

**Greenville County Planning Commission Minutes**  
**March 27, 2024 at 4:30 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.

**Commissioners Present:** J. Bailey, Vice Chair; J. Rogers; M. Shockley; F. Hammond (zoom); J. Barbare; J. Wood

**Commissioners Absent:** S. Bichel

**County Councilors Present:** B. Kirven

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

**1. Call to Order**

Vice-Chairman Bailey called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

**2. Invocation**

Mr. Shockley provided the invocation.

**3. Approval of the Minutes of the February 28, 2024 Commission Meeting**

**Motion:** by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve the minutes of the February 28, 2024 Commission meeting, as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**4. Rezoning Requests**

**CZ-2024-016**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-016.

The subject portion of the parcel zoned S-1, Services District is located along S. Charles Drive, a two-lane County-maintained local road. Staff is of the opinion that the requested rezoning to R-MA, Multifamily Residential District will not create an adverse impact on surrounding properties. Additionally, the requested zoning district is consistent with adjacent parcels to the North.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Barbare, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve CZ-2024-016. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (S. Bichel).

**CZ-2024-018**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-018.

The subject parcel, zoned O-D, Office District, is located along Ponders Court, a two-lane County-maintained local road, Independence Boulevard, a two-lane State-maintained local road, and Interstate 85-South, a State-maintained highway. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to S-1, Services District is consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan which designates the parcel as *Mixed Employment Center*. Additionally, the requested zoning district is consistent with adjacent parcels on the South side of Independence Boulevard.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Barbare, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve CZ-2024-018. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (S. Bichel).

### **CZ-2024-019**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-019.

The subject parcel, zoned R-12, Single-Family Residential District is located along Worley Road, a two-lane State-maintained collector road and Haughty Court, a two-lane County-maintained local road. Staff is of the opinion that the requested zoning of S-1, Services District is not consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property as Suburban Residential. The proposed district and use are also not consistent with the predominately residential properties along Worley Road, and could therefore have an adverse impact on the area.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Mr. Barbare, to deny CZ-2024-019. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (S. Bichel).

### **CZ-2024-020**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-020.

The subject parcel, zoned C-1, Commercial District is located along E. North Street, a five-lane State-maintained arterial road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to C-2, Commercial District would be consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property as Suburban Center. Suburban Center calls for regional commercial uses that serve community shopping and service needs in areas of high-frequency transit. The proximity of the property to the intersection of higher traffic roads creates a node for denser mixed-use commercial centers.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Barbare, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve CZ-2024-020. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (S. Bichel).

## 5. Preliminary Subdivision Applications

### PP-2024-010 – Woodland Summit

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Woodland Summit, a Cluster Option 1 Open Space Development in both the R-S, Residential Suburban and R-12, Single-Family Residential Zoning Districts. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Woodruff Rd and Scuffletown Rd. The applicant is requesting 81 lots on 37.35 acres for an overall density of 2.16 units per acre, although the two sections of the site meet their individual zoning district density requirements. The R-12 portion of the site consists of 40 single-family attached (townhomes) homes on 13.2 acres for a density on this portion of the site of 3.03 units per acre. The R-S portion of the site consists of 41 single-family detached homes on 24.15 acres for a density on this portion of the site of 1.69 units per acre. Access is provided off both Five Forks Road and Adams Mill Road (both State roads). Woodland Summit was previously denied in 2023 as application PP-2023-164.

The project includes two main entrances, six internal access roads with sidewalks, one cluster mailbox area with 4 9'X20' parking spaces, an additional 10 guest parking spaces, 20' undisturbed buffers, 5.44 acres of common area, one detention pond, and 10.76 acres of open space (9.23 acres required), with a mulched trail system proposed throughout the open space of the site.

The Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan designates the proposed developed area of this site with a Future Land Use of *Suburban Mixed Use*. Suburban Mixed-Use place types include a variety of single-family (detached and attached) and multi-family building types. Housing types should be designed as a cohesive, connected neighborhood, rather than isolated subareas. Buildings should be of a high-quality design, and developments should include common neighborhood amenities and open space connections. The Suburban Mixed-Use future land use recommends a density of 6 to 20 dwelling per acre. This application proposes a density of 2.16 units per acre.

