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Greenline – Spartanburg Neighborhood Revitalization
INTRODUCTION

Neighborhood Master Plan Purpose

Located northeast of the urban center of Greenville, South Carolina, the neighborhoods of Greenline and Spartanburg currently exist in a state of disrepair and ruin. Among many ailments, homes lie in disrepair; many abandoned, circulation is dangerous for public safety officials, and the perimeter of the neighborhoods is gated from the remainder of the city by means of an unkept wall of vegetation. Aside from long-time residents, most of the neighborhood residents are transient and many are unemployed. Beneath the rough, overgrown image of the existing neighborhood is the potential for a neighborhood that can become a prime, mixed income, single urban residential community; one community together, no longer separated by a large, steep drainage swale that has parted the neighborhoods for over 100 years.

The City of Greenville, South Carolina has completed several studies and analysis in recent years on how to revitalize the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood. The Clemson University Department of Planning and Landscape Architecture were given funding in 1996 to conduct a study of the neighborhood as well. This study provided an excellent background of information for the project. The City of Greenville most recently was awarded a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to conduct a more detailed study and Woolpert LLP was selected to complete this work. The study will consist of two phases, a conceptual plan and schematic site design for Phase 1 and a final design and construction documents for Phase 2. (Phase 1 is the subject of this report.)

History

The Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood has a long history originating back 130 years, making it one of the oldest neighborhoods in Greenville. The previous Clemson University study found the origin for the name of the neighborhood from a local historian. Greenline, according to the historian, came from a man named Mr. Green who owned a line of green houses in the neighborhood. The Spartanburg name came from Spartanburg Street, which used to be a part of Spartanburg Road. At one time Spartanburg Road connected all the way to the City of Spartanburg, South Carolina. Today the neighborhood has fallen into a state of general disrepair with numerous houses that are boarded up or in major need of repair, invasive vegetation that have taken over the site, dangerous intersections, and poor pedestrian routes that have developed over the years.

Location

The Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood is located northeast of downtown Greenville, South Carolina. It is bordered by Wade Hampton Boulevard to the northwest, Harrington Avenue to the northeast, East North Street to the southeast, East Stone Avenue to the west, and North Church Street to the west as well. Greenville is considered to be in the Piedmont area of the southeastern United States.
The Planning Process

Over the course of a nine month period of time, the process of developing a master plan for the revitalization of the Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhood evolved from an initial kickoff meeting with the client and numerous City officials to a preliminary presentation before City Council. The following information outlines the course of action with which Woolpert progressed through the programmed scope of work.

- A kickoff meeting began the planning process with the Consultant meeting with numerous City staff members who represented many different areas of expertise within the city’s structure. A background was provided of the neighborhood. Long time residents of the community also joined in on the discussion. The combined group determined the Issues and Goals for the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood at the session. This information composed the basic format for the development of the redevelopment plan.

- After a series of scheduled site visits, the inventory of the site was compiled and a series of site analysis maps were prepared. The purpose of the site inventory and analysis was to gather information about the physical condition of the neighborhood to familiarize project team members with issues and conditions to be addressed in the revitalization plan. These site analyses individually highlighted particular existing conditions through the site.

  The site analysis maps included:
  - Vegetation Analysis
  - Pedestrian Analysis
  - Vehicular Analysis
  - Site Suitability Map
  - Utility Analysis
  - Structural Analysis
  - Existing Land Use Analysis
  - Slope and Drainage Analysis

- During the course of gathering data and with the completion of the site analysis, a series of interviews were conducted with various City officials, neighborhood residents, and local real estate investors. The interviews provided Woolpert with a diverse cross-representation of opinions regarding the revitalization of the community. Furthermore, it helped provide Woolpert with a direction to prepare the conceptual phase of the project.

- A preliminary set of plan objectives were developed and addressed in preparation of the preliminary design. Among these objectives were the following:
  - Identification of buildable lots and recommended appropriate uses.
  - Re-plat property wherever necessary.
  - Recommend possible zoning changes.
  - Identify streets to be widened resurfaced, extended, and/or abandoned.
  - Evaluate the capacity of the existing sanitary service and drainage systems for future developmental impact.
• A planning charette was organized and conducted to gather further, interactive input from residents and law enforcement officials. Attendance was good and the input that was gathered helped to steer the direction that the proposed master would follow.

• Upon completion of the site analysis, together with information gathered from other individuals, Woolpert was then able to move forth with the conceptual design phase of the redevelopment master plan. Three conceptual plans evolved from the analysis phase and from the public input data received by the project team members. Each of the plans prepared used a different approach towards the redevelopment of the community. In all cases, Greenline and Spartanburg became one community, addressing many of the issues brought forth by those parties interviewed.

• A public presentation was held to receive feedback from the client and the community over reaction to the site analysis and preliminary design. The designs presented were intense and needed some time to be reviewed by the public, thus smaller, handout-sized copies were circulated among City officials and neighborhood residents. Accompanying the designs were lists of the Issues and Goals that were determined previously.

• After several weeks of review, the residents focused on individual aspects of each design and chose likes and dislikes while keeping in mind the goals that the project was to achieve in the process. Woolpert met again with the client and received input to allow the designers to complete the final master plan. The final plan indicated neighborhood areas that would required re-plating and/or rezoning as well as revising detailed design. The following items were also considered during the development of the final plan.
  - Streetscape enhancements.
  - Neighborhood Access, Circulation, and Identification Features.
  - Open Spaces and Park Areas.
  - Parking Plans for Neighborhood Residences
  - Edge Treatments
  - Pedestrian Linkages

• Woolpert presented the final plan to the Economic Development Committee, which included members of the City of Greenville City Council, to gain feedback and ultimately received approval of the final master plan design.

• A final executive summary report was prepared that included the process, analysis, and development of the concepts, find master plan and opinions of probable cost.
Greenline – Spartanburg Neighborhood Revitalization
ISSUES & GOALS

Project Issues

Considering the scope of the project and the number of problems associated with the site, the team at Woolpert collectively gathered a list of issues bearing strong impact on the project. These issues were presented before city officials and circulated among community residents. Crucial to the design of the redevelopment master plan, these issues placed a strong bearing on how the design was carried out. These issues were physical issues as well as social ones and included the following:

- No sense of entry into the neighborhoods
- Public transportation needs
- Ingress and egress to adjacent streets
- Separation of the neighborhoods
- Connectability of adjacent park areas
- Neighborhood core develop
- Housing mix types
- Kudzu growth
- Vehicle connection of neighborhoods
- Community perception of neighborhood
- Marketability
- Prevent gentrification of neighborhood
- Crime prevention/reduction
- Drug problems
- Vistas in and out of the neighborhood
- Relocation/displacement of residents during the improvements
- Foot trails are a problem
- Existing terrain (topographic restraints)
- Utility infrastructure
- Traffic control/calming
- Current roadway infrastructure
- Security lighting availability
- Storm water control and retention
- Possible landscape amenities
- Drainage is a problem
- Lack of curb and gutter
- More residential, less commercial
- Loss sense of pride in community
Project Goals

Along with the issues surrounding the project, a list of project goals was generated to allow City officials and residents to aim toward the resolution of problem issues.

- Increased home ownership
- A realistic phasing plan that is both affordable and adjustable.
- City commitment to the plan and project approach
- Make use of City in-house resources
- City commitment of general funds for the project
- Purchase options of homes by Police Officers in the area
- Increase awareness of neighbors in the area
- Increase quality of life for the neighborhood
- Create recreation linkages with adjacent parks
- Provide an implementation plan
- Enhancement of viewshed
- Theme of plants in neighborhood
- Create more natural environment areas
- Create a connection to Wade Hampton Boulevard and Stone Avenue
- Connection of the Greenline and Spartanburg Neighborhoods
- Development of a defined entrance to the neighborhood statement/gateway/signage at Stone and East North streets
- Possible name change for the neighborhood
- Enforcement of current building and zoning code
EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS

Over the course of several site visits, a thorough inventory of existing conditions were gathered and then synthesized to form a series of site analyses. This inventory ranged in items from pedestrian circulation patterns to existing slope and drainage conditions. These analyses help determine which areas are most suitable for design and development.

Existing Building Conditions

Building conditions of the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood, shown in Figure 3.1, have reached a general state of disrepair for many of the structures. The Spartanburg side is in better condition than the Greenline side, but there are a number of homes in both neighborhoods that are in disrepair.

Existing Building Conditions

Figure 3.1
A review of the conditions of each structure was compiled. Structures were then placed into four different categories. The categories used were 1) good, 2) fair, 3) poor, and 4) disrepair. Those buildings in category 4 are recommended to be removed and those in category 3 would have to be evaluated on a case by case situation as to whether it would be more economical to remove the building or to renovate it. The decision to tear down will also be influenced by where new road alignments will go and what roads should be closed entirely.

**General Building Assessment**

Those structures around the edge of the neighborhood were mostly in good condition; with some minor repairs needed. The apartments off Spartanburg Courts, as well as the duplexes in Hollywood Circle, were all considered in fair condition or better. These structures are newer, which probably is a factor in their appearance. A row of shot gun houses along Spartanburg Street across from Spartanburg Court are in poor condition, but have an architecture character similar to what was original to the neighborhood and may be worth restoring. Many of the homes in Greenline and Spartanburg are in poor condition and it is questionable whether they should be saved unless it is economically feasible. In the Greenline area there are a number of homes, as well as some in the Spartanburg area, that are considered to be in a state of disrepair and dangerous to occupy. These structures are currently vacant and, for the most part, boarded up. Having looked at the community center, its’ roof is in need of repair also. On the whole, the entire Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood is in need of a much needed facelift.

