

Greenville County Planning Commission Minutes
August 23, 2023 at 4:30 p.m.
Council Committee Room at County Square

Commissioners Present: S. Bichel, Chair; J. Bailey, Vice Chair; M. Shockley; J. Rogers; F. Hammond; J. Barbare; J. Wood

Commissioners Absent: M. Looper; J. Howard

County Councilors Present: None.

Staff Present: T. Coker; H. Gamble; R. Jeffers-Campbell; K. Walters T. Stone; J. Henderson; M. Staton; K. Mulherin; T. Baxley; IS Staff

1. Call to Order

Chairman Bichel called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

2. Invocation

Mr. Shockley provided the invocation.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the July 26, 2023 Commission Meeting

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve the minutes of the July 26, 2023 Commission meeting, as presented. The motion carried by voice vote.

4. Rezoning Requests

CZ-2023-052

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2023-052.

The subject parcel, zoned I-1, Industrial District, is located along Roper Mountain Road, a two to four-lane State-maintained arterial road and Snipes Road, a two-lane County-maintained Local road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to FRD, Flexible Review District would not be consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, which designates the majority of the parcel as *Industrial*. It would also be inconsistent with the Dublin Road Area Plan which also designates the parcel as *Industrial*. Furthermore, the Dublin Road Area Plan states that no increase in residential density is warranted without improvements to the area's infrastructure.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the requested rezoning to FRD, Flexible Review District.

Planning Commission added conditions

- Install SCDOT approved left turn lane onto Snipes Road.
- Use stormwater management to hold back the 100-year floodplain.
- Allocate right-of-way along Snipes Road for road improvements.

Discussion: Mr. Hammond asked staff to clarify the recommendation for infrastructure improvement within the Dublin Road Area Plan. Mr. Stone explained road improvements

were planned when the Dublin Road Area Plan was created. Mr. Stone stated some road improvements have been completed.

Mr. Bailey questioned if the nearby residents would want the parcel to have an industrial use instead of residential.

Mr. Shockley asked how old the Dublin Road Area Plan was. Mr. Baxley stated the most recent version is from 2018.

Al Cannaday explained in the year 2016, a rezoning resulted in the development of a commercial warehouse which upset residents of the Dublin Road area. Mr. Cannaday stated at the time, Councilor Barnes recommended Greenville County staff meet with local residents to come up with a plan for the vacant land in the area, which resulted in the Dublin Road Area Plan.

Mr. Bailey asked Mr. Cannaday, if the application was denied, was it his intention to see a factory on the parcel as opposed to residential development? Mr. Cannaday stated using the property for industrial or low density residential would be fine with the residents.

Mr. Hammond asked the applicant, Paul Harrison, to address stormwater concerns from the public hearing. Mr. Harrison stated they are willing to hold back up to the 100-year storm event to address the concerns and minimize stormwater run off from this site. Mr. Harrison explained they are only required to hold back up to the 25-year storm event. Mr. Hammond asked Mr. Harrison to explain the hold back difference between the 25-year and 100-year storm events. Mr. Harrison stated you would have more volume to detain water from storm events.

Mr. Hammond asked Mr. Harrison if they are improving the infrastructure. Mr. Harrison stated they will have to complete TIS recommendations and SCDOT recommendations. Mr. Harrison explained they could potentially provide road widening on Snipes Road if they could acquire the right-of-way.

Chairman Bichel asked the applicant to explain if they planned to rent to people only 55 and older or if they intended to revise their statement of intent. Deke Rochester explained through the fair housing act, you are allowed to restrict up to eighty percent of the property to a 55 and over renter. Mr. Rochester stated the point is to have no children on the property. Mr. Baxley clarified that the applicant's statement of intent states "The community will meet the Federal Housing Administration's requirements for an age-exclusive (55+) community under the Fair Housing Act Housing for Older Persons."

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve with conditions CZ-2023-052. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard)

CZ-2023-054

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2023-054.

The subject parcel, zoned R-7.5, Single-Family Residential District, is located along Gridley, Morris, and Bailey Streets which are all two-lane, County maintained local roads. Staff is of the opinion that a

successful rezoning to FRD, Flexible Review District would be consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan which designates the parcel as *Traditional Neighborhood*.

