MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2025 - 4:00 PM
Greenville City Hall, Council Chambers, 206 S. Main Street

---

1. **Call to Order**

   Chair Jeff Randolph called the meeting to order at 4:04PM.

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, Dr. Barry Nocks, and Paul Greene

   Staff Present:
   Mary Douglas Hirsch, Planning Director; Logan Wells, Deputy City Attorney; Michael Frixen, Principal Development Planner; Austin Rutherford, Senior Development Planner; Dallas Young, Senior Development Planner; Deanna Ensley, Planning Assistant

4. **Approval of Minutes**

   A. Approval of Minutes for meeting on October 2, 2025.

   Lynn Solesbee moved to approve the minutes. Pamela Adams-Singleton seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

5. **Call for Public Notice Affidavit from Applicants**

   Staff reported receiving all applicants' affidavits.

6. **Acceptance of Agenda**

   Dr. Barry Nocks moved to approve the agenda. Chris Laney seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

7. **Conflict of Interest Statement**

   Lynn Solesbee stated a conflict with AX-38-2025.

8. **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS (Public Hearing Required)**

   A. **Z-14-2025**
   Application by Kevin Holland for a **REZONE** of approximately 0.38 acre located at **706**

HAMPTON AVENUE from RH-D House D District, to RN-A, Neighborhood A District (TM# 0027000102800)

Staff report presented by Dallas Young. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:
None

Applicants Present Project:
None

Public Comment:
Marian London, 203 Echols St
Ms. London stated she lives close to the property and just wanted to ask if the owner was planning to demolish the existing units and build a quad-plex instead.
Mr. Young stated there was no intention stated to staff regarding demolishing the existing building, only to allow for the addition of 1 unit on the rear of the property and to bring the existing structure into compliance with the Development Code.

Board/Commission Discussion:
None

***MOTION:**
Mike Martinez moved to recommend approval of Z-14-2025. Dr. Barry Nocks seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

B. **AX-34-2025**
Application by United Housing Connections for **ANNEXATION** and **REZONE** of approximately 0.17 acre located at **25 N. VANCE STREET** from I-1, Industrial district, in Greenville County to RH-D, House D District, in the City of Greenville. (TM# 0123000102100)

Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:
None

Applicants Present Project:
None

Public Comment:
None

Board/Commission Discussion:
None

***MOTION:**
Chris Laney moved to recommend approval of AX-34-2025. Lynn Solesbee seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

C. **AX-36-2025**
Application by Jarod Motley for **ANNEXATION** and **REZONE** of approximately 0.34

acre located at **170 OTIS STREET** from R-7.5, Single-family residential district, in Greenville County to RH-D, House D District, in the City of Greenville. (TM# 0106000301300)

Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:
Ms. Adams-Singleton asked about the Greater Sullivan special emphasis plan and the comments on the FLUM.
Mr. Rutherford explained the plan was established decades ago for HUD funding and as the neighborhood was split between the City and County, and the City has been annexing the properties over time, they were trying to make sure those that are included in the County portion are still included moving forward after annexation. He also clarified that staff's comments on the FLUM are due to the City not extending the FLUM into the County areas at the time the FLUM was created, so it would need to be updated as properties are annexed into the City.

Applicants Present Project:
None

Public Comment:
None

Board/Commission Discussion:
None

***MOTION:**
Lynn Solesbee moved to recommend approval of AX-36-2025. Paul Greene seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

D. **AX-37-2025**
Application by David Dedvukaj for **ANNEXATION** and **REZONE** of approximately 19.96 acres located at **31 VICTOR STREET and 300 HAMMETT STREET** from PD, Planned development district, in Greenville County to IX, Industrial Flex District, in the City of Greenville. (TM#s 0153000100100, 0153000100101, and 0153001000100)

Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:
Mr. Randolph asked if the improved roadway that runs along the creek remains private, which was confirmed, and if there would be further development on parts of the property not being currently utilized.
Mr. Rutherford clarified those areas are either in use for the trail or parking for the mill.
Mr. Greene asked about fire access due to it being primarily surrounded by County property.
Mr. Rutherford stated it had already been discussed with the local stations to make sure they use correct roads and noted the current fire chief used to live in this area and is familiar with access points.

