

City of Roswell Downtown Development Authority
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, April 4, 2017
3:30 pm
City Hall – Room 220

Present: Michael Curling, Monica Hagewood, David Lyon, Steven Rowe, Dave Schmit, Randy Schultz

Absent: Lonnie Mimms

1. Call to Order: Meeting called to order by Chair Schulz at 3:30 pm.

2. Approval of Agenda: Motion was made to approve the agenda by Schmit and seconded by Rowe. Passed unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes: Motion made by Hagewood, seconded by Curling to approve minutes of the March 7, 2017 Regular Meeting. Passed unanimously. Motion made by Curling, seconded by Lyon to approve minutes of the March 23, 2017 Special Called Meeting. Rowe abstained. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Treasurer's Report: General Operating account \$144,817.00. Budgeted expenses remain ongoing, no major expenses anticipated prior to fiscal year end on June 1. Roswell Plaza account \$105,104.34.

4. Secretary's Report: Nothing to report.

5. Discussion of Downtown Development Projects:

a. Roswell Plaza/Southern Skillet.

Schmit provided an overview of RFP process to date and a review of the selection process. With the intent of today's meeting to select finalists to present on April 17 at 2pm in City Hall, Room 220. On April 27, a Special Called Meeting will take place in order to select one finalist, after which the DDA and finalist will enter into negotiations.

General project vision statement and intent statements were read from the RFP as a reminder of goals set for the property's redevelopment. These statements are to serve as guidance during review of proposals. For the purpose of this meeting, open discussion of the elements of each proposal focus on how well each meets the goals and incorporates innovation in design and programming of the site. Financial information related to the real estate transaction may only be discussed in DDA Executive Session.

Four respondents returned proposals, with three of four offering two proposals each, showing a concept for the City-owned property, and a concept for expansion including adjacent properties. The proposal from MidCity was for the City-owned property only.

For the record, Rowe recused himself from participation in the discussion.

Discussion of proposals followed in alphabetical order:

Beecham – Proposals 1 and 2

- Only proposal that does not include a parking structure. Private, surface parking is included as a part of the plan, no public parking.
- Scale, massing and overall quality of design relate well to site and historic district. Village-scale has strong appeal. Missed opportunity to address contextual grid.
- Program seems heavy on residential. Expanded plan option increases residential units, but address Norcross St and Fraser as distinct streets, each with own character. Neighborhood scale appropriately addresses Fraser St.
- Opportunity to discuss combination of uses and square footage allocations. Grocery may require additional square footage.
- Planted medians and parallel parking along Hwy 9 were positively received. GDOT approvals necessary.

Q: How might public parking be addressed, particularly with an expanded overall footprint?

Q: How does this design related to Roswell's UDC? Can the Village-style and scale be accomplished under the current guidelines?

Q: What is the team's experience/process of working with City and GDOT to accomplish pedestrian and stormwater improvements to Hwy 9, Norcross and Fraser Streets?

Q: What is the developer's experience with completed public-private mixed-use developments?

Crescent – Proposals 1 and 2

- Program and combination of uses is attractive, optimizes shared parking concept - office day use combined with evening commercial uses.
- Parking stands out as dominant, perhaps excessive, with visible surface parking from Hwy 9. Parking deck is located well and works with topography.
- Overall higher intensity of scale. Design aesthetic seems massive.
- Program and combination of uses has variation and appeal.
- Residential units massing along Fraser needs better understanding as to pedestrian feel.

Q: Option 2, the expanded version, assumes parking deck as necessary from the beginning of the project. How is Option 1 expandable?

Q: How might design detail address scale and character of the streets and district?

Fuqua – Proposals 1 and 2

- Initial reaction is to significant scale change and massing of the structures.
- Strong aspects of design: successful use of grid organization relates well to adjacent properties. Provides context and connectivity with site.

- Grid pattern shown in plan reinforces surrounding pedestrian and traffic patterns, but perspective drawings do not have as strong a relationship to surrounding buildings.
- Concern about the ground level aesthetic. Does it engage the street/pedestrians?
- Inspiration images show design variation and detailing that does not appear in the project drawings.
- Fuqua has a proven track record of developing similar and larger scale projects throughout the Metro.
- Partnership brings established relationships with desired tenants such as Whole Foods.

Q: How can the intensity of scale and massing be varied to relate with historic district?

Q: How to address parking on ground level that faces public streets? Looking for public street activation.

Q: Fuqua has developed many of these sites across the region with success. It feels like Roswell can be just another site. How can it be made unique for Roswell apart from other sites Fuqua has done?

MidCity Partners – Proposal 1

- Mill-style aesthetic discussed. Character is present and relevant to Roswell, but not seen in historic district area that surrounds the site.
- Massing of residential buildings - especially along South St. Heights and scale - question the visual impact.
- Program includes a larger grocer space at 20,000 sf and an additional 8,000 sf retail. Program seems heavy on residential as compared to commercial.
- Gallery building at the southwest corner is large, dominant. Question about street-level retail/commercial – how does it address/engage the street?
- Parking not visible from the street, good concept and placement next to grocery. Vehicular and pedestrian circulation considered, continuation of grid relates to adjacent properties.

Q: How does this design correspond with Roswell’s UDC? Can the respondent accomplish the industrial, mill-style architecture within the UDC guidelines?

Q: How might this plan be expanded?

After discussion, all DDA members agreed that each plan has elements of merit and elements to be improved upon. Schmit noted that some design elements are aspirational. Details including land acquisition, City and DOT approvals must be considered. The DDA does not control, but may be able to assist using its available tools. DDA incentives are not offered initially, but may become part of negotiations.

Motion made to invite all respondents to make a presentation of their proposal on April 17, 2017. Motion made by Schmit, seconded by Lyon. Passed unanimously.

Discussion of presentation format proposed that each of the four respondents will have 15 minutes to present their proposal, with a 10 minute question and answer period following. Teams with a second, expanded proposal will combine presentations of both options into

one presentation. Schmit will compile all notes and questions from this meeting to send to respondents in advance of presentations.

Councilman Horton determined the presentation order by a random draw.
Order will be:

1. Beecham
2. Fuqua
3. MidCity
4. Crescent

6. New Business/Announcements: No new business or announcements.

7. Recommendation to enter into Executive Session for purpose of discussing Real Estate:

No motion to enter into Executive Session.

8. Motion to Adjourn: Motion to adjourn by Hagewood, seconded by Lyon. Motion passed unanimously. Adjourned at 4:57 pm.