

MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
March 15, 2016

The Greenville Planning and Zoning Commission met on the above date at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall.

Mr. Tony Parker – Chair \*  
Mr. Terry King - \*                      Ms. Chris Darden – X  
Mr. Doug Schrade – \*                Ms. Ann Bellis – \*  
Ms. Margaret Reid - \*                Mr. John Collins - \*  
Mr. Dustin Mills - \*                    Ms. Betsy Leech –\*  
Mr. Les Robinson - \*                  Mr. Anthony Herring - \*

The members present are denoted by an \* and the members absent are denoted by an X.

**VOTING MEMBERS:** King, Schrade, Bellis, Reid, Collins, Mills, Leech, Herring

**PLANNING STAFF:** Thomas Weitnauer, Chief Planner; Chantae Gooby, Planner II, Andy Thomas, Lead Planner and Amy Nunez, Staff Support Specialist II.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Dave Holec, City Attorney; Merrill Flood, Assistant City Manager, Scott Godefroy, City Engineer; Roger Johnson, Economic Development Manager; Christian Lockamy, Economic Development Liaison and Jewel Jones, Communications Technician.

**MINUTES:** Motion was made by Ms. Reid, seconded by Ms. Leech to accept the February 16, 2016 minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

**NEW BUSINESS**  
**REZONINGS**

ORDINANCE REQUESTED BY BRANDON MITCHELL TO REZONE 1.4953 ACRES LOCATED ALONG THE SOUTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THOMAS LANGSTON ROAD AND 250+/- FEET WEST OF STERLING POINTE DRIVE FROM RA20 (RESIDENTIAL-AGRICULTURAL) TO CG (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) - APPROVED

Ms. Gooby, Planner, advised the Commission that two letters were received concerning the request and had been distributed prior to the meeting. One letter was from the representative of the applicant and one letter was from an adjacent property owner. She delineated the property. It is located along Thomas Langston Road adjacent to New Rover Pottery and Vancroft Townhomes. Currently, there is a single-family residence on the property. There is an intermediate focus area located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Memorial Drive and Thomas Langston Road which is where commercial is anticipated. This rezoning could generate an increase of 386 trips per day. The property is currently zoned RA20 and is located between OR and CG zoning. Under the requested CG zoning, the property could accommodate 9,800+/- square feet of commercial/retail space. The Future Land Use Plan Map recommends commercial

at the southwest corner of the intersection of Memorial Drive and Thomas Langston Road transitioning to office/institutional/multi-family to the west and south. The Future Land Use Plan Map is not dimensionally or site specific. The property is located at a transition area. In staff's opinion, the request is in general compliance with Horizons: Greenville's Community Plan and the Future Land Use Plan Map. The property is adjacent to similar zoning and the area properties have a similar zoning pattern already in place. This zoning pattern is in keeping with the Horizons Plan in that OR zoning is a buffer to commercial zoning. This request preserves the desired urban form. General compliance means that staff is not recommending approval but has no specific objection.

Mr. King stated that the transition of commercial to office/institutional/multi-family is to the south and west on the Future Land Use Plan. This request is away from the major intersection and he believes the commercial zoning is not suitable. He asked for further clarification since it appears the request is too close to the multi-family zoning in the area.

Ms. Gooby stated the property adjacent to the subject site is zoned commercial. The Future Land Use Plan is not dimensional or site specific. The request is in a transition area and by rezoning it to commercial it would have similar zoning as the general area.

Mr. King stated it recommends office/institutional/multi-family.

Ms. Gooby stated that staff's recommendation is the request is in general compliance, which means staff neither recommends approval or denial. The request is only 1.5 acres.

Chairman Parker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Steve Spruill, representative of the applicant, spoke in favor of the request. He stated that they looked into the property value concern that was raised by a letter of opposition. Many of the townhome properties are already adjacent to commercial zoning. Those properties were compared to the tax value of the homes adjacent to the request and the values are identical. Another concern was safety and security. The intended use would alleviate any of those concerns. The applicant's intention is a low key use and not to be open at night. His belief on the intended use would only have an average of 70 trips a day compared to the traffic report provided by staff that said 386 trips.