Applicants Present Project:
None

Public Comment:
Amy Cashen, 116 Aladin St
Ms. Cashen asked for clarification on if previous commitments for crossing improvements on the orange line would be affected by the annexation since the project hadn't been completed yet.
Mr. Rutherford stated the annexation would not affect any ongoing County projects.

Board/Commission Discussion:
None

***MOTION:**
Pamela Adams-Singleton moved to recommend approval of AX-37-2025. Dr. Barry Nocks seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

E. **AX-38-2025**
Application by Village Church Anglican for **ANNEXATION** and **REZONE** of approximately 2.43 acres located at **4 and 10 ALEXANDER STREET** from FRD, flexible review district, in Greenville County to IX, Industrial Flex District, in the City of Greenville. (TM#s 0150000200101 and 0150000200300)

Lynn Solesbee left the meeting at 4:26 PM
Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:
Ms. Adams-Singleton asked for the City's long-term plan for the area with it being continuously annexed and rezoned to IX and asked if there was a general idea of the future for past commercial/industrial sites.
Mr. Rutherford stated there was not yet an area plan as they had to work with each property owner individually as they applied for annexation.
Mr. Randolph pointed out the intended use for this property was a church.
Mr. Frixen explained that the IX district was specifically crafted for old mills and industrial buildings, and explained the zoning was more friendly for adaptive reuse for such buildings.
Mr. Randolph asked if IX allowed for multifamily dwellings, which was confirmed by up to 5 stories.

Applicants Present Project:
Heather Esch, 1 Pheasant Ct
Ms. Esch stated she was available for questions.

Questions to Applicant:
None

Public Comment:
None

Board/Commission Discussion:
None

***MOTION:**

Chris Laney moved to recommend approval of AX-38-2025. Paul Greene seconded the motion. Motion passed 6-0.

Lynn Solesbee returned to the meeting at 4:32 PM.

F. **AX-39-2025**
Application by Marc White for **ANNEXATION** and **REZONE** of approximately 1.11 acres located at **214 DUVALL DRIVE** from C-2, Commercial district, in Greenville County to BH, Business Heavy District, in the City of Greenville. (TM# 0272000101501)

Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:
Mr. Randolph asked if there was any significance to the neighboring property, also a dealership, not being in the City, which Mr. Rutherford stated there was not.

Applicants Present Project:
Austin Allen, 49 Greenwood
Mr. Allen stated he was available for questions.

Questions to Applicant:
Mr. Randolph asked if the purpose was to expand the dealership and if it would require infrastructure improvements, which was confirmed for both. Mr. Randolph also asked about any plans for a buffer.
Mr. Allen stated they were working with City staff to address buffering.
Ms. Adams-Singleton asked about light pollution standards and cameras.
Mr. Rutherford stated the lot would have to come into conformity with city standards, which would require lighting to not bleed into residential properties, and mentioned a security package would be submitted for cameras as well to be reviewed within the permitting process.

Public Comment:
None

Board/Commission Discussion:
Commissioners discussed illumination on the lot and adjacent properties, screening and fencing, and the need to meet City standards for site elements.

***MOTION:**
Mike Martinez moved to recommend approval of AX-39-2025. Paul Greene seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

G. **Z-17-2025**
Application by Dimitry Buehl for a **REZONE** of approximately 0.02 acre located at **514 ARLINGTON AVENUE** from RN-B, Neighborhood B District, to RNX-B, Neighborhood Flex B District (TM# 0078000400800)

Staff report presented by Dallas Young. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:
Commissioners discussed the connectivity of the buildings and Mr. Randolph clarified the buildings were connected by a party wall, but they were not accessible between the

properties.

Applicants Present Project:
Dimitry Bruehl, 5 Woodcrest Cir
Mr. Bruehl stated he was present to answer questions.

Questions to Applicant:
Mr. Randolph asked about the present use, which was stated to be vacant, though it was previously used for catering.

