

**Greenville County Planning Commission Minutes**  
**July 27, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.**  
**Conference Room D at County Square**

**Commissioners Present:** S. Bichel, Chair; J. Bailey, Vice-Chair; C. Clark; J. Rogers; F. Hammond; J. Howard; J. Barbare

**Commissioners Absent:** M. Shockley; M. Looper

**County Councilors Present:** None

**Staff Present:** R. Jeffers-Campbell; H. Gamble; C. Antley; M. Tollison; J. Henderson; K. Walters; T. Stone; L. Mann; N. Miglionico; IS Staff

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Invocation**

Mr. Howard provided the invocation.

**3. Approval of the Minutes of the June 22, 2022 Commission Meeting**

**Motion:** by Mr. Howard, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve the minutes of the June 22, 2022 Commission meeting, as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**4. Rezoning Requests**

**CZ-2022-063**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2022-063.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed amendments will provide the ability for Community Centers to open in areas that are fitting for Greenville County residents without having to go through rezoning requests and allow Staff the opportunity to have better regulations in reviewing these types of uses.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Barbare, seconded by Mr. Howard, to approve CZ-2022-063. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Shockley; M. Looper).

**CZ-2022-064**

CZ-2022-065 has been administratively withdrawn.

**CZ-2022-065**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2022-065.

The subject parcels, zoned R-R3, Rural Residential are located along Chickadee Drive, a two-lane County-maintained residential road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to R-R1, Rural Residential, is consistent with surrounding land uses. Currently, the subject parcels are existing nonconforming and would permit 3 dwelling units. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to permit a reconfiguration of lot lines and only 2 dwelling units would be consistent with the uses in the surrounding area.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Ms. Clark, to approve CZ-2022-065. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Shockley; M. Looper).

**CZ-2022-066**

CZ-2022-066 was withdrawn by the applicant.

**CZ-2022-067**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2022-067.

The subject parcel, zoned S-1, Services District, is located along Old Bramlett Road, a two lane County-maintained local road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to FRD, Flexible Review District to allow for a maximum of 300 single-family residential units is consistent with the Future Land Use Map in the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map in the Riverdale-Tanglewood Community Plan.

The development would have to meet the following conditions:

1. Provide a revised Traffic Impact Study satisfying the comments of the Greenville County Traffic Engineer.
2. Submit a Final Development Plan for review and approval prior to the issuance of any land development or building permits.

**Discussion:** Mr. Henderson explained the applicant needed to revise the traffic impact study showing the widening of Old Bramlett Road. Mr. Henderson stated if the traffic impact study is unsatisfactory, the applicant would be unable to submit a Final Development Plan.

Ms. Clark stated her interpretation of Mr. Walters comment was that he was asking for a different set of data, growth rate, and more intersections to be included in the traffic study. Ms. Clark stated she was going to recommend holding the application until a new traffic study is submitted. Ms. Clark stated the drawing they received was not as detailed as typically expected for a Preliminary Development Plan. Mr. Henderson stated the drawing met all requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and checklist. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained drawings are typically more detailed than what is required in the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Clark stated, based on the Planning Commission workshop, this drawing is similar to what they would see for a PD, not an FRD. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained as long as the applicant met the Zoning Ordinance, the drawing is sufficient. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated the point of the workshop

was to address the difference between what the Zoning Ordinance requires for a Preliminary Development Plan and a Final Development Plan. Ms. Clark asked how they are supposed to compare the drawing to a Final Development Plan when it has virtually no detail. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated Final Development Plans are currently reviewed by staff for consistency with the Statement of Intent and Preliminary Development Plan. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated as long as the drawing meets the Zoning Ordinance, there is sufficient information.

Chairman Bichel stated the Planning Commission will see this as a subdivision.

Ms. Clark stated she is trying to avoid similar problems to what the Planning Commission is currently experiencing.

Ms. Clark stated she had concerns about the traffic impact study not satisfying the County Engineer. Mr. Henderson stated they have added the condition to provide a revised traffic impact study. If they do not, they will not be able to move forward with the project.

Mr. Barbare stated after reviewing the traffic study and the staff recommended conditions, he feels confident the issue will be worked out as it must satisfy the County Traffic Engineer.

Chairman Bichel stated the traffic impact study needed to be sufficient to the County Traffic Engineers standards, and it should not only include Old Bramlett Road.