Mr. King stated that they need to consider all uses in the commercial zoning and not just the applicant's intended use.

Ms. Leech asked about buffers for the property.

Attorney Holec stated that any representation of what they may do over and beyond what the ordinance requires cannot be relied upon.

Ms. Gooby stated that buffer requirements are provided on the Bufferyard Setback and Vegetation Screening Chart in the Commission's packet.

Mr. Brandon Mitchell, applicant, spoke in favor of the request. His intent is retail and not anything offensive. He wants to be a good neighbor.

Mr. Rick Mitchell, adjoining property owner, spoke in favor of the request.

No one spoke in opposition of the request.

Chairman Parker closed the public hearing and opened for board discussion.

Mr. Schrade stated that the zoning is not an exact science. The request is already bordered by commercial.

Mr. King stated that the scope of use includes a liquor store or launderette and other uses that are not compliant with the neighborhood.

Mr. Schrade stated the adjoining properties are already adjacent to commercial and the concern of the scope of use already exists.

Mr. Collins asked how the County calculates the tax values for these properties.

Attorney Holec stated the County is statutorily required to value property at its fair market value.

Chairman Parker stated that New River Pottery has been there for some time.

Ms. Leech stated that there does not seem to be a lot of space for buffers.

Ms. Gooby stated that like uses do not require buffers but there could be minor screening.

Chairman Parker asked if a site and vegetation plan is required before a build-out.

Ms. Gooby stated yes.

**Motion made by Mr. Schrade, seconded by Mr. Mills, to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to advise that it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable plans and to adopt the staff report which addresses plan consistency and other matters. In favor: Schrade, Mills, Herring, Bellis. Opposed: Collins, Reid, King, Leech. Voting was tied. Chairman Parker broke the tie in favor of the motion. Motion carried.**

ORDINANCE REQUESTED BY POHL, LLC AND V. PARKER OVERTON TO REZONE 48.16+/- ACRES LOCATED ALONG THE SOUTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF BAYSWATER ROAD AND 700+/- FEET SOUTH OF FIRE TOWER ROAD FROM R6MH (RESIDENTIAL-MOBILE HOME [HIGH DENSITY]) TO CG (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) FOR 9.48+/-

ACRES AND OR (OFFICE-RESIDENTIAL [HIGH DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY]) FOR  
38.68+/- ACRES - APPROVED

Ms. Gooby, Planner, delineated the property. It is located south of Fire Tower Road and west of Corey Road. This rezoning is the last remaining piece of property along Bayswater Road that has mobile home zoning. The Winterville Charter School is adjacent to the east and Dudley's Grant Townhomes are adjacent to the west. The request has been divided into two tracts. Tract 1 is 9.5 acres and is requested for general commercial and Tract two is 38 acres and requested for office/multi-family. This property is part of the approved preliminary plat for Fire Tower Junction. There is a regional focus area at Bayswater Road, which is the largest commercial designation and is where commercial is anticipated. This rezoning could generate an increase of 1,300 trips per day. There is a signalized intersection at both intersections of Fire Tower Road and Bayswater Road. The property is impacted by the floodway and floodplains associated with the Fork Swamp Canal along the southern edge of the property. Tract 1 is zoned for high density mobile home and is requested for general commercial. The property could accommodate 62,000 square feet of commercial space. Tract 2 is zoned for high density mobile home and is requested for office/multi-family. There is no change in density between the existing and requested zoning for Tract 2, but this rezoning would also allow an office use. The Future Land Use Plan Map recommends commercial along Fire Tower Road from Bayswater Road transitioning to office/institutional/multi-family to the south. In staff's opinion, the request is in compliance with Horizons: Greenville's Community Plan and the Future Land Use Plan Map. The property is adjacent to similar zoning.

Ms. Leech asked if the conservation area to the south was a natural buffer.

Ms. Gooby stated yes.

Ms. Bellis asked if there are provisions for adequate buffering to Dudley's Grant.

Ms. Gooby stated that the required buffers are prescribed on the Bufferyard Setbacks and Vegetation Screening Chart. A copy of the chart is in the Commission's packet.

