

**Greenville County Planning Commission Minutes**  
**January 24, 2024 at 4:30 p.m.**  
**Council Committee Room at County Square**

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

**Commissioners Absent:** None.

**County Councilors Present:** M. Barnes

**Staff Present:** T. Coker; H. Gamble; R. Jeffers-Campbell; T. Stone; M. Staton; N. Miglionico; T. Baxley; K. Mulherin; IS Staff

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Invocation**

Mr. Barbare provided the invocation.

**3. Approval of the Minutes of the November 15, 2023 Commission Meeting**

**Motion:** by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve the minutes of the November 15, 2023 Commission meeting, as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**4. Rezoning Requests**

**CZ-2024-001**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-001.

The subject parcel, zoned R-M20, Multifamily Residential District, is located along Old Augusta Road Extension, a two-lane, State-maintained local road & Moon Acres Road, a two-to-three lane, County-maintained local road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to S-1, Services District would be consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, which designates the parcel as Mixed Employment Center and the South Greenville Area Plan, which designates the parcel as Commercial.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve CZ-2024-001. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**CZ-2024-002**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-002.

The subject parcel zoned S-1, Services District is located along S. Old White Horse Road, a two-lane County-maintained local road and Page Drive, a two-lane County-maintained local road. Staff is of the opinion that the requested rezoning to R-7.5, Single-Family Residential District would be consistent with adjacent uses to the South and would not create additional adverse impacts on surrounding properties.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to R-7.5, Single-Family Residential District.

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve CZ-2024-002. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

#### **CZ-2024-004**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-004.

The subject parcel zoned R-S, Residential Suburban District is located along Greenbriar Drive, a two lane County-maintained local road and Log Shoals Road, a two-lane State-maintained collector road. Staff is of the opinion that while the requested zoning district is consistent the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan in terms of density (3 – 5 dwellings per acre), the compatibility with uses along Greenbriar Drive and the surrounding area characteristics are not consistent.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the requested rezoning to R-10, Single-Family Residential District.

**Discussion:** Mr. Hammond pointed out the property was contiguous with four R-10 lots and asked if that impacted the staff's recommendation. Mr. Henderson stated those properties were not in Greenville County's jurisdiction and the properties on Greenbriar Drive were larger single-family detached dwelling homes. Mr. Henderson explained staff's recommendation was based on the existing properties on Greenbriar Drive.

**Motion:** by Mr. Wood, seconded by Mr. Rogers, to deny CZ-2024-004. The motion carried by voice vote with four in favor (S. Bichel; J. Wood; J. Rogers; J. Barbare) and three in opposition (F. Hammond; J. Bailey; M. Shockley).

#### **CZ-2024-005**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-005.

The subject parcel zoned R-S, Residential Suburban District is located along State Park Road, a two-lane, State-maintained arterial road. Staff is of the opinion that the requested rezoning to R-12, Single-Family Residential District is not consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan which designates the parcel as *Suburban Edge* and recommends a gross density of 0 to 1 dwelling per acre.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the requested rezoning to R-12, Single-Family Residential District.

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to deny CZ-2024-005. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**CZ-2024-007**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-007.

The subject parcel, zoned R-S, Residential Suburban District is located along Griffin Mill Road, a two-lane State-maintained collector road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to R-15, Single-family Residential District would be consistent with other approved rezoning requests along Griffin Mill Road. The potential residential density of 2.9 units per acre would be less than what is called for under the comprehensive plan designation of *Mixed Employment Center (3-8 units/acre)*, and only slightly above what is called for under the South Greenville Area Plan designation of *Rural Residential (1-2 units/acre)*.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to R-15, Single-family Residential District.

**Discussion:** Mr. Wood asked for the criteria that would trigger a traffic impact study. Mr. Henderson explained in the rezoning phase, only a review district meeting certain criteria would trigger a TIS; otherwise, it wouldn't be triggered until the preliminary plan phase, where 90 units would trigger the TIS.

**Motion:** by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve CZ-2024-007. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

*Mr. Rogers recused himself*

**CZ-2024-008**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-008.

The subject parcels, zoned FRD, Flexible Review District are located along Farmers Circle, a one-lane County-maintained local road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to S-1, Services District would remove protections assured to residents of Farmers Circle which were conditions of approval for the Flexible Review District rezoning. Staff also feels that allowing a commercial use, especially one utilizing large trucks, to encroach onto the narrow road could pose a safety risk.

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

**Discussion:** Mr. Hammond pointed out the surrounding S-1 zoning and stated that S-1 looked like the best use case for the land. Mr. Henderson stated the land use was not the issue; the screening requirements and truck activity restrictions within the nearby FRD were the reasons for recommending denial.

Mr. Hammond stated based on the contiguous S-1 and no opposition at the public hearing, he recommended approval of the rezoning request.

