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Preface

The City of Greenville, SC in collaboration with the Greenville Housing Authority is focused on developing a long-range plan for revitalizing the Nicholtown community and Jesse Jackson Townhomes.

The Nicholtown Master Plan represents the culmination of a detailed planning effort consisting of data gathering and an engaged community participation process. The planning process consisted of a three phase approach: “Issues & Opportunities”, “Visioning & Planning”, and “Action Plan”, a process totaling approximately five months. The first phase focused on establishing existing physical and market conditions. The second phase included a Community Charrette Week designed to build community consensus on the vision for future development in the areas of land use, transportation and targeted development on the Jesse Jackson Townhomes site. The third phase addressed implementation strategies.

The report is divided into four sections and follows the goals and requirements as outlined by the City of Greenville:

1.0 Background
Section 1 focuses on the existing physical conditions and market analysis of the study area and specifically documents the findings including the history and study area context, existing land use, building conditions and character, zoning, transportation and circulation issues, demographic and market conditions and development opportunities.

2.0 Development Plan
The development plan represents the future land use and circulation recommendations including concept plans for the redevelopment of Jesse Jackson Townhomes as derived during the Community Charrette Week.

3.0 Action Plan
The Action Plan describes methods for implementation of the recommendations described in the Development Plan. The elements include strategic implementation recommendations, a 10-Year Action Plan and Design Guidelines.

4.0 Appendix
The Appendix contains the complete market situation report, public meeting sign-in sheets, Nicholtown Compass Results and additional planning documents.
1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 History and Study Area Context

The Nicholtown neighborhood traces back to 1849 when Elisha Green willed a portion of his plantation which lay on both sides of Laurens Road towards the Reedy River to his daughter, Dorcas Green. Over the next thirty years this land was subdivided, seized and/or sold off to individuals outside of the Green family. During the 1870’s nine African American families are known to have settled in what was later known as Nicholtown including Martin Write, Jane Collins, Adam Walker, James Hall, Isaac Roberts, Elias Reynolds, Lee Garrette, T.W. Davis and Martha Sprouse.

The Nicholtown neighborhood is located in the center or “heart” of Greenville, South Carolina, about 1.5 miles from the downtown Central Business District, west of Pleasantburg Drive and south of Laurens Road. The southern portion of the neighborhood overlooks the Reedy River. Sprouting creek beds extend into the neighborhood. Prominent landmarks in proximity to Nicholtown include Cleveland Park, the Airport and the YMCA. Greenville Tech campus is within walking distance to the south and the University Center Campus is to the east across Pleasantburg Drive. There are several community facilities located in the interior of the neighborhood including the School District of Greenville County’s Beck Academy, Phillis Wheatley Recreation Center and Health Center, the Nicholtown Community Center as well as a host of faith-based institutions.

Historically, Nicholtown community residents were leaders in local, regional and national government in addition to Greenville’s education and business communities. Currently the neighborhood is guided by the leadership of the Nicholtown Neighborhood Association that is dedicated to improving the living conditions of the Nicholtown residents and neighborhood beatification.

For the purpose of the Nicholtown Master Plan, the study area is not inclusive of the entire Nicholtown neighborhood, but encompasses the southern quadrant that includes the Jesse Jackson Townhomes site. The study area encompasses approximately two hundred ninety acres bounded by the Reedy River to the west, McAlister and Greenacre Roads to the east, Ackley Road to the north and Faris Road to the south. Jesse Jackson Townhomes (once called Fieldcrest Village) occupies approximately 56 acres and is located in the center of the study area. In 1980’s the property was renamed after the civil rights leader – Jesse Jackson who resided there as a child.
1.2 Existing Physical Conditions

The inventory of existing physical conditions paints a descriptive picture of the current utilization of existing properties within the Nicholtown Master Plan study area. There were a combination of methods used to gather information in the areas of land use, building conditions and occupancy, zoning, transportation and circulation, and property ownership. The City of Greenville, SC provided Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data as a basis by which the planning team validated and gathered physical conditions information through a series of visual surveys conducted in October 2003. The purpose of gathering the existing physical conditions is to ensure that future development builds upon and addresses existing issues.

**Land Use**

The Nicholtown Master Plan study area is comprised of 712 parcels totaling approximately 287 acres amongst eight land use categories. The image of the Nicholtown neighborhood is categorized as a residential community, with 61% of the total land area consisting of single-family lots, duplexes and multi-family development including Jesse Jackson Townhomes and Roosevelt Heights apartments. The next largest land use in the area is vacant land. As noted on the existing Land Use Map, vacant properties occur on almost every block and range in scale from single-family size lots to large areas of overgrown, undeveloped land. Several of these properties exist along the creek bed and in topographically challenged areas.

Unlike typical urban neighborhoods, currently the Nicholtown neighborhood lacks a neighborhood commercial core. There are a few scattered commercial / convenience uses (some of which are not currently occupied) located in the periphery specifically along Rebecca Street and Ackley, Greenacre and McAlister Roads. As for institutional properties, 13% of the land area includes Beck Academy, Phillis Wheatley Center, Nicholtown Community Center and several faith-based institutions. In addition, open space facilities located within the study area include recreation fields at Phillis Wheatley Center and Nicholtown Community Center, and the historic African American cemetery. Cleveland Park (a regional recreational park and facility) is along the western boundary of Nicholtown.
Building Character

The state of structural conditions of existing building is critical to determining the character of a community and potential future redevelopment opportunities. An assessment of existing building conditions within the study area by the planning team was based on an overall observation of the exterior of the structures without taking into account interior renovations or unseen problems. Structural components that were considered include the foundation (cracks or settlement), roof (aged or deteriorated materials, exposed structures), exterior walls, doors and windows (broken glass, boarding), porch/balcony (missing frame, structural instability) and exterior upkeep (paint, yard and fencing.) The goal of this assessment was to get a snapshot of the overall state of repair and character of the housing stock, commercial and institutional facilities with the use of consistent categories of condition. The following designations describe the qualitative assessment measures as well as rough repair cost on a per unit basis:

- **STANDARD/ Minor Defects**
  Good Condition, may require minor repairs (cost up to $4,999)

- **SUBSTANDARD / Moderate Defects**
  Minor rehabilitation needed (renovation costs between $5,000 and $14,999)

- **DETERIORATED / Major Defects**
  Major rehabilitation needed (renovation costs between $15,000 and $45,000)

- **DILAPIDATED / Public Safety Hazard**
  Extensive rehabilitation necessary, may require demolition

![Existing Building Conditions Table]

### Existing Building Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Deteriorated</th>
<th>Substandard</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Total (Parcels)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>465</strong></td>
<td><strong>570</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Land Area (with structures)

- 2%
- 35%
- 63%
- 100%

Source: Quantified by Urban Collage, Inc.
According to the assessment, 63% of the parcels with structures are in good structural condition, thus requiring only minor façade improvements or no repairs. Structural settlement, poor site drainage and lack of modern conveniences contribute to the deterioration of the Jesse Jackson Townhomes. Nevertheless, almost every block within the study area has at least one structure that is in less than standard condition. The amount of visible deterioration is relatively low (less than 2%) which includes duplex and multi-family units on Hilton Street and with a few structures scattered throughout the neighborhood.

**Building Occupancy**

The existing occupancy of structures was also assessed during this process. The following designations describe standards used to make the determinations:

- **OCCUPIED**
  - Based on clear evidence of habitation by legitimate occupants
- **PARTIALLY OCCUPIED**
  - Based on two-family or multi-family dwellings or where two or more buildings occupy the same parcel.
- **UNOCCUPIED**
  - Based on clear evidence of the lack of legitimate occupants

Like the building conditions assessment, this assessment was determined solely on the visual appearance of the exterior of the structures. As a whole, the Nicholtown study area appears to be mostly occupied (95%). Of the 570 properties with structures, only 2% were categorized as unoccupied. The majority of these structures are residential units that have window boarding and are located on the west side of the creek. Roosevelt Heights and several duplex and multi-family buildings on Hilton Street appear to not be fully occupied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Unoccupied</th>
<th>Partially Occupied</th>
<th>Occupied</th>
<th>Total (Parcels)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Land Area
(with structures) 2% 3% 95% 100%

Source: Quantified by Urban Collage, Inc.
Zoning

There are five zoning districts enforced within the Nicholtown Master Plan study area – Single-Family Residential (R-6), Multi-Family Low Density Residential (RM-1), Multi-Family High Density Residential (RM-2), Convenience Commercial (C-1) and General Commercial (C-3). As stated in the existing land use assessment, the study area is primarily a single family residential community, thus 95% of the area is zoned for residential use, while only 5% is zoned for commercial use.

The R-6 district in the study area includes the concentration of existing traditional single-family dwellings. Some duplex units interspersed around Dime Court, Chaney and Elder Streets have this designation as well. The RM-1 district makes the transition from single-family to a slightly denser district that includes duplex units and scattered multi-family units (triplexes) along Clark and Hilton Streets. Oddly enough the allowable density is greater than the majority of the existing development- which is single family. This is probably due to the proximity of the Jesse Jackson Townhomes and the possibility of future expansion.

The RM-2 district encompasses the Roosevelt Heights and Jesse Jackson Townhomes properties adjacent to the presence of single-family and institutional uses along Rebecca Street. The C-1 zoning occupies a portion of the study area containing scattered residential, commercial and office uses fronting McAllister Road. This district also functions as a buffer between the more dense commercial uses along Pleasantburg Drive and the residential districts.
A brief description of the zoning districts is as follows:

**R-6 (Single-Family Residential) District**
The R-6 district allows for single-family detached residences and permits governmental facilities, education and faith based and recreational uses out-right. A minimum lot area of six thousand (6000) square feet is intended to preserve and protect the single-family residential character.

**RM-1 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential) District**
This zoning district incorporates a higher density residential use and includes Single-family, two-family and multifamily garden-type apartments. The density is 10 dwelling units (du) per acre(ac). Like R-6, governmental facilities, education and faith based and recreational uses are also permitted.

**RM-2 (High Density Multi-Family Residential) District**
The primary distinction between RM-1 and RM-2 is the maximum density; RM-2 about twice the former at 19.5 versus 10 du/ac. Limited office-type activities as special exceptions are permitted.

**C-1 (Convenience Commercial) District**
This zoning district is tailored for retail and personal service uses, limited in size to serve the immediate neighborhood. All residential types of uses are also included.

**C-3 (General Commercial) District**
The C-3 district is intended to accommodate a variety of general commercial uses characterized primarily by retail, office and service establishments of a limited size and oriented primarily to major traffic arteries or extensive areas of predominately commercial usage and characteristics.
1.3 Existing Transportation and Circulation Issues

A visual field study was made during the initial phase of the planning process to evaluate the physical conditions of the public infrastructure in the Nicholtown Master Plan study area. This assessment focuses on the existing infrastructure within the public right-of-way that specifically includes the evaluation of public sidewalks and streets.

**Streets**
In general the streets throughout the study area are in good condition with very few potholes or cracking and settlement. There are no major arterials within the study area. There are three collectors: Alameda Street, Clark Street, and McAlister Road. All other roads within the study area are local roads.

**Sidewalks**
High pedestrian traffic was observed throughout the study area despite the general absence of sidewalks. Pedestrian traffic occurs within the roadways and/or along dirt “desire paths” created by pedestrians in high traffic areas where no sidewalks exist. The existing Transportation & Circulation Map depicts the public streets where sidewalks exist – limited to a portion of Clark Street, Ramsey Court, McAlister Road, Nichol Street and Roosevelt Avenue. The remaining residential roadways lack sidewalks all together.

**Public Transit**
The Greenville Transit Authority provides bus service to the Nicholtown neighborhood and the Jesse Jackson Townhomes community. Currently bus stops, without shelters, are located on McAlister Road, Clark Street, Rebecca Street, Nichol Street, and Roosevelt Avenue. These arterials have frequent pedestrian movements but there are limited sidewalks, thus heightening the need for pedestrian safety. In addition to designated bus stops, the Greenville Transit buses will stop wherever there is a need (i.e., at mid-block points that are not designated stops).

