



City of Greenville Planning Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
Greenville Convention Center, Room 102  
4:00 PM, October 21, 2021  
Meeting Notice Posted October 6, 2021

---

NOTICE OF MEETING: Pursuant to Section 30-4-80 of the S.C. Code of Laws, annual notice of this Commission's Meetings was provided on December 31, 2021 via the Greenville City Website. In addition, the Agenda for this Meeting was posted outside the meeting place (City Council Chambers in City Hall) and was emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice. Notice for the public hearings was published in the Greenville News, posted on the properties subject of public hearing(s), mailed to all surrounding property owners, and emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice pursuant to Section 6-29-760 of the S.C. Code of Laws and Section 19-2.2.9 of the Code of the City of Greenville.

---

Minutes prepared by Sharon Key

Commissioners Present

Mike Martinez, Jeff Randolph, Derek Enderlin, Trey Gardner, Diane Eldridge and Pamela Adams

Commissioners Absent

Meg Terry

Staff Present

Assistant City Manager Shannon Lavrin, Associate Development Planner Jordan Harris, City Attorney Mike Pitts, Community Planner Monique Mattison (virtual), Development Planner Harold Evangelista, Development Planner Ross Zelenske, Interim City Engineer Clint Link, Landscape Architect Hannah Slyce, Planning and Development Services Director Jonathan B. Graham, Principal Development Planner Kristopher Kurjiaka, Principal Landscape Architect Edward Kinney, Senior Development Planner Austin Rutherford, Strategic Communications Administrator MJ Simpson (virtual)

Call to Order

Vice Chair Trey Gardner called the meeting to order at 4:02 PM. Mr. Gardner provided normal beginning procedures for Commission meeting. He explained the agenda of the Planning Commission, outlined the rules for procedure, and invited the other commissioners to introduce themselves.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Mr. Enderlin moved to approve minutes as proposed for the previous meetings. Mr. Randolph seconded the motion, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

### Call for Affidavits from Applicants

Staff reported that all public notice affidavits were received. Staff noted that one application had been deferred (Z-32-2021).

### Acceptance of Agenda

Mr. Randolph motioned to approve with moving item MD-21-658 to after MD-21-740 on the agenda. Ms. Eldridge seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Z-30-2021**

Application by Parker Group Development for a **REZONE** of approximately 2.36 acres located at **DOUTHIT CIRCLE AND N LEACH STREET** from RM-1, Single-family and multifamily residential district, to RM-2, Single-family and multifamily residential district (TM# 0075000301000, 0075000301100, 0075000300900, 0075000300203, 0075000300300, 0075000300202, 0075000300800, 0075000301101, and 0075000300206)

Staff report presented by Mr. Rutherford

### Commission Questions to Staff

The Commission members had questions regarding City Engineer comments.

Applicant Presentation: Drew Parker, 147 Wilbur St. – Presented the project details and offered to answer questions.

Ms. Adams asked about the relocation of current residents. The applicant noted the homes were vacant.

### Public comments:

Chris Daniel, 213 N. Leach St – Spoke against/undecided due to increase of traffic and sites a school, fire department, Air B&Bs as well as businesses and the lack of crosswalks for pedestrian safety. He discussed home ownership vs rental properties.

Gary Burgess, 209 N. Leach St. – In favor of improving the area, but as a civil engineer he had concerns regarding traffic and stormwater.

Cindy Jennings, 217 N. Leach St. – Discussed how an increase in density will result in an increase of runoff. Noted she was unable to put in a garage due to stormwater runoff issues.

### Commission Discussion:

The Commission asked the applicant, Mr. Parker, to discuss rental vs ownership. The applicant noted the Opportunity Zone may not allow this. Commissioner Ms. Adams asked about the public's concerns regarding traffic and density and if there was a community meeting. Mr. Parker discussed the inquiry of needing a traffic study and not needing one due to current traffic percentage. There were two neighborhood meetings held.

Mr. Link addressed traffic studies and the GVL2040 Comprehensive Plan available for public review

Ms. Eldridge asked if the project was not completed and the zoning was changed, what could there then be put on this land.

Mr. Martinez asked for clarity on voting on zoning and conditions to be put on projects that come back before the board. Staff noted conditions could not be placed on non-PD zoning requests.

**Motion: Mr. Enderlin moved to recommend approval for Z-30-2021. Seconded by Mr. Randolph. The motion failed by a vote of a 3-3 tie with Mr. Martinez, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Enderlin voting yes and Ms. Eldridge, Mr. Gardner, and Ms. Adams voting no.**

**B. Z-31-2021**

Application by City of Greenville for adoption of the West End Small Area Plan

Staff report presented by Mr. Rutherford

Commission Questions to Staff:

The board discussed with staff a question regarding the Pendleton Street frontage.

Applicant Presentation: Rob Robinson, Urban Design Associates virtually attended and provided an update on the draft. Ms. Eldridge asked about the public's request to pay attention to bike ways. Ms. Adams asked about safety pedestrian access points across Academy; staff noted there were four. Mr. Randolph asked about new and older developments with setbacks along blocks

Public comments:

Suzanne Woolf, 200 Perry Ave – Notes three areas that lack in the plan including concerns over light and noise pollution and abutting residential and concerns over green spaces.

