



City of Greenville Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
Greenville City Hall, 206 S Main Street, 10th Floor Council Chambers
4:00 PM, September 4, 2025

1. Call to Order

Chair Jeff Randolph called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

2. Welcome and Opening Remarks from the Chair

Chair Jeff Randolph invited the other members to introduce themselves, provided normal beginning procedures for the meeting, explained the agenda, and outlined the rules for procedure.

3. Roll Call

Dallas Young moved on to roll call of board members in attendance.

Commissioners Present:

Chair Jeff Randolph, Vice Chair Mike Martinez, Pamela Adams-Singleton, Lynn Alan Solesbee, Chris Laney, Barry Nocks, and Paul Greene

Staff Present:

Mary Douglas Hirsch, Planning Director; Logan Wells, Deputy City Attorney; Austin Rutherford, Senior Development Planner; Dallas Young, Senior Development Planner; Ross Zelenske, Senior Development Planner; Jordan Harris, Development Planner; Deanna Ensley, Planning Assistant; Paul Dow, City Engineer

4. Approval of Minutes

a. August 7, 2025 Public Hearing

Minutes to be reviewed at the next public hearing.

5. Call for Affidavits from Applicants

Staff reported receiving all applicants' affidavits.

6. Acceptance of Agenda

Barry Nocks moved to approve the agenda. Mike Martinez seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

7. Conflicts of Interest

None

8. Public Meeting Items (Hearing Required)

a. AX-28-2025

Application by Ray Kandoll for ANNEXATION and REZONE of approximately 0.4 acre located at 3119 N. PLEASANTBURG DRIVE from C-2, Commercial district, in Greenville County to BG, Business General District, in the City of Greenville. (TM# 0174010103100)

Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

None

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

None

***MOTION:**

Dr. Barry Nocks moved to recommend approval of AX-28-2025. Lynn Solesbee seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

b. AX-29-2025

Application by Greenville Transit Authority for ANNEXATION and REZONE of approximately 26.58 acres located at 205 ARCADIA DRIVE from R-7.5, Single-family residential district, in Greenville County to CV, Civic District, in the City of Greenville. (TM# 0176000100201)

Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

Ms. Adams-Singleton asked about staff comment on the site being similar to the fire department and recycling center.

Mr. Rutherford explained the likeness was regarding it being a government facility and is a like type.

Mr. Randolph asked if it would remain single-family zoned if it remained in the County which was confirmed.

Mr. Greene asked to clarify if there is any current residential usage and asked about the location and impact to the park mentioned by staff.

Mr. Rutherford confirmed there is no current residential usage on the site and that the park would not be impacted by the zoning.

Applicants Present Project:

None

Questions to Applicant:

None

Public Comment:

Angela Aiken- 306 Loop Street

Ms. Aiken expressed she was against the annexation and rezoning. She stated she was from the adjacent New Washington Heights community and there were concerns regarding the closeness to a residential neighborhood of the development, issues with roads and flooding after the development, and questions of where the property line was and how it would take away portions of their community center property. She stated their community was a historically black community and they felt portions were being taken away by the City and it was impacting their quality of life.

Mr. Randolph asked if the land was annexed if there would be a different zoning they would prefer.

Ms. Aiken stated she was against annexation entirely and stated she was concerned about the money being taken from the community.

Charity Jones

Ms. Jones pointed out that according to the map shown, the GTA property line cuts through the middle of their community center parking lot and they are concerned that additional land will be taken from their community.

Mr. Randolph asked Ms. Jones to clarify where that parking lot was.

Ms. Jones explained the property line used to be on the other side of a nearby stream and she was not sure how the line was adjusted to where it is now.

Mr. Greene asked staff to clarify where the community center was and if the whole parcel owned by Greenville transit authority which was confirmed.

Ms. Aiken stated a portion of the GTA property was supposed to be gifted back to the community, but never was. She also stated there is a park on the GTA property that has their community's name as well that was supposed to be included in that gift.

Sean Rusnak- 8 Warner Street

Mr. Rusnak introduced himself as the Vice Chair of Greenlink and stated he was in favor of the application as most of their staff are city employees and it would provide quick access to fire and local policing service. He stated they had tried to work closely with the community directly and clarified that they are not affiliated with the City or the County. He stated the goal was not to create a property that only works for us, but for the community and that they were still looking to return that piece to the community.

Ms. Adams-Singleton asked if based on his knowledge, the conversation with other board members was to give a portion of the GTA land to the community.

Mr. Rusnak clarified the area he was referring to and stated it doesn't serve any use for the GTA facility and was in the original discussion, but stated those conversations were before he had joined the board.

Dr. Nocks asked if the use of the property would stay the same regardless of it was in the City or County, which was confirmed, and asked about previously mentioned water runoff issues.

Mr. Rusnak stated to his understanding, it was a very overgrown area and there had been runoff issues prior to the development and that the condition had been improved since the development based on information they collected but would be happy to discuss if not found to be the case.

Mr. Solesbee asked staff if the property was annexed; would it cause issues with cessation of land to the community.

Mr. Rutherford stated it would not be a concern as there are options of split jurisdiction for properties.

Preston Johnson- 133 Farmwood Drive, Fountain Inn

Mr. Johnson stated he worked for a non-profit that had been working with the community, and stated the land in question is very clearly community land. He pointed out there is a physical distinction between the land, where the GTA property sits on top of the hill and the community is down the hill. He stated the area down the hill has always been the responsibility of the community to maintain, citing the hurricane damage from 2024 as an example. He claimed they had gone by the County offices and were unable to identify when the property was transferred to GTA.

