

Greenville County Planning Commission Minutes
October 27, 2021 at 4:30 p.m.
County Council Chambers at County Square

Commissioners Present: S. Bichel, Chair; M. Shockley; J. Bailey; C. Clark; J. Rogers; M. Looper; F. Hammond; E. Forest

Commissioners Absent: None

County Councilors Present: L. Ballard; E. Fant

Staff Present: T. Coker; T. Stone; J. Henderson; J. Wortkoetter; K. Walters; A. Lovelace; B. Denny; R. Jeffers-Campbell; M. Tollison; N. Miglionico; IS Staff

1. Call to Order

Chairman Bichel called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

2. Invocation

Former Commissioner Mark Jones provided the invocation.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the September 22, 2021 Commission Meeting

Motion: by M. Looper, seconded by F. Hammond, to approve the minutes of the September 22, 2021 Commission meeting, as presented. The motion carried by voice vote.

4. Final Development Plan Application

Chairman Bichel moves Roberts Farm to the top of the agenda with the consent of the Commission.

Roberts Farm Final Development Plan

Ms. Denny introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for the Roberts Farm Final Development Plan.

The subject property is zoned FRD, Flexible Review District. The property was originally zoned S-1 in April 2001 as part of Area 3. In May 2020, there was a rezoning request to R-M4, Multifamily Residential which was withdrawn by the applicant. The property received a successful rezoning to FRD, Flexible Review District in October 2020.

The applicant is proposing a single-family residential development that will consist of single family attached and detached residences. The development allows for a maximum of 109 detached structures in Zone 1, and 75 attached structures in Zone 2. However, the applicant is proposing 83 detached units in Zone 1, and 64 attached units in Zone 2 which is reflected on the plan before you. Additionally, the development will provide over 10 acres of dedicated open space area in Zone 3.

In review of the Roberts Farm Final Development Plan, staff finds that the submitted plans are consistent with the Preliminary Development Plan and the Statement of Intent that was approved. The plans also reflect general compliance with the conditions outlined in Section 3:9.1 of the Greenville County Zoning Ordinance, and comply with Article 21.1 of the Greenville County Land Development Regulations, which call for developments to be aesthetically pleasing and harmonize with the surrounding developments.

Based on these reasons, Staff recommends approval of the Final Development Plan.

Discussion:

Five nearby residents spoke in opposition of Roberts Farm. The first speaker, Cindy Edwards, stated many citizens came together in opposition of the high-density housing project due to concerns for the environment, school density, the area becoming more urban, dangers of increased traffic, and loss of the historical nature of the area. Ms. Edwards spoke on the traffic dangers in the area and noted the road has remained the same since 1981 despite the exponential growth since then. The second speaker, Anthony Mullinax, noted concerns with the ingress and egress, stating the road is already overused and lacks appropriate infrastructure. Mr. Mullinax expressed the need for a traffic light and major road improvements before any additional developments are approved. The third speaker, Kristen Worden, a nearby HOA president, presented her interpretation of the land use and zoning ordinance. Ms. Worden explained, when the ingress and egress was changed, after County Council approval, it significantly altered the basic concept and general characteristics of the FRD; therefore, the plan must be approved by County Council again. The fourth speaker, Bert Watts, a local Pastor, echoed the traffic and infrastructure concerns of other speakers. Mr. Watts explained he has had to call emergency services numerous times due to accidents at the intersection of East Mountain Creek Road and West Mountain Creek Church Road. The final speaker, Michael Martinez, an attorney with the South Carolina Environmental Law Project, reiterated Zoning Ordinance Section 8.8.9 and called on the Zoning Administrator to designate the alteration of the ingress and egress as a major change, sending it back to County Council for approval.

