

February 3, 2010

The Greenville Planning and Zoning Commission held a Comprehensive Plan Workshop on the above date at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall.

Mr. Bill Lehman - *
Mr. Bob Ramey - * Mr. Dave Gordon - *
Mr. Tony Parker - * Mr. Tim Randall - *
Mr. Len Tozer - * Mr. Godfrey Bell, Sr. - *
Ms. Shelley Basnight - * Mr. Hap Maxwell - *
Mr. Allen Thomas - * Ms. Linda Rich - *

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

VOTING MEMBERS: Lehman, Ramey, Gordon, Randall, Tozer, Bell, Basnight, Thomas and Rich

PLANNING STAFF: Tom Wisemiller, Planner; Chantae Gooby, Planner; Harry Hamilton, Chief Planner; Sarah Radcliff, Secretary; and Merrill Flood, Director of Community Development

OTHERS PRESENT: Dave Holec, City Attorney; Thom Moton, Assistant City Manager; Pat Dunn, Mayor; Calvin Mercer, City Council; Marion Blackburn, City Council; and James Rhodes, Pitt County Planning Director

NEW BUSINESS

Horizons Plan Review Process Outline and Schedule

Mr. Wisemiller stated items 1, 2 and 4 are intended as informational items only where no action is required, nor is public comment anticipated. He said the Planning and Zoning Commission is the lead agency for this scheduled five year review. He said this is an opportunity to look at what has happened since the plan was updated and how the community can respond to the next five years of changes. Mr. Wisemiller said this is an opportunity to recommit to the vision of the *Horizons* Plan and make changes as necessary. The Preliminary Draft Report was presented by staff in November for the purpose of soliciting public input. He said this is the first workshop held on the matter and there really isn't a deadline for this process. The idea is for public forums to be scheduled as necessary to get public input and to hold public hearings at P&Z and City Council meetings. He said the *Horizons* Plan review also explores the need for changes to the *Horizons* Plan text and/or Future Land Use Plan Map, if deemed appropriate. At the same time, questions pertaining to rezoning, subdivision, and/or changes to the Future Land Use Plan Map require public hearings. Mr. Wisemiller said individual requests for amendment to the Comprehensive Plan (CP) and completion of 5-Year review require advertisement & additional analysis. After resolution of all items, by majority vote, the report/plan will be forwarded to City Council for final action. City Council will hold another public hearing to consider formal adoption of final report and ordinance.

Mr. Wisemiller reviewed the outline of the project. He said staff completed the preliminary draft report in November 2009 and presented it to P&Z at the November meeting. Staff then updated the report to include P&Z comments and recommendations. He said P&Z will hold public hearings throughout February and March and staff will present a revised draft to P&Z for final review and action in the spring. Staff will then present the P&Z recommended draft report to City Council. He said a final review report & executive summary could be completed by spring 2010.

Mr. Thomas said his impression of the workshop was that it would be more of an informational and discussion time and that they would go to the next P&Z meeting to consider approving items at that time.

Mr. Wisemiller said staff thought there would be an opportunity to vote this evening, but that it was up to the commission. He said he thought if they decided to discuss it tonight and vote at the next meeting, they may have to hold another public hearing.

Mr. Thomas said he didn't see this as a workshop if it was a voting meeting.

Mr. Ramey said that was his understanding as well. He thought this would be discussion only, with participation from the public.

Mr. Holec said they could proceed however they wanted; however, he said they were not precluded from voting on the issues tonight. He said if they wait until the next meeting to vote on the items, they would not be required to open the items back up for public comment; however they could if they wanted to.

Mr. Tozer asked if another area was brought up for consideration during the public comment period if they need to vote on it tonight to get it included in the process.

Mr. Holec said they would because those would be new issues and in order to get them in the process they would need to vote on them.

Mr. Lehman asked if it would be okay for the board to decide that after they closed the public hearing.

Mr. Holec said it would.

Mr. Parker asked if the alternates would be included in the vote to decide whether or not to vote.

Mr. Holec said they would not.

Mr. Parker said Mr. Thomas was going to recuse himself on one of the issues and asked if he would be allowed to vote on whether or not the item should be voted on tonight.

Mr. Holec said once he has been recused, he will not be able to vote.

Mr. Thomas said of the three items being presented, the footprint for one of the items seemed to be very different than what was discussed at the last meeting. He said he wanted to know who asked for the change and on what grounds.

Mr. Lehman said they would discuss that item as it came up in the agenda.

