

**Greenville County Planning and Development Committee Minutes**  
**October 03, 2022 at 5:00 p.m.**  
**Conference Room D at County Square**

**Members Present:** J. Dill, Chairman; M. Barnes; C. Harrison; E. Fant; S. Shaw

**Members Absent:** None.

**Councilors Present:** X. Norris; L. Ballard

**Planning Commission Present:** None.

**Staff Present:** T. Coker; D. Campbell; R. Jeffers-Campbell; J. Henderson; T. Stone; L. Mann; K. Mulherin; J. McDuffie; N. Miglionico; IS Staff

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman Dill called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

**2. Invocation**

Mr. Harrison provided the invocation.

**3. Approval of the minutes of the September 19, 2022 - Committee meeting**

**Motion:** by Mr. Barnes to approve the minutes of the September 19, 2022 Committee meeting, as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**4. Rezoning Requests**

**CZ-2022-076**

Ms. Mann introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2022-076.

The subject property, zoned R-M20, Multifamily Residential District, is located on Fedex Way, a two-lane, County maintained residential road and Pine Creek Court Ext., a two-lane, County-maintained residential road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to S-1, Services District, which would create consistent zoning along Fedex Way, would not have an adverse impact on the area.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Fant, to approve CZ-2022-076. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**CZ-2022-077**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2022-077.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed amendment will assist in regulating properties that are in violation from enforcement actions and will remove the ability to abuse this provision to continue a violation indefinitely.

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

**Discussion:** Mr. Harrison asked if there were options to provide leniency in special circumstances. Mr. Henderson stated if this is adopted it will not be retroactive to any open cases and if a citizen is placed in violation, staff works with the applicant and will grant an exception as long as measures are being taken to correct the violation.

**Motion:** by Mr. Barnes, to approve CZ-2022-077. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**CZ-2022-078**

Ms. Mann introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2022-078.

The subject parcel, zoned O-D, Office District, is located along Draper Street, a two-lane County-maintained residential collector road and Abney Street, a two-lane County-maintained local road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to NC, Neighborhood Commercial which would allow for office, as well as retail, restaurant, and residential uses is consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, which designates the area as Traditional Neighborhood.

The development would have to meet the following condition:

1. Submit a Final Development Plan for review and approval prior to the issuance of any land development or building permits.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to NC, Neighborhood Commercial with the aforementioned condition.

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Fant, to approve with condition CZ-2022-078. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**CZ-2022-079**

Ms. Mann introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2022-079.

The subject parcel zoned NC, Neighborhood Commercial, is located along Poinsett Highway, a five-lane State-maintained arterial road. The Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan designates the parcel as *Mixed Use Corridor* and *Traditional Neighborhood*. The parcel is adjacent to R-7.5, Single-Family Residential zoning and uses. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to C-3, Commercial would not align with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan and would be too intensive for the area.

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

**Discussion:** Mr. Harrison agreed with staff's conclusion but asked if the applicant had been consulted on different zoning options. Mr. Henderson stated the applicant could use C-1 or C-2 zoning.

Chairman Dill asked if the Committee could change the zoning request. Mr. Campbell stated traditionally the applicant would submit a request to change the classification. Mr. Campbell

explained if the zoning classification changed the application would go back to other bodies that have previously provided a recommendation.

Mr. Henderson suggested the Committee hold the application to allow the applicant to change the zoning request.

**Motion:** by Mr. Harrison, to hold CZ-2022-079. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**CZ-2022-080**

Ms. Mann introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2022-080.

The subject parcel zoned R-M20, Multifamily Residential District is located along Earle Drive a two-lane County-maintained residential road and Larry Court a two-lane County-maintained residential road. While staff is aware that the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan designates the Future Land Use of this area as industrial, staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning would allow more intensive uses to encroach closer to the single-family residential dwellings in this area, which could create additional adverse impacts on these parcels.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Shaw, to deny CZ-2022-080. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**CZ-2022-081**

CZ-2022-081 was administratively withdrawn.