Luke Burke, the attorney speaking on behalf of the property owners, spoke in favor of Roberts Farm Subdivision. Mr. Burke reviewed the zoning history and Judge's order for this property. Mr. Burke stated his understanding of the role of Planning Commission at this point is limited by the Judge's order and the ordinance to reviewing the Final Development Plan and statement of intent and comparing it to the Preliminary Development Plan that was previously approved. Mr. Burke explained the Preliminary Development Plan is the exact same plan submitted previously and the Final Development Plan presented is substantially identical with the exception of further specific details regarding lighting and landscape. He also noted the statement of intent was the same. Mr. Burke addressed concerns from the opposition, explaining zoning staff already determined the access change was a minor change. Mr. Burke also addressed traffic concerns, stating the developer will comply with the traffic study recommendations, which will alleviate some of the traffic in this area. Mr. Burke reiterated the job of the Planning Commission was to review the Final Development Plan, ensure it complied with what County Council said the applicant could do, and if it does, they should vote to approve.

Mr. Rogers asked Mr. Burke how he responded to the point made that the change to the ingress and egress was not approved by County Council. Mr. Burke explained, once a rezoning to FRD is approved, staff decides if a change to that plan is minor or major. He said after it was approved in December 2020, a letter from staff stated the request was determined to be a minor change. Mr. Burke stated, according to the ordinance, staff is allowed to make that decision. Mr. Rogers pointed out Article 21.2 of the LDR giving the Planning Commission the right to impose additional or more restrictive requirements if it is determined to be in the public interest, including with respect to the points of ingress and egress. Mr. Burke stated, based on the Judge's order, the decision of the Planning Commission is based on using the standard outlined

in LDR 21.1. Mr. Rogers stated 21.1 is the Intent; his understanding was they were able to use any part of Article 21.

James Martin, the applicant, approached the podium to explain the access points were changed because SCDOT would not allow an access point on HWY 253 or Stallings Road. Mountain Creek Church Road was the only option for access points.

Mr. Rogers asked if SCDOT approved the two exit points on Mountain Creek Church Road. Mr. Martin explained SCDOT cannot speak to that road because it is a Greenville County road. Mr. Martin stated Greenville County has approved it with recommendations for lane widening.

The final speaker, Rob Rowen, spoke in favor of the plan, suggesting the Planning Commission vote for approval but with added conditions for traffic improvements. Mr. Rowen suggested these improvements should be paid in part by the developer.

Mr. Looper asked staff if there has been an updated traffic study since the one provided from 2020. Ms. Denny stated a revised traffic study was submitted in 2021.

Mr. Rogers expressed, without seeing the updated traffic impact study, it is hard to evaluate the impact of the recommendations that the developer stated they will comply with. He recalls one of the intersections has a rating of F and wondered if that rating had changed.

Ms. Clark pointed out inconsistencies with the name used for the traffic impact study and recent incorrect access road descriptions in the statement of intent. Ms. Clark stated there have been systemic issues with the application and she does not agree with staff that the access change was a minor change.

Mr. Forest asked what portion under their standard of review from the Judge's order can they take traffic into consideration when determining that this does not comply with the initial approval.

Chairman Bichel read an excerpt from LDR 21.2 stating the Planning Commission may impose additional or more restrictive requirements if it is determined that it is within the public interest.

Mr. Forest stated they have been instructed in a previous meeting that traffic issues are met if the developer is willing to follow the improvements that are required based on the traffic study, which is approved by SCDOT or Greenville County Roads and Bridges.

Mr. Rogers asked what binding commitment the developer had to ensure they would comply with the traffic impact study recommendations.

Mr. Forest explained they would not receive the approvals they needed to move forward if they did not specifically follow the application.

Mr. Bailey stated those improvements would have to be met in the standard application process.

Mr. Rogers questioned what improvements they are referring to.

Mr. Bailey explained the recommendations were to widen the road and add a third lane. He further explained, without developments like this one, these road improvement would not happen any time soon.

Mr. Hammond spoke to the Planning Commission's purview, explaining the FRD is being reviewed again. He stated, staff determined there was no major change and traffic engineers required the addition of a third lane on Mountain Creek Church Road to proceed. Mr. Hammond explained individual opinions are irrelevant and nobody on the Planning Commission had the expertise to add conditions for traffic improvements.

