



# City of Greer Planning Commission Minutes November 20, 2017

**Members Present:** Kevin Tumblin, Chairman  
Mark Hopper  
Judy Jones  
Brian Martin  
Micky Montgomery  
Suzanne Traenkle

**Member(s) Absent:** Don Foster

**Staff Present:** Kelli McCormick, AICP, Planning Manager  
Brandon McMahan, Zoning Coordinator  
Brandy Blake, Development Coordinator

---

## **I. Advisory Meeting**

Chairman Tumblin called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and read the opening remarks.

Mr. Tumblin stated that he would be recusing himself from the review of the Freeman Farm Preliminary Plat.

Mr. Tumblin recognized Ms. McCormick to speak. Ms. McCormick stated that Mr. Tumblin was resigning as Chairman of the Planning Commission. She thanked him for his years of service for the City of Greer and presented him with a gift.

### **A. Approval of Minutes for October 16, 2017**

Mr. Martin made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted for October 16, 2017. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 5 to 0. Mr. Hopper abstained from the vote. Mr. Foster was absent from the vote.

## **II. Public Hearing**

Chairman Tumblin opened the Public Hearing

### **A. November Cases**

Kelli McCormick presented the following Staff Reports and PowerPoint presentations to the Commission:

**ZONING REPORT  
STAFF REPORT TO THE GREER PLANNING COMMISSION  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2017**

---

**DOCKET:** RZ 2017-46

**APPLICANT:** Amanda Howard Griswold

**PROPERTY LOCATION:** 206 Taylor Road

**TAX MAP NUMBER:** 0537050201902

**EXISTING ZONING:** R-12, Single-Family Residential  
**REQUEST:** Rezone to R-S, Residential Suburban District

**SIZE:** 7.36

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:** Residential Land Use 2 Community

**ANALYSIS:** **RZ 2017-46**

---

**RZ 2017-46** is a rezoning request for a parcel located at 206 Taylor Road. This property is currently occupied with a single-family residence. The request is to rezone the property from R-12, Single-Family Residential, to R-S, Residential Suburban.

Surrounding land uses and zoning include:

- North: R-12, Single-Family Residential: single-family residential subdivisions
- East: R-12, Single-Family Residential: single-family residential subdivision
- South: R-20, Single-Family Residential: single-family residential
- West: Unzoned (Greenville County): single-family residential

As stated in the above section, this property is located in a Residential Land Use 2 Community. This Community category is generally where most residential subdivisions located across the city may be found. The density range of these areas is between 2.6 to 4.5 units per acre. There may also be some of the lower density developments who were at one time considered the more rural parts of the community, included in this category.

R-S, Residential Suburban, allows single-family residences, but also several other uses including animal hospitals, farms and ranches to include the raising of livestock, and a variety of other commercial uses that may not be compatible with the neighboring subdivisions. In addition, the purpose of the R-S, Residential Suburban, district is to provide reasonable safeguards for areas that are in the process of development with predominately single-family dwellings but are generally still rural in character. This area has developed into a suburban area. As such, Staff recommends denial of the rezoning request.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** DENIAL

Amanda Howard Griswold, applicant, spoke and advised the Commission that she doesn't currently live on the property and the property had been a family home that she currently has for sell. She stated she doesn't want to sell to a subdivision and she doesn't think she can sell to them because of Duke Power lines being on the property. She stated that she's had no interested buyers due to not being able to have animals such as a goat or a horse on a property with a barn and a pond. She also stated that she doesn't want to sell to someone to have a veterinary farm, she just wants to sell to someone who has family that can grow up there as she did. She advised that her realtor was present and would like to speak on the problems she's had selling the property.

Jenny Tesner, Ms. Griswold's realtor, spoke and advised that she's had the property for sell about 4 months. She stated the properties that surround Ms. Griswold's properties have been used rurally in the past. She stated that 109 Taylor Road was zoned to R-S and it is within view of the homes in the Heather Hill subdivision. She stated she has not had anyone contact her to buy the property for commercial use and that is not Ms. Griswold's intention to sell for commercial use. She stated she has had people inquire about purchasing the property that want goats and chickens for their personal use.

