



**Minutes**  
**City of Greenville**  
**Infill Development Review Committee**  
**5:30 PM November, 11, 2020**  
**Virtual Webex Meeting**

Minutes prepared by Brittney Ortiz

---

**NOTICE OF MEETING:** Agenda for this meeting was posted on November 10, 2020, via the Greenville City Website.

**City Staff:** Shannon Lavrin, Jonathan Graham, Courtney Powell, Kris Kurjiaka, Dwayne Cooper, Edward Kinney, Monique Mattison, Jordan Harris, Brittney Ortiz

**Committee Members Present:** Amanda Jones, Alan Mitchell, Bob Lloyd, Dan Einstein, Isaiah Dunlap, John Edwards, Robert Green, Sherry Barrett, Steve Mills, Yvonne Reader

**Committee Members Absent:** Reid Hipp

**Other Attendees:** Call-in User 1

**COMMITTEE MEETING:** The Infill Development Review Committee meeting continued on with city staff presenting unified drafts for the portions of the infill ordinance pertaining to neighborhood character, stormwater mitigation and management, and tree protection and replacement. Discussions at this meeting are intended to ignite final comments and retrieve approval from the committee to finalize the ordinance for City Council approval.

**AGENDA:**

**1. Welcome / Meeting Overview**

Assistant City Manager Shannon Lavrin began the meeting with greetings. Ms. Lavrin then explained a brief description of the committee's homework assignment with the objective to finalize the proposed ordinance for City Council review and approval in the coming weeks.

**2. Review General Administration and Neighborhood Character Protection**

Planning & Development Services Director, Jonathan Graham, began to display how the proposed infill ordinance headings and subject matters will be restructured and formatted. The revised structure is to be divided into four main sections involving Section 19-6.9.1 General/Administration, 19-6.9.2 Neighborhood Character Protection, 19-6.9.3 Stormwater Mitigation and Management, and 19-6.9.4 Tree Protection and Replacement. The presentation proceeded with the overall changes throughout the four sections, ensuring that the discussions resolved all of the Committee's previous concerns. While

discussing the 'Applicability' of the draft, Mr. Graham emphasized the change of the existing maximum lot coverage from 60 percent to the proposed 50 percent. When reviewing *Neighborhood Character Protection*, Mr. Graham discussed how necessary it is to limit the area of study within the same block when considering protection of the neighborhood character. The intent is to protect the city's historically older single-family residential zoned districts. Mr. Graham then addressed the committee's concerns, from the previous meeting, regarding garages, carports, driveways and parking pads with lot sizes, dimensions, and visual diagrams of properly executed front-loading garages and circular driveways. The new ordinance proposes to modify the maximum driveway width regulation within the front yard by limiting the front yard driveway width to up to 25 percent of the lot width. Mr. Graham went through all the relative dimensions, setbacks, visuals, and language to allow the opportunity for all committee members to properly understand the purpose behind the proposed revisions.

As part of the homework assignment, committee members were asked to include recommendations for exemptions under the new infill ordinance.

### **3. Review Section 19-6.9.3 Stormwater Mitigation and Management**

Dwayne Cooper, of Engineering, began his presentation of Stormwater Mitigation and Management with proposed revisions to the new ordinance. This presentation provided a broad array of single family infill stormwater mitigation techniques. When discussing *Stormwater Retention/Detention Standards*, Mr. Cooper explained that under the proposed new ordinance, the detention standards would remain the same as current regulations, ensuring that detention ponds will continue to properly blend into the neighborhoods. Mr. Cooper then addressed that major or minor stormwater permits are not currently required for single-family lots. The intent of the stormwater section of the ordinance is to provide efficient water quality and/or water quantity program standards for single-family infill lots or subdivisions. Parts (A) and (B) of the ordinance, addressing slope, are proposed to remain the same as the existing ordinance. Sections (C and D) of the proposed ordinance address how any increase or removal of impervious surfaces shall be mitigated. Additionally, this section proposes to eliminate the current maximum impervious lot coverage of 60 percent and instead implement an allowance to increase the height of the existing building, not just the footprint of the building. IDRC member Steve Mills asked, "If someone wanted to replace an old driveway with the same exact dimensions would they have to mitigate?" Mr. Cooper responded no and proposed citing the section "Applicability (C)" where it specifies "installation and/or expansion" rather than replacement.

### **4. Review Section 19-6.9.4 Tree Protection and Replacement**

Senior Landscape Architect Edward Kinney began his presentation on Tree Protection and Replacement. His presentation included images of the existing ordinance, including the overall proposed revisions for the new ordinance in redline. Mr. Kinney continued to discuss the changes and revisions under Tree Protection and Replacement. The intent of the revised section is to encourage incremental growth in tree protection, as well as, improve the environmental and aesthetic quality. Part (A) regarding *Tree Surveys*, is proposed to remain the same as the existing ordinance. Part (B) *Tree Planting* is proposed to modify the tree requirement for single-family lots from one tree per 3,000 square feet minus the building footprint to one tree per 2,000 square feet of the entire lot. With previous committee concerns about the number of trees planted, Mr. Kinney addressed four scenarios to illustrate how many trees planted would vary from the current ordinance and the new proposed ordinance. There are no proposed changes to part (C) of the ordinance regarding street tree requirements. There are no proposed changes to part (D) of the ordinance regarding heritage trees. Mr. Kinney made clear to the

committee that on private single-family lots, there are no current protections for heritage trees. This would likely remain the same in the new proposed ordinance for existing single-family lots. Mr. Kinney clarified that once the Heritage Tree section is finalized in the Tree Ordinance, Section 19-6.3 requirements will be consistent. Mr. Kinney then opened up the meeting for comments.

IDRC member Steve Mills expressed concern on how the revised ordinance would reduce the cumulative effect of the loss of tree canopy. Mr. Kinney replied that both the planting standards and quality standards are to be revised within the current tree ordinance. Mr. Kinney then explained how the changes in the new proposed ordinance to both planting standards and quality standards for planting tree types will likely improve the long-term survival rate of trees and losses. The new proposed ordinance further pushes the concept of tree mitigation to a 1 to 1 ratio to further increase the tree canopy. Mr. Kinney provided an example that if an individual takes down a 12-inch caliber tree, then that individual will need to replace with 12-inches worth of new trees on the property. IDRC member Dan Einstein expressed insurance concerns about historic trees in neighborhoods that cause age-related harm and safety problems. Mr. Einstein suggested to provide incentive opportunities for to preserve large historic trees. Assistant City Manager Shannon Lavrin agreed and informed the committee that the city is brainstorming creative ways for individuals to promote healthy tree growth. In the coming months, the city anticipates launching a tree campaign and is open to other opportunities for long-term solutions.

## **5. Closing Comments and Homework Assignment**

IDRC member, Amanda Jones, appreciated the redline visual presented by Edward Kinney and asked if all sections would be provided in redline to help visualize the adjustments to the new proposed ordinance. Staff agreed to provide the redline visuals. Committee members will receive a finalized copy of the proposed ordinance to further review and make improvements prior to the formal approval and adoption process.

## **6. Next Steps**

The next IDRC meeting will begin with a case study and proceed with discussing the homework assignment of the draft review with final comments on November 18, 2020. When the revised infill ordinance is completed and approved by the IDRC, both the Planning Commission and City Council will vote to approve, with public input at every step of the way.

**Adjourned at 7:08pm**