Chairman Bichel asked staff if the Zoning Administrator makes a ruling, does the Planning Commission have the authority to override it. Mr. Henderson said staff has the right to approve and make decisions on Final Development Plans. If an appeal is made or if staff chooses to bring a Final Development Plan before the Planning Commission, at that point the approval comes from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Rogers stated, according to LDR Article 21.2, the Planning Commission will evaluate staff's recommendation in its consideration of the application.

Mr. Forest explained, according to the Judge's order, the Planning Commission is reviewing the application to confirm that it is in compliance with the FRD that was initially applied for.

Chairman Bichel stated his interpretation of the Judge's order was to look at Article 21 and not use 3.1 anymore.

Mr. Hammond asked, if one or more Commissioners planned to vote to deny based on traffic, shouldn't they offer conditions to the traffic issues; and if you offer a condition to the traffic issue, are you qualified to offer the condition?

Mr. Bailey noted at the last workshop they were discouraged from adding additional conditions.

Mr. Forest stated they were told they cannot add additional conditions beyond the traffic engineer's recommendations.

Mr. Hammond explained the Commission voted in favor of recommending to County Council to approve the FRD zoning, it returned with traffic improvements and was determined by the Zoning Administrator to have no major change. Mr. Hammond stated if the Planning Commission has changed their mind, they owe it to the property owner and developer to explain exactly why.

Mr. Shockley acknowledged the difficult decision they have to make. Mr. Shockley stated he makes a motion for Planning Commission to approve under Section 3.9.1 and Article 21.1, and that they approve the staff recommendation as submitted for this development

Mr. Rogers stated he will be voting against the motion based on the following grounds: that the only evidence he has seen about traffic in the surrounding area and the intersection near there is a level of service rated F; there are two exit points on the small Mountain Creek Road where all the evidence is that the road cannot support that kind of exit traffic; that the plan is not

consistent with the original Statement of Intent that was approved by County Council; and the change in exit points is inconsistent with the plan that was approved by County Council. He believes Planning Commission has authority under Article 21.2 to make that determination in spite of what staff determined.

Mr. Hammond explained what he understands from Mr. Rogers statement is that Planning Commission has the power to override staff on major and minor change determinations.

Chairman Bichel stated he believes they do have the power to override staff.

Mr. Hammond stated he believes Chairman Bichel is incorrect.

Motion: Roberts Farm Final Development Plan: by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve the Final Development Plan for the Roberts Farm subdivision. The motion failed by hand vote with 4 in favor (M. Shockley; J. Bailey; F. Hammond; E. Forest) and 4 in opposition (S. Bichel; C. Clark; J. Rogers; M. Looper). Chairman Bichel stated the motion failed and since it was a tie vote the application fails and the application is denied.

5. Preliminary Subdivision Applications

PP-2021-195: Parkside Heights

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Parkside Heights, a cluster development under Option 2 of the Open Space Residential Development requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. The site is located approximately northeast of the intersection of Fork Shoals Road and Standing Springs Road. The applicant is requesting ninety (90) townhome lots on 13.77 acres at a density of 6.5 units per acre in the commercial zoning district (C-2). Access is provided off of Business Park Ct – a county road. Water and sewer will be provided by Greenville Water and Metro Sewer, respectively.

The project area is located in the Suburban Neighborhood character area of the Comprehensive Plan. Suburban Neighborhoods are generally shaped by residential subdivisions of medium-lot homes with relatively uniform housing types and densities. 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. The recommended density is 3 to 5 dwellings per acre. This development proposes 6.5 units/acre consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

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

Discussion:

Three nearby property owners spoke in opposition of the proposed subdivision. The first speaker, JH Harris, expressed his concerns about the increase in traffic this proposed subdivision would cause. The second speaker, Bonnie Orr, believed this area should be a commercial area, and adding residential subdivisions would be taking away from future business opportunities. The final speaker, Donovan Orr, echoed the concerns of the other two speakers. Mr. Orr stated this land should be used to create jobs and it would not be a safe or comfortable area for families due to the existing traffic and noise from nearby businesses.