Mr. Rogers stated if this came back to the Planning Commission as a subdivision, according to the Planning Commission workshop, their hands are tied due to County Council approving the rezoning.

Chairman Bichel stated that was true and he hopes County Council picks up on the concerns.

Ms. Clark asked for clarification on the Planning Commission's ability to hold an application. Mr. Henderson read Planning Commission Bylaws Article 6, Section I "Proposed zoning text and map amendments shall be considered, and recommendations shall be forwarded to the governing body within thirty (30) days after receipt of the proposed amendments, unless additional time is given by the governing body." Ms. Clark stated she is concerned because on different application, they have been penalized for not considering traffic at the preliminary review. Chairman Bichel stated he agreed but the motion contained the condition to include a revised traffic impact study.

Chairman Bichel stated the traffic impact study has to be approved by the Greenville County Engineer and County Council.

**Motion:** by Mr. Barbare, seconded by Mr. Hammond, to approve with conditions CZ-2022-067. The motion carried by voice vote with five in favor (J. Barbare; F. Hammond; S. Bichel; J. Bailey; J. Howard) and two in opposition (C. Clark; J. Rogers) with two absent (M. Shockley; M. Looper).

### **CZ-2022-068**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2022-068.

The subject parcel zoned R-20, Single-Family Residential is located along Stephenson St. Ext., a two-lane County-maintained residential road. Staff is of the opinion that the requested rezoning to R-7.5, Single-Family Residential to allow for a maximum of 8 units is appropriate for the area as it would be consistent with the parcels zoned R-7.5 abutting the rear of the subject parcel. Additionally, the property has unique constraints with regards to floodplain and existing infrastructure.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Howard, to approve CZ-2022-068. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Shockley; M. Looper).

## 5. **Final Development Plan Application**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Roberts Farm, Flexible Review District.

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:** Chairman Bichel stated this is the final step in the rezoning process.

Ms. Clark stated the zoning map has already changed.

Mr. Rogers stated it appeared, based on Judge Verdin's order, that the Planning Commissions hands are tied in the sense that, according to the order, once County Council approved the rezoning, the Planning Commissions ability to review this application was limited.

Chairman Bichel stated he agreed with Mr. Rogers

**Motion:** by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve Roberts Farm, Flexible Review District. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with five in favor (J. Rogers; J. Bailey; J. Barbare; F. Hammond; J. Howard) and two abstaining (S. Bichel; C. Clark) with two absent (M. Shockley; M. Looper).

## 6. **Preliminary Subdivision Applications**

### **PP-2022-087 Grove Creek Cottages**

Rashida Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Grove Creek Cottages, a Rural Conservation Subdivision developed under Article 22 of the Land Development Regulations, located southeast of the intersection of S. Piedmont Highway (Highway 20) and Bessie Rd (Highway 86), near the Anderson County line. The applicant is requesting 328 lots at a density of 2 units/acre in the Unzoned area of the County. Access is provided off of Old Pelzer Rd (state). Water and sewer will be provided by Greenville Water and Metro Sewer, respectively.

The proposed subdivision is located in the Rural Living character area of the Comprehensive Plan. 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. The recommended density is 1 dwelling per 2+ acres. This application proposes 2 units per acre, which is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff recommends approval with the standard and specific requirements with the following condition:

- All traffic improvements required by SCDOT shall be installed once 40 lots have been recorded.

Additional condition from the Planning Commission:

- Submit a revised plan showing mid-block pedestrian pathways connecting adjacent blocks at and between lots: 146 and 147, 153 and 154, 168 and 169 and 176 and 177.

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

Waverly Wilkes, the project engineer, spoke in favor of the proposed subdivision. Ms. Wilkes provided a brief overview of the project. Ms. Wilkes stated the project exceeded open space requirements, traffic improvements are planned in the area, and stormwater would be treated on site.

Chairman Bichel pointed out an error on the open space table. Ms. Wilkes explained they exceed the open space requirement and they created the table based on LDR Article 22 open space table requirements. Chairman Bichel stated he was unable to find any mid-block pedestrian pathways. Ms. Wilkes explained only one section of the plan does not meet the requirement and they have already looked into a resolution. Ms. Wilkes pointed out two locations for the six-foot pathways they plan to add and stated it would not affect the layout or number of lots on the plan.

