the idea of “arts changing a place,” in a part of the community where there have been shootings, and “spur(ring) a change” in a neighborhood that has been “concerned about safety issues.”

Mr. Stewart and the Arts Council had expressed interest in applying for a grant in partnership

with the city, Ms. Johnson said, so a plan was formed. The tenets of the plan are that “we will go in the public safety sector” and “use a variety of art forms.” The “geographic community” for this grant would be from Ribaut Road to Scott Street and Boundary Street to North Street. Among other goals, the grant would support a program of “art intervention”: getting young people in the community involved in positive, creative community art projects.

The Arts Council would be a key sponsor and an equal partner with the city, Ms. Johnson said, and she named a number of other potential partners, including those the city would bring (i.e., the fire and police departments, planning, etc.). The partners would hire 6–8 artists to conduct community events and workshops and set up mentorship programs, and, because “this is such a loose grant,” she said, some of the funds could be used for renovation. For example, Ms. Johnson said, if they were to use Washington Street Park for an arts event, they could put in restrooms there, whether the city owns it or not.

Ms. Johnson said this grant is “a combination of federal and private money, and it’s not a fair process” with points, etc. Some parts of the country are given “more weight than others.” There’s a 1.5% chance of getting one of these grants, she said. About 3% of the applications are funded. This grant has never been awarded in South Carolina, so it’s “a priority area” for ArtPlace America.

Larry Holman said he would like the Black Chamber of Commerce to be included as a partner. The organization’s new building will have a museum in it. Ms. Johnson said the Black Chamber of Commerce is already on her list of potential partners. The next step is to do a short proposal that indicates the neighborhood that the group has selected, and then they will approach those they have determined could be good partners for this project. She added that TCL is “already on board.”

SC-PRT Recreational Trails Program (RTP) – Southside Park Trail – There are three years of funding (2015–2017) in this round of RTP grants, Ms. Johnson said, so the city’s chances of obtaining funds are “better than they have ever been.” The city can apply for more than one project.

The RTP grants have an 80/20 match, and it’s a reimbursable grant, which means “you have to have the money in the bank up front.” The city will apply for a grant of \$100,000 – which is the most that an RTP grant would fund for a project – with the city matching \$25,000 or more.

Ms. Johnson said, unlike CDBG, for these grants, “choosing a discrete project that you can pay for . . . is better than trying to put more stuff in” the grant application. A specific, directed project will keep the city from getting “bogged down with the approval process,” she said. This is a federal grant that SC-PRT administers, and “the key” to getting funding “is recreation.” A required public meeting is scheduled for February 18; having one earns applicants 10 points. The city has sent its letter of intent, Ms. Johnson said, and had planned to rework and resubmit the same grants as were submitted in 2013 for the Southside Park trail and the Spanish Moss Trail trailhead amenities.

The budget for the trail was \$130,000 last time, and Ms. Johnson feels it should remain “pretty much the same.” The only question is a trail loop by Southside Drive, which has been slated for a volunteer project, Ms. Johnson said, so Mr. Prokop and **Liza Hill** may need to talk about that. For the matching funds, the city could use the \$25,000 that it typically budgets for Southside Park, Ms. Johnson said.

SC-PRT RTP – Spanish Moss Trail Trailhead Amenities – Ms. Johnson enumerated the various elements in the application the city had made for funding in the previous round of RTP grants, including an educational display area and two pedestrian connectors. This year, they plan to apply for funding only for restrooms and two handicapped parking spaces. Ms. Johnson said points were lost last time because the education area was included; RTP grants are meant to fund recreation. She said the argument that they would make for this grant is that there are no restrooms on a trail that will be 12-miles long when it’s completed.

Mr. Prokop said he would like to add “the structural integrity study” for the Depot building to the RTP grant. Ms. Johnson said they could only add that if the building is “used for recreational purposes.” Commissioner McFee said the “use of the building is only for the trail . . . at this point.” Ms. Johnson said if the city receives this grant, they would have to sign an agreement that says that “for the next 25 years, any investment from this grant will go only toward recreational uses,” which is why she had recommended seeking funding for restrooms. Mr. Prokop said if they lease the building, and the restrooms are open to the public – and those leasing the building know that – then it’s “open for recreational use, and it’s okay.” Ms. Johnson said, “It’s a stretch, but we can put (the structural study) in and see if they rule us out or not.”