Lexi Chicory, the project engineer, was the only person to speak in favor of the proposed

subdivision. Ms. Chicory stated the proposed subdivision meets all requirements for the Zoning Ordinance and Land Development Regulations.

Chairman Bichel raised concerns about the amount and location of the designated common areas. Ms. Chicory said 4.13 acres of open space is required, however, they are providing 1.83 acres of common area and 6.68 acres of open space. Chairman Bichel does not believe the common areas do not have meaningful proportions.

Motion for PP-2021-195: by Mr. Forest, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve PP-2021-195. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

PP-2021-196: Rolling Oaks

VAR2021-106: Rolling Oaks (Emergency Access)

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Rolling Oaks, a cluster development under Option 1 of the Open Space Residential Development requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. The project site is located just north of the intersection of Fairview Rd. and Neely Ferry Rd. The applicant is requesting ninety-eight (98) lots on 44.6 acres at a density of 2.2 units per acre in the single-family zoning district (R-20). Access is provided off of Fairview Rd – a state road. Water and sewer will be provided by Greenville Water and Metro Sewer, respectively.

Additionally, the applicant is requesting a variance from LDR Article 8.8.1A which requires a secondary emergency access point. Due to the geometry of the site and limited road frontage along Fairview Road, the applicant has widened the primary access road to 26' wide from the entrance to the first intersection.

The project area is located in the Suburban Neighborhood character area of the comprehensive plan. Suburban Neighborhoods are generally shaped by residential subdivisions of medium-lot homes with relatively uniform housing types and densities. 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. The recommended density is 3 to 5 dwellings per acre. This development proposes 2.2 units/acre consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff recommends conditional approval of the preliminary plan and VAR2021-106 with the standard and specific requirements.

Approval conditions are as follows:

- All traffic improvements warranted by the TIS shall be installed once 40 lots have been recorded by final plat. Required traffic improvements include a left turn lane southbound on Fairview Rd.
- The lot sequencing on the final plat must remain the same as the approved preliminary plan.
- A phased masterplan shall be submitted that shows all existing and proposed phases for all lots in the development for each final phase submitted.

Discussion:

There were no speakers in opposition to the proposed subdivision. However, there was one speaker in favor, Waverly Wilkes, the project engineer. Ms. Wilkes provided a brief description of the proposed subdivision and explained they worked with traffic engineers and SCDOT to determine the best option for traffic flow in this area. Ms. Wilkes pointed out the oversized left turn lane that would be installed and noted traffic conflict would occur less than 5% of the time

after the installation.

Ms. Clark questioned if the installation of the left turn lane would prohibit the business patrons from making left turns to exit. Ms. Clark also noted the traffic study stated the business would go from a LOS A to an LOS D and the subdivision will start at an LOS E rating. Ms. Wilkes stated the business patrons would be able to make left turns and a traffic conflict would arise less the 5% of the time. Ms. Wilkes acknowledged the traffic issues on Fairview Road and explained this road is on the top of SCDOT's list for future improvements.

Ms. Clark asked how to get access to the common area. Ms. Wilkes stated typically they would get access to the common area through the buffer; however, they would have no issues adding a common space access point.

Chairman Bichel asked why a variance was being requested if they were planning to widen the road. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained it was an alternate option, subject to Planning Commission approval. Chairman Bichel asked if the developers were planning to widen the road at the fire hydrants as suggested by the fire department. Ms. Wilkes explained this was not typically approved by Roads and Bridges due to issues with road design.

Motion for PP-2021-196: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve PP-2021-196 with conditions and to provide an access point to the common area. The motion carried by voice vote with 7 in favor (S. Bichel; M. Shockley; J. Bailey; J. Rogers; M. Looper; F. Hammond; E. Forest) and 1 in opposition (C. Clark).