The development would have to meet the following conditions:

1. Submit a Final Development Plan for review and approval prior to the issuance of any land development or building permits.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to FRD, Flexible Review District with the aforementioned condition.

Discussion: Chairman Bichel asked if the applicant was going to maintain the income levels required for work-force housing. Mr. Henderson explained non-adherence would be recognized by a complaint, then the applicant would need to complete a minor or major change to the FRD.

Motion: by Mr. Wood, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve with condition CZ-2023-054. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard)

Mr. Rogers recused himself.

CZ-2023-055

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2023-055.

The subject parcels zoned R-S, Residential Suburban District are located along Brown Road, a two-lane, State-maintained arterial road, Highway 153, a two to three-lane, State-maintained arterial road, and Interstate 185 Exit 12 Ramp, a one-lane, State-maintained road. Staff is of the opinion that the requested rezoning to S-1, Services District would permit uses that would be consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan which designates the parcels as *Mixed Employment Center* and the South Greenville Area Plan, which designates the parcels as *Service/Industrial*. Additionally, Staff believes the permitted uses would not have an adverse impact on the current surrounding uses.

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

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve CZ-2023-055. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard) and one recused (J. Rogers)

Mr. Rogers returned.

CZ-2023-056

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2023-056.

The subject parcel, zoned PD, Planned Development District is located along Highway 14, a two to six-lane State-maintained arterial road and Vaughn Road, a two-lane County-maintained local road. Staff

is of the opinion that the requested rezoning to PD-MC, Planned Development Major Change, to revise the Statement of Intent altering the signage standards would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding properties.

The development would have to meet the following conditions:

1. Submit a Sign Permit Application for review.

Based on these reasons, Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to PD-MC, Planned Development District - Major Change.

Discussion: Chairman Bichel asked why this was a major change. Mr. Henderson stated it was an increase in signage.

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve with condition CZ-2023-056. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard)

CZ-2023-057

Mr. Baxley stated CZ-2023-057 had been withdrawn.

CZ-2023-058

Mr. Baxley introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2023-058.

The subject parcel, zoned R-R3, Rural Residential is located along Old Hundred Road, a two-lane State-maintained Collector road. Staff is of the opinion that while the requested rezoning to R-R1, Rural Residential, is not consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan with regards to permitted gross density, the request is consistent with surrounding parcel sizes in the area and would not create an adverse impact on surrounding properties.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to R-R1, Rural Residential District.

Discussion: Mr. Wood stated the residents worked hard to have R-R3 zoning and changing it to R-R1 seemed like spot zoning. Mr. Wood explained there had been talk of duplexes being built in the area. Mr. Wood recommended denial.

Mr. Henderson stated duplexes are not a permitted use in R-R1 or R-R3. Mr. Wood stated it was his understanding they were going to build it and ask for forgiveness later.

Mr. Bailey pointed out nearby smaller properties and stated building duplexes would be a violation issue.

Mr. Wood explained they need to address spot zoning now before the area changed due to high demand.

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Wood, to deny CZ-2023-058. The motion carried unanimously voice vote with five in favor (S. Bichel; J. Bailey; J. Wood; J. Barbare; J. Rogers) and two in opposition (F. Hammond; M. Shockley) with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard)

5. Preliminary Subdivision Applications

PP-2023-101 Traynham Place

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Traynham Place, a Mixed-Use Group Development under Condition 28 and Article 10 of the Greenville County Zoning Ordinance, located north of the intersection of Augusta Rd and Interstate 85 adjacent to the City of Greenville. The applicant is requesting a mixed-use group development with 0.88 acres of commercial area and 87 single-family attached lots at a density of 10.65 units/acre in the C-2, Commercial zoning district.

The project site is located within the Transitional character area of the Comprehensive Plan Transitional Corridors are older, primarily commercial corridors with a wide range of land uses and development patterns. These places developed in the first wave of automobile-oriented design, and currently consist of extensive surface parking, numerous vehicular curb cuts, and inconsistent development patterns. Older, underutilized sites are candidates for reuse and redevelopment with improved access management, higher quality architecture and site design, and more pedestrian-friendly building placement. The recommended density is 12-30 dwellings/acre. Traynham Place is proposing 10.65 dwellings/acre.