Chairman Parker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jim Walker of Rivers and Associates, representative of the applicant, spoke in favor of the request. He stated all the traffic from the development will use Bayswater Road and then to one of two signalized intersections at E. Fire Tower Road. There is a natural buffer of trees along the Dudley's Grant Townhomes which has been kept. The sewer line was moved deeper into the subject property away from the tree line to create a 50-foot buffer from the townhomes. Any additional buffer or vegetation requirement would be submitted with a site plan for development on the individual lots. Development cannot happen in the floodway and must be at least 50 feet from the stream which is a natural buffer. He stated Bayswater Road is complete and has a sidewalk on one side.

Mr. Michael Overton, representative of the applicant, spoke in favor of the request. He stated there is no flooding he is aware of on this site. The R6MH zoning is a high density zoning. The request is to bring offices into the area.

Mr. Jack Morgan, adjacent property owner, spoke in favor of the request.

No one spoke in opposition of the request.

Chairman Parker closed the public hearing and opened for board discussion.

No board discussion was made.

**Motion made by Mr. Mills seconded by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to advise that it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable plans and to adopt the staff report which addresses plan consistency and other matters. Motion passed unanimously.**

ORDINANCE REQUESTED BY WGB PROPERTIES, INCORPORATED TO REZONE 7.87 ACRES LOCATED ALONG THE NORTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF CLIFTON STREET AND THE EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF EVANS STREET FROM CG (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) TO OR (OFFICE-RESIDENTIAL [HIGH DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY]) - APPROVED

Ms. Gooby, Planner, advised the Commission that an email from an adjoining property owner had been distributed prior to the meeting. She delineated the property. It is located near the intersection of Evans Street and Arlington Boulevard and specifically along Clifton Street. Currently, the property is vacant. Cypress Creek Townhomes are adjacent. There is a 20-foot greenway easement across the property. This greenway will connect Evans Street to the ECU Stadium. The property is impacted by the floodway and 100 and 500-year floodplains. Since the rezoning is from commercial to multi-family, there would be a decrease in traffic. Under the current zoning (CG), the property could accommodate 50,000+/- square feet of commercial/retail space. Under the proposed zoning (OR), the property could accommodate 100-110 multi-family units. The Future Land Use Plan Map recommends commercial at the intersection of Evans Street and Arlington Boulevard transitioning to office/institutional/multi-family and conservation/open space. The Future Land Use Plan Map is not dimensionally or site specific. The property is located at a transition area. In staff's opinion, the request is in general compliance with Horizons: Greenville's Community Plan and the Future Land Use Plan Map. The property is adjacent to similar zoning and the area properties have a similar zoning pattern already in place. This zoning pattern is in keeping with the Horizons Plan that OR zoning is a buffer to commercial zoning. General compliance means that staff is not recommending approval but has no specific objection.

Mr. Scott Godefroy, City Engineer, stated that development in the floodplain is possible but there are mitigation measures.

Ms. Leech asked for information regarding drainage of Evans Street due to elevation.

Mr. Godefroy stated there is a big difference in elevation and any development will require stormwater detention for a 10-year storm.

Ms. Bellis asked about the culvert on Arlington Boulevard near JH Rose High School.

Mr. Godefroy stated that the culvert is designed for the 10-year storm.

Chairman Parker opened the public hearing.

Jim Walker, Rivers and Associates, representative of the applicant spoke in favor of the request. He stated that there is only about 4.3 developable acres. The property has been zoned for commercial for over 40 years and never developed. The proposed zoning will decrease traffic.

Mollye Otis, adjacent property owner at Cypress Creek Townhomes, spoke in opposition to the request. She stated she had a petition with 13 of the 21 property owners who oppose the rezoning. They do not want high density multi-family. The quality of life will be diminished, vehicular and pedestrian traffic will increase. The greenway could increase the possibility of drug activity and crime. The residents should be included in the development of the property. The neighborhood does not want any development especially student housing.

Chairman Parker stated that the property is currently zoned commercial and could be developed as such at any time.