Motion for VAR2021-106: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve VAR2021-106. The motion carried by voice vote with 7 in favor (S. Bichel; M. Shockley; J. Bailey; J. Rogers; M. Looper; F. Hammond; E. Forest) and 1 in opposition (C. Clark).

PP-2021-202: Silvers Crossing (Resubmittal)

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Silvers Crossing. Silvers Crossing was conditionally approved by the Planning Commission on April 28, 2021 under case number PP-2021-054. The application has not been revised but has been resubmitted only to remove an approval condition no longer warranted by SC DOT namely, the addition of a right turn lane for north bound Sandy Flat. Consequently, this application is not subject to the Rural Conservation Ordinance.

Silvers Crossing is a conventional single-family development located just west of the intersection of Locust Hill Rd and Sandy Flat Rd in an unincorporated part of Greenville County. The applicant is requesting 19 lots in the unzoned area with an average lot size of 27,649 square feet on part of the development parcel consisting of 25.59 acres. Access is provided off of Sandy Flat Road. Water and sewer will be provided by Greenville Water and septic, respectively.

The proposed subdivision is compatible with the surrounding rural area and the Rural Village Character area of the Comprehensive Plan. Rural Villages contain a mix of commercial (mostly retail and neighborhood support) and residential uses. They are typically in older areas, with development that is automobile-oriented, yet walkable. These character areas are the center of rural life and centers for commercial and civic activities, with 4 to 8 dwellings per acre. This application proposes 0.74 units per acre.

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

Discussion:

There were no speakers in opposition to the proposed subdivision. However, there was one speaker in favor, Paul Talbert, the project engineer. Mr. Talbert stated he was available to answer any questions the Planning Commission may have.

Mr. Shockley asked staff why the condition was removed. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated SCDOT updated the traffic study due to an error on the original study; after reevaluation, it was determined the condition was no longer needed.

Motion for PP-2021-202: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Looper, to approve PP-2021-202. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

6. Road Name Change Application

RD-2021-193 Lilibet Trail to Pixel Trail

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a road name change application. The applicant is requesting to change the name of Lilibet Trail (L-PD-66) – a private drive in the Pleasant Valley subdivision in Travelers Rest. The proposed name is Pixel Trail.

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Motion for RD-2021-193: by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Looper, to approve RD-2021-193. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

7. Rezoning Requests

CZ-2021-92

Ms. Denny introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-92.

The subject parcel, zoned R-M20, Multifamily Residential and C-2, Commercial, is located along White Horse Road a Seven-lane State-maintained Arterial road. A successful rezoning would not only accomplish the applicant's goals of allowing for a car wash, but would also fix a split zone parcel and align with the uses along this automotive thoroughfare.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to C-3, Commercial.

Discussion:

Mr. Looper asked the applicant if this will be a modern facility or similar to car washes at Spinx. The applicant, Jonathan Cochrane, stated they would be a modern car wash.

Motion: by Mr. Looper, seconded by Mr. Forest, to approve CZ-2021-92. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2021-93

Ms. Denny introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-93.

The subject parcel, zoned R-12, Single-family Residential, is located along Old Pelzer Road a two-lane State-maintained Collector road. Staff is of the opinion that the request for I-1, Industrial is appropriate for this site, since I-1, Industrial zoning is adjacent to the site. Further, the South Greenville Area Plan and the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan call for Industrial for this area.

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

Motion: by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Ms. Clark, to approve CZ-2021-93. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2021-95

Ms. Denny introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-95.

The subject parcel zoned FRD, Flexible Review District and R-7.5, Single-family Residential is located along Bryant Street, a two-lane County-maintained local road. The requested changes to the FRD allow for increased safety in regards to traffic circulation, while still achieving many of the applicant's goals in the previously approved Flexible Review District. Staff is also of the opinion that the proposed 25% reduction in parking will not cause an adverse impact on the surrounding area due to the availability of shared and/or remote parking and other means of transportation.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. Submit a site plan for review and approval before the issuance of any land development or building permits.