**Curb & Gutter**
Currently, curb and gutter is only located where there is existing sidewalk. Additional curb and gutter is necessary wherever sidewalks are constructed. The addition of curb and gutter will also allow for the existing roadside ditches and swales to be eliminated, providing a much neater appearance.

**Water & Sewer**
The existing water and sewer infrastructure is adequate as reported by the Greenville Water System and the City. Deficiencies were reported by many of the residents; however these deficiencies appeared to be related to the lateral rather than the sewer pipes. All laterals serving the existing homes to be demolished will be replaced. The existing water and sewer lines...
in the right of way can remain unless the street is relocated. Water and sewer lines will need to be constructed for the new streets that are proposed.

Circulation Challenges
There is no direct thoroughfare for traffic through the study area. The roads wind through the surrounding neighborhoods. Only one road, Clark Street, goes through the Jesse Jackson Townhomes development.

1.4 Existing Demographics and Market Conditions

According to 2002 US Census figures the Nicholtown study area contains 2,161 housing units. Of this total 89% are occupied, however, only 42% of these units are owner occupied while the remaining 58% are renter occupied. These figures for Nicholtown are not significantly lower than those for the City of Greenville in which 47% of the city’s housing units are owner occupied and 53% are renter occupied.

The Nicholtown study area is a somewhat older area when compared with the City of Greenville, with 35% of the population older than 55. These age distributions indicate a large number of older retirees living in the area, including many retirees aging in existing public housing units and single-family homes in the neighborhood. Providing housing to meet this aging population, preferably within the Nicholtown neighborhood, should be a goal of this plan.

Nicholtown & Greenville Households by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Nicholtown Area</th>
<th>City of Greenville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>8,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>9,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>7,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>7,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>4,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>7,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,539</td>
<td>46,066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nicholtown’s housing situation has improved somewhat since 1990, with occupancies in the area rising approximately 3% and owner occupied units as a percentage of the neighborhood also increasing. Note the total units are not the same due to the change in census tracts for 2000.

Nicholtown Housing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>2955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>2719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Households in the Nicholtown study area are largely defined as lower-income households, with many earning below $25,000 annually. As shown in below, 50% of households in the neighborhood earn less than $20,000 annually and 60% earn below $25,000. These incomes are significant as they translate into home affordability. Homes being rehabilitated in the Greenville area are generally found as low as the mid $50’s and $60’s, generally requiring a household income of around $20,000 or more. New construction homes generally can be purchased in the mid $70’s and increase to the low $100’s, requiring minimum incomes of around $25,000 or more.

**Nicholtown Households by Income**

Assuming that approximately 30% of household income is spent on housing and that single-family housing products that are similar to those that could be offered in Nicholtown are selling for $50,000 (base price for renovated) and $80,000 (base price for new construction), home affordability can be computed. These study area incomes translate to 50% of the current population of the neighborhood being unable to afford renovated or in-fill new construction homes (most of whom live in Jesse Jackson Townhomes). Only 10% of households can afford to purchase renovated homes and 40% can afford to purchase new in-fill construction homes.

**For Sale Housing Market**

Home sales in the Nicholtown neighborhood are generally more affordable than those found in Greenville overall. All homes sold in the Nicholtown in the past three years have been priced below $100,000, ranging in price from below $20,000 up to $100,000. Many of those sold on the lower end of the price spectrum are in modest condition and are in need of significant investment. Many of these units are also investor units and are thus renter-occupied. The for-sale housing market strategy for Nicholtown should be the development of housing priced closer to the top of the existing housing market in the neighborhood, with single-family homes priced.
between $80,000 to $100,000 and townhouses initially priced between $75,000 and $90,000. Over time, as the neighborhood stabilizes, these prices could and should gradually increase as well to provide increased equity for homeowners. At the recommended price points, new housing could be affordable to 40% of Nicholtown residents as well as new residents seeking moderately-priced housing intown. Given our neighborhood housing characteristics and demographic and larger trends being seen in intown Greenville, opportunities appear fairly strong to develop new for-sale single-family homes and townhomes in Nicholtown.

RCLCo created a statistical demand analysis to estimate demand potential from three primary sources for new for-sale products in the city and in Nicholtown. Based on these sources, we estimate demand exists for approximately 130 homes per year priced from $45,000 to $150,000 within the city and translates into potentially 36 homes a year that could be absorbed in Nicholtown.

**Estimated Annual Demand for New For-Sale Housing in Nicholtown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Affordable Home Price</th>
<th>Annual Demand Potential</th>
<th>Potential Capture Rate</th>
<th>Nicholtown Capture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $45,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 - $75,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $105,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$105,000 - $150,000</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 - $225,000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$225,000+</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 262 36

**Rental Apartment Market**

The development of rental housing in and around the Nicholtown area appears to be a positive short-term opportunity. Nearly all of the in-town product in Greenville is comprised of aging garden-style apartments, with few modern choices for renters. Suburban apartment communities are also all garden-style apartments. This creates several opportunities in the Nicholtown neighborhood:

- Development of mixed-income and affordable housing, including housing for those earning 50% to 60% of the area’s median income, which could occur within the Jesse Jackson Townhome redevelopment as well as a renovated Roosevelt Heights; and
- Market rate, more urban-scale rental apartments, possibly integrated as part of a mixed-use project, likely to be located closer to Pleasantburg Drive.

Target market audiences include existing Jesse Jackson renters, neighborhood and area residents residing in aging, sometimes substandard apartment units, Greenville Tech students and aging Nicholtown and area residents represent opportunities for seniors housing. Finally, a more urban project, possibly developed with some first-floor retail, could attract professionals working in Downtown Greenville or along Pleasantburg Drive and I-385.

The achievable rents for these projects varies, with the mixed-use fronting Pleasantburg charging a premium to the immediate area, and the redevelopment projects a slight discount.
Nonetheless, approximate rents could range from $450 for a one-bedroom unit up to $700 for a three-bedroom unit, with two-bedroom units achieving around $525. Once these or similar projects are implemented, they will give Nicholtown a great sense of optimism and change. While maintaining its cultural heritage, the new housing stock will assure residents they can remain living in the neighborhood they grew up in as a child.

New rental product in Nicholtown priced largely below $800 in monthly rent should be able to achieve annual absorption paces in excess of 100 units.

**Estimated Demand Potential for New Rental Units in Nicholtown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $600</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600 - $800</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800 - $1,000</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 - $1,200</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,200+</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,962</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monthly Absorption:** 14.6

One demand source not fully explored to date is students at Greenville Tech. There are approximately 9,500 students on-site, with 3,900, or 41%, being full-time students. Assuming some doubling-up of students (roommates), we estimate there are 2,600 student households in Greenville. Holding renter propensity constant with the greater population of the city, we can safely assume up to 55% of students are renters, or 1,430 rental households. Even if only one in ten had an interest in living close to campus, and affordable housing options existed, potential demand of 143 rental units exist today. These units could be located somewhere around campus, including the fringes of the Nicholtown neighborhood; a potential opportunity for redevelopment.

**Market-Based Recommendations**

There are several major issues or factors that must be addressed to enhance these opportunities in the neighborhood for both for-sale and rental product.

**Key factors that should be addressed include:**

- Enhancing the connectivity of the neighborhood to surrounding neighborhoods and areas via sidewalks, trails and perhaps new streets;
- Creating more park and greenway orientations, taking advantage of the creek system in the neighborhood;
- Creating a “front door” to Nicholtown on Pleasantburg Drive via the redevelopment of older, underdeveloped commercial properties on Pleasantburg and the development of higher-density residential along a new entry street into the neighborhood;
- Pursuing development of portions of the Beck Academy fields or adjacent vacant properties for housing;
- Redeveloping Jesse Jackson Townhomes into a higher-quality, mixed-income community similar to Arcadia Hills; and
- Providing infill housing opportunities throughout the neighborhood.
1.5 Development Opportunities

Utilizing information gathered on the existing physical conditions of the study area, the development opportunities map attempts to identify properties that are most likely to redevelop in light of market pressures and planning efforts currently underway. Generally, three types of properties comprise those that are development opportunities:

- Vacant land
- Open Space/recreation
- Deteriorated or Dilapidated Structures
- Underutilized properties

The areas identified on the map are not necessarily a recommendation for improvement or any instruction that the City of Greenville must act upon. Rather, it is a tool that is used to help the Nicholtown community in focusing planning and development efforts.

The land use and building conditions maps provided the first pass of analysis for development opportunities: vacant land is shown in red while those properties in deteriorated condition are shown in pink. Though there are some structures that are categorized as substandard, these properties are viewed as future rehabilitation opportunities as opposed to development opportunities. The highest concentration of deteriorated structures are the multi-family and duplex dwellings located on Hilton Street and a few scattered single family units scattered in the western quadrant of the study area. Most vacant parcels on residential blocks are opportunities for single-family infill.

Beck Academy is also included as a potential development opportunity. The School District of Greenville County is currently assessing the relocation of the middle school’s Magnet and International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program to a new location that is more centralized in the existing attendance zone. This notion of relocating the school has received much opposition from the Nicholtown community for Beck Academy is the only school facility in the neighborhood. If Beck Academy relocates opportunities to adaptively reuse the existing facility are to be considered. (See plan recommendations in Part 2.0)

The Greenville Housing Authority in collaboration with the City of Greenville SC has embarked on the revitalization effort for the Nicholtown community including the Jesse Jackson Townhomes. The site is shown in blue on the Development Opportunities map and encompasses 56 acres. The buildings were constructed in 1952 consisting of 52 buildings of poured concrete and cinderblock construction with brick facades. The Greenville Housing Authority prepared a Hope
VI Grant Application for the revitalization of this site into a mixed-income community with diverse housing options. Site planning for the development site for submission in the HOPE VI Application was developed during this planning process. The details are described in the Section 2.0 of the report. (HOPE VI Application is pending at the time of this report)

The Roosevelt Heights apartments deserve mentioning as a development opportunity as well. Constructed in 1949 these 2-story brick buildings are architecturally nondescript and have seen better days. It is currently only 70% occupied and lacks modern conveniences such as central air conditioning but does provide a source of affordable housing in the community. Due to its proximity to stable single-family housing stock, this site is considered for redevelopment.
2.0 DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan represents the future land use and circulation recommendations including concept plans for the redevelopment of Jesse Jackson Townhomes as derived during the Community Charrette Week.
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2.1 Community Vision

Charrette Week

The Development Plan for the Nicholtown area was generated during an interactive community design charrette process, Thursday – Monday, November 13-17, 2003. The purpose of this charrette week was to provide a forum for all community stakeholders to enunciate their vision for the future of the Nicholtown Master Plan and Jesse Jackson Townhomes. The planning team established a temporary design studio at the Phillis Wheatley Center that was utilized throughout the week to conduct stakeholder interviews, workshops and design sessions.

The Charrette Week began with a public Kick-off meeting on Thursday night where over 90 Nicholtown and Jesse Jackson Townhomes residents, property owners, business owners, City Staff (including the Mayor and members of City Council), Greenville Housing Authority Board Members and staff were in attendance. The meeting format included the introduction of the planning team, an overview of the existing conditions analysis and the administering of a visioning exercise – the “Nicholtown Compass”. The exercise consisted of a series of questions and visual images that allowed participants to rate residential, commercial, transportation and circulation, openspace according to their appropriateness for the Nicholtown community. The following images depict the highest and lowest rated images selected by participants of the “Nicholtown Compass”. Detailed results of the visual preference survey and short answer questions are contained in the Appendix of this document.

Single-Family Residential

![Highest](#) Colonial-style architecture with minimum setbacks.

![Lowest](#) Typical narrow-lot home with front porch.

Multi-Family Residential

![Highest](#) Duplex that looks like a traditional single-family home.