Public Comment:
None

Board/Commission Discussion:
Mr. Randolph stated he remembered looking at these buildings during the 2023 rezone and stated having the buildings zoned together makes more sense.

***MOTION:**
Dr. Barry Nocks moved to recommend approval of Z-17-2025. Pamela Adams-Singleton seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

H. **Z-15-2025**
Application by the City of Greenville for a **TEXT AMENDMENT** of Article 19-2, Zoning Districts, and Article 19-3, Use Regulations, of the Greenville Development Code to establish a new entertainment district overlay and to establish citywide spacing requirements for establishments serving alcohol between 12 a.m. and 5 a.m. and for a **REZONE** to apply the overlay to those properties situated between College Street and Beattie Place to the north, East and West McBee Avenue to the south, Richardson Street to the west, and North and South Spring Street to the east.

Staff report presented by Michael Frixen. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:
Dr. Barry Nocks stated the proposal would essentially freeze late-night permits where they are now in the proposed district and asked for businesses that have permits, what happens if a business changes owners.
Mr. Frixen stated the late-night hour approvals run with the land so it would not have an impact.
Dr. Nocks commented it might cause a rush hour at midnight instead of 2am.
Mr. Greene asked why the proposed district stops at East McBee.
Mr. Frixen stated the area proposed had the greatest concentration of businesses impacted in close proximity to City parking garages, so the activity was enhanced in this area. He stated the City didn't want to go too wide and that they wanted to see the effects of the change in a very defined area.
Mr. Green asked about establishments that don't have a current permit that might want to apply for one that are in this district.
Mr. Frixen stated the planning office had not received any correspondence stating there were any tenants in line in the district that would specifically be wanting to operate past midnight, and he pointed out any new businesses would still be able to operate until midnight without any issues.
Mr. Martinez asked of all the incidents, what percentage were within the proposed

boundary.

Sgt. Brown, Central Business District Supervisor
Sgt. Brown stated he didn't have exact numbers, but stated anecdotally, their office focuses efforts on crowd control/call response in the proposed overlay area, specifically targeting the Main/Coffee Street intersection on Friday/Saturday nights and stated they stagger along Main Street for that purpose. He stated they have calls in other areas, but that that proposed area is most affected by service call volume. He also stated that distributing resources to downtown doesn't make any other area less safe and that, generally, downtown remains a safe place to be, they are only trying to maintain the current situation. Mr. Brown stated calls are coming from all avenues, and confirmed it's not just from people living in the area.
Ms. Adams-Singleton asked for details about why the proposal targets the garages, and asked about the impacts of seasonal changes, alcohol use, and responses from business owners.
Staff confirmed alcohol consumption was an influence, with the majority of late-night businesses selling alcohol, but it's also just the people downtown socializing. They stated the problem was really an over-abundance of people, crowding and loitering around establishments, who don't go to their cars and leave right away. It was pointed out the sidewalks don't close at 2am and that it was the City's responsibility to manage those sidewalks and the City had an interest in ensuring everyone returned home safely. Staff pointed out that the proposal was about finding a balance, that the overlay was a zoning tool used in other parts of the City already, and it was only being proposed for a year before coming back to re-evaluate.
Mr. Randolph asked Sgt. Brown to explain what was going on in the parking garages. Sgt. Brown stated people were just going to the garages hanging out, which did include some elements of illegal drinking, car club meet-ups, and they were treating it sort of like a tailgate. He stated the top floor of each garage is the main place, and it was difficult to enforce. He stated that hanging out/loitering can turn criminal and adds to the difficulty of the exodus of people at the end of the night where everyone is going back to their cars all trying to get out at the same time.
Ms. Adams-Singleton asked if the plan was modeled from other cities, and staff stated it was not an exact model, but that there were elements in the plan from other cities.
Mr. Martinez asked to clarify if it applied to businesses intending to service alcohol specifically.
Ms. Hirsch stated it was for any new businesses wanting to be open between midnight-5am, but confirmed it doesn't include hotels.
Staff confirmed that about 30–40 signs were placed in and around the downtown area 2 weeks ago informing residents and property owners of the meeting, that the project was at the prior month's Project Preview Meeting (PPM), was mentioned at the prior merchants' association meeting, and all property owners/occupants within the new proposed overlay had received a notification letter via mail about the proposal. It was also pointed out there were several reporters at the PPM who had covered the proposal.