Overview of Horizons Plan Review

Mr. Wisemiller gave a quick recap on the report and its contents. He said the format for the report starts with an Introduction/How to Use Guide followed by some background on the Comprehensive Plan. He said there were four main review/analysis sections: Implementation Review; Planning for Growth & Development; Review of Requests to Change FLUPM; and Review of Rezoning Activity. He said there were some text amendment recommendations from staff followed by new recommended planning initiatives.

Future Land Use Plan Map (FLUPM) Consideration, continued from November 17, 2009 meeting – Staff presentation and public comment period.

Mr. Wisemiller said the FLUPM is not a static blueprint. He said deviating from the plan should require an argument as convincing as the one in the plan and be shown as a possibility but not necessarily easy. FLUPM amendments should be consistent with *Horizons* Plan vision and policy framework and take into consideration focus area and transportation corridors maps, transportation & other applicable plans. The amendment process includes a public hearing process where the Planning & Zoning Commission makes recommendations and City Council takes final action on the items. He said adopting or changing the map does not directly alter zoning for any property; however, future changes to the zoning map are intended to be consistent with uses shown on the Future Land Use Plan Map. Criteria for amending the FLUPM include: Is the amendment compatible or incompatible with comprehensive plan intent and objectives based on uniformity, functionality, mobility/connectivity, efficiency, integration; Have the conditions changed, and if so, were the changed conditions previously anticipated at time of plan adoption; Does location of proposed classification(s) support the intent and objective of the comprehensive plan; Would resulting anticipated land use be properly located; Is it anticipated to cause undue negative impacts; Is it a desirable and sustainable land use pattern? Mr. Wisemiller said there are three areas of interest that they are looking at tonight. These items were not in the draft CP review report. These are areas that

property owners asked the commission to consider changing on the FLUPM as part of the CP review process at the November 2009 P&Z meeting. He said they are not parcel or individual site-specific and staff will present a primary area and a secondary area that would probably be impacted by a change to the primary area.

Area 1: Highway 13 (Dickinson Avenue Extension) – Proposed SW Bypass

Mr. Wisemiller said the primary area is located on the south side of Dickinson Avenue Ext., approximately ¼ mile northeast of the intersection of Dickinson Ave Ext. and Davenport Farm Road, in the immediate vicinity of the proposed SW bypass and contains around 26 acres. The property is located in the City's extended planning area but is in Pitt County's planning and zoning jurisdiction. It is primarily RR (rural residential), with scattered GC (commercial) zoning.

Mr. Ramey said Dickinson Avenue has needed resurfacing for years and asked why it hasn't been resurfaced.

Mr. Wisemiller said he would have to look into that. He said the property is located just outside of Vision Area E. Dickinson Avenue Ext. is designated as a gateway corridor. The future SW bypass is also designated as a gateway corridor and the Future Land Use Plan Map recommends OIMF (Office/Institutional/Multi-family) for both the primary & secondary areas.

Mr. Randall asked if the secondary area should include the areas to the west as well, where it appears the bypass would be coming through.

Mr. Wisemiller said that was something they could consider. He said once the property owner asked staff to look at that area they saw other areas that shared similar characteristics that would be impacted by the changes. He said the total area was in the ballpark of what the comprehensive plan had considered for where the bypass was going. He said to add more commercial to the west could create multiple focus areas and deviate more from the plan.

Mr. Randall said if they felt like it should be included in the next five years, should they consider doing the entire area now, rather than spot zoning each parcel.

Mr. Wisemiller said part of the rationale for how the additional areas were selected was that, on the other (west) side of the planned 264 Bypass, there are residential areas that might be impacted by development of commercial in that vicinity, whereas the primary and additional areas that are being considered at present are not adjacent to any existing residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Lehman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Mike Baldwin of Baldwin Designs spoke in favor of the request. He said he represented the owners of parcel 13788, Kathryn Vincent and Daphne Richardson. He said this property is immediately contiguous to the City's current ETJ and contains about ½ mile of commercial between it and Frog Level Road. He said the property is located on a major thoroughfare and the new plans that show the southwest corridor show this road being a divided road with a grassed median in the middle. The property is only .25 miles from where the interchange will take place. He said because the property is within close proximity to an intersection it creates an intermediate focus area. Mr. Baldwin said the property is bounded on the west by a new water tower that is under construction and on the east by a commercial facility that is currently vacant. He said they have located approximately one acre of wetlands on the property. He said they would be able to serve the property with sanitary sewer through Barrington Fields subdivision. The property is currently in Bell Arthur's water district; however, they only have a six inch main in front of the property and that may not be adequate to meet fire flow demands. If that is the case, there could be a request to bring the area into GUC's service area. Mr. Baldwin said he had met with Jimmy Evans, who owns property to the south, and he supports the request. He said he had also met with staff who agreed that due to the changing locations, OIMF was no longer appropriate. He said as far as the floodplain issue goes, this was some of the highest land in the county and in no flood zone areas. Mr. Baldwin said he had met with DOT about servicing the new road after it's built and has a plan of action in place.

