

Greenville County Planning Commission Minutes
September 22, 2021 at 4:30 p.m.
Conference Room D at County Square

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

Commissioners Absent: None

County Councilors Present: E.Fant

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

1. Call to Order

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

2. Invocation

Mr. Bailey provided the invocation.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the August 25, 2021 Commission Meeting

Motion: by Mr. Looper, seconded by Mr. Jones, to approve the minutes of the August 25, 2021 Commission meeting, as presented. The motion carried by voice vote.

4. Preliminary Subdivision Applications

PP-2021-179: Edwards Station

VA-2021-181: Edwards Station Variance Application

Rashida Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Edwards Station, an Open Space Residential Development under Option 2 of the Zoning Ordinance. The project site is located approximately a quarter of a mile south of the intersection of Edwards Rd and Wade Hampton Blvd. The applicant is requesting one hundred and twenty-eight (128) lots on 36 acres at a density of 3.6 units per acre in the multi-family zoning district (R-M4). Access is provided off of Edwards Rd – a state road. Water and sewer will be provided by Greenville Water and Taylors Sewer, respectively.

The project site is located within two character areas of the Comprehensive Plan: Mixed-Use Corridor and Suburban Neighborhood. Mixed-Use Corridors blend residential, commercial, or civic uses in one space, where those functions are, to some degree, physically and functionally integrated. An essential feature of this place type is the integration of multi-modal connections. 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. For Mixed-Use the recommended density is 12 to 40 dwellings per acre, while Suburban Neighborhood recommends 3 to 5 dwellings per acre.

Additionally the applicant is requesting a variance from LDR Article 8.8.1B which requires at least two access roads to the collector and thoroughfare street network. The site has limited road frontage and environmental constraints.

Staff recommends conditional approval of the variance and plan with the standard and specific requirements. Approval conditions are as follows:

- All traffic improvements required by the TIS shall be installed once 40 lots or 60 units have been recorded by final plat.
- A revised preliminary plan shall be submitted to Subdivision Administration and Land Development reflecting the SC DOT required improvement prior to issuance of land disturbance permit.
- 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:

Wake Fickey, a representative of the property owners, spoke in favor of the proposed subdivision. He stated the owners are in full support of the proposed subdivision.

Mr. Jones asked if there was any input from the fire department. Mr. Jones was concerned with the emergency access, stating if a fire started it would spread quickly and residents would have a difficult time getting out of the neighborhood. Mr. Jones asked why there was no secondary access. Westley White, the project engineer, explained the fire department approved of the emergency access and there was no secondary access due to environmental constraints.

Ms. Clark questioned why the variance application was submitted essentially blank. After discussions with Ms. Jeffers-Campbell, Mr. White, and a representative of the developer, it was determined that the full application was not submitted properly into City Works but the variance was being submitted at the guidance of the DOT.

Mr. Bailey pointed out the safety concerns a second access would cause. He stated if the emergency access was turned into a secondary access there would be no sight line in both directions.

Ms. Clark stated having one entrance on this busy road would make exiting the neighborhood difficult for the number of proposed residents.

Motion for PP-2021-179: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve PP-2021-179 with conditions. The motion carried by voice vote with 8 in favor (S. Bichel; M. Jones; M. Shockley; J. Bailey; J. Rogers; M. Looper; F. Hammond; E. Forest) and 1 in opposition (C. Clark).

Motion for VA-2021-181: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve VA-2021-181 with conditions. The motion carried by voice vote with 8 in favor (S. Bichel; M. Jones; M. Shockley; J. Bailey; J. Rogers; M. Looper; F. Hammond; E. Forest) and 1 in opposition (C. Clark).

5. Rezoning Requests

CZ-2021-78

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-78.

The subject parcel, zoned R-S, Residential Suburban, is located along Bracken Road, a two-lane county-maintained collector road. Staff is aware that a successful rezoning to R-MA, Multifamily Residential would allow for the applicant's proposed use of Single-Family and be consistent with surrounding properties' zones; however, staff is of the opinion that some permitted uses in R-MA are not appropriate for the subject property due to site constraints and road improvements in the immediate area.

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

Discussion:

Mr. Hammond asked staff to clarify the recommendation of denial.

Mr. Henderson explained the concern was with the zoning classification. Under the proposed zoning, it would allow for multiple parcels, which would not be consistent with the surrounding land use.

Mr. Forest questioned if I-2 would be more suitable for the property. Mr. Henderson stated 0.98 acres would not provide enough space but it could be possible if it was combined with other properties.

Mr. Bailey questioned what Zoning staff recommends for this location. Mr. Henderson explained R-S, Residential Suburban, could produce a couple of single-family lots and would be consistent with the surrounding land use.