Staff recommends approval with conditions of the preliminary plan with the standard and specific requirements.

The approval conditions are as follows:

1. Please provide a revised Preliminary Plan by September 1, 2023 with the following revisions in accordance with the Approved Augusta Road Corridor Plan and comments from SCDOT:
 - Please show a 15-foot roadside buffer.
 - Please show pedestrian connection to parcel M015010200601.
 - Please show on plan that the proposed access is aligned with the existing commercial driveway on the opposite side of Augusta Road.
 - Please label ADA ramps on each side of the proposed access point.

Discussion: There were no speakers in opposition of the proposed subdivision.

There was one speaker in favor, Paul Harrison, the project engineer. Mr. Harrison stated the SCDOT comments had been addressed and he had no objection to staff's recommendations.

Chairman Bichel questioned the recently approved ordinance restricting residential use in C-2 zoning. Mr. Coker explained C-2 zoning can provide a mixed use but a certain percentage of commercial use would need to be allocated. Mr. Coker stated the application likely pre-dated the enactment of the ordinance.

Chairman Bichel stated the project was a great infill design.

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve with conditions PP-2023-101. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard).

PP-2023-102 Amberly

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Amberly, an Option 1 Cluster Subdivision located northwest of the intersection of Fork Shoals Road and Interstate 185 near the City of Mauldin. The applicant is requesting 55 lots at a density of 2.92 units/acre in R-12, Single-Family Residential zoning district.

The project site is located within the Mixed Employment Center character area of the Comprehensive Plan. Mixed Employment Centers are a new type of office park or corporate campus-like developments geared toward meeting the needs of mid to large businesses. Typical features include signature architectural elements and a campus-style development pattern that connects jobs to amenities and places of residence in a well-organized fashion. The recommended density is 8-30 dwellings/acre. Amberly proposes 2.92 dwellings/acre.

Staff recommends approval with conditions of the preliminary plan with the standard and specific requirements.

The approval conditions are as follows:

1. All required traffic improvements required by the TIS shall be installed once 40 lots have been recorded by final plat.
2. Before submitting for Land Disturbance Permits, please revise the name of the Traffic Impact Study to “Amberly” to match the name of the subdivision.

Planning Commission added conditions

- Add additional open space access point.

Discussion: There were no speakers in opposition of the proposed subdivision.

Paul Talbert, the project engineer, stated he was available for questions.

Chairman Bichel stated there was not adequate access to the open space. Mr. Talbert explained that forty percent of the lots faced open space and there are sidewalks throughout the neighborhood. Chairman Bichel stated he would like to see direct access provided to the upper lots.

Motion: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve with conditions PP-2023-102. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard).

PP-2023-114 Village Grove

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Village Grove, a Flexible Review District. The applicant is requesting a single-family residential development with 285 single-family detached lots at a density of 2.34 units/acre in the FRD, Flexible Review District zoning district.

The subject property is part of the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, where it is designated as *Suburban Edge*. Suburban Edges are low-density residential areas that offer opportunities for low-intensity development that is well-integrated with the natural landscape and agricultural uses. Residential development may occur as individual single-family structures on large lots, or clusters of homes designed to preserve large amounts of open space, which should be interconnected as part of the county’s larger open space system. The recommended density is 0 to 1 dwellings/acre. Village Grove is recommending 2.34 dwellings per acre.

Staff recommends approval with conditions of the preliminary plan with the standard and specific requirements.

The approval conditions are as follows:

1. Please provide a revised Preliminary Plan by September 1, 2023 clearly labeling the individual proposed roadway improvements warranted by the Traffic Impact Study.
2. Provide the following traffic improvements as outlined in the Traffic Impact Study:
 - A northbound left-turn lane from SC-253 onto Old Bramlett Road and;
 - A westbound right-turn lane from SC-124 onto SC-253.
3. All required traffic improvements required by the TIS shall be installed once 40 lots have been recorded by final plat.

Discussion: There were no speakers in opposition of the proposed subdivision.

Paul Talbert, the project engineer, stated he was available for questions. Mr. Talbert pointed out the property boundary in the presentation was incorrect.

Chairman Bichel stated he couldn't find the lot tables. Mr. Talbert stated it was provided to staff.

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Hammond, to approve with conditions PP-2023-114. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard).

