



MINUTES
SPECIAL FORMAL MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL
CITY HALL, 206 S. MAIN STREET, COUNCIL CHAMBERS
Wednesday, January 22, 2019 - 5:30 p.m.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
Mayor Knox H. White

2. **ROLL CALL**
The following members of City Council were in attendance: Mayor Knox White, John DeWorken, Lillian Flemming, Ken Gibson, Wil Brasington, Russell Stall, and Dorothy Dowe

PRESENTATION

At this time, Interim Planning and Development Services Director Jay Graham presented a brief summary of the Ordinance. Mr. Graham addressed the timeline of the application process regarding the rezoning; the neighborhood and public engagement involved; and the critical issues including affordable housing, scale and density, traffic and transit, project review, and the master plan. Mr. Graham went into detail regarding each of these issues and the Planning Commission's recommendations for the plan.

3. **CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS COUNCIL**

Carlos Phillips, president of the Chamber of Commerce, spoke in favor of Item 4a saying it presents a good opportunity to demonstrate greatness and bold leadership. Mr. Phillips referred to the positive economic impact the County Square project can have on the community for many years and the teamwork required to make the project be successful.

Diane Smock, 103 Cleveland Street, spoke in opposition to Item 4a and asked Council to consider if the project aligns with the goals of the City's new comprehensive plan. Ms. Smock, one of a 40-member steering committee working on this comprehensive plan, said residents have identified as their top three priorities the following: affordable housing, transportation, and open green space. Ms. Smock stated she believes different standards have been applied to the applicant because it is Greenville County and said the vote should be suspended until a new charrette style master planning process is conducted by experts.

Butch Kirven, Chair of the Greenville County Council, spoke in favor of Item 4a and said the growing City and County have become one. Mr. Kirven acknowledged change is unsettling, but change can be shaped in how it affects the common interests of all residents. Mr. Kirven thanked Felsie Harris and the Haynie-Sirrine Neighborhood Association's support of the County Square project. Mr. Kirven commented on the County's possible donation of land for the Greenville Transit Authority's maintenance facility, the contribution of \$15 million for a West End parking garage, strengthening of minority inclusion in this project, and its debt authorization.

Becky Warth, 1 Seawright Lane, Vice President of the Haynie-Sirrine Neighborhood Association, speaking on behalf of Felsie Harris, President of the group, and the group

itself, spoke in favor of Item 4a with conditions. Ms. Warth added the group's support of the project is directly tied to the conditions set forth in a letter sent to City Council: a formal process for ongoing community engagement; the City will uphold the Planning Commission's recommendations; traffic and transit needs be addressed; and proposed funding be made available for affordable workforce housing options.

David Stone, 13 N. Irvine Street, representing Stone Family Properties, spoke about his family's ownership of 100 acres of city property and the investment of 27 acres in the Haynie-Sirrine Neighborhood. Mr. Stone said he regards Greenville County as a neighbor and asks them to be a better neighbor regarding planning the County Square project. Mr. Stone questioned if Greenville County should not be required to provide affordable housing on its property in the Haynie-Sirrine Neighborhood, why should his family be committed to offering affordable housing in that area.

Susan McLarty, 204 E. Hillcrest Drive, representing the Greenville Homeless Alliance, stated she had previously addressed both Councils regarding the County Square Project and possible concerns. Ms. McLarty said she was encouraged by the progress made between the two Councils working together, but reminded City Council of the immediate need for affordable housing. Ms. McLarty stated the Alliance also has concerns about transportation, but added the group appreciates the collaborative efforts of everyone involved on the project.

Rev. Al Masters, 625 Lynndale Court, parish associate at First Presbyterian Church in Greer, spoke in opposition against Item 3a because of its potential to displace area residents near the County Square project. Rev. Masters said he had previously never ridden public transportation until two years ago and was unaware of the needs in Greenville County for affordable housing and public transportation. Rev. Masters said he now tries to speak for those who are less fortunate than himself and expressed concern for the lack of inclusive vision for the community.