Public Comment:
James Williams, 107 Robin Rd
Mr. Williams asked if special exceptions were required to be issued if they meet specific criteria and why the Board of Zoning Appeals couldn't just deny new permits. He pointed out the proposal would limit the marketability of any current owners to sell their property and stated he was firmly against the proposal.

In response to Mr. Williams' questions, staff explained the criteria the Board of Zoning Appeals looks at to grant a special exception, and stated the reason they couldn't just have the Board of Zoning Appeals deny more applications was that the City wanted greater assurance it would happen and that if people were interested in being in the downtown, they would still be able to operate until midnight or they can look beyond the proposed boundary.

Scott Woods, 128 N. Main St
Mr. Woods stated it was redundant to have a boundary as well as pursue means of revoking permits and hurts the value of the property as he wouldn't be able to sell it to someone who wanted to pursue the same kind of business. He also pointed out the issues with liquor licensing requirements and how that would impact the ability of a new business owner to take over the existing business. He asked staff if he were to sell his business (City Tavern) would the new owner be able to continue running the business late-night, which staff answered they would, and asked the same for his other business (Society) which staff also confirmed.

Board/Commission Discussion:
Commissioners discussed the timing of a re-evaluation of the proposal if approved. Staff stated timing for re-evaluation could be worded as a condition of approval as well as allowing the Commission to revoke, expand, or modify the boundary at the re-evaluation. It was also confirmed prior to the re-evaluation of the boundary by the Commission that the City would have to go back through the PPM process and public notification.
Commissioners asked how the City planned to define success as to whether the boundary was working or not and the metrics for measuring that success.
Mr. Frixen stated there would be a combination review of information gathered from police data, late night surveys, inquiries and permitting requests, and from monitoring parking garage activity.
Ms. Adams-Singleton pointed out that the issue will only continue to get worse as there are not going to be less people moving to the area and suggested the possibility of a committee or business group's involvement in either an advisory capacity or in partnering with the City to help observe and monitor the progress of the proposal.
Mr. Frixen confirmed the City does have specific outreach partners already, such as the merchant's association.
Mr. Woods stated he was not part of the merchant association and was contacted by the city directly regarding the proposal. He stated he felt targeted due to the small area impacted, which impedes other businesses who would want to come in and operate out of his building if he were to sell.
Mr. Laney stated that having lived in this district before, he understands the public safety concern, but that he had concerns about the proposal and agreed with a lot of what the speakers had said. He pointed out the City has done a good job protecting the communities and neighborhoods and commercial property owners deserve the same respect and this would just shift the problem. He stated the proposal would essentially be asking people to roll up the sidewalks, which doesn't make sense, and he couldn't support that. He stated if the Commission were going to approve it, it would need to be for all of Main Street. He pointed out that he didn't like that there was no path forward and that he was concerned it would be an overreach, specifically by closing the public realm at 10pm.
Mr. Randolph asked if the café dining closure was moved back to midnight, would Mr. Laney be more amenable to the proposal,