Ms. Betty Mabery of Mabery Lane said she had a question about the request. She said on the map she received in the mail the additional area was shown going right through her property. She said the map being shown tonight is different and asked why there is a difference.

Mr. Wisemiller said in the map that was mailed the additional area was more generalized at that point. He said staff had looked at the area a little closer since then and the bypass, even though some of the area that was eliminated wouldn't be in the right-of-way, it didn't seem like it would be feasible for commercial construction.

Ms. Mabery asked if her property would still be affected.

Mr. Wisemiller said the dotted areas were not intended to be exact boundaries.

Mr. Randall asked Mr. Wisemiller to show Ms. Mabery the anticipated area of the southwest bypass.

Mr. Wisemiller showed where the anticipated bypass would go on the map.

Mr. Randall said it was basically right through her house.

Mr. Hamilton reminded everyone that these maps were not dimensionally specific. He said they do not represent a specific line from commercial to residential to office and so forth. He asked Ms. Mabery if she was interested in staying residential or if she was interested in commercial development.

Mr. Mabery said they were interested in commercial.

Mr. Hamilton said the maps in the plan are sufficient to include their property. He said whether or not their property should be rezoned to commercial would be decided at a different stage. He told Ms. Mabery she was still in the county's jurisdiction.

Mr. Randall asked if their property would eventually be taken by the state for the bypass.

Mr. Hamilton said that was potentially correct. He said if the commission chose to change the primary and secondary areas to commercial it would involve all of the frontage of Dickinson Avenue that is to the east extending west to the right-of-way area of the proposed southwest bypass and north and south to some depth that they deem appropriate at the rezoning stage.

No one else spoke in favor or opposition to the request.

Mr. Ramey suggested they delay the voting until the next meeting.

Mr. Bell asked if they voted on it tonight if it would just put it in position to be brought back to the commission at a later date.

Mr. Holec said if the commission decided to vote and make this recommendation it would become part of the amended comprehensive plan with the LUPM and at the end of the entire process there would be a public hearing and the commission would make a decision on whether or not to recommend the entire plan to City Council.

Mr. Randall said the southwest bypass was unforeseen in this area. He said extending the commercial down Dickinson Avenue to this area was logical and asked if they really needed to rehash the issue in another meeting or go ahead and get it out of the way.

Motion was made by Mr. Randall, seconded by Mr. Bell to vote on the item at this time.

Mr. Wisemiller said in the opinion of staff, the provision of additional commercial designation(s) in the subject area would be compatible with the general intent of the comprehensive plan, given changing circumstances since 2004, therefore change is warranted.

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Bell, seconded by Mr. Tozer to approve the request. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Hamilton said they need to specify the primary and secondary areas.

Motion was made by Mr. Bell, seconded by Mr. Thomas to approve both the primary and secondary areas. Motion carried unanimously.

Area 2: Highway 33 (Tenth Street Extension)

Mr. Lehman stated Mr. Thomas would like to be recused from voting on this item. Motion was made by Mr. Bell, seconded by Mr. Gordon to recuse Mr. Thomas from voting on this item. Motion carried unanimously. Mr. Holec stated Mr. Parker would vote in Mr. Thomas's place on this item.

Mr. Wisemiller stated the primary area is located on the north side of Tenth Street and includes the intersection of Tenth Street and Moses Drive. He said the property was zoned RA-20 at the time of the ETJ extension in 1989. The requested site was rezoned in 2007 to OR and a Land Use Intensity (LUI) special use permit was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission in 2008 for Parkland Campus. Mr. Wisemiller said the site plan was withdrawn and no permits have been issued. He said the proposed area is located in Vision Area C. East Tenth Street is a designated gateway corridor. Mr. Wisemiller said the OIMF corridor was designed to be a transitional use category and the general intent of the *Horizons* Plan for the subject area is for uses to progressively transition toward the river from more high intensity uses to lower intensity uses. He said the focus areas map does not recommend additional intensive commercial activity or other similar trip generators at the subject location and the impact on nearby residential neighborhoods should be considered. Mr. Wisemiller said part of the secondary area was located outside of the city's jurisdiction. He said the existing land uses consists of a mobile home park, some single-family residential, and some vacant lots.

Mr. Bell asked why staff included the extended area.