VA-2023-106 HVAC Screening Variance Application (Scuffletown Rd)

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a variance from LDR 10.3.7, Commercial Design Standards – HVAC Screening, which requires commercial uses to screen any ground-, wall-, and roof-mounted mechanical equipment, HVAC, emergency generators and other accessories from public roads and adjoining residential or commercial properties. Additionally, the ordinance requires that rooftop equipment be screened by a parapet or other architectural element that is equal to the maximum elevation of the equipment and is complimentary to the building's architecture. The applicant states that the variance is needed due to the following reasons: (1) the building shell was constructed in 2021 and the building design includes a parapet along the front and sides, (2) the visibility of rooftop HVAC units is minimal at the rear elevations because the units are located 25 feet inward on the roof from the rear, (3) The regulation was not enforced for two previous tenant upfits, (4) screening will require thirty-two roof penetrations into the existing roof system.

Staff recommends approval of the variance as requested.

Discussion: Mr. Bailey asked if there were any complaints about the lack of screening. Ms. Staton stated not that she was aware of.

Motion: by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Mr. Hammond, to approve VA-2023-106. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard).

VA-2023-111 HVAC Screening Variance Application (White Horse Rd)

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a variance from LDR 10.3.7, Commercial Design Standards – HVAC Screening, which requires commercial uses to screen any ground-, wall-, and roof-mounted mechanical equipment, HVAC, emergency generators and other accessories from public

roads and adjoining residential or commercial properties. Additionally, the ordinance requires that rooftop equipment be screened by a parapet or other architectural element that is equal to the maximum elevation of the equipment and is complimentary to the building's architecture. The applicant states that the variance is needed due to the following reasons: (1) the building shell is currently under construction and the building design includes a parapet along the front and sides, (2) the visibility of rooftop HVAC units is minimal at the rear elevations because the units are located 25 feet inward on the roof from the rear, and (3) screening will require thirty-six additional roof penetrations into the roof system.

Staff recommends denial of the variance, as the building shell is still under construction and staff is of the opinion that adequate screening could still be provided.

Discussion: Jason Smith, the project architect, explained the units would not be visible and adding a screen would increase the footprint on the roof.

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve VA-2023-111. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard).

VA-2023-121 Buffer Variance

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a variance from LDR 10.3.5, Commercial Design Standards – Screening/Buffering, which requires commercial uses to provide a wall, fence, compact evergreen hedge or other type of fence and shrubbery at least 6 feet in height along the side and rear exterior lot lines where located adjacent to a residential use (and/or district) for the purpose of screening non-residential activities from view. Additionally, the ordinance requires a 15-foot landscaped buffer along the exterior property lines adjacent to residential uses and districts. The applicant states that the variance is needed due to a change of use at the existing non-conforming property, which currently has no buffer. Specifically, the applicant is requesting a variance of 10 feet along the rear of the property and 8 feet along the right side of the property from the 15-foot buffer requirement. The applicant also states that they are the owner of the all surrounding properties

Staff recommends approval of the variance as requested.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve VA-2023-121. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard).

VA-2023-124 Willie Rowe Setback Variance Application

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a variance from LDR 8.7 Building Setbacks, which require a 5-foot setback from any side property line for properties that are Unzoned. The applicant is requesting a variance from this setback requirement due to the location of an existing structure adjacent to an existing access easement for a flag lot adjacent to the subject property. The setback variance is also necessary in order to subdivide the property.

Staff recommends approval of the variance as requested.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve VA-2023-124. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Looper; J. Howard).

6. Planning Report

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell presented the August Planning Report.

7. Old Business

None.

8. New Business

Mr. Hammond asked staff why the Planning Commission was not reviewing the LDR Amendment that was presented to the Planning and Development Committee. Mr. Hammond pointed out that they have provided a recommendation on similar items in the past. Mr. Coker explained it was at the prerogative of County Council because there was no requirement for a Planning Commission recommendation. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated the item in question would have first reading on September 5th, 2023 at the County Council meeting.

Mr. Barbare pointed out rezoning applicants should answer direct questions from the Planning Commission and not use it as a time to provide additional comments on their applications.

9. Adjourn

Without objection, Chairman Bichel adjourned the meeting at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Miglionico

Nicole Miglionico

Recording Secretary