



# MINUTES

## REGULAR MEETING OF PLANNING COMMISSION

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 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 4:01PM.

### 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; 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 November 6, 2025

Pamela Adams-Singleton moved to approve the minutes. Chris Laney 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. Paul Greene seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

### 7. Conflict of Interest Statement

None

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

#### A. AX-40-2025

Application for **ANNEXATION** and **REZONE** of approximately 0.05 acre located at

**243 WILLARD STREET** from R-M10, Multifamily residential district, in Greenville County to RH-D, House D District, in the City of Greenville. (portion of TM# 0054000404200)

*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 item AX-40-2025. Pamela Adams-Singleton seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.**

**B. AX-41-2025**

Application for **ANNEXATION** and **REZONE** of approximately 0.98 acre located at **1101-1109 HAMPTON AVENUE EXTENSION** from I-1, Industrial district, in Greenville County to RC-3, Community 3 District, in the City of Greenville. (TM# 0139000800300)

*Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.*

**Questions to Staff:**

Mr. Randolph asked about the distance to the Southernside neighborhood and if there was thought of expanding the boundary of the neighborhood to include this parcel

Mr. Rutherford explained the the neighborhood was across the railroad yard and stated if the property had been surrounded by the neighborhood, it would make sense it have it included, but this property had not been.

Mr. Greene asked if the area to the south was in the city limits and that he'd remembered seeing a property in the area in the last few months come before the Commission.

Mr. Rutherford explained that property was in the County but there was the Greater Greenville Sanitation property close by that was annexed in August.

Mr. Randolph asked about the portion near the pedestrian bridge which was confirmed to have been previously annexed into the City.

**Applicants Present Project:**

None

**Public Comment:**

None

**Board/Commission Discussion:**

None

**\*MOTION:**

**Dr. Barry Nocks moved to recommend approval of item AX-41-2025. Lynn Solesbee seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.**

**C. AX-42-2025**

Application for **ANNEXATION** and **REZONE** of approximately 8.01 acres located at **6040 PONDER'S COURT** from S-1, Services district, in Greenville County to IX, Industrial Flex District, in the City of Greenville. (TM# 0547020102008)

*Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.*

**Questions to Staff:**

Mr. Greene asked, since the parcel covers I85, if it gave the city any maintenance responsibility or oversight over that portion of the interstate.

Mr. Rutherford stated it improved the ability of emergency response, but did not grant ownership of the interstate, saying that it would stay with the state's Department of Transportation. He stated the City could partner with them in the future on certain projects but that was not currently in any plans.

**Applicants Present Project:**

None

**Public Comment:**

None

**Board/Commission Discussion:**

None

**\*MOTION:**

**Lynn Solesbee moved to recommend approval of item AX-42-2025. Dr. Barry Nocks seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.**

**D. AX-43-2025**

Application for **ANNEXATION** and **REZONE** of approximately 0.16 acre located at **100 GUESS STREET** from R- 7.5, Single-family residential district, in Greenville County to RH-D, House D District, in the City of Greenville. (TM#s 0106001101100)

*Staff report presented by Austin Rutherford. Staff recommends approval.*

**Questions to Staff:**

None

**Applicants Present Project:**

None

**Public Comment:**

None

**Board/Commission Discussion:**

Ms. Adams-Singleton asked about the requirement that proposals for annexing property be adjacent to current City property and for staff to clarify how that applied in this case.

Mr. Rutherford stated the adjacent property was kitty corner to the applicant's property.

**\*MOTION:**

**Paul Greene moved to recommend approval of item AX-43-2025. Lynn Solesbee seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.**

**E. Z-18-2025**

Application for **REZONE** of approximately 0.33 acre located at **104 COOK STREET** from RH-D, House D District, to RN-A, Neighborhood A District (TM# 0026000800100)

*Staff report presented by Dallas Young. Staff recommends approval.*

**Questions to Staff:**

Mr. Randolph asked to clarify the public notice timeframe required if a demolition was requested.