Chairman Bichel explained a zoning that could be better defined would be more appropriate for this area to avoid spot zoning.

Motion: by Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Looper, to deny CZ-2021-78. The motion carried by voice vote with 8 in favor (S. Bichel; M. Jones; M. Shockley; J. Bailey; C. Clark; J. Rogers; M. Looper; E. Forest) and 1 in opposition (F. Hammond).

CZ-2021-79

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-79.

The subject parcels are zoned R-12, Single-Family Residential and located along Viewmont Drive; a two-lane state-maintained residential road. Staff is of the opinion that rezoning to R-S, Suburban Residential is appropriate for the area and will bring the subject parcels into compliance.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to R-S, Residential Suburban.

Discussion:

Mr. Looper asked staff if this was the same case they rezoned last year. Ms. Staton said there was a similar request in the area but this was not the same property.

Mr. Jones stated they can keep chickens on their property now. Mr. Jones questioned how the rezoning would resolve the issue of the chickens roaming onto other properties. Mr. Henderson explained there are two issues at this location. The first issue is the property is not zoned to keep a rooster, which they already have. The second issue is with the chickens roaming onto other properties. The rezoning would allow for the residents to keep their rooster but they would need to prevent their animals from roaming onto other properties.

Mr. Looper asked what other animals the residents could have if the property was rezoned. Mr. Henderson stated, if rezoned, they could own any type of farm animal.

Mr. Bailey explained there are multiple entities the surrounding residents could rely on to ensure the property and animal regulations were properly enforced.

Mr. Forest points out the rooster could be a nuisance to neighbors and the rezoning could impact neighboring house values.

Motion: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Forest, to deny CZ-2021-79. The motion carried by voice vote with 8 in favor (S. Bichel; M. Jones; M. Shockley; C. Clark; J. Rogers; M. Looper; F. Hammond and E. Forest) and 1 in opposition (J. Bailey).

CZ-2021-80

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-80.

The subject parcel, zoned R-S, Residential Suburban, is located along St. Albans School Road, a two-lane county-maintained residential road. Staff is of the opinion that rezoning to R-12, Single-Family Residential is not appropriate for the area due to the existing infrastructure and further is not supported by the *Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan*, which designates this area as Rural Living.

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

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Looper, to deny CZ-2021-80. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2021-81

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-81.

The subject parcel, zoned R-S, Residential Suburban and I-1, Industrial, is located along Old Pelzer Road, a two-lane state-maintained collector road, and Emily Lane, a two-lane state-maintained collector road. Staff is of the opinion that the current zoning for both parcels is appropriate given the site constraints and the surrounding area.

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

Discussion:

Mr. Jones questioned if the industrial plant near this location was still active. Mr. Jones also wanted to know the distance this plant was to the location and if there are any contamination concerns. Waverly Wilkes, the project engineer, stated to her knowledge the plant was still open and looked to be a couple hundred feet away from the property. Ms. Wilkes stated she is unaware of any contamination issues. Ms. Wilkes pointed out the property has areas in a flood zone and rezoning would allow the developer to work more with the land.

Mr. Forest questioned how much of a buffer would be needed from the industrial plant. Ms. Wilkes pointed out a powerline easement creating plenty of natural separation.

Chairman Bichel explained if the property was rezoned, the adjacent industrial plant would not be able to expand.

Mr. Bailey spoke in reference to the flood zones, stating if the industrial plant were to expand it would exacerbate an already troubled area.

Mr. Rogers agreed with Chairman Bichel and cited concerns of Greenville County not having enough industrial area.

Motion: by Mr. Forest, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve CZ-2021-81. The motion failed by hand vote with 4 in favor (M. Shockley; J. Bailey; F. Hammond; E. Forest) and 5 in opposition (S. Bichel; M. Jones; C. Clark; J. Rogers; M. Loooper).

CZ-2021-82

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-82.

The subject parcel, zoned R-S, Residential Suburban, is located along Sterling Grove Road, a two-lane state-maintained collector road, and Augusta Road, a two-lane state-maintained arterial road. Staff is of the opinion that the subject property's location along an arterial and its close proximity to other similar uses and zoning districts makes this an appropriate location for the requested zoning of C-2, Commercial.

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

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Mr. Jones, to approve CZ-2021-82. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2021-83

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-83.

The subject parcel, zoned R-S, Residential Suburban, is located along Blakely Avenue, a two-lane state-maintained collector road. Staff is of the opinion that R-15, Single-Family Residential would be appropriate due to similar zoning density within this area.