Barbara Dunlap, adjacent property owner at Cypress Creek Townhomes, spoke in opposition to the request. She stated that the wetlands are not suitable for development. The rezoning could increase traffic and it is already difficult to get in and out of the neighborhood. Senior citizens in the neighborhood will not feel safe.

Mr. Herring asked if Ms. Dunlap thought tax values would decrease.

Ms. Dunlap stated yes and that people would move out of the neighborhood.

Kristie Anderson, adjacent property owner at Cypress Creek Townhomes, spoke in opposition to the request. She stated that Cypress Creek is secluded and private with amenities in close proximity. Development will lower property values. She wants to keep the commercial zoning.

Diane Wade, adjacent property owner at Cypress Creek Townhomes, spoke in opposition to the request. She is concerned about run off because Cypress Creek does not have curb and gutter.

Dagmar Hermann-Estes, adjacent property owner at Cypress Creek Townhomes, spoke in opposition to the request.

Jim Walker, Rivers and Associates, representative of the applicant spoke in rebuttal. He stated that the property could be developed at any time, but there is no market for commercial zoning.

No rebuttal in opposition made.

Chairman Parker closed the public hearing and opened for board discussion.

Ms. Leech stated that Evans Street and Arlington Boulevard is a busy intersection and there needs to be care with new development.

Chairman Parker asked staff for the zoning of Cypress Creek and the uses for the requested rezoning.

Ms. Gooby stated Cypress Creek is zoned OR and referred the Commission to the List of Uses for CG and OR in the Commission's packet.

Mr. Mills stated that the request is for the same zoning as Cypress Creek Townhomes. It has proximity to the greenway and runoff standards are better now than older developments.

Mr. Collins stated that the neighborhood would rather take a chance of what could be developed on the property with its current zoning.

Chairman Parker stated that the property could foreseeable have a big box retailer in the future.

Mr. Schrade stated that the rezoning could result in a decrease in traffic, the zoning is complementary with the greenway. Runoff will be addressed at the time of development.

Mr. Herring stated he feels the concerns of the neighbors. The proposed request is good.

Mr. Robinson asked about the buffer requirements from the current and proposed zoning.

Ms. Gooby stated that buffer requirements are prescribed on the Bufferyard Setback and Vegetation Screening Chart in the Commission's packet.

**Motion made by Mr. Herring, seconded by Mr. Schrade, to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to advise that it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable plans and to adopt the staff report which addresses plan consistency and other matters. In favor: Herring, Schrade, Reid, Bellis, Mills. Opposed: Collins, King, Leech. Motion carried.**

## PRELIMINARY PLATS

REQUEST BY TUCKER FARMS, INC. FOR A PRELIMINARY PLAT ENTITLED "CENTRE COURT". THE PRELIMINARY PLAT, CENTRE COURT, IS LOCATED OFF



HOLDEN ROAD, NORTH OF TOWER VILLAGE, SECTION 2, EAST OF SUMMERHAVEN, SECTION 2 AND SOUTH OF EVANS PROPERTY AND MELBOURNE PARK. THE PROPERTY IS FURTHER IDENTIFIED AS TAX PARCEL #68061. THE PRELIMINARY PLAT CONSISTS OF 2 LOTS ON 14.3025 ACRES. THE PROPERTY OWNER AND DEVELOPER IS TUCKER FARMS, INC. - APPROVED

Mr. Andy Thomas, Lead Planner delineated the request. The request is in the southern section of the City. The property is not impacted by the flood plain. It is near two major thoroughfares, Arlington Boulevard and Fire Tower Road. This is an extension of Holden Drive from Wimbledon Drive to its terminus in Summerhaven. This is an example of interconnectivity. The residents of Summerhaven will now have two means of egress. Holden Drive is being extended to create two lots. There will be a sidewalk provided from Holden Drive's terminus in Summerhaven to Wimbledon Drive. This property is bounded by duplexes to the west and south. There are apartments to the north. The property is zoned R-6 which allows single family residential, duplexes or apartments. If the property is further divided or has public streets, it will come back to the Planning and Zoning Commission. If it is developed as multi-family, it could be just a site plan. There has been a wetlands delineation approved by the Army Corps of Engineers for the southeastern corner of the property. We have a copy of the approval in the file. There is a 50 foot riparian buffer along the eastern side of the property. This is a major drainage feature. This area cannot be built upon and is reserved for environmental purposes. There is a twenty foot drainage easement along the southern boundary of the property. There is a fifty foot drainage easement along the northern boundary of the property. There will be no costs to the City of Greenville associated with this subdivision other than routine costs to provide public services. The City's Subdivision Review Committee has reviewed the preliminary plat and has determined that it meets all technical requirements.