**Existing Building Conditions Table**

In total, the findings of the building condition study found the following to be true:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Disrepair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenline</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartanburg</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Use Analysis**

The land use for the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood is basically residential. There is a mixture of single family housing, apartments, and duplexes that make up the housing for the area. There is one commercial location that housed the Mountain Top Cafè, however this establishment is now closed. A community center and two churches are also part of the neighborhood. On the edge of the neighborhood there is a greater mix of uses, including commercial space, office, food services, and emergency services.
Existing Land Use

LAND USE

The following eight land uses, identified in Figure 3.2, are within and surrounding the Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhoods.

Residential

Most of the neighborhood is residential with single family houses. Hollywood Circle contains duplexes on half of the circle. Apartments are located in several locations including Spartan Court, Spartanburg Court, along Bethel Street, Bruce Street, Chestnut Street, and Oakcreek Court.

Community Center

The community center is somewhat of a focal point for the Spartanburg side of the neighborhood. Greenline residents do not feel a part of the community center because the neighborhoods are divided
physically and socially. There is an outdoor covered basketball court, playground, and an old softball field at the center.

**Religious**

Two churches are within the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood. Bethel United Methodist Church is located in the Greenline area along Bethel Street. Mount Emanuel Baptist Church is situated within the Spartanburg area along Spartanburg Street just east of Mt. Zion Avenue. The churches’ congregations consist mainly of people from outside of the neighborhood who used to live in the neighborhood.

**Commercial/Office**

Numerous commercial locations surround the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood. Wade Hampton Boulevard is mainly commercial with a small stretch of housing. An antique store, hardware store, hair salon, and gas station are some of the diverse commercial opportunities available in the area. East Stone Avenue contains, a radiator shop, dry cleaning business, insurance company, and an auto parts store among others. The intersection of East North Street and Spartanburg Street also has a large amount of commercial and office areas including a laundromat, quick stop, salon, law office, pharmacy, photo shop, and a fitness center.

**Food Services**

Several eating establishments are located around the perimeter of the neighborhood including The Big Clock, a bakery, and the very popular Henry’s Smokehouse. Henry’s is a high traffic generator that attracts many residents of the neighborhood via a steep, worn path through thick kudzu.

**Emergency Services**

A fire station is located on the northwest side of the intersection of East North Street and East Stone Avenue. The fire station serves the Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhoods and the surrounding area.

**Greenspace**

A number of greenspaces and park areas exist within the Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhood. Included is the area behind the community center along Spartanburg Street where a neighborhood playground is located. Railroad Mini Park is located along Scott Street and Becker Street and serves the Greenline community. It contains a playground and basketball courts and lies adjacent to a small strip of greenspace between Railroad Street and Becker Street. This area is included as part of Railroad Mini Park and has a small landscaped area with benches for sitting.
There are several greenspaces around the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood. Timmons Park is located northeast of the neighborhood and provides a Disc Golf course, baseball field, mountain bike trails, tennis courts, picnic shelters, and a playground. Hessie Morrah Greenway is to the southeast of the neighborhood. The greenway is more of a passive area with bridges and a walking trail, no facilities are provided. A green area exists to the west of the neighborhood, along North Church Street and Wade Hampton Boulevard. This area is slated for the development of a hotel.

**Surrounding Park System Inventory**

There are a number of parks and a greenways that currently surround the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood, as shown in Figure 3.3. These parks are underutilized by the neighborhood residents, due in part, because they are hard to access by foot.

**Nearby Parks, Space & Greenways**

![Figure 3.3](image)
PARKS

Timmons Park

Timmons Park is northeast of the neighborhood and has several different amenities including an 18 hole Disc Golf course, mountain bike trails, tennis courts, picnic shelters, and a playground that are offered for individual and family enjoyment alike. The Little League field recently had sod and irrigation added to make for a nicer facility. Children from the community center in the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood currently use the field to play baseball. The playground for the park has also recently been updated with two play areas that have new swings and a seesaw. Currently there are physical barriers including topography and roads that do not allow easy access to the park from the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood.

Cleveland Park

Cleveland Park is located to the southwest of the neighborhood. It is the largest park in Greenville and includes many activities such as picnic shelters, a softball field, basketball court, tennis courts, walking/biking trails, and numerous playgrounds. A Vietnam War Memorial as well as Memorial to Major Rudolf Anderson are also located within the park. Also important to mention is a Rock Quarry Garden located within the park. Cleveland Park is located farther from Greenline-Spartanburg than Timmons Park, thus more roadway crossings occur between the park and the neighborhood. This makes the park even less accessible for residents of the communities.

Reedy River Falls Historic Park

Reedy River Falls historic Park is west of Cleveland Park and has been incorporated as a part of Cleveland Park.

GREENWAYS

Currently, there is one greenway near the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood. The potential is there to turn drainage corridors, including Richland Creek, into greenways that could connect surrounding parks to the community. Opposition may arise from surrounding communities with this connection. Therefore the new greenway would need to be designed in conjunction with the overall renovation of the neighborhood.

Hessie Morrah Greenway

Hessie Morrah Greenway is southeast of the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood. Access to the greenway is from the Overbrook Historic neighborhood across East North Street from Greenline-Spartanburg. With bridges and paths crossing the space, this greenspace is more passive than others. The City plans to create a walking trail to connect the bridges and steps that currently lead out of the greenway.
Pedestrian Circulation

The existing pedestrian pattern, shown in Figure 3.4, is quite random throughout the neighborhoods. There are many paths that have been worn from residents walking between neighborhoods and to the surrounding commercial areas. Residents also tend to walk along the streets to places of interest such as the community center, park spaces, and surrounding commercial areas.

Pedestrian Circulation Analysis

![Figure 3.4: PEDESTRIAN CORRIDORS](image)

PEDESTRIAN CORRIDORS

One sidewalk exists along Spartanburg Street. This corridor seems to be used quite extensively, particularly around the Community Center. The rest of the combined neighborhoods do not have
sidewalks and people are found to use the streets as pedestrian corridors and gathering spaces. This can be dangerous, especially when many roads have limited sight distance, varied widths, and blind curves. Paths have also been created between the Spartanburg and Greenline neighborhoods and serve as connections with surrounding businesses.

**Primary Pedestrian Flows**

The single sidewalk paralleling Spartanburg Street is considered the primary pedestrian corridor in the neighborhood. There is no existing connection to the Greenline side. Other primary flows occur along Summit Street and Hollywood Circle, also on the Spartanburg side. For the Greenline area, primary flows are around Bethel United Methodist Church and Bruce Street.

**Access Pedestrian Trails**

There are a number of secondary access pedestrian trails that residents have created walking to and from different areas. Many of these areas have unsafe grades and are overgrown by kudzu. These paths are also used for getaways when the police are pursuing criminals. These trails are shown on the map and include:

- Between – Cabot Court and Hollywood Circle
- Between Hollywood Circle and Spartan Court.
- Between Mt. Eustis and Wade Hampton to Henry’s BBQ
- Between Railroad Street and Spartanburg Street

**Loitering Locations**

There are several locations where people hang out and loiter. The Hollywood Circle area, especially near the community center is one. The abandoned restaurant behind Mt. Emanuel Baptist church is another. This area is hidden from view and is known to be notorious for illegal activities such as drug transactions and prostitution. Locations to the northwest of the community center along Summit Street and the two apartment complexes are also where loitering occurs.

**PEDESTRIAN/VEHICULAR CONFLICTS**

In general, there are pedestrian and vehicular conflicts throughout the neighborhood, mainly because there are no sidewalks except for along Spartanburg Street.
Vehicular Circulation

The overall interior road conditions of the Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhood, as shown in Figure 3.5 is in need of major repair. Some roads have been taken over by kudzu and are no longer used while others are very narrow and barely passable for one vehicle. Several roads have very steep slopes, while others are at the edge of cliff-like slopes with no guardrail protection. There are other roads with sharp, blind curves having dangerous visibilities of oncoming traffic, but in general, the majority of the existing roadway infrastructure is in need of repair and or replacement.

Vehicular Circulation and Parking

General circulation is poor and the street layout is very confusing, with numerous offset and misaligned intersections. Some roads run parallel to each other with just one row of housing in between. Parking on many streets is impossible because of the very narrow road widths that prevent vehicles from being able to pass by. The ratings used for the roads were similar to that of the housing with rankings of 1) good, 2)
fair, 3) poor, 4) dangerous to negotiate. A road could be deemed unsafe because of its width, slope, curve, or lack of guardrail. Dangerous intersections are indicated.

EXISTING VEHICULAR FLOW

The current vehicular flow is extremely poor. Traffic flow is much better in the Spartanburg community than in Greenline. Currently there is no connection for vehicles between the two sides. A large drainage ravine separates the two communities. In order to drive from Greenline to Spartanburg, you must drive onto a surrounding major thoroughfare. It is easy to lose your direction and become lost within the current street layout.

Major Vehicular Flows

In the Spartanburg community, Spartanburg Street is the primary vehicular route. Most local roads spur from this main corridor through the community. In Greenline, there are no major roads that transects the entire community.

