

Dockside developer to present

BY GREG OLIVER
THE JOURNAL

» INSIDE

CLEMSON — The developer of the controversial Dockside project will appear before the Clemson Board of Architectural Review tonight with the latest revisions to the proposed plan for a mixed-use facility.

“I always say that I believe in the process, and I think you’ll see that the current design bears that out,” said Brent Little,

▪ Clemson Planning Commission members discussed a potential development moratorium in the city on Monday night. **A2**

president of Fountain Residential Partners. “Someone that has seen the latest iteration told me they are excited about this project again.”

Holiday Avenue res-

idents living near the site have opposed the multi-story project due to concerns including increased traffic congestion, student housing and the density for the site. One concern involving plans for a parking reduction sought by Dockside was alleviated when the city denied that request. Little said he has no plans to include that in his newest submittal.

SEE DEVELOPER, PAGE A3

latest plans to BAR tonight



SPECIAL TO THE JOURNAL

This rendering shows a view of the proposed Dockside development from U.S. Highway 123 in Clemson.

FROM PAGE A1

Last month, Little reaffirmed his desire to continue efforts to build the mixed-use facility at the proposed site. The developer added he was in the process of reviewing and revising the site plan and planned on resubmitting the plan to the BAR.

“I can’t tell you whether we will receive approval, approval with conditions or whether we have eight more iterations of the plan to go,” Little said. “However, we are committed to work with the city and the stakeholders that are willing to work with us until we get it right and receive their approval. The city and the BAR have been fantastic to work with and are doing a great job for the city and their constituents.”

Proposed changes to be presented tonight include building stories, height, unit count, bed count, max-

imum unit size, parking and public green space.

Little said last month he remains committed to traffic signals at the intersections, adding that any other requirements for changes to roadways would be determined “as we go through the engineering and traffic impact analysis completion.” The developer said he had no plans to acquire any adjacent parcels to improve the density of the project.

Clemson planning and codes director Todd Steadman told city council last month that the developer said the city’s decision to deny the reduced parking application could make the site undevelopable. But Little said the following day he still planned to proceed with the project.

Elaine Masceri, part of the Build a Better Clemson group, said the proximity to Clemson University

for walking and biking made the parking reduction plan unrealistic

“From what I understand, bikers would have to be out on 123, and I don’t have to tell you what that would mean — there would be people hurt,” Masceri said.

Councilwoman Crossie Cox said last month that the project had too many students, with 600 beds, for them to walk to Clemson University’s campus.

“That was pretty much unrealistic,” Cox said.

Little said last month the entire site plan for the project would change.

“We will have to see what the number of units, unit mix and retail square footage are on the new plan to calculate the revised parking requirement,” Little said.