Commission Discussion: Ms. Eldridge discussed the three blocks that share frontages with Arlington Avenue. She noted a three-story building on this street would not be appropriate, so would like to reduce the size of new construction to 2 stories. Mr. Randolph discussed three- and four-story buildings in the cottage district and not allowing that near residential. He wishes to mention the historical evolution of commercial buildings in the area due to Greenville General and St. Francis. Ms. Lavrin discussed the ability to add that note into the motion. Ms. Adams was concerned with surrounding communities and traffic. Mr. Link discussed traffic studies for Augusta St and South Downtown Master Plan.

**\*Motion: Mr. Randolph moved to recommend approval with staff amendments and further amendments to provide bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements on N. Calhoun St. and the intersection of N. Calhoun St. and S. Academy St., add hospital historical context, in Table 3.1, break blocks WE 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 & 12 into an A and B and limit the Arlington blocks to building type A & B, and in Table 3.3, remove building type C from block 23. Seconded by Commissioner Mr. Martinez. Ms. Eldridge asked for clarification to see the blocks on the map. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0 vote.**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**A. MD-21-658**

Application by MHK Architecture for a **MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT** on approximately 0.97 acre located at **MAYBERRY STREET AND DELANO DRIVE** for 70 apartment units ("The Delano") (TM# 0055000200115).

*This item was moved with the approval of the agenda to after MD-21-740*

**B. Z-32-2021 Applicant has requested deferral to the November 18, 2021 meeting**

Application by City of Greenville for adoption of the Village of West Greenville Small Area Plan.

**C. SD-21-701**

Application by Colton Miller/Zenith Real Estate for a **SUBDIVISION** of 2.114 acres located at **E. FARIS ROAD** from 2 LOTS to 7 LOTS ("Annette Meadows") (TM# 026700-02-03000 and 026700-02-03001).

Staff report presented by Mr. Zelenske

Commission Questions to Staff: Mr. Randolph questioned home orientation and parking availability. Ms. Eldridge asked about the neighborhood meeting as Nicholtown expressed concern about resident's lack of being able to speak up. Ms. Adams asked about previous ownership of lots.

Applicant Presentation:

Colton Miller, 213 Hartland Place – Presented the application and discussed the neighborhood meetings that were held and details of project.

Christian Balsiger, 106 Timland Drive – discussed answering concerns heard from neighborhood. Mr. Martinez asked how many variations of the subdivision had been considered prior to the formal application.

Stephanie Gates, 245 Rocky Creek Rd – Noted the reasons for current layout are due to sewer easements and storm water easements.

Mr. Randolph asked about the Zoom meeting limits on the neighborhood meeting. Ms. Eldridge asked for a clarification regarding the first neighborhood meeting. Staff noted that the neighborhood meeting did meet technical requirements. Ms. Adams asked about environment studies and the applicant offered the Phase I reports. There was no evidence of a land fill on the site. The landscape architect on staff that we will follow tree ordinances.

Public comments:

Carrie Smith, 246 Alameda St – Ms. Smith is not supportive of this development as this housing community will lead to gentrification due to the high cost of the new homes. Her greatest concern is the move of the guard rail on the road and the creation of a common driveway is a blueprint for disaster. Quantity of traffic and high speed of traffic needs to have the guard rail in place due to the sharp curve and grade.

Sylvia Palmer, 5 Roosevelt Ave – Ms. Palmer noted she sent in 10 concerns of the neighbors and the first concern is the deception and the lot was purchased after the fact. The other concern is the school buses use the street and with a moved guard rail, it will cause a danger.

Another concern is the trees on the lot and increased flooding. Concern over a special neighborhood being built within a community causes exclusivity not inclusion. She Asked everyone in the room opposed to please stand – several people stand in opposition

Margaret McDuncan, 23 Palm St. – Discussed she is opposed to the plan for it is in a flood zone.

Evonne Reader, Tanner St – Opposed to the property being developed because the developer did not respond to the neighborhoods concerns and questions. She is concerned over the need for sidewalks and discusses the tree canopy and if trees are removed, it will lead to more runoff. She believes the high-priced homes will lead to displacement of current residents. Worried the developer is only coming for profit and not to make community better.

Sara Vant, 499 Glenn Rd. – She believes the public hearing sign was not placed conspicuous enough to be visible and worries the project has left nearby residents in the dark.

Rev. Hill, Zion Hill Baptist Church, 219 Glenn Rd – Has been in community for 20 years and is worried the proposed homes will not become a part of the community.

Fredrick Walker, 219 Alameda St – He notes runoff is already an issue and infrastructure is up to modern standards. Requests for the commission to ride through the neighborhood.

Stanley Clark, 101 Catlin Circle – Opposed to this development for it will lead to current residents to be forced out due to higher taxes.

Linda Mingo, 246 Alameda St. – Discussed how traffic is already bad. Damage already occurs to parked cars in roadway.