![Lowest](#) Brick apartments with front access and rear parking.
### Mixed-Use Development

**HIGHEST**

Village retail.

**LOWEST**

One and two story buildings intermixed with retail on ground floor.

### Open Space

**HIGHEST**

Neighborhood playground.

**LOWEST**

Plaza for festival/open-air market use.

On Friday, the planning team conducted a series of stakeholder interviews with neighborhood interests and stakeholders in order to flesh out the relevant issues that frame the Nicholtown and Jesse Jackson Townhomes revitalization. Those interviewed included Nicholtown residents, City department staff, City Council members, Greenville County Panning Commission, the Pleasantburg business community, community resources and service providers. In the evening a meeting with the Jesse Jackson Townhomes residents was convened to provide an opportunity to enunciate their concerns regarding future redevelopment and to discuss the current conditions of the property.

A community workshop was held on Saturday and focused on developing a future land use and transportation plan for the study area and a development concept for the Jesse Jackson Townhomes site. Using large scale base maps, colored markers and ribbon, participants worked in groups with facilitators to capture the vision of the future development pattern for the area. Several conceptual models of the redevelopment on the Jesse Jackson Townhomes site were also constructed using building blocks. The planning team working into the evening developing the consensus points from the workshop.
Sunday was dedicated to developing conceptual designs, illustrations, perspectives and site plans. The design studio was open throughout the day for community stakeholders to view the work in progress.

The Charrette Week concluded with a final presentation on Monday evening with nearly 100 people in attendance. Total participation during Charrette Week was over 200.

### Development Issues

During the series of stakeholder interviews conducted during Charrette Week, many of the relevant issues identified were divided into seven categories: Land Use and Development, Economic Development, Housing, Historic & Natural Resources, Traffic and Transportation, Community Facilities, and Urban Design. These issues were used in conjunction with the existing conditions analysis to assist in the formulation of the development plan.
2.2 Development Plan

The following pages describe the land use development initiatives as outlined in the Development Plan for revitalizing and improving the Nicholtown Master Plan study area and Jesse Jackson Townhomes.
The comprehensive vision for the revitalization of the Nicholtown neighborhood features and emphasizes diverse housing options including the redevelopment of Jesse Jackson Townhomes as a mixed income community with an array of housing options, the redevelopment of Roosevelt Heights apartments complementing the adjacent existing single-family community, and infill single-family development on existing vacant lots. It is envisioned that through this revitalization effort, the community will also feature a new greenway system and town green that building on existing natural resources and encourages healthy living for Nicholtown residents as well as infrastructure and pedestrian connection improvements that promote walkability and safety. Neighborhood retail services for the community are concentrated at the historic retail node in the heart of Nicholtown while opportunities to promote more local activity is focused along McAlester Road as mixed-use development. Regional serving retail services are concentrated along Pleasantburg Drive as envisioned by the Pleasantburg Drive Corridor Master Plan, 2004.
2.3 Development Initiatives (1 – 10)

1. Redevelop Jesse Jackson Townhomes as a HOPE VI Project
The Jesse Jackson Townhomes, geographically and historically, are the heart of the Nicholtown community. The conceptual design plan envisions a fully redeveloped mixed-income community with a diversity of housing options including single-family homes, townhomes, apartments and a senior housing facility. In addition, a new town green is envisioned as a front door to the new community. The Greenville Housing Authority recently applied for a 2003 HOPE VI Grant for the revitalization of Jesse Jackson Townhomes (application pending).

Town Green at Phillis Wheatley and Jesse Jackson Townhomes
Particular care has been given to design the new homes to reflect the individualized character, style, diversity and massing of the Greenville housing market. On the north-east side of the site, a new single-family neighborhood (74 homes) features traditionally inspired houses – modern interpretations of the ‘Craftsman Style’ bungalow – on forty to fifty foot lots that tie into the adjacent existing single-family housing stock to the north.

The 76 townhome units and 208 multi-family units, with craftsman-victorian style architecture, transition from the single-family blocks. These homes have street-facing front doors, stoops and defined front yards and back yards that replace an institutional development and ambiguous public/private space relationships.

In addition, there is a unique opportunity to provide a new senior housing development in close proximity to the Phillis Wheatley Center and new town green.

Recommendations:
- Develop a mixed income community with diverse housing options;
- Incorporate community facilities, infrastructure improvements and open space.
2. Roosevelt Heights Multi-Family Redevelopment / Infill

Constructed in 1949, the existing Roosevelt Heights 2-story brick buildings lack modern amenities and conveniences. The existing architectural character of the Roosevelt Heights area is not compatible to the adjacent single-family neighborhood. There are additional development opportunities on adjacent vacant lots to the east suitable for infill multi-family units. It is also suggested that the existing multi-family units north of Nichols street be redeveloped as single-family homes to create additional homeownership opportunities in the community.

Recommendations:
- Redevelop Roosevelt Heights and develop infill multi-family and single-family residential;
- Incorporate design elements consistent with the single-family neighborhood;
- Incorporate a new, small pocket park with the redevelopment.


As described in the existing conditions analysis, the majority of the Nicholtown Study Area is comprised of single-family residential neighborhoods with traditional building elements and styles that are the foundation of the character of Nicholtown. Throughout these residential areas are residences that should be preserved/ rehabilitated in a fashion that is compatible with the existing architectural character. There are also opportunities to construct new single-family homes on existing vacant properties with similar design elements.

Recommendations:
- Preserve and rehabilitate existing single-family homes with compatible architectural character;
- Develop infill single-family residential homes with compatible architectural character.

4. Duplex Redevelopment

As the demand for new housing in Nicholtown increases, and to satisfy the desire for housing options, the plan recommends redevelopment of existing duplex units in Hilton and Elder Streets with design elements that are compatible with the surrounding residential character. This development would provide a new and improved housing type to the Nicholtown area that is marketable to young couples and empty nesters looking for low maintenance residences.

Recommendations:
- Develop new duplex homes that encourage a higher quality of design while promoting design elements found in the single-family neighborhoods.
5. City Property Infill Development
The large undeveloped vacant property that lies between the Reedy River Greenway, The Beck Academy and an existing Single Family neighborhood has the potential to become a new development. Since this area is surrounded by single family housing, and as the demand for housing increases in Greenville, specifically the Nicholtown neighborhood, these sites should be developed to expand the housing market.

The traditional neighborhood development would consist of single-family homes on small lots (less than 1/4 acre each). Often referred to as cluster homes, this development type attracts young couples and empty nesters looking for low maintenance, detached single-family homes.

**Recommendations:**
- Develop new single-family homes on 1/4 acre or less lots;
- Develop new design standards to encourage higher quality development incorporating some historic design elements;
- Develop an interconnected road network with sidewalks.

6. Neighborhood Retail
There was community consensus that major retail services should be focused on Pleasantburg Drive. However there is an opportunity to provide neighborhood serving retail in the interior of the Nicholtown neighborhood in a few locations. The enhancement of existing, and the construction of new, but limited neighborhood retail to serve the community are important tools in the economic development of the community.

The plan proposes two focus areas for the development of neighborhood retail; the Rebecca and Dime Street district and the Greenacre Road area. The location of these sites helps to enforce the connectivity to the surround neighborhoods while promoting small business ownership that serves the community.

**Recommendations:**
- Promote centrally located neighborhood oriented retail establishments;
- Façade improvements of existing structures.
7. Beck Academy
The community’s foremost goal would be for the School District of Greenville County to reconsider their decision to relocate Beck Academy out of the neighborhood given the market-based planned new development associated with this plan. If this proves unlikely, the plan calls for a firm commitment to locate a new school facility, possibly a charter elementary or middle school on the Beck site as warranted by new development at some point in the near future. This would be a potential draw for new residents with children into the neighborhood.

Recommendations:
- Continue to work with the School District of Greenville County for options to utilize the existing facility for educational purposes.

8. Community Facilities Enhancements
Nicholtown is fortunate to have several community facilities that are well known to the residents. The currently planned enhancements to the Phillis Wheatley Center and Nicholtown Community Center will help bring these facilities up to modern-day standards while providing the community with multi-generational recreation and meeting space.

Recommendations:
- Maintain and enhance the old Phillis Wheatley Center and Nicholtown Community Center to include improved multi-generational recreational space.

9. Mixed-Use Development Corridors
Enhancing the sustainability and character of retail development along Pleasantburg Drive and McAlister Road are keys to the economic development of Nicholtown. As the demand for service-oriented retail increases the conversion of properties, adaptive re-use or wholesale redevelopment should be strongly considered as market realities continue to improve.

Recommendations:
- Encourage mixed-use development extended along McAlister Road and Pleasantburg Drive;
- Encourage infill development compatible with the character of the neighborhood;
- Promote adaptive reuse of existing structures where appropriate.
2.4 Circulation Plan

The following pages describe the transportation and circulation initiatives as outlined on the Transportation Plan for improving the Nicholtown community infrastructure.
2.5 Transportation and Circulation Initiatives (A-F)

A. Road Extensions/ New Roadways
To promote connectivity throughout the site new road extensions have been placed in several key locations. The new extensions will encourage development in the proposed City infill site along with the multi-family residential site at Roosevelt Heights. In addition the establishment of a formal road network throughout the Jesse Jackson Townhomes site will provide the framework for the HOPE IV revitalization program.

Recommendations:
- Extend existing roads to support new residential development (including sidewalks);
- Provide adequate new roadways to support new residential development.

B. New/Repaired Sidewalks
Despite the lack of sidewalks throughout the Nicholtown community there is a high volume of pedestrian traffic. The addition of sidewalks will help to promote connectivity within the community while providing formal links to community facilities and services. It is recognized that sidewalks can not realistically be added to all streets. However, the streets prioritized for new sidewalks are Rebecca, Alameda and Clark Streets, and Glenn and Greenacre Roads.

Recommendations:
- Construct new neighborhood sidewalks in several key locations, particularly in ways that connect to community facilities and services.
C. Bus Stops/Shelters
A key concern for residents was the need to enhance the existing bus service in Nicholtown with the installation of Bus Shelters at existing bus stops. With the installation of sidewalks on heavily traveled roadways, and bus stop at strategic locations, the pedestrian environment in the area will be greatly improved.

Recommendations:
- Build upon existing GRA service and routes with the installation of new bus stops and shelters.

D. Gateways
“Community Identity” is important to residents, business owners and visitors. By placing formal gateways at key intersections - E. Paris Road @ Catlin Street, Ackley @ Rebecca and S. Pleasantburg Drive @ LeGrand Boulevard- those traveling through the area will be able to identify the unique character of the community.

Recommendation:
- Develop new identity markers for the Nicholtown neighborhood.
E. Streetscape Improvements
Streetscapes enhance the pedestrian environment while promoting connectivity to residential and retail areas. Improvements to Rebecca Street and Clark Street should include pedestrian amenities such as sidewalks, lighting, and street trees at regular intervals. Intersection improvements such as brick pavers and crosswalks at strategic locations are also warranted to improve the pedestrian environment.

**Recommendation:**
- Enhance the entry and connectivity in the neighborhood with a new tree-lined streetscape and sidewalk improvements.

F. Pedestrian Connection
Pedestrian connectivity is a key component for promoting access to community facilities, transit, retail, and residential areas. To help support a destination, such as Cleveland Park, good pedestrian accessibility is essential and obtainable with the installation of a pedestrian trail.

**Recommendation:**
- Improve pedestrian access from the residential areas to Cleveland Park.

G. Reedy River Greenway
The enhancement of the Reedy River Site will help promote conservation along the river and the historical significance of the “Slipping Rock” while promoting connectivity throughout the Nicholtown Community. The Greenway will also serve to enhance the connections to Cleveland Park and Pleasantburg Drive. Access to the Greenway will be increased through the development of mixed-income housing along the Reedy River.

