

1) The Special Use Permit (SUP) issued ORDERS relating to the JPII athletic facility provided very specific protections for the residents of the adjoining neighborhoods. Did the BOA made its Orders based on input from the Planning Department? What has changed either in the policies or staffing of the City government that the Planning Department now appears to support the removal of these protections despite the constant and vocal opposition by the residents of the affected neighborhoods?

Yes, the Planning Department always provides input on all items that come before the Board of Adjustment. Nothing has changed in policy or staffing, the property owner has requested the change as is his right. Staff has to respond to any request put before a city board or commission. In this instance, the property owner does not want to continue to operate under the SUP. He has requested to change the land development regulations that he is currently operating under. It is staff's job to respond and provide recommendations to City Council. Ultimately, the decision is up to City Council. Again, this was not staff's idea to pursue this text amendment.

2) Is there a specified percentage of the adjacent property owners who must oppose this text amendment in order for the Planning Department to recommend against it? For example if 60% of the residents in the adjoining neighborhoods are in opposition would that suggest to the Planning Department that perhaps it might not be a good idea to nullify the SUP via the text amendment route? The citizens did not ask for this amendment, the majority of the affected residents oppose the amendment and it is very obvious that there was no need for the amendment other than to accommodate one person.

There is no specified percentage of who must oppose this text amendment in order for the Planning Department to recommend against the proposal. The neighborhood seems to be under the impression that the Planning Department makes policy. Staff makes recommendations and it is up to the various city boards and commissions and, ultimately the City Council to make a final decision. Any person/entity has the right to ask for a change. It is staff's job to respond to requests. The fact that the citizens did not ask for this amendment does not negate staff's job to respond to a request. Residents are welcome to attend public input meetings and public hearings where they may voice their concerns. Up until this point, there have been three fully noticed public hearings/meetings on this subject and before this process is concluded we will have at least 2 more. At the original BOA hearing, after notification to the neighborhoods, no one voiced opposition.

3) Since this small private school text amendment would change the restrictions for all the properties in Greenville what efforts is the City making to inform all its citizens on the possible positive and negative impacts on their neighborhoods? This needs to be something other than an advertisement in the Daily Reflector as the majority of folks do not get their news from the Reflector.

The City is not required by state statute to create an exhaustive list of all citizens and keep them informed of any and all changes. Our job is to follow the applicable statutes and to notify residents of the reasonably anticipated impacts both positive and negative. This change would only potentially add protections for the other existing neighborhoods. Existing small private schools can continue to follow the existing regulations, which is their most likely course of action as they are less restrictive. In addition, the city-wide impact is somewhat limited as this change will only affect small private schools and not public schools.

4) What other recourse do the residents of Greenville have to prevent an unwanted zoning change to be imposed on them by a single developer? Is the information listed somewhere on the City's website? Is it accessible to all residents?

The recourse to stop a rezoning or a text amendment is through the Planning and Zoning Commission and ultimately through the City Council. As Tom Barnett, Director of Planning and Development Services, stated at the meeting changes can be requested at any time and the decision making authority rests with the Council. All items that come before City Council are shown on the city's website, as well as in the [Daily Reflector](#) as required by state law. Any property owner has the ability to develop their property based on development regulations and to request changes to those regulations.

5) Based on current Greenville zoning regulations, would a multisport facility available for unlimited usage be allowed to be built in such a compact site and adjacent to this level of residential density?

Yes. Often times different zoning classifications are found next to each other. These classifications can be different and enable a variety of uses. In this case, the zoning of the athletic fields is very distinct from the surrounding property. It is zoned residential-agricultural (RA20). Planter's Walk and Planter's Trail are zoned single-family and Quail Ridge is zoned for multi-family. Currently, the zoning code would allow this type of situation in several places around the city.

6) Based on current **best practices in urban planning** would a multisport facility available for unlimited usage be allowed to be built in such a compact site and adjacent to this level of residential density?

Yes, it is considered best practice to locate facilities in places most accessible to the communities they serve. A residential neighborhood next door to a sports facility falls in line with best planning practices and smart growth principles.

7) We have been told repeatedly that Rich is afraid to go back to the BOA and risk losing the SUP and yet last night we also heard that SUP's are rarely revoked. Indeed you did not seem to be able to recall any. So why is the narrative being repeated as if there is a strong likelihood that such a thing would happen and the only option therefore is to go with a text amendment?

The narrative is being repeated because it is factual. Any SUP that goes back to BOA for a change or review, is at all times, and has all parts subject to review and change by BOA. The fact that SUP are rarely revoked does not change the fact that they could be revoked or changed.

8) Can you provide examples of similar small private school text amendments in similar municipalities so we can at least see what is considered normal for this situation? If no such thing exists then why is the city of Greenville seriously considering this option.

We can not provide you examples of similar small private school regulations combined with outdoor recreational facility regulations in other municipalities. Most other communities regulate their schools (public and/or private) separately from their outdoor recreational facilities. We chose to regulate them as one entity and to create more strict protections that are not found in other communities. The other places we looked at were not as specific or restrictive as the proposed text amendment.

9) I also noted last night that often when a citizen suggested a possible regulation or change, Planning staff would defer to Mr. Balot and ask him if it was acceptable to him. My final question is who is the Planning Department serving and looking out for their best interests? Mr. Balot or the residents of the affected neighborhoods?

The Planning Department's job is to serve as an arbiter between the community and the property owner who is requesting a change to their land use rights. So when the community made a suggestion for a change, our job was to see whether or not it was acceptable to Mr. Balot, just as when Mr. Balot had a request we looked to the community to see if it was acceptable to them. Our goal is always to reach common ground between both parties so one shouldn't be surprised when we look to either side for their input.