Mr. Young clarified it was 45 days and if the notice was not intended to allow for an appeal but for members of the public to reclaim any materials from the structure being demolished at the owners discretion and staff is not aware of an intent to demolish the structure on the property in question.

Mr. Greene asked if RN-A zoning was multifamily and what was on the property currently.

Mr. Young stated RN-A is intended as multifamily up to 4 units and its a single-family home on the property now.

**Applicants Present Project:**

None

**Public Comment:**

None

**Board/Commission Discussion:**

Mr. Randolph stated even if the structure on the property currently is not demolished, there is still quite a bit of vacant land on the lot that would be an opportunity for development.

**\*MOTION:**

**Pamela Adams-Singleton moved to recommend approval of item Z-18-2025. Chris Laney seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.**

**F. Z-19-2025**

Application for **REZONE** of approximately 0.34 acre located on **KING STREET** from RH-D, House D District, to RN-A, Neighborhood A District (TM# 0026000101001)

*Staff report presented by Dallas Young. Staff recommends approval.*

**Questions to Staff:**

Mr. Randolph asked if there were 2 single family homes between the lot in question on Hampton Avenue which was confirmed.

Mr. Greene asked if redevelopment would require a tree study which was confirmed.

**Applicants Present Project:**

None

**Public Comment:**

None

**Board/Commission Discussion:**

Mr. Greene asked what kind of conversations around this discussion had occurred with adjoining property owners.

Mr. Young stated staff always recommends developers speak with the neighbors of the property regarding any developments and they are required to send out notices. He confirmed staff does not solicit feedback directly from neighbors, but the projects are required to attend a Project Preview Meeting for members of the public to voice their concerns.

Mr. Randolph commented that the parcel looks like it was created from the backyards of other parcels.

Mr. Young stated he believed the property owner lives adjacent to this property and he was not sure of their intent other than selling the property.

Commissioners and staff discussed concerns of potential spot-zoning and other properties in the neighborhood that were zoned similarly in previous applications.

**\*MOTION:**

**Lynn Solesbee moved to recommend approval of item Z-19-2025. Dr. Barry Nocks seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.**

**9. PUBLIC MEETING ITEMS (No Public Hearing)**

None

**10. OTHER BUSINESS**

Michael Frixen gave Commissioners an update on the GVL 2040 5-year update and responses to prior surveys and public input workshops. The presentation is attached.

**Questions for Staff:**

Ms. Adams-Singleton asked about how green space requirements for redevelopment is calculated into the acreage goals for GVL 2040 and moving forward what the open space goal is.

Mr. Frixen stated those numbers are not included in the report and would be extremely difficult to track down, but that the goal was still 35% of the 2700 identified acres of open land remaining listed in the original GVL 2040 report.

Mr. Greene asked about the affordable housing section and how there were only 2 projects using development bonus listed when it seems affordable housing is constantly being discussed and asked if there was any idea of what success would look like.

Mr. Frixen stated those were the numbers of projects fully approved, and don't include the numbers of those still in discussion. He stated there have been a lot of changes that staff believe have impacted the ability of developers to utilize the development bonus including increases in cost to multifamily development and other types of pricing changes. He stated the path forward was to see how that settles in time and staff hopes to see more utilization of the development bonus in its current form before looking at amending the language.

Mr. Greene asked about the resiliency bucks reference.

Mr. Frixen stated that was the interactive module for the resiliency input session where about fake money was given to participants and they could put those "dollars" towards

specific items to give a measure of priority.

Mr. Greene asked if the City had sway on something like burying power lines.

Mr. Randolph gave an example from his recent experience with burying lines, pointing out its not just Duke power, but other utilities that use overhead lines and in his example found that even after Duke moved some lines, others were left up that don't actually work, but that the utilities didn't want to spend time removing after installing new ones.