Chairman Parker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ritchie Brown, representative of Stroud Engineering, spoke in favor of the request. He was prepared to answer questions.

No one spoke in opposition.

Chairman Parker closed the public hearing and opened for board discussion.

No board discussion made.

**Motion made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Mills, approve the request. Motion carried unanimously.**

## **OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS**

DISCUSSION ITEM - INFILL DEVELOPMENT



Mr. Thomas Weitnauer, Chief Planner, spoke on the item. He stated Chairman Parker directed staff to place this item on the agenda for discussion. He introduced the City of Greenville's new Economic Development Manager, Roger Johnson. Mr. Weitnauer presented slides of ten questions Chairman Parker asked staff to address to begin discussions on infill development following by staff responses:

**1. *What is infill development?***

Infill is a development strategy that uses land within an already built-up area for further construction, focusing on reusing and repositioning obsolete or underutilized buildings and sites.

- **Residential** Most prevalent type of infill development.
- **Commercial** Typically occurs on vacant, underutilized strip malls.
- **Brownfield** Replaces idled warehouses, gas stations, or factories.
- **Mixed-Use** Combines multiples uses located in close proximity to one another to work, conduct business, shop, dine, and socialize.

**2. *Why is infill good?***

- Uses existing infrastructure which helps to save cost rather than construct new.
- Transit-oriented infill can save developers capital costs for parking.
- Developers may be able to command higher rent or sales prices.
- Compact infill development in urban cores correlate with better real estate performance and higher property values due to the increased walkability and access to transit.

**3. *Is infill development sustainable?***

- Add to growth city's growth without as much sprawl.
- Uses current infrastructure and avoids public costs.
- Increased use of local amenities to reach more residents at a lower cost.
- Reduce negative externalities of derelict sites and reducing crime.
- Increases tax revenues and decreasing their cost structure.

**4. *How do similar sized cities encourage infill development?***

The City could research how other cities analyze and encourage infill development. Although not similar in size, the following cities have addressed infill development

- Austin, TX – Special Uses are designed to permit greater diversity of housing types
- Fort Collins, CO – Adopted mixed-use commercial to serve surrounding neighborhoods
- Chattanooga, TN – Adopted suburban infill regulations to recalibrate setbacks
- Huntersville, NC – Traditional neighborhood development overlay, offers a mix of uses

**5. *Does infill development contain [urban] sprawl?***

- Perception of boundless supply of inexpensive land for development.

- Inexpensive, low-density residential and commercial in remote areas contributes to inefficient infrastructure, roads and transit.
- Sprawling development pose a risk to a city's economy, infrastructure, and natural resources.
- Studies of sprawl advocate for infill development as an important antidote to inefficient and costly patterns of land use.

**6. *Is infill development considered smart growth?***

Demographic shifts affecting the housing market:

- Retired empty-nesters desire the connectivity that urban settings provide.
- Two-thirds of millennials want to live in walkable communities to utilize public transit.
- Single-person households desire the connectivity and type of pedestrian- and transit-oriented amenities of compact infill development.

**7. *Pros and Cons of Infill?***

**Pros**

Environmental Benefits

- By reducing sprawling development in rural environments, infill preserves scenic landscapes, agriculture, natural and environmental assets.
- Creates walkable communities, reducing reliance on the automobile.
- Improves air quality and reduces greenhouse gas emissions because more compact development can minimize trip generation and reduce driving.
- Brownfield infill development provides environmental benefits through remediation of contaminated sites.