Motion: by Mr. Looper, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve with conditions CZ-2021-95. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2021-96

Ms. Denny introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-96.

The subject parcel zoned R-S, Residential Suburban is located along Reid School Road, a two-lane State-maintained residential road. The density requested in the Flexible Review District does not align with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan. Staff is of the opinion that the Comprehensive Plan's future land use designation for this area is appropriate.

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

Discussion:

Mr. Hammond asked staff what the density for Suburban Edge was. Mr. Stone stated 0-1 units

per acre.

Chairman Bichel stated he dislikes three-story buildings next to single family residential due to the aesthetics and potential light disturbance.

Motion: by Mr. Forest, seconded by Mr. Looper, to deny CZ-2021-96. The motion carried by voice vote with 6 in favor (S. Bichel; M. Shockley; J. Bailey; C. Clark; M. Looper; E. Forest) and 2 in opposition (J. Rogers; F. Hammond).

CZ-2021-97

Ms. Denny introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-97.

The subject parcel zoned C-3, Commercial, located along S Hwy 14 is a Four-lane State-maintained Arterial Road. Staff is of the opinion that rezoning to C-2, Commercial is appropriate for the area and will not have an adverse impact on this commercial corridor.

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

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Ms. Clark, to approve CZ-2021-97. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2021-98

Mr. Lovelace introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-98.

The subject parcel zoned R-S, Residential Suburban is located along Sullivan Road a two-lane county-maintained residential road, and Blue Springs Way, a two-lane county-maintained residential road. Staff is of the opinion that rezoning to R-12, Single-Family Residential is consistent with the development patterns and zoning classification present in the immediate area.

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

Discussion:

Mr. Rogers asked staff why they feel this would be consistent with the surrounding land use. Mr. Lovelace explained two nearby parcels have already been rezoned to R-12; however, the GIS map has not been updated to reflect that.

Motion: by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Looper, to approve CZ-2021-98. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2021-99

Mr. Lovelace introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-99.

The subject parcel zoned R-7.5, Single-Family Residential, C-2, Commercial, and R-M20, Multifamily Residential is located along Hampton Avenue Ext a two-lane county-maintained collector road, Kelly

Avenue a two-lane county-maintained residential road, and Cedar Lane Ct a two-lane county-maintained residential road. Staff is of the opinion that while the proposed development will not meet the primary uses in the comprehensive plan, Mixed Employment Center calls for Multifamily Residential as a secondary use. This use will provide additional housing opportunities for the commercial activity in the immediate area. Additionally, the project will serve as a gateway to downtown Greenville aiding in the development of pedestrian pathways.

The development will have to meet the following conditions:

1. Revise handicap spaces to meet the current adopted version of ANSI 117.1 as required by Building Codes.
2. Submit a site plan for review and approval prior to issuance of any land development or building permits.

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

Motion: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve with conditions CZ-2021-99. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2021-101

Mr. Hammond recused himself.

Mr. Shockley exited the meeting.

Mr. Lovelace introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-101.

The subject parcel, zoned R-S, Residential Suburban, is located along West Georgia Road, a two-lane, State-maintained arterial road, and Fork Shoals Road, a two-lane, State-maintained collector road. Staff has concerns with the density and scale of the area requested to be rezoned in conjunction with a rezoning request of similar acreage and density on an adjacent parcel without specific plans; points of ingress/egress and connectivity; and inconsistencies with the Future Land Use Map and South Greenville Area Plan.

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

Discussion:

Mr. Forest asked staff if a specific plan was asked of the developer or a rezone to FRD. Mr. Lovelace stated it was not.