**Recommendations:**
- Develop a partnership with the Friends of the Reedy River;
- Develop new greenway system for pedestrian use;
- Build upon planned connections to Cleveland Park and Pleasantburg Drive.
3.0 ACTION PLAN

The Action Plan describes methods for implementation of the recommendations described in the Development Plan and Circulation Plan. The elements include strategic implementation recommendations, a 10-Year Action Plan.

3.1 Strategic Recommendations 28
3.2 10-Year Strategic Action Plan 34
3.3 Population Projections 35
The Action Plan identifies a series of tasks, variable mechanisms and associated costs to help ensure that planned revitalization projects become a physical reality in a timely and feasible manner. The development and circulation plan outlined in Section 2.0 describes a variety of short term neighborhood and City-wide initiatives that are intended to create an initial 3-year window of opportunity.

This Action Plan provides a comprehensive approach that allows the City of Greenville, SC, the Greenville Housing Authority and the Nicholtown community the opportunity to take full advantage of new development consistent with the community’s vision for the future. In particular, the implementation activities and recommendations are in keeping with several fundamental principals that have arisen from the planning effort:

- Implementation efforts should seek to create a balance between encouraging new development and maintaining the existing character and charm of the area.
- Implementation efforts should strike a balance between raising the standard of living in the community and maintaining a level of affordability and opportunity for existing residents, owners, businesses and institutions.
- Implementation efforts should seek to make physical connections within and outside of the Nicholtown Master Plan study area including Greenville Tech, Cleveland Park, and Pleasantburg Drive.

3.1 Strategic Recommendations

Nicholtown Master Plan participants have clearly stated the desire and will to further define the revitalization of Nicholtown and Jesse Jackson Townhomes through a series of implementation-oriented, neighborhood-wide and city-wide recommendations. The recommendations that follow were established by the planning team and evaluated from various perspectives including: site planning, urban design, transportation and parking, political, economic and market feasibility.

The following 4 implementation mechanisms are critical tools in achieving the overall vision of this plan:

1. Identify and Develop Realistic and Prioritized Implementation Program

It is important to realize that while all of these projects will have significant impact on the Nicholtown Neighborhood; it will take many years to complete the full revitalization of the area. As described in Section 2.0 these redevelopment projects include the redevelopment of Jesse Jackson Townhomes, restoration, rehabilitation and infill of single-family residents, development of new duplex housing, rehabilitation of existing retail and new mixed-use development, enhancements to public facilities and infrastructure improvements. Therefore, projects have been divided into distinct phases based on a variety of factors such as: current or likely funding available, implementation activities already underway, importance to the community, available market, proximity to other projects, etc. Due to the complexity and scope of many projects some incremental activities will take place as housing and infrastructure projects begin development in one phase and not be completed until the subsequent phase. Furthermore, the timing of individual projects may ultimately vary from what is
programmed as market realities and community objectives are refined in the coming years.

In general, the first phase is an immediate three-year plan focusing its resources in the areas of greatest potential. The second phase will incorporate a three to five year implementation period focusing primarily on the development of housing and addressing public safety issues. The final phase of the master plan builds on the previous phases and will continue major investment projects for a ten year implementation cycle. This phase will also serve as an opportunity to conclude any outstanding redevelopment projects and will allow the Nicholtown community, the City of Greenville and the Greenville Housing Authority to prioritize additional neighborhood needs.

In addition to identifying the phased schedule for the redevelopment projects, it is important to note that the Redevelopment efforts will require full and effective partnership among two sectors: public-sector development assistance agencies (e.g. City of Greenville), private-sector developers/ lenders/ investors (e.g. Greenville Housing Authority, Nicholtown Neighborhood Association, CDC’s, etc.).

The ten-year phasing schedule described herein assumes that the Greenville Housing Authority will be awarded HOPE VI funding for the redevelopment of Jesse Jackson Townhomes. It is important to note that the Greenville Housing Authority has committed itself to redeveloping JJT townhomes regardless of whether HOPE VI funding is received. However if the funding is not awarded, the redevelopment of Jesse Jackson will occur on a slower track thus extending the implementation schedule and marketability of the surrounding residential redevelopment initiatives.
2. **Build on Existing Housing Programs**

**The Home Ownership Program (KEY)**
The City’s Community Development Office has teamed up with the Greenville County Human Relations Commission to provide homeownership counseling and training to low to moderate income residents. The KEY program sessions take residents through a step-by-step home buying process. The two part program begins with a pre-counseling session where credit, current income and savings are reviewed and ends with a two week course that gives one an in-depth look at the process of buying and maintaining a home. In order to qualify for the program, the resident must:

- Be 18 years or older;
- Live and work within the city of Greenville and
- Earn less than 80% of Greenville’s median income ($43,900 for a family of four)

The program is facilitated by the City and Greenville County Human Relations Commission, Community Development Advisory Committee and other partners.

**Comprehensive Jobs Training/ Improvement and Placement Program (LADDER)**
LADDER is facilitated by SHARE (Sunbelt Human Advancement Resources). It provides an intensive, comprehensive system of training, services and support to meet the employment needs of eligible participants. To be eligible, resident must:

- Be 18 years or older;
- Live and work within the City of Greenville and in certain specified areas
- Earn less than 80% of the county of Greenville’s median family income ($43,900 for a family of four)

The program provides assistance for residents who desire to:

- Increase income
- Establish self-sufficiency
- Further basic education skills
- Acquire job skills training
- Obtain job placement assistance and obtain financial assistance

**Paint the Town**
A community based partnership between the City of Greenville and faith groups (churches, synagogues, mosques etc) to give owner-occupied homes in “Special-Emphasis Neighborhoods” a face lift. Beneficiaries fall within the low income bracket and are screened by the City’s Community Development Division. The City provides paint, supplies and basic training and technical assistance to volunteers. Projects typically take 1-2 days depending on the number of volunteers and the time available to work.

**Rental Rehabilitation Program**
This City of Greenville Community Development & Relations program encourages private investors to upgrade their rental properties available and affordable to low and moderate income families. Qualified investors are provided low interest loans from the City through the use of Community Development Block Grant funds and Home Investment Partnership funds in order to increase the supply of decent, safe and sanitary rental units in the City’s designated Special Emphasis Neighborhoods. The maximum loan amount (at 0% interest of a 10-year period) will be 75% of the total rehabilitation costs to a maximum of $15,000 per unit. In order to be eligible,

- Property must be currently occupied by low-to moderate income persons or families
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- Units must remain affordable to low and moderate income occupants for the life of the loan

Emergency Repair Program

The City of Greenville offers emergency home repairs to homeowners due to threats to health and safety. These health and safety issues include but are not limited to:
- Leaking roofs
- Electrical hazards
- Fire hazards
- Deteriorated floors, exterior walls, ceilings and
- Inadequate heat

Homeowners may be eligible to obtain forgivable loans for these repairs up to a limited amount ($10,000).

Community Improvement Program (CIP)

Qualified homeowners are provided an opportunity to rehabilitate their homes by obtaining a forgivable loan for the City of Greenville for up to $24,000. This program is administered through the City of Greenville Community Development Division using Community Development Block Grant funds for home repairs that bring the property up to code; repair or replacing items that are expected to need repair in the next 18 months; home beautification and general property improvements and; soft costs (appraisals, title searches, etc.)

3. Build Organizational Capacity to carry out Recommendations

Establish organizational capacity with the Nicholtown Neighborhood Association

The Nicholtown Neighborhood Association (NNA) is the leadership for the Nicholtown neighborhood. It has established a partnership with the City and has obtained its 501c(3) status. Numerous members of the organization have been actively involved in this Master Planning effort and they have expressed interest in building capacity for the organization to pursue redevelopment projects.

The NNA must organize a development implementation team and with the assistance of the City address implementation issues, execute and promote implementation strategies, and reflect shifting community desires. This volunteer representative team should strive to identify revenue sources, both public and private, that will enable the physical development of all the projects outlined herein. As a representative body, the committee will ensure that implementation initiatives are constantly meeting the needs and consensus of the community.

Implementation Summary:
- Establish a Community Development Corporation

...the NNA will ensure that implementation initiatives are constantly meeting the needs and consensus of the community.

Identify and Pursue Partnerships

It is not feasible for the City of Greenville alone to implement all of the recommendations outlined in the Master plan. Private investment is critical to revitalizing the physical community as well providing services to its existing and future residents. The following entities should be considered for immediate partnership opportunities:

Housing Partnerships
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- Non-profit agencies currently working in Greenville communities include Homes of Hope, Greenville Housing Futures

Outreach Service Partnerships
- Greenville Tech is a neighbor to Nicholtown with two campuses within the one-mile walking radius. Building on the existing relationship with the community, job/ trade training programs, college preparatory classes, micro-business programs should be explored for Nicholtown residents.

Greenspace/ Public Improvement Partnerships
- The Friends of the Reedy River to assist with the development of the Reedy River Greenway Trail/ Sliding Rock Greenway Trail

4. Establish Implementation Mechanisms

Amend Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance
The City’s Comprehensive Plan must, at a minimum, be amended so that the future land use plan is in conformance with the land use plan outlined in Part 2.0 of this plan. Furthermore, projected increases in population and employment should be updated to reflect the balanced model of growth outlined in this plan.

Design Guidelines
The Nicholtown Master Plan is intended to provide a blueprint for revitalization efforts within the community. A concise set of urban design guidelines and housing typology were developed and contained in a separate document in support of the vision, goals, existing land use and projects contained within the Master Plan.

The importance of these guidelines is two-fold. First, the long-term success and sustainability of the area will rely upon new investment that capitalizes on the single-family character, history and legacy of Nicholtown. Encouraging a consistent character of development will provide sustained marketability and, ultimately, economic health. Second, and perhaps more importantly, these guidelines will help improve the visual character and “livability” for existing residents of Nicholtown.

It should be noted, however, that these guidelines are not intended to create inflexible restrictions or economic hardships. Rather, they are meant to provide a useful tool for developers, homeowners and decision-makers in the effort to encourage development that is compatible with the existing character of the Nicholtown community. In particular, it should be recognized that many existing homeowners may not have the economic means to renovate their houses in full accordance with these guidelines. Furthermore, in some instances, certain guidelines may not be practical or feasible due to existing conditions or extenuating circumstances. Ultimately, these guidelines may be expanded and/or refined as warranted and as approved by community stakeholders and decision makers.

Implementation Summary:
- Amend the City’s Comprehensive Plan to reflect land use recommendations
- Incorporate and possibly expand design guidelines as a part of the zoning ordinance.
### Nicholtown Master Plan Redevelopment Projects

#### Redevelopment Projects Cost Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Single-Family Units</th>
<th>Duplex Units</th>
<th>Townhome Units</th>
<th>Multi-Family Units</th>
<th>Senior Housing Units</th>
<th>Institutional (sf)</th>
<th>Retail (sf)</th>
<th>Mixed-Use (sf)</th>
<th>Rehab Units</th>
<th>Development Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Jesse Jackson Townhome Hope VI Redevelopment</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Roosevelt Heights Multi-family Redevelopment/Infill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a Single Family Preservation/ Restoration/ Infill</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b Single Family Preservation/ Restoration/ Infill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c Single Family Preservation/ Restoration/ Infill</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d Single Family Preservation/ Restoration/ Infill</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$915,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e Single Family Preservation/ Restoration/ Infill</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f Single Family Preservation/ Restoration/ Infill</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g Single Family Preservation/ Restoration/ Infill</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h Single Family Preservation/ Restoration/ Infill</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Duplex Redevelopment [Elder Street]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Duplex Redevelopment [Hilton Street]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 City Property Infill Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$810,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Neighborhood Retail Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Beck Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Community Facilities Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Mixed-Use Development Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 10-Year Strategic Action Plan

Total Development Costs: $60,835,000
### Nicholtown Master Plan

#### Infrastructure Cost Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicholtown Master Plan</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportaion Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#’s correspond to labels on Circulation Plan Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A New/ Repaired Sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Street Sidewalk (includes streetscapes)</td>
<td>$390,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Street Sidewalk (includes streetscapes)</td>
<td>$223,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Road Sidewalk</td>
<td>$218,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenacre Road Sidewalk</td>
<td>$114,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Roadway Extensions/ New Roadways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allendale Street Ext</td>
<td>$276,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster Street Ext</td>
<td>$878,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Street Reloc plus Sidewalks (includes streetscapes)</td>
<td>$677,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road A (JJT on-site)</td>
<td>$433,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road B (JJT on-site)</td>
<td>$213,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulloch Street Ext</td>
<td>$109,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Bus Stops/ Shelters</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Gateways</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Pedestrian Connections</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Reedy River Greenway</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Construction Grand Total | $4,177,594 |
| Design Fees | $350,000 |
| Construction Engineering | $420,000 |
| Subtotal Total | $770,000 |
| Design and Construction Fee Contingency (5 Percent) | $38,500 |
| Fees Grand Total | $808,500 |

Total Infrastructure Cost $5,006,094

Assumptions: No right of way costs
Utility relocation costs limited to water and sewer construction
Sidewalk projects are for one side only

Total redevelopment costs for build-out of the Nicholtown Master Plan recommendation is $65,841,194.

