

**Greenville County Planning Commission Minutes**  
**May 22, 2024 at 4:30 p.m.**  
**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.*

**Commissioners Present:** S. Bichel, Chairman; J. Bailey, Vice Chair; J. Rogers; M. Shockley; F. Hammond; J. Barbare; J. Wood; D. Manning

**Commissioners Absent:** None.

**County Councilors Present:** None.

**Staff Present:** R. Jeffers-Campbell; J. Henderson; T. Baxley; K. Mulherin; C. Hill

**1. Call to Order**

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

Chairman Bichel welcomed Deborah Manning to the Planning Commission.

**2. Invocation**

Mr. Bailey provided the invocation.

**3. Approval of the Minutes of the April 24, 2024 Commission Meeting**

**Motion:** by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve the minutes of the April 24, 2024 Commission meeting, as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**4. Rezoning Requests**

**CZ-2024-029**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-029.

The subject parcel zoned R-7.5, Single-Family Residential District is located along Camden Drive, a two-lane County-maintained local road. Staff is of the opinion that the requested rezoning to S-1, Services District is consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, which designates the parcel as *Mixed Employment Center*. Additionally, the requested zoning district is consistent with zoning districts to the south and west.

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

**Discussion:** Mr. Bailey asked how the applicant would meet the setbacks requirements. Mr. Henderson stated he believed the area would be a playground.

**Motion:** by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve CZ-2024-029. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**CZ-2024-030**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-030.

The subject parcel zoned R-12, Single-Family Residential District is located along Alco Street, a two-lane County-maintained residential road and Hallcox Street, a two-lane County-maintained residential road. Staff is of the opinion that the requested rezoning to R-6, Single-Family Residential District is consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, which designates the parcel as *Traditional Neighborhood* and suggests a density of 6 to 20 units per acre. Staff also feels the requested zoning district would not have an adverse impact on surrounding properties.

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

**Discussion:** Chairman Bichel asked if the rezoning would be considered spot zoning. Mr. Henderson explained the lot size and configuration was consistent with the surrounding area.

**Motion:** by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve CZ-2024-030. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

### **CZ-2024-032**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-023.

The subject parcel, zoned R-12, Single-Family Residential District, is located along Roberts Road, a two-lane County-maintained local road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to R-M2, Multifamily Residential District would not be consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan which designates the area as Suburban Edge with a density of 0-1 dwellings per acre. Additionally, the proposed zoning district is not consistent with zoning districts in the surrounding area.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the requested rezoning to R-M2, Multifamily Residential District.

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Ms. Manning, to deny CZ-2024-032. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

### **CZ-2024-033**

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2024-033.

The subject parcel zoned C-1, Commercial District and C-2, Commercial District is located along W. Marion Road, a two-lane State-maintained collector road. Staff is of the opinion that the requested rezoning to C-3, Commercial District is consistent with the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, which designates the parcel as *Transitional Corridor* and suggests commercial as a primary use. Additionally, Staff feels the requested zoning district would not have an adverse impact on surrounding properties.

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

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Ms. Manning, to approve CZ-2024-033. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

## 5. Preliminary Subdivision Applications

### **PP-2024-046 Gridley Place**

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Gridley Place, a Flexible Review District subdivision located west of the intersection of Old Buncombe Rd (State) and Hammett St (County). The applicant is requesting 14 lots on 1.47 acres for a density of 9.52 units/acre. Access is provided off shared driveways along Morris St. (County) and Gridley Pl. (County)

The project is infill with seven duplexes over 14 lot with shared driveways per each duplex unit, two cluster mailboxes, and 20-foot screening buffers around the perimeter of the site.

The subject site is a part of the Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, where it is designated *Traditional Neighborhood*. Traditional Neighborhoods are characterized primarily by early and mid-twentieth century single-family homes, with some blocks including small-scale apartment buildings and attached townhomes. Parks and places of worship are also present. Existing housing stock should be preserved and improved; however, there are opportunities for single-lot infill development, which should be of a compatible scale and character with surrounding homes. The *Traditional Neighborhood* character area type recommends a density of 6 to 20 dwelling units per acre. Gridley Place is proposing 9.52 dwelling units per acre.