Minor Vehicular Flows

Minor traffic flows in Spartanburg are Stag Street to Summit to Spartanburg Street and Mt. Zion Avenue to Spartanburg Street. There is little traffic along Mt. Eustis because it is so narrow and has a large drop off.

For the Greenline area, a minor flow goes from Chestnut Street to Bruce Street and disperses into the neighborhood depending where one is going. Another minor flow is Hilly Street to Railroad Street and than dispersing again.

ENTRANCES

There are seven different entrances into the Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhoods, three are in Spartanburg and four are in Greenline.

Primary Entrances

Spartanburg Street at East Stone Avenue and East North Street are the primary entrances into the Spartanburg community. Spartanburg Street is the widest road and goes all the way through the neighborhood this is also the only road with a sidewalk. Both entrances are hidden between business establishments and are only apparent to residents of the neighborhood.

Primary entrances for Greenline are Hilly Street at East Stone Avenue and Chestnut Street at East North Street. These entrances are not as pronounced as those in Spartanburg and the streets are not as wide. Chestnut Street currently dead-ends with Bruce Street connecting off of this corridor. There is no direct way to get from Hilly Street to Chestnut Street.
Secondary Entrances

The secondary entrance into the Spartanburg community is Stag Street at Dupont Drive. It serves as an access point to Wade Hampton Boulevard, but is not as utilized or as prominent as Spartanburg Street. The entrance is also from a residential neighborhood.

Secondary entrances in Greenline are Scott Street and Becker Street at East North Street. Scott Street is extremely narrow upon entering the community and seems to be underutilized. Becker Street is used more than Scott but is at a dangerous intersection inside a blind curve on East North Street. The entrance of Becker is not defined and currently runs between a number of vacant lots on each side.

Dangerous Intersections

There are two dangerous intersections in Spartanburg. The first one is the intersection along Spartanburg Street that has a sharp curve that terminates into the intersection of Mt. Zion and Summit. This area is next to the community center and is very confusing. A second dangerous intersection is where Ashmore Street and Spartanburg Street connect near the entrance off East Stone Avenue.

There are four dangerous intersections in the Greenline community. The first is where Becker and East North Street intersect. When leaving the Greenline area, there is a blind curve that makes it almost impossible to see oncoming traffic making this probably the most dangerous intersection of the entire neighborhood. The second and third intersections both have extremely sharp curves and are very narrow. These are Snow at Railroad and Booker at Becker. A fourth dangerous intersection is Bethel near Booker that is narrow with confusing multiple intersections.

DEAD END ACCESS

Cabot Court off of East North Street is an entrance into the back of the Greenline neighborhood that ends with a dead end street. This is a very minor entrance that only serves this particular street. It is cut off from the rest of the neighborhood except for a pedestrian trail that has been created from people cutting through from Hollywood Circle in Spartanburg.

PARKING

Currently there are limited areas for parking. Most streets are narrow and do not allow enough room for both parking and through traffic. This presents a dangerous situation for emergency vehicles trying to get to a desired location and those residents trying to get to their house. Some cars are parked on lawns to not block roadways, but this creates an unsightly affect and contributes to the overall poor aesthetic of the neighborhood. Apartment areas seem to have adequately provided parking, although many areas are unsightly and in need of repair.
Slope and Drainage Analysis

The slopes and drainage patterns, as shown in Figure 3.6, that make up the limits of the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood, have provided the means and restrictions that have been the basis for the previously developed housing and roadway arrangements for the neighborhood.

The topography of the neighborhood is very severe, ranging from cliff-like outcroppings to low level creeks and floodways.

Slope and Drainage Corridors

![Figure 3.6](image-url)
DRAINAGE CORRIDORS

There are two major drainage corridors that run through the Greenline-Spartanburg communities. The main corridor is Richland Creek that runs along the western edge of the neighborhood flowing north to south.

The secondary drainage area does not always have water flowing through it and is used to collect overland runoff. It runs west to east through the middle of the neighborhoods with Spartanburg to the north and Greenline to the south. This drainage corridor is a major barrier between the two neighborhoods and severely limits possible connections.

HIGH POINTS

Two high points exist in the neighborhood. One is located in the Greenline portion of the neighborhood and the other in the Spartanburg neighborhood. The high point in the Greenline community is along the north side of Bruce Street and is 978 feet in elevation. The highest point in Spartanburg is located at the north end of Mt. Zion Street just west of the community center. It is 970 feet in elevation.

FLOODPLAIN AND LOW POINTS

A 100-year floodplain runs along the western portion of the neighborhood flowing from north to south and consists of approximately 9 acres. The floodplain follows the existing creek and culminates into a low point at the southwest portion of the neighborhood, west of Becker Street. This area formerly had housing within its limits, but after numerous flooding, homes were removed.

SLOPES

About 68 percent of the neighborhood has a slope of 10 percent or greater. This mixture of excessive slopes lends to the communities’ steep roads and lots. It also creates a major dividing line between the two neighborhoods. Furthermore, it is difficult to find areas to connect the two communities.

There are several locations with severe slopes that are greater than 20 percent. Some of the most severe are as follows. At Center Street in Greenline there is an elevation of 884 feet with a drop of 34 feet down to 850 feet at the floodway. In Greenline at Bethel Street there is an elevation of 964 feet that drops 52 feet to 912 feet along the floodway. In the Spartanburg area along Mt. Eustis Street the elevation is 920 feet and drops 30 feet to 890 feet in elevation at Henry’s Smokehouse. All of these slopes are greater than 20 percent and considered dangerous.
Vegetation Analysis

Vegetation within the neighborhoods, as shown in Figure 3.7, is in a general state of neglect. In many locations, the neighborhoods have been overgrown by Kudzu. Trees and shrubs appear to have not been thinned for many years.

Vegetation Analysis

![Figure 3.7](image)

VEGETATION

The neighborhood is isolated from the rest of the city in part due to its heavy overgrown vegetation. Kudzu has taken over many ground areas, trees, and bushes. The undergrowth has not been thinned
creating an abandoned feel to the neighborhood. Streetlights are blocked in many areas by trees that are in desperate need of trimming.

**GENERAL VEGETATION**

The neighborhood generally consists of dense, deciduous hardwoods, typical to the Piedmont. Oak, maple, and poplar are a few of the deciduous species of trees found within the neighborhood. There are some pines near Hollywood Circle, but overall fall within a minority of plant types. There are many invasive plants in the area such as kudzu, bamboo, and poison sumac. These types of plants are taking over the neighborhood and have done so since there has been no plan or efforts to control them.

**GRASSY OPEN AREAS**

There are several areas in the neighborhoods that have open green spaces. In Greenline there is the Railroad Mini Park and the floodway area to the west of Becker Street.

In Spartanburg, to the rear of the community center, there is a green area containing a playground. There are several pockets of open grassy space scattered throughout the neighborhood. These are located south of Hollywood Circle, south of Mt. Eustis Street, and south of Austin Street.

The neighborhood has access to six utilities. Neighborhood needs are not currently being met, due in large because residents can not afford to hook onto these utilities. Also problematic are landlords that have not updated and maintained adequate service connections in homes to accommodate existing utilities. The condition of underground utilities is unknown and safely assumed to be poor due to age.

**Water**

Current water service for the neighborhood is provided by the Greenville Water System. Main water lines run along Spartanburg Street as well as Stag Street in the Spartanburg. In Greenline the main water lines spur off of East North Street onto Scott Street and Chestnut Street. These lines are greater than 6 inches in diameter. From these main lines are smaller diameter pipes that run along minor streets that serve apartment buildings. The lines were installed in the 1950’s and their condition is questionable.

**Sanitary Sewer**

Western Carolina Sewer Authority provides sanitary sewer for the neighborhood. Primary lines run along sections of Spartanburg Street. Other lines spur onto minor streets and run through the drainage corridor that divides the two neighborhoods. Like water service, sewer lines were also installed in the 1950’s and their condition is uncertain but presumably old and in need of replacement.
Gas

Natural gas is provided by Piedmont Natural Gas. These lines run along major streets surrounding the neighborhood. Most residents can not afford to hook onto natural gas, thus they resort to the use of propane and oil for heat. These alternatives are more expensive, and in the case of propane, more dangerous.

Electric

Duke Power provides electricity. The lines are located above ground and run along the streets to utility poles. The poles and service lines are in a relatively decent state.

Telephone

Southern Bell provides telephone service to the neighborhood. These lines are also located above ground on poles along the streets. Not all residents have telephones. In fact, one out of ten homes do not have telephone service. This can cause serious problems in times of emergency.

Cable

TeleCable provides television cable service for the neighborhood. It is unknown how many residents actually use this service.
Greenline – Spartanburg Neighborhood Revitalization
CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

After inventory was collected and analysis conducted, the Woolpert team collaborated and prepared three plan alternatives. Project issues and goals were also analyzed during this phase to evolve feasible results. Each plan alternative investigated various physical and land use relationships within the two communities. One common element among the three was a connection between the two neighborhoods, uniting them as one. Due to the topographical constraints of the site, this connection was limited to a narrow margin of possibilities.

Concept A

The first of three design alternative displayed the following primary characteristics.