**Motion:** by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve CZ-2024-008. The motion carried by voice vote with five in favor (S. Bichel; F. Hammond; J. Bailey; M. Shockley; J. Wood) and one in opposition (J. Barbare) with one recused (J. Rogers).

*Mr. Rogers returned.*

**CZ-2024-009**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-009.

Under the current language of Article 7, Section 7:3.4, Side Setbacks in Single-family Residential Districts, of the Greenville County Zoning Ordinance, accessory structures on residential lots are only permitted in the side or rear yard. This is limiting on rural lots which tend to be larger and may contain both residences and agricultural uses. For example, under the current language of the Zoning Ordinance a 10-acre property with a home on the rear of the lot could not place a barn or stable closer to the road than the front line of the home. To address that limitation, this amendment proposes to add the following language to Section 7:3.4:

In the R-R1, Rural Residential District, R-R3, Rural Residential District, and AG, Agricultural Preservation District, accessory buildings, barns, and stables are permitted to be located in the front yard so long as the setbacks of the underlying zoning district are met. In the R-S, Residential Suburban District, accessory buildings, barns, and stables are permitted in the front yard when the minimum acreage of the parcel is at least 1 acre and the setbacks of the underlying zoning district are met. In the R-R1, R-R3, AG, and R-S districts, accessory structures in front yards shall not be set back less than 30 feet from any right-of-way line and may not occupy more than 20 percent of the front yard.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed changes would allow for more flexibility when laying out lots in rural zoning districts. It may also allow homeowners with agricultural accessory uses to utilize their land more efficiently.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Wood, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve CZ-2024-009. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

5. **Preliminary Subdivision Applications**

**PP-2023-186 Lily Grove Subdivision**

**VA-2023-187 Lily Grove – Secondary Entrance Variance Application**

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Lily Grove Subdivision, an Open Space Option 1 (Cluster) subdivision located south of the intersection of Old Grove Rd (State) and Highway 25 (State) near Gantt. The applicant is requesting 54 lots on 16.2 acres for a density of 3.33 units/acre. Access is provided off Old Grove Rd, which is a State road.

The project includes one main ingress/egress point, one internal road, a completed connection to the neighboring development to the north, one cluster mailbox located within cul-de-sac area, 20-foot screening buffers around most of the perimeter of the site, 0.94 acres of common area, one detention

pond, 0.15 linear miles of new public road, 5-foot sidewalks, and 2.92 acres of open space (2.43 acres required)

**VA-2023-186**, Second Entrance Variance Application was submitted by the applicant to request a variance from the requirements of LDR 8.8.1. LDR 8.8.1 requires that any subdivision of more than 30 lots provide at least two access points, the second of which may consist of an emergency access. If the configuration of the property does not allow for a secondary access, the paved surface of the main road shall be at least 26 feet wide to the first intersection. The Preliminary Plan does reflect the required 26 feet of pavement to the first intersection.

The site is a part of the Plan Greenville County future land use map, where it is designated as *Suburban Neighborhood*. Suburban Neighborhoods are generally shaped by residential subdivisions of medium-lot homes with relatively uniform housing types and densities. Homes include attached garages. Local streets are laid out in a curvilinear pattern with occasional cul-de-sacs. Streets may or may not include sidewalks. New single-family subdivisions should be designed with sidewalks, street trees, neighborhood parks, and community open space connections. This future land use type recommends 3 to 5 dwellings per acre. Lily Grove Subdivision is proposing 3.33 dwellings per acre.

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

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

There was one speaker in favor of the proposed subdivision, Jonathan Nett, the project engineer. Mr. Nett stated he met with Gantt Fire District and they are in support of the project.

Chairman Bichel asked Mr. Nett why they chose a cluster development design. Mr. Nett explained that due to the narrow parcel size, it made sense to make the lot sizes a little smaller. Chairman Bichel stated the intent of a cluster design is to preserve open space for recreational, environmental, or ecological reasons and asked which one described this proposed subdivision. Mr. Nett stated all of them and they provide a little more open space than was required. Chairman Bichel didn't understand why they didn't make it a R-7.5 design. Chairman Bichel thought the submission was a poor cluster design with no area for children to play. Mr. Nett stated they could look into providing more amenities. Chairman Bichel expressed dissatisfaction with the open space on the perimeter of the lots, explaining residents will eventually start turning that space into their own yard.

Mr. Rogers asked if the pond was a detention pond. Mr. Nett stated yes. Mr. Rogers pointed out the only usable open space was above the detention pond. Mr. Rogers stated if the only meaningful open space is approximately an acre, then it probably doesn't comply with the cluster development requirements. Mr. Nett explained the plan was showing a large pond, but he hoped to make it smaller.

Mr. Roger asked if the proposed subdivision was not a cluster development design, what would be the maximum number of lots? Mr. Nett was unsure but stated they would lose some lots.