### 3.3 Population Projections

Upon build-out of the proposed redevelopment projects, it is estimated that 2270 new residential units will come on line in the next 5 to 10 years in and surrounding the Nicholtown community. Of the said new households, 1770 are projected in the Pleasantburg Drive Corridor – as a result of the Pleasantburg Drive Corridor Study, 2003.

#### Proposed Youth Population in Nicholtown with Creation of New Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Additional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000 Census Data
4.0 APPENDIX

The appendix includes supportive planning documents developed throughout the planning process.

Design Guidelines
Market Situation Report
Nicholtown COMPASS Results
Public Meeting Participants
PREFACE:

The following pages represent a clear and concise guide to encouraging new development in Nicholtown that is compatible with the character of the existing community. These guidelines are intended to be straightforward, easy to use and a precursor to a more detailed set of standards associated with a potential new zoning code (timeline TBD).

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:

1. Single-Family Guidelines
2. Townhouse Guidelines
3. Multifamily Guidelines
4. Non-Residential Guidelines

GENERAL DESIGN STANDARDS:

5. General Residential Guidelines
6. General Non-Residential Guidelines
7. Public Space Guidelines
8. Streetscape Design Guidelines

Prepared By: URBAN COLLAGE, INC.
Prepared For: City of Greenville and the Greenville Housing Authority
INTENT:
New detached housing that is compatible with the existing fabric of the community and that promotes a walkable environment.

LOT LAYOUT STANDARDS:
Lot Width - Driveway Lot: 50 ft. min. (preferred); 65 ft. max.
Lot Width - Alley Lot: 35 ft. min. (preferred); 50 ft. max.
Lot Depth: Varies, 85 ft. min.
Side Setbacks: 5 ft. min.; 15 ft. max (zero lot line development allowed in locations where at least 8 lots are contiguous in a block)
Rear Setbacks: 25 ft. min. (accessory structures shall be 6 ft. min.)
Front Build-To Line (Infill): In cases where there is a predominance of existing adjacent houses to remain, infill housing shall be generally aligned.
Front Build-To Line (Subdivision): In cases where there is a lack of existing houses to remain, infill housing shall have a 20 ft. Front Build-To Line.
Driveways/Parking Pads: Shall at no point be wider than 9 ft. (except in rear yard or connecting to an alley) and shall only be located to the side and/or rear of a house (no front yard locations). Driveways may be located outside of the Building Envelope but shall be at least 2 ft. away from the side property line.
Garages/Accessory Structures: Shall be recessed at least 20 ft. from the front house facade. Only one garage car opening shall be allowed parallel with the street (unless obscured from public view); 2-car garage openings are allowed but shall be perpendicular to the street (or obscured from public view)
Sidewalks: All houses shall have a 4 ft. min. sidewalk connecting the front porch to the public sidewalk

ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS:
Building Height: 2.5 stories max. (from the street); no point of the structure extending above 35 ft. (tall floor-to-floor heights are encouraged).
Building Width: 18 ft. min.; 50 ft. max.
Roof Massing: All houses shall have at least one gable or dormer facing the public street and all roofs shall have a 12” min. overhang
Roof Pitch: Roof pitches shall be between 6/12 and 16/12 (porch roofs & non visible areas may be less)
Front Porches: All new houses shall have front porches that are at least 12 ft. wide and 6 ft. deep (wrap-around porches encouraged on corner lots).
Porch Columns: All front porches shall contain at least 2 porch columns; columns widths/proportions shall increase as column spacing increases. Porch columns shall include base and capital trim.
Front Doors/Stairs: Front doors and front porch stairs shall face the public street.
Finished Floor Height: 30 in. above grade min. (exceptions considered for accessibility reqs.)
Trim Details: 4” wide min. (or 1 brick course) trim shall be used at windows, doors, corners, cornices, eaves, rakes and fascias.
Acceptable Siding Materials: Wood, synthetic wood board, stone, brick, stucco (horizontal patterns only).
Discouraged Siding Materials: Vinyl, block, synthetic stucco, metal, plastic, plywood.
Acceptable Roofing Materials: Asphalt shingles only (no metal, rolled or built-up roofs)
Chimneys: Shall be faced in stone, brick or stucco.
Fenestration: 30% min. of the front facade shall be fenestrated.
INTENT:
New single-family attached housing that is compatible with the existing fabric of the community and that promotes a walkable environment.

LOT LAYOUT STANDARDS:

Lot Width-Interior Lot: 16 ft. min.; 24 ft. max.
Lot Width-End Lot: 21 ft. min.; 34 ft. max.
Lot Depth: Varies, 85 ft. min.
Side Setbacks-End Lot: 5 ft. min.; 15 ft. max (zero side setbacks required on interior sides of all lots)
Rear Setbacks: 6 ft. min. (incl. accessory structures)
Front Build-To Zone: Front facades of each unit shall fall within a 2' zone 15' back (thus allowing minor variations to help delineate individual units).
Minimum Unit Counts: For each contiguous development property, new attached housing shall contain at least 8 units.
Driveways/Parking Pads: All driveways/parking areas shall only be located to the side and/or rear of a unit (no front yard locations).
Shared Alleys: All attached developments shall be required to share rear parking access through the use of a shared alley (min. 12' wide). Alleys may be one-way or two-way. To the extent possible, alleys shall be accessed via the side of the block. Where not possible (i.e., infill development in block interiors), alleys shall be accessed via the primary street but shall have no more than 2 curb cuts.
Garages/Accessory Structures: Shall be provided only along the rear of the main dwelling structure and shall only be accessed via a shared alley (no front-facing garages).
Sidewalks: Each individual unit shall have a 4 ft. min. sidewalk connecting the front porch to the public sidewalk (no shared sidewalks).

ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS:

Building Height: 2.5 stories max. (from the street); no point of the structure extending above 35 ft. (Tall floor-to-floor heights are encouraged).
Individual Unit Width: 16 ft. min.; 24 ft. max.
Roof Massing: All dwelling units shall have at least one gable or dormer facing the public street and all roofs shall have a 12" min. overhang. Roof massing should be used to delineate each unit from one another.
Roof Pitch: Roof pitches shall be between 6/12 and 16/12 (porch roofs and non-visible areas may be less)
Front Porches: Each dwelling unit shall have front porches or stoops that are at least 6 ft. wide and 6 ft. deep (wrap-around porches encouraged on corner lots).
Front Doors/Stairs: Each dwelling unit shall have a front door that faces the public street.
Finished Floor Height: 30 in. above grade min. (exceptions considered for accessibility reqs.)
Acceptable Siding Materials: Wood, synthetic wood board, stone, brick, stucco (horizontal patterns only).
Discouraged Siding Materials: Vinyl, block, synthetic stucco, metal, plastic, plywood.
Acceptable Roofing Materials: Asphalt shingles only (no metal, rolled or built-up roofs)
Chimneys: Shall be faced in stone, brick or stucco.
Fenestration: 30% min. of the front facade shall be fenestrated.
INTENT:
New multifamily housing that is compatible with the existing fabric of the community and that promotes a walkable environment.

LOT LAYOUT STANDARDS:
Lot Width: 50 ft. min.; no max.
Lot Depth: Varies, 85 ft. min.
Side Setbacks: 0 ft. min. (20’ ft. min adjacent to single-family attached or detached housing)
Rear Setbacks: 6 ft. min. (incl. accessory structures)
Front Build-To Zone: Front facades shall fall within the first 15’ (variations within this zone along the facade and among buildings is encouraged).
Minimum Unit Counts: For each contiguous development property, new multifamily housing shall contain at least 8 units.
Parking Counts: 2 spaces per dwelling unit max. in off-street locations.
Off-Street Parking Areas: Parking areas shall be located in the rear yard only (no front yard locations).
On-Street Parking Areas: The provision of on-street parking is strongly encouraged and should be used to reduce the overall demand for off-street parking.
Driveways/Shared Alleys: All new multifamily developments shall be required to share parking access through the use of a shared alley or drive (min. 12’ wide). Alleys/drives may be one-way or two-way. To the extent possible, alleys shall be accessed via the side of the block. Where not possible (i.e., infill development in block interiors), alleys shall be accessed via the primary street but shall have no more than 2 curb cuts.
Garages/Accessory Structures: Shall be provided only along the rear of the main buildings and shall only be accessed via a shared alley or drive (no front-facing garages).
Block-Edge: buildings should be laid out so as to clearly define the block edge.
Sidewalks: Each individual building shall have a 6 ft. min. sidewalk connecting the entry way to the public sidewalk.
Utility/Refuse Areas: Shall be screened from public view.
Perimeter Fencing: Is not allowed except between and connecting to structures (if gated).
Pedestrian Layout: Structures shall be laid out in such a manner that it is easy for pedestrians to reach the public sidewalk through frequent gaps between structures.

ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS:
Building Height: 3 stories max. (from the street); no point of the structure extending above 45 ft. (tall floor-to-floor heights are encouraged).
Building Massing: Structures shall be designed so as to not overwhelm nearby single-family housing (i.e., frequent/smaller structures rather than fewer/longer structures); no structure shall be longer than 100’.
Roof Massing: All structures shall at least 2 gables or dormers facing the public street and all roofs shall have a 12” min. overhang.
Roof Pitch: Roof pitches shall be between 6/12 and 16/12 (porch roofs and non-visible areas may be less).
Front Porches/Stoops: Shall be incorporated into every structure and be at least 6 ft. wide and 6 ft. deep (wrap-around porches encouraged on corner locations).
Finished Floor Height: 30 in. above grade min. (exceptions considered for accessibility reas.)
Acceptable Siding Materials: Wood, synthetic wood board, stone, brick, stucco (horizontal patterns only).
Discouraged Siding Materials: Vinyl, block, synthetic stucco, metal, plastic, plywood.
Acceptable Roofing Materials: Asphalt shingles only (no metal, rolled or built-up roofs).
Chimneys: Shall be faced in stone, brick or stucco.
Fenestration: 30% min. of the front facade shall be fenestrated.
Front setbacks of new commercial buildings should be aligned with existing buildings to create a clearly defined edge. In the absence of an existing setback line, front setbacks along non-arterial roads should be no more than 25 ft. away from the curb (i.e. build-to line).

Shared parking for different tenants and uses is strongly encouraged to minimize the overall supply of parking.

Setback variations to accommodate outdoor cafes / dining are allowed but should be kept to a minimum.

Distinctive architectural treatments / massing on corner lot buildings (on major retail or gateway nodes) is strongly encouraged.

Parking lots, decks and building service areas should be located away from the view of primary streets and accessed via alleys or side streets, whenever possible.

All surface parking lots and decks should be clearly marked and accessible from primary streets.

On-street parallel parking is encouraged whenever possible and appropriate.