- Primary entrances into former Greenline off East Stone Avenue and East North Street.
- Primary entrances into former Spartanburg at the existing Spartanburg Street/East North Street intersection and off Harrington Avenue.
- A primary pedestrian connection extended from the core of the community to Wade-Hampton Avenue.
- A central park/greenspace near the existing/retained community center.
- Lots that back up to a common alley for function and nostalgia.
- No additional high density.
- An overall radial layout reaching from a central point in former Spartanburg.
- The partial removal of Spartanburg Street from East Stone Avenue to just southwest of Mount Emanuel Baptist Church.
- The realignment of Spartanburg Street from Mount Emanuel Baptist Church to East North Street.

Concept B

The second of the two concepts displayed similar characteristics to Concept A, but in a different street layout. The following are some of the primary features of concept B.

- Primary entrances into former Greenline off East Stone Avenue and East North Street.
- A winding boulevard corridor extending from East Stone Avenue through former Greenline terminating in former Spartanburg at a central traffic circle to the front of the existing/retained community center.
- Pockets of higher density, owner occupied residential dwellings at locations in both former Spartanburg and Greenline.
- A central pedestrian corridor extending from the existing community center area and greenspace to Wade-Hampton Boulevard.
- Greenways and nature trails interlaced throughout the community.
- The partial removal of Spartanburg Street from East Stone Avenue to just southwest of Mount Emanuel Baptist Church.
- The realignment of Spartanburg Street from Mount Emanuel Baptist Church to East North Street.
- The removal of Stag Street.
Concept C

Unlike Concepts A and B, Concept C demonstrated different characteristics. The following characteristics were demonstrated in this concept.

• Most existing entrances were retained from the current street layouts.
• Primary entrances are located at East Stone Avenue into former Greenline and a second of two entrances off East North Street.
• Another entrances are located off Harrington Avenue and the existing entrances off East Stone Avenue and Stag Street.
• The community center remains in its current location.
• No additional high density development is proposed.
• A park area is proposed at the intersection of East North Street and East Stone Avenue.
• Like the other concepts, greenways and nature trails wind extensively through the other two concepts.
Greenline – Spartanburg Neighborhood Revitalization
SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEM ISSUES

A number of problem issues currently exist within an around the site. The following text outlines how some of these primary issues were dealt with when designing the proposed master plan for a united Greenline-Spartanburg community.

1. No sense of entry into neighborhoods.

Regardless of locations throughout the community, there is no sense of entry into either community. Most of the perimeter of the neighborhood is behind a barrier of solid vegetation. In many cases, this vegetation is invasive and impossible to pass through. This increases the sense of a walled community and reinforces why a clear sense of entry needs to be established at key locations.

Solution

The creation of solid, boulevard style entrance statements (Figure 5.1) at the following locations anchor the community and create and inviting feel.

- East North Street at Chestnut Street
- East North Street at Spartanburg Street
- Dupont Drive at Stag Street
- East Stone Avenue at Spartanburg Street

Figure 5.1

2. Separation of the neighborhoods.

Both neighborhoods are currently divided by a large and rather steep drainage corridor. The embankments and slopes of this swale are heavily overgrown by invasive kudzu and need to be drastically thinned out for the safety of neighborhood residents.

Solution

In most cases the slopes along this swale are at a grade that makes it impossible to engineer a safe and feasible roadway. Thus, locations to connect these two neighborhoods are limited. In the proposed master plan, the connection occurs at the most shallow area of the swale. This is located to the southwest of duplexes currently located along Hollywood Circle and to the northeast of the end of Chestnut Street, as illustrated in Figure 5.2.

Figure 5.2
3. Connectability of adjacent park areas.

Currently, Greenline and Spartanburg are located on a natural progression of city greenspaces stretching from Timmons Park just to the north of Spartanburg, through Cleveland Park, to the historic park at Reedy River Falls. A connection of these parks via this community would be an asset not to be missed.

Solution

A series of greenways and nature trails are proposed in the master plan adding to the connectedness of the formerly separated Greenline and Spartanburg. These would connect to Timmons Park to the north and Cleveland Park to the south at various locations (Figure 5.3). One would connect at the main entrance at Stag Street and the other below, or to the south of the proposed park/greenspace between the floodway and former Becker Street.

4. Neighborhood Core Development

The development of a neighborhood core is crucial to the redevelopment of the new master plan. Currently, the neighborhood cores exist around the Community Center in the Spartanburg neighborhood and at Bethel United Methodist Church in the Greenline neighborhood. Unfortunately, each is now separate.

Solution

Creating a central core, as illustrated in Figure 5.4, would add to the feel of a connected neighborhood. Though the Community Center and central greenspace serves as the neighborhood center, the community churches still serve as anchors to the past with both sides of the community.

5. Housing Mix Types

Though most homesites in both neighborhoods are single family, there is a large number of properties that are renter occupied. Many long time residents, clearly spoke of desires to see an increase in owner
occupancy. This can be achieved by providing potential homeowners more of a selection than exclusively single family.

Solution

The Woolpert team worked closely with funding strategists and economic development officials with the City of Greenville to determine what alternatives could be offered. It was determined that the following sample mix, as shown in Figure 5.5, would serve the neighborhood well.

- Single Family detached homesites illustrated in yellow (Figure 5.5).
- Single Family attached homesites (duplexes, townhomes, and condominiums) illustrated in purple (Figure 5.5).
- Zero Lot Line Single Family attached illustrated in orange (Figure 5.5).
- Higher density apartment homes illustrated in red (Figure 5.5).

6. Community perception of neighborhood

As it currently exists, the images and community perceptions of both Greenline and Spartanburg are poor. With its maze-like street circulation, law enforcement officials become restricted. Abandoned structures harbor criminals and the wall of vegetation that surrounds the community screens it from passersby.

Solution

The implementation of a redeveloped master plan with an appropriate housing mix, safer layout, and overall better self image. The mix also lends to a diversity among the socio-economic make up of the community.

7. Vistas in and out of the community

Located towards the center of the Greenline community there is a large area of openspace that opens to a viewshed of the downtown district of Greenville (Figure 5.6). Most homesites in this vicinity are presently unoccupied or are abandoned.

Solution

This area would serve as prime real estate in an growing neighborhood. Develop this area to take advantage of downtown city views and vistas as shown in Figure 5.6.
8. Traffic Control / Traffic Calming

The existing vehicular circulation is confusing and haphazard. The few streets that are wide, have long straight stretches. This induces and encourages a higher rate of speed.

Solution

The following are recommended by means of the master plan to calm traffic and make navigating the streets of the community safer.

- Speed Humps (Figure 5.7)
- Clearly marked crosswalks.
- Winding roadways.
- Non-offset intersections.
- Clearly marked traffic signage.
- Well lit corridors.

Figure 5.7
Greenline – Spartanburg Neighborhood Revitalization
**Detailed Master Plan Discussion**

When all the feedback on the preliminary concepts was received, the Woolpert team collaborated to develop the final Master Plan, identified in Figure 6.1. The final plan used some characteristics from each of the preliminary concepts, but the final overall plan became an entirely new entity.
Entries

Primary

Primary entrances are located on East North Street at Chestnut Street, East Stone Avenue at Hilly and Spartanburg Streets, and East North Street at Spartanburg Street.

Each of these entries are to have features of a major, boulevard-style, gateway. Appropriate signage, lighting and landscape will accompany.

Secondary

A secondary entrance is located off Dupont Drive at Stag Street. Entry features will be less stated than primary ones. Landscaping and lighting will remain adequate.

Circulation

Circulation throughout the community was improved by removing a significant number of existing streets that varied in width, grade, and condition. By providing, wider, more fluid streets with better points of intersection and connection, residents can navigate the new community with ease. No longer should law enforcement officials fear becoming lost in the maze of streets that currently existing in the community.

Vehicular Roadway Improvements

The area of the community formerly known as Greenline has received extensive re-routing. These improvements included:

- At the entry into the community from Hilly Street, a boulevard-style street enters and bends to the right, passing a proposed community park that serves as a connection point to nearby Cleveland Park.
- The roadway continues a gentle bend to the right before terminating at a planted cul-de-sac.
- The entrance at Becker Street has been removed.
- A main connector street intersects Hilly Street and extends northward through most of former Greenline. This road bends to the northeast near Bethel United Methodist Church and gently curves back to the north terminating at the large, central greenspace in former Spartanburg.
- Two small eyebrow streets extend off the main corridor that travels through former Greenline. One is anchored by Bethel United Methodist Church.
- A formal, boulevard-style entrance enters into the neighborhood of East North Street.

Former Spartanburg received re-routing to many of its roadways, however, most of Spartanburg retained its existing course. These improvements included:

- Two primary boulevard entrances enter at existing entry points into former Spartanburg.
- Off East North Street, Spartanburg Street winds toward the community center greenspace passing the existing apartment style homesites and a newly proposed condominium/townhouse community.
Circling the greenspace to the rear of the community center, the newly re-aligned Stag Street branches to the north exiting the community at its existing intersection with Dupont Drive.

Spartanburg Street branches from the central greenspace circle and travels southwestward on its existing alignment.

Smaller streets connect Spartanburg Street and Stag Street, paralleling the central greenspace. This area offers two small cul-de-sacs and a private rear alley for garbage collection.

A day car center is located on Spartanburg Street just to the southwest of Mount Emanuel Baptist Church.

Three primary street types are found in the redevelopment master plan. The following typical section applications illustrate these various types of roadway applications.

Used primarily as collector corridors, boulevard style entrances (Figure 6.3) link the community with surrounding thoroughfares such as East North Street and East Stone Avenue. Tree lined and treated with appropriate entrance signage, these roads also serve as entrance statements into the community.