Mr. Laney stated it would be better. He stated they want to be open to the business community and the current proposal feels like it's saying "we're closed." When asked for other solutions, Mr. Laney said giving the other changes already made in the garages time to set in and see if those changes help would be a good start, but pointed out regardless of what time things close, there will still be a surge of people. He stated that punishing businesses is not the right way to address that.
Dr. Nocks agreed on the challenge of balancing safety and freedom and explained that zoning was just a tool to provide control over use and density, and the proposal was intended to maintain the density of service as it stands currently, allowing the City to set up a stable situation to be able to address issues and have the opportunity for other areas to grow.
Mr. Laney pointed out there is already a mechanism in place, the special exception permits, that go to the Board of Zoning Appeals for approval.
Ms. Hirsch stated the Board of Zoning Appeals has specifically asked for a formal policy to address the concerns and the City was trying not to have a blanket policy, but something that targeted the area of need.
Commissioners pointed out the businesses were not the ones causing the issues, it was a small group utilizing the services in the area. They questioned the data about the garages encouraging or being the root cause of the issues and whether the proposal was the correct method to address the problem. Commissioners discussed if it was a garage problem or a density issue with up to 5000 people leaving all at once.
Mr. Solesbee and Mr. Laney agreed that pushing back the outdoor dining limitation to midnight seemed more appropriate.
Mr. Greene commented that since changes had just been made to the parking garage situation, if they passed the overlay proposal, it would be difficult to tell which changes were having what impact and suggested staggering the implementation.
Ms. Hirsch explained the parking garage changes had already been in effect since August 2025, which had been several months prior to the discussion.
Commissioners discussed making a motion with changes to the café dining restriction being moved from 10pm back to midnight, specific measurements/metrics that will be used to identify success, and requesting a specific date for reviewing the proposal's progress.
Shannon Lavrin stated the City would be agreeable to move the café dining restriction back to midnight.

***MOTION:**
Paul Greene moved to recommend approval of Z-15-2025 with the following additional/amended conditions:

- **An amendment to the restriction on café encroachments beginning at 12am (midnight) instead of 10pm**
- **An additional condition that staff will provide an interim report 6 months after approval with metrics for success and analysis on progress.**

Dr. Barry Nocks seconded the motion.
Mr. Laney asked to clarify if the motion also moved the restriction of special exceptions after midnight to special exceptions after 2am. Mr. Greene explained his motion only changed the time for café encroachments.
Mr. Martinez asked to clarify if the metrics would only be provided after the year or if they

would be given earlier. Mr. Greene explained he proposed a 6-month check-in for the first report from staff on their metrics.

Motion passed 5-2.

Recess began at 5:58PM

Returned to the meeting at 6:07PM

I. **Z-16-2025**

Application by the City of Greenville for a **REZONE** of approximately 91.96 acres from the Haynie-Sirrine Planned Development District to Greenville Development Code zoning districts within the Proposed Zoning Map located along South Church Street, University Ridge, Howe Street, Harris Street, Claussen Avenue, Thruston Street, Augusta Street, McHan Street, Seawright Lane, Haynie Street, Chicora Avenue, Enoree Street, Dixon Street, McKay Street, Urban Street, Chapin Street, Pearl Avenue, Fred Garrett Street, Cedar Street, Springer Street, Francis Street, Wakefield Street, Briar Street, Cleveland Street, Biltmore Drive, Rose Avenue, Houston Street, Watts Avenue, Watts Court, and Tindal Avenue.

Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

Ms. Adams-Singleton asked about the Dunbar connector and if it would be impacted by the rezoning.

Mr. Rutherford stated this proposal was only for the existing parcels, but confirmed the city has purchased the property for the Dunbar connector for traffic management and that the developers of county square will be responsible for the construction of that road.

Mr. Greene asked to confirm if property owners who disagree with the City's rezoning of their parcels could ask for a different zoning during the ongoing meeting or at a later date, which was confirmed.

Dr. Nocks asked about a table designating proposed zoning and how it was different from staff zoning, which was explained to be property owners suggesting zoning instead of staff recommendations.

Mr. Laney asked about properties being down-zoned and if there would be specific properties they would review later.

Mr. Rutherford explained there were two nodes that were already essentially part of PD where a higher height was called for. He stated staff didn't reinvent the wheel, just modified from the previous zoning. He stated there were some properties that are down-zoned, but there are also properties going the opposite direction and staff took into account the PD comp plan in their determination to ensure there was still some consistency for those properties.

Mr. Greene asked about the theme of affordable housing and if the rezoning would assist in addressing that priority.

Mr. Rutherford explained there were other implementation efforts in the works on that. Specifically, he mentioned the City's purchase of land near Fred Garrett and S. Church streets and a plan to issue an RFP for help designing the site with the intent to partner on a mixed-income development. He also pointed out the zoning districts that can utilize the development bonus for additional height or dwelling units, specifically those zoned RN-B and higher.