Mr. Dow explained they have a full-time staff dedicated to under- grounding of power lines between 2 categories, commercial and residential. He stated there is a funding mechanism via percentage of Duke's revenue within the City that goes towards large commercial burying of lines and there is a residential program that provides a \$3000 subsidy to assist in burying service lines from the main line in residential communities.

Mr. Randolph asked about the cost for burying lines.

Mr. Dow stated it varies, but it is expensive, being in the millions for commercial districts, and a couple thousand for residential. He stated the City has an application process for the residential program and pointed out the benefits in situations where lines go down.

Mr. Randolph asked if permits were required for new underground lines and if there were requirements to remove overhead lines if new lines are put in and buried.

Mr. Dow confirmed a permit was required, but they do not always require the company to remove overhead lines as part of the permitting. He pointed out the City has a dedicated utility engineer tasked with addressing left over lines, of which there are miles of in the City.

Mr. Randolph pointed out even if Duke owns the poles, if another telecommunication service is still using the pole after Duke puts lines underground, the poles can't be taken down.

Dr. Nocks commended the City on their work in attempting to balance competing focus areas.

Ms. Adams-Singleton asked if there was a way to analyze the impact on the competing focus areas from development done since the passing of GVL2040 and how those focus areas may have impacted each other.

Mr. Frixen stated they should have a more in-depth discussion afterwards and how we might track that.

Mr. Randolph stated it might be beneficial to break down the affordable housing numbers by year. He stated when the new code went into effect it was a bit of a shock and it took a bit of time for people to figure out how to utilize the development bonus. He asked if ADUs were included in the numbers.

Mr. Frixen stated they were not, but there were about 10-15 ADUs permitted each year since the code.

Pamela Adams-Singleton asked if the City felt it was meeting their goals with housing affordability and what numbers were being pursued on that.

Ms. Hirsch stated conversations were happening on a daily basis revolving around affordability and stated the City would take as much as possible and that there was not a focus on a targeted number. She stated it was more a matter of the volume of conversation and the City has shown a commitment to getting creative through Greenville housing fund investments and utilization of accommodations tax revenues were a both huge win, as well as the purchasing of 6+ acres of Haynie-Sirrine and getting a footprint there.

Dr. Nocks pointed out the City has priorities they constantly push but the way to make progress is to push on several at once.

Mr. Greene stated regarding the Haynie-Sirrine purchase, though its been difficult to get any uptake on the development bonus, the City is literally putting \$12 million of its own

money into a project which is a very visible commitment.

Mr. Randolph commented the purchase was a recognition of pressure and tension we have in Greenville where 6 acres sold for for \$12 million, pointing out he could buy a whole city with that money elsewhere. He stated there is a uniqueness the Commission was up against and the pressure on the land itself to get vertical and the costs associated with it.

Ms. Hirsch commented that City staff worked hard on getting that deal completed and commented that the City would like to get greater help from the Commission on digging into how missing middle housing could look and feel like and that that should be a topic to follow moving forward and having some public education on that topic would be helpful for the next year.

Mr. Greene asked if staff had specific examples of success for similar projects or sites where the City saw good potential for use as missing middle housing.

Staff gave examples of areas through the City, included citing small area plans that specified areas and needs for missing middle housing.

Dr. Nocks stated it would be helpful for staff to include the stated goals, priorities, and challenges within the update itself and outline action items to give Council a reason to approve staff doing it.

Ms. Adams-Singleton asked about the transportation numbers and why the numbers showed rider numbers being high, but commuter numbers being low.

Mr. Frixen stated the discrepancy was due to the different information sources being pulled from for those different numbers and stated there was also a margin of error with the numbers.

Ms. Hirsch stated staff could do a bar chart to show ridership by year to assist in comparing the numbers.

Mr. Green stated it may also be helpful to show numbers by population to show the relationship between the metrics and make it easier to see trends in the data.

Dallas Young reminded the Commissioners of the upcoming meetings.

#### **11. Executive Session, if required**

None

#### **12. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.