Efrem Franklin, 9 Palm St – Discussed concerns over runoff with tree removal. Noted the homes will be in danger from cars running off road at sharp curve.

#### Commission Discussion:

Ms. Eldridge asked the applicant regarding a concern the neighborhood meeting instructions did not include a working phone number. Applicant responded there was a software error that didn't allow voicemails, but they followed up returning phone calls.

Mr. Martinez asked about the 8ft drop and the blind curve. The plan is a very difficult plan to read and is concerned about the viability of the plan and site. Wants to verify water way showing on the map site and references to the flood plain lines are correct. Applicant responds to concerns and questions including that a wetland study is being conducted and they will work within the guidelines of those flood plans.

Ms. Eldridge questioned the orientation of the homes in relation to the streets. Ms. Gates provided clarity on how homes would be oriented.

Mr. Randolph noted he sees several deficiencies per subdivision criteria.

**\*Motion: Mr. Randolph moved to deny the request due to planning deficiencies including access, orientation, ingress, egress, topography, and density for SD-21-701. Seconded by Ms. Eldridge. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.**

**D. MD-21-740**

Application by Christian Crear/Arbor Land Design for a **MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT** on approximately 2.11 acres located at **GROVE ROAD AND HAWTHORNE LANE** for 23 townhome units ("Hawthorne Summit") (TM# 0105000301200, 0105000301100, and 0105000300700).

Staff report presented by Mr. Zelenske

Commission Questions to Staff: Ms. Eldridge asked about the trees on the site. Mr. Randolph asked about access to adjoining alley, the AC Units, and the rear fencing. Mr. Enderlin asked about the green spaces and roofing comments from the DRB.

Applicant Presentation: Christian Greer, Arbor Land Design, 10 Williams Street – Presented the project and layouts, discussed the neighborhood meetings, and individual meetings with neighboring property owners.

Public comments: No Comments

Commission Discussion: Ms. Adams discussed the retention pond, fencing, and signage for the development. Mr. Randolph asked about shifting lots and removing units as options to meet setbacks.

Mr. Zelenske and the applicant discussed commissioner questions.

**\*Motion: Mr. Martinez moved to recommend approval with staff comments and conditions, for MD-21-740. Seconded by Mr. Randolph. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0.**

**A. MD-21-658**

Application by MHK Architecture for a **MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT** on approximately 0.97 acre located at **MAYBERRY STREET AND DELANO DRIVE** for 70 apartment units ("The Delano") (TM# 0055000200115).

***This item was moved with the approval of the agenda to after MD-21-740***

Staff report presented by Mr. Rutherford

Commission Questions to Staff: Mr. Randolph asked for staff comment #4 to be clarified and asked about the site plan maps. Mr. Martinez asked about the flood zone and elevation. Ms. Eldridge asked about the stucco comment. Ms. Adams asked about a submittal on replanting tree requirements.

Applicant Presentation:

Matthew Kragh, 816 S. Main St. – Applicant presented an overview of project and team members present to discuss flood plain, landscaping, engineering, and affordable housing component. There are a total 70 residential and 14 are affordable housing.

Krish Patel, Alta Vista Neighborhood – discusses the affordable housing units, they will be throughout the building and not segregated in one area.

Ms. Eldridge asked about the incentives and what the applicant considers an affordable unit and who qualifies for it.

Ms. Adams asked if other projects are in the works in the area and if they have reached out to the railroad on the neighborhood property and what the other surrounding neighborhood people have to say. Applicant Daniel Merritt, 508 Rhett St. – discussed railroad comments, drainage challenges, and street trees.

Mr. Enderlin asks about lot coverage percentages.

Ms. Adams and Ms. Eldridge discuss bike racks. Mr. Patel noted bike racks would be put on site.

Public comments:

Mary Duckett, 201 Pinckney St. – Stated protocol has not been followed. This is the first time I have seen these drawings. Mr. Patel called right before our neighborhood meeting to get on the agenda, but you have to ask in a timely manner to get on the agenda. She is disappointed and plans to address City Council.

Commission Discussion: Commission members discuss if proper protocol was followed and the need for the neighborhood to have that meeting to provide feedback. Staff discussed the applicant did technically meet the requirements, but the spirit of the neighborhood meeting may need to be done.

Ms. Adams discussed making sure the history of the neighborhood is preserved.

Mr. Randolph asks applicant how they feel about deferral. Mr. Patel asked if there is an option to approval with condition with the meeting. The Commission discussed that approval could not be given since the community may ask for design alterations.

Ms. Duckett spoke that it would not be fair for her to make a decision for the whole community, and she is an advocate for Unity Park and Mayberry St.

Mr. Patel requests to defer and to commit to a timeline to have the neighborhood meeting.

**\*Motion: Ms. Eldridge moved to defer MD-21-658. Seconded by Mr. Randolph. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0.**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**A. Staff Update**

Ms. Lavrin provides updates on:

- West End Small Area Plan
- Village of West Greenville
- Land Management Ordinance Update

**B. Upcoming Dates:**

**November 16, 2021 – PC Workshop**

**November 18, 2021 – PC Public Hearing**

**Adjourned at 8:18 PM**