Ms. Adams-Singleton asked about the parcel on Cleveland and staffs thoughts to zone it MX-2 instead of MX-5.

Mr. Rutherford explained 1 parcel of that group was not in the PD district and was already MX-2, so staff's recommendation was reflective of a zoning that was already provided and explained that the developer could go up to 4 stories by right if they utilized the development bonus, or they could make a subsequent request for rezoning.

The Commission took a break starting at 6:31PM

The meeting resumed at 6:47PM

Public Comment:
John Slipke, 43 Tindall Ave
Becky Worth, 1 Searock Ln
Mr. Slipke and Ms. Worth introduced themselves as Co-Vice Presidents of the of Haynie-Sirrine Neighborhood Association and explained they had begun partnering with the City in 2024 to replace the PD zoning. They went through the history of the neighborhood plans, including the most recent version from 2024 and stated they were in complete agreement with the proposed rezoning map to bring their neighborhood into compliance with the City's Development Code and specific regulations. They stated the current PD code would hinder their growth and achievement and the update represents real progress for their neighborhood. They acknowledged Shannon Lavrin and city staff, stated they had done an outstanding job engaging the neighborhood, and urged the Commission to recommend approval.

Preston Schultz, 106 Biltmore Dr
Mr. Schultz stated their property was proposed to be rezoned from PD to RH-B and he expressed support for rezoning and requested regulations on short-term rentals to be more flexible.

Collin Davidson, 1001 Church St
Mr. Davidson asked for clarification on the MX-5 rezoning proposal at the intersection of Pearl, Haynie, and S. Church and if staff had always intended for the rezoning to be to MX-5. He stated their concern was that the lots at that intersection were all currently empty except for theirs which had a building that was 7 stories, but was below grade, so effectively would mean their building would be overshadowed by any new developments. He stated he was concerned that they were not being allotted protections to be able to voice concerns as they were only informed of the rezoning in September. He stated he doesn't oppose the plan overall, but asked for consideration of height and how traffic will be handled down the line.

Mr. Rutherford explained that in the review PD zone, the node allowed up to 6 stories by right and explained there was a precedent set by the hotel itself and staff took it as if that building has it, they would give the same allowance to the other corners. He stated in updating the zoning, since the current Development Code doesn't have a district for 6 stories, staff had to make an administrative decision and MX-5 was the best match, which allows up to 7 stories, but only with the development bonus. It would be capped at 5 stories without that bonus. He also explained for traffic, the Church Street Bridge would be completed by June 2026, and the County Square development has specific requirements for mitigating traffic as they hit specific targets for additional improvements, as well as in this district, there are additional mitigation requirements for traffic for certain types of development that is part of the permitting process.

Brad Holter, Kain Company Residential and Sirrine LLC
Mr. Holter introduced himself as a representative of 525 University Ridge which he stated has been vacant for more than 20 years. He stated they have had many opportunities to sell the property, but they wanted to create a gateway into the downtown area on that property. He stated they didn't believe the PD should have come down that far to begin with, but now find they are being down zoned in the current proposal. He stated he understood the importance of stepping down in height, but stated it would be a very extreme step down and they request the property be zoned up to 6 stories to match the neighbors.

Kathy McCall, 148 Augusta Ct
Ms. McCall stated she is in agreement with Mr. Holter on the same property in that they felt were being down zoned. She stated they had not received any notice about the proposal and claimed it would devalue her property. She stated buildings across and behind hers are zoned MX-5 and she was not sure why hers is proposed to be MX-2.

Paul Mills, 225 Rocky Creek Rd
Mr. Mills spoke on the same property as Mr. Holter and Ms. McCall and stated he was the architect for the proposed building on the site and was working on a design plan that was for 6 stories that would fit the general massing of other buildings nearby. He stated MX-2 makes it difficult to build on the site and that he had a massing analysis that he could share with Commissioners that would show the various building massing for the area. He claimed 6 stories on the corner would not be out of place and to limit it would punish property owners and limit their ability to pursue further development.

