

**Zoning Docket from January 11, 2016 Public Hearing**

Docket Number	Applicant	CC DIST.	STAFF REC.	GCPC REC.	P&D REC.	COUNCIL ACTION
<b>CZ-2016-10</b>	Central Realty Holdings, LLC. for Archie L. Honbarrier Trust & Cenco, Inc. 5320 Honbarrier Drive 0533040100519, 0533040100520, 0533040100528, 0533040100529, 0533040100700 (portion), and 0533040100707 S-1, Services and R-S, Residential Suburban To FRD, Flexible Review District	21	Denial	Denial 1/27/16	Held 2/1/16 Held 2/29/16 Held 3/14/16 Withdrawn by Applicant 3/30/16	
<b>Public Comments</b>	<p><b>Some of the general comments made by Speakers at the Public Hearing on January 11, 2016 were:</b></p> <p><u>Speakers For:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Rece Morgan - Central Realty Holding CEO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Held three community meetings</li> <li>• Updated and reviewed traffic studies</li> <li>• Re-engineer the Garlington and Pelham intersections to 5 lanes</li> <li>• Taking on the cost of improving infrastructure to guarantee safety in the area</li> <li>• Will provide resources to pay for offsite improvements at roughly 1.5 million dollars</li> </ul> </li> <li>2) Saint Francis Representative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70,000sqft medical/office building to the east of the rezoning property</li> <li>• Intends to meet the medical needs in this area</li> </ul> </li> <li>3) Developer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long term holder of their properties</li> <li>• Second, Class A development in Greenville County</li> <li>• 38 million dollar development</li> <li>• Maintaining and enhancing natural buffer areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>4) 9 supporters recognized</li> </ol> <p><u>Speakers Against:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Resident <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic concern at Shamrock Lane and Garlington Road</li> <li>• Concerned over traffic increase</li> <li>• Concerns about Pelham road gridlock</li> <li>• Concerns of flooding in the area</li> </ul> </li> <li>2) Resident <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over traffic safety</li> <li>• Concern for access of emergency vehicles</li> <li>• Believes rezoning will negatively impact the quality of life</li> </ul> </li> <li>3) Resident <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern for emergency vehicles and flooding</li> <li>• Concern that emergency exit will turn into a second exit</li> </ul> </li> <li>4) Resident</li> </ol>					<p><b>Petition/Letter For:</b> None</p> <p><b>Against:</b> 11</p>

**Zoning Docket from January 11, 2016 Public Hearing**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to emergency exit onto Durham road</li> <li>• Track team practices in the area, concern for children’s safety</li> </ul> <p>5) Resident</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over floodplain to access certain areas</li> <li>• Concern over placing speed bumps</li> <li>• Concerned that adding another lane will not solve traffic issues</li> <li>• Poor visibility along Durham road and turning onto Garlington</li> <li>• Concern that traffic lights proposed would cause a backup if not synced</li> <li>• Proposed getting together with State, County and SCDOT</li> </ul> <p>6) 26 in opposition recognized</p> <p><b>List of meetings with staff:</b>  November 6, 2015 – residents  December 1, 2015 – applicant  December 8, 2015 – applicant  December 11, 2015 – residents  February 19, 2016 – applicant</p>	
<p><b>Staff Report</b></p>	<p>The subject property is 35.98 acres of storage, truck terminals, and vacant, wooded land. The property is located southeast of Interstate 85 and Pelham Road intersection. The property is also located west of the Garlington Road and Pelham Road intersection. Approximately 1,200 feet of frontage exists along Honbarrier Drive. Approximately 40 feet of frontage exists along Garlington Road. Significant topography and designated flood zones exist on the site.</p> <p>The applicant identified their proposed use as a multi-family complex.</p> <p>It is staff’s opinion that this requested rezoning would have negative impacts to safety and roadway capacity. Significant challenges exist to provide adequate site accessibility, with or without a major storm event, lending to concerns over public safety and traffic volume.</p> <p>The concerns for this site are basic: public safety is endangered for future residents with no viable secondary access solutions that avoid a floodplain. Alternative access should be included with any plan to commit significant traffic (for more than 300 units in this case) to a location with only single access over a proven flood hazard area. It should be noted that a secondary access, however, may also be adversely impacted by the same flooding even for emergency responders. Safety concerns may only be relieved by providing a full secondary access that avoids all floodplains.</p> <p>Staff has concerns over the additional traffic volumes generated by the proposed use and is of the opinion the surrounding road network cannot reasonably handle the additional traffic volumes without significant altering the character of the adjacent neighborhood and committing additional delays to Garlington Road and Pelham Road. A lack of information exists that ensures that anticipated traffic improvements will be effective at mitigating the additional volume.</p> <p>After careful evaluation the following specific areas were found to be deficient and unable to effectively support this development proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Honbarrier Drive bridge over Rocky Creek, serving as the only access, is located in the</li> </ul>	

**Zoning Docket from January 11, 2016 Public Hearing**

	<p>Special Flood Hazard Area and does not meet current standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No infrastructure bonding procedures exist to guarantee the completion of stated off-site road improvements.</li><li>• The submitted proposal does not currently include the additional off-site improvements mentioned by the applicant at the public hearing.</li></ul> <p>Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the application to rezone the subject site to FRD, Flexible Review District.</p>
<b>P&amp;D Committee</b>	<p>February 1, 2016: The Committee held the item upon request by the applicant.</p> <p>February 29, 2016: The Committee held the item to allow applicant to propose amendments.</p> <p>March 14, 2016: The Committee held the item to allow time to review the proposed amendments.</p>