**CZ-2022-082**

Ms. Mann introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2022-082.

The subject parcel, zoned R-20, Single-Family Residential is located along St. Mark Road, a two-lane State-maintained collector road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to R-M10, Multifamily Residential would align with the zoning of the parcels to the north and would not have an adverse impact on the area.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to R-M10, Multifamily Residential.

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Barnes, to approve CZ-2022-082. The motion carried by voice vote with four in favor (M. Barnes; C. Harrison; J. Dill; E. Fant) and one in opposition (S. Shaw).

**CZ-2022-083**

CZ-2022-083 was administratively withdrawn.

**CZ-2022-084**

CZ-2022-084 was administratively withdrawn.

5. **Held Rezoning Requests**

**CZ-2022-074**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2022-074.

The subject parcel zoned R-R1, Rural Residential, is located along Augusta Road, a five-lane State-maintained arterial road, and W. Georgia Road, a two to three-lane State-maintained collector road. The Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan designates the parcel primarily as *Rural Corridor* with a portion designated as *Suburban Mixed Use*. Additionally, the South Greenville Area Plan designates the parcel as *Transitional Residential* and *Transitional Commercial*. Staff is of the opinion that the requested rezoning aligns with existing plans and permits uses that are compatible with the surrounding area.

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

**Discussion:** Mr. Fant explained Mr. Ballard spoke to the buyer who stated they withdrew their offer due to the distance from sewer hookups. Mr. Fant stated the applicant is still seeking to rezone the property but there is no plan for the area.

Mr. Ballard stated he is concerned if the land is rezoned, knowing there isn't sewer in the area another Dollar General store would be constructed. Mr. Ballard stated he would prefer the land not be rezoned until there is a buyer with a solid plan.

Mr. Fant asked if the problem of buyers telling County Council their plan and then changing the plan would be addressed in the Unified Development Ordinance.

Mr. Harrison explained the zoning classifications will be more detailed and closely related.

Mr. Coker explained the UDO will provide tighter limitations but not eliminate applicants from being disingenuous.

Mr. Ballard stated he loved the idea of narrowing the zoning options.

Chairman Dill stated there is no way they can control what people do with their land within the zoning.

**Motion:** by Mr. Fant, to hold CZ-2022-074. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

6. **Application for Recommendation for Historic Property Designation: Piedmont YWCA**

Tyler Stone presented background information and an application for Historic Property Designation.

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Harrison, to approve and forward to full Council. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**7. New Business**

Chairman Dill asked why developers are not required to have community meetings before submitting preliminary plans for major subdivisions. Mr. Coker stated because it was not written into the Ordinance. Chairman Dill asked what it would take to require it. Mr. Henderson stated it would require a text amendment to the Land Development Regulations.

Mr. Fant asked if there were any plans for the Planning Commission's hands to not be tied after County Council approves an FRD. Mr. Coker explained County Council approves the zoning and the preliminary development plan. Once there is a preliminary development plan, there is an additional zoning step to provide a final development plan. Mr. Coker stated Planning Commission decides on the subdivision application. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained review districts are not just the zoning but are the plan for the site and what they are required to do with the land. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained if County Council approves the plan, but Planning Commission denies the plan, it typically ends up in litigation.

Mr. Harrison asked if an applicant brings an FRD for a subdivision are they required to have all the information on the plan before the public hearing. Mr. Henderson stated they are required to have a ten-day pre-submittal meeting and have all the items needed for submission. Mr. Coker stated staff is considering options to send FRD applications to the Subdivision Advisory Committee in the future to provide additional information to County Council for these type of rezoning applications.

Chairman Dill asked staff to bring information on requiring developers to have a community meeting for major subdivisions.

**8. Adjourn**

Mr. Barnes made a motion to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote and the meeting was adjourned at 5:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Nicole Miglionico*  
Nicole Miglionico  
Recording Secretary