Most commonly used throughout the community, two-way alleés (Figure 6.4), or two-directional, tree lined thoroughfares serve areas of higher traffic volume and longer stretches of roadway. These roads do not allow for curbside parking, however they are proposed to be paralleled by adequate pedestrian sidewalks.
Two-directional roads with curbside parking (Figure 6.5) are proposed for those areas of the neighborhood where traffic volumes are low and driveway space is limited. Alleys located to the rear of some homes toward the west side of the community.

**Pedestrian**

- All roadways through the community are paralleled by sidewalks (Figure 6.6) adequate to handle pedestrian traffic relative to the area of the site.
- A series of greenways and trails wind through most of the communities, primarily through the center. Other trails wind through the perimeter of the site. The trails that run along the western edge of the site, particularly along the stream east of Wade-Hampton Boulevard, serve as the connection trails to the surrounding park system.

**Vegetation**

An important factor in the implementation of a safely redeveloped community, is the thinning of vegetation throughout the neighborhood. Particular areas of concern are those that show evidence of invasive growth such as kudzu and sumac (Figure 6.7).

Larger more established hardwoods should be preserved to add to the neighborhood aesthetic and historical character.
Newly constructed boulevards, streets, and drives will be, in most cases, tree-lined and landscaped according to city ordinance. On boulevard-style roads, center islands and shoulder medians will also be tree planted.

**Lighting**

Each corridor through the neighborhood is recommended to be addressed with adequate lighting. This would vary in form from a standard street light to decorative uplighting near and around entrance treatments. In conjunction with Duke Power, the City should consider this as added security, pertinent to the safety of the residents and law enforcement that patrol the area.

**Housing**

Proposed for the redeveloped community are five different housing types. These housing types lend to the diversity of architectural size and amenities throughout the neighborhood. Most homesites that are considered in good condition, needing some repairs as well as those that can be renovated to retain their historical character will be preserved. This mix also allows for a more feasible economic base mix.

- Single Family Detached, Standard Lot Homesites
- Single Family Detached, Zero Lot Line Homesites
- Single Family Attached, Condominiums and/or Townhomes
- Single Family Attached, Duplexes
- Multi-Family Apartment Homes

The following illustrate and describe the different types of housing offered to mixed incomes within the redeveloped community.

**Single Family Detached, Standard Lot**

Single family homesites are the largest option of homeownership within the community. These will offer the standard front, rear, and side yard as seen in most residential communities. Homeowners will have the opportunities of off-street parking and the option of a carport or enclosed garage, as shown in Figure 6.8.

Private, fenced-in back yards also add to the privacy and neighborhood feel to the community.

*Figure 6.8*
**Single Family Detached, Zero Lot Line**

Homesites on zero lot lines, as shown in Figure 6.9, are place to the left or right side of the lot. This offers the homeowner, on especially smaller lots, more side and rear yard. This option works well with longer, narrow lots where the home plan is laid out in a more linear, shotgun fashion.

In the former Spartanburg neighborhood, there is a group of shotgun style homes that have an alley, at the rear of the homesites. This has been planned to have the option of a rear garage or covered parking off this alley. This, again, adds to the historic and neo-traditional feel of the community.

**Figure 6.9**

**Single Family Attached, Condominiums / Townhomes / Patio Homes**

A number of residents in the community are senior citizens. Single family, attached living, as illustrated in Figure 6.10, offers the status of homeownership, without the maintenance and upkeep of a standard, detached homesite. A monthly homeowners associates fee would cover many conveniences such as ground maintenance and garbage collection. It is proposed that some homesites offer garages and private patios.

**Figure 6.10**

**Single Family Attached, Duplexes**

Duplexes, or two dwellings sharing a common wall (Figure 6.11) are offered in a renovated and updated form on at cul-de-sac, formerly known as the southern end of Hollywood Circle.

These duplexes are proposed to offer conveniences of a standard homesite and should be well suited for senior citizens or those families with young children.

**Figure 6.11**
Multi-family Apartment Homes

The expansion of apartment homes (Figure 6.12) in the vicinity of Spartanburg Court offers renters more space located within a close proximity to the center of the community and town. The master plan proposes the renovation of existing structures as well as the addition of three new structures. Though this is a proposed increase in apartment homes, the overall, community base illustrates a noticeable decrease in the number of renter occupied homesites.

Housing Adjustment Totals

There were concerns from a number of residents within the community over the number of owner occupied dwellings in relation to renter occupied dwellings. To boost neighborhood image and ownership, residents were apprehensive of having a number of renter occupied units greater than or equal to what is currently existing. To illustrate how the new housing mix, in fact, decreased the number of renter owner properties, while increasing the diversity of housing options, Woolpert formulated a chart, illustrated below in Figure 6.13, to show the displacement of proposed housing types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Existing Units</th>
<th>Units to Be Removed</th>
<th>Units to Remain</th>
<th>Total Number of Housing Units</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (traditional lot)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>5% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (zero lot line)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplexes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family (apartment homes)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>48% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (community center, charter)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33% increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.13

Figure 6.12
Utility Recommendation

A preliminary review of the existing water and sewer utility infrastructure was completed to compare the location of existing utilities with the proposed layout of the revitalized Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhood area. With the proposed layout being such a radical change, few of the existing utilities would align with proposed access corridors and roadways. Therefore, a complete utility replacement was estimated for the proposed revitalized neighborhood. Also, given the potential age of some of the utility infrastructure, newer utility infrastructure would help minimize potential maintenance activities commonly found in aging utilities such as leaking pipes, main breaks, inoperable isolation valves, etc.

To accommodate the new layout of the neighborhood, it is estimated that approximately 14,000 LF of water main and 11,000 LF of gravity sewer line will need to be installed. The size of the water main shall be adequate to provide a minimum of 500 gallons per minute for residential fire protection, generally six inches and larger. The gravity sewer shall be capable of transporting the wastewater from the neighborhood, generally eight inches and larger will be needed. A majority of the utility would be in the roadway right-of-way. However, some utility locations may need to be located within utility easements in order to tie into existing sewer outfalls or other utilities. This will also depend on actual field conditions and can be determined during final design and layout.

Figure 6.14
Phasing and Projected Costs

Master Plan Phasing

When approaching the phasing of the proposed redevelopment, Woolpert assessed the condition of each separate neighborhood as it exists today, as shown in Figure 7.1. The Greenline community, by far, is in most need immediate redevelopment. Greenline has the highest number of homes that are in need of replacement and the most streets within the community that are in need of removal and realignment. Our recommendation therefore is to start the initial phasing in this portion of the project boundary.
Phase One

Phase One of the neighborhood redevelopment plan essential includes all that currently is known as the Greenline Community. This is illustrated within the boundary indicated as Phase One in Figure 7.1, page 7-1.

The following costs are associated with the implementation of **Phase One**.

1. **DEMOLITION OF EXISTING ROADWAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAVEMENT DEMOLITION</td>
<td>143,750.0</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$215,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURB AND GUTTER DEMOLITION</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIDEWALK REMOVAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATER LINE REMOVAL</td>
<td>1,242.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$7,452.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANITARY SEWER REMOVAL</td>
<td>1,500.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELECTRICAL REMOVAL</td>
<td>4,641.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$9,282.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TELEPHONE REMOVAL</td>
<td>4,448.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$8,896.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRUCTURAL DEMOLITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Single Family</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$145,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multi Family</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$52,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLEARING AND GRUBBING</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$530,755.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOBILIZATION (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,537.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTINGENCY (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$79,613.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$636,906.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ROADWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL EARTHWORK (s/s)</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPHALT PAVEMENT</td>
<td>Two Way w/ Curbside Parking</td>
<td>8,229</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$98,748.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Way Alleé</td>
<td>5,015</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$60,180.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$25,824.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURB AND GUTTER</td>
<td>standard</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rollover</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$29,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORM DRAINAGE</td>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$38,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drop Inlets</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$70,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAVEMENT STRIPING</td>
<td>1.0 LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEED HUMPS</td>
<td>3.0 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCRETE WALKS</td>
<td>6' walks</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5' walks</td>
<td>12,250</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$36,750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER SERVICE</td>
<td>8&quot; main transmission line</td>
<td>2,539.3</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$45,707.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6&quot; transmission line</td>
<td>1,860.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$29,760.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Hydrant</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural Tap</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,687.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANITARY SEWER</td>
<td>8&quot; PVC piping</td>
<td>1,300.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$28,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot; ductile iron piping</td>
<td>2,825.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$70,625.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot;x4&quot; structural &quot;y&quot; tap</td>
<td>410.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$102,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manhole</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleanouts</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NATURAL GAS</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EROSION CONTROL</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FINE GRADING (average 2&quot;)</td>
<td>20,000.0</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOP SOIL REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>20,000.0</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$88,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,098,382.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILIZATION (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$104,919.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$314,757.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,518,058.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Woolpert Phasing and Projected Costs
February 2001
Greenline - Spartanburg Neighborhood Revitalization
## 3. LANDSCAPING and OVERALL SITE AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING (every 25')</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$122,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEEDING</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDERBRUSH CLEAN UP</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GREENWAY TRAILS</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$8,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STREAMBANK CLEAN UP</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terrace Street Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SITE SEATING</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENTRANCE SIGNAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Entry</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
<td>$170,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Entry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directional</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MISCELLANIOUS WALLS</td>
<td>750.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$187,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$689,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOBILIZATION (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,462.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTINGENCY (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$103,387.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$827,100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OVERALL SUBTOTAL COSTS | **$827,100.00** |
| OVERALL PHASE ONE COSTS | **$3,982,064.93** |
Phase Two

Phase Two of the neighborhood redevelopment plan essential includes all that currently is know as the Spartanburg Community. This is illustrated within the boundary indicated as Phase Two in Figure 7.1, page 7-1.

