



MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF PLANNING COMMISSION

THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 2026 - 4:00 PM

Greenville City Hall, Council Chambers, 206 S. Main Street

Citizens may access the meeting at the following web address:

<http://greenvillesc.gov/MeetingMedia>

1. Call to Order

Jeff Randolph called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

2. Welcome and Opening Remarks from the Chair

Mr. 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, Lynn Alan Solesbee, Chris Laney, 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 Operations Coordinator

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of Minutes for meeting on February 26, 2026 and March 5, 2026

Mr. Greene moved to approved the minutes. Dr. Nocks seconded. The motion passed 6-0.

5. Call for Public Notice Affidavit from Applicants

Staff reported receiving all applicants' affidavits.

6. Acceptance of Agenda

Dr. Nocks moved to approve the agenda. Mr. Greene seconded. The motion passed 6-0.

7. Conflict of Interest Statement

Mr. Solesbee and Mr. Laney expressed conflicts with item AX-12-2026.

Mr. Solesbee and Mr. Laney left the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

8. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS (Public Hearing Required)

A. **AX-12-2026**

Application for **ANNEXATION** and **REZONE** of approximately 0.63 acre located on **REDLAND WAY** from R-20, Single-family residential district, in Greenville County to RH-C, House C District, in the City of Greenville. (TM#s 0543150101300, 0543150101400, and 0543150102100)

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:**

Dr. Nocks moved to approve item AX-12-2026. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

Mr. Solesbee and Mr. Laney returned to the meeting at 4:08 p.m.

B. **Z-5-2026**

Application for **REZONE** of approximately 2.92 acres of land located at **BUNCOMBE STREET and BUTLER AVENUE** from PD, Planned Development District, to MX-2, Mixed-Use 2 District (TM#s 0019000102700, 0019000100100, 0019000100500)

Staff report presented by Michael Frixen. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

Mr. Green asked if the 2019 Downtown Master Plan recommended specific zoning or intent of uses for the area, which staff explained it only provided a direction of vision, not specific zoning designations.

Mr. Randolph asked if the upper story setback would apply to the rear, which was confirmed.

Mr. Randolph asked if a minor change would be approvable by staff.

Mr. Frixen explained due to the change in architectural style, it would require a major change.

Applicant presentation provided by Jeff Walker, 3740 Davinci Ct., Peachtree Corners, GA 30092 and Brad Galland, 530 W. Main Street, Cartersville, GA

Questions to Applicant:

Mr. Randolph asked if the rationale for the new development plans were due to the previous plan no longer being considered for development, which was confirmed.

Public Comment:

Bob Lloyd, 14 Pinckney

Mr. Lloyd stated he shared a boundary with the parcel and spoke in favor of the application for rezoning due to the PD no longer being able to be implemented to allow the parcel to be developed.

Robert Benedict, 402 Hampton Ave

Mr. Benedict stated as an owner and having invested in rehabilitating properties in the area, he was in favor of the rezoning, but clarified he was not in support of the long term development plan and stated he would speak against the development at the Board of Zoning Appeals hearing for it.

Board/Commission Discussion:

Mr. Randolph asked about the ability of staff to pull PD rights due to no movement being made on the development, which staff stated wouldn't apply to this lot, hence the request to rezone and that as PD zoning is no longer allowed per the Development Code, they would not be able to amend the PD to something substantially different than what was previously in place.

Dr. Nocks stated it was prime land but was trapped in the PD and that he agreed the most efficient, if not the only way to move forward was to rezone the property. He agreed MX-2 would be consistent with rest of the area and was the most obvious action so the property could be put to a good and appropriate use. He concurred that there was every reason to approve the current application and have the specifics reviewed later for a particular use.

Mr. Martinez pointed out the property was on such a major thoroughfare and it was difficult to separate the use from the application at hand and it was a challenge from a planning standpoint as they would expect something significant due to location.

Mr. Greene stated he appreciated the speakers acknowledging the 2 phases for this issue and that it was hard to think of the property staying in its current status and hard to come up with a more appropriate zoning.

***MOTION:**

Dr. Nocks moved to approve item Z-5-2026. Mr. Solesbee seconded the motion.