Mr. Montgomery asked Ms. Tesner if the property is currently under contract. Ms. Tesner replied, no, because of the restrictions of the property the buyers have not wanted to put in a contract for the property.

Mr. William Dean, lives at 112 Ashby Cross Court, neighbor of Ms. Griswold's property, spoke and asked that Commission give the neighborhood that he lives in time to review the information about the request and he requested an extension to a later date. He stated that there is another property close to the location that had a dog kennel at one time and the smell and site was disturbing to the neighbors. He stated that the community was concerned about the affect a commercial business, similar to a kennel, would have on the surrounding property values.

Mr. Martin asked Ms. McCormick when the property was rezoned to R-12. Ms. McCormick replied it was rezoned in 2001 based on tax records. She asked Ms. Griswold if that sounded correct, she stated she doesn't remember.

Ms. McCormick read a list of all permitted uses in R-S zoning district and stated that while the intent is to sell to someone for single family use, if rezoned to R-S, the next owner of the property would be able to use the property for any of the listed uses without approval from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Montgomery asked staff is there is a zoning classification that isn't so broad. Ms. McCormick advised that at this time, R-S is the only classification that would allow Ms. Griswold to have any type of livestock. She stated that less broad zoning classifications do exist in other areas of the upstate and that the Commission may request staff to make an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. McCormick then gave some examples of Greenville Counties zoning ordinance.

Mr. Martin stated that he was concerned that if the Planning Commission denied the request, the property would not be able to apply for rezoning to the same zoning classification, or a lesser classification, for a year. He stated that he would feel differently if there was a buyer with a planned use that could be evaluated by the Commission, but he didn't want to make a decision on what could be. He stated that he would like to know what would be going on the property. He stated that the use of a kennel could be very disruptive to the surrounding property owners and that without knowing what would be going on the property makes him hesitant.

Mr. Hopper stated that even if the Commission knew what a buyer wanted to put on the property; there would be no way to know what someone would want to do in 6 months. He asked staff to advise the process of changing the zoning ordinance to include a less broad zoning classification, similar to Greenville County's R-20-A, Residential Agricultural Use.

Ms. McCormick stated that to add a similar type of zoning class to the ordinance, staff or Planning Commission would have to propose an amendment to City Council to start the process, and it would probably be spring before that were adopted, if everything went smoothly.

Mr. Martin and Ms. McCormick spoke about the options of tabling the request until Ms. Griswold had a prospective buyer, as well as having a contingency contract for the buyer.

Mr. Martin stated that the option of DRD zoning district might be an option for the applicant. He stated that DRD may give the applicant the most flexibility for potential buyers. Ms. McCormick stated that she would review the options with Ms. Griswold.

Ms. Griswold advised the Commission that she is interested in the less broad zoning classification because that is closest to what she intended the property to be used for, not a commercial use.

**Action** – RZ 2017-46

**Vote** – Mr. Martin made a motion to table RZ 2017-46 until a contract for sell has been established. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion, the motion carried with a vote of 6 to 0.

**ZONING REPORT  
STAFF REPORT TO THE GREER PLANNING COMMISSION  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2017**

---

**DOCKET:** RZ 2017-47

**APPLICANT:** Chip Fogleman, FRF Inc.

**PROPERTY LOCATION:** 258 Liberty Hill Road

**TAX MAP NUMBER:** 5-28-00-027.03

**EXISTING ZONING:** R-S, Residential Suburban District

**REQUEST:** Rezone to R-20, Single-Family Residential

**SIZE:** 17.38

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:** Employment/Regional Center near Residential Land Use 2 Community

**ANALYSIS:** **RZ 2017-47**

---

**RZ 2017-47** is a rezoning request for a parcel located at 258 Liberty Hill Road. This property is currently vacant. The request is to rezone the property from R-S, Residential Suburban to R-20, Single-Family Residential, in order to develop a single-family residential subdivision.