Mr. Wisemiller said they were trying to look at it as a corridor and staff interpreted that as the primary area. Mr. Hamilton said the primary area is the area that was already zoned O&R that had the multi-family development project approved with single-family in the rear. He said that was the primary area because that was the area the property owner came before the commission in November and proposed for a change to the Land Use Plan. Mr. Hamilton said the area to the east is the area that is directly impacted by what is done in the primary area so staff includes that in the study. He said the properties to the west were owned by the city; therefore that area was not included.

Mr. Mike Baldwin spoke in favor of the proposal. He said he represented the owners of parcels 10412, 30723 and 17290 owned by V Slew, LLC, Reuben Turner and Century Financial Services Group. Mr. Baldwin said the Eastern Pines area has experienced the highest growth of anywhere in Pitt County in the last three to four years. He said high growth dictates a need for commercial zoning and this request would blend with the commercial zoning across the street. He said the property was located close to two major thoroughfares, being Portertown Road and NC Highway 33. Mr. Baldwin said NC 33 was a five lane road and currently not even close to its capacity levels. He said there was multi-family to the north that would create transitional zoning. Mr. Baldwin said V Slew LLC, in a co-op with Greenville Utilities and the City of Greenville, has installed a lift station to serve this area. He said the additional area added by staff was not desired by the applicant. He felt that area should be for transitional zoning for Rolling Meadows. He felt this area was better suited for a land use change than the rezoning across the street that was just approved for several reasons. One reason is because he didn't believe the tract to the south of the railroad tracks would ever be rezoned multi-family, leaving no transitional zoning. He said they also have better drainage outlets where they wouldn't be impacting Lake Glenwood. He said Mr. Wisemiller said this would have an impact on neighborhood subdivisions. River Hills is located about a thousand feet to the east and Rolling Meadows to the west and he had a hard time understanding how this would be a detriment to residential uses.

Mr. Wisemiller wanted to clarify that staff was not recommending any change for the additional area, just showing that the area would be impacted by the proposed change.

No one else spoke in favor of the request.

Mr. Billy Battles of Lake Glenwood subdivision spoke in opposition to the request. He said to rezone this parcel would not be keeping with the intent of the *Horizons* Plan. He said the *Horizons* Plan mentions that development is not to adversely impact transportation and traffic. Mr. Battles said more commercial property would generate more traffic and activity. He said rezoning more property to commercial does not assure jobs. He said the *Horizons* Plan speaks of smart growth, which he did not see with this proposal.

Mr. Don Williams spoke in opposition to the request because he was concerned with preserving the value of the park land. Mr. Williams said he had collected 2,600 signatures from residents of the city to protect the park land and keep it from being sold. He said decreasing the value of the park would decrease the value of the property surrounding it. Mr. Williams also said there was no natural barrier between the park and the land being proposed.

Mr. Anthony Knoll of River Hills subdivision spoke in opposition to the request. He said the proposed change would be an incompatible use for the area as stated in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Brenda Highsmith of Simpson spoke in opposition to the request. She said she was not in favor of more commercial in the area because it would bring more traffic and traffic was already bad. She said this would also increase crime in the area and spoke about the traffic accidents that have occurred on Tenth Street in the past couple of years and the fatalities associated with those accidents.

Ms. Mary Ann Montgomery spoke in opposition to the request on behalf of FROGGS (Friends of Greenville Greenways). Ms. Montgomery said that changing the property to commercial because the property across the street was commercial was not a good principal for growth and planning. She said Mr. Baldwin stated Highway 33 was not close to capacity and she felt the idea of filling all of our roads to capacity was a questionable premise. She said a standard for changing the Land Use Plan Map was that the change should be desirable and sustainable, and this was neither. She said she was especially concerned with development being friendly and accessible to bicyclists and pedestrians and this site would be neither.

Mr. Baldwin spoke in favor in rebuttal. He said this proposal would have no impact on Lake Glenwood Subdivision.

Mr. Anthony Knoll spoke in opposition in rebuttal. He said impacts to Lake Glenwood go far beyond the fact that there may be a little more traffic. He said the current zoning was much more pleasant to look at if you are sitting in a city park than would be commercial zoning.

Mr. Lehman called for a vote to see if the commission wanted to vote on this item or continue it to the next meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Bell to go ahead with the vote. Mr. Randall called for discussion. He said he would like to hear staff's recommendation before voting. Mr. Parker, Mr. Bell and Mr. Tozer voted in favor. Ms. Rich, Mr. Gordon, Ms. Basnight, Mr. Randall and Mr. Ramey voted in opposition to the motion. Motion denied.

Mr. Lehman said they would now hear staff's recommendation.

Mr. Wisemiller said the current conditions of the subject area were anticipated during the 2004 *Horizons* planning process; therefore, no change is warranted.

Mr. Randall asked if the road was considered a major thoroughfare at that time and if the growth of the Eastern Pines area was anticipated.