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

Planning Commission added conditions:

1. Include external sidewalks.
2. Use an impervious product on the walking trail.

**Discussion:** Mr. Shockley asked why building for the 100-year flood was recommended. Ms. Staton stated Land Development made the recommendation from an engineering perspective. Mr. Shockley thought if it was something needed, it should be a requirement, not a recommendation, as well as listing the reason why it would be required.

There were three speakers in opposition of the proposed subdivision. The first speaker, Jonelle Phillips, expressed concern about stormwater and the lack of infrastructure. Ms. Phillips stated there was no point in providing a walking trail if it would be washed away in the rain due to the slope of the trail. The second speaker, Barbare Brown, asked the Planning Commission to hold the application due to the late changes to the application. Ms. Brown believed the Traffic Impact Study was inadequate and there was no parking for residents in

the townhouses. The final speaker, Douglas Stewart, expressed concern about existing and growing traffic problems.

There were three speakers in favor of the proposed subdivision. The first speaker, Waverly Wilkes, project engineer, provided an overview of the property's history and stated the plan revisions met the deadline requirements. Ms. Wilkes stated they are already planning to adhere to the 100-year storm requirements due to known flood issues in the area. Ms. Wilkes explained they have worked with Greenville County Roads and Bridges at every stage of the project and the traffic calming devices were approved by Greenville County staff. Ms. Wilkes stated they worked with SCDOT on traffic improvements. Ms. Wilkes pointed out there were no external sidewalks because there was no sidewalk to it connect to.

Mr. Rogers asked if the developer was amenable to a 30-day hold to address the public's concerns. Ms. Wilkes stated if they needed to, they would. Mr. Rogers made a motion to hold the application for 30 days, Mr. Shockley seconded.

Vice-Chairman Bailey stated there were two other speakers in favor of the proposed subdivision.

Allison Tucker, the project developer, stated they are amenable to a 30-day delay but have made all of the requested changes and additional changes. Ms. Tucker stated they are amenable to paving the trail and putting in sidewalks but would prefer it as a condition for approval. Ms. Tucker pointed out the project is well under the allowable units for the Five Forks Area Plan and they are conforming to the rights that currently exist on the property.

Mr. Rogers asked if they consented to the 30-day delay. Ms. Tucker asked if it was the only option and questioned what could occur in another 30 days that hadn't already occurred.

Darren Webb, the project developer, agreed with Ms. Tucker and stated they have listened and spoken to the community and don't know what 30 additional days would accomplish.

Vice-Chairman Bailey stated the 30 days would allow the adaptation of some of the public comments and provide the public with further time to review the plan.

Discussion ensued on whether or not the applicant agreed to the 30-day hold.

Ms. Tucker agreed to a 30-day hold. Mr. Rogers asked to re-word the original motion. The motion to hold the application failed.

Mr. Barbare asked if the traffic impact study was reviewed at the SAC meeting. Ms. Staton explained it was reviewed by SCDOT and Greenville County Roads and Bridges. Mr. Barbare asked if the complete traffic impact study could be viewed at the meeting. Ms. Staton stated no but it was provided in the Planning Commission packets. Mr. Barbare stated the left turn may continue to be an issue and asked if staff looked at those issues before determining their recommendation. Ms. Staton explained the staff looked at SCDOT and Greenville County Roads and Bridges' recommendations regarding what was needed. Mr. Barbare asked if the sidewalks were internal or external. Ms. Wilkes stated all internal sidewalks are provided and the developer is amenable to adding the external sidewalks.

**Motion:** by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Wood, to hold PP-2024-010 until the next Planning Commission meeting with the applicants consent. The motion failed by voice vote with two in favor (J. Rogers; J. Wood) and four in opposition (J. Bailey; J. Barbare; F. Hammond; M. Shockley) with one absent (S. Bichel).

**Motion:** by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Mr. Barbare, to approve with conditions CZ-2024-020. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (S. Bichel).

#### **PP-2024-014 – Harrington Phase 6**

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Harrington Phase 6, a cluster option 1 subdivision located north of the intersection of Fork Shoals Rd (State) and Interstate 185 (State). The applicant is requesting 68 lots on 23.91 acres for a density of 2.84 units/acre. Access is provided off Reedy Fork Rd, which is a State road. The site was previously approved as Amberly and as Harrington Phase 3.

The project includes one ingress/egress point, 3 internal roads, one cluster mailbox with one pull-off space, 20-foot screening buffers around the perimeter of the site, two detention ponds, 0.48 linear miles of new public road. 3.59 acres of open space are required for this site, and 4.05 acres of open space have been provided with this application.