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

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

**Motion:** by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve PP-2024-046. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

### **PP-2024-057 Hartness Phase 5**

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Hartness Phase 5, a Planned Development located south of the intersection of Pelham Rd and Highway 14. The applicant is requesting 62 lots on 14.28 acres for a density of 4.34 units/acre. Access is provided off Traverse Drive, a County Rd.

The project is a continuation of the overall Hartness Planned Development and adds 8 internal roads, one cluster mailbox, 122 parking spaces provided both on lots and by on-street parking spaces, 3.36 acres of common area, one detention pond, and 3,373 linear feet of new public road.

The subject site is a part of the Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, where it is designated *Suburban Neighborhood*. 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. Suburban Neighborhoods recommend a density of 3 to 5 dwelling units per acre. Hartness Phase 5 is proposing a density of 4.34 dwelling units per acre.

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

#### Planning Commission Conditions

- Add lot table per LDR 3.3.4(M)

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

Chairman Bichel stated there needed to be a lot table per LDR 3.3.4(M).

**Motion:** by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve with conditions PP-2024-057. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

#### **PP-2024-035 Savannah Oaks Estates**

##### **VAR2024-100 Savannah Oaks Estates – Secondary Access Variance Application**

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Savannah Oaks Estates, a Cluster Option 1 Subdivision located southwest of the intersection of Fairview Rd (State) and SC-418 (State). The applicant is requesting 99 lots on 113.51 acres for a density of 0.87 units/acre. Access is provided off of SC-418, which is a State road.

The project includes one ingress/egress point, 4 internal roads, 1 cluster mailbox, 20-foot screening buffers around the perimeter of the site, additional creek buffers along creeks on site, four detention ponds, 1.29 linear miles of new public road, and 47.24 acres of open space (45.40 acres are required), with mulched trails provided throughout the open space.

**VAR2024-100** was submitted to request a variance from LDR 8.8.1A which requires a subdivision of 30 lots or 50 single family attached dwellings to provide at least two access points. The applicant states that the development parcel has less than 600 feet of frontage on Hwy 418, is surrounded by creeks and landlocked on three of the 4 sides and has no alternate means of access. The applicant states that the entrance road will be widened to accommodate 26 feet from end of pavement to end of pavement.

The subject site is a part of the Greenville County Comprehensive Plan, where it is designated *Rural*. Rural place types include working farms actively used for agricultural activities, including cultivated cropland, pastures, and raising livestock. The physical environment may consist of fences, tree rows, wooded areas, ponds, or large swales to drain cropland. Rural place types also support the primary residence of the property owner and any out-buildings associated with the activities of a working farm — otherwise, these are places characterized by natural or cultivated landscapes with minimal development. The Rural character area type recommends a density of 1 dwelling per 2+ acres. Savannah Oaks Estates is proposing 1.14 dwellings per acre.

Staff recommends approval with conditions of the plan and variance request with the standard and specific requirements.

The conditions of approval are as follows:

1. Provide traffic calming along Road A in accordance with the Greenville County Land Development Regulations.
2. Per the Traffic Impact Study, construct a westbound left turn lane on SC-418 at the site access with at least 150 feet of storage and taper.
3. Prior to the issuance of building permits, all traffic improvements should be in place.

**Discussion:** There was one speaker in opposition of the proposed subdivision, Nancy Reynolds. Ms. Reynolds was concerned about the minimal buffer between her property and the development. Ms. Reynolds would prefer a larger buffer to protect the wildlife and screen the existing homes.

There were no speakers in favor of the proposed subdivision.

Mr. Shockley asked why the traffic improvements were required before permitting when previously improvements were required before 40 lots. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated it was a staff recommendation due to feedback from the previous Planning Commission meeting, but it could be altered. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell recommended returning to the prior recommendation of traffic improvements before 40 lots are recorded. Mr. Shockley stated that SCDOT had their own requirements. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated that the staff's condition had been seen as helpful with SCDOT.