Mr. Wisemiller said they did not anticipate a focus area here in the 2004 planning process.

Mr. Randall asked if the property across the street was anticipated in 2004.

Mr. Hamilton said the area across the street that was just rezoned to commercial was shown on the Future Land Use Plan Map as commercial in 2004. He said nothing had changed with respect to the

road system. Mr. Hamilton said the Eastern Pines development had been continuous for many years and it would continue to be a high growth residential area.

Mr. Randall asked where the next logical place would be for a commercial node of this type.

Mr. Hamilton said there were still areas to the south that haven't been developed as well as areas towards Lowes that were available. He said staff's opinion in 2004 and today is that there is an adequate amount of commercial development in this corridor.

Mr. Maxwell said his concern was that Portertown Road was referred to as a major thoroughfare; but if you traveled on it you wouldn't get that impression.

Mr. Ramey asked if this would damage the synagogue.

Mr. Wisemiller said commercial zoning in the proposed area would definitely have an impact on the synagogue.

Mr. Lehman asked Mr. Wisemiller to compare the opportunities the landowner would have for commercial verses O&I.

Mr. Wisemiller said if the land use plan were changed for the area from OIMF to commercial and was rezoned to commercial, depending on what type of commercial, it could be used for the full range of commercial uses and everything below that. He said if the property were zoned OR you could have office space and possibly multi-family and everything below that.

Mr. Lehman called for a motion.

Mr. Holec said the motion to vote tonight was already denied and that someone who voted in opposition to that motion would have to make a motion to reconsider it. He said if no action was taken, it would go to the next meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Gordon to reconsider the motion to vote on the item tonight. With no second, the motion dies and the item is continued to the next meeting.

Area 3: Evans Street

Mr. Wisemiller said the primary area contains approximately 2.6 acres on the west side of Evans Street, in the Lakewood Pines neighborhood area, which includes Lakewood Pines subdivision, Sherwood Acres subdivision and other adjacent lots located across from the intersection of Evans Street and Kirkland Drive. The area has historically been zoned medium density residential. He said the subject site is located in Vision Area G of the Comprehensive Plan. Evans Street is designated as a connector corridor and the FLUPM recommends medium density residential (MDR) along the western right-of-way of Evans Street. He said the existing land use is single-family and in the vicinity of some multi-family. Mr. Wisemiller said no traffic report was generated because the site wasn't determined and they would need more specific dimensions; however, the property is located along a major thoroughfare. He said the floodplain map shows the floodplain running through the primary site and close to the area.

Mr. Lehman asked if this neighborhood was on the list of neighborhoods for neighborhood preservation.

Mr. Hamilton said it had been single family for many years. He said this was not included in any neighborhood plan done to date and was not part of the neighborhood task force rezoning processes. He said in the back of the neighborhood, the rear portion of the lots fronting Pineview Drive, were included in the task force rezoning; but that was to rezone the back portion of the lots with the front, which were already rezoned single-family.

Mr. Ramey said this rezoning would hurt people.

Mr. Hamilton said this was not a staff request. He said the property owner of the primary site appeared before the commission in November and suggested that OIMF would be more appropriate

in this corridor. He said staff has studied the request and would present their recommendation at the commission's request.

Mr. Parker asked if Mr. Thomas was now able to vote.

Mr. Holec said he was only excused for the one item and he was now able to vote.

Mr. Bell asked to see the picture of the primary area.

Mr. Randall said this was the one that they had received an email about (see below).

From: Stephen Brody [mailto:stephencbrody@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 02, 2010 11:55 AM
To: Harry Hamilton
Subject: Planning & Zoning Workshop 2/3/10

Dear Mr. Hamilton

My name is Stephen Brody, I own a house at 2404 Evans Street that is being considered as part of the 5 year Horizons plan, and I will not be able to attend the meeting tomorrow night. I am committed to teaching a class in Raleigh, and in all likelihood will not be able to get back to Greenville in time to speak on behalf of my property.

I would like to submit this letter to be entered into the minutes for the meeting, distributed to the members of the committee, and if possible read out loud.

My home is designated in the "Primary Area" on Evans Street that is being considered. I feel that the property has it's highest and best use as a professional office location. It has been proven throughout town that professional offices on 5 lane roads have in fact helped to buffer adjacent neighborhoods from traffic and undesirable activities.

Additionally, in looking at my property, it is extremely well buffered from the Lakewood Pines neighborhood by a creek and a large hillside. As for buffering on each side, one side has an empty lot that I own, and on the other side is a large stand of old trees and vegetation.