The following costs are associated with the implementation of **Phase One**.

**1. DEMOLITION OF EXISTING ROADWAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAVEMENT DEMOLITION</td>
<td>185,725.0</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$278,587.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURB AND GUTTER DEMOLITION</td>
<td>2,260.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$11,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIDEWALK REMOVAL</td>
<td>9,040.0</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$45,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATER LINE REMOVAL</td>
<td>2,800.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$16,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANITARY SEWER REMOVAL</td>
<td>9,490.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$75,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELECTRICAL REMOVAL</td>
<td>4,256.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$8,512.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TELEPHONE REMOVAL</td>
<td>8,486.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$16,972.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRUCTURAL DEMOLITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Single Family</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$237,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multi Family</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$52,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLEARING AND GRUBBING</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$843,291.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOBILIZATION (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,164.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTINGENCY (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$126,493.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,011,949.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ROADWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL EARTHWORK (s/s)</td>
<td>125,000.0</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPHALT PAVEMENT</td>
<td>Two Way w/Curbside Parking</td>
<td>13,060.0</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$156,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Way Alleé</td>
<td>21,566.0</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$258,792.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>2,060.0</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$24,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alley</td>
<td>1,005.0</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURB AND GUTTER</td>
<td>- standard</td>
<td>13,800.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$165,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- rollover</td>
<td>4,850.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$58,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORM DRAINAGE</td>
<td>Piping</td>
<td>10,800.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$129,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drop Inlets</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$156,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAVEMENT STRIPING</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEED HUMPS</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCRETE WALKS</td>
<td>6' walks</td>
<td>79,650.0</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$238,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5' walks</td>
<td>19,290.0</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$57,870.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER SERVICE</td>
<td>8&quot; main transmission line</td>
<td>4,628.9</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$83,320.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6&quot; transmission line</td>
<td>4,797.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$76,752.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Hydrant</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$32,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural Tap</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
<td>$1,687.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANITARY SEWER</td>
<td>8&quot; PVC piping</td>
<td>4,500.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$99,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot; ductile iron piping</td>
<td>6,800.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$170,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot;x4&quot; wye tap</td>
<td>410.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$102,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manhole</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleanouts (25% of manholes)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL GAS</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$225,000.00</td>
<td>$225,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINE GRADING (average 2&quot;)</td>
<td>20,000.0</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP SOIL REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>20,000.0</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200.00</td>
<td>$209,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB TOTAL**                   |                                       |          |      |           | **$3,658,172.06** |
**MOBILIZATION (5%)**            |                                       |          |      |           | **$182,908.60**   |
**CONTINGENCY (15%)**            |                                       |          |      |           | **$548,725.81**   |
**TOTAL COST**                   |                                       |          |      |           | **$4,389,806.47** |
### 3. LANDSCAPING and OVERALL SITE AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>700.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$245,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEEDING</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDERBRUSH CLEAN UP</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GREENWAY TRAILS</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STREAMBANK CLEAN UP</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terrace Street Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SITE SEATING</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENTRANCE SIGNAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Entry</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Entry</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directional (Installed)</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$13,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MISCELLANIOUS WALLS</td>
<td>750.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$187,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$831,750.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOBILIZATION (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$41,587.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTINGENCY (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$124,762.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$998,100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL SUBTOTAL COSTS**  
$5,333,213.56

**OVERALL PHASE ONE COSTS**  
$6,399,856.27
GREENLINE-SPARTANBURG NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION
ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST

January 5, 2000

Phase One
1. DEMOLITION OF EXISTING ROADWAYS
   TOTAL COST $636,906.00

2. CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ROADWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE
   TOTAL COST $2,518,058.93

3. LANDSCAPING and OVERALL SITE AESTHETICS
   TOTAL COST $827,100.00

OVERALL PHASE ONE COSTS $3,982,064.93

Phase Two
1. DEMOLITION OF EXISTING ROADWAYS
   TOTAL COST $1,011,949.80

2. CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ROADWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE
   TOTAL COST $4,389,806.47

3. LANDSCAPING and OVERALL SITE AESTHETICS
   TOTAL COST $998,100.00

OVERALL PHASE TWO COSTS $6,399,856.27

Overall Probable Construction Costs $10,390,321.20
Greenline – Spartanburg Neighborhood Revitalization
FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

The Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhood, located north of downtown Greenville, was the subject of a two part revitalization plan prepared by the Clemson University Planning and Landscape Architecture Department. The 1997 plan, which was commissioned by the City of Greenville’s Community Development and Relations Division, contains strategic goals and design alternatives for implementing a revitalization of the neighborhood.

The proposed strategic goals for the neighborhood are:

- Increase Resident Participation in the Neighborhood.
- Improve the Physical Condition of the Neighborhood.
- Increase Home Ownership Opportunities in the Neighborhood.
- Increase Employment and Income Opportunities for Residents.
- Increase Educational Levels Among Residents.
- Promote Existing Programs and Resources Available to Neighborhood.
- Reduce Crime in the Neighborhood.

Following acceptance of the plan by both the residents and the city, Woolpert LLP was selected to develop a Conceptual Plan and Schematic Site Design that would guide the physical revitalization of the neighborhood. The process for developing the Conceptual Plan included base mapping; an inventory and analysis of the geographic area, including transportation, natural features, existing physical characteristics, land use and infrastructure; the identification of issues and opportunities; a design charrette; and community involvement.

The final Master Plan includes streetscape enhancements; open space and park areas; infrastructure improvements; parking and traffic improvements; pedestrian linkages; as detailed in the drawings and cost estimates.

Need for Project

Most people feel that they should be able to live anywhere within the city limits without fear for their life or property. This basic tenant is one of the many reasons why the Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhood should be revitalized. Others include:

1. The neighborhood is one of the oldest in the city of Greenville. Its physical location and elevation offer views of downtown Greenville.

2. A strong commitment to affordable housing and neighborhood development can change a city and the people who live there.

3. The land has value because of its center city location and proximity to downtown.

4. Existing infrastructure, including roads, water, sanitary sewer, and power utilities, make it cost effective.
5. The resident population of Greenline-Spartanburg need affordable housing and strong neighborhood development programs that will give families and individuals stability and a sense of self worth.

**Identification of Project Participants**

With respect to the identification of funds to implement the Greenline-Spartanburg Master Plan, the most significant project participant is the City of Greenville. The city has utilized funds from its US Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] Entitlement Grant to pay for the preparation of the two part Clemson Revitalization Plan, and the Woolpert Conceptual Plan, with Schematic Site Design. The Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhood is just one of the nine city neighborhoods identified for revitalization in the 1995 Consolidated Plan for Community Planning and Development, which was prepared by the Community Development and Relations Division. In addition, the City of Greenville’s Comprehensive Plan is a neighborhood based plan, thus emphasizing the role of neighborhoods in preserving the quality of life in Greenville.

The active participation of the residents and property owners in Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhood is crucial to making revitalization a reality. The citizens of the community must organize and become goal oriented. They must demonstrate commitment to themselves and the programs that are made available to improve their community.

The local business community and non-profit organizations must also play a role in the revitalization of Greenline-Spartanburg. They possess the financial resources, skills, and personnel that are needed to initiate and guide the revitalization of the neighborhood. Ultimately, the entire citizenry of Greenville can play a role in the revitalization of all city neighborhoods by supporting the initiatives that are identified below.

**Revitalization Programs**

The Clemson Revitalization Plan contained a section that identified existing programs and funding sources offered by the City of Greenville that utilize funds obtained from outside sources, primarily the federal and some state government agencies. They include the Community Development Block Grant Program [CDBG]; the Home Investment Partnership program [HOME]; the New Home Ownership Program; the Community Improvement Program; the Grant Assistance for Inner City Neighborhoods [GAIN] and a few others.

The Clemson Plan also included other non-city programs and funding sources provided by the Enterprise Foundation, Community Development Corporations [CDC’s], the Urban league, the Greenville Housing Futures, the Greenville Housing Authority, and Habitat for Humanity. These programs also obtain funds from sources outside of the City of Greenville, including the federal and state government, as well as private sources.

In the process of preparing this report, a few other programs, not previously mentioned, were identified. These programs are categorized under the heading of housing or neighborhood development, and are described below.
Housing

- **The Teacher Next Door Initiative** is a HUD zero interest home loan that places teachers in HUD designated revitalization areas to help improve the quality of life in the neighborhoods by their presence.

- **The Officer Next Door Sales Program** is a HUD zero interest home loan that places police officers in HUD designated revitalization areas to help improve the quality of life in the neighborhoods by their presence.

- **Rich Relatives Program** is a program that helps prospective first time home buyers understand the variety of financial resources available to them by identifying programs offering low interest mortgages and down payment assistance.