Jason Smit, 111 Elm Street, spoke in support of Item 4a and said he resides in the neighborhood adjacent to the Haynie-Sirrine Neighborhood. Mr. Smit stated he now supports the County Square project because of the compromises which have been made in the plan and the concerns which have been addressed.

Ian Thomas, 209 Perry Avenue, spoke on behalf of the West End Neighborhood Association and in support of the Haynie-Sirrine Neighborhood's decision to be in favor of the County Square project. Mr. Thomas said he personally has several reservations about the project, but hopes the planning charette with the UDA Consultants will be successful.

Bob Lloyd, 14 Pinkney Street, spoke as the President of the Hampton Pinkney Neighborhood Association, and discussed challenges facing neighborhoods like his and Haynie-Sirrine from building projects including traffic impact, building mass, and building design. Mr. Lloyd referred to the need for subsequent traffic studies once a project has been completed and the need for significant downtown area developments to adhere to the master downtown plan.

Laurens Nicholson, 701 Belmont Avenue, stated he understands the magnitude of this project and believes the Planning Commission's recommendation will make the project better.

Horace Butler, Jr., 12 Dean Street, spoke as President of the Greater Sullivan Neighborhood Association and in support for the Haynie-Sirrine community's decision to back the County Square project. Mr. Butler asked Council to stand behind the Planning Commission's recommendations for the project and to consider the bus route for the Halton Road community, the placement of minority bids in writing, and the commitments to affordable housing. Mr. Butler also encouraged the continued involvement of the community in the project.

Efia Nwangaza, 202 Lavinia Avenue, spoke in opposition to Item 4a and said there is too great a shortage of affordable housing. Ms. Nwangaza stated the movement of government services away from the downtown results in more callous poverty and homelessness policies. Ms. Nwangaza said the Council has a duty not only to the Haynie-Sirrine community but to all neighborhoods in the City.

Ed Zeigler, 38 Lanneau Drive, spoke in support of Item 4a and stated the redevelopment of the County Square site is a rare opportunity to expand the downtown core and to realize very distinctive and quality architecture. Mr. Zeigler encouraged Council to advance the project while maintaining sensitivity to the surrounding areas and being bold and progressive toward the future.

SUMMARY

At this time, Mr. Graham presented a brief summary of the recommendations by the Planning Commission. These included the following: County Council's \$2 million commitment over five years with another \$5 million proposed for affordable housing; requirement of open space in the form of plazas and play areas; improvement of neighborhood connectivity via bike paths and trails; elimination of undesirable commercial uses near neighborhoods; broader area approach to traffic, mitigation traffic plans during and after construction, built-in triggers for new traffic studies, and required traffic and parking studies within five years of construction; and a scheduled master plan for the South Downtown area that is inclusive of the entire Haynie-Sirrine Planned Development and the proposed County Square sub-district contained within the Haynie-Sirrine Planned Development. Mr. Graham also discussed the Planning Commission's requirements regarding building heights, density, setbacks and buffers, parking, and the project review.

Councilmember Brasington asked for clarification regarding the South Downtown Master Plan. Mr. Graham said this plan will include the entire South Downtown area and added the Haynie-Sirrine Master Plan is a subset of the proposed South Downtown area while the County Square project is a subset within the Haynie-Sirrine neighborhood. Mr. Graham referred to the timeline for this Master Plan process, noting the stakeholder meetings and public open house will begin on February 4-5 with the plan for the adoption of the plan taking place in June.

Councilmember Dowe asked if the 3-D option was chosen as part of the plan's designs. Mr. Graham confirmed the entire South Downtown Master Plan will feature this option and provide good visuals.

4. NEW BUSINESS – (Ordinances – First Reading)

- a. Ordinance to rezone approximately 40 acres of real property located on University Ridge, Thurston Street, Howe Street, South Church Street, President Street, and Wakefield Street by creating the Greenville County Square Sub-District within the existing Haynie-Sirrine Planned Development District (Tax Map Numbers 0091010700100, 0091010700200, 0069000300300, 0069000300303, 0091010100100, 0091010200100, AND 0069000300301) (Z-10-2019)
(Presented by Interim Planning and Development Services Director Jay Graham)

Councilmember DeWorken moved, seconded by Councilmember Brasington, to approve first reading.