The property has been serving as a rental property. The rent that the property has been able to demand has been dropping due to the increasing traffic on the road. Additionally, I worry that tenants of the house with children face an increased risk for accidents due to the proximity to the 5 lane road.

The house which was built in 1962 is approaching it's 50th birthday, and while it is not an historic house it is a home that speaks and reflects the history of Greenville. I feel the historic tone to the property can best be preserved by retrofitting the interior of the house for the needs of a small professional office, while at the same time maintaining the facade in it's original state.

Thank you for accepting this letter and passing it on to the members of the Planning & Zoning Board.

Respectfully from a 30 year citizen of Greenville

Stephen C. Brody

252-321-0362

Mr. Wisemiller said that was correct. He said Mr. Brody had sent the email because he was unable to make it to the meeting.

Mr. Lehman opened the public hearing and asked for those in favor to come forward.

Ms. Jackie Leonard spoke in favor of the request. She said she was a property owner on Evans Street and also a licensed NC Real Estate Agent. She said most of the houses located on Evans Street are at the end stage of their functional and economic life. She said the thoroughfare was a major contributor to that and Evans Street is a liability and detriment to the properties as they exist as purely residential; however, if they were to become office/residential, the thoroughfare would become an asset to the property and increase the value of the property. She felt rezoning would add to the highest and best use of the property. She said rezoning would offer some transitional zoning to the area as well.

Mr. Thomas asked how many of the properties were rentals verses owner occupied dwellings.

Ms. Leonard said there were several rental properties in the area but did not know an exact number.

Mr. Wisemiller showed the map with that information to the board.

Ms. Alice Askew of Brentwood subdivision spoke in favor of the request. Ms. Askew said she was in favor of office buildings and residential for the area but not apartments. She felt the property across the street should be changed as well.

Mr. Wisemiller said they looked at the area across the street as a separate issue because of different circumstances.

Mr. Roy Beck spoke in opposition to the request. Mr. Beck said he lived next door to the property in question. He said the property being considered contained three lots, not one and he is not against the house lot being reclassified; however there are two other lots there. He said flooding was a major problem for this property.

Mr. Wisemiller said the property is all under the same ownership and the owner asked staff to look at this area.

Ms. Mary Crozier, president of the Lakewood Pines Neighborhood Association, spoke in opposition to the request. She said she had received a letter two weeks ago telling them about the request. She presented a list of 95 signatures of persons in opposition to this request to the board. Ms. Crozier said there were people in opposition to the request present this evening from the Lakewood Pines, Brentwood, and Sherwood subdivisions.

Ms. Beth Ward, of 112 Lakewood Drive, spoke in opposition to the request. She said their Homeowners Association has been on file at the courthouse since 1946 along with the covenants and restrictions. She said all of the lots in the subdivision are designated as residential. She said the area under consideration is part of Lakewood Pines. She said part of the covenants is that no lot can be subdivided or transferred as a single lot. Ms. Ward said development over the years has caused more problems with flooding for their neighborhood.

Ms. Betsy Leech of 218 Pineview Drive spoke in opposition to the request. Ms. Leech said the restrictive covenants of the neighborhood say all lots should be single-family dwellings and the lots shall not be divided. She said based on those covenants, the proposed zoning would not be allowable in this area. She said there is a lake located in the subdivision where the people who built the area felt it was important to have a place for a natural wildlife habitat. She said the neighborhood was well known for their wonderful trees and flowering shrubs. Ms. Leech said they also have a wetland behind the area with many riparian buffers extending through the neighborhood. She said the Green Mill Run runs north of Lakewood Pines and it would be impacted by any new development in the area for consideration.

Mr. Gary Gilliland of 216 Pineview Drive spoke in opposition to request. He said Mr. Wisemiller said Lakewood Pines was in the area. Mr. Gilliland said actually the lot submitted for review and all the surrounding lots, with the exception of lots in Sherwood Acres, are located within the Lakewood Pines Subdivision and subject to deed restrictions. He said it seemed inconsistent with the objectives

of the *Horizon* Plan to put a land use in that is inconsistent with the deed restrictions that have been in place longer than Greenville has had jurisdiction over this land. He said there should be a traffic study on Evans Street before this is finalized.

Ms. Mae Stancill of 110 Lakewood Drive spoke in opposition to the request. Ms. Stancill said she was most concerned with storm water runoff. She said they already have storm water damage in Lakewood Pines and this would just add to that.

Ms. Suzanne Lea of 203 Pineview Drive spoke in opposition to the request. She said the City of Greenville's Historic Preservation Commission has hired a consultant to characterize neighborhoods in the City of Greenville with respect to their historic nature and possibly put them on the register for the National Register for Historic Preservation. She said they would be looking at homes in the older section of Lakewood Pines in the near future. Ms. Lea said Lakewood Pines is the oldest subdivision in Greenville.