- **The South Carolina State Housing and Finance Agency** offers first time home ownership programs such as the Homeownership Mortgage Revenue Bond Program, the Single Parent Program and the Palmetto ByWays Program. The agency also offers the Mortgage Assistance Loan Program. For rental projects, the agency offers the Section 8 Rental Assistance Program, the Multi-family Tax Exempt Bond Financing Program, and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program. In 1992 South Carolina enacted the South Carolina Housing Trust Fund which commits revenues from the documentary stamp tax to the development of affordable housing.

- **HOPE VI** grant funds are made available to public housing authorities to fund the demolition of severely distressed public housing developments in anticipation of revitalization of these sites which will lessen and reduce the concentration of low income families and build sustainable mixed income communities.

- **Community Development Block Grant Section 108 Loan Guarantees** provide communities with a source of financing for land acquisitions, economic development, property rehabilitation, and public facilities, with an emphasis on large scale development. As a HUD entitlement city, Greenville may apply for up to five times its latest approved grant amount. The repayment period is twenty years. HUD has the ability to structure the principal amortization to match the needs of the project and the borrower. The security for the loan is the city’s current and future CDBG funds.

Neighborhood Development

**South Carolina Parks, Recreation and Tourism Grants.** These grants include the:

- Recreation Land Trust Fund [RELT] which is for acquisition only of land for the purpose of public recreation;
- Park and Recreation Development Fund [PARD] available in each county for recreation facilities;
- Land and Water Conservation Fund [LWCF] which is a 50-50 match program for land acquisition or facility development; and,
- Recreational Trails Program which provides funds for trails and trail related projects.

**The 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program,** sponsored by the US Department of Education, awards grants to inner city schools to create a school based community learning center for safety after
school and summer havens for children and their families. Program activities should be directed toward literacy, nutrition, health, etc.

**CASAWORKS** is a grant offered to mental health agencies by the Department of Health and Human Services. This program assists single mothers with one or more children under the age of 11 who need help leaving a life of substance abuse and poverty.

**New Approach Anti-Drug Grants** offered by HUD to use a comprehensive, coordinated neighborhood approach to eliminate drug related and other crime problems in the vicinity of low income housing.

**Identification of Significant Funding Sources**

The funding sources for a project of this magnitude broadly fall into two categories: internal and external. The principal advantage of external funding is that someone else is providing the money as in the federal and state agency programs described above. The disadvantage is external funding comes in small increments over an extended period of time. This makes it difficult to energize the revitalization process quickly enough to keep participants motivated.

Alternatively, internal funding generally provides larger amounts of capital funding, with a greater flexibility and control over where, when, why and how much of the resources will be spent. When a city generates its own money the pace of progress is accelerated and the entire citizenry becomes involved financially, then emotionally. The revitalization process can become a deep source of city pride that brings people together and demonstrates a commitment to one another.

A few methods of generating internal funds are:

- **Property Tax Dedication.** Involves the dedication of at least one cent [one mil or 1 cent per $100] of property tax collected in the City of Greenville to housing programs offered by the city.

- **General Obligation Bond.** Long term financing of capital projects through general obligation bonds offered to public and private investors through an investment banker or bonding agent for the city. General obligation bonds are usually approved by referendum vote of the citizens, because approval may require a property tax increase to meet the debt obligation. The bond can be structured specifically for redevelopment of blighted neighborhoods, street improvements or commercial corridors.

- **City of Greenville Capital Improvement Program [CIP].** Capital improvement program is a planning and budgeting process for identifying major facility needs, projecting fiscal resources, establishing priorities and developing schedules for the acquisition or construction of capital facilities. The adoption of a CIP by the City Council is a statement of policy regarding the timing, location, type, and funding of future projects.

CIP’s involve the scheduling and outlay of a substantial amount of funds that a local government can seldom pay for through appropriations from the annual operating budget. Typically, cities have some amount of unexpended funds from the annual operating budget that are transferred to a capital fund that serves as a savings account for future projects. Therefore, the more traditional method for
implementing the CIP is a direct expenditure from the city’s principal sources of revenue that have been saved over time.

- **Individual Development Account Consortium** is a consortium of local area banks that create a loan pool. The fund also accepts personal bequests, donations and grants, which in turn allow the city to offer affordable housing in stable neighborhoods to low and moderate income families. The program requires the participant to receive home ownership education, open a savings account at one of the banks, and invest in that account for a period of at least six months. Participants have up to three years to save at least $1,000, which the consortium then triples to allow for a down payment on a home. The banks also offer lower than conventional mortgage rates.

- **Community Reinvestment Act [CRA] and Banks.** The federal CRA gives banks credit for participating in the rebuilding of impoverished neighborhoods and the provision of mortgages and business loans to the people living there. The bank works in conjunction with a CDC, or sometimes act through their own community development corporation.

- **Tax Incentives.** These are offered by the city to private developers to help encourage them to invest in a neighborhood or special district. Tax abatement defers, for a period of time, the taxes on the increased value resulting from improvements to real property. Tax increment financing provides local government funds in the form of bonds, to encourage development of real property. A percentage of the collected property taxes from the development are then used for retiring the bond.

- **Sales Tax Increase.** Proposing to increase the local sales tax to fund the revitalization of all neighborhoods in Greenville would involve a referendum. Projects could be restricted to infrastructure improvements such as roads, sanitary sewer and water, that benefit the entire city.

- **Sale of Surplus Property.** The city may have surplus property to put on the market for sale to generate income for neighborhood revitalization. An inventory and evaluation of all surplus property could be taken immediately to determine whether this option is feasible.

- **Formation of Limited Partnership of Investors.** Persons who support and believe in the viability of the revitalization plan may be interested in forming limited partnerships to purchase property and rehabilitate it, or develop a new housing or commercial project. What may be financially difficult for one person to attempt, can be accomplished by a group of ten or twenty people who make a limited investment.

- **Fund Raising/Donations.** Gifts of money and materials to fund various neighborhood revitalization efforts can be generated through promotion.
Summary

Public investment in infrastructure and housing opportunities, combined with neighborhood involvement can be catalysts for lasting change. A major step in creating a strong neighborhood is helping residents develop plans and strategies for improvement. With the plans in place, a combination of several funding sources is necessary to launch a neighborhood revitalization project of this scope.

This report has summarized some of the city’s existing programs and offered many suggestions for other funding sources. The funding strategies and budgeting procedures presented are for general guidance in the city’s initial decision making process. The objective of the process is to determine the feasibility of any particular approach. Further details can be provided on the programs the city feels are most appropriate for accomplishing its goals. In evaluating these options and balancing difficult choices, always remember good neighborhoods make great cities.
Greenline – Spartanburg Neighborhood Revitalization
CONCLUSION

The development of the proposed improvements for the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood will make a significant change to the existing character and overall image of the existing neighborhood. The plan development process has been met with favorable approvals from both the residents of the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood and the City Administrators. The final solution is a culmination of ideas and input from many persons and perspectives. The development of the new community plan has corrected the major Issues that were identified in the beginning of the planning process and has provided for the implementation of the Goals that were also established in the initial part of the planning.

There were many different topics that were discussed during the planning process. Major Issues and Goals that were provided for in the plan include the following:

- A 13% increase in the number of living units over the amount of living units that currently exists within the project boundary.
- Thirty nine (39) more townhomes living units than currently exist.
- Increased single family development by adding eighty eight (88) additional single family housing units over what currently exist.
- Decreased multi-family housing and apartment living by reducing the duplex living units that exist by eight (8) living units and eliminating seventy three (73) apartment units that currently exist.
- Improved vehicular circulation for the neighborhood resulting in better security and safety.
- Development of a single neighborhood concept for the entire project.
- Improvement the accessibility of the neighborhood from the surrounding perimeter roadways.
- Development of a better front door image for the neighborhood by reducing the amount of entrances into the neighborhood.
- Provisions for attractive entrance statements at each entrance to the neighborhood.
- Development of a united community.
- Improved infrastructure in the form of new utility services, roads and walkways.
- Ties of the neighborhood to the City of Greenville Parks and Recreation facilities.
- Realistic implementation plan for the orderly redevelopment of the neighborhood.
- Increased home ownership potential.

The quality of the planning process will now need to be complemented with an orderly progression of implementation to bring the redevelopment of the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood to a reality. The master plan has provided a road map for development and a sequence for construction. The proof will be in the successful development of the project.
Greenline – Spartanburg Neighborhood Revitalization
APPENDIX

Interviews

Interviews were conducted prior to the conceptual design phase to acquire information from residents, city officials and property owners. It was time provided for those in the communities to tell Woolpert what they feel are the good and bad characteristics of the neighborhoods as they currently exist. Likewise, they provided ideas of what they, as current residents, felt should be implemented in the redevelopment of a united community. There were three groups of citizens interviewed.

These groups were interviewed over the course of visit to Greenville, June 16th, 2000.