Councilmember Dowe moved, seconded by Councilmember Flemming, to suspend the local rule of order set forth in Section 2-78 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Greenville. The motion carried unanimously.

Councilmember Stall moved, seconded by Councilmember DeWorken, to amend the Ordinance in order to strike the Planning Commission's Conditions numbers nine and ten and adopt in their place the following: (1) the final Staff recommendations and conditions pertaining to traffic mitigation and (2) all final development plans shall be approved at the Staff level with appeal to the Planning Commission provided, however, all multi-family developments are subject to the multi-family design standards as well as the approval process and procedure set forth in the Land Management Ordinance (LMO).

Mr. Graham stated Council and audience members with printed versions could locate these items on page 64.

Mayor White stated this amendment came from discussions concerning the importance of the traffic issues related to this project and the belief multi-family projects will be the first residential developments associated with it.

Councilmember Dowe asked Councilmember Stall if suspending conditions number nine and ten would not be giving less oversight. Councilmember Stall stated it is more oversight and a better solution. Councilmember Flemming said she does not want to wait for five years to do a traffic study and prefers being able to do one earlier if it is needed. Councilmember Dowe expressed confusion over the conditions of number nine regarding mitigating traffic measures and triggers. Mayor White said the five-year period was an arbitrary figure, but due to the long-term nature of the City and County relationship during this project it is more fitting to be able to do a traffic study when needed. Engineering Services Manager Dwayne Cooper explained the build out time period involved with the traffic study as the recommendations currently state.

Councilmember Brasington asked Mr. Cooper to address the traffic mitigation plan which is currently in the Ordinance. Mr. Cooper stated all developments follow the standard procedures of the Institute of Traffic Engineers and added this development is in line with the standards in its current plans. Councilmember Brasington questioned if there was a way to approximate the monetary value, over time, of the traffic measures. Mr. Cooper replied he did not have the exact figure, but it would be in the millions of dollars. Mr. Cooper also confirmed for Councilmember Brasington City engineers felt the traffic plan met the intention of the Ordinance and a construction traffic plan had to be included and approved by City engineering.

After discussion, this motion to the amendment passed unanimously.

Councilmember Dowe asked Mr. Cooper who owns the property needed for an extension of Dunbar Street over Augusta Street through Logan Park and if those individuals had been included in any discussions. Mr. Cooper stated it was his understanding Greenville Housing Authority owns the property, is building the development known as Logan Park, and has been involved in discussions. Mr. Cooper also discussed other traffic mitigating circumstances.

Councilmember Flemming asked about the height recommendations for the County Square project. Mr. Graham verified the Planning Commission's proposal is 12 feet in height.

Councilmember Brasington moved, seconded by Councilmember Flemming, to add an additional amendment to incorporate the entire South Downtown District connectivity study done by UDA into the Ordinance. City Attorney Mike Pitts verified Councilmember Brasington was offering an additional amendment.

Mayor White warned not to be too specific about the street planning. Councilmember Brasington said his intent is to be certain to incorporate communications from the public into the plan and to include the street standards in it. Councilmember Gibson suggested examining this additional amendment before the next reading.

Councilmember Brasington moved, seconded by Councilmember Flemming, to rescind the additional amendment regarding the incorporation of the South Downtown District connectivity study.

Councilmember Dowe stated she would like the plan to refer to the 2009 Comp Plan rather than just saying Comp Plan so as not to confuse people with the GVL2040 Plan currently being created.

Councilmember Dowe asked Mr. Graham for clarification regarding the bike lanes and certain design standards in the Greenville County Square plan. Mayor White added the City always focuses on the ground level of its buildings.

Councilmember Flemming commented on the need for public transportation for Halton Road with consideration for connectivity with other bus routes as well as the inclusion of minorities and the disadvantaged for the construction bidding process.

Councilmember Dowe asked Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget Matt Efird to explain the arrival at the \$7 million figure. Mr. Efird discussed the City's financing of the parking structure and how it is financed with reference to the funds for Affordable Housing. Mr. Efird also related how the Multi-County Park Agreement plays into the revenue streams for the project.