Mr. Dennis Mitchell of 101 Kirkland Drive spoke in opposition to the request. He said he lived across the street from the proposed site and felt changing that property would ultimately deteriorate the rest of the residential areas surrounding the property.

Mr. Ray Sobel of 110 Kimberly Drive spoke in opposition to the request. Mr. Sobel asked if there was a need for this type of change. He said it was already difficult to get onto Evans from Kirkland and thought we should be encouraging the "greening" of Greenville and not adding more concrete.

Ms. Brenda Highsmith spoke in opposition to the request. Ms. Highsmith said she resides in Simpson but visited a friend in the Lakewood Pines subdivision on a daily basis. She said it was a beautiful neighborhood and she was concerned with the traffic in the area. She had a letter regarding storm water drainage infrastructure and asked if that would be required before the area is rezoned.

Mr. Wisemiller said there was no rezoning being requested at this time, but that letter had nothing to do with a rezoning.

With no one else to speak in favor or opposition, Mr. Lehman closed the public hearing.

Motion was made by Mr. Bell, seconded by Mr. Ramey to not vote on the issue at this time. Mr. Bell, Ms. Rich and Mr. Ramey voted in favor. Mr. Randall, Ms. Basnight, Mr. Tozer, Mr. Gordon and Mr. Thomas voted in opposition. Motion failed.

Motion was made by Mr. Ramey, seconded by Mr. Randall to deny the request.

Mr. Lehman asked for staff's recommendation.

Mr. Wisemiller said in the opinion of staff, the current conditions of the subject area were anticipated during the 2004 *Horizons* planning process; therefore, no change is warranted.

In the opinion of staff, the current conditions of the subject area were anticipated during the 2004 *Horizons* planning process; therefore, no change is warranted.

Motion carried unanimously.

Recommended *Horizons* Plan Text Amendments

Mr. Wisemiller said there was a recommendation to put consideration criteria for rezoning requests and requests for changes to the FLUPM in the plan. He said the Planned Unit Development Ordinance/Master Planned Community item has been completed and moved to the Implementation section of the draft report. Mr. Wisemiller said the City Manager's office has recommended adding a Sidewalk Improvement Plan and Policies. He said the recommended amendment, if adopted, would go into the *Horizons* Plan in the Plan Elements section, Mobility Policy Statement and state the following: "The City of Greenville will adopt a comprehensive Sidewalk Improvement Plan and associated sidewalk improvement policies and ordinances to ensure that sidewalks are, pursuant to such a plan, provided for and/or constructed at the time of street extension and individual site/lot development." Mr. Wisemiller said the commission did not need to vote on these items at this time.

He said the commission could recommend any changes to these amendments or add additional ones at this time.

Mr. Randall asked if there was a sidewalk plan already in place.

Mr. Hamilton said sidewalks are required pursuant to the subdivision regulations to be installed at the time of new street construction. He said limited roads, cul-de-sacs and short loop roads are exempt from that requirement. He said sometimes a developer might build a sidewalk if there are other sidewalks in the area. He said the city, as well as the state, has a sidewalk improvement program for building sidewalks on high volume streets. He said the city currently does not have a sidewalk improvement plan that is adopted in the same sense as the thoroughfare plan where they know where all the future sidewalks will be.

Public and Commission comment period and requests for changes and/or additions to the Plan

Mr. Wisemiller said this is a time for open discussion on any portion of the current *Horizons* plan or draft report, including the Future Land Use Plan Map and other maps and an opportunity for new requests. He said the Commission's adopted public comment policy will apply. Public comments will be recorded and at the conclusion of the public comment period, any requests for changes or additions to the *Horizons* Plan or the FLUPM will be listed and the Commission will then vote to determine whether to consider each respective request at a future public meeting, whether it is a regular meeting or another workshop.

Mr. Lehman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Gary Gilliland said because this is a work in progress, staff should make it easier for the public to track changes to the plan by the date the change was made.

Ms. Betsy Leech had a question about the differences in the maps presented for the area of interest concerning Lakewood Pines. She said the conservation open space area that provides an important buffer for their neighborhood was missing from the "after" map. She said there was also a more intensive level of commercial being concentrated on that map. She wanted to be sure that the areas of conservation open space would not be changed to Office/Institutional Multi-family and that they would not be built upon. She also said she would not like to see more commercial development on Arlington around the Rose High School area.

Mr. Jim Ward asked the board to consider changing the area located at the intersection of Greenville Boulevard and 14th Street to commercial. He said three of the four corners of the intersection are already zoned commercial. Mr. Ward said he had already cleared three lots at the intersection because the houses weren't rentable. He said there is a significant presence of rented homes, vacant homes and homes for sale in the adjacent Hardee Circle area.