The subject site is a part of the Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, where it is designated *Mixed Employment Center*. 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 connect jobs to amenities and places of residence in a well-organized fashion. The Mixed Employment Center Character Area Type recommends a density of 8 to 30 dwelling units per acre. This site is proposing a density of 2.84 units per acre.

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

The approval conditions are as follows:

1. Please provide a revised Preliminary Plan by April 3, 2024 showing a 50-foot wetland buffer.

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

There was one speaker in favor of the proposed subdivision. Darren Webb, the project developer, provided a brief overview of the merging of the two developments.

Mr. Woods stated the area was a traffic nightmare.

**Motion:** by Mr. Wood, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve with conditions PP-2024-014. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (S. Bichel).

#### **PP-2024-032 – Freya's Meadow**

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Freya's Meadow, a conventional subdivision located south of the intersection of Old White Horse Rd (State) and Hwy 276 (State) near the City of Travelers Rest. The applicant is requesting 35 lots on 30.97 acres for a density of 1.12 units/acre. Access is provided off Hodgens Road, which is a County road, as well as off of Old White Horse Rd, which is a State road.

The project includes two ingress/egress points, 2 internal roads, one cluster mailbox with one pull-off space, 20-foot screening buffers around the perimeter of the site, 5.41 acres of common area, one detention pond, 0.38 linear miles of new public road. There is also an existing family cemetery on site, which the applicant is proposing to remain in common area with additional screening and buffering around the perimeter as well as a 10-foot access from the public right-of-way.

The subject site is a part of the Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, where it is designated *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 Suburban Edge character area type recommends a density of 0 to 1 dwellings per acre. Freya's Meadow is proposing 1.12 dwellings per acre.

Staff recommends approval with conditions of the plan with the standard and specific requirements. The conditions of approval are as follows

1. Please submit a revised Preliminary Plan by April 3, 2024 clearly labelling the 50-foot riparian buffer.
2. Prior to submitting a land disturbance permit, a bunched arrow study shall be submitted to LDD including a plan showing the impacted area. If applicable, a revised preliminary plan shall be submitted to Subdivision Administration and LDD for administrative approval to address impacts to bunched arrow.

Planning Commission conditions

1. The revised Preliminary Plan should include a cul-de-sac at Hodgens to provide an emergency entrance only.
2. The revised Preliminary Plan should include a 30-foot buffer along all adjacent public right-of-ways.
3. The revised Preliminary Plan should provide landscaping along the dry pond area on site.

**Discussion:** There were two speakers in opposition of the proposed subdivision. The first speaker, Jim Campbell, provided an overview of the character of the area and stated the development is adjacent to his property. Mr. Campbell expressed concern about the use of septic, water quality and water quantity. Mr. Campbell asked for a significant visual barrier between the dry detention pond and his property. The second speaker, Josh Smith, expressed concern with the traffic and sight distance on Hodges Drive. Mr. Smith stated the density did not match the character of the area and asked for a larger buffer around the subdivision.

There were two speakers in favor of the proposed subdivision. The first speaker, Darya Dimintyanova, the project representative, provided a brief overview of the project. Ms. Dimintyanova stated they have no issue providing one entrance but the regulations required two entrances. Ms. Dimintyanova explained the lots would not be mass graded and many trees would remain. Ms. Dimintyanova stated water run off would flow toward the road then be collected by the detention pond.

Mr. Rogers asked if the second entrance could be turned into emergency access only. Ms. Staton stated it could be turned into an emergency access per fire department regulations. Mr. Shockley stated it would take care of the sight distance concern as well. Ms. Staton

explained as long as the fire department approved, staff did not have an issue with the second entrance being turned into emergency access only.

Mr. Barbare asked if the developer was amenable to additional buffering.

The second speaker in favor, Metti Seppela, the developer, stated they could easily put a 30-foot tree-save buffer around the property.

Mr. Barbare asked if there would be additional buffering and landscaping around the dry pond. Mr. Seppela stated they would leave it natural or provide some plantings.

Mr. Barbare asked what happens to the bunched arrowhead when it is received by Land Development. Ms. Staton explained Land Development would review the study and if any changes are needed the preliminary plan would be revised. Vice-Chairman Bailey stated depending on the change, if its major or minor, would determine if it returned to the Planning Commission. Ms. Staton stated that was correct.

**Motion:** by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Mr. Barbare, to approve with conditions PP-2024-032. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (S. Bichel).

