

# OCONEE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

415 South Pine Street - Walhalla, SC



TEL (864) 638-4218 FAX (864) 638-4168

## MIUNTES

6:00 PM, MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 2017

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

OCONEE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLEX

**Members Present:** Mr. Ownbey  
Mr. Kisker  
Mr. Lyles  
Mr. Gramling  
Mr. Johnson  
Mr. Pearson  
Ms. McPhail

**Staff Present:** David Root, County Attorney  
Bill Huggins, Zoning Administrator – Community Development  
Adam Chapman, Planner I – Community Development

**Media Present:** Dick Mangrum, WGOG

### 1. Call to Order

Mr. Ownbey called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

### 2. Invocation by County Council Chaplain

Mr. Root gave the invocation.

### 3. Public Comment for Agenda and Non-Agenda Items (3 minutes)

### 4. Approval of Minutes

Motion made to approve minutes by Mrs. McPhail and seconded by Mr. Pearson.  
Minutes approved 7-0.

### 5. Public Comment for Agenda and Non-Agenda Items (3 minutes)

Two individuals chose to speak:

- Mike Smith – Mr. Smith brought some design element suggestions for the proposed Hwy 123 Corridor Overlay and will email it to the Commission and Staff.
- Jim Codner – Mr. Codner spoke in favor of keeping the Small-Area Rezoning requirements as-is or at least similar in form and function.

## **6. Staff Updates**

Tru Hotel – Mr. Huggins spoke about the start of work on the Tru Hotel in Hartwell Village. Mr. Huggins also spoke about the administrative work of staff. He also brought up a “Ten at the Top” publication showing that Oconee County has over 30% of it’s homeowners paying more than 30% of their income on housing.

## **7. HWY 123 Corridor Overlay Ordinance**

The Planning Commission members led a detailed discussion on the proposed ordinance. Mr. Johnson noted, frontage roads, may fall beyond the scope of the Planning Commission and Staff’s ability. Mr. Johnson also noted that defining what the front of the building is and the Commission noted that the sidewalks, signage, fences, tree mitigation sections need to be modified as directed. Design standards should be added as per the County’s Comprehensive Plan and design review can be done at the Staff level with appeals process directed to the Board of Zoning Appeals. Mr. Gramling suggested that new business should be “right –in, right-out” and add “left-U-turn” lanes on Hwy123. Mr. Kisker noted that the proposed ordinance, without frontage roads, should be finalized for submittal. Mr. Johnson made the motion to direct staff to make the edits that follow and remove the frontage roads from the proposed ordinance. Mrs. McPhail seconded and voted on 7-0. Mr. Owenby led the Commission in going page-by-page in editing and updating the proposed ordinance.

## **8. Staff Presentation: Multi-family/Group development Options**

Mr. Huggins presented a variety of other County’s standards for Multi-Family and Group housing. Mr. Johnson noted that there is no current way to build multi-family without going for a variance. Mr. Pearson noted that the County should be proactive in establishing performance standards for the future before issues arrive. Mrs. McPhail suggested addressing open-space, landscaping, refuse and other parameters in any proposed amendment. Mr. Johnson noted that each zoning district that can support multi-family should have an amendment that directs developers to the multi-family section. Mr. Johnson suggested density should be reliant on a greenspace requirement as long as there is a parking space per resident. Mr. Pearson suggested leaving the setbacks where they are, in 38. Mrs. Lyles clarified that multi-family housing would be more restrictive than the current Control-Free District currently mandates. Mr. Root noted that there is no clear way for a developer to build multi-family in Control-Free Districts.

**9. Proposed amendment change regarding moving setback requirements for the Control Free District from Chapter 38 to Chapter 32.**

Mr.Root noted his method of creating three options for removal/changing the small-area rezoning. Mr.Gramling made a motion to apply zero (0) acres as the standard. There was no second to the motion. Mr.Pearson stated that 200 acres is excessive and that the 51% of property owner requirements is inappropriate. Mr. Pearson mentioned that 50 acres and 100% of property owners be the requirement. Mrs.Lyles noted that inheritance cases where there are multiple people getting 100% of property owners on the deed to sign may be difficult. Mr.Johnson stated that getting a number of people to agree on things is difficult when property is involved. Mr.Kisker offered 100 acres with 100% of property owners involved be the standard. Mr.Gramling noted that having an acreage requirement for rezoning is unique to Oconee County. Mr.Johnson posed the questions “should there be no minimum rezoning size?”. Mr.Gramling stated he is against the adjacent properties being able to rezone neighboring properties. Mrs.McPhail noted that County Council has the final say regardless of the size of the parcel, to approve or decline any petition. Mrs.Lyels posed the question “would reducing the zoning size add a large amount of work to County Council?”. Mr.Owenby mentioned that Anderson County, who has no rezoning requirements, had only 5 rezoning requests in 2016. Mr.Pearson made a motion that the language in option two, that any and all property owners must sign, the land me contiguous and there must be at least 50 acres of property. Mrs.McPhail seconded the motion. Mr.Johson asked staff if this was he appropriate place in the code to place this language. Staff agreed that this was the appropriate place. Mr.Root noted that this would make it easier for property owners to rezone. Mr.Kisker recommended amending the motion to 100 acres with 100% of property owners signing. Mrs.McPhail noted that the larger the mass of land the more future planning is protected. Mr. Owenby made a motion to amend the motion to 100 acres, Mrs.Lyels seconded. Mr.Pearson and Mr.Gramling were the dissenting votes. Mr.Owenby called for the vote on the amended motion, vote was 5-2 with Mr.Gramling and Mr.Pearson as the dissenting votes.

**10. Old Business**

No old business

**11. New Business**

**No new business**

**12. Adjourn**

Motion made to adjourn at 8:04PM

Anyone wishing to submit written comments to the Planning Commission can send their comments to the Planning Department by mail or by emailing them to the email address below. Please Note: If you would like to receive a copy of the agenda via email please contact our office, or email us at: [achapman@oconeesc.com](mailto:achapman@oconeesc.com).