Mr. Prokop said if they are going to put in restrooms, they have to have a structural study first, anyway, so he would include the cost of that study in the grant. Commissioner Murray wondered, if the city receives the grant, including funds to do the structural analysis, and then down the road, the building is leased out for events, if that would put the city “in a gray area” in terms of the grant agreement. Mr. Prokop said he’s not suggesting that they seek this funding for structural analysis of the whole building. Ms. Johnson said only 5% of the grant request could be used for architectural engineering costs. Mr. Prokop said to ask for that amount, then.

Ms. Johnson showed the commission a Depot building plan, including restrooms, drawn by a former city intern. She said that she feels the plan to increase parking at the trailhead is not “a compelling case for this grant.” She has seen the Lawrence Group’s parking plan for the Depot area, and having done many of these grants, she “can’t imagine they would fund the parking.” Mr. Prokop said he understood that the PATH Foundation had done a study. Ms. Johnson said Ms. Hill had told her it was the Lawrence Group. Chairman Verity said the foundation and the Lawrence Group had “worked together on the parking plan.”

Commissioner Murray asked the cost estimate for these restrooms. Ms. Johnson said the old grant lists demolition, repair, and new construction at about \$75,000–\$80,000, plus \$5000 for architectural engineering review.

Ms. Johnson said that at council's work session, **Merritt Patterson** had brought up that when the city applied for this RTP grant before, they were "under the impression that (the Depot building was) on sewer," but, she said, "it's been confirmed . . . today that (it is) not on sewer." By code, she said, they can't use a septic tank with multiple restrooms – which this plan has – so it will need to be hooked into the sewer.

Mr. Prokop asked where Ms. Johnson had gotten the estimates for the grant budget, and she replied that those were the numbers that were used in the previous RTP grant application. Mr. Prokop said those estimates are far too low and had been determined "with the assumption that it was on sewer," not septic. He feels they need to discuss the costs with BJWSA to ensure that they're correct. Ms. Johnson said the grant application is due March 2, and Ms. Hill is waiting for **Joe DeVito** (BJWSA) to give her an estimate for connecting to the sewer system. "You could pull the plug" on this grant application, she said, "if it looks like the sewer" costs are too much of an issue, Ms. Johnson said.

Commissioner Lesesne asked if BJWSA was giving the city estimates of its costs to do the work. Commissioner McFee said BJWSA would do the work, but they have not given the city an estimate to connect to sewer yet. BJWSA owns the whole trail, he said, as well as the Depot building, which the city is leasing and will be putting the restrooms into.

Ms. Johnson said that they should not proceed with the grant application if they think that they might not do the project because the price of the sewer connection is too high, or because the other cost estimates are way off. She said trail grants are based on points, and 25 points are based on "your prior history with Parks, Recreation, and Tourism," so any applicant that has given back a grant in the past will lose some points; "if you didn't do a PARD grant on time . . . you lose points," as will applicants who "messed up a grant" from other PRT funds. The City of Beaufort doesn't want to risk setting a bad precedent with PRT, Ms. Johnson said.

Mr. Prokop said there are "pre-fab sewers" available for \$75,000, so "we have to look at the numbers" because there are "several ways we could go with it."

CDBG List – Ms. Johnson said, according to Ms. Anderson, this is "close to being final," so they can discuss this when it is.

Housing Rehab Grants – Ms. Johnson asked how the Redevelopment Commission wants to handle this grant. Ms. Anderson said they have been handled at the staff level in the past. Commissioner McFee told the commissioners that **Barbara Laurie**, who lives on Duke Street, had been at the special council meeting because she had thought grants were being discussed at that time; she is interested in "opportunities . . . with the rehab grants," and he knows there are other residents who are interested in them, too. Chairman Verity said these grants "fit into our infill plan."

REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SECTOR 1

Chairman Verity said he, Commissioner McFee, and Ms. Johnson had met “to take a look at” a redevelopment plan focused on the Sector 1 area, which is east of Ribaut Road. Ms. Johnson had given the commissioners a worksheet that was based on the group’s discussion. As a first step in the process of making this redevelopment plan, they had approached the questions for which the state statute requires answers. Chairman Verity highlighted some of what the group had suggested (e.g., which neighborhoods would and would not be included in the boundaries of the Sector 1 redevelopment plan, based on their need for redevelopment).