Mr. Rogers requested staff explain their concerns with the requested density in comparison to the Future Land Use Map and the South Greenville Area Plan. Mr. Lovelace stated the comprehensive plan designates this area as rural living, with a density of 0-1 units per acre. Mr. Stone stated the South Greenville Area plan designates the area as a transitional residential which is more of a suburban to traditional neighborhood. He explains the conflicting recommendations could be due to the specifics of the public participation process during the creation of each plan. Mr. Rogers asked staff for their opinion on the impact of traffic in the

area. Mr. Stone stated he does not have the expertise to speak to traffic issues; however, single family homes typically produce about 10 trips per day.

Chairman Bichel reminded the Commissioners that Ms. Wilkes presented all the traffic improvements at the Public Hearing.

Mr. Bailey noted he drives these roads 4-5 times a week and they are not incredibly congested. He doesn't believe this would be a terrible idea for the area and it would provide needed workforce housing.

Ms. Clark pointed out rezoning for R-12 would exceed the density that is recommended by the Comprehensive Plan and South Greenville Area Plan.

Motion: by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Ms. Clark, to deny CZ-2021-101. The motion carried by voice vote with 4 in favor (S. Bichel; C. Clark; J. Rogers; M. Looper) and 2 in opposition (J. Bailey; E. Forest) with 1 absent (M. Shockley) and 1 recused (F. Hammond).

CZ-2021-102

Mr. Lovelace introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-102.

The subject parcel, zoned R-S, Residential Suburban, is located along West Georgia Road, a two-lane, State-maintained arterial road, and Fork Shoals Road, a two-lane, State-maintained collector road. Staff is of the opinion that though there is commercial zoning at the intersection of these two thoroughfares, a successful rezoning to C-3, Commercial would further extend commercial development along these predominantly residential roads.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the requested rezoning to C-3, Commercial.

Discussion:

Mr. Rogers pointed out this request is similar to the previous request, and is requesting more density than is recommended.

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Forest, to approve CZ-2021-102. The motion failed by hand vote with 3 in favor (S. Bichel; J. Bailey; E. Forest) and 3 in opposition (C. Clark; J. Rogers; M. Looper) with 1 absent (M. Shockley) and 1 recused (F. Hammond). Chairman Bichel stated the motion failed, the application did not receive sufficient votes; therefore, the application is denied.

CZ-2021-103

Mr. Lovelace introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-103.

The subject parcel, zoned R-R1, Rural Residential, is located along West Georgia Road, a two-lane, State-maintained arterial road. Staff has concerns with the density and scale of the area requested to be rezoned in conjunction with a rezoning request of similar acreage and density on an adjacent parcel without specific plans; points of ingress/egress and connectivity; potential adverse impacts on the Huff Creek Watershed; and inconsistencies with the Future Land Use Map and South Greenville Area Plan.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the requested rezoning to R-15, Single-Family Residential.

Discussion:

Ms. Clark explained she would not be voting in favor of this application because of the large part of the parcel that lies in the watershed. Ms. Clark stated there are impaired waters to the south along Huff Creek.

Mr. Forest stated he did not believe the developer would be able to do much with the property after the denial of CZ-2021-101, which was going to be an extension of the development.

Motion: by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Looper, to deny CZ-2021-103. The motion carried by voice vote with 4 in favor (S. Bichel; C. Clark; J. Rogers; M. Looper) and 2 in opposition (J. Bailey; E. Forest) with 1 absent (M. Shockley) and 1 recused (F. Hammond).

8. Planning Report

Mr. Hammond returns to the meeting.

Mr. Coker presented the October Planning Report to the Commission.

9. Old Business

None.

10. New Business

Election of Vice-Chairperson

Discussion:

Mr. Rogers stated Mr. Bailey was the only nomination for Vice-Chairman he received.

Motion: by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Looper, to accept Mr. Bailey as Vice-Chairman by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with 1 absent (M. Shockley).

11. Adjourn

Without objection, Chairman Bichel adjourned the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Miglionico

Recording Secretary