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

Discussion:

Mr. Rogers requests staff to clarify if the green area is R-S and if the area is mostly R-S, why are they recommending the rezoning to R-12. Mr. Henderson clarifies the rezoning is for R-15 and staff is recommending the rezoning due to properties to the west already zoned R-15.

Ms. Clark asks if water is available. Mr. Henderson confirms there is a 12 inch water main on Blakely Avenue.

Motion: by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve CZ-2021-83. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2021-84 – **Withdrawn by Applicant**

CZ-2021-85

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-85.

The subject parcel, zoned R-15, Single-Family Residential, is located along Crestwood Drive, a two-lane, state-maintained collector road; Crestwood Forest Drive, a two-lane, county-maintained residential road; and Central Court, a two-lane county-maintained residential road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to R-10, Single-Family Residential would be consistent with surrounding land uses and density and would not have an adverse impact on this area.

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

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Looper, to approve CZ-2021-85. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2021-86

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-86.

The subject parcel, zoned R-10, Single-Family Residential, is located along N Parker Road, a two-lane, state-maintained collector road. The majority of N Parker Road, and the entirety of the immediate area, consists of R-10, Single-Family Residential zoning. Staff is of the opinion that the current zoning is appropriate and maintains the existing character of the area.

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

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Looper, seconded by Ms. Clark, to deny CZ-2021-86. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Hammond recused himself.

CZ-2021-87

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-87.

The subject parcel, zoned PD, Planned Development, is located along Pelham Road, a five-lane, state-maintained arterial road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to PD-MC, Planned Development-Major Change to allow for an expansion of the existing use on the adjacent parcel not allowed under the current zoning is consistent with surrounding land uses and would not have an adverse impact on this area. The development will have to meet the following condition:

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

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to PD-MC, Planned Development-Major Change with the aforementioned condition.

Discussion:

Chairman Bichel requests confirmation of DOT's approval. The applicant, Greg Minton, confirms DOT approved the plan.

Motion: by Mr. Forest, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve with condition CZ-2021-87. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote, with one absent (F.Hammond).

Mr. Hammond rejoined the meeting.

CZ-2021-88 Withdrawn by Applicant

CZ-2021-89

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-89.

The subject parcel, zoned R-10, Single-Family Residential, is located along Crosby Circle., a two-lane county-maintained residential road. The subject parcel is surrounded on all sides by R-10, Single-Family Residential and is a part of an existing subdivision. Staff is of the opinion that the current zoning is appropriate and maintains the existing character of the area.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the requested rezoning to R-6, Single-Family Residential.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Forest, seconded by Mr. Jones, to deny CZ-2021-89. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

CZ-2021-90

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-90.

The subject parcel zoned R-S, Residential Suburban is located along Hwy 651, a two-lane state-maintained collector road. Despite the proposed uses being permitted under NC, Neighborhood Commercial and Neighborhood Commercial being considered a review district, staff is of the opinion that rezoning to NC, Neighborhood Commercial is not the appropriate zoning classification for the request due to Section 8:3.1. More specifically, this section notes that “NC commercial development is aesthetically compatible with neighboring residential properties, and will not create a nuisance due to noise, traffic generation, lighting, or appearance.”

Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the requested rezoning to NC, Neighborhood Commercial.

Discussion:

Mr. Bailey asked staff if a rezoning to FRD would have been a better request. Mr. Henderson explained that FRD would have more regulations; however, there would still be the possible noise complaint issues with this location.

Motion: by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Mr. Forest, to deny CZ-2021-90. The motion carried by voice vote with 8 in favor (S. Bichel; M. Jones; M. Shockley; C. Clark; J. Rogers; M. Looper; F. Hammond and E. Forest) and 1 in opposition (J. Bailey).

CZ-2021-91

Joshua Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2021-91.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed amendments will provide a new zoning option for property owners who wish to zone land characterized by agricultural activities.

Based on these reasons, Staff recommends approval of the proposed Text Amendment.

Discussion:

Chairman Bichel states staff did a great job and he agrees with this Text Amendment

Mr. Jones agrees with Chairman Bichel, stating that after many years of requesting more zoning options for agricultural land, this is nice to see.

Mr. Hammond asks staff for clarification on the 150ft non-disturbance area under the special event facility section. Mr. Henderson explains this is applicable to activities associated with the special event facility, mostly activities that would cause a possible nuisance.

Motion: by Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Looper, to approve CZ-2021-91. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

6. Planning Report

Mr. Tee Coker presented the September Planning Report to the Commission.

7. Old Business

8. New Business

9. Adjourn

Without objection, Chairman Bichel adjourned the meeting at 6:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Miglionico

Recording Secretary