Historic Preservation Benefits. Adaptive reuse of historically important buildings and sites can offer economic development opportunities and cultivate the growth of heritage tourism.

**Cons of Infill Development**

Physical Barriers

- Environmental issues such as hazardous contamination in Brownfield sites can be a major barrier to infill development.
- Increased density as a result of infill development tends to cause more traffic and noise which can be perceived as undesirable by community members and developers.
- Existing infrastructure may be inadequate, deteriorating, or lacking capacity for many infill development projects that require higher levels of service.

NIMBY Barriers. Not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY) attitudes of community members can block infill development.

Economic Barriers. Infill development can be extremely costly for developers.

- High land acquisition costs for infill sites.

- Higher construction costs because a developer may incur for costs for rehabilitation or brownfield remediation.
- Time-consuming land use development approval and permitting processes.
- Lack of funding for infrastructure maintenance and upgrades often needed to support more dense infill development.
- Financial models used by banks can act as a barrier to securing capital investment.

**8. *Economic impact of infill development?***

Infill development encourages a more efficient investment in infrastructure because it encourages growth in designated growth areas where there is existing infrastructure already in place.

Additionally, residential infill development can expand homeownership, mixed-use development, and increase a community's tax base.

**9. *What steps would Greenville have to take to create ordinances that would encourage infill development?***

Regulatory Barriers

- Inflexible zoning codes can unintentionally restrict infill.
- Strict separation of land uses can limit innovation.
- Zoning regulations can prevent mixed-use development. Parking regulations may prohibit or limit infill development. Lengthy, costly, and unpredictable land use development approval and permitting processes can greatly deter infill development and redevelopment.

**10. *Are there other incentive options we can explore?***

- Consider incentives for redevelopment and infill development areas primed for development.
- Creating flexible zoning, site, and building regulations can promote infill development.
- Consider revising regulations to allow for mixed-use development, revise density limits, allow height and density bonuses, and reduced parking ratios in areas served by public transportation.
- Expedite the land use review process, providing an administrative review option for certain projects and waiving building permit fees.
- Conduct research to determine whether Federal or State grants are available to encourage infill development.

Chairman Parker stated he requested the information due to questions arising about infill development at the the Comprehensive Plan Committee and other task forces he has served. He feels it is necessary to have a public discussion on what the City is doing.

Mr. Weitnauer stated that with projects he has been a part of, infill is costly. He stated the Super Block project as an example of revitalization with a lot of characteristics of infill and funding sources of funds for it.

Mr. Merrill Flood, Assistant City Manager, stated that some tools are already being used by the City. He stated examples: of the Façade Improvement Grant (FIG), Tax Increment Finance Program adopted by the Redevelopment Commission, the City matches funds granted to Affordable Housing, and the Capital Investment Grant which is an incentive program.

Chairman Parker asked if there was an incentive plan for strip malls on Memorial Drive.

Mr. Flood stated it depends on the project and if there is community benefit and a return on jobs.

Ms. Leech asked if there was information on benefits for investors.

Mr. Weitnauer stated development shows cost of build/rehab and show the return on investment. He had no examples but it usually is done for profit.

Mr. Flood stated as part of an incentive package, the requirement is to make sure the project is financially sound and makes sense on how the public dollar is spent. If there is an incentive project, a public hearing would be held.

Chairman Parker asked if is there an incentive package prepared for the City to recruit business.

Mr. Flood stated yes and the Economic Development Division handles it.

Mr. Herring asked about the Tobacco Warehouse and if it could be used for infill.

Mr. Flood stated yes. The City owns it and it currently is going through Brownfield clean up. When ready it will be marketed for adaptive reuse/mixed use.

Mr. Roger Johnson, Economic Development Manager, spoke. He stated the Imperial site is a prime example of how infill development can work and improve the community. He stated it currently has barriers to future development. It needs to be cleaned and remediated before another capitalist would invest in the property. The intent of the property is a job producing component. Once completed it will be back on the tax role and bring jobs to the community so that everyone wins.

**With no further business, motion made by Mr. Schrade, seconded by Mr. King, to adjourn. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Merrill Flood, Secretary to the Commission  
Acting Director of Community Development Department