The first group consisted of realtors and property owners. The following were in attendance at this first interview session:
- Roy M. Gullick, Greenville, SC
- Todd Hardaway, Central Realty Co., Greenville, SC
- Alan Landreth, City of Greenville
- Dick Locke, Greenville, SC
- Steve Loftis, Tinsley R. E., Greenville, SC
- Kenn Bullock, ASLA, Woolpert, LLP
- Laura Kaminski, Woolpert, LLP

The following items were discussed:
- It is important that the Greenline and Spartanburg Neighborhoods become one and also connect to the surrounding neighborhoods. Not sure that Dupont and Harrington neighborhoods want to be joined with them.
- Looking at connections to Timmons Park. The group thinks there would be some opposition from other neighborhood in connecting to Timmons Park.
- Zoning problem with 25’ and 30’ lot widths, need to get away from lots this small.
- Minimum lot sizes should be around 6,000-7,000 square feet, like in similar developments, with a minimum lot width of 50’.
- Selective streets should be removed to improve circulation.
- Possible goal to input low to moderate housing. Fears that this would inhibit development of upper income housing.
- Should consider middle class, styles of housing.
- The group feels that the Greenline-Spartanburg Neighborhood is the prettiest location in Greenville.
- In order to change the Greenline-Spartanburg area, you need to take care of the current problems such as the drug traffic and loitering. Increased police presence is needed.
- Make the area less dense with enhanced streetscapes and more sidewalks and greenspace.
- Improved Infrastructure and street lighting need to be addressed to allow for a better image.
- One realtor’s property was recently renovated, but unfortunately burnt due to the tenant’s use of propane heat. The property owner will not rebuild unless the neighborhood and city work together to improve conditions in the neighborhood.
• Renovation needs to be done simultaneously throughout the community to make an apparent difference instead of a by-house basis.
• The steep, overgrown drainage corridor dividing the community needs to be thinned and restored to retain a natural appearance. This would alleviate the invasive growth of vegetation and dumping nuisance that currently occurs.
• Need to enhance connection between Timmons and Cleveland Parks.
• Apartments that were built new in the 70’s have never been fully occupied. There are 3 apartments with 33 units. Property managers have had difficulty commanding the rent needed. Thus, most have had a very high turnover.
• Home ownership in this area is less than 10%. The city needs to explore the possibility of using new options for ownership. There is a possibility that Section 8 funds for subsidized income for home ownership could be used.
• Habitat for Humanity would be a good demonstration program for the area.
• Thick, invasive vegetation has been known to harbor much of the crime in the area.
• Biggest negative is some of the neighborhoods’ own residents.
• The perceived “front door” entrance to the community is located off of East North and is in need of renovation and enhancement.
• Need to improve entrance off of Wade Hampton to Dupont Street.
• Stay away from high density housing in the area.
• Selected structures should be removed while others should be renovated.
• There would be a benefit to using primarily single family housing (in the range of $40-50,000 per unit). This cost range was used at the Viola neighborhood renovation. Renters are more likely to take care of single-family homes rather than apartments.
• It is thought that residents would be more inclined to better care for their property if they had the opportunity to own their own homes.
• It is very important to drive the price of housing down so residents can better afford them. This needs to be tied to a City subsidy program.

The second group consisted of city staff. The following were in attendance at this first interview session:
- Myron Alderman, City of Greenville, Police
- Daniel F. Durig, City of Greenville, Public Works
- Paul Ellis, City of Greenville, Parks and Recreation
- Norm Gollub, City of Greenville, Economic Development
- Tom McDowell, City of Greenville, Fire
- Mike Ridgeway, City of Greenville, Traffic Engineer
- Wes Wagner, City of Greenville
- Kenn Bullock, ASLA, Woolpert, LLP, Charlotte, NC
- Laura Kaminski, Woolpert, LLP, Charlotte, NC

The following items were discussed:
• Though located within a flood prone area, the greenspace to the rear of The Big Clock restaurant across Richland Creek is one location that could be considered for a city owned parkspace.
There are currently three different parks and recreation facilities in and around the communities. Overbrook Greenway and Valley, Railroad Street Park (Greenline), and the David Helms Community Center are within this area. Timmons Park and Cleveland Park are adjacent to the site.

A greenway tie to Timmons at Dupont is desired. Currently, residents use streets as a sidewalk.

Could try to implement a greenway in the vicinity of the abandoned floodplain at Richland Creek at East North Street to serve as a tie to Cleveland and McPherson Parks.

Mr. Ellis feels that there is a need to tie the different parks to the neighborhood, however a greenway would be difficult to prove effective. This would be due to the overgrown appearance of the drainage corridor and natural areas.

More land around the Community Center off of Spartanburg is desired. It currently has a building and staff. Facilities are claimed to be inadequate. These include a softball field that is too small and basketball courts have had little success in serving multi-use as tennis facilities. It is thought that these could be converted to parking.

Basketball is the biggest draw. It serves the community in greater numbers than the summer playground, morning senior programs, and tutorial programs.

Railroad Mini park is good for kids under 12. There are fewer incidents of vehicular conflicts, as children rarely have to cross streets.

Community gardens worked once on Spartanburg Street. Now there is a need for someone to control this effort. This could be a viable option for future development.

There are unsupervised, latchkey children in need of after school programs with supervision and discipline.

East Street Elementary and Greenville Middle School are the schools for the neighborhood.

The drainage corridor could also have a wetland component.

Myron Alderman, Police

Drug traffic and vandalism, especially to site lighting, are problems within the neighborhood, especially around the Community Center. This is a good lookout point for police, with a road that goes all the way through the neighborhood.

Police strongly encourage the removal of a nightclub where Mountain Top Café is located now.

A connection between the two neighborhoods is desired.

A park would be visible at the southern portion of the site, at East North and East Stone Avenue in the flood prone area. It would be a good observable location of the Overlooks and the I-385 areas.

There have been security problems with Timmons Park. It is felt that police would run into similar problems with Greenways. People have been known to hide in dark areas and access the park after hours.

Police feel that a main problem associated with a greenway through the neighborhood connecting Timmons and Cleveland Park is that of neighborhood access after dark. Parks in the City of Greenville are closed at dusk.

Expand vision on traffic calming.

Restrict the number of entrances but still have access to the area. “Straight through-flow” on Spartanburg Street is prime for drug dealers and because the Community Center is public property, they can legally socialize in this vicinity.
Tom McDowell, Fire Chief

- If parallel parking is provided, access to an emergency can be blocked. It is desired that no parking be allowed on the streets.
- The lack of connection between the two communities is a hindrance in an emergency situation. Emergency management cannot access Greenline from Spartanburg without leaving one community before entering another.
- It is difficult to organize people when neighborhoods perceive themselves as separate. Greenline does not think they are part of Spartanburg and its Community Center and visa versa.
- Housing stock is marginal. Single family housing with larger lots is better for fire protection.
- Code allows landowners to board up dilapidated houses to secure them. Only if housing is condemned as an unsafe structure, will it be torn down. There have been problems with residents using scrap from abandoned houses for firewood.
- Twenty-six feet is the desired road width for fire trucks.
- By record, the fire department has responded quickly to emergency situations within the communities.
- The Fire Department would like no apartments above two floors.
- Homeownership has been known to reduce the amount of fires.

Daniel Durig, Public Works

- Homeownership on the western side of the community has improved neighborhood conditions within this immediate vicinity.
- Standards with zoning need to be changed. Thoughts on neo-traditional neighborhoods are encouraged despite lower densities.
- Consider a bus route through a redeveloped, united community.
- Space and routes for garbage pick-up should be encouraged.
- There are problems associated with sections of the existing sanitary sewer. A lot of people resort to joining onto their neighbor’s system.
- Storm water has NOT been master planned. Neighborhood storm water design is a typically feasible route. Consider wet detention as a possibility.
- Mr. Ellis stated that dry detention is better for park maintenance for there is liability.
- There is a potential for flooding at North Church Street and East North Street and Stone.
- Overall the communities’ biggest problem is circulation.

The third group consisted of residents from the Greenline-Spartanburg neighborhoods. The following were in attendance at this first interview session:
- James Brown, Deacon, Mount Emanuel Baptist Church, Greenville, SC
- Mary Cleveland, Greenville, SC
- Evelyn E. Dogan, Greenville, SC
- Walter Dogan, Greenville, SC
- Reverand D. L. Holland, Greenville, SC
- Mary Love, Greenville, SC
- Henry Nuttry, Westside Properties, Greenville, SC
- Tracy M. Truscott, City of Greenville, Police
- Kenn Bullock, ASLA, Woolpert, LLP
- Laura Kaminski, Woolpert, LLP
The following items were discussed:

- The neighborhood association is referred to as Greenline-Spartanburg Street Community Organization.
- Residents want to see the two neighborhoods united as one community.
- An “updated” neighborhood over a “destroyed” neighborhood is preferred.
- Residents strongly desire the ability for neighbors that take pride in the community to return after displacement and completion of the redevelopment.
- A higher, owner occupancy rate is strongly desired.
- Currently, if residents relocate from Mt. Zion to Spartanburg Street, it is considered progress.
- Residents would like to have sidewalks and better roads.
- Progress would be felt within the neighborhood should the redevelopment commence.
- Single family homes are strongly preferred over multi-family apartments.
- Currently most homesites do not meet local code. Renters fear that if their homes are updated to meet codes, landlords and property managers may raise rent.
- Residents would like access to a grocery store and Laundromat, but not in the neighborhood. It is recommended it be located along the outside edge of the community. Residents could be provided an opportunity to own a store on the perimeter.
- Most members of the two churches are from outside the neighborhood (the two churches in the communities were once home churches).
- A Police Substation in the Community Center could strongly benefit the neighborhood (with required direct access to the outdoors). This would be temporary while the neighborhood was in transition.
- Senior housing is recommended in Hollywood Circle. It is important that these homes be handicap accessible. Seniors want to be independent.
- It would be nice to have the Police Substation next to senior housing.
- Selective housing removal is suggested while others should be renovated.