“The current zoning map would suffice” until the form-based code is approved, which is scheduled for June 30, Chairman Verity said. There would be no changes to the street layout; street-level improvements would continue, and “the corridor plans for Carteret, Charles, ‘Baby Boundary’, etc. would be part of it,” he said. Cost estimates would come from the Civic Master Plan, as would projects; the group chose projects from the Civic Master Plan list that they thought “would be important to those particular neighborhoods” in Sector 1. Some deal with civic infrastructure issues, others with development and redevelopment. The RDC would oversee the plan and would review – but not approve – any new process under the new code, Chairman Verity said. The group recommends that some preapproved designs be put forward for use by the developers of the Arts Overlay District or another project in the infill district, in order to expedite those projects. The group is not recommending changing any statutes, rules, or approval processes, he added.

Commissioner McFee said the group had looked at the requirements of the statutes, discussed key issues, and brainstormed, as well as looking at civic investment through private/public partnerships; they had affirmed that “the Civic Master Plan is a huge key for us.”

Ms. Johnson said that the last time the commission had discussed this, they “talked about doing the whole sector – doing sector-by-sector,” but the group had determined that this “was too much . . . for the first plan,” so they “took on the neighborhoods first.”

Chairman Verity said this redevelopment plan is somewhat motivated by the Arts Overlay District proposal, which is a private initiative, so the group feels “it’s important to have a broad overlay of this area . . . to give as many tools as possible to people who want to develop these properties.” The intent is not for the city to buy properties, Chairman Verity said, but “to partner and promote and try to increase the activity in these areas.”

Commissioner Cromer said he has “a problem with the road diets,” since they are “shrinking the road on Boundary Street.” Chairman Verity said all of these ideas need to be discussed. The RDC will need to approve a redevelopment plan at some point, but these are projects that the group thought were good from a timing perspective and “potentially doable.” Commissioner Murray asked if the commission could take on projects in areas other than those listed on the worksheet without modifying the redevelopment plan. Chairman Verity said, “We would expect separate plans for different areas of the city.” If they proceed with the idea of going to the Historic District Review Board with preapproved plans, Commissioner McFee said, those plans could be used anywhere else in the city, not just in historic areas. Chairman Verity said the

regulations call for a separate plan for “each of the areas we want to invest in, so we could do a separate plan for downtown.” Commissioner Murray said he was thinking of a parking structure in downtown Beaufort, and there could be benefits to “running it under the RDC,” so he wondered if that should be included in this plan or be an addendum. Chairman Verity said, “We just didn’t want to open that door at this point.”

Ms. Johnson said the area in a redevelopment plan needs to be blighted, or it must meet the criteria for a conservation district, which is something the group hadn’t discussed when they met. Commissioner Lesesne asked why they had excluded downtown Beaufort from Sector 1. Chairman Verity said approval of the plan will require a public hearing; while “downtown has its issues,” he said, they’re not the same issues as these other neighborhoods in Sector 1 have. He’s open to suggestions, though. Commissioner Lesesne said he thinks downtown is great right now, but only at street level; a lot of the spaces above that seem undeveloped.

Chairman Verity said he doesn’t “feel there are any limitations to this.” They will continue to bring the redevelopment plan back to the commission. Making clear that it is not the city’s intention to purchase property is key, he reiterated. Ms. Johnson said this is also different from other redevelopment plans because the RDC had decided that it wouldn’t be the review body; staff or an appropriate city board or commission will do review.

INITIATIVE UPDATES

Economic Development

Commissioner Murray said the committee had met last week. The Association for Defense Communities will have an event in Charleston February 29 – March 2, and he and Commissioner Cromer will attend to discuss bases, shared services, etc.

There’s been a lot of “behind the scenes discussion among the municipalities” about county council and the county’s economic development strategy, Commissioner Murray said. County council had called on all of the municipalities to attend a Governmental Committee meeting about two months ago; the mayors attended. The municipalities were asked to determine their economic development goals and to give them to county council. The mayor had submitted a letter on behalf of the City of Beaufort. When they next met with county council, Commissioner Murray said, the county asked for “a consolidated recommendation” from the four municipalities. Just before county council’s work session last Thursday, he said, the municipalities had presented a joint letter “with six very clear recommendations,” and county council had discussed it Friday morning. He had gone to the county’s retreat, and he said they took the municipalities’ recommendations very seriously. The next step for the county is to hire a facilitator/consultant who will analyze all of the economic development studies that have been done countywide in the last 5 years, why the LEA failed, the goals of the four municipalities, and the county’s goals, and will then “propose some structure for the county moving forward,” all within 90 days. Commissioner Murray said he is “cautiously optimistic” about this.