Mr. Parker said this was a sensitive area, like Evans Street, and stated for the record that his parents reside on Hardee Circle.

Mr. Ward said he intended to meet with the residents in the area to discuss this matter. He said there was only one single-family residence contiguous to the property and they would speak in favor of this request.

Mr. Wisemiller asked how far Mr. Ward would want to go once it was time to request a rezoning.

Mr. Ward said he would like for staff to study the area from the intersection through parcel 23076. He said he would only be asking for the first five parcels as the primary area.

Mr. Hamilton said the secondary area would probably extend down to the next intersection, which is Adams Boulevard.

Mr. Rocky Russell, developer, spoke about the deterioration of the student housing facilities in the area. He said he had spoken with several of the property managers and was told they were experiencing between forty to fifty percent vacancies and attributed that to the explosion of these types of facilities permeating Greenville. He said when R6 zoning was created, no one envisioned

this happening and he asked the board to consider being more selective when locating these types of facilities to lessen the effects of deterioration on them.

Mr. Parker asked Mr. Russell if he was asking for an occupancy ordinance.

Mr. Russell said he was just suggesting a different zoning that would allow student housing complexes because there is getting to be too many in certain areas of the city.

Mr. Hamilton said the student housing units that Mr. Russell was referring too are subject to special use permit approval of the commission, which gives them the ability to control the location of student housing within the zones where it is an option.

Mr. Jim Hoff asked the board to consider a change to the FLUPM for the area located south of Old Pactolus Road near Santee Mobile Home Park from residential to commercial. He said property to the west is already zoned commercial and property to the east is industrial. He said part of the property is in a flood hazard area; therefore, not suitable for residential zoning.

With no one else to speak, Mr. Lehman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Wisemiller said there were two requests to change the FLUPM. He said there was a request for the public to be able to see changes made to the draft plan and the FLUPM. He said there was also a request to look at some areas around the Lakewood Pines subdivision, but did not hear a specific request for a change to the plan.

Ms. Leech she objected to a conservation easement being zoned Office/Institutional/Multi-family because it is more likely that it will be developed. She said there was also an area on Arlington Boulevard marked commercial and she didn't feel there should be any more intensive uses in that area.

Mr. Wisemiller said the FLUPM was not intended to be boundary specific. He said those factors would be taken into consideration during the rezoning process.

Mr. Hamilton said of the two maps she is referring to, one is the FLUPM which does have areas that are shown as conservation open space. He said they were not easements, but areas with certain environmental characteristics such as stream systems, wetlands, or as a buffer between areas with high impact uses and areas with low impact uses. He said the other map she is referring to, where those areas no longer appear, is the zoning map. Mr. Hamilton said the entire city, including the areas underneath the green areas are zoned something and when requests for rezoning are submitted, staff knows by the green areas to have a separation of use of some type. He asked Ms. Leech for clarification on the other area she was speaking of.

Ms. Leech said she did not want more intensive commercial development around the school on Arlington Boulevard.

Mr. Hamilton asked if there was a specific location she was speaking of.

Ms. Leech said right in front of University Suites apartments.

Mr. Hamilton said that area was currently zoned that way and changing the land use plan would not do away with that zoning.

Ms. Leech said she would like to consider changing the zoning for that area.

He said the area she is referring to is already recommended in the land use plan for OIMF, which is what she is requesting, but it is currently zoned Commercial so the land use plan does not need to be amended. He said the property owner or the commission would need to initiate the rezoning of the property.

Mr. Wisemiller said Mr. Jim Ward and Mr. Jim Hoff had requested a change to the FLUPM. He said Mr. Rocky Russell made a suggestion that the approval of student housing be looked at more closely.

Mr. Lehman said he would like to take each item and vote on it separately.

Mr. Wisemiller said the first item was a request by Gary Gilliland to make it easier for the public to track changes to the draft plan and FLUPM.

Motion was made by Mr. Ramey, seconded by Mr. Gordon to study this request and bring it back at a later date. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wisemiller said the next item was the request by Mr. Jim Ward for property located at the intersection of Greenville Boulevard and 14th Street.

Motion was made by Mr. Bell, seconded by Mr. Thomas to study this item and bring it back at a later date. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wisemiller said the next item was the request by Mr. Jim Hoff for property located off Old Pactolus Road.

Motion was made by Mr. Ramey, seconded by Mr. Tozer to include this area in the study and bring it back at a later date. Motion carried unanimously.

There being no other business the meeting adjourned at 9:46p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Merrill Flood
Secretary