Surrounding land uses and zoning include:

- North: Unzoned (Spartanburg County): vacant
- East: Unzoned (Spartanburg County): single-family residential
- South: R-S, Residential Suburban: single-family residential
- West: Unzoned (Spartanburg County): single-family residential
- S-1, Services: single-family residential and a farm business

As stated in the above section, this property is located in an Employment/Regional Center near Residential Land Use 2 Community. Both the Employment and Regional Centers contain a mixture of non-residential and residential uses. Generally, the adjacent land use category (RLU2) is where most residential subdivisions located across the city may be found. The Regional Center is focused around the hospital and the area around and south of 85 has developed due to many factors including close proximity to major employers including BMW. Therefore, while this area has been developed historically with farms and large residential lots, the area has transitioned into an area where subdivisions are desirable for development due to the same factors that make this area attractive for non-residential growth, including the proximity to transportation corridors and the availability of needed services including water and sewer. The change in zoning from R-S, Residential Suburban, to R-20, Single-Family Residential, would allow a denser development, but still fall in line with the RLU2 Community and the mix desired in the Employment and Regional Center. In addition, an analysis of the entrance road and needed improvements to any future development on this parcel will be reviewed by the appropriate agency with authority over the road. As such, Staff recommends approval of this rezoning request.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:****APPROVAL**

Chip Fogleman, applicant, spoke in favor of RZ 2017-47 and stated that the proposed development will have 19 lots, all on septic tank. He stated the entrance would be off Liberty Hill Road. He stated that these will be grading and sold off individually with no mass grading.

Zane Gray, neighbor residing at 151 Liberty Hill Road, stated that he is concerned of the impact a development will have on the road. He stated that the road is small, that the increase in traffic will be a problem for all of the residences on the road, and that he speaks for the whole block.

**Action** – RZ 2017-47

**Vote** – Mr. Martin made a motion to approve case RZ 2017-47. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 5 to 1. Ms. Jones voted in opposition.

**ZONING REPORT  
STAFF REPORT TO THE GREER PLANNING COMMISSION  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2017**

---

**DOCKET:** RZ 2017-48

**APPLICANT:** Gloria Murrillo

**PROPERTY LOCATION:** 600 Hampton Road

**TAX MAP NUMBER:** 9-03-10-122.02

**EXISTING ZONING:** RM-1, Residential Multi-Family  
**REQUEST:** Rezone to C-3, Commercial

**SIZE:** 0.43

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:** Transit Oriented Corridor and Residential Land Use 3 Community

**ANALYSIS:** **RZ 2017-48**

---

**RZ 2017-48** is a rezoning request for a parcel located at 600 Hampton Road. This property is currently vacant. The request is to rezone the property from RM-1, Residential Multi-Family, to C-3, Commercial, in order to use the parcel for a commercial parking lot/truck parking site.

Surrounding land uses and zoning include:

- North: R-M1, Multifamily Residential: single-family residence (owned by same owner)
- East: R-M1, Multifamily Residential: apartments
- South: C-3, Commercial: vacant
- West: C-2, Commercial: overflow parking for Nissan of Greer

As stated in the above section, this property is located within a Transit Oriented Corridor and Residential Land Use 3 Community. Both uses are seen in this area with a mixture of high intensity commercial and multifamily housing directly adjacent. The small size of this lot and the desired business, which is similar to the lot directly across Hampton Road, make this rezoning request acceptable in this location. As such, Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL**

Jorge Medina, husband of applicant, spoke in favor of RZ 2017-48 and stated that they want to park two dump trucks on the property for their business.

Mr. Martin asked Mr. Medina if there was a fence between this property and the apartments. Mrs. Medina replied, yes. He also stated that he understands he will have to fence the entire property and is willing to meet those requirements.

Mr. Montgomery asked Mr. Medina if they intended to pave the property. Mr. Medina stated they were going to gravel the lot.

**Action** – RZ 2017-48

**Vote** - Mr. Hopper made a motion to approve RZ-2017-48. Ms. Jones seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 6 to 0.

#### 4. Preliminary Plat Review

#### Braeburn Orchard

Kelli McCormick presented the Commission with the details and layout of Braeburn Orchard preliminary plat.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval contingent upon departmental and all applicable agency approvals.**

Paul Harrison, Bluewater Civil Design, gave a brief overview of the proposed development. He stated that he had two different builders for the community, which would allow two different price points for the homes. He also stated they are having a traffic study conducted.