Councilmember Dowe verified with Mr. Kirven the business plan for the project shows 61 percent of combined multi-family and hotel occupancy.

Mr. Cooper confirmed for Councilmember Dowe the maintenance responsibility for the roads involved is just during the construction phase of the project. Mr. Cooper stated once the road or right-of-way is dedicated to the City, then the City assumes responsibility for the maintenance.

Councilmember Dowe asked about specifics regarding affordable housing in the plan. Mayor White stated the City is relying on the Housing Fund for investing its funds into affordable housing land purchases. Councilmember Dowe asked for confirmation of lack of an agreement existing for land in the subdistrict for affordable housing other than what is planned for Logan Park. Interim Community and Economic Development Director Ginny Stroud verified her statement, but added the affordable housing plan for the Haynie-Sirrine Neighborhood and the County Square project is an ongoing process. Ms. Stroud added discussions have been made to offer developers incentives for building affordable housing in the County Square project.

Councilmember DeWorken commented on the collaboration within City staff, area neighborhoods, and the City and County Councils.

Councilmember Dowe asked Mr. Cooper for clarification on whether the County has full financial responsibility in the application for increasing sewer and/or stormwater if needed. Mr. Cooper verified that statement is correct.

Councilmember Dowe asked Greenville Transportation Authority Director James Keel if there is an idea for the cost or means involved to get people to the new location at Halton Road. Mr. Keel replied there has been preliminary planning to get individuals there and stated there is a route going to Mall Connector Road, which crosses over Halton Road. Mr. Keel added basic service can be provided fairly quickly without negative impact.

Mr. Keel also addressed the proposed maintenance facility and the grant GTA received in 2018 including information about the need for matching funding, in-kind services, or land donation to build the facility. Councilmember Dowe asked what is required to move forward with this facility and Mr. Keel stated there is a land donation needed. Mr. Kirven stated a land donation would have to be approved by County Council based upon a recommendation by County Administrator Joe Kernell. In response to Councilmember Dowe's question of timing, Mr. Kirven added this recommendation could take place fairly soon. Mr. Kirven stated the County is a strong supporter of public transportation.

Councilmember Dowe stated the City does not have a vehicle to ensure County Council adheres to the upcoming UDA plan. City Manager John McDonough confirmed her statement and added the County plans to participate in the upcoming planning process with the City.

Mayor White thanked everyone for participating in the process and stated he looks forward to the upcoming building.

Please find attached the comments made at this time by Councilmember Dowe for the record prior to the vote.

The amended motion carried 6-1 with Councilmember Dowe voting in opposition.

5. ADJOURN.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m.


LILLIAN FLEMMING, MAYOR PRO TEM


CAMILLA G. PITMAN, MMC, Certified PLS
CITY CLERK

MEETING NOTICE POSTED AND MEDIA NOTIFIED ON JANUARY 17, 2020.

I truly appreciate the work of all of the stakeholders who have devoted so much time to learning about this project, offering perspective, and working to reach consensus. This has not been an easy process. It has been fast paced, with an evolving set of requests and proposals as we have approached this first reading, and I thank everyone for a consistent willingness to come to the table.

I have never believed that this project or this vote was a slam dunk. It was worthy of deep research and debate and I want to preface my statements with what I have done myself to get to this vote. I began closely following the project when it came before the Planning Commission in the June work session last year, and continued through neighborhood meetings in July and August, as well as the October PC meeting where a vote was taken to support the application with conditions in a 5-2 vote. I have met with surrounding neighborhood residents, property owners, community stakeholders, local developers who are not involved with this project for an objective perspective, Phil Mayes and Mark Masaschi representing Roca Point, County Councilmember Butch Kirven, County Council member Lyn Ballard, other members of County staff, Greenville Transit Authority staff, and our own City staff who have been extremely patient with my questions and ongoing requests for more information. I have read the existing Haynie-Sirrinc Master Plan, the University Ridge Public Private Redevelopment Agreement between the County and Roca Point, the University Ridge Fiscal and Economic Impact Analysis provided by RKG, and a large stack of comments from the community received by email and regular mail. As a result of this effort, I provided a list of items to the City Manager and planning staff last week that I felt were essential to serve the needs of the surrounding community if this project moves forward, several of which I have tried to bring forward during deliberation at this meeting.