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell clarified that the road would be widened from the entrance to the first intersection.

Discussion ensued on modifying condition 3; "Prior to the issuance of building permits, all traffic improvements should be in place."

Chairman Bichel asked if the riparian buffer was treated as a wetland or if the space could be used. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated that it is treated as a standard buffer, not a wetland.

Chairman Bichel stated the design did not conform to the Comprehensive Plan and violated LDR 11.3.2, LDR 11.4, LDR 11.4(A), LDR 11.4(B), LDR 8.18(E)(2), LDR 8.18(E)(3), and LDR 8.18(E)(5).

Mr. Wood made a motion to deny based on non-conformance to the Comprehensive Plan and violation of LDR 11.3.2, LDR 11.4, LDR 11.4(A), LDR 11.4(B), LDR 8.18(E)(2), LDR 8.18(E)(3) and LDR 8.18(E)(5).

Mr. Hammond stated staff recommended approval and asked staff to address the Planning Commission's reasons for denial. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained some points are subjective, and the ordinance doesn't prescribe how the subdivision needed to be laid out but does give the Planning Commission some ability to weigh in on the layout. However, it is a grey area and isn't very clear. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated the application met the ordinance requirements. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained that the cluster ordinance is not just to provide play or recreational areas but to preserve environmentally sensitive areas, which the application does. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated there are many reasons a Planning Commission member may not support the plan, and it is up to the Planning Commission as a whole to decide if those are relevant issues.

Mr. Hammond stated the open area doesn't appear to be a play area but to preserve environmentally sensitive areas. Mr. Hammond explained the Planning Commission gets into a subjective grey area based on minor issues.

Mr. Bailey stated he supported the subjectivity because there are many issues with cluster developments, and it is the only way to make a meaningful choice to protect certain areas.

Ms. Manning expressed concern about cluster developments in the middle of a rural area and stated that she wants to maintain Greenville County's beauty and charm.

Mr. Hammond stated he becomes concerned as the process becomes more complex because it is time-consuming and expensive and needs to be fair to all parties.

Mr. Rogers stated that staff can do a great job, but their scope is different from the Planning Commissions'. Mr. Rogers explained that it is important to defer to staff for the most part, but the Planning Commission analyzes the plan through a broader lens.

Mr. Shockley expressed concern about the future of roadway requirements and asked that the Planning Commission resolve the issues in his absence.

**Motion:** by Mr. Wood, seconded by Ms. Manning, to deny PP-2024-035. The motion carried unanimously by hand vote with five in favor (S. Bichel; J. Bailey; J. Wood; D. Manning; J. Rogers) and three in opposition (J. Barbare; F. Hammond; M. Shockley).

#### **VA-2024-050 Radiant Church Variance Application**

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell addressed the Commission members with a variance request from LDR Section 10.3.5 *Screening/Buffering*, which requires a "15-foot landscaped buffer along all exterior property lines adjacent to residential uses and districts" to be maintained. The applicant states that the variance is needed because this is the only location on site that SCDOT would allow the driveway, thereby causing the driveway to be in the buffer for the undeveloped property to the north.

Staff recommends approval of the variance as requested with conditions. The conditions are as follows:

1. Please provide screening meeting section 10.3.5 of the Land Development Regulations. This may be a wall, fence, compact evergreen hedge or other type of evergreen foliage, or a combination of fence and shrubbery at least 6 feet in height along the property line.

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion:** by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Shockley, to approve with condition VA-2024-050. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

#### **8. Planning Report**

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell presented the May Planning Report.

#### **9. Old Business**

None.

**10. New Business**

Chairman / Vice Chairman Election

**Motion:** by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Wood to accept Mr. Bichel as Chairman and Mr. Bailey as Vice-Chairman by acclimation. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Chairman Bichel thanks Mr. Rogers and Mr. Shockley for their service on the Planning Commission and introduced Ms. Franklin, Mr. Holland and Ms. Phillips.

**11. Adjourn**

Without objection, Chairman Bichel adjourned the meeting at 5:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Nicole Miglionico*

Nicole Miglionico

Recording Secretary