

Greenville County Planning and Development Committee Minutes
August 3, 2026, at 5:00 p.m.
Council Committee Room at 301 University Ridge, Greenville, SC 29601

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, notice of the meeting date, time, place, and agenda was posted online, at 301 University Ridge, Greenville, and made available to the newspapers, radio stations, television stations, and concerned citizens.

Members Present: R. Bradley, Chairman; B. Blount; A. Mitchell; C. McGahhey; E. Fant

Members Absent:

Councilors Present:

Planning Commission Present: E. Sternberg; C. Parham; D. Franklin

Staff Present: D. Carlile; C. Plumbee; T. Baxley; D. Sanders; J. Henderson; J. Hanna; A. Price

1. Call to Order

Chairman Bradley called the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m.

2. Invocation

Mr. Bradley provided the invocation.

3. Approval of the minutes of the July 13, 2026, Committee meeting

Motion: by Mr. McGahhey, to approve the minutes of the July 13, 2026, Committee meeting, as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

4 CZ-2026-0031

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2026-031.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed amendment would increase watershed protections for the Mountain Creek area, which are major concerns for the local citizens. The community is concerned that the increase in impervious development and loss of vegetated areas along wetlands and streams could worsen flood events. Staff does, however, recommend revisions to the version of the text amendment which was initiated at the Planning & Development Committee. These revisions are to better align the language of the proposed Section 8:13 with existing language in the County's Land Development Regulations and Stormwater Ordinance. They would also clarify the variance process from these requirements.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the proposed text amendment, with the submitted revisions.

Discussion: Mr. Baxley provided context on the overlay district guidelines, including a 100-foot riparian buffer and stormwater standards designed to hold a 100-year storm event. He explained that staff's revisions establish reviewable planting metrics for the 50-foot perimeter buffer and align vocabulary directly with the county's core stormwater ordinance to prevent legal contradictions. He noted that the Planning Commission voted to approve the text with one added amendment: removing staff's proposed two-year sunset clause.

Mr. Blount noted opposition to sunset clauses because future councils or changing staff groups might forget to track them. He asked if a set review could simply be placed directly on the calendar instead. Mr. Henderson mentioned that the ordinance could easily be amended to mandate a structural revisit within 6 to 18 months, which would grant security to staff without letting the rules expire.

Mr. Mitchell recommended taking out the sunset clause entirely and substituting a formalized review period. Mr. Blount asked for confirmation that the Planning Commission suggested taking out the sunset clause. Mr. Baxley confirmed they did and read the current layout text aloud, noting it matched old riparian buffer structures where rules completely expire in two years unless Council takes direct action to readopt them. Mr. Blount noted that the public explicitly wants this protection to remain firmly in place for longer than two years, meaning it needs standard success tracking text instead of an expiration trigger.

Mr. McGahhey urged his colleagues to kill the sunset option immediately. He warned that developers would simply stall their major pipeline filings for 12 months to outwait the overlay, reverting automatically to laxer historic standards. He moved to strike the clause, arguing that if a piece of regulation has a flaw, the committee should explicitly vote to fix the product rather than killing the entire framework through a sunset.

Mr. Blount questioned if this was the appropriate time to legally introduce the motion. Mr. Henderson noted that while the base packet included the sunset clause, the Planning Commission's recommended text package had already deleted it. Mr. Henderson stated that if the committee wanted to inject a brand-new review window back into the text, a fresh motion would be required.

Mr. McGahhey pointed out that the physical text layout sitting in front of them still explicitly contained the two-year expiration language in the very first paragraph, meaning it had not yet been physically excised from the document they were voting on. Ms. Plumblee suggested that the text could proceed forward to the full council with an attached recommendation to drop it. Mr. McGahhey strongly objected, asserting that committees possess the absolute procedural power to amend any ordinance directly before it leaves the room, rather than relying on full council floor procedures. Ms. Plumblee noted that because it is a formal text amendment, the committee's vote serves strictly as a recommendation package to the full council, meaning any internal shifts still function as a collective "recommendation as amended". Mr. Henderson cited Article 3:27 of the Zoning Ordinance to verify that the final product moving to Council reflects what the committee endorses.

Mr. McGahhey clarified that when the package lands on the council floor, the controversial expiration sentence must be completely removed from the face of the draft so council members only vote on the final endorsed product. Mr. Baxley explained that because the sunset clause was embedded in the original public notice draft rather than a fresh staff revision, a total elimination of the concept in committee might legally trigger a mandatory new public hearing requirement before full council adoption

Motion: by Mr. McGahhey, to amend CZ-2026-032 to remove the sunset clause language. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote

Motion: by Mr. McGahhey, to approve CZ-2026-032 as amended and forward to full council. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote

CZ-2026-032

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2026-032.

The subject property, zoned C-1, Commercial District, is located along Renfrew Avenue, a two-lane County-maintained local road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to the I-1, Industrial District would be consistent with similar zoning in the area, and would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding properties.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to the I-1, Industrial District.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Fant, to approve CZ-2026-032. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2026-033

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2026-033.

The subject property, zoned R-15, Single-Family Residential District, is located along Highway 14, a three-lane State-maintained arterial road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to the C-1, Commercial District would not be consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan future land use designation of *Suburban Neighborhood*, nor would it be consistent with similar zoning in the area.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the requested rezoning to C-1, Commercial District.