Ms. Clark explained the property is located in the Rural Living character area of the Comprehensive Plan, which would dictate approximately 82 homes. Ms. Clark stated the proposed plan has four times the amount that is recommended. Ms. Clark asked how the number of homes was determined. Ms. Wilkes explained they determined the number of homes based on the adjacent Mixed-Use designation area, located near an Industrial designation area, and due to the amount of infrastructure needed to provide sewer to the lots. Ms. Clark asked if they planned to provide walking trails. Ms. Wilkes stated there are sidewalks throughout the community but at this point, for grading purposes, they have not identified any walking trail routes. Ms. Clark asked for clarification on SCDOT's traffic impact

study response. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained if the traffic improvement associated with Cottage Woodridge Subdivision do not occur, SCDOT will require an updated traffic impact study and will attach traffic improvements to this proposed subdivision. Ms. Clark stated she is concerned because traffic improvements are not required until forty lots have been recorded. Chairman Bichel stated permits will not be allowed until SCDOT is satisfied. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained the condition ensures the developer cannot record lots until traffic improvements are satisfied.

**Motion:** by Mr. Barbare, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve with conditions PP-2022-087. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Shockley; M. Looper).

### **PP-2022-105 Langford Hills**

Rashida Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Langford Hills, a rural conservation subdivision located a third of a mile south of the intersection of Garrison and Augusta Rd in the unzoned area south of I-185. The applicant is requesting 174 lots at a density of 1.06 units/acre with an average lot size of 21,555. Access is provided off of Garrison and Augusta Rd –state roads. Water and sewer will be provided by Greenville Water and septic, respectively.

The proposed subdivision is located in the Rural Living character area of the Comprehensive Plan. 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. The recommended density is 1 dwelling per 2+ acres. This application proposes 1.06 units per acre.

On 11.17.2021, the Planning Commission denied Langford Hills case PP-2021-219 due to a split vote. At the public hearing, citizens expressed concerns regarding the preservation of the McDavid House – a structure listed on the Greenville County Historic Resource Survey. The applicant revised and resubmitted the plan under case PP-2021-298 to address the preservation of the historic resource but was denied on 1.26.2022. Application PP-2022-043, which was the same as the application denied on 1.26.2022, was also denied on 4.27.2022. Since then, the McDavid House has been demolished and no longer exists on site. The current application has two less lots with approximately 2.78 more acres of open space.

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

Approval conditions are as follows:

- All SCDOT required improvements shall be installed once 40 lots have been recorded by final plat. Specifically, a right turn lane shall be installed at Access 3 or at US 25 and Garrison Rd as directed by SC DOT.
- 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:** Three nearby residents spoke in opposition of the proposed subdivision. The first speaker, John Hill, stated the proposed subdivision has been denied three times, the

developer filed a lawsuit and the court ruled in favor of the Planning Commission's decision, and no changes have been made to the current plan other than the 1800s-era home that was once on the property is now destroyed. Mr. Hill expressed concern about the use of septic on 174 lots stating it will provide a dangerous impact to the local water table and pollute streams. The second speaker, Anne Peden, stated the community is broken hearted due to the loss of the historic McDavid house and is scared the developer will destroy the other house on the property. The final speaker, Mark Yost, stated the proposal is a poor attempt at rural conservation and expressed concern about the use of septic.

There were three speakers in favor of the proposed subdivision. The first speaker, Waverly Wilkes, the project engineer, provided a brief overview of the project. Ms. Wilkes stated they have protected the existing graveyard and access is provided. Ms. Wilkes explained septic lots are permitted individually, must have soil tested and be signed off by consultants and SCDHEC, and must provide appropriate buffers. Ms. Wilkes stated septic regulations are full covering and expansive. Ms. Wilkes explained there was a long process and attempt to work on the existing homes on the property and Greenville County condemned the house that was destroyed. Ms. Wilkes stated neither of the homes are historic or on a protected list. Ms. Wilkes explained the existing house is marked out from the development.

Mr. Rogers asked how this plan was different than the one that was most recently denied. Ms. Wilkes stated mainly it is the frontage, the home around lot one is now excluded from the plan, and the McDavid home is no longer there. Mr. Rogers asked if they tore down one house and put more lots in. Ms. Wilkes stated they did not gain any additional lots.