Scott Johnston- 411 University Ridge

Mr. Johnston stated he was speaking on behalf of the Urban League of the Upstate and that as there was a need for a clear sequence of events, he suggested that the subdivision and deeding of the property to the community prior to annexation and rezoning might be the appropriate order to help address the neighborhoods concerns.

Board/Commission Discussion:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

Mr. Randolph asked staff to clarify if the commission recommended approval, would it only be for the parcel that GTA owns.

Ms. Wells answered technically the commission is only making a recommendation on the zoning if City Council approved an annexation so the actual annexation would only be under the authority of City Council to decide and the only thing the commission is deciding on is the zoning of the parcel in question. She also clarified that if there is a discrepancy or property dispute in the future regarding the property, it would be up to the court to decide on how it needs to be handled.

Mr. Greene commented there definitely seems to be a dispute as to western corner of the property and it seems it would be significantly trickier to un-annex the property.

Mr. Rutherford stated neither the commission nor the City has the purview to adjudicate a property line dispute.

Ms. Wells stated the City goes off the property descriptions given from the County Register of Deeds office that are on formal record for the property.

Mr. Rutherford stated the property has been recently developed so records are relatively new and have recently been renewed.

Mr. Martinez asked if the commission holds any responsibility on clarity in issues such as this.

Mr. Rutherford stated since the display records are based on County records, they are accurate to what the land deeds display.

Mr. Randolph stated he believes for the use it is an appropriate zoning to use CV

Mr. Rutherford stated that even for a community center use, it would be an appropriate zoning district as all city community centers are also zoned CV.

Mr. Randolph pointed out that there are also more protections on properties in the City versus county.

Mr. Solesbee stated if City Council annexes the property CV would be the only district that would make sense, but asked if that happened and there was a subsequent successful property line dispute where the community got the land, would that property still be annexed or would it fall back out to the county.

Ms. Wells stated it would be part of determination of the court as part of the adjudication.

Dr. Nocks pointed out the question at hand then was the use. He stated it will operate the same if it's in City or County as questions of use of parking, park access, etc. are not going to be impacted by their decision since that is more of a property dispute issue and he stated zoning/annexation will provide more protections in regard to fire/police and annexing won't do anything to harm the community.

Ms. Adams-Singleton clarified the community would not be losing anything regardless of if in city or county, but it would be more of a concern for the community to have a conversation either through covenant or agreement with Greenlink about the property.

Mr. Greene asked if City Council approval would create jurisdictional issues.

Mr. Rutherford stated since emergency calls are made through address points and the address for the community center would remain in the County, it would not be impacted.

Mr. Randolph asked city engineering staff to address storm water issues mentioned previously considering the property was permitted and developed in the county.

Mr. Dow confirmed that if annexed, the property would fall under City codes for storm water requirements and after issues previously mentioned, he already plans to follow up on the development.

Mr. Laney commented that the speakers would most likely find the city to be a better advocate for the issues being faced than the county.

***MOTION:**

Chris Laney moved to recommend approval of AX-29-2025. Dr. Barry Nocks seconded the motion. Motion passed 6-1.

c. AX-30-2025

Application by Anthony F. Gallo, III for ANNEXATION and REZONE of approximately 0.9 acre located at 14 DEERING STREET from R-7.5, Single-family residential district, in Greenville County to RC-2, Community 2 District, in the City of Greenville. (TM# 0106000900800)

Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

Mr. Greene asked what the generally contemplated use for that zoning type was. Mr. Rutherford explained its mainly used for multifamily uses due to the allowance for massing and numbers of units. He explained lower districts wouldn't be appropriate due to the number of units the church could fill. He stated the zoning proposed does also allow for limited commercial, but per his understanding this development would be purely multifamily.

Applicants Present Project:

Anthony and Anna Gallo- 404 River Street

Mr. Gallo stated the vision was for specific multifamily use as there is an affordability problem in the City. He stated the current owner/pastor agrees with the development and they plan on the creation of a memory hall to preserve some of the artifacts/history in the building. He said he was adamant about restoring properties and this project is purely a revitalization and adaptive re-use of the building.

Questions to Applicant:

Dr. Nocks and Mr. Laney asked about the number of units and on any intention of mixed uses.

Mr. Gallo stated they intend to have 28-31 units in the structure and are currently working through parking constraints to work out a definitive number. He stated they were mostly 1-bed/studio units and would be solely residential with amenities such as common areas, bike storage, etc.

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

Mr. Randolph asked if approved, if there would be other uses for the proposed zoning which was confirmed.

***MOTION:**

Mike Martinez moved to recommend approval of AX-30-2025. Pamela Adams-Singleton seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

d. AX-31-2025

Application by David Stone, Jr. for ANNEXATION and REZONE of approximately 0.28 acre located at JENKINS STREET, SHORT MINUS STREET, AND MINUS CHAPEL LANE from R-7.5, Single-family residential district, in Greenville County to RN-A, Neighborhood A District, in the City of Greenville. (TM# 0112000100200, 0112000100300, 0112000100400, and 0112000100500)

Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

Mr. Randolph asked if the properties are redeveloped if adjoining streets would be brought up to city code.

Mr. Rutherford confirmed if needed yes, and pointed out that Jenkins was updated relatively recently, and the roads are well established.

Applicants Present Project:

None

Questions to Applicant:

None

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

None

***MOTION:**

Lynn Solesbee moved to recommend approval of AX-31-2025. Paul Greene seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

9. Public Meeting Items (No Public Hearing)

None

10. Other Business

a. Staff Updates on Planning Projects and Initiatives

Mr. Rutherford informed Commissioners of updates to the GVL 2040 and Downtown Design Guidelines public input sessions at the August PPM. He also informed commissioners of the upcoming public meeting to rezone the Haynie-Sirrine neighborhood.

11. Executive Session, if required

None

12. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 PM.