Discussion: Mr. Mitchell stated he has concerns regarding traffic entrance and egress on the Highway 14 property, noting he was prepared to vote against the application regardless of the outcome.

Chairman Bradley asked if this property belonged to the tax attorney seeking a new office, and if they tried for a different zoning district. Mr. Baxley confirmed it was, adding that they originally aimed for an OD (Office District) classification. However, because the historical layout could not satisfy standard OD setback thresholds, they opted for C-1. He stated the applicant has since approached the Board of Zoning Appeals for variances and plans to retry for the OD in the future.

Mr. McGahhey asked if the applicant wanted the committee to hold the case until the appeals board ruled. Mr. Baxley answered no, stating that if the committee denies C-1 today, the applicant can immediately resubmit a new OD request because it functions as a more restrictive classification.

Motion: by Mr. Fant, to deny CZ-2026-033. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2026-036

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2026-036.

The subject parcel zoned C-3, Commercial District, is located along Interstate 185, a four-lane State-maintained Interstate. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to I-1, Industrial District would

be consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan future land use designation of *Industrial*. The requested district would also be consistent with similar zoning in the area.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to I-1, Industrial District.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Fant, to approve CZ-2026-036. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2026-037

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2026-037.

The subject parcel zoned I-1, Industrial District, is located along Grove Reserve Parkway, a five-lane County-maintained minor collector road. Staff is of the opinion that while the requested zoning district may not be consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan future land use designation of *Industrial*, a successful rezoning to C-2, Commercial District would be consistent with the South Greenville Area Plan future land use designation of *Commercial*. The requested district would also be consistent with similar zoning in the area.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to C-2, Commercial District.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Fant, to approve CZ-2026-037. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2026-038

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2026-038.

The subject parcel zoned C-3, Commercial District, is located along Interstate 185, a four-lane State-maintained Interstate. Staff is of the opinion that while the requested zoning district may not be consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan future land use designation of *Industrial*, a successful rezoning to C-2, Commercial District would be consistent with the South Greenville Area Plan future land use designation of *Commercial*. The requested district would also be consistent with similar zoning in the area.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to C-2, Commercial District.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. McGahhey, to approve CZ-2026-038. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2026-039

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2026-039.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed text amendment would reduce the frequency of Use by Special Exception requests submitted to the Board of Zoning Appeals for home-based businesses by adding some of the more commonly requested businesses to the permitted use table. This would create more opportunities for citizens looking to start a home-based business while also reducing the added time and cost associated with going to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Based on these reasons, Staff recommends approval of the proposed text amendment.

Discussion: Mr. Blount expressed concern regarding the generic classification of "artists," noting that an individual building heavy rebar art structures on an 80-acre lot shouldn't face the same parcel caps as an urban site. He asked if this item should go back to the Planning Commission for rural scaling fixes.

Mr. Bradley expressed similar concerns, emphasizing that the code is scaled for more urban properties rather than considering rural residents who live half a mile off the street and park their cars out of view. Mr. Henderson explained that the structural client caps are fueled by occupant building codes rather than on-street parking.

Mr. Mitchell asked if a non-paid trade student or intern would count against the single permitted non-resident employee cap. Mr. Henderson answered yes, clarifying that if an assistant is helping execute the trade operations on site, they fall under the employee cap. Mr. Henderson added that commercial agriculture is already permitted outright in RS districts and above, meaning rural farmers do not need to utilize the home occupation rules to grow crops.

Mr. Blount asked how the county plans to handle existing home operations that currently host 7 or more active clients. He questioned if a grandfathering system exists. Mr. Henderson noted that the text doesn't contain a grandfather clause, but confirmed enforcement is complaint-driven.

Mr. Fant suggested passing the framework as-is rather than stalling it with tedious line amendments, noting they can easily clean up individual bugs later if citizen complaints pile up.

Mr. Henderson added that by removing original links to Section 12-1 parking codes, home businesses are saved from being legally forced to install concrete handicap ramps, expansive turning stalls, and commercial bathrooms.

Motion: by Mr. Fant, to approve CZ-2026-039. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2026-040

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2026-039.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed text amendment would provide a compromise between Council Members, Planning Commissioners, and citizens concerned with residential development, and private land owners and developers looking to utilize their property for these developments. The amendment would also consolidate the open space development options, creating more cohesive review criteria.

Based on these reasons, Staff recommends approval of the proposed text amendment.

Discussion: Mr. McGahhey praised the draft as an exceptional compromise that balanced intense developer, citizen, and workshop feedback over several months.

Mr. Blount stated that while he wouldn't block its passage today, he would actively vote "no" at full council unless amendments are added to fix the townhome rules. He stated his district is heavily overcrowded, and allowing areas to build 100% townhomes without coming before Council for a rezoning strips away public representation. Mr. Henderson clarified that the text does not give developers free rein to place townhomes anywhere. If the underlying layout zone explicitly restricts attached housing, a developer must still secure a full rezoning.

Mr. Fant asked when the committee could realistically review any townhome problems that surface down the line. Mr. Price noted that a mandatory 6-month review window is permanently written into the text, followed by mandatory 18-month reviews to clean up issues.

Motion: by Mr. McGahhey, to approve CZ-2026-040. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

5. **Adjourn**

Mr. McGahhey made a motion to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dakota Sanders
Dakota Sanders
Recording Secretary