The second speaker in favor, Marcelo Torricos, the project attorney, spoke about the recent lawsuit involving this project and the Planning Commission. Mr. Torricos stated the issue before the court, at that particular time, was whether or not the Planning Commission in its denial letters had to provide specific reasons for their denial. The court ruled that the minutes themselves are the record and the specific reasons do not need to be included in the denial letter. Mr. Torricos explained the difference in this application to the applications before was there are two fewer lots, the historical houses are no longer an issue because one has been removed and one was condemned by Greenville County, and there is no variance request in this application. Mr. Torricos stated there was no data to support pollution of the water table and none has been presented. Mr. Torricos explained there has been a lot of discussion about the Comprehensive Plan and the number of units per acre. Mr. Torricos stated the Planning Commission knows the Comprehensive Plan is merely a guide and if the Planning Commission were going to require density to meet the Comprehensive Plan, then the Planning Commission is effectively zoning property without due process. Mr. Torricos stated in reference to the turn lane that was an issue at the last meeting, the developer is committed to following all of SCDOT's recommendations.

Mr. Howard asked for clarification about the existing homes on the property and if they are listed as historic protected homes. Mr. Torricos stated the homes were eligible for the registry but were not listed on any registry, then Greenville County condemned one of the homes and it was torn down. Mr. Howard asked if that added to the open space. Mr. Bailey explained the buffer added additional open space.

Mr. Rogers asked for clarification about the comment regarding the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Rogers explained the Comprehensive Plan contains density recommendations and was adopted by Greenville County Council. Mr. Rogers stated he does not understand how that is denying due process if the Planning Commission uses it as a guide in adjudicating a petition. Mr. Torricos explained his interpretation is the Comprehensive Plan is a guide for Greenville County to enact things like the Land Development Regulations or Zoning Ordinances. Mr. Torricos does not believe the Comprehensive Plan can be a basis for denial of preliminary conditional approval. Mr. Torricos stated if County Council wanted to take the Comprehensive Plan and modify Land Development Regulations or Zoning Ordinances with it, that is fine, but it should not be a basis for denial. Mr. Torricos explained zoning property requires many steps, processes, and public input. If the Comprehensive Plan is going to be used to set density, you are depriving people of due process.

Ms. Clark stated the LDR states the Planning Commission needs to review plans and decide if they are in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Torricos stated you have to take a holistic approach to how you view “in harmony” with the surrounding area, because if you take that statement strictly, you will never be able to advance any developments in any areas that don’t already have development. Mr. Torricos explained we need to look at growth and where growth is going. Ms. Clark stated the Future Land Use Map for this area was supposed to reduce septic lots by 59%. Ms. Clark stated this application is two-three miles south of the closest sewer connection and approving an application with this density on septic is not helping Greenville County reach the goal of septic lot reduction.

The final speaker in favor, Darren Webb, the developer, pointed out similarities between PP-2022-072 River Preserve, which was approved last month, and this application. Mr. Webb explained Langford Hills has fewer lots with about the same density, has slightly more open space, both projects have septic, and Langford Hills is within a less restrictive character area.

Chairman Bichel read Judge Verdin’s order conclusion, “Therefore, the Court finds that there is a sufficient record to explain Respondent’s denial of Appellant’s application. The Court does not find that that Respondent made its decision with no evidentiary support or in an arbitrary or capricious manner. Appellant also committed no clear errors of law. Accordingly, Respondent’s decision is affirmed”. Chairman Bichel stated the Planning Commission has denied this subdivision three times and the Judge has concluded the same thing Planning Commission has.

Mr. Rogers moved to deny the application based on the following grounds:

1. The reason’s set forth previously and the Judge’s order.
2. The plan is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
3. Based on the concerns of septic use.

Mr. Hammond stated staff has recommended approval, ReWa has approved the use of septic, and nobody has presented a quantitative reason septic would be detrimental to this area. Mr. Hammond explained septic systems are sophisticated and expensive systems. If given a choice, sewer is preferred, but there is not a choice in this application. Mr. Hammond stated the subdivision fronts a five-lane US Highway that is at approximately 50% of its capacity, there are no traffic concerns with the application. Mr. Hammond explained if the Planning Commission was consistent with what was approved and denied based on the Comprehensive



Plan, he would be comfortable denying based on it, but there is no consistency. Mr. Hammond stated the Comprehensive Plan is an aspirational document and there is no Ordinance that enforces the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Howard stated there was consistency when using the Comprehensive Plan and asked why it wouldn't be able to be used as guidance.