Discussion ensued on potential ways to make the open space more meaningful.

*Chairman Bichel and Mr. Nett agreed to hold the application for 30 days.*

Mr. Hammond asked staff to comment on the application since they recommended approval. Ms. Staton stated, in her opinion, the application met the requirements of a cluster subdivision, and additional greenspace was provided at her request.

Mr. Shockley explained the property was a unique design and he agreed with staff.

Mr. Hammond stated he doesn't understand the position of losing 4-5 lots but then having no common area.

Chairman Bichel asked Mr. Nett if he still wanted to hold the application. Mr. Nett stated yes.

**PP-2023-189 Sharondale Estates - WITHDRAWN**

**VAR2023-113 Sharondale Estates – Buffer Variance Application - WITHDRAWN**

**VAR2023-114 Sharondale Estates – Secondary Access Variance Application - WITHDRAWN**

*Chairman Bichel stated PP-2023-189 had been withdrawn.*

**PP-2023-200 Cades Mill**

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Cades Mill, an Open Space Option 1 (Cluster) subdivision located north of the intersection of W Georgia Rd (State) and Fork Shoals Rd (State). The applicant is requesting 120 lots on 47.10 acres for a density of 2.54 units/acre. Access is provided off Fork Shoals Rd, which is a State road.

The project includes two ingress/egress points, 4 internal roads, one cluster mailbox with three parking spaces, 20-foot screening buffers around the perimeter of the site, 1.74 acres of common area, two detention ponds, 0.73 linear miles of new public road, 5-foot sidewalks, and 21.6 acres of open space (7.1 acres required)

The subject site is a part of the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, where it is designated as *Rural Living*. Rural Living place types are transitional 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 interconnected open space. Hobby farms on large lots with residential homesteads are common land uses. Rural Living character area types suggest a density of one dwelling per two or more acres. Cades Mill is proposing a density of 2.54 dwelling units per acre.

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

The approval conditions are as follows:

1. All SCDOT required improvements shall be installed once 40 lots have been ~~recorded~~ permitted by final plat. (revised by the Planning Commission.)
2. Submit an approved sewer capacity form prior to the issuance of any permits.

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

There was one speaker in favor of the proposed subdivision, Josh Baker, the project engineer. Mr. Baker provided a brief overview of the project. Mr. Baker stated they met with SCDOT and

SCDOT is allowing them to drop a turn lane as long as they install a no left turn sign on the south entrance.

Mr. Wood does not agree with dropping the left turn lane and expressed concern with the traffic on Fork Shoals Road.

Mr. Rogers stated he is also concerned about the traffic but complimented the cluster subdivision design.

Mr. Shockley asked if the requirement that “all SCDOT required improvements shall be installed once 40 lots have been recorded by final plat.” was previously required once the lots had been permitted not just recorded. Mr. Shockley stated it was arduous to make the roadway improvements without building permits.

Mr. Hammond stated he would make the motion to approve with the approval conditions and the wording to state “once the 40 lots have been permitted.”

Mr. Rogers asked staff if it would be an enforcement issue, stating from previous discussions it seemed it would be difficult to keep track of.

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained Subdivision Administration has no way of monitoring or tracking building permits in an approved subdivision once a final plat has been recorded. Consequently, staff recommend that language for the standard condition regarding the installation of required traffic improvement be amended to more clearly state the intent which is to ensure that required traffic improvements are installed at the appropriate time and in coordination with SCDOT.

Discussion ensued about altering the language of “All SCDOT required improvements shall be installed once 40 lots have been recorded by final plat.”

Mr. Shockley pointed out the current language makes it seem as though you have to have the road improvements completed when you record the plat. Mr. Shockley stated the wording should change on this application and every application going forward.

Mr. Hammond suggested going forward with the revised condition and address any additional revisions in the future.

**Motion:** by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve PP-2023-200 with conditions. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**PP-2023-201 Traynham Place (Previously Approved PP-2023-101)**

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 86 single-family attached lots at a density of 10.51 units/acre in the C-2, Commercial zoning district. This revised plan also adds an additional detention pond in the commercial area that the applicant states will be converted to an underground detention pond at the time that the commercial portion of this development is developed.

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. All previous approval conditions apply.

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

**Motion:** by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve PP-2023-201. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**8. Planning Report**

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell presented the January Planning Report.

**9. Old Business**

None.

**10. New Business**

Mr. Barbare inquired about how to make cluster developments more definitive. Staff explained that it is being worked on in the UDO. Mr. Shockley stated it was the job of the Planning Commission to make the final decision because of the varying types of lots and unique aspects of each application.

**11. Adjourn**

Without objection, Chairman Bichel adjourned the meeting at 5:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Nicole Miglionico

Recording Secretary