A zero setback is promoted in the retail nodes such as Main Street where high pedestrian activity is expected or encouraged.

Single-family areas should be screened from non-residential areas with an 8’ wide (min.) landscaped buffer.

All parking lots/decks shall be located within block interiors to minimize their visual impact and should be well landscaped.
All new residential buildings should be of historically compatible design in terms of architectural style, details and materials.

Front Doors should be visible from the street.

Front porches should be included as a design feature as frequently as possible.

Roofs of new infill housing units should be of simple form and consistent with existing historic housing. Roofs should have a pitch of at least 8 inches for every 12 inches and an overhang of at least 12” wide.

Windows should be of vertical proportions (double-hung windows). Shutters should be sized to match the proportions of the windows.

The use of architectural details is strongly encouraged.

The use of decorative features such as bay windows and brackets is encouraged.

Multi-family housing should be of an appropriate scale and historic character in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood.
The architectural design, details and materials of new non-residential buildings should be compatible with existing adjacent structures.

Non-residential buildings should be constructed of brick, stone, or other high-quality finishes. Exposed concrete blocks or metal sided buildings are strongly discouraged.

Business signs incorporated on building facades are recommended (rather than monument signs). Wall signs perpendicular to building face that are more visible for pedestrians are strongly recommended.

Commercial buildings offering a mix of compatible uses (i.e. office or residential above ground floor retail) are strongly encouraged.

Building facades should be articulated with canopies, porches, cornices, roof lines and window details to avoid monotonous blank facades.

Commercial buildings should include large storefront windows and awnings or canopies to encourage active pedestrian use.

All new non-residential buildings should address the street. Main entries should be oriented toward major streets.

Canopies and awnings may extend over the public sidewalk provided obstructions are kept to a minimum clear height of 8’.

Active public uses such as retail shops and outdoor cafes are encouraged on the ground floor of buildings.
The streetscape should frame and offer a variety of experiences. In general, denser developments should be provided with wider sidewalks and more pedestrian amenities (such as benches, landscaping, etc.).

The nature and intensity of streetscape improvements may vary by street. However, a consistently designed set of materials should be utilized (street lights, benches, bike racks, trash receptacles, etc.).

For residential streets, sidewalks (6’ min.) should be separated from the roadway with a planting strip (3’ min.) which shall include street trees and street lights (where feasible).

For storefront streets, sidewalks should be provided with a clear zone (10’ min.) adjacent to the building face and a furniture zone (5’ min.) along the edge of the sidewalk where possible.

For more urban commercial areas, an additional transitional area (15’ max) can be provided for outdoor dining/terraces or public gathering.

Street intersections identified as major entry points into the neighborhood should be properly landscaped and signed to establish a visual gateway for motorists and pedestrians.

All new public spaces should be accessible from the street and/or the pedestrian greenway and linked via a network of pedestrian trails and walkways.

Public spaces should be well-lit, secure and provided with proper directional signage. Landscape design should consist of local flora.

Appropriate pedestrian amenities should be provided in public parks and open spaces. Amenities include gazebos, benches, grills, drinking fountains, play equipment, etc.
Typical street section for Alameda Street, Glenn Road and Greenacre Road.

The typical road section should include a 5'-00" minimum continuous sidewalk on one side of the street and a 22'-00" minimum roadway width.

Typical street section for the Allendale Lane Extension, the Webster Street Extension, the Beck Street Extension, Clark Street, the McCullough Street Extension and Roads A & B.

The typical road section should include a 6'-00" minimum continuous concrete sidewalk on both sides of the road with a 4'-00" planting area and a 22'-00" street right of way.

Typical street section for Rebecca Street.

The typical road section should include a 5'-00" minimum continuous sidewalk on one side of the street and a 22'-00" minimum roadway width.
INTRODUCTION

Background and Objectives

As part of the Urban Collage team, Robert Charles Lesser & Co., LLC (RCLCo) was retained by the City of Greenville and the Greenville Housing Authority to conduct an analysis of the rental and for-sale housing markets in and around the Nicholtown neighborhood. Nicholtown is a lower to moderate-income neighborhood a couple of miles east of Downtown Greenville that is home to Jesse Jackson Townhomes, a number of other rental apartments and rental and owner-occupied single-family homes. The proposed redevelopment of the Jesse Jackson Townhomes by the Greenville Housing Authority and the targeting of HOPE VI funds as part of this redevelopment are precipitating the study.

Our objective in this engagement is to conduct an analysis of the existing demand and supply conditions and trends, place the neighborhood in the context of these local trends and apply broader national trends to identify potential redevelopment opportunities in the Nicholtown of the community.

Methodology

To achieve this objective, RCLCo completed the following research and analytical steps:

1. Analyzed key demographic data both locally and nationally to characterize trends and conditions that may impact development opportunity;
2. Gained perspective on current conditions and trends in the for-sale and rental residential markets, in both Nicholtown itself and in-town Greenville;
3. Conducted interviews with residents, property owners, and real estate professionals such as builders and developers, to gain an understanding of perceptions of the study area, potential market or development opportunities and visions of what the study area could become;
4. Met with local officials including those from the Greenville Housing Authority, to gain an understanding of the current public housing situation in Greenville, the processes behind it, and the future vision for government assisted housing in Greenville;
5. Created an opportunity matrix, summarizing trends occurring in the study area, implications for the neighborhood, and the level of opportunity for future for-sale and rental residential land uses;
6. Tourd the Nicholtown neighborhood to identify key potential redevelopment sites to be used as a catalyst for future development; and
7. Participated in public input processes to gain additional input into identified opportunities and potential development locations.
CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS

The conclusions and recommendations presented in this report were reached based on our analysis of the information available to us from our own sources and from the client as of the date of this report. We assume that the information is correct, complete and reliable.

Our conclusions and recommendations are based on certain assumptions about the future performance of the global, national, and/or local economy, as well as that of the real estate market and on other factors similarly outside either our control or that of the client. To the best of our ability we analyzed trends and information available to us in drawing these conclusions and making the appropriate recommendations. However, due to the very fluid and dynamic nature of the economy and the real estate markets, it is critical to continually monitor the economy and the market, and to revisit the aforementioned conclusions and recommendations periodically to ensure that they stand the test of time.

We assume that in the future the economy and the real estate markets will grow at a stable and moderate rate. Often this assumption is made due to budget limitations that prevent us from delving deeper and/or more frequently into the economic forecast or the forecast of the real estate markets. History tells us that the economy is quite cyclical, and the real estate markets are typically very sensitive to these cycles. Our analysis does not take into account the potential negative impact that major economic "shocks" could have on the national and/or the local economy, and the residual impact on the real estate market and the competitive environment. We are currently in the midst of a mild economic slowdown, the timing, depth and duration of which is unknown.

Additionally, we assume that economic, employment and household growth will occur more or less in accordance with current expectations, as will other forecasts of trends and demographic and economic patterns. Along these lines, we are not taking into account any major shifts in the level of consumer confidence; in the cost of development and construction; in tax laws (i.e., we have assumed stable property and income tax rates, deductibility of mortgage interest, etc.); or in the availability and/or cost of capital and mortgage financing for real estate developers, owners and buyers. Should any of the above change, there is good reason to believe that this analysis should be updated, and the conclusions and recommendations summarized herein be reviewed accordingly (and possibly revised).

We also assume that competitive projects will be developed as planned (active and future), and that real estate demand will be met with a reasonable stream of supply offerings. Finally, we assume that major public works projects occur and are completed as planned.
STUDY AREA ASSESSMENT

A foundation to realizing potential development opportunities in the neighborhood is understanding the key strengths of the study area on which revitalization can be built and the key challenges that must be addressed. The following summarizes these strengths and challenges.

Key Neighborhood Strengths to Build On:

• Nicholtown is in close proximity to Downtown and South Main districts, both of which are experiencing significant revitalization and redevelopment;

• The areas surrounding the Nicholtown Neighborhood feature a mix of housing types and prices, including many high end neighborhoods;

• Nicholtown has strong access to large job centers, including Downtown;

• The community also features strong regional access via I-385 and I-85 and Greenville Transit;

• Demonstrated demand for infill residential is now being seen in Greenville market with the development of new residential product;

• The neighborhood is adjacent to Pleasantburg Drive, which is going through a revitalization process, and offers the potential to synthesize efforts and maximize benefit to both areas;

• Opportunities associated with the implementation of Jesse Jackson Townhomes, which may be redeveloped as a HOPE VI project, create significant momentum for redevelopment of the neighborhood; and

• Nicholtown has relatively good access to retail, including access to two grocery stores, drug stores and other neighborhood-oriented retail uses.

Key Challenges to Revitalization

While the above represent real building blocks for revitalization and redevelopment in the Nicholtown neighborhood, there are a number of issues that must be addressed for the neighborhood to realize its full potential. These include:

• Much of the Nicholtown neighborhood suffers from a perception, accurate or not, of high crime, disinvestment and poverty;

• Housing stock in the neighborhood ranges significantly in terms of quality and condition, with a number of properties being beyond repair;

• A high level of homes are renter occupied, resulting in a more limited sense of community and a decreased level of neighborhood sustainability;
A lack of access and connectivity of neighborhood and its surrounding uses, with the area being hidden or disconnected by creeks, a river, a wall and commercial development;

Adjacent neighborhoods that turn their backs on Nicholtown, disallowing it to associate with nearby amenities such as Cleveland Park;

The neighborhood lacks definition, with no visibility or frontage on Pleasantburg and no entrance feature;

While non-existent today, success could bring pressures for gentrification in parts of the neighborhood; and

The presence of many residents who are unable to afford substantial increases in home prices and rents without significant proactive policies on the part of local government and non-profit entities.

NATIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

There are a number of major demographic shifts occurring in the U.S. today and over the next 10 years that could impact development and revitalization opportunities in intown Greenville and the Nicholtown neighborhood. The following summarizes these larger trends and their potential impacts.

1. The Growth of Smaller Households: Nationally, between 1960 and 2000 one-person households grew from 13 percent to 26 percent of the nation’s households. Similarly, unmarried (roommate) households grew from 22 percent to 48 percent over the same time period. Going forward (see Figure 1), it is anticipated that much of the national household growth within the next 10 years will likely be the result of increases in non-family, one-person and two-person households, including married childless couples1. During that same time period (2000 to 2010), households classified as families with children are expected to decline in total numbers as Baby Boomers (now in their 40s and early 50s) transition to Empty Nesters and Generation X (those in their 30s and late 20s) defer starting families. These shifts are significant as singles and childless couples represent groups more readily attracted to smaller-lot single-family homes, attached townhouses and condominiums, and rental apartments; land uses typically found at infill locations (including intown Greenville) and products that would fit well into the Nicholtown Neighborhood.

---

1 Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
2. The Aging of the Baby Boomers: As the “Baby Boomer” generation continues to age, it is expected that over 50 percent of the National population will be over the age of 65 by the year 2020. From 2000 to 2010, the number of households over the age of 65 is expected to grow by close to 20%. This is again significant, as these aging households will increasingly seek locations and housing products that simplify their lifestyle and needs. This includes intown locations with shorter commutes, smaller homes and yards, proximity to retail and services, and other “ease of lifestyle” characteristics. Currently, Nicholtown has a high percentage of older residents.
3. Increasing Interest in New and Old Urbanism: Americans, including those in the Southeast, are increasingly interested in more walkable, neighborhood-scaled environments. Included in these are newer Traditional Neighborhood Developments (TNDs) in suburban areas as well as infill and revitalization projects in more mature areas. The previously aforementioned demographic shifts are feeding into this housing shift, the evidence of which can already be seen in new and revitalized housing product Downtown and in surrounding areas. Previous RCLCo and national research indicates demand for new or older urbanism from up to one-third of households in a market; far exceeding current supply of new product in the area.

