

Greenville County Planning and Development Committee Minutes
October 28, 2024 at 5:00 p.m.
Special Called Meeting
Council Committee Room at 301 University Ridge Greenville, SC 29601

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, notice of the meeting date, time, place and agenda was posted online, at 301 University Ridge, Greenville, and made available to the newspapers, radio stations, television stations and concerned citizens.

Members Present: E. Fant, Chairman; C. Harrison; M. Barnes; R. Bradley; A. Mitchell

Members Absent: None.

Councilors Present: None.

Planning Commission Present: None.

Staff Present: C. Antley; T. Coker; R. Jeffers-Campbell; N. Miglionico; IS Staff

1. Call to Order

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

2. Invocation

Mr. Barnes provided the invocation.

3. Unified Development Ordinance

Tee Coker, Assistant County Administrator of Planning & Development, provided a presentation on the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Mr. Coker stated the project purpose was to integrate and streamline the County's land use and development ordinances into a single cohesive code.

Discussion: Mr. Barnes asked what would be required if the trees incorporated in the 10% requirement died. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained that a tree protection plan is required to identify where the trees are located, and the Planning Department has added a position for a tree inspector to verify that the trees selected are living and viable, but the ordinance does not address replanting. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated that the requirement would not apply to sites without trees, and there is flexibility on sites where the developer can make a good case for why the trees cannot be preserved.

Chairman Fant asked staff to clarify the regulations around accessory dwellings. Mr. Coker explained that the UDO defined accessory dwellings as subordinate dwelling units. These units would require a building permit and be limited by lot size. Mr. Coker stated that the structures are expensive to build and intended to add value to existing properties.

Mr. Barnes asked if renting out the accessory dwellings would be allowable. Mr. Coker stated yes, and they would be taxed the same percent as the entire parcel.

Mr. Mitchell asked if the accessory dwelling could be attached or detached. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated that it has always been allowed to be attached, but the detached option is new. Mr. Coker explained that Greenville County has allowed accessory dwelling units for many years, but we just haven't been able to call them that. Currently, you can build a mother-in-law suite on site, but the structure has to be connected by a covered walkway to the main house, which is then considered a house addition. What has been happening is that

the walkways are taken down after inspections and certificates of occupancy. Mr. Coker explained that regarding the impact on Greenville County, if you want to have an accessory dwelling unit, you would likely already have one. Mr. Coker stated that the UDO allows greater flexibility in having them attached or detached with greater regulating factors, such as lot size, covenants, and feasibility.

Mr. Barnes asked if the accessory building would use the existing septic tank on the property. Mr. Coker explained that SCDES would regulate that.

Mr. Harrison explained that it is difficult to have one development ordinance for the entirety of Greenville County due to the size and diversity of the area. Mr. Harrison stated there are a lot of positive changes in the document, and we shouldn't let 10-15% of things that people may want to change hold up the process. Mr. Harrison explained that the document had been worked on for 5 years, and to believe that it was rushed is short-sighted and disrespectful. Mr. Harrison stated that with the area's growth, doing nothing was not a solution.

Chairman Fant agreed with Mr. Harrison and did not believe they should kill the ordinance because of two or three things they didn't like. Mr. Fant explained that the document would never satisfy everybody but encouraged the Committee to look into making amendments at second reading or in the future if they notice things are not working the way they were intended to.

Mr. Bradley stated he reached out to the community and people knowledgeable in zoning and development regulations, and they came up with a list of issues.

1. Staff commented that they are tired of working on the UDO and that it will urbanize the entire County. Staff said to pass it, and they will fix it.
2. It doesn't protect the unzoned or underdeveloped areas.
3. Minimizes protection of open space in unzoned areas.
4. 100% participation from property owners for proposed zoning.
5. No administration manual on the website.
6. Document tables missing information.
7. Most of the public comments went unanswered.
8. Community septic allowance for RV parks.
9. Footnote errors.
10. Staff only reviews apartments and RV parks.
11. Planning Commission decisions are not included in major subdivisions.
12. The UDO overreaches the power of Greenville County employees.
13. No infill standards.
14. 20% density bonus for affordable housing without consideration of proximity to employment centers or public transportation.
15. The mill village overlay provides no map or list of applicable villages.

Mr. Bradley believed 80% of the document was good but thought it should be 100% right before implementation.

Chairman Fant stated he thought Greenville County got rid of community septic tanks last year. Mr. Coker explained that no community septic tanks are allowed in Greenville County, but RV parks sharing a septic field are not considered community septic. Mr. Coker stated that for over two decades, RV parks have been a staff-level approval and are currently only

allowed in unzoned areas, which has not changed from the LDR to the UDO. Mr. Coker explained that the County Council makes the determination on zoning that would allow apartments in commercial and multifamily districts.

Some discussion ensued on banning RV parks in Greenville County.

Mr. Harrison pointed out that the RV park situation is similar to various scenarios in the UDO, where something that isn't wanted in one district may be welcome in a different district. Mr. Harrison stated he agreed with getting things right the first time, but this document will never be 100% right for everyone in Greenville County.

Chairman Fant pointed out that Greenville County changes demographically every day.

Mr. Mitchell proposed requirements to review proposed RV parks.

Mr. Mitchell believed the community meetings, tree conservation, affordable housing incentives, sidewalk and road requirements, and increased coordination with utilities were good additions to our regulations. Mr. Mitchell stated that some things in the UDO could be improved, but if they can move forward and make changes in the future, it is the way to go.

Motion: by Mr. Harrison, to approve and forward to full Council. The motion carried by voice vote with four in favor (E. Fant; C. Harrison; M. Barnes; A. Mitchell) and one in opposition (R. Bradley).

4. Adjourn

Mr. Barnes made a motion to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote and the meeting was adjourned at 5:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Miglionico

Nicole Miglionico
Recording Secretary