Commissioner Murray said there are ongoing conversations with business accelerators and incubators, such as Charleston’s Digital Corridor and the Don Ryan Center in Bluffton.

Infill

Commissioner McFee said they are sending “stakeholder letters” to property owners in the Northwest Quadrant and Old Commons neighborhoods. After the next meeting committee, he will have more information to share about incentives, he said.

Downtown

Commissioner O’Kelley said the committee hasn’t met but plans to this week, and Chairman Verity has given him “a full agenda.”

Boundary Street

Chairman Verity said he had no report on Boundary Street from Commissioner Keyserling. Mr. Prokop said on February 18, there will be an “open session” for all of the businesses on Boundary Street to come with questions about the project. The construction so far has had “no big issues,” he said, and a water shutdown to install a valve, which would have affected hotels and residences, is “being handled.”

Incentives, Codes and Regulations

Commissioner Cromer said the committee hadn’t met, but he and Commissioner O’Kelley are on the Beaufort Code review committee. Ms. Anderson said that the code committee was on a break, but would meet the following week. Staff would like to hold two public workshops on “the general code” in March, followed by meetings in individual neighborhoods, focusing on the map and the code as they pertain to that specific neighborhood. The first public workshops with the Metropolitan Planning Commission will also be in March, to deal with the code itself and the maps, Ms. Anderson said.

Commissioner Cromer asked Ms. Anderson the status of the business license project with TCL; Ms. Anderson said streamlining the review process is a council goal, so staff is working with TCL on that and would be meeting with them the following day, when TCL will “show us the as-is process.” If staff concurs that this process is what they do on a daily basis, she said, TCL will then take that to the development community for its input.

Ms. Anderson said a committee comprised of representatives of the city’s citizen boards and commissions is doing the technical review of the form-based code. There are also two council/RDC members on the committee: Commissioners Cromer and O’Kelley.

INITIATIVES IN PROGRESS – UPDATED REPORT

Chairman Verity said highlighted projects on the report commissioners had received have happened since the last Redevelopment Commission meeting.

Chairman Verity said he had attended the Design Review Board to represent the Redevelopment Commission and speak about the Harris Teeter project. He felt “the

interchange” among the board, staff, and Harris Teeter was “very good.” The DRB had objected to Harris Teeter’s new proposal because of the way the grocery was placed on the site, but they didn’t reject it, and Harris Teeter is interested in **Lauren Kelly**’s alternative plan. Commissioner Cromer said he had also attended and felt it was positive.

Mr. Prokop said the Lowcountry Produce building sale has been completed, and the city had maintained ownership of the parking spaces. Also, they are moving forward as quickly as they can to put in a kiosk in the 500 Carteret Street lot and to create new parking for employees. They have received “a tremendous amount of interest” in leasing space in the 500 Carteret Street building, Mr. Prokop said, and they have sent a flier to the Carolina Developers Association to determine if there is interest in “developing the building in . . . a private/public relationship.”

Mr. Prokop said “the bigger contractors and subcontractors” are getting big jobs like the Walmart development, so prices are increasing. For example, the city had estimated that “Hancock Street would be a \$70,000 job. The quote came in at \$169,000.” As more development comes in, costs to do the work will go up, Mr. Prokop said.

Commissioner Murray noted that the Red Rooster Café had moved into the former Red Lobster/Olive Garden location on Boundary Street today. On one side, they serve breakfast and lunch, and on the other, they serve dinner. Of the restaurant’s former location on Ribaut Road, Mr. Prokop said, “We had heard that it was sold to (be) an expanded gas station.” Ms. Anderson said the “building is probably proposed for demolition.”

Commissioner Murray asked Mr. Holman for an update on construction of the Black Chamber of Commerce space. Mr. Holman said they are looking forward to opening in August; work is almost two months behind, he said, but “it’s moving along.” The building will have offices, a commercial kitchen, a conference/training room, incubator space, and a gallery for the community to display and sell artwork. The museum will be on the Duke Street side. The conference space will hold 75–100 people, Mr. Holman said.

Chairman Verity said the Cultural District board of directors had asked that the Redevelopment Commission provide it with a member for its board. **Commissioner Lesesne made a motion, second by Commissioner Murray, to recommend Commissioner McFee for the Cultural District board. The motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Johnson said the commission had asked for “war room” maps in the planning conference room, and Ms. Kelly has provided some and should have the rest in a week.

There being no further business to come before the commission, **Commissioner Murray made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Green, to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously,** and the meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.