The implications of these demographic shifts are wide and varied and tend to further support mixed-use development, specifically alternative housing options. Surveys indicate that many one and two-person households prefer housing other than traditional single-family detached products. Further, surveys have shown that ease of lifestyle, both in terms of location and housing product, becomes more significant for empty nesters and retirees. Taking advantage of these trends through the development of appropriate residential products and price points and neighborhood stabilization and revitalization should be a priority in the City’s efforts to revitalize Nicholtown.
DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

Not surprisingly, households in the Nicholtown study area are largely defined as lower-income households, with many earning below $25,000 annually. As shown in Figure 3 below, 50% of households in the neighborhood earn less than $20,000 annually and 60% earn below $25,000. These incomes are significant as they translate into home affordability. Homes being revitalized in the Greenville area are generally found as low as the mid $50’s and $60’s, generally requiring a household income of around $20,000 or more. New construction homes generally can be purchased in the mid $70’s and increase to the low $100’s, requiring minimum incomes of around $25,000 or more.

Assuming that approximately 30% of household income is spent on housing and that single-family housing products that are similar to those that could be offered in Nicholtown are selling for $50,000 (base price for renovated) and $80,000 (base price for new construction), home affordability can be computed. These study area incomes translate to 50% of the current population of the neighborhood being unable to afford renovated or in-fill new construction homes (most of whom live in Jesse Jackson Townhomes). Only 10% of households can afford to purchase renovated homes and 40% can afford to purchase new in-fill construction homes.

The Nicholtown study area is a somewhat older area when compared with the City of Greenville, with 35% of the population older than 55. These age distributions indicate a large number of older
retirees living in the area, including many retirees aging in existing public housing units and single-family homes in the neighborhood. Providing housing to meet this aging population, preferably within the Nicholtown neighborhood, should be a goal of this plan.

Figure 3: Nicholtown & Greenville Households by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Nicholtown Area</th>
<th>City of Greenville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>577, 16%</td>
<td>8,957, 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>488, 14%</td>
<td>9,165, 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>646, 18%</td>
<td>7,830, 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>578, 16%</td>
<td>7,274, 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>494, 14%</td>
<td>4,878, 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>756, 21%</td>
<td>7,962, 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,539</td>
<td>46,066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to 2002 US Census figures the Nicholtown study area contains 2,161 housing units. Of this total 89% are occupied, however, only 42% of these units are owner occupied while the remaining 58% are renter occupied. These figures for Nicholtown are not significantly lower than those for the City of Greenville in which 47% of the city’s housing units are owner occupied and 53% are renter occupied. They are, however, strikingly different from Greenville County, in which 68% of households own their own home and 32% rent.

Nicholtown’s housing situation has improved somewhat since 1990, with occupancies in the area rising approximately 3% and owner occupied units as a percentage of the neighborhood also increasing. Note the total units are not the same due to the change in census tracts for 2000.

Figure 4: Nicholtown Housing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>2955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>2719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSING MARKET OVERVIEW

For-Sale Market

In the past few years, single-family permits in the City of Greenville have grown steadily, while multifamily permits have been somewhat more sporadic and project-specific. The growth of single-family construction in the city, especially in 2003, is indicative of the trend towards moving intown. Multifamily permits are also showing activity, whereas in years past pertained only to large apartment communities. Albeit a modest amount, this intown permit activity is encouraging for the success of a redeveloping Nicholtown.

Figure 5: Building Permit Trends in The City of Greenville

Home sales in the Nicholtown neighborhood are generally more affordable than those found in Greenville overall. As shown in Figure 6, all homes sold in the Nicholtown in the past three years have been priced below $100,000, ranging in price from below $20,000 up to $100,000. Many of those sold on the lower end of the price spectrum are in modest condition and are in need of significant investment. Many of these units are also investor units and are thus renter-occupied. Providing new product in the neighborhood that is more consistent with the higher end of the
home sales spectrum will provide some upside potential for homeowners through increasing overall neighborhood housing values and thus owner equity.

**Figure 6:** Nicholtown Home Sales, 2000-2003

**Competitive Market Trends**

As shown by the permit data, the City of Greenville has not experienced a great deal of single-family home sales. In 2003, a few new infill communities have sprouted up, with a wide array of products offered. At the higher end of the spectrum, the Vineyards at North Main is an intimate street of 15 new single-family home just north of downtown. These home are being built in an existing stable neighborhood, and are priced in the mid $200s. The targeted audience for these homes is the empty nester. Another project with the average home price over $200,000 is Mill’s Mill. This is an old brick mill building being redeveloped into 105 loft units. The starting price of the lofts is $115,000, and goes all the way up to over $400,000. The loft units have sold very well, attracting mainly young singles and empty nesters. The success of this building, should it be maintained throughout the project, should spur other investment in older industrial and school buildings with a strong sense of character and architecture.

Poinsett Homes is offering new townhomes for $125,000 just off of Pelham Drive, a fairly short distance away from Nicholtown. These have been very well received by all market segments, and are on pace to sell almost 50 per year. Only a short walk away is another Poinsett community, Pelham Springs. Already sold out, it took just one year to sell 113 quadruplexes in this subdivision.
The quads ranged in price from the mid $150s to high $170s and buyers represented every market segment.

More comparable to the most likely product that will be offered in Nicholtown, Viola and Washington Pointe offer homes with some subsidy, such as a forgivable second mortgage or lot provided by the City. Viola, which began nine years ago, features homes priced around $100,000, and ranging in size from 1,100 to 1,400 square feet. The city offers a $25,000 forgivable second mortgage, making the home price closer to $75,000 if the purchaser stays in the home for 5 years. A new section of this subdivision has just opened up with 37 lots. Finally, Washington Point is a 25 lot community which has been selling since 1998. Homes here range from $70,000 to $83,000 and average 1,200 square feet in size. These homes are offered below market due to the fact that the City of Greenville provides the lots at no charge.

Initial Market Opportunity

The for-sale housing market strategy for Nicholtown should be the development of housing priced closer to the top of the existing housing market in the neighborhood, with single-family homes priced between $80,000 to $100,000 and townhouses initially priced between $75,000 and $90,000. Over time, as the neighborhood stabilizes, these prices could and should gradually increase as well to provide increased equity for homeowners. At the recommended price points, new housing could be affordable to 40% of Nicholtown residents as well as new residents seeking moderately-priced housing intown. Given our neighborhood housing characteristics and demographic and larger trends being seen in intown Greenville, opportunities appear fairly strong to develop new for-sale single-family homes and townhomes in Nicholtown.

Possible sites for these projects include:

- The vacant land behind Beck Academy, which could include single-family homes;
- The six dilapidated homes on Hilton Street, a suitable site for a small single-family or townhouse project;
- Sections of Jesse Jackson Townhomes or Roosevelt Heights, offered for sale either through HOPE VI or City of Greenville subsidies.

Estimated For-Sale Demand Potential

Utilizing the neighborhood strengths and challenges, demographics and competitive housing market situations, RCLCo created a statistical demand analysis to estimate demand potential for new for-sale products in the city and in Nicholtown. Demand from three primary sources was incorporated into this analysis, including new household growth in the city and county, city owner households turning over in the market, and city renter households converting to homeownership. Based on these sources, we estimate demand exists for approximately 130 homes per year priced from $45,000 to $150,000 within the city. Given the limited supply of housing in the city
currently, a capture rate of 40% was assumed for homes priced between $45,000 and $105,000, and tapering off to 15% above $105,000, as the challenges facing Nicholtown limit its market attractiveness to those with more homebuying options. This translates into potentially 36 homes a year that could be absorbed in Nicholtown.

**Figure 7:** Estimated Annual Demand for New For-Sale Housing in Nicholtown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Affordable Home Price</th>
<th>Annual Demand Potential</th>
<th>Potential Capture Rate</th>
<th>Nicholtown Capture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $45,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 - $75,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $105,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$105,000 - $150,000</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 - $225,000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$225,000+</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>262</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rental Apartments

The in-town Greenville apartment market is the smallest in the Greenville area and consists of mainly older stock. There are approximately 1,400 units that make up the market, and as of May of 2003 have a vacancy rate of 9.9%, the lowest of any submarkets in Greenville. Given the record-low mortgage rates of the past several years, this occupancy rate is considered quite healthy. Rental rates have fallen slightly since the same time last year, with average rent for a one bedroom unit at $450; 2 bedrooms $524; and three bedrooms at $697. No new product has been built in the area since 1996, indicating potential latent demand for new rental apartment product. Only one new market-rate rental apartment community is being developed in the in-town area; Wachovia Place in Downtown, where rents range from $1,000 for a one bedroom to over $2,000 for a two bedroom unit.

![Figure 8: Rental Apartment Vacancies, Central Greenville Submarket; 2001 to 2003](source: Carolinas Real Data)

To understand the condition of the in-town rental apartment market, 12 rental apartment communities were profiled. These communities include apartments located within just a few miles of Nicholtown. Of these, most are over 20 years old and feature standard amenities such as a clubhouse, pool, tennis, fitness and playground. Average price per square foot is around $.60, although newer complexes, such as Stonesthrow or The Preserve at Wood Lake, average closer to $.80 per square foot. The chart on the next page shows prices compared to square footages, broken out by unit type.
The newest community in the area is the Preserve at Wood Lake, located near the Downtown Airport. It was built in 1996 and is currently at 85% occupancy. The lower than average occupancy could be due to the high prices per square foot at this complex. Ranging from $0.78 to $0.96, they are the highest rents in the area. Closer to Nicholtown is Stonesthrow, built in 1990. Although the prices per square feet are substantially lower than the Preserve, $.050 to $0.78, the community is currently 98% occupied. Of the 388 units, 42% are one-bedroom, 46% are two-bedroom, and 11% are three-bedroom units.

In Nicholtown itself, Roosevelt Heights is priced below any other comparable in the area. Built in 1950, all units are either one or two bedrooms and are relatively small, ranging from 548 to 663 square feet. According to Carolina’s Real Data, the complex is currently at 88% occupancy, although local sources claim in reality occupancy is much lower. Roosevelt Heights is in rough shape and creates an eyesore for Nicholtown’s residents, begging for redevelopment or demolition.

Arcadia Hills HOPE VI Project

Currently under way just north of the Nicholtown Neighborhood is Greenville’s newest HOPE VI project, Arcadia Hills. What were once 340 units of public housing known as Woodland-Pierce Homes, is now a charming community of for-rent housing, to be followed by for-sale units. There are 48 rental homes in the first phase (nearing completion), ranging in size from 640 to 1350 square feet. The one-bedroom homes are renting for $404, two bedrooms for $468, and three
bedrooms from $569. The next step for Arcadia Hills is to offer for-sale homes, which will be priced form $60,000 to $90,000 depending on number of bedrooms. Additionally, public housing and tax credit units will be offered, and townhomes will be offered in the future as well. All in all, 34 public housing units, 48 tax credit units, 95 for-sale market rate homes and 38 townhomes (mix of tax credit and market rate) will be built at Arcadia Hills. The initial success of Arcadia Hills offers insight into potential demand for a redeveloped Jesse Jackson Townhomes, which, if awarded a HOPE VI grant, would have a profound impact on the Nicholtown neighborhood.

Market Opportunity

The development of rental housing in and around the Nicholtown area appears to be a positive short-term opportunity. Nearly all of the in-town product in Greenville is comprised of aging garden-style apartments, with few modern choices for renters. Suburban apartment communities are also all garden-style apartments. This creates several opportunities in the Nicholtown neighborhood:

- Development of mixed-income and affordable housing, including housing for those earning 50% to 60% of the area’s median income, which could occur within the Jesse Jackson Townhome redevelopment as well as a renovated Roosevelt Heights; and
- Market rate, more urban-scale rental apartments, possibly integrated as part of a mixed-use project, likely to be located closer to Pleasantburg Drive.