Sondra Freeman, 31 Tindall Ave
Ms. Freeman just wanted to ask if Airbnb's were allowed in the district, specifically around Biltmore Avenue.

Staff explained Airbnb's were only allowed in MX zoning districts, which did not include Biltmore Avenue.

Stephanie Gates, 106 Wakefield St
Ms. Gates stated her comments strictly pertained to Wakefield street and that she was not against the proposal, stating she felt the RNX-C zoning for the street was appropriate with there already being some commercial uses and Airbnb uses, but did mention that those owners who were residential would prefer to see those properties remain majority residential moving forward.

David Stone, 13 N Irvine St
Mr. Stone stated he wanted to reiterate some points from an email he sent to the Commissions about the 6 acres along McKay and Angusta where there is a section of MX-2 zoning proposed. He pointed out the area of RN-Z zoning that is between RC-2 and MX-2 and asked the board to consider allowing an RC-2 zoning instead on that property to allow for a density bonus with the intent of providing affordable housing in the area.

Tom Brault, 7215 Richwood Ter Chevy Chase, MD
Mr. Brault stated he was present to assist the landowners of the Cleveland and University Ridge properties. He stated to clarify, the property was zoned PD and was not included in

the 2022 rezoning, stating there were conflicts in data. He stated he hopes the existing 6 stories proposed could work, and stated he opposes the current proposal and suggests 6 stories for that corner.

Mr. Rutherford clarified that 2 parcels on that corner have always been part of the PD since 2002 and the parcel directly on the corner was never been in the PD. He stated it had been zoned C-1 under the old code and was rezoned to MX-2 during code rewrite in 2023. He explained this caused a split where 2 of the parcels in question were in the PD in the process of being rezoned and the 3rd had been rezoned 2.5 years ago. He stated the only pieces of the PD that were not being rezoned were in County Square due to the ongoing development agreement for those parcels.

Board/Commission Discussion:
Mr. Laney pointed out for the parcels on the corner of Cleveland and University Ridge, since the corner lot is not a part of the PD, that would have to be rezoned later anyways if all the lots were intended to be used for one building, regardless of what the PD rezoning ended up being. Regarding Mr. Stone's comments, he stated he was amenable to discussion on changing the block to RC-2 as it was separated from other RN-A parcels with a street.
Ms. Adams-Singleton agreed with Mr. Laney on being amenable to reviewing an RC-2 zoning per Mr. Stones statements, pointing out it could assist in the transition of both height and density between corridor and node areas and residential.
Mr. Greene asked for the difference between RN-A and RC-2 which was explained to be a slight height difference, but also a larger density allowance with RC-2.
Mr. Randolph asked what would be allowed on the corner of University Ridge and Cleveland under the current PD zoning rules.
Mr. Rutherford answered technically up to 6 stories, but that there were additional restrictions on the development type. He explained the building type dictates the height of the building under the PD and that the only time 6 stories was feasible was if the building was a mixed-use, office use, or similar. He stated that under the proposed building type and the current PD, they would only have been allowed up to 3 stories.
Ms. Adams-Singleton asked if for that same property there was consideration for parking for how to develop on those parcels.
Mr. Rutherford stated that those sections were specifically called out for 4 stories under the plan the year prior and how it related to buildings across the street.
Commissioners commended staff and the neighborhood leadership for their collaboration on the proposal and overall agreement of the parties.

***MOTION:**
Paul Greene moved to recommend approval of Z-16-2025. Pamela Adams-Singleton seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

9. PUBLIC MEETING ITEMS (No Public Hearing)

None

10. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Staff Update on Planning Projects and Initiatives

Michael Frixen provided updates on the GVL 2040 plan including the most recent public input workshop.

Barrett Armstrong gave an update on the changes to the Downtown Design Guidelines.

B. Upcoming Dates:
December 4, 2025- Planning Commission Public Hearing
January 6, 2026- Planning Commission Public Hearing

Staff reminded Commissioners of the next regular Public Hearings on December 4, 2025 and January 6, 2026.

11. Executive Session, if required

None

12. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:29 PM.