Mr. Hammond stated the Comprehensive Plan is not law or zoning. It effectively becomes density without going through a zoning process to be used whenever it occurs to be used and has not been used consistently by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Barbare stated he agrees with the staff recommendation and failed to see the concerns raised.

Mr. Bailey stated he agrees with Mr. Hammond based on historical review of previous approvals and denials.

Ms. Clark stated, as long as a subdivision is in a suburban area, the Planning Commission is more than happy to consider the Comprehensive Plan, but when it is in a rural area we hear comments like we just heard. Ms. Clark stated the Planning Commission is inconsistent because they are not consistently applying the same level of review for suburban areas and rural areas.

Mr. Hammond stated you cannot cherry pick the Comprehensive Plan when it suits your needs and not pay attention to it when it doesn't.

Mr. Rogers stated we spent \$400,000 on the Comprehensive Plan and the argument seems to be that we need to apply it all the time, in which case it would be a binding document, then the argument would be that it is not a binding document. Mr. Rogers explained the Comprehensive Plan is a guidance document that you apply with judgement.

Chairman Bichel stated the Judge's response is affirmed. The Planning Commission has denied this subdivision three times and it was upheld.

**Motion:** by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Ms. Clark, to deny PP-2022-105. The motion carried by voice vote with four in favor (J. Rogers; C. Clark; S. Bichel; J. Howard) and three in opposition (J. Barbare; F. Hammond; J. Bailey) with two absent (M. Shockley; M. Looper).

**PP-2022-110 Bethany Farms (Revision)**

Rashida Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Bethany Farms, a single-family subdivision located in the unincorporated area of Simpsonville on the northeast corner of the intersection of East Georgia and Bethany Road in the Scuffletown Rural Conservation District. The applicant is requesting 69 lots on 82.76 acres in the R-S residential suburban zoning district. Access is provided off of Bethany Rd – a state road, and E. Georgia Rd. – a state road. Water and sewer will be provided by Greenville Water and septic, respectively.

The proposed subdivision is located within 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. 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. The recommended density is 3-5 dwellings/acre. Bethany Farms is proposing 0.83 dwellings/acre.

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

- In accordance with LDR 8.21, deciduous (canopy) or evergreen trees shall be planted to create a visual screen along parcels 0552010100348 and 0552010100305 in the areas where there is not natural vegetative buffer.

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

Paul Harrison, the project engineer, spoke in favor of the proposed subdivision. Mr. Harrison stated he was available to answer questions.

Ms. Clark stated East Georgia Road and Bethany Road are rural scenic roads. Ms. Clark asked why access runs through almost two acres of trees. Mr. Harrison stated it was the high point of the road and they needed to design access in that way due to sight distance requirements. Ms. Clark asked if there are any requirements to plant trees within the 150 foot buffer on East Georgia Road and Bethany Road. Mr. Harrison stated a screening buffer is required within the first 50 feet. Ms. Clark explained you want to minimize the view of the subdivision from the road. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained trees need to be planted in an informal manner to provide a screen.

**Motion:** by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Howard, to approve PP-2022-110. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Shockley; M. Looper).

#### **PP-2022-112 Brisk Haven**

Rashida Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Brisk Haven, a conventional subdivision located west of the intersection of Blakely Ave. and Reedy Fork Rd. The applicant is requesting 82 lots at a density of 3.77 units/acre in the C-2, Commercial zoning district. A small portion of the development site is zoned R-S (parcel# 0594010100104). Access is provided off of Blakely Ave (state). Water and sewer will be provided by Greenville Water and MetroConnects, respectively.

The site is also located within both the Suburban Mixed Use and Mixed Employment Center area of the Comprehensive Plan. 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 applicant is proposing 3.7 units per acre which is inconsistent with the comprehensive plan's recommendations of 6 to 20 dwelling units per acre for Suburban Mixed Use.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- Approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals for Use by Special Exception for the lift station
- A revised Preliminary Plan shall be submitted to Subdivision Administration following any approvals granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

**Discussion:** There were four nearby residents in opposition of the proposed subdivision. The first speaker, Kerry Lord, provided a petition against the proposed subdivision and asked his neighbors in attendance to stand. Mr. Lord stated there was no justification to develop single family residential homes under the C-2 zoning, it is incompatible with the surrounding area, and there is inadequate infrastructure to support the development.