Motion passed 6-0.

C. Z-6-2026

Application for **REZONE** of approximately 0.38 acre of land located at **1210 NORTH PLEASANTBURG DRIVE** from PD, Planned Development District, to BG, Business General District (TM# 0276000300501)

Staff report presented by Dallas Young. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

Mr. Greene asked about the ownership of the nearby pedestrian bridge which was confirmed to be Bob Jones University.

Commissioners asked about the architectural differences and use requirements between the PD and the proposed zoning.

Staff confirmed the architectural style would be allowed to match those of the BG district and that the largest change for use, would be to allow drive-thrus by right or continued residential.

Mr. Greene commented that it was interesting that only 1 part of the overall PD was requesting the zoning change.

Applicant presentation provided by Stephanie Gates, 225 Rocky Creek Road.

Questions to Applicant:

Mr. Randolph asked about the motivation for rezoning which Ms. Gates stated was to allow more flexibility for potential buyers of the property, but stated there were no current plans for the parcel actively in place.

Commissions asked if the commercial parcel was part of the home owners association or other private restrictions that would require it to maintain architectural requirements from PD standards moving forward. Ms. Gates stated there were no HOA for the overall development, just the residential piece, but stated there were agreements in place for things such as the private roads, but nothing that would limit the use or architecture to her knowledge.

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

Commissioners commented that this application was different than the last in that it was more expansive in uses as it stood, was not as restrictive, and the request would not make the site materially different than its current uses allowed other than townhomes or drive thrus.

Mr. Randolph stated concerns for other parcels developing on the lots with certain representations for the plans for the other lots, such as architecture and setbacks that would no longer be enforced.

Mr. Rutherford clarified there were no architectural standards listed under the PD outside of for the townhomes and the only constraint was the uses of the site. He confirmed during a modification in 2022, a PD for the townhomes themselves included numerous pictures and representations of architecture for those, but that the commercial parcels were not included in that.

Mr. Martinez asked staff if the Development Code had not changed, would staff have accepted a project that was drastically different than other established sites in the PD.

Mr. Rutherford stated since the PD doesn't have anything called out about architecture, it would have been open to interpretation.

Mr. Randolph asked if under the existing PD, a setback variance was requested, would staff consider that to be a major change, which Mr. Young confirmed, stated that was an element specifically called out in the PD.

Mr. Laney pointed out that the standard for concerns for properties next to residential has been to protect neighborhoods.

Commissioners asked for clarification on what options their legal authority gave them.

Ms. Wells stated they could not make a change or condition to the request, only make a motion on the request/application at hand.

Dr. Nocks pointed out the City did not want to continue maintaining PDs and that he was inclined to approve the application.

Mr. Solesbee pointed out the only other use that would allow for what they are looking for would be BG, so he would tend to agree with Dr. Nocks, stating all else equal, the largest issues are setback and allowing drive thrus beyond just coffee shops and it would still have buffers to protect nearby residential, so he was also inclined to approve the application.

Mr. Greene asked about the access to the site being off Dean's Pleasant, which staff confirmed was the only access and had always been planned that way.

Commissioners discussed concerns with traffic backing up into the neighborhood. Staff pointed out for the drive thru components, traffic engineering would review the traffic flow to ensure there would not be spillover into adjacent neighborhoods as part of a development application.

***MOTION:**

Mr. Solesbee moved to approve item Z-6-2026. Dr. Nocks seconded the motion. Motion failed 2-4. Dissenting Commissioners included Mike Martinez, Jeff Randolph, Chris Laney, and Paul Greene.

Mr. Greene stated leaving the application with no recommendation would not give City Council a clear picture of the Commissions preference for the application.

Mr. Greene moved to deny Z-6-2026. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-2. Dissenting Commissioners included Lynn Solesbee and Dr. Barry Nocks.

9. PUBLIC MEETING ITEMS (No Public Hearing)

None

10. OTHER BUSINESS

Staff provided an update on resources provided to the Commissioners prior to the meeting and confirmed the Planning and Development Department had completed its move to new offices at 15 S. Main Street.

11. Executive Session, if required

None

12. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.