Mr. Martin asked why there was not a buffer on all four sides of the property. Ms. McCormick stated that there will be a 25ft setback along the south side of the property line where there is no buffer shown on the proposed layout, due to a sewer access road that the developer will not be able to encroach into. She stated that the development on the other side of the road will have a 25ft setback as well, which will give 50ft plus the width of the road, that is all essentially a buffer or setback from both communities. Mr. Martin said that since there was a natural buffer there then it would be ok.

Mr. Martin asked if there would be sidewalk going in on Snow road. Mr. Harrison stated that it would be tough to do that because there are some features along Snow road that could make that difficult. Ms. McCormick read the ordinance for sidewalks for clarity. She stated that this would have to be reviewed by Steve Grant, City Engineer and he would make the decision and if the developer did not want to have sidewalks along this area of Snow road, that they would have to apply for a variance.

**Action** – Braeburn Orchard Preliminary Plat

**Vote** – Mr. Montgomery made a motion to approve Braeburn Orchard preliminary plat. Ms. Traenkle seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 6 to 0.

#### 5. Preliminary Plat Review

#### Pelham Glen

Kelli McCormick presented the Commission with the details and layout of Pelham Glen preliminary plat.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval contingent upon departmental and all applicable agency approvals.**

Tim Campbell, engineer for the project, gave a brief overview of the proposed preliminary plat.

**Action** – Pelham Glen Preliminary Plat

**Vote** - Mr. Martin made a motion to approve the Pelham Glen preliminary plat. Mr. Hopper seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 6 to 0.

Mr. Tumblin recused himself from the following preliminary plat review and stepped down from the dais. Mr. Hopper acted as Chairman for the remainder of the meeting.

## 6. Preliminary Plat Review

## Freeman Farm

Kelli McCormick presented the Commission with the details and layout of Freeman Farm preliminary plat.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval contingent upon departmental and all applicable agency approvals.**

Kevin Tumblin, applicant for the project, gave a brief overview of the proposed development.

Mr. Montgomery made a motion to approve the Freeman Farm preliminary plat. Ms. Jones seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 5 to 0. Mr. Tumblin recused himself from the vote.

Mr. Hopper closed the Public Meeting.

**III. Executive Session** – None

**IV. Other Business** –

### **2018 Calendar Dates Approval**

Ms. McCormick presented the Commission with the proposed meeting dates for 2018. She reminded the Commission that they would need to think about nominations or Chairman and Vice Chairman for 2018.

Ms. Jones made a motion to approve the proposed meeting dates for the 2018 calendar. Mr. Martin seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 5 to 0. Mr. Tumblin was not at the dais during this vote. He remained in the audience.

### **Final Development Plan Review**

Ms. McCormick advised that the ordinance does allow Planning Commission to designate staff to review final development plans. She asked the Commission consider this for the month of December so applicants would not have to wait potentially 60 days until the next meeting in January 2018 for review and approval. She stated that she would also like the Commission to consider allowing staff to review final development plans on a permanent basis. She stated that the times staff would bring a final development plan to the Commission would be if there were an issue between staff and developer/engineer that could not be resolved; or to allow public feedback if staff feels that it could be an issue. She also stated that with most of the final development plans, staff is seeing is almost the same items contained on the preliminary plat that the Commission has previously approved. She advised that major changes, however, would come back to the Commission for review, but as long as the final development plan meet the requirements of the ordinance, and was the same as the previously approved preliminary plat, that staff could approve these final development plans.

Mr. Martin stated that he would be ok with staff approving FDP's if there was one designated person on staff to do so.

Ms. McCormick stated that in other communities, the ordinances have specific items listed of what changes are required to come back to the Planning Commission for approval and what staff is allowed to approve. Mr. Hopper asked if that is something staff can compile, or if the Commission needed to come up with those items and specific requirements.

Ms. McCormick advised that she could draft a text amendment to the zoning ordinance and present it in January to the Commission. Mr. Martin stated that he thought that is the best way to move forward.

### **Training Opportunities**

Ms. McCormick stated that the City will have five new members to the Boards and Commissions in the upcoming New Year and that there will be training for all Board/Commission members in the beginning of the year.

### **V. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.