Target market audiences include existing Jesse Jackson renters, neighborhood and area residents residing in aging, sometimes substandard apartment units, Greenville Tech students and aging Nicholtown and area residents represent opportunities for seniors housing. Finally, a more urban project, possibly developed with some first-floor retail, could attract professionals working in Downtown Greenville or along Pleasantburg Drive and I-385.

The achievable rents for these projects varies, with the mixed-use fronting Pleasantburg charging a premium to the immediate area, and the redevelopment projects a slight discount. Nonetheless, approximate rents could range from $450 for a one-bedroom unit up to $700 for a three-bedroom unit, with two-bedroom units achieving around $525. Once these or similar projects are implemented, they will give Nicholtown a great sense of optimism and change. While maintaining its cultural heritage, the new housing stock will assure residents they can remain living in the neighborhood they grew up in as a child.

Rental Apartment Demand

As noted in the opportunity section above, demand for new rental apartments is assumed to emanate from existing Greenville renters in turnover, including those either in financial distress (likely seeking subsidized units) or those living in older units with some physical condition where the unit is somewhat functionally obsolete.

As shown in Figure 10, approximately 5,000 rental households are in turnover each year in Greenville. The choices for many of these renters, which are dominated by households earning
less than $30,000 annually (able to afford no more than $600 per month in rent without financial distress), are older rental apartments in varying condition. Approximately 1,800 of these renters, in fact, are either in financial distress or living in units with physical conditions as defined by the U.S. Census (equating to 36% of all rental units in Greenville). Assuming a 5% to 10% capture of these households by price point, new rental product in Nicholtown priced largely below $800 in monthly rent should be able to achieve annual absorption paces in excess of 100 units.

Figure 10: Estimated Demand Potential for New Rental Units in Nicholtown

The market becomes more competitive when examining capture potential for the remaining 1,866 units turning over annually. Many of these units that are not in financial or physical distress are occupied by medium to higher-income renters with more choices in the market. Given the current state of the Nicholtown neighborhood and the relative unattractiveness of Pleasantburg Drive, achieving rents above $1,000 per month is very unlikely in the short-term. Assuming captures of approximately 5% of non-distressed renters in turnover, new rental apartment product in Nicholtown could conservatively achieve annual absorption paces of 75 units annually. To the extent a truly unique project is developed, and areas along Pleasantburg Drive enhanced, achievable absorption levels could exceed these amounts.

One demand source not fully explored to date is students at Greenville Tech. There are approximately 9,500 students on-site, with 3,900, or 41%, being full-time students. Assuming some doubling-up of students (roommates), we estimate there are 2,600 student households in Greenville. Holding renter propensity constant with the greater population of the city, we can safely assume up to 55% of students are renters, or 1,430 rental households. Even if only one in ten had an interest in living close to campus, and affordable housing options existed, potential demand of 143 rental units exist today. These units could be located somewhere around campus, including the fringes of the Nicholtown neighborhood; a potential opportunity for redevelopment.
Against this background, we believe that, if a comprehensive plan is undertaken for the Nicholtown neighborhood, and Jesse Jackson Townhomes were redeveloped, there are significant redevelopment opportunities in the neighborhood for both for-sale and rental product. Product developed in the neighborhood should be moderately priced, generally staying below other area market-rate projects, and comparable to slightly above other subsidized housing endeavors intown. A goal should be to enhance the quality of the neighborhood through new housing development, while positioning this new housing in a manner that allows it to be both affordable to existing residents, yet creates upside equity through increased property values.

There are several major issues or factors that must be addressed to enhance these opportunities. Key factors that should be addressed include:

- Enhancing the connectivity of the neighborhood to surrounding neighborhoods and areas via sidewalks, trails and perhaps new streets;
- Creating more park and greenway orientations, taking advantage of the creek system in the neighborhood;
- Creating a “front door” to Nicholtown on Pleasantburg Drive via the redevelopment of older, underdeveloped commercial properties on Pleasantburg and the development of higher-density residential along a new entry street into the neighborhood;
- Pursuing development of portions of the Beck Academy fields or adjacent vacant properties for housing;
- Redeveloping Jesse Jackson Townhomes into a higher-quality, mixed-income community similar to Arcadia Hills; and
- Providing infill housing opportunities throughout the neighborhood.

For-sale products recommended in the neighborhood include a mix of single-family detached homes and attached townhouses. Initially, we recommend single-family homes priced from $80,000 to $100,000 and attached townhouses priced from $75,000 to $90,000. It may be necessary to first establish new single-family development, paired with infrastructure improvements (possibly including a green or small park), prior to developing new attached townhouses.

As noted earlier, rental product should range in price from $450 for a market-rate one-bedroom unit to $750 for a market-rate three-bedroom unit. Interior product in the neighborhood, including portions of Jesse Jackson and Roosevelt Heights, should target more affordable renters, including those earning between 50% and 60% of the area’s median income. Product on the fringes of the neighborhood, including redevelopment product along Pleasantburg, should look somewhat more urban and intense in character than typical garden-style apartments and, if possible, should incorporate some ground floor retail. These apartments should be marketed toward intown workers and/or Greenville Tech students. Regardless, City involvement will likely be needed to...
spur redevelopment via parcel assemblage. Greenville Tech participation will be required for any new student housing endeavors and, given the nature of student housing, pricing and unit mixes and sizes will need to be independently studied.

Several projects have been recommended as part of the larger Nicholtown Master Plan. The following summarizes these projects and RCLCo recommended unit pricing for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Price Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beck/City Property</td>
<td>30 – 40 Single-Family Homes</td>
<td>$90,000 - $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Heights</td>
<td>30 – 35 Single-Family Homes</td>
<td>$80,000 - $90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 – 120 Rental Apartments</td>
<td>$425 - $700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Jackson Redevelopment</td>
<td>208 Flats (Market Portion)</td>
<td>$475 - $750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 Townhouses</td>
<td>$75,000 - $85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73 Single-Family Homes</td>
<td>$90,000 - $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattered Neighborhood Product</td>
<td>50 – 70 Single-Family Homes</td>
<td>$75,000 - $85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 – 50 Single-Family Rehab</td>
<td>$60,000 - $70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 – 50 Rental Duplexes</td>
<td>$550 (2BR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Rehab Rental Apartments</td>
<td>Depends on unit size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This engagement was conducted by Adam Schwegman, Associate, under the direction of Todd Noell, Vice President. If you have any questions regarding the conclusions and recommendations included herein, or wish to learn about other RCLCo advisory services, please call (404) 365-9501.
GENERAL LIMITING CONDITIONS

Every reasonable effort has been made to insure that the data contained in this study reflect the most accurate and timely information possible and it is believed to be reliable. This study is based on estimates, assumptions and other information developed by RCLCo from its independent research effort, general knowledge of the industry and consultations with the Client and its representatives. No responsibility is assumed for inaccuracies in reporting by the Client, its agent and representatives or any other data source used in preparing or presenting this study. This report is based on information that was current as of November 2003, and RCLCo has not undertaken any update of its research effort since such date.

Our report may contain prospective financial information, estimates or opinions that represent our view of reasonable expectations at a particular point in time, but such information, estimates or opinions are not offered as predictions or as assurances that a particular level of income or profit will be achieved, that events will occur or that a particular price will be offered or accepted. Actual results achieved during the period covered by our prospective financial analysis may vary from those described in our report and the variations may be material. Therefore, no warranty or representation is made by RCLCo that any of the projected values or results contained in this study will actually be achieved.

Possession of this study does not carry with it the right of publication thereof or to use the name of "Robert Charles Lesser & Co., LLC" or "RCLCo" in any manner without first obtaining the prior written consent of RCLCo. No abstracting, excerpting or summarization of this study may be made without first obtaining the prior written consent of RCLCo. This report is not to be used in conjunction with any public or private offering of securities or other similar purpose where it may be relied upon to any degree by any person other than the Client without first obtaining the prior written consent of RCLCo. This study may not be used for any purpose other than that for which it is prepared or for which prior written consent has first been obtained from RCLCo.
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Town green with combination green space and hardscapes.
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Large open space/field for festivals and recreation.
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Wide sidewalks with glass-front retail and street trees.
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Wide sidewalks with glass-front retail and street trees.
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Large community park with walking trails and open space for recreation.
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**OPEN SPACE**

Recreation fields.
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**OPEN SPACE**

Small, landscaped pocket parks.
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Neighborhood playground.
CIRCULATION
Neighborhood street.
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CIRCULATION
Public transit.
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CIRCULATION
Public transit waiting area.
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CIRCULATION
Residential streets with on-street parking.
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CIRCULATION
Wide sidewalks with a variety of paving types and pedestrian-scale street lights.
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CIRCULATION
On-street bike lanes.
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CIRCULATION
Clearly delineated pedestrian crosswalks.
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CIRCULATION
Bus stop.
SURVEY RANK: 3.3

CIRCULATION
Pedestrian-only nature trails and bike paths.
SURVEY RANK: 3.5

CIRCULATION
Traffic circles.
SURVEY RANK: 3.0

CIRCULATION
Brick crosswalks & intersections.
SURVEY RANK: 3.3
CIRCULATION

Neighborhood gateway/marker.

SURVEY RANK: 4.0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision: survey results</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>demographics of survey participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 38% live in Nicholtown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 23% work in Nicholtown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 7% shop in Nicholtown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 32% own property in Nicholtown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>length of years in Nicholtown</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 40% less than 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 60% 10+ years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>age of survey participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 9% 21 - 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 40% 36 - 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 32% 51 - 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 19% 65+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gender of participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 48% male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 52% female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>type of new housing appropriate for JJT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 34% single family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 16% townhomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 15% duplex/quad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>strategy to make attached housing compatible with neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 43% design homes to look like single family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>appropriate price range for new housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 67% less than $100K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 24% $100K – $150K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>appropriate location for new commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 64% pleasantburg dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 28% on corners in neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>types of commercial desired for neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- grocery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sit down restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- dry cleaners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- book store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sandwich shop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>type of institutions desired in neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- day care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- senior center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recreation center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>appropriate location for new open space</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- near reedy river</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision:</td>
<td>Survey Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of open space desired in neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>Recreation areas, passive green space, walking/biking trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of open space desired for JJT</strong></td>
<td>Community garden, cookout areas, paths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision:</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where is the most traffic congestion?</strong></td>
<td>JJT, Rebecca/Dino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate method to reduce traffic congestion</strong></td>
<td>Congestion not a problem, signal timing, build new roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision:</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most dangerous place for pedestrians to cross</strong></td>
<td>Ackley/Rebecca, Pleasantburg Dr., McAllister Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements to public transit</strong></td>
<td>More bus stops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision:</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needed improvements for pedestrians</strong></td>
<td>More sidewalks, better lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place with strongest sense of identity</strong></td>
<td>Beck Academy, Churches, Phillis Wheatley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision:</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What can enhance the character of Nicholtown?</strong></td>
<td>More landscaping, decorative lighting, more sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What income levels should new residents be?</strong></td>
<td>47% ensure mix of incomes, 43% concentrate on affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abermanibie</td>
<td>Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acker</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acker</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acker</td>
<td>Jennie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackie</td>
<td>Maurice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker White</td>
<td>Dayatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banity</td>
<td>Christine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barger</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeks</td>
<td>Larry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belcher</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone</td>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blulutone</td>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen</td>
<td>Harry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Wilhon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Beverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Wilburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruster</td>
<td>Beverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck</td>
<td>Camille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck</td>
<td>Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>Micheal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Debi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Grady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Brody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Lowra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Grady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butt</td>
<td>Jason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byers</td>
<td>Nonna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byers</td>
<td>Donna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>Harold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castice</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>Camille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement</td>
<td>Becky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin</td>
<td>Heather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Jimmy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Timmy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>Edward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby</td>
<td>Mildred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curti</td>
<td>Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Beatrice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Stan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Stan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Walter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Stan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard</td>
<td>Chandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard</td>
<td>Vera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogan</td>
<td>Latoya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>