#### **VA-2024-004 – The Narrows – Private Road Width Variance Application**

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a variance from LDR Table 5.1 Design Standards Chart, which requires that access roads for private residential streets be 20 feet in width. The applicant states that the request is to allow for the private roadway width to be 18 feet. The applicant states that the approved plans show a standard roadway typical section with an asphalt width of 18 feet and that construction has commenced based on the approved asphalt width of 18 feet, with curb and gutter installed. The applicant lists six specific reasons to support this variance request: (1) The applicant states that the approved plans show a dimension of 20 feet street width as measured from face to face of new curb, rather than end of pavement to end of pavement; (2) The applicant states that Table 5.1 does not explicitly state that road width should be measured from end of pavement to end of pavement; (3) The applicant states that the road only serves six lots on 19 acres; (4) The applicant states that an 18 foot street width is allowed under the scenario of an alley with two-way traffic in places with greater density than this project; (5) The applicant states that steep slopes and a retaining wall are in place at the entrance of the site, meaning there is not adequate width to widen the asphalt to 20 feet; (6) The applicant states that there are undulations in the field topography that, if widened, could produce steeper slopes, possibility for erosion, and encroachment onto neighboring properties.

Due to the unique circumstances of this case, Staff is of the opinion that approval of this variance is reasonable due to the small size of this development, which is in line with the size of a minor subdivision (6 lots). Because of this, Staff recommends approval with condition of the variance as requested.

The approval condition is as follows:

1. Please add a note to the Final Plat stating: “The private road shall not be accepted and/or maintained as public right-of-way.”

**Discussion:** None

**Motion:** by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve with conditions VA-2024-004. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**VA-2024-013 – 15ft Landscape Buffer Variance Application**

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a variance from LDR Section 10.3.5 Screening/Buffering, which requires commercial uses to provide and maintain a 15-foot landscaped buffer along the exterior property lines adjacent to residential uses and districts. The applicant states that the existing building, which predates current county development requirements, has sat vacant for many years and that the applicant intends to redevelop the property as storage for a limited number of tenants. The applicant states that the existing building sits 5 feet from the rear property line, and thus are requesting a 10-foot variance from the buffer requirement for the rear property line.

Staff recommends approval of the variance as requested.

**Discussion:** None

**Motion:** by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve VA-2024-013. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**VA-2024-018 – Settlement Manor Apartments – 100 ft Riparian Buffer**

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a variance from LDR Section 8.22.22.A.3, which requires that a minimum 100-foot riparian buffer as measured from the top of the stream bank inland shall be established along each side of all intermittent, perennial, and blue line streams within watershed draining 50 acres or more. The applicant states that the preliminary layout has been approved by the state of South Carolina for affordable housing funder since 2021 based on 120 units being provided. According to the applicant the acreage required for the buffer would be nearly 50% of the site, and would not allow for the site to be constructed per the preliminary layout as submitted and approved by SC State Housing.

Staff recommends approval of the variance as requested.

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve VA-2024-018. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**VA-2024-021 – RJW Sales LLC – 20 ft Building Setback Variance Application**

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a variance from LDR Section 12.5.4 Minimum Setbacks for Group Developments, which requires a 25 setback from any external lot line, except where land uses are the same as uses permitted in the adjoining properties outside the development. The applicant is proposing to open a gun sales shop in an existing commercial building on site. The unzoned parcel includes a residential structure on site as well, which is why the group development setback of 25 feet is required. The applicant states that the request is to allow use of the existing building on site, which currently sits 14.7 feet from the property line. The applicant is requesting a variance of 10.3 feet to address the encroachment of the existing building into the setback.

Staff recommends approval with conditions of the variance. The approval condition is as follows:



1. The required screening and buffering must be provided along the rear and side of the building.

**Discussion:** Vice-Chairman Bailey asked if the neighboring driveway was on this property or on the property line. Ms. Staton stated the driveway slightly encroaches on this property. The applicant and commission discussed the history and reason for the request.

**Motion:** by Mr. Wood, seconded by Mr. Rogers, to approve VA-2024-021. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**8. Planning Report**

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell presented the March Planning Report.

**9. Old Business**

None.

**10. New Business**

None.

**11. Adjourn**

Without objection, Vice-Chairman Bailey adjourned the meeting at 6:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Nicole Miglionico*

Nicole Miglionico

Recording Secretary