Chairman Bichel stated the Comprehensive Plan recommends 6-20 dwelling units per acre for this area. Mr. Lord stated the area is directly on the border of Rural character area and everything else on that road has been in the family for generations. Mr. Bichel asked how the area became C-2 zoning. Mr. Lord stated the owner rezoned C-2 years ago but was uncertain why.

The second speaker in opposition, Ray Santoianni, stated local property values will decline, C-2 zoning was never intended to provide residential areas, and the traffic increase estimate is too low. The third speaker, Geeta Nangia, presented pictures to show the narrowness of the road. The fourth speaker, Angela Kay, expressed concern about drainage issues. Ms. Kay stated her property already experiences drainage issues from a new development and is concerned this development will provide even more drainage problems. Ms. Kay stated she does not believe the schools will have enough room for all the new developments in the area.

Austin Allen, the project engineer, spoke in favor of the proposed subdivision. Mr. Allen provided a brief overview of the proposed subdivision. Mr. Allen explained the property is zoned C-2 for a commercial meat plant. Mr. Allen stated within C-2 zoning you are allowed to develop under R6 zoning. Mr. Allen explained C-2 zoning allows for more than just single family detached homes, currently allows 16 units per acre, and could be developed at a much higher density than what they are proposing. Mr. Allen stated the goal for this subdivision and Willow Mist is to create inner-connectivity. Mr. Allen reviewed the traffic impact study and road conditions. Mr. Allen explained stormwater will meet all regulations and they are not allowed to create detriment to any surrounding properties.

Chairman Bichel asked why they need an appeal from the Board of Zoning Appeals. Mr. Allen explained a lift station is not an approved use within the current zoning.

Ms. Clark stated the area is located in the Suburban Mixed-Use character area. Ms. Clark explained subdivision applications continue to be presented to the Planning Commission without varying lot sizes or dwelling types, which is what Suburban Mixed-Use encourages. Colton Miller, the developer, pointed out initially Brisk Haven and Willow Mist were one development which would have contained some variation.

Chairman Bichel stated this proposal provides less density than it could.

Angela Kay, a speaker in opposition, explained the meat packing business is a small enterprise. Ms. Kay pointed out her barn and what the surveyor considered wetlands.

Mr. Bailey explained this proposed subdivision could come back with townhomes and apartments without needing the Planning Commission's approval.

**Motion:** by Mr. Howard, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve with conditions PP-2022-112. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Shockley; M. Looper).

### **PP-2022-113 Willow Mist**

Rashida Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Willow Mist, a Cluster Development under Option 1 of the Zoning Ordinance located west of the intersection of Blakely Ave. and Reedy Fork Rd. The applicant is requesting 31 lots at a density of 1.5 units/acre in the R-S, Residential Suburban zoning district. Access is provided off of Blakely Ave (state). Water and sewer will be provided by Greenville Water and ReWa, respectively.

The site is located within both the Suburban Mixed Use and Mixed Employment Center area of the Comprehensive Plan. 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. Mixed Employment Centers are a new type of office park or corporate campus-like developments geared toward meeting the needs of mid to large businesses. Typical features include signature architectural elements and a campus-style development pattern that connects jobs to amenities and places of residence in a well-organized fashion. The applicant is proposing 1.5 units per acre which is inconsistent with the comprehensive plan's recommendations of 6 to 20 dwelling units per acre for Suburban Mixed Use, and 8 to 30 dwelling units per acre for the Mixed Employment Center.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions that will be required:

- Approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals for Use by Special Exception for the lift station
- That a revised Preliminary Plan be submitted to Subdivision Administration following any approvals granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

**Discussion:** Kerry Lord was the only speaker in opposition of the proposed subdivision. Mr. Lord expressed his sadness about the approval of the previous subdivision and stated he is concerned with the same issues about this proposed subdivision.

Austin Allen, the project engineer, spoke in favor of the proposed subdivision. Mr. Allen provided a brief overview of the project. Mr. Allen stated he believes this proposed subdivision meets the intent of a cluster subdivision.

Chairman Bichel stated the cluster design is better than most.

**Motion:** by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Howard, to approve with conditions PP-2022-113. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with two absent (M. Shockley; M. Looper).

## **6. Planning Report**

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell presented the July Planning Report.

## **7. Old Business**

None

**8. New Business**

None

**9. Adjourn**

Without objection, Chairman Bichel adjourned the meeting at 7:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Nicole Miglionico*

Nicole Miglionico

Recording Secretary