I have done this, to be consistent with how I wish to serve, and how I committed to serve prior to being elected.

I will be voting against this ordinance because of the following concerns:

1. In the area of Affordable Housing:

- There is not a pre-negotiated price for land in the proposed subdistrict, nor do we have an agreement to purchase land anywhere else in the Haynie Sirrinc neighborhood to develop workforce housing. In other words, beyond what is currently underway and planned for Logan Park, I do not expect any commitments for workforce housing in the Haynie Sirrinc neighborhood, or additional affordable housing in the Haynie-Sirrinc neighborhood, which has been the greatest concern of that community going back as far as the 2002 Master Plan.

2. In the area of Transportation:

- There is not a written commitment from the County to fully and incrementally fund the public transportation needed for a new circulator route to the Halton Road location.
- There is not a written commitment from the County to convey the property at Rutherford Rd and Worley Rd for the new GTA maintenance facility. Although not directly related to the County Square project, the issue of access to transportation is a major concern and this maintenance facility site is critical to the long term operations of Greenlink. There is no justification for continuing to delay this commitment of land, especially given the City's good faith effort to accelerate deliberations on this subdistrict vote at the County's request.

3. In the area of Master Planning to ensure as a city, we get the best outcome on this project:

- Based on the agreement between the County and Roca Point, the Overall Principles Governing the Sale of the Property, as specifically outlined in section 18.1 and 18.2, will be to maximize the land value, meaning profit from the sales. This project does not consider what is best for our City, and RocaPoint has made it abundantly clear that they are solely motivated by dollars per acre of land. Sale of each parcel will be decided by a majority of the Management Committee which consists of 3 representatives of RocaPoint, the Chairman of County Council, the Chairman of the Council Finance

Committee and the County Administrator. With this structure, the land owned by the Greenville County taxpayers will be sold at the discretion of 6 people, with an objective of maximizing profit from the land sales. This will directly contradict what we tried to address with the only existing Haynie-Sirrine master plan. In that plan, it states "The primary concern of the existing residents expressed during the entire planning process was the issue of housing affordability and displacement. People indicated concerns that they would be removed from the very neighborhood in which they grew up in favor of newer, more "Upscalen development." So that was the community's greatest concern in 2002 and unfortunately they were right to be concerned. The current Haynie-Sirrine community is not the representation of what Haynie-Sirrine should be or was planned to be some 17 years ago, and this proposed project will likely cause displacement of some remaining residents in Haynie-Sirrine and potentially the surrounding areas.

- In this process it has become clear to me that the current county square facility is outdated, inadequate, and warrants development. It is the "what" and the "how" that I am dissenting on with my vote. This is a project that was designed to provide the funds to build a \$68 million County Square facility, and permanently relocate State services to another location. It is based on a business plan that assumes 61% of the developed square footage is high end apartments and hotel space, two categories that many residents would like to see less of as we continue to grow. It became possible through the intergovernmental agreement that created the Multi-County Industrial Park (MCIP), which requires that for the next 30 years, all property tax collected on the site will go towards the project or for the economic development of Greenville County, and neither the city nor the school district will receive any of that until 2047. The only revenue to the City until 2047 will be fees from building permits, business licenses and hospitality and accomodations taxes which of course, are restricted in use.

Our Chamber of Commerce recently submitted a resolution in Support of Downtown Transformative Projects and included this proposed project as one they consider 'Transformative". The objection I have, and am expressing with my vote, is that I am not convinced at this point that this is what the City of Greenville wants to be transformed into. An additional period of time for LIDA to complete the Master Plan of the entire South Downtown, including 3D visualization which they have been commissioned to do, would allow us to fully consider public input through the charrette process with a proven and trusted expert in urban design.

Submitted for the record on First Reading of the Ordinance , January 22, 2020.